
ІСТОРІЯ ТА ТЕОРІЯ МУЗИЧНОГО МИСТЕЦТВА І КУЛЬТУРИ: ДО 110-РІЧЧЯ ОДЕСЬКОЇ НАЦІОНАЛЬНОЇ МУЗИЧНОЇ АКАДЕМІЇ ІМЕНІ А. В. НЕЖДАНОВОЇ

UDC 78.01+78.07

DOI <https://doi.org/10.31723/2524-0447-2023-37-1>

Olexandra Ivanivna Samoilenko

ORCID: 0000-0002-2071-9587

Doctor of Art History, Professor, Vice-Rector for Research

Odesa National A. V. Nezhdanova Academy of Music

al_sam@ukr.net

ODESA SCHOOL OF MUSICOLOGY AS AN INTEGRATIVE PHENOMENON: EUROPEAN ORIGINS AND MODERN NATIONAL TENDENCIES

The purpose of the article is to develop relevant approaches and argue for modern definitions of the school phenomenon based on the study of the experience of Odessa academic musicology. The research methodology combines historiographical, personological, hermeneutic and semiological approaches. Special attention is paid to the typology of constitutive features and axiological features of the school phenomenon. The scientific novelty consists in a holistic historical and theoretical assessment of the Odessa school of musicology as a complex dialogic phenomenon that organizes the interaction of the European tradition of historical and systematic musicology with modern trends in the national formation of musical education and science. It is proposed to define the musicological school at several levels, including an approach to it as a practical institutional creativity – a way of professionalization and in-depth differentiation of forms of knowledge and reconstruction of reality. The conclusions state that the modern school of musicology is a collective and personal interpretive phenomenon, the result of the cognitive and understanding activity of a person and community, an integrative indicator of communicative, musical-creative and musical-linguistic achievements. Here the concept of an artifact becomes decisive – both as a material and as a spiritual (psychological) achievement, an objective evidence of the creative

essence (transformation) of a person's subjective consciousness. The school reveals, as the main one, the experience of transformation, reconstruction, change of the real world and man, new modeling of reality, self-improvement; it is a heuristic-technological type, at the same time a personal-transgressive cognitive type; it is an experience associated with significant changes in the way of life and thinking, in relations with the environment, which is capable of providing author's models of cognitive activity, both in art and in science.

Key words: school, musicology, experience, man and the real world, musical creativity, understanding and cognition, language self-realization, modern education, scientific-discursive form.

Самойленко Олександра Іванівна, доктор мистецтвознавства, професор, проректор з наукової роботи Одеської національної музичної академії імені А. В. Нежданової

Одеська музикологічна школа як інтегративний феномен: європейські витоки та сучасні національні тенденції

Мета статті – на основі вивчення досвіду одеського академічного музикознавства розробити актуальні підходи й аргументувати сучасні визначення феномена школи. **Методологія** дослідження поєднує історіографічний, персонологічний, герменевтичний та семіологічний підходи. Особлива увага приділяється типології конститутивних рис та аксіологічних ознак явища школи. **Наукова новизна** полягає у цілісній історико-теоретичній оцінці одеської музикознавчої школи як складного діалогічного феномена, що організує взаємодію європейської традиції історико-систематичного музикознавства з сучасними тенденціями національного формування музичної освіти та науки. Пропонується визначення музикознавчої школи на декількох рівнях, з включення підходу до неї як до практичної інституціональної творчості – способу професіоналізації та поглибленої диференціації форм пізнання й реконструкції дійсності. У **висновках** зазначається, що сучасна школа музикознавства – це колективно-особистісне інтерпретаційне явище, результат пізнавальної й розуміючої діяльності людини та спільноти, інтегративний показник комунікативних, музично-творчих і музично-мистецьких досягнень. Тут вирішальним постає поняття артефакту – і як матеріального, і як духовного (психологічного) досягнення, об'єктивного свідчення творчої сутності (перетворення) суб'єктивної свідомості людини. Школа розкриває, як основний, досвід перетворення, перебудови, зміни реального світу та людини, нового моделювання дійсності, самовдосконалення; це евристико-технологічний тип, у той же час особистісно-трансресивний когнітивний тип; це досвід, пов'язаний з істотними змінами в способі життя й мислення, у відносинах з навколишнім, який здатний надавати авторські моделі пізнавальної діяльності, як у мистецтві, так і в науці.

