

PART I

MUSIC

1. THE DYNAMIC MUSICOLOGY AS A CURRENT TREND IN THE THEORY OF MUSIC

Ion Gagim¹

Abstract: *The purpose of communication is to present a system of principles that constitute the high school course Introduction to dynamic musicology - a subject that is taught to future musicians / teachers of music and it is a consideration, a generalization, an actualization of the basic theories of musicology science and their interpretation in the context of the modern paradigm of scientific knowledge, as well as in terms of its active use in musical education and performing practice in the vocational and general music education system with appropriate adaptation. The given principles are formulated and developed by the author as a result of thinking / rethinking the basic traditional positions of musicology focusing on modern views of music as a spiritual phenomenon on topical issues of human initiation of the XXIst century to one of the highest manifestations of culture.*

Key words: *dynamics / dynamism, relationship, function, intra sonorous, dynamic musicology, principle, written form of music, sonorous form of the music, auditory music analysis, meta musicological*

Musicology is the science of the art of music. "The science of art" is a "curious" combination, because it is contradictory in its very essence, as it implies "interference" of the left hemisphere processes (= thinking) "in the internal affairs" of the completely different processes that occur in the right hemisphere (= experience). However, this syntagm, in spite of its inadequacy like, exists, because there is in reality the corresponding region of human knowledge. However, with all this, the problem, as contradiction, remains the same even when manifesting a strict sequence and requires examination. An inquiring mind can formulate the question: Is there a reverse option, we mean, "a symmetrical response" - "Art of Science" as an area of human knowledge / learning? If so, how does it look? And if not, why not? And can it exist as a matter of principle? And again, if it does, then how, and if does not, why not?

The question is not an amateurish, an ironic or a rhetorical one. It is formulated *in fact*, as touching *nature of relations* of these two mutually exclusive phenomena by their nature, "ice" and "flame". It turns out that «the ice" can judge "the flame" but "the flame" cannot yet judge "the ice". In general, can they be joined by whether its basis – we mean, organically and naturally - these two different emanations of the human mind? And, does the musicology, the field we are interested in, put the question in this way? After all, it concerns it in a directly way². Of course, the debate on this question may lead us to

¹Professor PhD Hab., „Alecru Russo” State University from Bălți, Republic of Moldavia, email: gagim.ion@gmail.com

² As an extreme version, this idea may sound as follows: "Music - a closed world, an access to the world of logic, of which can be carried out only in a forced and artificial way." (L. Sabaneyev. Quoted. by: Kazantsev L. Foundations of the theory of music content, Astrakhan, 2009, p. 9).

ancient times - to the era of the original human attempts to discover the world where he/she lives and his/her desire to formulate in certain concepts, his/her observations-conclusions. Therefore, this aspect of the problem is not the subject of today's discussion. Nevertheless, the question has the right to exist and we considered it necessary to put it as one of the justifications for the concept of our article.

Even if the theory of music does not put "officially" the question in such a way and does not look for an objective answer to it, it tries to do it involuntarily in practice and namely, to go beyond the scientific tends in order to explain a number of phenomena occurring in its subject field. For example, regarding one of the key categories - the "content of music"³. However, another question arises: to what extent it is feasible, ie, to what extent it may be conducted by "*algebra* the operation on *harmony*"? It must be done in such a way, that its harmony, should not be "dissected", but on the contrary - that it should remain "safe and sound" and that it should manifest itself in all its color. After all, this is the essence of art!

There is a science of music and its achievements in discovering art of sounds. Its contribution to the creation of the music by the man, as a great spiritual phenomenon in the study of the mastering it in the theoretical and practical plans, etc. deserves the highest estimation. But at the same time, we should not forget that no matter how important and irreplaceable would be the science of music and no matter how far it has progressed in this regard, there is still here forever its "Sannikov Land" - "mysterious country, lost among Arctic ice". And maybe in this case, "the ice" and not the arctic ones, but the ice is ice, it gives nothing but the cold. How could we save "oasis" (in this case - the quintessence!), ie, the living breath of music in the circle of "cold ice" of its theoretical, scientific analysis / learning?

