

UDC 78.072“20”
ID ORCID 0000-0002-7256-4214
DOI 10.5281/1993-6400-2020-2-70-76

Nikolayevska Yu.

*Kharkiv I. P. Kotlyarevsky National
University of Arts*

NEW DIMENSIONS OF MUSICOLOGY OF THE 21ST CENTURY: THE EXPERIENCE OF MODELLING THE INTERPRETATIVE THEORY OF MUSICAL COMMUNICATION

Nikolayevska Yu. New dimensions of musicology of the 21st century: the experience of modelling the interpretative theory of musical communication. The study presents an interpretive theory of musical communication in the context of musicology of the last third of the XX – early XXI centuries. Its actualization in the last third of the 20th – the beginning of the 21st centuries is connected with the dominance in the musical communication system of the subject of creativity, designated as the image of the human who interprets – Homo Interpretatus.

Definition provided and marked Homo Interpretatus a central element of the system of the description of a new communicative paradigm – interpretology, which is based on the synthesis of cognitive science and musicology and is a scientific method that structures a new space of communication. It is stated that the presence of the interpretative component specifies the content of the basic categories: the personality who interprets; the interpretive awareness; the interpretive mind; the interpretive thinking. Suggested the concept of “the communicative strategy” (subordinate to the Homo Interpretatus) and its typology is given (the composing, the performing, the listening, the interpreting).

Keywords: *interpretology, interpretive theory of musical communication, musicology of the 21st century, communicative strategy, Homo Interpretatus.*

Ніколаєвська Ю. В. Нові виміри музикознавства XXI століття: досвід моделювання інтерпретативної теорії музичної комунікації. У дослідженні представлено інтерпретативну теорію музичної комунікації в контексті музикознавства останньої третини XX — початку XXI століття. Її актуалізація пов'язана з домінуванням у системі музичної комунікації суб'єкта творчості, позначеного як *Homo Interpretatus* (людина, що інтерпретує). Надамо дефініцію та позначено *Homo Interpretatus*

*центральним елементом системи опису нової комунікативної парадигми — інтерпретології, що базується на синтезі когнітивістики й музикознавства та є науковим методом, що структурує новий простір комунікації. Указано, що наявність інтерпретативного компонента специфікує зміст таких базових категорій, як: особистість, що інтерпретує; інтерпретувальна свідомість; інтерпретувальний розум; інтерпретувальне мислення. Запропоновано поняття «комунікативна стратегія» (супідрядне *Homo Interpretatus*), та надано його типологію (композиторська, виконавська, слухацька, інтерпретаторська).*

Ключові слова: *інтерпретологія, інтерпретативна теорія музичної комунікації, музикознавство XXI століття, комунікативна стратегія, Homo Interpretatus.*

Николаевская Ю. В. Новые измерения музыковедения XXI века: опыт моделирования интерпретативной теории музыкальной коммуникации. В исследовании представлена интерпретативная теория музыкальной коммуникации в контексте музыковедения последней трети XX — начала XXI века. Ее актуализация связана с доминированием в системе музыкальной коммуникации субъекта творчества, обозначенного как *Homo Interpretatus* (Человек Интерпретирующий). Предложена дефиниция, и *Homo Interpretatus* обозначен как центральный элемент системы описания новой коммуникативной парадигмы — интерпретологии, которая базируется на синтезе когнитивистики и музыковедения и является научным методом, структурирующим новое пространство коммуникации. Указано, что наличие интерпретативной компоненты специфицирует содержание таких базовых категорий, как: интерпретирующая личность; интерпретирующее сознание; интерпретирующий разум; интерпретирующее мышление. Сформулировано определение понятия «коммуникативная стратегия» (соподчиненное *Homo Interpretatus*), и представлена его типология (композиторская, исполнительская, слушательская, интерпретаторская).

Ключевые слова: *интерпретологія, інтерпретативна теорія музичної комунікації, музикознавство XXI століття, комунікативна стратегія, Homo Interpretatus.*

Problem statement and analysis of recent publications. In the 21st century, in connection with the transformation of artistic processes, new forms are born; there are previously unknown types of communication, fundamentally new in their content – the art of *proto-*. This is largely due to the problem of personal identity faced by the self-awareness of the modern human. The art practice of the Modern time poses many complex questions to the researcher: about new ways of forming and birth of specific artistic language systems, about reducing the distance between the author and the addressee of the art message, about “re-adjusting” the perceiving awareness, and in general – about the criteria and limits of art

Рецензент статті: Козак О. І., доктор мистецтвознавства, професор, Харківський національний університет мистецтв імені І. П. Котляревського

Стаття надійшла до редакції 31.01.2020

itself, which is in the situation of the Modern time or non-classics.

