

# Social and Musical Communication

## Past and Present

Alexander Yakoupov

Russian State Specialized Arts Academy

Moscow, Russia

e-mail: rgsai@mail.ru

**Abstract**—In this article the author discovers the connection between the society and music communication. He believes music communication to be an important part of social life. He studies the development of public music taste in the XXth century in Russia. Musicians' involvement into cultural life and education in Russia is analysed. Social-musical management is also studied.

**Keywords**—society; musical communication; music culture; music education; music taste formation; musical perception

### I. INTRODUCTION

This article is dedicated to the historical analysis of the attempts to manage the socio-musical life in Russia (both theoretically and practically). We would also try to outline the most acute problems of the existence of the academic genres of musical art, the problems that have arisen just recently, in the transitional period of the country's cultural development.

### II. HISTORY OF RUSSIAN MUSIC SOCIETIES

The first attempts of this kind were undertaken in the 30s and 40s of the 19th century. It was the time when concert societies were founded in the land's major cities. Thus The Moscow Musical Assembly headed by N. A. Melgunov and I. I. Genishta was founded in 1834. It took upon itself the responsibility of 'guiding the musical taste and education of the Moscow public' (1, 12).

In its turn, the Petersburg Symphonic Society, headed by M. D. Rezvy, publicised the symphonic work of the Western masters. Over 90 concerts were organised during the initial six years of its existence, 174 symphonies, 120 overtures and 15 'solos' were performed. The list of authors who performed included Haydn, Mozart, Cherubini, Schubert, Beethoven, Mendelssohn, etc (see 1, 12). One should bear in mind here that normally the existence of serious music in the 19th century Russia took on a very limited, closed character attitude (the court theatre, salon music, house concerts in the estates of the nobles, etc.).

Such conditions of socio-musical communication, of course, hardly assisted in the formation of the new genres designed for the public forms of musical presentation (symphony, oratorio, instrumental concert, overture), although the time for developing those genres was already ripe in Russia back then. Moreover that musical tendency

then started to take on some social significance. In this respect it is enough to mention the social and creative activity of M. I. Glinka, A. S. Dargomyzhsky and many other Russian composers of that time. So, the musicians joined by the mentioned communities and strove, in spite of the established socio-cultural tradition, to perceptibly widen the field of socio-musical communication. Thus, they were, as a matter of fact, the pioneers in managing the processes of musical communication. Among the activists of this kind we should single out V. F. Odoevsky whose criticism and unceasing care for the introduction of the most advanced forms and methods of education in Russia greatly contributed to the development of the processes of musical communication in the country.

The group called The Concert Society organised by A. F. Lvov with A. N. Serov's participation had the same socio-cultural objective. According to a prominent Russian composer, author and critic, the musicians believed the cultivation 'of the taste for the real beauties of the musical art' to be the major object of their society (1, 13). Another Petersburg centre (the so-called University Concerts) whose activity began on April 4, 1843 proclaimed the promotion of the national music as its chief objective. We have information that the romances by Glinka were performed there, as well as his music to the play Prince Holmsky, the romances and Bolero by Dargomyzhsky, the songs by Varlamov, a symphony by Gussakovsky and other works by the Russian composers.

The first years of the 2nd half of the 19th century - the time when the democratic tendencies became apparent in the social life of Russia - were characterised by a sharp increase in the professional musicians' attention to social communicative processes in music and art in general. V. V. Stasov (see 2) believed that a new stage in the development of the national musical culture was signalled by the foundation of the Russian Musical Society in 1858, the society whose chief object was making serious music accessible to the great masses of the general public.

In the 60s the idea of raising the general culture level of the public became rampant. Sunday schools for the common folk opened throughout the country. In the wake of this movement, on March 18, 1862 first classes were conducted at the Petersburg Free musical school founded by M. A. Balakirev. V. V. Stasov wrote upon the event, 'Now, in the

days of the general joyful excitement, Balakirev, the first in the whole of Russia, decided to help the general musical illiteracy as well and create a similar charitable school for music...' (2, 26 - 27).

It is noteworthy that the accessible epistolary sources (see 16) testify that Balakirev was rather critical of the empirically developed means of musical education, the means which, according to him, were characterised by a narrow technological focus and were not doing much to bring about a real insight into the aesthetic intentions of the creators of music - the composers. So, the founder of the Mighty Bunch intuitively felt the importance of an adequate understanding of this in particular, the very fundamental, the original sphere of the functioning of the processes of musical communication in a society - its importance for the general culture of musical perception.

Alongside the noble objectives that Balakirev and his Mighty Bunch comrades pursued, they were also interested in hearing their work in a real choral and orchestral performance, not just in a household (piano and vocal) variant. Among other things, there was a lot they wanted to check out and see for themselves: they wanted to know whether the instrument capacities were properly used, whether the singers were comfortable with performing this or that passage, whether the music would reach the listeners, whether they would really understand it, etc.

In this respect, much hope was held out for the Free musical school, as a means to assist the development of the processes of musical communication in the society. Besides organising the school, they hoped for the opportunity to put together large performing collectives that would enable them to educate the listeners' tastes and present their own work to the listeners in accordance with, again, their own aesthetic beliefs. Indeed, the founding of the Free musical school was the first step in Russia towards actual planning and regulating the social musical life. Unfortunately, we lack sufficient documentary material related to the results of that work. Anyway, the cornerstone was then laid, the precedent created.

The formation of the more mature public tastes and the emergence of new tendencies in the concert life of the Russian cities acted as the spur for the modernisation of the forms of socio-musical communication, it also required the presence of the appropriate professionals - the specialists in musical education. In the 30s through 50s of the 19th century professional performers in Russia were only educated in the theatrical colleges (in Petersburg and Moscow) and in the Royal choir. The musical education was obviously lagging behind the tendencies of the musical art as a whole and was far from adequate to the actual dynamics of the then processes of musical culture development\*.

The following might support the point. By the end of the 50s and the beginning of the 60s of the 19th century the social development in Russia (both cultural and economic) was greatly influenced by the ideas of national identity. The general guidelines of the composer's creative activity were very much in accordance with the patriotic sentiment of the public. It is reflected in Glinka's *Life for the Tsar*, *Ruslan*

and *Lyudmila*, *Kamarinskaya*, *Prince Holmsky*, etc; in Balakirev's *Overture upon the Three Russian Songs*, in Dargomyzhsky's *Rusalka* (*The Mermaid*), *The Little-Russian Kazachok*, in Cui's *Prisoner of the Mountains*, *Moussorgsky's Scherzo*, and later - *Boris Godunov* and the symphonic overture *Night on the Bald Mountain*, etc. But for a number of reasons (the scarce numbers of professional performers, an abundance of dilettantes, the rigid traditions of salon performance, etc.) the music of the Russian composers was rarely heard from the theatre or concert stage, and even if it was performed, the initiative usually belonged to the musicians themselves.

