

## CULTURE AND ART

DOI <https://doi.org/10.51647/kelm.2021.1.2.2>

### ТЕКСТОВЫЙ ВЫМЯР ДИСКУРСА МУЗЫЧНОГО: АСПЕКТ ТЕОРЕТИЧЕСКИЙ

**Iryna Piatnytska-Pozdniakova**

*доктор истории искусства, доцент Катедры Искусства Музыки  
Миколаївського Університету Народового імені Василя Сухомлинського  
(Миколаїв, Україна)*

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-7211-1602

e-mail: [musik\\_prof@ukr.net](mailto:musik_prof@ukr.net)

**Adnotacja.** Artykuł poświęcono złożonej problematyce dyskursu muzycznego, który funkcjonuje w warunkach praktyki artystycznej, realizując się na poziomie tekstów, przybierając różnorodne formy. *Metodologia* polega na zmianie perspektywy analitycznej, która pozwala zidentyfikować i przeanalizować cechy merytoryczne dyskursu muzycznego. *Nowością naukową* jest identyfikacja mechanizmów interakcji między dyskursem a tekstami muzycznymi. *Wyniki badań.* Skupiono się na dyskursie muzycznym jako zdarzeniu stałym, w którego kontekście teksty muzyczne przybierają formę wydarzeń rezonansowych i przyczyniają się do odnowy tradycji muzycznych. *Praktyczne znaczenie.* Wyniki badań mogą być wykorzystane do dalszych badań i opracowywać materiał, na wykładach z teorii ukraińskiej kultury muzycznej.

**Słowa kluczowe:** dyskurs, dyskurs muzyczny, podejście analityczne, przestrzeń tekstowa kultury muzycznej.

### TEXTUAL DIMENSION OF MUSICAL DISCOURSE: THEORETICAL ASPECT

**Iryna Piatnytska-Pozdniakova**

*Doctor of Art Studies, Associate Professor,  
Associate Professor at the Department of Musical Arts  
V. O. Sukhomlynskyi Mykolaiv National University (Mykolaiv, Ukraine)*

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-7211-1602

e-mail: [musik\\_prof@ukr.net](mailto:musik_prof@ukr.net)

**Abstract.** The article is devoted to raising the complex issues of musical discourse, which functions in the context of artistic practice, realizing itself at the level of texts that take on a wide variety of forms. *The methodology* consists of changing the analytical perspective, which allows to identify and analyze the essential characteristics of musical discourse. *The scientific novelty* lies in the identification of mechanisms of interaction between discourse and musical texts. *Research results.* Attention is focused on musical discourse as a fixed event, in the context of which musical texts take the forms of resonant events and contribute to the renewal of musical traditions. *Practical significance.* The results of the study can be used for further research and development of the material, for courses of lectures on the theory of Ukrainian musical culture.

**Key words:** discourse, musical discourse, analytical approach, textual space of musical culture.

### ТЕКСТОВИЙ ВИМІР МУЗИЧНОГО ДИСКУРСУ: ТЕОРЕТИЧНИЙ АСПЕКТ

**Ірина П'ятницька-Позднякова**

*доктор мистецтвознавства, доцент,  
доцент кафедри музичного мистецтва  
Миколаївського національного університету імені В. О. Сухомлинського (Миколаїв, Україна)*

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-7211-1602

e-mail: [musik\\_prof@ukr.net](mailto:musik_prof@ukr.net)

**Анотація.** Стаття присвячена складній проблематиці музичного дискурсу, який функціонує в умовах художньої практики, реалізуючи себе на рівні текстів, що набувають найрізноманітніших форм. *Методологія* полягає у зміні аналітичного ракурсу, який дозволяє виявити та проаналізувати сутнісні характеристики музичного дискурсу. *Наукова новизна* полягає у виявленні механізмів взаємодії між дискурсом та музичними текстами. *Результати дослідження.* Закцентовано увагу на музичному дискурсі як фіксованій події, в контексті якої музичні тексти набувають форм резонансних подій та сприяють оновленню музичних традицій. *Практичне значення.* Результати дослідження можуть бути використані для подальшого дослідження та розробки матеріалу, для курсів лекцій з теорії української музичної культури.

