

**PIANO CONCERTO NO. 1 BY S. PROKOFIEV AS A SUBJECT OF STYLIS-
TIC MULTIPLICITY OF PERFORMING INTERPRETATIONS**

The article is devoted to the analysis of Piano Concerto No. 1 by S. Prokofiev in the direction to the current in modern time intonation solution. The center of the analysis of the above work by S. Prokofiev – revealing style components of the composition, which among the early works turned out to be the representative of the author's composer style and the reflection of the style transformations of the art world of the 1910s, which form the style palette of interpretation searches today.

Keywords: concert as a genre, current intonation, playing music, piano expressiveness of sound, style in music.

The relevance of the work topic is defined by the inexhaustibility of S. Prokofiev's genius for new performing renditions the source of which is the stylistic simultaneity of the great Russian composer's works, life circumstances and cultural background related to the fate of the musical Ukraine, who in his works repeatedly used Ukrainian images-themes. The update of performing settings according to historically changing tastes of the public, which tastes are clearly controlled by the mystical in title and completely really-everyday as to the psychology of artistic activity – the "spirit of the epoch", generating the phenomenon, terminologically referred to as "current intoning" [5].

The goal of this study is the analysis of the Piano Concerto No. 1 by S. Prokofiev in terms of style components of the work, which among the early works turned out to be the representative of the author's composer style and the reflection of the style transformations of the art world of the 1910s, which form the style palette of interpretation searches today. Specific objectives are the selection of style trends objectively detected in the 1910s and received special development in the postmodern epoch of the 2000s, as well as the analysis of Prokofiev's Concerto in the light of the aforesaid style of simultaneity and with access to the performing concept, realizing the "current intonation" of the work in the 2010s.

The methodological basis of the work appears intonation comparative-style analysis (comparative method in musicology) formed by B. Asafiev [3] and his followers [10, 11], including in Ukraine [5; 8]. Essential is hermeneutical perspective, bequeathed by the works of G.Krechmar [7] and B. Yavorsky [4], as well as the cultural section [8], which determines the focus on the performing basis of the musical professional thinking. The scientific novelty of the work is defined by the originality of the theoretical approach to the work, being one of the most popular works of the

composer in the contemporary piano repertoire. The practical value is determined by the needs of performing art, that the research materials can be used at the lessons of special piano classes, as well as courses on the theory and history of music performance in the higher and secondary music school.

S. Prokofiev's Concerto No. 1 for piano with orchestra Des-dur was created by the author in 1911–1912, marked by the manifestation in artistic field of the quality of style "avant-garde", perceived by his contemporaries in the active correlation with the modernity of the late XIX – early XX century and the academized directions of the previous epochs. The very Des-dur key, hymnal piano-orchestral introduction of the composition clearly created allusions to the general tonus of the sound of Tchaikovsky Piano Concerto No. 1 (written in b-moll, however, given in the "majorized glow" of Des-dur reference to the VI stage in the initial and the main theme of the work). One-piece structure of the poem and an abundance of large technics oriented to the relation with the Concerts of F. Liszt and the pianism of A. Rubinstein. The starting rhythm-formula of the psalmodizing figure (in tempo Allegro briosissimo) clearly indicated the inversely transformed Kant's sequence of Glinka's "Glory!"

However, the above "references to the tradition" of First Concerto of the young composer, with this work also approving its performing pianistic position of "metal" playing, have not been noticed by critics (as we understand, the audience was more adequate in accepting the idea of the work). Let us try to realize that annoying "youth" tonus of Prokofiev's Piano Concerto No. 1, which so obviously eclipsed the traditional means of expression in many contemporaries' perception.

One of the frankly abusive reviews was the statement of N. Bernstein's in that spirit that it was a "crazy" work to which epithet "dirty music" can be applied [quoted by the book of I. Nestiev, 11, p. 76]. General view of the intervalics of the chord vertical this Concerto proves the moderation of those constructions that the young writer offered against the background of the musical exoticisms of N. Rimsky-Korsakov, K. Debussy, especially A. Scriabin. The first place in the number of charges in the "final distortion" (see L. Sabaneev [ibid]) takes – "energetically rhythmized rigidity and brutality," "primitive cacophonousness" etc. That is, it is about *inappropriate*, from the viewpoint of the critics, *simplification of the rhythmic side of the presentation*, which reached the climax of polyrhythmic stratification of the heir of Chopin's rhythm-virtuosity – of A. Scriabin (a faithful adherent of the latter was L. Sabaneyev, the most authoritative of the detractors of early Prokofiev).

