



UDC 7.071

**Olena Berehova\***

Institute for Cultural Research of the National Academy of Arts of Ukraine  
01032, 50/52 Taras Shevchenko Blvd., Kyiv, Ukraine

## Comparative Poetics of Composers' Creativity in the Formation of the European Cultural Paradigm

**Abstract.** The study of common and distinctive features of national cultures, principles of their interaction and development in historical and modern aspects is one of the urgent tasks of modern humanities. The present contribution is a comparative study of two musical cultures – Romanian and Ukrainian – on the example of the creative activity of their prominent representatives Borys Lyatoshynsky and George Enescu. The relevance of the study is determined by the need for further development of comparative cultural studies, the need for scientific reflection on the specifics of the development of European musical cultures in the twentieth century, and the lack of study of typological parallels of Ukrainian and Romanian musical cultures. The search for creative parallels and distinctive features in the compositional oeuvre of Borys Lyatoshynsky and George Enescu determined the purpose of the study. The study uses a set of methods: historical and cultural, biographical, interdisciplinary, comparative, genre and style analysis, generalisation and systematisation. One of the obvious common features is the universalism of both creative personalities, which is confirmed by their significant achievements in all types of musical activity. The appeal to folk song sources, the influence of romanticism, modern musical trends of the early twentieth century, similar genre-stylistic preferences, and a tendency to conducting and pedagogical activities are undeniable coincidences in the compositional practice of both artists. Distinctive features of creative activity are conditioned by the features of socio-cultural systems in which composers were formed. At the same time, the full professional self-realization of both artists and outstanding creative results suggest that a master of great talent can realise his potential in a socio-cultural system of both open and closed types. The practical significance of the study is determined by the broad prospects for further development of the proposed topic, the use of materials in scientific research on the relevant topic and the possibility of their introduction into lecture courses of art universities

**Keywords:** George Enescu, Borys Lyatoshynsky, composer, comparative cultural studies, Romanian culture, Ukrainian culture

Article's History: Received: 01.03.2022; Revised: 16.07.2022; Accepted: 20.08.2022

### INTRODUCTION

Each national culture preserves the memory of the personalities of talented figures who have made a great contribution to the treasury of not only their own but also world culture with their multifaceted activities. The importance of this contribution is not always realised during the artist's lifetime,

often it takes some time. This particular study will focus on two prominent figures of European culture of the twentieth century, Borys Lyatoshynsky (1895-1968) and George Enescu (1881-1955), who made a significant contribution to the development of musical art in Ukraine and Romania.

#### Suggested Citation:

Berehova, O. (2022). Comparative poetics of composers' creativity in the formation of the European cultural paradigm. *Interdisciplinary Cultural and Humanities Review*, 1(1), 13-19.

\*Corresponding author

Thus, the specific case of G. Enescu and B. Lyatoshynsky was chosen for the study due to the exceptional talent and outstanding role of both musicians in the development of musical cultures of their countries, significant coincidences in the types of musical activity, themes of creativity, genre preferences, methods of working with folklore material, and the fact that their main creative achievements belong to the same historical period – the first half and middle of the twentieth century. For the purpose of scientific objectivity and reliability, it is worth noting that the creative (performing and composing) activity of Gheorghe Enescu began and ended a decade and a half earlier, but this is not a big obstacle to the implementation of a comparative study of the selected figures.

A lot of studies and monographs are devoted to the works of the classics of the national schools of composition George Enescu and Borys Lyatoshynsky. In recent years, new materials have begun to appear that present the creative work of these musicians from a new angle, opening previously unknown pages of their biographies. In particular, V. Sandu-Dediu [1], based on the research of the archives of the former Romanian secret police, proves that during the last years of Gheorghe Enescu's life in Paris, the composer was under the close supervision of the *Securitate*. B. J. Robinson [2] explores the virtuoso style of George Enescu's violin and cello sonatas, derived from the Romanian folk music tradition. B. Taylor [3], using various interrelated concepts, such as landscape, rhythm and memory, tries to establish new aesthetic criteria for understanding the chamber and orchestral music of G. Enescu. P. A. Trillo [4] on the basis of recordings of the violin sonata op.25 "in Romanian folk character" performed by George Enescu himself in 1943 and 1949 formulates the theory of expressive use of glissando.

