

Report on teaching deformities in the study of the discipline of Musical Forms

OLEG GARAZ, Associate Prof. PhD
“Gheorghe Dima” National Academy of Music Cluj-Napoca
ROMANIA*

Abstract: Do composers produce cells, figures, motifs, or periods? Does the concept of form only mean a string of capital letters in music? How interested can a singer be in the form of instrumental music? What could the word composition mean after all? And why would compositional analysis be different from simple form analysis? There are just as many questions that produce logical and legitimate anxiety. And all this because of the form of music which is synonymous with the form of water. With only one difference: water is liquid and formless, and music's only sense of form is acoustic and invisible. Because the form of music cannot be and is not musical. The discipline of musical forms teaches nothing about form, only compositional scheme. Which has nothing to do with music. Do composers produce articulations or perhaps ideas, melodies, meanings, and themes? Which in turn can assume various compositional schemes. After so many questions, it would be appropriate to formulate a final query: given so many distortions, what exactly does the discipline *Analyses of musical forms* teach students?

Keywords: musical forms, musical analysis, systematics, terminology.

1. Introduction

The study of musical forms trains in a chain of terminological, systematic, and historical confusions because all three enter into a sustained semantic conflict, which in turn, presented in the form of a course, is offered to students for learning. After the didactic deformations of the discipline of music history, the situation with the discipline of forms is a second one in which history enters into an obvious conflict with pedagogy, i.e. the didactic method of teaching. In the end, the students learn the didactic system, that is, one formulated for more effective assimilation, but several of its segments have almost nothing in common with the real evolution of musical thought in the compositional plane. And this didactic deformation cannot mean anything other than a blockage and thus the orientation of knowledge in a direction that is much less effective cognitively. That is, depriving students of the possibility of becoming autonomous evaluators in terms of analytical activity.

* oleg.garaz@gmail.com

2. Musical forms. A false and confusing terminological “synesthesia”

Indeed, the title of this discipline corresponds entirely to the situation in which the terms of olfaction would be used as a description of the properties of the thermal sense. Could it be a case of synesthesia? Not at all like that. Just about confusion. It is only about identifying a logical object as a phenomenological one. That is, a scheme is presented as a phenomenon or event.

It is exactly as in the case of the concept of musical genre, where the word genre is not only a typological nomenclature, as in the case of literature, drama, poetry, painting, or sculpture, but one that on the archetypal-biological (physiological) chain directly indicates the feminine (invisibility and thus irrationality) of singing and the masculine (visibility and thus rationality) of dancing. Only the traditional identification criteria – source, composition, ethos, content, and context of application – represent typological nomenclature, and not ontological substance (substrate that the other arts do not possess because their genealogies are completely different).

And as the process of teaching a subject is a narrative one, in which the image of the referential context strictly depends on the content of the terms used, the involvement of terminological confusions will produce an alternative reality, which at best will have limited applicability, and at worst case it will be an inoperable one. The most important, however, will be the consequence (a reduced or even dysfunctional one) in terms of training. In other words, not only will students not be able to orient themselves in systematic taxonomy typologically, but they will have no access to an equal understanding of genealogy (descent along the historical vertical) and ecology (the specific place among other typologies of “forms”, on the horizontal of a stylistic stage).

In the given case, the confusions are layered over a situation that is not at all complicated and not at all complex. Things must be taken one at a time.

2.1. A first distortion: in music, form is not form

Neither the form, the genres, nor the styles, can be musical or otherwise¹. They are attributive terms – forms, genres, styles, (of) music, (of) literature, (of) poetry, (of) theater, (of) architecture. And this is not a problem of grammar or, in general, of philology. These are terms without a specified reference because always the form is assigned to something. Hence the confusion with the definitions.

¹ This idea is supported by the Soviet philosopher and dissident Alexander Zinoviev: “Logic is the same for all sciences. There is and cannot be any special logic for this or that science (physics, chemistry, history, mathematics, etc.), different from the logic for other sciences”; in: Alexandr Zinoviev, *The Understanding Factor*, Москва: Алгоритм-Эксмо [Algorithm Publishing House], 2006, p. 125. In the context of the sciences and arts, one could say that the term form comes from architecture or sculpture, the term genre from biology, and the term style from rhetoric and, more broadly, from philology. In other words, it is about the term form applied to music: form of music, genre of music, and style of music.

More. The phrase musical form is meaningless because it has no specific musical reference. There are no specific musical forms. In music, the term form has only one referent, and this one exclusively is acoustic in its capacity as an ontological object. So the form of music is an ontological fact, or, more precisely, the (acoustic) way in which music exists. This is the only form in which music can exist, namely as a sound object². I mean, it would be like asking what is the shape of water. And it is obvious that in music the term form functions in a metaphorical sense since there is no resemblance to the usual sense, i.e. the specific shape of material objects (tall, wide, long or narrow, heavy, light, bulky or tiny), and that as a design in material (wood, stone, metal, plastic, glass, etc.) of geometric figures (triangle, circle, parallelepiped, square, etc.) – wardrobe (parallelepiped), airplane wing (triangle, for airplanes battle), wagon wheel (circumference) – or of natural shapes (the shape of the human body, the shapes of plant or mineral objects, the shapes of geological (mountains), celestial (clouds) or aquatic (waves) objects).

In another sense, the “musical” form cannot be found in the score either, which is a material support on which the analogies or graphic replicas of the sounds – the notes – are written down. Or vice versa, as in the notional language: graphic signs – notes – are visual symbols of concrete heights-durations. The graphic object stands as a sign for the acoustic object. However, only the heights and durations are noted on the portable. The rest, that is, the intensity is not noted on the portable, but only by letters (*f* or *p*), and the timbre does not even have any graphic symbol.

The graphic form of the notes has nothing in common with its acoustic referent, in the same way, that the visual form of the word form has nothing in common with the (“winding” shape of) a saxophone or the shape of Stephen the Great's sword. It is only about the assigned semantic meaning and only as a reference to an actual reference. The notation is only instruction for use – a visual symbol of reference and without any accompanying instruction for learning the reproduction technique (which must be learned additionally, along with the meanings of the graphic signs) – which through consensual graphic conventions (in a certain era) refers to its absolute references – the specific form of the acoustic object (in the dynamic, timbral, and processual senses). But in parallel with the form as an acoustic object, the form as a structural

² There are, however, at least two other types of “sonority”. By virtue of the existence of inner hearing (non-acoustic reference), it can be about the intuitive or imaginary sonority of a theme (The Lover's Theme from Berlioz's *Fantastic Symphony*), of a harmonic block (Wagner and the “Tristan chord”), of a counterpoint, or an orchestral episode. In his *Memoirs*, Berlioz recounts a dramatic episode in connection with the appearance in his imagination of the first part of a symphony in *A minor*, which the composer, forced by circumstances, had to give up. Also, the existence of a residual (non-acoustic) sonority must be admitted, a totally mnemonic one, containing episodes of variable extension or even the entire musical composition.

object must also be taken into account in the sense of the individual uniqueness of each musical composition, as a criterion for differentiation from other compositions conceived in the same structural pattern. This relationship can be considered as a replica of the binomials – form-content or structure-expression. Both acousticity and structural uniqueness are two states of affairs that elude awareness of the term form as a standard or pattern.

2.2. Two fused deformations (2 and 3): the musical form is not of the music

In reality, the discipline of musical forms deals with the taxonomy and thus the hierarchy of compositional schemes. This would be a first deformation. I mean, a confusion. The dynamic-representational form of music itself is to blame – an acoustic flow with an undifferentiated sonority in discrete segments. In other words, the composer does not intend a pause after the exposition, the treatise, or the half (including here also a coda), to signal to the audience the limits of the constitutive articulations of a *sonata-allegro*. In tonal-functional music, these functions are fulfilled by the caesura typologies, which are pause, pedal, multiple repetition, and cadence. That is a series of conventions intrinsic to both the structural and the semantic string. Conventions that are the result of a consensus developed with a view to the conscious assimilation of both strings. And which in its ultimate consequences serves dramaturgical logic, the fourth function, a superior one, in the series of compositional functions³.

³ As V. Bobrovski mentions in his article: “Musical form and its components have two indissoluble sides – functional and structural. By the functional side must be understood everything that represents the meaning, role and importance of a given component. By the structural one – what is related to (the place it occupies in the whole of the other constitutive components of the form – author’s note), the external features. The functional side of the musical form is the main one, the fundamental expressive element; the structural one is subordinate to it.” (Bobrovski, 1971, p. 27) Thus, there are four functional typologies. *First*, the general logical functions: introduction, presentation of the theme (exposition), middle-elaborative, connecting, and concluding. The *second*, the general compositional functions, and the *third*, the special compositional functions, hold specific responsibilities within the limits of the initio-motus-terminus formula (of Boris Asafiev). The difference between the logical functions and the compositional functions consists in the positioning of the former outside the structural legalities – extended situation, while the following act inside the structural legalities – intrinsic situation. At the same time, the differentiation should be made between the compositional form (schema) as a principle, and the compositional form as a given of a concrete work. These three typologies belong to the group of form-generating functions. Although, already the special compositional functions could also be identified as specifically procedural functions. A last and superior group of functions, the *fourth*, is the group of dramaturgical functions, representative in terms of the expressive organization of a musical work. The basic dramaturgical component consists in the type of organization of the ideatic-thematic contrast, and which finds its analogy in certain psycho-affective states expressed in music (Bobrovski, 1971).

It is about putting together – in a certain orderly sequence – some semantically and thus structurally discrete segments of musical material. The scheme of composition – of orderly placing in sequence – consists of a sequence of capital letters that symbolize the discrete and thus differentiated articulations (by content, expression, and tempo) of the musical work. Should it thus be understood that a mere orderly succession of constituent articulations is considered the form of musical composition? How can an ontological fact – the evolutionary-cumulative procedural unfolding of an acoustic object – and a string of capital letters organized in a logical consequence, by which the articulations of a musical composition are symbolized – a logically organized scheme – be synonymous, remains a mystery. In musical thinking, the term form ends up having a strictly metaphorical meaning. I mean, a conventional one.

Unlike the composition of a heavy (i.e., useful) machine, a truck engine, or a hydroelectric turbine, where function (utility) is the exclusive consideration, and that without any aesthetic “complements”, in the case of music, it is about the consubstantiality between acoustic and semantic. Given this confusing form-content dichotomy, it would be logical to ask: if there is, what would be the difference between the form of the form and the form of the content, as well as clarifications regarding the form of the acoustic and the form of the semantic? Of course, the function of the propagation agent, i.e. a purely utilitarian one, of acoustics should be specified, as well as the function of an agent of communication and streamlining of semantics (meanings, i.e. the ethos of registers, timbres, intensities, etc.). This is because the musical composition represents a pan-formal entity, one resulting from the fusion of all the forms adopted by the totality of the constituent elements, both the physically perceptible (acoustically) and the logically deducible (formulable) ones (the intentional, compositional, sound material) and psychologically noticeable (with psycho-affective consequences). In other words, it is about the state of non-differentiation between the ontological and the psychological (the latter with its ontology), which can be translated as a fusion between cause and effect, where, at the same time, the effect is its cause, as well as vice versa.