The topic of the present study is stipulated by the overriding need for an interpretative theory of music communication. Its actualization in the last third of the 20th – the beginning of the 21st centuries is connected with the dominance in the musical communication system of the *subject* of creativity, designated as *the image of the human who interprets* – **Homo Interpretatus**. Thus, the known ideas of the “open composition” (U. Eco [25]) and of the “multiplicity of interpretation”, “rhizome”, which generates models (J. Deleuze [8]), “death of the author” (R. Barth [3]), and “the end of the composer’s time” (V. Martynov [12]) are supplemented by the concepts of contonation (I. Matsievsky [13]), metanoia (Anke Hennig [26]) – the key settings of the creativity of composers, performers and listeners, the final “builders” of invariant form, declared in a contour way.

The terminological changes recorded in the research of the 2000s are related to the process of transformation of communicative processes, and this applies to both the perception of art and the artistic (more broadly – creative) self-expression. We can state that the basic principle of the modern methodology of humanitarian knowledge is interpretativeness (let us remember the emergence of “interpretive literary criticism”, interpretative translation theory, interpretative theory of culture, etc.). The 21st century, indeed, is the era of the triumph of interpretive thinking (I. Dobritsyna [10]), “interpretationism in the broadest sense” (or interpretive approach, according to V. Demyankov [9, p. 309]).

Analysis of recent publications on the topic.

All of the above said led to the development of several scientific directions in the musical science in the late 20th and early 21st century, which are operating at the intersection of different humanities: from philosophical anthropology and culturology to the sociology of communication and musicology. Thus, one of the most powerful theories in the depths of musicology is the theory of musical interpretation. In the foreign musicology, its development is associated with the research of Jean-Jacques Nattiez [30], who developed a conditional three-dimensional concept of the composition (creation, performance, perception); T. Adorno, who wrote about the need for “interpretive analysis” [2], Gisèle Brelet, who saw the task of the performer in finding harmony between the “essence of the composition” and the original “contribution of its implementation” [27]; H. Danuser, who actualized the performative line of research, in the light of which there appears a historical reconstruction, traditional realization and the actualizing type of performance [28]; Hans-Joachim Hinrichsen [29], who emphasizes the rethinking of the phenom-

enon of musical interpretation, calling research a “sub-discipline” of musicology (Die Interpretationsforschung – German, Performance Studies – in Anglo-American science), which it became for the last 20 years and rejoicing that musicology transcends the boundaries of pure text analysis (Textanalyse) or historiography (Kompositionshistoriographie).

In the Soviet musicology, the theory of interpretation began to take shape in the 70s of the 20th century (N. Korykhalova “Interpretation of Music”, 1979 [11]). In Ukraine, the theory of interpretation was thoroughly developed by V. Moskalenko in his doctoral dissertation (“Creative aspect of musical interpretation”, 1994 [18]) and continued in the topics of scientific conferences of the Ukrainian Society of Music Analysis organized by him (since 2000). V. Moskalenko’s “Lectures on Musical Interpretation” (2012) contain a system of description of the performance process and development of categories, among which the basic ones are “interpretation-interpreting”; “interpretation version”, types of interpretations, “style of musical creativity”, “interpretive direction of creative activity” [17].

As for today, within the theory of interpretation, a well-developed conceptual system has been developed, and it covers not only the actual “interpretation”, but also related musicological dimensions: “hyper-interpretation” (A. Usmanova [20]), “re-interpretation” (P. Volkova [5]); the concept of musicological interpretation (O. Samoilenko [19]); the theory of reflexive awareness in the musical creativity of L. Shapovalova ([24]), in which the categories “I-awareness”, “reflection”, “I-Other”, “synergy”, “God-cognition”, and “spiritual communication” are mastered; the ideas of *the performance ontology* by V. Medushevsky, which have been set out in separate articles [15], reports at conferences and in the manual “*Spiritual analysis of music*” [14]. The return to ontology actualizes the problem of a human, the inter-modality of his/her perception and thinking, and led to the search for integrative methodologies within musicology and the formation of *interpretology as a science of interpretation in musical creativity*. It records the change in the entire vertical of spiritual cognition of musical creativity, which actualizes the synergistic concept of music and the methodology of a reflexive approach to its study.

