

The Theory of Musical Communication

The Theory of Musical Communication

By

Alexander N. Yakupov

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



The Theory of Musical Communication

By Alexander N. Yakupov

Reviewed by M.Y. Tarakanov, Doctor of Arts

This book first published 2016

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2016 by Alexander N. Yakupov

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-9736-1

ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-9736-5

The monograph is dedicated to a general research of the communicative processes that encompass the creation, interpretation, perception and evaluation of the phenomena of the musical art. The numerous internal and external communicative links in the spheres of the composer, the performer, the listener and the musicologist-critic—the links that constitute a complex integral system of the musical information transmission—those links are considered in the socio-cultural aspect, the aspect that determines the high social role of the academic genres of music.

The book may be of use to professional musicians and to all those interested in the acute problems of musicology, musical aesthetics, the sociology of music and musical pedagogics.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Chapter One.....	11
The Theoretical Problems of Musical Communication	
Chapter Two	42
The Universe of Musical Communication	
Chapter Three	65
Musical Communication as an Integrative Process	
Chapter Four	82
The Structure of Musical Communication	
Chapter Five	115
The Communicative Means of Music, Main Methods of Musical Reproduction and Channels of Musical Perception	
Chapter Six	138
Socio-Musical Communication: Past and Present	
Chapter Seven.....	165
On the Theory of Managing the Processes of Musical Communication in the Society	
Conclusion.....	211
Schemes and Tables	216
Bibliography	221

INTRODUCTION

In a modern society, the unprecedented development of mass media has enabled music, including serious music, music enriched by sublime emotional content, to enter every level of social life and to occupy a leading position amongst other arts. But the unlimited possibilities for music to enter man's social existence have created a situation where serious musical genres have to compete with the expansion of mass entertainment, popular music.

And these are not the only changes the social being of musical art has undergone. The changes include the emergence of technical media that do not only reproduce, but also perform and create music, the global expansion of the European performing culture, the universal interest in non-European musical traditions and national cultures, the globalisation of the systems of musical education and, finally, the universal enthusiasm for various means of musical and sound self-expression that leads to an unprecedented complexity and diversity of a man's sound environment.

So, any music (unfortunately, including its best, most beautiful, classical samples) has acquired in addition to its most basic aesthetic purpose a different meaning. For a modern man it has become something of a tonal background, against which he carries on his other non-aesthetic, mundane activities.

This is only a short account of those aspects distinguishing the social being of music today from its situation at the time when the great work of Bach and Beethoven, Mozart and Chopin, Glinka and Tchaikovsky was created at the time when all other professional and folk music came into being during the whole course of previous human history.

Nevertheless, on the verge of the 21st century, in spite of all the changes, the spiritual treasures, the everlasting value of classical music, the academic genres of musical art continue nurturing the mind and heart of the modern man. Therefore he is able to fathom the noble ideals the music contains, to personally get in touch with the loftiest creations of the human spirit.

So, on the threshold of the new era the problem of *the ecology of the serious music* is becoming more and more acute. It is the problem of protecting this kind of music (as well as all the other noble arts) from the ex-

pansion of a sound culture that has quite different origin and objectives. In relation to this, in the musical theory and practice, the interest for the practical and theoretical study of the social being of serious music has been rising. Nowadays this interest is duly focused on the study of *the phenomenon of musical communication*. The phenomenon is considered as an essential, complex entity that reflects the diversity of human musical communication and empowers the countless links created between people in the sphere of music, its content and message, its form of expression, its ways to influence a man's inner self and his outward contacts with life and nature.

Quite obviously the interest for a thorough study of this kind has not been prompted by purely scientific needs. It has been primarily dictated by the urgent task to learn to influence, with proper tact and wisdom, the artistic and creative processes that go on in a society, especially taking into consideration the fact that those processes represent a universal means of modern man's socialisation. Naturally the influence in question is not intended to subdue or suppress an individual's creativity. On the contrary—it is meant to liberate his spiritual powers. The mobilisation of those powers is quite important today for the protection of humanity from a certain danger of degradation emerging spontaneously here and there as a result of the simple fact that many tasks that were formerly purely human are nowadays carried out by lifeless machines.

So the study of musical communication proves to be closely connected with the global problems of the present—the menace of the planetary catastrophe, the search for the ways of humanity's survival and progress—the problems that were discussed by the major thinkers of the epoch: Vernadsky, Peccei, T. de Chardin and others (see, for example, 184). One should say that these problems were raised by the Russian musicians as early as the 19th century, particularly in its second half when the democratic tendencies strengthened and the potential of Russian literature and other arts was actively developed. In this respect it should suffice to mention the work of A.N. Serov and V.V. Stasov, M.A. Balakirev and N.A. Rimsky-Korsakov, P.I. Tchaikovsky and A.N. Scriabin, many other Russian musicians.

It seemed that in the Soviet reality of the 20s those tendencies started to develop anew on a theoretically solid basis. The tendencies were supported by the official declarations of introducing the masses to serious art and culture. Indeed, it was the time when a new branch of musicology—*the sociology of music*, that first emerged in Europe in the late 19th century—came forth in Russia. The fact that this new area was explored by the

most prominent Russian musicologists of the period—B.V. Asafyev, V.G. Karatygin, B.L. Yavorsky and others—seems quite essential.