For musicology are characteristic the other contradictions too, as well as of the existing order. Let us turn to the concept of "musical analysis" (Analysis of Music). In most cases, (or usually) when acting appropriately, it is not an analysis (a description, a characteristic) of the music itself carried out (although it is called "musical"), but *the shapes* of the work. After all, there is a product as opus form, ie as "an object", and there is music of the work as a sound that cannot be "an object" in the known sense of the word. The shape of the work and the music of the work - with their well-known dialectical interrelationship and interconditionality - after all, are different things. The opus-work is a written, material, graphical expression of music that can be analyzed and investigated objectively, according to the known scientific methods. The music is "what sounds and what is heard" (B. Asafiev). But analyzing the written form and analyzing the sounding music is not the same thing. In this case, the subjects of analysis are different, and this means that the methods must be different, too.

³ The problem of the content of music is one of the most difficult and, in fact, controversial issues of musicology, which has no objective scientific solutions. (See, for example: Kholopova V.N. *Music as art*. St. Petersburg, 2002; Kazantsev L.P. *Foundations of the theory of music content*, Astrakhan, 2009; Kudryashov A.I. *Theory of music content*. St. Petersburg: Planet of music, Lan, 2010 et al.).

Does the musicology have today these different methods? The question seems to remain open. (It turns out that the theory of music ...does not deal with the music?).

And another thing, related to "non-compliant". The traditional analysis of a musical work is performed visually (through the eyes along the musical score), while the music is a sound-auditory substance. It turns out, that an unjustified and an unwarranted substitution of one the form of knowledge with another form takes place scientifically (and semantically). And, this with the fact that these two types of information (visual and auditory), having a known cooperation, find themselves – in their extreme and supreme expressions – in strict opposition, as they represent two different worlds, two different plans of our consciousness⁴. Regarding this issue B. Asafiev, in his *Guide to the concerts*, when referring to the concept of form, delimits the two sharply defined divergent (emphasis added – I.G.) sense. From the point of view of continuous variation of becoming human intonations form in music, it is always created and recreated (already someone's vivid performance, in essence, the intonation even popular, well-known for a long time work, opens new qualities of form and even qualitatively new form). From the perspective of the tone-architecture, of *the music comprehended vision* (emphasis added – I.G.), the form is always scheme by which "flow" or are weaved the sounds - "musical elements" (melody, harmony, rhythm), as if they do not constitute manifestations of living intonation (...). In this respect, my work (...) is entirely based on auditory and intonation comprehension of the music, but on visual and notional, mechanical and constructive one"⁵. Did this interpretation of the concept of musical form become (and other musical concepts) a common thing in musical practice? Is this approach applied when *mastering* music? This question remains open, I guess. Faced to this kind of difficulty in discovering the mysterious nature of its subject, the musicology is forced to make all sorts of compromises. For example, borrowing from other art forms and from different areas of knowledge necessary concepts to describe their definitions, in fact, indescribable objectively phenomena.

Another "claim" to the modern musical science is the following (according to tradition and inertia) the way of classical methodology, it means, that one, which was formed on the basis of Aristotelian logic, Euclidean geometry, Cartesian dualism, Newtonian physics, etc., in a word, based on the "mechanistic" view of the world. But from the first decades of XXth century, the science began to move on the other way of understanding the universe, the nature, the life, the man and his consciousness, which started by discovering the quantum physics (also called the - NB - "Wave"!). As a result, the picture of the world began to change in the human consciousness, the man's understands of *the nature* of this world.

⁴The problem of specificity of information (and, therefore, cognition) obtained by ear and eye, their comparison, as well as the concept of "musical type of cognition" is considered by us in the book: Gagim Ion. *Music and philosophy*. Chişinău: Science, 2009, p. 20-32. On this topic, G. Gachev also commented deeply enough and convincingly. (Gachev G. *Musical and visual civilization*. Moscow: The university book, 1999).

⁵ Asafiev B.V. *Guide to the concerts*. Moscow, Soviet composer, 1978. the 2nd Ed., p. 9

In this regard, many sciences began to revise their traditional paradigms, adapting the principles of a new study of epistemology. The branching traditional areas of knowledge began to appear as new scientific disciplines: in physics - quantum physics, in biology - systems biology, etc. The psychology (the most "related" area, in the known sense of music) changes from atomistic to integrallist (holistic), from molecular to synthetic, from static to dynamic, from behavioral to the transpersonal one. The musicology, in the study of his subject, keeps going, in general, on the way of the same epistemology, formed on the basis of methods of exact / natural sciences and is therefore the most appropriate for them (but not for the art). But the musicology deals with another field of science - Humanities. It does not only deals with it, but, according to the specifics of its subject, is "on the far border" even of this field.

