

Interpretations of Composing Factors in the 20th-Century Conception of the History of Music

The article undertakes the analysis of the interpretation aspects of composing factors in the conceptions worked out by the most distinguished authors of the 20th-century music history (E. Wolf and C. Peterson, W. Danckert, P. Bekker, A. Halm, H. H. Eggebrecht, A. Nowak, H. Mersmann, W. Gurlitt, Yu. Kholopov, C. Dahlhaus and others).

The basic conclusion of the analysis: the authors of the conceptions of music history come nearer to the notion of the principal of composing by way of theoretically making the issues concerning the disclosure of the origin of music more topical.

Key words: music autonomization process, emancipation of its parameters, the cyclic character of typological styles, organic and mechanic genotypes, style and form, Pythagorean tone, musical material, double character of form derivatives, obertonics, music consciousness, principle of composing, composing factor.

Introduction

The topicality of the article theme "Interpretation of Composing Factors in the Conceptions of the History Music" is conditioned by a need to more thoroughly motivate the historical evolution of the principle of composing. It is important not only for the sake of a deeper perception of the origin of composing but also for the adaptation of this experience for didactic purposes. The author of the article does not intend to embrace a greatly wide and versatile object of music history on the whole. The present article is only an addition to one of the parts of the earlier published treatise "The Origins of Systematics of the Principles of Composing" – "A Principal of Composing as a Historical Category."¹

The 20th century is rich in a great many works on music history, music historiography, history of philosophy, etc. The reader may get dissatisfied failing to find among the authors of the analyzed conceptions such names as G. Adler, H. Riemann, E. Bücken, etc. or W. Wiora, Fr. Blume and others. The article also does not deal with the conceptions, for example, in "New Oxford History of Music" or "Neues Handbuch der Musicwissenschaft" or a popular D. J. Grout and C. Palisc's "A History of Western Music". It also does not analyze the reviews of the conception of music history in the latest encyclopedias (The New Grove, Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart, etc.).

The object of investigation is only those conceptions which are particularly useful, stimulating the historical notion of the principal of composing. Thus, it is natural that the attention is most of all concentrated on those works the authors of which base their ideas on versatile composing factors, for example, accordics, melodics, rhythm, form, etc. Besides, noteworthy are both objective, for example, correlation of accordics and melodics, tone, sound material parameters, obertonics and subjective – musical consciousness, types of notions, the composing factors. It goes without saying that priority is given to those works where the composing factors are granted a special status, turning them into original common traits of composing, which will serve to base the conceptions of history of music.

Besides, an attempt is made to analyze not only the validity of the interpretations of composing factors but also to systematize approaches and ideas. Thus, the object of the article comprises only some of the original conceptions of history of music worked out by the 20th-century musicologists. ((E. Wolf, C. Peterson (1923), P. Bekker (1928), A. Halm (1913), H. H. Eggebrecht (1977), A. Nowak (1973), H. Mersmann (1922), W. Gurlitt (1966), Yu. Kholopov (1982), C. Dahlhaus (1977)².

Starting to analyze the conceptions of the 20th-century history of music, it is reasonable to bring to mind that the majority of these works continue the ideas inherited from a romantic centenary. One of them is the conception of the autonomy of the art of music. A great many 19th-century historians thought that the

art of music was evolutionizing gradually, liberating composition from old church types, textures from *cantus firmus*, creating new voice melodies, etc. In this way, music gradually becomes art in its own right, independent of the ritual, text, and in its classical stage reaches the apogee of its perfection. The autonomy idea of the art of music together with the absolutization of the classical norms of composing was trailing through all the conceptions of the 20th-century history of music.

Correlation Between Accordics and Melodics

Part of the 20th-century historians base their conceptions on the correlations between accordics and melodics. Some of them interpret this correlation in this kind of way with a view of motivating the process of the autonomy of music (E. Wolf, C. Petersen), others make an attempt to explain stable constants in the history of music (W. Danckert, P. Bekker, A. Halm). Erich Wolf and Carl Petersen model the history of music as the evolution of melodic-vocal origin towards that of accordic-instrumental. The culmination of this evolution – Bach's fugue where in the opinion of the authors, the correlations between melodics and accordics are from a mathematical point of view clear and evident. Whereas the second culmination – Beethoven's sonata which demonstrates the priority of accordics over melodics. Musicologists consider that it makes possible to split the form, therefore, the composers, particularly romantics, in later periods made use of the text and literary programme in order to reinforce the integrity of music. In their analysis of the manifestations of pre-tonal music, they point out that the medieval monophony is not self-contained due to its dependence on a word, whereas Greek music is a pro-image of European music³.

The most acceptable feature of this conception rests possibly in the attempt to glance at the development of music, starting from the Greeks to the 20th century, through the prism of an integral defined factor of composing. However, on the whole, it is evident that the authors of the conception adopted the vice of the 19th-century theory of music, one of which can be seen in the proposition that Bach's fugue seems to exemplify the equality between melodics and accordics. The mentioned proposition has become a stereotype seldom questioned up to our days, particularly in the academic medium of music. Here little attention is given to the fact that Bach's fugue is constructed from accords supported by key. The key proper is first of all the accords representing scale functions. Hence, Bach's fugue is principally the art of accords of horizontal voice-leading. The authors of the conception somehow fail to notice the equilibrium between accordic and melodic origin in Palestrina's polyphony which, by the way, is outwardly highly close to Bach's polyphony. Here, however, the inner principles of musical structure are different. It is noteworthy that different to Bach, Palestrina (incidentally, like the majority of Renaissance masters) used to construct his works from voices. Therefore, Palestrina's motets should be rather called the melody art of vertical voice – structure. Thus, despite the outer textural similarity, it is the principles of composing – tonal and modal – that essentially separate Bach and Renaissance masters.

