

Dan Dediu

ROMANIAN EXPERIMENTAL MUSIC BETWEEN 1960-2000

Abstract: This study has two parts: a general theory of experiment, and a descriptive part about Romanian experimental music in the second half of the 20th century. An experiment is an adventure and its nature depends on negation. Time is always the main enemy of an experiment, because in time the experiment transforms itself into tradition. So the concept has to be always redefined and interpreted in a fluid context. From this perspective our study researches experimental music in Romania between 1960-1996. Generations of composers are observed critically according to a chronological category: the decade. In that way one can see the flow and development, in time, of some important musical ideas in Romanian compositional thinking, like heterophony, archetypal music, spectralism, events, and folklore.

Keywords: avant-garde, experimental music, Romanian music, Eastern Europe, Adorno, heterophony, archetypal music, spectrality.

Fictitious Interlude

I would have loved to have seen Adorno's face sometime during the 1950's when he found out that Stravinsky had begun to compose serially and that Schönberg had returned to the realm of tonality. I would have loved to have witnessed his spontaneous verbal response, to have opened his own opusculum of 1948 entitled "*Philosophie der neuen Musik*", and to have reminded him of his own implosive and sententious statements in which Stravinsky is called a *reactionary*, a *standard-bearer of restoration* and Schönberg a *prophet of new music*. I would then have loved to have read with him an article entitled *On revient toujours* written by Schönberg, which had just been published by the press. After having administered to him this dose of moral anaesthetic and having moved beyond the awkward moment of self-critical confession, which would have probably consisted of pensive silence, I would have confined myself to telling him – impersonally speaking – that we should not put forward and recommend aesthetic conduct while the creators are still living. I would have said: "The risk is too great!" and would have bowed before this monument of thought. But my wishes remain in the realm of imagination, as I neither saw Adorno's face at that moment nor did I succeed in inserting the well-chosen quotations – not without a trace of satisfaction – into the conversation we might have had. I couldn't even meet him and express my reproaches with a meaningful look cast at the right moment, nor did I have any possibility to communicate by less

conventional means, let's say telepathically, my disapproval of his attitude. All this could not have happened simply because I was not born at that time. However, I can carry out an experiment, thus hoping to take tardy, and obviously ideal, revenge against post-war Adornian musical criticism. I am going to ask the question that will guide us in studying a certain part of Romanian contemporary music of the 1960-1996 period, more precisely music which may be called *experimental*: are the two Adornian "poles" – Stravinsky and Schönberg – really so different in their compositional manner? Starting from this point, I'll try to define experiment within its geographical and historical context, without excluding the possibility of extending theoretical remarks to other musical cultures.

EXPERIMENT IN GENERAL

Experiment as a form of adventure

Experiment is a form of adventure, and like any adventure, bears within itself an ambiguous essence, which on one hand is *repellent*, and on the other, *attractive*.¹ Resulting from the joint, uncontrollable actions of the principles of *play* (παίδικα) and *seriousness* (σπουδή), adventure appears in a triple hypostasis, *mortal, aesthetic and amorous*, and shares that feature of time which one might call *temporal insularity*. Like a dagger, adventure incises time and transmutes its progress into singular and exemplary experiences. But this temporal insularity is not chaotic: it possesses well-defined borders, very different in nature. While we know the beginning of an adventure, its development and end escape us; we are forbidden to know them. Thus, the result of an adventure is, by definition, uncontrollable.

Experiment as a form as aesthetic adventure will accordingly be uncontrollably open-ended and indeterminate. We may establish experimental progressive parameters, or think of possible directions, but we cannot know what will happen during its evolution. Briefly, experiment can be controlled only as far as its starting point and its genesis are concerned. Teleologically speaking (since an experiment is also finally an act, and is affected by the principle of finality) there are two ways in which an experiment can end:

1. To succeed (–)
2. Not to succeed (+)

¹ Jankelevitch, Vladimir, *L'aventure, l'ennui, le Sérieux*, Paris, Aubier, 1963, pp.12–13.

