

ПЕРСОНАЛЬНИЙ ВИМІР ІСТОРІЇ МУЗИКИ

UDK 78.021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31318/2522-4190.2019.124.165417>

GLIVINSKY VALERY

New York, USA

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6402-0682>

val@glivinski.com

RETHINKING STRAVINSKY HISTORICALLY AND THEORETICALLY

A new perspective is proposed on the evolution of musical culture in the 20th century. Within this process, the central position occupied by the work of the St. Petersburg Classic School – Stravinsky, Prokofiev, and Shostakovich – is highlighted. For a more profound understanding of Stravinsky’s music, the categorical pair of the morpheme and morph is introduced for use in musical analysis. The morphic realization of the morphemes of the environment, motion, space, and dissonance, and the Janus morpheme, is traced in the text of the romance *Spring (Cloister Song)* and in the Introduction to the ballet *The Rite of Spring*. An essential conclusion is drawn regarding the polymorphic nature of the musical fabric in the Russian master’s works.

Key words: the work of Igor Stravinsky, *Spring (Cloister Song)*, *The Rite of Spring*, morpheme, morph, polymorphism.

This work was prompted by the American music scholar Severine Neff’s article, published in a collection dedicated to the 100th anniversary of Stravinsky’s *The Rite of Spring*. The article contains interesting facts discovered in the Vienna Schoenberg archive, and its central idea brooks no doubt, justifiably disputing the legitimacy of imposing on this masterpiece aesthetically foreign performance principles. At the same time, confusion arises regarding the concepts and terms used by the author of the article (in the second decade of 21st century!) to define the uniqueness of Stravinsky’s creative legacy. Citing polemical statement by Schoenberg (from a manuscript entitled “Polytonalists”), which cast doubt on “the ability of Stravinsky, Alfredo Casella, Milhaud, and Bela Bartok to structure coherent and organic forms from a basic configuration, or *Grundgestalt*,” Neff promotes an alternative thesis regarding “Stravinsky’s structural orchestration [14; 310, 325].” Is that all? Could it truly be that the composer’s epoch-defining discoveries in practically all spheres of the musical art during the first half of the 20th century can be reduced to merely the particularities of his orchestration?

A similar situation arose during my review of the monograph by Italian music scholar Angelo Cantoni entitled *The Language of Stravinsky* [3]. I read the foreword to that book with growing pleasure. The thoughts the author expresses at the beginning of the work resonate with my own understanding of Stravinsky’s role and place in the musical culture of the past century. Further in, however, the monograph posits a whole array of claims that are debatable if not outright mistaken. One of them is as follows:

“The use of generative cells, i.e. thematic nuclei generally enunciated at the beginning of the piece and from which all other components develop is a basic principle of twentieth century music... one of the major common elements between his

(Stravinsky's – V.G.) music and the music of most composers of this period. It has its origin in the cyclical form typical of nineteenth century and became increasingly systematic in the course of the following century [3, 5].”

Essentially, the reference to the principle of “generative cells, i.e. thematic nuclei” from which proceed all subsequent components of the work is a terminologically veiled hint at serialism and its dominant role in the musical language of the past century. While accepting that serialism occupies a special place in the arsenal of expressive tools employed by 20th-century music, I would note that it is only one of several ways, all of comparable artistic importance, to organize the musical fabric. The principle Cantoni mentions of “developing” musical form out of intonational and thematic “nuclei” is inherent to all stages of the development of European music, where it appears in the form of Gregorian chants, cantus firmus technique, fugue, the variation and the sonata forms. Equally debatable is Cantoni's approach to justifying the affinity between Stravinsky and his contemporaries. Considering the composer's key role in the musical culture of the early 20th century, there is every reason not to discuss the commonalities, but rather to examine the Russian master's direct influence on the creative practices of his time. This applies especially to work with folklore, the temporal organization of the musical fabric, texture, and orchestration.

Clearly, Cantoni's arguments are based, even if in veiled form, on the main idea of Adorno's *Philosophy of Modern Music* (here I have in mind the Second Viennese school's central position in 20th century musical culture). In our articles on the three great St. Petersburg composers—Stravinsky, Prokofiev, and Shostakovich—I.S. Fedoseyev and I presented a different point of view on that historical period [5; 6, 27-31]. Arguing for the St. Petersburg Classic school's **central position** in the music of the last century, I would like to emphasize that at present, the classical music of the past has an existence which is based on *selectability*. By this I mean the “rankings” for composers from various eras that has taken shape today. The choice of names which underlies those rankings is historically determined by the state of public taste and depends on the makeup of the listening audience. The criterion for selectability turns out to be to what extent the work of one creator or another meets modern-day aesthetic demands. Today the music of the Viennese classics from the late 18th to early 19th century – Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven, along with their contemporaries Gluck and Rossini – satisfy that criterion. The Baroque era is represented in the rankings first and foremost by Bach and Handel. Also interesting to today's listener is the work of Vivaldi, Scarlatti, Corelli, Couperin, and Rameau. Today the 20th century is associated mostly, in my opinion, with Stravinsky, Prokofiev, and Shostakovich, as well as Scriabin, Rachmaninoff, Richard Strauss, Mahler, and Puccini, and these associations will persist in the future. Without a doubt, new generations of classical music lovers will listen to (and professional musicians will continue to learn) works by composers from various national cultures and schools: the Second Viennese school of Schoenberg, Berg, and Webern; the Frenchmen Debussy, Ravel, Poulenc, Honegger, and Messiaen; the Russians Sviridov, Slonimsky, Shchedrin, and Schnittke; the Americans Ives, Gershwin, and Bernstein; the Hungarian Bartók; the Czech Janáček; the Finn Sibelius; the Germans Orff and Hindemith; and the British Britten. As for composers in the musical avant-garde, especially during its second wave (1940–1970), their legacy, it seems to me, is gradually losing relevance for listeners today. Profound aesthetic and communicative issues intrinsic to the works of Boulez, Nono, Berio, Stockhausen, Kagel, Lutosławski, Penderecki, Xenakis, Denisov, and Gubaidulina complicate perception of their music, making it an extremely rare occurrence in concert halls.

