

ALEXANDRA SAMOILENKO (Odesa / Ukraine)

Odesa School of Musicology as an integrative phenomenon: European origins and modern national tendencies

Dear colleagues, I am very glad to congratulate all the participants of this wonderful conference, which allows us to strengthen professional and purely human international ties in our difficult times.

Dear colleagues, the topic of my report is due to two main reasons. First of all, to outline the leading features of the Odesa School of Musicology as a fairly stable educational and scientific phenomenon; secondly, to find out the nature and purpose of the school of musicology in general, as part of modern humanities culture, which combines the general and the special at the level of cognitive tradition.

The interaction of the European tradition of historical and systematic musicology with current trends in the formation of national forms of music education is a fundamental feature of the Odesa School of Musicology.

Its foundation is the professional scientific and pedagogical activity of the representatives of the Odesa Conservatory – today the Odesa National Music Academy named after Antonina V. Nezhdanova, which is based on educational and scientific initiatives of two departments: Department of Music Theory and Composition; Department of History of Music and Musical Ethnography.

The history of the Department of Music Theory and Composition dates back to 1934. The origins of the Odesa Theoretical School of Musicology are the opening in the mid-1860s of music classes by the “Society of Music Lovers” under the leadership of Peter Sokalsky, as well as the activities of his successors, students of Nikolay A. Rimsky-Korsakov – Porphyry Molchanov, and then Vitold Malyshevsky and Vasil Zolotaryov. Its methodological foundations were laid by mastering the methodological guidelines of the St. Petersburg School of Musicology, and through them – by restoring certain principles of German musicology, of course with some correction to new professional and educational tasks.

The historical direction of Odesa academic musicology, formed in the 50s of the last century, has always unfolded in a rather broad interdisciplinary context, so it immediately acquired signs of systematic one, combining research efforts of musicologists of different generations who followed Guido Adler’s approach. In particular, Georgy Viranovsky (1935–2013), who taught a course on musical theoretical systems at the Odesa Academy, can be considered a follower of German systematic musicology.

However, over the last few decades, the traditional division of musicological disciplines into theoretical and historical (with a corresponding continuation of the distribution in each field) no longer justifies itself. Along with this, we observe many separate authorial attempts to renew the model of musicology. Sometimes

this is done with a focus on the holistic method and an understanding approach:¹ sometimes – in order to organize on a cognitive and linguistic basis.² The diversity of musicological conceptualism is affected by related problematic phenomena; they are associated with the appeal to the antinomic principles of culture and phenomena of time,³ also lead to the discovery of various forms of dialogue in art.

Not less productive in the theoretical sense is the appeal to the problem of catharsis as the basis of understanding, the effect of attachment to meaning, the highest moment of psychological development and emotional fullness of consciousness, at the same time – the central moment of artistic perception that is programmed by the compositional construction of an art work.⁴

New problematic theoretical directions have a double validity. On the one hand, they arise on the basis of permanent humanitarian issues, namely, questions about the essential contradictions of human life, the mechanism of culture and its creative functions, the distant transcendent meanings that attach the experience of the individual to the existence of the universe. On the other hand, for such an art discipline as modern musicology, the above-mentioned issues have not yet become quite “their own”, it means, they have not reached methodological integrity and subject coherence. The key question about musicology today can be formulated in a following way: what is a school of musicology and is it able to form a special methodological branch of the humanities as a whole?

In our opinion, all the innovations that take place both in the scientific research and in the educational spheres of Odesa musicology (more broadly – Ukrainian,

¹ Moris Bonfeld, *Music. Tongue. Language. Thinking: (Experience in systematic analysis of musical art)*. Part 1. Theses. Moskva: MGZPI, 1991.

Nina Gerasimova-Persidskaya, *Integrity as a universal and its manifestation in music*. Scientific comp. NMAU im. P. I. Tchaikovsky. Vol. 51: Questions of organization of artistic integrity of a musical work. Kyiv 2005, p. 3–8.

Nina Gerasimova-Persidskaya, *On the perception of music and comprehension of meaning*. Scientific comp. NMAU im. P. I. Tchaikovsky. Vol. 60: Theoretical and practical aspects of musical meaning. Kyiv 2006, p. 3–8.

