

Dāvis ENGELIS

# Discourse of Authority and Implicit Power Relations in Music Criticism in the Latvian Mass Media

*Autoriteto diskursas ir užslėpti galios santykiai Latvijos žiniasklaidoje skelbiamuose muzikos kritikos straipsniuose*

Jāzeps Vītols Latvian Academy of Music, K. Barona iela 1, Rīga, LV-1050, Latvija  
engelis.davis@gmail.com

## Abstract

According to the linguist Roman Jakobson, we use language by applying several language functions to our speech (Jakobson 1960). Therefore, we cannot expect to extract all meanings from a text by looking at it only at an explicit level. Language is a problem, and the same goes for music criticism. By using discourse analysis (DA), the reader can interpret the implicit meanings of the text, which include: 1) construction of a critic's self-image and authority, 2) an increase or a decrease in the social distances between audiences and the classical music industry, and 3) an interpretive answer on how critics in the mass media put into words what they hear at a concert. Here, I argue that DA reveals two important aspects of music criticism: how music critics perceive the functions of music criticism and the function of language in criticism.

The origin of this study lays in the interest of the situation of music criticism in the Latvian mass media. Thus, I conclude this paper with an analysis of reviews written by two Latvian music critics.

**Keywords:** classical music criticism, authority discourse, language functions, discourse analysis, implicit meaning, mass media.

## Anotacija

Anot kalbininko Romano Jakobsono, kalbėdami naudojamės keliomis kalbos funkcijomis (Jakobson, 1960). Todėl nagrinėdami tekstą tik sąmoningai, visų jo prasmių nesuprasime. Kalba problemiška; tą patį galima pasakyti apie muzikos kritiką. Pasitelkdamas diskurso analizę, interpretuotojas gali perskaityti užslėptas teksto reikšmes, tokias kaip: 1) kritiko savivokos, autoriteto konstravimas; 2) socialinės distancijos tarp publikos ir klasikinės muzikos industrijos didėjimas arba mažėjimas; 3) interpretacijos, kaip kritikai žiniasklaidoje perteikia žodžiais tai, ką išgirdo koncerte. Šiame darbe teigiama, kad diskurso analizė atskleidžia du svarbius muzikos kritikos aspektus, susijusius su tuo, kaip šio meno kritikai suvokia kritikos paskirtį ir kritikoje naudojamas kalbos funkcijas.

Ši tyrimą paskatino domėjimasis muzikos kritikos padėtimi Latvijos žiniasklaidoje. Darbas baigiamas dviejų latvių muzikos kritikų parašytų recenzijų analize.

**Reikšminiai žodžiai:** klasikinės muzikos kritika, autoriteto diskursas, kalbos funkcijos, diskurso analizė, užslėpta reikšmė, žiniasklaida.

## Introduction

The article is part of my master's thesis, which is still in development. I presented a part of it at the 46<sup>th</sup> Baltic Musicological Conference "Cultural Change and Music Criticism" in Vilnius, 2018. I will at times refer to the authors that spoke before me and who had insights that fit into my theme.

The title given in the conference booklet and on my first drafts of the thesis is as follows: *Discourse of Music Criticism in Reviews about Classical Music in Mass Media: A Case Study of Latvia, USA, and Great Britain*.

From the moment I began this study, I was interested in the discourse of music criticism in the mass media. During

the first year of studies, I narrowed down this theme to the discourse of authority and implicit power relations in classical music reviews. In this article, I focus on music reviews written by two Latvian critics.

In this article, I will focus on a few aspects of music criticism:

1) music criticism is no exception to the way discourse analysis (DA) looks at the text. It implies that:

2) music criticism should be considered in the context of its social properties;

3) music critics use language to talk about music by both explicitly sharing their subjective views and evaluations of art and by implicitly trying to objectify their subjective views and evaluations.

## The structure of the text

First, I will continue the introductory part by giving a few definitions and a brief overview of the data used in my thesis.

Second, I will point out some keywords and key concepts central to DA and the discourse of authority.

Third, I will then use these concepts as a foundation for the qualitative analysis of two reviews written by Latvian music critics.

In the fourth part—the conclusions—I will emphasize some points of concern (in my opinion) about music criticism (I work occasionally as a freelance music critic). During the conference in Vilnius, Aušra Kaminskaite raised one such concern in her paper “Emigrant Critics”—the humiliation of an artist by the critic.”

DA looks at the text as a problem, and here I refer to Teun van Dijk, who has characterized critical discourse analysis (CDA) as analytical discourse research that primarily studies the way social-power abuse and inequality are enacted, reproduced, legitimated, and resisted by *text* and *talk* in the *social* and political context (van Dijk 2015). Thus, I understand the meaning of discourse as the social use of language.

In this study, I argue that language is not a solution—so to speak, a well-made tool we can use to communicate about music, but rather a problem—a multi-functional system (let’s take, for example, the six functions of language by Roman Jakobson (Jakobson 1960), which is filled with meanings both explicit and implicit). To paraphrase the words of van Dijk, CDA focuses on discourses within, not outside their social contexts (van Dijk 2015: 467).

That fully concerns music critics as well. The presumption that music critics—innocently, so to speak—evaluate concerts and recordings and selflessly serve the highest ideals of art without any relation to social contexts may be suitable to the critical tradition of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century. As we will see below in the examples given by Nicolas Slonimsky, the high ideals of the critic are questionable even when we look back at those times (the earlier days of music reviews).

Music critics, alongside music producers and PR specialists, speak extensively about classical music publicly. Also, classical music critics implicitly construct themselves as authorities and experts in their reviews.

This idea stems from the work by Russian linguists Mikhail Bakhtin and Valentin Voloshinov. I’ll quote a short passage by Graham Allen, one of the greatest scholars of intertextuality:

Bakhtin and Voloshinov argue against Saussure that “there is no real moment in time when a synchronic system of language could be constructed” (1986: 66). This is because language is always in a “ceaseless flow of becoming.” Language, seen in its

social dimension, is constantly reflecting and transforming class, institutional, national and group interests. No word or utterance, from this perspective, is ever neutral. (Graham 2000: 18)

In other words, language use implicitly shows how we represent reality. There are different ways that we can talk about something, and the usage of different grammatical properties can imply different attitudes.

## Keywords, definitions

I’ve already defined the discourse of this study and what I mean by this term. Before we go further, let’s look at a few other central keywords and definitions.

