

## **INTERPRETATIVE QUALITIES OF THE MODERN MUSIC COMPOSITION**

**Maidenberg-Todorova K. I.**

### **INTRODUCTION**

Contemporary domestic musicology reveals a number of topical issues regarding the relationship between composer and musicology, as well as between composer and performing positions. The first series of questions is determined by the specific features of the process of creating music. It touches on the evolution of musical writing systems and musical thinking, reflects changes in their position in various sociocultural conditions.

If at the early stage of music development its sound was based, to a greater extent, on the capabilities of the human voice, so then there was subsequently attracted an increasing number of musical instruments. Then, electro-acoustic and electric instruments began to enter the musical routine, artificial synthesized sounds and specific sounds – noises, knocks, creaks – began to play a significant role. And composers of the edge of the XX – XXI centuries began to think more with “silence” than with sounds; in their works, silence became symbolic, it became “sounding” (just remember the “4’33’” by J. Cage, “I hear ... Silence...” by S. Gubaidulina).

In this regard, there arise questions about those new principles of musical composition that can be brought to their common denominator, to the phenomena of aleatorics and sonoristics, most common in the second half of the XX century. These phenomena find close interaction with each other, continue to remain in the foreground of composer's innovations – despite the fact that they exist quite a long time and are found in the creative systems of representatives of various national schools. As recognized "composer techniques" of the XX century, they acquired an independent form of existence, special artistic functions and grew into a certain style direction. The technological and artistic potential of these methodological paradigms of musical composition has not yet been fully discovered, much less known, especially from their chronotopic conditions.

However, despite the numerous findings of the intersection of the expressive capabilities of the aleatory and sonoristic techniques in particular, as well as their synthesis in a modern aleatory-sonoristic composition, it needs a deeper formulation, also, in connection with the problem of “open work”, and the latter clearly needs updating – in connection with the study of the phenomenon of modern musical composition.

In the modern relationship between composer and performing positions in contemporary musical creativity, the written form of the composer text is not endowed with constant structural and semantic features and often has no sound precedents. It acts as a kind of visual and graphic object, and the performer's personal assessment of this text becomes especially free, autonomously author's. At the borders of composer's and performing understandings of such a text, a common sphere of special interpretative techniques arises, defining and revealing a new style designation of modern musical creativity.

### **1. The phenomenon of interpretation in context of contemporary humanitarian knowledge**

The problem of interpretation is one of the most traditional and stable for modern musicology. Its importance and relevance is ensured by its connection with the text problem. In recent years, the theory of interpretation has become universal – not only in the field of music science, but also in a number of humanitarian disciplines of a philosophical and psychological profile, revealing a connection, in particular, with the problem of cultural consciousness and personal autonomy. Therefore, even with traditional approaches, the problem of interpretation reveals systemic complexity, creates its own conceptual circles, chains of epiphenomena, its own structural subsections. “The interpretation has its own history and that this history is an integral part of the tradition itself”; “We interpret in order to highlight, extend and thereby support the life of the tradition in which we ourselves are. This means that the time of interpretation belongs in some way to the time of tradition”<sup>1</sup>.

The significance of cognitive canons in relation to the phenomenon of interpretation is enhanced by the fact that this phenomenon itself has a strong connection with cultural tradition. According to the theory of the German philosopher G. Gadamer, in the process of creating an artwork, his author is constantly forced to overcome the tension that arises between expectations coming from tradition and new habits initiated by him. The process of creating a work is always associated with the opposition of historical consciousness and the ability of a creative person to self-reflection. It is precisely this confrontation between the traditional and innovative, past and present artistic experience that is the process of interpretation according to Gadamer. Unlike G. Gadamer, the French philosopher P. Ricoeur, believed that any interpretation allows you to overcome the distance between the past cultural era and the era of the interpreter, so that the interpreter either becomes a contemporary of the text he interprets, or appropriates the meaning of the interpreted art object, seeks to make it his own, therefore, he intends to

---

<sup>1</sup> Рикер П. Конфликт интерпретаций. Очерки о герменевтике. М.: КАНОН-пресс-Ц; Кучково поле, 2002. 624 с. Р.58.

achieve the expansion of self-understanding through understanding of the other. P. Ricoeur notes that “the work of interpretation reveals a deep plan – to overcome the cultural distance, the distance separating the reader from an alien text, and thus include the meaning of this text in the current understanding that has the reader”<sup>2</sup>.

