

The Model of the Other in Shostakovich's Work

Sebastian VÎRTOSU

Associate Professor PhD

“George Enescu” National University of Arts, Iași

Abstract: The aim of this article is to conduct early research that is meant to provoke further (directions) studies based on the relationship between the art creator and his/her Self, as well as between the creator, performer and auditor or between the creator, the political power and other fellow creators. These relationships are subsumed and interpreted according to the theme of the International Conference of Doctoral Schools within “George Enescu” National University of Arts of Iasi, *Intersections in Artistic Research: The Model of the Other and the Culture of Mobility*, having Dmitri Shostakovich at the center of analysis and research. The article comprises three parts: Argument, Chapter I - The fugue of the inner perspective in Shostakovich’s works; Shostakovich’s interaction with his work; Shostakovich’s interaction with the public by means of his work. The interpreter’s interaction with the audience by means of Shostakovich’s work; Chapter II – Shostakovich’s intersections with the Soviet Power; The Model of the Other in Shostakovich’s work compared to other models of other modern composers of his time and Conclusions - where a practical example of *the model of the Other* in Shostakovich’s creation is presented in the form of a script created to the music of *String Quartet No. 5, op. 92*.

Keywords: Dmitri Shostakovich’s creation; 20th century modern music; musical movements and orientations.

Argument

A research subject that certainly has two concrete dimensions, *human mobility* and the *direct contact* of those who meet on the meridians of the world. From the dawn of man, even before the beginnings of civilization, *mobility* played a leading role in survival. It ensured the first *hunter-gatherers* with a source of food and health (not being sedentary). However, this mobility is not only found in humans. Almost all animal species possess and practice it; some even make a real mastery of it, migrating huge distances for food, nesting, or wintering.

Therefore, *mobility* has been an engine of survival for many species, not a recent discovery, by any means. Without it, life could not thrive, for this *movement* not only brings food, but leads, in humans, to economic, cultural, religious exchanges, to sharing ideas, mentalities, as well as enriching

linguistic or genetic legacies. These exchanges made on multiple levels of human life, apart from *mobility*, also need an extremely important factor, namely, *trust*. Without *trust*, *mobility* alone is not enough. Going around the world doing business, one needs to be trustworthy and to have trust in others, because otherwise no exchange between people would be possible, only war and robbery would reign. Consequently, *the model of the Other* is the expression of the trust one has in the Other when interacting with him/her, when crossing paths with him/her. Naturally, the reverse is also valid; *the model of the Other* must see in one a trustworthy person, otherwise nothing will materialize. These considerations only wish to show that *the model of the Other* and *the culture of mobility* are as old as the human being itself, being inseparable from it even after man's sedentarization and the emergence of the first cultural centers and ancient agrarian civilizations.

At this point, we shall return closer to our days and analyze the manner in which the two concrete dimensions, *mobility* and *direct contact*, were reflected in Dmitri Shostakovich's life and creation, adapted, nonetheless, to the specifics of his life and creation. For this reason, when we shall speak of the *culture of mobility* in Shostakovich, we will not do so primarily by thinking about his travels (although, we will definitely not exclude them, should they be of particular importance in the logical development of the discourse) but, we will see what his *sources* of inspiration were, because some are from the Slavic (Polish-Russian) world, while others from the Western world. This *mobility* already shows us that, without having to move physically, the bases of his creation can still be found at a great distance from the place of his birth. This is also a form of *mobility*, but one in the realm of ideas, concepts, sounds, forms that circulate with greater density than Shostakovich could have done in person. The *intersections* or *the model of the Other* will have a different paradigm than that carried by their first meaning. We shall highlight first of all his relations with the Soviet Power in general, but also with the people in his close circle.