But in defense of the young genius V. Karatygin put forward the following: "His concert has so many new and fresh harmonies, melodies here are so clear, juicy and original, *rhythmics is so elastic everywhere* (here and further italics of E.Kh.), and most importantly – all the time life is in full swing, the *sun of lively imagination* is shining "[12, p. 4]. From the above one conclusion arises: either irritatingly or captivating new for contemporaries was – the *rhythm-feeling and total "solar-clear" un-reflexing tone of Prokofiev's expression*.

The first concert was composed by Prokofiev in 1911, which became a landmark in his creative biography – see thesis: "The period until 1911 in the composer's activity of Prokofiev was the period of the original gaining power"; and then – "... significant milestone in Prokofiev's life: that year he started to be published for the first time, made his first performance in the open symphony concert and... wrote the first completely independent major work..." [11, p. 64, 66].

These highly personal set of circumstances of Prokofiev's biography were strongly reinforced by the *stage-by-stage approach* of 1911 in world music scenario. Along with the Piano Concerto No. 1 by S. Prokofiev stand the works that opened the style of the XX century in the variety and confrontation of directions. Including the following: "Petrushka" by I. Stravinsky, "Pierrot Lunaire", "Waiting", the book "The doctrine of harmony" by A. Schoenberg, "Bluebeard" and "Allegro barbaro" by B. Bartók, "Nocturne" by N. Lysenko, "Der Rosenkavalier" by R. Strauss, finally, it is such an important milestone as the creation of the association "Russian Ballet of Sergei Diaghilev" et al., determined for the whole world the style of Russian music in the XX century.

In the version of opera works of Schoenberg and Bartok, created quite independently of each other, striking is the exact "hit" of both in the concept of "compressed" opera (monoopera, opera-dialogue), claiming the concept of the universe, similar – passion structure on the subject of the Cross in the "Scherzo" in "Allegro barbaro" by Bartok.

"Nocturne" by Lysenko is also a "compressed" opera in which the composer completely abandons the dramatic accents of the previous operatic works – and this quality of expression makes it similar with the "Rosenkavalier" by R. Strauss, in which the composer opens a new for his style formation – *neoclassical*, and at that *moderate neo-classical*, which radically opposes his pre-ressionism images of "Salomea" and "Elektra" in 1905–1907. "Petrushka" by Stravinsky and "Pierrot Lunaire"

by Schoenberg are different: it is a break with the impressionist-symbolist array of works of the previous years in favor of the *Fauvist-primitivist complexes*.

It should be noted that this semantic turn afterwards *directly was not repeated neither by them nor by the other authors*, "Pierrot Lunaire" is stylistically unique in its creator's heritage, especially in relation to other authors – we will not find emulation to the style of this opus in any of the composers-professionals (unless the "Song" by A. Vertinsky, or rather, its cumulative stage-artistic appearance ...). The uniqueness and energy of the "rotary" action "against the current" (see the title of the book by choreographer M. Fokin) on "Russian Ballet by S. Diaghilev" or "Teaching of Harmony" by Schoenberg is not necessary to prove.

As emphasized in the work by E. Markova [8], all of these vivid works, marked by 1911 year of creation, clearly represent the turn of their authors – *"to the new shores", to the uncompromisingly elected break with previously developed stylistically-specific indicators, but also comprising "style according to item of exception" in the personal-author style continuum and emblematic in relation to the author's credo as a whole*. And, perhaps, "strange chamberness" of the sound of "Pierrot Lunaire" by Schoenberg and symbolist salonness of "Nocturne" by Lysenko most fully represents the phenomenon of the discoveries in 1911 year (for artistic discoveries of 1907–1908, 1912–1913, 1917, and other years – have fundamentally different semantic characteristics).

That is how is filled with concreteness of community in fundamentally different what is associated today with the idea of the "epochal" style in the historical science and the history of art (see "Intonation Dictionary of the Epoch" by B. Asafiev [3]), which characterizes that "historical indeterminism" of the epochal territorial-regional interactions in humanities, and which has a parallel to the physical indeterminism of microcosm [see E. von Neumann about the quantum indeterminism as a manifestation of "behavior" of nature, in which the law of sufficient reason is "not always" found, quoted by the book of D. Arabadji, 1, p. 189].

In 1952 was published the work of C. Jung, together with V. Pauli "Synchronicity as a principle of acausal relationships" [1, p. 190 – 191]. As stated in the book of D. Arabadji, the work of C. Jung, "discusses the phenomena that cannot be understood by the principle of causality (causativity): we are talking about some related *in meaning* (italics by E.M.) coincidences" [1, p. 191]. What Jung calls the "new connection," is nothing else but a "causal connection." "New connection" for Jung –

is "*conceptual connection*" because: "... the only visible and provable connection between them (the events) is common sense or equivalence" [1, c. 182].