Interpretation plays a significant role – both in the very being of an art work, and in the assimilation of its artistic content and meaning. Interpretation in the broad sense of the word is traditionally understood as an interpretation, explanation of any real situation or ideological position; as a special concept of the methodology of science, based on a semiotic analysis of the language of science, the procedure of giving meaning to the formal constructions of the language of science, as a result of which the latter turn into meaningful terms or statements. Interpretation is also often considered as attributing some meaningful meaning, meaning to the symbols and formulas of the formal system; as a result, the formal system turns into a language that describes a particular subject area.

In art, interpretation is an integral and necessary component of the process of artistic creation and perception of an art composition. The artistic reflection of reality in art necessarily includes the moment of its interpretation (explanation). Rethinking an art work (often multiple) during the inheritance and development of spiritual culture each time becomes its new interpretation. N. Korykhalova writes that “in essence, any perception of an art composition is its interpretation. Perception is impossible without interpretation; it involves the active processing of the received impressions. In the process of this interpretation, an aesthetic object<sup>3</sup> is created”.

Interpretation in art can be considered as a field of hermeneutics, since it defines the aspect of understanding aimed at the semantic content of texts. Any fixed art work is an encrypted text, the decoding of which is influenced by the identity of the one who comes into contact with this text. When putting a certain meaning in his work, the author does not always publish it. Sometimes you can find direct or indirect confirmation of interpretation in personal correspondence, and sometimes the author purposefully hides his own vision of the work.

P. Ricoeur calls the interpretation as the work of thinking, "which consists in deciphering the meaning behind the obvious meaning, in identifying the levels of meaning contained in the literal meaning"<sup>4</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> Рикер П. Конфликт интерпретаций. Очерки о герменевтике. М.: КАНОН-пресс-Ц; Кучково поле, 2002. 624 с. Р.34.

<sup>3</sup> Корыхалова Н. Интерпретация музыки: теоретические проблемы музыкального исполнительства и критический анализ их разработки в современной буржуазной эстетике. Л.: Музыка, 1979. 208 с. Р. 159.

<sup>4</sup> Рикер П. Конфликт интерпретаций. Очерки о герменевтике. М.: КАНОН-пресс-Ц; Кучково поле, 2002. 624 с. Р. 44.

In philosophy in general and musicology, there is a separation of the study of interpretation problems in the objective and subjective aspects. In the first case, the emphasis in the study falls on the work of the composer, in the second, on the creative personality of the performer, the interpreter.

Let us disagree with some provisions of this statement. Interpretation is always a subjective phenomenon, since interpretation is categorically impossible without a personality factor. The ability to interpret is inherent in every person, at the same time it is a distinctive human, individual and personal ability. We find confirmation in the interpretation of the term of interpretation by V. Demyankov, who considers it as “a characteristic of an artistic presentation similar to a musical one”, which “has subjectivity”<sup>5</sup>.

You can interpret both objects, phenomena that make up everyday life, and facts, events that happened at a certain historical distance, as well as possible ones in the future. Art objects are an event located in all temporal positions – in the past, present and future.

According to the concept of Y. Lotman, expressed in the work “About Two Communication<sup>6</sup> Models”, one can define the interpretation of an art work as a way of transmitting information in a message between recipients – the author and the recipient. The first “Me-Him” mode of communication implies that the message is known to the sender and unknown to the addressee; information is transmitted in space, the code and message are constant, as is the amount of information. The second model is implemented in the communication of the type “Me-Me”. In this case, the message is known to both the sender and the addressee. Information moves not in space, but in time; while the code and message are changed. In such communication, Y. Lotman observes a tendency to decrease values, since the addressee and the sender, as one person, do not need to fully decipher them. This type of communication is manifested when the author and the recipient are combined in one person

If the interpretation of everyday phenomena can be connected at a given time with only one person, then interpretation in the field of art is a complex, multi-component phenomenon. This process implies the presence of at least two sides of interpretation in relation to this one object of the author and the recipient.

In the literature devoted to the problems of musical composition interpretation, as a rule, they speak of symbolic structures, due to the recognition of which the interpretation process itself is carried out. When referring to musical interpretation, the study of one of its forms, namely, the performing side predominates. Despite the fact that the attention of researchers

---

<sup>5</sup> Демьянков В. Интерпретация, понимание и лингвистические аспекты их моделирования на ЭВМ. М. : Издательство Московского университета, 1989. 172 с. Р. 40.