Ключові слова: школа, музикознавство, досвід, людина та реальний світ, музична творчість, розуміння та пізнання, мовна самореалізація, сучасна освіта, науково-дискурсивна форма.

The relevance of the topic of the article is determined by the need to develop a systematic approach to the phenomenon of the musicological school in the context of the modern Ukrainian educational and cultural environment. It is also relevant to highlight the historical development of the Odessa Academic Musicological School and to define its theoretical foundations and methodological guidelines.

The purpose of the article is to develop relevant approaches and argue for modern definitions of the school phenomenon based on the study of the experience of Odessa academic musicology.

The main content of the article. First of all, to outline the leading features of the Odesa School of Musicology as a fairly stable educational and scientific phenomenon; secondly, to find out the nature and purpose of the school of musicology in general, as part of modern humanities culture, which combines the general and the special at the level of cognitive tradition. The interaction of the European tradition of historical and systematic musicology with current trends in the formation of national forms of music education is a fundamental feature of the Odesa School of Musicology.

Its foundation is the professional scientific and pedagogical activity of the representatives of the Odesa Conservatory – today the Odesa National Music Academy named after Antonina V. Nezhdanova, which is based on educational and scientific initiatives of two departments: Department of Music Theory and Composition; Department of History of Music and Musical Ethnography.

The history of the Department of Music Theory and Composition dates back to 1934. The origins of the Odesa Theoretical School of Musicology are the opening in the mid-1860s of music classes by the “Society of Music Lovers” under the leadership of Peter Sokalsky, as well as the activities of his successors, students of Nikolay A. Rimsky-Korsakov – Porphyry Molchanov, and then Vitold Malyshevsky and Vasil Zolotaryov. Its methodological foundations were

laid by mastering the methodological guidelines of the St. Petersburg School of Musicology, and through them – by restoring certain principles of German musicology, of course with some correction to new professional and educational tasks.

The historical direction of Odesa academic musicology, formed in the 50s of the last century, has always unfolded in a rather broad interdisciplinary context, so it immediately acquired signs of systematic one, combining research efforts of musicologists of different generations who followed Guido Adler's approach. In particular, Georgy Viranovsky (1935–2013), who taught a course on musical theoretical systems at the Odesa Academy, can be considered a follower of German systematic musicology.

However, over the last few decades, the traditional division of musicological disciplines into theoretical and historical (with a corresponding continuation of the distribution in each field) no longer justifies itself. Along with this, we observe many separate authorial attempts to renew the model of musicology. Sometimes this is done with a focus on the holistic method and an understanding approach (Moris Bonfeld, 1991 [6]; Nina Gerasimova-Persidska, 2005, 2006 [11–12]; Irina Kushmina, 2004 [18]): sometimes – in order to organize on a cognitive and linguistic basis (Mark Aranovsky, 1998, 1974 [2, 3]; Victor Bobrovsky, 2013 [5]; Ivan Kotlyarevsky, 1989, 2002 [16, 17]; Yevgeny Nazaykin, 1982, 1998 [21–23]; Igor Pyaskovsky, 1987 [24]). The diversity of musicological conceptualism is affected by related problematic phenomena; they are associated with the appeal to the antinomic principles of culture and phenomena of time (Vsevolod Zaderatsky, 1995 [14]; Victoria Sukhantseva, 1990 [29]), also lead to the discovery of various forms of dialogue in art.

Not less productive in the theoretical sense is the appeal to the problem of catharsis as the basis of understanding, the effect of attachment to meaning, the highest moment

of psychological development and emotional fullness of consciousness, at the same time – the central moment of artistic perception that is programmed by the compositional construction of an art work (Aleksandra Samoilenko, 2002, 2003, 2018 [26–28]).