Reseda Kushmina, *Language and music as semantic sound forms of culture*. Cand. thesis: 24.00.01–theory and history of culture. Kazan 2004.

² Mark Aranovsky, *Musical text. Structure and properties*. Moskva: Composer, 1998.

Ivan Kotlyarevsky, *On the concept of musical thinking*. *Musical thinking: essence, categories, aspects of research*. Kyiv: Musical Ukraine. 1989, p. 28–34.

Yevgeny Nazaykinsky, *Sound world of music*. Moskva: Music, 1998.

Yevgeny Nazaykinsky, *The logic of musical composition*. Moskva: Music, 1982.

Igor Pyaskovsky, *Poetics of musical thinking*. Kyiv: Music, 1987.

³ Vsevolod Zaderatsky, *Musical form*. In 2 issue. Issue 1: Textbook for specialized faculties of higher musical educational institutions. Moskva: Music, 1995.

Victoria Sukhantseva, *Category of time in musical culture*. Kyiv: Lybid, 1990.

⁴ Aleksandra Samoilenko, *Musicology and methodology of humanitarian knowledge. The problem of dialogue*. Odesa: Astroprint, 2002.

Aleksandra Samoilenko, *Compositional-semantic analysis of music and catharsis*. *Materiali to the Ukrainian Musical Studies*. Vol. 3. Kyiv, 2003, p. 88–93.

and even more broadly – European) are connected with the attempts to answer this question.

It should be emphasized that a specific feature of today can be considered the strengthening of applied practical functions of musicology, which manifest themselves primarily through educational and communicative testing. This approbation claims to reach beyond academic courses, to open new ways of applying musicological ideas in the semantic world of culture. But it is interesting that these ways are determined in the process of live dialogic communication in different information contexts and organizational forms; they generate even completely new scientific and creative projects and discursive practices (such as the International Musicological Seminar “Musicological word in information content of (post)-modernity”, which has been held for several years on the basis of the Odesa Music Academy, in recent years in an online format, gathering a wide audience).

As defined by the psychological works of Dmitry Leontiev,⁵ some other representatives of the Russian psychological school, as well as the classic Western works of Erich Fromm⁶ and Viktor Frankl,⁷ the leading human trait is the ability to self-actualization, which associated with the creation of symbolic language, special, autonomous metaphorical spaces of human existence. Spirituality, freedom and responsibility are seen as the leading existentials of human existence, which become the main psychological artifacts of culture and generate their own artistic precedents.⁸ That means that the nature of human consciousness and the preconditions of artistic creativity coincide.

Therefore, it should be borne in mind that, as Lev Vygotsky⁹ once noted, a full-fledged notion of an artistic phenomenon, as well as the methodological justification of the art criticism approach, are not possible without solving certain psychological issues. Systematic presentation of these issues gives rise to *the psychology of art* as one of the basic disciplines of modern systematic musicology.

Theoretical guidelines of this disciplinary field include: the concept of psychology of art in the concept of L. Vygotsky; determination of the place and role of psychological knowledge in the modern world and the psychological conditionality of aesthetic categories; consideration of the problem of aesthetic and artistic emotions; determination of the nature and functions of psychological artifacts in the “living world of culture” and their artistic “precedents”; study of artistic communication as a psychological process, dialogical aspects of artistic in-

⁵ Dmitry Leontiev, *Psychology of meaning: nature, structure and dynamics of semantic reality*: 3-rd ed., Ext. Moskva: Sense, 2007.

⁶ Erich Fromm, *To have or to be?* Per. from English. 2 ed. Moskva: Progress, 1990.

⁷ Viktor Frankl, *Man in search of meaning*. Moskva: Progress, 1990.

Viktor Frankl, *Criticism of pure “communication”: how humanistic is “Humanistic Psychology”*. Humanistic and transpersonal psychology. An anthology. Mn.: Ast., 2000, p. 211–240.

⁸ Frankl, *Criticism of pure “communication”*, p. 225.