### Criticism

As David Beard and Kenneth Gloag have described *criticism*, pinpointing the key concepts of musicology, “can be understood as the regular activity of reviewing concerts and recordings” (Beard and Gloag 2016). In this exact sense, I use the term “music criticism” in this study.

Now, I also use the term classical music to narrow down the focus. As general, unfocused and problematic it may be, I use the term “classical music” in its most general meaning; that is, the sorts of music that so-called classical music critics write about are quite diverse, ranging from concerts by symphony orchestras, chamber ensembles, and opera productions to multimedia projects and contemporary music performances. May I add, so as not to pass by this detail as self-explanatory, that any of these terms may overlap and none of them excludes the other.

From the perspective of media editors-in-chief, writing reviews about classical music usually means to write about symphonic concerts, whatever the application of terms “classical” or “popular,” “academic,” or “non-academic” may best suit the actual music played, as well as chamber music concerts, opera productions, and music festivals curated by major concert venues.

Thus, I may not exclude from this study a text written by the classical music critic about, say, an electronic music festival or a popular music concert.

### Data

I began this study by building text corpora from classical music reviews written by Latvian, American, and English critics. In this paper, I will show an analysis of reviews by two Latvian critics. In addition, I will show a few examples of similarities in the language use of American critics to provide general insight into how differently the critics describe music and interpretation. A substantial comparison between the reviews of Latvian, American, and English critics is a task for future research.

There are not many music critics in the Latvian media and even fewer regular reviewers of classical music events. The majority write for the biggest local newspapers. Therefore, I have also chosen foreign music critics who write for some of the major newspapers, excluding professional music magazines of any sort. All the reviews chosen for analysis were published in 2017 or 2018.

Another argument of choice is that all these critics write regularly about the musical events at their local cultural institutions. Accordingly, the majority of the Latvian music critics, particularly those who appear at my study, write regularly about concerts organized by the main music institutions in Latvia, in particular, the Latvian National Symphony Orchestra, the chamber-orchestra *Sinfonietta Riga*, the Professional Orchestra Riga, opera productions at the Latvian National Opera, and a number of chamber music concerts and fewer multi-media concerts that usually fall under the categories of classical music or classical contemporary music.

A similar local context applies to American music critics. For example, Alex Ross (*The New Yorker*) and Anthony Tommasini (*The New York Times*) write elaborately about the New York Symphony Orchestra. They also review the productions at the Metropolitan Opera and write extensively about chamber-music concerts.

### *Implicit meaning in the text*

Teun A. van Dijk writes:

Implications and presuppositions are powerful semantic properties of discourse that aim to obliquely assert “facts” that may not be true, as when politicians and the media refer to the violence of demonstrators or the criminality of minorities (van Dijk 2015: 473).

In the context of a concert review by a music critic there are—I may assume, for the most part—no political ideologies to submerge or hide; rather, the DA will focus on critics’ points of view, attitudes, and positions, which, even if not explicitly articulated in the text, may be revealed with the DA.

Before we continue with the analysis of Latvian critics’ reviews, I have provided in the next several paragraphs some examples of language use that are typical criteria for a DA that are applied to the analyzed text. Note that these examples of language use can be merged into one sentence and overlap, as we will see in some examples.

### *Nominalization*

Nominalization means actions turned into objects, verbal processes turned into nouns. Here is an example, taken from (Kress and Hodge 1979):

strikers picket a factory => picketing

An activity which was initiated and performed by miners in a specific place and time now seems to have an autonomous existence. Furthermore, the new verb created by nominalization can appear as the actor in a new construction, thus making the decoding of its meaning even more obscure. Guntar Kress and Robert Hodge characterize nominalization as follows:

... there are two major effects associated with that transformation, which amount to a quite radical changing of the original form. First, although we know that there was an actor and an affected, the specific identities of both have been lost. We can guess about their identity, but we can never be certain. Second, in the resulting surface form the only thing that meets us is the verbal version of the action which was performed, and in this way, our attention is directed to what is present and directed away from what is no longer there. So the focus of the expression has been altered by the speaker, our vision has been channelled and narrowed. A last effect, which is perhaps somewhat more subtle, lies in the change in nature of the concept from *verb* to *noun*, and all the attendant changes in meaning which that change entails. (Kress and Hodge 1979: 21)

### *The passive transformation*

Norman Fairclough writes:

Agentless passives [...] leave causality and agency unclear. In some cases—and this is also true for nominalization—this may be to avoid redundancy if that information is already given in some way. In other cases, it can be obfuscation of agency and causality. (Source of quotation)

Take a look at this example:

I wrecked the car > The car was wrecked

Here the active voice is turned into a passive voice, thus making the action more ambiguous. “The car was wrecked” is an agentless passive: the actor is removed, so we do not know who wrecked the car. The deletion of the actor goes in hand with agentless passives and nominalizations. When a music critic, for example, says: “It is presumed that...” (instead of: “I presume that...”) they implicitly take their assumption for granted: in other words, what they have presumed ought to be general knowledge, and everybody else should think the same.

Here are two examples taken from reviews by Latvian critics. They may sound a little odd in English because of the differences in syntax and word choice,<sup>1</sup> but the main goal is to illustrate the passive transformation in a context of music criticism.

For example, in one of the reviews, the Latvian critic writes: “There is an inkling...” But the critic could have said “I have an inkling” and it would be a different sentence. In another review, the phrase “A gratification could be felt”

appears. As I said, hardly anyone (of the English critics that I have read) would use such a form in their reviews. With these examples, I wanted to underline the noticeable presence of agentless passives in Latvian music reviews.

### ***Delocution***

Delocution (also the French *délocution*) is more a general term to describe a speech act where the actor and the receiver are obscured, absent, or objectified. Delocution also implies removing the actor; so, instead of the phrase, “I think the concert was bad,” I may say, “The audience’s reaction showed that the concert was bad.” Here, delocution hides the sender of a message and grounds the evaluation of artwork with *argumentum ad populum*.

### **Using terminology without explaining the meaning of it**

The practice of using terminology without explaining its meaning obscures the meanings implied by the critic and makes the review more vulnerable to questioning—what did they mean by using a certain term?

### ***Linguistic tools***

In DA, I rely on linguistic classifications that can help reveal the implicit meanings of the text (mainly language modalization defined by the French linguist Patrick Charaudeau [1995] and the six language functions identified by the Russian-American linguist Roman Jakobson [1960]). Below, I give a brief example of two of Jakobson’s language categories more characteristic either to Latvian or American music critics.