A study by a group of Ukrainian musicologists M. Kopytsia, I. Savchuk, O. Putiatytska is devoted to the work of Borys Lyatoshynsky in the aspect of epistology [5]. The authors discover that epistolary creativity is a special type of activity that preserves and transmits the personal creative experience of the artist to the next generations, and consider the prospects for the development of national epistolary science with further search and deciphering of sources relevant to the development of national culture. Another group of authors – O. Martsenkivska, O. Vasylenko and O. Harmel [6] – investigate romantic traditions in the instrumental music of Borys Lyatoshynsky and ways of its rethinking in the genre of a piano ballad.

Obviously, the life and work of such extraordinary personalities as Borys Lyatoshynsky and George Enescu will continue to attract the attention of researchers. However, so far in the scientific literature there are no studies devoted to these two prominent composers in the comparative aspect.

**The purpose** of the study is to identify similarities and differences in the compositional work of prominent representatives of Ukrainian and Romanian musical cultures – Borys Lyatoshynsky and George Enescu.

### **Comparative studies in modern humanities: State and prospects**

However, before proceeding to the search for common and distinctive features in the chosen figures' works, it is

necessary to briefly dwell on the state of development of comparative studies in modern humanities.

The priority in the development of comparative studies in the humanities belongs to literary studies, in particular to German and French writers and literary critics of the Romantic era.

At the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the first comparative studies in the art of music were introduced, although from that time until now the concept of "comparative musicology" has been used mainly in the field of ethnomusicology. A great contribution to the development of this area was made by German scientists who studied the musical traditions of the peoples of the world: Otto Abraham [7], Erich Hornbostel and Kurt Sachs [8] and others. In 1959, the "Treatise on Comparative Musicology" by French Indologist and musicologist Alan Daniel was published [9]. This is a theoretical work, which summarised the experience of the author's many years of stay in India and his knowledge of oriental music (Indian, Chinese, Guret).

American and British ethnomusicologists (in particular, Philip V. Bohlman [10], Martin Clayton [11] and others) continued to develop comparative studies. In the collection of scientific studies "Comparative Musicology and Anthropology of Music: Essays in the History of Ethnomusicology" (Chicago Studies in Ethnomusicology), edited by Bruno Nettl and Philip Bolman [12], 19 scholars from 5 countries explore important contemporary problems of the history of ethnomusicology in the context of its methodological and theoretical foundations and compare traditional musical cultures of the world while criticising comparative musicology as a scientific discipline. The same area is further explored by Timothy Rice [13], Patrick E. Savage and Steven Brown [14].

Many scientists felt the need to expand the methodology of one scientific discipline and combine the theoretical and methodological developments of various related sciences in an integral (interdisciplinary) approach to comparative research. In particular, the Romanian literary critic Adrian Marino in his work "Comparativism and the Theory of Literature" proclaims the intention "to develop a literary theory, the goals and means of which would be specific and in the aggregate comparativist" [15]. Another study by the scientist argues the need to develop a purely comparative theory of literature [16]. At the same time, crucially important for the researcher is the study not only of literary phenomena as such and in correlation with one another, but also in reflection with the phenomena of spiritual culture in a broad sense, including contacts, influences, intertextual connections, etc.

American literary scholar and cultural critic of Hungarian descent Steven Totossy de Zepetnek was one of the first to declare the importance of introducing a comparative approach in cultural studies. In the article "From Comparative Literature Today to Comparative Cultural Studies" [17], the researcher summarised the achievements of his colleagues from around the world in the field of comparative literature and proposed to extend the achievements of literary studies to a wider field of cultural studies. He defines the concept of comparative cultural studies as: 1) to study literature (a text and/or a literary system) in the context of culture and the discipline of cultural studies;

