

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-37977-9 - Music and Society: The Politics of Composition, Performance and Reception

Edited by Richard Leppert and Susan McClary

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Foreword
The ideology of autonomous art

JANET WOLFF

The notion that Art – at least Great Art – transcends the social, the political and the everyday has been under attack for fifteen years or so, in a concerted development of work across a number of disciplines. These disciplines include the relatively new areas of cultural studies, film studies and feminist analysis, as well as the sociology of the arts, the social history of art, and minority voices within departments of English and other literatures. In all the interdisciplinary activity around these developments (new journals, conferences, courses and degrees), music is strangely absent. It is as though music claims a particular exemption from the sociological critique of culture, retaining its special quality as transcendent and autonomous.

The papers in this volume represent an important breakthrough in the study of music by challenging the notion of music as autonomous. But it is crucial to understand where this ideology of autonomous art originated, both in general and with regard to music. In this Foreword, I shall review some of the recent work which has been done on the historical construction of 'aesthetic autonomy', contrasting this with the actual social and ideological nature of all cultural products. I will then go on to consider the relative absence of music from this critical work, and look at some of the possible reasons for its apparent exemption. In particular, I want to examine the argument that music is less amenable to sociological or social-historical analysis because of its abstract or non-representational nature, and to suggest that music is not, in fact, unique in these characteristics: certain other art forms are equally abstract and non-representational.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-37977-9 - Music and Society: The Politics of Composition, Performance and Reception

Edited by Richard Leppert and Susan McClary

Excerpt

[More information](#)

2 JANET WOLFF

Moreover, even with regard to literature and representational painting, I would argue that an analysis which is restricted to the interpretation of what is represented at the level of content, character and narrative is inadequate. To that extent, music does not present any additional problems which render sociological analysis impossible.

In England during the past few years there have been heated debates about the nature, and the future, of art education. A major focus of argument, for example at the Royal College of Art in London, has been the relationship between art and design, and between art and industry. Any suggestions that art education should be relevant to the needs of industry and business have been met with that outraged reaction which invariably occurs when the sanctity and purity of Art seem to be challenged. A practical art education is incompatible with the still dominant notion that Art is an individual creation, the result of creative talent and particular inspiration, which could only be contaminated and impeded by any extra-aesthetic concerns.

Without wanting in any way to appear to be defending the specifically Thatcherite inflection of the current argument in favor of the relevance of the arts (as opposed, for example, to the very different intentions behind the nineteenth-century version of William Morris and of the Arts and Crafts Movement), I do think it is worth pointing to the totally unexamined premises on which the would-be saviors of Creativity base their defense. One relevant piece of historical information, which has been lost in the general commitment to a timeless conception of Art, is the fact that contemporary art education originated in a close relationship with industry. The schools of art and design in Britain were set up as the product of a Government Select Commission in 1835, whose concern was with design in manufacture.¹ The ideological premise that the arts ideally work outside the constraints of specific commission and of political or economic imperatives thus postdates even that relatively recent moment in the cultural formation of the industrial bourgeoisie.

The Romantic notion of the autonomy of art, which is still dominant in the late twentieth century, is essentially a product of nineteenth-century ideology and social structure. However, as Arnold Hauser and others have clearly shown, it was preceded, and enabled, by developments much earlier, and in particular by the rise, in the late Renaissance and since, of the notion of the 'artist', as distinct from the craftsperson. Hauser suggests that Michelangelo was the first 'modern artist', not in the sense that there was

¹ See, for example, Nicholas Pearson, *The state and the visual arts: a discussion of state intervention in the visual arts in Britain, 1760–1981* (Milton Keynes, 1982).

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-37977-9 - Music and Society: The Politics of Composition, Performance and Reception

Edited by Richard Leppert and Susan McClary

Excerpt

[More information](#)*The ideology of autonomous art*

3

something particular about his work which was unprecedented, but because he was associated with important changes in status and conditions of production which promoted the individual artist as creator of his work. These included: the end of dependence on the guilds; improved economic situation; abandonment of the requirement that the artist provide a guarantor for a contract; and emancipation from direct commission. Central to the new conception of art and of the artist, and closely tied to the parallel development of humanist thought, is 'the discovery of the concept of genius, and the idea that the work of art is the creation of an autocratic personality, that this personality transcends tradition, theory and rules, even the work itself'.² Over the following centuries, the individualism of the liberal-humanist thought associated with mercantile capitalism and with the bourgeoisie confirmed and reinforced the aesthetic ideology of the artist as sole and privileged originator of the cultural work.