1. The inner perspective in Shostakovich's works. Shostakovich's interaction with his work. Shostakovich's interaction with the public by means of his work. The interpreter's interaction with the audience by means of Shostakovich's work

Dmitri Shostakovich's creation falls within the tumultuous 20th century, a century that has known all the lighted and dark areas of mankind. A nature so sensitive that it could not remain indifferent to such complex social and political events and actions. In this regard, he identified on an existential level with human suffering, he appropriated it on a personal level, he did not avoid it. He identified himself in the model of the wronged, of the oppressed, he was their spokesperson.

This sincere empathy however has manifests itself in an unusual way in his creation, seemingly contradictory to everything that I have stated so far, namely, Shostakovich was never at the center of the story, he never seemed to be part of the action. Indeed, emotionally, mentally, maybe even physically, in certain situations, he was not absent, he was there feeling everything without censorship, but he was never at the center of the action. He is the storyteller, the witness, the reporter, the cameraman, who sees everything, who records everything, who empathizes and suffers a great deal, but is not directly involved in the middle of the action, but is positioned somewhere on the side, describing to us what he sees and hears. His entire creation, no matter how staggering or expressionistic it is, bears the mark of the *storyteller*, the *witness* who describes in great detail, with honesty and full of emotion, what he saw around him. The composer's interaction with the images suggested by his music, or with the events described, seems to be neutral. However, this neutral state must not be confused with indifference, because Shostakovich is never uncaring. He is affectively and emotionally empathetic with everything that happens before him, he is not an objective, unbiased observer, but really cares and defends those tormented and afflicted by various horrors, in other words, he is on their side. He has a complex personality, hard to define stylistically, and now we understand why. Perhaps the most appropriate term, instead of *complex personality*, would be *paradoxical personality*; this is the only way we can understand how someone can be neutral but also empathetic at the same time, which is difficult to notice in everyday life but perfectly natural in Shostakovich's case (obviously, in his creation, because from this point of view we are observing his position while he reveals his works to us). Thus, as a fine empathetic observer, Shostakovich has a great interaction with the real or imaginary characters of his creation, to whom he grants all his credibility and emotional and mental support. In terms of mobility, however, he is an unimportant, fixed point from which he observes, unhindered, all the unfolding action which he then describes in great detail, with an extremely intense and convincing emotional and expressionistic charge, sending us vivid images of an uncensored raw realism.

Antoine Golea¹ considers Shostakovich a humanist composer, alongside De Falla, Enescu, Bartok, Prokofiev, Honegger, Milhaud, Auric, Dallapiccola, Jolivet or Messiaen. This categorisation supports our statement about Shostakovich as being an empathic observer, but it does not support that of him being a neutral observer. Nor could it, because as mentioned earlier,

¹ Antoine Goléa, *Esthétique de la musique contemporaine*, 1954, Paris, Cap. II, *apud* Gh. Firca, *Structuri și funcții în armonia modală* [Structures and functions in modal harmony], București, Editura Muzicală, 1988, p. 11.

Shostakovich's *paradoxical* and complex *personality* cannot be easily fit into just one category².

Any analysis of a human personality, even more so one of Shostakovich's stature, can never be fully encompassed due to the fact that we will always observe only one dimension, only a part of it and never the whole. This is also a paradox; even though the human being is finite in space and time, any analysis will always come up against subjectivism, lack of comprehensive information, therefore aspects will be perceived either incompletely, subjectively, or wrongly. Our analysis perceives Shostakovich, or rather, perceives *the model of the Other*, in Shostakovich the composer, as a fixed observer, in an unimportant, discrete point, from which he can nonetheless observe everything empathetically, but without participating or interacting in a direct manner. It is a cinematic way of structuring a musical composition internally. We, the listeners, together with Shostakovich become witnesses and, at the same time, emotionally empathetic with the scenes and characters unfolding before our eyes on the screen, but without being able to intervene, without being active characters in the script.

One might wonder if other composers have this cinematic way of structuring a musical work as well. The answer is no. The majority, even if they describe a special, clear, objective scene, are in the middle of the action, one can feel them acting directly³.