The authors of the conception also failed to avoid some evident mistakes. For example, their interpretation of Gothic polyphony is exceptionally based on a linear principle, though the principle of organum composing essentially bases itself on the finish of the perfect vertical. Incidentally, this "sin" has been rather universally accepted as a norm. It finds its characteristic reflection, for example, in Yulya Yevdokimova's book on medieval polyphony⁴. Besides, one can state an evident centrism of E. Wolf's and C. Peterson's conception in respect of Bach's and Beethoven's works based on A. B. Marx' and H. Riemann's works on the theory of music. T. Cherednichenko aptly points out anachronistic features characterising the classics' centrism: the priority of instrumentalism over vocal music, the priority of the classical harmony norms over folk melody and polyphony. The most unacceptable point in the reviewed conception is the devaluation, intervoven with the wrong establishment of composing priorities, of pre-classical and post-classical music.

This conception from the point of view of the common trait of composing also has a "white spot". Though the authors make an attempt to interpret Greek music as a certain pre-image of European music, still this pre-image, unfortunately, is not associated with the phenomena of accordics and melodics.

Werner Danckert, giving priority to a perfect line and the equilibrium of accordics, elaborates an eternal and historically stable theory on musical constants. The cycles of historical styles are argued on

the basis of his triad construction of correlation (linearics – equilibrium – accordics). In the investigator's opinion, the triad of styles – pre-classics – classics – post-classics is echoed by the Gothic – Renaissance – Baroque cycles. He thinks that such styles are also characteristic of each national school (Netherlandish, Italian, English). On the all European scale, he perceives a cyclic rhythm the second, final, triad of which coincide with the prosperity of German music. In his attempt to base typological features of styles, W. Danckert singles out the criterion of an equilibrium between a perfect line and accordics (classics). In the case of the dominance of linearics, we can speak of pre-classics and that of accordics – post-classics⁵.

One can make sure that W. Danckert's styles seem to be ideal, non-temporal types of music. W. Danckert's theory in this respect is novel, stimulating to think about that what remains stable, invariable, cyclic in the development of the theory of music. W. Danckert's conceptual idea however falls through when he begins to reason about eternal common traits of composing, for example, "an ideally perfect acquilibrium between a line and accordics"⁶. This argument employed with the purpose of basing typological styles seems too much ambivalent. On the one hand – pure abstraction (there are no criteria for the establishment of perfect acquilibrium) and on the other – too specific (accord, line) in material respect due to which emerges space for speculative constructions. The specificity of composing material and the universality of correlation resting in it practically give no idea as to the manner the work is composed and the principle of composing. Let us say, knowing in advance (a priori) about a perfect acquilibrium between the line and accordics one can hardly ever succeed in establishing the composing method and style of the Lithuanian sutartinės (polyphonic songs).

An original interpretation of the correlation between accordics and melodics is offered in the conception of the theory of music worked out by Paul Bekker⁷. The central categories of his theory – "*mono-sounding*" (Ein-Klanglichkeit) and "*poly-sounding*" (Mehr-Klanglichkeit)⁸ which mark two stable types of music. He employs the term "mono-sounding" for a homophonic-harmonic aspect of musical material, which potentially hides the merging of sounds into a single voice. This unity can disperse into many sounds and unite again and even merge. It is characteristic of instrumental homophonic forms. In its turn, the instrumentalism of music witnesses a mechanic type of music. "Poly-sounding" is the term given by P. Bekker to characterize a polyphonic aspect of musical material associated with the individuality and vocality of a melodic voice. The vocality of music denotes the organic character of music. In the course of history, the organic and mechanic types of the material exist in a permanent contradiction due to the fact, as the author himself states, that the history of music is the history of sound material"⁹.

One of the most unusual Bekker's ideas is that the type of material (organic, mechanic) irrespective of the composing manner – polyphonic, homophonic as well as modal, tonal – does not change its genotype constants, remains permanently in opposition with another genotype. This kind of situation is interpreted as a stable history of the sound material in opposition. Anyway, the problem arises whether the constants of the history of stable music can focus on musical material indeed. Today, with the emergence of possibilities to synthesize an acoustic object, a new topicality concerning sound material has clearly come to the fore. The very first experiments on electronic music showed that the material is closely connected with the principle of its creation. So much closely that it is first of all necessary to define the principle but not the material. It was Karlheinz Stockhausen¹⁰ who was the first to theoretically disclose this phenomenon. On the other hand, P. Bekker's conception of the theory of music is of interest due to the fact that distinguishing organic and mechanic types of material it seems to invite one for a metaphysical reflection – what is natural and unnatural in the world of musical sounds, incidentally, in the history of music? Nevertheless, a practical capacity of P. Bekker's conception could seem stupefying. For example, making an attempt to genotypically oppose integral phenomena of syncretic music where both instrumental and vocal origins compose an indissoluble unity.

The reinterpretation of the factors of melodics and accordics can be also seen in the conception of the history of music by August Halm. The mentioned factors and their relationship in this conception assert themselves through two musical cultures – style and form. The first is represented by a monothematic (polyphonic) culture, closely associated with the principles of the fugue, the second – polythematic (homophonic), principally based on sonata-form principles. The musicologist interprets the fugue and sonata as ideal models

of music. Due to this peculiarity, such models realize themselves only by chance in the course of history. In his opinion, Bach realized an ideal model of the fugue and Beethoven that of sonata by chance (!).¹¹

The rational kernel of A. Halm's conception can be found in his methodology. He takes pains to distinguish and define not really existing but ideally constant (functional) types of music. However, it seems reasonable to associate a functional type of music with the logic of composing conditioned by the period of time, whilst the musicologist does not delve deeper into this determinant. It results in the emergence of a great many "vacant" historical periods and facts of composing in his architectonics of a historical process. For example, Mozart's music does not correspond to the sonata-form model and the Renaissance to that of fugue culture, etc.

The reviewed interpretations of the correlation between accordics and melodics in the conception of the history of music lead to the conclusion that this kind of correlation can mean the dominance of one element or the equilibrium of both as well as opposition. Sometimes the primary norms of melodic and accordic character are reinterpreted beyond recognition, for example, polyphonic, monophonic or monothematic, polythematic.

No matter how differently the coordinates of verticality and horizontality and their interrelation can be interpreted, it is next to impossible to substantiate the history of music on these grounds on the whole. First of all, it is hard to make conclusions about the coordinates of verticality and horizontality without knowing the principle of composing. Besides, today's practice witnesses a tendency to avoid these coordinates as a certain stereotype. And more. They seem to be senseless in archaic sincretic music.