Today, the science of music is in front of this kind of methodological problems. Of course, you can pass by all was mentioned above and follow the tradition, because the achievements of musicology as in theoretical and in practical part (and this is the most important – the exit in living life of musical culture) reached, as already was mentioned, the incredible progress. Nevertheless, the science of music cannot be satisfied by the achievements and stop looking for others, more appropriate approaches and methods of study and presentation of its subject – the music as sounding living phenomenon. Moreover, that the principles of the new paradigm of understanding the world where the man lives today, including himself as an integral, organic element of this world, are very close to the nature of music, to its very essence.

We have already written about the postulates of modern epistemology in terms of fitting in musicology in their field of action⁶. As justification of the main idea of this article can be mentioned some of the most important theses of a new scientific paradigm:

- The transition from mechanistic concept to *the dynamic* interpretation of nature, life, thinking, consciousness, evolution. The world is not a machine, consisting of individual elements, but it is a single, harmonious living *organism*.
- The transition from objects to their *correlations*. Any object must be defined not by itself, but due to its relations with other objects. Gregory Bateson (Bateson), for example, believes that correlations should form the basis for all definitions and that it is necessary to explain to children from the very schooldays⁷.
- The transition from reductionism to *holism*, which understands the world as a single indivisible whole, but allocated human phenomena and objects understand them as meaningful ones only as part of the whole.
- The transition from structure to *rhythm*. Modern physics describes the matter not as a passive and inert energy, but as "a continuous dance of energy," with certain rhythmic patterns. The concept of rhythm plays a fundamental role in the development of a new holistic view of the world.

⁶ Gagim Ion. *Music and the new world of science*, Akademos Journal, no. 2 (21), 2011, p. 119-125

⁷ Op. by: Capra F. *Moment of truth*. București, Technical Edition, 2004, p. 81

- The transition in psychology, from structures to *processes* that underlie them; the reliance on mental *dynamics* in terms of *energy* flow (not a thinking-reasoning reliance, but experience one). *The movement, the dynamics*, the continuous *transition* of some states (processes) in the others are the nature of our psyche⁸.
- The holographic principle of the world dispensation: the whole is encoded in each of its parts. In order to express *the dynamic nature* of reality, David Bohm (Bohm) formulated by analogy with a hologram, the concept *Holomovement* not to study the structures of objects, but *the structures of the movement*⁹.

Highlighting the key concepts of the new epistemology (*dynamics / dynamism, process, motion, structure of movement, relationship / correlation, transition, rhythm, organism, energy, holism*, etc.) we observe a conceptual transition from "statics" to "dynamics", from "mechanical" approach to the "organismic"¹⁰ one, from the study of "objects" to the study of "relationships" between the objects, etc.

Another characteristic trend of the modern era is the integration of science that provides an advanced research of the subject. In such a way, the traditional practice of musicology cooperation with other disciplines (psychology, philosophy, aesthetics, cultural studies, lexicology, etc.) in solving their problems, should be boldly extended, because the music laws in force of art are identical to the laws of the objective reality, from its space level to the subatomic world level. This will allow to put forward the musicology as an advanced science, but the music will acquire a true understanding and meaning for the modern man in the matter of knowledge and transformation of his world and himself.

With all this, we do not want to claim that musicology "stuck" in old the ossified forms of study of their problems. But we need to go further. The logic of things leads to the conclusion that we need a transition of musicology to the new epistemological vector, in particular - a "universal" transition to a dynamic paradigm. Why a "universal" one? The dynamic approach in musicology, as you know, is not new. It is sufficient to refer, for example, to B. Asafiev and E. Kurt, who at the beginning of XX-th century, laid the foundation of the study of musical phenomena in terms of movement, process and energy. We can also refer to other authors who have continued and developed the appropriate direction¹¹. However, despite all the achievements in this regard, the question is not settled. The dynamic interpretation must be subjected to all the concepts,

⁸ Mental processes - "as melody," says Merleau-Ponty. (Merleau-Ponty Maurice. Phenomenology of perception. Paris, Gallimard, 1971).

⁹ Bohm David. *Quantum Theory*. New York: Prentice Hall, 1951

¹⁰ Henry Orlov says: "Organismic approach, which is described by Bertalanffy (Ludwig von Bertalanffy. Open Systems in Physics and Biology // Perspectives on General System Theory. P. 127) sees in the phenomena of dynamic interactions. He tries to understand the processes of development, (...) forces, allowing to self-organize (...). Organismic system (...) is not material, but functional" one".(Orlov G. Tree of Music. St. Petersburg: Composer, 2005, p. 47-48).