The contemporary version of this conception, however, would not have been possible without the specific developments in the social relations of cultural production in the nineteenth century. The dissolution of the bond between artist/author and patron was more or less completed under industrial capitalism, and the artist, like other kinds of producers, was compelled to operate through the market – producing works and looking for buyers. This literal freedom from constraint (which was, of course, also the cause for many other kinds of unfreedom and new constraints) completed the image of the artist as detached from society, as working in total independence from external pressures, and as expressing his or her own personality in the work of art. Essential to this development was the growth of numerous cultural institutions which effectively mediated between the free-floating artist and potential patrons: dealers, critics, publishing houses, journals and so on. (The transformation of production of fine arts was paralleled by changes in literature, for it was also the case that much writing before the eighteenth century was produced under some form of direct patronage.)³ Thus the actual situation of the artist/author from the mid-nineteenth century helped to produce the myth that art is an activity which transcends the social. In the twentieth century, this myth has been sustained by the continued marginal existence of cultural producers, and by the persistence and proliferation of specialized arts institutions and personnel – publishers, agents, museum curators, arts editors, and even arts-funding bodies.

² Arnold Hauser, *The social history of art*, trans. in collaboration with the author by Stanley Godman (1951; reprint ed. London, 1962), II, p. 61.

³ See Diana Laurenson, 'The writer and society', *The sociology of literature*, Diana Laurenson and Alan Swingewood (London, 1972), in particular pp. 91–116.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-37977-9 - Music and Society: The Politics of Composition, Performance and Reception

Edited by Richard Leppert and Susan McClary

Excerpt

[More information](#)

4 JANET WOLFF

Finally, the idea of aesthetic autonomy has been multiply compounded by the authority of academic disciplines, notably art history, literary criticism, and aesthetics itself. The development of the notion of the artist as creative personality and free intellectual worker was endorsed by the birth of an art history which focused on artists and their work. Vasari's *Lives of the painters* (1550) is the most important early example of this tradition. The discipline of art history, to this day, has been largely a history of great artists and of great works or movements. Apart from certain relatively marginal writers, the mainstream of art history, at least in the English-speaking world, has retained and reinforced a conception of fine art as transcending the social and the historical by virtue of its status *as* art. Until the recent development of a more critical art history (informed by Marxism and feminism), there was little attempt to comprehend artistic production in its political and social context or to examine the very notion of aesthetic autonomy.

Literary criticism, too, has developed, in its rather shorter history, as an approach which sanctifies a particular literary canon in isolation from its material and social conditions of production and reception. Tony Davies has suggested that 'literature, literary ideology and literary history "came into being" at the same moment', namely the 1860s,⁴ that they legitimate one another, and that they were central, through the system of education, to the ideological formation of the unity of the English bourgeoisie. The work of Marxist critics like Terry Eagleton and Francis Mulhern has shown how the academic study of literature continues to operate as ideology, despite, or rather because of, its passionate insistence on its detachment from ideology and on the non-ideological nature of the texts it studies.⁵ Here, too, the myth of aesthetic autonomy, itself the product of specific historical developments, is guaranteed by the academic discipline which takes 'literature' as its legitimate object. And aesthetics – the philosophy of art – colludes in this exercise, since this discipline also exists in a symbiotic relationship with the idea of 'Art' as comprehensible in terms which are purely intrinsic.⁶

⁴ Tony Davies, 'Education, ideology and literature', *Red Letters*, 7 (1978), p. 7. Reprinted in Tony Bennett *et al.*, eds., *Culture, ideology and social process* (London, 1981), pp. 251–60.

⁵ Terry Eagleton, *The function of criticism: from The Spectator to post-structuralism* (London, 1984); Francis Mulhern, *The moment of Scrutiny* (London, 1979).