<sup>6</sup> Лотман Ю. Я и другой как адресаты (о двух моделях коммуникации в системе культуры). Автокоммуникация. *Семiosфера*. СПб. : Искусство, 2001. С. 163–177. Р. 163.

is drawn to other forms of interpretation – composer, listener, musicological, – the identification of logical connections between them is not predominant.

Meanwhile, it can already be considered universally accepted that a musical composition is the result of a combination of three sides of interpretation – composing, performing and listening, and should be considered in the unity of all these parties, taking into account their specificity. This is especially significant for modern musical creativity, when the boundaries between these forms of interpretations become extremely unstable.

There is a need to justify approaches to formal separation and some substantial distribution of the phenomenon of musical interpretation, contributing to the generalization and systematization of interpretation types, the definition of their kind of hierarchy in relation to the musical text.

Such a justification, claiming a systemic nature, is proposed in the work of A. Samoilenko. The researcher distinguishes three main types of interpretation in a broad sense – applied (ordinary or everyday), scientific (theoretical and analytical) and artistic (creative). (Similar interpretation gradations were revealed in the works of V. Demyankov, N. Zhukova).

By applied interpretation A. Samoilenko understands the basic and starting form of all other efforts of understanding, which helps to define the interpretation as realized and expressed understanding, as a way of a single sign fixation, objectification of understanding. According to the researcher, “applied interpretation defines the main criteria for scientific and artistic interpretations, reveals their duality, a certain antinomy and dynamism, indicates the ability of the interpretation process in self-interest, “aesthetic futility”<sup>7</sup>. A. Samoilenko considers the main criterion of applied interpretation to be success – failure (completeness – incompleteness). The main antinomy of scientific interpretation, according to A. Samoilenko, is truth-untruth, proof – non-argumentation. Its main determinants are verbalization, objectivity, analyticity, connection with real processes, the prevailing extensiveness and a differentiated approach to the subject of interpretation.

In relation to the artistic interpretation, the following indicative characteristics are determined: out and oververbality, the figurative and poetic nature of the desire for ambiguity, substantial redundancy, universalization (openness) of knowledge, tendency to expand the subject area in order to increase persuasiveness, spontaneity, connection with conditional processes, the conditional reality of art.

One type of artistic interpretation, of course, is musical interpretation. A. Samoilenko defines its four forms: composing, performing, listening and musicological.

---

<sup>7</sup> Самоїленко О. Теорія музикознавчої інтерпретації як напрям сучасної герменевтики. Часопис Національної музичної академії ім. П. І. Чайковського. Київ : НМАУ ім. П. І. Чайковського, 2011. № 2 (11). С. 3–10. Р. 4.

Each of these forms has direct contact with the musical text. A musicological interpretation stands apart from the list of musical interpretation types and turns out to be borderline, since it operates not only in musical, but also in verbal text, and, therefore, can be partially attributed to scientific interpretation.

Concerning the problem of interpreting a musical text, we inevitably touch upon the problem of text and its transformation, since interpretation is a process of operating with sign structures, as well as a process of the inevitable increment of the meaning of these structures. To interpret something, one must have the presumption of the iconic nature of this subject.

V. Demyankov notes that the essence of interpretation is a trinity of such factors: as the attitude towards the object of interpretation as a sign (presumption of interpretability), interpretation as a process and interpretation as a result<sup>8</sup>. In our opinion, this provision reflects the interaction of composer (attitude towards the object of interpretation as a sign), performing (interpretation as a process) and listening (interpretation as a result) forms of interpretation.

According to R. Bart, the text is known, comprehended through its relationship to the sign. “The work is closed, reduced to a certain signified. Two types of significance can be attributed to this signified: either we consider it explicit, and then the work serves as the object of science of literal meanings, or we consider this signified as secret, deep, it must be searched for, and then the work is subject to hermeneutics, interpretation”<sup>9</sup>.

Therefore, the interpretation of musical literary text, the purpose of which is to decipher and understand the performer of semantic codes, should be based on a “textual strategy” (according to N. Myatieva<sup>10</sup>) that allows to adequately decipher the historically determined codes that occur in a particular work and are influenced by socio-historical situation, the musical style of the era, the level of notation development, various preferences of the composer, that means, the contextual conditions of the work.