New problematic theoretical directions have a double validity. On the one hand, they arise on the basis of permanent humanitarian issues, namely, questions about the essential contradictions of human life, the mechanism of culture and its creative functions, the distant transcendent meanings that attach the experience of the individual to the existence of the universe. On the other hand, for such an art discipline as modern musicology, the above-mentioned issues have not yet become quite “their own”, it means, they have not reached methodological integrity and subject coherence. The key question about musicology today can be formulated in a following way: what is a school of musicology and is it able to form a special methodological branch of the humanities as a whole?

In our opinion, all the innovations that take place both in the scientific research and in the educational spheres of Odesa musicology (more broadly – Ukrainian, and even more broadly – European) are connected with the attempts to answer this question.

It should be emphasized that a specific feature of today can be considered the strengthening of applied practical functions of musicology, which manifest themselves primarily through educational and communicative testing. This approbation claims to reach beyond academic courses, to open new ways of applying musicological ideas in the semantic world of culture. But it is interesting that these ways are determined in the process of live dialogic communication in different information contexts and organizational forms; they generate even completely new scientific and creative projects and discursive practices (such as the International Musicological Seminar “Musicological word in information content

of (post)-modernity”, which has been held for several years on the basis of the Odesa Music Academy, in recent years in an online format, gathering a wide audience).

As defined by the psychological works of Dmitry Leon-tiev (2007 [19]), some other representatives of the Rus-sian psychological school, as well as the classic West-ern works of Erich Fromm (1990 [33]) and Viktor Frankl (1990, 2000 [31]), the leading human trait is the ability to self-actualization, which associated with the creation of sym-bolic language, special, autonomous metaphorical spaces of human existence. Spirituality, freedom and responsibility are seen as the leading existentials of human existence, which become the main psychological artifacts of culture and gen-erate their own artistic precedents (Frankl, 2000, p. 225 [31]). That means that the nature of human consciousness and the preconditions of artistic creativity coincide.

Therefore, it should be borne in mind that, as Lev Vygot-sky (1968 [10]) once noted, a full-fledged notion of an artis-tic phenomenon, as well as the methodological justification of the art criticism approach, are not possible without solving certain psychological issues. Systematic presentation of these issues gives rise to *the psychology of art* as one of the basic disciplines of modern systematic musicology.

Theoretical guidelines of this disciplinary field include: the concept of psychology of art psychology of consciousness in the concept of L. Vygotsky [7–10]; determination of the place and role of psychological knowledge in the modern world and the psychological conditionality of aesthetic categories; consid-eration of the problem of aesthetic and artistic emotions; deter-mination of the nature and functions of psychological artifacts in the “living world of culture” and their artistic “precedents”; study of artistic communication as a psychological process, dia-logical aspects of artistic influence and artistic “purification” (catharsis); identification of psychological motives in the the-ory of artistic genres by Mikhail Bakhtin (1986 [4]) and their accumulation in the “canonical psychology” of the school of

Vladimir Romenets (1998 [25]); identification of new ways of art analysis in the projection to the concept of spiritual, symbolic intentions of human consciousness in art; study of the construction of artistic composition in its accordance with the semantic structure of personal consciousness. psychological aspects of musicological analysis.

Updated musicological methodology under its influence acquires the features of epistemological analysis and provides: the approach to music as a process and the total result of artistic thinking; the creation of the concept of musical language as one that reflects the “psychological duel” of art and reality; attempts to create universal dictionary-encyclopedic models of musical culture; development of game theory and taking into account the evaluative ambivalence of the artistic image as a game factor (conditions of the “game”).

In turn, the categorical preconditions of the epistemological approach are revealed by humanitarian works, which, firstly, address the mysteries of the human spirit, and secondly, reveal the functionality of a musical artifact, it means, they touch on the problem of structural analysis of art.

