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Abstract
From 1650 to 1950, Russian music theory grew from a teaching medium for reading the neumes of monophonic chant in the seventeenth century, to a Western-influenced pedagogical tradition in the nineteenth century, and finally in the twentieth century to a wide-ranging native discipline encompassing important studies in harmony, melody, mode, form, counterpoint, polyphony, analysis, acoustics, aesthetics, and folk music.

This dissertation is a comprehensive survey of the discipline of Russian and Soviet post-chant music theory from 1650 to 1950. It is the first work written outside the Soviet Union to document and analyze fully the development of music theory in Russia and the Soviet Union. It not only provides the historical framework of the growth of the discipline of music theory in Russia, but also discusses the origins and subsequent outgrowths and transformations of the theoretical ideas that have shaped its history. Among seventeenth- to nineteenth-century theorists discussed are N. Diletsky, the foreign pedagogues and theorists V. Manfredini, G. Hess de Calve, J. L. Fuchs, I. K. Hunke, Y. Arnold, and the Russian theorists V. F. Odoevsky, A. N. Serov, H. Larosh, P. I. Chaikovsky, N. A. Rimsky-Korsakov, Y. N. Mel'gunov, A. S. Arensky, M. M. Ippolitov-Ivanov, and Y. V. Kurdimov. The ideas of twentieth century Russian and Soviet theorists such as S. I. Taneev, B. L. Yavorsky, G. E. Conus, G. L. Catoire, N. A. Garbuzov, B. V. Asafiev, L. A. Mazel, I. Y. Ryzhkin, V. A. Tsukkerman, Y. N. Tiulin, A. S. Ogolevets, and A. N. Dolzhansky are discussed in detail.

This study is divided chronologically into two sections: Section I (Parts I-IV) takes up the Russian era from 1650 to 1900, and Section II (Parts V-VIII) covers the twentieth century--the last segment of the Russian era from 1900 to 1917 and the Soviet era from 1917 to 1950. Section I outlines the origins and establishment of a Russian music theory from one based initially on foreign theory; and Section II illustrates the full flowering of the discipline up the watershed year 1950. Linear-based theories, following the indigenous practices of chant and folk music, have contributed significantly to the growth of Soviet music theory.
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Music theory in the Soviet Union today is an established discipline. The Moskow Conservatory [Moskovskaiia gosudarstvenniiia konservatoriia imeni P. I. Chaikovskogo], for example, founded in 1865, currently has a department of music theory with some twenty-five members, each of whom both teaches theory courses and conducts specialized research on some theoretical topic. Over the years—reaching as far back as the seventeenth century for the beginning of post- chant music theory—many valuable theoretical studies by prominent Russian and Soviet theorists have been published in Russia, but we in the West have remained largely unaware of Russian advances in this field. The development of Russian and Soviet post-chant music theory, though, has followed a fascinating course from its origins in the seventh century, one well worth our scholarly interest and attention.

During the three hundred years from 1650 to 1950, Russian music theory grew from a teaching medium for reading the neumes of monophonic chant in the seventeenth century, to a Western-influenced pedagogical tradition in the nineteenth century, and finally in the twentieth century to a wide-ranging native discipline encompassing important
studies in areas such as harmony, melody, mode, form, counterpoint and polyphony, analysis, acoustics, aesthetics, folk music, and history. This growth accompanied similar advances in composition and musicology.

The purpose of this study is to trace and examine in detail the development of the major trends in Russian and Soviet post-chant music theory during this three-hundred-year period. It is divided chronologically into two sections: Section I (Parts I-IV) takes up the Russian era from 1650 to 1900, and Section II (Parts V-VIII) covers the twentieth century—the last segment of the Russian era from 1900 to 1917 and the Soviet era from 1917 to 1950. Section I outlines the origins and establishment of a Russian music theory (as opposed to a theory derived solely from foreign texts and theorists); and Section II illustrates the full flowering of the discipline up to 1950. The year 1950 is a suitable cut-off point because in that year, after the 1948-49 debacle when many Soviet composers, theorists, and musicologists were officially denounced, Soviet theory and musicology essentially began anew, with the issuance of new guidelines for theorists and musicologists. The enmity of the previous period mitigated somewhat, allowing for an atmosphere of greater cooperation in the fulfillment of common goals. The subsequent re-growth and development of the field of music theory, though, took a number of years; the tracing of this process and its transformation into contemporary Soviet theory is the topic of a separate study. The year 1950, then, is a watershed year, marking both the end of the previous era and the beginning of a new one.
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Although a "Russian school of music theory" did not originate until the 1870s and 1880s, when both Chaikovsky and Rimsky-Korsakov established separate "schools" through their textbooks and teachings, prior to this time various Western schools of theory and methodologies were advanced and promoted by both Western and Russian theorists in Russia. Because the field of music theory and its study in Russia in its early years developed in a rather serendipitous, unplanned fashion, promoted by independent-minded foreign pedagogues, I have not found any true continuity of approach during this time, other than a pedagogical, somewhat elementary one. Therefore I will not devote a great deal of space to most of these non-Russian works, which are isolated in the sphere of their own subsequent influence from both outside and inside Russia. Other elements also influenced the development of music theory in Russia. Thus for the foreign-dominated years from 1680 to 1871, I will focus not only on the lives and works of the most important foreign theory pedagogues living and working in Russia, but also on "extra-theoretical" topics influential in the development of music theory, such as the cultural milieu, the state of music--and music theory--education, music criticism, and advances in composition and musicology. But there are four important and original foreign theoretical works, not translations but works written in Russia for Russians, that were published in Russia in the nineteenth century; these I will examine in terms of their Western influence, which they all exhibit to some degree, their major approach and characteristics,
and their role in the establishment of a Russian music theory. By examining the developments of these earlier periods the achievements of the "Russian school" following 1870 can be more fully appreciated. Beginning with Chaikovsky's harmony textbook of 1871, the focus of attention will shift from one of historical analysis and description (Parts I-III) to one of examination and analysis of Russian theorists and their ideas (Parts IV-V). I will conclude with detailed studies of the achievements of Soviet theorists (Parts VI-VIII).

The comprehensive approach of this study necessitates the inclusion of a wide range of theoretical texts, including those intended for pedagogy in both general composition and more special topics such as counterpoint, harmony, and form, and those resulting from specialized research, i.e., speculative works. Generally, those texts examined in Section I are practical, pedagogical works, with the focus in these works initially on composition in general, which includes general bass and counterpoint, and then shifting towards the specialized areas of theory, most notably harmony. In Section II, the texts are for the most part from the realm of speculative theory. These areas tend to overlap at times, so the distinction is not always so clear. But a work may be considered pedagogical if its stated purpose is as such and its exterior signs—format, order, inclusion of exercises or drills, etc.—and content identify it as such. Several works intended for pedagogical purposes have turned out to be more speculative because of the unique nature of their content, and they will therefore be examined
as speculative. Through much of the nineteenth century, music theory was referred to as the theory of composition. Close to the turn of the century this reference was substituted by a new name—musical science, borrowed from the German term "Musikwissenschaft." Viewing theory as a science stimulated the gradual shift away from strictly pedagogical works towards more speculative ones. Music came to be viewed not just as an art, but also as a science, that is, as a discipline that could be investigated and from which laws could be extracted. The theory of composition had "laws," granted, but these "laws" had not yet been satisfactorily proven. The notion that music could be analyzed and discussed as a science with provable laws and axioms led to the appearance of several distinguished and many less distinguished but nonetheless interesting works, to which the label "speculative" may be applied.

The Annotated Bibliography includes both works discussed and those not discussed. The latter are either of such minor importance that they do not merit attention or they cover tangential topics. They are included for the sake of comprehensiveness. The criteria for selecting works that are discussed are many and varied. The most important of the selected works are those that have had a significant and continuing impact on Soviet music theory. These would include works by Chaikovsky, Rimsky-Korsakov, Taneev, Yavorsky, Mazel, Catoire, Asafiev, Tsukkerman, and Tiulin. Others had a significant and immediate but not long-lasting impact on Soviet theory. Among the major theorists, works
by Comus, Garbuzov, and Ogolevets fall into this category. Still others are included because of their emphasis or potential, which becomes readily apparent in an historical study; this category includes works by Arnol'd and Kurdiumov. And finally, some works are included simply because they were the most important and best works of their time in Russia. The early pedagogical works by Fuchs and Hunke are of this sort.

Such a complete study of Russian music theory has never before been attempted in the West. Until recently, there existed only a few articles in English on this topic, and these treat it only in a superficial or insufficient manner. Some of the more important Russian and Soviet theoretical texts have been translated into English, including those by Peter Chaikovsky, Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov, Sergei Taneev, Boleslav Yavorsky, Boris Asafiev, and Varvara Dernova, but these works constitute only a fraction of the total body of Russian theoretical literature. In 1983 a book of articles in English devoted to Russian and Soviet music theory was published; it includes articles by me and other scholars on the more important Russian and Soviet theorists from 1900 to 1950, as well as my introductory article on the history of Russian music theory. This present study expands greatly on those articles. It is my goal in writing this dissertation to make available to Western theorists a detailed summary of the achievements of Russian and Soviet theorists, and to promote more interest in their works and in the general field of Soviet music theory.
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Concerning the transliteration of Russian names and words, I have followed primarily the system adopted by the Library of Congress; any deviations from this system have been made for the sake of greater accuracy or ease of pronunciation or reading.
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3 Russian Theoretical Thought in Music (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1983). My articles are "Russian Music Theory: A Conspectus" (pp. 1-82), and "The Contributions of Taneev, Catoire, Conus, Garbuzov, Mazel, and Tiulin" (pp. 253-378). The book also contains articles on the works of theorists Boleslav Yavorsky (by G. D. McQuere), Boris Asafiev (also by McQuere), Varvara Pernova (by Roy Guenther), and on the theory of Russian chant (by Nicolas Shidlovsky).
SECTION ONE

RUSSIAN MUSIC THEORY, 1650–1900
PART I

ORIGINS OF MUSIC THEORY IN RUSSIA:
SOCIAL AND CULTURAL MILIEU, 1650-1773
Chapter 1

The Seventeenth Century: The Beginnings of Post-Chant Theory

Introduction: Chant Theory and Notation. Written music theory in Russia dates from the fifteenth century, when music in Russia consisted primarily of monodic vocal church music, znamennyi raspev [chanting by signs], the only professional written music, and folk music, both vocal and instrumental, which was maintained by an oral tradition. Therefore theoretical texts from the fifteenth through most of the seventeenth centuries deal exclusively with chant. They were generally called azbuki [alphabets]. Those from the fifteenth century only list the chant neumes and their Slavonic names; beginning in the sixteenth century, the azbuki came to contain two parts—one containing the list of neumes, the other explaining how these neumes were to be performed. At least seventy azbuki from the sixteenth century are known.

In the seventeenth century, a tumultuous period in Russia's cultural history, information about new musical devices and styles—namely, the five-line staff, square notation, and polyphony—began to penetrate into Russia from the West, from Poland through the Ukraine. At the same time the adoption of these new methods was being advocated, a reform movement within the Russian Church to improve chant notation...
and to correct abuses in chant performance was under way. A controversy among church members arose. The reformers, headed initially by the Patriarch Nikon (1652-1656), viewed the new methods favorably, while the opponents of reform—various schismatic groups including the "old believers"—wished neither to alter the old chant tradition nor to accept polyphony. Ultimately the controversy was settled in favor of the reformers. Not only was the chant notation improved and the abuses removed, but polyphony and Western notation were introduced as well. The resolution of this controversy, then, established the conditions necessary for the development of a theory based not on chant but on polyphonic music, and this held profound significance for the future of music theory in Russia. Three Russian theoretical texts from the second half of the seventeenth century deal directly with the issues of this controversy—treatises by Alexander Mezenets, Tikhon Makarevsky, and Nikolai Diletsky.

Although the theoretical texts by Mezenets and Makarevsky treat only chant and its notation, a brief examination of them will illustrate the significant notational reforms taking place and will help to place Diletsky's work, the first in Russia to deal solely with polyphonic music, in context. Mezenets's work, Izveshchenie o soglasneishikh pometakh [Notice about the most agreeable pomey], resulted from efforts to reform chant notation within traditional limits. In 1655, Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich (1645-74) appointed a commission of fourteen chant experts, headed by the monk and music theorist Alexander Mezenets, to standardize the various editions of
church chant by improving its notation and eliminating musical and textual abuses. This commission disbanded in 1658 without producing any results. A second commission of six members, with Mezenets again as its head, met from 1666 to 1668, and issued Izveshchenie [Notice], which, although it carries the name of Mezenets as its author, was actually the joint effort of the commission members.

Mezenets's Izveshchenie [Notice], the last theoretical work to deal solely with znamennyi chant and its traditional neumatic notation, contains the most complete exposition of the theory of znamennyi chant. Its most important innovation concerns notation. Russian chant notation, like the Byzantine chant from which it was derived in the tenth century, is neumatic. The neumes, called znamena [sign] or kriuki [hook]—hence, znamennyi or kriukovoe chant—do not indicate the exact pitches of the notes but serve as mnemonic devices indicating only the general direction of the melody and the length of the temporal relationships. In the early seventeenth century, Ivan Shaydur, a Novgorodian singer, devised a system of "cinnebar letters," a needed reform that allowed for the indication of intervallic relationships. Mezenets developed a further refinement of chant notation and its intervallic and pitch representation. Designed as a substitute for Shaydur's "cinnebar letters," which were difficult to copy and to print, Mezenets's system of shaded (black) signs, which were added designations attached to the neumes, resulted in the exact notation of chant melodies. With this system, Mezenets thus defended neumatic notation against the encroachment of the five-line staff and square
notation. Through it he attempted to perfect and preserve the traditional methods of notation, rather than adopt the newer lined notation.

Other musicians were more willing to accept the new notation. The monk and music theorist Tikhon Makarevsky, in his work Kliuch razumenlia [The Key of understanding], written in the 1670s and early 1680s, became the first to write a treatise acquainting Russian musicians with the Western system of the five-line staff and square notation. He accomplished this through the innovative application of the form of the dvoznameniki—manuscripts in which the chant is written in both neumatic and staff notation—to a theoretical guide. The content of the Kliuch [Key] itself, though, was not new, and could be found in other guides or azbuki. In the view of chant and azbuki authority Maksim Brazhnikov, the theoretical ideas in the Kliuch [Key] are stated insufficiently, and as a theoretical guide to chant, it is inferior to other, more prominent azbuki. Brazhkinov states:

[The Key] is a collection of theoretical information, already to a significant degree "cut off from" ancient [music], but still not standing definitively on the ground of the new musical art. In the Key of Tikhon Makarevsky one does not sense the adherence to principle that so advantageously distinguishes Alexander Mezenets and Nikolai Diletsky, in particular the first, whose views are stated directly in his work.

Makarevsky's work was the last Russian music theory text concerned solely with chant, ending a nearly three-centuries-long tradition; for at the same time the neumatic notation was being perfected but subsequently discarded in favor of the five-line square notation, the monodic chant itself was gradually being replaced by the new forms of polyphonic singing.
Polyphony and Nikolai Diletsky. By the middle of the seventeenth century, strochnoe penie [line singing], a primitive type of polyphony involving two, three or possibly four voices, in which separate melodies were sung simultaneously, was believed to have been performed in the church. This type of polyphony was soon supplanted by another, more authentic type of polyphony, partesnoe penie [part singing]. Although Russian church musicians had certainly become aware of this style of composition earlier, probably during the first half of the seventeenth century, they received written information about it only in the 1670s, from the Kievan composer and theorist Nikolai Diletsky (c. 1630–c. 1690). Diletsky himself composed music in this new style, but he is perhaps better-known for his treatise about it, Musikiskaya grammatica [Musical grammar], which he translated into Russian from Polish, the language of the original 1675 manuscript, in Moscow in 1679. The Kiev-born Diletsky, a graduate of the Jesuit Academy at Vilnius, had studied music composition with the composers Marcin Mielczewski and Jacob Rożycki in Poland, where composition was influenced by Italian models. He lived in Smolensk before coming to Moscow in 1678 to become choir director and composer to Count Grigory Stroganov (1656–1715), whose church choir was one of the best in Russia. There he trained Russian composers such as Nikolai Kalashnikov and Vasily Titov in the new style, which was soon accepted and performed in the church. Diletsky himself wrote a number of compositions, including Kherubimskaia and Liturgia, preserved in museums and libraries in Moscow and Kiev. He died sometime between 1680 and 1690.
Diletsky wrote several versions of his treatise, as well as two or three variants of each of these versions. Twenty-five manuscript copies from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries are known today, most of them in Russian; the original Polish text has not been discovered. It was popular mainly in Russia and copies have been found in several remote areas of Russia, testifying to its widespread dissemination. It remained popular and influential for nearly one hundred years; during that time no comparable theory book appeared in Russian.

The most significant reasons for its popularity and dissemination, aside from its being the only work of its sort in Russian, are its comprehensiveness and style. Its wide breadth of subject matter, presented in an erudite manner by a musician fully knowledgeable in philosophy and rhetoric, ensured its position as an influential work.

Diletsky included information for all types of reader—musicians—singers, composers, conductors and teachers—but directed his comments mainly to two groups: "I am writing a musical grammar, intending it for musicians of two sorts—simple singers and beginning composers." Yet he devoted the majority of the chapters to composition. The type of music advocated by Diletsky, partesnoe penis, is the vocal concerto, consisting of from three to eight parts and divided into concertino and tutti sections, the exact placement of which depends on the text chosen. The style is polyphonic ("concerted"), with sections of homophonic ("natural") music interspersed, generally at cadences.

Diletsky devoted the first three chapters to the rudiments of music—modes, accidentals, note names, solmization (based on the West-
European tradition), clefs, transposition, triads, inversions, intervals, and the concertino-tutti division. Some of Diletsky's ideas on mode and harmony are transitional, prefiguring those of Rameau and even, in the opinion of the Soviet theorist Vladimir Protopopov, certain twentieth-century Russian theorists such as Boleslav Yavorsky and Boris Asafiev, for instance, from these three chapters, his views on mode and the triad, which I will examine in greater detail.

Diletsky's harmonic foundation is one of fully-developed major and minor. His interpretation of mode is threefold—major, minor, and mixed—and is based on its expressive qualities. The major and minor modes are the "happy" and "sad" modes, respectively, and are exemplified by the triads ut-mi-sol and re-fa-la. The mixed mode contains elements of both major and minor; it was, in the mid-seventeenth century, a prominent feature of the chant brought in from Kiev that temporarily superseded the indigenous znamennyi chant. The example given by Diletsky in the 1679 manuscript is reminiscent of certain Kievian chants exhibiting this mixed mode. (See Example 1.1.) Looking ahead, such a mixture of major and minor—whether within or between modes—may be found in both Russian folk and professional music and has been noted and applied in the last century or so by many Russian and Soviet theorists. Known in the twentieth century as the variable mode, this mixed mode figures prominently in the theories of Boleslav L. Yavorsky, another Kiev-born theorist whose ideas on mode and intonation were influential in Russia in the 1920s and later. Yavorsky derived his theories in large part from his analyses of folk music.
Example 1.1. Diletsky's mixed mode.