The *mobility* of the observer-neutral composer Shostakovich is null, his emotional interaction, however, is intense and maximal. Shostakovich's influence on the music-loving public was strong from the very beginning. Not necessarily in the unreserved acceptance of his work (even though, in most cases, it was precisely that) but rather in the hypnotic force of his music. The (apparently) simple writing hides an extremely powerful musical energy capable of impressing and impregnating the audience emotionally and imaginatively. Of course, there is no secret, there is no wonder, Shostakovich had the rare ability of great creators to use any method in their art to achieve maximum efficiency (in his case, he used any rhythmic, melodic, harmonic, modal, polytonal, polymodal, polyrhythmic process possible where its

² Paul Collaer sees Shostakovich as being part of the 3rd generation of modern composers, namely, those who try to reconcile the different directions in new music, alongside Auric, Poulenc, Orff, Dallapiccola. Cf. Paul Collaer, *Geschichte der modernen Musik*, Stuttgart, 1963, pp. 25-29, *apud* Gh. Firca, *Structuri și funcții în armonia modală* [Structures and functions in modal harmony], *op. cit.*, p. 11.

³ Beethoven, for example, in his symphonies, quartets, sonatas, is the Titan who fights for us, he is the one who suffers; even though we can identify with his sufferings and fights, he is the main character. Mozart is always in the middle of the action, be it inside his own feelings or in an external action. Berlioz, in the *Symphonie Fantastique*, is the main character in all its parts. Impressionists are always present with their subjective feelings, not those of others. And the list could continue.

presence was imperatively required in the economy of the musical composition). Moreover, he sought to simplify the musical discourse as much as possible so that the audience, whether informed or not, could understand the message, the story, the characters, the emotional states or the images present in the script and in the architecture of the musical work. He was aware that Modernism would have brought panic to the music-loving public, making the latter hesitant to attend concerts. Therefore, to be able to interact with the public as well as possible, he sought to eliminate the fear of Modernism or the public's lack of understanding of modern music through simplification and well-chosen musical methods.

Some composers, or other creators, prefer to isolate themselves in “ivory towers” and become hermetic without caring if the public understands or accepts them, creating works of art (apparently) only for themselves and not necessarily for a wide audience. This is not Shostakovich's case. From the very beginning, he wished that “five words, if he said to them, to be understood, rather than a thousand words not understood by anyone”⁴. Hence the conciseness and clarity of his musical discourse, being compared in this regard to Mozart and Vivaldi. His main concern in interacting with the audience was to ensure that they left the concert having understood and appropriated the message of the musical work.

The interpreter/performer's role as a mediator between the composer and the audience is overwhelming. It could be likened to that of a priest of a religion who makes the connection between God and the people. In the case of music, the responsibility is equally great, because the manner in which he renders the work as he understood or visualized it can positively or negatively influence the audience's reaction. However, it is not only that. The interpreter also bears responsibility for the audience's health, as the audience comes in healthy and, without realizing why, could go home with organic or metabolic imbalances as a result of a poor performance. Nor does it have to be a performance below any level, it is enough for all theagogical, dynamic, technical or interpretive requirements not to be performed naturally. The public may not even perceive all the interpretive “shortcomings” (especially if they are not knowledgeable or professional), but those “shortcomings” will negatively affect the health of the listeners to a greater or lesser degree (not just the listeners, the interpreter him/herself can be affected by his/her performances full of “shortcomings”). Therefore, the interactions of an interpreter with the public are not so simple and innocent, but entail taking care of the public, which, like a child, entrusts him/herself to the doctor or teacher as well as the interpreter/performer. This trust must not be deceived, nor treated superficially.

⁴ To paraphrase the Apostle Paul, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 14:19.