The modern interpretology is a set of scientific concepts (devoted to the study of performance style as a typological category, genre, creative thinking, etc.) and schools or, according to L. Shapovalova, “integrative discipline” [22] and the direction of “cognitive musicology” [21; 23]. The paradigmatic changes has required not only interdisciplinary connections, but also the renewal and rethinking of the categorical apparatus, the search for approaches re-

lated not only to interpretation, explanation, but also to the interpretation of new meanings and meanings in the system of new musical communication. Thus, along with the existing approaches mastered by the music science (structural-semiotic, synergistic, ontological, cognitive, musical-psychological, etc.), we have provided a substantiation of a new “branch” of communication theory – the interpretive theory of musical communication, which obviously combines music theory, music interpretation and cognitive science.

The goal of this study is the substantiation of the interpretative theory of musical communication, which is stipulated by the new status of Homo Interpretatus in the art of the 20th – 21st centuries.

Exposition of the main material of the study.

The scientific thought in the 20th century suffered several tectonic faults. In particular, there was a “linguistic” turn (early 20th century), which was marked by the reliance on the text; a cognitive turn (late 1950s – 1960s) and an interpretative turn (from the late 1970s), which replaced the textual approach and gave new impetus to the human sciences. The proposed interpretative theory of musical communication is one of the concepts of modern musicology and reflects changes in the perception and understanding of the world.

In the system of modern musical communication, the importance of the art of interpretation and dominance of Homo Interpretatus is unparalleled. The communicative structure of the Modern time art reflects the change of the connections in the formed hierarchy of “composer-performer-listener”. What is presented (created by the composer or performer) sometimes loses its relevance, becoming “everyday”, the connections and contexts of the composition become relative, mobile. According to the definition of philosophers, culturologists, art critics, the emphasis shifts towards the recipient (who can also be the author, interpreter or anyone who perceives the work of art). Therefore, the main meaning of the proposed concept is to justify the role of the interpreter (author, performer, or listener) in the process of *co*-listening or contonation. The latter means creating the perspective of the sounding of a certain composition, and emphasizing the role of the listener, which in most cases becomes more significant and active (not accidentally, the emphasis in the development of the communicative theory by V. Medushevsky [16] was placed on perception). P. Vaclavik’s axiom about the “irreversibility of communication” [4] in the perspective of musical art can be accepted with an important note: owing to the “counter texts” of the performer and the listener, it is *always reversed*.

The ascending position, which embodies **the ethos** of the interpretative theory of musical com-

munication, is the idea of the infinite *cognition of the Other*. Musical communication is structured by “eventfulness”, which for each communicator implies the “production of presence” (H. U. Gumbrecht [7]) and the *experienced type of meaning* (Augustine [1]). Therefore, we see a new subject of creativity – Homo Interpretatus – as a determinant of communicative processes in the Modern time art. The following definition is proposed:

Homo Interpretatus is designated as a symbolic image of a person in contemporary culture, a modus of its cognition, which is capable of changing its status from culture-*post* to culture-*proto* (making it not final but ascending), which actualizes the cognitive essence of the musical experience of self-awareness of *I* by fixing its *openness* and inversion to the fundamental eventfulness of culture.

The separation of Homo Interpretatus ¹ necessitates gradual adaptation through the modelling of new analytical tools – a system of concepts within the interpretative theory of musical communication. The presence of an interpretative component specifies the content of the basic categories.

The interpreting personality is a personality with the dominant properties of creative processing of information obtained as a result of communication (at all stages of the communicative process).

The interpretive awareness is the dominant of the creative process in the contemporary art. It is able to cover all the polyphony and nonlinearity of space-time.

The interpretive mind (“the mind which interprets”) is the concept of a synergetic concept of the world, marked by openness to the heuristic possibilities of the nonlinear method of cognition. It is the ability to think nonlinearly and combine several paradigms in the process of cognition of the world (musical art), which leads to heuristic discoveries.

The interpretive thinking is the transition from latent-strategic action (J. Habermas [6]) at the level of the idea to its implementation in the process of communication in order to invent *new dimensions of customary meanings*.

The interpretive style is a manifestation of the nature of Homo Interpretatus.

Musical communication in this sense is a process of comprehension – *a space of communication and transformation* of Homo Interpretatus. This act is relevant both for the stage of creating a composition (Composer-Text) and for the stages of interpretation (Composer-Text-Performer), perception (Composer-Text-Performer-Listener) and comprehension (Composer-Text-Performer-Listener-Researcher).

¹ Among other conceptual Homo (Homo sapiens, Homo projectivus, Homo habalis, Homo divinas, Homo legens, Homo apertus, Homo simbolicus, Homo significazione, Homo credens, Homo Aestheticus, Homo sinesthesis, Homo cognitus).