Discussing the problems that the situation presented in his report to the RMS (the Russian Musical Society) A. G. Rubinstein said, '... in spite of the obvious, quite undisputed musical gifts of our people, all our orchestras are full of foreigners, all the music teachers are foreign. <...> And the social layers that could be expected to present us with a considerable number of people who would be willing to prepare themselves for the orchestral and teaching positions - either lack finances to get a musical education, or <...> have no hope or certainty that, having once dedicated themselves to music, they would be able to constantly pursue that path...' (3, 261). So, in that same year A. G. Rubinstein and the RMS directorate addressed the public and the government with an appeal to support the idea of founding in Russia a higher institution of musical education - a conservatoire.

The analysis of the cultural events, in particular, of the social and the psychological context of the existence of music in Russia in the second half of the 19th century - such an analysis quite decisively proves that the development of the process of musical communication at that time demanded such an instrument as a special kind of educational institution, an institution that could variously influence the development of the musical life, as well as assist in its managing and optimisation.

### III. RUSSIAN CONSERVATORIES CREATION

Founding conservatoires, first in Petersburg, then in Moscow, A.G.Rubinstein and his associates created, as a matter of fact, the necessary conditions for building an integral system that could enable the initial formation and the subsequent self-regulation of the processes of musical communication. With the appearance of the conservatoires, the musical life as a closed communicative chain (A.N. Sokhor) within which various processes take place (from the creation to the different stages of assimilation of the musical values) - the musical life gained the opportunity to include in its orbit the specialists capable of sustaining the functioning of the musical life at a sufficiently high quality level.

Many Russian composers had given considerable attention to the issues related to the spreading of the processes of musical communication into the deeper layers of the Russian society. Thus, in 1892 in one of his critical works, P. I. Tchaikovsky actively advocated the idea that in order to augment the numbers of the true music lovers 'the choir education should be advanced and developed in all the

elementary schools of the land' (4, 373). He was also greatly concerned about the education of the 'educated' public, that, he believed was 'in need of careful guidance' (4, 31).

At the beginning of the 20th century the development of high-quality education for the amateur musicians is closely connected to the names of S. I. Taneyev and his follower B.L. Yavorsky - the people who founded the Moscow public conservatoire. At that time it was a new type of the non-professional musical education institution where a deep and serious approach to understanding music was combined with the generally democratic cultural practices and intentions (see 5).

The 20s - 40s, and especially, the first decade of the century was characterised by an active search for the ways and means of managing the processes of socio-musical communication - a search attempted by many progressive professional musicians. It was at that time that the first and probably the most decisive steps were made towards the formation of the managed system of creating, publicising and assimilating the musical values in the society. Although this very activity and the very epoch of the national culture (musical culture as well) development currently receive quite diverse evaluation - and that situation is quite justified, the intentions, the scope of the ideas and the experience gained at the time may all present interesting material for theoretical analysis.

In 1918, the musical department (MUSO) was founded within the structure of the RSFSR People's Commissariat for Education. During its first years the department was really quite an active and important organ that enjoyed full-time or consultant co-operation of many authoritative specialists. Suffice it to say, that in its activities MUSO was guided by the progressive opinions of such highly cultured musicians as B. V. Asafyev, B. L. Yavorsky, N. Y. Brusova, V. N. Shatskaya, N.I.Grodzenskaya, M. A. Rumer, et al. Using the progressive ideas and principles of V. Odoevsky, S. Miropolsky, A. Maslov, A. Karasev, V. Gutor and other Russian musicians who had advocated the democratic ways of the social existence of music, the workers of MUSO attempted to establish a system based upon the versatile development of the human creative ability. It was thus quite natural that one of the first resolutions of MUSO contained the decision to include the subject 'music' into the curricula of the general secondary schools as 'an element of the general education of children, equal to any other subject' (6, 758).

By that time B. L. Yavorsky had developed his integrative methods of forming an active way of musical perception. The methods were based upon the three interrelated components: 1) performing music in class (choir singing, and participation in the so called 'noise' orchestra of non-pitch percussion instruments); 2) moving to the music (the rhythmic); 3) the direct participation of children in the spontaneous musical creative activity.

Yavorsky, his pupils and followers did not see their primary object in teaching the wider public the performing arts, but rather in introducing the public to the complicated process of the adequate (that is, corresponding to the

author's idea) perception of a musical piece. Thus they contributed to the development of the musical culture and tried 'to bridge the gap between the professional education and the public' (7, 78). The related didactic methods and principles were widely tested at the Moscow and Kiev public conservatoires that represented a more democratic (according to the notions of that time) variant of the public musical school founded by Balakirev.

At that time this particular movement was rather successful. In the second half of the 20s the public conservatoires founded in many provincial centres of RSFSR and other republics were re-organised into state musical education institutions and that played a major part in the cultural development of a number of regions of the country.

The Russian public conservatoires of the beginning of the century are currently of special interest, not only as a model of an enlightening, educational movement, but as an impressive example of the practical realisation of the tasks and objectives of planning and projecting within one of the most sensitive aesthetic spheres - the sphere of the musical art with a long-established spiritual tradition.

The process of education in a public conservatoire consisted of three stages. At the first stage, dedicated to a certain musical phenomena, Yavorsky used such activities as listening to music accompanied by explanatory discussions, choral singing and movement to the music, and conducting. He considered the integrative methods of understanding and teaching music very important. As soon as the appropriate knowledge and skills were accumulated, he proceeded to the second stage - the study of musical harmony. Then the third stage came - the actual musical activity as represented in the choral and instrumental/ensemble performance in class and at concerts. Thus Yavorsky's didactic principle consisted in the simultaneous introduction to the various phases and channels of the processes of musical communication, in the interrelated usage of the means most active in a given respect.

#### IV. THEORETICAL ANALYSIS OF MUSIC IN RUSSIA

From the viewpoint of the integrative approach, it is important to note the attempt by MUSO and its leaders to manage all the processes and 'blocks' (A. Sokhor) that make up the musical culture of a society. The acuteness and complexity of the problems that arose in that respect are best reflected in the theoretical and journalistic works by B. V. Asafyev. He was one of the first professional musicians who really participated in the theoretical analysis and the practical handling of the issues of planning and organising the activity of the social institutions related to the musical art - that is in managing the social musical communication.