The rapid development and complexities of the 20th-century world changed people's perceptions of space, time, the universe and themselves. The artistic response to those changes logically resulted in an enrichment of art with new approaches and resources borrowed from science and technology. The methods and forms of these borrowings could be either direct or, to varying extents, mediated. The history of 20th-century music proves that the direct influence of non-artistic forms of human endeavor on art was highly ineffective in terms of value. Attempts to construct meaningful artistic concepts on the foundation of mathematical logic, statistical laws, computer programming, or acoustic experimentation were unsuccessful. But this is completely logical, given that no methodology focused on mastering the external, objective world can become a full-fledged foundation for artistic creativity, which appeals first and foremost to a person's subjective inner world. Simultaneously, we must not ignore the obvious fact that the world views and perceptions of people today, having been influenced by scientific and technical progress, have become more rational and structured, and more open to influence by new ideas and concepts. The striving for newness, thirst for newness, and search for the new have transformed into universal internal engines in practically all spheres of human endeavor, including art. In music, one of the most persistent heralds of the idea of the new as the central moving force in the creative process has been Schoenberg. In the article *New Music, Outmoded Music, Style and Idea*, he writes:

“What is New Music? Evidently it must be music which, though it is still music, differs in all essentials from previously composed music. Evidently it must express something which has not yet been expressed in music. Evidently, in higher art, only that is worth being presented which has never before been presented. There is no great work of art which does not convey a new message to humanity; there is no great artist who fails in this respect. This is the code of honor of all the great in art, and consequently in all great works of the great we will find that newness which never perishes, whether it be of Josquin des Pres, of Bach or Haydn, or of any other great master. Because: Art means New Art [18, 39].”

Keeping in mind that this text reflects Schoenberg's views in the 1930s and 1940s, it can be considered a declarative, programmatic statement. It must be admitted that this apologia for the new contains certain contradictions. The first question, which immediately arises, is what exactly the author means by newness in art. The context in the citation above allows for a tripartite answer:

- Music “which, though it is still music, differs in all essentials from previously composed;”

- That which “has never before been presented” in art;

- A “new message,” intrinsic to any great work of art.

Out of these assertions by Schoenberg, I can agree without reservation only with the last. But is something “never before presented” in art necessarily a “new message?” Probably not. The overarching theme of any type of art, at any time, is mortal man, fated to perish, within the immortal world which surrounds him. In this sense, the theme of art has remained unchanged since the beginnings of human civilization. This overarching theme can be brought to life by various methods, which reflect the historical level of development of the artistic language. The newness of a brilliant work of art is not absolute, and it should in no way be taken as something which “differs in all essentials from previously composed” works. The historical evolution of European music proves that the creators of brilliant works (Schoenberg mentions three of them: Josquin des Pres, J.S. Bach, and Haydn) were, in terms of their historical mission, both innovators and refiners. They succeeded in accumulating the experience of previous generations in

a perfected artistic form. The creative impulses which channeled that accumulation, in turn, stimulated the further development of music. Refining and perfecting as a doorway to the future was not Schoenberg's lot. He worked in an era when the musical culture on which he had cut his teeth had already reached a phenomenal zenith and was gradually declining and decelerating. Despite the individual greatness of Mahler and Richard Strauss, in them, as well as in the work of masters such as Reger and Schreker, Austro-German music at the turn of the 20th century was exhibiting clear signs of *historical exhaustion*. With the prophetic passion so intrinsic to him, Schoenberg proposed a radical method of overcoming this situation. The Austrian master's main musical and artistic feat was his "Method of Composing with Twelve Tones Which are Related Only with One Another [18, 107]." Schoenberg considered that method, and nothing else, to be the means by which to "assure the supremacy of German music for the next hundred years (an assertion which did not stand the test of time – V.G.) [16, 45]".

Schoenberg's radical methodological innovations opened a Pandora's box in the music of the last century, in the name of which *the psychology of scientific and technological invention was carried over into the sphere of artistic creation*. As forms of human endeavor, scientific and technological invention and artistic creation serve different end purposes. The end purpose of the first is a mass product based on the replication of the constructive idea with which it is endowed. Humankind used that product to improve its habitat as a species. The end purpose of the second is to create a work of art, in which the author (whether a painter, poet, writer, or composer) realizes himself as a unique spiritual creature. The artistic value of a work revealed to the world depends directly on how fully the universal worldview and perception of the corresponding era is re-created within it. In Schoenberg's creative identity, his incarnations of artist and inventor co-existed and provided the framework for the specificity – very often contradictory – of his musical and aesthetic insights and his overall creative practice. Everything in Schoenberg which was interpreted as internally contradictory was overcome by his creative genius, while in his students and successors (with the exception of Berg), it mutated into a persistent tendency toward widening the aesthetic gulf between the artist/inventor and the audience. Schoenberg's ideas found their full and ultimate expression in works by the musical avant-garde (two decades before and two or three decades after World War II), and also in a few post-avant-garde phenomena, among which American minimalism is the best known. From today's standpoint, the musical avant-garde and post-avant-garde of the last century is of mostly historical interest. Its limited impact on the worldwide musical process can be reduced to the means of musical expression they invented, and nothing more. Not a single composer belonging to the 20th century musical avant-garde and post-avant-garde succeeded in composing a landmark musical text for that century or a genuine artistic masterpiece.

Returning to Cantoni's monograph, I would like to note that despite its numerous analytical accomplishments, in the end, it provides yet more evidence that Stravinsky's musical language does not yield easily to a systematic approach. Up till now, all attempts to find a system in it similar to the systems in Schoenberg, Hindemith or Messiaen have been unsuccessful. The most prominent of these, and the one prompting the most energetic polemics, was the attempt spanning several decades by a group of American music scholars to pin on the Russian master the role of consistent octatonist. But this attempt finally proved baseless [for details, see: 7]. The fault with that sort of attempt lay in a misunderstanding of the particular traits specific to Stravinsky's artistic nature. In his work, Stravinsky, like any genius, is isomorphic to his environment. The work of the

Russian master is the most appropriate artistic response to the polyphony of humankind's perception of the world in the 20th century [6, 27-28]. Focused on incorporating mainly the cultural and artistic objects existing outside of it, Stravinsky's creative method cannot be patterned on a foundation of any one formal or linguistic principle. At the heart of his method lies an algorithm for artistic decision-making determined by responses to specific aspects of a stylistically heterogeneous *multitude* of reconstructed essences. It seems to me that examining the individually characteristic nature of this algorithm, which is resistant to the sway of time, is one possible way to come closer to understanding the basis for the Russian master's creative thinking.

