

*M. Marushko*

## **TYOLOGICAL FUNCTIONS OF MUSIC AND PERFORMING DIALOGUE AND MODERN PERFORMING PRACTICE**

*The article is devoted to the dialogue of pianist and conductor in the performance of a concerto for piano with orchestra as one of the kinds of creative communication; typological features and functions of musical dialogue are identified. The materials are two interpretations of the performing M. Argerich Third Piano Concerto of S. Prokofiev in creative collaboration with conductors A. Previn and C. Abbado.*

*Keywords: musical–performing interpretation, performing dialogue, Piano Concerto, S. Prokofiev, M. Argerich, A. Previn, C. Abbado.*

The basis of any interpretation is personal to the subject matter of interpretation, that is, its special, personal understanding. Performing interpretation is always a kind of self-expression of the artist. Due to its sensory experience performer creates a work of art more interesting and varied, affects the depth of the listener's subconscious.

*The problem of the dialogue of pianist and conductor, we are interested in, is located directly in the plane of problem solution of interpretation. In this article, the focus is on the work of the outstanding pianists of our time – Martha Argerich, namely her interpretation of the Third Piano Concerto of S. Prokofiev with well-known conductors André Previn and Claudio Abbado.*

Martha Argerich is one of those musicians who is subject to any music direction and of any complexity. Her performance is always intellectually original, highly virtuoso and testifies about the amazing technology.

Both named interpretations of M. Argerich allow to make sure that the distinct imaginative concepts of the conductors allow the pianist to reach the construction of two different semantic models of the same concert, each of which, while remaining distinctive, matches dramatic composing text.

The concert, in its essence is a dialogical phenomenon. Performance – as well. The performer is in constant dialogue with the music, the composer and the listener. The concert also includes dialogue with the conductor and, accordingly, with the orchestra. For each person dialogue is an integral part of life, but for a musician a dialogue is the only form of creative artistic expression.

Dialogue as an important component of the musical performance of interpretation has its own characteristics. If for the artist the interpretation material is visible environment,

natural phenomena, and then awakened with them imagination and personal experience, and for a writer – the complex interaction of historical, social and personal determinants of the life experience, for the musician–performer objective environment and the base material is the text of a musical work created by the author and other preface, that is strange, but mastered and assigned in the performing process as the creation of *a new* –sounding form of musical text. You can draw an analogy with Plato's doctrine of “ideas”, then the sequence of *the idea – the subject – the image of the subject* is identical to the sequence of *cultural and historical experience – the author's text (composer interpretation) – performing interpretation*.

Thus, for the interpretation concept the communicative factor is the initial. The interpretation itself is a dialogue. The last can be of several types, and can take various forms. Thus, there are *four basic types of Dialogue* – consent dialogue, controversy dialogue, “dialogue of the deaf”, dialogue “by default”. This typology is sufficient to refer to modifications of musical performance in the interpretation of contemporary practice.

*Consent dialogue* implies convergence of the conversation in their motivation to achieve together the main recipient (over–addressee) of the dialog. *Controversy dialogue* is motivated by the desire to establish palpable stress in the communication process associated with the allocation of intentional consciousness of each of the subjects of the dialogue.

“*Dialogue of the deaf*”, as the most consciously self–centered form of communication, is the basis of paradoxical concepts and is not possible in the ensemble or orchestral–symphonic performance. However, as the prerogative of the creative efforts of the soloist musician, it can serve as a conductor of new polystylistic – polysemantic concepts.

*Dialogue “by default”* is a nostalgic form, indirectly communicate with tradition by styling or imitation, including a mimetic reconstruction of other, not its, musical performance interpretation.

If we evaluate the dialogic aspects of musical performance from the perspective of the listener, we can say that the most successful form of a dialogue between the soloist and the conductor is a *controversy dialogue* which is only possible when performers are “sympathetic” to each other, feeling themselves at this time the creators of the new semantic space, which produces new meanings.

A striking example of such a dialogue, in our opinion, are the two performing interpretation of Martha Argerich, discussed in this article. Being conceptually different, they

are a manifestation of a high creative freedom, while the capacity for deep empathy for each of the performers, allowing direct person–style intention to recreate a unified holistic artistic design, to achieve a sense of destination as the ultimate goal of creative dialogue.