At that time Asafyev first publicised a very valuable idea upon the psychological aspect of propagating serious music. He wrote, 'There should be a single intention - not to force music upon anyone, but to persuade through the music itself; not to purely entertain, but to please, bring joy and excitement...' (8, 13). In the articles A Little Upon Musical

Education, The Routine (8) he had laid a theoretical foundation for the principle of musical interest formation, the principle that A. N. Sokhor later termed as 'the method of influence through activity'. Asafyev (as well as Yavorsky) justly noted that it was one of the most effective methods of developing 'the musical thought and receptiveness of the people' (8, 18). We believe that this principle should be given an important place in the theoretical foundations of managing the processes of musical communication.

Asafyev had allotted special and considerable attention to the issues of the methods and the organisation of the school children's learning music. He firmly believed that the principle that the school practice had developed - the principle of learning music should be replaced by the principle of observing the musical phenomena (see 8).

He also actively discussed the importance of the musical folklore for the school curricula. It is noteworthy that his position in this respect was not supported 'by the sentimental appeals to patriotism, to the beauty of the good old folk songs, to the idea of their purely aesthetic importance, but by an actual realisation of the pedagogical necessity of using this particular sphere of the musical art to influence the ear and the imagination - the sphere that really possesses the potential and the spurs to develop in the people that come in contact with it the aesthetic and the musical thought and abilities' (8, 96; all italics by the present author. - A. Y.).

At the same time a very important methodological generalisation was formulated. Asafyev believed that the musical school 'should not by all means shun the highly cultured people away by the cut and dried paragraphs from the musical textbook, by the purely technological aspects of music, since the people's need for music is not at all limited by mastering the standardised technical skills' (8, 134). Though the general idea itself was quite common for the Russian musical pedagogics of the time, the stress that Asafyev makes allows us to say that it was quite an attempt to suggest the method of using the person's own characteristics and peculiarities in forming his interest to music. At the same time Asafyev expressed the idea of the priority of the humanitarian aspect in the musicians' professional education. This keystone principle of developing the aesthetic education is quite as acute and important today, as it used to be at the time that it had been first expressed.

Understanding the pressing necessity of managing the musical life in a manner that would insure the quality improvement of the listeners' interests, Asafyev wrote in 1927, 'It is high time to tackle the problem of bringing up the cultured, understanding listeners, who are presently quite few and upon whose intellectual level the whole progress of our music ultimately depends <...> There is only one way out: through the rational organisation of the centres of listening to music we should proceed to educating the intellectual listener' (8, 131). Speaking on the pre-requisite conditions he noted, 'And then those who are strangers to art but have become art figures under the hypocritical mask of the saviours of the cultural values, and those who are not

alien to real art but who have neglected their free will and are conscientiously prostituting their talents, only when they start feeling ashamed of their evil role and when they surrender their 'achievements' only then could we hope that the real, carefully controlled work for the sake of musical enlightenment would commence' (8, 27 - 28).

We see here that the professional vocabulary of one of the founders of the national musicology legitimately includes such terms as 'control', 'management', 'organisation', and the like. This demonstrates that the principles of the multi-aspect role of the musicologist-critic in the optimisation of all the socio-musical communication processes - the principles formulated in this particular study - are quite practically reasonable.

This is, in short, the complex of problems related to the scope of this particular study that the specialist musicians of the 20s actively tried to resolve. It is necessary to note that that period was generally characterised by the wide use of a great amount of various forms of managing the musical life. But the present study would be quite insufficient unless the various conflicts and discrepancies of the time are given some consideration since those conflicts had a great influence upon the trends and circumstances of the Russian musical culture in the subsequent decades.

Analysing the related works of the period, one cannot but notice an important shift in terminology. The terms like 'musical education' quite familiar to a musician of a democratic background were gradually superseded by the term 'musical propaganda'. There's nothing evil about the very word, of course. It has been long used in accordance with its established meaning. But in this particular case the replacement is deeply significant. It quite obviously stresses the fact that the ideological and political factors came to play the major part in the 'managing and administration' of the musical art.

The methods of getting the musicians involved into the education and propaganda activity were, on the part of the MUSO, increasingly taking on a mandatory character. Later the situation was characteristic of the government organs that replaced MUSO (the Committee on art matters and the Ministry of culture). The heading 'Musical propaganda' was included into the plans and schedules of the numerous different cultural and artistic institutions and establishments. The external (and most important to the powers that be) results of the related activity became invariably reflected in the various reports. For instance, the Soviet composers' meetings and conferences discussed such reports as the proof of the transformation that the musicians' mind and opinions underwent - the musicians were believed to 'be constantly striving to join their individual artistic experience with the unprecedented growth of the public interest to art' (8, 136).

Meanwhile, in the chase for some kind of documentary 'results' the work of musical education was conducted against the actual professional interests. It was especially characteristic of the provinces. On the one hand, on demand of the undeveloped public taste the musicians often had to perform the so-called 'salon' repertoire. On the other hand,

it was not a rare occasion that the administration forced a poorly prepared musician to perform for a large audience.

Asafyev numerously highlighted these negative circumstances. For instance, he wrote in one of his works, 'Having a meagre store of the musical material, the artists came out to educate the people that were only starting to familiarise themselves with the art of sound, and the artists in their turn had no clue as to who they were addressing and what they were addressing them with. Tonnes of schmaltz romance production, piles of 'oh, so sweet' song cheapness and kitsch horrible in its tastelessness were crashed upon the public that was quite unprepared, unable to see whether they were fed something healthy or some undisguised junk' (8, 26-27). In a different fragment, he states with disappointment '... in most of the cases all the concerts for the general public are conducted in the circumstances of most careless performance, which the musicians approach as their cumbersome and painful duty' (8, 14).

We would like to note here that such an attitude - characterised by a lack of interest towards the business of getting the essential properties and meaning of the music across to the listener - is still quite common among some musicians. We believe that it is brought about by a very superficial contact with the musical piece itself, by the lack of the well-established connection with the authors, the performers, the musicologists and critics - the connections that should be taken constant care of at all the stages of the musical education.

We would like to note, nevertheless, that there were some contradictions in the opinions of Asafyev himself - the contradictions that were characteristic of the considered epoch as a whole. Thus, in 1947 he addressed the composers in the following manner, 'The country is teeming with all-embracing impulses and slogans - this is the great triumph of the Soviet democracy! The composers should strive to find such a musical language that will touch the heart of the millions - the language that would permeate every piece - from a popular song to the operas, cantatas and symphonies containing elevated intellectual generalisations. This is what the ideas should be aimed at, as well as the forms that express the ideas' (8, 137). Still, we believe that speaking as the musical oracle of the official ideology, Asafyev could not help to realise the possible negative impact of the opinions he expressed.