⁶ The contradictory features of the concept of 'autonomy' have been discussed recently by Peter Bürger, *The theory of the avant-garde*, trans. Michael Shaw (Minneapolis, 1984). Bürger (p. 35) explores the paradox that, in contemporary bourgeois society, art is *in fact* autonomous (i.e., art has become separated from other aspects of social life), while at the same time the ideology of autonomy has to be attacked in order to expose the very production of this autonomy. In this he follows Theodor Adorno, *Aesthetic theory*, trans. G. Lenhardt

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-37977-9 - Music and Society: The Politics of Composition, Performance and Reception

Edited by Richard Leppert and Susan McClary

Excerpt

[More information](#)*The ideology of autonomous art*

5

Culture, however, is a social product, and the study of culture and the arts must accordingly be sociologically informed. Here it is only possible to indicate some of the social processes which have been involved in the production of art. The social and economic factors relevant to the understanding of art include: contemporary forms of patronage; dominant institutions of cultural production and distribution (workshops, academies, art schools, publishers, galleries, concerts, music publishers, broadcasting companies, and so on – each of which has its own social history and specific social relations); the relationship of the State to cultural production (censorship, control of certain institutions, funding); the sociology of cultural producers (background, class, gender); and the nature and constitution of consumers (literacy rates, availability of cheap materials as a result of improvements in printing, reproduction and other technological developments, social divisions among audiences/viewers/readers).⁷ The history of any art is a history of the interplay of these many factors.

I have already indicated the way in which ‘Art’ itself is a historically specific fact, produced in particular and contingent social circumstances. It can also be shown that the division between ‘high art’ and both ‘popular art’ and the so-called ‘lesser arts’ (decorative arts and crafts) is based on social, rather than aesthetic, distinctions. Paul DiMaggio has demonstrated, for example, how the arts in early nineteenth-century Boston were a promiscuous mix of levels, genres and styles, which played to and were enjoyed by audiences from a wide range of social backgrounds. ‘Museums were modelled on Barnum’s . . . : fine art was interspersed among such curiosities as bearded women and mutant animals, and popular entertainments were offered for the price of admission to a clientèle that included working people as well as the upper middle class . . . Moses Kembal’s Boston Museum exhibited works by such painters as Sully and Peale alongside Chinese curiosities, stuffed animals, mermaids and dwarves.’⁸ By the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the divisions between high and popular culture with which we are familiar had been clearly made, and these divisions were firmly grounded in class divisions.

A parallel process of differentiation had also been occurring in England,

(London, 1984), p. 320. Habermas has recently made a similar point concerning art’s actual autonomy from society, and the dilemmas this produces. See Jürgen Habermas, ‘Modernity versus postmodernity’, *New German Critique*, 22 (Winter, 1981), pp. 3–14.

⁷ For examples of this type of work, see Milton C. Albrecht *et al.*, eds., *The sociology of art and literature: a reader* (London, 1970); and Howard Becker, *Art worlds* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1982).

⁸ Paul DiMaggio, ‘Cultural entrepreneurship in nineteenth-century Boston: the creation of an organizational base for high culture in America’, *Media, Culture and Society*, 4/1 (1982), p. 34.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-37977-9 - Music and Society: The Politics of Composition, Performance and Reception

Edited by Richard Leppert and Susan McClary

Excerpt

[More information](#)

6 JANET WOLFF

where the pre-industrial cultural pursuits, enjoyed on a cross-class basis, were gradually replaced by a class-specific culture, the high arts of music, theater and literature being the province of the upper-middle and middle classes, and the popular cultural forms of music hall, organized sport and popular literature providing the entertainment of the lower classes. In this process, too, the elimination of traditional cultural activities, and the introduction of new, urban-based entertainments, has to be seen in relation to the developing and problematic relationship between the bourgeoisie and the working class: the increase in what have been called 'rational recreations' was part of the effort made by the new ruling class to control the working class and to legitimate its own rule.⁹

The distinction between high art and the lesser arts has, historically, been closely tied to gender difference in the production of culture. Just over ten years ago, an American feminist art historian asked the question, 'Why have there been no great women artists?'¹⁰ and it has been a large part of the project of the feminist social history of art to try to find an answer. It is evident that the relative invisibility of women in the history of the arts is the result of a variety of exclusionary practices, changing from one period to another, but always discriminating against women. In the history of painting, for example, women artists have had difficulty in gaining admission to guilds and workshops, been excluded from membership of the academics, and been barred from the life class. Even in the history of literature, where, of course, there have been rather more female practitioners, there is plenty of evidence of institutional and ideological constraints on women. With the growing prestige of the novel in the nineteenth century, publishers increasingly favored male novelists over female novelists.¹¹ And critical practice, in literature and indeed in all the arts, has consistently undermined, neutralized and dismissed work by women.¹² In the fine arts, those areas in which women did come to outnumber men – flower painting, embroidery, and so on – were consequently downgraded in status (in a process with which we are very familiar). A recent book on the history of

⁹ For example, see Robert W. Malcolmson, *Popular recreations in English society 1700–1850* (Cambridge, 1973).

