

UDC – 78.01

THE METHODOLOGY FOR THE ANALYSIS OF MUSICAL WORKS IN WESTERN EUROPEAN AND RUSSIAN MUSICOLOGY: TRADITIONS AND CONTEMPORARY LEADING VECTORS

Natia Dekanosidze

Doctor of Arts, assistant-professor at Tbilisi State Conservatoire
V. Sarajishvili Tbilisi State Conservatoire; 8-10 Griboedov str., Tbilisi 0108, Georgia

Abstract

The discipline “Analysis of musical works” counts over two hundred years. The study subject of this discipline changes in due course. If in the 19th century theory of Analysis developed towards schematization of forms, in the 20th century deep comprehension of the individual character and peculiarities, originality of musical work became a pressing issue. This tendency especially developed in the 20th century. The discipline of Analysis diverts its focus from the ascertainment of a form-scheme to the problems of musical thinking and via this to the phenomenon of human idea generally. In the process of analysis “form-structure” is replaced by the new concept “Analytical form”, universal understanding of the musical form, which encompasses all parameters of musical-artistic thinking.

New goals of the discipline demanded new methodology. New works are presented in the genre of research, where musical form is studied not only as a particular type of structure, but also as a dramaturgical principle and is considered in the prism of era, style and genre peculiarities, semiotic meaning of music lexemes and the semantics of musical works, which is hidden in music and needs to be brought to the surface.

Keywords: *musical analysis, musical forms, musical content, schematization, form-structure analytical form, entire analysis, complex analysis, semiotic analysis, hermeneutic analysis.*

In the early 2000s, when musical science entered new phase of development, emerged the necessity to summarize and generalize the traditions and achievements of previous centuries. Such necessity was determined largely by the particular diversity of the 20th century occurrences, perception of its complete picture needed to look at and analyze the events from a broad perspective. Such a summary of the walked path is also necessary for the science “Analysis of musical works”, which counts more than two hundred years.

Today “Analysis of musical works” is a complex discipline for the synthesis of musical-theoretical subjects in Georgian, Russian/former Soviet and Western European musicology. It generalizes and integrates the knowledge in musical theory, harmony, polyphony, organology (science of musical instruments), history of orchestra styles and music history acquired by those who take the course. The subject aims to encompass structure as well as artistic content of the work. The topic of the study is the form of work, which is regarded from two basic aspects: unified system of musical-expressive means and a definite compositional structure. The educational discipline also familiarizes musicians with the diversity of musical forms, their constructive, intonational-thematic and dramaturgical peculiarities, historical origin and development, basic terms and notions. Today the discipline is summarizing and integrating, however main object of the study underwent changes over time.

The science for the analysis of musical works, as the “science on musical forms”, originated in the mid 18th century. Emancipation of the object of analysis, as a science on forms began in the epoch of crystallization of classical musical structures - in the middle of the 18th century (G. K. Koch, I. Matheson, K. G. Ziegler), but at the time theoretical notions for analysis were still presented together with the practical theory of compositions. (A. B. Marx “Die Lehre von der musikalischen Komposition”). Later the analysis acquired the status of an independent scientific discipline, but this became clearer by the end of the 19th century. From this viewpoint, a different approach is Riemann’s theory, which is no longer teaching on composition, but the study of the rules and laws, which are related with the art of the past, allowing not to create the new, but to generalize the already-created.

In the 19th century theory of analysis mainly developed towards the systematization and schematization of traditional musical forms, which had originated in the 18th century and, once and for all consolidated in the 19th century (form and its schematic side as the main object of analysis are presented in the works of A. B. Marx and H. Riemann). Until the 1920s-1930s the discipline of analysis named “Analysis of musical forms” mainly involved definition of the composition of musical form, which was in compliance with the form schemes provided in the manual. At the same time, the analysis paid little attention to the peculiarities of thematic development processes and other means of expression. This type of manuals were: “Music Theory” (1818) by G. Hess de Calve, “Guide to composing music” (1859-63) by J. Gunke, “Die Grundzüge der musikalischen Formen und ihre Analyse” (1852) by E. F. Richter, “Musikalische Formenlehre” (1878) by L. Bussler, „Musical form” (1891) and “Applied forms” (1895) by the English scholar E. Prout. In Russian musicology such works were: “Guide to the study of forms of instrumental and vocal music” (1893-94) by A. S. Arensky, “Musical form” (1934-1936) by G. L. Katuar, the latter was used as a manual for musicologists in the 1930s. At the same time created were works which did not discuss musical work only from the standpoint of form schematization, but boasted more universal, comprehensive and generalizing type of analysis. Such, for instance, are the works by H. Riemann and especially by E. Kurth (the ideas provided in Kurth’s work became the basis for Asafyev’s “theory of intonation”).