And all this all the more since the catena – the universal organizing invariant of the scheme, but also a sound process, as well as a musical one (intentionally organized as an expressive speech) – is at best the consequence of a combinatorial manipulation standardized as a logical pattern. And which does not even allusively bear any reference to anything like form, much less to a musical form (how can a form be musical?). Just a sequence of capital letters: ABA, ABACA, AB, ABACABA, or ABABA. No more.

So the musical form is a sequence of capital letters, whose role is to indicate the number and ordering in sequence of the constituent articulations? Moreover, in the best case, the string of letters has the function of a typological

nomenclature. That is a *taxon*. And even if this terminological “synesthesia” has long since been assimilated as a standardized understanding, it must be noted that confusion is standardized – the designation of an ontological (phenomenological) object by a logical literal scheme. The ridiculousness of the situation, however, lies in the fact that neither the first nor the second possess anything that could be identified as musical. The latter is a reference to a completely different order that has nothing in common either with the ontological fact of the form or with the logical fact of the scheme. Both are exceeded by the expressive content of the phonic, sonorous, musical process.

In the case of a musical composition, the sound material, although it is organized into discrete constitutive segments, according to certain (logical) compositional schemes, in turn represents the replication of a group of ontological archetypes⁴, which is consistent with the acoustic status itself, so an exclusive one ontological of the musical form.

This is the second distortion: the “musical” form is not music. The musical form, i.e. the compositional scheme, represents the essentialized replication of some processes (with invariant value) of articulating objective reality itself. And then, by its very compositional scheme, a musical work is organized as a replica of a certain typology of processual invariants of objective reality. This is a second factor of ontological substance (compositional scheme), after the acoustic one (proper form), representing both form and compositional scheme.

The American musicologist Mark Evan Bonds, however, formulates his own two understandings of musical form, contained in two phrases such as *inner* form and *outer* form (Bonds, 1991, p. 1). Acknowledging the ambiguity and (already) anachronism of the term *form* as shape (the appearance of logical-structural configuration) and, not surprisingly, as fashion (“clothing” of content), the distinction is made between external form as logical-structural conception and the inner form, that is, by referring to the content as a suggestive-expressive conception. However, following Hanslick's logic (*Vom Musikalisch Schönen*, 1895), it should be stated that the compositional scheme serves as the external form, and the internal one refers directly to the

⁴ In the volume entitled *10 Studii de Arhetipologie* [10 Archetype Studies] (Braga, 1999), the Cluj university Corin Braga discerns three typologies of archetypes, namely: *metaphysical* (ontological) archetypes, *psychological* archetypes, and *cultural* archetypes. In music there are just as many analogies for each archetype. The actual phenomenon of form (acoustics, as object and sound process) belongs to the ontological archetype. The cultural archetype corresponds to sound organization systems (syntactic and tonal, in their capacity as historical-cultural indicators). And the genres correspond to the psychological archetype, in the sense of the masculine (the diurnal regime of the image, the choreographic invariant) and the feminine (the nocturnal regime of the image, the invariant of the song), with a subsequent sublimation (in the Enlightenment period of the musical Baroque) into the instrumental.

microstructural aspects and, as a consequence, to the written one, a third element that Bonds does not indicate. The expression is only a cumulative effect of some acoustic causes. And then, not only the suggestive-expressive reference, but also the microstructural-scriptural one, both, adopt the status of the suspended third party in a fluctuating functional indecision regarding the inner form. But then, where can the mobile sound arabesques be located, that is, the form of an acoustic object?

What it is? In reality, things are a bit more complex than just referring to the archetypal. The principles that the compositional schemes symbolize are, in fact, the consequence of a stratified consubstantialization (therefore, discernible in discrete entities) between logical, semiotic, philosophical, and, consequently, archetypal.

The actual fundamental compositional typologies are both simple and few. And many and complex are the particular conceptual achievements within each historical period. Compared to the informative-didactic exposition of a “form” typology, the exercise of identifying a series of analogies from other domains of thought, with which, for example, binary and ternary compositional schemes share membership in the same invariant typology, is useful and even more. In music, the latter (the invariant) represents only a technical-procedural particularization of an equally original and generative conceptual entity located at a much greater depth and identifiable as an archetypal one. And only as a content of human consciousness, and only as a consequence of the identification of a structural-formal invariant (as an image).

The first group, i.e. the primary nucleus, is represented by the *chain* generative scheme in both its forms: (a) the isomorphic chain (a-a-a-a-a-n+1) and (b) the heteromorphic chain (a-b-c-d-e-f-g-h-n+1). Pure forms of these two chain typologies are few both by Antiquity and by abstraction (schemes or logical principles of string and set). For the first type, we can remember the genre and practice of lament, and for the second – the chain schemes (medieval and renaissance music). Truly generative appears to be the mixed scheme, which combines the elements of the first two typologies: a-b-a-c-a-d-a-e-a-n+1, because the established typologies of strophic schemes represent historical “cuts” from the mixed chain and, consequently, established as compositional patterns⁵.

The second group contains the typologies of configurational compositional schemes:

⁵ A detailed exposition is published in the *Muzica*, No. 7/2017, in the undersigned's study entitled *Formele muzicii: exerciții de combinatorică arhetipală (propunere hermeneutică-metodologică)* [Forms of music: Exercises in archetypal combinatorics (hermeneutic-methodological proposal)] (I). In an expanded form, this study is published in the volume *Uneltele muzicologiei* [The Tools of Musicology] (București, 2022).

Subgroup 1. Strophic schemes: (mono, in principle, only small – periodic), bi-, and tri-strophic small (simple) and large (complex);

A. In the logical sense, we are talking about the typologies of binary logic (true-false (non-true) or, in terms of musical composition – identity-otherness) and, respectively, of ternary logic, a typology of multi-semantic logic, an evolved (extended) derivation of binary logic (less-equal-more, or cold-warm-hot).

In the case of binary logic, the principle of identity, the principle of contradiction, and the principle of the excluded third have a determining role. Binary logic also underlies all programming languages.

A stronger analogy with the logic of music is the concept of Stephen Cole Kleene (American logician and mathematician, 1909-1994) – strong logic of *indeterminacy*, as well as the concept of Graham Priest (British philosopher and logician, b. 1948) – the logic of *paradox*. Both typologies are based on three constitutive elements: lie (false) – indeterminacy (according to Priest – paradox) – and truth. In other words, in the case of a three-strophic composition, the path is followed from section A – an absolute novelty that admits any type of continuation + section B (alterity) as structural indeterminacy (thematic and tonal instability) and processual fragmentation + section A (possibly easy or strongly varied) – the definitive, definite, and thus immovable form in its structure.

B. The two semiotic conceptions can also be invoked: the first being a binary one, by the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1913) – *signifier-signified*, and the second, a ternary or triadic one (syllogism logic), by the philosopher, to the American mathematician, logician and semiotician Charles Sanders Peirce (1839-1914) – *signifier-signified+reference* (the object).

C. In a *philosophical* sense it is about *duality* in the dialectical understanding of the *struggle of opposites* (*true-false* antinomy, or in theological terms, *heavenly-earthly*, *angelic-demonic*, and as an already Eliadesque extension – sacred-profane), while the structure *ternary* finds an analogy in the understanding of the *dialectical triad* – *thesis*, *antithesis*, *synthesis* (G. W. F. Hegel, 1770-1831), in the idea of going through an evolutionary path of knowledge through (1) *the formulation of the thesis*, (2) *the production of the contradiction through the formulation of the antithesis*, and in general (3), *overcoming contradiction* by reaching *synthesis*. Although dialectic of the three elements (*triplicity*) is much more suitable for the organizing principle of *processual* evolution, especially in the case of the *sonata Allegro*, a *processual* design of three-strophic articulation. This specification is all the more pertinent, since in the case of the *Classical sonata*, these three functions rather as a design of the structure in dramaturgy – *initio+motus+terminus*.

D. The archetypal acceptance resides in the direct reference to representations of objective reality, and the binary scheme finds an analogy in any type of properly ontological dual cyclicity – *day-night, female-male, child-old, sun-moon, light-darkness* or *light-shadow, heat-cold, spring-autumn* or *summer-winter*, or, in Gilbert Durand's terms, night regime and day regime of the image, with an opening towards the archetypes of the *masculine* and the *feminine*⁶ (Durand, 1998), but also with a continuation in the two concepts of the Swiss psychoanalyst C. G. Jung – *animus* (masculine unconscious) and *anima* (feminine unconscious). Also, there are other openings towards antinomian pairs: ethical-moral – good-bad, aesthetic – beautiful-ugly (with a multitude of intermediate antinomian categorical pairs), logic – true-false also joining this string. In other words, *kallos* (beauty) + *agatos* (goodness) + *aletheia* (truth) as opposed to *κακός* (brownish/evil) + *αἰσχρός* (aisk(h)ros/ugly) + *σευδής* (pseudes/false).

And the ternary would find its analogy in several meanings: (1) the kingdoms of nature – mineral, vegetable, animal, (2) sacred geometry – the triangular geometric figure (the series of pyramidal constructions – Egyptian and Mesoamerican), (3) the existential factor – the human ages (childhood, maturity, old age), with the corresponding rites of passage (birth, wedding, funeral), (4) the domain of the Sacred (religious metaphysics) – the Christian trinity, a string that continues in esoteric occultism Hermes Trismegistus (the great triple), (5) the field of alchemy and the states of matter – *negredo*, *rubedo*, and *albedo*, but also the three processes – dissolution, coagulation, and crystallization, but also (6) a first acceptance of the principle of return (the dramaturgical idea of the half, the small and big bistrophic with reprise and tristrophic *da capo* a-b-a), which finds its analogy in the double cyclicity – day-night-day and night-day-night, respectively. In this sense, it is not at all surprising that these two compositional schemes are not musical at all, but represent a logical formalization of invariants with archetypal value.

Subgroup 2. *Rondo* scheme (in turn, strophic) and *Variation* scheme, where the strophic is only the theme, the variations of the theme represent identical replicas of the same compositional scheme (the classical ornamental variations as a reference).

Both the scheme and the principle of *rondo* (rotation) represent a quantitative expansion of the first two types of strophic model (binary and ternary), which highlights the criterion of the multiple halves (resumption) as a determining one. Thus, the entire mediated articulation of a *fugue* can be understood as a *rondo-type organization*, but in the sense of “treatment”, since the

⁶ In terms of musical thought, this antinomy – masculine-feminine – refers to the area of the concept of gender, although it is a binary structure.

consequence is built by alternating *the middle halves* of the theme (A, Av, Av1...) and non- thematic (B, C, D ...), from which the *rondo*-variational structuring of the Treatise emerges. And in the case of the *rondo* scheme – the alternation of the theme and the episodes – despite the *figurative* or perhaps even *elaborative* material and the number of episodes, the return of the Theme seems to reduce to zero the counter of the structural-expressive accumulations already achieved, “resetting” the entire procedure through restart from section A.