Hence, the authors of the reviewed conceptions, making an attempt to substantiate different aspects of historicity – the cyclic recurrence, invariability, etc. of the musical autonomy evolution – have absolutized the norms of horizontality and verticality characteristic of classical tonal music, turning them into hypothetical common traits.

Concepts of Tones and Parameters

Some of the 20th-century historians of music, reinterpreting certain conceptions of general concern in the composing practice, namely tone, material, etc., tried to substantiate the unity of historical process. The best telling examples are the conceptions of H. H. Eggebrecht and A. Novak.

In the opinion of Hans Heinrich Eggebrecht, the history of music witnesses the influence of the Pythagorean principle, i. e. the conception of a mathematical – instrumental – theoretical tone. The author holds that a mathematical tone, enlarging the moment of instrumentality in practice, realizes its theoretical potency and together determines the quality of music. The author singles out several historical stages of music: tone as a number (Middle Ages), tone as a number and sounding (Renaissance), overtone tone as the physics of a sense (New Ages) and at last again tone as a number (20th c.). It is evident that the history of music in H. H. Eggebrecht's conception coincides with the evolution of the concept of tone¹². This concept stimulates to raise topical questions of methodological character. For example, whether the history of music is the fixation of sound potential discovered by composing practice, or merely the evolution of the theories on tone; or whether a musical tone is a theoretical concept or the expression of a sense. H. H. Eggebrecht accentuates particularly the significance of theory for the history of music because it was the theory that "gave birth to practice (music – *auth.*) for the first time".¹³ Besides, "musicality is above all determined by mathematical correlations with other sounds".¹⁴ The concept of Pythagorean tone fostered by the historian is contrasted with the concept of the New Ages sound as the expression of a sense (I. N. Forkel). It is common knowledge that this conception looks on an overtone sound as if on the material of nature or power the potentials of which are unfolded by the great innate talent of the composer. No wonder that a dominant approach considers music to be the heart's language discovered by a sense.¹⁵ In the opinion of H. H. Eggebrecht, the conception of Pythagorean tone dominates in history since the rational kernel is higher and strains after dominance.¹⁶ It is just here that possibly the greatest shortcoming of H. H. Eggebrecht's conception unfolds itself. In his attempt to explain the unity of history on the basis of the united composing origin (Pythagorean tone), the scientist devaluates intuition and practice. The reason why it is hard to force

the history of music into a logical construction is the permanently functioning intuitive musical origin associated with natural acoustic potential of talent and sound.

Theoretical, logical and mathematical definitions of tone constantly interact and fight with the sentiments of the essence of sounds and the practice stimulated by the latter. This process goes back to olden times. For example, Aristoksen's conception inclined for practiciness, in many cases contradicts the concept of Pythagorean music. Whereas the avant-garde of contemporary music illustrates unlimited number of constant rational and intuitive moments of music as well as some manifestations of "theoretical phantoms". (This proposition can be just as well witnessed evidently, say, by the works of the Lithuanian composer Bronius Kutavičius. It would be of great interest to know the results if a historian of music made an attempt to characterize the works of this composer on the basis of the concept of a theoretical tone.)

On the other hand, the aspect of a mathematical tone suggested by H. H. Eggebrecht seems to be more topical not for the history of music on the whole but rather for the evolution of acoustic tuning, reflecting Pythagorean, natural and tempered harmonies. These harmonies are echoed by appropriate composing principles – modality, tonality, etc. Besides, the concept of a mathematical correlation has also gone through the epochs based on Euclid's geometry, Ptolemaus' mysticism of numbers, Decartes' system of functional-numerical meanings, Lobachevski's non-linear geometry, etc. Another question. Are only mathematical correlations rational in music? Unquestionably, H. H. Eggebrecht adopted quite a big part of mistakes made by his predecessors. One of them – the correlation between instrumental and vocal origins based on mathematical preconditions. Giving priority to the first, the investigator incautiously omits an instrumentarian part related to the evolution of the percussions. It is reasonable to bring to mind that the percussions are often void of defined tone. In addition, he associates the evolutionary dynamics of Pythagorean – instrumental tone with the practice of the vocal polyphonic organum. However, it contradicts the instrumental prerequisites of the author's conception. It should be only added that the substantiation of music, as of autonomous art, on the basis of the theoretical tone concept does not also seem systematically logical, because classicist forms first of all oriented themselves to a tone as the expression of a sense.

Adolf Nowak reinterprets the category of musical material for the needs of his own concept. His interpreted musical material is marked by general parameters of sounding: pitch, rhythm and loudness. A. Nowak makes these universalias (parameters) work for history, making use of the term interaction. The investigator notices that the parameters of material in earlier music existed in a certain unity guaranteed by a genre type. Whilst the parameters in serial music acquire autonomy due to quantitative proportions of each parameter.¹⁷ Thus, A. Nowak finds a possibility to explain the theory of music through variable types of interactions, retaining eternal parameters of material. Still, having maximally charged the concept of material with contemporaneity and formulated the types of interparametric interactions on the basis of this concept, he finds himself quite unexpectedly in a logical "deadlock". The author of the concept fails to notice that his interaction is established between the parameters of musical material known in advance. Whereas the differentiation proper of the sounding parameters is a certain operation and a principle of composing. It is due to the principle of composing (partly to interaction) that the sounding is divided into original parameters of music (for the sake of clearness, let's think what a modern knowing of Nowak's parameters could give investigating the phenomenon of deep sincretism, for example, archaic second polyphony).

The purification of parameters made the investigator employ additional instruments, the so-called notion of analogy (highly probable to save the notion proper). The notion of his analogy is devoted to the establishment of the time of notion, drawing parallels with universal history. Despite a theoretical "cracking" of the conception, with the acceptance of scientific prerequisites, the same notion of analogy could serve as a true compliment to the investigator. Unquestionably, every interaction (the principle of composing) is essentially the result of the period-based thinking and the world perception.