2) in cultural studies proper, to study literature with borrowed elements (theories and methods) from comparative literature; 3) to study culture and its constituent parts and aspects in the mode of the proposed approach of “comparative cultural research” instead of the one that prevailed in the late twentieth century – a predominantly monolingual approach to the consideration of a topic in view of its nature and problems in only one culture. According to Zepetnek, “comparative cultural studies is a branch of research where certain provisions of the discipline “comparative literature” merge with the selected provisions of the field of cultural studies. This means that the study of culture and cultural products, including (but not limited to) literature, communications, media, art, etc., is carried out in a contextual and relational framework and with a variety of methods and approaches, interdisciplinary and, if and when necessary, involving teamwork” [17]. Comparative cultural research, according to S.T. Zepetnek, does not exclude actual text analysis or other well-established areas of research. Accordingly, in a better case, the frameworks and methodologies available in the systematic and empirical study of culture contribute to comparative cultural studies. Zepetnek argues that comparative cultural studies are innovative because “the concept of cultural studies in most cases lacks comparative, that is, contextual, pluralistic and supranational range and depth of thinking and application” [18].

The numerous comparative studies in the humanities confirm the prospects of the comparative approach in cultural studies proposed by S.T. Zepetnek. Comparative studies in such a broad cultural discourse are massively deployed in linguistics in different countries, along with cinema [19], electronic media [20], psychology [21] and other humanities.

Valuable in the context of the study is the contribution by T. Portnova, in her studies on genre and style in contemporary musical theatre [22-24] offers a new research methodology based on a systematic and comparative analysis of genre elements of ballet and opera performances. This gives the researcher the opportunity to expand the understanding of the vocabulary of contemporary dance, orienting researchers to the latest integrative approaches to the acquisition of the synthetic nature of musical and theatrical genres.

In recent years, representatives of theoretical and historical musicology have also developed an interest in comparative studies. The concept by Ukrainian musicologist Y. Chekan [25] summarises the previous experience of comparing the personalities of two musicians-representatives of two different national schools of composition, and their creative achievements and stylistic features. As the researcher notes, earlier musicians-contemporaries – representatives of the same musical culture – were compared to identify both common features and differences in their creative systems. The same principle of comparison, according to Y. Chekan *et al.*, can yield fruitful results when the selected artists belong to different national schools. “However, in this case, one should be very careful with the choice of a pair for comparison” – the musicologist warns [25]. Y. Chekan demonstrates his concept on the example of the creative activity of two composers of Hungary and Ukraine – Zoltan Kodai and Stanislav Lyudkevych on

such parameters as the social origin of musicians, education, belonging to the same generation, analysis of folklore, compositional, musical-pedagogical, musical-critical activities.

The fruitful ideas of T. Zepetnek, T. Portnova, Y. Chekan and other scientists became the impetus for writing this article, in which a comparative study of two musical cultures – Romanian and Ukrainian – on the example of personalities and creative principles of their outstanding representatives was carried out, especially since such studies have never been carried out.

### ***The beginning of the artistic course of George Enescu and Borys Lyatoshynsky: In the captivity of romanticism***

The debut of Enescu as a composer took place in Paris: in 1898, the famous maestro Édouard Colonne conducted his first opus – “Romanian Poem” (1897) – a symphonic suite for orchestra and male choir without words. The bright, youthful romantic poem brought the author huge success with the sophisticated and fastidious French public and wide publicity in the press. In the “Romanian Poem”, as in both Romanian Rhapsodies (1901), which became the most popular in the creative heritage of Enescu, with virtuoso brilliance develops the true Romanian lutar melodies.

Similarly, B. Lyatoshynsky made his composer-conductor debut: in 1917, at the stage of mastering the basics of composing at the Kyiv Conservatory, he publicly conducted the second part of his First Symphony, entitled “Lyrical Poem”. Lyrical and dramatic in content, the First Symphony (1918) by B. Lyatoshynsky demonstrated large-scale, monumental images, fluency in polyphonic technique, and a delicate sense of orchestral harmony.

The compositional debuts of both artists showed their mastery of the most complex musical genres, which include the genres of symphonic music, and a tendency to romantic lyrical poetry (Enescu – “Romanian Poem”, Lyatoshynsky – “Lyrical Poem”).