As we can see, the turning point in Prokofiev's biography of 1911 – is not accidental: it is the access to the new conscious by the author frontiers of creativity coincides with the nomination of a new stage in the development of Russian music, the European art world as a whole. And noted by the contemporaries *rhythmic primitivizations, refusal of the tragic reflection and psychologism*, so differently valued by the listeners of Prokofiev's Piano Concerto No. 1, made *a new quality of self-expression*, the sharpness of perception of which is impossible in the second half of the XX century and the 2000s. In addition, Prokofiev' in his Piano Concerto No. 1 defined the concept of the genre of this work as some alternative to the "ensemble of solo instrument with orchestra" and the "superiority" of the party-solo in union with the "subordinateness" of the orchestra party [12, p. 4].

This "alternative" approach of Prokofiev ignores completely the *classics of post-Beethoven's Liszt's symphonized "competitive"* (i.e. theatrically-dialogized) concert – to the species of monologism of *obligate* concertness of pre-classic kind. L. Raaben states in relation to Prokofiev's piano style as a whole and with respect to the analyzed Concerto No.1 – "toccateness" multiplicity "of strokes non legato" and "sharp staccato sounds", with – "grace of texture", "grace and transparency of timbres (especially in the lyrics ...)" [12, p. 3]. The foregoing indicates *clavierization* of Prokofiev's piano style, clearly avoiding orchestral contrasts of cantilena-solo and Tutti's sounds of Liszt-Rubinstein's pianism. The dominant type of sound is motorics, including graceful, breakable-fragile, as is the case in the themes of the main, collateral parts, in Andante episode et al.

The said setting for motorics, as a permanent component of the thematic fillings of the composition contains connection with the prosymbolist formation of musical expression, which was indirectly recorded in the critical essay in St. Petersburg sheet dated August 5, 1912, which recorded four historical stages of formation of the Russian school of composers – from M. Glinka to A. Scriabin and S. Prokofiev [11, p. 76]. And presented at each of the "stages" pairs of names (Glinka – Rubinstein, Tchaikovsky – Rimsky-Korsakov, Glazunov – Arensky, Scriabin – Prokofiev) did not form the stylistic antithesis (specialness of Dargomyzhsky and Mussorgsky "dropped" from the stylistic transformations of the school), demonstrating more complementarity than alternatives.

Thus, declaratively-motor is the theme of the introduction, sounding three times in the Concerto, giving its structure rondal features *ritualizing* by the effect of *perpetuum mobile* the typology of sonata thematic shifts, that are less likely to discover antitheticity, monologizing the presentation of the Concerto music. Psalmodic figure and the line of ascent, making up the basis rhetorically high signs of theme-refrain, theme of introduction of the Concerto, are also found in the cadence (c. 3, *Poco più mosso*) in the form of mostly "linear" figures, and in the main part (c. 7, *Tempo primo*) as playing of mainly psalmodizing, pedally reciting construction similar in collateral party (c. 12, *Meno mosso*).

The tempo-texture colorizations of the Concerto themes exclude their opposition: in all these themes the main "nerve" of expression is *young energeticity*, differing in the degree of manifestation of *one and the same idea-image*: young joyful Aspiration to the High. This type of *non-conflictness* of the solution of sonata scheme reveals in the poem structure of single-movement Concerto the indicators of variation-suite, which corresponds to the Baroque genesis of the concert form (compared to the Organ concert d-moll by Vivaldi, eg.). This setting on the hymnal clearness of the sound shaded by the mysterious outlines of march music in the collateral part, in the music of which I. Nestiev caught the signs of "strange fabulousness" [11, p. 75], is correlated with the formation of concert genre in the works of P. Tchaikovsky and S. Rachmaninoff, quite close to the spiritual sources of the mentioned genre typology and revealed in the demonstrative confrontation to tragic-dramatic tempts of them to opera-symphonic compositions.

"Strange fabulousness" of the collateral is motorically colored in the mirror reprise (from c. 31, *Poco più sostenuto*), informing of gaining "movement mass" in rhythmic ostinato counterpointing to the main themes-image of lines. The Concerto reprise remarkably demonstrates the original *contrasting polyphony* of textural solutions (connection of texture idea of "tarantella-likeness" the main part with the "strange march," the main theme of the collateral – from c. 31), which comprises the distinctive quality of Prokofiev's thinking in its twinning with similar texture setting of M. Glinka and the latter with the French origins of Mozartian thinking. For when all the "density" of octave "tapes" in the texture of Concerto, the latter demonstrates a clear predominance of "two-layeriness" of presentation, showing enlarged-weighted presentation of clavier-harpsichord two-voice texture of the music of the old masters of the Franco-British school – exactly for this type of presentation was aimed the

training of N. Tcherepnin, whose World of Art sympathies were fed with frank Mozartism.