Homo Interpretatus is a central element of the system of the description of a new communicative paradigm – interpretology, which is based on the synthesis of cognitive science and musicology and is a scientific method that structures a new space of communication. All opponents of interpretative practices base their messages on the fact that interpretation (meaning the experience of interpretation, scientific knowledge) often overshadows the experience of the direct experience of music (interpretation as a “living text” in the process of communication). In the process of developing counter-arguments, musicologists and philosophers repeatedly find points of convergence/repulsion, but the question of “justification” of interpretation still remains open. Indeed, the way which the measures of “meaning” and “presence” correlate with each other is seen by us as a reflection of the changes that the theory of interpretation reflected on the path of its existence. The interpretative theory of musical communication takes into account both measures. The presence of the interpretative component specifies the content of the basic categories: the personality who interprets; the interpretive awareness; the interpretive mind; the interpretive thinking.

The analytical component of interpretology relies on the traditions of academic science (a music composition, a musical form, language/speech, dramaturgy, and texture), the performing one develops the specificity of the activities of Homo Interpretatus through established or relatively new concepts, such as: contonation, style, sound-image, performing poetics, and performing chronotope. The performing text is structured through “sound-image” and “chronotope” and is a consequence of the strategies chosen by the subject of interpretation. The temporal unity of the linguistic elements of the style system constitutes the performing poetics conditioned by the Homo Interpretatus style (in all possible forms).

The openness of **Homo Interpretatus** is manifested through the concept of “the communicative strategy”. **In the broad sense**, it is a way of *translating the meaning*, a mandatory choice of the vector of communication in the system “composer-performer-listener-researcher”; in the narrow sense, the understanding of this category implies a **position** that is significant for the **Human who interprets** in relation to *the Other* (the composer, performer, listener, and researcher). The application of the concept of communicative strategy (in the sense of “purposefulness”) as a unit of musical communication and methods of identifying its types makes it possible to reconstruct the process of interpretation as a process of dialogic interaction, to model its essential characteristics as a *process of communication*. The communicative strategy means a significant correlation for the interpreting personality of the type of the

position in communication (in this case, the position in relation to the Other) and the type that expresses this position of the modal form (its communicative structure). Thus, the concept has a volume, defines the subjects of relations and value orientation.

The projection of the Human who Interprets has influenced (in each specific case) on the invariant communicative structure and transformed the interactions within it. Owing to this, the communication strategy has the following functional separation (differentiation):

- the composing – as a creative one,
- the performing – as the objectification of the sound form of the composition,
- the listening – as a strategy of *co-intoning* of the sound form (on the principle of “presence”) (H. U. Gumbrecht),
- the interpreting – as an explanatory one (“culture of meaning”, according to H. U. Gumbrecht).

Thus, the communicative strategies are a plurality of ways to implement interpretive thinking and to create a space of communication of Homo Interpretatus. The meaningful scope of the concept defines the subjects of the relationship and their value orientation. On the one hand, this volume is a part of communicative interaction, in which a certain communicative goal is achieved through various verbal and nonverbal means; on the other hand, the result of the practice of making music is a new space of meaning:

- the composing strategy – the interpretation at the level of the idea of text addressability (to other subjects of communication, to the Other as the subject of communication);
- the performing strategy – the interpretation of the idea of the Other in the process of reproduction in a live sounding;
- the receptive (listening) strategy – complicity, i.e. the interpretation of the performing text as the meaningful one which is sounding and transforming communicative space;
- the hermeneutical strategy – the interpretation of communicative action as a process of correlation of linguistic and extra-linguistic contexts.

The system of relations to the subject, object and result of interpretation is illustrated in the table 1.

The process of interpretation is fixed in communicative strategies. Therefore, the dynamism of the internal features of communicative strategies is manifested in the variants of their tactics and forms. Their individual authorial selection reveals the hierarchy of Homo Interpretatus’ communicative priorities and the model of communication/interaction with the Other.

Conclusions of the study. The proposed theory is a system that studies forms and means of interpre-

Table 1

<i>Subject</i>	<i>Composer</i>	<i>Performer</i>	<i>Researcher</i>	<i>Listener</i>
<i>Object</i>	Philosophical ideas, concepts, images, emotions, technologies	Composer's text (composition)	Composer's or performer's text (composition)	The artefact of art
<i>Result</i>	A composition recorded in writing or in sound	Version, composition, recorded in sound	Text recorded verbally (in writing or orally)	Simultaneous impression (with a passive participation) or the act of presence of the listener (an active participation)

tation, it has fixed the “interpretative turn” in contemporary art, and it is predetermined by the practice of the present, is substantiated by it and generalizes it. The meaning of the interpretative theory of musical communication is to justify the role of the interpreter (the author, the performer, and the listener) in the process of *co*-listening (contonation) – that is, creating the perspective of sounding of a particular composition, and emphasizing the role of the listener, which becomes more and more significant and active.

