INTERPRETATION FEATURES OF THE SONATA FOR VIOLIN AND PIANO BY GENNADY LYASHENKO

Abstract. This article examines the sonata for violin and piano by the famous Ukrainian composer of the 20th-21st centuries, Gennady Lyashenko. The music piece was written in 1993 and is dedicated to the tragic events that took place in Ukraine during the 20th century. Testimony of the first performers of the sonata, facts from their personal communication with the author of the article are presented.

The composer's interpretation of the violin and piano sonata genre is considered using the example of Gennady Lyashenko's sonata. Despite the complex organization of the musical language, Gennady Lyashenko's sonata has certain features of the traditional sonata cycle.

The study compares two interpretations of this sonata: Sofia Suldina (violin) – Oleg Bezborodko (piano) and Matvii Suhovyi (violin) – Anna Pashkovska (piano). The analysis of the composer's interpretation through the prism of the performing versions reveals the interpretive potential of the musical work.

The genre invariant of the work obeys some figurative tragic content. Considering the composer's interpretation from the position of "new – traditional" allows us to understand the model of the work.

The dramaturgical relief, despite the complex lado-harmonic events, clearly leads to the tragic climax in the finale. Some differences in emotional content in both interpretations do not significantly change the semantic content of the work. Executive interpretive versions of the work from different angles show the embodiment of the author's ideas.
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**Formulation of the problem.** In the 20th century, Ukrainian music violin and piano sonatas’ genre is characterized by a variety of artistic and stylistic currents, namely impressionism, romantic expressionism, urbanism, neoclassicism, avant-garde (use of new techniques), etc.

Gennady Lyashenko’s sonata for violin and piano represents a certain communicative puzzle for performers, the solution of which greatly simplifies the listener's perception of the composer's work and its encoded content. Performers, interpreting the work, create their own versions of the music piece, place certain individual accents, which, however, do not contradict the dramatic relief of the work.

**Analysis of recent research and publications.** Many Ukrainian and foreign scientists were engaged in the research of sonatas for violin and piano interpretation. However, in relation to this study, the works of M. Denysenko-Sapmaz [3,4] and M. Rzhevska [9,10] are significant.

The purpose of the article is to consider the composer's interpretation of the sonata genre for violin and piano using Gennady Lyashenko's sonata example and its embodiment in performance interpretations to identify clear ways of learning, playing and perceiving this music.

**Presenting the main material.** Sonata for violin and piano was written by Gennady Lyashenko (1938–2017) in 1993. As the musicologist M. Rzhevska notes, the sonata was created in parallel with the Lamento for strings and the Fourth Symphony, dedicated to the memory of the victims of the 1932 Holodomor [9, P. 48], and these images were reinterpreted and embodied in the work. However, there is another opinion. This is the testimony of the first performers, my colleagues at the department of the chamber ensemble of the UNTAM by Olga Karasko (violin) and Larisa Hryshko-Ratkovska (piano). Larisa Oleksiivna recalls that during the conversation with the composer, the tragic image of Chernobyl was discussed. By the way, the first performance of the sonata took place in October 1993 in the House of Scientists of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine in the Kyiv Music Fest’93 concert program. This tragic work immediately enters the repertoire of leading performers.

The recording of this sonata in 2008 was made by S. Suldina (violin) and O. Bezborodka (piano) at a concert for the composer's 70th anniversary in the small hall of the UNTAM. Oleg Bezborodko is a candidate of art history, professor, pianist, composer, studied composition with Gennady Lyashenko, now heads the department of special Piano No. 1 at the UNTAM. Sofia Suldina worked at the chamber ensemble department in 2008, now lives and works in Switzerland, violinist (Zurich), the winner of Sargo (Lucerne) and Klang Forum Wien (Vienna). The second entry – students of the UNTAM Tchaikovsky, Matviy Sukhovoy (violin) and Anna Pashkovska (piano), laureates of the first prize of the VI open competition of pianists Interpretation of modern music (Modern Music Workshop / Creative workshop of interpretation of modern music) in the nomination "Chamber Ensemble ". 
Oleg Bezborodyko (piano), who has studied this composition with Gennady Lyashenko, is valuable as a person who closely communicated with the artist during the educational process, is familiar with his compositional method.