The initial position on the poetics of music is combined with an assessment of the interdependence of “artistry” with artificiality (made), which determines all the functional capabilities of artistic creativity form. Boris Gubman proposes to name communicative, cognitive, educational, educational, playful, hedonistic as the main functions of art (1997, p. 159 [13]). This list seems fairly free; from the point of view of traditional aesthetics, suggestive, ethical and aesthetic, compensative, heuristic (predictive), evaluative, and some other functions can be added to it. But, in our opinion, the primary, those from which all others are separated, I mean fundamental, are three functional aspects of art (art form): dialogical, symbolic and cathartic.

Today we have to admit that the cognitive-evaluative system of musicology is formed in accordance with the functional and communicative tasks of musical art. And if art

is defined as a form of culture associated with the subject's ability to aesthetic development of the modern world and its reproduction in the figurative and symbolic aspect through the resources of creative imagination (Gubman, 1997 [13]), then musicology should be defined as *a scientifically discursive form of reproduction of figurative and artistic, and therefore aesthetic and psychological, content of music by its verbal and symbolic modeling.*

The starting genre-genus differences of art, which determine its division into separate artistic varieties, are, first of all, differences in artistic interpretations of the phenomena of space and time, which form both external and internal borders of cultural experience. The history of art unfolds as a history of spatial and temporal symbolism, which seeks to represent universal forms of communication. As Pavel Florensky noted, “the more ontological the *vision*, the more universal the form” (2001, p. 562 [32]). These words of Florensky are part of his concept of “artistry” (“art”), as a dream that turns into reality; the canons of artistic creativity are connected with that reality, and the canons themselves generalize the spatial and temporal requirements of the perception of an art work. According to the theologian, in its foundations, art must always remain a fact of Divine reality, a manifestation of a higher spiritual experience, a vision of completeness – of holiness (2001, pp. 534, 543, 551 [32]). Thus, Florensky provides a symbolic basis for considering the canonical factors of art at all its levels.

Inheriting Florensky's canonical and symbolic approach, Sergey Averintsev tries to bring it to the scope of the “sophian ontology”. He proposes to consider the set of art forms – poetics – as a single logosphere, when he finds the phenomenon of the logo in the pervasive semantic order of existence (1999, p. 115 [1]). The concept of the semiosphere, introduced by Yury Lotman (1998 [20]) and can be explained by a certain psychological reconstruction, is close to the concept of the logosphere, because otherwise it remains an

alienated abstraction. Thus, from “imagination” and “*vision*” to the semiosis of culture (which Lotman studies), the path runs through the genesis of “great” cultural symbolism and the branch of artistic and formative canons associated with this symbolism. This path presupposes the self-significance of the phenomenon of interpretation as a way of transmission – retransmission of symbolic meanings and symbolic forms. Scientific and educational musicological praxeology also joins the interpretive field of culture, it is an active part of the socio-cultural environment.

Explaining this process from the standpoint of system-integrative musicological methodology, taking into account the peculiarities of music as an artistic phenomenon, we should note that the problem of transpersonal transmission of artistic meanings in music can combine semiological and psychological plans of musicological discourse. This is due to the fact that most semiological concepts have a psychological origin, especially such as meaning, value, life experience, memory, communication, creativity. It is also quite clear that the leading semiological categories – sign, meaning, language, speech, image, symbol, text – appear as psychological formations, and only as a result of their psychological content they are “transposed” into certain artifacts of human cultural activity.

Modification of the aesthetic and psychological approach as a necessary component of art history symbolology is revealed in the works of Yu. Lotman, who believed that art is the most complex “machine” ever created by man: it is a “machine” that allows a person to experience what did not happen to him, but what can happen. This “invincible virtuality” of art is associated with specific means of artistic thinking, first of all, the special semantics of sign systems, different for different types of art (Lotman, 1998, p. 404 [20]). The art form is evaluated by the researcher, first of all, as a form of production of new meanings – new spiritual substances that express both the freedom of man (creative

imagination of man) in relation to the objective reality that is reflected, and the responsibility of man to himself and the subjects of his communication.

