

Musical Education

Original article

UDC 78.078

<https://doi.org/10.56620/RM.2024.4.119-128>

EDN: NJICEH



Pedagogical Practice at the Gnesin Russian Academy of Music: Temporal Parallels

Dmitri V. Belyak

*Gnesin Russian Academy of Music, Moscow, Russian Federation,
d.belyak@gnesin-academy.ru[✉], <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2823-1746>*

Abstract. The article discusses the history of Pedagogical Practice, an academic discipline inextricably linked with the Gnesin House that has been under revision since the mid-2010s. To identify its fundamental principles, an analysis of the transcripts of the meetings of the Artistic Council of the Gnesin State Musical-Pedagogical Institute (GSMPI) from 1947–1952 is conducted. The documents note the role of practice in the educational process (as it was understood and defined by the founders of the Institute), its duration and connections with other subjects of the pedagogical and methodological cycle, as well as various forms of conducting classes at different levels of education. Parallels with the current state of the discipline taught at the Gnesin Russian Academy of Music (GRAM) allow us to draw conclusions about possible prospects for its development: the use of an assistant form at the specialist and master’s levels, which will allow future teachers of the middle and higher levels to become familiar with the specifics of their work, and to conduct practical training in existing educational institutions. The novelty of the study consists in its introduction into scholarly circulation of archival data published for the first time, along with the restoration of a historical snapshot over a five-year period that reveals the features of the “Gnesin pedagogical concept” that characterises the unique approach of GSMPI/GRAM.

Keywords: Gnesin State Musical-Pedagogical Institute, Gnesin Russian Academy of Music, teaching practice, “Gnesin Pedagogical Concept”, assistant practice, disciplines of the pedagogical and methodological cycle

For citation: Belyak D. V. Pedagogical Practice at the Gnesin Russian Academy of Music: Temporal Parallels. *Russian Musicology*. 2024. No. 4, pp. 119–128. <https://doi.org/10.56620/RM.2024.4.119-128>

Translated by Thomas Beavitt.

© Dmitri V. Belyak, 2024

Introduction

The 150th anniversary of the birth of Elena Fabianovna Gnesina (1874–1967) can rightfully be considered a landmark event for Russian culture. The reasons for the special attention paid to this date are quite obvious: the Gnesin family's comprehensive approach to pedagogical problems provided the foundation for an effective and unique system of music education. This creative process culminated in the opening in 1944 of the Gnesin State Musical-Pedagogical Institute (GSMPI),¹ the first educational institution in history focusing on training top-level musician-teachers for schools and colleges of the Soviet Union and now contemporary Russia. The uniqueness of the university is due to the careful maturation and rather long (about 50 years) development period of the pedagogical views of the Gnesin family. As the head of the Department of Music Theory and Vice-Rector for Research Tatiana Naumenko notes, “one of the phenomenal peculiarities of the Gnesin Institute from the first day of its existence was the absence of any kind of acutely expressed ‘formative period’ — from the first days of its existence, the educational institute began to work in such a natural manner as if it were continuing a process begun earlier.” [1, p. 26] According to Elena Fabianovna Gnesina's student in 1956–1964, Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor of the Department of Pedagogy and Methodology of the Gnesin Russian Academy

of Music, Head of the Department in 2010–2015, Augusta Malinkovskaya, “the Gnesin School is... an understanding of the enormous, decisive importance of pedagogy in academic music education.” [2, p. 25]

The holding of numerous events throughout the country in 2024, in the year of the 80th anniversary of the university, including the establishment of the Elena Fabianovna Gnesina scholarships,² is, of course, an important component of the commemoration. However, the anniversary year also stimulates us to search for answers to certain pressing questions: in what does the uniqueness of the Gnesin system consist? What innovations have been introduced into music education as a result? And most importantly, for what reason was this done?

The starting point of our discussion was the so-called “Gnesin pedagogical concept”; here is how it is characterised by Augusta Malinkovskaya: “In the course of continuous searches for ways to improve musical education, the original Gnesin concept of musical education and model for its implementation were developed, whose essence lies in the fundamental training of creatively thinking musicians having a wide range of knowledge and skills, possessing professional mastery and seriously equipped in the field of pedagogy.” [3, p. 142] Thus, the main idea of this concept is the formation of a special type of teacher,³ who is prepared to work under any conditions, and is therefore equipped with theoretical

¹ In 1992, the Gnesin State Musical Pedagogical Institute (GSMPI) was transformed into the Gnesin Russian Academy of Music (GRAM).