¹⁰ Linda Nochlin, 'Why have there been no great women artists?', *Art and sexual politics: women's liberation, women artists, and art history*, eds. Thomas B. Hess and Elizabeth C. Baker (New York, 1973), pp. 1–43.

¹¹ Gaye Tuchman and Nina Fortin, 'Edging women out: some suggestions about the structure of opportunities and the Victorian novel', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 6/2 (1980), pp. 308–25.

¹² See Elaine Showalter, 'Women writers and the double standard', *Woman in sexist society: studies in power and powerlessness*, eds. Vivian Gornick and Barbara K. Moran (New York, 1971), pp. 452–79.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-37977-9 - Music and Society: The Politics of Composition, Performance and Reception

Edited by Richard Leppert and Susan McClary

Excerpt

[More information](#)*The ideology of autonomous art*

7

embroidery documents the involvement of men in this practice in earlier centuries, and the evolving association of the craft with domesticity and femininity, as well as the concomitant decline in prestige of this work, from the seventeenth century, and particularly during the nineteenth century.¹³

The social basis of cultural practices and institutions is still central to the analysis of the arts in the twentieth century. Several writers have found useful the term ‘cultural capital’, taken from the work of the French sociologist, Pierre Bourdieu, to describe the way in which different social groups use culture as a kind of capital, confirming their social position, excluding other social groups, and guaranteeing the reproduction of these social divisions from one generation to another.¹⁴ The contemporary sociology of art, like the social history of art, can explore and expose the social bases of those divisions between art forms which are generally presented as purely aesthetic. Rock music is not (at least so far) cultural capital; neither is pottery-making. Soap opera on television does not rank with mainstream theater in the hierarchy of the arts. Science fiction, detective novels and romances have not yet appeared on the syllabuses of many university English degrees (except perhaps in one or two more progressive establishments, and then as optional courses, marginal to the traditional canon). In all this, the maintenance of an elite culture and of the traditional preserve of ‘high art’ operates at the symbolic level to reinforce the social power of a particular minority. But the challenge of the social-historical analysis of culture throws into disarray the dominant discourse, raising apparently insoluble problems of aesthetic judgment, cultural policy, and, on the practical level, arts funding. When the contingent nature of the ranking of the arts becomes clear, it is a little more problematic to continue to insist that the work of the Royal Shakespeare Company just *is* better than that of a local political theater group (‘better’ too being a socially-located judgment produced by those accredited with the power to make universal aesthetic pronouncements).

So far, I have talked about the institutions and social relations in which culture is produced and consumed. I have not considered the text itself – the painting, the novel, the film. It will not be surprising, however, to find that the text bears the traces of those historical processes in which it originates. A good deal of the recent work in the sociology of the arts has been the critical analysis of texts, which, moving away from art historical

¹³ Rozsika Parker, *The subversive stitch: embroidery and the making of the feminine* (London, 1984).

¹⁴ Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction: a social critique of the judgement of taste* (London, 1984); see also Paul DiMaggio and Michael Useem, ‘The arts in class reproduction’, *Cultural and economic reproduction in education: essays on class, ideology and the state*, ed. Michael W. Apple (London, 1982), pp. 181–201.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-37977-9 - Music and Society: The Politics of Composition, Performance and Reception

Edited by Richard Leppert and Susan McClary

Excerpt

[More information](#)