The authors of the reviewed conceptions have to a certain extent reinterpreted in a popular way the notions of musical material. On the one hand, they adapted a very old notion of Pythagorean tone for the marking of a historical perspective (H. H. Eggebrecht), and on the other – oriented a very new notion of the material parameters to a historical retrospective (A. Nowak). This was the way how the investigators

made an attempt to argument the unanimity of the history of music. Both authors failed to reach their goal in a sense that their conceptions were principally based on material but not on the principle of composing. The evidence of this fact has become particularly prominent nowadays, when the composer often starts his process of work from the synthetization of sound material. There is not much doubt left concerning the priority of interactions, principles and methods in respect of material (tones, parametres).

Form of Music as the Pro-Image of Historical Architectonics

The authors of the 20th- century conceptions of music sometimes tried to adapt for the articulation of historical epochs the things of time logics characteristic of the classicist musical form. There were cases when historical periods of time were articulated taking into consideration the peculiarities of the classical melodic period (H. Mersmann), or that of rhythm (W. Gurlitt).

The essence of Hans Mersmann's reasoning – if a piece of work emerges from a sound, then the history of music should also spread in an analogous way. He bases this analogy on the feature of doubleness (squaresness) of a classical work – that of melodic motifs, sentences, themes, parts, etc. The doubleness of the structure of form grows consistently into the doubleness of styles. It follows that some styles – Romanic, Renaissance, Classic – appropriately correspond to others – Gothic, Baroque, Romanticism.¹⁸

The rational kernel of the conception worked out by H. Mersmann – a universal dialectical negation insight which is adapted for the alteration of the process of music and history alike. Unfortunately, different from the multi-level doubleness of the classical music form, the investigator seems not to detail a historical attestation, limiting himself only to the establishment of the doubleness of musical epochs. Dialectical negation however can take place not only between epochs but also in the frames of a single style (for example, the early and late romantics), in the person of one composer (M. K. Čiurlionis' work), etc. The most serious weak point of the conception is demonstrated by the fact that his constructed architectonic picture of time is marked by a mechanic alteration of double styles, where an open style is constantly changed by a closed one and that of continual – discrete. One cannot help noticing that the cyclic character of styles asserts itself monosemantically not only within the epochs of modal or tonal music (Romanic – Gothic or Classic – Romanticism), but also within the bounds of both epochs (Renaissance – Baroque). It leads to the conclusion that H. Mersmann's cycles are constructed ignoring the composing principles undergoing modifications in the course of history – modal and tonal.

Willibald Gurlitt compares the epochs of style also according to the peculiarities of musical rhythm. He singles out three epochs of music: those of amplitude (tempo), length (rhythm value) and a syntetic accent. The architectonics of the history of music is composed of two triads of styles. One of the triads is arranged by way of epoch “measure“ 300 years later, the other – 150.¹⁹

(300)	(300)	(300)	(150)	(150)	(150)	
(550)	850	1150	1450	1600	1750	1900
musica plana	cantilena romana	modal - mensural rhythmics	proportional mensural hythmics	progression rhythmics	measure freedom	free measure
(amplit.)	(lenght)	(accent)	(amplit.)	(length)	accent)	

In W. Gurlitt's conception, much clearer than in those of his predecessors, shows itself a potential insight into a cyclic opening of a sepearate sound – temporal peculiarities in historical time. The other W. Gurlitt's idea worth-mentioning is associated with an observation that the tempos of the historical cyclic alteration moving towards the newest times pick up speed. Nevertheless, alike his predecessors (W. Dankert, H. Mersmann), the investigator fails to avoid the interpretation of the mechanistic cyclic time. His constructed styles of rhythmic

quality (of amplitudes, length, accent) move cyclically irrespective of essential determinants of historical logic of composing (here again the boundaries of modal and tonal epochs are levelled).

Thus, historians, reinterpreting temporal dimensions – a melodic period (H. Mersmann), rhythm (W. Gurlitt) – of a piece of music, made an attempt to base the architectonics of historical alteration. Still, the authors of their conceptions paid little attention to the objective logic of the modifications of historical classical tonal form. Their failure was conditioned not only by the absolutization of the norms of the classical tonal form but also by not sufficient enough apprehension of the origin of composing principle. It is easy to notice that the composing principle is a core which binds a type of work with an appropriate epoch. For example, a tonal principle not only defines the principle peculiarity (factor) of the New Ages music but also bases the type of composition. Analogically, the modal manner of composing associates pretonal epochs and the types of works. Thus, it is expedient to look for the universal determinants of the work and historical architectonics not in the types of musical form but in the origin of the music composing principle.

Extrapolations of Physical and Mental Common Traits of Composing

The authors of the conceptions of music history do not limit themselves to historical interpretations of the factors found within the bounds of the composition. Part of them try to base their systems taking into account the universal factors which condition composing. Some of them concerned themselves with natural acoustic phenomena (J. Chailley, Y. Kholopov), others – musical consciousness (C. Dahlhaus).

Yuri Kholopov, forming his own conception, denotes a universal attraction and solution (consonance – dissonance) factor in a natural spectre of sound. This phenomenon enables him to think that the art of music is the opening of the potential in the sphere of sound nature. The theory of music reveals these potentials to the greatest extent because Y. Kholopov thinks that it is structurally isomorphic to the row of overtones.^{20,21} In the investigator's opinion, a natural tone-row in the history of music is reflected by modal types enriched with their elements and their connections (he supposes that up to the 9th c. dominated the modes marked by an acoustic ratio 1:1. 1:2, from the 9th c. – 2:3, later – 4:5 and 5:4, etc.).²²

The investigator holds that the history of music grown from an acoustic tone-row as a "proto-mode", which potentially concentrates all other modes, is completed. The completeness of the history of music is conditioned by the variable pitches of sounds in overtonics (in his opinion, it is the only historically developing parameter!). The possibilities of the differentiation between the pitches of sounds are limited. History therefore cannot help coming to an end. The completeness of history makes an analogy for the completeness of an autonomous work of music (Russ. *цельность*). Both factors of completeness stand out for their continuous isomorphism. For example, analogy is composed not only of the whole of overtone and historical phenomenon but also of separate modal types from the simplest to the most complex. Y. Kholopov adapts this continuous isomorphism of structural levels for the elucidation of the autonomous form of harmonic tonation. T. Cherednichenko wrote: "... a triad is the differentiation of the fundamental tone (it has overtones of a third and a fifth); the cadence combination T-D-T is a differentiation of a triad; at last – an autonomous form of music is a differentiation of the cadence combination". Besides, he raises this kind of isomorphism to the world perception and philosophical heights.²³ Hence, he makes an attempt to explain nearly everything through a generalizing principle of overtonics.