Homo Interpretatus is designated as a symbolic image of a person in contemporary culture, a modus of its cognition, which is capable of changing its status from *culture-post* to *culture-proto* (making it not final but ascending), which actualizes the cognitive essence of the musical experience of self-awareness of *I* by fixing its *openness* and inversion to the fundamental eventfulness of culture. Homo Interpretatus is a subject that reveals the cognitive potential, constitutes a space of communication, and allows anyone who joins it to change the communicative and artistic space (the external, objective one as well as the internal, personal one). Such experience is substantiated by the need for the *Other* and the cognition of the *Other*. The conceptualization of the image of Homo Interpretatus as the embodiment of awareness/thinking and creativity of the 20th – the 21st centuries embraces all possible attributes of the interpretative experience of Homo Musicus, but does not come down to any of them.

The interpretative theory of music communication has formed its organon – a cognitive method that covers all dimensions of interpretation. The methodology of the research, based on the synthesis of modern humanities and theoretical musicology, allowed developing an *interpretative and communicative approach* for the study of different artefacts and values of musical communication of the 20th – 21st centuries.

Thus, the interpretative theory of music communication is a **theory of integrative type, which**

demonstrates the system of concepts of art of analysis of the activity of Homo Interpretatus, which recorded a change in the paradigm of musicological awareness from the semiotic-hermeneutic one – through the anthropological one (a human-dimensionality of music as an analogue of a personality).

The content of the concept testified to an interpretative turn that is strategic to modern culture. Its vector in the scientific meta-awareness is marked by the change of “culture-post” to “culture-proto”, which is open to infinity.

The prospect of further development of the topic is concluded in the further development of the basic principles of interpretative theory of musical communication.

Bibliography:

1. Августин, блаж. Христианская наука или основания герменевтики и церковного красноречия. [Репринт]. Киев, 1835. 355 с.
2. Адорно Т. В. Избранное : социология музыки / пер. : М. И. Левина, А. В. Михайлов ; сост. С. Я. Левит, С. Ю. Хурумов. Москва ; Санкт-Петербург : Университетская книга, 1998. 445 с. (Книга света).
3. Барт Р. Смерть автора. *Барт Р. Избранные работы: Семиотика: Поэтика* : пер. с фр. / сост., общ. ред. и вступ. ст. Г. К. Косикова. Москва : Прогресс, 1989. С. 384–392.
4. Вацлавик П., Бивин Дж., Джексон Д. Аксиомы теории коммуникации. *Межличностное общение : хрестоматия* : [невербальная коммуникация, мужской и женский стили общения, манипуляции в межличностном общении, аксиомы межличностной коммуникации, речь в межличностном общении] / сост. Н. Казаринова, В. Погольши. Санкт-Петербург : Питер, 2001. С. 11–25. (Хрестоматия по психологии).
5. Волкова П. С. Реинтерпретация художественного текста (на материале искусства XX века) : автореферат ... д-ра искусствования : 17.00.09 / Краснодарский государственный университет культуры и искусств. Краснодар, 2009. 34 с.
6. Габермас Ю. Постметафізичне мислення / пер. з нім. В. Купліна. Київ : Дух і Літера, 2011. 280 с. (Сучасна гуманітарна бібліотека).