Diletsky also uses the term "mixed" to refer to the "tone" of the music, by which he means that the music moves from one type of notation—flats, for example—into another—such as one without flats (called "simple")—and back again. Or a mixed song may be formed from the use of different cadences, the majority ending on one pitch, the rest on another. In other words, a mixed song may be one in which the mixed mode is prominent, or it may simply contain modulations or transpositions into a different key. Diletsky uses keys containing up to four flats or three sharps. His interpretation of the triad ("a concordance of the third and fifth notes") and his reliance on the bass note of the triad as the fundamental sound of the triadic harmony—he clearly points out that in an inversion the bottom note of the triad appears in the alto or tenor part, the "high bass," as he calls it—are also prescient of Rameau's theories.

Beginning with the fourth chapter, Diletsky "gets down to the rules" of composition, rules which "are necessary for the sake of the third and the fifth [referring to triads], [and] most of all—for the sake of the concerted composition." Through four chapters, Diletsky
illustrates how to write music on a given bass line (using examples each concentrating on one interval, either ascending, descending or both, generally in a sequential fashion), how to employ simple counterpoint and imitation (with or without an independent bass line), how to harmonize a chant or other song in the homophonic style, how to begin a composition using different intervals, and how to write an invention (thereby showing that his rules are equally applicable to instrumental music).

His discussions of elements such as cadence and form are also forward-looking. His "characteristic" and "uncharacteristic" cadences are identical to present-day full and half authentic cadences, with the full participation of the leading tone in major and minor. The characteristic or usual cadence, similar to the full authentic cadence, is illustrated in Example 1.2a; the uncharacteristic or unusual cadence, similar to the half authentic cadence, is illustrated in Example 1.2b. A characteristic cadence in three-part harmony, with the participation of the leading tone, is shown in Example 1.2c.

Diletsky discusses form in general terms, dividing it into sections according to function: beginning, middle, and end. In this view of form, Protopopov sees "the influence of rhetoric, an exceptionally developed science, having entered into the trivium—grammar, rhetoric, logic. Diletsky undoubtedly studied rhetoric at the Vilensky Academy [the Jesuit Academy in Vilnius], and this is evident in his treatment of musical form." Protopopov goes one step further, though, and, as he did with Diletsky's theory of mode, relating it to that of a twen-
tieth-century Russian theorist, points out a connection between Diletsky's view of musical form and that of a prominent twentieth-century Soviet theorist, Boris Asafiev:

The inclusion of music in the sphere of action of the laws of rhetoric is an extremely interesting phenomenon in the theory of the seventeenth century. However here it is desirable to stress the anticipation by Diletsky of the theory of musical form, developed in our time by B. V. Asafiev. His idea about three functions—initio—movere—terminus—continues to be developed fruitfully in the theoretical works of a whole group of Soviet theorists, the beginning of it, though still pale, in the Grammar of Diletsky.18

Example 1.2. Diletsky's cadences: a) Usual: bass moves a fifth down or a fourth up (like authentic cadence); b) Unusual: bass moves a fifth up or a fourth down (like half cadence); c) Usual: with leading tone.

In his discussion of form, Diletsky illustrates ways to begin the music, and ways to extend or develop the opening material, such as transposition, a change of rhythm, rearrangement of the motives, or modulation. For the latter, Diletsky composed bass progressions in each of the twelve major and twelve minor keys, following the circle of
fifths, which he illustrates using enharmonic changes, indicating, apparently, an acceptance of tempered tuning.

Alongside these forward-looking elements in Diletsky's treatise exist a number of more traditional ones, such as his reliance on the hexachord (ut, re, mi, fa, sol, la), which Protopopov believes is a reference not to mode—even though Diletsky has to add a second hexachord to the first in order to obtain the leading tone—but to solmization, and his illustration of counterpoint only by the elementary means of simple imitation. But Protopopov is a firm proponent of the advanced (for his time) nature of Diletsky's theories, interpreting them in the most favorable manner to support his views. Take, for example, the matter of the hexachord. It is apparent that Diletsky treated the question of mode separately from the question of scale, which he achieved through the combination of hexachords. The concept of mode was akin to human feeling, which had certain melodic and harmonic manifestations. Protopopov asserts, "The modal theory of Diletsky arises unconditionally not from the hexachord, but from the full octave scale." In support of this view, Protopopov offers Diletsky's employment of the leading tone in cadences (both major and minor), which, Protopopov feels, Diletsky viewed in harmonic terms. In this case, Protopopov is arguing against the interpretation of Diletsky's harmonic—modal, in Protopopov's terminology—theories as still mired in the sixteenth-century modal system, and in favor of interpreting Diletsky's use of the hexachord for solmization purposes. This view is perfectly acceptable. Here it is important to distinguish between hexachords
used for solmization and tones employed in an incipient major-minor harmonic system. Also, although his connections between Diletsky's theories and those of certain twentieth-century theorists are of interest, it might have been better had he investigated the possibility of any connections—theoretical or otherwise—between Diletsky and theorists contemporaneous to him, or perhaps earlier. Protopopov employs this approach only once in the course of his discussion of Diletsky's theories, in a search for the use of the terms major and minor.

Diletsky's throwbacks to chant as well as other rudimentary means in an otherwise advanced outlook for his time and environment reflect the changing nature of the music and of the whole cultural milieu of that time. Diletsky was at the crossroads between the old and the new, East and West; and such a position was bound to generate conflicts. That he was able to produce an interesting and useful work in spite of these difficulties is testimony to his abilities as a theorist and composer.

Diletsky was familiar with the existing theoretical literature of his time, but exactly which theoretical sources he may have consulted is not known. In the preface to Musical Grammar he does refer in general to the Latin theory texts he studied, but does not list the titles. Protopopov has speculated as to which books Diletsky had read and consulted, but reached no firm conclusions. He lists eight treatises that Diletsky might have known, all from the period 1511 to 1650. In all probability, Diletsky was familiar with the work by Simon Starovolscum, Musices practicae erotemata, published in Krakow in 1650.
But concerning this work Protopopov reveals only that it contains a statement of the theory of music that is detailed for its time; he makes no comparisons between it and Diletsky's work. Diletsky is careful throughout the book, though, to provide the reader with the Latin equivalencies for his Slavic terminology, which is one indication of his acquaintance of the Latin texts. Gerald Abraham, in his article on Diletsky for The New Grove, mentions only Diletsky's "garbleo recol-lections of Zarlino's writings." In another source he states, "Diletsky seems to have had some knowledge of Zarlino, probably at second or third hand, but he evidently understood him very imperfectly. Nearest he gets to concepts of major and minor is to say that 'ut-mi-sol is merry music, re-fa-la is woeful.'" This, as we have seen, sorely underestimates Diletsky's knowledge and approach.

Yet any reader of Diletsky's book will soon discover that he created an original text. He did not rely heavily on other theoretical sources, but based his theories on close, analytical observations and personal knowledge of the current compositional practices of the leading Polish and Ukrainian composers of his day (including himself). He included numerous examples of contemporary musical literature in his book, a practice not usually found in Western theoretical texts at that time. For examples in his book, Diletsky relied mostly on works by his teachers, the Polish composers Marcin Mielczewski and Jacob Rozycki; but he also included examples from the works of the Polish composers Serapion Zamarevich and Elisei-monakh, and the Ukrainian composers Ziuska and Kalenda. Protopopov recognizes Diletsky's "reliance on
analysis and the generalization of musical literature" as "a remarkable quality of Diletsky's work: we are not aware of a similar phenomenon in the theoretical works of West-European scholars of that epoch."

Protopopov also comments on Diletsky's use of exercises approximating the existing musical style, which distinguishes Diletsky's work from those of Western theorists. This practice constitutes an important aspect of contemporary Soviet theory as well.

Diletsky was certainly aware of the uniqueness of his work, as this thought, interjected into text unrelated to it, reveals:

"It is impossible to compare this grammar with others, written by people of little knowledge, who collect examples of a beautiful song, but do not know by which rules it is written. My grammar states the rules—with which to begin and how to compose music; and if you investigate thoroughly someone else's work, you will know—by which rules it is written by [its] creator." 25

He was even sure of his treatise's lasting influence and historical significance, and history has proven him right. For Diletsky's work was the first to present to Russians in their native language the theory of Western music, and it remained the only such guide in Russia for nearly a century; no similar book—either by a Russian or foreigner—was published in Russia during that time. Further, it remained the only guide for composition of church music for even longer. For Russian composers who had no other opportunities to learn the rudiments of composition, it served as the basic text well into the eighteenth century. However, this influence occurred only in Russia; its impact on theory in Western Europe, had it been known there—outside of Poland—is difficult to determine. Protopopov believes that Diletsky's
Grammar would have found a wide and receptive audience in other countries:

If the Grammar had in its time been published in Latin, or, as the treatise of Bononchini, in Italian, then a wider distribution and influence in Europe would have been secured for it. Having remained in manuscript in Russia, it turned out to be influential only within the limits of Russia.27

One of the most influential and ardent proponents of the new polyphony and the new notation was the Moscow Deacon Ioanniky Trofimovich Korenev (died c. 1681), for whom Diletsky also worked. He too wrote a music treatise, Musikia [Music], in the 1660s (second version, 1671) in the form of a dialogue. It was appended to Diletsky's work in 1681 as a forward. In it Korenev ranked music on an equal plane with other scientific disciplines, stating that music was "a second philosophy and grammatic." He believed in musical education for all, and encouraged the acceptance of secular music on a level with sacred music, holding the opinion that the rules of musical composition were the same for both types of music. With these views, Korenev was far ahead of most of his contemporaries; such an outlook as his did not gain general acceptance in Russia for many years.

Russian musicians had developed a rather sophisticated theory of music for one of its sources of native music, chant. But the void in music theory created by the appearance of new Western music would not soon fill up; first the new styles had to be assimilated, imitated, and transcended before a new native music theory could emerge. Through all this time, though, it is surprising that no additional theoretical works concerning polyphonic vocal music were written, considering its
application in the churches. Even when theory books did appear in
Russia again in the 1770s, no such works were among them; they were all
Western books devoted generally to the Western theory of figured bass.

Secular Music and Music Education. Other significant developments
in the seventeenth century concerning music include the growth of
secular music, and an increased emphasis on education. During Alexei's
reign (1645-1676), secular music began to gain in prominence, a trend
fostered by the growing Russian interest in the foreign musical enter-
tainments brought into Moscow by the foreign settlers. Alexei him-
self had in his service a Polish organist, Simon Gutovsky, who played
with other instrumentalists at festive meals; Alexei also engaged
foreign trumpeters to play dance music. Some of the nobility had
keyboard instruments in their homes; the more wealthy among them em-
ployed their own personal orchestras, consisting of a small number of
string, brass and percussion instruments. Not surprisingly, the boyar
Artemon Sergeevich Matveev, a friend of the Tsar's who was acquainted
with Western culture, had such an orchestra. In 1672, at the request
of Alexei, who had developed a liking for theatrical productions,
Matveev organized a court theater where plays written and produced by a
Lutheran pastor in Moscow, Johann Gottfried Gregory, were staged.
Since the casts for these plays were recruited from the German suburb
in Moscow, the language of the plays was German initially. The next
year, 1673, to ensure that future performances would be given in
Russian, Matveev founded Russia's first theater school to train serfs
in the theater arts, including drama, dance and music, for performance in this theater. These performances thus became an additional avenue through which Russians began to become acquainted with secular Western music.

Beginning in the seventeenth century, the Russian nobility began to develop a desire and need for book learning and scientific training, also encouraged by their increased exposure to Western knowledge and technology. Many of the nobles undertook to educate themselves and their children; consequently, the demand for translations of foreign books was very great, and scholars were brought in to teach and to provide translations. Some textbooks began to appear in the mid-seventeenth century. In 1687, within the decade of Diletsky's arrival in Moscow, the first institution of higher learning, the Slavo-Greco-Latin Academy, was founded in Moscow. Here, instruction in the liberal arts—grammar, poetics, rhetoric, philosophy, theology, and law—was offered, with Greek as the official language of instruction. Church singing was also taught at the Academy, providing a unique opportunity for such study outside the monasteries.

This growing Russian familiarity with Western music, learning, and education methods, although still in its rudimentary stages, provided the background against which Peter the Great was able to instigate his various reforms, setting in motion an even greater desire for things Western during the eighteenth century. The adoption of Western-style polyphony and notation, the importation of Western musicians and scholars, and the new emphasis on education were all very important developments that held a continuing influence over life in Russia.
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1 For a detailed investigation of chant theory, see Maksim Viktorovich Brazhnikov, Drenerusskaia teoriia muzyki. Po rukopisnym materialam XV-XVIII vv. [The Old-Russian theory of music. From manuscript materials of 15th-18th cc.] (Leningrad, 1972). For a concise explanation of major developments in chant theory, see Brazhnikov, "Drenerusskie uchebniki muzyki" [Old-Russian textbooks of music], Sovetskaia muzyka, No. 1 (1970), pp. 87-92.

2 Russia's cultural history of the last six hundred years is brilliantly interpreted by James H. Billington in The Icon and the Ax (New York: Random House, 1966). Billington calls the period from the mid-seventeenth to the mid-eighteenth century "the century of schism," which is also the title of his third chapter, pp. 115-205. For both historical and cultural information on the seventeenth century in Russia, see V. O. Kliuchevsky, A Course in Russian History: The Seventeenth Century, trans. Natalie Duddington (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1968).

Since Poland was Russia's largest Western neighbor, facing Russia along most of Russia's western border, it was largely from Poland that Western culture reached Russia in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Two Polish composers, Nikolai Gomolka and Jan Brandt, introduced polyphony to the Ukraine; in turn, Ukrainian composers journeyed to Poland to study the technique of composing in this new style. After 1654, when the Ukraine, which had been a part of Poland, formed an alliance with Russia (an alliance recognized by Poland in 1667, when Moscow gained control over eastern Ukraine and Kiev), many Ukrainian composers went to Russia, bringing with them information about Western music.

The northern Russian city of Novgorod has also been suggested by Milos Velimirovic as a source of Western music, as it was an important trading and music center and had contacts with European cities. (See his article, "Russian and Slavonic Church Music," The New Grove, XVI, 340.) Velimirovic agrees, though, that the most likely source for Russia's acquaintance with Western polyphonic practices was Poland; he refers in particular to the strong political ties between the two countries during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.
Its complete title: Izvishchenie o soglasneishikh pometakh vo krattse izlozhennykh (so izlashchnym namereniem) trebuiushchim uchitissia penie [Notice about the most agreeable pomety briefly stated (with good Intentions) to those required to study singing]. (Pomety are the letter designations of pitch in znamennyi notation.) This work was later published by S. V. Smolensky as Azbuka znamennogo penie. Izvishchenie o soglasneishikh pometakh startsa Aleksandra Mezenetsa [An alphabet of znamennyi chant. Notice about the most agreeable pomety by elder Aleksandr Mezenets] (Kazan, 1888).

Alexander Mezenets's "worldly" name—outside the monastery, that is—was Alexander Stremoukov; his dates are unknown. From 1657 he was a proofreader at the Moscow Synodal Printing House, and from 1668 a member of the Council of Elders of the Zvenigorod Savva-Storozhki Monastery. It is not known why or even how he came to head the two commissions on chant reform. See Maksim Brazhnikov, "Azbuka Aleksandra Mezenetsa," Sovetskaia muzyka, No. 6 (1968), pp. 101-04, and Dreverusskaia teoriiia muzyki, pp. 328-368.

In 988 Prince Vladimir accepted the Christian religion. The earliest surviving musical manuscripts date from either the middle of the eleventh century or the early twelfth century, depending on the source of information. Regarding this discrepancy, Velimirovic writes:

The Russians were "officially" converted to Christianity in 988 A.D. This is the same period in which the use of neumatic notation may already be found in Byzantium. Turning to the Russian domain, good reasons exist to trace the beginnings of an intensive writing and copying of musical manuscripts in Russia to approximately the middle of the eleventh century. Indeed, the paleographic study of neumatic notation in Slavonic manuscripts of Russian origin appears to support the statements encountered in the Russian Primary Chronicle that describes a flowering of literary activities, especially of translating and copying manuscripts, during the reign of Yaroslav the Wise, who ruled until 1054 A.D. In short, the earliest use of any kind of neumatic notation among the Slavs seems to date from about the middle of the eleventh century, although most of the sources still extant date from a somewhat later period—from the latter part of the eleventh and, more profusely, from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries (Milos Velimirovic, "The Melodies of the Ninth-Century Kanon for St. Demetrius," Russian and Soviet Music. Essays for Boris Schwarz, ed. Malcolm Hamrick Brown [Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1984], p. 13).

Tikhon Makarevsky took monastic vows, and from 1675 held various administrative positions in different monasteries—head of the Troitsky Makarev'sky Zheleziotsky Monastery in Makar'ev (1675-1677), steward of the Savva-Storozhki Monastery in Zvenigorod (1680-1694), and treasurer
of the Patriarchal fiscal department in Moscow (from 1694). He probably wrote the key in the 1670s or early 1680s, but certainly not later than 1685, the date given on one of the copies (G. A. Nikishov, "Tikhon Makarev'ski," Muzykal'naia entsiklopedia [Musical encyclopedia], 5 [Moscow, 1981], cols. 537-538).

7 Dvoznamenniki first appeared in the last quarter of the seventeenth century as a means of helping singers learn the new lined notation. Both azbuki and chant collections were written in this form.

8 Brazhnikov, Drevnerusskaia teoria muzyki, p. 402.

9 Extant manuscripts of this type of polyphony date from the mid-seventeenth century (N. D. Uspensky, "Strochnoe penie," Muzykal'naia entsiklopedia [Musical encyclopedia], 5 [Moscow, 1981], col. 336).

10 Diletsky wrote the first edition of his treatise in Vilnius in 1675; this version is not extant. He translated it into literary Russian in 1679 in Moscow, at the request of his employer Count Stroganov. Diletsky made the second edition, an earlier translation of the first edition, in Smolensk in 1677, on a commission from the civil servant Timofei Dementianovich Litvinov. Diletsky created the third edition also in Moscow; well-preserved variants of this edition from 1679 and 1681 exist. This last edition is usually found coupled with the treatise by Ioanniki Korenev. The 1681 variant may even have been made after Diletsky's death. In 1723 Diletsky's work was translated into Ukrainian in St. Petersburg.

Diletsky's Grammar was first published by S. V. Smolensky in 1910: Musikiiska gramatika Nikolaia Diletskogo (St. Petersburg, 1910) is based on the 1681 manuscript. A facsimile edition of the Ukrainian translation from 1723, Nikola Diletsky, Gramatika musikalna, was published in Kiev in 1970. A new translation of the 1679 manuscript (first edition) was recently published in the Soviet Union: Nikolai Diletsky, Idea gramatiki musikiiskoi [The idea of musical grammar], Pamiatniki russkogo muzykal'nogo iskusstva [Monuments of Russian musical art], vol. 7, trans. and ed. Vladimir Protopopov (Moscow, 1979). Protopopov's edition contains a description, history, facsimile, transcription, and translation (into modern Russian) of the 1679 manuscript, as well as excerpts and descriptions of other editions and variants, and articles investigating nearly every aspect of Diletsky's life and work. Protopopov's work itself is a monument to fine scholarship. I have utilized both his translation of the manuscript and its accompanying commentary for my own discussion of Diletsky's work.