These brief considerations apply, obviously, also when interpreting Shostakovich's work. We will have to precisely identify phrasing, intonation, technique, expression, and to attempt to find the best image, story or the most suitable characters to support the architecture of the work and its development for the author's message (as understood by us as interpreters) to reach the auditor without any loss of signal. Then, with strong confidence in our role as intermediaries, we bring the work of art to life by always letting the music shine through and not ourselves, because then we are good performers, when it is not us who come to the forefront, but the work of art, and implicitly, the author. The performance must be sincere and intense, we must believe in it and not just pretend, because the audience will immediately feel the insincerity of both the performer and his/her performance.

2. Shostakovich's intersections with the Soviet Power; The *Model of the Other* in Shostakovich's work compared to other *models* of other modern composers of his time

The destiny of the man and composer Dmitri Shostakovich was full of ups and downs, he knew both *agony* and *ecstasy*. He came from a family with Polish roots, his great-grandfather, Piotr Szostakiewicz, was deported to the Urals for fighting against Russian domination in a territory that had once belonged to Poland, and his grandfather, Boleslaw, was exiled to Siberia because, being a member of the socialist revolutionary organization "Land and Freedom", he had participated in the insurrection against Russia in 1863. Therefore, we notice that his ascendant path was equally energetic and agitated. One must point out the fact that Dmitri Shostakovich's ups and downs were not the result of revolutionary deeds, like his ancestors. His life, from this point of view, as Shostakovich the man, was peaceful. His works lifted him up in the good graces of the Power, and they also took him down to the blackest despair⁵.

From an early age he came into contact with the dramas of life, as a child being seduced by the ideals of the Bolshevik Revolution. Shortly after enrolling at the Conservatory of Petrograd, his father died, which forced the young composer and pianist to sing in a cinema accompanying silent films in order to support himself. This period would mark his pictorial and visual compositional style with which he conquered the public and specialists.

⁵ We recall here a troubling episode when, called to an interrogation at the NKVD headquarters, from which he did not come out very well, being Saturday, the investigator told him to go stay with his family and to come back on Monday. The composer was sure he was going to be deported to Siberia, at the very least. When he returned on Monday, he was shocked to discover that the investigator had been arrested and executed a day earlier. Thus, Shostakovich escaped from a hopeless situation, especially since one his brother-in-law had already been convicted and was, most likely, in Siberia. (Episode mentioned in the documentary film *Shostakovich against Stalin* by Larry Weinstein.)

At the beginning of the 1930s, agencies of arts and culture propaganda strongly demanded that artists bring to the fore the working class, factories and socialist-type relationships. In these new conditions, it seemed that the position of semi-official composer of the Power would be occupied by Shostakovich, given the fact that he was the most famous and valuable composer of his generation. However, the price paid by the composer was commensurate, accepting compromises with the Power. In 1935 he was part of the delegation of Soviet artists that went on tour in Turkey, but in 1936 he was knocked to the ground following the performance of his work *Lady Macbeth of the Mtsensk District*. Stalin was also present in the concert hall, but the next day an article in the *Pravda* newspaper defamed the composer and his work. It is believed that the author of the article was Stalin himself. This was the moment in which Shostakovich thought he would be deported, but escaped only because the officer who was investigating him was arrested and executed a day earlier.

Generally, Shostakovich's creation was regarded, at least in some of his works, as a form of resistance against Soviet censorship and power. At the same time, however, at least in some periods, he was also the composer of the Power. Therefore, his complex personality incapable of fixing only on a certain direction would seem paradoxical and inexplicable at a quick glance. But we could understand it if we analyzed carefully what is commonly called *the Russian (Slavic) fatalistic spirit*. It is that state of mind that longs for something beautiful, followed by remorse and regret that in pursuing that beautiful ideal one has committed an unforgivable sin. This tireless but suffocating oscillation between wanting, doing, and sinning pushes such people to all possible heights of despair, vileness, or holiness. Most often, this state of mind has no real basis either in virtue or in sin, but the pangs of conscience or the delight for some moral deeds quickly succeed each other, leading one to different extremes. Of course, Shostakovich went through this state of the Slavic (Russian) spirit all his life. On the one hand, he believed in the ideals of the Revolution which proclaimed a state free from servitude and the exploitation of man by man, but on the other hand, he saw how the selfish, wretched human nature treacherously created through Soviet propaganda an enslavement of the human being, depriving it of the most basic rights for which many people fought during the Bolshevik Revolution. His music must not be viewed and understood only in this key, of anti-Soviet resistance. We must approach his work also through other reception plans, because he was truly an authentic creator, fully capable of rendering all human states of mind and spirit and not only a "masked" critic of the Power.