**Ключові слова:** дискурс, музичний дискурс, аналітичний підхід, текстовий простір музичної культури.

**Introduction.** In the context of this article an attempt is made to touch on the problems of musical discourse, focusing on its characteristics. It is noted that musical discourse in the conditions of artistic practice acquires not only a contextual but also a textual dimension, directing the vector of the polylogue of musical communication to actualize the meaning, realizing itself at the level of various texts. Simultaneously, musical texts take on a wide variety of forms: from the author's intentions to analytical interpretations, in the context of which the semantic levels of musical culture are revealed, and already known postulates acquire a new reading. Attention is also focused on the fact that in the context of musical discourse, various text structures acquire ambiguity, and their understanding occurs at socio-cultural, historical, stylistic, grammatical, semantic, motivational levels, which together determine the strategy of its representation. The purpose of this article is to understand the mechanism of interaction between texts and musical discourse. Moreover an attempt is made to comprehend musical discourse as a fixed event, in the context of which musical texts take the forms of resonant events and, expanding the boundaries of the socio-cultural space, contribute to the renewal of musical traditions.

**Main part.** The issues stated are presented by thorough theoretical research and have an interdisciplinary vector of direction which allows to talk about its relevance that remains an open space for reflection. However, one of the little-studied aspects has been the perspective of the study of musical discourse as a text space.

The **purpose of the article** is to reveal the peculiarities of musical discourse as a complex organized text space with a variable diversity of its understanding, which can take the form of a relatively fixed event, in the context of which there is a representation of the musical culture of a certain time.

The etymology of the term *discourse* has its roots in the Latin *discurrere* (to negotiate, discuss) which, in the context of medieval academic science, received an interpretation of reflection, i.e. logically constructed oral (or written) speech. In this sense, the semantic load of the discourse is similar in meaning to the concept of text as a semantically connected integral sequence of sign units.

During the XVI–XVIII centuries, the term *discourse* was used in this sense and was synonymous with scientific research, and discursive thinking was understood as analytical actions through which knowledge of any phenomena is possible. However, in the XVIII century, the concept of discourse acquires additional characteristics due to introspection as an integral part of the discursive analysis, which involves addressing the internal structures of the phenomenon under study. In the XIX century, a change in the forms of scientific discourse together with the form of presentation of scientific results appears, and the concept itself begins to function in the field of exact sciences (purposeful, logical scientific thinking) and humanities (free expression of thought, which may not be scientifically structured). However, the discourse retains its key characteristic of normativity, which implies the existence of formal logical structures.

In the early twentieth century, the problem of discourse receives a new vector of development, and the term *discourse* is widely used in the context of the humanities, usually associated with the work *Language and Discourse* by Belgian linguist E. Buisans in which the binary opposition "language - speech" is expanded, and the term itself is thought of as a mediator between language and the process of speech. In this context, discourse acquires the meaning of the mechanism of language actualization in the communication system.

Various theories of discourse in the humanities arose under the influence of linguistic studies, in the context of which it was emphasized that language analysis should consider not only grammar but also the process of its functioning in society (speech interaction, activity approach, etc.). As a result, various approaches have emerged, including critical discourse analysis (T. A. Van Dijk, N. Fairclough, and R. Wodak), structural analysis of myths, and the study of ways of communicating in different cultures (W. Labov, N. Rees), cognitive models of understanding coherent text and discourse (T. A. Van Dijk, W. Kintsch). However, in the second half of the twentieth century, the discursive practice has changed significantly, and the discourse itself is becoming one of the key categories of scientific analysis, the subject of special studies of philosophical and socio-humanitarian disciplines, which led to the emergence of a range of interdisciplinary fields of studies.

Since the 1960s, discourse acquires a categorical meaning and correlates with the concept of text which contributed to the development of semiotics as a specialized field of knowledge. In the 1970s, scientific research specified the term *discourse*, which was interpreted as a way of actualizing the text, where text and speech were thought of as aspects of discourse. Meanwhile, recognizing the primacy of the text in relation to the discourse, the dynamic form of existence of the text was studied, and the field of research included various actions with language and speech. Such approaches to discourse have contributed to the emergence of various areas, including sociolinguistics, linguosemiotics, French discourse analysis, the theory of speech acts, critical discourse analysis, and more. At the same time, they sought to integrate different concepts, which led to the emergence of interdisciplinary research, where the organization of the meaning of discourse was defined by the *theme* as a dynamic formation that unfolds in the context of discursive practice.