15 For more on Yavorsky and his theories, see Parts V and VI of the present work.


18 Ibid.


21 Ibid., pp. 583-584.


28 It was published as such in Smolensky's 1910 edition of Diletsky's treatise.

29 Cited in Tamara Nikolaevna Livanova, Ocherki i materialy po istorii russkoi muzykalk'noi kul'tury [Essays and material on the history of Russian musical culture], I (Moscow, 1938), 79.

30 Soldiers, diplomats, merchants, craftsmen, engineers, priests—all types of foreigners with valuable Western expertise had been invited (at different times and for varying reasons) to come to Russia to work in their specialty, and, in the case of the craftsmen particularly, to teach their skills to Russians. This occurred from the fif—
teenth century on. Not until the seventeenth century, however, did this commercial and artistic "intercourse" turn into "influence" (Kliuchevsky, pp. 274ff). During Ivan's reign (1533-1584), West Europeans working in Russia formed a "German Settlement" outside of Moscow. After its destruction during the Time of Troubles, foreigners settled wherever they liked. Complaints from Muscovites, though, forced Czar Michael to forbid foreigners to buy houses or to build chapels; eventually, in 1652, the foreigners were moved back to the original settlement. "It was this German Settlement that helped to transmit European culture to such spheres of Muscovite life as had nothing to do with the essential material needs of the state. . . . It is interesting to see how eagerly the Moscow upper classes seized upon foreign luxuries and attractions imported from the West" (Kliuchevsky, p. 289). Western music was, of course, one of these "attractions."
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Ol'ga Evgen'evna Levashova, Iury Vsevolodovich Keldysh and Aleksei Ivanovich Kandinsky, Istoriia russkoii muzykii [The history of Russian music], I (Moscow, 1972), 96.
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Artamon Sergeevich Matveev, a favorite of Czar Alexei's, "was a government clerk's son who had boyar rank bestowed on him. Matveev's home was furnished in Western style, and he was the first man in Moscow to hold receptions to which guests came not to drink, but to talk, to exchange thoughts and news, with the hostess taking part in the conversation" (Kliuchevsky, p. 294). Matveev, with his familiarity with Western music and customs, would appear to have been the ideal person for Alexei to select to organize a Western-style theater.

At least two plays on Biblical subjects were given in 1672, one presented especially in honor of Peter's birth. The author and producer of these plays, Johann Gregory, was recruited to train Russians in the theater school. Since music and dance were prominent features of these and later dramas, it is probable that many Russians "first became acquainted with secular singing and secular instrumental music not in life, but in spectacles" (Livanova, p. 189).
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Kliuchevsky summarizes the process in this manner:

The upper strata of Moscow society apparently began to develop intellectual curiosity, interest in learning, a desire to reflect upon subjects that in the old days lay beyond the Russians' field of vision and were unnecessary for their daily life. . . . Russian society's attitude to western Europe was imperceptibly changing. At first Europe was regarded merely as a workshop of military and other articles, which could be bought without asking how they were made; now it was beginning to be looked upon as a school, in which one could learn not only crafts, but the arts of living and thinking (pp. 293-294).
It was the decision of the Muscovite Patriarchate, "advised by resident Ukrainian intellectuals and by the patriarchs of the Eastern church," to open an academy for the teaching of the liberal arts. "The 'Greek' party of the clergy, temporarily victorious over the 'Latins' in the post-raskol theological debates, was able to stipulate Greek as the official language of instruction" (Max J. Okenfuss, "The Jesuit Origins of Petrine Education," The Eighteenth Century in Russia, p. 114). Thus, the first teachers were Greeks, the Lichud brothers. When they began to teach Latin, though, they were dismissed; and two of their students took over.
Chapter 2

The Eighteenth Century to 1773: Winds from the West

During the rest of the seventeenth century and much of the eighteenth century, the most significant developments for the establishment of a music theory in Russia concerned not music theory per se, but the general cultural and educational environment. Thus this chapter investigates those elements that most significantly enhanced the atmosphere for the establishment of the discipline of music theory—educational and societal reforms, the importation of Western music, and greater attention to scholarly pursuits.

The Reforms of Peter the Great. In 1689 Peter I gained the throne, after overthrowing his sister Sophia. Peter's educational and societal reforms and innovations had a profound impact on the future course in Russia of all areas, including music. Peter himself was not greatly enamored of music; his personal involvement with music was limited to his singing in church and his importation of Western musicians to play in military bands for his new Western-style army. Nevertheless, Peter's open espousal of Western practices and traditions in music—even though limited to military music—as well as in
military, industrial, and scientific areas helped to establish a taste among Russians for Western styles and innovations in these areas. In music this turning to the West for entertainment and stimulus scarcely abated for the next century or more following his death in 1724.

Despite Peter's personal disinterest in sophisticated Western music, secular music in the Western style continued to flourish during his reign. Music retained its place at court, as in Alexei's time, when the use of secular music at certain functions first became popular. The musicians from Peter's military bands also performed at court festivals and other ceremonies, parades, dances, balls, dinners and masquerades. Small groups of them also played at various functions in the homes of the nobility. In 1721 a group of German musicians, a small orchestra, arrived in the entourage of Duke Schleswig-Holstein, who was seeking to marry Peter's older daughter. They performed at balls and festivities, and gave chamber concerts of Western seventeenth- and eighteenth-century music for members of the court. The core group of these musicians, together with their director Johann Hubner, remained in St. Petersburg to work for the Russian court, and became the foundation of a court orchestra, headed by Hubner. Theatrical productions were once again given—the earlier theater begun by Matveev had ceased to exist when Alexei died—although the length of existence of this new theater was also not long, from 1701 to 1707. In these productions music by Western composers and also Russians (Diletsky's pupil Titov, for example) was performed.

In matters of education and scholarship, Peter initiated improve-
ment or new activity in several areas. For example, he called for the founding of specialized schools to teach such subjects as navigation and languages; he commissioned the translation and publication of important foreign works; he approved a revised script and reformed the alphabet; he required the publication of Russia's first journal Vedomosti [Gazette], to keep his subjects informed of military and other matters (1703); and he founded the Academy of Sciences. He also transformed the Slavo-Greco-Latin Academy, which by 1701 had lost much of its prestige due to internal quarrels over its curriculum, requiring that it be modeled on the Kiev Academy, "a classical school of the European-wide Jesuit type, a Latin school founded on a vertical curri-
culum of grammar and the humanities . . . both a school of general education, and a training-ground for future clerics, as were most
Western colleges." Latin, not Greek, was now the required language, and the subjects included grammar, poetics, rhetoric, philosophy, and theology. This school, and others like it that were established throughout Russia, "had a major impact on the cultural development of Russia. . . . They became permanent and important institutions for the education of Russians, affecting the intellectual life and the social mobility of many, including some of the gentry and the peasantry.' Also during Peter's reign, the first secular book in Russian history, Leonty Magnitsky's Arithmetic, "more a general handbook of useful knowledge than a systematic arithmetic," appeared in 1703; some twenty years later Ivan Pososhkov wrote On Poverty and Wealth (1724), the first original economics treatise written by a Russian.
The Academy of Sciences: Foreign Scholars. The Academy of Sciences and the gymnasium attached to it were both established after Peter's death, in 1725 and 1727, respectively. For the opening of the Academy, fourteen scholars, some of the most learned men in Europe invited by Peter to become members of the Academy, assembled in St. Petersburg. These scholars came mostly from Saxony and the Baltic German provinces (as did many of the teachers for the specialized training schools); the students at the gymnasium were sons of Baltic Germans and other foreigners, and Russian students from the Slavo-Greco-Latin Academy. Instruction was in Latin, the official language of the Academy. Peter intended the Academy of Sciences to serve as an important intellectual center for research and education, and it more than fulfilled his intentions.

Concerning music, the Academy of Sciences sponsored music classes in its Gymnasium. Also, two members of the Academy during this time were interested in the subject of music as a physical science. The works of these two scholars in the field of music provide an interesting footnote to the development of a Russian music theory and music culture, for these men had no direct effect on this development. Nevertheless, they deserve mention by virtue of their having written and published works in Russia, for Russians and others to read and study.

The Swiss Leonhard Euler (1709-1783), one of the great mathematicians of all time, resided in St. Petersburg as a member of the Academy from 1727 to 1741 and then again from 1766 to 1783. Although not a musician, Euler was interested in music from the scientific point of
view, acoustics being one of his favorite subjects. He wrote articles on the velocity and propagation of sound, the vibrating string, bells, kettledrums, breathing, and other physical aspects of sound. One of the many books he wrote while a professor at the Academy was a work on music theory, Tentamen novae Theoriae Musicae, nearly completed by 1731 and published in St. Petersburg in 1739. Euler's purpose in writing this work, in which he develops a theory of consonance based on coincidence of frequency, was

that I should study music as a part of mathematics and deduce in an orderly manner, from correct principles, everything which can make a fitting together and mingling of tones pleasing. In the whole discussion I have necessarily had a metaphysical basis, wherein the cause is contained why a piece of music can give one pleasure and the basis for it is to be located, and why a thing to us pleasing is to another displeasing.

Such a work as Euler's presented an anomaly in eighteenth-century Russia, for music as a scholarly discipline, with theoretical writings and investigations, simply did not exist then. His book Tentamen was unusual enough in the West, as it presented a theory of consonance classification of mode and scale which was the most complete exposition of the subject yet to appear anywhere. Yet it had little if any impact on the development of music theory in Russia.

Another scholar at the Academy (from 1731 to 1744), Wolfgang Kraft (1701-1754), directed his attention to the question of the relation of sounds to colors, a topic in which Euler also later (and even later—Rimsky-Korsakov and especially Scriabin) became interested. In a speech to the Academy (in Latin) on April 29 (May 10), 1742, Kraft asked the question, if it were possible that different colors,
arranged—as he put it—in some well-known fashion (i.e., equating the seven diatonic pitches with the seven colors of the spectrum) would produce in the eyes of a deaf person an impression or entertainment similar to what we receive with our ears from a proportional arrangement or accord of tones in music. Kraft’s interest in this subject was possibly stimulated by reports from France about color keyboards. This speech was later translated into Russian and published as Rech Wolfganga Krafta o muzykal’nom soglasii [The Speech of Wolfgang Kraft about musical accords].

Foreign Musicians and Music Education. The influx of foreign scholars into Russia to work at the Academy was mirrored by a similar influx of foreign musicians, beginning in the 1730s. Peter’s niece and eventual successor Anna Ivanovna (ruled 1730–1740), invited the first foreign opera company to perform in Russia, not only for entertainment but also as a means of raising the prestige of her court, making it more equal to those of other European monarchs. An Italian theatrical company, "borrowed" from the Warsaw company of Frederick Augustus I, Elector of Saxony and King of Poland, arrived in Moscow in early 1731. In March, they began performing plays and intermezzi; and the musicians played frequently at court social evenings. But it was not until December 11, 1731, that the first opera was presented in Russia, Giovanni Alberto Ristori’s commedia per musica, Calandro, given in the Kremlin in Moscow. Although this troupe was disbanded two years later, after the death of Augustus, already in 1732 Anna had sent
Johann Hubner to Italy to recruit court musicians for her own opera troupe and orchestra. By 1736 an imperial theater had been set up in St. Petersburg to accommodate the performance of Francesco Araja's opera seria *La forza dell'amore e dell'odio*, and opera was performed in the capital regularly from then on. Araja was appointed maestro di cappella to Anna; this trend of appointing foreigners, mainly prominent Italian composers such as Paisiello, Sarti and Cimarosa, to such or similar posts continued through the turn of the century.

In addition to opera, ballet and chamber and orchestral music also flourished in Russia during the eighteenth century. Although solo instrumentalists, singers, conductors, directors, and composers were foreigners, for many years most of them Italian, the ranks of the orchestras (opera and otherwise) and the dance corps were increasingly being filled by Russian performers. This reflects increased educational opportunities for aspiring musicians, which were also initiated during Anna's reign. In 1738 a choir school was founded in the Ukraine by Glukhov to train singers for the court choir, which had been moved to St. Petersburg in 1713. Two years later, classes teaching the playing of orchestral instruments, established by Hubner, were opened. Also in 1738 the St. Petersburg Theatrical School was founded, though it was not formally opened until 1779. The Academy of Arts, opened later in the 1760s, also held music classes.

All of these schools were involved in the education of professional musicians needed to fill the growing ranks of singers and instrumentalists performing at court and in the houses of the nobility,
many of whom had their own opera companies or orchestras. By 1755 a sufficient number of trained Russian singers and instrumentalists existed so that an all-Russian opera production—albeit still with music composed by a foreigner—could be staged: Araja's Tsafal 1 Prokris, written on an original Russian text by A. P. Sumarakov.

A different sort of musical education was established for the training of Russia's youth. The Corps de Cadet, a military school that offered a broad general education, founded by Anna in 1732, became the first secular school to offer a course in music. The gymnasium of the Academy of Sciences also offered music classes. In the second half of the eighteenth century, numerous other schools, among them Moscow University—founded by Mikhail Lomonosov in 1755—and the Smolnyi Institute, were established; they too joined the ranks of those schools where music could be studied. At the Smolnyi Institute, for example, musical topics included the theory of music and even composition, in addition to singing and the playing of various instruments.

Thus, during the first two-thirds of the eighteenth century, music in Russia grew to the point where sophisticated performances of Western music could be presented by both foreign and Russian musicians, and growing numbers of musical amateurs—the nobility, mainly—were being educated to appreciate this music and perform it themselves. Yet professional secular music in Russia in the eighteenth century was still dominated by foreigners. Foreign performers were used to a great extent, the composers and directors were foreigners, and even Russia's first music chronicler was a foreigner. Jakob Staehlin von Storksburg
(1712-1785), a German who was invited in 1735 to come to Russia as a member of the Academy of Sciences, became the editor of the St. Petersburg Vedomosti [St. Petersburg gazette]. His reports on Russian musical life for that newspaper were later compiled into a book, Nachrichten von der Musik im Russland (Leipzig, 1769-1770), which is the primary source of information for Russian music of the eighteenth century.

Foreigners undoubtedly were recruited to teach music as well, both in the schools and privately; but the names of specific teachers are not known. No textbooks for the study of singing or instrument-playing appeared or were published during this time. Although classes in theory are known to have been given, no theory texts suitable for these classes appeared either, with the exception of Diletsky's work. Either the theory instructors used copies of Diletsky's book, or they used material from their own experience or studies, or they used foreign textbooks brought in from abroad. In general, though, textbooks were not used in Russian schools, as in the West; the teacher provided a manual for the course based on his own studies. Technical manuals and translations of the classics and other works of interest were published, though, for instructional purposes.
1 With regard to culture, Peter's most far-reaching reforms involved government administration, the status of nobles, and education. He modernized the administration of government and required the evaluation of performance as the major criterion for appointment and promotion in government service. He instituted the Table of Ranks (1722) to ensure qualified personnel; a government employee began at the bottom—fourteenth rank—and was promoted according to performance and seniority. He made secular education a prerequisite for government service by the nobility; consequently, education also became necessary for entry into the upper classes. He founded specialized technical schools and prepared for the establishment of the Academy of Sciences. He also reformed the societal obligations of all classes, and changed their outward dress and appearance to conform to that of Westerners.

Thus, the way of life of the nobility profoundly changed, while that of the lower classes and peasants also changed but more slowly. After a time, as a result of these changes, a new generation of educated Russian noblemen arose, capable of taking part in European society. Although there was some initial resistance to Peter's reforms, the inevitability of these changes was soon recognized. Such a change as compulsory secular education had been foreshadowed in the seventeenth century by an increased desire for knowledge and training, and was therefore not as oppressive as it might have first appeared. In fact, most or all of Peter's innovations can be viewed as culminations of seventeenth-century trends, but the sheer force of his will and personality made them appear all the more radical and abrupt. However, these reforms provided the necessary framework for the Russians' growing appreciation of and participation in cultural activities, both European and Russian.

2 A book devoted to recollections about Peter by contemporaries who knew him contains a lengthy anecdote by Count Paul Ivanovich Jagouschinsky, a military officer in Peter's service and later Minister of State under Anna, about Peter's taste in music. Although Peter learned nothing about painting in his youth, when he went to Holland in 1697, he was greatly attracted to Flemish works of art, which he later began to collect. But he never acquired a similar liking for fine
music; the types of music he liked were always similar to what he had heard as a youngster, such as drums, fifes, balalaikas, and shepherd's pipes. Iagoschinsky describes Peter's liking for military-style music:

The cornets and trumpets which he heard at Riga ... and other towns in Germany, ... made much impression on him, by their grave and majestic sounds. He sent for several of these musicians, and after having heard them play, ... [took] some of them into his service ... on his return to Russia. ... Thus the old music which we hear in Germany played in the church steeples, was the delight of Peter, and his old Boyars, during their repasts.

But when he afterwards put his army on the footing of the German troops, the music of the different regiments, composed of Hautboys, French horns, and bassoons, diminished his taste for trumpets and cornets. He took pleasure in hearing this military music when at table with his generals, and when in good humour, added to it half a dozen trumpets, drums, and fifes.

The attention paid by the Emperor to the marine, which he had created, brought trumpets into fashion again. As ... he had ordered the trumpet to be used in his ships, it became again his favourite instrument and sounded whenever he went on shipboard, or indulged in the pleasures of the table. ... (Jacob Staehlin von Storcksburg, Original Anecdotes of Peter the Great [London, 1788; Facsimile rpt. New York: Arno Press & The New York Times, 1970], pp. 318-320).

Other musical styles and instruments also attracted him:

As Dutch customs were particularly suited to his genius, the chimes which he heard in ... Amsterdam, that rung while business was transacting on the exchange, were most grateful to his ear. He ordered similar chimes to be cast for the cathedral of Petersburgh, and the church of St. Isaac.

He also acquired a taste ... for the music of [Poland], particularly for a large kind of bag-pipe, called bock-pleiffe, of a very loud and harsh sound. ... He even learned to play on it, and was so attached to this kind of music, that he held the Italian in little estimation, nay banished it from his court, as well as the French, for which he had a real aversion (ibid., pp. 320-22).
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Okenfuss, p. 114.
Ibid., p. 130. The Greek influence was thus reduced, and pertained only to fundamental matters of dogma; the Latinizers won on the issue of the basic language and the style of education. The effects of this change in emphasis were great:

The Latin bias in theological education represented the final victory of the new clergy over the traditional Greek-oriented monastic establishment of Muscovy. Henceforth, Russian theological education—almost the only form of education in eighteenth-century Russia—was far more Western in content than before. Latin replaced Greek forever as the main language of philosophic and scientific discourse; and Russia adopted through its church schools a more sympathetic attitude toward secular learning and scholastic theology than the more patricularly inclined Grecophiles would have tolerated (Billington, pp. 165-166).