On an archetypal level, we must remember the practice called *horea* (for Romanians *hora*, for Eastern Slavs – хоровод/horovod – *The Sacred Spring* by Igor Stravinsky) – dancing in a circle, serving as a reference both the image of the solar disk and the idea of cyclicity. However, this is a particularly strong archetype precisely in its ontological acceptance, namely the doctrine of the Eternal Return, which, for example, Nietzsche treats first in *Die fröhliche Wissenschaft* (The Joyful Science, 1882), then in *Also sprach Zarathustra* (Thus Spoke Zarathustra, 1883-85), as well as his writing entitled *Ecce Homo* (Behold Man, 1888). Also, in the dialogue *Πολιτεία* (Politeia, *Republic*, I), Plato invokes an additional symbol – of the double spiral, starting from a center both ascending and descending, with the meaning of evolution and involution, respectively. It is interesting to note that through the *rondo* compositional scheme, the archetypal scheme is carried out through which the archetypes themselves persist in the collective consciousness through repetition (cyclic resumption). Mircea Eliade's writing – *The myth of the eternal return* (originally *Le mythe de l'éternel retour*, 1949) – everything and everything being revealed *illo tempore*, evolution itself presents itself as a continuous and endless repetition of the original moment of Creation.

The variation scheme contradicts the sectioned extrapolation procedure or a double extrapolation – a simultaneous one, of the identical (A) and the heterogeneous (B, C, D...) – of the *rondo*, by eliminating the heterogeneous elements of the initial theme (origins). Thus, the variations represent equally a string and a set of replicas of the concatenated theme in the procedure of continuous extrapolation of the identical. But at the same time, not paradoxically, the archetype of variation is transformation, an idea that completes the mechanism of extrapolation of the identical and the heterogeneous, by referring to the quality of cyclical extrapolation.

This is because the *replica will never be identical to the original, because every time it will be, at least, a different temporal positioning (later, late), which implies an evolutionary coefficient, whatever its meaning. In this sense, the rondo and the variations are simultaneously antinomic and consubstantial.*

Or, the meanings of the archetype of *transformation* can be *change, passage or transition, renewal or innovation, and univocity or irreversibility.*

Thus, the transformation will always be synonymous with regeneration in the sense of reproduction, but each time in other terms, because it is a question of a qualitative transformation so that in the end the sense of substitution works. This last meaning acts as a negation of the theme or the previous line. The transformation has four possibilities of realization: quantum leap (juxtaposition between two different qualities), convergence (synthesis, fusion), emergence (symptomatic emergence), and gradual transformation (gradual, i.e. sequential). The last two typologies display an explainable kinship, the difference being only in procedural terms and at the level of scale of manifestation (micro-, meso-, or macro-), and the compositional and, this time, the aesthetic meaning of evolutionary variation is exploration and invention – structural and equally expressive⁷.

These two compositional schemes must be treated in tandem because both are organized based on the principle of consequence – both are mediated schemes of the chain – but articulated through two processes opposite in meaning.

(A) In the case of the *rondo* scheme it is an internalized scheme, i.e. one unfolded within the limits of an integral composition. In the case of the variation scheme, however, the scheme has only the theme (ornamental variations of the classical type as a reference), the rest is a series of replicas of the original. In opposition to the internalized organization of the *rondo*, the variations present the externalized organization of the consequence of the constituent articulations, which can appear in different quantities – from six to thirty-two.

(B) A second meaning of the opposition consists in the technique of organizing the concatenation: in the case of the *rondo* scheme, it is about the principle of juxtaposition (A-B-A-C-A), while in the case of the variations the principle of graded differentiation acts (A-Av-Av1-Av2-Av- n+1).

(C) A third meaning of this opposition lies in referentiality: the *rondo* refers to the stanza-couplet principle, having the song as its prototype, while

⁷ A logical question arises: what is explored, for example, in the case of a theme (without gender differentiation)? Leonard B. Meyer gives a conclusive answer in a text of his own, which he publishes in several sources and in two musicological genres. Either it is an analytical study – *Some Remarks on Value and Greatness in Music* (Meyer, 1959, pp. 486-500) –, or it is a chapter with the same title from a monograph – *Music, The Arts, and Ideas: Patterns and Predictions in Twentieth-Century Culture* (Meyer, 1957/1994, pp. 22-41). In this text, the American musicologist aims to explore the (structural and expressive) potential of a fugue theme, but the evaluation is concerned with both the value of this potential and the value of creative invention in the sense of the revealing formulation of a possible content. It is about the *Concerto Grosso Op. 3 No. 3*, by Geminiani, and, respectively, the *Prelude and Fugue in G major*, for organ, by Bach. An exciting analytical treatment of the subject unfolds between pages 24-26, which reveals the banality of Geminiani's approach and the (almost) unfathomable fecundity of Bach's thought.

the variations suggest a much greater (temporal-cultural) depth, referring directly to the prototype – the isomorphic catena invariant (as replication, even varied, of the identical). In conclusion, both compositional schemes refer to their vocal origins, although here, however, the syncretic primacy of danced singing should be noted.

Group 3. Procedural compositional principle (strophicity – three-articulation – higher order) of dramaturgical (cyclical) substance: *fugue* and *sonata-allegro*. Even if the structural organization belongs to the strophic principle – with exclusive reference to the ternary typology, both the *fugue*⁸ and, especially, the *allegro* of the *sonata*, can be considered to consist of three parts of a higher order as long as the meaning is no longer only structural, but already a procedural-dramaturgical one, which is connoted by the trinomial *initio-motus-terminus* (Boris Asafiev⁹).

In the context of the formulation and emergence of the tonal-functional system (Rameau), especially the last segment of the musical Baroque (starting with the 17th century) presents itself as a field of equally multiple and intense transformations: the shift from modal to tonal-functional, the shift from polyphonic to homophonic, the emergence of the concepts of genre and style, the expansion of the opera and *oratorio* genre in favor of the mass genre, and the space of structural thinking emerges the principle and, respectively, the trimorphic scheme based on the *da capo* principle¹⁰.

⁸ The ternary (trimorphic) structure of the fugue – the reference here is the *Well-Tempered Clavier* by J. S. Bach – is an example in the purely statistical sense of the word as the majority typology in both volumes. But there is also the tetramorphic typology through the existence of additional articulations such as the counter-exposition, the false half, or the coda.

⁹ The source text is entitled *Музыкальная форма как процесс* [Musical Form as Process], Leningrad: Muzîka, 1971.

¹⁰ In the monograph entitled *Principles of musical form in J. S. Bach* (1981), the musicologist Vladimir Protopopov mentions the importance of this principle in the two already crystallized genres of Baroque music: Chapter 1, *The principle of da capo in Bach's instrumental works* and Chapter 2, *The principle da capo in Bach's vocal works*. A thematic analogy in Romanian musicology is the *Formele muzicale ale Barocului în creația lui Bach* [Musical Forms of the Baroque in the Works of J. S. Bach] (in three volumes) by Sigismund Toduță. Comparing these, in principle, two monographic studies, a difference in substance must be mentioned. Protopopov's text is formulated in an exclusively analytical-synthetic order, since the architecture of each chapter presents the main conceptual stem – the principle of *da capo* (ch. 1 and 2), the principle of the *sonata* in *rondo*-variational forms in Bach (ch. 3), or the description and classification of fugue forms in Bach (ch. 5) –, around which the annotated examples of works and annotated examples of scores are organized in the form of multiple references. Compared to Protopopov's (hyper)essentialization of synthesis, Toduță's text (and collaborators) is a much more “relaxed” one, even if it excels through a pedantic systematic precision of formal typologies in Bach's creation. The relationship between these two monographs could be evaluated in terms of metaphorical (organic) in Protopopov and, respectively, metonymic (mechanical) in Toduță.

The compositional scheme of the *fugue* can be considered as a transitive model, because, as Protopopov mentions, if the emphasis is on the expositional principle (including here also the mid-entries), then the scheme of variations (Pachelbel and Reincken) comes to the fore, but if the emphasis falls on the episodes, the *rondo* scheme is revealed (Protopopov, 1981, p. 122). But only in Bach's *fugues* is the necessary tonal unity achieved, as well as the distribution of tonal functions between the articulations of the form (Exposition – T-D, Treatment – D-S, Reprise – T(S)-T), thus determining the orientation towards the future *sonata allegro* and ignoring, practically, the other Baroque typologies of the *sonata* – the Scarlattian *sonata* and the *sonata* as a suite.

An exciting dialectical relationship articulates between several compositional schemes such as, on the one hand, the Baroque *sonata* (bistrophic, Domenico Scarlatti's “exercises”) and the *sonata* as a suite (from works for solo instruments to Bach's overtures and *concertos grosse*) – with related gender differentiations such as *sonata da chiesa*, *sonata da camera*, *trio-sonata* – in the etymological sense sonar, and, on the other hand, the genealogy of the procedural tristrophic of *da capo* from the *fugue* to the classical *sonata-Allegro*.

In turn, the classical *sonata* absorbs both Baroque proposals: (1) in the plan of the *allegro* form of the *sonata* are incorporated the acquisitions offered by the *fugue* – the procedural tripodicity and, in a new sense – dramaturgical, exposition-treatment-interval, the integral tonal plane through the unifying invariant *da capo* – exposition-interval, the elaborative substance of the treatment, the distribution of tonal functions (the tonal plane) between themes and articulations, the support of the thematic principle, from the monothematic *fugue* towards the bitematism of the classical *sonata*, as a prototype of the future authentic (dominant) relationship between the main theme and the secondary theme here serving the theme-response relationship (actually, the T-D relationship); and (2) in terms of the cyclic aspect, the classical *sonata* absorbs the suite invariant (a cycle composed of a variable number of parts, between three and five), keeping the Baroque residue of the *minuet*, which will only later be replaced by the *scherzo* only by Beethoven.

Group 4. The principle of cyclicity: the chain of higher order. From the point of view of structural complexity, the higher-order chain refers to externalized strophicity, where whole parts of a cyclical work – *symphony*, *opera*, *oratorio*, and *mass* – serve as strophic articulations. It is about the criterion of structural complexity, which is imposed as the ultimate higher level of a musical composition. In the chapter titled *Hierarchy of Complexity* (Sokolov, 2013), musicologist Oleg Sokolov indicates four hypothetical levels of it:

1. the forms that are made up of intonations, motifs and phrases, and that have a conclusion only at the end – the simplest or elementary, the limit being the periodic type structure;

intermediate level: large elaborate period (standard);

2. the forms that are made up of elementary ones – from complex or double period to simple forms;

the level of intermediate forms

(tri-pentastrophic, tristrophic double small, etc.)

3. forms that are made up of simple ones – large or complex forms;

the level of constitutive-contrasting forms

4. forms that are made up of autonomous compositions – cyclic forms made up of parts built, in turn, from *internalized* complex articulations (Sokolov, 2013, pp. 17-18)

Of course, these four levels represent only orientation taxa, with intermediate levels, because the movement from the lower level to the ultimate level occurs gradually, even exceeding (in each case) the limits of its own typological level¹¹. And if in the case of monolithic forms, i.e. having internalized articulations, the tonal-harmonic and thematic links are decisive, then in the case of cyclic forms, the typology of movement (tempo) comes to the fore.

Oleg Sokolov also observes it can also be about supra-cyclical compositions such as triads of sonatas (in the creation of Medtner and Prokofiev), and even above, cycles of works that are not unified by the author's conception, but have content links (Mahler's symphonies, Tchaikovsky's three late symphonies).