The conception of the history of music worked out by Y. Kholopov seems to have gathered to a certain extent all the vice (partly achievements) not only of his nearest predecessors (N. Kayser, J. Chailley) but also those of the New Ages history of music on the whole. T. Cherednichenko points out several sources of Y. Kholopov's theoretical conception, namely the model of Pythagorean numbers, Hegelian development, Goethean immobile-mobile symbol of unity, medieval existence (micro-macro-auth.).²⁴ In addition, she notices certain mythological features, coinciding with the notions of the biblical creation of the world, primary unity.²⁵

One of the most evident shortcomings in Y. Kholopov's history of music is its impotence to integrate the newest (minimalism and serialism) and the oldest (ethomusic) links of history. No less problematic is his modal postulate. The centralization of a mode emerging due to the dissolution of dissonance into conso-

nance, is a common trait of composing, which arises in relief within a rather short period of history. This kind of mode can not be in principle applied either to a modal or archaic period of the history of music (e. g. it is hard to imagine a modal centre in a sutartinė).

From the investigator's point of view, all modes are centralized. It is evident however that in modal music the attraction of dissonance to consonance is practically not a motive power of this music. It is not the opposition of non-sound structures but a variant'ness that is characteristic of it. On the other hand, the evolution of mode does not exhaust music on the whole. Neither the beginning of history nor its end even its centre – are qualitative differences connected with the pitch of sounds. A great many other parameters of music (e. g. historical changes in rhythmic) undergo changes in the course of history in a parallel or synchronic way.

Contradictory seems to be one of Y. Kholopov's basic propositions about the dependence of harmonious material and the character of functional correlation.²⁶ On the contrary. His conception discloses other things – no matter how much harmonious material might changed (until avant-garde sonorous inclusive), its manner of functioning remains the only and unchanged – tonal. On the other hand, one finds easy to notice the difference between the functioning of, say, dissonance seconds in a sutartinė and analogous intervals in O. Mesiaen's music. Here a centralization approach is beyond any application.

Carl Dahlhaus is convinced that the facts of the history of music are inseparable from a factograph that gives sense to them, therefore, only the notion of music can be the object of history. The author distinguishes its several types: functional (16–17 c.), affective (17–18 c.), biographical (18–19 c.), autonomic (19–20 c.) and informational (2nd half 20th c.). Each of these notions, as he thinks, is conditioned by a changed approach to a piece of music. Besides, the investigator states that there is no causal sequence between various types of the notions of music, however, all of them are united by a historical conscious of music. It follows that a historical process of music has neither architectonics nor a united logical principle (more precisely, based on a principle without a principle).²⁷

The rational kernel of C. Dahlhaus' conception seems to concentrate itself on the overestimation of the role of the thinking of the subject (musical consciousness).²⁸ It is easy to perceive that any objective changes in the sphere of the composing of music can take place with the emergence of new ideas. In short, with a new way of thinking, appears a new correlation of the subject with environment and sounding. In its turn, the changed musical consciousness materializes its ideas through new structures of composing. It is not by chance that C. Dahlhaus, singling out types of consciousness, first of all has mind musical works of a certain type. The latter are called analogically like the types of the notions of music. Dahlhaus identifies evidently an objective existence of the piece of music with the state of musical consciousness.

It is here that a doubt crops up. Is a piece of music likewise a state of consciousness marked by a certain autonomy of phenomena?

There is another point that casts doubt. A proposition of Dahlhaus' conception. He considers that there exist no causal links between the types of musical consciousness.²⁹ The acceptance of this conception would lead to the idea that today's state of the composing of music, incidentally, and the situation of civilization on the whole is a thing completely unbounded with the past. It must be admitted that similar eclectic sceptical nuances in C. Dahlhaus' conception provoke metaphysical way of thinking. Here it is worth mentioning Arvydas Šliogeris' sentence – "history is nothing".³⁰

C. Dahlhaus' position could be understood only partially. The unprecedented dynamics of the present period, to put it mildly, has muddled up the very fundamentals of learning. It is therefore natural that at present the history of pop music has no generalizing methodological base, making possible to aptly substantiate the processionalism of music. There is also no reason for doubt that a much more topical for composing practice is the knowledge of the music reflecting epochal changes in the composing order than the formulation of musical consciousness and types of notions.

The interpretation of universal, composing – conditioning factors – overtonics (Y. Kholopov) and musical consciousness (C. Dahlhaus) – in the conception of the history of music has uncovered a topical problem on the relationship between acoustic object and music-creating subject. It is worthy of mention here that we began this investigation with the analysis of the interpretations concerning the correlation between melodics and accordics. This time, the members of the correlation touch upon the in-depths of the

very essence of composing. Unfortunately, the principles of the authors of both conceptions have maximally polarized them, therefore, their attempts were not enough justified. The absolutization of the overtone phenomenon turns the conception of the history of music into a kind of myth, trying to elucidate acoustic mysteries of nature. In its turn, the overestimation of musical consciousness prevented them from substantiating historical links due to the fact that the objective factors merged with the thinking proper.

The analysis of both conceptions draws nearer the idea about the composer's relationship with sounding as the only rational way out, and together explains the origin and principle of composing as well as opens a possibility for a new interpretation of the history of music on this basis.

Conclusion

The interpretations of compositional factors in the 20th-century conceptions of music history are not monosemantic. Theorists employ the most diverse compositional approaches for their argumentation. They can be at least partially grouped. Some of them give priorities to the relationships between accordics and melodies (E. Wolf and C. Peterson, C. Danckert, P. Bekker), others, – to form, style (H. Mersmann, W. Gurlitt), to material (H. H. Eggebrecht, A. Nowak), or obertonics and musical consciousness (Y. Kholopov, C. Dahlhaus). Regardless of the fact that the authors of conceptions choose different composing arguments, it is however easy to notice that it is the tradition of tonal music which they principally represent. In frequent cases musicologists orient their arguments to the criterion of the autonomy of music. The majority of them think that a piece of music tonally composed due to its perfect structural character distinguishes the art of music among others as being autonomous. This orientation prevented many musicologists from reaching a conclusion that the art of music has always been inseparable from other forms of art (i. e. tonal music from drama).³¹ The discovery of the autonomy of the New Age music principally meant nothing else but a historical dominance of the tonal composing principal. Nevertheless, the creators of conceptions have not adequately appreciated this moment. Thus, it was no chance that they did not essentially question the tonal principle of composing and oppose it to a modal or serial one. Historians limit their aim only to the reinterpretation of tonal elements. It means that they treat these elements as certain common traits of composing.