### ***Two language functions in criticism***

When the corpora of Latvian and American music reviews started to build up, the most distinctive difference I noticed was the specific proportions of the referential function in the Latvian reviews and the poetic function in the American reviews. I would like to quote what Jakobson has said about the language functions:

Although we distinguish six basic aspects of language, we could, however, hardly find verbal messages that would fulfil only one function. The diversity lies not in a monopoly of some one of these several functions but in a different hierarchical order of functions. The verbal structure of a message depends primarily on the predominant function. (Jakobson 1960)

This idea can also be applied to music critics. Obviously, none writes completely referentially and none is completely poetic in their reviews. But a hierarchical order of functions can be noticed and a predominant function can be discerned with DA.

A side-note: at least at this stage of the study I don’t make a generalization that Latvian critics write referentially and American critics write poetically. Instead, I want to give the reader an idea of how differently these authors approach the discourse of music criticism. Below, I give a brief description of how the referential and the poetic functions of language help to interpret the implicit power relations in a review about classical music.

*The referential function*—a message in relation to reality. In a music review, this function helps to answer the question: *what did I hear?* and to project one’s knowledge of the actual musical event—a recording or a concert. A predominance of this function together with particular uses of grammar shows the critic as an objective listener or showing their judgments as implicitly objective.

*The poetic function* (also: emotive, expressive function)—a message in relation to oneself—in a music review, this function helps to answer the questions: *how did I hear it?*, *how did it sound?*, and *what was it like?*, or *what did I experience* by perceiving this artwork? The predominance of this function shows the critic as a *subjective listener* or showing their judgments as explicitly subjective.

### ***Metaphor***

The musicologist Nicholas Cook (1990) argues that besides judging an artwork, criticism can also contribute greatly to the creation or discovery of new meanings. He also speaks of the evaluative function of art criticism as excessive and unnecessary, being in opposition with the American philosopher Noel Carroll, who sees the evaluative function—judging the artwork as good or bad—as the core function of art criticism (Carroll 2009). However, it is important to remember that Cook emphasizes the differences between music criticism and (in his example) literary criticism, while Carroll speaks of art criticism in general.

Nicholas Cook refers to authors who have spoken about criticism as a form of engaging with an artwork. Martyn Evans in his dissertation *The Participant Listener* argued that:

... when we succeed in conveying an insight via a fruitful metaphor, what we have done is not merely to reflect on the aesthetic object but to engage in it. (Cook 1990: 20)

Teun A. van Dijk, shows the power of metaphor in another light:

Specific discourse structures, such as topics, arguments, metaphor, lexical choice, and rhetorical figures, among many other structures [...] may influence the contents and the structures of a mental model in ways preferred by the speakers. (van Dijk 2015: 472)

Indeed, the metaphor can be used to convey implicit social and political meanings. However, in regard to music criticism, the metaphor and other types of figurative speech

can make the review easier to perceive for wider audiences instead of relying on heavy usage of terminology. Thus, I can argue that a critic widens or narrows the audience of classical music (or the number of people who engage in classical music discourse in the mass media), based on the critic's language use in a review.

In Table 1 are some examples of metaphorical language from reviews by American music critics. I am certain, on the basis of my engagement with Latvian music criticism, that such diversity of figurative speech is typically alien to Latvian music critics. I have sketched a brief typology of the variety of comparisons used by American critics to describe music ranging from visual to physical. And there is even an example of music being compared to a scent.

**Table 1.** A brief typology of the comparisons used by the American music critics

VISUAL	PHYSICAL	SCENT
hazy, shimmering <b>music</b>	steamy <b>music</b> of Jugendstil Vienna	orchid-scented <b>music</b>
violet <b>harmonies</b>	liquid <b>rhythms</b>	
glittering <b>panorama of sound</b>	explosive opening <b>tocatta</b>	
	complex, enveloping nebulae of <b>sound</b>	
	darkly radiant mass of <b>sound</b>	
	soft, lushly diatonic <b>chord</b>	
	milky <b>passagework</b>	

## Analysis

Let us take a closer look at some reviews of two Latvian music critics who are among the most regular reviewers for the classical music scene in Latvia—Armands Znotiņš and Inese Lūsiņa. I will focus on the implicit power relations between the critic and the reader and the ways the critics construct their image. In this qualitative analysis, I focus on the descriptions, reflections, and judgments of music and musicians. I do not delve into general descriptions of events that have no direct relation to describing the artwork. In the quotations the reader will see some sections highlighted in italics—those are my emphasis with the intention to draw the reader's attention to a specific aspect of language.

I chose to present the analysis of Znotiņš's review about the Sansuī open-air festival, published in *satori.lv* on August 23, 2017 (Znotiņš 2017) and Lūsiņa's review about the concert "Courland's Ring," published in *diena.lv*

on November 30, 2017 (Lūsiņa 2017). In the analysis of Lūsiņa's review, I also quote from the review about the 75th anniversary concert of Aleksandrs Viļumanis, published in *diena.lv* on November 24, 2017 (Lūsiņa 2017a) and the review about the concert of *Musicaeterna* and *Sinfonietta Riga*, published in *diena.lv* on October 26, 2017 (Lūsiņa 2017b).

### *Analysis 1: the review by Armands Znotiņš*

The first concert of the open-air festival that appears in Znotiņš's review happens in a grain dry-house. Znotiņš begins by paying attention to specific details and describing his first impressions of the acoustics in the dry-house. Znotiņš lets the reader know as many as four times that what he heard has made some kind of impression directly on him. It is typical for Znotiņš to answer the question—what did music arouse in me?—by making the performance or some of the musical parameters a subject of the sentence or an actor that has done something ("the gradual change of the thematic phases *sustained an unremitting attention*," "the material of the musical intonations and the rhythmical structures *inspired* to an equal extent," "the interpretation . . . *created an impression*") [emphasis mine—D. E.]. In addition to these examples, in another Znotiņš writes:

Secondly, there's (one has)<sup>2</sup> an inkling that [...]. (here and below quoted from Znotiņš 2017)

It should seem obvious that this inkling belongs to no one other than Znotiņš himself, but the actor in the sentence has disappeared, thus creating an impression that such an inkling could happen to anyone who has listened to the same musical piece. In that same review, there are examples that put the authority discourse in motion with the help of language use much more effectively.

Znotiņš writes:

One should think that *the composer didn't have to be disappointed* in the level of precision achieved by the ensemble led by Normunds Šnē [emphasis mine—D.E.]