But almost from the very start the true theoretical reliability of this new promising venue of research was shaken by various disfigurements caused by political and ideological reasons. The proper methodological basis supported by a genuinely humanitarian approach was substituted for the class principle meant to divide people on the grounds of their political affiliation, the principle contaminated by antihuman impulses.

The sociology of music experienced a revival during the “thaw” period in Russia in the 60s. It was expected to theoretically enlarge upon the problems of the optimisation of the social being of music and develop a comprehensive approach towards the exploration of the deepest aspects of music’s social purpose and towards the study of the peculiarities of musical language, the formation and stylistics of music, etc. (In connection with that period the names of A.N. Sokhor, Y.V. Kapustin, V.P. Fomin, V.S. Zuckerman and some others should be mentioned.)

But now when tens of years had passed it becomes evident that the sociology of music as a branch of sociology in general is quite unable to exhaustively research all the multifarious aspects of the functioning of serious music in social life. The reason for that appears to be the fact that, although the sociology of music strives to consider the creation, reproduction and social functioning of music in their interconnection, it does not accept them as its special subject. “The processes of institutionalisation of art’s development and functioning” (268, p. 25) are generally looked upon as the subjects of musical sociology.

Several studies dedicated to the exploration of the complex problems of the nature of musical art, the regularity of its language and structure represented a different trend in musicology. Those works concentrated, for instance, on the specific character of musical perception, the compositional logic of a musical piece, the plurality of the sound universe of music (Y.V. Nazaykinsky), the system character of its means of expression (L.A. Mazel) and the flexibility of those means when directed to the audience, that presupposes the reaction of the latter (V.V. Medushevsky). Of course, the studies in the above-mentioned areas, as well as the fundamental works of S.S. Skrebkov, V.P. Bobrovsky, Y.N. Tyulin, Y.N. Kholopov, V.N. Kholopova, Y.A. Ruchyevskaya and others; also the many articles dedicated to some of the facets of the mentioned problems—all of that has contributed to the analysis of the important, most basic aspects of the social being of music. But none of the mentioned studies has ever attempted to consider the same components of the functioning of musical integrity in

the context of a specific study of the socio-musical communication as the primary subject of musicological research.

It is worthwhile to note here that historically three trends have been developed in musicology. One of them concerns itself with the *problems of the development of music*. This is the area of the theory of composition, historical and theoretical musicology, etc. Another trend concentrates on the *problems of musical reproduction* (the history and theory of musical performance, the theory of performing styles and musical pedagogics). Finally, the third trend focuses its interest on *the functioning of music in a society* (the psychology of musical perception, applied sociology, musical criticism, etc).

One has to mention that none of the above trends is willing to lock itself within its narrow area of research. A more thorough examination quickly discloses that there are numerous, sometimes escaping links interconnecting the cited trends. For example, the study of the evolution of classical and modern harmony is conducted on the basis of a deep research of the historical development of musical genres, a research that is eventually inseparable from the analysis of the social purpose of music. Another example—the theory of musical thinking touches upon the problems of the structure of a musical piece, researched within theoretical musicology; at the same time, it deals with the structure of musical perception—the problem that lies in the sphere of psychology and sociology (see the works of V. Medushevsky, A. Moles: 144; 156; and others). Nevertheless, none of the trends in question sets the study of the existing links and interdependencies as its specific objective. A study of this kind would be aimed at exploring the musical process in its integrity as a single functional system with all its complex and multifarious communicative connections, internal as well as external. Therefore the whole previous evolution of musicology on the one hand and the acute problems of present-day musical life, on the other, lead us to the understanding of the study of the above-mentioned group of problems to be set aside as a special branch of musical theory.

As a theoretical problem, the problem of musical communication is not a new one for musicology. The interest towards it has been rising recently. But it is usually concentrated on the separate aspects of the problem; it fails to encompass it as a whole. And although some of the questions of the communicative function of music, of the role of communication in the musical life of a society, etc., have been cleared up, its specific integrity, and the dynamics of its development have not been researched thoroughly. The major elements of the communicative process have not been revealed, its structure has not been analysed. Obviously, quite understandable difficulties arise in the course of such an analysis. They are inevitable while

trying to comprehend the system and the process character of any complex spiritual entity, which includes a complicated structure of internal connections and links that, in their turn, may each unfold in accordance with a different temporal rhythm and bear an intricate pattern of their own internal links and may each be characterised by the diverse types of information that circle within them. Therefore the musical theory of today faces a necessity to fill the gaps that currently limit the scope of its practical influence and applicability.

Today the historical and theoretical musicology has thoroughly studied the ways and regularities of the evolution of musical language and the constructive principles and compositional basics of creating a musical piece. The generalising concepts of the intonational form, stylistics, thematic aspects, general logic of a musical creation, the particulars of its formation, etc., have been deeply worked out. In the musicology of performing the processes of the so-called secondary creativity—the interpretation of music, the reproduction of music on stage—have been diligently and meticulously explored. But one of the main questions of musical theory, doubtlessly essential to all of its branches, remains largely unanswered. The question is *how, in which way, by what means* do all the explored regularities and principles of music and its major phenomenon—a *musical piece* (together with the specific communicative techniques based on the peculiarities of human perception)—enable the music to have a socially significant external existence and enable its meaning and message, its form and purport to be adequately translated for all the participants of musical communication in a society?