¹¹ It is interesting to note that this approach appeared simultaneously with the birth of quantum physics, but most likely, regardless of it. The overall spirit of the age (as a manifestation of the "collective unconscious" at this stage of the evolution of human consciousness and thinking) directed all searches in the same direction.

categories, definitions, which marked the phenomena which occur in music, from the smallest to the largest its components. This necessity (and relevance) is due not only to the general nature of music as a dynamic phenomenon, but also to the spirit of each of its elements - from sound to form. This is also due, as we have already seen, to the very spirit of time.

Considerations of this kind formed the basis of the concept, of the form and content of the readable university course "*Introduction to the dynamic musicology*." What were the main considerations and actions taken by us in order to implement the planned concept? The term "musicology" "sets the tone" to the given interpretation, because it includes the name of the concept of "logos", with its "sacral", original and metaphysical sense (but the name must be in harmony with the content, and vice versa). "Logos", in this sense we associate with fluidity, "knowledge" based on "word-concept" - with statics.

Our other step in this direction was a wide and inclusive approach of the concept of "dynamism" in music by treating it on different levels of its manifestation in musical work. As a result, we have identified the following types of it:

- *Kinetic (or temporal)* – as a movement-process in time. This aspect of dynamism has an *objective* nature and manifests itself in two plans: a) as physical movement of sound in time (sound - matter of music - has a natural length) and in space, b) as physical movement in time of the most musical discourse / music work ("form-process" by Asafiev).
- *Intra sonorous (or intralingual)* as a result of various processes ("events") occurring between the sounds of two main lines: the horizontal (for example, at the level of intonation) and vertical (at the level of harmony)¹²; (or rather, beginning with the processes occurring in the sound), forming a variety of sound, dynamic and energy fields.¹³ (The process begins with a single sound, which is already this kind of field).
- *Vertically*, related to the processes taking place on the basis of pitch of the sound: melos, per se fret, harmony, etc. and which has a "volume", "spherical" character.
- *Horizontally*, related to the processes taking place on the basis of the duration of the sound, which has a linear and "flatness" character: meter-pulsation, rhythm, tempo, agogics, form as movement, etc.
- *Acoustic* - as the power of sound, marked by known dynamic shades: f, p, cresc., dim. etc.¹⁴

¹² Tchaikovsky, following his remarks, denoted one of the fundamental laws on which builds music (musical "matter"): "The combination of musical sounds are of two kinds: those in which the sounds one after the other, and those in which they are heard at the same time." (P.I. Tchaikovsky Guide to the Practical Study of harmony // CAP. T. III-A, M., 1957, p. 9).

¹³ See for example: Nazaikinskii E. Sound world of music. M. 1988. We emphasize that the interest in the inner "life" of sound increases in the compositional practice of our time. It is known that some modern composers are looking for different ways of applying in writing of the spectral structure of the sound.

¹⁴ The wide musical practice, as is known, is limited to this aspect of the reviewing the concept of "dynamics" in music.

- *Internal*, as sound and auditory tension. This type of musical dynamism has a subjective character, as it refers to the auditory sensation in the form of psycho-physiological reactions to the sound / to the sounding stream.
- *External*, including and unifying the above-mentioned types of *acoustic* and *kinetic* dynamism. In these cases, both processes would take place on „*the external*” side of the musical movement, in comparison with *intra sonorous* type.
- *Perceptual*, taking place when hearing and perceiving the music as "energy" flow. (Including the performance of music).
- *Specific and musical*, expressed in the form of these two kinds of dynamism: *external* (as physical movement and as force of sounding, however, having only a musical sense, in contrast, for example, with the power of sound in spoken language) and *internal* (*intra sonorous*).
- *Universal (or general)*: the dynamism covers all sound space of the work and manifests itself at all its levels - from the general plan to the smallest of its constituent units, creating and maintaining its integrity.¹⁵
- *Global* - including the musical phenomenon in the paradigm of modern epistemology based on a dynamic concept (nature) of the world, man and his consciousness, whose direct representative is the sound (including the musical one).