The author creates an implicit presumption that, from the viewpoint of the composer, the precision level of the ensemble was adequately high. This sentence would become more neutral had Znotiņš added that he learned this by speaking with the composer after the concert. Here, we can do nothing else but to read between the lines. Thus, the reader can develop a notion of the critic's position, from which the critic can survey not only the position and opinion of the composer but also the audience. Right after the quote above Znotiņš continues:

... there's only one problem—it is doubtful whether any of the listeners really fully comprehended the composer's intention. What was described in the program as an "interactive wide-format video-projection, an abstract sound painting,

in a way, where the four audio channels of the composition will play out on an oscilloscope,” in the Aknīste drying house, unfortunately, turned into an optional shadow theater, but in order to understand what the composer wanted to say with the English text by Artūrs Punte the public should be given a chance to get acquainted with the libretto in the score [...].

In this quote from the review, Znotiņš continues to project his opinion through a third-person view, this time by speaking on behalf of the listeners and audience. The description given by the author is problematic because it does not make clear sense of whether he shares his own perception of the composition or if he deliberately assumes the position of a gate-keeper, a defender of the public. In other words, Znotiņš doesn't say that it was *he* who didn't fully comprehend the composer's intention or that *he himself* felt he should have been given a chance to get acquainted with the libretto. From the viewpoint of DA (Fairclough and van Dijk), Znotiņš's ambiguous position can be interpreted as an acknowledgement of his authority by implicitly attributing to himself the power to speak on the behalf of other listeners. Yet, it does not stop him from giving a positive evaluation of the artwork.

Further in his review, Znotiņš discusses the new piece by composer Platons Buravickis. There he repeats a similar method, this time combining in one sentence both an evaluation of the artwork and interpretation; the problem is that Znotiņš's evaluation doesn't come from him but from the conductor of the piece, Normunds Šnē:

The interpretation led by Normunds Šnē, which, by the way, this time stood out with a much better balance between the acoustic and electronic lines of the score, signified that Buravickis has achieved a striking concert-piece: the gradual change of the thematic phases sustained unremitting attention during the whole performance; the material of the musical intonations and the rhythmical structures suggested to an equal extent and by constantly various timbral variations and melodic impulses, the creative intensity expressed in “Demontage Aesthetic” didn't lose its tension, not for a single moment.

Within the framework of one extended sentence, Znotiņš manages, first, to dissociate himself from his evaluation, and second, to identify the ability of the music to sustain unremitting attention and to suggest. Several questions arise when we read this paragraph: did the striking quality of Buravickis's piece derive from Šnē's interpretation, or does Znotiņš's designation dedicated to Buravickis still relate to the interpretation? If the former is true, was the unremitting attention and suggestion described below experienced by the conductor or the critic? In order to avoid giving the reader a notion that this questioning is simply splitting hairs, take a closer look at the conclusion of the sentence:

... the creative intensity expressed in “Demontage Aesthetic” didn't lose its tension, not for a single moment.

The sentence begins with an evaluation of the interpretation; immediately, an evaluation of the artwork follows (“a striking concert piece”) and then a subjective emotional experience (the reader should assume that it's the experience of the critic). In the meantime, Znotiņš explains what he meant by “a striking concert piece,” and he concludes with the phrase “the tension of the creative intensity” which, we could assume, sums up everything else mentioned in the quote.

On the other side, as Znotiņš describes in one sentence both the interpretation of the conductor and the piece written by Buravickis, it becomes even harder to find logical ties from which we could deduce what is said about whom or what refers to whom. Especially because Znotiņš ascertains the musical parameters but does not explain or interpret them in relation to the musical piece. For example, he calls the “timbral variations” a quality that's present in Buravickis's composition but doesn't say what exactly varied in Buravickis's piece—did the timbre change from, for instance, delicate to sharp, from one orchestra group to other, from piercing and unpleasant to warm and pleasing? In other words, in the description of the artwork and interpretation, Znotiņš puts groups of concepts one after another, referentially ascertaining their presence but not interpreting their meaning. Let us reduce the same quote to the subjects of the sentence to see more clearly how many constructions of concepts and terms a reader must go through in a single sentence:

interpretation>balance>acoustic and electronic lines>striking concert-piece>thematic phases>unremitting attention>intonative material>rhythmical structures>timbral variations>melodic impulses>creative intensity>tension

Here, at least two weak points of Znotiņš's reviews appear—first, complicated, dense syntax combined with a heavy dose of music terminology. Why is that a weak point? Because such a review is difficult for the perception of those readers who are not acquainted with the particular terminology. The dense syntax and the cascades of subordinate clauses make the understanding of the message more difficult, thus narrowing the number of potential readers and in turn narrowing the potential audience who engages in the public discussion about classical music.

The second weak point of Znotiņš's reviews is the unevenly argued use of concepts and terminology; that is, he often uses terminology without explaining the meaning of it. We could still argue that in the example above, Znotiņš explains the “tension of creative intensity” with the “gradual change of the thematic phases,” “material of musical intonations and rhythmical structures,” “timbral variations,” and “melodic impulses.” The explanation itself, however, consists of a few ambiguous, unexplained concepts.

Further, Znotiņš continues the review with this observation: “The ‘Demontage Aesthetic’ can be perceived as none

other but an example of urban music.” The critic evaluates the piece as an “example of urban music,” not explaining what he means by using the concept “urban music.” Znotiņš continues with a paraphrase about Buravickis’s annotation for the newly written piece: “One has to conclude that to hear aristocratic sophistication amid the pneumatic hummer thumps and to arrive at lava torrents in the final, the interpretation of the piece must be heard in the acoustics of the Great Guild Hall.” I cannot argue against Znotiņš’s “pneumatic hummer thumps” nor the “lava torrents,” because they are figurative comparisons; the only possible argument against it would be any other form of figurative speech, another metaphor. However, it doesn’t explain the concept of “urban music” or, at least, what Znotiņš makes out of it.

### *Analysis 2: the review by Inese Lūsiņa*

One of the ways to implicitly support authority discourse in a text is to assume that my (the critic’s) opinion corresponds with the opinions of other listeners. In other words, the critic assumes that they understand or have a good knowledge of the “general taste,” or they appeal to “common experience”—I heard it the same way others heard it. To paraphrase Norman Fairclough: The critic is speaking on behalf of themselves, their readers, and indeed all (right-minded?) citizens. In so doing, it is making an implicit authority claim—that they have the authority to speak for others.

