The Phenomenon of Chamberness and its Incarnation in the Chamber Music and Chamber Ensemble: Genre-Ontological and Semantic Aspects

Iryna I. Polska
Kharkiv State Academy of Culture, Kharkiv, Ukraine

Abstract---The article is devoted to chamberness identification, its meaning and specifics as a musical phenomenon. The aim of the article is to determine the ontological, semantic and genre specifics of chamberness and the nature of its embodiment in the fields of chamber music and chamber ensemble. The article is based on the integrative approach, proceeding from a combination of general scientific (cultural, phenomenological, historical, comparative) and special art criticism methods and approaches. The author considers chamber music and chamber ensemble as a nature of chamberness incarnation. Phenomenological, ontological, semantic, genre and categorical aspects are fundamental to this study. The substantial foundation of this study is primarily theoretical and phenomenological conception of a chamber ensemble, formulated in the scientific works of the article’s author. The state of the modern Ukrainian Chamberness (Cameralistics) and the Theory of the ensemble are briefly described. The role of musical chamberness category is characterized and its specificity is defined. The problems of definition and differentiation of “chamber music” and “chamber ensemble” concepts are considered. An ontological specificity of chamberness, determined by its human dimension and quantitative and spatial limitations, is determined. Emphasis is placed on the role of anthropocentrism and measure category in defining the essence of a chamberness phenomenon. The nature of musical chamberness, ensembleness and concertness categories interaction is revealed. The semantic transformations of chamberness manifestations and interpretations in the cultural space of the twentieth century are analyzed.

Keywords---history of an ensemble, musical art, musical history, traditional musicology, Ukrainian musicology.
**Introduction**

Determination of an essence and semantic specificity of the basic artistic categories, identification of the main aspects and levels of their existence seems to be an important task of a modern music science. These are the categories of chamberness, the importance of which in the formation of European musical culture semantic field has become more and more evident. First of all the historical role of chamberness is crucial to chamber music – one of the most significant, representative spheres of musical art, and its most important component – the chamber ensemble (Vereshchahina et al., 2021; Lian, 2021). Despite the great importance of a chamber music and chamber ensemble in musical history, the world’s musical science still lacks a research, devoted specifically to the general questions of semantic and genre specificity of these phenomena or the essence of a chamber music per se. Created mainly by the Western musicologists, these works (for all their value) often do not consider chamber ensemble issues comprehensively, from ontological, phenomenological or categorical positions, focusing predominantly on an artistic phenomena. Among the most important musicological researches that have played a significant role in the historical process of comprehending the essence of chamberness and chamber music, one should particularly mention the scientific works of (Nohl, 1882; Adorno, 1999; Asafyev, 1979; Miller, 1948; Robertson & Music, 1970).

In Ukrainian musicology, until the last years, music chamberness, and especially theory and history of a chamber ensemble, was one of the least studied fields (in the semantic-phenomenological aspect). The vast majority of scientific works represented in a chamber ensemble problematic field, was primarily related to a non-specific study of this phenomenon’s manifestations from the standpoint of traditional musicology – in historical, theoretical or analytical aspect, or in the aspect of ensemble’s performance and pedagogy practical tasks solution. Research of a chamber ensemble art was carried out mainly at the level of selective theoretical analysis of a chamber ensemble compositions or ensemble performance and pedagogy practical problems solution. The lack of a general chamberness and chamber ensemble concept, their theory, methodology and appropriate terminological apparatus hindered the scientific development of this problem (Gazor & Shoghi, 2021; Sutton & De Backer, 2009).

An integral historical and theoretical concept of a chamber ensemble as a cultural phenomenon and genre system was first developed and put forward by the author of this article (in the monograph “Chamber Ensemble: History, Theory, Aesthetics” Polskaya (2001), doctoral dissertation “Chamber Ensemble: theoretical and cultural aspects” Polskaya (2003), and other publications. Since the beginning of the 21st century, a noticeable updating of this field’s research is observed. Publication of a series of collections “Chamber-instrumental ensemble: history, theory, practice”, published in Lviv by the creative and scientific initiative of N. Dyka, facilitated the further development of Ukrainian chamber music, theory and history of an ensemble (Pylatiuk & Dyka, 2015).