In the 20th century topical became the issue of understanding the individual nature of work and its uniqueness. Musical science had a new attitude to the idea of musical form. After that many opinions were expressed about the object and methods of analysis. Researchers started talking about the indivisibility of form and content. This tendency became particularly strong from the 1930s. The discipline of analysis shifted its focus from the statement of facts to the problems of musical thinking and in this way to the phenomenon of human thought. In the process of analysis introduced was the notion “analytical form” (Medushevsky’s term) instead of “form-structure”, universal understanding of form, which encompassed all parameters of musical-artistic thinking. Despite the fact that at the time there existed no universal and unified analysis theory, unified methodology and approach of analysis failed to be formed, still distinguished can be a number of important issues which were in the focus of attention during the analysis, such as: problem of the unity of work, significance of a specific structure and function, access to the essence of work, ascertainment of style theory, peculiarities of form formation process, the study of how the process segues into structure.

New tasks of the discipline required elaboration of new methodology for the analysis. The manuals deal only with research, where form is studied not only as a type of particular structure, but as a dramaturgical principle and is considered in the light of epoch, style and genre peculiarities. It should be noted that the Soviet school followers established the type of analysis called ‘entire’ or complex analysis. The new tendency was manifested in the change of the subject name - "Analysis of musical compositions," instead of "Analysis of forms", which indicated to the changes in the content and the approach of the subject.

Thus in the analysis of musical work Soviet musicology replaced typology of forms by typology of the means for musical expression, where form is presented as one of a leading means. Russian musicologists believe that for the right analysis it is essential to know the peculiarities of the regularities and general principles of form-making, expressive possibilities of musical language elements, interrelation between expressive means, mechanisms of their simultaneous action and knowledge of author's style. From this viewpoint the form only plays role of prism, in which particular work is considered and this should not be an end in itself for the consideration. The principles of "entire analysis" are presented in the works of the musicologists such as: L. Mazel, V. Zuckerman, I. Tiulin, E. Ruchievskaya, I. Sposobin, S. Skrebkov, B. Asafyev, V. Bobrovsky, V. Medushevsky and others. The same opinion is shared by: C. Kühn, C. Dahlhaus, T. Adorno, H. Grabner, H. Goldschmidt, D. Toyev, etc.

It should be noted that Western musicological practice radically deviated from the problem of traditional structure analysis. In this regard, particularly big is the impact of Schenker's theory, which completely ruled out the systematization of forms, and not just forms, from the problem of analysis. H. Schenker is the author of the phrase: "Music is a live motion of tones in nature space" and as Kholopov mentions one important achievement of Schenker's system is that he was one of the first who tried to understand the concept of music and find solution from the primary idea to the entire developed tissue.

The subjectivity and radicalism of Schenker's theory is determined by its exaggerated significance of harmonious initial within major-minor system, this is why this approach cannot be used for the analysis of music of all epochs and styles. In addition, Schenker's methodology blurs the distinction between the peculiarities of polyphonic and harmonic-polyphonic form constructions; analysis of harmonic axis ignores other important factors as well (e.g. thematic, meter-rhythmic, the form proper). In this regard it is also notable that Schenker had his own understanding of composition notion. Speaking of composition, he used the term "improvisation", as the contrary, antipode of the rational, preliminarily provided and created according to certain recipes. With the term "improvisation" Schenker tried to explain the self-moving nature of music directed by internal forces, which he believed is not the product of the realization of rational schemes and is intuitively identified by composers in the creative process. Despite such extraordinary attitude Schenker's theory gained certain popularity in the circle of musicians. His merit lies in the fact that the innovative approach enabled musicians to overcome the powerful inertia of sketchiness in reviewing the work. Original analysis of work also made it possible to see relatively unnoticed details of a work.

From the mid 20th century subjective view gains foothold in musicology and particularly in the discipline of analysis, resulting from the efforts of some scientists and researchers not to take a closeup look at the events, from an objective perspective, but from any particular angle. In addition to the principle of Schenker's analysis, this feature is also characteristic of Bobrovsky's theory of form, presented in the work "Functional Basics of Musical Form". This distinguished and a very interesting concept of the scholar is also not applicable to, for instance, the analysis of pre-Renaissance music and that close to modernity.

Since the last quarter of the 20th century to the present day popular has been the research in musical semiotics. In such works researchers aim is to allot in a musical text elements of separation so-called "migrating formulas", music lexemes, like "rhetoric formulas" which have a specific meaning. The authors of such works are A. Danieluo ("Semantique musicale", 1967), V. Karbuzitsky ("Grundriss der musikalischen Semantik", 1986), L. Ratner, S. Maltsev ("Semantic of musical sign", "*Semantika muzikalnogo znaka*", 1980), A. Kudryashov ("Theory of musical content", "*Teoriya muzikalnogo sodержaniya*", 2010).