Shostakovich's creation has only one *model of the Other*: the human, human drama, human tragedy, the hopeless fight against relentless and merciless destiny. These landmarks are reflected and noticeable in all pages of his creation. This fatalism in his works caused him many problems with the Soviet Power

that wanted art to always be triumphalist, where there was no place for doubts or criticisms, whether masked or not. Shostakovich only sees the Human in relation to destiny, he does not see himself at all. As previously mentioned, Shostakovich observes, but only observes others, those around him. His music renders his narrative as a storyteller, as a spectator of others, very rarely seeing himself in subjective introspection, and even then is perceived in relation to *the model of the Other* rather than in an analysis of the self. Therefore, Shostakovich is the eternal humanist, or the Promethean humanist who strives in a Beethovenian manner to transcend the difficulties of the lives of those around him. He sees himself through *the model of the Other*, he is the manifestation or the most suitable definition of *the model of the Other*, the one who, like *Don Quixote*, fights the windmills for some ideals in which nobody else believes anymore, except him.

We have seen earlier what *the model of the Other* is in Shostakovich's creation, namely, the Human, Humanism in relation to self-denial. In what follows, we will analyze, in just a few paragraphs, what *the models of the Other* are in the vision of other modern composers, contemporary with Shostakovich.

We shall start with Stravinsky, for whom *the model of the Other* is *the Hero, the Archetype, the Myth*. *The Firebird* and *the Rite of Spring* are telling evidence.

Prokofiev's universe manifests another *model*, namely, the world of fantasy, the world of phantasms, surreal and burlesque, scattered with sarcastic or caustic accents.

For Enescu, *the model of the Other* is the *hypersensitive Human*, impressed by nature, by sensations, by history, by childhood, by the spoken beginnings, murmured by music from the beginnings of human civilization. This *model* is overloaded in an overloaded amalgam of voices and sounds, like lianas in a thick jungle.

In Bartók, a *cubist model of the Other*, a constructivist model is manifested, crafted onto an archaic background that transcends nations or ethnicities, although he uses some folkloric nuances as well (like Enescu).

Schönberg presents us with *a model of the Other* that breaks down, dehumanizes, automates itself, alienates itself and others, discovering itself empty on the inside.

Finally, Shostakovich's art is perfectly recognizable among these coryphaei of the 20th century, his music weaving together fragments of each, just as fragments of Shostakovich are also found in other modern composers. His music intrigues us, unsettles us, creates shattering or diaphanous images, leads us through agony and ecstasy, shakes us and impresses us. It is the music of an oscillating destiny, the music of a man who has seen many terrible but also beautiful things, it is the music of an era and of an oppressive system, but

at the same time, it is a music of liberation, a music of *the Human* and of the *idealistic and naive Humanism*.

Conclusions

In closing, instead of conclusions, we will present in a practical way the manner in which *the Model of the Other* manifests itself in a quartet by Dm. Shostakovich, aspects highlighted so far only theoretically. I have selected for this demonstration *Quartet no. 5, op. 92 in B-flat major* for which I have constructed a script project entitled: “The lovers of Verona”. The script was created in 2012 under the direction of Mihai Bica together with a group of actors from the Dramatic Theater of Braşov in the form of a silent film, Shostakovich’s music being performed by the “Gaudeamus” String Quartet and accompanying the actors’ play, with the title proposed by the director “*Carpe diem* in performing art”. The show was presented to the public at Casa Armatei in Braşov⁶.