In the 1990s and at the beginning of the 2000s, theories of discourse are most intensively integrated into various fields of knowledge, forming interdisciplinary directions. In particular, such connections are observed between linguistics and psychology, linguistics and sociology, psychology and anthropology, which contributed to the emergence of a new field of discoursology and allowed to expand the meaning of the term *discourse* from purely linguistic to philosophical, gaining the status of an independent approach, in particular:

- from the standpoint of the linguistic approach, discourse is a structurally complete content-speech formation, which can consist of several statements and a whole text;
- from the standpoint of the functional approach, discourse is a way of language functioning in a social context;

- from the standpoint of a pragmatic approach, discourse is a socio-cultural space;
- from the standpoint of a philosophical approach, discourse is a body of rules that have historical, cultural, and social characteristics.

The definitive field of the term *discourse* in different dictionaries, despite minor differences in wording, highlights such basic characteristics as communicativeness, dialogicality (openness, interactivity), dynamism, pragmatism (targeting the audience), macrosituationality, illocution (carried out in the process of speech), time constraints, social orientation and language functionality, psychologically-oriented space (i.e. the inclusion of both verbal and nonverbal communication, which is limited by spatio-temporal and human factors), etc.

From another point of view, discourse is thought of as a complex communicative form of language, which reflects the mentality of the ethnos, or a set of knowledge in a particular field of culture, which is fixed by sign systems. In this case, the communicative form is understood as oral speech, written and non-verbal text of the author, which arises in his imagination. From such positions, the text is considered as a discourse, and discourse is understood as a special form of language functioning (Kubryakova, 1997: 19). That is, a special discourse can also be concentrated in the texts, which can be attributed to a particular social or professional group as a relatively alternative world that actualizes vocabulary and grammar in different types of discourse. Specifically, the discourse allows the reproduction of the lexical, syntactic features of the linguistic picture of a particular individual, his worldview, and is a reflection of both social practices and socio-cultural knowledge in general. In this case, discourse is considered not as a mental, but a communicative-pragmatic activity (Karasyk, 1998), in the context of which language is focused on discourse, and texts are the result of speech activity, the generalization of which occurs at the level of the language system.

Despite the rather wide range of discourse research, they can be grouped in two directions:

- discourse as a cognitively conditioned communicative event, which is recorded in written texts. From such positions, discourse is a unit of operational analysis that has a purely functional direction. The discursive analysis involves identifying the components of the communicative process, reflected in its intratextual organization, and the nature of the influence of extralinguistic factors (social, cultural, etc.) on the formation of linguistic patterns;
- discourse as a set of thematically correlated texts that correlate with each other, function within a single communicative sphere or "discursive formation" (in Foucault's terminology), the meaningful dimension of which is revealed through intertextual connections. In this sense, discourse as a pragmatically oriented space-time continuum can have an oral or written form, verbal and nonverbal components, represent a particular historical period, social community, or the whole culture. In this case, discursive analysis involves the identification of those common features that unite different texts and the analysis of the strategies that are implemented in them in a single discursive space. Thus, the emphasis is on the conventional nature of communication, which is associated with the pragmatic conditions of generation and perception of different types of texts.

Although these are different approaches in defining discourse, they are not fundamentally different, as they emphasize different aspects of the same phenomenon and define its characteristics such as communicativeness, dialogicality, dynamism, pragmatism, macrosituationality, illocution (setting and solving problems is carried out in the process of speech), time constraint, social orientation and language functionality, psychologically oriented space (i.e. the inclusion of both verbal and nonverbal communication, limited by space, time and human factors, which allows identifying the substantive unity of different texts).

Regardless of the direction of research, most scholars recognize the text as a complex synergetic product, the birth process of which takes place at the level of personal consciousness and appeals to emotional experience, genetic and cultural information, and sociocultural knowledge, providing an adequate response to the challenges of reality. In this sense, discourse acts as a mediator of socio-cultural communication and is characterized by specific features (thematic, lexical, syntactic, etc.) that "actualize its meaning, intentions and functions" (Potapchuk, 2013: 140).