¹¹ What Oleg Sokolov states is the idea that between the four traditional typologies there are several “links” of a very different “ascension” in complexity. In this sense, the didactic taxonomy presents itself as one, if not really simplistic, then as a very simplified one, and which presents the entire system of forms as constituted by discrete typologies, given as such by the stabilized forms and made referential by tradition. But it would be a mistake to use such a system as an analysis tool, because in reality, as Oleg Sokolov states, the taxonomy of music forms is not presented as a hierarchy in steps, but rather as a continuous river oriented in a continuous widening in the sense of increasingly advanced degrees of structural-processual complexity. The transition from simple/small strophic patterns to complex/large strophic patterns is achieved through several intermediate patterns. What such a reformulation from the image of the ladder to the image of the river can mean in terms of typological diversity remains only to be imagined, especially since in various professional musical cultures the acceptances of formal patterns will obviously be different according to their own deep musical cultures (oral and anonymous traditions). For example, one is the pattern and genre of *ländler* for the area of Germanic cultures, and quite another will mean *хоровод (horovod)* in Russian culture or *hora* in Romanian rural musical culture, especially as creative consequences at the level of the academic compositional tradition.

Now, already at the level of large cyclic forms (higher order chain), it can no longer be only about the role of structural particularities – as in the case of elementary, simple, and complex forms, because the latter requires a necessary complement already through the role that has within one or more stages of social evolution.

From a historical point of view, the chain principle of higher order found its expression, consecutively, in large cyclical forms with the role of totalizing the determining contents of a historical period. This would be the first function. In Paul Bekker's opinion, such a cyclical form is the symphony, a compositional concept that involves mobilizing the entire audience as an audience and merging them into a single experience. This would be the second function – unifying. This type of channeling with an obvious function of coercive appeal could only be exercised if several determining conditions were respected: (a) a large form, i.e. a cyclical one, (b) an extended interpretive composition, (c) to be able to ensure a lasting acoustic stream, with the aim of as strong and deep impregnation as possible of the broadcast contents. And all this (d) within a single event.

And, for example, neither the novel (to a greater extent), nor the drama (to a lesser extent, by its theatrical specificity), rose to such a height by the (a) distanced presentation and (b) mediated, but also through the determinant (c) of the purely individual experience they provoked. And even in an age of triumphant emotional individualism and subjectivism like Romanticism, the symphony continued to exercise its unifying function, elevating individualism and subjectivity to the highest level of exemplarity of universal value.

Was the symphony the only form able to exercise such a function? No, because the German musicologist continues: “In earlier periods such a role was played by masses, passions, and oratorios” [Bekker, 1926, p. 25/ Aranovski, 1979, p. 14]. In an orderly historical sequence, this consequence would be – masses, oratorios, and passions, but the *opera* genre is missing from this sequence. In this case, the correct typological sequence would be – *mass-opera-symphony*, one totalizing genre for each typology of social organization: the *mass* for theocratic societies, the *opera* for aristocratic ones, and the *symphony* already for emerging democratic societies.

Such a mutation from the theocentric to the anthropocentric, that is, from the *mass* directly to the *symphony*, indeed, could not be understood without the mediating character of the work – a secular “mass” – focused exclusively on the hyperbolization of the anthropocentric. To compete with the *symphony*, the *opera* first succumbs to the Classical Viennese model – the *symphony* as a generalized expression of Man and Existence, so that in Romanticism the image of the Individual, of the Personality given in its particular emotional experiences can be reached (Bekker, 1926, p. 16).

And it would not be possible to imagine another situation, as long as these three cyclic typologies acted in tandem with the ideology of the respective historical period, in terms of content it is a generalized expression of the spirit (ideological-aesthetic and, respectively, emotional-imaginary of) the weather. It can be assumed that having the same function - of organizing autonomous individuals into an integral body called a collective of auditors (public) and of merging/homogenizing the public into the same experience, historically only a substitution has occurred /dislocation of the *mass* (Middle Ages-Renaissance) through *opera* (Baroque), and, respectively, of opera through *symphony* (Viennese Classicism-Romanticism), i.e., in synchrony with the reformulation of social structures and, respectively, ideological contents.

In addition to the achievement in terms of historical typologies – the mass, the opera, the symphony –, the catena finds its fulfillment in the minimalist-repetitive technique. Thus, the temporal space contained between the catena in its generative meaning (the first level of the system) and its explicit revelation as a technique in the works of minimalist composers, can be considered as an integral evolutionary cycle, thus closed and completed, of thinking in the plane of form.

In conclusion, the entire taxonomic system of compositional schemes presents itself in a articulated image. The generative chain invariant, which is at the base of this hierarchy (first level) is found at the upper (fourth) level – of the cyclic invariant of the higher-order chain. In the middle of the system, between the two typologies of the chain, there are two other levels. The second one represents the configurational invariant of the strophic typologies (small and large bi- and tri-strophic, as well as the *rondo* with variations), and the third one finds the higher-order strophic in the procedural sense – the *fugue*, in its technique and form, and the classical *sonata* in both its guises, of the form (*Sonata Allegro*) and of the genre (the traditional four-part cycle).

2.3. Deformation 4: ignoring the generative-evolutionary consequence

Looking at the evolution of compositional thinking, the learning process and historical reality are mirrored. In other words, pedagogy and history relate as two antinomies, because didactic logic reverses the historical logic of the genesis and evolution of thought in the plane of the logic of the compositional organization of musical artifacts. And what is being studied has nothing in common with what was in historical reality. Coursework *The systematics of typologies of compositional schemes* (the real title of the discipline) does not give any indication as to the actual historical determinants that led to the emergence and development in certain eras of certain compositional patterns. So the school prepares students for a reality that doesn't exist and as a consequence gives them a tool that doesn't work.

The didactic consequence of typologies of compositional schemes is structured from simple to complex: (a) elementary structures (cell-figure, motif), (b) the mediating role of the phrase, (c) simple and double period, (d) short strophic small and big, (e) the long strophic of the *rondo* and *variations* (this is not a compositional pattern except in the case of the theme), (f) the higher-order strophic, especially the *sonata-allegro*, and (g) the cyclical forms – the junction with the criterion of gender –, the chain of higher order. In other words, nothing to do with historical development.

Or, the accumulative logical structuring, from simple to complex, in the plan of teaching completely excludes the understanding of the system of compositional schemes in their determining connection with the patterns of practices and social organization as a system that generates norms, rules, and laws, regarding the evolutionary orientation of musical thought, of the provenance of the schemes from popular or religious musical practices (institutional – church or academic)¹², differentiated over time, and of the decisive flow through which the need to express certain contents claimed certain specific compositional schemes for their expression.

The general historical picture is an extremely complex one and acting through multiple determinants and evolutionary variables, what the discipline Systematics of typologies of compositional schemes offers, in the end, turns out to be equally far too little, sufficiently imprecise in the sense of a fragmented general picture (i.e. scattered), and consequently ineffective formatively.

Without resorting to authoritative sources (manuals, monographs, and analytical, systematic, and historical treatises), a first and hypothetical origin of compositional schemes can be identified as a vocal one. Both cantability and, above all, orality, are two coordinates of a generative nucleus in the plane of the constitution of musical discursive logic. But as intonation without rhythm cannot be imagined, the concurrence of the choreographic parameter should also be admitted through the triple suggestibility – facial, manual, and, in general, the dynamics of postural evolution – as “illustrative” support and expressive amplification of the sound-music string. It is about multiple and concentrated actions, but in the suggestive-expressive plane, it is about a third component which is the narrative one. Thus, the repetitiveness of the refrain as a mnemonic (rememorative) anchor and the evolutionary propensity of the couplet as an elaboration of the narrated subject can be legitimized.

¹² The consequence of the cultural typologies is clear – from the rural-type organization, thus being about a ritualized, anonymous, oral, and non-institutionalized culture, to the urban-type organization, with the intrinsic institutionalization of all forms of collective existence (administrative, political, religious, and generally cultural).

Given this hypothesis of the consubstantiality of the three components – vocal, choreographic, and narrative – it is not difficult to postulate the primacy of long compositional schemes, namely by the narrative parameter (a second meaning of orality – incantatory, declamatory, poetic), as the more appropriate form both for formulating and for sharing some necessary and important contents in terms of collective consciousness and existence. This action, in turn, has three functions: the first, the homogenization of the imagination and sensitivity of the whole group through the joint participation (emotionally involved) in the vocal-choreographic-narrative “ritual” (religious practice in a formative sense), the second, updating and completing of the collective memory and, implicitly, of the transmission of its contents between generations (mythological practice in terms of memory and history), and thirdly, of the imaginary correlation of group members with the dynamics of the surrounding reality (the function of orientation, coordination, and control). Whether it is about the rites of passage (birth, wedding, death), about the rituals (holidays) of the agrarian calendar cycle or the annual (magical)-religious ritual, or in terms of the mythological imaginary background in its quality of living, lived history of the whole group.

In favor of the primacy of long and extensive schemes – couplet-chorus, rondo, variations – the positioning against the generative-primordial structure which the catena also advocates. Important are the degrees of revelation of the chain principle in the patterns of musical thought and practice. In this sense, long compositional schemes are situated in immediate proximity, while short patterns present themselves as strongly historically (temporally) and culturally mediated. Thus, closer to the chain, means closer to the primordial, to the ahistorical, and, implicitly, to the archetypal¹³.

This criterion of the historical primacy of the long forms contradicts the traditional scientific (musicological) taxonomy, and, in descent, the didactic one. The increase in complexity has nothing to do with the reality of historical evolution but only serves the principle of gradual initiation of students into the systematics of the traditional forms of European compositional culture. In another sense, it is logical to admit that the small forms serve to constitute the large forms, as has been established by tradition since the 18th century. But

¹³ Unsurprisingly, a proximity to the primordial principle – the chain – is displayed by Béla Bartók's musical thinking or, more precisely, his method of composition is largely based on the variational method. It is about melodic-repetitive entities (*ostinato*), where a melody of folklore origin is presented as *ostinato*. This fact is analyzed in detail in the study entitled *Вариационно-куплетная форма в фолклорных обработках Б. Бартока* [The couplet-variational form in B. Bartók's folklore works] by Nina Iudenic: “Variation in the most diverse forms - from the severe to the most free - is the organic characteristic of Bartók's music. It can be said that this is one of the main aspects of his method, which determined the composer's great attention to the variational forms themselves”. (Iudenic, 1971, p. 162)

music being a processual-cumulative phenomenon, i.e. dynamic – unfolding of acoustic materiality over time, its original and equally generative form is, however, the chain of succession and alternation. The evolution of musical thought in terms of compositional schemes should probably be seen as a progressive fragmentation with a sense of intensification, from the narrative intrinsic to the emotional-suggestive extrinsic.

2.4. Deformation 5: the dialectic of primacy – structural or thematic?

Namely, this is where a series of conceptual intuitions come from, but also analytical findings, which, in contradiction with the hegemony of instrumentality, reveal, however, nuclei of an obscured or perhaps even excluded origin, which is vocality.