It is symptomatic that the absolute majority of historians interpret composing differences between epochs in a purely quantitative way. For example, through the intensification of the accordic origin (H. Eggebrecht), the level of the differentiation of the material (A. Nowak), the cyclic rhythm (Mersmann and others). It should be also mentioned that the investigators while explaining history base themselves exclusively rather on structural-material composing factors than functional-logical ones. For example, they accentuate the following sound structures: accord, melody, rhythm, form, tone, obertonics, sound parameters. Material criteria of argumentation prevent the investigators from properly basing the processional aspect of music history. Notworthy is the fact that a material argument interpreted for a longer historical period starts to inevitably "rupture", lack a logical consequence and turn into something incomprehensible (say, the collision of H. H. Eggebrecht's "Pythagorean tone" with the "physics of feeling"). On the other hand, it is also impossible to properly articulate composing periods of time through material factors. Such factors seem to be too inert for this role (the best telling example in this respect is an obertonics argument tested by Kholopov).

It is this lack of analysis that makes the greatest shortcoming of the 20th-century historical conceptions of music. Nevertheless the authors of conceptions would also grope certain probabilities in the evolution of music. For example, part of them felt non-ambiguously the connections between a piece of music and historical dispersion.

Particularly noteworthy in this respect is Y. Kholopov's isomorphic-obertonal variant of the connection between a piece of music and the history of music, echoing a biblical myth.

C. Dahlhaus' approach to the connection between the history of music and a piece of work was different. He made an attempt to escape from a hypnotizing stereotype of tonal music. The historian concentrated his attention on musical consciousness. He thinks that a certain historical state of musical consciousness makes possible to judge about adequate types of the pieces of music. Still, C. Dahlhaus did not

explain more thoroughly the way musical consciousness determines a piece of music and how this mechanism functions.³² Eclectic connection variants of the history of music and a work in a certain period can turn into “something” hard to guess.

References

- ¹ See: *Komponavimo principai/ Teorija ir praktika*, Vilnius, 1999.
- ² Historical conceptions of the 20th-century music are reflected in the following works:
Wolf E., Petersen C. 1923. *Das Schicksal der Musik von der Antik zur Gegenwart*. Breslau.
Danckert W. 1979. *Musik und Weltbild. Morphologie der abendländischen Musik*. Bonn.
Bekker P. 1928. *Organische und Mechanische Musik*. Bln. u. Lpz.
Halm A. 1913. *Von zwei Kulturen der Musik*. München,
Eggebrecht H. 1977. *Musikalisches Denken*. Wilhelms-haven.
Nowak A. 1973. *Geschichtsbewusstsein als Problem neuer Musikästhetik// Zwischen Tradition und Fortschritt. Über das musikalische Geschichtsbewusstsein*. Mainz.
Mersmann H. 1922/23. *Versuch einer Phänomenologie der Musik //Zeitschrift für Musikwissenschaft*, No5.
Gurlitt W. 1966. *Musikgeschichte und Gegenwart*. Bd. I. Wiesbaden.
Холопов Ю. 1982. 1976. *Изменяющееся и неизменное в эволюции музыкального мышления. // Проблемы традиций и новаторства в современной музыке*, с. 52-104; *Лад //Музыкальная энциклопедия. Том 3. – М., 1976*, с. 130-143.
Dahlhaus C. 1977. *Grundlagen der Musikgeschichte*. Köln.
Чередниченко Т. 1989. *Тенденции современной западной музыкальной эстетики*. Москва.
- ³ Wolf, Petersen, *ibid.*
- ⁴ Евдокимова Ю. 1983. *Многоголосие средневековья X-XIV века*. Москва, с. 18-108.
- ⁵ Danckert, *ibid.*
- ⁶ Danckert, *ibid.*, S. 108
- ⁷ Bekker, *ibid.*
- ⁸ Bekker, *ibid.*, S. 73.
- ⁹ Bekker, *ibid.*, S. 82.
- ¹⁰ See: Stockhausen K. 1963. "...wie die Zeit vergeht..." // *Texte*. Bd. I, Köln, , S. 140-151.
- ¹¹ Halm, *ibid.*
- ¹² Eggebrecht, *ibid.*
- ¹³ Eggebrecht, *ibid.*, S. 11.
- ¹⁴ *Ibid.*, S. 22.
- ¹⁵ *Ibid.*, S. 47.
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*, S. 7.
- ¹⁷ Nowak, *ibid.*
- ¹⁸ Mersmann, *ibid.*
- ¹⁹ Gurlitt, *ibid.*
- ²⁰ Холопов, 1982.
- ²¹ Холопов, 1976. Also see.: Кюрегян Т. 1992. *Музыкально-теоретическая система Ю. Н. Холопова. //Laudamus*. М.
- ²² Incidentally, J. Chailley much earlier than Y. Kholopov presented a very close conception of harmony progress. He bases the historical stages of the harmony shift also on an obertonal principle (for more see: Chailley J. 1951. "Traité historique d'analyse musicale").
- ²³ See: Чередниченко Т. 1992. *Идеи Ю. Н. Холопова к философии музыки //Laudamus*, М., с. 42.
- ²⁴ *Ibid.*, с. 46.
- ²⁵ *Ibid.*...
- ²⁶ Холопов Ю. 1974. *Очерки современной гармонии*. М., с. 30.
- ²⁷ Dahlhaus, *ibid.*
- ²⁸ C. Dahlhaus opposes his conception to a universally dominating biographical model of historicity. In his opinion, the continuity of a historical process is supposed to emerge by way of the application of a novel type of description method. He notices that the novel type method is also employed when speaking only about genre or the evolution of styles.