Having examined the compositional heritage of Enescu and Lyatoshynsky in general, it is possible to conclude that in quantitative terms, the creative heritage of Lyatoshynsky is twice as much as that of Enescu: 70 completed opuses by Lyatoshynsky against 33 by Enescu. At the same time, it is worth considering that Lyatoshynsky still has about 20 works without specifying the opus, music for 6 theatrical performances and 14 films, editing and instrumentation of 10 major works of other composers (operas, ballets, concerts, etc.). Enescu has more than 90 completed works without specifying the opus, and over 30 sketches of unfinished works, including the first act of the opera “Blue Lotus”. Enescu’s great engagement as a concert performer – violinist, pianist, ensemble player, conductor – often took away precious time in the art and made it impossible to complete all creative ideas. Analysis of the genre spectrum of Enescu’s and Lyatoshynsky’s works reveals certain similarities. The early periods of artistic activities of both composers are especially indicative.

In the 1890s and 1900s, in addition to the first orchestral and concert works, Enescu wrote a lot of chamber and chamber-vocal music. These were instrumental trios, quartets, quintets, works for various compositions, piano miniatures with romantic genre features (nocturnes, pastorals, serenades, improvisations, barcarolles, ballads, etc.) Enescu

also composed a lot of vocal and choral works, songs, including vocal cycles to the poems of Romanian, Austrian and French poets.

The early period of Lyatoshynsky's work (1910-1920) is also marked by a significant predominance of chamber and chamber-vocal genres. These are three string quartets, a trio for piano, violin, and cello, two sonatas for piano, a sonata for violin and piano, and a large number of lyrical chamber vocal works for voice accompanied by the piano to poems by German, English, French, Belgian, Russian and other poets. And although in B. Lyatoshynsky's author's definitions romantic genre occurs rarely (exceptions may be the Second Piano Sonata Op. 18 (sonata-ballad, 1925) and Ballad for Piano Op. 22 (1928)), however, romantic symbolism is present in the images of dreams, memories, dreams, night, moon, bird, loneliness, etc., but also in the style of the works – in the darkened colour of the piano part, the accumulation of tart dissonances, the atmosphere of mystery, mysticism, and numbness.

Thus, both composers in the early periods of work were united by the attraction to the music of romanticism and, at the same time, a great interest in the latest musical trends. From a young age, George Enescu loved the music of Johannes Brahms and Richard Wagner, was fascinated by the lyricism of Jules Massenet and the elegance of Gabriel Fauré, the impressionist searches of Claude Debussy and Maurice Ravel, the Verist trends in Italian music. Later, it was influenced by the Second Viennese School, neoclassical and neo-baroque trends. Lyatoshynsky's favorite composers were mainly Schubert, Liszt, Wagner, from Russian music he preferred Scriabin. Lyatoshynsky was also interested in musical modernism, in particular symbolism, expressionism, the work of composers of the Second Viennese School, highly appreciated the opera "Wozzeck" by Alban Berg. B. Lyatoshynsky was one of the first in the former Soviet Union to write atonal music, for which he was later severely criticised and accused of so-called formalism by official musical circles.

### ***Professional self-realisation as overcoming the tragedy of the individual***

In the mature and later periods of G. Enescu's and B. Lyatoshynsky's works, there are also numerous genre similarities. For example, each of them repeatedly referred to the genre of symphony, orchestral suite, overture. Enescu's works include three complete symphonies for large symphony orchestra (opuses 13, 17 and 21, the last one – with chorus), Chamber Symphony Op. 33, three orchestral suites (opuses 9, 20, 27). Lyatoshynsky has five symphonies (opuses 2, 26, 50, 63, 67), and four orchestral suites (opuses 24, 56, 60, 68). It is interesting that both composers turned to the genre of symphonic overture first in the early period, and then at the end of their life journey. Enescu first wrote Three overtures for orchestra (1891-1894), "Tragic" (1895) and "Triumphal" (1896) overtures, and for the last time turned to this genre in 1948, creating a concert overture "on Popular Romanian Themes" op. 32. A milestone in the early stage of the musical biography of B. Lyatoshynsky's "Overture on Four Ukrainian Themes" op. 20 (1926), for which he received one of his first prizes. For a long period of time the composer did not turn to this genre, but in the 1960s he wrote two overtures – "Slavic"

op. 61 (1961) and "Solemn" op.70 (1968). Both composers also turned to the genre of opera: "Oedipus" (1931) by G. Enescu, "Golden Hoop" (1929) and "Schors" (1937) by B. Lyatoshynsky. But such a spectacular and bright genre as ballet did not attract them.