It is easy to explain the terminological difficulties current-day music theory encounters in characterizing Stravinsky's work. The existing terminological apparatus, grounded on the theoretical conceptualizations of specific musical- historical styles, has no capacity to explain the texts in which those styles become the objects to which Stravinsky's transformative creative energy is applied, texts which enter into dialogue with the composer's authorial identity [on Stravinsky's dialogism, see: 4, 7-11]. By all appearances, the time is ripe for terms and concepts that would allow for a fuller characterization of the Russian master's creative practice, with fewer conceptual losses. To refresh the musical terminology, we could rely either on the introduction of new terms, or on the use of terms already existing in other areas of human knowledge, necessarily adapted to the conditions of a new environment. Having chosen the second approach, I have directed my attention to a fundamental concept in linguistic morphology, the *morpheme*, defined as the "fundamental unit of a language, often described as a minimal symbol, i.e., the unit in which a particular phonetic form contains a particular meaning and which cannot be broken down into simpler units of the same type" [11]¹. When applied to music, a morpheme is a specific structure of sounds in their horizontal progression and vertical combinations, shaped by rhythm, timbre, and tessitura. In mediating its physical (acoustic) nature in a musical image as a result of the aesthetic mastering of the surrounding environment, the morpheme is then an object combining within it both material and spiritual starting points. In 20th-century music, the concept of the morpheme is reflected not in the results of intensive experimentation with the frequencies and wavelengths of sound as a physical object, but rather in the new musical imagery those experiments inspired (the idea of the existence of sound as a point, or the "punctiform music" of Webern, Boulez and Stockhausen), new compositional approaches and tools (Schoenberg's *klangfarbenmelodie*, the timbre-polyphonic stratification of unison in Stravinsky, Polish timbre music, etc.).

In defining the morpheme as the fundamental unit of meaning in a musical language, I have in mind its inalienable property of innate conceptuality. Perceived instantly by the ear, but difficult to define verbally, this property is directly connected with the associative and figurative possibilities of aural perception. As a rule, a morpheme triggers a polysemic array of figurative and semantic associations. This polysemy arises from the expressive specifics of music as an art form and is regulated both from the "right" and the "left." Movement to the right, toward a reduction of associative polysemy, lowers the artistic value of the morpheme and makes it easier to recognize. Movement to the left, connected with a significant expansion of the figurative

¹ In Russian-language music scholarship, the terminological apparatus of linguistic morphology is usually presented with the adjective "morphological." For instance, Ivashkin, in his article "Shostakovich and Schnittke: Towards the problem of the big symphony," asserts that both masters "complete the process of modulation from syntactic to morphological symbolism for musical thoughts" [9, 6].

and associative field, has a fatal effect on that innate conceptuality and reduces the probability it will be appropriately aurally perceived. The level of morphemic polysemy, both figurative and semantic, is fairly mobile and changeable. While it remains an attributive property of a musical text, this polysemy also lives its own life, relying in large part on the specifics of perception in a particular historical era. It is vital to note that in this area, as in many other areas of music scholarship, there are more questions than answers. Musicology has, or could have, a much easier time handling the more or less convincing explanations for the “rightwing” nature of morphemes in, for example, the music of Meyerbeer, Reger, Schreker, Rubinstein, and Serov, or the extremely “leftwing” morphemes in many representatives of the late 20th-century musical avant-garde (1940–1970), than it does handling the paradox of the morphemic corpus in the music of Bach, for example. A clear explanation for the morphemic polysemy in Bach, Handel, the Viennese classics, Schubert, Schumann, Chopin, Brahms, Wagner, Tchaikovsky, or the three St. Petersburg classic composers of the 20th century – composers at the center of aural perception—remains, to this day, a conundrum.

As the basic element of meaning in a musical language, the morpheme rests on the foundation of its *morphs*. In linguistics, a morph is the “minimal unit of meaning in a text, the textual representation of the morpheme [10].” A similar relationship between the two concepts is fully applicable in musical analysis, as well. In describing the morphemes most characteristic of Stravinsky, I will steer clear of any kind of genre or stylistic connotations. This is because in music the morpheme acts as a kind of *sound construction*, which acquires a genre and stylistic morphic “flesh and blood” in a specific musical text. The morph represents the morpheme both in the form of chord and in the form of a more or less expansive structure. The morpheme and the morph have the same relationship as an invariant and a variant. For example, the first 13 measures of the “Introduction” to Stravinsky’s *The Rite of Spring* is nothing other than a morph (variant) of one morpheme (invariant) which is typical of Stravinsky, one which can be defined as the **morpheme of the environment**. The constructive idea behind the **morpheme of the environment** lies in the interaction of two or more sound progressions which are most cases temporally atactic. In structural contrast to one another, these progressions also diverge in terms of tessitura and timbre, which allows them to generate, in the listener’s associative perception, an image of a sort of space-time continuum, an “environmental habitat.” What kind, exactly? In *The Rite of Spring*, the **morpheme of the environment** may be associated with the ancient Slavic primordial, natural world.

The first 13 measures of *The Rite of Spring* have attracted attention from many Stravinsky scholars. This texturally transparent “Introduction” contains an array of artistic discoveries which influenced the development of musical language in the 20th century. A detailed analysis of the rhythmic structure of the bassoon solo in this section has been completed by Boulez [2, 60-62]. In Stravinsky’s virtuosic compositional technique, the French master observes elements of symmetry, parallelism, retrograde motion, and varied repetitions. One more could be added: the *improvisational nature* of the bassoon solo. Essentially, it is an artistic re-creation of an instrumental folk tune whose playful, spontaneous rhythmic development reveals itself in multiple fermatas on melodic priority tones and in elements of rhythmic quantitiveness. In Russian-language Stravinsky scholarship, the first to note this was N. Myaskovsky [22, 596]. Later, B. Asafyev remarked on the “pipelkeness” of the bassoon solo [1, 43], as did I. Vershinina [24, 149]. As Stravinsky himself noted in his *Memories and Commentaries* (1960), a substantially modified melody from an “anthology of Lithuanian folk music”

provided its folkloric source [23, 121]. Interestingly, three decades previously, French researcher A. Schaeffner had pointed to a more specific address: No. 157 in A. Juszkiewicz's collection *Litauische Volks-Weisen* (Part I, Kraków, 1900) [17] (Example 1). American music scholar Lawrence Morton, based on an imprecise reproduction by Schaeffner of Juszkiewicz's original, suggested that Stravinsky's "faulty memory" might have contributed to this situation [13, 12]. In a Russian edition of the *Dialogues*, another possible source was identified: No. 60 in a collection by Oskar Kolberg, also published in Kraków in 1879 [21, 364].

LE SACRE DU PRINTEMPS



1. Les premières mesures de l'Introduction.



2. Motif populaire de Lithuanie, emprunté pour l'Introduction.

Example 1. Illustration XXI from the appendix to Schaeffner's monograph on Stravinsky.