Genre-branch and regional vectors are among the leading ones in contemporary Ukrainian chamberness and ensemble’s theory and history development. Represented by the vast majority of the last decades musicological researches,
they are the most actualized in contemporary Ukrainian musicology. However, despite the significant potential gained by a musicological thought in understanding of chamber music issues, theory and history of the chamber ensemble, this problematic area still stays largely unrepresented in Ukrainian musicology (Mas-Herrero et al., 2018; Xing et al., 2019).

The relevance of this article is determined by the decisive role of chamberness in humanistic cultural space formation, the enormous chamber music artistic achievements (and above all a chamber ensemble), as well as the urgent need in systematic theoretical understanding of the above mentioned issues in modern Ukrainian science. The purpose of the article is to determine the ontological, semantic and genre specificity of a chamberness and the nature of its embodiment in the fields of chamber music and chamber ensemble. The objectives of the study are:

- To identify the content and nature of the chamberness category, its determinants and attributes.
- Ontological and semantic chamberness specificity disclosure.
- To define the essence of a chamber music and chamber ensemble as main chamberness manifestations.
- To cover the nature of interactions between the categories of chamberness and ensemble, chamberness and concert.

The category of music chamberness and its specificity

Chamberness is one of the fundamental categories that determine phenomenological, socio-cultural, communicative and semantic specificity of the European art existence as such – and above all, the musical art. It is one of the ontological and semantic foundations of European humanistic art of Modern times, which is closely linked to the highest levels of human spiritual manifestations, the ethos of culture and its anthropocentric dimension. At the end of the nineteenth century, chamberness unique role and its high musical importance was emphasized by German musicologist Ludwig Nohl. He pointed out that chamber compositions “do not mean to separate us, but to connect, <...> ascending into those higher spheres where, thanks to magic and ennobling beauty, our arbitrariness humbles and silences. Which vocation is nobler, what tasks are richer?” (Nohl, 1882). Chamberness category is a generic term among the type terms, the most important of which is chamber music and chamber ensemble, in semantic field of which the chamberness plays the decisive role (Luo & Bhakta, 2020; Strait et al., 2010).

Talking about the Chamber music, English musicologist Alec Robertson notes: “The term itself covers a vast field of beautiful, and still for too little known, music, the exact limits of which are undefined” (Robertson & Music, 1970). He rightly notes: “Chamber music is so comprehensive that it can be taken to include anything from a vocal or instrumental solo to such compositions as Bach’s Brandenburg Concertos or Schönberg’s first Chamber Symphony for fifteen solo instruments” (Robertson & Music, 1970). The existence of a fundamental unity among the vast variety of chamber music types and forms, as well as substantially similar features that allow “to unify them in a general concept”, are
also emphasized by other researchers (Stupel, 1970). Therefore, it should be noted that the substantive-ontological basis and carrier of this semantic unity is precisely chamberness; and mainly chamberness is one of the attributes of chamber (and chamber-ensemble) music as such (Mas & Gómez, 2012; Cornelis et al., 2010).

Calling chamber music “One of the Most Satisfying and Stimulating Music Fields” Robertson (1970), Alec Robertson makes special emphasis on its content-phenomenological specificity: “Chamber music provided a medium for the expression of particularly intimate ideas <...> (and) it does not depend for its effects upon great plashes of sound, and great variety of tonecolour, or great virtuoso display. In chamber music there is room only for the essentials, all padding is avoided. One is aware of the musical essence, of the composer’s inmost intentions” (Robertson & Music, 1970). Similar vision about a chamber music’s meaning as a concentrated embodiment of a chamberness semantics is expressed by the Russian researcher E. Pesikov: “Chamber music is a reserve of human individuality, a guide to the complex world of deep psychology. Not crushed by passion, but focused on an extreme image’s “sharpness” – this is the meaning and essence of a chamber music” (Pesikov, 1963).