In addition to genre coincidences, there are parallels in the themes and imagery of the works. One of them is the idea of a person's struggle with inhumane forces, fate. In particular, Enescu's opera "Oedipus" and Lyatoshynsky's "Third Symphony" (1950, second edition 1954) are prime examples of this.

In the ancient myth of Oedipus, Enescu was attracted to the idea of human resistance to unfair, evil forces, his victory over fate. At the same time, the composer emphasised in the image of Oedipus a high civic position, responsibility to his people, the desire to save them, even at the cost of his own well-being. The musical dramaturgy of the opera combines the system of leitmotifs and the principle of monothemism, which reveals the connection of Enescu with the romantic composers Berlioz, Liszt, and Wagner. Many pages of the opera (especially those related to the images of nature) are saturated with Romanian folk melodies close to the composer.

The third symphony h-moll op. 50 by Lyatoshynsky impresses with the depth of artistic content, the power of tragic images and the innovation of musical language. This is a symphony-drama in which good and evil, light and darkness, humanity and cruelty are contrasted. Lyatoshynsky's innovation was the use of Ukrainian folklore sources and their combination with the leitmotif system, the principles of modern musical thinking and the features of the composer's individual symphonic style. Throughout the symphony, there is a "fatal" theme of the introduction and a side part of the first part, which symbolises the image of "people's power". In the first edition (1950) the symphony had the epigraph "Peace will win the war". After criticism of the symphony, the finale of which was considered insufficiently optimistic, B. Lyatoshynsky made the second edition of the symphony (1954), significantly revised the finale and removed the epigraph. Today this work is recognised worldwide as the pinnacle of Ukrainian symphonism of the twentieth century.

The second common theme for both composers-patriotic – is associated with the works in which the national character of the music is revealed through folk sources. For Enescu, these are the above-mentioned "Romanian Poem", two "Romanian Rhapsodies", and the Third Sonata for violin and piano "On Popular Romanian Themes" (1926), "Villageoise" for orchestra (1937-1938), Suite for violin and piano "Childhood Impressions" (1940), etc. In addition to the already mentioned Overture on Four Ukrainian Folk Themes and the Third Symphony, B. Lyatoshynsky composed the "Ukrainian Quintet" (1942, second edition 1945), the opera "Golden Hoop" (1929), Suite on Ukrainian Folk Themes for String Quartet (1944), arrangements of Ukrainian folk songs, choruses and many other works. In the last period of his creative work, Lyatoshynsky expanded the range of national-tonal sources, adding Polish, Serbian, Bulgarian, Russian and other Slavic melodies. Thus, he continued to develop the concept of Pan-Slavism, which he inherited from his teacher Reinhold Gliere.

Thus, Gheorghe Enescu – the head of the national school of composition, and the founder of modern Romanian music in many genres – became the first Romanian composer to receive international recognition. His music is characterised by national identity, he skilfully transformed the features of Romanian folk-instrumental (*leutar*) performance and advanced it to the European level, achieved a synthesis of national imagery and stylistics with European traditions, especially romanticism and impressionism. Touching upon the themes of humanistic and patriotic orientation, Enescu appeared as an heir to the high humanistic ideals of European art, an artist-philosopher and psychologist, able to reveal the characteristic features of the Romanian mentality with great artistic power. The multifaceted creative activity of Enescu played an important role in the development of the Romanian musical culture of the twentieth century.

Lyatoshynsky as an outstanding symphonist, the founder of the conflict-dramatic, conceptual type of symphonism in Ukrainian music, and a brilliant master of orchestral writing, has become one of the strongest “poles of stylistic attraction” (G. Grigorieva) for modern Ukrainian composers. An artist and an intellectual he enriched the figurative and genre palette of Ukrainian music with highly humanistic ideas, laid the potential for vividly expressive folklore innovations, proposing a type of deeply philosophical, conceptual development of folklore material with a radical transformation of the figurative content. Borys Lyatoshynsky was the first in Ukrainian music to implement the idea of the intonational and figurative kinship of Slavic cultures, behind which there is a deeper idea of commonwealth, equality, and unity of European peoples. The oeuvre of Lyatoshynsky had an extraordinary influence on the development of Ukrainian music in the second half of the twentieth century.