1. If it succeeds the experiment turns into technique, and becomes a contextual asset which has been empirically tried and which creates existential meaning within a particular environment and conditions. The success of an experiment inevitably involves renouncing its experimental condition (cf. *supra*).

2. If it does not succeed, (or is considered a failure, either by the audience or by its creator) the experiment is abandoned and another logical variant, another experiment, is tried. History has often recorded the cases of abandoned experiments being resumed and revived after a time, only then revealing the essential content that might generate the experiment with possibilities of success.

Experiment's Nature

I have often asked myself, after first getting in touch with an artistic experiment, if the creative impulse expressed is one that negates or if there is also a second impulse which enriches the first iconoclastic impulse. It is obvious that the predominant attitude of experimentation is *negation*, in whatever form this might appear: from the negation of a tradition, either cultural or avant-garde, to the negation of another experiment. But a negation cannot exist by itself, and cannot on its own feed artistic creation. It only gives the first impulse and meaning to the creator's search: that of discovering novelty by eliminating (negating) possibilities that have already been used. Thus, experiment is a form of conquering still untrodden artistic areas, a kind of artistic "enrichment". But, just like any accumulation, this is mainly *quantitative*. Through experiment, undreamed-of realms are discovered, and newly conquered domains are mapped. However, this does not generate insight, it only accumulates quantity. To pass from quantity to quality, the amassing fever of the explorer should be followed by a farmer's insight and patience. Hence, negation comes to terms with quality in its attempt to get rid of its dependence on the things negated, but this alliance will have, as we'll see, destructive consequences on the experiment's nature.

Quality may appear in an experiment at the moment its source is identified in the creative mind. While an experiment's nature as an aesthetic idea was quantitative, the creator's nature alone is able to endow it with quality. The source of this quality is twofold: if the experiment is determined by a strong emotional creative impulse, by *emotion*, the experiment will be one of content; if the experiment generates from a previously planned aesthetic idea meant to be put into practice by a *concept*, then it will be considered an experiment of form. *Emotion* and *concept*, taken either separately or together, may turn an experiment into

a work of art, by instilling formal and content *qualities*. But while quality settles gradually in the experiment, we see the experiment being dissolved and turning into something else, into success or certainty.

Like a chrysalis, the notion of experiment disappears when it is qualitatively enriched, leaving room for the work of art to emerge like a butterfly. Its fragility rests in the transitory and ephemeral condition it creates. Any improvement of the situation will only destroy the axiological and *temporal insularity* of the experiment. Quality becomes in this context harmful, an infirmity, a sickness, as it necessitates leaving the meanwhile, the interval. An adventure of the spirit, horizontality invasive, an experiment haunts its own essence with negativity and superficiality, promoted as values *per se*.

The answer to the question I asked earlier might be the following: negation is the main ontological feature of experiment. Any interference with it by another characteristic, whether of form and/or content, is considered to be an intrusion, which, in any case, destroys experiment as such. From the not-yet-experiment, through the almost-experiment, the experiment itself, slightly-more-than-experiment, and ending in the work of art, the order of TO BE subjects the notion of experiment to a pressure whose last term is *metamorphosis*. In this sense, there is no successful experiment (cf. *infra*) because once successful, it will leave the experimental category and turn into a qualitative, valuable artistic reality.

Experiment and Tradition

Experiment can be distinguished from non-experiment only in relation to an artistic tradition. It cannot judge itself, but can only compare itself to something that had existed before, to a precedent of the same kind. Thus, experiment exists only by comparison. It sounds the realms of possibility, starting from the solid tradition that it opposes. The fundamental question of its existence would be: experiment in relation to what? G. Steiner wrote: “in the case of a radical innovation - either poetical, visual or musical (...) the reaction of the one who perceives it consists of a complex movement which incorporates *novelty* into *the already-known*”.² This mental mechanism is specific to any human perception, as described in the theorization of Zen Buddhism: the three steps in perceiving any ordinary event (visual, auditory, etc.) called *nen* follow a mental path which opens with the message received, continues with the spontaneous response to it, and ends with the immediate comparison of this stimulus

² Steiner, George, *Die Musik der Gedanken*, in *Lette International*, Heft 29, Sommer 1995, Berlin.

to previously assimilated stimuli which are part of our experience.³ In this sense experiment is determined by an existential component, which we might call tradition⁴ and in relation to which it defines itself by means of a feature called *novelty*.