Thus, the semiological consideration of art is “placed” between two problems: problems of conditionality and problems of understanding, each of which has a pronounced aesthetic and psychological inclination. One can define the understanding of art as the possession of a measure of its conventionality; it is possible to define the conventionality of art as the expression in the artistic form of the level and scope of understanding of man and the world.

On the basis of the expressed opinions, we will try to formulate actual modern definitions of the school phenomenon, those to which the Odesa musicological community tries to rise.

First, it is a school as memory – a way of accumulating and preserving knowledge, a form of acquiring knowledge, a certain tradition and collective canons of cognition and awareness. The determining factors here are chronotopes (chronological approach) – the unity of temporal and spatial factors, their awareness and embodiment in special symbolic forms. Orientation to the real, to the surrounding reality, at the same time reflection – memorization, it means the formation of experience. In this case, the school appears as a form and method of organization, ordering the space-time of human life in its common, general being purpose.

Secondly, it is a school as a direction, trend, vector of activity, practical institutional creation – a way of professionalization and in-depth differentiation of forms of cognition and reconstruction of reality, determination of permanent criteria of professional action, communication, implementation of common ideas and plans. Dialogue as intersubjective and subject-object communication, including between external socio-situational guidelines, needs and internal individual human interests, so, in a broad interpretation of the concept, is decisive here. Thus, the school finds its scientific and disciplinary institutional type, which is determined by the study

of the surrounding reality with its objective laws, knowledge and development of reality, focuses on ideal knowledge (examples are cognitive systems of different eras, which form certain external and internal boundaries, structural features and subject specification, starting with ancient astronomy and ending with modern psychophysiology, it means, from the sciences of the universe to the science of man).

Third, it is, of course, a school as a union of souls and minds, creative union, spiritual and practical unity of individuals – a way to identify the personal factor of human experience and the phenomenon of Teaching (apprenticeship), which characterizes different areas of activity, but as close communication to the one, so, it is a prerequisite for the transfer of artistic experience as an individually symbolic. Here the category of understanding becomes decisive.

In this case, the school appears as a personal and creative type of communication, focused on the reproduction of invisible worlds, the embodiment of the imaginary, acquires its artistic and valuative inclination, its own internal psychological order (training), a set of qualities, properties, skills. That means, it is a way of forming and revealing the creative energy of personal human consciousness, restructuring the functional mental apparatus and organizing the thought process; thus, it reveals a person's ability to self-actualize. Here the determining factor is self-knowledge or soliloquium, as well as linguistic self-realization, including the choice of linguistic and symbolic form.

We can even say that the modern school of musicology is able to discover its own psychological and reflexive type, based on self-awareness and self-esteem, the study of the inner world of man as the main and determining. Hence the shift of boundaries between objective and subjective reality, the multiplication of dimensions of reality (examples can be found from Augustine's Confession to Nikolay Berdyaev's Self-Knowledge and further, in the phenomenon of "novel of the flow of consciousness" initiated by Marcel Proust,

in general in the novel art in its broad sense, according to Mikhail Bakhtin).

The scientific novelty consists in a holistic historical and theoretical assessment of the Odessa school of musicology as a complex dialogic phenomenon that organizes the interaction of the European tradition of historical and systematic musicology with modern trends in the national formation of musical education and science. It is proposed to define the musicological school at several levels, including an approach to it as a practical institutional creativity – a way of professionalization and in-depth differentiation of forms of knowledge and reconstruction of reality.

Hence, in general, the modern school of musicology is a collective and personal interpretive phenomenon, as a result of cognitive and understanding human activity, an integrative indicator of communicative creative achievements as well as musical and linguistic achievements. Here the phenomenon and the concept of an artifact are decisive – both as a material and as a spiritual (psychological) achievement, objective evidence of the creative essence (transforming) of personal human life.

The conclusions. The school reveals, as the main one, the experience of transformation, reorganization, change of the real world and man, new modeling of reality, self-improvement; it is a heuristic-technological type, at the same time a personality-transgressive cognitive type; associated with significant changes in lifestyle and thinking, relationships with others, it maximizes style indicators in science, art, life, it claims to authorship, provides authorial models of life, personal life-art, including in cognitive activities, as in art, and in science.