In the recent years in some works that deal with the cited problems of musicology certain communicative properties, techniques and methods were analysed and a considerable amount of useful material was accumulated (see, for example, 147). But the culturally and socially acute problem of a comprehensive study of the whole group of questions, essential for musical communication management, remains beyond the scope of musical theory. Such a situation is unavoidable, as the links of the integral communicative chain, as it was stated above, have largely been considered separately.

The answers to this compound set of questions obviously cannot be found within any single one of the mentioned branches of musicology. The solution to the problem as a whole (let us repeat, a problem cardinal to musical theory) may only be discovered in the interrelation of the various branches of musicology. In other words, the necessity to develop a *theory of musical communication* becomes quite evident. Such a theory would have as its specific task the study of the complicated processes of the in-

terchange of musical meanings between all those concerned in the integral process of musical communication.

Of course, the development of a theory of this kind is a very difficult task that can only be completed with the effort of many scholars. At the same time, taking into consideration the necessity to resist the various crises of today (named at the beginning of this work) with the help of the power of art, and striving to optimise the management of musical life in present-day Russia, we think it advisable to try and suggest a few ways of building up such a theory. These suggestions are based on the diverse research material accumulated within the theory of music, as well as on the practical experience of organising musical life. Developing such suggestions is what the present monograph is aimed at. This work is not an attempt to decisively resolve the problem raised in it, that is, to develop the theoretical basis for the study of musical communication in all its abstractions and interdependencies. It seems that within the scope of this work one would only hope to make a preliminary sketch, an outline of the theory that is sought for, to specify an approximate set of its major problems.

We would like to emphasise that one of our final objectives is to clear up the basic principles and methods of managing the functioning and the development of musical processes in a community. The work will deal with the management of musical communication, which stands for providing the best social conditions for this kind of communication in the musical, cultural and aesthetic life of a community.

Let's set just one limitation. The object of our study will stand for the so-called serious music, that is, academically oriented European music. The specific peculiarities of communicative processes that take place within other, non-European musical cultures, in folk music, in the experimental kinds of modern music, popular and variety show music are definitely worthy of becoming the subject of an independent research. Having said that, we will try to clarify the notions and terms used in the course of this work.

As it is well known, there are two basic approaches to treating the essence of the notion "musical communication". The advocates of the first approach (A. Moles, V. Borev and A. Kovalenko; see: 154–156; 40) treat the term and the phenomenon that corresponds to it in connection with the development of the modern media of mass communication (mainly, the electronic media). The other approach (A.N. Sokhor, V.V. Medushevsky, Y.V. Kapustin; see 228–239; 147; 100) considers the term in relation to the aesthetic essence of a musical piece and, consequently, links it to the

notions fundamental to the temporal unfolding of a musical piece—its *process quality* and its *functionality**. The author of the present work would rather hold to the second understanding of the phenomenon and notion in question, but he makes an attempt to found his study upon a wider category. This category is the musical process as a whole, as an integral dynamic entity that includes all the aspects of the existence of music in a society.

In this respect we deem it necessary to note the following. Although in the musicological works the notion of musical form from the process point of view and from the functional point of view, as well as the other notions of musical life, are not sufficiently related to the inherent communicative properties of music, in the general art theory these relationships are more deeply elaborated. For instance, it is noted,

“...the essential quality of the artistic process “is contained in the representing of the idea through communicative forms, perceived by the society, in the creative artist’s ability to foresee the artistic ideas of his contemporaries, the ways the artistic forms would progress. The understanding of the dynamic interchange within the system ‘*artist-creative activity—work of art society—artist*’ enables one to follow the historical continuity of the aesthetic culture, its forms and methods, the innovative interpretation of the reality and the past. This kind of approach explains the *qualitative changes* in the typological characteristics of the readers, viewers, listeners—the evolution of the social interests” (180, p. 31; italics by the author—A.Y.).

There is a direct indication here, both of the communicative essence of the artistic process, and of the active role of its participants, as well as of the dynamic quality of creative activity, the quality that characterises the acts of imparting and perceiving the aesthetic information.

Then how do we define the notion of musical communication taking into consideration everything that was said above?

We believe, that *musical communication*** is the dynamic system of imparting, receiving and storing information, that is inherently characteristic of the diverse and integral process of creating, accumulating, distributing, consuming and evaluating the musical values, that provides for the optimal functioning and effective interaction of all the participants and structural elements of the above process. This system unfolds in time and

* One has to mention that both the notions are quite thoroughly elaborated in the theory of music in this country (see: 13; 34–35; 150; 207).

** Communicatio, communicatio (Latin)—message, connection, contact.

space, connecting the musical art with the other spheres of social consciousness and activity, assisting the growth of the social influence of musical art and drawing the feedback from society that enables the art to enrich and develop itself.

In the process of musical communication diverse spheres take part in constant interaction. They bring about the specific acts of aesthetic values being created by the artist (individual or collective), interpreted by the performer and perceived by the listener, of the aesthetic result being evaluated by the musical critic. They also account for the interchange with the wide variety of social and historical, aesthetic, psychological and dynamic layers of the social consciousness in its constant development.

Musical communication has to deal with different kinds of information (sound, visual, code information, symbolic and semantic information, etc.). But its basic informational material is “the system of the expressive means of musical language that works on the different layers and levels of the listener’s psychological constitution” (L.A. Mazel). A communicative system of this kind brings about the realisation of the various functions characteristic both of the musical piece itself and of all the participants of the musical aesthetic process. This realisation evolves along different lines, and this provides for the multifarious and concentrated character of its impact (L.A. Mazel) on the public musical consciousness and the spiritual world of a separate musical individual.