Experiment as Novelty

The feature of *novelty*, which is involuntarily acquired by any experiment, is, in fact, a reflex of quantitative extension. Novelty cannot be conceived without extension, without going beyond the limits of a given framework, which I earlier called tradition. Any deviation from tradition's standards will be considered an extension and will automatically acquire the feature of novelty. When this feature is considered in an aesthetic context it is called *originality* and it involves an extremely severe condition of existence: *preliminary imitation as preparation for invention*. In the artistic field, it is impossible for something to be an invention before it has passed through the preliminary stage of imitation. And by imitation we don't mean a mere copy of tradition, but the possibility of imitating the experimental stimulus in its form. We should not insist here on the terms of imitation and invention. But we should keep in mind that the originality of an experiment should be regarded as the output of two forces operating on different levels: imitation and invention. Hence the originality of an experiment does not mean just invention, but a mysterious equilibrium between *mimesis* and *inventio*.

THE RELATIVITY OF THE NOTION OF EXPERIMENT

Novelty cannot be regarded statically, as a break with a tradition that is always the same. What we call *tradition* is continuously being changed by the inclusion of elements that, until recently, were considered to be experiments. Consequently, novelty cannot be deemed to start from the notion of an impenetrable and invariable tradition, but in comparison with a permanently redefined tradition. Analysing the *novelty* of an experiment is therefore very difficult. The versatility of novelty in relation to what we call tradition reflects another feature of experiment: *relativity*. Experimental novelty cannot be defined. There are cases when experiment is

³ Zender, Hans, *Happy New Years*, Freiburg im Breisgau, Herder, 1991, p.44.

⁴ Dibelius, Ulrich, *Komponieren gegen den Dogmenzwang, Ästhetische Konzepte nach 1945 und heute*, in Merkur, Deutsche Zeitschrift für europäisches Denken, Stuttgart, Klett-Cotta, Februar 1996, pp.115-126.

related to a cultural tradition which it negates at a certain moment – let's say the 1960s – while another experiment, thirty years later, in the 1990s, affirms what was previously negated, in the context of a tradition, this time built upon the institutionalization of the former novelty. In this sense both the attitude that negates tradition and the attitude that continues it belong to the realm of experiment. What is experiment in an *avant-garde* tradition (which may be considered as a *tradition of non-tradition* or, using Benoit Duteurtre's term, *academized anti-academicism*)?⁵

This example clarifies the fact that an experiment cannot be regarded in the same way in different contexts of different periods of time. For example, one thing is called an experiment in the 1960s, and something else is called experiment in the 1990s. Hence the notion of experiment is *contextual* and consequently *relative*.

ROMANIAN EXPERIMENTAL MUSIC

Defining the problem

Before outlining various expressions of experiment in music, that is before restricting our previous theoretical observations to the characteristics of a well-defined field, it is essential to explain the standpoint that we will further adopt, and according to which we will select the direction used to illustrate three decades of Romanian experimental art. It is obvious that the experimental impulse and its outcome – experimental art – were represented as such in Western *avant-garde* movements at the beginning of the 20th century. Thus, the influence they had, especially over young creators in Eastern Europe, was extremely powerful, fascinating and paralysing as such, from the point of view of creativity. Hence, in the context of an East-European culture, artistic experimentalism will appear under two forms, chronologically (successively) considered:

1. As an *import* of experimental ideas from Western *avant-garde* and an *imitation* of these ideas, and then
2. As the generation and creation of local experimental ideas.

