

## 第 12 回資料

### 調性という名の不在の中心

#### *First or simple form of relative value*

$$20 \text{ yards of linen} = 1 \text{ coat}$$

“The expression of the *value* of linen in the coat impresses a new form upon the coat itself. After all, what is the meaning of the *value-form* of linen? Evidently that the coat is exchangeable for it.”

“If one considers the value relation of both commodities in their *qualitative* aspect, then one discovers in that simple expression of value the mystery of value form, and hence, *in nuce* of money.”

#### *First or simple form of relative tonality*

$$\underline{A-Dur} = \underline{E-Dur}$$

“The expression of the tonality of A-Dur in E-Dur impresses a new form upon E-Dur itself. After all, what is the meaning of the tonality-form of A-Dur? Evidently that the modulation from A-Dur to E-Dur is possible. ”

“If one considers the tonal relation of both keys in their *qualitative* aspect, then one discovers in that simple expression of tonality the mystery of tonality form, and hence, *in nuce* of tonic.”

“The equation: 20 yards of linen = 1 coat (or 20 yards of linen are worth a coat) includes, after all, precisely the identical equation: 1 coat = 20 yards of linen (or one coat is worth 20 yards of linen).

The relative value-expression of the linen, in which the coat figures as Equivalent, thus contains *from the reverse* the relative value-expression of the coat, in which the linen figures as Equivalent.”

“Each of both commodities is only an Equivalent for the single other species of commodity, and thus only a *single Equivalent*.”

“The equation: A-Dur = E-Dur (or A-Dur is worth E-Dur) includes, after all, precisely the identical equation: E-Dur = A-Dur (or E-Dur is worth A-Dur).

The relative tonality-expression of A-Dur, in which E-Dur figures as Equivalent, thus contains *from the reverse* the relative tonality-expression of E-Dur, in which A-Dur figures as Equivalent.”

“Each of both keys is only an Equivalent for the single other species of key, and thus

only a *single Equivalent*.”

“If I compare the linen, for example, with other commodities instead of coats, then I also obtain *other relative value-expressions*, other *equations* (like 20 yards of linen = u coffee; 20 yards of linen = v tea, etc.). The linen has *just as many different relative value-expressions* as there exist commodities different from it, and the number of its relative value-expressions constantly increases with the number of kinds of commodities which newly enter into existence.”

“If I compare A-Dur, for example, with other keys instead of E-Dur, then I also obtain *other relative tonality-expressions*, other *equations* (like A-Dur = e-moll; A-Dur = C-Dur, etc.). A-Dur has *just as many different relative tonality-expressions* as there exist keys different from it, and the number of its relative tonality-expressions constantly increases with the number of kinds of keys which newly enter into existence.”

*Second or developed form of relative value*

*20 yards of linen = 1 coat, or = u coffee, or = v tea, or = x iron, or = y wheat, or etc., etc.*

*Second or developed form of relative tonality*

*A-Dur = E-Dur, or = e-moll, or = C-Dur or = a-moll, or = d-moll, or etc., etc.*

“In the first form (20 yards of linen = 1 coat) it may appear like an accidental fact that these two commodities are exchangeable in this *specific quantitative relationship*. In the second form, however, a background which is essentially different from and determinant of the accidental appearance immediately shines through. The accidental relationship of two individual possessors of commodities falls away.”

“It becomes clear that it is not the exchange which regulates the amount of value of the commodity, but in the opposite way the amount of value of the commodity which regulates its relationships of exchange.”

“It becomes clear that it is not the modulation which regulates the tonal functions of chords, but in the opposite way the tonal functions of chords which regulate the modulation.”

“This second form contains within itself an essential development of form. For latent in it is, after all, not only the fact that linen happens to express its value at one time in coats, and at another in coffee, etc., but the fact that it expresses its value *as much* in coats *as* in coffee, etc.: *either* in *this* commodity or that or the *third*, etc.”

“.....not only the fact that A-Dur happens to express its tonality at one time in E-Dur, and at another in e-moll, etc., but the fact that it expresses its tonality as much in E-Dur *as* in e-moll, etc.: *either* in *this* key or that or the *third*, etc.”