²⁹ *Ibd.*, p. 129-131.

³⁰ Šliogeris A. 1996. *Transcendencijos tyla*. Vilnius.

³¹ The proposition from the Romantic epoch about the autonomy of music as art is unusually vital and has survived up to now. The idea of the autonomy of classical music was widely adopted by the musicology of the Soviet period. M. S. Kagan was right saying that it is the world perception of the epoch that determines the dominance of one particular art, and the latter dictates its "fashions" to other arts (for more see: Каган М. 1972. *Морфология искусства*, 11.). Classical music adopted the principles of the dominant drama art of the period. It follows that the autonomy of music alike that of composing is conditional and depends on the universal determinants of a more general character.

³² The following idea illustrates C. Dahlhaus' opinion on the determinants of a piece of music: "The development of serial music into stochastic and from it into aleatoric does not require a social-historical excursion; it is based by the inner categories of the history concerning the problems of the work." (see: Dahlhaus C. 1974. *Musikgeschichte als Sozialgeschichte?* // *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*, No 11).

Interpretations of Composing Factors in the 20th – Century Conceptions of the History of Music

Summary

The authors of the 20th-century conceptions of the history of music, when choosing one or another element of tonal music and interpreting it as a common trait of composing, base their approaches on different arguments. Some theorists, presenting differently perceived aims and object of the history of music, give priority to the relationship between accordics and melodics (E. Wolf and C. Petersen, W. Danckert, A. Halm) or form, style (H. Mersmann, W. Gurlitt), or material (H. H. Eggebrecht, A. Nowak), or obertonics and even to a musical consciousness (J. Cholopov, C. Dahlhaus). It is symptomatic that the absolute majority of the authors interpret differences in composing between epochs principally on a quantitative criterion and base themselves on structural-material factors of composing, but not on functional-logical ones. Such criterion prevents from properly basing both the continuous process of the history of music and its articulation. Some doubts also arise as to the unity of the history. The reason for an ill-succes rests in the fact that theorists were not sufficiently concerned with the functionality of the material. Therefore, they failed to grasp the principles of composing representing the period of music.

The authors used to rightly feel certain probabilities related to the dispersion of the history of music. Of great importance are their attempts to substantiate the connection between the history of art and a piece of music. Incidentally, they made attempts to substantiate this connection drawing a direct analogy between a classical tonal work and history, totally ignoring the principles of composing proper.

The greatest merit of the conceptions of the 20th-century history of music is the fact that their authors due to a generalized interpretation of various factors of composing, which enabled them to conceptually actualize the issues concerning the disclosure of the origin of the composing music, approached the principle issues, notably the principle of composing, the determinants of a composing epoch and composition, etc.

Komponavimo faktorių interpretacijos XX a. muzikos istorijos koncepcijose

Santrauka

Kaip galėjome įsitikinti, komponavimo faktorių interpretacijos XX a. muzikos istorijos koncepcijose nevienprasmės. Priklausomai nuo požiūrio į muzikos istoriją, skirtingai suprantamų istorijos tikslų bei paties objekto, koncepcijų autoriai savaip traktuoja vienus ar kitus komponavimo faktorius ir pagrindžia autorines koncepcijas. Mokslininkų argumentacijai praverčia įvairiausi komponavimo atžvilgiai. Juos galima bent iš dalies sugrupuoti. Vieni jų prioritetus suteikia akordikos ir melodikos santykiams (E. Wolf ir C. Petersen, C. Danckert, P. Bekker), kiti – formai, stiliui (H. Mersmann, W. Gurlitt), tretji – medžiagai (H. H. Eggebrecht, A. Nowak), ketvirtji – obertonikai ir muzikinei sąmonei (J. Cholopov, C. Dahlhaus). Nors koncepcijų autoriai pasirenka skirtingus komponavimo argumentus, tačiau nesunku pastebėti, kad jų pasirinkimą didele dalimi sąlygojo tonaliosios muzikos tradicija, kuriai jie iš esmės atstovauja. Ši aplinkybė didele dalimi lėmė ne tik atitinkamą tonalių elementų interpretavimą, bet ir klasikinių komponavimo normų išaukštinimą, o kartais ir suabsoliutinimą. Labai dažnai savo argumentus mokslininkai suorientuoja į muzikos autonomiškumo kriterijų. Pasak daugelio jų tonaliai sukomponuotas muzikos kūrinys dėl savo tobulo struktūriškumo išskiria muzikos meną tarp kitų kaip savarankišką. Ši orientacija daugeliui mokslininkų neleido pakilti iki minties, kad muzikos menas visada neatsiejamas nuo kitų menų (pavyzdžiui, tonali muzika nuo dramos), tačiau komponuojama ji kaskart vis kitaip. Naujųjų amžių muzikos autonomiškumo atradimas iš esmės reiškė ne ką kitą kaip istorinį tonalaus komponavimo principo įsivyravimą. Visgi koncepcijų kūrėjai šio momento adekvačiai neįvertino. Todėl neatsitiktinai mokslininkai iš esmės nekvėstavo tonalaus komponavimo principo, nepriešino jo nei su modaliniu, nei serijiniu. Istorikai tenkinasi vien tik tonalių elementų perinterpretavimu. O tai reiškia, kad jie šiuos elementus traktuoja kaip tam tikras komponavimo bendrybes. Tai leidžia koncepcijų autoriams neapdairiai, sakytume, „žongliruoti“ per epochas, labiau nepaisant jokių kokybinių muzikos komponavimo skirtumų. Simptomatiška, kad absoliuti dauguma istorikų komponavimo skirtumus tarp epochų interpretuoja grynai kiekybiškai. Pavyzdžiui,

akordinio prado stiprėjimu (H. Eggebrecht ir kt.), medžiagos diferencijavimo laipsniu (A. Nowak ir kt.), cikliniu ritmu (Mersmann ir kt.). Be to, būdinga tai, kad autoriai, aiškindami istoriją, išimtinai remiasi struktūriniais – medžiagininiais komponavimo faktoriais, o ne funkciniais – loginiais. Pavyzdžiui, akcentuojamos šios garsų struktūros: akordas, melodija, ritmas, forma, tonas, obertonika, garsų parametrai. Medžiaginiai argumentacijos kriterijai autoriams neleidžia tinkamai pagrįsti muzikos istorijos procesualumo. Būdingu atveju medžiaginis argumentas, interpretuotas ilgesniam istoriniam tarpsniui, neišvengiamai ima “trūkinėti”, stokoti loginio nuoseklumo ir virsti nesuvokiamu. (Prisiminkime H. H. Eggebrechto “pitagorinio tono” susidurimą su “jausmo fizika”.) Kita vertus, medžiaginiai faktoriai neįmanoma deramai artikuliuoti ir komponavimo laikmečių. Tokie faktoriai, regis, pernelyg inertiški šiai rolei. (Ypač akivaizdus šiuo atžvilgiu J. Cholopovo išmėgintas obertonikos argumentas.)