## 2. Interpretation of plaintext in contemporary composer creativity

In the field of musical creativity, interpretation appears to be an even more complex and multifaceted phenomenon, associated with at least three subjective positions due to the compulsory conditions for the existence of a musical composition – the triad relationship of the composer, performer, and listener. E. Pototskaya notes that the author's and performing aspects allow us to highlight the product of interpretation – a musical composition – that arises

---

<sup>8</sup> Демьянков В. Интерпретация, понимание и лингвистические аспекты их моделирования на ЭВМ. М. : Издательство Московского университета, 1989. 172 с. Р. 46.

<sup>9</sup> Барт Р. От произведения к тексту. *Избранные работы: Семиотика. Поэтика*. М. : Прогресс, Универс, 1994. С. 413–423. Р. 416.

<sup>10</sup> Мятлева Н. Исполнительская интерпретация музыки второй половины XX века: вопросы теории и практики : автореф. дисс. .... канд. искусств.: 17.00.02/ Магнитогорск, 2010. 26 с.

as a result of a creative act. Both the composer and the performer-interpreter are aimed at creating a literary text as a carrier of aesthetic values. If a composer creates a “frozen” text, the interpreter in the process of performing intonation “revives” it and demonstrates it in time and space”<sup>11</sup>. In the triad “composer-performer-listener” an organic unity is concluded, creating the integrity of an art work, in particular a musical composition. This triad relationship is applicable to a fixed author’s text prevailing in musical writing.

In the oral tradition, in which musical writing is not used for mental reasons, and the performer is always and totally the author of the work. Therefore, the relationship of the three above-mentioned parties is grouped in opposition, where the composer-performer is on one side of the scale, and the listener is on the other.

In modern academic composer practice, in the context of the author’s composer text emancipation, the performer is given much more freedom in manifesting an individual principle that affects not only the integrity of the work, but also the details that make up the musical whole.

In this case, there is a significant difference from the previous version. Under the oral tradition, the composer and performer are united in one person, and the process of creating and performing music is syncretic. In the written tradition, the composer is not a performer, but he deliberately assigns part of his functions to the “second person”, that is, to the performer who is forced to partially solve the composer’s tasks. In this case, the composer is often guided by the capabilities of the performer. This determines the range of expressive musical means. Therefore, the relationship between the composer and the performer becomes a separate opposition, which in turn affects the external factor – the listener. The listener becomes an observer, a witness to the act of creating a musical composition created in the interaction of the composer and performing parties.

Textual musical fixation can be considered as a potential form of being a musical composition, the specificity of which lies in the fact that it appears in the form of a variant set.

In modern academic composer practice, in the context of the author’s composer text emancipation, the performer is given much more freedom in manifesting an individual principle that affects not only the integrity of the work, but also the details that make up the musical whole.

When creating a composition, the composer always chooses his time and his space, that is, his musical artistic reality. The composer, who does not fix a clear structural sequence, but provides an opportunity for a piece to independently create its own chronotope, gives the piece significant freedom. Such a work is re-created each time and its chronotopic framework changes all

---

<sup>11</sup> Потоцька О. Стильова типологія фортепіанно-виконавської інтерпретації : дис. ... канд. мист. : 17.00.03 / Одеса, 2012. 240 с. Р. 13.

the time (let's recall the Third Sonata of P. Boulez). This means that the work receives its own artistic reality, creates it itself. A similar compositional chronotope is located at the intersection of the aleatory and sonoristic directions.

Closely intertwined, aleatory and sonoristic techniques not only become the basis of the general movement or developmental structure, but also form thematic elements that entail other principles of variant development, containing an improvisational beginning, since the temporal dimension is involved here. A special role is acquired not only by sounding elements, but also by pauses, which are sometimes not written out in the text, but are indicated by the visual distance between the sounding elements – “sounding structures” (term of M. Arkadiev)<sup>12</sup>.

Such formations are a combination of “sounding and non-sounding” structures in which improvisation is given particular importance. It will be called an aleatory-sonoristic complex, and composition in which these complexes are present will be called an aleatory-sonoristic composition.

An aleatory-sonoristic composition is attractive because it provides an opportunity to interconnect the personal consciousness of the composer and the phenomenon of objective time, due to which it acquires the status of a real one. In reality, we are constantly confronted with the problem of choice; an aleatory-sonoristic composition provides this option to both the composer and the performer.