The second form consists of a *sum* of the familiar equations of the first form. Each of these equations (like ‘20 yards of linen = 1 coat’,) contains also the reciprocal ‘1 coat – 20 yards of linen’, in which case the coat manifests its value in the linen and precisely thereby manifests the linen as an Equivalent. Now, since this holds of each of the innumerable relative value-expressions of linen, we obtain:

*Third, reversed or reciprocal second form of relative value*

*1 coat = 20 yards of linen*

*u coffee = 20 yards of linen*

*v tea = 20 yards of linen*

*x iron = 20 yards of linen*

*y wheat = 20 yards of linen*

*etc. = 20 yards of linen*

“The *relative value-expression* returns at this point to its original form: 1 coat = 20 yards of linen. Now, however, this simple equation is further developed. “

“In form II (20 yards of linen = 1 coat or = u coffee, or v tea or x iron, etc.), the form in which the linen develops *its relative value-expression*, it relates itself to each individual commodity (coat, coffee, etc.) as a *specific Equivalent*, and to all of them together as to the *environment of its specific forms of the Equivalent*.”

“Just as linen consequently became an *individual Equivalent* by the fact that *one* other commodity related itself to it as form of appearance of value, that is the way linen becomes – as the form of appearance of value common to all commodities – the *universal Equivalent* (...).”

The second form consists of a *sum* of the familiar equations of the first form. Each of these equations (like A-Dur = E-Dur,) contains also the reciprocal ‘E-Dur = A-Dur’, in which case E-Dur manifests its tonality in A-Dur and precisely thereby manifests A-Dur

as an Equivalent. Now, since this holds of each of the innumerable relative tonality-expressions of A-Dur, we obtain:

*Third, reversed or reciprocal second form of relative tonality*

E-Dur = A-Dur

e-moll = A-Dur

C-Dur = A-Dur

a-moll = A-Dur

d-moll = A-Dur

etc. = A-Dur

“The *relative tonality-expression* returns at this point to its original form: E-Dur = A-Dur. Now, however, this simple equation is further developed. “

“In form II (A-Dur = E-Dur, or = e-moll, or C-Dur, or a-moll, etc.), the form in which A-Dur develops its *relative tonality-expression*, it relates itself to each individual key (E-Dur, e-moll, etc.) as a *specific Equivalent*, and to all of them together as to the *environment of its specific forms of the Equivalent*.”

“Just as A-Dur consequently became an *individual Equivalent* by the fact that *one* other key related itself to it as form of appearance of tonality, that is the way A-Dur becomes – as the form of appearance of tonality common to all keys – the *universal Equivalent* (...).”

“The illusion as if the equivalent-form of a commodity resulted from its own corporeal nature instead of being a mere reflex of the relationships of other commodities: this illusion strengthens itself with the continuing development of the *singular Equivalent* to the *universal* (...).”

“The illusion as if the equivalent-form of a key resulted from its own individual nature instead of being a mere reflex of the relationships of other keys: this illusion strengthens itself with the continuing development of the *singular Equivalent* to the *universal* (...).”

If the universal relative value-form, ‘One coat = 20 yards of linen’, (where the linen is universal Equivalent) is turned around into ‘20 yards of linen = one coat’, the coat does not thereby become universal Equivalent for all other commodities, but only a particular Equivalent of the linen. The relative value-form of the coat is only universal because it is the relative value-form of all other commodities at the same time. What holds true of the coat, holds true of coffee, etc. It follows, therefore, that the universal relative

value-form of commodities excludes these very commodities from the universal form of Equivalent. On the other hand, a commodity like linen is excluded from the universal relative value-form as soon as it possesses the universal form of Equivalent.

If the universal relative tonality-form, 'E-Dur = A-Dur', (where A-Dur is universal Equivalent) is turned around into 'A-Dur = E-Dur', E-Dur does not thereby become universal Equivalent for all other keys, but only a particular Equivalent of A-Dur. The relative tonality-form of E-Dur is only universal because it is the relative tonality-form of all other keys at the same time. What holds true of E-Dur, holds true of e-moll, etc. It follows, therefore, that the universal relative tonality-form of keys excludes these very keys from the universal form of Equivalent. On the other hand, a key like A-Dur is excluded from the universal relative tonality-form as soon as it possesses the universal form of Equivalent.

Actually, (...) *universal relative value-form and universal Equivalent-form* are the contradictory, reciprocally-presupposing and reciprocally repelling poles of the *very same* social form of commodities.