Billington, pp. 182 and 186.

Okenfuss, p. 126. Throughout the eighteenth century, foreigners continued to dominate the membership of the Academy of Sciences; more than two-thirds of the total membership for the century have been shown to be foreigners (Billington, p. 696).

Peter said in reference to the Academy:

These learned men will write books treating of the elements of the different sciences, and I will direct them to be translated into our language. They will be obliged to explain them to their pupils, who, in their turn, will explain them to theirs. Works of other kinds, though written in Latin, will do us honor throughout Europe. The world will see that we cultivate the sciences, instead of despising them like barbarians; and all the officers of my empire, whether of the different boards, the chancery, or treasure, will consult the academy in all difficult cases (related by "a singular," Staehlin von Storkenburg, p. 344).

Billington on Euler's contribution to Russian science:

The arrival of the Academy of Sciences as a serious institution for the higher scientific education of native Russians can be dated from the beginnings of group research by the Russian apprentices of Pallas and of the great mathematician Leonhard Euler. . . . When he died in 1783, he left Russia with a significant number of Russian-speaking scientists capable of introducing advanced mathematics into the curricula of other educational institutions (p. 215).


In this work Euler developed a theory of consonance based on frequency in which the degree of consonance is determined by the size of the product of the ratio of the frequencies: the smaller the terms, the more pleasing the combination, therefore the more consonant. A unison (1:1) belongs to the first degree, the octave (1:2) to the second, the twelfth (1:3) and double octave (1:4) to the third, and so on. Using only the numbers of the ratios, Euler invented a formula for determining precisely the degree of consonance.

The formula is \( s-n+1 \); \( s \) is the sum of the prime factors of the exponent and \( n \) is the number of these factors. In the case of the major triad \((4:5:6)\), which belongs to the ninth degree of consonance, the exponent is 60, the least common multiple of 4, 5 and 6. The prime factors of this exponent 60, that is, those prime numbers that when multiplied reach 60, are 2 · 3 · 5, therefore \( s=12 ([2×2]+3+5) \). The number of the factors is 4, therefore \( s[12]-n[4]+1=9 \), which is the degree of consonance of the major triad. Here are Euler's degrees of consonance up through 10:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>degree:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>intervals:</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>P8</td>
<td>P12</td>
<td>P5</td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>M10</td>
<td>M6</td>
<td>m6</td>
<td>m7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P11</td>
<td>M3</td>
<td></td>
<td>m3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>degree:</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>intervals:</td>
<td>major triad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>first inversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>minor triad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>second inversion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Helmholtz acknowledged the similarity between the results of this system and those of his own, and also acknowledged that, in one sense, his investigations in the area of sensory perception filled in the gap left by Euler's work (*On the Sensations of Tone* [New York: Dover...
Euler extended his classification to include not only a wide variety of intervals and chords (containing up to sixteen notes), but also modes and modulations. His modes number six, only the last three of which were used by contemporary composers: 4-major; 5-minor; 6-major and minor. "For the most part, composers today use a mode composed of both major and minor which belongs to our sixth mode, which is abundantly evident in today's compositions" (Euler, trans. by Smith, p. 242). These three modes are identical—in nomenclature, at least—to those explained by Diletsky.

See Leonhard Euler, *Lettres à une princess d'Allemagne* (St. Petersburg, 1768-1772).

Information about color keyboards was reported in *St. Peterburg Vedomosti* [The St. Petersburg Gazette], No. 33 (1742) (Nikolai Fedorovich Findeizen, *Ocherki po istorii muzyki v Rossi s drevneishikh vremen do kontsa XVIII veka* [Essays on the history of music in Russia from the most ancient times to the end of the eighteenth century], II [Moscow, 1929], 33). For example, there probably were reports about L. B. Castel's color-harpsichord, constructed around 1722 (influenced by Kircher and Newton).

Trans. G. N. Teplov (St. Petersburg, 1744).

Most of the scholars were German; but most of the musicians were Italian.


Levasheva et al., p. 113.

Barenboim, col. 779.

This work was translated into Russian and published in 1935 as Muzyka i balet v Rossii XVIII veka [Music and ballet in Russia of the XVIII century]. In addition to this work and Original-Anekdoten Peters des Grossen (1785), Staehlin von Storksburg also wrote Beylagen zum neuerbärdertem Russland (Riga and Leipzig, 1769-1770).

Okenfuss, p. 128.
Summary to Part I

Thus in the field of music theory during this period only one significant text appeared—Diletsky's Musical Grammar. No other important post-chant theory texts appeared during the remainder of the seventeenth century and for much of the eighteenth century. Diletsky's text, though, constituted an auspicious beginning for an eventual Russian music theory, for in certain respects it foreshadowed some twentieth-century Russian texts, with which it had more in common than with later Western-oriented texts that subsequently appeared in Russia. But Diletsky's work ultimately became outdated and was set aside in favor of texts examining more Western techniques such as general bass.

The musical activity discussed in Part I spans the reigns of eight rulers of Imperial Russia: Alexei (1645–1676), Peter (1689–1724), Ivan (who ruled with his half-brother Peter until his death in 1696), Catherine (1725–1727), Peter II (1727–1730), Anna (1730–1740), Elizabeth (1741–1762), and Peter III (1762). Of these tsars and tsarinas, three are especially remembered for their influence on the development of musical life in Russia—Peter for his emphasis on education and Westernization, Anna for her cultivation in court life of Western
musical culture and for her continuation of Peter's policies of education and Westernization, and Elizabeth for her continued sponsorship of education and the arts and sciences. Even so, despite its recent advances, music in Russia was still in the early stages of its development. But during the reign of Catherine II, called "Great" (1762-1796), this development of Russian music and musical life expanded significantly. A native school of musical composition began to emerge, and the first publications on music appeared: Staehlin's books, the first collections of folk songs and the first published theory books in almost one hundred years all date from the early years of her reign.

Thus the beginning of her reign coincides roughly with the beginning of a new period in the development of Russian music and music theory, and brings to a close the previous era just discussed, which may be viewed as a preparatory state in which elements and conditions were made ready for such eventual developments as did occur. This new era, a period encompassing roughly sixty years, is covered in Part II.
PART II

FOREIGN MUSIC THEORY AND THEORISTS IN RUSSIA, 1773-1830
CHAPTER 3


Catherine II's Reign: Advances in Music and Music Education. The last thirty years of the eighteenth century and the first thirty years of the nineteenth century form a critical period of initial growth and development of music and music theory in Russia. During Catherine the Great's reign (1762-1796) music, particularly opera, was very popular and fashionable at court and among the aristocracy. In spite of Catherine's reported personal lack of enthusiasm for music, later in her reign she nonetheless supplied several libretti for court and other composers to set to music. Already in 1764 she invited a French theatrical company to perform opera comique at the court, thus adding to the large number of Italians already present. In all, the court maintained several theatrical and operatic companies, a ballet company, an orchestra, and a chapel choir. Many of the aristocracy, such as Counts Kamensky, Sheremetev, and Skavronsly, had their own theaters or orchestras. Count Skavronsly, it is reported, became so enamoured of opera that he required his servants to address him only in recitative.

During the early, most decisive years of her reign, Catherine continued to build on the foundation laid by Peter and Elizabeth:

44
If Peter had opened a window to Europe and Elizabeth had decorated it with rococo frills, Catherine threw open the doors and began to rebuild the house itself. She looked beyond the technological accomplishments of the North European Protestant nations to the cultural glories of France and Italy and the political traditions of England. . . . As the only articulate ideologist to rule Russia between Ivan IV and Lenin, she changed the terms of reference for Russian thought by linking Russian culture with that of France, and by attempting to base imperial authority on philosophic principles rather than hereditary right or religious sanction.2

"Francomania" in Catherine's era embraced music as well, but the Italians maintained their hegemony throughout in this area. Among the prominent Italian composers who held court positions during this time were Vincenzo Manfredini (capellmeister 1758-69 and 1798-99), Baldassare Galuppe (capellmeister 1765-68), Tommaso Traetta (capellmeister 1768-75), Giovanni Paisiello (court composer, 1776-84), Giuseppi Sarti (capellmeister 1784-86, 1790-1801), Domenico Cimarosa (composer 1787-90), and Martín y Soler (in Russia 1788-1806, but court composer and capellmeister 1790-94).

During the 1760s and 1770s, advances pertaining to music and music theory were made in three areas—education, composition and publishing. Elizabeth had overseen the founding of Moscow University (1755) and the Academy of Arts (1757); Catherine established foundling homes, first in St. Petersburg and then elsewhere, and an institute for the education of the daughters of the nobility, the famous Smolnyi Institute where, as mentioned, classes in theory and composition were held. At the Moscow Orphanage, a theatrical school that provided training in drama, music, and dancing was founded in 1773. In most educational institutions, in fact, music had become by the 1770s an established part of the regular curriculum. Specialized schools even began to appear, such
as the music school founded in 1783 by the Czech musician Mikhail Kertselli; here all strata of society were welcome—nobles, merchants, and others of the middle classes, and peasants—though in separate sections. Often whole groups of peasants were sent by their landlords to study here, presumably so they could take part in musical activities as desired by the landowner. It is reported that classes in general-bass and composition were offered here as well. On the estates of the nobility, foreign musicians were often invited to instruct the children of the family and usually ended up teaching the peasants, too. In particular, the presence of an orchestra and theater on the estate of Count Sheremetyev provided educational opportunities for many young serf musicians, some of whom later became noted composers and performers.

Catherine also reorganized the Academy of Arts in 1764; at this time music classes were added to the three subjects already taught—painting, sculpture, and architecture. Several Russian musicians who became among Russia's first native composers, such as Yevstignei Ipatovich Fomin (1761-1800) and Ivan Yevstaf'evich Khandoshkin (1747-1804), received their early musical training at the Academy. Among those who taught at the Academy were the foreigners H. F. Raupach (1728-1778), who was director of the music department 1777-78, Matteo Buini (in Florence 1748-49), and Blasius (or A.) Sartori, and later, the Russian Vasily Alekseevich Pashkevich (c. 1742-1797).

In addition to the Academy of Arts, one other native organization contributed significantly to the training of Russia's first composers—the court chapel choir, which was directed for some years by Galuppi.
Two Ukrainians who were sent as youngsters to sing in the choir, Dmitri Stepanovich Bortiansky (1751–1825), who studied composition with Galuppi, and Maksim Sozontovich Berezovsky (1745–1777), became important composers, particularly of choral music. Bortiansky (in 1769–79), Berezovsky (in 1765–73), and also Fomin (in 1782–86) were sent to Italy to study with Padre Martini. The educations of other Russian composers took various forms: Osip Antonovich Kozlovsky (1757–1831) was Polish by birth and received his training in Warsaw; G. N. Templov—also the translator of Kraft's book—was a nobleman and received a general education befitting his rank; and Stepan Anikievich Degtiarev (1766–1813), a peasant, studied with G. Sarti at the theatrical school on the Sheremetev estate.

Russia almost had a national music school nearly seventy-five years before the founding of the first Russian conservatory. In 1786 Sarti began to work for Potemkin, who officially established a Russian Music Academy with Sarti as its head. Unfortunately, the Academy never actually came into existence. In 1790 Sarti went back to work for the court in St. Petersburg, but he retained the title of director of the non-existent Academy. Sarti began but never finished a Trattato del basso generalis.

Under Catherine's rule, a native school of composition began to emerge. The two earliest known Russian operas date from 1772. Unfortunately, only the librettos remain; the composers are unknown. The earliest extant opera, Rebirth, dates from 1777. By the end of the century—and the end of Catherine's reign—some twenty-one operas by
Russian composers such as Pashkevich, Fomin and Bortiansky had been presented, some of them incorporating Russian folksongs and Russian subjects. Other genres explored by native composers during this time include choral music ("spiritual concertos" by Berezovsky and Bortiansky), songs and romances (Templov, Fedor Mikhailovich Dubiansky, Kozlovsky), and other types of chamber music such as dance miniatures, variation cycles, and other music for piano.

Outside of opera, the most popular forms of music were Russian songs and romances, and music for the piano and guitar. These genres became popular because there was emerging, in addition to native composers, a large number of musical amateurs or dilettantes who desired music that could easily be played or sung in the home for their own enjoyment. Russian folksongs—or their imitations—were easily adaptable for such purposes. In 1776 the court guslist (the Russian gusli is a type of string instrument, which is bowed or plucked, depending on its shape) Vasily Fedorovich Trutovsky (c. 1740–c. 1810) published the first part of his collection of folk songs, Sobranie russkih prostyh pesen s notami [A collection of Russian ordinary songs with music], the first such collection to be published. The second, third, and fourth parts were published in 1778, 1779, and 1795, respectively. Trutovsky also published a set of Variations on a Russian Song for piano or harpsichord in 1780. Many such variations and numerous dance miniatures for keyboard instruments were published during the 1780s and 1790s. Some of the first music journals were also directed towards Russia's keyboardists, such as the Journal de musique pour le clavecin.
The First Published Theory Works. Amidst this rise in musical activity and no doubt resulting directly from it, theory books began to be published during the 1770s. The first practical theory book to appear since Diletsky's nearly one hundred years ago—and, following the fashion of the day, aimed at keyboardists, not choral composers—was Georg Simon Löhlein's *Klavier-Schule*, published in Russian translation in Moscow in 1773. Its publisher, Christian-Ludwig Weber, Russia's first commercial music publisher, also put out a second book on practical music theory that same year, a translation of a French book on the fundamentals of reading music by an unknown author, *Essai méthodique sur la manière d'enseigner aux enfants à lire la musique aussi facilement que l'écriture ordinaire*. In all, by the end of the century, five works in the field of practical music theory, four of which were foreign works or translations of foreign works, were published. Six music journals and magazines, in Russian and other languages, were also published during this time, as well as other works directed at amateurs, such as J. D. Gerstenberg's *Karmannaia kniga liubitelei muzyki* [A pocketbook for amateurs of music] for 1795 and 1796. These publications reflect not only an increase in interest in learning about music among amateurs but also the great increase in book printing in general that took place during Catherine's reign.

Löhlein's book and the *Essai méthodique* were representative of the two categories encompassing the majority of books on theory published
in Russia up to 1830—one category comprising books on thoroughbass and another made up of books on the rudiments of music or elementary harmony. Into the former category fall Giovanni Paisiello's *Regole per bene accompagnare il Partimento* (St. Petersburg, 1782), and David Kellner's *Treulicher unterricht im General-bass* (1732), published in translation in Moscow in 1791; into the latter category falls Dem'ian Petrun'kevich's *Nastavlenie otrokam uchashchimsia Notnomu Peniui, c iasncishim pokazaniem tonov vsemu notnomu pravilu prinadlezhashchikh* [A manual to young men studying sight-singing, with the clearest reading of tones belonging to all the music rules], published by the Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg in 1793. Paisiello's book, written while he was music director in St. Petersburg (1776–1784), is dedicated to Catherine's daughter-in-law, the Grand Duchess Maria Fedorovna, who took lessons from him. It and Kellner's book are both foreign works, Paisiello's being in Italian and Kellner's having been brought in from abroad. Petrun'kevich's book, on the other hand, is not only the first manual of sight-singing published in Russia, but also quite probably the first theory book written by a Russian.

Petrun'kevich, a teacher at the gymnasium of the Academy of Sciences, probably wrote his book for students of singing at the gymnasium. Included in it is information on keys, note names, rhythm, and terminology, interspersed with musical examples; at the end is an eleven-page supplement containing two three-voice chorales, offered presumably as note-reading exercises. The *Essai méthodique*, published twenty years earlier, is also directed to a young audience learning to
read music; it covers the same topics but includes no examples from the 
music literature, only exercises. The Russian edition contains an 
addition to the original French version, a dictionary of forty-three 
Italian musical terms with translator Evgraf Smagin's interpretations 
of them into Russian. Smagin's translations, however, did not make 
their way into general usage.

Of the three books on thoroughbass, Löhlein's was undoubtedly the 
most useful and influential. It contained more detailed and, as op-
posed to Kellner's, more recent information not only on the rudiments 
of music and harmony and the art of thoroughbass, but also on more 
advanced harmony and the principles of composition. Like Diletsky's 
work, it no doubt proved useful to a variety of readers—amateurs, 
students of composition, and keyboardists—more so than the other two 
books on the same general topic. Löhlein's work, appearing in Russia 
almost a century after Diletsky's work, constitutes the first important 
theory book on secular music available to Russian readers in their own 
language. It is divided into two parts, the first part devoted to 
reading music and playing the keyboard, the second to harmony and 
accompaniment. Under harmony, Löhlein discusses modes, triads, seventh 
chords and inversions, ninths, and modulations, as well as Rameau's 
Fundamental Bass. He devotes three chapters specifically to accompani-
ment, with a fourth on the composition of a fantasy or "playing from 
the head," followed by a five-page fantasy with the ground harmonies 
given underneath. This book, then, would be an ideal source of infor-
mation not only for the keyboardist, of which there were many in Russia
at this time, but also for the beginning composer desiring to learn to
write piano or vocal music, both popular genres at this time.

Other theory books besides the five just mentioned were available
to Russians during this time, as is evident from publishers' and book-
sellers' catalogues, newspaper announcements and other sources, such as
 correspondance, bibliographies, autobiographies, and the like. For
example, in the correspondance between Count Sheremetev and Ivar,
references are made to the works of Fux, Mersenne, and Bemetzrieder.
In another publication of Weber's, Kratkoe poniatie o vsekh naukakh
dlia upotrebleniia iunoshestvy [A brief idea about all the sciences for
use to young people], published in Moscow in 1774, in answer to ques-
tions concerning the best music books for study and reference, the
author recommended the books by Ph. E. Bach, F. W. Marpurg and G. S.
Löhlein for the clavier; E. G. Baron for the lute; J. J. Quantz for the
flute; L. Mozart for the violin; P. F. Tozi, J. F. Agricola and J. A.
Hiller on singing; and J. G. Walter and J. J. Rousseau for diction-
aries. These books being the best and most recent works available
anywhere—only three date from before 1750, with the earliest, the
Baron, from 1727—indicates not only the level of expertise of the
author but also the supposed availability of these works to the Russian
reader. Of course, these books are not all theory books, though they
all contain some information on theory; the most theoretical of them
all, Löhlein's book, was readily available to Russians in their own
language. The Mozart book was translated into Russian in 1804.
Among the textbooks and theory books listed in Gerstenberg's book
catalog for 1796 were books by Gurney, Mattheson (1735), Telemann (1737), Ph. E. Bach, Heinichen (1728), Türk (1791), Kirnberger, Marpurg (1713), Albrecht (1761), Petre (1767), and Albrechtsburger (1790). It is apparent, then, that a wide range of theory books were available to Russians, although works by Rameau are conspicuously absent. But since only a handful of these works were published in the Russian language, these works were accessible only to those in the upper classes with foreign language training and abilities.