Thus, many parallels between Enescu and Lyatoshynsky have been found in the genre spectrum, figurative and stylistic content, dramaturgy of the works and the significance of the composer’s overall performance. It is also necessary to mention the tragic fates of both artists.

The tragedy of Enescu was that as a composer he did not receive due recognition during his lifetime. And even the active conducting activity of Enescu, his attempts to include his own works in concert programmes could not improve this situation. After his death, his work was forgotten in his homeland for many years. From Leon Botstein’s article, it becomes apparent that under the head of the communist government of Romania, Nicolae Ceausescu, everything was done to undermine and destroy the legacy of Enescu. For many years, the Palatul Cantacuzino, which after Enescu’s death housed his museum along with the archives, was not heated, which led to its deplorable state [26]. But over the past 30 years, the situation has changed for the better, Enescu’s work has finally gained well-deserved recognition both in his homeland and among the international cultural community. His pieces are performed and recorded by the world’s leading soloists and symphony orchestras, and the International Enescu Society [27], the International Enescu Festival and Competition [28], and the George Enescu Museum have dedicated their activities to disseminating information about the composer and his multifaceted creative

heritage. There are websites where recordings and sheet music of Enescu’s pieces are publicly available [29], as are numerous Romanian and foreign researchers of the artist’s work.

Borys Lyatoshynsky’s fate as a composer was also tragic, but for a different reason: he lived under constant ideological pressure, which was cultivated by the ruling Communist regime in Soviet Ukraine. Lyatoshynsky was accused of formalism for his modernist searches, which were considered the general trend in the development of art throughout Europe, later subjected to devastating criticism of some of his works (Second, Third Symphonies), tried to “squeeze” his work into the “Procrustean bed” of the socialist realism method. At the same time, the significance of Lyatoshynsky’s work in his homeland was recognised during his lifetime, he received prizes, awards, honorary titles, and had recitals. Today in Ukraine commemorative events are held to honour the composer – concerts, festivals, and scientific conferences. In the concerts of the first Ukraine International Music Festival “Kyiv Music Fest”, according to the tradition established by the student of B. Lyatoshynsky, the prominent Ukrainian composer of the twentieth century Ivan Karabyts, always performed symphonic works of B. Lyatoshynsky, and in the 1990s, the American conductor of Ukrainian origin Theodore Kuchar recorded all 5 symphonies of Lyatoshynsky with the Odesa Symphony Orchestra on CDs. There is the State Prize named after Borys Lyatoshynsky, which is awarded annually to talented young composers. There is also a private office-museum of B. Lyatoshynsky in the house on Bohdan Khmelnytsky Street in Kyiv, where he lived. There is a website where one can download sheet music of many compositions by Lyatoshynsky [30].

As for international recognition, Borys Lyatoshynsky’s work is still little known in the world, although this does not detract from its artistic value. In this regard, paraphrasing the statement of a scholar, it can be said that the work of Lyatoshynskyi is “a world-class phenomenon, regardless of whether it is known to the world or not...” [31].

Thus, both artists – George Enescu and Borys Lyatoshynsky – can be examples of different models of behaviour in different socio-cultural systems. This is the type of “free artist”, formed in the open atmosphere of the leading European musical centres, independent of public institutions and socially unbiased (G. Enescu) and the opposite type of “genius of an enslaved nation”, according to the prominent Ukrainian poet Yevhen Malanyuk [32], forced to study, live and work in a “closed environment”. And although these prominent composers belonged to opposite socio-cultural systems, the outstanding results of the creative activity of both George Enescu and Borys Lyatoshynsky were evidence of the professional self-realisation of both artists. This suggests that a master of great talent can realise his creative potential in a socio-cultural system of both open and closed types.

## CONCLUSIONS

One of the main findings of this study is the discovery of many common features in the representatives of the two ancient European cultures.