⁹ Lev Vygotsky, *Psychology of art*. Moskva: Art, 1968.

fluence and artistic “purification” (catharsis); identification of psychological motives in the theory of artistic genres by Mikhail Bakhtin¹⁰ and their accumulation in the “canonical psychology” of the school of Vladimir Romenets;¹¹ identification of new ways of art analysis in the projection to the concept of spiritual, symbolic intentions of human consciousness in art; study of the construction of artistic composition in its accordance with the semantic structure of personal consciousness. psychological aspects of musicological analysis.

Updated musicological methodology under its influence acquires the features of epistemological analysis and provides: the approach to music as a process and the total result of artistic thinking; the creation of the concept of musical language as one that reflects the “psychological duel” of art and reality; attempts to create universal dictionary-encyclopedic models of musical culture; development of game theory and taking into account the evaluative ambivalence of the artistic image as a game factor (conditions of the “game”).

In turn, the categorical preconditions of the epistemological approach are revealed by humanitarian works, which, firstly, address the mysteries of the human spirit, and secondly, reveal the functionality of a musical artifact, it means, they touch on the problem of structural analysis of art.

The initial position on the poetics of music is combined with an assessment of the interdependence of “artistry” with artificiality (made), which determines all the functional capabilities of artistic creativity form. Boris Gubman proposes to name communicative, cognitive, educational, educational, playful, hedonistic as the main functions of art.¹² This list seems fairly free; from the point of view of traditional aesthetics, suggestive, ethical and aesthetic, compensative, heuristic (predictive), evaluative, and some other functions can be added to it. But, in our opinion, the primary, those from which all others are separated, I mean fundamental, are three functional aspects of art (art form): dialogical, symbolic and cathartic.

Today we have to admit that the cognitive-evaluative system of musicology is formed in accordance with the functional and communicative tasks of musical art. And if art is defined as a form of culture associated with the subject’s ability to aesthetic development of the modern world and its reproduction in the figurative and symbolic aspect through the resources of creative imagination,¹³ then musicology should be defined as *a scientifically discursive form of reproduction of figurative and artistic, and therefore aesthetic and psychological, content of music by its verbal and symbolic modeling.*

¹⁰ Mikhail Bakhtin, *Aesthetics of verbal creativity*: 2 ed.; comp. S. Bocharov; approx. S. Averintseva and S. Bocharova. Moskva: Art, 1986.

¹¹ Vladimir Romenets / Irina Manokha, *History of the twentieth century psychology*. Kyiv: Libid, 1998.

¹² Boris Gubman, *Art. Culturology. XX century. Vocabulary*. St. Petersburg: University Book, 1997, p. 159–161.

¹³ *Ibid.*

The starting genre-genus differences of art, which determine its division into separate artistic varieties, are, first of all, differences in artistic interpretations of the phenomena of space and time, which form both external and internal borders of cultural experience. The history of art unfolds as a history of spatial and temporal symbolism, which seeks to represent universal forms of communication. As Pavel Florensky noted, “the more ontological the *vision*, the more universal the form”.¹⁴ These words of Florensky are part of his concept of “artistry” (“art”), as a dream that turns into reality; the canons of artistic creativity are connected with that reality, and the canons themselves generalize the spatial and temporal requirements of the perception of an art work. According to the theologian, in its foundations, art must always remain a fact of Divine reality, a manifestation of a higher spiritual experience, a vision of completeness – of holiness.¹⁵ Thus, Florensky provides a symbolic basis for considering the canonical factors of art at all its levels.

Inheriting Florensky’s canonical and symbolic approach, Sergey Averintsev tries to bring it to the scope of the “sophian ontology”. He proposes to consider the set of art forms – poetics – as a single logosphere, when he finds the phenomenon of the logo in the pervasive semantic order of existence.¹⁶ The concept of the semiosphere, introduced by Yury Lotman (1998)¹⁷ and can be explained by a certain psychological reconstruction, is close to the concept of the logosphere, because otherwise it remains an alienated abstraction. Thus, from “imagination” and “*vision*” to the semiosis of culture (which Lotman studies), the path runs through the genesis of “great” cultural symbolism and the branch of artistic and formative canons associated with this symbolism. This path presupposes the self-significance of the phenomenon of interpretation as a way of transmission – retransmission of symbolic meanings and symbolic forms. Scientific and educational musicological praxeology also joins the interpretive field of culture, it is an active part of the socio-cultural environment.