Despite such a variety of different approaches to the study of discourse, to this day there is no clear definition of to what instrumental level it belongs. The rather diverse picture of the definitions of discourse allows us to interpret it as an approach and as a form of textual analysis, and as a set of different analysis techniques, and as a tool for language research (its structure, functions, and methods of application). Such a varied terminological dimension of discourse testifies to the existence of both broad and narrow understanding of it. In particular, discourse in the narrow sense is understood as a dynamic process of generation and perception of the text, which has a socio-cultural and pragmatic orientation. In a broad sense, this process includes the process of speech and the text itself, which are specific concepts in relation to the generic discourse that unites them.

In the twentieth century, extrapolation of the concept of discourse in the field of music allowed us to reach a new level of understanding of socio-cultural space with its innovative, complexly organized musical text and a variety of forms (performing, analytical interpretations, etc.). Musical discourse is conceived as a relatively fixed event that has a clear vector of presentation of the musical culture of a certain time, where musical texts take the form of resonant events that expand the boundaries of the socio-cultural situation and contribute to the renewal of musical traditions. The extremely complex socio-cultural period of development of musical art of the twentieth century, with its articulation of significant values and concepts encrusted in the sometimes unfavorable context of the ideological coordinate system, was able to emphasize the need to root in the musical space the idea of self-worth and uniqueness of music culture. Emphasis on the most important semantic accents of the musical culture of that time, the structure of the communication space around various musical events allowed not only to preserve their achievements of compositional practice but also to encrust in its context new development trends.

Introduced in theoretical musicology, the term *musical discourse* referred to complex processes in the development of the musical culture of the twentieth century with its extremely complex genre and style potential and dynamics of socio-cultural development. In this sense, the musical discourse was conceived as a complex semantic space, a kind of macrostructure, and had several dimensions, including:

- institutional, revealing the relationship between the individual and different institutions and represented by various forms (presentations, representations, interpretations, etc.) and different levels of abstraction (written, oral, visual, etc.);
- contextual, revealing different variants of the socio-cultural situation in which the discourse is realized;
- mental, which reveals the values and motivations of the artist's personality of a certain type of culture.

Any discourse can be “revealed, described and understood only in context” (Vodak, 1997: 76), which will decode its semantic dimensions. This is an important thesis because, in the context of musical discourse as a socially-oriented interactive interaction, textual structures become ambiguous, and their understanding takes place at the socio-cultural, historical, stylistic, grammatical (syntactics), semantic (semantics), motivational (pragmatics) levels, including the strategy of its representation.

In general, the view of music as discourse is not new in theoretical musicology and has gained its meaning in the context of the works of both domestic and foreign researchers. The sociology of music joined the problem of understanding the musical discourse the most, focusing its attention on the study of the social aspect of the functioning of music, but the concepts of *musical speech* and *musical text* remained out of its attention. Meanwhile, most scholars thought of discourse as a multidimensional “text space” (according to Yu. Lotman), which presents a mental model of the artist's personality, which is manifested at the level of interpretations, semantic reconstructions open to polylogue, and so on. However, in theoretical musicology, *musical discourse* has not acquired a methodological justification, as evidenced by the openness of its definition field, the uncertainty of types and criteria of analysis, genre and style varieties, modes, and more. However, there are some analytical works in the context of which emphasis is placed on the functioning of artistic practices of composers in the discursive space of musical culture. In particular, in the works of O. Beregova the concept of discourse is thought of as a “complex communicative phenomenon”, and musical discourse is presented as a “communicative event”, as a process of unfolding and interpreting a musical work, as a stream of musical speech behavior “In a situation of musical communication” (Beregova, 2009: 187).

From such positions, the purpose of musical discourse is “... expression and transmission using the sound matter of emotionally ordered artistic information; the way of its realization is a creative dialogue between all participants of musical communication, which is carried out on several, qualitatively different lines of communication” (Beregova, 2009: 188). The issue of musical discourse was raised in the context of intertextuality as one of the forms of its manifestation. Simultaneously, intertextuality in a broad sense was thought of as the presence of constant and dynamic components in a musical text, and in a narrow sense as the presence of a “foreign word” (in M. Bakhtin's terminology) in the form of various “figures of context” It is M. Bakhtin's ideas about the “foreign word” that arises when interacting with other texts (forming a certain “dialogue” (Bakhtin, 1975: 35)), which had an important impact on the formation of intertextuality as the presence of elements of previous artistic texts in the new text.