#### V. TIME OF FORMALISTIC DEVIATIONS

A year later, on February 10, 1948, the notorious Party resolution was published - the one that accused the most prominent composers of the time of formalistic deviations, blamed them for abandoning the principles of the classical musical art. At first sight, the resolution was based upon the reasonable and understandable intention to make the most prominent musical figures aware of the new educational intentions, to make them search the ways of developing the perceptive abilities of the general public. But, as M. Tarakanov justly notes, 'the resolution that accused Prokofiev, Shostakovich, Myaskovsky, Khachaturian, Muradeli and others of formalism was flagrantly unfair towards their music which was characterised by an

extremely colourful and strong expressiveness and was in fact related to the Russian classical tradition in the closest possible manner' (10, 5).

At the same time, the unbroken continuity of tradition was combined in the work of the cited composers with the use of the modern musical language. As M. Tarakanov notes, 'the revolution in the musical thinking of the 20th century had taken place, it had led to the emergence of totally new principles. Particularly, the dissonance was 'emancipated' and that led to mastering the new means characterised by a higher intensity, expressiveness and sharpness of sound. So, comparing the modern music to the noise of a construction site when all the equipment is in operation the party culture and art ideologist Zhdanov had actually tried to present his own tastes and conservative preferences as the expression of 'the general public opinion'' (11, 5).

It is widely accepted today that the attempts to manage and administrate art by a direct (or even indirect) interference with the artist's creative process are counterproductive. But this viewpoint makes some jump to the conclusion that all management and administration in the sphere of art is evil. So, one has to decide from the very start - what can be managed in the social being of art; which methods could, and should, be regulated; who should be responsible for that regulation. Since these are the issues to be discussed in the next chapter, here we would only like to note the futility of the very attempts to create some kind of a universal method or complex of means designed to regulate the public musical mind and based upon 'propagating' the classical music. Still, this is exactly the approach that dominated the related educational activity of the period just considered.

#### VI. MUSIC PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICE IN THE SOVIET UNION

In the pedagogics and the educational practice of the time, there existed a considerable number of contradictory trends; there was much diversity and conflict. Some of the contradictions and discrepancies still persist. One of the sharpest paradoxes is related to the issue of the 'educational violence' against a personality. The psychologists note though, that some measure of violating the person's free will is probably quite unavoidable in education, no matter how unfortunate this very fact may seem. At the same time, it all depends on the person who uses this small measure of educational pressure and what the object of its use is. Thus when this whole problem is discussed, it is important to focus not upon the fact of the very existence of such pressure in introducing the serious music to a person, but upon the unfortunate inability of some educators to understand the burning necessity of taking the individual interests of the student into consideration, as well as the whole educational continuum, the listener's experience of the student, etc.

Unfortunately, the actual practice of the musical education at the time that we are trying to discuss was mostly characterised by an undifferentiated approach to the listeners who were regarded as a mass, not as some kind of unity consisting of individuals, as something abstract,

average, impersonal. And while, say, Asafyev was opposed to forcing anything upon the listener, it basically related to the 'tactical' aspects of performing before an audience, not to the 'strategic' issues of the musical education as a whole.

It is noteworthy, though, that Asafyev himself saw most of those paradoxical discrepancies. So, once he sadly stated in a public speech, 'There are public musical schools. There are attempts to 'explain' music at concerts. All that should exist, and should be done. The pity is that all that is not properly systematised and organised. There isn't much success. The masses welcome the music, but still remain quite strange to it' (8, 17).

Breaking the logic of our analysis a little bit, we would like to say that at different times, at the various stages of the social development the ways of 'consuming', absorbing music are quite different. The aesthetic outlook of the society changes, the attitude towards the content, the subject matter of music evolves, the approach towards the kinds, the genres, the forms of the musical pieces that exist also develops and transforms - the whole character of the aesthetic perception does not stay the same. In short, the evolution of the musical art itself and the development of the musical life in a society are processes characterised by great diversity and complexity.

Thus, the absence of the theoretically justified means of managing the socio-musical communication, particularly the lack of the practically and theoretically proven ways of stimulating the social interest to serious music - all that invariably prompted the country's musicians to continue the related studies and research.

We would like to note here that in the 70s a concept (and the related methods) of musical education in the general schools developed by D. B. Kabalevsky and his followers gained considerable popularity. Kabalevsky believed, as well as Asafyev had done before, that the main object is not just the specific musical education, but rather, 'the influence upon the whole personality, and most of all, upon the spiritual characteristics of the student through music' (12, 273). Kabalevsky also suggested that music at school should not be regarded as a theoretical subject 'that is learned and should be taught and studied'. We cannot minutely analyse the concept here. We would only like to remark that it somehow separated talking of music from the more specialised related activities aimed at a deeper understanding of the musical language as the major means of significant communication in the spheres of the composer, the performer and the listener (as well as the musicologist - the teacher of music in this particular case). So, this very separation failed to allow the concept to reach the goals that its authors set for it.

Let us get back to the historical analysis of the issue of managing and administrating the socio-musical processes. Up to now, the discussed experience had mostly to do with the direct (sometimes quite spontaneous) initiatives put forward by the musicians themselves. Meanwhile, the search for the effective ways of administrating the social musical life was not only conducted empirically; there has been some major theoretical activity as well.

One might say that the most advanced Russian musicians started to address the problems of the musical art's expansion and evolution quite a long time ago. This whole complex of issues started to take on some systematic theoretical shape in the middle of the 19th century. This process is particularly related to the name of the prominent Russian composer, scholar of music and author A. N. Serov. He distinguished the four areas of the social being of music: 1) the church; 2) the theatre; 3) the concert; 4) the household (13, 165). Many Russian composers, performers, critics and pedagogues also considered the problems of music's social existence. Among them - such a prominent figure of the Russian culture as V.V. Stasov, the great composer P. I. Tchaikovsky and others.

The end of the 19th century was the time when the first theoretical studies upon musical perception and the development of the musical thought appeared in Russia. They were, at first, mostly empirical and could not be regarded as fundamental theoretical works. At the same time, some of those works might still be considered of interest today, for instance, the ideas of the composer and theorist P. P. Sokalsky; expressing some opinions upon the musical folklore he tried to discuss the psychological, physiological and sociological aspects of its formation (14).

We should also remark here that soon Asafyev specified the issues that constituted the field of musical sociology as the new area of musicology that studied the problems of the social being of music (see 15). It is interesting that among the primary theoretical problems that he noted as far back as 1924 was the problem of the dependence of the composer's creativity upon his socio-musical environment that, as Asafyev believed, was characterised by its own laws, 'intonation', 'rhythm' (16).