Thus, the polar quantities that determine the phenomenon of school are the world and man, by the way, in the gradual approximation and intensification of interaction; the cognition of the world takes place in accordance with human self-knowledge, and vice versa: the development of one's own abilities – the ability to know, understand, creatively

transform reality – allows to establish new aspects, rules and qualities of the so-called objective reality.

All the shown aspects of the phenomenon of musicological school exist in unity and correspond to the integrity of human history, historical human existence, and the personal consciousness of an individual. Then the phenomenon of school meets the needs of human language consciousness, the need for the formation and expansion of the human language environment, increasing the aesthetic contexts of human life.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Аверинцев С. Логос. С.С. Аверинцев. *Софія-Логос. Словник*. К.: Дух і Літера, 1999. С. 154–159.
2. Арановский М. Мышление, язык, семантика. *Проблемы музыкального мышления: сост. и ред. М. Арановский*. М.: Музыка, 1974. С. 90–128.
3. Арановский М. Музыкальный текст. Структура и свойства. М.: Композитор, 1998. 343 с.
4. Бахтин М. Эстетика словесного творчества. 2-е изд. Сост. С. Бочаров; прим. С. Бочарова и С. Аверинцева. М.: Искусство, 1986. 445 с.
5. Бобровский В. Тематизм как фактор музыкального мышления: Очерки. Вып.1. М.: Музыка, 1989. 268 с.
6. Бонфельд М. Музыка. Язык. Речь. Мышление: Опыт системного анализа музыкального искусства. Ч. 1. Тезисы. М.: МГЗПИ, 1991. 125 с.
7. Выготский Л. Мышление и речь: Изд. 5, испр. М.: Лабиринт, 1999. 352 с.
8. Выготский Л. О психологических системах. *Л.С. Выготский. Собр. соч. в 6-ти томах*. Т.1. М.: Педагогика, 1982. С. 109–131.
9. Выготский Л. История развития высших психических функций. *Л.С. Выготский. Собр. соч. в 6-ти томах*. Т.3. М.: Педагогика, 1983. С. 5–328.
10. Выготский Л. Психология искусства. М.: Искусство, 1968. 576 с.
11. Герасимова-Персидская Н. Целостность как универсалия и ее проявление в музыке. *Науковий вісник НМАУ ім. П. І. Чайковського*. Вип. 51: *Питання організації художньої цілісності музичного твору*. Зб. статей. К., 2005. С. 3–8.
12. Герасимова-Персидская Н. О восприятии музыки и постижении смысла. *Науковий вісник НМАУ ім. П. І. Чайковського*. Вип. 60: *Теоретичні та практичні аспекти музичного смислоутворення*. Зб. статей. К., 2006. С. 3–8.
13. Губман Б. Искусство. *Культурология. XX век. Словарь*. СПб.: Университет. кн., 1997. С. 159–161.

14. Задерацкий В. Музыкальная форма. В 2-х вып. Вып.1. *Учебник для специализированных факультетов высших музыкальных учебных заведений*. М.: Музыка, 1995. 544 с.

15. Козаренко О. Українська національна музична мова: генеза та сучасні тенденції розвитку. Дис. ...доктора мистецтвознавства; 17.00.03 – музичне мистецтво. К., 2001. 412 с.

16. Котляревский И. К вопросу о понятийности музыкального мышления *Музыкальное мышление: сущность, категории, аспекты исследования*. К.: Музична Україна, 1989. С. 28–34.

17. Котляревський І. Пріоритетність як фактор розвитку музикознавства / І. Котляревський. *Теоретичні та практичні питання культурології: Українське музикознавство на зламі століть. Збірник наукових статей*. «Сана», 2002. Вип. IX. С. 3–10.

18. Кушмина Р. Язык и музыка как смыслообразующие звуковые формы культуры. Дис. ...канд. философ. наук: спец. 24.00.01 – теория и история культуры. Казань, 2004. 167 с.