As a reminiscence of the cantabile-vocal origin, and at the same time, of the long forms, appears the attempt of the musicologist Iuri Holopov, who proposes the systematization of the (already) homophonic and polyphonic instrumental forms starting from the structure with the theme function (Holopov, 1971, p. 65). Traditionally, the primary unit of form is considered the period, which is a formal entity in which a single relatively elaborated and completed musical idea is set forth (Mazel, 1967, p. 498). Here, however, differentiation is necessary, which L. Mazel formulates as follows: “Based on the systematization of forms relatively reduced in size (from the period and even up to the large tristrophic form inclusive) and homophonic (but also of forms that combine elements of homophony and polyphony) the degree of structural complexity is set, which as a structural “unit” have the period, regardless of its dimensions” (Mazel, 1960, p. 165). But in the case of other homophonic forms (*variations, rondo, sonata*, etc.) thematic and tonal relationships are the basis. The advantage of such a systematization lies in the simplicity of approaching all forms of homophonic music and in the (analytical) safety it offers, but also one that is widespread and elaborated in the smallest details, so that it has become usual, natural, and already for a long time can be considered traditional (Holopov, 1971, p. 66).

But, Holopov continues, as the content of his product the composer does not compose periods, but themes, regardless of the formulation of the latter as periods or as more extended structures. That is, a composer works on the meanings of content, and not on the meanings of structure. Namely thematism, as a structure with determined semantic functions, and is primarily the object of the composer's work, the theme being, in fact, the carrier of imagery and expression¹⁴. This is because the form, in addition to its purely structural

¹⁴ Specifically starting from this formulation, the undersigned's study entitled *The symphonic suite “Scheherazade”: the model of a multiprogrammatic conception*, in *Artes. Journal of Musicology*, no. 27-28/2023. In the economy of analytical discourse, the information on the

identity, is primarily an expressive entity in the sense of invigorating stimulation (as Pascal Bentoiu suggested in *Imagine și sens* [Image and Meaning]), and endowed with a suggestive-communicative function. Unlike the word theme, the word period does not communicate anything. In another order of ideas, the gradations of contrast (in a complete picture: repetition-contrast-variation) as a tool to equally stimulate the expression-suggestiveness, but also the procedural tempo in an elaborative sense, are determined not by the ratios inside the period, but inside the theme. Through such a classification criterion – the theme – the relationship between form and genre can be visualized with much greater clarity, a purpose for which the period proves to be unfit.

In other words, not the structural complexity (how many joints or parts), but the functions of the joints of the musical form serve as a criterion for the systematization of the forms. And since the higher, most important functions of the musical form consist in the exposition of the theme and its elaboration, then the logical and structural unit of the musical form is the theme (and not the period). And the theme becomes the criterion for systematizing the forms (Holopov, 1971, pp. 69-70).

Holopov's systematization originates, first, in Hugo Riemann's systematization¹⁵, but it goes even further into the historical depth, also recovering the systematization of Adolf B. Marx, unfairly neglected in the opinion of the Russian musicologist. Both taxonomies are formulated starting from the thematic criterion.

Riemann's taxonomic formulation:

1. Forms with a single theme: A+B+A, the first A being the main idea, and B being treated together with the last A – the two-part form of the *lied* (the theme of the variations from Beethoven's *Sonata No. 12*);
2. Forms with autonomous elaborated middle section: A+B (trio, second theme, middle section) + A – three-part form of *lied* and also a small form of *rondo* (Beethoven, *Scherzo*, and *Andante* from *Sonata No. 15*, and *Adagio grazioso* from *Sonata No. 16*);
3. Forms with three or more themes: A (a-b-a) + B (a-b-a, with a strongly contrasting third theme) + A (a-b-a) – (larger) *rondo* forms (Beethoven, the endings of *Sonatas No. 1* and *No. 3*, first movement of *Sonata No. 13*, Chopin, *Waltz op. 18*, *E flat major*);

compositional schemes of each of the four parts served only as complementary arguments, subordinated to the thematic, that is, semantic, content analysis.

¹⁵ This is expounded in *Grundriss der Kompositionslehre* (with the “suffix” *Musikalische Formenlehre*) (Riemann, 1905, pp. 117-118).

4. Forms with two themes treated as a whole: A (first theme + intermediate segment + second theme + concluding segment) + B (elaborative articulation) + A (as the initial thematic group) – the so-called *sonata* form (forms standard *sonata*) (Holopov, 1971, pp. 68-69);

However, from this systematic, it becomes obvious that the alternation between upper and lower case letters, which according to didactic usage indicate articulations of the form, in reality represent *thematic indicators*, the alternation of letters primarily indicates the alternation of themes. In other words, the primacy is held by the content criterion (a+b+a+c+a), the structural-compositional one holding a secondary role. If things were the other way around, then, for example, in the case of a small tristrophic form, where all three articulations would have an identical periodic extension (8 bars), qualitative differentiation would have been impossible, because it would be about identical replication in the image of isomorphic chain (a+a+a).

This dialectical relationship of the struggle of opposites, i.e. between the taxon theme (content) and the taxon period (structure), is traditionally resolved in favor of the period as the typical form of exposition of the theme. Although, Holopov notes, there are enough examples with the theme often written in the form of more elaborate constructions than the period. For example, the theme of variations by tradition is bistrophic. The main theme of the final *rondo* (of a cycle) is frequently both bistrophic and tristrophic. In Tchaikovsky, the main themes in *sonata* forms appear more often as tristrophic, and the structure of the main theme in the first movement of *Symphony No. 5* should be seen as an intermediate form between small tristrophic and big tristrophic (Holopov, 1971, p. 71).

And then, from here it emerges that the traditional taxonomy of forms represents only a statistical ensemble of the most frequent patterns, and does not provide the image of the entire typological field of musical thought and practices. And even less they provide examples of the missing “links”. Thus, it remains without any explanation, for example, the transitional (transitional, intermediate) forms from the small strophic forms to the large strophic forms, and then to the rondo with the variations. The discipline *Analysis of musical forms* does indeed offer a specialization, but only in terms of a fragmentary taxonomy, i.e. only the disparate pieces of an incomplete analytical installation, and not very effective as a cognitive-heuristic tool.

2.5. Deformation 6: microstructure as the beginning of the study of forms?

The didactic study of compositional schemes is organized from simple (simple schemes) to complex (complex schemes), and this is in contradiction with historical reality: long (narrative), extensive schemes, precede simple,

intensive (dialectical) schemes. Thus, the didactic evaluative criterion from simple to complex not only does not reflect reality – from long (*rondo-variational* in the couplet-chorus relationship) towards a progressive shortening (*Da capo*) and, implicitly, a simplification but misses one of the causes intensifications – from narrative-extensive forms and thus with a reduced procedural coefficient – the tendency towards stationary (weak or even non-evolutionary statism) –, towards dialectical-intensive forms (evolutionary dynamism) with an amplified procedural coefficient.

And then? In the beginning was... the cell. Along with the figure. Not. It's not about biology, it's about the forms of music. And then vice versa. In the beginning was the figure. And only then the cell. Two sub-formal entities. Two postures of Asafiev's intonation. Two entities from which the study of "forms" traditionally begins, i.e. compositional schemes. The first fact to note is the non-existence of any associative link between the cell-figure and the compositional scheme. The question reappears: what does the composer compose? Cells and figures, compositional schemes, or first themes, i.e. explicit ideational and expressive material? What is the relevance of this binomial (cell figure) in the constitution of a compositional scheme? However, the latter is much easier to understand - $A+B$, $A+B+A$, $A+B+A+B+A$, or $A+B+A+C+A$ –, the letters representing coefficients thematic, and not structural – and much simpler being, first, the assimilation of the entire hierarchy of these schemes. Both (and "form" as a scheme, and the whole taxonomy of schemes) being presented as such, as a referential level, can later serve as a starting point for both "immersion" in the microstructure (more cells and fewer figures), as well as for "taking off" towards higher compositional levels of procedural relevance.

The didactic argument could be the simplicity of an elementary and indivisible (sub)structural entity. But in reality, it is only an apparent simplicity, with a very different capacity to generate structure or, more precisely, a very different and specific dialectic between structural and expressive in the sense of the volume of information generated, accumulated, and emitted.

The first, the cell, is endowed with a triple potential: semantic (thematic), processual-evolutionary (temporal), and structural-textural (spatial), which allows it not only to unfold as a theme but as an integral composition in its written totality. The second is stationed at a single function, the ornamental one (for example, the Baroque ornamental variation procedure). That is, a basic one, and, asemantic, that is, athematic (for example, the Albertine bass, with all its harmonic meaning) and idiosyncratic. In other words, the cell has sufficient generative energy to reveal its differentiation potential towards reaching the form of a thematic profile, having the function of seeds that eventually germinate into a tree of the entire musical composition. It's about individuation.

That is, displaying a certain processual-evolutionary potential. And the figure manifests itself as a structure whose function is repetitive, auxiliary, one of filling (rather rhythmic, and equally metro-tectonic) the sound space and time with conventional musical material. This is without any possibility of diversifying the expression in the sense of focusing on the subjective specificity. In this case, only the cell turns out to be a metaphor¹⁶ for the entire work, i.e. an organic entity, able to ensure, unlike the redundant passivity of the figure, the articulation of the three active procedural determinants – repetition-contrast-variation.

Historically, a long and difficult evolution from figurative thinking to cellular-nucleic thinking must be noted. Only the latter, activated at the beginning of the 19th century with the emergence of romantic musical thinking, also initiated the already modern acceptance of the theme concept and the image of the thematic¹⁷ basin. Or, in this situation, the keyword is emancipation (from the tradition of figurative thinking), which consisted in the specific Baroque-Classical way in opposition to the Romantic one to solve the problem of saturation or equal completion of space and time (assigned to sonority and therefore of form) with musical material. That is, filling what Leonard B. Meyer calls a gap (in the sense of emptiness, fault)¹⁸. In the full form of the idea, the keyword turns into the complete phrase semantic emancipation. In other words, it is about the permissive capacity that the figure and the cell have, respectively, in terms of the amount of information (meanings, expressive amount, compositional inventiveness, and in general everything related to content) that they can generate and they can traffic.

¹⁶ The metaphoric aspect and even, perhaps, the symbolic function of the cell consists, at first, in the fact that it potentially already contains within itself the entire work, so that later this singularity unfolds through its very generative capacity that takes the form of the process of continuous evolutionary transformation. In turn, the figure “staticism” in an implacable censorship of transformation, which leaves only the possibility of a metonymic, that is, mechanical, repetitive replication concatenation.

¹⁷ In his volume entitled *Музыкальная форма как процесс* [Musical form as a process] (Asafiev, 1971), the academician Boris Asafiev formulates the phrase *intonational background of the historical period*. The term *intonation* implies two meanings: (1) the act of intonation, that is, the specific way of existence of the musical form as a process of intonation, and (2) intonation, which is, on the one hand, the manifestation of sonority, and on the other, the awareness sonority. In other words, “... in order to be vocally expressed, the idea becomes intonation (Asafiev, 1971, p. 211, a.n.)” and “... first of all, intonation represents the quality of conscious utterance” (of a meaning). (Asafiev, 1971, p. 259)

¹⁸ In the opinion of the American musicologist, the inventiveness and, at the same time, the value of a composer's thinking can be evaluated according to the decisions that, for example, Bach takes in opposition to Geminiani to fill the structural gaps (gaps, faults) that “crack” between the sounds of a melody, between harmonic pillars, or, in general, between compositional micro- or macro-articulations (Meyer, 1957/1994, chapter I – *Meaning in Music and Information Theory*).