Also, it is important to clarify some other key notions that follow the given definition and are used throughout the course of the work.

We understand the process of musical communication as a *closed system* of the functioning of musical information in a society, a system that unfolds in time and space. The notions of *spheres* and *phases* of musical communication are also introduced in the course of this work. The notion of “*the sphere of the communicative process*” stands for a local part of the process that is limited by certain *spatial* parameters, within the limits the consecutive *storing*, *processing* and *transmitting* of the musical information takes place. This monograph cultivates the notion of the four communicative spheres—the sphere of *the composer* (the author, the addresser of a communication), the sphere of *the performer* (the interpreter of a communication), the sphere of *the listener* (the addressee of a communication) and the sphere of *the musicologist-critic* (the commentator of a communication and the regulator of the communicative process as a whole).

The notion of “*the phase of the communicative process*” stands for one of its local components taking place within certain temporal parameters, within which the specific procedures of accumulating, processing and

transmitting the musical information are realised. Within the structure of each of the cited spheres of musical communication (the author's, performer's, listener's, musicologist's sphere) *three phases*, during which the mentioned procedures are realised, are singled out. The notion of "*communicative chain*" is used in two meanings: it may denote the sequence of transmitting the musical information from one sphere to the other (from the author to the performer, and further to the listener and the critic) as well as the progressing through the communicative phases within one sphere (say, within the sphere of the performer, when he moves through the different stages of mastering a musical piece before presenting it to the audience).

The notion of "*the channel of communication*" stands for an established way or venue along which the informational interchange between the addresser and addressee of the musical communication is conducted.

The three other notions that we use are connected with the procedures typical for musical communication—the procedures of *encoding* and *decoding* the musical information. The term "*musical code*" denotes a semantically contracted structure that bears the content of images and ideas and is expressed through the typological means of musical language. *Encoding* stands for the transfer of one type of information into the other. In relation to music, it has to do with transferring the spiritual and aesthetic content from the ideal form (the form of thought and feeling) into a materialised musical form. In its turn, *decoding* stands for the transformation of the contracted (encoded) form into an unfolded, expanded one that restores the original meaning intended by the author.

So, this book is an attempt to explore the main regularities of the creation and the functioning of the integral system of musical communication and to discuss on that basis the essence of the system's components—of the processes of generating, imparting, perceiving and evaluating the aesthetic values of music. The work studies the essential properties of each of the communicative spheres of the composer, the performer, the listener and the musicologist (critic), analyses the interrelationship of these spheres, discovers the basic communicative channels through which the musical information revolves in a society, demonstrates the transformation of information during the procedures of encoding the artistic meanings and the symbols those meanings bring about.

The monograph contains seven chapters. The first chapter reviews the musicological, philosophical, sociological, psychological and pedagogical literature that bears upon the subject of the monograph. It contains an outline of the basic sources of the present study and reveals the most essential ideas that the sources embrace. In the following four chapters musical

communication is analysed and the aspects of its universal role in the existence of musical art, of its dynamic and structural components and links, of the integrity of the means, ways and channels of transmitting musical information are studied.

In the two finishing chapters the author strives to outline the situation in which serious music in modern society functions and exists in order to advocate the necessity and demonstrate the possibility of managing the appropriate processes to better utilise the musical art for the spiritual revival and development of man on the verge of the 21st century.

CHAPTER ONE

THE THEORETICAL PROBLEMS OF MUSICAL COMMUNICATION

It has been mentioned in the Introduction already that musicology has not brought about any special studies that would thoroughly and sufficiently explore musical communication as a complex (system) phenomenon, that integrates all the inherent characteristics of music and its major element—a *musical piece*—and the processes that take place outside that piece during the communication between *the composer* (its author), performer (interpreter), *listener* (“consumer”) and *musicologist* (critic).

At the same time the Russian and foreign musical theory has produced a number of works that, along with the study of many other important problems of musical art and the phenomenon of a musical piece, touch upon or even analyse the various points that have to do with the essential processes of social existence of music, their specific characteristics in relation to each of the cited participants of musical communication that account for the community of perceiving music and understanding its meaning.

In this chapter we would strive to outline the group of works on musical theory that directly or indirectly touch upon the problems that we consider important for the elaboration of the theory of musical communication. We would first review the fundamental works published during the recent sixty years.

Both of the most prominent figures of national musicology of the 20s—B.V. Asafyev and B.L. Yavorsky—have contributed to the considerable growth of interest toward the problems of the interchange and interrelation of the two musical worlds—the world of the creator and the world of the listener. Proper consideration was also given to the obvious fact that the key role in the communication thereof belongs to a third participant—the performer,

“...since the life of a musical creation is in its performance, that is, in putting it into sounds and presenting its meaning to the listeners” (13, p. 264).

The dominant idea of all of the Asafyev's works, including his earliest studies, is the idea of the intonational nature of music as "the art of the intoned meaning" (13, p. 344). This idea was most accurately elaborated in his second book "The Musical Form as a Process" (13). The intonation concept that this scholar advocated and the fundamental notions and terms he introduced to elucidate the concept—those of intonational epochs, intonational crises, as well as the notion of the "intonational vocabulary"—contribute directly to the study of the deeper ways the musical communication between all of its participants works.