The works by A. V. Lunacharsky also seem quite interesting today, although they are, of course, very political and ideological. Indeed, being no professional musician he gave considerable attention to the sociology of music, though he obviously regarded the nature of the latter from a purely materialistic viewpoint. Thus, analysing the book *The Sociological and Rational Bases of Music* by M. Weber he blames the author for insufficient attention to the physical aspects of music and its physiological determinants, he insisted on the analysis of the psycho-physiological nature of musical meaning from the viewpoint of the social phenomena (9, 175).

Today his polemic articles on the studies by M. Weber, R. Gruber who advocated the socially elitist direction in music seem to be of considerable interest for we can now quite calmly appreciate their methodology, the forecasts that made, on the one hand, and his critical method - on the other.

The subsequent development of the musical life quite obviously called for a change from the sporadic empirical studies upon the administration of the social musical life to the establishment of a theory of the relationship of the society and the music - that is, musical sociology. The initial stage of its development in the 30s and the 40s was quite interesting but it was soon cut short for the sociology as a whole was proclaimed to be just a 'pseudo-theory'. So, by

the middle of the century most of the problems that had been previously considered within musical sociology came to be regarded as various aspects of musicology.

Then, from the beginning of the 60s a process of revival and restoration of the unjustly neglected theory began. The sociology of music gradually came to be regarded as an independent discipline. This period was signalled in 1967 by A. N. Sokhor's article *Developing the Sociological Science*. In the article the author successfully demonstrated the necessity of a detailed study of the actual musical culture level of the various social groups, of a thorough research of the problems of the musical art existence and of the social musical life.

The next stage in the development of the national sociology of music was signalled in 1972 by the appearance of V. S. Zuckerman's book *The Music and the Listener* (18). That was, as a matter of fact, the first fundamental work on the related subjects. The author analyses the musical interests, preferences and tastes of the different groups of the population in the industrial Urals. The analysis is based upon the results of a significant sociological research. The book's value is contained in the fact that it combines diverse and interesting empirical material with important theoretical generalisations.

Along with introducing into the theory much new practical material, Zuckerman analyses some basic notions, such as the musical culture of the society, the musical needs. He also attempts to disclose the ways of formation of the public musical culture. He offers the following definition of the category 'musical culture'; he believes it to be 'a part of the general aesthetic culture of a given society at a particular moment of its historical development. The musical culture is a complex of the musical art values accumulated by the society, in the activity of the individuals and institutions related to the production, preservation and distribution of these values' (18, 67).

In 1975 A. N. Sokhor developed a mature foundation of the sociology of music, its subjects, basic categories and fundamentals. The monograph *Sociology and Musical Culture* is in fact a detailed study in the sociology of music that contains an elaborate overview and the set of notions of the basic problems considered within the related theory. The major tasks of the theory are discussed, as well as its structure and methods, the social functions of music as a kind of art are defined - the kind that is very specific both in the character of the communicative links that connect it to the real and the imaginary world of the Human, and in the genesis of the very processes that take place within the socio-musical communication.

Studying the phenomenological essence of the musical culture, Sokhor succeeded, on the one hand, in separating the notions of 'music' and 'musical culture' (that had previously been quite often confused); on the other hand - he disclosed the integrative essence of the notions. According to the definition that he used the musical culture was a complex 'unity of music and its social functioning' (232, 84). This unity is represented as a multi-component system that includes the musical values, all the activity

related to their creation, preservation and distribution; all the individuals involved in that activity, as well as all the organisations and social institutions, all the instruments, equipment and appliances that are used in the course of the cited activity (see 19, 84 - 85).

Considering the musical culture from the philosophical viewpoint Sokhor, as well as M. S. Kagan (20), stresses its dual, at once spiritual and material, nature. At the same time, it does not prevent him from focusing upon the basic problems of the spiritual content of music and of the noble humanitarian role of the musical culture - this kind of focus helps to see their true nature.

Considering the basic components of the musical culture, Sokhor singled out the four fundamental 'blocks': 1) creation; 2) performance; 3) distribution; and 4) the perception of music. Besides, two additional components are mentioned: 1) the musicology, or musical theory and 2) the management or administration. He believed that all the mentioned blocks together constitute a joint, integral mechanism and the functioning of every block is syncretically connected with all the other blocks.

Upon the problems of managing and administrating the musical art, Sokhor wrote, 'The administration or managing is the 'block' that includes the government and public institutions and organisations that should co-ordinate and direct the functioning of all the other 'blocks', forecast and plan their activity to a degree, enable the musical culture to fulfil its social functions through the co-operation and interrelation with the other areas of the society's spiritual culture. Management and administration (through some outside influence, or based upon some self-governing intentions) is necessary for normal functioning of any kind of musical culture (or any system in general). The role and the responsibility of the administration is especially high in <...> the society where it can (and should) make use of the scientific methods of management, utilising the knowledge of the general laws of the cultural development and basing its course upon the special theory of the musical life of a society - the musical sociology' (19, 113).

Unfortunately Sokhor has not elaborately researched the object and the subject aspects of administrating as a theoretical problem. But since in the national musical theory, it was the first attempt to fundamentally research the sociological issues, we deem it quite possible to accept the lapidary character of the material presentation as well as the relative quality of some of the expressed opinions and conclusions.

One of the valuable aspects in Sokhor's book is the attempt to consider the interrelation between the aesthetic progress and the methods of management. For instance, he noted a very important aspect, 'The real aesthetic progress that implies the true preservation and development of traditional national cultures does not proceed on its own, quite independently' (19, 127). The theorist justly believes that proper conditions (political and material) are prerequisite for the successful progress. Only when these proper conditions are in place some of the acute problems can be resolved - the preparation of the national specialists,

the establishment of the mass audience, the growth of interest towards the ethnic culture of the various regions of Russia and the world, the increase of those cultures' prestige, etc.

Studying the problems of the musical perception Sokhor came to a very important conclusion that the very phenomenon (and consequently - the term) bears a much wider meaning and cannot be reduced to the purely psychological treatment of the process. Considering the musical reflection of a given object of perception, he points out the important role of the abstract thinking and fantasy, it is due to them 'that [the phenomenon] takes on some properties of a creative process (although, generally, the activity should be termed as recreating or reproductive, not as an independent productive activity)' (19, 129).