A Theory of Folk Music. A different sort of theory, that of folk music, began to develop in Russia earlier and more independently than theory in general. Other collectors of folk music followed Trutovsky's pioneering efforts of the 1770s and published similar collections. One such collector, Nikolai Alexandrovich L'vov, published his collection, Sobranie narodnykh russkikh pesen s ikh golosami. Na muzyku polozhil Ivan Prach [A collection of native Russian songs with their parts. Ivan Prach set them to music], in 1790. L'vov, a multi-talented artist—he was, among other things, a poet, diplomat, mechanic, architect, opera dramatist, graphic artist, musician, and folk song collector—provided in his collection a forward, "O russkom narodnom penii" [On Russian folk song], in which he presents his observations of the songs in the collection concerning their polyphonic texture, their tonality, and other theoretical qualities. L'vov's article therefore constitutes the first theoretical work on Russian folk song written by a Russian scholar in Russia. With this article L'vov also became the
first to publish evidence concerning the polyphonic nature of Russian folk songs. L'vov more than once in his forward remarks on the "musical strangeness" of the folk songs in his collection, referring to their modal originality, and testifies as to the authenticity of his collection concerning such native characteristics of the songs. But L'vov and Prach later came under attack for Prach's harmonizations, which were criticized during the nineteenth century for their "European"—i.e., non-Russian—flavor. However, the modal qualities of Russian folk song were not fully realized and understood by all at this time. And Prach, a piano teacher and composer who received his education in his native Czechoslovakia, probably considered that his harmonizations, given the available theoretical knowledge, which was primarily European, were perfectly natural. This in no way diminishes the importance and influence of L'vov's collection. In addition to containing a pioneering theoretical forward, it served as a source for melodic material for numerous subsequent composers, among them Glinka, Musorgsky, Rimsky-Korsakov, Chaikovsky, and even Beethoven, in his Razumovsky quartets, op. 59.

Summary. Thus, by the last quarter of the eighteenth century, Russian musical amateurs and professionals alike were discovering a need for musical textbooks of different sorts, theory books prominent among them; and publishers were beginning to respond to this need. Since Russia had not yet produced any native theorists, but relied instead on pedagogues and books imported from the West, the theory
books were, with the exception of one book aimed at singers and Paisiello's book for his student and patroness, translations of popular Western textbooks. The need for the azbuki having long since been replaced, and Diletsky's work by this time somewhat old-fashioned, students of music theory in Russia again turned to the West for information and guidance. The chosen works were for the most part pedagogical and practical, reflecting the basic needs of the musicians. There was not yet a place for original or more speculative theoretical works; that would come only much later, after the establishment of a suitable system of music education in Russia. As Russia entered the nineteenth century, such a system did not exist; the best music education was still to be found abroad, and that was where most promising talented musicians were sent.
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Chapter 4

The Nineteenth Century, 1800–1830:
Vincenzo Manfredini and Gustav Hess de Calvé

**Musical Life and Education.** As we have seen, Russia's first theoretical works were all instructive manuals, destined for use by students in class, or more likely, by amateurs studying at home by themselves or with a tutor. The basic topics covered in these manuals were the rudiments of music or the art of thoroughbass. Books on the latter subject, if detailed enough, could be and were used as manuals for composition as well. This situation also prevailed throughout much of the nineteenth century, but changed in two very important ways as the century progressed. First and foremost, although there were few Russian theorists and theory books during much of the century, by the end of the century there were only Russian theorists in Russia, and the great majority of theory books published in Russia were by Russians. Second, books on thoroughbass slowly gave way to books on harmony; by 1900, most of the theory books were either on harmony or elementary theory. The emphasis throughout the century remained practical and pedagogical, though; but within this stream of thought there were significant differences among textbooks, which will be examined.
During the first thirty years of the nineteenth century, Russian musical life and education remained for the most part as it had been at the end of the previous century. Foreigners continued to dominate Russian musical life in composition, performance, and education, although aristocratic amateurs began to take an increasingly larger role in the organization and sponsorship of musical life. These talented aristocrats also began to take a greater interest in music as a scholarly topic, and their writings about music and their efforts to organize musical education had a great impact on the future course of Russian music later in the century.

Education remained still in the hands of foreigners. Aspiring composers learned their craft from foreign composers or pedagogues residing in Russia (usually through private lessons, since the school training was insufficient), or they went abroad and studied with prominent pedagogues such as Padre Martini in Bologna, as had Fomin, Berezovsky, and Bortiansky. However, the latter option was available only to a select few. Most of the Russians who did study music in Russia at this time and who later became prominent as performers, composers, critics, or pedagogues received the bulk of their musical education and training from private lessons with foreign pedagogues living in Moscow and St. Petersburg. Two such pedagogues in Russia during this time were the German theorists Johann-Heinrich Miller (1780–1827) and Johann Leopold Fuchs (1785–1853). A number of Russian composers and musicians studied with Miller, such as dramatist, diplomat and musician Alexander Sergeevich Griboedov (1795–1829), composer...
Alexander Alexandrovich Aliab'ev (1787-1851), composer Alexei Nikolaevich Verstovsky (1799-1862), and composer Count Mikhail Yur'evich Viel'gorsky (1788-1856). Verstovsky also studied theory with Brandt and Tseiner, and Viel'gorsky with Martín y Soler (in St. Petersburg from 1788 to 1806, except for a year's stay in London), Tauberg, and Cherubini (in Paris). During Sarti's stay in Russia, he taught a number of Russian composers, among them Ukrainian composer and choir director Artemy Luk'ianovich Vedel (1772-1808), composer and conductor Lev Stepanovich Gurilev (1770-1844), composer and conductor Stepan Ivanovich Davydov (1777-1825), Dehtiarov, and composer and pianist Daniil Nikitich Kashin (1770-1841). The German composer and pianist Johann Wilhelm Haessler, who lived in Russia from 1792 to 1822, also taught Russian pupils, among them Viel'gorsky and composer and pianist Iosif Iosifovich Genishta (1795-1853). Genishta in turn taught theory to composer and violinist Alexander Levovich Gurilev (1803-1858), son of composer L. S. Gurilev. Dehtiarov also studied composition with Antonio S. Sapienza (1755-1829), an Italian composer who taught at the theater school in St. Petersburg and later at the Smolnyi Institute in addition to giving private lessons.

These composers and their sponsors and critics, along with writer and critic Vasily Petrovich Botkin (1811-1869), theorist and folklorist Nikolai Alexandrovich Mel'gunov (1804-1867), composer and singer Ivan Alexandrovich Rupin (1792-1850), composer and singer Alexander Yegorovich Varlamov (1801-1848), composer Ivan Fedorovich Laskovsky (1799-1855), composer Mikhail Ivanovich Glinka (1804-1857), and writer
and theorist Prince Vladimir Fedorovich Odoevsky (1804–1869) (the latter two, giants in their fields, will be discussed in Parts III and IV), were the major composers and writers of the first half of the nineteenth century. Serious critical writings about music did not begin to appear until the mid-1820s and will be covered beginning in Part III. Russian musical composition continued as it had towards the end of the previous century, with emphasis on opera, songs and romances, chamber music, piano music (influenced by John Field, who worked and taught in Russia from 1803 until his death in 1837), and overtures and similar orchestral works, including symphonies.

Theory books. Theoretical works published during this period increased in both quantity and quality, as did nearly everything musical in Russia at this time. Unfortunately, although a growing number of Russians took up composition during this period, relatively few Russians taught composition or theory, and even fewer produced theory textbooks or related works. Of the eight theoretical works published in Russia between 1800 and 1830, only one is by a Russian author. This, a work by one Ivan Komendatov—about whom nothing else is known—entitled, Nachal'noe osnovanie o garmonii [The basic principles of harmony], was published in Moscow in 1801. In his work Komendatov discusses chords, intervals, enharmony, scales, and cadences. This brief pamphlet (24 pages plus tables and examples) provides the necessary information for beginning keyboardists, and is typical of the theoretical works written by Russian authors before the appearance of
Chaikovsky's work in 1871—a brief textbook, devoted to a presentation either of the rudiments of theory or of elementary harmony.

Of the seven remaining theory books, all by foreign authors but published in Russian, two especially deserve discussion—one by the Italian composer Vincenzo Manfredini, who lived and worked in Russia in the eighteenth century, and one by a Hungarian musician who lived in Kharkov, Gustav Gustavovich Hess de Calvé. These works are more significant because of their comprehensiveness, breadth, and depth of topic, and because of the relative importance of their authors, either at court (Manfredini) or in Kharkov musical society (Hess de Calvé).

The other works include two texts on thoroughbass by Lud. Minelli and F. Tyskh, a book about writing accompaniments by Minelli, a treatise on the aesthetics of harmony by Jean-Baptiste-Louis Gresset written originally in 1733, and a book on the fundamentals of music by Bonifacio Ascoli.

Vincenzo Manfredini. Manfredini (1737-1799), an Italian composer and music theorist, worked in Russia as a court composer and capellmeister from 1758 to 1769 and again from 1798 until his death the following year. His theory book, Regole armoniche, which he wrote while in service to Catherine the Great and dedicated to her son, the Grand Duke Paul Petrovich, was first published in Venice in 1775. The second edition, a greatly expanded version of the first edition, was published in Venice in 1797, and served as the basis for the Russian translation by the Russian composer S. Degtiarev (who had studied
Italian at the Moscow University) published posthumously in St. Petersburg in 1805. In the first edition, Manfredini discussed the fundamentals of music in Part One, and elementary harmony, thoroughbass and Rameau's *bass fondamentale* in Part Two. For the second edition, he added Part Three on singing and vocal ornamentation, and Part Four on counterpoint and fugue. This last segment on counterpoint sets Manfredini's work apart from its predecessors in Russia, for such information had not been published in Russian since Diletsky's work in 1680; and raises it from being just another textbook on thoroughbass to being a textbook on composition. Manfredini's work is therefore also similar to Diletsky's in its approach, in that it is useful to a wide spectrum of musicians—singers, keyboardists, and composers.

Manfredini's change in approach in the second edition—from a thoroughbass textbook to a composition and performance manual—also affected the first two parts, for information given here is more detailed and sophisticated in the second edition than in the first. For example, the coverage of harmonic principles in Part Two is greatly expanded. In the first edition, he defines the triada(s), illustrates the intervallic content of chords, classifies them according to consonance and dissonance (major triads were consonant, seventh chords dissonant), illustrates three types of cadence—simple, compound and false—which were to serve for modulation or to end a piece, and describes five different forms of the seventh chord. In the second edition, he also gives the names of chords, discusses main chords and their derivations, such as inversions and other types, and devotes a segment to modula-
tion. With this additional information, Manfredini provided a more firm foundation in harmony for either the keyboardist or the composition student.

The latter would then be able to proceed to Part Four, in which Manfredini discusses not only the rules of counterpoint, including simple counterpoint, figurative counterpoint, part-writing rules, imitation, double counterpoint, fugue, and fugato, but also defines and discusses at some length the different styles of music—church, serious, and buffo. Thus Manfredini's book provided the most complete theoretical information yet available in the Russian language, and quite possibly served as a textbook for Russian students of composition. No doubt the translator and composer Degtiarev had this goal in mind when he published his translation, for he certainly knew firsthand exactly what was needed.

Gustav Gustavovich Hess de Calvé. The second and more important theoretical work of this period encompasses an even broader spectrum of musical topics than did Manfredini's, a scope mirrored by its author's own numerous interests and talents. A Hungarian by birth who accepted Russian citizenship in 1814, Gustav Gustavovich (Adolf) Hess de Calvé (1784—after 1839) was a man both of science and of art. On the scientific side, having received a Ph.D. degree from the ethico-political faculty of the recently established Kharkov University, he became a factory director and published articles on his specialty, mineralogy. On the artistic side, he composed music, wrote critical reviews on
music and the theater, and in general did much for the concert life in Kharkov as a director and concert pianist. He was also a theorist and music historian, as testifies his major work, Teoriia muzyki [The theory of music], published in Kharkov in 1818.

Because of his adopted Russian citizenship, his activities on behalf of musical life in the Ukrainian city of Kharkov, and his writings, which were published only in Russia, Hess de Calvé can very nearly be considered a native Russian music theorist. He was the first of the foreign musicians and pedagogues who lived and worked in their adopted homeland to contribute an original theoretical work in the Russian language for the use of native students of theory or composition. Others followed his example, and their works form the nucleus of music theoretical literature in Russia until the 1870s. Since these works appeared nowhere else, and were published in no other languages (an exception to this are the works of Fuchs, discussed in Chapter 5), they constitute the only written, extant evidence for a study of music theory in Russia at this time and therefore merit more detailed examinations. It is sufficient to state that these works, while they did not form the foundation for music theory in Russia—Chaikovsky's and Rimsky-Korsakov's books were more valuable in this regard—they none-theless contributed greatly to its development.

Although it is entitled The Theory of Music, Hess de Calvé's work contains discourses not only on the aesthetical and theoretical elements of music, but also on instruments, style and form, and the history and ethnography of music. It is in two parts, the first devoted to
the aesthetics of music and to the principles of thoroughbass and composition, the second to instruments, to the numerous forms and genres of music, to the history and aesthetics of ancient and Greek music, and to Israeli and Turkish music. His goal in writing this work was "to give to the amateurs of music in Russia the means to the best understanding of their art." He lamented that, in spite of Russia's "natural disposition towards this art," which compares with no other nation's in the universe, "we Russians still do not have one systematic work, adapted to the present music." He hoped that, as a result of having read and understood his book, students, amateurs, and other musicians already trained would be able to read and correct scores, or, especially, to write music. Knowing his audience he aimed for practicality and declined to write a complex work filled with mathematical computations. . . [since] for the beginner it is as useful as the logarithmic tables are for babies. For this reason I attempted to bring into order the different parts of music. . . with the hope that the systematic order makes more noticeable the gaps, requiring more exact research, which in time will be corrected by musicians more expert and experienced than I.

Thus Hess de Calvé's work provided nothing new to theoretical knowledge; he left the task of research and speculation to others. He was more interested in the pedagogical aspects of his work, hoping through it to promote a more professional attitude among Russians towards music education. He criticized the dearth of opportunities for a music education in Russia. As a result of this lack, he wrote, young virtuosos arrogantly attempted to write music without the proper knowledge of the craft of composition; women had little opportunity to
study music despite their talent, due to the lack of books and expert teachers; and children of country nobility were equally deprived due to their distance from the cities. Because of music's great influence on the moral and aesthetic education of youth, Hess de Calvé believed it should be taught in the academies and universities on a level with literature and mathematics: "The character of a generation is recognized through the exact observation of the path of music."

Hess de Calvé's stress on the strong emotional and aesthetic impact of music permeates the entire book, even to the extent that he devotes a whole section to "the effect of music on different illnesses." It is also reflected in his definition of music: "the agreement of different sounds, by well-known rules, in one general agreeable sound; or a row of sounds produced by ardent feeling and consequently painting a vivid picture, powerful to support and to strengthen this feeling." Repeatedly he refers to the musics of different nationalities, which are as different as their languages (language being, after all, the source of music), but only in detail. In general all music shares the same goals, means and uses, which is the meaning Hess de Calvé implies when he states, "Music is an art, based on invariable rules." These rules, applied loosely and broadly, concern the engendering of feeling through a well-known sequence of sounds, its effect (i.e., the goal); the methods through which sound is produced, such as voice or instruments, and the types and characteristics of sounds, such as notes, melody, harmony, rhythm, modulation (i.e., the means); and when the sounds are produced, and their types (i.e., the uses). All
musics of all peoples share such rules; it is only in the details that these musics differ from each other.

Such a definition explains why Hess de Calvé put forth a "world-view" of music in his book, and why he was not content to limit himself just to the music in his immediate environment, or in Western Europe. He apparently was strongly influenced not only by professional (Western) music, but also by folk music; and this colored his view of music in general. Besides wanting to set down the rules of composition for Russians, he also wished to expose them to a broader view of music, one in which there was a place for all types of music—Western, Eastern, and Slavic.

In the theoretical portion of his work, which actually takes up only one-third of its length—still a sizable number of pages, though, since the book itself contains over six hundred pages—Hess concentrates on the detailed rules of music as they are found and applied in professional Western music. Having consulted the works of numerous Western theorists, among them Guido d'Arezzo, Kirnberger, Marpurg, Vogler, Albrechtsberger, Forkel, Rousseau, Krinitz, and Sulzer, he most often replies to the ideas of Kirnberger, Rameau, and Sulzer (i.e., Schulz). In fact, Hess de Calvé derives his own theory of harmony in large part from Kirnberger's writings, most notably Die Kunst des reinen Satzes in der Musik (1771; 1776-79), to which he refers often. A detailed comparison of this work with Hess de Calvé's Theory of Music on the subject of harmony reveals that Hess de Calvé agrees with Kirnberger on nearly every point of harmonic theory. Unfortunately,
instead of following Kirnberger's logical sequential development of
topics, Hess de Calvé's manner of presentation reverts to that used by
the theorists of the thoroughbass school, even though he claims to be
following more recent methods developed by "Kirnberger, S. Bach,
14 Albrechtsberger and others." As did Heinichen, Mattheson, Löhlein
and other thoroughbassists before him, Hess de Calvé classifies all
chords according to the intervallic construction of the chords; and,
similar to the approach of Mattheson and others, he discusses them in
the numerical order of the lowest or most characteristic interval of
the chords—prime, second, third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh and
ninth. Thus he begins with what he calls the second-chord, or the six-
four-two chord, and continues with the three-four (six-four-three)
chord, four-six (six-four) chord, five-six (six-five-three) chord, six
chord, seventh chord, and ninth chord. Yet he does not provide treat-
ment of all the possible intervallic combinations making up the chordal
vocabulary of his day; in all, he discusses or illustrates only approx-
imately one-third of the sixty-nine chords that Mattheson, for example,
15 contains in his intervallic classification.

Hess de Calvé's strict adherence to this scheme led him to some
curious consequences, inconsistencies, and omissions. For example, his
discussion of one particular chord in its various manifestations, such
as the dominant seventh chord or the half-diminished seventh chord on
the leading tone, is scattered throughout the text, making a logical,
comprehensive approach to harmonic theory almost impossible. In other
problematic treatments, he omits any lengthy discussion of the root-
position triad (except as a chord of resolution), and discusses the seventh chord as a general topic only after the discussions of its various types and inversions. To superimpose Kirnberger's harmonic theories over this antiquated thoroughbass approach—not altogether inappropriate since Kirnberger's own approach to harmony is founded on the common practice of the thoroughbass era—nonetheless results in a statement of harmonic principles in Hess de Calvé's book that is incomplete and illogical. The reader's resulting difficulty in understanding (and at times pure incomprehensibility, especially if the reader lacks any knowledge of Kirnberger's ideas) is compounded by two additional serious drawbacks—a difficult translation from Hess de Calvé's original German and the absence of any musical examples in score. (There was no music printer in Kharkov at the time.) The examples, such as they are, are written out with letters for notes and fractions for rhythmic values, and frequently contain errors.