Describing the essence of a chamber music phenomenon, Alec Robertson focuses on the defining role of the content-communicative attributes of chamberness per se: “Chamber music has frequently and rightly been described as the music of friends, in allusion to an intimate team work of the players involves and its special character” (Robertson & Music, 1970). The musicologist also emphasizes the semantic uniqueness of a chamber music phenomenon, its socio-cultural multifunctionality and historical significance: “Chamber music is a bountiful source of pleasure to those who know the field. It is at once one of the most enjoyable and the most dignified of literatures. The musical amateur often makes it his hobby and considers it the mainspring of his musical existence. The experienced layman finds himself richly rewarded for his intelligent listening. The professional musician turns to it for relaxation and for a kind of a great pleasure. Furthermore it has challenged the greatest composers to their best offers” (Robertson & Music, 1970).

According to academician B.V. Asafyev the role of chamberness in general musical culture system is extremely important. He extols chamber music to be the “highest sphere of musical concentration” Asafyev (1979), in which “the composer achieves the maximum of influence (not external) within the strict limitation of tools” (Asafyev, 1979). The main stylistic property of a chamber music, according to Asafyev’s textbook definition is “closed music-making” (author’s italics) (that is, the desire to influence a limited circle of listeners in a small room)” (Asafyev, 1979). Emphasizing the semantic differences of a chamber music, B. Asafyev brings out all its other qualities from this main feature: “Hence the inherent character, its own technique and in many respects its own content incline, especially one in the sublime-intellectual and personal psyche spheres, as well as in contemplation and reflection field” (Asafyev, 1979). Appreciating the role of a chamber sphere in overall musical system, he points to the existence of “composers’ natural tendency to self-deepening, to <...> introspection and self-knowledge through a chamber creativity” (Asafyev, 1979).
B. Asafyev characteristics of a chamber music calls up with the one by Theodor Adorno: “Chamber music almost always kept something from the esotericism of philosophical systems of identity. In it, like in Hegel’s works, all the qualitative diversity of the world is turned inward. After that, it seems natural to define chamber music as introverted, self-deepened music” (Adorno, 1999). Noting that “distinction between European and symphonic chamber music <...> rests only on a different influence direction (on a larger or smaller audience)” (Asafyev, 1979).

B. Asafyev emphasizes the semantic differences between symphonic and chamber music, which, “Like all music, saturated with life sensations, but being self-deepened, it’s less prone to visualization and exposes the “raw material of external feelings” to much more refined <...> processing than <...> in <...> symphonies” (Asafyev, 1979).

A. Sohor in his article “Theory of musical genres: tasks and prospects”, along with emphasis on the general nature of chamber music and its genres, reveals the semantic specificity of a “chamberness” category. He emphasizes that “chamber genres differ <...> from monumental <...> by common features of content and style, which are covered by the concept of “chamberness” (predominant interest in personal, private, detailed etc.)” (Sohor, 1983). Mainly these differences, according to him, “could be called sense genre and a genre style of a chamber music” (Sohor, 1983).

Revealing an ontological nature of chamberness, the scientist especially pointed on the socio-cultural conditionality of these features because of “small number of performers and, as a consequence, the comparative limited audience” (Sohor, 1983). Focusing on the fundamental role of conditions and performance composition, which determine its phenomenological, genre, and stylistic specifics, A. Sohor points out that “the decisive importance of the performance environment affects it, however not only chamber music, but a whole group of genres, represented by it. Genres are differentiated by a qualitative composition of the performers inside it” (Sohor, 1983). Therefore, a chamber art sphere, because of its meaning and special psychological capacity, by A. Stupel’s correct expression, is “the most psychologically close form of musical communication” (Stupel, 1970). It should be noted that the emotional-psychological component is one of the most important attribute features of chamberness in its various genre manifestations (Lbova et al., 2013; Juslin, 2013).

**Chamber Music and Chamber Ensemble: Definition Problems**

It is the priority of chamberness principles (that determine the genetic content of a “chamber music” generic concept) to define the content and scope of a “chamber ensemble” type concept. It was repeatedly emphasized by the article’s author that chamber ensemble in its substantive essence is an embodiment of an anthropocentrism principle and chamberness semantics, which reflects both the sincerely-personal or socially-trusting [friendly-trusting] emotional origin, and in-depth intellectual-philosophical, combining paradoxically accessibility and elitism focuses (Polskaya, 2001). The content of the term “chamber ensemble” is related to the synthesis of chamberness (basic orientation on small closed spaces and small number of participants and listeners, conditioned by a “human dimension”, deep psychological or sincere communication intimacy) and ensemble
(harmonious compatibility, coherence, balance and integrity) (Polskaya, 2001). It is at their crossroads where a special artistic and communication aura of the chamber ensemble arises. The main type of a chamber ensemble is a chamber-instrumental ensemble, that has specific historically established temporal, semantic, genre-style and communicative features. Mainly this form is traditionally referred as a “chamber ensemble” generalized name.