7. Гумбрехт Х. У. Производство присутствия: чего не может передать значение / пер. с англ. С. Зенкина. Москва : Новое литературное обозрение, 2006. 179 с.
8. Делез Ж. Логика смысла ; Фуко М. *Theatrum philosophicum* / пер. с фр. Я. И. Свирского. Москва : Раритет ; Екатеринбург : Деловая книга, 1998. 480 с.
9. Демьянков В. Лингвистическая интерпретация текста: Универсальные и национальные (идиоэтнические) стратегии. *Язык и культура: Факты и ценности: к 70-летию Ю. С. Степанова. Сер. «Studia philologica»* / отв. ред. : Е. С. Кубрякова, Т. Е. Янко. Москва : Языки славянских культур, 2001. С. 309–323.
10. Добрицына И. А. От постмодернизма к нелинейной архитектуре: архитектура в контексте современной философии. Москва : Прогресс-Традиция, 2004. 416 с.
11. Корыхалова Н. Интерпретация музыки: Теоретические проблемы музыкального исполнительства и критический анализ их разработки в современной буржуазной эстетике. Ленинград : Музыка, 1979. 208 с.
12. Мартынов В. Зона *opus posth*, или Рождение новой реальности. Москва : Классика XXI, 2005. 286 с.
13. Мациевский И. Контонация и формообразование (в музыке европейской и внеевропейской, традиционной и современной). *Мациевский И. В пространстве музыки* : [в 3 т.]. Санкт-Петербург : РИИИ, 2011. Т. 1. С. 3–33.
14. Медушевский В. Духовный анализ музыки : учеб. пособие : в 2 ч. Москва : Композитор, 2014. 632 с.
15. Медушевский В. К теории исполнительства: о Божественных тайнах общения (из цикла: «Если есть бытие есть и общение»). *Проблеми взаємодії мистецтва, педагогіки та теорії і практики освіти. Когнітивне музикознавство* : зб. наук. ст. / Харк. нац. ун-т мистецтв імені І. П. Котляревського ; ред.-упоряд. Л. В. Шаповалова. Харків : Видавництво ТОВ «С. А. М.», 2010. Вип. 29. С. 130–141.
16. Медушевский В. О содержании понятия «адекватное восприятие». *Восприятие музыки* : сб. ст. / ред.-сост. В. Н. Максимов. Москва, 1980. С. 141–155.
17. Москаленко В. Г. Лекции по музыкальной интерпретации : учеб. пособие. Киев : Клякса, 2012. 272 с.
18. Москаленко В. Г. Творческий аспект музыкальной интерпретации (к проблеме анализа) : исследование. Киев : КГК им. П. И. Чайковского, 1994. 157 с.
19. Самойленко О. Теорія музикознавчої інтерпретації як напрям сучасної герменевтики. *Часопис Національної музичної академії ім. П. І. Чайковського*. Київ : НМАУ ім. П. І. Чайковського, 2011. Вип. 2. С. 3–11.
20. Усманова А. Гиперинтерпретация. URL : <http://www.top-actions.info/postmodern/645-g/35669-giperinterpretatsiya.html> (дата звернення : 20.11.2014).
21. Шаповалова Л. В. Апология когнитивного музыковедения. *Musiqi Dünyası (Мир музыки)* / Бакинская консерватория. 2013. № 1(54). С. 49–55.
22. Шаповалова Л. В. Интерпретология как интегративная наука. *Проблеми взаємодії мистецтва, педагогіки та теорії і практики освіти. Когнітивне музикознавство* : зб. наук. ст. / Харк. нац. ун-т мистецтв імені І. П. Котляревського ; ред.-упоряд. Л. В. Шаповалова. Харків : Видавництво ТОВ «С. А. М.», 2017. Вип. 46. С. 289–300.
23. Шаповалова Л. В. Логос музыки, или апология когнитивного музыковедения. *Традиції та новації у вищій архітектурно-художній освіті* : зб. наук. праць. Харків : ХДАДМ, 2007. Вип. 4/6. С. 89–93.
24. Шаповалова Л. В. Рефлексивный художник. Проблемы рефлексии в музыкальном творчестве. Харьков : Скорпион, 2007. 292 с.
25. Эко У. Открытое произведение: Форма неопределенность в современной поэтике / пер. с итал. А. Шурбелева. Санкт-Петербург : Академический проект, 2004. 384 с.
26. Avanesian A, Hennig A. *Metanoia: A Speculative Ontology of Language, Thinking, and the Brain* / transl. by N. F. Schott ; foreword by L. Bryant. London ; Oxford ; New York ; New Delhi ; Sydney : Bloomsbury Academic, 2014. 232 p.
27. Brelet G. *L'interprétation creatrice: essai sur l'exécution musicale*. Paris, 1951. Т. 1: L'exécution et l'oeuvre. 242 p.
28. Danuser H. *Musikalische Interpretation*. Lilienthal : Laaber-Verlag, 1992. Band 11 : Neues Handbuch der Musikwissenschaft. 469 S.
29. Hinrichsen H.-J. *Musikalische Interpretation und Interpretationsgeschichte. Historische Musikwissenschaft. Grundlagen und Perspektiven* / Ed. M. Calella, N. Urbanek. Stuttgart: Metzler, 2013. S. 184–200.
30. Nattiez J.-J. *Musicologie generale et semiologie*. Paris : Christian Bourgois, 1987. 400 p.