² Decree of the President of the Russian Federation of June 20, 2022 “On the celebration of the 150th anniversary of the birth of E. F. Gnesina.” URL: <http://publication.pravo.gov.ru/Document/View/0001202206200013> (accessed: 02.10.2024).

³ This is stated in the Charter of the Gnesin State Musical Pedagogical Institute: one of the main stated tasks of the Institute is “the education of specialists <...> devoted to the socialist Fatherland and capable of carrying out work to further expand and improve the musical and artistic education of workers of the USSR” [Charter of the Institute. 1944. The Russian State Archive for Literature and Art (RSALA). Fund 2927. List 1. Portfolio 1. P. 1].

knowledge and practical skills, as well as having a broad overview of the problems of pedagogy. The implementation of this concept demanded not only significant professional experience, but also, of course, a special type of thinking. It was embodied, on the one hand, in the development of a set of disciplines in the pedagogical and methodological cycle, which can be considered innovative in the system of music education: here, first of all, we are referring to courses in methodology and pedagogical practice. According to Malinkovskaya, “back in 1925, Elena Fabianovna began to engage in pedagogical training for technical school students in a circle for studying methods for teaching piano playing. Like all her associates, she was guided by the understanding that the objective of educating teaching musicians is not achieved spontaneously during the process of training performers: the pedagogical component of training requires special organisation, as well as its substantive, structural, methodological development and equipment.” [4, p. 12] On the other hand, an important role is played by the key idea underpinning the “foundation” of the Institute: performing and pedagogical activities are inseparable and interdependent.⁴ Thus, all components of the GSMPI concept complement each other to form a holistic system that continues to function to this day.

It should be noted that the Gnesin High School began its work during a time of active research into systems of musical education.

This allows us to draw parallels with the present day, at a time when the form and content of many disciplines are also undergoing a process of revision. One of these courses turned out to be pedagogical practice, which has undergone significant changes. In search of the foundational principles of this discipline, we turned to archival documents consisting in the transcripts of the meetings of the Artistic Council of the GSMPI from 1947 to 1952.

**“In Our Institute, Practice
Must be Up to the Mark”:
On the Role of Teaching Practice
at the Gnesin State Musical-Pedagogical
Institute**

What place did pedagogical practice occupy among other disciplines? Let us quote the words of the dean of the vocal faculty, Nina Aleksandrovna Verbova: “For our university, pedagogical practice is not a ‘required curriculum,’ but the most important subject, the main subject for our students, regardless of whether they will become teachers immediately after graduating from the institute or after some time of performing practice.”⁵ The central importance of this discipline, the high level of dedication and quality of work expected from students not only by the university teaching, but also more specifically by the Gnesin sisters, is evidenced, in particular, by the words of Elizaveta Fabianovna⁶: “I was present when the students brought their students, and I find that you are

⁴ See Charter of the Gnesin State Musical Pedagogical Institute [Charter of the Institute. 1944. RSALA. Fund 2927. List 1. Portfolio 1]. Another graduate of Elena Gnesina’s class, A. V. Malinkovskaya, mentions the same thing. See: [2, p. 138].

⁵ Transcript of the meeting of the Institute Council to discuss the results of the winter examination session and the results of the work of the faculties and departments for the previous period and materials for it. January 29, 1949. RSALA. Fund 2927. List 1. Portfolio 43. P. 17.

⁶ Elizaveta Fabianovna Gnesina (1876–1953) — the fourth of the five Gnesin sisters, violinist. In 1949 — Associate Professor, Acting Professor of the Department of String Instruments at the Gnesin State Musical Pedagogical Institute.

far from up to par in this matter. The students' diaries contained bookish expressions; there were many incorrect formulations and other unnoticed shortcomings. Not all students submitted their diaries, and not all of the diaries that were submitted were good", she criticised her colleagues. Her speech ended with the phrase: "In our Institute, practice must be up to the mark."⁷ The fact that teaching practice was conceived not only as a process of consolidating professional skills acquired within the framework of the pedagogical methodology course, but also as a school for educating future specialists, is evidenced by the words of the dean of the Historical-Theoretical-Composition Faculty, head of the department of music theory Pavel Gennadyevich Kozlov: "We must learn that teaching practice is not only the sum of teaching skills, it is a school for educating young teachers."⁸