In this context, we will focus our investigations only on the second form. This we'll consider only as a culture able to free itself from the influence of a certain experimental model, in order to formulate its own needs according to its specific circumstances. As a consequence of our earlier statements, we are not going to add any value judgements to the selection we'll make, because its criteria will consist in pointing out

⁵ Duteurtre, Benoit, *Requiem pour une avant-garde*, Paris, Laffont, 1995.

novelty in comparison with a permanently *redefined tradition* (cf. *infra*), and *novelty* does not necessarily imply aesthetic value. Also, if one of the experiments we cite goes beyond the condition of experiment in general and becomes a work of art (thus being given a value judgement), this will have happened only when it is assimilated as novelty and incorporated into a new, more integrating tradition than the previous one. The method we are going to use to emphasize some reference points indicating what we consider to be *originality* is very simple; it relies on a procedure of eliminating what was culturally validated, that is, what was given a name and an interpretation (a critical and aesthetic foundation), in other words was *institutionalized*. So, we'll confine ourselves to the realm of *possibility*, to what we earlier called *failed experiment*, which might however point the way towards someday finding *something else*.

Experimentation Possibilities

We'll mention some directions in which the European experimental impulse has taken since 1945, but which won't be included in our research as they have already been the subjects of many exegeses and interpretations, which have turned them into a new tradition. Designations like *dodecaphony*, *electronic music*, *concrete music*, *serial music*, *mobile opera*, *indeterminacy and opening*, *happening*, *electro-acoustics*, *instrumental theatre*, *graphic notation*, *collective creation*, *minimal and repetitive music*, *new complexity and new simplicity*, *inter- and multimedia*, *postmodernism*, coupled with impressive critical references represent experimental directions already institutionalized and integrated in an *experimental tradition*.

However, eliminating all these directions from our concerns without taking into account the temporal dimension would be a theoretical error, since all the above mentioned designations define tradition from the point of view of the year 2000. In order to properly understand experimental events and avoid falling into the trap of 'purism' we'll have to construct some conceptual elements, to be used as instruments, to help us better understand the experiment phenomenon in the context of Romanian musical culture. We therefore need to define successive traditions instead of a single updated tradition.

These *successive traditions* correspond to a psychology specific to 20th century creators, which makes conceptual distinctions between generations by means of a temporal standard which has become almost a cliché: the *decade*. According to this belief, the art of a decade will be (according to some manifestos *must be*) different from that of the previous or future decade. If we adopt this cultural preconception, then one might define a *tradition of the 1960s* and another *of the 1970s*, differently from that of

the '1980s, which in its turn differs from that of 1990s. Thus four experimental traditions are obtained between the 1960s and 1990s. The remarkable feature of this division is the fact that each tradition includes the preceding ones.

Experiment in the 1960s

Compared to the West, the Romanian musical tran in the 1960s revolved around folkloric-neoclassicism⁶ coupled with the aesthetics of socialist realism. The young generation of Romanian creators, receptive to the avant-garde trend in contradiction to Zhdanovist dogmas, came into conflict with the defenders of the purity of socialist realism (of the "heigh-rrup" style). Works that may be considered today as masterpieces of Romanian music began their life under the then insulting label of experimentalism: *Cantata III, Crossroad and Formants* by Stefan Niculescu, *Eratostene's Sieve* and the *Hourglass-cycle* by Anatol Vieru, *Columna Infinita and Masa Tacerii* by Tiberiu Olah, *Monumentum and Archways* by Aurel Stroe, *Incantations and Symmetries* by Cornel Taranu, *Textures* by Mihai Moldovan, *Studies* for orchestra by Liviu Glodeanu, *Diptych* for orchestra by Adrian Ratiu, *Concerto for piano and string orchestra* by Dan Constantinescu, *Ritual for the Thirst of the Earth* by Myriam Marbé.

Different in aesthetics and compositional technique, the above-mentioned works have in common their need to explore new realms of sound. The fact that some of them resisted the ravages of time, demonstrates that their value was not only due to experimental impulse, but that, beyond this impulse, there was always a profound musical basis.