One of the negative sides of the approach is that musical events are discussed with a mathematical scrupulosity and the works are overfilled with complex terminology. Such analysis often results in deplorable and inconsequent results (e.g. sometimes a researcher attempts to

consider each interval specifically, load the analysis with unnecessary details, which may not at all convey the essence of the work and become a kind of end in itself). Such semiotic analysis of music as a system of symbols often leads to the deformation of the spontaneity of musical idea, perception of its naturalness and creates the sense of artifice.

In the last quarter of the 20th century hermeneutic analysis, often identified with semiotic analysis, becomes popular in the works of many musicologist-researchers. But if semiotics attaches importance to music, hermeneutics explores depth of the work, the semantics, which is hidden in music and needs to be brought to the surface. It should be noted that hermeneutic analysis often develops into the analysis of form, expression means, artistic-emotional side of the work, this is why it is difficult to draw a clear line between hermeneutic and complex analyses. Elements of hermeneutic research are encountered in many musicological works; however, this principle is of particular importance in the works of the musicologists such as L. Mazel, T. Cherednichenko, C. Dahlhaus, H. Motte-Haber, E. Chigareva, V. Shirokova and others.

Despite the upheavals that took place in the analysis at the end of the 20th century the problem – which particular, specific tasks must be solved by the theory of analysis, solution of which would result in the formation of analysis as a systemic theoretical discipline, are considered relevant and open for the discipline.

References

- 1) Bobrovskij V.P. Funkcional'nye osnovy muzykal'noj formy. M.: Muzyka, 1977. Bobrovski V.P. Functional basics of musical form. Moscow: Music, 1977 (*in Russian*)
- 2) Bonfel'd M.Sh. Analiz muzykal'nyh proizvedenij: Struktury tonal'noj muzyki. Chast' 1, M.: VLADOS, 2003. Bonfeld M. Sh. Analysis of musical works: Structures of tonal music. P.I, Moscow: VLADOS, 2003 (*in Russian*)
- 3) Vlasova N.O. Genrih Shenker i ego analiticheskaja teorija // Muzykal'no-teoreticheskie sistemy XX veka. M.: Muzizdat, 2011, 123-145. Vlasova N.O. Heinrich Schenker and his analytical theory // Musical-theoretical systems of XX century. Moscow: Muzizdat, 2011, 123-145 (*in Russian*)
- 4) Kholopova V.N. Teorii muzykal'nogo sodержaniya, muzykal'noj germenevtiki, muzykal'noj semantiki, sxodstvo i razlichia // Obshestva teorii muzyki. M. № 3. 2014/1, 20-42. Kholopova V.N. Theories of musical content, musical hermeneutic, musical semantic, similarities and differences // Society of musical theory. Moscow. № 3. 2014/1, 20-42 (*in Russian*)
- 5) Kudrjashev A.Ju. Teorija muzykal'nogo sodержaniya. hudozhestvennye idei evropejskoj muzyki XVII - XX vv // uchebnoe posobie dlja muzykal'nyh vuzov i vuzov iskusstv. SPb.: Lan', 2010. Kudriashev A.I. Theory of musical content. Artistic ideas of European music of the XVII - XX centuries // A manual for music universities and arts universities. SPb: Lan, 2010 (*in Russian*)

- 6) Lagutina E.V. Genrih Shenker i ego «Uchenie o garmonii»: avtoreferat na diss. kand. iskusstv. M., 2014. Lagutina E.V. Henrich Schenker and his “Study about harmony”: Abstract on the thesis of the candidate of Arts. Moscow, 2014 (*in Russian*)
- 7) Mazel' L.A., Cukkerman V.A. Analiz muzykal'nyh proizvedenij. M.: Muzyka, 1967. Mazel L.A., Zuckerman V.A. Analysis of musical works. Moscow: Music, 1967 (*in Russian*)
- 8) Pylaev M.E. Karl Dal'hauz o sud'bah analiza muzyki XVIII-nachala XX veka. Zhurnal “Obshhestva teorii muzyki”. № 1. 2013/1. 179-186. Pilaev M.E. Carl Dahlhaus about the fate of the analysis of music XVIII-early XX century. Journal of the "Society of Music Theory". № 1. 2013/1. 179-186 (*in Russian*)
- 9) Holopov Ju. Muzykal'no-teoreticheskaja sistema Hajnriha Shenkera. M., 2006. Kholopov I. Musical-theoretical system of Heinrich Schenker. Moscow., 2006 (*in Russian*)
- 10) Shenker G. Svobodnoe pis'mo. Tom I: Tekst / Per. B. Plotnikova. Krasnojarsk, 2003. Schenker H. Free writing style. Vol. I: Text and translation by B. Plotnikova. Krasnoyarsk, 2003 (*in Russian*)

Article received: 2017-05-03