8 JANET WOLFF

and literary critical discussions of style and of internal characteristics of works of art, attempts to interpret the meaning of these works in terms of the social and ideological categories represented in them. Art is always ideological, not in the sense that it contains a political message, but in that its meanings are the literary/visual/filmic representation of the extra-aesthetic. The way in which women are depicted in the fine arts is integrally bound up with the way in which they are perceived in a patriarchal culture. (It is important to add that this is a two-way relationship; painting does not just 'reflect' social reality, but is also involved in its production.) The concerns of the nineteenth-century novel, as well as its formulation of issues and its silences, are the concerns of the wider society in which it was produced. The corollary of this, more recently emphasized by work on 'reception aesthetics', is that the meaning read *from* texts will be to some extent that produced by their readers/audiences. Insofar as texts are complex, offering the possibility of a variety of interpretations, then new readers will interpret through the perspective of their own experience and world-view. Meaning is never fixed, and reading is always re-reading.¹⁵

The idea of aesthetic autonomy, constructed in specific historical and social circumstances, and reinforced by the critical and ideological practices of certain academic disciplines, is beginning to disintegrate. We should not exaggerate the extent to which this socio-critical work has gained acceptance and incorporation within the mainstream of the disciplines of art history and literary criticism. Nevertheless, the sociological approach is now reflected in a large, and growing, amount of important analytical and historical work. Its use by increasing numbers of writers and teachers, and its representation in courses, texts and conferences, constitutes a major challenge to the traditional modes of thought.

The striking exception to all this, until recently, has been music. It is rare to find courses on music in interdisciplinary degrees of cultural studies. Cross-disciplinary journals which publish essays on the sociology of the arts do not often include pieces on music. And most work which has been done on what might be called a 'sociology of music' remains at the level of institutional analysis, audience research or social history. The sociology of music in the United States includes studies of the internal relations of an opera company, and of a symphony orchestra; of the nature of conducting as a profession; and of types of patronage of music.¹⁶ An interesting histor-

¹⁵ See Robert C. Holub, *Reception theory: a critical introduction* (New York, 1984); Terry Eagleton, *Literary theory: an introduction* (Minneapolis, 1983), chapter 2: 'Phenomenology, hermeneutics, reception theory'; and Hans Robert Jauss, *Toward an aesthetic of reception*, trans. Timothy Bahti (Minneapolis, 1982).

¹⁶ Rosanne Martorella, 'The relationship between box office and repertoire: a case study of

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-37977-9 - Music and Society: The Politics of Composition, Performance and Reception

Edited by Richard Leppert and Susan McClary

Excerpt

[More information](#)*The ideology of autonomous art*

9

ical study has explored the development of concert life in European capital cities in relation to the rise of the middle class, with its particular social calendar and social life, and its 'invention' of domesticity.¹⁷ Scholars of popular music have usually looked at the music industry and at those who use music (sociology of youth culture), or they have analyzed music through its lyrics.¹⁸

For both popular and classical music, there is hardly any work so far on the ideological nature of musical 'texts', that is, of the music itself, although, interestingly, one of the founding fathers of sociology, Max Weber, did attempt to analyze music (harmony, the dominant seventh, scale systems, and so on) in terms of the progressive rationalization of society.¹⁹ There have been some exceptions to this, particularly in very recent years,²⁰ but on the whole the ideology of autonomy still rules in the study of music. This may be partly explained by the more specialized and technical knowledge which sociologists and social historians untrained in musi-

opera', *Sociological Quarterly*, 18/3 (1977), pp. 354–66; and also Robert Faulkner, 'Orchestra interaction: communication and authority in an artistic organization'; Jack B. Kamerman, 'The rationalization of symphony orchestra conductors' interpretive styles'; and Stephen R. Couch, 'Patronage and organizational structure in symphony orchestras in London and New York'; all in *Performers and performances: the social organization of artistic work*, eds. Jack B. Kamerman and Rosanne Martorella (New York, 1983).

¹⁷ William Weber, *Music and the middle class: the social structure of concert life in London, Paris and Vienna* (London, 1975). See also Alice M. Hanson, *Musical life in Biedermeier Vienna* (Cambridge, 1985).

¹⁸ For example, Richard A. Peterson and David G. Berger, 'Cycles in symbol production: the case of popular music', *American Sociological Review*, 40/2 (1975), pp. 158–73; also Simon Frith, *Sound effects: youth, leisure and the politics of rock 'n' roll* (London, 1981); Dick Hebdige, *Subculture: the meaning of style* (London, 1979), and Alan Durant, *Conditions of music* (Albany, 1984), chapter 6: 'Rock today: facing the music'.