During these years, composers like Stefan Niculescu, Aurel Stroe, and Anatol Vieru began to concern themselves with the mathematical modelling of musical structures. Stefan Niculescu investigated what he called, in a now famous study, *musical syntaxes, heterophony* in particular, and then went deeply into the analysis of formalizing rhythmic counterpoint. Aurel Stroe inaugurated a series of articles theorizing the mathematical model of "*composition classes*" and later of music based on the *catastrophe* and *morphogenesis* theories. Anatol Vieru conceived an exhaustive study of the octaviant modes from the point of view of *set theory*.

Experiment in the 1970s

When the experimentation of the '1960s was institutionalized, thus becoming itself a tradition, a new generation of creators formed another

⁶ Known under the less-flattering name of 'pasunism' (from the Romanian word pasune, meaning pastureland), designating a local type of jingoism.

“assault group”, aiming to conquer new and ever-different realms of sound. These artists took over the virulent character of innovation from the previous generation, claiming to be even more original than their predecessors. While what we earlier called the ‘1960s experiment was an outcome of various influences which post-war Western avant-garde and the exegesis of Enescu’s last compositions exerted on a whole generation of creators, the same cannot be said about the aesthetic aspirations of the composers beginning to define their personalities in the ‘1970s. They created music different from that of their predecessors, continuing John Cage’s experiments and grafting them onto Brancusian aesthetics of the essentials. And this is what gave birth to the great experimental trend of “archetypal” music. Octavian Nemescu, whose creation and personality are inextricably connected to the birth of this trend; Corneliu Cezar, fervent researcher of sound phenomena and of the correspondence between the physical macro-universe and the sound micro-universe; and Corneliu Dan Georgescu, a scrupulous apologist of the archetype and its resources, are just a few major figures of the experimental movement named “archetypal music”.

Other directions of experimental impulse are to be found in the same restless mind of Octavian Nemescu, the theorist of so-called “imaginary music”, a musical species intersecting the realms of mystical meditation and musical therapeutics.

The various tuning scales experimented in the opera *Orestia*, taken from European and extra-European traditions, led Aurel Stroe to create an extremely personal musical idiom which transcends the condition of experiment to enter the realm of axiology.

Another restless adept of experiment, different in each work, is Ulpui Vlad, whose monumental creation entitled *Mosaic* was innovative in making the most of the possibilities given by various musical ensembles. The central idea of this work, written for all the instruments of a symphonic orchestra, is based on the calculation of each instrumental combination so that, at any moment, a chamber ensemble (duo, trio, quartet, etc.) can be extracted out of the score, the result being always under control and responsible.

Spectral music was tackled by various composers, such as Fred Popovici, Lucian Metianu, Octavian Nemescu, and later in the ‘80s, by Calin Ioachimescu, as an experiment, trying to point out “the anatomy of sound”. Other sound experiments were carried out by Nicloae Brîndus and Anatol Vieru in the field of *instrumental theatre*, and by Costin Cazaban, M. Mitrea-Celarianu in that of “*conceptual music*”⁷. In the

⁷ This stock phrase used by critics seems to us pretty vague and in any case irrelevant as far the music type designated is concerned.

same decade, composer Iancu Dumitrescu, approaching the term *happening*, inaugurated with the “Hyperion” Ensemble a series of improvisation concerts which would influence his compositional manner. This is a very interesting way of tackling musical creation, one that consists in a “reversal” of the composing strategy: with Iancu Dumitrescu music was constructed by working with the performer, writing being subsequent to the “composing” itself.