G. Golovinsky came to an important conclusion about the *genre transformation* of the Lithuanian folk melody, in which "a sad song transforms into a contemplative, calm, slightly improvisational folk tune [8, 157]." V. Zaderatsky adheres to a similar point of view, paying extra attention to the "varied repetition of motifs at the same pitch level" as the moving force behind the improvisational development [25, 29]. The re-working of the folkloric source based on its melodic, rhythmic (and, as a result, also genre) transformation is presented as a finished product in the "Introduction" to *The Rite of Spring*, with all the previously done work remaining outside the frame. In contrast, in the romance *Spring (The Cloister)*, based on verses by Gorodetsky and composed five years previously to *The Rite of Spring*, we can plainly see the stages of such a process.

40 *Molto sostenuto* ♩ = 54

„Ах ты, по - ле, мо - я во - ля, Ах, до - ро - га до - ро - га!
 „O les champs qui tant m'en - chan - tent, chers chemins que tant j'ai - mais!

p

Example 2. *Spring (The Cloister)*, measures 40-44.

The middle section of the romance begins with the theme (Example 2), the final transformation of which can justifiably be considered a precursor to the introductory bassoon solo in *The Rite of Spring* [20, 94]. The artistic approaches used in the presentation and development of this theme are already fully Stravinsky-like. An intonationally cohesive melody, within which the archetypal features of a lyrical feminine protracted (*protiazhnaia*) song appear in many forms, has become a vocal implementation of the poetical text (*Ah tyi, pole, moya volya, / Ah, doroga dorogá!* [*Ah, meadow, my freedom, / Ah, the road I cherish!*]). These features included the characteristic range of a sixth, the rhythmic emphasis on the exclamation “Ah!”, the natural-minor key, and the type of melodic cadence, based on the singing of the natural (minor) dominant’s tones. The composer reacts keenly to the crosswise poetic parallelism of the word combinations: “*pole-volya | doroga-dorogá*” (horizontal) and “*pole-doroga | volya-dorogá*” (vertical). The key meanings of the words *volya* (will, freedom) and *dorogá* (dear, cherished) are underlined by the tessitura, rhythmically (by use of quarter notes and half notes), and also with the aid of intrasyllabic chant. The piano accompaniment, in its paradoxical interaction with the vocal part, introduces genre and stylistic intrigue to the first four measures of the middle section. After a tonic *e-minor* chord in the piano part, two chordal ritornelles sound like folk choral entries, filling the melodic stops in the voice line. In the vocal part, we clearly hear a mixture of modal priority tones: a natural dominant or major third and tonic. The harmonic progression in the piano part evolves according to an alternative scenario, from the dominant to subdominant. Like chains in a descending harmonic sequence, both piano ritornelles violate the logic of traditional functional-harmonic development ($D \Rightarrow S$ instead of $S \Rightarrow D$). They also are polyphonically stratified: the oscillation of the thirds in the higher voice, the lower pedal in fifths and the counteracting movement of the tetrachords in the melodic *h-minor* and harmonic *a-minor* in the middle voices. Genre synthesis is noticeable in this lyrical fragment. In this way, the genre of “poetry set to music”, so characteristic for a whole array of Russian composers in the early 20th century (15, 43-46), absorbs the features of adaptations of folksongs for voice and piano with which Stravinsky was very familiar from the collections by Rimsky-Korsakov, Lyadov, and Tchaikovsky. The genre foundation of the voice part is a protracted (*protiazhnaia*), lyrical woman’s song which, even with all its singability, hearkens to calendar-driven ritual songs in its tonal makeup (major pentatonic from g^1). The piano accompaniment, meanwhile, resonates keenly with the voice, imitating choral entries.

The piano's responses with their nonstandard harmonic logic and polyphonic stratification of texture on linearly isolated components include one other morpheme typical of Stravinsky's thinking: the **morpheme of dissonance**. At its foundation lies a sound construction the constituent parts of which form dissonant (minor second, major seventh, or tritone) friction. In the fragment of *Spring (The Cloister)* analyzed here, the dissonant friction of the diverging tetrachords in the middle voices (octaves with an internal tritone) gives the piano accompaniment shades of a refined psychologized tone painting, born mostly of the images from the poetic text ("pole" and "doroga").

The **morpheme of dissonance** and its morphic manifestations in Stravinsky's works, marked by phonic astringency and modal acidity, help to shed light on one of the fundamental properties of the composer's musical thinking. The musical and historical context of the **morpheme of dissonance** includes a wide array of phenomena within which departures past the boundaries of traditional major-minor tonality are accomplished with varying degrees of radicalism. Because Stravinsky's main creative antagonist in the first half of the 20th century was Schoenberg, we can compare the Russian composer's **morpheme of dissonance** with analogical phenomena in the work of the Austrian master. Here we must address the generally recognized concept of the "emancipation of the dissonance." The fullest presentation of what Schoenberg meant by "emancipation of the dissonance" comes from reading his article *Composition with Twelve Tones*. Here, the idea of "comprehensibility" is at the center of the concept.

"What distinguishes dissonances from consonances is not a greater or lesser degree of beauty, but a greater or lesser degree of *comprehensibility*. In my *Harmonielehre* I presented the theory that dissonant tones appear later among the overtones, for which reason the ear is less intimately acquainted with them... Closer acquaintance with the more remote consonances – the dissonances, that is—gradually eliminated the difficulty of comprehension ... The term *emancipation of the dissonance* refers to its comprehensibility, which is considered equivalent to the consonance's comprehensibility. A style based on this premise treats dissonances like consonances and renounces a tonal center [18, 104-5]."

Worth noting that Schoenberg considered this attitude toward dissonance, and to its potential to transform into consonance based on the aural perception of farthest tones in the overtone scale, to be only an *assumption*. It could be taken as an interesting hypothesis, if not for the fact that from it, concrete creative conclusions follow, bringing with them first the atonal, then twelve-tone techniques of the composer. When considered not as a hypothesis but rather as an artistic and aesthetic platform for creativity, the idea of the "emancipation of the dissonance" reveals several profound contradictions. First of all, it negates the foundation of European music: the opposition of consonance and dissonance. In the European musical tradition, consonance and dissonance are considered aesthetic antagonists. We could say that in European music the opposition of consonance and dissonance has become a sort of acoustic equivalent to the figurative opposition between Love and Hate, Good and Evil, Life and Death. The history of European music provides evidence of the growing role of dissonance in its artistic and aesthetic opposition to consonance. However, we cannot find, in even one of the multiple original styles predating Schoenberg, an instance in which the opposition of consonance and dissonance completely loses its system-defining role.