One of the most important issues repeatedly discussed at meetings of the Institute's Artistic Council was the connection between a number of disciplines and their implementation in teaching practice. In particular, Associate Professor of the Special Piano Department Moisei Emmanuilovich Feigin complained in 1951 that "...there is still not a sufficient connection between theory and practice —

the methodology course is not yet properly connected with the students' work on pedagogical practice; there is an ill-considered content of the classes, as well as mistakes and gaps."⁹ Evgeniya Andreyevna Bokshchanina, a lecturer at the Department of Music History, pointed out some of the problems faced by students of the Faculty of History, Theory and Composition.¹⁰ It should be noted that the need for a close connection between the methodology course and pedagogical practice was discussed even earlier, in 1947, by Associate Professor of the Department of Pedagogy and Methodology Alexander Dmitrievich Alekseyev,¹¹ who also proposed extending the methodology course to five semesters.¹² Clearly, while this is a question that remains relevant at all times, today, in the context of significantly reduced curricula, it acquires a special significance.¹³

During discussions of practice, the issue of selecting a pedagogical repertoire was repeatedly raised. Feigin emphasised its importance as follows: "We cannot imagine a music teacher who would not treat with complete awareness and would not approach with deep criticism the material on which we will educate our students. <...> Our students must master the criteria within the walls of the Institute and learn to critically approach

⁷ Transcript of the meeting of the Institute Council... P. 22.

⁸ Transcript of the meeting of the Institute Council to discuss V. O. Berkov's lecture, preparation for the winter exam session, and approval of the topics for diploma theses. December 1, 1951. RSALA. Fund 2927. List 1. Portfolio 90. P. 27.

⁹ Transcript of the meeting of the Institute Council to discuss the results of the test and examination session and the conduct of students' teaching practice. January 27, 1951. RSALA. Fund 2927. List 1. Portfolio 75. P. 16.

¹⁰ She also noted a "lack of connection between teaching practice and the methodology course. "I had not established contact with Konst[antin] Konst[antinovich Rozenschild], we need to maintain closer contact in the future." [Ibid. P. 18]

¹¹ From 1951 — Professor; from 1972 to 1978 — Head of the Department of Pedagogy and Methodology.

¹² Minutes of the meetings of the Institute Council and corresponding materials. November 2, 1946 — June 30, 1947. RSALA. Fund 2927. List 1. Portfolio 35. P. 17.

¹³ To date, the methodology course has been taught for only two semesters.

literature for students. They must be innovators in this matter.”¹⁴ Thus, a methodological basis was laid for the emergence of a new discipline at that time — “Study of the pedagogical repertoire,” which has been removed from the current curriculum.

The list of “points of contact” between pedagogical practice and other disciplines can be continued further. Let us turn again to Feigin’s words: “At our students’ evenings and tests, we sometimes listen to works that have recently been published. During the tests on methodology, we give students an assignment: an independent critical analysis of works. Some of the topics of the diploma theses are devoted to these works.”¹⁵ A preference for the methodological aspect of the topics of diploma papers was repeatedly expressed at meetings of the Artistic Council. In particular, the deputy director of the GSMPI, Yuri Vladimirovich Muromtsev, entering into a polemic with the dean, Pavel Gennadyevich Kozlov, said: “You think that we need to preserve the old formulation [‘An attempt to analyse the performance of the Second Sonata for Cello by N. Ya. Myaskovsky.’ — *D. B.*]; performance analysis is easier than methodological analysis. But, it seems to me, methodological analysis is more suitable for the specialisation of our Institute.”¹⁶

He was later supported by Associate Professor, Acting Professor of the Department of String Instruments Alexander Kondratievich Vlasov, who added: “It is important to learn methodical analysis of any piece.”¹⁷ Thus, the task was set to teach the student to work with compositions of any level of complexity, any style, any time of writing.¹⁸ It is no exaggeration to say that within the walls of the GSMPI a new type of teacher was formed — one methodologically equipped with a broad overview of professional problems, who was capable of analysing and generalising pedagogical experience.