This script came into existence while working on my Doctorate Thesis *String Quartet in the creation of Dm. Shostakovich*, as a demonstration of what a performing musician artist must do when preparing a work to be presented before the public. The interpreter must not sing (only) notes, these representing just a code, a language through which the composer expresses his images, feelings or story in a veiled way. The interpreter attempts to re-compose either the same story (if it is programmatic music), or to think of another one that perfectly overlaps with the music (like a silent film or a ballet).

The Lovers of Verona

Scenographic vision by Sebastian Vîrtosu to the music of *Quartet No. 5 op. 92 in B-flat major* by Dmitri Shostakovich

In these lines, a special role will be given to the music of this quartet. It will be the *soundtrack* to a possible script, either for a silent film or a ballet. This quartet comprises three parts. Each part will be similar to an Act within a play, opera or ballet.

Act I (Part I)

- Scene I (mm. 1-12) – A square in an Italian *quattro-cento* town. Mottled people walk around on various errands, street vendors call out for customers.

⁶ See *CARPE DIEM (după o idee de Sebastian Vîrtosu, regia Mihai Bica)* [*CARPE DIEM* (after an idea by Sebastian Vîrtosu, directed by Mihai Bica)], retrieved from <https://youtu.be/MNJOjECMZkg>

- Scene II (mm. 13-38) – Suddenly, two noblemen start arguing. They are the heads of two noble families, Capulet and Montague, who hate each other to death for reasons long forgotten. The people in the square fret, trying to separate them. Finally, one of them walks away towards a young and beautiful lady, his daughter, and leaves the square still mumbling about his enemy, dragging the poor girl after him.

- Scene III (mm. 68-83) – Now, the young lady becomes the center of our attention. Her heart is full of candor and love and, standing on the balcony, she dreams of the moment when she will love and be loved.

- Scene IV (mm. 83-104) – From under the girl’s balcony, a young man, wearing noble attire, appears who, in only a few words declares that he has had the young lady in his heart and in his mind for a long time. Happy Juliet (mm. 105-115), for it is her to whom we are referring, professes the love in her heart with all her might. Then, little teasing, little jealousies (mm. 116-130) and their vows of love are swallowed up by the noise of the street and the nearby square.

- Scene V (mm. 138-329) – But the love of Romeo and Juliet is not to the liking of their families. They stand in their way, giving them troubles, arguments, duels, threats, street fights. To all these conflicting states, Juliet opposes her heart, in love and hurt at the same time (mm. 349-363). The concern for the fate of their love takes over the two lovers (mm. 363-403).

- Scene VI (mm. 404-481) – The quarrels and threats disappeared for the moment. Juliet, on the balcony, alone, sad, looks into the distance, lost in thought, when suddenly, she hears the chords of a guitar (mm. 404-481) and, without seeing him, she knows for sure that it is Romeo. Then, her thoughts go towards the fulfillment of their love, without any other obstacles in their way, and she slowly falls asleep thinking about the love of her life.

Act II (Part II)

- Scene I (mm. 1-8) – Her dreams were fairly agitated, it is midnight, it is cold, but more than the cold, Juliet is scared by a premonition colder even than death. This makes her feel like her whole body is freezing. Slowly, she starts to get braver (mm. 9-43). Her fears reappear, but this time she rebels against Fate (mm. 44-57 and 58-72) and even scolds Romeo for leaving her alone with these dark thoughts, when, surprisingly, Romeo himself appears on the balcony (mm. 75 -103). Now, both are tested by grim omens (mm. 117-124), but optimism, youth and Love win, and here they are, once again, in each other’s arms (mm. 150-174). Weary, they fall asleep next to each other.