According to our definition, a chamber ensemble is “a special sphere of musical art functioning, related both to composer`s creativity and performing activities (professional and amateur), characterized by harmonious artistic coherence, balance and integrity, involving performance in small enclosed spaces for a limited number of listeners” Polskaya (2001) and including:

- The process of musician`s (primarily instrumentalists) collective performance (from two to ten).
- Quantitative and qualitative composition of the participants (an artistic group of a chamber composition performers as a complete creative continuum – an ensemble)
- Musical compositions which, by their substantive and formal parameters, belong to a chamber (primarily chamber-instrumental) music and are intended for such joint performance“ (Polskaya, 2012).

Chamber ensemble can also be briefly defined as “a phenomenon of a closed personal creative communication and interaction of a limited number of participants in a small limited space (microcosm) through shared emotional experience and intellectual comprehension of chamber-musical art compositions” (Polskaya, 2012). Let us designate that a chamber ensemble as “a unique phenomenon that summarizes the features of chamberness and ensembleness, has stable, semantically identified properties, represents the most important chamber music genre sphere and often acts on a conceptual level as its analogue and representative” (Polskaya, 2001). However, as noted above, the “chamber music” concept is generally broader than the “chamber ensemble” concept, including, in addition, the concepts of “chamber orchestra”, “chamber symphony”, “chamber-instrumental music for solo performance” (piano, violin, cello, etc.), as well as chamber-vocal music, chamber opera, etc. Therefore, the necessary terminological differentiation of the terms “chamber ensemble” and “chamber music”, which are often interchanged even in authoritative publications (especially in Western, English-language musicology, where these terms exist in a certain syncretism).

A striking example of this substitution is, in particular, the Harvard Music Dictionary, in which the concept of chamber music is defined as follows: “Chamber music. Instrumental ensemble music, in which there is one player for each part, as opposed to orchestral music in which there are many more players than parts. According to the number of players (of parts), chamber music is classified as follows: trio (three players), quartet (four), quintet (five), sextet (six), septet (seven), and octet (eight). If the ensemble consist of strings only, the composition is called a string trio <...>, string quartet <...>, or string quintet <...>. If one of the strings is replaced by another instrument, names such as horn trio (horn, vl., vlc.), as piano quartet (pf., vl., vla., vlc.) are used. These terms apply to
the instrumental groups just described as well as to the compositions written for them” (Apel & Daniel, 2013). This definition, which does not mention any other types of chamber music, except ensemble (named in a very limited format), certainly refers exclusively to the “chamber ensemble” concept, and not to chamber music in general.

Another example of this kind is the characterization of a “chamber music” concept as presented in the above-mentioned book “Chamber music”, about which A. Robertson himself in his Introduction states: “This book adopts usual term limitations: that is, instrumental ensemble music with one instrument for a part and for no bode larger than a nonet, and therefore music for groups of players that can be accommodated in a fairly large room” (Robertson & Music, 1970). It’s clear this is also about a chamber ensemble, not the chamber music as such.

In this context, some objections are also raised by the definition of the chamberness category range and associated problem field, proposed by the Ukrainian researcher Povzun (2018), “Investigating the notion of chamberness, genesis and ontological phenomenon development, we base on the analysis of leading formation factors and evolution of this phenomenon: the historical conditions of a chamber and ensemble music performance; organological foundations of an ensemble music playing; timbre-articulation and dynamic foundations of a chamber-ensemble creativity; genre-semantic features of chamberness as a generalization of certain figurative-associative qualities, content concretization; the concept of chamber-instrumental instrumentalism as a certain set of object-instrumental ensemble qualities and ideally-psychological features of its participants” (Povzun, 2018). It should be noted that L. Povzun’s dissertation is generally imbued with the conceptual ideas and statements of this article’s author, reproducing intensively (unfortunately, not always correctly!) the author’s thoughts, definitions and logic of the compositional and dramatic development of our studies in the field of chamber ensemble’s history and theory. However, interpretation of the essence of the chamberness category, proposed by L. Povzun, is quite debatable and raises many fundamental objections.