After having identified the possible levels and aspects of the musical texture, where the dynamic factor appears, we see that it has a comprehensive and pervasive nature. Due to this, a piece of music is brought to our hearing consciousness as a "runaway" energy flow, carrying our ears and our minds with it. The concept of the course is based, therefore, on the translation of consciousness trained into the study of various musical phenomena from the static and "technical" plan to the dynamic and "energy" one or, in terms of G. Orlov, from the "tonal" to "modal" with the appropriate "replacement" of some conceptual categories on the others, such as "crystal" to "flame"; *the relation* of the other tones in *the dynamic field*; of the structural unit by a factor of *expression*; a means of asserting *logics* on means of asserting *the state*; is directed to *thoughts* - directed to *feeling*, etc.¹⁶

Thus, the basic positions of the exposition (mastering) of the material of the course¹⁷ are: the transition from statics to dynamics, from "mechanism" to "organism", from structure to function, from scheme to process, from formal and technical / constructive to expressive and meaningful, from quantity to quality, from screen image to image-flow, from moments to events, from music to sound / tones, from visual and graphic aspect of the elements of the musical language to their hearing and expressive aspect, from text to music detection in

¹⁵ "The music is not a thing; it is an organic process, whose integrity is not supported by the structure, but by internal and external stresses - the dynamic equilibrium of interacting forces." (Orlov G. *Tree of Music*. St. Petersburg: Composer, 2005, p. 50).

¹⁶ Orlov G. Op. ed. p.167-168

¹⁷ About the content of our course, see: I. Gagim, Concentric principle of the course "Introduction and dynamic musicology" // Methodological and methodical problems of general music education. Materials of the international conference. St. Petersburg, A.I. Herzen RPSU . 2009. P. 14-20.

the text, from language to speech, etc. Respectively, the priorities change when analyzing (studying) the music / the musical work and its component / its elements.

In the context of the given approach the key categories are of the following order: *movement-process, dynamism, relation / correlation, interaction, interdependence, conjugation, gravitation, attraction, resolution, stability, instability, stress, relaxation, intensity, energy, function / functionality, system / systematic state, deployment / formation of the (image / content), submission-subordination of the (tones), etc.* This kind of concepts has a "live", "semantic" character. The music is not a static phenomenon, but an ecstatic (going beyond statics) one. The ecstatic state is a state of "flight", of "ecstasy." Hence is the feeling that the music "raises" ("exalts") our spirit when dealing with it. When studying musical phenomena of paramount importance, we state that the phenomenon (element of musical discourse) is determined by its *essence*, but not by its structure. This very essence is contained in the function of the element phenomenon. (It is known that the function creates the appropriate body/organ, and not vice versa).

The given approach in the presentation of the study of the music phenomena is associated with another important (and natural, in our case) method: the auditory one. The music, as we know, is not presented in musical notes, but in the sounds-sounding.¹⁸ "The starting point for a new way of studying the music should be not the musical score, says Abraham Moles (Abraham), but the sound material, defined by its coordinates".¹⁹ The analysis (theoretical examination) of the corresponding structures of the musical work should be accompanied by "the hearing" (real or imaginary) in order to make appear in the minds the "sonorous" and not the "technical and formal" image. Proceeding from it, the intonation, as textual form that has, graphically (on paper), only one type, becomes sounding *intonation* and appears multivariate, depending on the context (in the analysis of the semantic and / or performing during the performance).²⁰ The unit of measure becomes in this case, the "movement" rather than the element-"object" that is, the action of the element and not its statistical statement (according to the principle: "not "flower", but "flowering", not "dance", but "dancing", not "life", but "living", etc.). Thus, we change the focus from the structural and expressive on the visual and informative (and auditory) method to study the work. The musical score should be considered as a specific medium of reality, and not as a "thing in itself". In a similar sense, A. Kudryashov asserts that we need "an adjustment of theoretical musicology from the traditional (...) her structural and grammatical (music – I.G.) hearing (...) in the direction of hearing (...) meaning."²¹

¹⁸ We regard this question in more detail in the article: *About auditive factor in music* // Review of artistic education, no. 3-4, Iassy, 2012, p.7-14.

¹⁹ See: Kurt Blaukopf. *Music and Technology* // Musical Review, Paris, 1970, no. 268-269, p. 163. (Op. by: Giuleanu Victor. *Treaty of music theory*. Bucharest: Music, p. 24)

²⁰ "Again and again, we can assert that musical fixation actually keeps a thousandth part of a sound sense." (Nazaikinskii E. *Sound world of music* . Moscow: Music. 1988, p. 161).