Actually, (...) *universal relative tonality-form and universal Equivalent-form* are the contradictory, reciprocally-presupposing and reciprocally repelling poles of the *very same harmonic* form of keys.

Rather, it is the *developed relative* value-form (20 yards of linen = one coat *or* u coffee *or* = v tea *or* = etc. "the *developed* form of relative value (form II)") that now becomes the *specific* relative value-expression of the universal Equivalent.

Rather, it is the *developed relative* tonality-form (A-Dur = E-Dur, *or* = e-moll, *or* = C-Dur *or* = etc. "the *developed* form of relative tonality (form II)") that now becomes the *specific* relative tonality-expression of the universal Equivalent.

*20 yards of linen = 1 coat, or = u coffee, or = v tea, or = x iron, or = y wheat, or etc.*

*1 coat = 20 yards of linen, or = u coffee, or = v tea, or = x iron, or = y wheat, or etc.*

*u coffee = 20 yards of linen, 1 coat, or = v tea, or = x iron, or = y wheat, or etc.*

*v tea = etc.*

"But each of these equations *reflexively* yields coat, coffee, tea, etc. as universal Equivalent and consequently yields value-expression in coat, coffee, tea, etc. as universal relative value-form of all other commodities."

*A-Dur = E-Dur, or = e-moll, or = C-Dur, or = a-moll, or = d-moll, or etc.*

*E-Dur = A-Dur, or = e-moll, or = C-Dur, or = a-moll, or = d-moll, or etc.*

*e-moll = A-Dur, or = E-Dur, or = C-Dur, or = a-moll, or = d-moll, or etc.*

*C-Dur = etc.*

“But each of these equations *reflexively* yields E-Dur, e-moll, C-Dur, etc. as universal Equivalent and consequently yields tonality-expression in E-Dur, e-moll, C-Dur, etc. as universal relative tonality-form of all other keys.”

“The result is that all commodities exclude themselves from the universal form of Equivalent, the socially valid displaying of their amounts of value.”

“The result is that all keys exclude themselves from the universal form of Equivalent, the harmonically valid displaying of their property of tonality.”

How, then, is value (and/or tonality) created?



“This shift from the goal-oriented stance of consumption toward the properly capitalist stance of self-propelling circulation allows us to locate desire and drive with regard to capitalism. Following Jacques-Alain Miller, a distinction has to be introduced here between lack and hole: lack is spatial, designating a void *within* a space, while hole is more radical, it designates the point at which this spatial order itself breaks down (as in the "black hole" in physics). That is the difference between desire and drive: desire is grounded in its constitutive lack, while drive circulates around a hole, a gap in the order of being. In other words, the circular movement of drive obeys the weird logic of the

curved space in which the shortest distance between the two points is not a straight line, but a curve: drive "knows" that the shortest way to attain its aim is to circulate around its goal-object." (Slavoj Žižek, *The Parallax View*, Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2006)

Tonic as a metonymic stand-in for the void within the tonal space

The *goal* of modulation → To fill in the void of tonal space, musicologically expressed, to establish tonic

Its (true) *aim* → To circulate around the absent center of "circle of fifths"

The circular movement of drive and/or modulation

"A drive as it were turns failure into a triumph—in it, the very failure to reach its goal, the repetition of this failure, the endless circulation around the object, generates a satisfaction of its own."

(Slavoj Žižek, *The Parallax View*)

"A modulation as it were turns failure into a triumph—in it, the very failure to establish tonic, the repetition of this failure, the endless circulation around the object, generates a satisfaction of its own."

Crucial here is the difference between the lost tonality, which is frequently called atonal, and the perpetual chromatic motion. While the former is the object around which a number of different chords circulate forever, the latter is the eternalization of this circulation as such. Berg shows this more conclusively than his teacher Schoenberg.

In *Lulu*, for example, he derives various 12-tone rows with artistic skills from one 12-tone row which is made up of two hexachord scales in B-flat major and E major. As a result, in this self-multiplication of the 12-tone series, various major and/or minor chords sound in fragments. However, they are no longer based on the already lost tonality but on the chromatic circular movement.

Source: Albert Dragstedt, *Value: Studies By Karl Marx*, New Park Publications, London, 1976, pp. 7-40.