One way the reader can recognize such implicit authority claims is to notice manipulation with pronouns, which is one of the basic language use problems that DA deals with. A critic can use the pronoun “we” and turn an active into passive when they formulate their opinion about what they had heard. The more consistently such language use appears in a text, the greater the impact it deals on the message.

For example, Inese Lūsiņa begins her review on Verdi’s Falstaff with the sentence:

Completely unknown and surprising Verdi, whom we suddenly, for the first time in Latvia, discovered as someone who embodies an opera—a lyrical comedy—with sparkling humor. (here and below quoted from Lūsiņa 2017)

And in the next paragraph:

Maija Kovaļevska appeared as a comic opera character, which was totally unexpected to all of us [...].

Lūsiņa defines these observations as if speaking on behalf of everybody present. In another review Lūsiņa writes:

It is confirmed by the concert cycle “Latvian Ring,” a dedication to the centenary, which we can not only perceive as a musical summary of cultural history but which is indeed written as such.

From the viewpoint of language use and authority discourse, let us take a closer look at two parts of the sentence. First, at the sentence as a whole: this is not the only review where Lūsiņa uses the modality of truth (“which is indeed written as such”), thus stressing the conformity of her interpretation in connection with reality, in other words, implicitly improving the authority of her observation. Because, by referring to Lūsiņa’s text, “we can not only perceive” the “Latvian Ring” in the light of Lūsiņa’s interpretation but it “is indeed written as such.”

Second, about the subordinate clause in the last quote: a common trait appearing in Lūsiņa’s reviews is to use the plural form of the second-person pronoun “we.” Because of the Latvian conjugations, Lūsiņa can insert “we” indirectly into the text, as it appears in the sentence (*varam uztvert kā* > (we) can perceive as). From the viewpoint of DA, Lūsiņa thus constructs her identity as an author by identifying herself (the critic) with the ambiguous pronoun “we.” For Otto Jespersen and Roman Jakobson, the first-person and second-person pronouns constitute the primary category of the linguistics term *shifters* (Fludernik 1991:193). The meaning of the shifters (or “the deixis,” the term used by some Latvian linguists [Kalniete: 2016]) can be understood only from the context. For example, the pronoun “we” can contain multiple possible viewpoints (we = I and you, or “we” as an ironic position, etc.).

In Lūsiņa’s text the deixis “we” is undeciphered. Thus, it complicates the position of the author, which in turn helps to construct the authority discourse of the author. Namely, the author doesn’t explain whether “we” means, for example, I + reader, I + other listeners of the concert, I + those having good knowledge of classical music discourse.

In the same review, Lūsiņa directly or indirectly uses the deixis “we” two more times:

... our most well-known, polysemantic symbol, the folksong “Blow, Wind!”

Because the author does not decipher the meaning of “we” or “ours,” the reader of the review can guess different interpretations, but in this example as well as in the further text of the review, we can interpret the use of deixis as standardizing and simplifying the receiver of the message (the reader of the review), equating it to the author’s criteria. In this first case, we could accept Lūsiņa’s simplified reality and implicitly accept that “we” here means “Latvians” because of the evocation of the folksong “Blow, wind!” Either way, the author makes an implicit claim that “we” are united by this specific polysemantic symbol that is most well-known “to us.” Lūsiņa implicitly presumes that there exists a certain, unnamed circle of people (“we”) who have a well-known symbol, the folksong “Blow, wind!” in common as a cultural reference. It seems more logical to draw the conclusion that Lūsiņa speaks here about a rather narrow circle of

people, one that's more likely to be measured in friends and acquaintances rather than a whole nation. Further, Lūsiņa acknowledges the ambiguousness of the symbol: "aren't we glorifying too much the 'drinking song' 'Blow, Wind!,' which received a standing ovation in the Liepāja Great Amber Hall?" Lūsiņa also interprets the folk song with a clear-cut argument that we should treat the text of the folksong metaphorically, but in a familiar, didactic tone, by bringing the phatic function (maintaining contact) with an informal allocution:

Dear all, the message of the song isn't about praising boozing, showing the Latvian as a constant drunkard, but rather about the Latvian's self-dependence and self-confidence. If we'll read the text, not in a primitive, straight (literal) way, but metaphorically, everything will fall into its place.

Let's return to the beginning of the review where Lūsiņa writes:

In post-modern culture, working with different primary sources, citations, stylizations, allusions, compilations, and collages is nothing new, but in the context of Latvia one can assert that in the last years a new tendency—even a compositional model and maybe already a cliché—to combine big variety of academic and ethnic musical cultures in large collages.

Although indirectly, Lūsiņa clarifies that with the concept of post-modern culture she understands a composition model specifically with large collages, but further in the text she either simplifies it ("To put such a huge, diverse layer upon layer in a cauldron and watch what will happen is a simultaneously tempting and dangerous challenge."), or explains it ambiguously: "The specific songs and pieces in the program unite in two meta-compositions."

Lūsiņa explains that by meta-composition she means the united movement, where folk music and original pieces written by composers are combined together. However, it's difficult to agree that different musical genres in a linear arrangement, in a "united movement," instantly create a meta-composition in the same meaning as meta-timbre or meta-instrument is created by the junction of other, already existing timbres or other, already existing instruments in a particular context. The concepts given by Lūsiņa—both post-modern culture and meta-composition—stay in the referential language function because she mentions both as present in the artwork but interprets or analyses neither of them—nor the meta-composition, nor the post-modern compositional model with the academic/ethnic collages.<sup>3</sup> Lūsiņa also writes that "Blow, wind!," played by pianist Vestards Šimkus, was toned in a "meditative-jazzy" way and does not provide further elaboration about whether the musical meditateness relates to her own subjective experience when listening to the piece or whether it is an implicit, ironic judgment, implying that the music did not

have deeper content; there's also a lack of explanation about how we should understand the term "jazzy," considering the wide scope of connotations and musical style the concept "jazz" holds. The text continues with: "The academic arrangement of 'Blow, wind!' by composer Imants Ramiņš." What is the meaning of "academic arrangement"? Being acquainted with the sound of Ramiņš's arrangement, it's hard to accept that Lūsiņa would have used the concept "academic" in the sense which, in correlation with art, is offered at the site *tezaurus.lv*,<sup>4</sup> namely, "something that strongly abides traditions, something that is closely related to them." Similarly, we could ask what the meaning of Lūsiņa's "interludes of life-impetuosity" is in the premiere piece by Valdis Butāns. Lūsiņa doesn't elaborate on any of these concepts; she doesn't explain what she means by them or how they should be understood in the context of the artwork.