Hess de Calvé adopts all of Kirnberger's innovative theories, such as his theories of basic or essential chords, of essential and non-essential dissonances, of the consonant and dissonant properties of the six-four chord, and of his interpretation of Rameau's Fundamental Bass. He also adopts Kirnberger's biases against many of Rameau's theories, although, like Kirnberger, he accepts the premise of Rameau's theory of chord inversion and the idea of Fundamental Bass, although not the specific interpretation of it as applied to the designation of chord versus dissonance. Although Hess de Calvé exhibits throughout a certain familiarity with Rameau's theories, it was probably through
Kirnberger's writings (in *Die Kunst* and in Sulzer's [Schulz's]
*Allgemeine Theorie der schönen Kunst*) that he became acquainted with
Rameau's theories, which explains why he easily accepts without ques-
tion Kirnberger's own views towards the theories of the French theo-
rist. For example, Hess De Calvé refers specifically to Kirnberger in
his discussion of the French added-sixth chord, which Hess de Calvé
considered an unnecessary designation: "It [the chord of the added
sixth] is found in the works of distinguished French musical writers,
who used it for an essentially consonant chord in half-cadences and
called it 'l'accord de sexe ajoutee;' but this chord is completely
excessive, as we see is possible from Kirnberger's *The Art of Pure
Composition*.

Hess de Calvé agrees with Kirnberger concerning the "absurdity" of
Rameau's Fundamental Bass, i.e., his theory of "supposition," and
adopts Kirnberger's method of accounting for certain dissonances above
his own fundamental bass:

Rameau calls each chord containing [the interval of a seventh] a
seventh chord; [but] absurdities, which each student also should
recognize as such, occur from this. Look at the following exam-
ple, with a Rameau-like fundamental bass (Example 4,1). The
fourth in relation to the fifth in the second chord contains [the
interval of] a second; but no one besides Rameau and his blind
followers would take it into his head to place a seventh chord
from A in the foundation. In that case a certain fourth from this
basic tone, which does not resolve, is found in the harmony. It
has the same relatedness with the ninth in the following measure;
the fifth [B], which essentially belongs to the fundamental chord
[E, in Hess de Calvé's view], in this chord also may not be used
[as a dissonance in the second chord of the measure]. Who does
not feel that both the fourth and also the ninth are accidental
suspensions before the third and the octave, into which they at
times are resolved, and that the basic harmonies of this example
are the following simple triads: G – d – e – b?17
Thus to Hess de Calvé, the ninth chord really does not exist, either as a singular phenomenon or in Rameau's interpretation as a "supposed" seventh chord; the ninth is merely a retardation or suspension of the octave, to which it resolves (sometimes it resolves to the tenth). He therefore admits to a disagreement with Sulzer [Schulz], who, in *The Theory of Fine Arts*, desired each chord in which the ninth occurred to be called a ninth chord; "If, Sulzer says (*The Theory of Fine Arts*), to desire to call each chord in which is met the ninth of the bass tone a ninth chord, then too many of such ninth chords are found."
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Also, discussing the distinctions between melody and harmony, Hess de Calvé adopts Sulzer's interpretation of Rousseau's objection to Rameau's supposed notion "that all music is based only on harmony and that even melody itself occurs from harmony." Yet Hess de Calvé's
agreement with this statement depends on his interpretation: "If we wish to translate the word harmony as euphony, then I too am almost one thought with Rameau; for melody then only may be melodic, if it is harmonic or euphonious; but I may not agree, if we take harmony in such a sense as present writers understand it." Since, he adds, "harmony invented in our time for our contemporary music" has a different set of standards and cannot be compared to the music of the ancient Greeks—whose music was solely melodic, sung in unison with no harmony—he concludes, "Therefore the knowledge of harmony and the invention of melody are completely different things; the latter is a gift of nature, and the former is achieved through exercise." Earlier in the book he states, "It is necessary to revere melody as an organ, in order to explain its feeling by means of tones, and harmony as a means in order to give to this organ more strength and action." Hess de Calvé did not believe harmony to be subordinate to melody, only that the two were mutually supportive.

In accordance with his view of "the invention of melody" as "a gift of nature," and as an "organ," Hess de Calvé did not develop any theory of melody, beyond discussing its emotional characteristics and the types of motion as manifested in voice-leading. Harmony, though, he considers capable of being learned, its knowledge "achieved through exercise." Hess de Calvé defines it as "the joining of many tones, whose general motion is based on invariable rules drawn from the means of content." (Harmonic is one of two types of motion, melodic being the other.) The notion of "invariable rules," applied here in a more
restricted sense than in his definition of music—although there the
term "rules" could mean the same as here—means the "rules of strict
composition." "For knowledge of these rules, the exact knowledge of
thoroughbass and composition is required."

Hess de Calvé defines thoroughbass as

the bass that gives not only the fundamental voices of the chords,
but also the intervals included in these chords. These latter are
designated by numbers and signs, which in general are called the
signature under each fundamental voice. . . . This signature, or
in general the numbering of the bass, is still necessary since it
is possible to take different chords in one and the same bass.
. . . The significance of thoroughbass is to facilitate for us the
viewing of the score, to study to avoid any incorrect moves, to
observe the harmony and to be attentive to its colors, which to
the untrained ear remain concealed; further it shows us methods,
modulations, in short, a very pure and true musical composition.

It would appear, then, that for Hess de Calvé the term "thoroughbass"
does not represent the entire sphere of harmony, as some other theo-
rists of this time conceived it, but only the bass line and the verti-
cal structures of chords as represented by the signatures. His more
limited yet proper view of thoroughbass, then, conflicts with his
overall approach, which has more in common with thoroughbass texts than
a more modern approach in which inversions are treated as such, as
variations of their root-position chords.

He therefore concentrates on the two elements of harmony—the
structure of chords, and "the rules of harmony motion," i.e., the
joining together of chords. Hess de Calvé devotes much less coverage
to these rules, though, then he does to chord structure. A chord is "a
sound produced from many harmonic tones; and the art to compose musical
pieces is based on the ability to produce chords, by a definite method,
in good order and also [in good] joining." The impression given here that composition is based almost totally on the knowledge of harmony is not Hess de Calvé's intention. The invention of melody is also necessary, but of course that cannot be taught. He states:

In musical pieces the varied change of both [harmony and melody] is allowed, so that here a knowledge of harmony, there the invention of melody may be in different degrees stronger or weaker. If to take a piece that would consist only of harmony without a joining with melody, then of course a majority of chords that would conceal the inadequacy of the melody and that may be taken only by the trained ear would occur; but without a well-constructed harmony, the best melodic piece would be tiresome; in non-experts it would have no effect.27

As in Kirnberger's approach to harmonic theory, the two basic chords are the triad (consonant) and the seventh chord (dissonant):

The seventh chord is the essential dissonating basic chord, as the triad is the essential consonating basic chord. ... All remaining essential consonant or dissonant chords occur from inversions of both these basic chords. ... Besides these there are no other basic chords in harmony.28

Hess de Calvé defines the triad, the basic consonant chord, both in terms of its function—as tonic and as chord of conclusion—and in terms of its intervallic structure—third, fifth and octave, calculated from the bass or root. He identifies initially only the two main types of triad—major and minor—and introduces the diminished triad later, under the topic of the six-chord (first inversion triad). Like Kirnberger, though, Hess de Calvé includes the diminished triad and its inversions among the consonant chords.

The basic dissonant chord is the seventh chord, which Hess de Calvé initially defines as the dominant-seventh chord located on the fifth tone above tonic. The importance of the tonic and dominant
chords is such that, according to Hess de Calvé, "without these two chords, namely the main, or chord of tonic, and the chord of the dominant, there may not be any music piece, any transitions, any deviations, or end." He subsequently identifies four types of seventh chord, those occurring naturally on G (Mm7), A (mm7), B (dm7), and C (MM7), which equal Kirnberger's first four essential seventh chords. He does not include Kirnberger's fifth essential seventh chord, similar to a half-diminished seventh chord but with a major third (B-D#-F-A), a chord that Kirnberger mentions only in Die Kunst. Neither Kirnberger nor Hess de Calvé includes the fully diminished seventh chord in this group. Kirnberger's statement regarding the diminished seventh chord applies equally here: "There is no triad to which the diminished seventh could be added as an essential dissonance." Hess de Calvé: "The diminished seventh chord . . . may never be an essential fundamental chord, as Rameau, being mistaken, says; but it always has as its basis [root] the lower third of the bass tone of the seventh chord."

Hess de Calvé discusses three types of seventh chord—essential, accidental or unauthentic, and passing. The essential seventh chords are those in which the seventh forms an essential dissonance, as in the four chords mentioned above. Regarding the resolution of this type of seventh chord, Kirnberger states a general rule, which applies also to Hess de Calvé's approach: "Every essential seventh [chord] is followed by a bass progression by ascending fourth or descending fifth to a triad, unless an inversion of this chord is used. If it progresses up by step, then the root is really a third below, and the seventh is a
ninth."

For example, take the third seventh chord listed above, what we call the half-diminished seventh chord on B (B–D–F–A), a chord that Hess de Calvé uses frequently for illustration. If this chord resolves to a triad on E, a fifth below or a fourth above, then it is an essential seventh chord. If it resolves to a triad on C, then it is not an essential seventh chord, but, according to Hess de Calvé, what he calls either an accidental or, to use Kirnberger's terminology, unauthentic seventh chord. In this type of seventh chord, the fundamental bass is a third below the actual bass (in this case G, a third below B), and the A is not a seventh but a ninth. Therefore the A is but a suspension to the G (Example 4.2a–c). (Example 4.2c, an inverted form of Example 4.2b, is the only chord to which Hess de Calvé refers as unauthentic; he prefers the term "accidental.") Kirnberger makes an additional distinction between the unauthentic seventh chord and the nonessential seventh chord (that is, a chord in which the seventh is nonessential). Both are actually first inversions (a six-five-three chord) of an essential seventh chord in which the sixth is temporarily displaced by a seventh, thus creating the illusion of an essential seventh chord in root position. In the nonessential seventh chord, the seventh resolves to the sixth before a change of harmony (over the same bass note), thus creating a six-five inversion of an essential seventh chord; but in the unauthentic seventh chord the seventh resolves only into the following harmony. In the latter case the real root is a third below the bass note and the seventh is actually a ninth (Example 4.2d–e).
Example 4.2. Hess de Calvé: a) essential seventh chord; b) accidental seventh chord; c) unauthentic seventh chord.
Kirnberger: d) nonessential seventh chord; e) unauthentic seventh chord.

Hess de Calvé understood and repeated Kirnberger's observation concerning the effect of adding the seventh to the triad—that this addition makes the triad less perfect, destroys its consonant sound and therefore requires the resolution to another harmony. Hess de Calvé interprets it in this manner:

The seventh chord contains not only the chord in which is met the seventh, but also [the chord] in which it is an essential dissonance. The necessity, attached to the perfect cadence, to add one interval to the triad of the dominant, which inclines this chord to the triad of the main tone, and compels the bass to appear in tonic, introduced the seventh. From here occurred the four-voice seventh chord, in which is found the minor seventh; therefore it is taken from the scale of the following tone... The seventh so naturally is represented and so it is necessary to lead to the following harmony... It always is necessary to produce the following harmony, the disturbed peace... attached to the transformation of the triad... being perceptible.
Kirnberger includes the chord with a major third, a diminished fifth, and a minor seventh, or B-D♭-F-A, as an essential seventh chord, as mentioned. In second inversion, this chord is the augmented sixth chord. Hess de Calvé does not list this chord as one of the essential seventh chords, nor does he give the origin of the augmented sixth chord except to say that it occurs on the sixth degree of minor, and is the third [sic] inversion of a seventh chord. According to the latter, he evidently considers the root of this chord, the fundamental bass, to be G, but he does not mention this. Hess de Calvé calls this chord "an improper sixth chord," and resolves it to the dominant chord in minor. He makes no mention of its occurrence in a major key. He illustrates only two forms of this chord, those currently labeled the Italian and the French augmented sixth chord (Example 4.3).

Example 4.3. Hess de Calvé: Augmented sixth chords.

The treatment of the augmented sixth chord varies from Hess de Calvé through the other foreign theorists up to Chaikovsky and Rimsky-
Korsakov; and for this reason I have elected to follow this development and compare the varying treatments. It is just one of the possible means for comparing the different pedagogical ideas of these theorists, but particularly because of Chaikovsky's unusual treatment of the augmented sixth chord, such a means takes on a significance beyond that of other comparable means.

Because of Hess de Calvé's less-than-complete understanding of Kirnberger's basic approach to harmony theory, he fails to communicate adequately some of the more subtle nuances of Kirnberger's ideas. Yet it was not Hess de Calvé's intention to present a complete theory of harmony but merely to present those aspects that he thought would be useful to Russian readers.

Regarding the portion of Theory of Music on chord structure and connection just discussed, Hess de Calvé's work can never be considered much more than an introduction, and an imperfect one at best, to Kirnberger's The Art of Strict Composition. Hess de Calvé did not intend his work to be comparable in size and scope to Kirnberger's work. For example, his selection of theoretical topics is more narrow than Kirnberger's. In addition to the topics of chord construction and connection (chapter 12), Hess de Calvé also covers scale, mode, intervals, melodic motion, the basic rules of strict part-writing, non-harmonic tones, tempo and accent (chapters 6-11, 13-14), as well as the more general non-theoretical topics discussed earlier (chapters 1-5). But he leaves out any discussion of counterpoint, harmonic accompaniment, meter, or melodic construction. And his coverage of harmonic
theory is far less comprehensive than Kirnberger's. He devotes little attention to modulation, for example, to which Kirnberger assigns an entire chapter. Essentially, what Kirnberger covers in seven chapters, Hess de Calvé covers in three.

Nevertheless, Hess de Calvé's Theory of Music was a notable achievement in the annals of Russian music theory, in spite of its problems—its antiquated and at times confusing approach to chord construction; Hess de Calvé's dependence on the ideas of a theorist at least a generation or more removed from his own and his lack of originality regarding harmonic theory; and, regarding the printed edition itself, a poor translation and a lack of musical examples in score. As we have seen, the ideas expressed by Hess de Calvé in the theoretical portion were not outside the mainstream of Western theoretical thought of the late eighteenth century; and had the work been published outside of Russia, it would have commanded little attention. However, the extent of its impact inside Russia is not known. Subsequent theorists in Russia also adopted an approach similar to Kirnberger's theory of essential dissonance; but whether their choice in this was in any way influenced by Hess de Calvé is not possible to determine. Although they modeled their works on those of other foreign theorists, their choices may have been subtly affected by knowledge that such an approach had already been undertaken in Russia. Yet Hess de Calvé's awareness about and knowledge of thoroughbass technique and the works of other, Western theorists; his directing the work specifically to a Russian audience, believing that no similar work in Russian existed (he
did not indicate any acquaintance with the works by Kellner, Lühlein or Manfredini, for example); his discourses on music history, aesthetics, music ethnology, and folk music; and his definitions and discussions of numerous types, styles, forms, and genres of music—the combination of all these traits into one work was a singular accomplishment for a musician in early nineteenth-century Russia. For this alone the work should have been widely circulated among the musical cognoscenti in Russia; indeed, evidence suggests that Odoevsky and Griboedov were familiar with and studied from this book in the 1820s. Perhaps Hess de Calvé's publishing his work in Ukrainian Kharkov and selling it only by subscription prevented it from reaching a very wide audience. However, portions of it were published in the Ukrainian Herald in three separate articles in the two years prior to its publication.

Hess de Calvé is better remembered today for his views on Russian music than for his borrowed and poorly-presented theoretical ideas. His faith in the continuity and future of Russian music places him at the forefront of propagandists—one of the earliest—of Russian national music. He praised the oral tradition of folk song, without which "we would already long ago have completely forgotten the melody of our forefathers," called for the collection of folk music, and, given this rich source, believed "passionately... in the glorious future of Russian music." Nonetheless, his work must be counted as an important contribution to Russian theoretical literature as well, since it contains one of the first and—at that time—most exhaustive treatments of harmonic theory written for Russians in their own language.
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2 Another Russian, Dmitri Fedorovich Kushenov-Dmitrevsky (1782-1835), a guitarist, wrote two works describing how to compose music for the piano using either dice or tables of prepared musical phrases, but these works can hardly be considered as serious efforts in music theory: Opyt muzykal'nogo iskusstva kostiami, ili luchshii sposob sochineni Piasy bez poznaniia not i muzyki dlia piano-forte [An experiment of musical art with dice, or the best method to compose songs without knowledge of notes or music for the piano-forte] (St. Petersburg, 1822) (published in Russian and German); and Damskiy muzykal'nyi kabinet, soderzhashchiy v sebe iskusstvo sochineni po izlozhennym tablitsam raznogo roda pes'yi dlia piano-forte, kak-to: arii, romansy, Russkie pesni, kadrili, mazurki, ekoszy, val'sy i proch [A ladies musical cabinet, containing in it the art to compose by stated tables of a different sort songs for the piano-forte, such as: arias, romances, Russian songs, quadrilles, mazurkas, ecossaises, waltzes and others], 2 parts (St. Petersburg, 1828) (published in Russian and French). Kushenov-Dmitrevsky also wrote two books on the playing of the guitar and the gusli.
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David Beach, the editor and translator of the English translation of Kirnberger's Die Kunst, explains Kirnberger's reason for including the diminished triad among the consonant chords:
For Kirnberger, the justification for considering the diminished triad as consonant lies in his tuning system. He makes a distinction between the false fifth (45:64), which is a dissonance and whose inversion is the tritone (23:45), and the small fifth, which is larger than the false fifth by 1/64. . . . Kirnberger explains that the closer the proportion is to 5/7, the more usable is the small fifth as a consonance in the diminished triad (Kirnberger, p. 47, translator's note).

30 Hess de Calvé, p. 225.
31 Kirnberger, p. 49, Table 3.2: "The Essential Seventh Chord and Its Inversion."
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39 Vladimir Fedorovich Odoevsky, Muzykal'no-literaturnoe nasledie [Musical-literary legacy], ed. G. B. Bernandt (Moscow, 1956), p. 642:

In one of the letters Gribedov asked Odoevsky to supply him with the necessary books, including "the composed in Russia and for Russians" Theory of Music of Hess de Calvé. Music . . . was one of the paths to the friendly intimacy between Prince Odoevsky and Gribedov. The sister of Gribedov, Maria Sergeevna (subsequently Durnovo), played superbly both on the piano and in particularly on the harpsichord. Frequently musical study groups were arranged in the house of the Gribedovs. Gribedov himself was a fantastic pianist,—but beyond that he and Odoevsky studied also the theory of music, as a science, which at that time was a great rarity.

. . . Gribedov was a student, if we are not mistaken, of the famous Petersburg harmonist Johann [Heinrich] Miuller [1781–1826].
The subscription for Hess de Calvé's book was announced in at least two journals: "Smes. 2. Ubedomlenie" [A mixture. 2. Information], Syn otechestva [Son of the Fatherland], Part 30, No. 25 (1816), pp. 250-252; and "O podpiske na novyiu knigy" [About a subscription to a new book], Ukrainskii vestnik [Ukrainian herald], Part 3 (August, 1816), pp. 237-240.