The mentioned study, as well as the other works by Asafyev, especially his articles, always contain a very particular and important point—the author's concern for the development of an adequate (intonational) perception of music, that lets the music really reach its addressee—the mass listener that is looking forward to encountering the noble art*. We have to remark here that later during the Soviet era this uplifting tendency largely dominated the fundamentals of the functioning of the process of musical communication and the ways the process was "managed" (this point is discussed in greater detail in the finishing chapters of the present book).

The theoretical convictions of B.L. Yavorsky were also very much in favour of the educational tendency in musical art, in support of the optimisation of the existence of the classical music in society. These ideas were largely sourced from the democratic aspirations of many major Russian composers—such as M.A. Balakirev, N.A. Rimsky-Korsakov, S.I. Taneyev and others. Unfortunately some of Yavorsky's ideas are reflected only in his correspondence (particularly addressed to his student and follower S.V. Protopopov; see: 195; 296) and the only work that was almost completed—*The musical thinking of Russian composers from Glinka to Skryabin*. Yavorsky strove to disclose the deeper layers of the genesis of music, the links that interconnect the different processes of human reality and bring about musical expressiveness. In this pursuit he had considerable grounds for confronting musical language with the verbal speech. That was done not as much to demonstrate the dependence of former upon the latter, but to discover the fundamental differences that exist between them, the specific character of the musical speech—the specific character that is contained in its diversity, its inherent multifaceted quality that coexists

* One has to note that the concern for the truly musical perception of music, as well as the intonation concept as a whole, was largely brought about by subjective factors (a rare kind of absolute pitch, characterised by dynamic inertia). See: the article by Y.V. Nazaikinsky, "Asafyev's Ear" (167).

with the invariable character of the meanings expressed through music. Some of the related ideas were expressed by Yavorsky in a very deep article, little known to the present-day reader called *Text and Music* (297).

Yavorsky attempted to research the genesis and the evolutionary character of the musical thinking, to learn which actions and manipulations bring about and support the processes of perceiving, understanding, creating music (by the composer and the performer). In the course of those studies Yavorsky came to the realisation that a basic, fundamental factor has to be found, a factor that we would call "*the structure-forming component of the system*". According to Yavorsky this major factor was *the harmonic factor*. In different periods of his career he used to term it in a number of ways ("the harmonic rhythm," "the hearing gravitation," etc.). The theorist successfully disclosed the specifying role of the harmonic aspect of the musical sound, the aspect that variously influences the other components of the musical integrity—the rhythm, the volume dynamics, the timbre palette, etc., as well as the constructional and compositional peculiarities of a piece in a broader sense (see: 295, 296).

The essential problems of music as the art of human aesthetic communication studied by Yavorsky and Asafyev, the problems of the specific character of musical language, of the *compositional* and *constructional form of music* as reflected in the works of these scholars have largely predetermined the subsequent development of the national musical theory, outlined the area of its most intense interest, particularly, in the sphere of the communicative process analysis.

Out of the few fundamental works published in the first half of the century, the monograph *The structure of a musical piece* (1946, see: 46) by A.K. Butskoy deserves special consideration. One has to stress the obviously controversial character of this work. This is a study in which the deep theoretical aspirations and valuable findings of the author are essentially neutralised by the official ideological dogma, especially rigid at the beginning of the fifties.

For instance, the monograph advocated the dogmatic idea that,

"Any work of art is a complex *ideological superstructure*, a *reflection* of the *material world* itself and the *Weltanschauung*, the understanding of the reality, <...> that is characteristic of the human society <...> and is eventually defined by the production forces and the production relationships" (46, p. 19; italics by the present author.—A.Y.).

Thus the author of the monograph supported the belief that any work of art is irrevocably dependent on the development and life of society. Such carryovers from the so-called "vulgar sociologisation" characteristic of the

musicology of the 20s, that considered itself Marxist, led the author to the rejection of every manifestation of the truly spiritual, fantasy, unreality aspects in music, forced him to think,

“The freest, the most dauntless flight of fantasy cannot surpass the limits of the content that the consciousness has gleaned from the objective reality” (46, p. 23).

The author constantly stresses the dependence of the personal, individual factors on the social ones (“the personal aspects that are ruled by the social ones,” “...through his personality the artist reflects the ideology of his social milieu,” etc.). The author makes no scruples about criticising the great composers, whose personal inadequacies provoked various digressions from the “correct understanding of the life’s phenomena” and “crippled” some aspects of their creativity. Thus he blames A.N. Scriabin for his absorption in the search for God, characteristic of a certain part of the Russian intelligentsia that made the composer think of himself as a messiah,

...“create a confused pseudo-philosophy and try to put it into practice in the ‘universal mystery of the freely flowing spirit of human creativity’” (46, p. 22).

Butskoy is particularly revolted by the aesthetic concept of the well-known Austrian art critic E. Hanslick (320), by the latter’s numerous ideas having been in conflict with the established musicological dogma. Such ideas for instance,

“Beauty in music arouses the feeling as an auxiliary effect, but first of all it works on the fancy” (320, p. 20);

“...the beauty of a musical piece is something purely musical <...> that has no bearing on any alien, non-musical sphere of thought” (320, p. 9);

“...not only does music speak in sounds, it speaks in sounds only” (320, p. 170);

“...the content of music is the moving sound forms” (320, p. 33).