Experiment in the 1980s

At the beginning of the 1980s a revival of traditional music inspiration is to be noticed, but this time in an experimental context and with an aesthetic of distillation and stylisation of certain melodico-rhythmic lines. Folk music filtered by compositional techniques derived from post-war musical thinking, such as textures, collage, stylistic allusion, effectology, now appeared in a softened form, filled with an intuitive and emotional content. This way of decanting all types of extremism – either fervently traditionalist or fanatically avant-garde - facilitated the appearance of a way of thinking shared by both the so-called 1980s generation and their predecessors, conceptually transformed under the influence of an overwhelming “Zeitgeist”. Composers like Adrian Iorgulescu (the *Hypostases* series, *Second String Quartet*, Doina Rotaru (*Concerts for flute and orchestra*, *Second Symphony*), Calin Ioachimescu (*Tempo '80*, *Musique spectrale*), Liviu Danceanu (*Quasi-Opera*, *Quasi-Fugue*, “*Great Unification*” concert), Christian Alexandru Petrescu (*May Night* for solo voice, a work worthy of the Guinness Book of Records, *Trochos*), Violeta Dinescu, Maia Ciobanu, Sorin Vulcu, Adrian Pop, and Viorel Munteanu experimented with new ways of tackling composition. However, this was without the radicalism of previous generations. One might even advance the idea of exhausting the experiment notion, and of a lack of appetite of the younger generations for the provisional character of experimentalism. The composers quoted above inserted experimental elements into their works, but their aesthetic is one of synthesis, of appropriating experimental demands and including them into a refined sound discourse, the creative impulses becoming “music” again.

Most creators of the 1980s agreed to the gradual abandonment of experimentalism and a resumption of previously rejected themes. As a matter of fact this would be the main characteristic of Romanian music in the 1990s.

Experiment in the 1990s

As a response to the concerns of some Romanian writers, young composers experimented with the controlled collective creation. Nicolae Teodoreanu, who initiated the project and created the work's writing algorithm, turned to a number of creators – George Balint, Ioan Dobrinescu, Dana Teodorescu, Mihai Vârtosu, and Dan Dediu – to carry out the experiment. Unfortunately, the lack of group cohesion between the creators involved made them abandon this project, unique in its intention in Romanian music.

Partial experiments were still carried out within the new music Ensemble: “*Archaeus*”, coordinated by Liviu Danceanu (the repertoire range of the group including extremely diverse works); and in some groups such as: *Trio Contraste* from Timisoara, *Traiect* (conducted by Sorin Lerescu), or *Ars Nova* (led by Cornel Taranu). The *spectral* music school, whose major promoters are Calin Ioachimescu and Fred Popovici, extended its scope to include a younger generation of composers. This was also due to the influence of French musical culture, known and enthusiastically promoted by interpreters such as Daniel Kientzy, Pierre-Yves Artaud or by Parisian institutes of electroacoustic music such as GRM (Group de Recherche Musicale) and IRCAM (Institut de Recherche et Coordination/Acoustique). In addition to composers tackling spectral music technique in these years, disciples of the *archetypal* school, centred on the personality of Octavian Nemescu, appeared as well. However, this movement was slightly represented by illustrative works, being confined to musical commentary and glossing over works belonging to its coordinator and initiator.

A synthesis between the *graphic notation* experiments of the '60s and '70s, those of *controlled aleatory*, electroacoustic and *concrete* music was made by Ana Maria Avram (the *Ikarus* cycle), all grafted onto tragic, troubling aesthetics. Creators like Mihaela Stanculescu Vosgianian (the *Interferences* cycle), Livia Teodorescu, Dana Teodorescu, Dora Cojocaru, Adrian Borza, Laura Mânzat, Radu Popa, Irinel Anghel, Liviu Marinescu, Bogdan Voda, Cristian Lolea, and Catalin Cretu offered possibilities for experimental impulse to develop in Romanian culture, under different coordinates from those known until then. “*Post-fiction*” chamber opera, written by the undersigned, expressed this idea from a post-modern perspective and with a *hybridization* technique exploiting different ways of expression, and musical inter-textuality (“*styles-surfing*”).

The fact that the 1990s musical experiment is not the same as that of the 1960s should not make us presume an exhaustion of its exploratory power, of its being “outdated” as an avant-garde expression, or simply, that it was dying. What we should notice is the experimental notion transformation according to a tradition ever different from one decade to

another. The lack of experimental types characteristic of the '60s from the conceptual framework of the '90s does not point to a crippling of experiment as such, but to a *change of viewpoint* regarding the meaning of experiment. Thus, the 1990s did not lack experimental impulse, as many of the creators of the previous decades stated regretfully, and who could not notice the change of mental attitude, which turned the experiment of yesterday into tradition, and hid from view its true essence.