²¹ Kudryashov A.Y. *Theory of music content*. St. Petersburg: Planet of music; Lan, 2010, p. 10-11

The dynamic musicology puts ("exalts") phenomena, taking place in the music, to another level of awareness (and, consequently, their application in the process of learning, performance and perception of the music) - from the level of *concepts* to the level of *categories*, gives them a different epistemological and informative "status". The concept has a "static", "formal and technical" character when explaining / learning and perceiving the processes, but the "category" has a "living" one. "The concept" treats something as an "object", as a "thing", but the "category" - as a phenomenon. This approach puts the emphasis on the substantive plan of the work, compared with the formal and technical one, orients the interpretation of the elements of music through their semantics and gives them a different "look". For example, "the interval", as a *concept*, is "the distance between two adjacent sounds is measured in semitones-tones", but "the interval", as a category (phenomenon) is based on the concept of *relationship*. A relationship is a "movement", "a living vibration", "sending" of one sound to another and "an expectation" by second for the first. Thus, the interval is the "communication" between the sounds; it is their "dialogue". The first sound of the interval should be considered (reproduced heard) only in connection with the second, and the second - in connection with the first, that is, in the context of the whole (holistically). The interval as a sound phenomenon, is not two sounds, but is a unified whole line. The interval is the flow of the *transition* from one sound to another. The first sound is caused by the second and the second, by first. A sound without the other does not exist as element of the *interval*.

As a result, we have formulated the following **principles**, underlying the "dynamic musicology":

- *Dynamic* (with the above-mentioned aspects: a) as power of sounding; b) as movement (kinetic); c) intra sonorous, manifested at different levels of a musical work).
- *Correlational*: the transition from "objects" to their "relationship" ("correlations").²²
- *Functional*: each element in music has a specific function, role.²³
- *Conversion*²⁴: "noun" (statics) transformation into "adjective" (movement): music into sounds, text into sounding; the motive as "the smallest structural and semantic unit of the musical form" into "musical motive" as a unit of movement, as the initial impulse of the audio stream / musical discourse, etc.²⁵

²² "The music is much stronger than the other arts, it is based on relationships, and not on objects of relationships. In music, for the composer is important not so much the the sounds, but the intervals-intonations . The main matter in harmony is the pitch relationships. "(Nazaykisky E. Sound world of music . Moscow, Music, 1988, p. 10).

²³ Medushevsky B. Intonational form of music. M., Composer, 1993

²⁴ Conversion (from Lat. Conversion - transformation, change) - change of nature of the object / phenomenon; ling. - the act of inversion of the noun by an adjective in any logical operation while maintaining the quality of logical steps.

²⁵ Referring again to Mr. Orlov: "If at the previous stage of mental work is described in a language consisting mainly of adjectives, then, now it is dominated by verbs (...). With each transition to a higher layer, the acquired experience resets its original "body" and "reincarnates itself" (Orlov G. op. Ed., p. 23-24). The author attributes this thesis to the levels of perception of music, but the idea can be applied when studying the theoretical levels of music.

- *Organismic*: the musical work is not a mechanism, but it is an organism/body.
- *Meta Conceptual* (= "going beyond the concepts") in considering transition phenomena / of music elements from the level of concepts to the level of categories.
- *Phenomenological*, relating to the content of the music, which is something purely musical, untranslatable; the music is music.²⁶
- *Meta musicological*: consideration of musicological categories in a large context, from universal positions.²⁷
- *Transdisciplinary*: the music (intonation) is not in sounds, but "between" (or "above") the sounds; the sounds are combined in a certain reality, located on each of them, but at the same time, including each of them - this is what can be called the "spirit" of intonation, the "spirit" of the general sound of movement / discourse / music.²⁸
- *Reflective*: those who study the music, not only master the appropriate information in the form of musical category, "ascertain" their presence and "remember" it, but approach them analytically, discuss-reflect, seek to understand their nature, their different aspects, driving forces, possible hidden contradictions, and so on.²⁹
- *Gaining living experience* (in the theoretical study of music): categories, elements of musical language, the phenomena taking place in the music, are "experimented" and "experienced" on personal experience: they are intoned, played by the instrument, improvised, composed as training tasks, and so on.³⁰
- *Hearing/ auditory* - appropriate musical phenomena, mastered theoretically, as concepts / categories, pass the way of the auditory experience: are perceived as live music in different musical works. Visual form of the analysis of musical score is complemented by of auditory method of studying *music* of the work.³¹

The presented approach transfers the musical phenomena, given theoretically as concepts / categories, to another level of awareness,

²⁶ V.N. Kholopova considers the "content" in music as a monad, as an independent substance. (Kholopova V.N. Music as art. St. Petersburg, 2002). In this context, we are dealing with the problem of musical perception of music, developing and applying in practice the technique (technology) of this type (level) of communication with the music.