Carried to its logical conclusion, the idea of the "emancipation of the dissonance" leads to the creation of a musical text in which the acoustic differences between consonances and dissonances are smoothed over, thereby depriving the text of its intonational and figurative contrasts. In it, musical development occurs by way of dynamics, tessitura, texture, and timbre. Intervallic combinations, by virtue of their

acoustic neutrality, no longer serve as the most prominent musical and expressive approach. That place is occupied by rhythm, meter, tempo, and timbre. Unlike the interval-neutral work described above, the features of which can be found in late works by Webern and in pieces by Boulez and Stockhausen, the **morpheme of dissonance** in Stravinsky assumes an opposition between consonance and dissonance. For example, in the second measure of the “Introduction” to *The Rite of Spring*, the tone cis^1 in the horn clashes sharply with the c^2 in the solo bassoon¹. At the same time, the melodic development of the bassoon tune (along the tones in the E-minor triad) with the triple repetition of the rhythmically varying iambic motif $h^1 - a^1$ is marked by tonal ambiguity. It is difficult to say what the tonic is here, and what sort of figure this is: plagal or mildly authentic (with a natural minor dominant)².

Against the background of the tonal ambiguity (*a-minor* – *e-minor*) in the bassoon part, the cis^1 in the horn on the downbeat of the second measure is perceived as a contextual intonational conflict. This is most likely the contrasting timbre of the brass instrument and the dissonance of the major seventh (diminished octave). The cis^1 in the horn and its subsequent resolution and return can be interpreted as the third of the harmonic dominant in *d-minor*. Diatonically, it can also be interpreted as a variable major-minor third. S. Skrebkov describes the conflicting tones of the bassoon and horn as “variable modal centers secured by a minimum number of melodic tones.” He believes that the tonality of the cis^1 in the horn is based on “the most ancient, primitive means of the ostinato return to the initial tone after a half-tone deviation from it [19, 414].” A similar aberration in perceptions of Stravinsky’s music is based on another characteristic trait of his compositional technique, which we can call the **Janus morpheme**. Like the two-faced ancient Roman god Janus, the Russian master endows his musical constructions with features which preclude an unambiguous interpretation, either in terms of modal and harmonic organization, formal structure and compositional functionality, or, in the end, in terms of the imagery and its meaning.

The morphic realization of the **Janus morpheme** in Stravinsky, from the textural point of view, reveals properties of fluctuation, variability, and ambiguity. As a rule, the compositional functions are realized in the morph of the **Janus morpheme** through dynamic juxtaposition. As a conflictual intonational element, the cis^1 in the horn is resolved at d^1 , while with its return on the second beat of the third bar it disavows the previous event. This is not the “ostinato return to the initial tone,” but rather a functional alternative to the logic of melodic development in the bassoon part, based on four varied repetitions of the original five-tone tune. The rhythmic and melodic changes in the micro-couplet variant-reprise structure of the solo bassoon, and the expansion of its tone series with the upward leap by a fourth, $a^1 - d^2$, transform the second and third beat of the second bar into a zone of utmost melodic distance from the original intonational seed. In contrast, the cis^1 in the horn at that moment takes on relative modal stability, resolving at d^1 . The third measure can be described as a reversal of those roles. The fourth, which is the closest to the first, variation of the original tune in the bassoon is layered over the horn’s return to cis^1 , confirming the previously announced intonational contradiction.

¹ The horn’s cis^1 in the second measure of *The Rite of Spring* is reminiscent of the cello and bass *Cis* in the main theme in the first part of Beethoven’s Third Symphony (with a similar approach of invasion the intonationally conflicting element). Despite the dissimilar stylistic context, this example permits us to illustrate the two composers’ different creative methods: dynamic-procedural in Beethoven and object-descriptive in Stravinsky (for a more detailed comparison of the creative methods specific to the Viennese and St. Petersburg classic composers, see: 6, 27-28).

² Messiaen defines the tone model of the bassoon solo as a “six-tone scale (natural *a-minor* without the sixth tone) [12, 140].”

Worth special notice is the temporary functional disagreement between the bassoon and horn parts. This relationship between *zones of stability and instability*, based on their vertical and horizontal positional displacements with respect to one another, is a source of hidden, potential energy for further development. The musical fabric of the “Introduction” to *The Rite of Spring*, based on the interaction of morphs of the three morphemes (Janus, environmental, and dissonance), is evidence of its *polymorphic* nature. Each of the morphs makes its specific contribution to forming the complete artistic image. For instance, the morph of dissonance, strengthening the textural layering of the bassoon and horn lines, emphasizes the polyphonic nature of the environmental morph. The functional profile of the latter, thanks to the Janus morph, acquires features of the introductory and expository types of musical presentation. The bassoon line personifies the first, and the horn line the second. In doing so, the Janus morph transforms the initial three measures of *The Rite of Spring* into a flexible structure containing elements of both closedness and openness.

Comparing the logic of musical development in the initial measures of the middle section of *Spring (The Cloister)* and the “Introduction” to *The Rite of Spring* is extremely helpful when it comes to understanding the special features of Stravinsky’s style. Both examples prove that the basis of the Russian master’s creative thinking is a virtuosic *game* played with the linguistic rules of musical systems which have developed over time. Here, he plays with the mature major-minor system in Western European music and the modal and genre system from Russian musical folklore. Relying on a tradition that hearkens back to Glinka, Stravinsky puts elements of these systems into atypical, crosswise interaction, predicated by basic musical ideas with their roots in the specifics of the composer’s individual style. These ideas, as motivational impulses coming from the inside and aimed at the creative process, may be described as extratextual sound constructions which exist in convoluted form: morphemes. Tracing how the Russian master’s morphemic corpus is deployed as morphs in each of his works, I am convinced, will allow us to make progress toward an understanding of the specific traits characterizing his creative method.

Elements of polymorphism, so characteristic for the “Introduction” to *The Rite of Spring*, are also present in *Spring (The Cloister)*. For example, the conclusion to the first stanza in the middle section (Example 3), marked by the bright, nonstandard parallelism of the images of the “*mostok* [little bridge]” and “*svechka* [little candle]” (*Ah, mostok u chista polya, / Svechka chista chetvergа [Ah, little bridge near the clear field / Little Holy Thursday candle]*) inspired Stravinsky to use multilayered psychologically enriched tone painting, born of elements from the morpheme of space and morpheme of movement.