A distinctive feature of performing interpretation of M. Argerich – A. Previn is their complete agreement with each other in relation to the concept of the concert, which significantly due to the organic nature of their performance, their facial expressions and gestures. Speaking about their interpretation as a dialogue and co–creative cooperation, it should be noted that both performers are forced by each other, according to the context of the work performed by them, and at the same time seem to dissolve in the music audio stream, thereby rendering own performance in some sacred act.

Third Piano Concerto by Sergei Prokofiev is one of the phenomena of the genre, it is appropriate to the original meaning of the word concert: competition, suggesting equivalence of piano and orchestra. You may find that the piano part is in itself orchestral; it is connected with the symphonic composer’s thinking and gives the opportunity to talk about the piano as an instrument orchestra. However, the orchestral parts is not accompanying or texturally lighter: it is quite independent plan of musical expression, representing master performance with instrumental timbres. Frequent phenomenon becomes a leading dynamic exchange functions between the piano and orchestral parts. There are episodes in which the piano serves as part of the orchestra with a special timbre and a color stain. Nevertheless, even in such composition moments S. Prokofiev does not deprive the artist–pianist of technical difficulties; on the contrary, it strengthens them, thus indicating the importance of equipping the virtuosity in the pianist performing.

Thus, we can say that the Third Concerto is not more than a concert – symphony, or a symphony for piano with orchestra.

In fact, we are faced here with the fact that the piano and the orchestra parts are quite equal and equivalent in function. Furthermore, in this context, one can speak about interdependence of these parts. Sometimes the solo part doesn’t really need the help of the orchestra, for itself texturally complicated and, accordingly, timbre diverse that allows to speak about its orchestral. There are also such episodes, when the orchestra acts as the main protagonist. In such cases, the pianist is nothing to do but to follow the conductor, as the last is not only organizer of tempo–rhythm, but also the creator of the dynamic field.

On example of the Third Piano Concerto it is clearly perceptible that Sergei Prokofiev is a composer, possessing sensitive symphony hearing and orchestral thinking. It is confirmed both by the articulation and textural techniques inside the piano part. And some, and others are in direct dependence to the orchestral timbre, ie the instrument and palette. It means that S. Prokofiev treats the piano as an instrument orchestra, where each register and each timbre have its counterpart in the orchestra, and the articulation depends on what kind of strokes is characteristic for each instrument.

Interpretation of Argerich – Previn is particularly attractive from the point of view of interaction of the pianist with the conductor, that is, their co-creative dialogue. Analyzing this performance, you may find that the pianist in most cases follows the conductor in an effort to treat the greatest concert in accordance with the composer's intention.

Dialogue of Martha Argerich and Andre Previn is very interesting for the Performing stylistic analysis. We must say that the pianist, by nature, is quite charismatic and shows on the stage her volitional qualities of the soloist. At the same time, herself is not more important, and her interaction (understanding) with the conductor, for the embodiment of the general idea and the achievement of the main sense of the destination as the ultimate goal of creative dialogue. It may be noted that, in addition to his own agogics in clearly solo episodes, pianist is interested in the conductor's idea, his integrity in respect of works, and thud Argerich is often in “captivity” of conductor’s agogics.

Evaluating the performance of the same concerto with Claudio Abbado, we find a different interpretation. Dialogue of Argerich – Abbado creates a special semantic space, more like a lyrical epic narrative with elements of heroics. When immersed in the world of Prokofiev's music in the imagination, as in reality, the pictures of the heroic past of the composer's homeland appear. Exactly this creative sphere leaves here to the fore, and performing, comic, holiday – only small sketches, which are woven into the fabric of the storyline.

The interpretation of Argerich – Previn is full of play, fun, humor (and sometimes grotesque) and special episodes of slow lyricism; interpretation of Argerich – Abbado can be characterized as a heroic poem.