Rejecting Hanslick’s views Butskoy fails to see the extreme character of his own position. He fails to take into consideration the fact that the sphere of art evolves along its own specific lines, since it is a secondary creative activity of a human being and is different from other forms of human activity. Nor could he see human thinking, particularly artistic and

musical, to be a *structural and system phenomenon**. Therefore, any musical fragment—from the simple sound that is only characterised by its pitch, its continuity within metre, timbre and volume, to a whole musical piece with its often complicated system of images, associations, etc.—works upon *different layers of the human psyche*. That accounts for the fact that the layers and the stages at which an individual perceives musical meaning are numerous, and the “meanings” vary from listener to listener.

It was said above that the work by Butskoy is controversial. Nevertheless, we believe he sometimes express valuable opinions, very helpful in the respect of developing the theory of musical communication. Thus, while analysing the genesis of musical language, he states the latter,

“Cannot be translated into any other language, whether verbal or the language of any other art. <...> The unique quality of the musical language only points to the fact that music is irreplaceable, that it carries out the unique task in understanding and realising the world. This is ‘the pledge of the bare necessity’ of music, of its importance in human life” (46, p. 90).

We considered a brief critical analysis of A.K. Butskoy’s work necessary because it might help the national musicology to get rid of the ties that bound it throughout the recent decades in its analysis of the major categories. These are the categories of the integrity of the musical content and the material form, the relationship of the intellectual and the emotional sources of music and the certain conventionality of musical language and thinking that are manifested in a special system of encoding the message in the musical form.

Nevertheless, in spite of certain influence of the old methodological dogma, there was a tendency in the related works of the 70s and 80s to deeply research the nature of musical meaningfulness and the means of expressing it in the sound integrity of a piece. The number of special works dedicated to some of the major related subjects grew. First of all, the analysis of the system of expressive means in the European music of the past centuries was undertaken in the works by L.A. Mazel, V.A. Zuck-

* The systems and structure approach to the analysis of musical thinking was developed in the works by M.G. Aranovsky, I. Buryanek and others in the 70s (see: 8; 45). Later it gained considerable recognition. This approach is stressed in S.G. Kuzanov’s dissertation. It helps disclose the specific character of this phenomenon of human creativity, unique in its orientation and determining the genesis, the existence and the functioning of musical phenomena, and, at the same time, manifested through them (see: 123, p. 2).

erman, V.V. Medushevsky and Y.V. Nazaikinsky. Then, the studies were made to research the stylistic integrity of a musical piece as a historically predetermined phenomenon (the works by S.S. Skrebkov, V.V. Protopopov and others). Finally, works dedicated to the study of the regularities of the formation of music were published by V.P. Bobrovsky, A.P. Milka, V.V. Medushevsky, Y.V. Nazaikinsky and others.

In relation to the key problem of the present monograph, we have to take into consideration the fact that the inherent regularities of the existence of a musical piece, music in general, studied in the cited works, do not find identical reflection in the processes of *creating*, *performing* and *perceiving* (listening to) musical texts.

The *triadic* character of the musical art, the differentiation of the three spheres of creative activity in its general structure are discussed, to a certain degree, in various related works, but the essence of these works is usually focused on the immanent properties of music itself, and those properties are usually considered only from the viewpoint of studying the activity of the creator of music, its author.

But since the object of the present work is the study of the process of the *transfer* of the essence of the author's message contained in a musical piece into the spheres of performing it and listening to it, the transfer that is possible due to the emerging communicative links; since the object of the work is this, we are more interested in the general aspects of the genesis of the musical creative process and in its essential characteristics, which are analysed in the publications of the cited authors.

One of the central problems of musicology—the problem of the *genesis and semantics of musical language*—is, quite obvious, also central for this work, since the language of music is the basic means of musical communication. In this respect the present author has largely grounded his research upon the studies of L.A. Mazel; in particular, the ideas and concepts he put forward in his book *On the analysis of music: an essay in bringing together theoretical musicology and aesthetics* (138). This work develops a new *aesthetic, culturological* approach to the analysis of the expressive means, semantic meanings and the structure of musical language. This kind of approach has enabled the author to gain the ground for some major generalisations and to set forward some principles and ideas fundamental for musicology. For instance, using the probability principle, Mazel created *the concept of the expressive abilities of the musical means* disclosing their true semantic meaning only within certain context. The starting point for elaborating this idea in his concept is the suggestion that there exist in European musical culture certain historically formed *units of*

expressiveness, which had established themselves in the public musical consciousness (Mazel terms them as “*intonational and genre complexes*”).

It is these complexes used by all the participants of the multidimensional processes of social musical communication that may in a probability fashion be manifested on all of the communication stages.

The other keystone ideas of the concept of expressive abilities are also of considerable importance—particularly the idea of the integrity and the paradoxical character of individual expressive means, the principle of the multitude character and the concentrated character of their impact. As a whole, L.A. Mazel's concept has disclosed the necessity and brought about the possibility of studying the deeper language regularities that are common to the musical thinking of the composer, the performer and the listener.

Most valuable material on the processes of musical communication and the meaningful content of the information that is exchanged during that communication is contained in the major work by S.S. Skrebkov *The aesthetic principles of the musical styles* (219).

Understanding “musical style as <...> *the highest kind of aesthetic integrity*” (219, p. 10; italics by A.Y.) the author of the above work constantly stresses a very important aspect. The stylistic integrity, according to Skrebkov,

“In the shape of often practically imperceptible generic links is spread throughout a musical piece; it permeates the *theme, the language, the formation* of music. It is manifested in the imagery of the piece as a whole, in the creative tradition of *the composer*, in his *attitude to life, to the listeners, to the performers*” (219, p. 10; all italics by the present author.—A.Y.).