45 *più f*

Ах, мо-сток у чи-ста по-ля, Свеч-ка чис-та чет-вер-га!
 Pe-tit pont et libre es-ra-ce, Cier-ge pur du Jeu-di-Saint!

mf

Example 3. *Spring (The Cloister)*, measures 44-48.

In Stravinsky, the **morpheme of space** is based, as a rule, on two elements. The reverberating pedal-tone background is associated with endless distances, while the melodic relief which pours over it creates the impression of something visibly within reach, as if, while regarding the “clear field” which stretches to the horizon, we suddenly see the “little bridge” attached to it. Placing the focus on a concrete detail, in the end, strengthens the impression of spatial eternity. The piano accompaniment creates a spatial aura thanks to the bass pedal in fifths, $E_1 - H_1$, on top of which is layered the harmonic oscillations of the middle voices, endowing the image (the sight of the “clear field”) with vibrational mobility.

The sound construction which is the **morpheme of motion** is based on the contrasting combination of two horizontals. One of them is manifested as regularity, and the other as irregularity. A morph of the **morpheme of motion** appears in measure 46 to 47 in the form of the rhythmically irregular (eighth notes and quarter notes) vocal part – the circular rotation of the melody in the range of the major third could be associated with the wavering flame of a “little candle.” The regularity of the piano accompaniment is based on the rhythmic uniformity of the middle voices (quarter notes) and the bass (half notes). The coming together, in the piano part, of the figurative background from the previous two measures with the bass line from the exposition part of the romance, which imitates the ringing of a bell (“*Zvonyi-stonyi, perezvonyi* [*Tolling, moaning, tolling more*]”), underlines this fragment’s special semantic role in the compositional structure of the whole. The bright, dynamically emphasized *H-major* in the vocal part is supported by the authentic cadence of the piano accompaniment. It transforms in an instant from a dominant of *e-minor* to a new situational tonal center. The image of the “Little Holy Thursday candle,” as the culmination of the initial phase of the middle section, anticipates the dramatic scene of the lovers’ rendezvous. The **morpheme of motion** and **morpheme of space** morphs, the tone painting, and the genre domain described by ringing bells gives this image a volume especially rich in meaning even with its extremely sparing use of textural resources.

The initial eight measures, in the rondo-like form of the middle section of *Spring (The Cloister)*, play the role of a contemplative, lyrical refrain. The feeling that this is a rondo arises mostly out of the textural transformations in the piano part. For example, in the first episode (measures 49–57), memories of a lovers’ rendezvous are accompanied by even beats of rotund chords, operating on octave foundations (there is a similar type of piano accompaniment in the romance “*Ich grolle nicht*” in Schumann’s vocal cycle *Dichterliebe*). In the second instance of the refrain (measures 58–65) there is growing agitation, emphasized with more frequent and longer pauses in the vocal part, supported by evolving melodic counterpoints in the piano (as in the Letter Scene in Tchaikovsky’s *Eugene Onegin*). The culmination of the middle section in the second set of four measures from the second instance of the refrain, as well as the events that follow it, are evidence of the composer’s keen response to the turns in subject and imagery of the poetic text. The “little bridge” music from the first instance of the refrain, thanks to the syntactic fragmentation and intonational honing of the vocal part, the modulation from *e-minor* to *E-major*, and the figurative lacework of the piano accompaniment, transforms into the music of the “Flame of the little candle wavers.” The culminating apex of the middle section, at the line “Kissed on the lips,” is based on the sung *con passione* melody of the “Little Holy Thursday candle.” Serving as counterpoint to this is a melodic wave in the

middle voices of the piano accompaniment, reminiscent of Rachmaninoff, and its bass, imitating the tolling of bells. What could follow such an ecstatic explosion of emotion? Stravinsky provides a remarkable, psychologically justified answer to that question in the form of a dully tranquil piano interlude. The “Little Holy Thursday candle” melody is repeated here once more, as a brightly lit memory (example 4). This fragment is yet another outright confirmation of the *polymorphism* in Stravinsky’s musical thinking.

The image shows a musical score for measures 64-68 of Stravinsky's *Spring (The Cloister)*. The score is written for voice and piano. The vocal line is in G major and 6/8 time, with the tempo/mood marked 'con passione'. The lyrics are in Russian and French. The piano accompaniment features a prominent middle voice line that imitates the tolling of bells. The score includes a dynamic marking 'p' and a chord symbol 'C 6 0 0 2 K'.

Example 4. *Spring (The Cloister)*, measures 64-68.

The second episode of the middle section of *Spring (The Cloister)* is a passionate, questioning recitative by the abandoned heroine, laid over a piano chord succession that sounds like a funeral bell. The most expressive moment of the vocal part turns out to be the question, repeated two times: “*Gde tyi?* [Where are you?]” (measure 70). The intonational transformation of the “Little Holy Thursday candle” melody inside it is based on chromaticism, signaling the direct impact of Tchaikovsky’s lyrical melodicism. The structural and genre-stylistic modifications in the third, final instance of the refrain are dictated by the tasks of constructing the form as a whole. The smooth, artistically grounded transition from the lyrical, confessional middle section to the landscape-depicting reprise is helped along by the structural rearrangement of the material. The third instance of the refrain begins at its second set of four measures, in which the only changes compared to the first instance are in the middle voices of the piano part (they have become static). The first four measures have been reconceptualized from the standpoint of genre and style. The vocalization of the material, intended to “even it out” in terms of melody and rhythm, in the end transforms it into an instrumental tune sung by a voice (Example 5). It is this circumstance that served as V. Smirnov’s starting point for comparing the instrumental tune of *Spring (The Cloister)* with the opening bassoon solo in *The Rite of Spring*. However, in terms of the role they play in the form of the whole, the vocalize in *Spring (The Cloister)* and the bassoon solo at the beginning of the ballet are fundamentally different. While the first is a transitional intonational link, preparing the ground for the “ringing” of the reprise of the romance, the second, as the main element in the environmental morph, plays a defining role in shaping the entire artistic aura of *The Rite of Spring*.

The image shows two systems of musical notation for the piece 'Spring (The Cloister)'. The first system is marked 'a piacere' and consists of a treble clef staff with a melodic line and a grand staff (treble and bass clefs) with a piano accompaniment. The second system is marked '80 Tempo I' and also consists of a treble clef staff with a melodic line and a grand staff with a piano accompaniment. Dynamic markings 'f' and 'pp' are present in the second system.

Example 5. *Spring (The Cloister)*, measures 76-81.