To realize the difference between the role of the figure (in the Baroque and the Mozartian Rococo respectively) as opposed to the cell (already in Beethovenian Pre-romanticism), Charles Rosen's account of the similarity of passages in the *Piano Concerto K. 450* is relevant, in *B flat major*, and the *Piano Concerto K. 595*, also in *B flat major*. The same fact is found between the end of the *Piano Sonata K. 333*, in *B flat major*, and the *Piano and Violin Sonata K. 454*, also in *B flat major*. All four works belong to Mozart. The conclusion is obvious:

These passages are formed out of the basic elements of tonality: placing them well requires a certain mastery, but the invention of material here may be said to be almost at the zero degree. It is easy to see how any one of these passages may conveniently be replaced by a similar one from another work (Rosen, 2000, pp. 353-355).

This account is important because it confirms Leonard B. Meyer's idea of the filler function with figurative material and thus the expansion of structural space, which Rosen exemplifies through the role of arpeggios, figurations, in Mozart music, of virtuosity, or the fanfare figures:

(...) the conventional elements of structure, the banal figuration, and the arpeggios help Mozart to solve the problem of an expansive form. (...) They (figurative typologies – author's note) allow the composer to slow down the momentum as the development section reaches its end after the disconcertingly swift changes of the opening, and endow the return to the opening theme with the necessary breadth. (Rosen, 2000, p. 357)

It becomes obvious that in an expressive sense, figuration represents a simple sound relief, a commonplace, impersonal, and, at the same time, conventional, serving also as useful material for improvisation (that is, intended for figurative variation). But at the same time, it also offers a much easier and more comfortable reception of the musical material, i.e. without requiring an additional effort to understand.

Only at the level of these two microstructural entities – the cell and the figure – the accumulation of information necessary for differentiation (historical, generative, textural and structural, processual, semantic) positions the approach to this topic in a stage after the assimilation of the idea of compositional scheme and the entire typological hierarchy. This finding is pertinent to the abstraction that both the cell and the figure possess – both as entities actively involved, first, in building the structure. At this microstructural level, a typological differentiation is necessary both according to the content load and according to the structural complexity.

At the first level of evaluation, both the *cell* and the *figure* turn out to be (1) sub-semantic, i.e. neutral, entities and equally sub-formal: the cell, by its elementary and indivisible structural paucity (although with melodic-textural potential), and the figure by conventionalism (with rhythmic-textural potential). Both entities are endowed with *intonational* potential. The real semantic load (2) is manifested by the reason, still located at a sub-formal level, and thus relatively autonomous, that is, lacking a necessary more consistent, and more extensive contextualization. The latter is realized at the pre-formal level (3) of the *phrase* as the cumulation of already semantically contextualized *motifs*. The complete levels, both formally and semantically, are realized in the structure of the *period*, a structure able to adopt the state of the autonomous structural entity as a *monostrophic* form.

Even if a composer does not compose periods, but themes, in terms of analytical instrumentation, the microstructural means prove to be very advanced as well as complex in terms of understanding, as well as practical assimilation. Here we should also add the involvement of the two alphabets – Latin and Greek: the Latin letters *x*, *y*, and *z* for cells, the Greek letters α , β , (and possibly γ) for motifs, again the Latin letters *a*, *b*, (and possibly a *c*) for phrases, also Latin letters, but already capital letters *A*, *B*, for compositional schemes starting from the period level.

Each theme of the course *Typological Identification of Compositional Schemes* (i.e., *Musical Forms Analysis*) answers a question. But given this microstructural complexity (and by the sub-semantic and sub-formal abstraction), the series of lectures on the topic of microstructures has the task of clarifying, that is, answering, an extremely complex question: in what way (like compositional technique) is a sub-semantic and sub-formal entity used in both the structural and procedural edification of a musical composition? It is only here that a further deformation becomes evident, a constitutive one, to explain the meaning of the microstructure as a primary element in the process of constituting the themes and large articulations of a compositional scheme. Although in reality, the microstructural elements have as their function, first of all, the edification and continuous completion of the *texture*. Because these two entities – the cell and the figure – before being considered *microstructural* elements, they display its authentic potential only as *textural-subsemantic* and, obviously, *subformal* elements.

In this specific case, the deformed definition of the figure-cell belongs to the erroneous attribution – as (sub)structures of the musical “language” and having the motifs and phrases as taxonomic continuity, so that in the end they arrive not at the *theme*, but at the *period* as a completely different taxonomic ending. That is, orienting the accumulation of elements towards scheme and structure. The correct attribution – as (sub)structures of the texture and consequently of the theme as a fundamental compositional element, would

reorient in its bed the meaning of the motif and the phrase as the first elements of all *texture*. In this way, the understanding of how the (sub)structural elements reach the necessary capacity (as in the case of Beethoven's *III and V symphonies*) to generate an entire symphonic cycle can be achieved.

2.6. Deformation 7: *Beethovenocentrism* as the substance of the didactic approach.

The didactic study of compositional schemes is based to a great extent on the exemplification of the logical-structural patterns elaborated in Beethoven's creation. It is an implacable argument. Indeed, there are extensions to both Baroque and Romantic forms, obviously, as periods before and after Viennese Classicism. Indeed, the work of Haydn and Mozart is also visited. But without excesses compared to the hegemon who is, however, Beethoven. No mention of the forms of the Middle Ages or the Renaissance¹⁹, except perhaps only optionally, in passing, and in any case in a superficial way. Nor is much discussed about the forms of the first musical modernism (until 1914 – Schönberg's atonal works, Stravinsky's ballets, Debussy's creation, or about the incipient Brutism in Russolo's or Varèse works, with an extension until 1924, the initiation of the dodecaphonic practice). In any case, no more profoundly than in the case of medieval and renaissance music.

Returning to *Beethovenocentrism*, a first explanation would refer to the suffix *-centrism*, with the specification that Beethoven's entire creation is positioned between Baroque and Romanticism. But it is a somewhat relative identification, as long as Haydn and Mozart enjoy a similar position as Viennese classics.

In terms of compositional patterns, the musical Baroque presents itself as an era of typological formulation and accumulation (form, genre, style), while musical Romanticism amplifies, develops, innovates, and ultimately pushes things toward its end-of-century dispersion. To what point do Baroque accumulations lead and what amplifies and innovates Romantic conceptions? The answer is: towards the exemplarity of the library of Beethovenian patterns and, respectively, starting from the same Beethovenian patterns. And not from Haydn and Mozart.

In this case, why is it only about Beethoven and not together with Haydn and Mozart? The key word is emancipation, and the dividing line between the period of aristocratic cultures and the emergence of democratic cultures is drawn through the year 1789, the Great French Revolution (Haydn is 57 years

¹⁹ The thematic fascicles belonging to the composer Vasile Herman from Cluj should be mentioned here: *Formele muzicii medievale europene* [The forms of medieval European music] (1978) and *Formele muzicii Renașterii* [The forms of music of the Renaissance] (1980), respectively.

old, Mozart – 33, and Beethoven – 19), equally Masonic, anti-monarchical, and anti-clerical. And which, in terms of musical culture, puts an end to both, and above all, aristocratic excellence, as well as church-religious continuity, in their capacity as ideologies, but also dominant social groups. In other words, it is about such a library of contents that we can understand, share, and take on because it must be admitted that precisely these contents also represented the basis of the collective imaginary, whose “spearhead” is already the actuality of the XXIst century.

Haydn's emancipation overlaps precisely over the period of rise and crisis respectively (9 Thermidor, 27 July 1794, arrest of Robespierre) – Symphonies No. 93-96 (the first four of the series of London Symphonies, 1791, the year of Mozart's death) and *Symphonies No. 103-104* (1795, last two). Beethoven's creative emancipation corresponds to his conceptual reformulation in terms of organic thinking, as defined and described by Leonard B. Meyer (1984, p. 262), with the writing of the *Eroica Symphony* (No. 3, in E flat major, op. 55) during 1803-1804 (the year of Napoleon's coronation as Emperor of France). Mozart, however, remains a composer whose art is totally “closed” stylistically between temporal limits and tributary to the artistic rigors of Viennese aristocratic culture (*rococo* culture, an irrelevant one in the new post-revolutionary and imperial cultural paradigm).

Being the youngest – Haydn b. 1732, Mozart b. 1756 and Beethoven b. 1770 –, the latter succeeds in a conceptual reformulation already after the first two symphonies still tributary to the so-called Viennese Classicism, to initiate a completely different conception, other expressive references, another stylistic, and in general a completely different ideology (proto-Romantic, as if in the lineage of Goethe and Schiller's *Sturm und Drang*, but already one with a pan-European extension by the new European, Napoleonic space) even compared to Haydn (largely, however, tributary to aristocratic aesthetics) with whom he coexisted until 1809. But neither emancipation nor conceptual transformation can be considered sufficient answers for understanding *Beethovenocentrism*, a term coined by musicologist Ivan I. Sollertinski in his text entitled *Historical Typologies of musical dramaturgy*.

A further question would refer to the persistence of Beethoven's figure as a cultural symbol (not only of Germany, but of the whole of Europe), and as a conceptual reference with pan-European values throughout the 19th century. Five are the answers that hypothesize the Titan from Bonn and not any other composer of the 18th century. And all five of these answers are closely related.

1. The first answer, of social-historical substance, identifies Beethoven's entire creation with the duration of the imperial-revolutionary historical period initiated by the Great French Revolution. The generally heroic-pathetic-monumental-mobilizing ethos of his music can rightly be considered as an authentic *mythologem* of the historical period not only between the years 1804-

1824 (the year of writing his last symphony, the 9th) but even between the years 1789 and 1917²⁰. The entire 19th century can be subdivided by the three revolutions – 1830 (and the official beginning of Romanticism, drama *Ernani* by Hugo), 1848 (with the active involvement of Wagner), and 1870 (Paris Commune), in as many stages, which spill over the border the next century – the first Russian revolution of 1905 and the Bolshevik revolution of 1917. Six events with cumulative effects at the end of the First World War (1918, the year of Debussy's death) determined the disappearance of four empires: German, Austro-Hungarian, Russian, and Ottoman²¹.

The following four answers are of rather ideological-aesthetic substance, but with an obvious valorizing-canonical intention and with a reference to the intrinsically musical substance of Beethoven's creation.

2. (1) The first answer is formulated by E. T. A. Hoffmann in the review that appeared on the performance of Beethoven's *Fifth Symphony*²² (1910), in which he affirms the latter as the forerunner of Romanticism, but with more clarity in the text entitled *Alte und Neue Kirchenmusik* (1814), in which he hypothesizes Palestrina and the conception of a *cappella* music as absolute or

²⁰ Only a segment of this period is contained in the first volume entitled *The Age of Revolution: Europe 1789-1848* (1962), part of a whole tetralogy, belonging to the British historian Eric Hobsbawm. The entire historical course is distributed as follows: *The Age of Revolutions 1789-1848* (1962), *The Age of Capital: 1848-1875* (1975), *The Age of Empire: 1875-1914* (1987), and *The Age of Extremes: The Short XX Century 1914-1991* (1994). However, the historical path 1789-1917 can be considered unequivocally an era of revolutions, regardless of the capitalist or (colonial) imperialist determinants that have an obvious role as a generating cause, revolutions appearing as effects.