However, based on all above, the category of a chamber music cannot be considered only on the material of a chamber instrumental ensemble outside the whole array of a chamber music. Chamberness, as we have repeatedly emphasized, is much wider than a chamber ensemble, while a chamber ensemble, in turn, often goes beyond chamberness. That is why attempts to consider these concepts as completely almost identical, equivalent, lead to the above-mentioned substitution of concepts, terminological nebulosity, blurring of their boundaries. It should also be noted that chamberness is a feature not only of ensemble genres (not limited to instrumental) but also vocal ones.

One can’t fully agree with L. Povzun’s conclusion that “chamber invariance arises as a result of an external and internal forms interaction, with a certain initiative advantage of the internal one, which is the generator of all derivative concepts (chamber music, chamber ensemble, chamber orchestra, chamber symphony, chamber opera, etc.)” (Povzun, 2018). Can the notions of “chamber music”, “chamber ensemble” etc. be considered as chamberness derivatives? Rather on the contrary, the category of chamberness has already emerged at a high stage in
the development of these phenomena and their corresponding concepts as a generalization of their semantic properties.

Therefore, L. Povzun’s thesis that “since genres of a chamber ensemble were yet during their formation, mainly chamberness should be considered as a genetic core of a chamber ensemble creativity”, doesn’t correspond the historical sequence (Povzun, 2018). In our view, this thesis seems to be an exaggeration that violates the determination of primary and secondary principles. It is chamber (chamber ensemble) music that is the first sphere of a secular instrumental musical tradition of Modern times, high European instrumentalism in general, and its genre-chronotopic, socio-cultural, communicative and semantic features became the meaningful basis that led to the chamberness art formation. It also should be noted that chamberness is not only a feature of an ensemble genres (not only instrumental) but also vocal ones. An important segment of a chamberness range is a chamber orchestra as an important genre of a chamber music. It should be noted that the specificity of this phenomenon is clearly manifested by the revelation of the similarities and differences that exist between it and symphony orchestra on the one hand, and chamber ensemble on the other. Therefore, the terminological differentiation of the terms “chamber ensemble” and “chamber orchestra” is essential in the context of the research. The substantive and functional features of a chamber ensemble, which fundamentally distinguish it from an orchestra, are.

- Aesthetic “personalization”, orientation to the reflection of an individual spiritual world.
- Single instrumental performance of each instrumental part by one musician (“one performer – one part” principle) – as opposed to orchestral duplication of performing parties (“one part – several performers” principle).
- An equal way of performing communication (as opposed to hierarchical in the orchestra).
- Quantitative boundaries caused by differences between social group and collective concepts, which are determinative to an ensemble and collective types of musical culture.

According to our classification, the scope of the term “chamber ensemble” is defined by.

- The means of functioning (composer creativity and joint performance/music playing).
- Location and operating conditions (intended for playing in small enclosed spaces).
- Genre purpose (applied or autonomic music).
- The sphere of functioning (family / home music, concert performance, music pedagogy).
- Socio-cultural purpose (performing for oneself or for the audience; targeting professionals or amateurs).
- The nature and means of communication and psychological interaction (consolidating effect).
- Quantitative (small – from two to ten – number of performers and ensemble parties) and qualitative parameters.
- The degree of genre stability.
- Content specificity (the embodiment of both sincerely-personal, emotionally-trusting, and intellectual-philosophical principles, orientation on both accessibility and elitism) (Polskaya, 2001).

The cited features of a substantive chamber ensemble specificity are clear reflection of a chamber music historical semantics in general.