Now we can refer to the musicologist Nicholas Cook, who makes a provocative, but nevertheless noteworthy, statement that music, as opposed to literature, offers a considerably more restricted number of choices about the aesthetic experiences we receive from a musical piece; therefore, the music critic takes a less prestigious and less important position than a literature critic (Cook 1990: 171–173).

Cook also explains that, in this case, he talks about critics who write their critiques, addressing a wider audience by using figurative speech as opposed to specific terminology. For example, every critic can increase the possible choices of aesthetic experience with the help of hermeneutics by adding a new interpretation of how we can perceive a musical piece. And Cook justly stresses that music critics and music journalists, in particular, will always balance on the dangerous edge between creating an apt metaphor, a neat comparison, or very bad hermeneutics (he evokes as an example Arnold Schering's notorious interpretation of Beethoven's instrumental pieces as inspired by literary works) (Ibid.).

Almost all concert participants in Lūsiņa's review are referentially enumerated; generally informative paragraphs, more typical of a press release or a referential enumeration of art events, are a common stylistic feature appearing in Lūsiņa's reviews. In the review of "Courland Ring," only the premiere piece by composer Valdis Butāns has received an extended description. By describing music or musicians, Lūsiņa typically uses the objective adjectives and subjective interpretive axiological adjectives. Fewer affective adjectives are present, but Lūsiņa usually attributes them not to herself, but to the artwork or artist by using the passive voice participle:

The result is vitally evocative; convincing in the content; the stirring melody by Imants Kalniņš; a striking and stirring encounter in music; with such effectual interpretation.



It remains unclear whether the result evoked, the content convinced, or the melody stirred the critic herself or whether she objectifies her experience of reality, presenting it as pre-existing. In other words, Lūsiņa doesn't explicitly show that it is "her feeling"; rather she points to what everybody should have felt: "... in his musical language one could feel very clearly the particular, incomparable French school; it can be felt even over the acute mourning of the author; it is perceptible and it worked also in the live broadcast; at present, the voice of Kristīne Opolais palpably changes."

In a similar way, Lūsiņa uses the verb "to feel/to sense":

It strikingly singles out the contrasts and makes the musical dramaturgy more relief, allowing to feel and understand the process even when it's not possible to hear (or read on the screen) every nuance of the text.

The next example is delocutive; in other words, the critic indirectly speaks on behalf of every member of the concert audience:

It was a display of stage artist's commitment which awakened everyone and carried to other reality, genuine and heartfelt to the bone [...].

There are times when Lūsiņa uses the verb "to feel/to sense" (or, as an adjective, in the form of "cordially"<sup>5</sup>) for a depiction of singer's performance:

He reached the high summits naturally, self-evidently—they were not sportive but genuinely felt.

And:

It was confirmed by the cordially and enthusiastically sung the White Father's arioso.

In Lūsiņa's reviews, sometimes the emotive function of the language (the message in relation to the sender) explicitly appears:

I was seized by a fright; I'd like to say a few words to answer the regular discussion that's been stirred up again; ...I perceived the extended scenes of "Baņuta" as steps towards such production; By listening and visually observing how Vasilis Sinaiskis leads the reading of Jānis Ivanovs and Edward Elgar opuses it was clear that the conductor hasn't lost anything from his youth temperament and energy.

But rarely these emotive sentences refer to the artwork or description, or analysis, or judgment of it (in the following excerpt we can notice the poetic function, rarely used by Lūsiņa: the comparison "glowing" that's used to describe the emotional experience of the artwork):

I doubt that it would make such an effect in every other concert but in the "Courland Ring" it turned out as suitable"; It spoke glowingly, directly, emotionally bare and humane.

## Conclusions of analysis

The analysis above highlights some of the questions about authority discourse we as readers and interpreters of texts can ask and discuss:

- what do the words chosen by a critic actually say about music?
- what do the words chosen by a critic actually say about the critic themselves?

In the analysis, we saw how delocutive speech acts (the speech acts where the traces of the actor and the listener disappears) appear in different forms in reviews about classical music and how they implicitly add to the authority discourse. With the help of DA, we can interpret these speech acts.

In Armands Znotiņš's reviews, music is often the subject of the sentence, an actor that creates sensations in the listeners. In other words, it is the reality, the artwork that appears as a sender of the critic's message (the review), not the critic himself. Znotiņš explicitly speaks on the behalf of composer and listener, thus implicitly stating his authority. Znotiņš's reviews are dense with complicated terminology as a way to objectify his observations and strengthen his authority. Together with dense syntax, this forms a review that narrows down the possible discourse of classical/contemporary music that appears in mass media rather than contributing to the discourse. Clusters of terminology dominate the way Znotiņš describes and evaluates the musical pieces and interpretation; moreover, Znotiņš rarely explains the terms and concepts in his texts, thus more easily bringing them under possible critical scrutiny. From the reader's viewpoint, Znotiņš addresses the classical music discourse to a relatively small audience who is acquainted with the terminology used typically in music analysis.

Among the media that publishes Znotiņš's reviews is the nationally conservative *Latvijas Avīze* (*The Latvian Newspaper*); it presents itself as "the most read daily newspaper, standing up for Latvian population and the national interests of the state."<sup>6</sup> The review analyzed in this paper was published in *satori.lv*, an internet journal of "culture and independent thought."<sup>7</sup> Satori also underlines the youth as one of the growing parts of its audience. It has also published guidelines for authors. One of the suggestions include:

We suggest you avoid verbosity, unreasonable or excessive usage of slang, professional jargon, and dense professional terminology.<sup>8</sup>

As we saw in the analysis, Znotiņš's individual style is quite the opposite of the editorial suggestion quoted above. Truth be told, those are editorial guidelines, not rules. Nonetheless, Znotiņš favors viewing classical/contemporary music events in the light of the "high culture," echoing DiMaggio's analysis of the late nineteenth-century

Boston's upper class who founded the Boston Symphony Orchestra as a "definition of a prestigious culture that they could monopolize as their own" (DiMaggio 1982: 48).

In Inese Lūsiņa's reviews, the deixis "we" appears either as an emotive function ("we" addresses "I," "I heard" equals "we heard") or as a conative function (saying to the listener what they should have heard, should have felt). Lūsiņa often combines affective adjectives (which describe what the person experienced, sensed, felt, perceived) with the passive voice, thus creating a distance between her subjective experience and its actual appearance in the review. In other words, Lūsiņa objectifies her review with a strong presence of delocutive speech acts.