Thus, the position of pedagogical practice at GSMPI can be characterised as *primus inter pares*; let us note that the role of other disciplines of the pedagogical cycle, including the specialist classes, was not devalued. In this light, the words of the dean of the piano faculty, Adolf Davidovich Gottlieb, are noteworthy: “We graduate teachers who can play and sing well, teachers who are excellent performers; this is how I understand our task; this is our main difference from the conservatory graduate school.”¹⁹ His words confirm that the unity of performance and pedagogy declared in the Charter was one of the most important guidelines for the pedagogical staff and management of GSMPI. Teaching practice has thus become a “centre for converting”

¹⁴ Transcript of the meeting of the Institute Council to discuss the editorial article of Pravda “Unsuccessful Opera” from April 19, 1951. June 1, 1951. RSALA. Fund 2927. List 1. Portfolio 81. P. 50.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 51–52.

¹⁶ Transcript of the meeting of the Institute Council on approval of the certification of postgraduate students and the topics of students’ diploma theses, discussion of the report on the implementation of the plan for scientific and methodological work of the Institute for 1950. December 13, 1950. RSALA. Fund 2927. List 1. Portfolio 73. P. 2.

¹⁷ *Ibid.* P. 3.

¹⁸ This is worth noting separately since the absence of a developed interpretation (let us call it a “performance tradition”) should not be an obstacle to working with a particular composition in class. In fact, this is exactly what requires thorough theoretical, analytical and historical preparation of a university graduate.

¹⁹ Transcript of the meeting of the Institute Council on the work of graduate students, preparation for the summer examination session and new admission of students. May 12, 1951. RSALA. Fund 2927. List 1. Portfolio 79. P. 16.

knowledge, both that obtained within the framework of theoretical disciplines and in the classroom specialty, into a specific result — the performances of one's own students.

What place does this discipline occupy in the hierarchy of contemporary values? Let us give some figures: internship for students at the Institute in 1948–1952 lasted from the 3rd to the 5th year,²⁰ while in 2022 active practical training took up only a single 4th year.

No less important is the attitude of students towards this discipline. Nowadays, students at music colleges “not so rarely have to be convinced” of its expediency: “It must be acknowledged that not all students, even while studying at a university, can clearly understand and explain to themselves — and still less to their students — their method of revealing the figurative meaning of a piece and the methods of its pianistic implementation,” writes Olga Saigushkina. [5, p. 62] All this points to insufficiently developed pedagogical thinking, without which it is difficult to imagine a specialist succeeding in this field. It can be assumed that the prospect of further work in an educational institution, for example, following the results of targeted training, will replenish the lost motivation of students and revive interest in the discipline that prepares them for professional activity.²¹

Forms of Conducting Pedagogical Practice: Problems and Their Solutions in the History of GSMPI/GRAM

In the late 1940s and early 1950s, teaching practice was still a very “young” discipline, which led to discussions about its goals and objectives, as well as its characteristics at different levels of education. The most significant discussions about forms of teaching practice took place in the period from 1948 to 1952.²² Let us note that even today the problem of forms of practice is not only not closed, but is, in fact, at the stage of fundamental rethinking.

Discussions on the form of the internship were related to the search for options that could solve the problem of adaptation of young specialists in the professional environment. And in this case, the most pressing question was: how to distribute the responsibilities of the manager and the student intern. During the discussions, two forms were discussed: assistant practice, as well as the independent work of the student under the guidance of a supervisor-consultant.

The debate about the appropriateness of these forms was quite active. Gottlieb spoke in favour of the relative autonomy of students: “Teaching practice will only make sense when each student has an independent area of work.”²³ This same

²⁰ As confirmation, we will cite Vlasov's words: “Teaching practice this year yielded satisfactory results, students of the 3rd–5th years all had students” [Transcript of the meeting of the Institute Council to discuss the results of the spring credit and examination session and candidates for the vacant position of professor of the composition department, approval of the certification of graduate students. June 30, 1951. RSALA. Fund 2927. List 1. Portfolio 83. P. 9].

²¹ One would like to believe that the format of targeted training will help to “breathe life” into a whole range of disciplines — methodology, study of the pedagogical repertoire, pedagogical practice and others, without which the formation of a teacher and his or her “role” is practically impossible.

²² The most accurate in this regard are the words of Muromtsev, which in many ways are still relevant today: “It is difficult to provide a specific recipe now. We are doing experiments, we have done a lot, but we need to look for new forms and types of practice, and then we will implement this and overcome our difficulties” [Transcript of the meeting of the Institute Council on the organisation and implementation of pedagogical practice for students and seminars on socio-political disciplines, the work of the faculty on the study of Marxist-Leninist theory. November 19, 1949. RSALA. Fund 2927. List 1. Portfolio 53. P. 28].