Improvisation is an integral and necessary plan of modern composer creativity, especially expressive in the conditions of the aleatory-sonoristic organization of the work. Despite the fact that aleatorics comes from a completely different aesthetic position, improvisation can rightly be considered its historical predecessor. The community is visible not only in the non-fixation of the performing text. Aleatorics (artistic, that means, limited) absorbed the principles of improvisation, as the ability to develop a given musical element and play music in the context of the proposed work. Through improvisation, random elements are reproduced in the sections provided by the composer, and a “random” sequence of notes, a “random” rhythm or timbre is selected. But the “random” is selected from the “intellectual stock” of the one who performs the given work. That means, there is either a reconstruction of personal evaluations, interpretation canons, or clichés set by the composer are used. If there are boundaries established by the author, the performer is given freedom, which is expressed through improvisation. Consequently, the author suggests and prescribes improvisation in his work.

In sonoristic music, improvisation is inevitable, as the temporal plan of sound matter – the distribution of distance from sound to sound – is the space of freedom. When the time interval is not indicated by pauses, or even the

---

<sup>12</sup> Аркадьев М. Креативное время, «археписьмо» и опыт Ничто. URL: [http://www.chronos.msu.ru/old/RREPORTS/arkadyev\\_creatif.htm](http://www.chronos.msu.ru/old/RREPORTS/arkadyev_creatif.htm).

interval measured in seconds, but simply by the distance on paper, then the distance in time becomes a space of improvisation.

With the combination of aleatorics and sonoristics in one work of the aleatory-sonoristic plan, the role of improvisation is enhanced; it penetrates both “sounding” and “non-sounding” structures, making the recorded work free of its own internal “framework”.

In this regard, there is a need to reconsider the interpretation of modern aleatory-sonoristic composition, as with the transformation of the composer's language there are also significant changes in musical notation, with a bias towards its graphic equivalent. This trend turns the performer into a hermeneutist, who must decipher the composer text.

U. Eco calls such compositions "open"<sup>13</sup>. In such works, the performer is given extraordinary freedom of performance when he not only can understand the composer's instructions in accordance with his perception ... but he is simply obliged to influence the form of the composition, often by an act of creative improvisation, determining the duration of the notes or the sequence of sounds. It seems theoretically important that the concept of an open work by U. Eco combines with the concept of improvisation. We are talking about improvisation as a necessary component of the creative process.

The performer always exceeds the norms of the performed work established by the author. In other words, U. Eco considers improvisation as a broad aesthetic phenomenon, as a component of the musical and creative process. In such compositions, the line between the composer and the performer is increasingly blurred. “The familiar, seemingly eternal “distribution of roles” between the composer and the performer, when one composes music and fixes it in notes, and the other learns the composition from these notes and performs it in front of the audience, is neither eternal nor universal”, Korykhalova<sup>14</sup> rightly observes. First of all, this is expressed in the text itself, in which the composer no longer writes down the sequences of notes he needs, but only gives a hint at the direction of their movement, due to which the piece ceases to sound stable every time, but it acquires mobile forms, or even suggests the artist to improvise. And although such improvisation is not a chaotic and spontaneous expression of the will of a musician, but a musical action within the canons of the surrounding textual environment, it carries its own symbolism, implies the symbolism of this medium, claims to linguistic independence – the role of an autonomous means of transmitting information, therefore becomes a kind of new “oral text”. The properties of plaintext indicated above pose a number of questions for us: how

---

<sup>13</sup> Эко У. Открытое произведение: Форма и неопределённость в современной поэтике СПб. : Академический проект, 2004. 384 с.

<sup>14</sup> Корыхалова Н. Интерпретация музыки: теоретические проблемы музыкального исполнительства и критический анализ их разработки в современной буржуазной эстетике. Л.: Музыка, 1979. 208 с. Р. 4.

much interpretation is possible with respect to compositions of plaintext nature; should the performer of such compositions be considered only a co-author or a new individual author? It is rather difficult to answer all these questions at this stage of the study. We will try to approach them comprehensively, relying on ideas about the potential textual form of being a composition.

The product of composer creativity is, first of all, sounding music. Music notation is just a neighbourhood that allows the author to fix the created, albeit necessary, tool. A note text is represented by a set of codes, ciphers, the conventionality of which is indicated by the possibility of fundamentally different ways of encoding musical thought. The note text as a sign system serves to fix the “sound signs” of music. It is difficult to call the performer of plaintext works as an interpreter, since the source text material is not defined; it is expressed in symbols specially invented by composers, and not in expressed musical notes. The author of such a composition is more likely to act not as a composer, but rather as an “initiator,” a stimulator for a performer who, in essence, becomes a composer, or rather an improviser of music.