Explaining this process from the standpoint of system-integrative musicological methodology, taking into account the peculiarities of music as an artistic phenomenon, we should note that the problem of transpersonal transmission of artistic meanings in music can combine semiological and psychological plans of musicological discourse. This is due to the fact that most semiological concepts have a psychological origin, especially such as meaning, value, life experience, memory, communication, creativity. It is also quite clear that the leading semio-

¹⁴ Pavel Florensky, *Iconostasis*. Pavel Florensky. Christianity and culture. Moskva: Folio, 2001, p. 521–626.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. pp. 534, 543, 551.

¹⁶ Sergey Averintsev, *Logos*. S.S. Averintsev. Sophia – Logos. Dictionnaire. Kyiv: Spirit and Litera, 1999, p. 114–115.

¹⁷ Yury Lotman, *On the nature of art*. Yu. M. Lotman. About art. St. Petersburg: Art – St. Petersburg, 1998, p. 400–404.

logical categories – sign, meaning, language, speech, image, symbol, text – appear as psychological formations, and only as a result of their psychological content they are “transposed” into certain artifacts of human cultural activity.

Modification of the aesthetic and psychological approach as a necessary component of art history symbolology is revealed in the works of Yu. Lotman, who believed that art is the most complex “machine” ever created by man: it is a “machine” that allows a person to experience what did not happen to him, but what can happen. This “invincible virtuality” of art is associated with specific means of artistic thinking, first of all, the special semantics of sign systems, different for different types of art.¹⁸ The art form is evaluated by the researcher, first of all, as a form of production of new meanings – new spiritual substances that express both the freedom of man (creative imagination of man) in relation to the objective reality that is reflected, and the responsibility of man to himself and the subjects of his communication.

Thus, the semiological consideration of art is “placed” between two problems: problems of conditionality and problems of understanding, each of which has a pronounced aesthetic and psychological inclination. One can define the understanding of art as the possession of a measure of its conventionality; it is possible to define the conventionality of art as the expression in the artistic form of the level and scope of understanding of man and the world.

On the basis of the expressed opinions, we will try to formulate actual modern definitions of the school phenomenon, those to which the Odesa musicological community tries to rise.

First, it is a school as memory – a way of accumulating and preserving knowledge, a form of acquiring knowledge, a certain tradition and collective canons of cognition and awareness. The determining factors here are chronotopes (chronological approach) – the unity of temporal and spatial factors, their awareness and embodiment in special symbolic forms. Orientation to the real, to the surrounding reality, at the same time reflection – memorization, it means the formation of experience. In this case, the school appears as a form and method of organization, ordering the space-time of human life in its common, general being purpose.

Secondly, it is a school as a direction, trend, vector of activity, practical institutional creation – a way of professionalization and in-depth differentiation of forms of cognition and reconstruction of reality, determination of permanent criteria of professional action, communication, implementation of common ideas and plans. Dialogue as intersubjective and subject-object communication, including between external socio-situational guidelines, needs and internal individual human interests, so, in a broad interpretation of the concept, is decisive here. Thus, the school finds its scientific and disciplinary institutional type, which is determined by the study of the surrounding reality with its objective laws,

¹⁸ Ibid.

knowledge and development of reality, focuses on ideal knowledge (examples are cognitive systems of different eras, which form certain external and internal boundaries, structural features and subject specification, starting with ancient astronomy and ending with modern psychophysiology, it means, from the sciences of the universe to the science of man).

Third, it is, of course, a school as a union of souls and minds, creative union, spiritual and practical unity of individuals – a way to identify the personal factor of human experience and the phenomenon of Teaching (apprenticeship), which characterizes different areas of activity, but as close communication to the one, so, it is a prerequisite for the transfer of artistic experience as an individually symbolic. Here the category of understanding becomes decisive.