²³ Ibid. P. 27.

form was widely used at the Faculty of History, Theory and Composition.²⁴ Shortcomings were also revealed: in particular, Gottlieb criticised students for “abstract reasoning”: “For example, a child plays in an elementary arrhythmic manner, and when discussing the results of the performance, I heard the following definition: one student says — ‘excessive romanticism in the performance’.”²⁵

A similar situation has developed with assistant practice. Professor of the Department of Special Piano Theodore Davidovich Gutman spoke about it as a successful experiment: “With the provision of pedagogical practice, the situation was as follows: in individual cases, we gave it to the 5th year of first-year students of the Institute.”²⁶ Assistant work by students of the State Musical-Pedagogical Institute was also carried out outside the walls of the university: “We sent two students to practice at the School of the Moscow State Conservatory and to the class of Valeriya Vladimirovna Listova so that the results could

be shown to our commission,” said Gottlieb.²⁷ He further added that “we should think about the possibility of a broader organisation of diploma practice directly in Moscow schools so that our commission would accept the credits.”²⁸ Thus, the experience of organising assistant practice was obviously quite successful.

There were also critical statements, for example, Vlasov’s words that “classroom lessons with teachers also do not produce results.” “Assistant practice has not proven itself yet,” he concluded.²⁹ During the discussion of the specifics of graduate students’ practice, Gottlieb also expressed criticism: “We use a passive form of practice for young teachers: a graduate student attends a professor’s classes, sits and observes the professor’s work. It is more appropriate for a young person who wants to master his or her speciality to teach under the guidance of a highly qualified specialist.”³⁰ At the end of his speech he concluded that “every graduate student should be provided with students.”³¹

²⁴ Let us cite Kozlov’s words as an example. He noted that “Komissarskaya turned out to be a good teacher, helped the school last year and completed the entire course” [Ibid. P. 29].

²⁵ Transcript of the meeting of the Institute Council to discuss the results of the winter examination session and the results of the work of the faculties and departments for the previous period and materials for it. January 29, 1949. RSALA. Fund 2927. List 1. Portfolio 43. P. 21.

²⁶ Transcript of the meeting of the Institute Council on the work of graduate students, preparation for the summer examination session and new admission of students. May 12, 1951. RSALA. Fund 2927. List 1. Portfolio 79. P. 18.

²⁷ It should also be noted that students from other faculties also completed their practical training outside the Institute: in particular, Kozlov said that “composers Odinets and Polshina work independently, lead a music literature group at a school in Setun” [Transcript of a meeting of the Institute Council on the organisation and implementation of students’ pedagogical practice and seminars on socio-political disciplines, the work of the faculty on the study of Marxist-Leninist theory. November 19, 1949. RSALA. Fund 2927. List 1. Portfolio 53. P. 29]. This same form of practice has survived to this day.

²⁸ Ibid. P. 27.

²⁹ Transcript of the meeting of the Institute Council to discuss the results of the test and examination session and the conduct of students’ teaching practice. January 27, 1951. RSALA. Fund 2927. List 1. Portfolio 75. P. 17.

³⁰ Transcript of the meeting of the Institute Council on approval of the work plan of the scholarly and creative student society and discussion of the work of graduate students and materials for it. October 13, 1951. RSALA. Fund 2927. List 1. Portfolio 86. P. 21.

³¹ Ibid. P. 22.

Thus, the priority of independent work of a student or postgraduate student was proclaimed along with a criticism of the passive form of practice.

The result of these discussions was the resolution of the Artistic Council of the GSMPI dated February 13, 1952, which drew attention to the organisation of the teaching practice of postgraduate students in two forms:

a) assistant work at a university in the class of one's supervisor according to a plan approved by the department;

b) independent work with school-age students."³²

The thus-adopted compromise option included elements of both independent and assistant work, as well as familiarity with school and university pedagogy. Consequently, both forms of practice fully prepared the specialist for future activities. This is how the pedagogical practice of Augusta V. Malinkovskaya was organized, as per her individual plan during postgraduate studies (see: [6, p. 57]).