Discussing the forms of musical activity existing in the society, Sokhor differentiates them into three groups. The first includes the passive forms. He describes it as 'listening to functional music as a kind of background, the music in a motion picture, a theatre performance; listening to music in a live concert, at home, at a friend's party, at a country outing, while listening to concerts and watching plays'. The second group includes the semi-active forms: reading books and articles on music; collecting various kinds of records, participating in a discussion club, etc. Finally, the third group includes the active forms: like, say, a solo performance at home, participating in some kind of an amateur collective, as well as arranging music, improvisation, etc.

The typology suggested by the author does not seem quite exhaustive. The traditional and innovation activity forms of the primary component of the process of social musical communication – the composer, the author of the musical piece - are absent from the typology, whereas it is the composer who is the addresser of the musical message (according to the general theory of communication). The message that the composer produces then starts to circulate within the various spheres and channels of the social musical communication. The very forms that the author considers are chosen quite at random, whereas the basic forms of the musical information transformation (encoding and decoding) are neglected, - the forms that, as we tried to demonstrate in the previous chapters, constitute the deeper essence, the very meaningful aspect of the processes of musical communication.

At the same time, we believe Sokhor's attempt to lay the methodological foundation for forming an individual's musical interests to be quite significant. He singles out the following methods: 1) rationalisation (the rational explanation of the emotional and gnosiological importance of music); 2) using the specific characteristics of the object; 3) using the individual and psychological properties of the subject (inducing one aspect of the interest through another); 4) influence through the environment/milieu; 5) influence through activity.

The classification that Sokhor suggested for the different types of public audiences is still of considerable interest, too. He classifies the audiences in the following

manner: the general (the whole) audience, the audience of an event, the audience of a series of events, the audience of the pieces, the audience of a composer, the audience of a performer, the audience of the genre, the audience of a particular institution, the audience of the whole socio-musical establishment. Still, just one of the aspects of the serious music audience differentiation is taken into consideration here. Possibly, a study of the different aspects (to be considered later) is necessary.

From the viewpoint of the present study, one chapter of Sokhor's work seems particularly important. It is the chapter that considers the musical life as a global system of socio-musical communication. It is noteworthy that the author here goes beyond the routine understanding of communication as a means of some kind of electronic connection and the technology of information interchange.

Sokhor justly regards the whole musical life of a society as a closed communicative chain, within which 'the various elements emerging at the creative stage dynamically circulate - the elements that later go through the other stages and thus undergo certain transformations under the influence of the various parts of the chain' (19, 176).

Another work that is of undisputed interest is the book *The Performing Musician and the Audience*. The book theoretically discusses the important sociological issues of the modern concert practice as an integral part of the musical life. The work is based upon actual sociological studies' materials; new tendencies in the musical life of the West are revealed (see 21).

Most of the previous analysis in the present study proves the idea first suggested in the Introduction that the sociology of music failed to resolve the basic problem that it addressed. It was the problem of finding the foundations for the means and ways of intensifying the musical life. The musical sociology could not resolve the problem even theoretically for it initially abstracted itself from the traditional interests of musicology, focused upon the issues of the musical language meaningfulness, on the role of the formative structures of a musical piece, on the specific properties of the composer's, the performer's and the listener's creativity, on the specific characteristics of the different kinds of musical activity, etc. Thus, one of the fundamental principles of the present study is justified - the principle that the research of the musical communication processes is only possible within an integral, systematic approach, and the elaboration of this kind of approach should become one of the primary tasks of theoretical musicology, one of the basic objects of its interest.

Finishing the chapter we would like to briefly analyse some of the problems of the current musical life - those that are closest related to this present study. We would attempt to consider them in the context of the existing kinds of approach and evaluation of the present socio-cultural situation as a whole.

At first we deem it important to touch upon the issue of the relationship between the notions 'culture' and 'social communication'. At a glance, the relation between them

does not seem to be quite obvious. However, A. Moles, for instance, believes that culture is even 'originated through the means of mass communication'; among those means he singles out two components 'education (upbringing) and inter-personal relationship' (22, 84; all italics by the present author - A. Y.).

In a different passage the same author of the well-known monograph *Cultural Socio-dynamics* (22) explains, 'The term culture encompasses a complex of intellectual elements that a human or a group possesses, a complex characterised by a certain stability that is related to an entity that can be called 'the world memory' or the social memory - the memory materialised in libraries, monuments, languages' (22, 83).

The definitions contain certain important points. If the bases of the musical culture (understood both intellectually and emotionally) are initially related to the means of the social musical communication, then the productiveness of those bases greatly depends on the educational factors, that, as Moles puts it, harmonise in the human mind the whole complex of the intellectual elements significant to the process of musical perception. Therefore, there come forth certain organisational requirements to the process of musical education and to the social inter-personal relationships that arise in connection with serious music. This is one of the major issues related to the situation that exists in our general education practice, and, consequently, in our whole culture.

It is interesting that at the same time that Moles conducted his research, attempts were made to consider the notion of the aesthetic culture in the aspect of managing its development. Thus, the Bulgarian sociologist Zh. Zh. Bychkova includes management into the very structure of the social aesthetic culture. The system of that culture, according to her, consists of the five integrated components (see 23, 11):

- the aesthetic creative activity;
- the joint aesthetic value;
- the means of distributing aesthetic values;
- the aesthetic perception;
- the system of management.

According to the author, the first four components constitute the object of management, and the last component - the subject (23, 11).

We note here that many foreign studies dedicated to the issue of the relationship between the culture and the processes of the musical communication in a society (particularly the studies made by the Eastern European specialists under the influence of the Soviet theorists) were long dominated by the class approach that quite neglected the individual psychological characteristics, the human's unique inner world, the personality's spiritual microcosm - all these immensely important to the understanding of the cultural essence of music (23, 40).

A stunning example of this approach is a work of the Hungarian musical sociologist Janosc Moroty in which the perception of the musical values is polarised depending on the class affiliation of the listener and the issue of the general humanitarian values is completely neglected (see 24).

We have to note, though, that in the more recent works the theorists of the same orientation remark that, 'today the culture <...> is confronted with the task of searching the new approaches that would intensify its development' (25, 1). This task is then considered as the one that 'accounts for the importance of the critical analysis of the previous experience and of providing the planning with new objectives that constitute the foundation for the scientific character and the methodological integrity of that planning' (25, 1).

But the theorists hardly ever go beyond those general formulations. They currently note only that 'the theoretically justified management of the aesthetic culture is understood as the elaboration of the measures to create the favourable conditions for the aesthetic activity and as the improvement of the processes that bring the public in contact with art' (25, 1; all italics by the present author. - A. Y.). Evidently, they leave the more specific characterisation of the conditions and the optimisation of the processes to the appropriate specialists, that is, (in our case) to the musicians themselves.