19. Леонтьев Д. Психология смысла: природа, строение и динамика смысловой реальности. *3-е изд., доп.* М.: Смысл, 2007. 511 с.

20. Лотман Ю. О природе искусства. *Лотман Ю. Об искусстве*. СПб.: Искусство, 1998. С. 400–404.

21. Назайкинский Е. Звуковой мир музыки. М.: Музыка, 1998. 254 с.

22. Назайкинский Е. Логика музыкальной композиции. М.: Музыка, 1982. 319 с.

23. Назайкинский Е. О психологии музыкального восприятия. М.: Музыка, 1972. 384с.

24. Пясковский И. Поэтика музыкального мышления. К.: Музыка, 1987. 182 с.

25. Роменець В., Маноха І. Історія психології ХХ століття: *Навч. посібник. Вст. ст. В.О. Шатенка, Т.М. Титаренка*. К.: Либідь, 1998. 992 с.

26. Самойленко А. Музыковедение и методология гуманитарного знания. Проблема диалога. Одесса: Астропринт, 2002. 244 с.

27. Самойленко А. Категория музыкального мышления в концептуальном контексте психологии искусства. *Музичне мистецтво і культура. Наукова зб. Вип. 26*. Одесса, 2018. С. 157–168.

28. Самойленко А. (2003). Композиционно-семантический анализ музыки и катарсис. *Українське музикознавство. Наукові матеріали. Вип. 3*. Київ, 2003. С. 88–93.

29. Суханцева В. Категория времени в музыкальной культуре. К.: Лыбидь, 1990. 184 с.

30. Франкл В. Критика чистого «коммуникации»: насколько гуманистична «гуманистическая психология». *Гуманистическая и трансперсональная психология. Антология*. Мн., 2000. С. 211–240.

31. Франкл В. Человек в поисках смысла: *Пер. с англ. и нем. Вступ. ст. А. Леонтьева*. М.: Прогресс, 1990. 367 с.

32. Флоренский П. Иконостас. *Павел Флоренский. Христианство и культура*. М.: Фолио, 2001. С. 521–626.

33. Фромм Э. Иметь или быть? *Пер. с англ., общ. ред. и посл. В.И. Добреньков. 2-е издание, доп.* М.: Прогресс, 1990. 336 с.

REFERENCES

1. Averintsev, Sergey (1999). Logos. S.S. Averintsev. Sophia – Logos. Dictionnaire. Kyiv: Spirit and Litera. P. 114–115 [in Russian].
2. Aranovsky, Mark (1974). Thinking, language, semantics. Problems of musical thinking: comp. and ed. M. Aranovsky. Moskva: Music. P. 90–128 [in Russian].
3. Aranovsky, Mark (1998). Musical text. Structure and properties. Moskva: Composer [in Russian].
4. Bakhtin, Mikhail (1986). Aesthetics of verbal creativity: 2 ed.; comp. S. Bocharov; approx. S. Averintseva and S. Bocharova. Moskva: Art [in Russian].
5. Bobrovsky, Victor (2013). Thematism as a factor in musical thinking. Essays. Chaikovsky. Mussorgsky. Scriabin. Rachmaninov. Moskva: KomKniga. Issue 2 [in Russian].
6. Bonfeld, Moris (1991). Music. Tongue. Language. Thinking: (Experience in systematic analysis of musical art). Part 1. Theses. Moskva: MGZPI [in Russian].
7. Vygotsky, Lev (1999). Thinking and language: Ed. 5, rev. Moskva: Labyrinth [in Russian].
8. Vygotsky, Lev (1982). About psychological systems. L.S. *Vygotsky. Coll. Op. in 6 volumes*. T. 1. Moskva: Pedagogy. P. 109–131 [in Russian].
9. Vygotsky, Lev (1983). History of the development of higher mental functions. L.S. *Vygotsky. Coll. Op. in 6 volumes*. T. 3. Moskva: Pedagogy. P. 5–328 [in Russian].
10. Vygotsky, Lev (1968). Psychology of art. Moskva: Art [in Russian].
11. Gerasimova-Persidskaya, Nina (2005). Integrity as a universal and its manifestation in music. *Scientific comp. NMAU im. P. I. Tchaikovsky*. Vol. 51: *Questions of organization of artistic integrity of a musical work*. Kyiv. P. 3–8 [in Russian].
12. Gerasimova-Persidskaya, Nina (2006). On the perception of music and comprehension of meaning. *Scientific comp. NMAU im. P. I. Tchaikovsky*. Vol. 60: *Theoretical and practical aspects of musical meaning*. Kyiv. P. 3–8 [in Russian].
13. Gubman, Boris (1997). Art. Culturology. XX century. Vocabulary. St. Petersburg: University Book. P. 159–161 [in Russian].
14. Zaderatsky, Vsevolod (1995). Musical form. In 2 issue. Issue 1: Textbook for specialized faculties of higher musical educational institutions. Moskva: Music [in Russian].
15. Kozarenko, Oleksandr (2001). Ukrainian National Musical Language: Genesis and Modern Trends in Development. Doct. Thesis: 17.00.03 – musical art. Kyiv [in Ukrainian].
16. Kotlyarevsky, Ivan (1989). On the concept of musical thinking. *Musical thinking: essence, categories, aspects of research*. Kyiv: Musical Ukraine. P. 28–34 [in Russian].