Fictitious Postlude

My imaginary conversation with Adorno at the beginning of these pages might end with the conclusion that it isn't Schönberg who is the typical example of experimentalism in the 20th century, but it is Stravinsky. The image of the former, confined to a space delimited by strict coordinates, which he never crossed and within which he was continuously innovating, is just a cliché worthy of a simplistic Hollywood mythology, out-of-date and, obviously, far from reality. Schönberg was by no means the ossified creator that Adorno would imagine and impose on us.

However, the true experimenter of our century is Stravinsky. Because *experimenter* means adventurer, which in its turns is a permanent swinging between seriousness and play. Stravinsky's experiments, their formidable versatility which cannot overcome the impression of obvious stylistic unity, illustrate a sound musical conception: each time a new challenge, a new temptation to explore *known* or *unknown worlds*, *known worlds still unknown*, *unknown worlds yet known*. What is known? And what is unknown? These are questions that help us escape from intoxicating the future by exercising our nostalgia. They are permanently extended limits of the essence of experiment as a form of aesthetic adventure.

Bibliography

Adorno, Theodor Wiesegrund, *Philosophie der neuen Musik*, Frankfurt/Main, Suhrkamp, 1989.

Anghel, Irinel, *Orientari estetice contemporane. Muzica conceptuala (I, II)*. Revista Muzica nr. 3 (pp. 95–112) si nr. 4 (pp. 98–118), 1993.

Anghel Irinel, *Orientari estetice contemporane. Muzica minimala repetitiva*. Revista Muzica nr. 4 (pp. 30–52), 1994.

Bürger, Peter, *Ende der Avantgarde?* in Neue Rundschau, 106 Jahrgang 1995, Heft 4, Frankfurt/Main, S. Fischer Verlag, 1995, pp. 20–28.

Cezar, Corneliu, *Introducere in sonologie*, Bucuresti, Editura Muzicala, 1984.

Dibelius, Ulrich, *Komponieren gegen den Dogmenzwang. Ästhetische Konzepte nach 1945 und heute*, in MERKUR, Deutsche Zeitschrift für europäische Denken, Stuttgart, Klett-Cotta, Februar 1996, pp. 115–126.

- Duteurtre, Benoit, *Requiem pour une avant-garde*, Paris, Laffont, 1995.
- Iorgulescu, Adrian, *Timpul muzical, materie si metafora*, Bucuresti, Editura Muzicala, 1988.
- Iorgulescu, Adrian, *Timpul si comunicarea muzicala*, Bucuresti, Editura Muzicala, 1991.
- Jankélévitch, Vladimir, *L'aventure, l'ennui, le sérieux*, Paris, Aubier, 1963.
- Nemescu, Octavian, *Capacitatile semantice ale muzicii*, Bucuresti, Editura Muzicala, 1983.
- Niculescu, Stefan, *Un nou "spirit al timpului"*, Revista Muzica nr. 9 (pp. 10–16) 1986.
- Niculescu, Stefan, *Reflectii despre muzica*, Bucuresti, Editura Muzicala, 1980.
- Sandu-Dediu, Valentina, *Ulpui Vlad: a Composer's Portrait (I, II)*, Revista Muzica nr. 3 (pp. 29–43) and 4 (pp. 20–37), 1993.
- Sandu-Dediu, Valentina, *Doina Rotaru. The Flute Concertos*, Revista Muzica nr. 4 (pp. 9–17), 1992.
- Sandu-Dediu, Valentina, *Postmodernismul: un nou manierism?*, Revista Muzica nr. 3 (pp. 11–22), 1995.
- Steiner, George, *Die Musik der Gedanken*, in *Lettre International*, Heft 29, Sommer 1995, Berlin.
- Vieru, Anatol, *Cuvinte despre muzica*, Bucuresti, Cartea Romaneasca, 1994.
- Vieru, Anatol, *The Book of Modes*, Bucuresti, Editura Muzicala, 1993.
- Wehovsky, Stephan, *Notizen zu einer unmöglichen Deseinsform. Die Rolle des Intellektuellen nach dem Ende der Avantgarde*, in *Neue Rundschau*, 106. Jahrgang 1995, Heft 4, Frankfurt/Main, S. Fischer Verlag, 1995, pp. 93–108.
- Zender, Hans, *Happy New Years*, Freiburg im Breisgau, Herder, 1991.