In this case, the school appears as a personal and creative type of communication, focused on the reproduction of invisible worlds, the embodiment of the imaginary, acquires its artistic and valuative inclination, its own internal psychological order (training), a set of qualities, properties, skills. That means, it is a way of forming and revealing the creative energy of personal human consciousness, restructuring the functional mental apparatus and organizing the thought process; thus, it reveals a person's ability to self-actualize. Here the determining factor is self-knowledge or soliloquium, as well as linguistic self-realization, including the choice of linguistic and symbolic form.

We can even say that the modern school of musicology is able to discover its own psychological and reflexive type, based on self-awareness and self-esteem, the study of the inner world of man as the main and determining. Hence the shift of boundaries between objective and subjective reality, the multiplication of dimensions of reality (examples can be found from Augustine's Confession to Nikolay Berdyaev's Self-Knowledge and further, in the phenomenon of "novel of the flow of consciousness" initiated by Marcel Proust, in general in the novel art in its broad sense, according to Mikhail Bakhtin).

Hence, in general, the modern school of musicology is a collective and personal interpretive phenomenon, as a result of cognitive and understanding human activity, an integrative indicator of communicative creative achievements as well as musical and linguistic achievements. Here the phenomenon and the concept of an artifact are decisive – both as a material and as a spiritual (psychological) achievement, objective evidence of the creative essence (transforming) of personal human life.

The school reveals, as the main one, the experience of transformation, reorganization, change of the real world and man, new modeling of reality, self-improvement; it is a heuristic-technological type, at the same time a personality-transgressive cognitive type; associated with significant changes in lifestyle and thinking, relationships with others, it maximizes style indicators in science, art, life, it claims to authorship, provides authorial models of life, personal life-art, including in cognitive activities, as in art, and in science.

Thus, the polar quantities that determine the phenomenon of school are the world and man, by the way, in the gradual approximation and intensification of interaction; the cognition of the world takes place in accordance with human self-knowledge, and vice versa: the development of one's own abilities – the ability to know, understand, creatively transform reality – allows to establish new aspects, rules and qualities of the so-called objective reality.¹⁹

All the shown aspects of the phenomenon of musicological school exist in unity and correspond to the integrity of human history, historical human existence, and the personal consciousness of an individual. Then the phenomenon of school meets the needs of human language consciousness, the need for the formation and expansion of the human language environment, increasing the aesthetic contexts of human life.

¹⁹ Further reading: Mark Aranovsky, *Thinking, language, semantics. Problems of musical thinking: comp. and ed. M. Aranovsky. Moskva: Music, 1974, p. 90–128.*

Victor Bobrovsky, *Thematism as a factor in musical thinking. Essays. Chaikovsky. Mussorgsky. Scriabin. Rachmaninov. Moskva: KomKniga, 2013. Issue 2.*

Ivan Kotlyarevsky, *Priority is a factor in the development of musical knowledge. Theoretical and practical nourishment of cultural studies: Ukrainian music knowledge on evil. Collection science articles. Vol. IX. Melitopol: "Sana", 2002.*

Oleksandr Kozarenko, *Ukrainian National Musical Language: Genesis and Modern Trends in Development. Doct. Thesis: 17.00.03 – musical art. Kyiv 2001.*

Yevgeny Nazaykinsky, *On the psychology of musical perception. Moskva: Music, 1972.*

Aleksandra Samoilenko, *Temporal epistemes of music and temporal categories of historical musicology. Journal of the National Music Academy of Ukraine named after P. I. Tchaikovsky. No. 3 (36), p. 146–152.*

Aleksandra Samoilenko, *The category of musical thinking in the conceptual context of the psychology of art. Musical art and culture. Scientific Bulletin. Vol. 26. Odessa, p. 157–168.*

Lev Vygotsky, *Thinking and language: Ed. 5, rev. Moskva: Labyrinth, 1999.*

Lev Vygotsky, *About psychological systems. L.S. Vygotsky. Coll. Op. in 6 volumes. T. 1. Moskva: Pedagogy, 1982, p. 109–131.*

Lev Vygotsky, *History of the development of higher mental functions. L.S. Vygotsky. Coll. Op. in 6 volumes. T. 3. Moskva: Pedagogy, 1983, p. 5–328.*