Now, bearing in mind the above considerations, we would like to get back to the social being of music in the current national practice. The popularity of the musical art, in spite of all the crises of the various aspects of the Russian social life, still dominates, as compared to the other kinds of aesthetic creativity. Thus, according to the sociological studies, regularly conducted since the 60s, the music definitely occupies one of the leading positions amongst the other arts. At the same time the studies demonstrate that it is impossible to precisely evaluate the quality of the listeners' interests.

It is common knowledge that the entertainment music proves to be the most popular. This trivial 'discovery' also demonstrates that among this wide swathe of the public tastes, the least aesthetically valuable ones turn out to be the most rampant.

Research proves, by the way, that the same situation is quite characteristic of the existence of many other kinds of art. Thus, G.Dadamyán and D. Dondurei analysed the results of the sociological research that compared the works of art that had received positive validation from the competent specialists and those that were widely popular (films, plays, books were compared). The acclaim of the general public, unfortunately, was directed towards the least valuable of the considered works (see 26).

This circumstance has led the researchers to at least two conclusions. First, that the theoretical thought 'has encountered some fundamental, largely unexplored and even insufficiently described phenomena related to the specific character of the modern time' (26, 31). Second, that the democratisation of the many spheres of the spiritual and

aesthetic life does not at all induce the spontaneous growth of the millions' attention to the established (but previously available to just a few people) paragons and norms of the cultural behaviour (ibid.).

Therefore, one cannot expect that the well-established trends of the personal aesthetic development would automatically take on the general significance that the favourable socio-cultural conditions would permit. In this respect, it was noted that 'the wide masses' involvement into the processes of the cultural consumption has led to the results that, from the viewpoint of the basic principles of the enlightenment ideology, proved to be quite unexpected' (26, 31).

Here lies one of the major contradictions of the academical musical genres' functioning nowadays. The youth's musical world is sharply divided into two very contradictory areas 'the serious' and 'the light' music. It is characteristic that a poll conducted among the symphony and chamber concert-goers proved that only 10.6% of them were interested in the pop music. On the other hand, only 2.5% of pop music lovers go to symphony concerts (18, 109 - 110).

There is another problem closely related to the one just mentioned. The entertainment music boom has long been accompanied by the listeners' neglect not only of the older classical music, but of the modern serious music as well.

And it is this same period, during which the emotional creativity of the century starts to intensively cultivate the subtlety of the aesthetic understanding of the Man's inner world, of his relationship with reality. In other words the means of self expression, the musical language has become more complicated. At the same time, the potential mass listener remains beleaguered by the entertainment music. Therefore, a gap appeared between the modern musical life's achievements and the degree to which the mass listener is prepared to perceive and understand the present-day music.

To found the methodological approaches to bridging the gap, the culture theorists of today try to define the essence of the musical culture through the subjective, the personal aspect. Within this tendency and developing A. F. Losev's ideas, R. A. Telcharova introduces and justifies (using the results of a sociological research conducted within a musical pedagogics educational institution) the notion 'the musical aesthesis of a person'. In her opinion, this term is suitable for defining 'the inter-subjective links that enable the introduction of the criterion of the personal insight into the world of music' (27, 48).

The author suggests an original understanding of the hierarchy of the musical aesthesis and the appropriate acts of the mind that enable insight into the musical world. The first stage of the musical aesthetic attitude is the uncertain environment of the subjective musical impressions and opinions. The second is characterised by the reduction of the latter into the field of the musical mind. The third stage brings in a new quality when the musical eidos of the piece is singled out. The fourth stage is the most productive

(creative). Then 'the return to the personal «I» takes place to overcome the subjective rigidity and to define, for oneself and for the others, the 'musical truth' with all its eidetic strictness and personal feeling' (27, 38; italics by the present author - A. Y.).

The regularities of ascending the stages of the cited hierarchy should be taken into consideration in studying the problems of the musical social existence. These regularities are also important from the viewpoint of the subjective and the objective conditions of optimising the communicative processes that define the social life of music (the issues have been considered in the previous chapters).

We have to note here that the same problems are currently of considerable interest for the Western theorists as well. Thus, in one of his recent books *Music and Culture* (1990) the English musicologist N. Cook suggests the reason why some modern music is unacceptable for most listeners, he believes it is because the musical theory focuses too much attention on the study of the past traditions as the preliminary condition for understanding the music itself. He advocates the just opinion that listening to music for the theoretical research purposes and listening to music for aesthetic pleasure are quite different things. He finishes the chapter *Composition and Culture* by accepting the necessity to distinguish between the traditional musicological and the truly scientific explanation of the musical phenomenon.

We have to give the national musicology its due - thanks to its close and diverse relationship with the related fields of knowledge (the aesthetics, psychology, the cultural theory) - in the recent years it has been evolving exactly in the same direction. The conceptual opinions contained in the fundamental works by the national theorists, opinions related to the nature of music as a social phenomenon, present rich material for considering the conditions for the adequate social existence of music, for discussing the essence of the related processes of musical communication.

It is known that the technical revolution, along with its diverse progressive influence, also has a destructive effect upon the traditional forms of musical life, as well as the general condition of the man's spiritual world. When the modern technical means of music distribution entered every home, the proportion of listening as the basic form of satisfying the musical needs greatly increased.

This circumstance seemed to be quite welcome at first. Later, it turned out that the increase in household listening was accompanied by a fall in the actual musical activity itself. Thus, a study by Y. Y. Bourlina finds that 92% of the questioned young people listen to music on the radio, television, etc - and prefer that form of listening to all the other ones. Y. N. Bogatyreva marks the dual character of the technical/electronic distribution of music. On the one hand, there are unlimited opportunities for people to come in contact with it, for its impact on the masses, for the increase of its importance in everyday life, on the other hand - there is a certain devaluation of music going on that results from its becoming quite a household item (28, 125). The existence of these contradictions is demonstrated by the fact that the interest to visiting concerts and to taking part in

amateur musical activity has recently perceptibly decreased in Russia.

The development most harmful for the musical culture is contained in the fact that as the result of an unchecked proliferation of the technical acoustic means a global tonal environment emerged, an environment that is dominated by the same entertainment music of considerably low aesthetic value. Unfortunately, it is this environment that today predetermines the musical tastes of the vast majority of the population.

A number of analysts quite justly believe that the social life of the musical piece that has been put through the electronic means of communication is perceptibly shortened, consequently, the piece is devalued and vanishes from active use much faster. How do we account for that?