Bibliography

1. Асафьев Б. Книга о Стравинском. Ленинград: Музыка, 1977. 279 с.
2. Boulez P. *Stocktaking from an Apprenticeship*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1991. 316 p.
3. Cantoni A. *The Language of Stravinsky*. Hildesheim ▪ Zürich ▪ New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 2014. 500 p.
4. Гливинский В. Позднее творчество И. Ф. Стравинского. Исследование. Донецк: Донеччина, 1995. 191 с.
5. Glivinsky V. & Fedoseyev I. The St. Petersburg Classic School: myth or reality? // *European Journal of Arts*, vol.1, 2016. pp. 14-20.
6. Glivinsky V. & Fedoseyev I. The Creative Archetypes of the Classic Composers' Schools // *European Journal of Arts*, vol.3, 2016. P. 24-31.
7. Гливинский В. «Муха в борще» или Рассказ о том, как поссорились Аллен Форт с Ричардом Тарускиным // *Музыковедение*. 2016. № 10. С. 44-51.
8. Головинский Г. Композитор и фольклор. Из опыта мастров XIX–XX веков. Очерки. Москва: Музыка, 1981. 279 с.
9. Ивашкин А. Шостакович и Шнитке. К проблеме большой симфонии // *Музыкальная академия*. 1995. № 1. С. 1-8.
10. Морф // *Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь*. Москва: Советская Энциклопедия, 1990. URL: <http://tapemark.narod.ru/les/311b.html> (дата обращения: 07.10.2017).
11. Морфема // *Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь*. Москва: Советская Энциклопедия, 1990. URL: <http://tapemark.narod.ru/les/312a.html> (дата обращения: 07.10.2017).
12. Мессиян О. Анализ «Весны священной» Стравинского. Ритмические персонажи // *Устилог – Hollywood: о Стравинском и его творчестве: сб. статей / Ред.-сост. В. В. Смирнов*. Санкт-Петербург: Композитор•Санкт-Петербург, 2011. С. 137–210.

13. Morton L. Footnotes to Stravinsky Studies: *Le sacre du printemps* // Tempo, New Series, No. 128 (Mar., 1979). P. 9-16.
14. Neff S. How Not to Hear *Le sacre du printemps*? Schoenberg's Theories, Leibowitz's Recording // The Rite of Spring at 100. S. Neff, M. Carr, G. Horlacher, & J. Reef ed. Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2017. P. 304-330.
15. Ручьевская Е. О соотношении слова и мелодии в русской камерно-вокальной музыке начала XX века // Ручьевская Е. А. Работы разных лет: В 2 т. Т. II: О вокальной музыке / Отв. ред. В. В. Горячих. Санкт-Петербург: Композитор • Санкт-Петербург, 2011. С. 43–90.
16. Rufer J. The Works of Arnold Schoenberg. London: Faber & Faber, 1959. 214 p.
17. Schaeffner A. Strawinsky. Paris: Le Éditions Rieder, 1931. 127 p., LX ill.
18. Schoenberg A. Style and Idea. New York: Philosophical Library, 1950. 224 p.
19. Скребков С. Художественные принципы музыкальных стилей. Санкт-Петербург: Изд-во «Лань»; Изд-во «Планета музыки», 2016. 448 с.
20. Смирнов В. Творческое формирование И. Ф. Стравинского. Ленинград: Музыка, 1970. 152 с.
21. Стравинский И. Диалоги: Воспоминания. Размышления. Комментарии / Пер. с англ. В. А. Линник, общ. ред. и послеслов. М. С. Друскина. Ленинград: Музыка, 1971. 414 с.
22. Стравинский И. Переписка с русскими корреспондентами. Материалы к биографии. Том II: 1913–1922 / Сост., текст ред. и комм. В. П. Варунца. Москва: Композитор, 2000. 799 с.
23. Stravinsky I., Craft R. Memories and Commentaries. London: Faber and Faber, 2002. 311 p.
24. Вершинина И. Ранние балеты Стравинского. Москва: Наука, 1967. 223 с.
25. Задерацкий В. Полифоническое мышление И. Стравинского. Москва: Композитор, 2007. 277 с.

References

1. Asaf'ev, B. (1977). *Book of Stravinsky [Kniga o Stravinskoy]*. 2nd ed. Leningrad: Muzyka, 279 p. [in Russian].
2. Boulez, P. (1991). *Stocktaking from an Apprenticeship*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 316 p. [in English].
3. Cantoni, A. (2014). *The Language of Stravinsky*. Hildesheim·Zürich·New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 500 p. [in English].
4. Glivinskij, V. (1995). *Later works of I. F. Stravinsky. Study. [Pozdnee tvorchestvo I. F. Stravinskogo. Issledovanie]*. Donetsk: Donechchyna, 191 p. [in Russian].
5. Glivinsky, V. & Fedoseyev, I. (2016). *The St. Petersburg Classic School: myth or reality? European Journal of Arts*, vol.1, pp. 14-20. [in English].
6. Glivinsky, V. & Fedoseyev, I. (2016). *The Creative Archetypes of the Classic Composers' Schools. European Journal of Arts*, vol. 3, pp. 24-31. [in English].
7. Glivinsky, V. (2016). "A fly in a borsch" or a story about how Allen Fort quarreled with Richard Taruskin [«Muha v borshhe» ili Rasskaz o tom, kak possorilis' Allen Fort s Richardom Taruskinym]. *Musicology [Muzykovedenie]*, vol.10, pp. 44-51. [in Russian].
8. Golovinskij, G. (1981). *Composer and folklore. From the experience of masters XIX – XX centuries. Essays. [Kompozitor i fol'klor. Iz opyta masterov XIX–XX vekov. Ocherki]*. Moscow: Muzyka, 279 p. [in Russian].