In turn, the pedagogical practice of students of the 3rd–5th years gradually “moved to the rails of school practice,” as Alekseev expressed it.³³ On January 27, 1951, Muromtsev said: “We are now facing an important stage in the work along the line of pedagogical practice — the transition to a school base. The project of the Committee [on Arts Affairs

under the Council of Ministers of the USSR] states that it is considered appropriate to transfer children's practice to a children's school, increase the number of personnel, and integrate a seven-year school into a children's school.”³⁴ Although this was stated many times, the project was not implemented: on November 17, 1951, the new deputy director of the Institute, Alexei Nikolaevich Aksenov, said that “now it is difficult to predetermine new forms of pedagogical practice, *maybe* [mine italics. — *D. B.*] this will be a branch of our [seven]-year school.”³⁵ Despite this, an optimal form of conducting the practice was found and preserved: university students worked with one school pupil and one college student.³⁶ Thus, in the course of numerous and very intensive discussions and debates, both forms of practice were finalised and adopted.

Nowadays, the conversation about the forms and tasks of practice can be updated in the context of the “stratification” of higher education. As an example, we will cite the practical work of fourth-year students. According to the guidelines, the practical work of “bachelors” and “specialists” differs to only a superficial extent. This is a paradox, because a bachelor's degree graduate is focused on the school and college level of music pedagogy, while a “specialist” can apply for a place at a university, as enshrined

³² Transcript of the meeting of the Institute Council to discuss the scholarly and methodological work of the departments. February 13, 1952. RSALA. Fund 2927. List 1. Portfolio 95. P. 24.

³³ Transcript of the meeting of the Institute Council to discuss the results of the test and examination session and the conduct of students' teaching practice. January 27, 1951. RSALA. Fund 2927. List 1. Portfolio 75. P. 15.

³⁴ *Ibid.* P. 22.

³⁵ Transcript of the meeting of the Institute Council to discuss the political studies in student groups, the results of teaching practice and the implementation of plans for scholarly and methodological work. November 17, 1951. RSALA. Fund 2927. List 1. Portfolio 89. P. 12.

³⁶ Following its definitive establishment in the second half of the 1950s, this form was widely used thereafter. Malinkovskaya writes about this: “As a rule, each student had two students of different ages, which reflected the focus on his readiness for work in both the primary and secondary levels of musical education.” [4, p. 14]

in regulatory documents.³⁷ A student who has completed a five-year course may be unprepared for teaching activities at the higher education level, since the appropriate form of practice is simply not provided. This, in turn, comes into conflict with the specifics of the Gnesin Pedagogical School. According to Malinkovskaya, “from the very beginning of its historical formation and development, it implemented the principles of *successive conjugation* [italics mine. — D. B.] of the stages of a musician’s education, the links of the educational system.” [7, p. 81] Thus, the problem of continuity requires understanding at a more specific level, i.e., within the framework of the discipline “Pedagogical Practice.”

A similar situation arises with master’s students, who only in their second year conduct “independent studies and studies under the supervision of a supervisor with students,”³⁸ note that in this case both independent and assistant forms of work are used. However, the certification procedure, which is carried out on the basis of “a written report from the trainee and a review of the work by the intern’s supervisor,” raises several questions. [Ibid.] Thus, control over the progress of master’s students’ internships, contrary to the Gnesin tradition of collective discussion, is individual and rather conditional.

Conclusion

At the present time, the need arises to revise established forms and tasks of practice, some of which have become less relevant. Some proposals can be voiced now: for example, it seems possible to involve senior students of the specialist program, as well as master’s students, in working with students of the preparatory department (as independent work),³⁹ as well as with junior students in the role of assistants. In general, it can be stated with confidence that the renewal of the original Gnesin disciplines — in particular, pedagogical practice — is possible only by relying on those principles and approaches that were developed by the luminaries of the Gnesin House.

We will summarise as follows. At GSMPI, practice was recognised as perhaps the most important discipline of the pedagogical cycle, since it combined knowledge, skills and abilities accumulated within the framework of various courses during the training process; it also prepared future teachers for the professional environment in which they expected to find themselves after graduating from the university. Over the course of three years, their working style was formed and honed to gradually reveal their “pedagogical role.” Thus, the concept of the Institute was

³⁷ In the section “Type of tasks of professional activity: the pedagogical,” the following appears: “Teaching professional disciplines in the field of musical and instrumental art in educational organisations of secondary vocational and higher education” [Main professional educational program of higher education “Piano.” Specialty 53.05.01 Art of concert performance. Specialization: Piano / Ministry of Culture of the Russian Federation; Gnesin Russian Academy of Music. Moscow, 2021. P. 4].