It is, first of all, the universalism of both creative personalities. The era, in which George Enescu and

Borys Lyatoshynsky lived, required artists of universal type, and that is exactly what they were, as evidenced by their achievements in almost all types of musical activity – composing, performing, musical-pedagogical and public music. The indisputable similarities in the compositional practice of both artists are the reliance on folk song sources (Romanian – for George Enescu, Ukrainian and wider – Slavic – for Borys Lyatoshynsky), the influence of Romanticism, the latest musical trends of the early twentieth century, the similarity of genre and style preferences, the

importance of compositional creativity in general, the tendency to conduct and pedagogical activity, selfless service to art. Such a large number of coincidences not only indicates the closeness of the creative natures of George Enescu and Borys Lyatoshynsky but also is an indicator of their deeper connection, true spiritual kinship.

The prospects for further study of the subject are to expand the personalities of musical artists and the list of national musical cultures that can be compared with Ukrainian culture to identify common and distinctive features.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Sandu-Dediu, V., & Enescu, G. (2018). Posthumously reviewed. *Studia Musicologica*, 59(1-2), 61-69. doi: 10.1556/6.2018.59.1-2.5.
- [2] Robinson, B.J. (2017). Virtuosity and dor: George Enescu and the Hora Lungă. *Studia Musicologica*, 58(2), 175-196. doi: 10.1556/6.2017.58.2.3.
- [3] Taylor, B. (2017). Landscape-rhythm-memory: Contexts for mapping the music of George Enescu. *Music and Letters*, 98(30), 394-437.
- [4] Trillo, R.A. (2018). Enescu performs Enescu: Glissandi in the sonata op. 25 'dans le caractere populaire Roumain'. *International Review of the Aesthetics and Sociology of Music*, 49(1), 115-135.
- [5] Kopytsia, M., Savshuk, I., & Putiatytska, O. (2022). Epistological documents of the history of Ukrainian music: An attempt of conceptual analysis. *Ad Alta – Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, 12(1), 231-218.
- [6] Martsenkivska, O., Vasylenko, O., & Garmel, O. (2021). Ballad genre in the piano music of B. Lyatoshynsky. *Ad Alta – Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, 11(2), 152-158.
- [7] Abraham, O., & von Hornbostel, E. (1904). *Phonographierte türkische Melodien*. Retrieved from <http://vlp.mpiwg-berlin.mpg.de/references?id=lit39585>.
- [8] von Hornbostel, E., & Sachs, C. (1914). Systematik der Musikinstrumente: Ein Versuch. *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie: Organ der Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte*, 46, 553-590.
- [9] Danielou, A. (1959). *Traité de musicologie compare*. Paris: Hermann.
- [10] Bohlman, P.V. (2012). *Music and culture: Historiographies of disjuncture, ethnographies of displacement*. New York and London: Routledge.
- [11] Clayton, M. (2003). *The cultural study of music: A critical introduction*. New York: Routledge.
- [12] Nettl, B., & Bohlman, P.V. (1991). *Comparative musicology and anthropology of music: Essays on the history of ethnomusicology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [13] Rice Timothy. (2001). *Grove music online*. doi: 10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.article.46454.
- [14] Savage, P.E., & Brown, S. (2013). Toward a new comparative musicology. *Analytical approaches to world music*, 2(2), 148-197.
- [15] Marino, A. (1988). *Comparatisme et théorie de la littérature*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- [16] Marino, A. (2007). Word and time: Comparative studies and theory of literature. *Poetics of Comparative Literature*, 6, 46-58.
- [17] Tötösy de Zepetnek, S. (1999). From comparative literature today toward comparative cultural studies. *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture*, 1(3). Retrieved from <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1041&context=clcweb>.
- [18] Tötösy de Zepetnek, S. (2003). *Comparative cultural studies and the study of central European culture*. Retrieved from <http://www.kakanien-revisited.at/beitr/theorie/stotosy1.pdf>.
- [19] Nurmanova, Z., Zhapanova, M., Shuretayev, A., Yesdauletov, A., & Yesdauletova, A. (2021). Literary comparative studies on the example of kazakh literature and cinema. *Astra Salvensis*, 1, 239-250.
- [20] Tassilova, A., Zhappasov, Zh., Shyngyssova, N., Sarybayev, M., Sadenova, A., Tasylova, N., & Kozgambayeva, G. (2018). Comparative analysis on digital diplomacy in Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan and Kyrgyzstan. *Astra Salvensis*, 11, 321-332.
- [21] Patel, A.D., & Demorest, S.M. (2013). *Comparative music cognition: Cross-species and cross-cultural studies*. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-12-381460-9.00016-X.
- [22] Portnova, T.V. (2017). Genre art system: Experience of a comparative analysis of theatre (ballet, opera) and pictorial arts. *Ponte*, 73(8), 194-211.
- [23] Portnova, T.V. (2018). Genre and style interaction in solutions staged ballets of the nineteenth, twentieth centuries. *Astra Salvensis*, 6(12), 689-694.
- [24] Portnova, T.V. (2020). Choreography and choreographics: A comparative analysis. *Astra Salvensis*, 1, 575-594.
- [25] Chekan, Yu. (2019). Zoltan Kodály and Stanislav Lyudkevych. *Scientific Herald of Tchaikovsky National Music Academy of Ukraine*, 124, 162-168.
- [26] Botstein, L. (1997). Rediscovering George Enescu. *The Musical Quarterly*, 81(2), 141-144.
- [27] Official website of the Enescu Society. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.enescusociety.org/>.
- [28] Official website of the Enescu International Music Festival. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.festivalenescu.ro/>.