Дан Дедиу

РУМУНСКА ЕКСПЕРИМЕНТАЛНА МУЗИКА ИЗМЕЂУ
1960. И 2000. ГОДИНЕ
(Резиме)

У раду се на неконвенционалан начин разматрају ставови о историјским улогама И. Стравинског и А. Шенберга изложени у *Филозофији нове музике* (1948) Т. В. Адорна. Још пре него што су стваралачке активности ових композитора биле завршене, њихове позиције су у тој књизи сагледаване као супротстављене: с једне стране је био Стравински као „реакционаран“ и „некрофиличан“, а с друге стране је Шенберг означен као „пророк нове музике“. Међутим, у периоду после 1949. године Шенберг објављује чланак *On revient toujours*, а Стравински започиње своју серијалну фазу. Ове чињенице неминовно воде ка закључцима да је свака непотпуна теорија ништавна (1) и да су црно-беле концепције проблематичне (2). Стога се

могу поставити два питања. Прво: да ли су *заиста* естетски ставови ове двојице композитора толико различити? Друго: да ли је могуће да композитор задржи један исти став према компоновању током целог живота? Због тога се аутор у првом делу рада бави општом теоријом експеримента.

Експеримент је авантура и његова природа је заснована на негацији и иновацији. Могуће је контролисати само почетак експеримента, док је крај отворен. Ако се покаже да је експеримент успешан, он се претвара у технику и постаје заједничка културна вредност, чиме улази у традицију. Ако је неуспешан, његова идеја ће бити напуштена, а можда ће се после извесног времена поново јавити. Време је увек главни непријатељ експеримента: историја га претвара у традицију. Зато се његов концепт мора стално редифинисати и интерпретирати у флуидном и релативизујућем контексту.

Такав концепт представљен је у другом делу студије, где се из те перспективе посматра експериментална музика у Румунији између 1960. и 2000. године. Деловање композиторских генерација критички се посматра током sukcesивних деценија. Интересантно је да су сви експериментални покрети изградили своје сопствене традиције и углавном успели да институционализују своје садржаје. Тако аутор уочава конфликт између различитих експерименталних традиција, на пример, оних из седамдесетих година у односу на оне из претходне деценије. Иако се по себи разуме да се реалан живот не одвија подељен у деценије, чини се да има основа да се догађаји у послератној Румунији посматрају управо на тај начин. Педесете године биле су под доминацијом Стаљинове идеологије, шездесете су под Чаушескуовом, на следећу деценију рефлектовали су се покрет из 1968. године и кинеска „културна револуција“, док су осамдесете и деведесете биле прожете постмодерним духом времена.

У кључне речи румунске експерименталне музике убрајају се *хетерофонија* (Стефан Никулеску, Тиберију Олах), *архетипска музика* (Мирјам Марбе, Корнелију Дан Ђорђеску, Октавијан Немеску, Корнелију Цезар), *спектрализам* (Хорацију Радулеску, Калин Јоакимеску), *хепенинг* (Јанку Димитреску, Николае Брандуш), *планетарни фолклор* (Аурел Строе).

У постлудијуму студије аутор се враћа питањима о Стравинском и Шенбергу. Излаже се идеја да се „експериментална суштина“ може више применити на првог (као што и Адорно тврди, али с другим образложењем), и то због његове разноврсности и радозналости (али не и некрофилије). У овим разматрањима треба узети у обзир чињеницу да су обојица композитора на неочекиван начин променили своје ставове према музици у периоду после објављивања Адорнове књиге. Из свега тога произлази да се експеримент (као музичка авантура) не може добро разумети ако се појмови апсолутизују.

(превела Мелита Милин)

UDC 78.031.4(498)

78.038.01(498)“1960/2000”