**Ontological specificity of chamberness: human dimension, spatial limitation and seclusion**

One of the fundamental components of chamberness in all its manifestations is anthropocentrism, the “human dimension”, which predetermines in-depth psychology or sincere animation of a chamber (chamber ensemble) music. Defining the categorical specificity of a chamber ensemble, we have repeatedly emphasized that “chamber ensemble phenomenon is largely determined by its anthropogenic component, primarily due to the personalized status, the nature of role communication and interaction, the social-ethical vector, etc. It is the “human dimension” of an ensemble that is the semantic dominant of this phenomenon, the most important factor in its specificity and cultural role” (Polskaya, 2015). The anthropomorphic attributes of a chamber ensemble are deep psychology, emotional sensitivity and responsiveness, tendency to joint personal consolidation, rapprochement and mutual understanding, on the one hand, and intellectualism, adequate reflection of the thinking process itself and an increased ability for the concentrated embodiment of philosophical and ethical moral principles, from another hand.

The same features are inherently attributive for the chamberness phenomenon in its historical formation and development. (It should be marked that in 20th –21st centuries music the emotional-personal component of chamberness is largely concede to conceptual intellectualism). Anthropocentrism is also closely connected to another category of chamber-ensemble genres existence (and generally chamberness per se), – a category of measure that reveals through a principled focus on small closed spaces and a small number of performers and listeners. At the same time, human plays a major role in a chamber ensemble and chamber music as such, becoming in a full sense – as Protagoras and Socrates used to say – the measure of all things and phenomena (Polskaya, 2001).

Chamber music and chamber ensemble are characterized by the absence of excessively large spaces and people masses who suppress the role of an individual personality. Here is one more author’s quote: “The ensemble is a community of “soloists”, individuals with their own unique appearance, manners, characters. Its main measure is always a human personality, taken in relationships with other people“ (Polskaya, 2001). The “human dimension” of chamberness determines the small scale of chamber lounges and concert halls, where chamber and ensemble music is performed. These scales allow a person not to get lost in space and to feel their importance in interaction with music and other people in spatial conditions that are natural for human life.
Adorno (1999), while characterizing the social and metaphysical essence of a chamber music, emphasizes that a “home” notion, that is, “a place where chamber music settles, a place predetermined for it by the volume of her sound” is decisive for it. He also notes that it was “The Small Hall where music and society made a truce”. In this context, the key starting point of L. Povzun’s concept of “historically-aesthetic, spatial-acoustic, artistic-organological universality of chamberness” raises categorical objections (Povzun, 2018). Determining the phenomenological specificity of chamberness, L. Povzun constantly emphasizes on stylistic and chronotopic versatility of this category, with which one cannot agree.

According to this researcher, chamberness phenomenon is created first of all by stylistic characteristics and author’s conception of chamber ensemble compositions, which is – contrary to the existing scientific conception – independent from spatial and socio-cultural conditions. Emphasizing that “the unique stylistic properties of chamberness <... > provide a chronotopic versatility of instrumental and ensemble compositions” (Povzun, 2018). Ms. Povzun notes: “From our standpoint, chamberness as a semantic category is formed not by physical-spatial (limited spaces) and sociological (social community) indicators, but by a complex artistic and communicative “author – composition – performer – ensemble – acoustic space – listener” construct, with an undisputed primacy of semantic author’s content and artistic performance” (Povzun, 2018). According to L. Povzun, “The phenomenon of chamber instrumental-ensemble genres lies in a space-acoustic versatility – the disconnection with the place of action; semantics of instrumental-ensemble compositions and specific artistic and expressive means indirectly refer to a chamberness genetic basis, regardless of its context” (Povzun, 2018). And further: “All of the above allows us to define the phenomenon of chamberness as a spatial-acoustic “instrumental universality “that gives birth to the semantic multiplicity of ensemble compositions” (Povzun, 2018).

That is, in other words, the phenomenon of chamberness lies in the absence of the phenomenon itself, and the unique sense of chamberness, its specific aura, do not exist on a meaningful intersection of space and time, but are preserved in all conditions. However, from the literary and cultural theory of artistic chronotope, initiated by Bakhtin (1986), and the musicological concept of the genre-communicative situation, it turns out that the chronotopic context is one of the determining factors that gives rise to the meaningful side of art. Chamber composition cannot exist and be equally perceived in the conditions of an idyllic or “national square” chronotopes (Bakhtin, 1986). If chamberness or any other phenomenon, has no special functioning conditions, no spatial, socio-cultural and genre-communicative boundaries and can exist outside of any chronotopic context – everywhere, then does such a phenomenon have its own unique specificity that can and should be determined, and is it worth to be determined at all.