9. Ivashkin, A. (1995). *Shostakovich and Schnittke. To the problem of the big symphony [Shostakovich i Shnitke. K probleme bol'shoj simfonii]*. Academy of Music [Muzykal'naja akademija], vol. 1, pp. 1- 8. [in Russian].
10. *Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary [Lingvisticheskij jenciklopedicheskij slovar']* (1990). *Morph [Morf]*. Moscow: Sovetskaja Jenciklopedija. Available at: <http://tapemark.narod.ru/les/311b.html> (Accessed 5 Jan. 2019). [in Russian].
11. *Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary [Lingvisticheskij jenciklopedicheskij slovar']* (1990). *Morpheme [Morfema]*. Moscow: Sovetskaja Jenciklopedija. Available at: <http://tapemark.narod.ru/les/312a.html> (Accessed 5 Jan. 2019). [in Russian].
12. Messian, O. (2011). *Analysis of the "Spring sacred" Stravinsky. Rhythmic characters [Analiz «Vesny svjashhennoj» Stravinskogo. Ritmicheskie personazhi]*. In: V. Smirnov, ed., *Ustyluh – Hollywood: about Stravinsky and his work: cb. articles [Ustilug – Hollywood: o Stravinskom i ego tvorchestve]*. St. Petersburg: Kompozitor, pp. 137–210. [in Russian].
13. Morton, L. (1979). *Footnotes to Stravinsky Studies: Le sacre du printemps. Tempo*, vol. 128, pp. 9-16. [in English].
14. Neff, S. (2017). *How Not to Hear Le sacre du printemps? Schoenberg's Theories, Leibowitz's Recording*. In: S. Neff, M. Carr, G. Horlacher, and J. Reef ed., *The Rite of Spring at 100. Indiana: Indiana University Press*, pp. 304-330. [in English].
15. Ruch'evskaja, E. (2011). *On the relationship between words and melodies in Russian chamber-vocal music of the beginning of the twentieth century [O sootnoshenii slova i melodii v russoj kamerno-vokal'noj muzyke nachala XX veka]*. In: V. Gorjachih ed., Ruchevsckaya E. A. *Works from different years: In 2 volumes. T. II: About vocal music [E. A. Ruch'evskaja. Raboty raznyh let: V 2 t. T. II. O vokal'noj muzyke]*. St. Petersburg: Kompozitor, pp. 43– 90. [in Russian].
16. Rufer, J. (1959). *The Works of Arnold Schoenberg*. London: Faber and Faber, 214 p. [in English].
17. Schaeffner, A. (1931). *Stravinsky [Strawinsky]*. Paris: Éditions Rieder, 127 p., LX ill. [in French].
18. Schoenberg, A. (1950). *Style and Idea*. New York: Philosophical Library, 224 p. [in English].
19. Skrebkov, S. (2016). *Artistic principles of musical styles [Hudozhestvennyye principy muzykal'nyh stilej]*. 2nd ed. St. Petersburg: Lan', Planeta muzyki, 448 p. [in Russian].
20. Smirnov, V. (1970). *The creative formation of I. F. Stravinsky [Tvorcheskoe formirovanie I. F. Stravinskogo]*. St. Petersburg: Muzyka, 152 p. [in Russian].
21. Stravinskij, I. (1971). *Dialogues: Memories. Reflections. Comments [Dialogi: Vospominanija. Razmyshlenija. Kommentarii]*. Leningrad: Muzyka, 414 p. [in Russian].
22. Stravinskij, I. (2000). *Correspondence with Russian correspondents. Materials for the biography. Volume II: 1913–1922 [Perepiska s russkimi korrespondentami. Materialy k biografii. Tom II: 1913–1922]*. Moscow: Kompozitor, 799 p. [in Russian].
23. Stravinsky I., Craft R. (2002). *Memories and Commentaries*. London: Faber and Faber, 311 p. [in English].
24. Vershinina, I. (1967). *Stravinsky Early Ballets [Rannie balety Stravinskogo]*. Moscow: Nauka, 223 p. [in Russian].
25. Zaderatskij, V. (2007). *Polyphonic thinking I. Stravinsky [Polifonicheskoe myshlenie I. Stravinskogo]*. 2nd ed. Moscow: Kompozitor, 277 p. [in Russian].

Стаття надійшла до редакції 17.12.2018 р.

Гливинський В. В.

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6402-0682>

Нью-Йорк, США

val@glivinski.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31318/2522-4190.2019.124.165417>

Переосмислюючи Стравінського історично і теоретично

Актуальність дослідження витікає з необхідності більш точного визначення місця І. Стравінського як представника Санкт-Петербурзької класичної школи в музичній культурі ХХ століття.

Мета дослідження – охарактеризувати особливості мови російського майстра, які перетворюють його на ключову постать музики минулого століття і дозволяють образному ладу творів І. Стравінського стати найбільш яскравим вираженням світогляду та світовідчуття людини його часу.

Методологія дослідження базується на новому, морфологічному типі аналізу, в основі якого – категоріальна пара «морфема-морф», запозичена з лінгвістичної морфології. В процесі аналізу використані також елементи цілісного і стильового аналітичних типів.

Основні результати та висновки дослідження. Морфологічний аналіз творів І. Стравінського дозволяє виявити набір інваріантних звукових конструкцій (морфем), іманентна концептуальність яких прямо пов'язана з асоціативно-образними можливостями слухацького сприйняття. Морфеми середовища, руху, простору, дисонансу, Януса, будучи реалізованими в текстах конкретних творів у вигляді морфів, взаємодіють одна з одною, наділяючи музичну тканину особливою властивістю поліморфності. Саме поліморфність, як головний динамізуючий фактор музичного становлення, надає образам І. Стравінського неповторну художню міць.

Ключові слова: творчість Ігоря Стравінського, «Весна (монастирська)», «Весна священна», морфема, морф, поліморфізм.

Гливинский В. В.

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6402-0682>

Нью-Йорк, США

val@glivinski.com

Переосмысливая Стравинского исторически и теоретически

Актуальность исследования вытекает из необходимости более точного определения места И. Стравинского как представителя Санкт-Петербургской классической школы в музыкальной культуре ХХ века.

Цель исследования – охарактеризовать особенности языка русского мастера, которые превращают его в ключевую фигуру музыки прошлого столетия и позволяют образному строю произведений И. Стравинского стать наиболее ярким выражением мирозерцания и мироощущения человека его времени.

Методология исследования основана на новом, морфологическом типе анализа, в основу которого положена категориальная пара «морфема-морф», заимствованная из лингвистической морфологии. В процессе анализа использованы также элементы целостного и стилевого аналитических типов.

Основные результаты и выводы исследования. Морфологический анализ произведений И. Стравинского позволяет выявить набор инвариантных звуковых конструкций (морфем), имманентная концептуальность которых напрямую связана с ассоциативно-образными возможностями слушательского восприятия. Морфемы среды, движения, пространства, диссонанса, Януса, будучи реализованными в текстах конкретных произведений в виде морфов, взаимодействуют друг с другом, придавая музыкальной ткани особое свойство полиморфности. Именно полиморфность, как главный динамизирующий фактор музыкального становления, сообщает образам И. Стравинского неотразимую художественную мощь.

Ключевые слова: творчество Игоря Стравинского, «Весна (монастырская)», «Весна священная», морфема, морф, полиморфизм.