The foregoing suggests the following conclusions regarding the performing readings of Piano Concerto No. 1 by S. Prokofiev, who revealed in the artistic conception the obvious in post-symbolic analogy to the Baroque forms of protopoemic type:

1) allocating rhythmic energy of "steel" perpetuum mobile, primitivist sincerity of which put off or admired at the first hearing of the work in the distant 1910s;

2) capturing continuity to the playing motorics of impressionist-symbolist canvases appealing to the "simulation of childishness" of clavier Rococo of the XVIII century;

3) underlining the Baroque hymnal zeal of sound coming from the depths of non-conflict thematism and super-individual lyrics of the early concerts;

4) finding common ground with the academic romantic tonus of presentation, which nourished Prokofiev with mediation of A. Glazunov, whose influence on the young composer was certainly the case.

The known performers of the works by S. Prokofiev, S. Richter, M. Argerich, Lang Lang represent different facets of style outputs, the first of which, S. Richter, clearly projects the experience of his performing Bachianism and Beethovenism, creating the type of monumental-solemn sound correlating with the idea of Baroque art. M. Argerich, like no other, covers the connection with the figurativeness of Mozartism programmed, while not claiming to first-ground row, by the composer's text. Undoubtedly, performed by Lang Lang is most recognizable youth-provoking principle of Concerto sounding, while most modern soundings of the work, including in the training conservatory performance practice of Prokofiev, are directed to the support on the academic romanticization of the work style.

Taking into account the neosymbolist [9] wave of modern post-avant-garde and typical of the latter style setting on simplified-"flight" type of playing, the interpretations of M. Argerich and Lang Lang claim privileges in the current-intonation preferences, though the objective artistic merits of Richter's performance, being the confident of the composer in presenting his piano works to the audience, has imperishable virtues.

REFERENCES

1. D. Arabadji between the sacred and the profane: [collection of articles] / D. Arabadji. – Odessa: Druk, 2009. – 224 p.; Ill.

2. Arabadji D. Essays of Christian symbolism / D. Arabadji. – Odessa: Druck, 2008. – 548 p., ill.
3. Asafiev B. musical form as a process / B. Asafiev. – M.–L.: Music, 1971. – 379 p.
4. Berchenko R. In search of the lost meaning. Boleslaw Jaworski on "Well-Tempered Clavier" / R. Berchenko. – M.: Publishing house "Klassika–XXI", 2005. – 372 p.
5. **Verkina T. Current intonation as performing problem: abstract of thesis ... PhD in History of Art: 17.00.03 / T. Verkina. – Odessa, 2008. – 16 p.**
6. Davydov M.A. Performing musicology as a phenomenon of Ukrainian scientific tradition / M.A. Davydov // Performing musicology. Encyclopedic Reference. – Lutsk: OJSC «Volyn Regional Printing House», 2010. – P. 4–6.
7. Kretzschmar G. The history of opera / G. Kretzschmar. – L: Academia, 1925. – 406 p.
8. Markova E. I.A. Kotlyarevsky in the context of creative preferences of the generation of the 1950s – 1960s. / E. Markova // Transformation of education and culture: traditions and modernity. Collection of studies. International scientific-creative conference. Kyiv, May 2–3, 2012 – K: NAKKKiM, 2012. – P. 113–126.
9. Markova E. Neo-Europocentrism and neosymbolism of the early XXI century / E. Markova // B. Kholopova, L. Canaris E. Markova, S. Taranets. Neo-Europocentrism: musical culture at the turn of the centuries. Book 1. – Odessa: Astroprint, 2006. – P. 76 – 128.
10. Medushevsky V. Ontological basis of the interpretation of music / V. Medushavsky // Interpretation of a musical work in the context of the culture: [Collection of articles]. – M., 1984. – Ed.129. – P. 5–11.
11. Nestiev I. Life of Sergei Prokofiev / I. Nestiev – Moscow: Soviet composer, 1973. – 662 p.
12. Prokofiev S. Concerto No. 1 for piano and orchestra. Transcription for Two Pianos. Introductory article by L. Raaben [Sergei Prokofiev. Concerto No.1 1 for piano and orchestra. Transcription for Two Pianos]. – M.: Muzgiz, 1962. – 52 p.
13. Jung C. Synchronicity: acausal unifying principle // C.G. Jung Synchronicity. Collection. – Moscow: Refl–buk, K.: Vakler, 1997. – 179 p.