²¹ A parallel can be drawn between Beethoven and Shostakovich. If Beethoven's mythologeme ensures its persistence through the bubbling character of European revolutions, then Shostakovich's mythologeme would include in his symphonies the history of the USSR in its significant events – the year 1905 (*Symphony XI*), the year 1917 (*Symphony XII*), The Great War for the Defense of the Fatherland: the siege of Leningrad (*Symphony VII*), joined by the events of Baby Yar (mass execution of the *Jews*, *Symphony XIV*), and the aftermath of the conflagration (*Symphony VIII*). This proximity can also be seen as a continuity of historical thematization, in the sense that Beethoven's “umbrella” covers the period up to 1914, and Shostakovich's “umbrella” covers the following period, starting from 1905, which, what and right, it overlaps the end of the Beethovenian domain. However, two states of affairs should be differentiated: (1) the river of depth of the Beethovenian mythologem as a universal emblem of European musical culture and (2) the emergence of the last European cultural modernity (the third) after the dispersion of Romanticism, through several conceptual orientations which are the basis of the new image of European musical culture – on the one hand, orientations with a certain aesthetic determinant such as Neoclassicism in opposition to Post-romanticism, Verism, Realism, Expressionism, Impressionism, and on the other hand, orientations with a certain determinant of this specific musical data – Atonalism, Symbolism and Bruitism.

²² The text appears in two consecutive issues of the *Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung*, the first part in no. 40 of July 4, 1810, pp. 630-642, second in no. 41 of July 11, 1810, pp. 652-659; likewise, the volume of David Charlton (ed.) (1989), *E T A. Hoffmann's Musical Writings*, can be consulted.

pure vocal music as a model and challenge for Romantic composers, in an obvious parallel to Beethoven's pure instrumental music.

3. (2) The second answer is given by Robert Schumann through his idea of the *New Poetic Age*²³, in which contrapuntal instrumental music (Bach) and homophonic instrumental music (Beethoven) would merge: *canon 48+32*²⁴.

4. (3) The third answer belongs to Adolf B. Marx (1997), who states that with the *3rd Symphony*, the *Eroica*, the history of European music reaches its fulfillment, and instrumental music, as an expression of ideas, is considered ideal music.

5. (4) The fourth answer is produced by Richard Wagner in his *Program for the performance of the Ninth Symphony* (1846), a text in which he captures in the sonorities of Beethoven's last symphony an overcoming of the limits of absolute music and an end to the history of the symphony (Grey, 2009, p. 480). In Part IV, Wagner senses a Beethovenian intuition regarding his own (that is, Wagner's) conception of musical drama, which he, Wagner, thus brings to fruition.

As a conclusion of the entire path of Beethoven's canonization, two (nostalgic-Neoclassical) writings of August Halm entitled *Unsere Zeit und Beethoven*²⁵ (Halm, 1911) and the Beethoven monograph should be mentioned (Berlin: Hesse, 1927). And to this latter argument may be attached the romantic preoccupation with identifying a possible "Beethoven's Tenth Symphony" as happened, for example, with Brahms' *Symphony No. 1*, and which already starting with the latter, acquires the proportions of a true nostalgia and neo-classical artistic orientation, which later spills over the entire 20th modernist century (the Reger-Shostakovich conceptual arc).

Thus, Sollertinski's term – *Beethovenocentrism* – acquired a very solid and sustained support during Beethoven's lifetime, and through a series of successive reconfirmations it adopts a genuine *metanarrative* status that survives to this day. Beethoven's compositional schemes thus become the universal key for learning and reading what is the very form of music for a

²³ The text entitled *Zur Eröffnung des Jahrganges 1835* appears in *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* (1835, no. 1, p. 3), (*apud* Dahlhaus, 1999, p. 105). Another source is *Gesammelte Schriften über Musik und Musiker* (Schumann, I, 1854, pp. 59-63). Also worth mentioning here is the text entitled *Von zwei Kulturen der Musik* (Halm, 1913/1947), about the Bachian *fugue* and the Beethovenian *sonata*.

²⁴ "The well-tempered harpsichord is the Old Testament, while Beethoven's sonatas are the New Testament. We have to believe in both." Walker, A. (2010). *Hans von Bülow: A Life and Times*. New York: Oxford University Press, p. 341.

²⁵ August Halm, however, maintains fidelity to Schumann's *canon* – 48 + 32 – by even publishing another text entitled *Unsere Zeit und Bach* (1915). But to the conclusion of *Bach-fugue* and *Beethoven-sonata*, the German composer, theologian and teacher adds a third element – *Bruckner-symphony*.

later comparative-evaluative design on the creation of any other composer, group, school, national culture, or historical period²⁶.

Starting with the rationalist, individualist, and voluntarist determinants, which he proposes and through which Beethoven's music²⁷ survives, which shaped the mentality, sensibility, and imaginary of an entire 19th century²⁸, the image of the Titan from Bonn goes through many differentiating filters that accumulate an increasingly prominent reputational value. Thus, through Hoffmann's differentiation, the first referential phrase (1) pure instrumental music is slowed down, but to the detriment of pure vocal music. Through Schumann's association (in fact, differentiation) the second referential phrase (2) homophonic instrumental music is slowed down, but at the expense of contrapuntal instrumental music. Through the evaluative reasoning of Adolf B. Marx the third referential phrase (3) ideal instrumental music (as music) is put into circulation, and through Wagner the evaluation of Beethoven's music as (4) absolute (instrumental) music, and even surpassing this truly transcendental limit. However, none of the composers of the 19th and 20th centuries, but none of the previous periods, enjoyed such a propaganda campaign carried out by the composers themselves.

In this way, both the compositional schemes and the taxonomy of Beethoven's genres, both referential (of obvious totalizing exemplarity), become vehicles for establishing the primarily homophonic instrumentality as dominant. Through Beethoven's conception of music, Rameau's proposal, and not Rousseau's, finds triumphant confirmation and spectacular persistence: the

²⁶ Here the musicologist Edward Lowinsky's effort to establish Josquin des Prez as a "Beethoven" of the Renaissance should be mentioned. A spectacular deconstruction of this idea is undertaken by the British musicologist Paula Higgins, *The Apotheosis of Josquin des Prez and Other Mythologies of Musical Genius*, in *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 57, No. 3 (Autumn 2004), pp. 443-510.

²⁷ It is about Enlightenment rationalism – on a logical-structural level – and thus classicist, on the one hand, and individualistic voluntarism, this time (proto)romantic – on a psycho-affective level, on the other. The volitional vector finds its further realization in Wagner's preoccupation with the writings of Schopenhauer (*The World as Will and Representation*), and the individualist-solipsistic vector – in the creation of Scriabin. And barely Mahler overcomes this Beethoven-centric metanarrative inertia by resorting to the genres of lied and vocal symphony, finding a reference in Schubert's vocal creation.

²⁸ The Beethoven case can be read in at least two semantic keys. The first consists in matching the Beethovenian contents (generated during the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars) with the 19th century of revolutions, even passing into the first decades of the 20th century (Vladimir I. Lenin: "I don't know better music than the *Appassionata*"). While the second one proposes Beethoven as a cultural reference with metanarrative value, i.e. in his capacity as an archetype (in terms of content) and, respectively, as invariant (in terms of structures), both in terms of the geographical horizon (pan-European extension) and in time (panhistorical extension). Both understandings – both matching and determining streamlining – can be treated as consubstantial with an identical truth value.

tonal-functional system and the primacy of instrumental music. In terms of didactic study, both adopt an obvious primacy in their normative quality, and such evaluative “tools” apply both to vocal music, and choreographic music, but also to other types of syntactic organization – modal and contrapuntal.

2.7. Deformation 8: The meaning of the written reference on the level of compositional relevance.

In a natural order of things, the continuation of the assignments in the discipline *Analyzes of musical forms* (the traditional title) should pursue two fundamental objectives: (1) to represent a replica of the evolution of musical thought, emulating, one by one, each corresponding type of thought to each historical period, and (2) the basic didactic reference should be compositional, that is, learning the process of cumulative growth of the structure of a musical work, and not a simple scholastic appropriation of compositional schemes.

At the beginnings of European culture, musical thought manifested itself through monodic type organization and continued through the gradual increase in complexity in terms of texture, that is, through syntactic sound organization systems: heterophonic, polyphonic, and homophonic. Here, however, another didactic deformation appears – the beginning of the study with layered textural forms, where the function of the bass, the function of the soprano, as well as the functions of the middle voices are present. Too many floors to consider, especially with the movement of cells and motifs at various levels of texture.

Observation. This circulation of cells and motifs at all levels of writing raises at least two questions. The first, as indicated above, consists of an identification: whose growth and evolutionary accumulation is determined by this circulation and agglutinating interaction of cells and motifs — of the scheme, that is, of the articulations, or the texture? Because even after the incipient enunciation of the first sounds, and even before the clarification of any phrasal or periodic articulation (structures already semantically loaded), it is about the initiation of written accumulation, which advances towards formalization as an articulation with a fully formulated meaning.

The second question tries to identify an alternative possibility of agglutination of microstructures, one from the very beginning compositionally oriented, and not just, simplistically, structurally. It is about the very logic of concatenating microstructures, and not so much to *textural* accumulation, but rather of compositional accumulative consequence. That is, following both the typological identity of the entities entered into the process of compositional growth, as well as their logical organization in a relational consequence in an expressive (dramaturgical) sense.

In this case, a timely question arises: what is the type of texture in which the logic of concatenation and evolution would be the most exposed, of

immediate visibility, and thus would be the easiest to identify, systematize, and, consequently, to analyze? That is, to learn the meaning as well as the structure of the analytical discourse. What, how, and for what purpose is subject to analysis. It is difficult to achieve this kind of understanding by resorting to contrapuntal or homophonic-harmonic writings (both “storied”) which would involve additional understanding of the function of the tonal planes.

And then it must be noted that the logic of compositional structuring will be most visible in the case of the simplest type of texture – the monodic one. That is, in fact, a “non-textural” exposition. This is how the primacy of recourse to the microstructural level would become logical and justified from a didactic point of view, which would involve visualizing in the smallest details the process of accumulation and progressive evolutionary transformation.

But the Beethoven-centric determinant of the European cultural pool (in which the discipline of forms is still anchored today) will place in relative irrelevance, for example, the exemplary compositional organization of the Gregorian chorale. And it would not be difficult to trace, analyze, and assimilate, the compositional organization of the monodic sound string through the laws of repetition (A-A), variation (A-Av), and contrast (A-B). But both the temporal distance (about fifteen centuries) and the otherness of the collective mentality (postmodernity) together with the social organization (democracy), intervene as so many semantic and generally cultural censorships, submerging the music of equally theocentric and theocratic societies in a certain strangeness, which in a didactic sense will be synonymous with reduced formative efficiency. The Beethovenian compositional standard is much closer to us and thus much more familiar, but also more strongly anchored (in sensitivity and mentality) by the norms of congruent disciplines such as, harmony together with the laws of tonal-functional sound organization, and not the neumatic modalism of the medieval *Ordinarium Missae* or the chorale variants *Viderunt Omnes* in the conception of Leoninus and Perotinus the Magnificent respectively.