Paradoxically, but such an understanding of chamberness, which has no chronotopic and aesthetic boundaries, is in some degree overlapping with estimates of this phenomenon in the art history of the 20–80s of the twentieth century, motivated by new social ideas, the heyday of technocratic civilization, cultural gigantomania, the collapse of traditional forms of personal
communication. It is clear that all such motivations have long gone away and have no relation to an analyzed work, however proclaimed by Povzun (2018), the idea of stylistic and chronotopic chamberness universality, its independence from any spatial and sociocultural conditions is in fact the proof of chamber music self-identification loss.

While determining the chamberness specificity, it should be emphasized that this category is the dominant, but not the only fundamental feature of a chamber-ensemble music, many genres of which (in particular, the two-piano duo) are primarily concert. Therefore, the definition of phenomenological and semantic specificity of chamberness requires a broad context considering of an antinomic pairs “chamberness – concertness” and “chamberness – ensembleness” dialectical interaction. Many ensemble genres are stylistically ambivalent and can equally belong to both chamber and concert music directions. This applies especially to the art of the late 19th – beginning of 20th centuries, the characteristic features of which are polygenre, polystylistics, interaction and interpenetration of forms and meaningful moments. In a course of historical evolution, many genres, chamber-ensemble and concert-symphonic ones, has passed similar path of genre transformation, enrichment and expansion of artistic and stylistic possibilities.

Enormous role in the formation of the phenomenological specificity played another fundamental category of a chamberness – the ensembleness (author’s terminology). There is “a special feature of coordinated interaction, determined by the internal prerequisites of the musical elements compatibility, characterized by the harmonious compatibility of their combination and carried out both simultaneously and procedurally” (Polskaya, 2001). Balance of holistic community, compatibility – and individual uniqueness is associated mainly with an ensembleness category; measures, proportionality, coherence and harmony of musical art diverse components. In musical performance, the ensembleness is manifested at the next levels.

- The ratio of general and particular, general and special, general and individual in the performance phenomenon per se, in the “performing organism”.
- Personal emotional and psychological interaction of musicians-performers.
- Role interaction of performing parties.
- Timbre-phonic interaction of performing parts (instrumental or vocal).
- The interpretation and technological interaction of musicians.
- Thematic interaction of performing parties musical material.

The ensembleness reflects the communicative and ethical-aesthetic specifics of different artistic components coexistence, and is one of the fundamental categories of performing genres functioning. In musical performance, mainly various ensemble genres manifest this category most deeply and multifaceted – primarily in a chamber-ensemble sphere, which is a substrate of ensembleness per se, where the phenomenon of an ensemble music focuses in a concentrated form. Chamberness and ensembleness categories coexist in a dense (sometimes indivisible) relationship. Human interaction, inherent to an ensemble communicativeness, generated by a human dimension is the basis and immanent
manifestation of a chamberness. Herewith, chamberness, which is both a life-giving source and the result of such interaction, creates its unique aura.

It should be noted that the ensembleness category must be considered primarily in the broad semantic-phenomenological meaning (as an embodiment of harmonious compatibility, coherence, balance and integrity), and not only in narrow, purely performative-technological interpretation, which reduces philosophical-aesthetical level and impedes the understanding of an essential content balance between ensembleness and chamberness. (L. Povzun’s thesis is an example of such a narrow interpretation: “We isolate the chamberness phenomenon and make its discursive and textual analysis (without rejecting the ensembleness thesis as a leading factor in performing a joint sound performance)” (Povzun, 2018). We note that some terminological nebulosity is inherent in this work in total.

It was repeatedly admitted by the author in her scientific works about the existence of a certain chamberness “genetic code” Polskaya (2001), which imprints the character of certain cultural traditions, spheres of artistic activity and, above all, on all genres of chamber and chamber-ensemble music. The influence of this genetic code is clearly felt in the musical culture of 20th – early 21st centuries. Thus, the decisive role of a chamber ensemble in the musical culture of the 18th–21st centuries determined by its psychology, emotional sensitivity, tendencies toward personal consolidation and corporate identity, direct modeling of social-personal relationships – and intellectualism, adequate reflection of a thinking process, increased ability to a concentrated expression of a philosophical-aesthetic expression.