¹⁹ Max Weber, *The rational and social foundations of music*, trans. and ed. Don Martindale, Johannes Riedel, and Gertrude Neuwirth (Carbondale and London, 1958). The work of Theodor Adorno on the sociology of music also stands out as a major exception to this generalization. See, for instance, his *Introduction to the sociology of music*, trans. E.B. Ashton (New York, 1976), and *Prisms*, trans. Samuel Weber and Shierry Weber (1967; reprint ed. Cambridge, Mass., 1981).

²⁰ See, for instance, Jacques Attali, *Noise: the political economy of music*, trans. Brian Massumi (Minneapolis, 1985); John Blacking, *How musical is man?* (Seattle, 1973); Dave Laing, *One chord wonders: power and meaning in punk rock* (Milton Keynes, 1985); Susan McClary, 'Pitches, expression, ideology: an exercise in mediation', *Enlitic*, 7 (1983), pp. 76–87; Richard Norton, *Tonality in Western culture* (University Park, Penn., 1984); John Shepherd et al., *Whose music? A sociology of musical languages* (London, 1977); Christopher Small, *Music – society – education* (London, 1977); Rose Rosengard Subotnik, 'Adorno's diagnosis of Beethoven's late style: early symptom of a fatal condition', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 29 (1976), pp. 242–75, and 'The historical structure: Adorno's "French" model for the criticism of nineteenth-century music', *19th Century Music*, 2 (1978), pp. 36–60; Leo Treitler, 'History, criticism, and Beethoven's Ninth Symphony', *19th Century Music*, 3 (1980), pp. 193–210, and "'To worship that celestial sound": motives for analysis', *Journal of Musicology*, 1 (1982), pp. 153–70.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-37977-9 - Music and Society: The Politics of Composition, Performance and Reception

Edited by Richard Leppert and Susan McClary

Excerpt

[More information](#)

10 JANEF WOLFF

cology feel unable to engage in and thus inhibited from approaching.²¹ Yet, apart from the mystique surrounding music, there is nothing to prevent anyone from learning about harmony and composition, and since there are plenty of people who have this expertise – musicians, music critics, and music historians – there must be other reasons why the idea of autonomy continues to attach to music so much more tenaciously than to the other arts.

In the sociological study of the arts, it is literature which has proved the most amenable to analysis in terms of ideology-critique and textual semiotics. It appears that the literary text, with its range of characters, narrative line, and linguistic codes, provides a subject-matter which can easily be discussed in terms of social-historical ‘types’ (Engels, Lukács), class world-views (Lucien Goldmann),²² or bourgeois forms of theater (Raymond Williams).²³ That is, the content of the literary text is very often the basis of a socio-critical study. Similarly, in the case of representational painting, the sociological de-coding is likely to depend on character/person depicted or narrative/event portrayed: the nude as part of patriarchal culture,²⁴ the growing problems of class relations as manifested in changing portrayals of rural workers,²⁵ or Goya’s paintings and engravings as expressing the social and political contradictions of Bourbon Spain.²⁶ Representational and figurative arts do present one obvious level of interpretation by which we can connect the social and ideological to what is represented in the text.

Music, on the other hand, is abstract and non-representational. (I am, of course, ignoring music with words or lyrics – songs, opera, popular music – on the assumption that what is problematic is not the analysis of the linguistic, but the de-coding of the music itself.) Music does not represent bourgeois characters, gender relations, or political conflicts, at least in any literal or visible manner. For this reason, it is often argued that music somehow does transcend the social and the contingent in ways which literature, film and representational painting do not. I want to conclude by contesting this claim, in order to suggest that the non-representational character of music is no explanation for its exemption from sociological analysis.

²¹ See Frith, *Sound effects*, p. 13, on his own lack of ‘the vocabulary and techniques of musical analysis’.

²² Lucien Goldmann, *The hidden god: a study of tragic vision in the Pensées of Pascal and the tragedies of Racine*, trans. Philip Thody (London, 1964).

²³ Raymond Williams, ‘Social environment and theatrical environment: the case of English naturalism’, *Problems in materialism and culture* (London, 1980), pp. 125–47.

²⁴ John Berger, *Ways of seeing* (Harmondsworth, 1972).

²⁵ John Barrell, *The dark side of the landscape: the rural poor in English painting 1730–1840* (Cambridge, 1980).

²⁶ Gwyn A. Williams, *Goya and the impossible revolution* (London, 1976).