In theoretical musicology, the understanding of intertextuality as a huge citation fund was stated in the works of B. Gasparov and, later, received a wide range of interpretations “from citation to imprint of structure”, which are certain “fragments and “have only a metonymic function”. Later, in the works of M. Aranovsky, intertextuality became the dominant characteristic of the musical text. Already in the late 1990s, the stated issues in terms of intertextuality were continued in the works of L. Berezovchuk, L. Dyachkova (1996), B. Katz (1995), L. Kazantseva, A. Klymovytsky (1994), I. Kokhanyk, V. Moskalenko, I. Peskovsky, M. Raku (1999) and many others. In particular, different types of such intertextuality markers as citations, allusions, stylizations, associative images, metaphors, archetypal symbolism and many more were classified.

Further analysis of textual interactions to identify the semantic levels of musical texts has led to the separation of different modes of their comprehension. From such positions, any artistic text, and musical in particular, potentially contains other texts as a combination of various constructive elements, ideas, plot schemes, and structural models due to the peculiarities of artistic thinking, which is based on the human memory, where artistic signs-images of non-textual reality are preserved. That is, a musical text is a potential thesaurus of a certain historical and cultural time, and intertextuality is a semiotic space of different language systems, which are referentially correlated.

Despite a large number of thorough studies, it should be noted that the musical discourse is characterized by a pragmatic direction and dialogical nature of the texts presented in it, interacting with each other. The texts mean not only the author's intentions in the form of musical works but also performing interpretations, analytical readings (reviews, previews, dialogues, analytics, criticism, etc.), which build the semantic dimension of the discourse. It is a rather polyphonic form of existence of various musical texts, where thoughts “sound”, points of view are expressed and semantic dimensions of musical culture, in general, are born. In this context, musical speech and musical text are thought of as specific concepts in relation to the generic discourse in the context in which they operate. It is from such positions that the musical culture of the second half of the XX – beginning of the XXI centuries is analyzed, in the context of which radical changes in the understanding of the musical matter occurred. As a result, there is an open form in aleatorism, minimalist patterns replace classical vocabulary, the fusion of timbre and texture leads to new principles of compositional organization, the rejection of the causality of classicism leads not only to a new syntax with a complex semantic dimension but also leads to significant changes in music languages in general. Moreover, the analytical vector of the semantics of the musical language is shifted into the conceptual dimension of the musical-speech processes of meaning formation, as a reflection of the way of artistic Being.

**Conclusions.** The semantic unity of different components of the musical-speech flow immersed in the situation of musical communication is manifested in the musical discourse. In this sense, the socio-cultural aspect of musical discourse can be understood through various forms of its functioning, while the cognitive will reveal the semantic levels of musical text, which acquire space, multidimensionality, and textual heterogeneity. From such positions between the musical text and the discourse the relations of realization are built where different discourses can be manifested in the musical text. That is, it is in the context of musical discourse that thought processes find their explicit expression, acquiring forms of text characterized by its inclusion in the social context, where speech – text – discourse exist in macro-dialogue and are a polyphony of “different voices” of culture to some extent.