Summary to Part II

During this period of Russian music history, then, Russian musicians made significant advances in the areas of music composition and performance. More Russians than ever before took up composition or performance as serious pastimes. Serfs, former serfs (some serfs were granted their freedom in order to pursue musical careers or as a reward for service), and other lower- and middle-class people took up music as a means of employment; and aristocrats took it up as a means of entertainment or, in the case of those who were very serious about their "dilettante" musical activity, as a subject of scholarly or critical activity. Yet, as through history beginning with the ancient Greeks, the lower-class professional musician still maintained a lower status than the upper-class amateur, a situation that prevailed through a good portion of the nineteenth century. Only with the establishment of the first Russian conservatories in the 1860s did this situation begin to change appreciably.

Yet these advances in composition and performance did not extend much into the area of music education and even less into the field of theory, either as a speculative subject or educative subject, even
though it was during this period that the first theory books were published in Russia, after the long hiatus following the appearance of Diletsky's work. In these two areas—music education and theoretical knowledge—Russians still relied heavily on foreigners. In addition, the theoretical works that did appear, although far better than any previously published in Russian, were still more often than not out-of-date or inadequate, either in style or content or both. Hess de Calvé's timely work, which appears to have been circulated among knowledgeable amateurs during the 1820s, was unfortunately not sufficiently well-written or prepared in its theoretical portions to provide a suitable theory education. However, the idea of essential dissonances and chords was taken up in principle by later theorists in Russia, so perhaps Hess de Calvé played a role in focusing attention on this approach.

Only during the next period from 1830 to 1860, when a distinctly Russian school of music composition arose and the foundation for the establishment of the first Russian conservatories was laid, were some important, better-written, and more contemporary theory books published in Russia. Although still written by foreigners, these works nonetheless provided the necessary information about theory and also served as models for the Russian works that eventually followed.
PART III

RUSSIAN INTELLECTUAL LIFE AND FOREIGN MUSIC THEORY: 1830–1860
Introduction to Part III

Part III covers the years 1830 to 1860. This period roughly coincides with the reign of Nicholas I from 1825 to 1855, which was marked at both beginning and end by two very significant events—the Decembrist uprising at the time of his ascendancy to the throne, and the Crimean War, which ended in failure not long after his death. During his generally conservative rule, some reforms were undertaken—the law was finally codified, steps towards greater limitations on serfdom were taken, and the currency was stabilized. His basic policy, though, came to be autocratic and reactionary. Liberalism was suppressed and many notables were jailed or exiled. His foreign policy of legitimism was thwarted by Russia's defeat in the Crimean War. Thus this period was not one of great personal freedom.

Nonetheless it witnessed an incredible flowering in the arts begun in the 1820s. The writers Alexander Pushkin, Mikhail Lermontov, and Nikolai Gogol, the painters Karl Briullov and Alexander Ivanov, and the composers Mikhail Glinka and Alexander Dargomyzhsky were all working at various times during this period. Thus Russia's artistic force rivaled that of Europe and put the country "on the map," so to speak. But in music, both in theory and in composition, true Russian hegemony in its
own country came only during the 1860s and later. And in the fields of theory and music education, this period under discussion is still dominated by foreigners.
Chapter 5

The 1830s and 1840s: "Quantum Leaps" in Music Theory and Composition

The Russian Intelligentsia and Musical Life. The advent of the 1830s brought several significant changes in Russian musical life, most importantly the appearance of Mikhail Ivanovich Glinka (1804–1857) as Russia's foremost composer. In 1836 in St. Petersburg his first opera Zhizn' za tsarom [A life for the tsar] (now called Ivan Susanin) premiered. This first great work of a truly native Russian music, together with Nikolai Gogol's comedy Inspector General and Karl Briullov's opera-inspired painting, "Last Days of Pompeii," both of which appeared the same year, formed "a kind of watershed in the history of Russian art."

Another notable development, begun already in the 1820s, involved the quickening of the pace of intellectual musical life in Russia, and, indeed, of intellectual life in Russia in general. In the late eighteenth century, many in the aristocracy embraced Masonry, a fraternal order that had been introduced in Russia in the early eighteenth century. Beginning in 1776, however, led in Moscow by the publisher and writer Nikolai Ivanovich Novikov (1744–1818), Masonry began to acquire a higher, more esoteric significance than previously; and it was "this
second, Moscow phase of the Russian Masonic history . . . [that was] to have such an important impact on the subsequent development of Russian culture." This "higher order" Masonry had a great influence on the development of intellectual life in Russia:

The concept of small circles meeting regularly, the idea of a corporate search for true knowledge and higher justice, the love of esoteric ritual and readings, the tendency to see moral, spiritual, and aesthetic concerns as part of one higher concern—all this became characteristic of Russian aristocratic thought and was to leave a permanent if ambiguous legacy of chaos and intensity. These circles—rather than the government chanceries or the new universities—were the main channels for creative thought in early-nineteenth-century Russia.

At first politics and religion were the main areas of aristocratic concern; but, following the Decembrist uprising in 1825, the drive to political reform was ended and "the aristocratic passion for political discussion all but died." Instead, philosophy, history, and literary criticism became the major currents of Russian thought and culture. The aristocratic intellectuals turned from the consideration of practical matters to more remote, speculative or theoretical considerations in such fields as mathematics, astronomy (an important philosophical journal of the day was Teleskop [The telescope]), and, most importantly, German romantic philosophy: "On soil that was thoroughly prepared by the occult theosophic pursuits of higher order Masonry, the seeds of Shelling's and Hegel's great philosophic systems were now sown."

Ultimately, this movement led to "the birth of the Russian intelligentsia," in the decade beginning in 1838—the "remarkable decade," as it has been called. The younger members of this intelligentsia, all well-born and well-educated, embraced Hegelian philosophy and Ger-
man romanticism zealously: "They conceived themselves as being a dedicated order, almost a secular priesthood, devoted to the spreading of a specific attitude to life, something like a gospel." Politically, the emergence of this group led ultimately to the 1917 Revolution. Culturally, it led to the great literary movement in nineteenth-century Russia and to the invention of social criticism (the writings of Vissarion Grigorevich Belinsky [1811-48]). Isaiah Berlin refers to the phenomenon of the formation of this intelligentsia, "with its historical and literally revolutionary consequences, . . . [as] the largest single contribution to social change in the world."

This ferment of ideas spilled over into the musical arena as well, influencing both Russian music and musical life. The gatherings of literary "evenings" where these intellectuals exchanged ideas and views included not only philosophical and critical discussions but also literary readings and musical performances by the leading authors, composers and performers of the day, attended by poets, philosophers, critics, litterateurs, and musicians. Certain personages became noted hosts of such evenings. For example, the Moscow home of Alexander Sergeevich Griboedov, dramatist, poet, diplomat, and musician, was a center for such activity during the 1820s. Griboedov himself, who had studied theory with Miuller, played the piano, organ, and flute, and composed music and texts for music. The St. Petersburg home of his friend Prince Vladimir Fedorovich Odoevsky, a noted litterateur, critic, musician, and a Shellingian who dominated philosophical life of the 1820s, became an important center in the 1830s. Others who also spon-
sored such evenings were poet Anton Antonovich Del'vig (1798-1831), the young romantic Nikolai V. Stankevich (1813-40), who helped to introduce Hegelian thought into Russia and who dominated philosophical life of the 1830s, composer Count Mikhail Yur'evich Viel'gorsky, his brother, cellist Count Matvei Yur'evich Viel'gorsky (1794-1866), and writer and singer Princess Zinaida Alexandrovna Volkonskaia (1792-1866).

The dual interests of literature and music led several authors to turn to music as a topic of their literary endeavors. In romantic philosophy, "the creative artist was in many ways the prophet; and the critic, the priest, of romanticism." Thus, the birth of music criticism can be said to date from this time, although it was some years before the appearance of Alexander Serov, Russia's first great music critic. Odoyevsky was probably the first to write critical articles about music; however, his musicological and theoretical writings left an even greater legacy, as one of the founders of Russian classical musicology. Odoyevsky's first writings on music date from 1822. Other writers such as Alexander Dmitrievich Ulybyshev (1794-1858), Dmitri Yur'evich Struisky (1806-1856), Osip Ivanovich Senkovsky (1800-1858), Vasily Petrovich Botkin (1811-1869), Yanuary Mikhailovich Neverov (1810-1893), and Mel'gunov wrote music articles and critical reviews beginning in the 1820s and 1830s in such journals as Journal de St. Peterbourg, Severnaia pchela [The northern bee], Literaturnaia gazeta [The literary newspaper], Vestnik Evropy [The bulletin of Europe], Moskovskii telegraf [The Moscow telegraph], and others. No regular music journal existed at this time. The lifting of a ban on published
criticism of the artists of the imperial theaters in the mid-1820s also undoubtedly contributed to the proliferation of music reviews.

A few musicological works by Russians began to appear during this period as well, but neither their subject matter nor their printed language was Russian. In 1822 Prince Grigory Vladimirovich Orlov (1777-1826) published in Paris a two-volume history of Italian music, *Essai sur l'histoire de la musique en Italie*. It appeared in both French and German, but never Russian. Orlov's work is purely historical. In its 702 pages, Orlov discusses not only the contemporary schools of composition in Naples, Rome, Bologna, and Venice, but also the history of Italian music and European music in general, beginning with the Greeks. For biographical and historical information, Orlov cites a number of sources; but for definitions of musical terms and the like, he relies exclusively on Rousseau's *Dictionnaire de Musique*.

Ulybyshev published his three-volume biography of Mozart, *Nouvelle biographie de Mozart, suivie d'un aperçu sur l'histoire générale de la musique*, in Moscow in 1843, after spending more than ten years on it. Although portions of it appeared in a Russian journal in 1844, a full Russian translation was made only years later, in the 1890s. Ulybyshev feared that, because so few Russians at this time were interested in reading books about music, publishing his biography in Russian would not expose it to a very wide audience. In his work, Ulybyshev provided not only a biography of Mozart, but also a survey and discussions of the composer's music. His method of discussion and research is analytical, but in a descriptive, rather than a technical or theore-
tical, manner. In fact, as the Soviet musicologist A. Shteinberg points out, Ulybyshev "does not believe in 'algebraic harmony,' does not plunge into theoretical depths, [and] only to a small degree gives a technological analysis. The researcher is free from formal state-
ments of relationships of 'constructive details' in works." 13
Ulybyshev himself spoke out against excessive theorizing in critical articles:

There is a well-known recipe for the fabrication of articles of this sort. Tones, tempo and rhythm are pointed out, its aesthetic character is defined by several epithets, comprehended at random . . . [sic] A phrase of the melody is pulled out in one place, a bass passage in another; then, if maestro critico is somewhat educated, he explains to us the sort of double counterpoint, directing the connection and exchange of themes in the develop-
ment; he points out to us in detail the suspicious fifths, the doubtful octaves, the incorrect chords and the intervals gone astray. All this is not difficult, but of what use is it to the reader? . . . [sic] What is there in common between a grammatical skeleton . . . and the inner sense of a work? 14

Yet, as we shall see, Ulybyshev was not above critical theorizing in his own works. I will examine in greater detail some of Ulybyshev's theoretical attempts in my discussion of A. N. Serov (Part IV).

Unfortunately, the lack of interest among Russians, even educated ones, towards such musicological works and the "anti-theory" attitude among many musicians themselves prevailed yet for several more decades, in spite of the advances in both fields during this period. Theory was viewed not as an end in itself but only as a means to an end—composition—and this attitude was a common one through the rest of the nine-
teenth century.

Another scholarly undertaking, begun in 1835, was the compilation
and publication of the first Russian encyclopedia, Entsiklopedicheskii Leksikon [Encyclopedic dictionary]. This task must have been a herculean one that ultimately overwhelmed the publishers; for although they completed seventeen volumes in four years, they managed to cover only the letters "a" through "d." Yet those seventeen volumes contain over one hundred articles on musical topics, some of which were written by Odoevsky. Modest Dmitrievich Rezvoi (1807-1853), an engineer, composer, cellist and scholar, served as the first music editor of the encyclopedia. I will discuss some of his entries in a subsequent section.

Music Education: Public Lectures. Along with the increase in compositional, scholarly, and literary musical activity during the 1830s came an increase in pedagogical activity in music. Classes in the various institutions and private homes continued, while the theatrical schools in Moscow and St. Petersburg and the court choir in St. Petersburg became centers for a higher level of music education. In the late 1830s, classes in the playing of orchestral instruments were begun in the court choir school; later, classes in piano playing and composition were also added.

Also in the 1830s the practice of giving public lectures and courses in music history and theory was initiated. A brief examination of these lectures—who gave them, how they were organized, who attended, etc.—will provide a better understanding of the state of music theory at this time and the type of theoretical instruction being provided. The reasons for their existence may have been several.
First, the theory education provided in the schools may have been insufficient, causing those desiring it to look elsewhere for instruction. Second, the private theory and composition pedagogues in the cities may have been lacking for private pupils, or, conversely, the lessons themselves may have been too expensive for the average music student. Offering public courses was one way of augmenting one's income without lowering the fees charged to private pupils. Third, it may have been just a "fad," taken up and offered for a time by the more entrepreneurially minded pedagogues. A combination of these reasons probably provided sufficient impetus for these courses.

Karl Domanovsky was one of the first to give such a course in St. Petersburg, according to this announcement from a popular periodical of the day:

Karl Domanovsky, a pupil of the celebrated I. F. Miuller, zealously wishing to popularize in Russia the theory of music according to the method of his instructor, intends to open in the local capital [St. Petersburg] a public course of harmony. This course will be divided into four parts: 1. Thoroughbass, 2. Counterpoint, 3. Double counterpoint, 4. Fugue and canon. The lectures will be read in the Russian, German and French languages, two times a week.16

The first part on thoroughbass was to last four months, for which the cost was to be fifty rubles for one language. At least one hundred students were needed before the course could be given. The multi-language approach, reflecting the varied strata of Russian society, was taken so as to accommodate as many students as possible.

Another announcement from 1837 revealed the intention of the Parisian Joseph Guillou (1784-1853), a critic and first flutist of the St. Petersburg theaters, to give a course in solfege and musical phrase-
17

seology. In 1839 the composer and pedagogue Heinrich Bollez wanted to offer a music course, but had no suitable location for the class. Public demand, however, caused him to announce the opening of a course in thoroughbass and counterpoint (at an unspecified location). The author of the newspaper article in which the course was announced underscored the need in Russia for the educational means to foster Russian musical talent:

In each remarkable foreign university a musical faculty, or lecturers for reading lectures about music, is found. Abroad, music is obliged to this by its unusual dispersion. There is no doubt that public lectures about music also yield rich fruit here, and greatly encourage a taste for the musical art. It should be recognized that music in Russia is still in its infancy, or, at least, hitherto little has been done by us in the field of musical composition; but . . . fantastic talents, which perhaps would always remain concealed, will awaken when there is the means to study this art.18

The same author cited two advantages of such courses:

First, students accustomed to a method based on hard rules in time become composers and founding musicians. The dry and unattractive beginning rules acquire unusual interest from the fact that the students aspire to one and the same goal from one and the same point; further, it greatly promotes the hopes that the students in one course all work together and compete in hopes before each other. From a multifaceted treatment of the given theme, from the comparison among themselves of different points of view, exact ideas about musical taste are formed in students and they are trained from the very beginning to avoid in their compositions mono-forms and repetitions. G. Bollez said to us that he himself experienced all this. Second, public lectures, primarily before all other methods of teaching, serve as a great relief, both to the teacher and also to the student; the words of the teacher are received by many listeners and the student acquires a significant benefit in the monetary relation.19

Each course given by Bollez was to run from December to May 1, and to consist of two lectures a week, given in German and in Russian. To acquaint prospective students with his method of teaching, Bollez
invited them for two free lectures.

As listed in the announcement, the basic topics covered within each subject—thoroughbass and counterpoint—were as follows:

1) Thoroughbass: a) Theory of music; explanation of words: tone, interval, consonance, dissonance, chord, harmony, modulation, thoroughbass; b) General rules of pure composition; c) Practical and theoretical study of the constitution and significance of chords; d) About organ music, modulations in it and others.
2) Course of counterpoint: a) Explanation; b) Simple counterpoint; c) Double counterpoint; d) Fugue and canon; e) Old tones, old keys [modes]; f) Higher composition of recitative, orchestral, spiritual, harmony and dance music; g) Analysis of the best classical works of old and new composers.

According to this, then, Bollez's two courses would offer in twelve months a more than adequate—if not complete—guide to composition, including information not just on thoroughbass and counterpoint, but also on harmony, modes, form, and analysis. The appearance of these and other public courses indicates a need for them that was not being fulfilled, apparently, through institutional studies, or through private lessons, which were perhaps too expensive for many students. The cost of Bollez's courses, though, was not cheap and was much higher than the cost of Domanevsky's course—forty rubles a month or one hundred and fifty rubles in advance for the course on thoroughbass, fifty rubles a month or two hundred rubles for the course on counterpoint and higher composition, or seventy-five rubles a month or three hundred rubles in all for both courses.

Two years later, Bollez was still giving these courses. In the academic year 1839-40 he had twelve students; eight studied only thoroughbass and four had gone on to composition. Compared with
Domanovsky's projected enrollment of one hundred for his class in 1832, twelve seems a very small number. That same year, though, Bollez lowered his subscription price, perhaps in an effort to attract more pupils. Even so, only children from the wealthier families could afford to take these courses. Nowhere is it indicated whether these pupils received any individual instruction on written work, or whether the courses consisted solely of group lectures. If the latter were the case, then the number of Bollez's students was distressingly low.

In an announcement of a course given by the German Karl Arnol'd (1794-1873) in 1840 on the history of music, the rules of simple counterpoint, and thoroughbass, the working of practical exercises by the student and the individual attention of the teacher were specifically mentioned, so perhaps this was a new approach:

[Mr. Arnol'd] will also talk about thoroughbass: 1) tones, intervals, chords, their classification and nomenclature; 2) resolution of chords and intervals; 3) modulation and 4) melody and rhythm. In readings about thoroughbass, Arnol'd will dictate the most important explanations and rules, and to those wishing to study practically, will give examples from resolution, and will return them to the students, with notes of mistakes and with explanations, why they are considered mistakes. 22

More than likely, though, these public lectures required little practical work on the part of the student. For that, of course, private instruction in theory and composition—by Miller and Fuchs, for example—was still available to the wealthier students, and it remained a relatively popular means of instruction.