By the present day the world has accumulated a colossal amount of the musical aesthetic values. Their availability through the electronic sound reproduction means and the natural human orientation towards 'discovering' everything new, together with the burning free time deficit quite obviously present the modern potential listener with 'a single contact' syndrome in relation to the musical piece. After, so to speak, a 'lounge' variant of perceiving a musical piece, in the circumstances quite obviously unpoetic, the listener might get an illusory impression of 'knowing all' about the piece, even though he may realise the inadequacy of such perception of music as compared to a concert performance.

The recent decrease in the number of musical school students aggravates the situation. Several theorists note the general fall of the 'consumers' initiative' in relation to serious music. One of the ensuing results is, for instance, the augmenting rate of the national performers', composers' and music teachers' emigration.

Probably one of the most serious difficulties in organising the musical life in the newer Russian cities is the absence of any established traditions that play a major part in developing and sustaining, within the provinces, of the level of musical culture attained by the nation. As a rule, the population of the new cities is made up and grows due to the influx of the former countryside population whose listening experience is smaller than that of a city dweller. Still the infrastructure of a new city often lacks exactly those elements that provide for the publicising of the academical music genres (choral, opera, symphony and chamber music).

From the managerial point of view, the most burning problem of purposeful organisation of the musical life is the lack of co-ordination between the institutions of musical culture. The philharmonic societies, conservatoires, the musical colleges and schools, the musical societies and other social institutions of the musical art often function without having a proper idea of each other's activities. Such a situation leads to a general lack of balance in the musical life as a whole.

In addition to everything that has been said we would like to note that today the noble art of music, as well as the culture in general, is increasingly involved into the spheres

where the economic laws reign. In their activity, the musicians increasingly have to come in contact with such notions as the production costs, income, profit, subsidy, the volume of the potential and the realised demand.

The economic factors become an important criterion in discussing the possible future ontological status of a new musical piece. In a word, the unusual requirements that the economic laws dictate influence the social functioning of the processes of musical communication related to the content of the musical art and its existence in the society.

The cited problems can no longer be resolved by the empirical method of trial and error. The objective reality of the described situation quite obviously suggests that the problems of management in all the spheres of social life, including the art, should receive much more attention and consideration.

## VII. CONCLUSION

Thus the search for the theoretically well-grounded methods of management in the musical sphere, for more effective ways of organising the diverse processes of musical communication that can be termed as the circulation system for the very blood of the social musical life - this kind of search is currently taking on an ever-increasing, unprecedented importance.

## REFERENCES

- [1] NATANSON, V. A. Before the Opening of the Moscow Conservatoire: The Introduction // The Moscow Conservatoire: 100 Years: 1866 - 1966. - M., 1966. - P. 11 - 32.
- [2] STASOV, V. V. Articles on Music. - M., 1978.
- [3] BARENBEUM L. A., A. G. Rubinstein. - L., 1957.
- [4] CHAIKOVSKI, P. I. The Critical Articles. - M., 1953.
- [5] KORABELNIKOVA, L. S. S. I. Taneyev in the Moscow Public Conservatoire: from the History of the Russian Musical education. - M., 1974.
- [6] The Musical Education / Aliev, Y. B. // The Musical Encyclopaedia: In 5 Vols. - M., 1976. - V. 3.
- [7] SATS, I. Yavorsky in the Moscow Public Conservatoire // B. Yavorsky. Articles. Memoirs. Correspondence. - M., 1972. - V. 1. - P. 77 - 98.
- [8] ASAFYEV, B. The Selected Articles on Musical Enlightenment and Education. - The 2nd ed. - L., - 1973.
- [9] LUNACHARSKY, A. On the Sociological Method in the Theory and History of Music (the book on music by M. Weber) // In the World of Music: Articles and Speeches. - M., 1971. - P. 158 - 176.
- [10] TEVOSIAN, A. The Sociological Aspects of the Cultural and Historical Reconstruction in Musicology // The Issues of Musical Sociology. - M., 1990. - P. 100 - 119.
- [11] TARAKANOV, M. Y. The Soviet Music of Yesterday and Today: A New Glance at the History and the Current Problems / Novations in Life, Science, Technology. - The 'Aesthetics' Series. - M., 1989. - Issue 5.
- [12] KAGAN, M. S. Aesthetic Activity As an Information System // Iskusstvo Kino (The Art of Cinema). - 1975. - #12. - P. 99 - 121.
- [13] SEROV, A. N. Music: The Overview of the Current Situation of the Musical Art in Russia and Abroad // Selected Articles. - M., 1957. - V. 2. - P. 159-166.
- [14] SOKALSKY, P. P. The Russian Folk Music, the Great Russian and the Little Russian in Its Melodic and Rhythmical Construction and Its Differences from the Modern Harmonic Music. - Kharkov, 1888.

- [15] ASAFYEV, B. V. On the Short-term Objectives of the Sociology of Music: The Preface // Moser, G. The Music of the Medieval City. - Translated from German., ed. by I. Glebov. - L., 1927. - P. 3 - 10.
- [16] GLEBOV, I. (Asafyev, B.) The Theory of the Musical Historical Process As the Basis of the Musical Historical Knowledge // The Objects and Methods of Art Studies. - Petrograd., 1924. - S. 63 - 80.
- [17] ZUCKERMAN, V. S. The Music and the Listener. - M., 1972.
- [18] SOKHOR, A. N. The Sociology and Musical Culture. - M., 1975.
- [19] KAGAN, M. The Aesthetic Culture As a System // The Issues of Musical Sociology. - M., 1980. - P. 76 - 97.
- [20] KAPUSTIN, Y. V. The Performing Musician and the Audience. - L., 1985.
- [21] MOLES, A. The Socio-dynamics of Culture. - Translated from French. - M., 1973.
- [22] BUTSKOY, A. K. The Structure of a Musical Piece. - L.; M., 1948.
- [23] MOROTHY, Janos. English Music and the bourgeois, Music and the proletariat / Translated from Hungarian. - Budapest, 1974.
- [24] ZHIGZHIDZHABYN, B. The Prospects of Culture Development in the People's Republic of Mongolia: The Programme and Object Approach: The Abstract of the Kandidat Dissertation in Philosophy. - L., 1991.
- [25] DADAMYAN, G. G., DONDUREI, D. B. The Social Functions of Art: Awaiting the New Concepts // The Social Function of Art and Its Kinds. - M., - 1980. - P. 25 - 37.
- [26] TELCHAROVA, R. A. The Musical Culture of an Individual as the Subject of Philosophical Analysis: The Abstract of the Doctorate Research in Philosophy. - M., 1992.
- [27] 3BOGATYREVA, Y. N., TROITSKY, A. K., NIKITINA, K. I. The Music and the Listener // The Human in the World of Aesthetic Culture. - M., 1982. - p. 117 - 142.