#### Bibliography:

1. Бахтин М. Проблемы содержания, материала и формы в словесном творчестве. *Вопросы литературы и эстетики*. Москва: Худож. лит. 1975. 504 с.
2. Берегова О. Сучасні теорії дискурсу і рефлексії в розробці теорії музичної комунікації. *Актуальні проблеми мистецької практики і мистецтвознавчої науки*. 2009. Вип. 2 (11). С. 185–191.
3. Водак Р. Язык. Дискурс. Политика. Волгоград : Перемена. 1997. 139 с.
4. Дьячкова Л. Проблемы интертекста в художественной системе музыкального произведения. *Интерпретация музыкального произведения в контексте культуры: сб. тр.* Вып. 129. РАМ им. Гнесиных. Москва, 1996. С. 17.
5. Карасик В. О категориях дискурса. *Языковая личность: социолингвистические и эмотивные аспекты: сб. науч. тр.* Волгоград; Саратов : Перемена. 1998. С. 185–197.
6. Кац Б. Об интертекстуальности последней симфонической темы Брамса. *Выбор и сочетание: открытая форма: сб. ст. к 75-летию Ю. Г. Кона*. Петрозаводск ; Санкт-Петербург. 1995. С. 18–21.
7. Климовицкий А. «Пиковая дама» Чайковского: культурная память и культурные предчувствия. *Россия – Европа: контакты музыкальных культур: сб. научн. трудов Рос. института истории искусств. Проблемы музыкознания*. Вып. 7. Санкт-Петербург, 1994. С. 221–274.
8. Кубрякова Е. Виды пространства текста и дискурса. *Пространство и время: материалы научн. конф.* Москва : МГУ. 1997. С. 19.
9. Потапчук М. Песенный дискурс как коммуникативный процесс. *Вестник Челябинского государственного ун-та*. 2013. № 2 (293): Филология. Искусствоведение. С. 140–143.
10. Раку М. «Пиковая дама» братьев Чайковских: опыт интертекстуального анализа. *Музыкальная академия*. 1999. № 2. С. 9–21.

#### Referenses:

1. Bahtin M. Problemy soderzhaniya, materiala i formy v slovesnom tvorchestve. [Problems of content, material and form in verbal creativity]. *Voprosy literatury i estetiki*. Moscow: Hudozh. lit. 1975. 504 p. [in Russian].
2. Bereгова O. Suchasni teoriyi diskursu i refleksiyyi v rozrobci teoriyi muzichnoyi komunikaciyi. [Modern theories of discourse and reflection in the development of the theory of musical communication]. *Aktualni problemi misteckoyi praktiki i mistectvoznachoyi nauki*. 2009. Vip. 2 (11). P. 185–191 [in Ukrainian].
3. Vodak R. Yazyk. Diskurs. Politika. [Language. Discourse. Politics]. Volgograd: Peremena. 1997. 139 p. [in Russian].
4. Dyachkova L. Problemy interteksta v hudozhestvennoj sisteme muzykalnogo proizvedeniya. [Problems of intertext in the artistic system of a musical work]. *Interpretaciya muzykalnogo proizvedeniya v kontekste kultury: sb. tr.* Vip. 129. RAM im. Gnesinyh. Moscow. 1996. P. 17 [in Russian].
5. Karasik V. O kategoriyah diskursa. [About the categories of discourse]. *Yazykovaya lichnost: sociolingvisticheskie i emotivnye aspekty: sb. nauch. tr.* Volgograd; Saratov: Peremena. 1998. P. 185–197. [in Russian].
6. Katz B. Ob intertekstualnosti poslednej simfonicheskoj temy Bramsa [On the intertextuality of Brahms' last symphonic theme]. *Yzbor i sochetanie: otkrytaya forma: sb. st. k 75-letiyu Yu. G. Kona*. Petrozavodsk; Sankt-Peterburg, 1995. P. 18–21 [in Russian].
7. Klimovickij A. “Pikovaya dama” Chajkovskogo: kulturnaya pamyat i kulturnye predchuvstviya. [Tchaikovsky's “Queen of Spades”: Cultural Memory and Cultural Premonitions]. *Rossiya – Evropa: kontakty muzykalnyh kultur: sb. nauchn. trudov Ros. instituta istorii iskusstv. Problemy muzykoznanija*. Vip. 7. Sankt-Peterburg. 1994. P. 221–274. [in Russian].
8. Kubryakova E. Vidy prostranstva teksta i diskursa. [Types of text space and discourse]. *Prostranstvo i vremya: materialy nauchn. konf.* Moscow: MGU. 1997. P. 19. [in Russian].
9. Potapchuk M. Pesennyj diskurs kak kommunikativnyj process. [Song discourse as a communicative process]. *Vestnik Chelyabinskogo gosudarstvennogo un-ta*. 2013. № 2 (293): Filologiya. Iskusstvovedenie. P. 140–143. [in Russian].
10. Raku M. “Pikovaya dama” bratev Chajkovskih: opyt intertekstualnogo analiza. [The Tchaikovsky Brothers “The Queen of Spades”: The Experience of Intertextual Analysis]. *Muzykalnaya akademiya*. 1999. № 2. P. 9–21. [in Russian].