²⁷ "The so-called "the musical" the concept, nearly, borrowed from the immeasurably wider "outside" field of the universal human experience." (Orlov G. Op. Ed., p. 18).

²⁸ "The tone is a particle of intonation. (...) The intonation is deployed as a clutch of tones. However, it is impossible to represent the matter as if intonation is derived from the colors. It is primary. (...) Not the tone makes the music, but the music makes the tone. Here we are dealing with the effect of generalization - at every sound as if compressed, is concentrated the whole course of intonation. Only with such condensation the sound becomes a tone." (Nazaikinskii E. Sound world of music. M.: Music, 1988, p. 24).

²⁹ In the preface to his Guide to the concerts Asafiev B. writes: "The basic concepts of music (...) are not given as formal and dry definitions, but as discussions of this term-phenomenon, born of art (...) process." (...) I wanted not just to inspire to (readers - I.G.) (...) the definition of poster, ready-made formulas, but to cause cognitive interest - the work of thought over this musical concept." (Asafiev B.V. Guide to the concerts. Moscow: Soviet composer, 1978, p. 8).

³⁰ "Out of the experience there is no music. Only experience becomes a reality, comes into existence and is revealed as a special world of meanings, of specific relationships, measures and logics. There can be no music theory (emphasis added - I.G.) if it does not nourish itself with musical experience" (Orlov G. Op. Ed., p. 13).

³¹ In the spirit of given statements of Asafiev (See above.: Asafiev B.V. Guide to the concerts. ... p. 9).

understanding, perception and performance, gives them a different epistemological and informative status, contributes to the approximation of scientific and theoretical consideration of *the nature* of the object which they represent – the music as live-sounding *art*.

References

1. Asafiev B. *Musical form as a process*. Leningrad: Music, 1971, p. 207
2. Asafiev B. *Guide to the concerts*. Moscow: Soviet composer, 1978. Ed. 2nd, p. 9
3. Bershadskaya T.S. *Articles from different years*. Sb.st. / Ed-status. O.V. Rudnev. St. Petersburg Union of Artists, 2004, p. 22, 50
4. Gagim I. *Concentric principle of the course "Introduction and dynamic musicology"* // Methodological and methodical problems of general music education. Materials of the international conference. St. Petersburg, AI Herzen RPSU, 2009. p. 14-20
5. Gagim I. *Music and music education in the context of modern epistemology* // Music Lessons in the modern school. Coll. of articles and materials. Vol. 4. St. Petersburg: RPSU 2009. p. 9-20
6. Gagim I. *Necessary inversion or rethinking of the auditory factor in musical science* // Music education in the modern world: Dialogue times. Part I. St. Petersburg: RPSU 2010, p. 23-33
7. Gachev G. *Music and visual civilization*. Moscow: The University book, 1999
8. Kazantsev L. *Foundations of the theory of music content*, Astrakhan, 2009
9. Kudryashov A.Y. *Theory of music content*. St. Petersburg: Planet of music; Lan, 2010
10. Medushevsky B. *Intonational form of music*. Moscow: Composer, 1993
11. Nazaikinskii E. *Sound world of music*. Moscow: Music, 1988
12. Orlov G. *Tree of music*. St. Petersburg: Composer, 2005, p. 47-48
13. Kholopova V.N. *Music as art*. St. Petersburg, 2002
14. P.I. Tchaikovsky *Guide to the Practical Study of harmony* // CAP. T. III-A, M., 1957, p. 9
15. Bohm David. *Quantum Theory*. New York: Prentice Hall, 1951
16. Capra F. *Moment of truth*. Bucharest, Technical Publishing House, 2004, p. 81
17. Gagim Ion. *Music and philosophy*. Chisinau, Publishing House Science, 2009, p. 20-32
18. Giuleanu Victor. *Treaty of music theory*. Bucharest: Music, p. 24
19. Merleau-Ponty Maurice. *Phenomenology of perception*. Paris, Gallimard, 1971