In modern music, the role of the performer is significantly expanded, since the composer involves active intervention in his own text. When creating a composition, the composer always chooses his time and his space, that is, his musical artistic reality. The composer, who does not fix a clear structural sequence, but provides an opportunity for a piece to independently create its own chronotope, gives the piece significant freedom.

If we compare the modern musical tradition of plaintext with the traditional fixed, then we come to the following observations.

When scoring music, for example, by J. S. Bach, a huge variety of options can arise – these are interpretations. But we do not consider this as an improvisation on the urtext given by the composer. We consider this as a transcript of urtext in the traditions of the created composition time. In modern music, referring to the works of, for example, J. Cage, where the instructions can be compared with the urtext, proposed, however, in a completely different type of fixation – open, offering countless options for the performance of interpretations, we consider it possible to speak of improvisation. But do not forget that many of J. Bach's preludes implied the ability to improvise in the textual direction indicated in the notes. And in the works of J. Cage there are often much more author's remarks than in the urtext of J. Bach.

As a rule, working with the urtext of J. Bach, the interpreter tries to keep the era style and the author's style of the composer as uniform as possible. When interpreting the works of the modern era, the tasks remain the same. Firstly, this is the general syntax of a modern musical language, and secondly, these are the conditions in which the artist places the artist, that is, the author's style or the style of a particular composition. In a composition,

where improvisation is provided, improvisation takes place within the framework of the author's style or in the style of this composition. It would be absurd to imagine improvisation in the style of J. Haydn in J. Cage's text. If R. Shchedrin provides improvisation in style, then this style mix is inherent in the idea of this composition and is not random.

Clear text gives greater freedom of reading, i.e. its great variation. The introduction of oral elements into the written text led to the form of generalization of previous experience in which the composer creates an impromptu fixed work. We are talking about the inclusion of aleatory techniques in the text, when the composer seeks to turn the performer into an improviser or even a co-author of a composition.

For improvisation, as for the oral type of making music, based on memory, fixed text is an important role. An improvising musician, possessing skills, knowing the rules of the formation and development of the material, operates with various semantic blocks in his memory. These blocks formed over many years of experience and long practice of music; operating with them, the improviser does not create anything fundamentally new (not previously existing) from the subject thematic side.

At the same time, he has his own territory of creative freedom, which, just as improvisational, involves a number of restrictions dictated by the choice of a fixed text. In plaintext musical compositions, any compositional remarks, instructions, or graphic instructions become an organizing factor for the improviser.

When reproducing the aleatory-sonoristic constructions, the performer involuntarily comes to the act of improvisation, choosing the pitch or rhythmic sequences proposed by the composer as a fixed text.

In connection with the aleatory-sonoristic composition, which is the most vivid expression of a composition with plaintext, improvisation, as a necessary side of the musical and creative process, becomes part of the textual structure of the aleatory-sonoristic composition, therefore, goes over to the side of composer interpretation.

Nevertheless, musical text, both fixed and plaintext, requires the same creative costs in preparation for scoring. Despite the fact that the process of artistic interpretation is a creative act that takes place immediately during the performance, the performing interpretation of the work, being the result of the artist's creative activity, is equally created not in front of the public, but in intense, lengthy home work. In either case, the performer must know the symbolism of the language in which the musical text is recorded. The conditional system decoding, in the symbols of which the composer fixes his composition, presupposes, at a minimum, knowledge of the "rules of the game", characteristic of the musical practice of the time that this system functions, and the presence of a lively intonation background.

This "intonation context" can be compared with the concept of the compositional meaning, which is revealed to the performer-interpreter in the process of studying the text. The concepts of meaning and interpretation are fundamentally correlated and mutually complementary. They express the main content of the complex and difficult problem of understanding (comprehension) reality by a person. Just as the analysis of meaning involves a procedure for its formation and identification – interpretation as an “understanding” procedure and interpretation itself presupposes the existence of certain semantic structures that are understood as a process of interpretation. Penetrating into the semantic stratum of the composition, the performer involuntarily thinks out the manner of its implementation, that is, affects the style and stylistic parameters. “Carrying out a stylistic interpretation, its author has in mind the rules of this type of art and the extent to which this work reaches its goals. These objectives may be indicated in the preface, introduction, heading, etc.”

Thus, if the improvisation provided by the author of the plaintext is carried out while preserving the stylistic parameters of the author’s composition, then this is rather not an improvisation based on the material of this composition, but a performing interpretation.