Sounding performing text allows to note that where Andre Previn creates the atmosphere of the play (everything is not seriously, for fun) and introduces elements of theatricality, for Claudio Abbado quite seriously “vortex of tragic past are blowing”. The

scope of the lyric is also presented differently: in the interpretation of A. Previn it gets romantic features; in semantics of performing shape created by C. Abbado, – it is shrouded in both fabulous (IV variation of Part II: *Magic Lake at ice cave*), and the epic graphic associations (part I of the entry topic, the V variation of Part II); It assumes paintings and figurative allusions (adverse Party of Part III: *the theme of rising sun*).

In this regard, an important component of the performing interpretive space becomes a compositional organizing the position of the conductor. Besides general method groups for the pianist and conductor (phrasing, articulation, tempo–rhythms, dynamics) there are individual for the pianist – a touch and pedaling; for the conductor – control of timbre modulations of Orchestra (removing the forefront of an instrument, the tone group) and determination of the dynamic features of the orchestra at various stages of development of a musical work.

The third concert is only a three–part concert S. Prokofiev, while the second part of it is not a lyrical center. It is written in the form of variations, which follow one another, creating a sequence of images (both heroic and lyrical). Overall, the concert is inherent in a mosaic pattern. There coexist with surprising ease and cheerfulness clown grotesque, lyrical and heroic, not contradicting, but determining each other.

I must say that while Andre Previn brings to the fore the gaming sphere, Claudio Abbado focuses on those images that are associated with a lyrical and heroic spheres. This results in a difference in the understanding and interpretation of the III part of the concert. In the interpretation of Argerich – Previn Part III becomes a statement of joy (adverse party) and the achievement of ecstatic fun final. In the interpretation of Argerich – Abbado lyrical adverse part becomes a long–awaited dawn after the night of the storm, and the finale is a celebration of light and the victory of life over death.

Performing arts presupposes that the artist pronounced volitional beginning. It applies to both a soloist and a conductor. The soloist must be able to lead a while as a conductor, being the organizer temporitme must be deep enough to understand what he wants soloist, what is its concept. In contrast to the solo performance, dialogical parameters are sufficiently available, in this case, a dialogue can only be based on mutual interest and informed understanding.

Two main types of conductors can be identified:

conductors, which primarily seek to embody the concept of the soloist;

conductors, which are prone to engage in polemics with the soloist for the realization of their own concepts.

In turn, there are soloists with varying severity of volitional qualities. Often the conductors are faced with the fact that the lead singer simply does not know what he wants, but because of his ambitions, does not want to listen to the opinion of the conductor. In such cases, the performance becomes interpretation, as there is no clear concept, and there is only a sense of uncertainty due to random spontaneous “differences”.

Soloists who are worthy of the name of interpreters, create a new semantic space, dominating the whole audio stream at the same time, following the music and comprehending its inherent properties. Their performing is always logically built at the same time, attracts, enjoying quality of suggestion, implies redundancy meanings and signification. With such soloists conductor can not and, we believe, should not be the main protagonist. However, his role from it does not become less responsible, in contrast, the conductor provides a serious mission – to be the creator of a new concept, even if it is completely at odds with its own original concept. To this end, the soloist should be able to convince the conductor.

As an example, we give a small excerpt from the memoirs of English conductor Adrian Boult. Boult tells how once he had a chance to perform in D minor a concert of I. S. Bach with Walter Giesecking. Before the rehearsal “Giesecking stepped onto the stage of the old “Queen’s Hall” and stared in horror at the seated rows of about seventy–string players – they were waiting for the concert in D minor by Bach. This concert I’ve always considered (and performed with other soloists) as a work full–blooded, energetic ... In response to a question Giesecking I said that the orchestra is able to accompany and offered to get his opinion, play a part. When we finished playing, he still found that too many musicians ... continued to regard an invoice incorrectly. The word “texture” struck me, and I said: “Mr. Giesecking, what do you think: this concert is Piano or harpsichord?” He jumped up and said that although he had to play on a big concert grand, which we had given him, he still time thinking about the harpsichord. I sent some fifty musicians home, and the remaining twenty–play “in an undertone” to the full satisfaction of Giesecking. He then asked me if I liked the sound of this concert. “I always thought this concert a full–fledged writing, – I confessed – but happy that our audience ... had the opportunity to hear different interpretation” [1, p. 164].