It is also stressed,

“The theoretical musicology focuses on the logic of the musical art, strives to find the fundamental definition of the *general principles of musical thinking*” (219, p. 12; italics by the present author.—A.Y.).

* We believe that this idea should be taken further. Into the context of the studied logical relationships in music one should introduce not only the inner structure of a musical piece, but all the communicative processes during which it is created by the author, reproduced by the performer, perceived by the listener and historically and semantically evaluated by the musicologist (critic).

In the context of the present monograph one of Skrebkov's ideas may be said to be of special interest. It is the idea that the theory of music while studying the style and therefore having a musical piece as its central object,

"Should not be distracted from the essential links and relationships amongst which the piece emerges and lives—from the process during which the creative intention of the composer first arises, from the requirements of the contemporary audience, <...> from the tasks and challenges the performers of the piece faced" (219, p. 11).

Nevertheless, later in the book the author concedes,

"The theory of music has to follow *different ways* while taking into consideration the connections of the piece with the different components of its environment. In its generalisations the theory *has to abstract itself* from the elements of historical fortune and sheer chance that are present in those data [the facts on the performing cycle of the piece, the reaction of the audience and the critics is meant here.—A.Y.], since the object of musical theory is to define the basic *general characteristics* of a musical piece" (218, p. 11; italics by the present author.—A.Y.).

Therefore the starting point of this study is justified: the processes of musical communication, that determine both the social stage of the existence of a musical piece and the beginning stages of its forming and creation (including their historically predetermined peculiarities) have not yet been central to musicological research, but have rather been considered as side circumstances, external to the art itself. Today, as it was put forward in the Introduction, the vast changes in the whole complex of the social existence of music as an art have led the musical theory to the necessity of focusing on the nature and peculiarities of these processes.

To research the mechanisms of transferring the aesthetic meanings from the composer to the other participants of the system of communication, one has to study the problem of the musical piece since this form of musical message is the very material that cycles through "the communication links" and serves as the central object of communication between the composer, the performer, the listener and the critic. One also has to take into consideration the importance of form in the emerging of music as an art, the specific character of the form's creation and existence, and the peculiar ways in which the form is fixed and perceived.

Discussing the fundamental importance of the perception for the adequate understanding of musical form as a genuinely aesthetic phenomenon, essential for music, B.V. Asafyev wrote,

“The form of sonata allegro contains the expressiveness of symphonism. It openly manifests, in a feeling that is so alive for composers, the resilience, the resistance and at the same time the flexibility that contribute to the amazing intensity and expressiveness of the musical development. These qualities are fully understandable and tangible for the composers and are very hard to comprehend outside music, as well as the notions and, quite real for musicians, sensations of introductory tone, harmony, interval, development. <...> And those who do not feel the elasticity of the sonata allegro as well as the elasticity and ‘gravitation’ of the links in every interval will face a great, even unsurpassable difficulty in becoming a musician. It is the deafness of pitch (not the physiological deafness of the ear, but exactly <...> the deafness of pitch, of the musical ear)” (13, p. 303; italics by the present author; the thinned out type by the original author.—A.Y.).

Then Asafyev makes an important note stressing the role of the general understanding of the elements of the musical form. In fact, this has to do with one of the major conditions that provides for the effectiveness of communicative processes. In relation to that Asafyev writes the following, and we deem it very important,

“One cannot be an artist without understanding the nuances of colour and chiaroscuro, although one can distinguish colours perfectly, as many non-professionals do. <...> So, the musicologists that claim that they disclose the meaning of music, without hearing the musical forms as the product of thinking process, ‘improvise their own meanings’ with the accompaniment of music, but are not thinking together with the composer” (13, p. 303; italics by the present author; the thinned out type by the original author.—A.Y.).

In Russian musicology the problem of form in music—in a broad understanding, when it is considered as a system of means that contribute to expressing the aesthetic meaning through sound—has provoked the interest of many theorists, and therefore it has been thoroughly and carefully researched. A considerable contribution to the theory of the musical form was made in the works by V.P. Bobrovsky, (34; 35), V.V. Medushevsky (144; 145), A.P. Milka (150), V.V. Protopopov (194), Y.V. Nazaikinsky (165) and some others.

In his book *The functional bases of musical form* V.P. Bobrovsky develops Asafyev’s ideas on the dynamic character of musical form as an intonational phenomenon that bears a certain meaning. According to Bobrovsky, the function of musical form, its role and purpose lie exactly in being the medium for that meaning. He defines the musical form as a *multilevel hierarchical system* with elements characterised by two closely

interrelated aspects—the *functional* and the *structural*. The former the author understands as “everything that has to do with the meaning, the role, the purport of a given element within the system,” and the latter as “everything that deals with its concrete expression, its inner structure” (35, p. 13). The system approach advocated by Bobrovsky is very important for the analysis of musical communication undertaken within this work. Bobrovsky considers the functional and the structural aspects of music inseparable; he claims that they can only be separated by logical abstraction (35, p. 13) since they exist as an integral unity.