So, let's consider the composition, dramaturgy and stylistic features of the sonata. It is written in three parts that go *attacca*. The cycle traditionality can be seen only in the number of parts and in a hint of their genre basis. However, there is an undeniable emotional and psychological component of the sonata genre – it is the transmission of "psychological states, a person, his feelings, thoughts, ideas" [11, P. 25]. It is quite difficult to determine the genre invariant in this sonata, due to the fact that stylistic innovations have a weak correlation with the listening experience and make the understanding of this work quite difficult. The task of the performers is to understand and reproduce a kind of communicative puzzle set by the composer.

Gennady Lyashenko's instrumental works are characterized by certain "author's signs" [3, P. 24]. M. Denysenko-Sapmaz notes that his compositional method is connected with the idea of modality, "which is the key to intonational organic language" [3, P. 25].

The first part of the *Improvvisazione* is assigned only to the violin. From the very beginning, the composer outlines a certain scale construction in which the part will be exhibited: g-a-h-c-des-es-fesis (ges). It can be conventionally called the main topic. Despite the absence of traditional components of the Allegro sonata, the sections of the form are quite clearly defined: the first section to the *sul ponticello* mark, which has five waves of development.

In the last (the longest wave), the melody breaks out on the second octave and quickly returns to the initial *G minor* dynamics within *pp*. It is truly an improvisation: without a meter, with acceleration in each wave and durations from eighth to thirty-second, the sustained note is written out with a horizontal bar without indicating the duration. S. Suldina and M. Suhovy perfectly reproduce this section, one can only note more subjective, personal in S. Suldina's performance.

The second section (from *sul ponticello* to *pizzicato rubato*) is a retrospective of fragments of tragic events. To reflect greater tension and tragedy, the author uses unconventional playing techniques: *sul ponticello* (on a stand), behind a stand, which immediately gives the music a specific cold, whistling sound and immerses the listener in ominous images. The composer in a separate violin part edited by S. Suldina gives more detailed instructions than in the piano, namely: on the stand, on bridge and behind the stand, between bridge and tailpiece, *arpeggio* four strings. The last recommendation concerns different strokes at the same time: an *arco* on a long note and a *pizz arpeggio* on it. The music unfolds from *pp* to *f*: exits to *G flat*, A second octave and to the highest notes of *sul ponticello* without indicating a specific pitch. All this resembles screams that turn into wails. Waves with delay, which are similar to the first section, return to *pp*, the dissonance increases (diminished octave, major ninth, major seventh in juxtaposed with major second). S. Suldina performs this
episode as a tragic memory with a return to the present. M. Sukhovi reflects the tragedy itself and the reaction to it.

The third section begins with *pizzicato rubato* and continues to *meno mosso*. It can be classified according to its content to conditional development. An enlarged octave (A flat) is present in the contours of the musical plane in *pizzicato rubato*. The melody leads to a new peak of despair (seventh *fa–mi*), which is emphasized by flagolets on *ff*. B flat and A flat are added to the given key. Ascending two-part passages with double strokes end with a *glissando rapido* from G of the second and D of the third octave, which gather energy for the climax. The culmination of the Improvvisazione is the assertion of the *minor nonna* G – A flat as the "extreme limit" of human capabilities. The section ends with the initial tone of G minor octave on *pp*.

*Meno mosso* acts as a conclusion, a kind of coda, which absorbed all the tragic-dissonant sounds of *Improvvisazione*, but in between, a ghostly hope appears in the form of an A major statement, as another, but already bright, climax. However, the section ends in G minor nona – A flat, returning the music to the world of gloomy images. S. Suldin puts a more substantive emphasis on the A major climax as the optimistic point of the piece, while M. Sukhovi has both climaxes of equal value.

In the second part of *Moderato*, one more "author's mark" can be noted, it is the encrypted numbers 1932 (according to the version of M. Rzhevskaya) [7, P. 49]. Each number is the number of fourths in the sounds of the initial theme (1– F, 9 – F, 3rd 2 – E flat).