References:

1. Blessed Augustine. *De doctrina Christiana*. (Russ. ed.: Blessed Augustine. (1835). *Khristianskaya nauka ili osnovaniya germeneytiki i tserkovnogo krasnorechiya* [Christian science or the foundations of hermeneutics and church eloquence]. Kiev).
2. Adorno, T. W. (1998). *Izbrannoe: sotsiologiya muzyki* [Favorites: the sociology of music]. Moscow; St. Petersburg: Universitetskaya kniga. (In Russian).
3. Barthes, R. (1967). The Death of Arthur. *Aspen Magazine*, 5/6 (Russ. ed.: Barthes, R. (1989). *Smert avtora* [Death of the author]. In R. Barthes. *Izbrannye raboty: Semiotika. Poetika* [Selected works: Semiotics. Poetics] (pp. 297–318). Moscow : Progress).
4. Watzlawick, P., Beavin, J. & Jackson, D. (2001). *Aksiomy teorii komunikatsii* [Axioms of communication theory]. In *Mezhlichnostnoe obshchenie* [Interpersonal communication] (pp. 11–25). Saint Petersburg: Piter. (In Russian).
5. Volkova, P. S. (2009). *Reinterpretatsiya khudozhestvennogo teksta (na materiale iskusstva XX veka)* [Reinterpretation of the artistic text (on the material of the art of the 20th century)]. (Extended abstract of Grant PhD thesis). Krasnodar State University of Culture and the Arts, Krasnodar, Russia. (In Russian).
6. Habermas, J. (1988). *Nachmetaphysisches Denken. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag* (Ukr. ed.: Habermas, J. (2011). *Postmetafizychnе myslennia* [Post-metaphysical thinking]. Kyiv: Dukh i Litera).
7. Gumbrecht, H. U. (2004). *Production of Presence: What meaning cannot convey*. Redwood City, Ca. (Russ. ed.: Gumbrecht, H. U. (2006). *Proizvodstvo prisutstviya: chego ne mozhет peredat znachenie*. Moscow: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie).
8. Deleuze, G. (1969). *Logique du sens*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit (Russ. ed.: Deleuze, G. (1998). *Logika smysla* [The logic of sense]. In G. Deleuze. *Logika smysla & M. Foucault. Theatrum philosophicum*. Moscow : Raritet ; Ekaterinburg : Delovaya kniga).
9. Demyankov, V. (2001). *Lingvisticheskaya interpretatsiya teksta: Universalnye i natsionalnye (idioetnicheskie) strategii* [Linguistic interpretation of the text: Universal and national (idio-ethnic) strategies]. In E. S. Kubryakova, T. E. Yanko (Eds.). *Yazyk i kultura: Fakyty i tsennosti: k 70-letiyu Yu. S. Stepanova* [Language and culture: Facts and values: To the 70th anniversary of Yuriy Sergeyevich Stepanov]. Ser. “Studia philologica” (pp. 309–323). Moscow: Yazyki slavyanskikh kultury. (In Russian).
10. Dobritsyna, I. A. (2004). *Ot postmodernizma k nelineinoy arkhitekture: arkhitektura v kontekste sovremennoy filosofii* [From postmodernism to nonlinear architecture: architecture in the context of modern philosophy]. Moscow: Progress-Traditsiya. (In Russian).