**Conclusions of the discursive power relations within music criticism**

As I said at the beginning, I may deviate a little from my subject in order to share some urgent concerns about music criticism. Nevertheless, this deviation is about the discursive power relations within the music criticism.

Daniel Leech-Wilkinson, in his lecture at the Vilnius conference, already raised the topic of critical assault, which is still alive in contemporary criticism. Nicolas Slonimsky published the *Lexicon of Musical Invective—Critical Assaults on Composers Since Beethoven's Time* (Slonimsky 1953) in the 1950s. This lexicon may not be conceived as one of scholarly value, but this anthology of swear-words and rude, discouraging, and blatantly abusive language used explicitly by music critics is more than just a series of amusing real-life anecdotes; rather, it provides valuable material for thought

on the matter of the authority of music critics, particularly when it is viewed through the looking glass of critical discourse studies, language use, and social context.

It's insightful to pay attention to Slonimsky's ironic and sketch-like but nevertheless apt and logical observations and ideas of typology. The 669 excerpts from critical reviews allowed Slonimsky to make some generalizations about how critics describe their, what he calls, "non-acceptance of unfamiliar." From the preface of the book, we can draw up a brief typology of a wide spectrum of speech acts in which critics described their inability to comprehend the unfamiliar, radically new ways of musical composition through various types of figurative language and typical arguments (see Figure 2). Among them:

- *Expressions that relate to Chinese culture*
- *The complexity of mathematics*
- *Argumentum ad notam falsam*—for example: "Schumann's harmonies were so obtrusively crude that no number of wrong notes would be detected by the subtlest listener"
- *Physical ugliness/the "inferior" race of the composer*
- *Animal noises*
- *Immorality*
- *Impotence*

Before Leech-Wilkinson's lecture, I truly believed that such extreme use of language was more representative of the criticism of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, which is the main source of this lexicon. Still, even today, music criticism has preserved many conservative ideologies and principles stemming from that time (as a practicing music critic, I have faced such ideologies and principles when

**Table 2.** Excerpts from N. Slonimsky's *Lexicon of Musical Invective*

CHINESE	MATHEMATICS	ARGUMENTUM AD NOTAM FALSAM	PHYSICAL UGLINESS OF COMPOSER
Strauss lets loose an orchestral riot that suggests a murder scene in a Chinese theater	The science of Monsieur Berlioz is a sterile algebra	Whether one sings or plays wrong notes in such an insalubrious style is utterly immaterial	I met Debussy . . . the other night and was struck by the unique ugliness of the man
Schoenberg . . . as comprehensible as a lecture on the fourth dimension delivered in Chinese	The music of Wagner imposes mental tortures that only algebra has right to inflict	<b>IMPOTENCE</b>	Max Reger . . . an ogre of composition . . . a swollen myopic beetle with thick lips and sullen expression
<b>ANIMAL NOISES</b>	Rimsky-Korsakov has evidently evolved a musical enigma which is too complex of solution now	Brahms .. die Sprache der intensivsten musikalischen Impotenz	
shades of expression of which the voice of the nocturnal cat is capable			

asking musicians what they expect from music criticism), and the *problem of the authority of the critic and the implicit meanings in the text of the critics* are issues much complicated in today's cultural journalism. The critical assaults by music critics—the examples given both by Leech-Wilkinson and by Slonimsky—give much material for thought on the discursive power relations within the text of music criticism and the dubious role of the critic as a gate-keeper or the representative of good taste.

## Endnotes

- <sup>1</sup> In general, American critics use more adjectives while Latvian critics rely more on verbs to describe music or interpretation.
- <sup>2</sup> I assume that both forms of English should display the Latvian original (*ir nojauta, ka*) in the same way.
- <sup>3</sup> Sergei Kruk discusses similar problematics more extensively, focusing on texts about artworks by Latvian art historians/art critics in "Approaches to Semiosis in Latvian Sources" (2013).
- <sup>4</sup> The online thesaurus dictionary of Latvian language
- <sup>5</sup> In Latvian both words share a common stem.
- <sup>6</sup> In: <http://abonesana.la.lv/abonesana> [last checked 2018 02 07].
- <sup>7</sup> In: <https://www.satori.lv/par-satori> [last checked 2018 02 07].
- <sup>8</sup> In: <https://www.satori.lv/vadlinijas-autoriem> [last checked 2018 02 07].

## Bibliography

- Beard David and Gloag Kenneth, *Musicology. The Key Concepts*, Second edition. Routledge, London, 2016.
- Charaudeau Patrick, *Une analyse sémiolinguistique du discours* in: *Langages* n° 117, Larousse, Paris, mars, 1995
- Cook Nicholas, *Music, Imagination, and Culture*. Oxford University Press Inc., New York, 1990
- Eiser J. Richard, *Attitudes and the words we use*. in *Rhetoric, Ideology and Social Psychology* ed. by Charles Antaki and Susan Condor, Routledge, 2014
- Fludernik Monika, *Shifters and Deixis. Some Reflections on Jakobson, Jespersen, and Reference* in: *Semiotica* 86, 1991, s. [193] — 230.
- Graham Allen, *Intertextuality. The New Critical Idiom*. Routledge: London and New York, 2000.
- Jakobson Roman, *Closing Statement: Linguistics and Poetics*. Reprinted from *Style in Language*, edited by Thomas A. Sebeok, Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1960.
- Jakobson Roman, *Shifters, verbal categories, and the Russian verb* in: *Russian and Slavic Grammar. Studies 1931—1981*. ed. by Linda R. Waugh and Morris Halle, 41—58. Mouton Publishers, 1971
- Jakobson Roman, *Verbal Art, Verbal Sign, Verbal Time*, ed. by Krystyna Pomorska and Stephen Rudy, University of Minnesota, 1985.
- Kalniete Madara, *Norādāmie vietniekvārdi kā vietas deiksi latviešu valodā* [Demonstrative pronouns as space deixis in Latvian], Latvian University, 2016
- Kress Gunther and Hodge Robert, *Language as Ideology*. Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1979.
- Kress Gunther, *Linguistic processes in sociocultural practice*. Deakin University Press, Victoria, 1985.