But taking into account the (explosive) structural and procedural fecundity of the cell, i.e. of organic thinking, but also the obvious modernity of this type of thinking, a didactic return to the Baroque period should be admitted, in which statism would serve as a counterweight generative of the figure because it would offer simpler and “slower” images, i.e. much more accessible in terms of reception and awareness of compositional logic. It is about a tempered processuality, an obvious conventionalism – figurativeness + the laws and typologies of the *caesura* (cadence).

In a second sense, the simple strophic patterns of the Baroque are already elaborated and without any difficulty can serve for didactic exposition as

material for analysis. It could even serve as reference didactic material, i.e. starting the whole course and the study of forms, respectively. This refolding would serve a deeper awareness of the innovative value and grandeur of Beethoven's thought in terms of forms, but it would also open the way to the higher form of strophicity that is the pattern of the Beethovenian *sonata* cycle. As an argument for the "retreat" towards Baroque music, the very title that Bach gave to his works – *übung*, that is, exercises for learning the art of musical invention, would serve.

Where would it start in this case? By the Beethoven-centric future (that is, from the point of positioning in the Baroque), the selection of repertoires would meet at least three criteria: (1) the instrumental genre, to which would be attached the didactic primacy of (2) the monodic, which in turn respects and criterion of information organization (3) from simple to complex (i.e., from small forms to large forms), the most recommendable would be the Baroque repertoires for *solo* instruments. Works of the vocal genre could not be accepted because of the "distortion" caused by the presence of the word (text), and the choral genre would be excluded because of the writing layering. And then as a starting point that would combine both objectives – both learning the analysis of form and, simultaneously, the awareness of compositional logic – would serve, for example, works such as the *Suites for solo cello* (all the dances being designed in the bistrophic scheme), the *Sonatas and the partitas for solo violin* by J. S. Bach, or *30 small sonatas for solo violin* by Tartini, and not the *Anna Magdalena Bach Notebook* as traditionally used.

In the end, it should not be excluded that in the next stage of the study of the forms (already at the master's or doctorate level) resorting, on the one hand, to the monody of the Gregorian chorale, but also, on the other hand, to repertoires monodies of Romanticism – for example, Paganini's *24 Caprices for Solo Violin*, *Six Sonatas for Solo Violin, Op. 27*, by Ysaÿe, *4 Sonatas for solo violin, op. 42*, and *7 Sonatas for solo violin, op. 91*, by Max Reger – or, in particular, of Modernism – two *sonatas (No. 1 and No. 2) for solo violin* by Hindemith, *Sonata for solo violin* by Bartók and Edison Denisov respectively, *Sonatas op. 82, op. 95, and 126*, for solo violin and *24 Preludes for solo cello, op. 100*, by Mieczysław Weinberg, or *6 Capricci for solo violin* by Sciarrino *et al.*, there being at least six works for *solo* violin by George Enescu.

Namely, this type of repertory orientation can be completed with solo repertoires of truly monodic aerophone instruments. Only at a later stage and as a natural evolution would the transition to works with layered writing, and obviously to works of more advanced structural complexity, be logically justified. This is because the logic of the increase in complexity means primarily the increase in *textural* and, implicitly, *compositional* complexity, which logically orders the accumulation of analytical technique starting from monodic through contrapuntal (multiple monody) towards homophony

(accompanied monody). This is the only way the following definition becomes clear, timely, and, consequently, useful: *we call musical form the action of intoning a structurally dramaturgically organized sound process on a compositional level.*

3. Conclusions

Currently, the didactic study of musical forms boils down to a scholastic treatment of a set of compositional schemes: microstructures, small forms, large forms, *rondo-variations*, and *sonata Allegro*. And this without going into a more advanced depth, of structural *invariants* (historical genealogy) and *archetypal* understandings that would allow making the necessary connections and differentiations between *sound organization systems*, *compositional schemes*, and *genre typologies*. But what about the compositional schemes in the basin of contrapuntal music, vocal music, and choreographic genres? Because we are in a situation where the archetypal meanings – male-choreographic and female-vocal – are completely excluded. For a long time, the situation in which instrumentalists will study instrumental forms, singers – vocal forms, and choreographers – choreographic forms will remain utopian. This is a starting, focusing, and, consequently, specialization study. Likewise, the forms of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, as well as the forms from the creation of the three musical modernisms of the 20th century, remain equally outside the didactic study. Which have nothing to do with Beethovenomorphic compositional schemes.

References

- Aranovski, M. (1979). *Симфонические искания. Проблема жанра симфонии в советской музыке 1960-1975* [Symphonic quests. The problem of the symphony genre in Soviet music of 1960-1975]. Leningrad: Sovetski Kompozitor.
- Asafiev, B. (1971). *Музыкальная форма как процесс* [Musical form as a process]. Leningrad: Muzika.
- Bekker, P. (1926). *Симфония от Бетовена до Малера* [Symphony from Beethoven to Mahler]. Leningrad.
- Bobrovski, V. (1971). К вопросу о драматургии музыкальной формы [On the problem of the dramaturgy of musical form]. In *Теоретические проблемы музыкальных форм и жанров* [Theoretical problems of musical forms and genres]. Moskva: Muzika.
- Bonds, Mark E. (1991). *Wordless Rhetoric. Musical Form and the Metaphor of the Oration*. Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London: Harvard University Press.

- Braga, C. (1999). *10 Studii de Arhetipologie* [10 Archetypology Studies]. Cluj-Napoca: Dacia.
- Charlton, D. (ed.) (1989). *E T A. Hoffmann's Musical Writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dahlhaus, C. (1999). *L'Idée de la musique absolue*. DOI: 10.4000/books.contrechamps.1213. Contrechamps.
- Durand, G. (1998). *Structurile antropologice ale imaginarului* [Anthropological structures of the imaginary]. București: Univers Enciclopedic.
- Garaz, O. (2022). *Uneltele muzicologiei* [Tools of Musicology]. București: Eikon.
- Garaz, O. (2017). Formele muzicii: Exerciții de combinatorică arhetipală (propunere hermeneutică-metodologică) (I) [The forms of music: Archetypal combinatorics exercises (hermeneutic-methodological proposal)]. *Muzica*, 7, 39-68. București: Uniunea Compozitorilor și Muzicologilor din România.
- Garaz, O. (2023). Suita simfonică „Șeherezada”: modelul unei concepții multiprogramatice [The symphonic suite “Șeherezada”: the model of a multiprogrammatic conception]. *Artes. Journal of Musicology*, 27-28, 1-35. Iași: Editura Artes.
- Grey, Thomas S. (ed.) (2009). *Richard Wagner and His World*. Princeton-Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Halm, A. (1911). Unsere Zeit und Beethoven. *Die Rheinlande*, 11, 60-66.
- Halm, A. (1915). Unsere Zeit und Bach. *Die Rheinlande*, 15, 310-311.
- Halm, A. (1913/1947). *Von zwei Kulturen der Musik*. München: Georg Müller Verlag/ Stuttgart: E. Klett.
- Hanslick, E. (1895). *О музыкально-прекрасном* [original title *Vom Musikalisch Schönen*], Moskva: Jurgenson Music Trade.
- Herman, V. (1978). *Formele muzicii medievale europene* [The forms of medieval European music]. Cluj-Napoca: Conservatorul de Muzică „Gheorghe Dima”.
- Herman, V. (1980). *Formele muzicii Renașterii* [The forms of music of the Renaissance]. Cluj-Napoca: Conservatorul de Muzică „Gheorghe Dima”.
- Hoffmann, E. T. A. (1810) Alten und Neuen Kirchenmusik. *Allgemeine Musikalische Zeitung*, 40, 41.
- Holorov, I (1971). Принцип классификации музыкальных форм [Principle of classification of musical forms]. In *Теоретические проблемы музыкальных форм и жанров* [Theoretical problems of musical forms and genres]. Moskva: Muzika.
- Iudenici, N. (1971). Вариационно-куплетная форма в фольклорных обработках В. Бартока [The couplet-variational form in V. Bartók's folklore works]. In *Теоретические проблемы музыкальных форм и жанров* [Theoretical problems of musical forms and genres]. Moskva: Muzika.

- Marx, Bernhard A. (1997). *Musical Form in the Age of Beethoven: Selected Writings on Theory and Method* (edited and translated by Scott Burnham). Cambridge-New York-Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Mazel, L. (1960). *Строение музыкальных произведений* [The structure of musical works]. Moskva: Muzika.
- Mazel, L. & Zuckerman, V. (1967). *Анализ музыкальных произведений* [Analysis of musical works]. Moskva: Muzika.
- Meyer, L. B. (1957; 1994). *Music, The Arts, and Ideas: Patterns and Predictions in Twentieth-Century Culture*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Meyer, L. B. (1959). Some Remarks on Value and Greatness in Music. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 17 (4), 5-21.
- Meyer, Leonard B. (1984). Music and Ideology in Nineteenth Century. *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*, 262. Stanford University. Retrieved from https://tannerlectures.utah.edu/_resources/documents/a-to-z/m/meyer85.pdf.
- Protopopov, V. (1981). *Принципы музыкальной формы II. С. Баха* [Principles of musical form in J. S. Bach]. Moskva: Muzika.
- Riemann, H. (1905). *Grundriss der Kompositionslehre (Musikalische Formenlehre)*. Leipzig: Max Hesse's Verlag.
- Rosen, Ch. (2000). Tradition without Convention: The Impossible Nineteenth-Century Project. *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*, University of Utah, April 11. Retrieved from https://tannerlectures.utah.edu/_resources/documents/a-to-z/r/Rosen_01.pdf
- Schumann, R. (1854). *Gesammelte Schriften über Musik und Musiker, I*. Leipzig: Georg Wigand's Verlag. Retrieved from https://de.wikisource.org/wiki/Gesammelte_Schriften_%C3%BCber_Musik_und_Musiker
- Schumann, R. (1835). Zur Eröffnung des Jahrganges 1835. *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik, 1*. Retrieved from https://de.wikisource.org/wiki/Gesammelte_Schriften_%C3%BCber_Musik_und_Musiker
- Sokolov, O. (2013). *О типологии музыкальных форм* [On the typology of musical forms] (handbook for students of higher education institutions). Nizhny Novgorod: Publishing House of the Conservatory.
- Toduță, S. (1969; 1973; 1978). *Formele muzicale ale Barocului în operele lui J. S. Bach* [Musical forms of the Baroque in the works of J. S. Bach], 3 volumes. București: Editura Muzicală a Uniunii Compozitorilor din Republica Socialistă România (vol. 1); Editura Muzicală a Uniunii Compozitorilor (vol. 2); Editura Muzicală (vol. 3).
- Walker, A. (2010). *Hans von Bülow: A Life and Times*. New York: Oxford University Press.