11. Korykhalova, N. (1979). *Interpretatsiya muzyki: Teoreticheskie problemy muzykalnogo ispolnitelstva i kriticheskii analiz ikh razrabotki v sovremennoi burzhuaznoi estetike* [Interpretation of music. Theoretical problems of musical performance]. Leningrad: Muzyka. (In Russian).
12. Martynov, V. (2005). *Zona opus posth, ili Rozhdenie novoi realnosti* [Zone of Opus Posth, or The Birth of a New Reality]. Moscow: Klassika XXI. (In Russian).
13. Matsievskii, I. (2011). Kontonatsiya i formoobrazovanie (v muzyke evropeiskoi i vneevropeiskoi, traditsionnoi i sovremennoi) [Contonation and formation (in European and non-European music, traditional and modern)]. In I. Matsievskii. *V prostranstve muzyki* [In the space of music] (vol. 1, pp. 3–33). Saint Petersburg: RIII. (In Russian).
14. Medushevskiy, V. (2014). *Dukhovnyi analiz muzyki* [Spiritual analysis of music] (vols 1–2). Moscow: Kompozitor. (In Russian).
15. Medushevskiy, V. (2010). K teorii ispolnitelstva: o Bozhestvennykh tainakh obshcheniya (iz tsikla: “Esli est bytie est i obshchenie”) [To the theory of performance: about the Divine secrets of communication (from the cycle: “If there is being, there is communication”)]. *Problemy vzaiemodii mystetstva, pedahohiky ta teorii i praktyky osvity. Kohnityvne muzykoznavstvo — Problems of interaction of art, pedagogy and theory and practice of education. Cognitive musicology: a collection of scientific articles*, 29, 130–141. (In Ukrainian).
16. Medushevskiy, V. (1980). O soderzhanii ponyatiya “adekvatnoe vospriyatie” [On the content of the concept of “adequate perception”]. In V. N. Maksimov (Ed.). *Vospriyatie muzyki* [Perception of music] (pp. 141–155). Moscow. (In Russian).
17. Moskalenko, V. G. (2012). *Lektsii po muzykalnoi interpretatsii* [Lectures on musical interpretation]. Kiev: Klyaksa. (In Russian).
18. Moskalenko, V. G. (1994). *Tvorcheskii aspekt muzykalnoi interpretatsii (k probleme analiza)* [Creative aspect of musical interpretation (to the problem of analysis)]. Kiev: KGK im. P. I. Chaikovskogo. (In Russian).
19. Samoilenko, O. (2011). Teoriia muzykoznavchoi interpretatsii yak napriam suchasnoi hermenevtyky [Music interpretation theory as a modern hermeneutics trend]. *Chasopys Natsionalnoi muzychnoi akademii im. P. I. Chaikovskoho — Scientific herald of Tchaikovsky National Music Academy of Ukraine*, 2, 3–11. (In Ukrainian).
20. Usmanova, A. (N. d.). *Giperinterpretatsiya* [Hyper-interpretation]. Retrieved from <http://www.top-actions.info/postmodern/645-g/35669-giperinterpretatsiya.html>. (In Russian).
21. Shapovalova, L. V. (2013). Apologiya kognitivnogo muzykovedeniya [Apology of cognitive musicology]. *Musiqi Dünyasi*, 1(54), 49–55. (In Russian).
22. Shapovalova, L. V. (2017). Interpretologiya kak integrativnaya nauka [Interpretology as an integrative science]. *Problemy vzaiemodii mystetstva, pedahohiky ta teorii i praktyky osvity. Kohnityvne muzykoznavstvo — Problems of interaction of art, pedagogy and theory and practice of education. Cognitive musicology: a collection of scientific articles*, 46, 289–300. (In Ukrainian).
23. Shapovalova, L. V. (2007). Logos muzyki, ili apologiya kognitivnogo muzykovedeniya [Logos of music or apology of cognitive musicology]. *Traditions and innovations in the higher architectural-artistic education*, 4/6, 89–93. (In Russian).
24. Shapovalova, L. V. (2007). *Refleksivnyi khudozhnik. Problemy refleksii v muzykalnom tvorchestve* [Reflective artist. Problems of reflection in music]. Kharkiv: Skorpion. (In Russian).
25. Eco, U. (1967). *Opera aperta Forma e indeterminazione nelle poetiche contemporanee*. Milano: Bompiani (Russ. ed.: Eco, U. (2004). *Otkrytoe proizvedenie: Forma i neopredelennost v sovremennoi poetike* [Open composition. Form and uncertainty in modern poetics]. Saint Petersburg: Akademicheskii proekt).
26. Avanesian, A. & Hennig, A. (2014). *Metanoia: A Speculative Ontology of Language, Thinking, and the Brain*. London; Oxford; New York; New Delhi; Sydney: Bloomsbury Academic.
27. Brelet, G. (1951). *L'interprétation creatrice: essai sur l'exécution musicale* [The Creative Interpretation; essay on musical execution] (vol. 1: L'exécution et l'oeuvre). (In French).
28. Danuser, H. (1992). *Musikalische Interpretation* [Musical Interpretation] (vol. 11: Neues Handbuch der Musikwissenschaft). Lilienthal: Laaber-Verlag. (In German).
29. Hinrichsen, H.-J. (2013). *Musikalische Interpretation und Interpretationsgeschichte* [Musical interpretation and interpretation stories]. In M. Calella, N. Urbanek (Eds.). *Historische Musikwissenschaft. Grundlagen und Perspektiven* (pp. 184–200). Stuttgart: Metzler. (In German).
30. Nattiez, J.-J. (1987). *Musicologie generale et semiologie* [General musicology and semiology]. Paris: Christian Bourgois. (In French).