- Kruks Sergejs, *Semiozes izprante latviešu avotos: valodnieku un mākslas zinātnieku zīmes koncepciju kritika* [Approaches to Semiosis in Latvian Sources], 2013
- Carroll Noel, *On Criticism*. Routledge, 2009.
- Pêcheux Michel, *Language, Semantics and Ideology. Stating the Obvious*. English translation by Harbans Nahpal (1982). The Macmillan Press Ltd, London and Basingstoke, 1975
- van Dijk Teun A., *Critical Discourse Analysis in: The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, Second Edition. Ed. by Deborah Tannen, Heide E. Hamilton, and Deborah Schiffrin. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2015.

## Online sources

- Lūsiņa Inese, [https://www.diena.lv/raksts/kd/recenzijas/lielkoncerta\\_put-vejini\\_recenzija-kurzemes-gredzenanoslepums-14185964](https://www.diena.lv/raksts/kd/recenzijas/lielkoncerta_put-vejini_recenzija-kurzemes-gredzenanoslepums-14185964) [last checked 2017 12 02], 2017.
- Lūsiņa Inese, <https://www.diena.lv/raksts/kd/recenzijas/dirigenta-aleksandra-vilumana-75-gadu-jubilejas-koncerta-recenzija-maestro-pieredze-un-misija-14185595> [last checked 2017 12 02], 2017a.
- Lūsiņa Inese, <https://www.diena.lv/raksts/kd/recenzijas/vasilija-sinaiska-jubilejas-koncerta-ar-liso-recenzija-meistarumiklas-14184631> [last checked 2017 12 02], 2017b.
- Znotiņš Armands, <https://www.satori.lv/article/ieskats-festivala-sansusi-otraja-diena> [last checked 2017 10 24], 2017.

## Santrauka

Diskurso analizė traktuoja tekstą kaip problemą. Teunas van Dijkas apibūdina kritiškąją diskurso analizę kaip diskursyvų analitinį tyrimą, kuriuo pirmiausia siekiama atskleisti tai, kaip *rašytinis* ir *sakytinis* tekstas socialiniame ir politiniame kontekste įtvirtina, atkuria, įteisina ar atmeta nelygybę ir piktnaudžiavimą socialine galia (van Dijk, 2015).

Teksto problematika aktuali ir muzikos kritikos srityje. Prielaida, kad muzikos kritikai – taip sakant, nekaltai – vertina koncertus ir įrašus nesavanaudiškai tarnaudami aukščiausiems meno idealams ir nėra niekaip susiję su socialiniu kontekstu, galbūt ir galėtų apibūdinti XIX–XX a. pradžios kritikos tradiciją, tačiau taip pat ne be išlygų, kaip matyti iš šio darbo pabaigoje pateikiamų Nicolo Slonimskio surinktų užgaulių kritinių straipsnių pavyzdžių.

Muzikos kritikai kartu su muzikos prodiuseriais ir viešųjų ryšių specialistais viešojoje erdvėje plačiai kalba apie klasikinę muziką. Taigi jie kuria reikšmingą klasikinės muzikos diskurso dalį žiniasklaidoje. Recenzijose klasikinės muzikos kritikai netiesiogiai įtvirtina save kaip autoritetus ir ekspertus.

Anot kalbininko Jakobsono, kalbėdami naudojames keliomis kalbos funkcijomis (Jakobson, 1960). Todėl nagrinėdami tekstą tik sąmoningai, visų jo prasmų nesuprasime. Kalba problemiška; tą patį galima pasakyti apie muzikos kritiką. Pasitelkdamas diskurso analizę, interpretuotojas gali perskaityti užslėptas teksto reikšmes, tokias kaip:

- 1) kritiko savivokos, autoriteto konstravimas;
- 2) socialinės distancijos tarp publikos ir klasikinės muzikos industrijos didėjimas arba mažėjimas;
- 3) interpretacijos, kaip kritikai žiniasklaidoje perteikia žodžiais tai, ką išgirdo koncerte.

Šiame straipsnyje teigiama, kad diskurso analizė atskleidžia du svarbius muzikos kritikos aspektus, susijusius su tuo, kaip muzikos kritikai suvokia šio meno kritikos paskirtį ir kritikoje naudojamas kalbos funkcijas.

Pasitelkęs diskurso analizę, suklasifikavau būdus, kuriais muzikos kritikai apibūdina arba vertina muzikos kūrinius ir jų interpretacijas. Kritiko autoritetui įtvirtinti naudojamos tokios kalbinės raiškos priemonės kaip daiktavardinės ir neveikiamosios rūšies konstrukcijos, autoritetingas kalbėjimo stilius, sudėtingi terminai be paaiškinimų ir apibrėžimų bei metaforos.

Darbe analizuodamas dvi šiandienos latvių muzikos kritikų – Inesės Lūsiņas ir Armando Znotiņšo – recenzijas, parodau, kaip klasikinės muzikos recenzijose skirtingais pavidalais reiškiasi šnekamosios kalbos aktai, kai panaikinama riba tarp kalbėtojo bei klausytojo, ir taip netiesiogiai kuriamas autoriteto diskursas. Diskurso analizė padeda interpretuoti šiuos šnekamosios kalbos aktus.

Znotiņšo recenzijose muzika dažnai yra sakinio veiksnys – veikėjas, kuris skamba ir generuoja klausytojų jautimus. Kitaip tariant, pats kūrinys yra tikrovė; jis, o ne pats kritikas, siunčia žinią (recenziją). Akivaizdžiai kalbėdamas kompozitoriaus ir klausytojo vardu, Znotiņšas netiesiogiai teigia savo autoritetą. Muzikos kūrinių bei interpretacijų aprašymuose ir vertinimuose gausu terminų; negana to, jis retai savo tekstuose aiškina sąvokas ir terminus, todėl šie tekstai veikiausiai bus dar atidžiau analizuojami. Taigi Znotiņšo klasikinės muzikos diskursas adresuojamas gana nedidelei auditorijai, susipažinusiai su dažniausia muzikos analizei būdinga terminologija.

Lūsiņas recenzijose deiksė „mes“ atlieka arba emocinę funkciją („mes“ reiškia „aš“, „aš girdėjau“ tapatus „mes girdėjome“), arba konotacinę (pasakoma, ką klausytojas ar klausytoja turėjo išgirsti arba pajusti). Neretai derindama jausminius būdvardžius (nusakančius žmogaus potyrius, pojūčius, jausmus ir mintis) su neveikiamosios rūšies konstrukcijomis, Lūsiņa atskiria savo subjektyvią patirtį nuo perteikimo recenzijoje. Kitaip tariant, gausiai naudojami šnekamosios kalbos aktai Lūsiņai padeda objektyvizuoti recenziją.

Delivered / Straipsnis įteiktas 2019 02 11