Therefore, while analysing the processes of musical communication, any small change in any of the elements of the structure of musical form may be considered as a modification, a deviation in its function—in its *role of building the meaning* into the musical phrase. On the other hand, Bobrovsky’s work contains another valuable idea. It is the well-grounded and elaborated idea of *the variability* (mobility) *of the functions* of musical form. This property is always manifested in the variability of the constructional and compositional structures of the integral whole—a musical piece*. The concept of the variability of the functions enables one to theoretically analyse as well as practically research the oftentimes substantial changes in the meaning of music in the processes of musical communication that take place within the chain “*the composer—the performer—the listener—the musicologist-critic*”.

A different aspect of the analysis of the musical form is developed in the works by V.V. Medushevsky (144; 145; 146) generalised in the monograph *The intonational form of music* (145). The author focuses on studying the *content aspect and the intonational* aspect of the deep (basal) factors of musical expression. According to Medushevsky, the musical form (in its broadest sense) is an intonational form that reflects, through the unity of its *emotional* (according to Medushevsky, proto-intonational) and *logical* (analytical) aspects, the inner world of the individual*. A deep and

* In finishing lines of his study the author presents the following definition of the musical form, laconic but exhaustive: “The musical form is a functionally mobile process of the intonational expression of a certain artistic idea” (35, p. 328). One should note that this is the notion of the essence and the role of musical form in the emerging of the spiritual meaning of music, that has become the leading notion in our further analysis of understanding and the developing the form and its elements during the processes of musical communication.

*.It is not by chance that the author of the quoted monograph considers the problem of understanding the intonational meaning of music as central to the professional

thorough analysis related to the conceptual idea of the high purpose of music has enabled the theorist to rise to a number of substantial generalisations concerning the basic ways the musical form emerges and develops, particularly its reproduction during performance.

Considering the multiplicity of the ways a performer may recreate the music, Medushevsky justly notes,

“Although in music, as in everything else, a human being is granted freedom, but he also takes responsibility, and although the variants of understanding are numerous, the difference between the correct and the distorted still remains” (145, p. 233).

The author is critical of the approach whereby,

“...the solution of the problem of the difference between arbitrariness and artistic freedom <...> is usually sought after within the horizontal of form and meaning, <...> whereas first of all one should focus on the spiritual vertical. <...> The problem of adequacy is first and foremost the problem of the *spiritual calibre*, the preservation of the highest ideas and the unacceptability of letting the public culture debase itself” (145, p. 233).

Therefore, the highest spiritual criterion of evaluating all the manifestations of the musical form is considered as, probably, the most important, essential instrument in the analysis of all the aspects and laws of musical communication in human society.

The author had been approaching these conclusions gradually. One of the stages that led to their crystallisation was a thorough analysis of the communicative functions realised in a musical piece. This analysis was undertaken in the book *On the laws and means of the aesthetic impact of music*. Medushevsky develops the theory of the communicative function of music considering the function in its close connection with the semantic function of music. Theorising in this direction, he proceeds from the notion of “the form meant for the listener” introduced by Asafyev. This notion characterises “the highest degree of the communicative perfection of music”. In relation to all that, Medushevsky has deeply analysed (taking into consideration the peculiarities of perception) the communicative techniques, the structure, the appropriate syntactic means and the various manifestations of the communicative function—the way it is manifested through clarification, the heuristic impact of musical meaning, etc.

and general musical education reform (see: 148). This major question is raised again in the finishing chapters of the present work.

While discussing ontological issues and the issues of the social existence of music as a sphere of human spiritual communication and interaction, Medushevsky follows the tradition of assigning these issues to the field of sociology and social psychology (see: 147, p. 121), although he touches upon the influence that the “whole system of communication” should have on the structure of a musical piece.

It is the works of Y.V. Nazaikinsky that largely blaze the trail for the theoretical analysis of the phenomenon of musical communication as a whole, as a *complex, multi-component and multi-level system* (163–166). His major publications are *Upon the psychology of musical perception* (1972, see: 166), *The logic of musical composition* (1982, see: 165) and *The sound universe of music* (1988, see: 163). These works form a triad, so to speak. In that triad, the theorist gradually advances from the deep analysis of the genesis of the psychological phenomena that led to the creation of music and its influence upon man, to the discovery of the laws of adequately constructing the compositional form of a musical piece, the form that corresponds with the specific characteristics of human thinking, and further to the study of the whole sound environment around us, the environment bringing about the very emergence of music, as well as the appropriate, more or less favourable, circumstances of its social existence.

The cited works have largely served as an impulse for the study we are trying to undertake here. This study should be a complex one, related to the other branches of theoretical thought outside musicology, but it would still have to be principally *musicological* in its consideration of the problem of socio-musical communication, and that problem would have to be researched in all its vital, quite real integrity*. In this respect we took as our lodestar the following words by Nazaikinsky,

“I have oftentimes witnessed as the stratagems and fanciful constructions of counterpoint, the ingenious stylistic ornaments, the bright harmonic colours prevent the mind, all too prone to analytical thinking, from seeing the deep, the elusive, the most mysterious lanes along which the musical thought progresses, as the *exaggerated* focus on the technical, the material aspect of the work of art turns quite unexpectedly into a flight from its inner meaning, so much so, that the musicians fail to notice the very es-

* The communicative aspect is involved in many works on intonation. Genre, style, form, aesthetic trends in music and its consideration are also characteristic of the studies upon the sociological and aesthetic problems of music. Nevertheless, as Y.M. Rags justly notes, “the musicologists tend rather to claim that their works are communicatively oriented, than to really explore the pertinent subjects” (160, p. 3).