Act III (Part III)

- Scene I (mm. 1-46) – a cunning threat lurks to destroy their happiness. Evil hovers in the air, still diffuse, but ready to strike at the right moment. Yet

the vapors of the night are chased away by the dawn (m. 47-52 and 52-90). The heads of the two families each discuss in their own family how to separate the two young lovers (mm. 91-151). Romeo and Juliet, in the sunlight, do not suspect anything of what is in store for them (mm. 151-167).

- Scene II (mm. 168-321) – Evil is no longer diffuse, but becomes more and more obvious and daring. The fight is given between unequal forces, Evil seems to be stronger, Romeo and Juliet can only oppose by the power and purity of their Love.

- Scene III (measures 321-353) – before the madness of Evil, one can only oppose, alongside Love, only Song (mm. 321-353). Romeo begins to accompany Juliet on the guitar. This small thing changed the balance of forces in their favor and in that of their Love. Next come the joy and the happiness of the victory of Good over Evil (mm. 353-400). Evil, however, lost a battle, not the War. It will continue to lurk, in hiding, to bring either Romeo and Juliet, or others less fortunate, to their doom (mm. 401-489).

This is where my dramaturgical experiment ends, on the music of *Quartet No. 5 op. 92* by Dmitri Shostakovich, in which the Good and Love triumphed, at least this time.

Bibliography

- Berger, Wilhelm-Georg (1970). *Cvartetul de coarde de la Haydn la Debussy* [String Quartet from Haydn to Debussy], București, Editura Muzicală.
- Berger, Wilhelm-Georg (1979). *Cvartetul de coarde de la Debussy la Enescu* [String Quartet from Debussy to Enescu], București, Editura Muzicală.
- Bughici, Dumitru (1978). *Dicționar de forme și genuri muzicale* [Dictionary of musical forms and genres], București, Editura Muzicală.
- Bouscant, Liouba (2003). *Les quatuors à cordes de Chostakovitch*, Paris, L'Harmattan.
- Călinescu, Matei (1995). *Cinci fețe ale modernității – Modernism, Avangardă, Decadentă, Kitsch, Postmodernism* [Five Faces of Modernity - Modernism, Avant-garde, Decadence, Kitsch, Postmodernism], translation by Tatiana Pătrulescu and Radu Țurcanu, *Afterword* by Mircea Martin, București, Editura Univers.
- Cholopov, Juri (2002). *Modalität in den Streichquartetten von Dmitri Schostakowitsch*, in: *Schostakowitschs Streichquartette*, “Ein internationales Symposium. Schostakowitsch – Studien”, 5, hg. v. A. Wehrmeyer, Berlin (“*Studia Slavica Musicologica*”, vol. 22), pp. 121-161.
- Firca, Gheorghe (1966). *Bazele modale ale cromatismului diatonic* [The modal basis of diatonic chromaticism], București, Editura Muzicală.
- Iorgulescu, Adrian (1988). *Timpul muzical. Materie și metaforă* [Musical time. Matter and metaphor], București, Editura Muzicală.

Music Section

- Marcu, Măriuca; Moga, Ion (1978). *Dicționar elementar de științe* [Elementary Dictionary of Science], București, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică.
- Messiaen, Olivier (1944). *Technique de mon langage musical*, vol. II, Paris, Alphonse Leduc.
- Meyer, Krzysztof (1994). *Dmitri Chostakovitch*, traduit de l'allemand par Odile Demange, Paris, Librairie Artheme Fayard.
- Niculescu, Ștefan (1980). *Reflecții despre muzică* [Reflections on music], București, Editura Muzicală.
- Platon (1986). *Opere*, vol. V, București, Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică.
- Stravinski, Igor (1967). *Poetica muzicală* [Musical poetics], București, Editura Muzicală.
- Vieru, Anatol (1994). *Cuvinte despre sunete* [Words about sounds], București, Editura Cartea Românească.