In the twentieth century the world music culture has endured a long period of crisis. Its major socio-cultural determinants were: colossal socio-historical cataclysms of the last century; the establishment of a technocratic civilization dominance, the flowering of technical means of recording and sound reproduction, mass media, including electronic ones; the dehumanization of society, the disintegration of traditional forms and structures of personal communication, the decline of home chamber music traditions; the dominance of mass culture in music, its gradual displacement of classical chamber and musical heritage into the sphere of elitism.

However, the tendency towards chamberness is quite noticeable in the musical culture of the twentieth century. Thus, by A. Schoenberg’s own admission, “chamberness is a kind of generic property of a system of compositional technology he created” (Raaben, 1986). In the twentieth century new genres of chamber orientation are emerging and those that already exist are actively developing – chamber opera, chamber symphony, chamber choral music. The level of chamber performance popularity is increasing – chamber ensembles, chamber orchestras, chamber choirs etc.

In the domestic art of the 1920s–1980s there was a prolonged period of wary (and often negative) attitude of official Soviet ideology to chamber music as an “alien phenomenon of individualistic bourgeois culture”, since it was, on the one hand, essentially individual (not for masses), and, on the other, largely elitist. This view
reflected, in particular, the dramatic difference between real social functions of chamber art and those needed for its existence in Soviet society from a political and ideological point of view.

It is significant that in many Soviet period researches, dedicated to a chamber music or certain genres of a chamber ensemble, there is a compulsory statement that in our era chamber music has long gone beyond the chamber as such, having acquired an unprecedented scale, – both informative and social. Such theses, persistently repeated, give the reader a feeling that the authors are thus trying to avoid ideological reproach, to prove that chamber music is connected not only with an individual-personal spiritual world of a human, that it is not elitist at all, but very democratic instead and concludes frameworks of a collectivist folk culture. Sometimes, such expressions even made some apologies for the fact that chamber culture is not a culture of streets and squares, not a culture of grand human masses, and the authors made timid attempts to bring the initial positions of these opposite types of cultures a bit closer.

In fact, statements of this type seems to be an attempts to prove that chamber music, chamber ensemble are not chamber de facto, that is, they’ve lost their identity, ceased to be themselves. Chamber music with its psychology, direct appeal to the human personality, its intellectual and emotional wealth, feeling and mind, to humanistic values, seemed incompatible with the totalitarian regime to the authorities, like a harmful bourgeois remnant. It was entitled to exist only if proving its loyalty. Perhaps this attitude towards chamber music by the official authorities has partly led to a rather difficult situation, which later turned domestic musicology in this problematic area. However, chamberness magic and attractiveness was stronger than all circumstances, and in the second half of the twentieth century humanity has witnessed how chamber music, born again like the Phoenix, from the ashes of unprecedented historical turmoil of the era, had found every year more and more fans. During this period, the scope of chamber art has been extremely expanded. In second half of the twentieth century’s art, as we previously noted, two prevailing trends coexist:

- The centrifugal tendency to “maximize”, to enjoy mass grandiosity and entertainment.
- The centripetal tendency to chamberness “minimization”, psychologization of human communication, the effect of which extends to various types of arts – theater, cinema, television (widespread chamber theaters, various reader, pantomime theaters, etc.; the transformation of lyric and poetic cinema with its tendency towards chamber motives into one of the leading cinema areas; chamberness as a fundamental feature of tv specificity that determines the credibility of communication with an audience, etc.) (Polskaya, 2001).

Thus, at the turn of the 20th – 21st centuries chamberness per se has become one of the principal dominant features of contemporary art. Further development of chamberness tendencies is observed also in an art of the beginning of the 21st century.
Conclusion

The main conclusions of the study may be presented in a short Conclusions section, which may stand alone or form a subsection of a Discussion or Results and Discussion section. Provide a statement that what is expected, as stated in the "Introduction" chapter can ultimately result in the "Results and Discussions" section, so there is compatibility. Moreover, it can also be added the prospect of the development of research results and application prospects of further studies into the next (based on result and discussion) (Fischli et al., 1998).
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