Among other things, the conductor is easy to work with a knowledgeable their business performer. Moreover, it is under these conditions is possible dialogue between the two artists (odds dialogue), to create music and sound space, endowed with certain iconic, where new meanings are born. Actually, for this there is an art to a certain system of signs to express individual understanding of the essence of being, an individual image of the world, his philosophy of life and art in it.

The difference between the two interpretations is detected due to the difference in performing tricks. These include tempo–rithm, agogics, dynamics, phrasing and articulation. These basic components of musical performance give life to a piece of music, and are parts of one whole, which we call “music–intonation complex” (in the terminology of Malinkovsky). The latter is a tool for semantic filling works, i.e. to create its semantic load.

The difference between treatments is also associated with the internal state of the artist, with his self–identification at a given time in a given place. Understanding the personal “I” and “I–other” (whether it be composing a text or another artist) as one's own is an important criterion for assessing the artistic material.

It should be noted that, unlike other arts (literature, painting, sculpture and architecture), the music is an art that comes alive in time. It becomes tangible space only when sounding takes form. This suggests that the art of music is impossible without performing. If spatial art “communicate” with its recipient directly, the music, turning in time, is unthinkable without a mediator in the person of the artist. At the same time, the role of the artist in the art of music is not limited to only presenting to the listener of the composer's copyright text. Musical performance, as well as any other performance, is always individual and can be polar semantic configuration, showing thus different interpretations of the same text.

In all his compositional and dramatic trends music is the conventional art, as it is devoided of verbalization and can be defined as a system of signs, facing the experience of sensory consciousness. Thus, it is nearer the other art forms associated with the concepts of the human soul, and from an aesthetic need to wake up “feeling better”.

According to A. F. Losev, music is a “mobile unity in coalescence” and “the integrity of the fluid in the set.” “Thus music can cause tears – no idea about a subject; capable of causing bravery and courage – no idea for whom and for what purpose; able to inspire awe –

it is unknown to anyone. It merged all but merged into its some indivisible existential essence. ... You can survive, but you can not think of these things clearly.” Losev also writes that “pure” musical being is out of space, “there is a being a chaotic and formless. This solid elusiveness ... and at the same time omnipresence ...” [3, p. 209–210].

Performing dialogue of soloist and conductor, becoming the object of study, it finds specific quality criteria for the evaluation, due, in particular to the distinction of performing concert form with the orchestra of solo works. In the latter case, the pianist is free in the choice of tempo, dynamics, articulation and phrasing, in dialogue with the a conductor, he must deliberately abandon the idea that only depends on him all the “happening”. Therefore, it is advisable to go back to the question of the extent to which in the genre of the concert presented *the principles of the solo*.

Concert as a creative dialogue performer and conductor, becoming the subject of study and structural analysis, as the main instrument of shaping detects tempo–rhythm organization, responsibility for which lies entirely on the conductor. Considering the two different interpretations of the Third Piano Concerto S. Prokofiev, as the evaluation criteria will elect those performing funds that use conductors to implement a holistic artistic design.

A. Malinkovskaya speaking about tono – procedural energy as an important part of piano performance, piano division offers the following types, revealing their qualitative differences: Virtuoso; Lyricist; Narrator; Improviser; Actor (director, playwright); Wanderer; Architect (architect, builder); Retarder time; Thinker. Trying to figure out which type would be the most suitable for the conductor's performance, we came to the conclusion that such is the architect. That definition, which gives A. Malinkovskaya: “Architects is outstanding strategists form; they always – “above the current moment”; very promising, swing open space, compresses and thereby straining that vibrates Tono–procedural power. In implementing this type of molding is dominated by form “crystallized” principles of coverage of the whole, a kind of deductive work of thought – from general to specific. Initially, grasping relations on a large scale form, they are trained in his thinking mechanisms generalizations compression ... thinking with “greater unity” makes them ... use tempo–rhythm as a kind of lever form–creativity” [4, p. 174].

However, the conductor is not only form–creator, but also the subject, which organizes time in its unity and multiplicity, in its indivisibility (wholeness) and separateness. Music is



an expression of the time, with all its correlative instruments: mobility and quiet; unity and divisibility.