³⁸ Practical training. Teaching practice: working program of the discipline. Basic professional educational program “Piano.” Direction of training 53.04.01 Musical and instrumental art. Profile — piano. Education level: Master’s degree / Ministry of Culture of the Russian Federation; Gnesin Russian Academy of Music. Moscow, 2019. P. 4.

³⁹ Let us note that there is already a precedent; in a report dated January 27, 1951, Kozlov spoke about students of the History-Theory-Composition Faculty: “The harmony group, solfeggio is a group for preparing for the university, and the theory group is for preparing for college” [Transcript of the meeting of the Institute Council to discuss the results of the test and examination session and the conduct of students’ teaching practice. January 27, 1951. RSALA. Fund 2927. List 1. Portfolio 75. P. 19].

revealed in pedagogical practice, since it was here that the necessary synthesis of theory and practice, pedagogy and performance, specific method and creative content arose. Thus, pedagogical practice in the historical heritage of GSMPI/GRAM appears as a complex multi-component mechanism, which functions to preserve and develop

Russian musical and methodological traditions. I would like to believe that in our day and in the future, the words “I am a graduate of the Gnesin Academy” will evoke ideas of indisputable competence, broad erudition, as well as a sense of responsibility for those traditions that made this person a true professional in his field.

References

1. Naumenko T. I. The Academic Activities of the Gnesins' State Musical-Pedagogical Institute During the First Ten Years of its Work. *Problemy muzykal'noi nauki / Music Scholarship*. 2024. No. 1, pp. 24–36. <https://doi.org/10.56620/2782-3598.2024.1.024-036>
2. Malinkovskaya A. V., Bukrinskaya M. A. A Scholar Knows No Boundary in Time: An Interview with Avgusta Malinkovskaya. *Contemporary Musicology*. 2022. No. 2, pp. 5–42. (In Russ.) <https://doi.org/10.56620/2587-9731-2022-3-005-042>
3. Malinkovskaya A. V. Academical Music Education in the Context of Educational Traditions of Gnesin School. *Vestnik kafedry YuNESKO. Muzykal'noe iskusstvo i obrazovanie [Bulletin of the UNESCO Chair: Musical Arts and Education]*. 2014. No. 4, pp. 131–145. (In Russ.)
4. Malinkovskaya A. V. “Kvalifikatsiya — prepodavatel’”: gnesinskie traditsii pedagogicheskoi podgotovki studentov v kontekste razvitiya otechestvennogo muzykal'nogo obrazovaniya [“Qualification — Lecturer”: Gnesin Traditions of Student’s Pedagogical Training in the Context of the National Musical Education’s Development]. *Gnesinskie pedagogicheskie shkoly: istoriya i sovremennost'* [*Gnesin Pedagogical Schools: History and Modernity*]. Moscow: Gnesin Russian Academy of Music, 2022, pp. 9–19.
5. Saigushkina O. P. Pedagogicheskaya praktika v muzykal'nom vuze: na puti k pedagogicheskomu masterstvu [Pedagogical Practice at a Music High School: on the Way to Pedagogical Mastery]. *Gnesinskie pedagogicheskie shkoly: istoriya i sovremennost'* [*Gnesin Pedagogical Schools: History and Modernity*]. Moscow: Gnesin Russian Academy of Music, 2022, pp. 60–68.
6. Belyak D. V. Under the Sign of the Gnesins' House: Marking the Anniversary of prof. Malinkovskaya. *Contemporary Musicology*. 2022. No. 3, pp. 43–57. (In Russ.) <https://doi.org/10.56620/2587-9731-2022-3-043-057>
7. Malinkovskaya A. V. History of an Educational Project Carried Out in the Gnesin House Half a Century Ago. *Scholarly Papers of Gnesin Russian Academy of Music*. 2023. No. 2, pp. 76–82. (In Russ.) <https://doi.org/10.56620/2227-9997-2023-2-45-76-82>

Information about the author:

Dmitri V. Belyak — Cand.Sci. (Arts), Associate Professor at the Department of Pedagogy and Methodology, Head of the Editorial and Publishing Department, Gnesin Russian Academy of Music, Moscow, Russian Federation.

Received: 27.09.2024

Revised: 31.10.2024

Accepted: 05.11.2024