Any copyrighted composition is open. However, introducing the term “open composition”, U. Eco makes a small reservation: “In order to avoid terminological misunderstandings, it should be noted that the name “open” is given to these composition, even if it is best suited to describe the new dialectic of the relationship between the composition and the performer, here it must be taken by virtue of the agreement that allows us to distract from other possible and legal meanings of this expression”<sup>15</sup>. The researcher notes that in aesthetics the concept of openness of an art work, as well as completeness, refers to a situation of artistic perception. An art work is an object produced by the author. It organizes its semantic content so that any person who perceives it can again comprehend the composition, its original form, conceived by the author.

The perception of a musical composition is associated with the multi-level character of the musical text and their relationships. The performing interpretation, as well as the listening one, reveals only some of the many meanings laid down by the author inside a musical text. Sometimes this can lead to a radically new semantic result. An art work, appearing as a form, completed and closed in its strictly verified perfection, is always open, providing the opportunity to interpret yourself in thousands of ways and without losing your unique identity. However, there are a number of parameters that remain the same for performing and listening interpretations;

---

<sup>15</sup> Эко У. Открытое произведение: Форма и неопределённость в современной поэтике СПб. : Академический проект, 2004. 384 с. P. 27.

it's fixed author's means of musical expressiveness – pitch, rhythmic basis, the established form of the whole composition. However, in the case of a reference to a work based on a plaintext, that is, one in which the above fixed means become mobile, the author entrusts these means to the interpreter-performer. This is a special kind of work, which is based on just plaintext, in which improvisation is an integral part of the interpretation process. A distinctive feature of such a plaintext composition is that it does not follow the accepted canons of the language system, but establishes a new language system with new laws (sometimes from one composition to another). Therefore, it is so difficult to give a delineating or generalizing definition of the style orientation in modern music.

The performer brings much more personal to plaintext works than to a traditional composition. He has to be an “interpreter” of author's symbolism, to recognize “signs” that are purposefully set by the author. The lack of completeness of the text is not a consequence of the loss of its part due to historical time spans between its creation and reproduction. This is a completely independent type of text, the way the composer expresses his will. Therefore, the interpreter of such works can be called “co-author of their own free will”. He merely follows the rules indicated by the author; however, due to the property of the plaintext, he has to “re-create” the work. The mastery of the performer and his understanding of copyright rules, combined with the openness of the text give rise to countless interpretations and countless options for the existence of one work. In connection with the difference between an open work and a plaintext, the phenomenon of improvisation and its qualitative indicators are differentiated.

Each element of the musical text – musical notation, verbal or graphic designation – due to its semiotic nature, can be deciphered within a certain field of values. Each time, the performer is faced with the choice of the method of reading, musical and textual information decoding. It is this process of decoding, the process of interpretation, and understanding of the musical text. A musical plaintext can be understood only by means of a certain degree of assignment by a performer of composer signs, codes and rethinking them through improvisation.

It is no coincidence that E. Pototskaya<sup>16</sup> sees the process of performance development as an independent type of activity in the form of the following chain: “improviser – composer-performer – performer-composer – performer – performer-enlightener – interpreter”. In our opinion, it is worth “lengthening” this chain by one more link: an interpreter-improviser; for in the music of the XXI century, in which the type of the author's plaintext prevails, the interpretation is inextricably linked with improvisation.

---

<sup>16</sup> Потоцька О. Стильова типологія фортепіанно-виконавської інтерпретації : дис. ... канд. мист. : 17.00.03 / Одеса, 2012. 240 с.

## CONCLUSIONS

Interpretation is an exclusively subjective phenomenon, which is always inherent in creative self-expression and fully realized in a triad sequence of composer, performing and listening interpretations. Interpretation finds its completeness in the bordering intersecting zones of perception or reproduction of a musical composition: traditional and innovative, alienation – appropriation. Thanks to balancing between the poles of these oppositions, the process of understanding a musical composition, acceptance and assimilation of its semantic content is activated. In modern music, this process can be defined as the transfer of a work from a composer to a performer, with a partial “transfer of copyright” to the performer.

This trend is due to the existence of a new form of musical text, which allows the performer-interpreter to be realized as a co-author of the work. This form of text can be considered as plaintext.