- [29] Site with audio recordings of works by G. Enescu. (n.d.). Retrieved from [https://imslp.org/wiki/Category:Enescu,\\_George](https://imslp.org/wiki/Category:Enescu,_George).
- [30] Lyatoshynsky, B.M. (n.d.). Scores of works by Ukrainian composers site. Retrieved from <http://ukrnotes.in.ua/Lyatoshynsky.php>.
- [31] Slovenské pohľady. (1965). Retrieved from <https://matica.sk/informacne-pracoviska/slovenske-pohlady/archiv-slovenske-pohlady/>.
- [32] Malaniuk, Ye. (1995). *Thoughts about the art. Ukrainian literary studies*. Lviv: Svit.

### Олена Миколаївна Берегова

Інститут культурології Національної академії мистецтв України  
01032, б-р Тараса Шевченка, 50/52, м. Київ, Україна

## Порівняльна поетика композиторської творчості у становленні європейської культурної парадигми

**Анотація.** Дослідження спільних та відмінних рис національних культур, принципів їхньої взаємодії і розвитку в історичному та сучасному аспектах є одним із нагальних завдань сучасної гуманітаристики. У статті здійснено компаративне дослідження двох музичних культур – румунської та української – на прикладі творчої діяльності їх видатних представників Бориса Лятошинського та Джордже Енеску. Актуальність статті зумовлено потребою в подальшій розробці компаративних культурологічних студій, необхідністю наукової рефлексії щодо специфіки розвитку європейських музичних культур у XX столітті, невивченістю типологічних паралелей української та румунської музичних культур. Пошук творчих паралелей і відмінних рис у композиторській творчості Бориса Лятошинського та Джордже Енеску зумовив мету дослідження. У статті використано комплекс методів: історико-культурологічний, біографічний, міждисциплінарний, компаративний, жанрово-стильовий аналіз, узагальнення і систематизація. Однією з очевидних спільних рис є універсалізм обох творчих особистостей, що підтверджується їхніми вагомими здобутками в усіх видах музичної діяльності. Звернення до народнопісенних джерел, впливи романтизму, модерних музичних напрямів початку XX ст., схожі жанрово-стильові уподобання, схильність до диригентської і педагогічної діяльності є беззаперечними збігами у композиторській практиці обох митців. Відмінні риси творчої діяльності зумовлені особливостями соціально-культурних систем, у яких сформувалися композитори. Водночас повна професійна самореалізація обох митців та визначні творчі результати дозволяють зробити висновок, що майстер великого таланту може реалізувати свій потенціал у соціально-культурній системі як відкритого, так і закритого типу. Практична значущість статті визначається широкими перспективами подальшої розробки запропонованої тематики, використанням матеріалів у наукових дослідженнях за відповідною тематикою та можливістю їх включення до лекційних курсів мистецьких ЗВО

**Ключові слова:** Джордже Енеску, Борис Лятошинський, композитор, порівняльні культурологічні студії, румунська культура, українська культура