17. Kotlyarevsky, Ivan (2002). Priority is a factor in the development of musical knowledge. *Theoretical and practical nourishment of cultural studies: Ukrainian music knowledge on evil. Collection science articles*. Vol. IX. Melitopol: “Sana” [in Russian].

18. Kushmina, Reseda (2004). Language and music as semantic sound forms of culture. Cand. thesis: 24.00.01 – theory and history of culture. Kazan, 2004 [in Russian].

19. Leontiev, Dmitry (2007). Psychology of meaning: nature, structure and dynamics of semantic reality: 3-rd ed., Ext. Moskva: Sense [in Russian].

20. Lotman, Yury (1998). On the nature of art. Yu. M. Lotman. About art. St. Petersburg: Art – St. Petersburg. P. 400–404 [in Russian].

21. Nazaykinsky, Yevgeny (1998). Sound world of music. Moskva: Music [in Russian].

22. Nazaykinsky, Yevgeny (1982). The logic of musical composition. Moskva: Music, 1982 [in Russian].

23. Nazaykinsky, Yevgeny (1972). On the psychology of musical perception. Moskva: Music [in Russian].

24. Pyaskovsky, Igor (1987). Poetics of musical thinking. Kyiv: Music [in Russian].

25. Romenets, Vladimir, Manokhina Irina (1998). History of the twentieth century psychology. Kyiv: Libid [in Ukrainian].

26. Samoilenko, Aleksandra (2002). Musicology and methodology of humanitarian knowledge. The problem of dialogue. Odessa: Astroprint [in Russian].

27. Samoilenko, Aleksandra. (2018). The category of musical thinking in the conceptual context of the psychology of art. *Musical art and culture. Scientific Bulletin*. Vol. 26. Odessa. P. 157–168 [in Russian].

28. Samoilenko, Aleksandra (2003). Compositional-semantic analysis of music and catharsis. *Materiali to the Ukrainian Musical Studies*. Vol. 3. Kyiv P. 88–93 [in Russian].

29. Sukhantseva, Victoria (1990). Category of time in musical culture. Kyiv: Lybid [in Russian].

30. Frankl, Viktor (2000). Criticism of pure “communication”: how humanistic is “Humanistic Psychology”. *Humanistic and transpersonal psychology. An anthology*. Mn.: Ast. P. 211–240 [in Russian].

31. Frankl, Viktor (1990). Man in search of meaning. Moskva: Progress [in Russian].

32. Florensky, Pavel (2001). Iconostasis. *Pavel Florensky. Christianity and culture*. Moskva: Folio, p. 521–626 [in Russian].

33. Fromm, Erich (1990). To have or to be? Per. from English. 2 ed. Moskva: Progress [in Russian].