If the written text is inherent in the multiplicity of signs and meanings with the stability of external compositional boundaries and internal structural organization, that is, the unity of the plural, then the nature of the oral text implies the freedom to choose from a variety of meanings of a certain sign position those that express the dynamic side of the communication process, represent the plurality of a single, the probabilistic nature of which is explained by the absence of strictly fixed known compositional boundaries. In the plaintext, both of these structural and semantic principles are combined – the unity of the plural and the plurality of the one, assuming the performing choice of one of them as the dominant: strengthening of the varied plurality of values, semantic functions relative to fixed structural elements (the prevalence of structure over meaning); accentuation of freedom, openness of the general structural organization of the text, relativity (exaggerated convention) of its structural components with the distinctness of the chosen compositional "idiolect" (the term of Y. Lotman) – semantic position (the prevalence of meaning over structure).

This type of text represents a great interpretative freedom for the performer. It allows to vary the very sign nature of the text in accordance with the understanding of the interpreter. The text becomes moving, lively, not “frozen” in its chronotopic boundaries, and therefore the role of the performer-interpreter of modern music should be reviewed.

The plaintext interpreter involuntarily brings much more personal to the composer text than when performing fixed text. He has to be an “interpreter” of author’s symbolism, recognize the “signs” prescribed by the composer, and then use them at his discretion, therefore, improvise to the values set by the composer and partially fixed in writing, each time for the first time creating an oral text. As a result of this, composer's author’s musical expressive means (pitch, rhythmic basis, and the establishment of the whole work form) go over to the side of moving performing means of expressiveness.

## SUMMARY

The article studies the phenomenon of interpretation in contemporary composer creativity as a multi-level phenomenon. The role of interpreting processes and their understanding in humanitarian knowledge is considered. The degree of the interpretive approach significance in the study of modern aleatory-sonoristic composition is revealed. Since the modern aleatory-sonoristic composition positions itself as an “open work”, the interpretative relationship of the composer and performer, the composer acts as the initiator of a musical event containing its own sign system. The performer acts as an interpreter and improviser, since improvisation is provided by the author of the plaintext and is limited by the framework of the author's style settings. Within the framework of plaintext, the performer through improvisation is realized as a co-author of a musical composition, expanding the sound, and therefore semantic multiplicity of the composer plaintext.

## REFERENCES

1. Аркадьев М. Креативное время , «археписьмо» и опыт Ничто. URL: [http://www.chronos.msu.ru/old/RREPORTS/arkadyev\\_creatif.htm](http://www.chronos.msu.ru/old/RREPORTS/arkadyev_creatif.htm).
2. Барт Р. От произведения к тексту. *Избранные работы: Семиотика. Поэтика*. М. : Прогресс, Универс, 1994. С. 413–423.
3. Демьянков В. Интерпретация, понимание и лингвистические аспекты их моделирования на ЭВМ. М. : Издательство Московского университета, 1989. 172 с.
4. Корыхалова Н. Интерпретация музыки: теоретические проблемы музыкального исполнительства и критический анализ их разработки в современной буржуазной эстетике. Л.: Музыка, 1979. 208 с.
5. Лотман Ю. Я и другой как адресаты (о двух моделях коммуникации в системе культуры). Автокоммуникация. *Семиосфера*. СПб. : Искусство, 2001. С. 163–177.
6. Мятлева Н. Исполнительская интерпретация музыки второй половины XX века: вопросы теории и практики : автореф. дисс. .... канд. искусств.: 17.00.02 / Магнитогорск, 2010. 26 с.
7. Потоцька О. Сильова типологія фортепіанно-виконавської інтерпретації : дис. ... канд. мист. : 17.00.03 / Одеса, 2012. 240 с
8. Рикер П. Конфликт интерпретаций. Очерки о герменевтике. М.: КАНОН-пресс-Ц; Кучково поле, 2002. 624 с
9. Самойленко О. Теорія музикознавчої інтерпретації як напрям сучасної герменевтики. Часопис Національної музичної академії ім. П. І. Чайковського. Київ : НМАУ ім. П. І. Чайковського, 2011. № 2 (11). С. 3-10. С. 4.

10. Эко У. Открытое произведение: Форма и неопределённость в современной поэтике СПб. : Академический проект, 2004. 384 с.

**Information about the author:**

**Maidenberg-Todorova K. I.,**

Ph.D. in the History of Art, Associate Professor  
of the Department Of Music Theory And Composition,  
Odessa National A. V. Nezhdanova Academy of Music  
6 H., 2 Ap., Knjajeska str., Odessa, 65029, Ukraine  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2384-6426>