Dalis mokslininkų, žvelgdami per medžiagos prizmę ir atrasdami tam tikras skambesio konstantas, be to, bandė paaiškinti muzikos istorijos vieningumą, nekintamumą. Tai ir Bekkerio mechaniniai ir organiniai muzikos genotipai, ir H. H. Eggebrechto pitagorinio tono sugrįžimai ir pan. Visgi šie mokslininkai, manytume, nesusimąstė, kad pats medžiagos sukūrimas, jos formulavimas ar netgi sintezavimas taip pat yra kūrybinis principas, kuris neišvengiamai kinta. Tad jų siekiai, regis, susikirto su imanentine muzikos komponavimo logika ir jos istorija. Perinterpretuodami tonalius elementus, koncepcijų autoriai menkai paisė fakto, kad medžiaginiai muzikos elementai glaudžiausiu būdu susiję su jų funkcionavimo būdu. Būtent medžiagos funkcionavimo būdas pirmiausia ir leidžia suvokti atskiros epochos būdingus skambesio elementus. (Akivaizdumo dėlei palyginkime tonacinės ir modalines tercines vertikalių struktūras. Vienos jų turi pagrindinį toną, kitos ne.) Nepakankamas šios aplinkybės paisyimas koncepcijų autoriams neleido apčiuopti esminių vieną ar kitą muzikos laikmetį reprezentuojančių komponavimo principų. Vadinasi, mokslininkai ėmėsi kurti savo koncepcijas nuodugniau neapsvarstę, kas yra laikytina esmingiausiu komponavimo faktoriumi, kuriuo remiantis būtų galima nuosekliai pagrįsti muzikos istoriją. Kaip tik tai ir sudaro ryškiausią XX a. muzikos istorinių koncepcijų trūkumą.

Nors ir būdami netikslūs ir neretai rimtai apsirikdami, koncepcijų autoriai taip pat apčiuopdavo ir tam tikras muzikos evoliucinės raidos tikimybes. Pavyzdžiui, dalis autorių nedviprasmiškai nujautė muzikos kūrinio ir istorinės sklaidos sąsają. Kai kurie jų net manė, kad muzikos istorija panašiai kaip kūrinys prasideda garsu. Tad šie autoriai minėtą sąsają siekė pagrįsti analogijos būdu, pasiremdami ar tai klasikinio melodinio periodo dvejybiškumu (H. Mersmann), ar ritmo stiliais (W. Gurlitt) ir pan. Lygindami tonalios muzikos struktūras su sunkiai aprėpiama muzikos istorijos visuma, autoriai neįsivaizdavo, kad klasikinis tonaliosios muzikos kūrinys nėra jokia istorinės architektūros analogija, bent jau niekaip neįrodoma tokiu būdu. Galima suabejoti ir mokslingumo prielaidomis. Antai teigiama, kad garsas – tiek kūrinio, tiek istorijos pradžia (H. Mersmann). Visgi akivaizdu, kad muzikos pradžios siejimas su “kažkuo” (ritmu, tonu, triukšmu ir pan.), patenka į ydingų klausimų ratą, tokių kaip iš kur atsirado muzika, menas, žmogus, kada bus pasaulio pabaiga ir pan.

Todėl atitinkamų koncepcijų autoriai mažų mažiausiai pademonstravo savo bandymų nevaisingumą ir žymia dalimi diskreditavo pačią sąsajos idėją. Ypač pažymėtinas šiuo atžvilgiu J. Cholopovo izomorfinis – obertoninis kūrinio ir muzikos istorijos sąsajos variantas, prilygstas biblijiniam mitui.

Kiek kitaip į muzikos istorijos ir kūrinio sąsają pažvelgė C. Dahlhausas, pabandęs išsiveržti iš hipnotizuojančio tonaliosios muzikos stereotipo. Istorikas sutelkia dėmesį į muzikos sąmonę. Jo nuomone, tam tikras istorinis muzikinės sąmonės būvis leidžia spręsti apie adekvačius muzikos kūrinių tipus. Visgi C. Dahlhausas nuodugniau nepaaiškino, kokiu būdu muzikos sąmonė determinuoja muzikos kūrinių, kaip veikia šis mechanizmas, tad jo a priori nusakomas muzikinės sąmonės ir kūrinio ryšys netrukus patenka į akligatvį. Pagal mokslininko koncepcijos logiką, kūrinių tipai keičia vieni kitus be jokios paveikos vieni kitiems. O muzikinė sąmonė kažkuriuo laikotarpiu gali pavirsti nežinia kuo.

Eklektiniai muzikos istorijos ir kūrinio sąsajos variantai (C. Dahlhausas, J. Cholopovas) nušalyje palieka pačius komponavimo principus. Todėl suprantama, kad autoriams keblu tinkamai išspręsti minėtas problemas.

Na, o koks gi XX a. muzikos istorijos koncepcijų pozityvusis aspektas, ar jis pakankamai akivaizdus?

Manytume, didžiausia XX a. muzikos istorijos koncepcijų teigiamybė yra ta, kad jų autoriai apibendrintai interpretuodami įvairius komponavimo faktorius ir šitokiu būdu conceptualiai suaktualindami muzikos komponavimo prigimties atskleidimo klausimus, priartėja prie centrinių problemų, tokių kaip – komponavimo principas, komponavimo epochos ir kompozicijos determinantės ir pan.