The rhythmically coded progression of the piano part acts as a timeless leitmotif of memory (stated 4/4 time), like a clock counting down the time. A tragic and grotesque finale with a hint of dance will begin with it. This part can be divided into several sections, namely: A-B-C-D-A1-E-A2.

The theme (section A, measures 1–17) begins in the piano part. The next section B (measure 18) is represented by the violin part in free meter (sense minsura), it has a certain course in the tones of e, f, h, which is the basis of this improvisational music.

Section C (from bar 19) is determined with the onset of metrical organization. In the rhythmic plan, the transmission of a peculiar hint of a waltz in the form of a triplet continues. With the development of the musical material, the rhythmic structures become more complicated (dash, reverse dash), the transparent texture covers the extreme registers. The characteristic interval composition of this episode: second, seventh, diminished and augmented intervals convey the increasing degree of tension.

In the next episode D (from measure 40) there is a rapid dynamization of the texture with its compaction. Wide dissonant intervals in the parts of both instruments seem to stretch the emotional sphere to the extreme limit. In measure 63, the quadruple canonical development of the theme (A1) begins, and this theme is performed for the first time by the violin from measure 64.
As a reaction to the theme, the following episode of E in free meter (bar 74) can be perceived as a reaction to the theme. Phonic echoes and the second with a clear ethno-characteristic intonation (according to O. Kozarenko) delineate the scene of the event. The part ends with a two-fold canonical continuation of the theme in contrasting dynamics (bars 75–88).

Both pairs of performers feel this part in their own way. For example, in the performance of S. Suldina – O. Bezborodka, priority will be given to a philosophical view of events, with an emotional, but internally restrained presentation of the material and with a culminating point in the last performance of the ff theme. This concept of the second part emphasizes the overall development and the author's idea. The culmination of M. Chukhovy and A. Pashkovskaya takes place quite traditionally – before a conditional reprise (the continuation of the theme (A1) in the violin part). In general, a greater emotional openness is felt in this performance due to the colorful timbre palette and the individualization of each section of the form, which shakes up the form to some extent.

The tragic Allegro finale is written in 4/4 and has a hint of genre dance ability. In the extreme sections of the finale, the parts of both instruments are autonomous. They seem to be placed in two different dimensions – the "leitmotif of memory" from the second part and "pretend folk fun".

In the middle melancholic-lyrical section (from bar 61), the instruments coexist in a kind of dialogue. In the reprise (from measure 87), the initial material is dynamized. A quiet and slow coda is preceded by a grand and tragic cadence in the violin part. The coda (v. 132) returns with images to the Meno mosso from the Improvvisazione. The sonata ends in G in both instruments.

The culmination of the finale and the entire sonata falls on a cadenza in the violin part. There are no differences in the interpretation of the finale between pairs of performers. Both performance versions confirm the tragic imagery of the finale and the entire work. With some variations in the interpretation, for example, of the second part, the performers penetrated deeply into this unique and multidimensional puzzle, interpreted and conveyed the encrypted "author's signs" to the listening audience.

Conclusions. So, it can be noted that despite the complex organization of the musical language, Gennady Lyashenko's sonata has features of a traditional sonata cycle with a deep meaning. The composer creates his genre invariant on the basis of the traditional sonata cycle. The deep tragic meaning realized through complex musical material largely transformed the usual model of the sonata cycle. Looking at the work from the new-traditional position allows us to determine the permanent features of the sonata cycle model and the individuality of its composer's interpretation. The main compositional and dramaturgical supports, which are programmed by the composer's project, are stable elements and give certain guidelines to the performers. The first and second parts lead to a tragic climax in the
finale. The considered performance versions demonstrate different interpretations of the composer's work. S. Suldina – O. Bezborodko tend to an intellectual and philosophical reading of the work. M. Sukhavy – A. Pashkovska is prone to expressionistic presentation of musical material. The existence of different interpretations makes it possible to understand the composer's work on a new level, to reveal its interpretive potential.
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