Thus, the most important quality of this kind of performance is a dialogue organized by temporality, time parameter control, foresight and premonition of the duration and driving dynamics. Understanding and foreboding – that support the performing properties dialogue between the soloist and conductor, can cover the entire sounding musical flow, that is, to recognize its shape in order to then identify the key points of this form and give them a semantic definition. Naturally, each conductor (and indeed the artist) will affix semantic emphasis on those terms (“sites”) form, that, in his opinion, the most due to the basic idea of the work.

In the case of a concert of S. Prokofiev an opportunity to take a different composing text is found, that is to celebrate the score different reference points, and, on this basis, to offer one or the other interpretation of the work. Speaking about the above two interpretations of this concert, we can state with confidence that Andre Previn and Claudio Abbado reference points are arranged differently. If Previn all the time tries to make the concert carefree–play character, making it easier (wherever possible) the orchestral texture, Abbado, attaching great importance to the field of heroic images, often in the foreground a group of brass instruments are displayed, which have Previn is in most cases smoothed.

In general, the two criteria of the line can be defined by which we evaluate and compare the two interpretations, treating them as a creative dialogue: 1) tempo–rhythmic side as the organization of time; 2) the timbre expressive, responsible for the dynamic aspect of becoming a musical work and the value of having the conceptual significance.

I must say that tempo–rhythm of musical works in the course of execution will depend on the internal biorhythm artist. Theater teacher and filmmaker S. V. Gippius in his book “The training of creativity. Gymnastics senses” offers a different scale of the tempo–rhythms, which may be a person (actor), conditionally dividing them into 10 gradations. Among them, he calls the ultimate passivity, “a gradual transition to brisk–being”, readiness to any action, tempo–rhythm of “cautious attention,” “hectic pulse of life”, the loss of ability to understand and regulate their activities. [3] While these tempo–rhythms are able to replace each other in the course of action. For the charismatic leader (in this case is such as a conductor and soloist) the most typical detected tempo–rhythm of “cautious attention: (it is characterized by determination, speed of reaction to the change of mood

and so on) and “readiness to any action.” They are convenient for creative interaction, which is observed in the interpretation we have discussed above.

Significantly, in the process of execution of biorhythms of the soloist and conductors are in tune with each other, because this process can be described as an artistic or creative empathy.

All of the above gives us an opportunity to identify a few key points of performance of the process and allows you to make the following conclusions:

1) dialogue, discovering different forms, is an integral part of music and performing arts. The most high-quality form of a dialogue between the soloist and the conductor is a disagreement dialogue is possible only in the presence of performers' pronounced intentionality and empathic qualities, thanks to which the band reach the integrity of artistic conception;

2) concert as a creative dialogue of the soloist and conductor of an important component of interpretive space reveals compositional organizing position of conductor; the latter is a form-creative and time organizer (tempo-rhythm). The most important qualities of this kind of dialogue are performing foresight and premonition of the duration and driving dynamics;

3) the difference of interpretation, found in the comparative analysis, determined by the internal state and the degree of concentration of performers (conductor and soloist) on tempo-rhythmic process side, consequently, their ability to convert experienced (audible) time in the phenomenon of the musical sound.

### ***REFERENCES:***

1. Boult A. Mysli o dirizhirovanii // Ispolnitel'skoe iskusstvo zarubezhnyh stran. Vyp. 7 / [sost. G. EHdel'man; red. L. Barenbojm]. – M.: Muzyka, 1975. – S. 164.
2. Gippius S. V. Trening razvitiya kreativnosti. Gimnastika chuvstv [EHlektronnyj resurs]. – Rezhim dostupa: <http://psylib.ukrweb.net/books/gippi01/index.htm>
3. Losev A. F. Muzyka kak predmet logiki // Losev A. F. Iz rannih proizvedenij. – M.: Pravda, 1990. – S. 209–210.
4. Malinkovskaya A. V. Klass osnovnogo muzykal'nogo instrumenta. Iskusstvo fortepiannogo intonirovaniya: ucheb. posobie. – M.: Vlados, 2005. – S. 174.