Theory Books. While the emphasis in subject-matter in the public courses and lectures focused on thoroughbass and counterpoint as the
two most important compositional techniques, the emphasis in the theory books written or published in Russia during this time—as in Europe—was beginning to shift away from thoroughbass towards harmony or composition in general. The textbook of harmony—the principles of harmony stated as such and not as thoroughbass technique—first appeared in Russia during this period. This shift in one respect reflects the trend in West European music theory away from the emphasis on eighteenth-century thoroughbass technique as both a compositional and a performance means and back to an emphasis on its performance aspects, but in another respect signals the growing importance of the study of composition in Russia. From 1773 to 1830, six works on thoroughbass, from a total of thirteen foreign and domestic works, were published; from 1830 to 1870, four works on thoroughbass, from a total of twenty-one works, were published, the latest in 1864. Thus the number of thoroughbass textbooks published in Russia was reduced from nearly half of the total number of theory texts to less than one-fifth of the total. From 1773 to 1830, two works on composition—loosely defined as any work containing information on a subject in addition to harmony (or thoroughbass) such as counterpoint (Manfredini) or form (Hess de Calvó)—were published; from 1830 to 1870, seven works on composition were published, an increase from fifteen percent to one-third. During the latter period, two works on harmony were also published, as opposed to none in the previous period.

Other topics of books appearing during this period include elementary harmony (six), instrumentation (two), and music in general, inclu-
ding theory (one). Of these works, still only a small number (four)
were by Russians; these include three short books on elementary theo-
ry—similar to the earlier works by Petrunkevich and Komendatov—and
one short book on instrumentation (Glinka's notes on the subject, as
published by Serov). The remaining works either were by foreigners
living in Russia (eight books), or were brought in from abroad and
translated into Russian (eleven).

Most of the foreigners living in Russia who wrote theory textbooks
were pedagogues. Not surprisingly, their works constitute the most
significant works published in Russia during this time. (Only one of
the elementary theory books written by a Russian, that by Odoevsky, and
one of the books brought in from abroad, by Ernst F. Richter, are
equally worthy of consideration. See Part IV for discussions of these
works.) The foreign pedagogues include the Germans Johann Leopold
Fuchs (1785-1853), whose two works are actually two very different
versions of the same book; Karl Arnol'd (1793-1873) (one book); Franz
Xavier Gebel (1787-1843) (one book); Vikenty Osipovich Lemokh (one
book); and the Czech Joseph Karlovich Hunke (1802-1883) (two books).

With the exception of one of the books by Hunke, a textbook on harmony,
the works by these authors were all guides to the study of composition,
or, as in one case, a guide to the general study of theory (only one of
the imported books was of this sort). Through their pedagogical and
writing activities, these theorists exerted the greatest influence in
the field of music theory in Russia during this time.
Johann Leopold Fuchs (1785-1853). Of these foreign writer-pedagogues, Fuchs and Hunke were the most prolific, the most thorough, and, consequently, the most important. (The works of the other three theorists mentioned are, for various reasons, far less significant, and will be discussed later.) Their works span this time period, Fuchs's appearing at the beginning and Hunke's near the end. Fuchs's first work, Praktischeskoe rukkovedstvo k sochineniiu muzyki [A practical guide to the composition of music], published in St. Petersburg in 1830, was a milestone in the history of music theory in Russia. Like Hess de Calvé's work, it was written with the Russian composer in mind, only more so in that it contains a ten-page supplement, "A Guide to the Composition of Russian Church Song," the only guide of its kind in existence at that time (and the only such guide since Diletsky's work in 1680). In addition, Fuchs provided the most systematic, comprehensive and advanced survey of traditional, pedagogical compositional theory—with the emphasis on harmony and practicality—so far available in the Russian language.

The translator, M. D. Rezvoi, a former pupil of Fuchs's (who wrote it in his native German), writes in the book's forward how it came to be written, for whom it was intended, and its contents:

Profiting for several years by lessons of Fuchs in thoroughbass, I had the opportunity to make sure of the superiority of his method of teaching. Many of his friends, being of the same opinion, persuaded him to disseminate the use of this method to a large circle, through the publication of a theoretical work on his system. Yielding finally to their unceasing persuasions, Fuchs decided to get down to the statement of his guide; having spent a large part of his life in Russia, from gratitude to it he wanted [his guide] to be useful primarily to Russian Artists and for this
conceived the idea to publish this work in the Russian language. This is why I was made a participant in this useful book, though this is also little-known. If the preferred guide, by a superlative and perfectly new system of statement, by its brevity and clarity, is of use to foreigners, then the more so it deserves the gratitude of Russian Artists, so deprived in theoretical works on the musical art. Knowing that a singing chorus makes up numerous classes of artists in Russia, Fuchs wished also to disseminate the use of his work among them and added a special article on Russian Church Singing for them; this all the more so compels us to recognize his book as our native work. . . . Here is stated all that is necessary in the theory of music composition; the practical part of this work and the numerous examples and problems, facilitating self-study, give the means to young artists, to talented geniuses of music, to develop their ability and to compete in the latter with well-known composers of Germany, Italy and France. Russia, so capable in the fields of science, only in one—music—still stands on a very low step. This short work will be the first foundation for such hopes and such glory, which its sons anticipate in the field of music.25

Obviously there was a great need in Russia for a book of this sort, and Fuchs, apparently, was the person capable of answering to this need. Born in Dessau in 1785, Fuchs came to Russia probably shortly after the turn of the century. Trained as a pianist, he gave lessons on that instrument for a while. But he had greater success as a teacher of harmony and counterpoint, and with his erudition and broad knowledge in music and other areas commanded respect and authority among the intelligentsia, as Rezvoi testifies: "Leopold Fuchs is considered one of our most learned contrapuntists. Many of our best artists and amateurs thank him for their theoretical instruction. For all his learnedness Mr. Fuchs is a professed enemy of every scholastic 26 pedantry." In addition to his pedagogical activities, he also composed music, primarily oratorios.

Among his students were Rezvoi, Yury Arnol'd, composer and critic Feofil Matveevich Tolstoi (1810-81), and, for a short time, Glinka. He
apparently taught them privately and individually, for there is no record of his having given any public courses. Instead, in order to reach a wider audience, his supporters persuaded him to write a textbook. Presumably, since the book was intended for the self-learner, those students using the textbook would not have the benefit of an instructor. Consequently Fuchs provides concise, detailed coverage of harmonic principles, along with sections on counterpoint and form, and includes numerous exercises, an important element lacking in previous translated works published in Russia. The main topics (ordered as in the book) include intervals, basic chords, the principles of partwriting and voice-leading, figured bass, the formation and use of chords (triad, seventh chord, ninth chord, diminished seventh chords, augmented-sixth chords, augmented triads, six-four chords), non-harmonic tones, related modes, modulation, cadences, rhythm, and form. Chapters devoted to exercises appear periodically throughout, but both the actual exercises and examples are separated from the main text into two notebooks, the first containing examples and problems, the second the solutions.

Except in the chapter on Russian church music, Fuchs derived his approach from Western European theoretical thought. He was especially influenced by the theories of Gottfried Weber, whose idea of Grundharmonie [fundamental harmonies] he adopted. According to Fuchs (and Weber), the fundamental chords (Grund-Akkord) include three forms of the triad—major, minor, and diminished—and four types of seventh chord—those occurring diatonically on G, A, B, and C. In essence, no
difference between this idea and the Kirnberger-Hess de Calvé idea of essential chords exists; with the exception of the chord on B, which Kirnberger interpreted differently according to its resolution and dissonance treatment, the subcategories are the same. Also in Fuchs-Weber, all other harmonies are derivatives of these basic chords. Although Fuchs often refers to the fundamental seventh-chords as essential, like Kirnberger he generally applies the term "essential seventh chord" only to those seventh chords resolving a fourth above or a fifth below. Non-essential seventh chords include the "imaginary seventh chord," a major ninth chord without a root that resolves stepwise—similar to Kirnberger's "unauthentic" seventh chord—and the diminished seventh chord, a minor ninth chord without a root. Thus in his use of fundamental bass, and the formation, labeling, and resolution of seventh chords, we see elements of the harmonic theories of Rameau and Kirnberger as well as of Weber.

Fuchs derives other chords from the alteration of fundamental or essential chords. Continuing my comparison of augmented sixth chords from Hess to Calvé to Chaikovsky and Rimsky-Korsakov, I illustrate here his derivation of augmented sixth chords. In his discussion of these chords, Fuchs includes those chords derived from the triad—today referred to as the Italian sixth chord—and those derived from seventh chords—the French and German augmented sixth chords. Hess de Calvé, it will be remembered, presented only the augmented sixth chords equivalent to the Italian and French augmented sixth chords. Thus Fuchs was the first to present in print to Russians the possibility of an
additional version, the German augmented sixth chord, which he treats as a variation of the French augmented sixth chord. He constructs the latter "from the raising of the sixth in the second inversion of the third essential seventh chord [B-D-F-A]. Resolution is, as usual after the third seventh chord, the major triad (E major) located a fourth above the basic tone (B) of the previous chord." (See Example 5.1a.) Thus Fuchs resolves the augmented sixth chord on the basis of the proper resolution for an essential seventh chord, not on the basis of the step-wise motion of the augmented sixth interval. A variation occurs when B is replaced with C, the minor ninth from the fundamental tone (Example 5.1b). He illustrates the resolution of this chord to the tonic six-four chord (A minor). The fundamental note remains B for both augmented sixth chords. According to Fuchs, the fundamental note of the augmented sixth chord is always two thirds below the bass note with one exception: "When in this chord C instead of B is placed, then this may be applied to the third inversion. The fundamental tone remains B, and is therefore three thirds below the bass. The figuration here is 4-3." (See Example 5.1c.) Fuchs does not illustrate the resolution for this chord; presumably it too would resolve to the tonic six-four chord, which is at the distance of a fourth from the fundamental tone of the augmented sixth chord only by virtue of its inversion.

Concerning modulation, a topic to which Hess de Calvé devoted little attention, Fuchs again goes beyond his predecessor and presents a more detailed and thorough discourse on the subject. He distin-
Example 5.1. Fuchs: a) usual augmented sixth, formation and resolution; b) variant with C instead of B; c) varied chord in third inversion.

guishes two main types—a "deviation or transfer into a new mode [tonality]" and a "passing deviation." In the first type, the feeling of the main tonality is destroyed; in the second the feeling of the main tonality remains throughout a short sojourn into a related key. Expanding upon the first type, Fuchs describes several variations: modulation into related keys; a continual transfer in which no tonality exists, each transitory tonality being approached through its dominant and keys related to the dominant; and a quick transfer into remote tonalities, for which diminished and augmented chords, inversions, and enharmonic transpositions are useful. With few exceptions and some variations, Fuchs's distinctions between modulatory types, which are basic distinctions, remain fairly consistent in Russian modulatory theory throughout the nineteenth century.
Possibly the most useful and influential section of Fuchs's guide was the four-page Russian-German dictionary of seventy-two musical terms compiled by the translator Rezvoi. Since, as he said, he had no Russian model for the text, he had to invent many Russian words and expressions for previously untranslated—or poorly translated (i.e. Smagin's attempts)—terms. His choices were so appropriate that most have become standard in Russian musical vocabulary. For the German word Tonart, a word often confused with Ton, used in both Russian and German, for example, he substituted the word lad, meaning mode, a designation previously not used but which today is standard terminology. He describes how he came to make this particular change:

But since both the expressions Tonart and Ton are met in many definitions included in this book, then accepting Ton for both words would create an uncomfortable understanding. Wishing to avoid that, I decided to translate the expression Tonart with the word lad, which is used primarily in popular language and in my opinion expresses the proper meaning. Rezvoi is recognized today as the chief codifier of Russian musical terminology.

Fuchs's work became the first theory book to receive substantial reviews in the Russian press, rather than the publication announcement or short cursory review usually accorded to such books. No doubt this was due not only to the stature and reputation of the author as a composer and pedagogue, but also to the growing numbers of journalists and writers knowledgeable about and interested in music theory. The paucity of such works in the Russian language heretofore also contributed to the heralding in the press of its arrival. Two reviews of Fuch's work are notable, as they are both by eminent writer-musicians—
one, in Severnaia pohela [The northern bee] by Ulybyshev, and another in Literaturnaia gazeta [The literary newspaper] by Struisky.

Struisky's review provides more substantial and useful criticism than Ulybyshev's. His opening remarks explain why he, a music amateur and not an "Artist," wrote this review and why, although Fuchs's book had great potential use to Russian musicians, it would not receive much attention from either serious artists or amateurs:

This useful book is without a doubt the best of all published music theories in the Russian language. Even in Germany itself, where the number of General-basses may constitute a large library, this guide to the composition of music would be a remarkable phenomenon, by [its] simple statement, joined with erudition, alien to pedantry. Fuchs is hardly not the first German-Harmonist, who, giving up refinement and unnecessary complications, turned attention to the essence of the subject. He leads the student to the goal not by sinuous paths, but by the main road. This clarity and simplicity is a consequence of lengthy experience; theory without practice never reaches its goal. The translator and pupil of Fuchs, an unmercenary lover of music and expert of his subject, bestowed his compatriots with a fantastic book: gratitude to him is the first duty. He fulfilled his business, in the best possible way.

If this book were able to find a judge, a scholarly Artist, then I would not communicate my remarks; but we say sincerely: Russian Artists to this day have not studied music Theory: from them nothing is expected. Foreign guest-Artists in large part are ignorant in the Russian language: and in them is a poor prospect. The fate of this book is possible to foresee beforehand: our Journals will brag about it unaccountably, a great number of amateurs of Music will not read it; the stores of Nets and Lengol'd will preserve it, as a treasure, which no one is able and wants to set out, until such a day, when the dawn of Russian music appears on the horizon of European harmony.

Getting down to the remarks, in advance I request the readers not to consider these as consequences of my self-confidence and knowledge; I said, why I decided to communicate my thoughts about such a subject, which I studied not as an Artist, but as an amateur: that is, in hours of repose, not placing music either as a means or as an end. Perhaps my superficial remarks will be of use to my beloved art; perhaps they will induce someone from the experts to enter into the field of criticism, and the work of Fuchs will not remain without sufficient evaluation.
Struisky's closing remarks echo these sentiments in his somewhat pessimistic hopes for the wide dissemination of Fuchs's work and his hopes for the future of Russian music. As reasons for his pessimism, he points to two deficiencies, one in the character of the Russian artist and the other in the Russian educational system:

The achievement of the Theory of Fuchs inalienably consists in brevity and simple statement, without metaphysical erudition. But as his goal was to publish a book for the self-student, then the arrangement of his Theory is not completely satisfactory. Besides this, his book is precious and useful to Russian musicians, I wish sincerely that the goal of the honorable Author is justified by fulfillment; that his system will form here a Northern Cherubini. In Russia there is much talent, [but] the education for it is lacking. . . . [sic] Here in conclusion it is possible to note lightly that Russian Artists are quick, but--not hard-working, in spite of the wonderful Russian proverb: Under the lying stone and water is not a mosque.34

Struisky's harsh evaluation of his artistic countrymen—that they were lazy and were not interested in applying their talents to the serious study of music composition—echoes the view propounded twelve years earlier by Hess de Calvé, who criticized young virtuosos for attempting to plunge into composition without being properly or adequately prepared. But aside from any Russian character flaws, the necessity for serious work in theory and composition apparently was not being impressed strongly enough upon youngsters interested in music as amateurs or in music careers, there being no Russian tradition for such; and the lack of an adequate system of professional music education contributed greatly to this distressing circumstance.

In his criticism of Fuchs's book, Struisky lists eight specific points that he believes Fuchs treated poorly, all of which have to do
less with the material being presented than with the means of its presentation but which are, nonetheless, valid criticisms. These points fall into three categories: incorrect or insufficient definitions (intervals, seventh chord, progression by fifths, cadences, transfers, and modulations); the premature placement of the presentation of certain materials (information concerning triads and seventh chords that more properly belong to a discussion of modulation, a later topic, instead of to chord types, an earlier topic); and—Struisky's main criticism—the lack of the coordination of examples technically incompatible with the level of subject-matter being presented, which results in the usage of a particular practice before it had been introduced and explained in the text. Thus, he concludes, the book was less useful to the self-student than it had been intended. Nonetheless, since a work such as this was greatly needed in Russia and since it was the best of its sort in the Russian language—due to its brevity, simplicity and erudition, in Struisky's words—he recommends it highly and sincerely hopes that it would have a better fate (and a more expert evaluation) than what he had sarcastically outlined for it.

Ulybyshhev, in his review, does not provide the more expert criticism of Fuchs's book that Struisky sought. Such an evaluation probably was not possible at this time, given the lack, as Struisky pointed out, of a Russian musician fully knowledgeable in music theory and capable of writing about it. Unlike Struisky's, Ulybyshhev's review is totally laudatory and uncritical. Acknowledging the lack of a tradition of music composition in Russia, he blames
the neglect of this noble Art in a people endowed with a very
different disposition to music ... [on] the absence in the
Russian language of theoretical works on this subject. This
important deficiency, hindering the education and refinement of
our Artists, not knowing the German or French language, did not
escape the notice of Fuchs ... [who had] the fantastic thought
to state the foundations of musical Science in a form understand-
able for our compatriots.35

Ulybyshev was thus more kind to his countrymen than Struisky or Hess de
Calvé, blaming for the lack of a Russian compositional tradition not a
Russian indisposition towards hard work, but the overemphasis on theo-
retical instruction in foreign languages, which would make such lessons
and published information accessible only to the privileged few.

Rather than dwelling on any of the book's drawbacks or insuffi-
ciencies, Ulybyshev points to its positive aspects and, particularly,
to the legacy of Weber, whom he called Fuchs's "mentor," and "the most
prominent of the contemporary theorists." He gives primary credit to
Weber for the purging from the pedagogical technique of theory through
"argument and ridicule" "all this pedantic knowledge"—"the numerous
strange rules and ... commentaries, arbitrary instructions and still
the most useless prohibitions, and childish subtleties." Instead,
Ulybyshev acknowledges, "the only indisputable rules of music consist
of the requirements of educated hearing." Weber's simplified ap-
proach obviously pleased the anti-theoretical Ulybyshev, who disdained
excessive theorizing, both in analysis and pedagogy, an attitude common
among certain of the musical autodidacts of the nineteenth century, as
we shall see in Part IV. In his view, by adopting Weber's approach,
Fuchs inherited Weber's legacy, so to speak. In addition, two features
of Fuchs's book that Ulybyshev praises specifically are the lexicon and
the application of practice alongside theory, and rightly so, for these are two very important elements of Fuchs's legacy in the field of theory textbooks. The lack of criticism in Ulybyshev's review and the generally favorable tone of his statements lead one to believe that Ulybyshev, in his delight at having finally such a guide to composition in Russian—and a simplified one at that—could not bring himself to say anything adverse about it.

By the changes made in the second edition of his work, Novaia metoda, soderzhashchiia glavnyia pravila muzykal'noi kompozitsii [A new method, containing the main rules of music composition], which came out fourteen years after the first edition, Fuchs tacitly acknowledges many of Struisky's critical points concerning his first work. As a result of these changes, this edition is essentially a new work, very different from the first, particularly in its format. A most striking departure from the previous edition is the printing of the text in both German and Russian in dual columns on each page. Perhaps this was done so that the book could be compared or used in conjunction with other untranslated German theory texts; but more than likely it was done to accommodate German students or Russian students more comfortable in German than in their native tongue. Many of the theory lectures given during this time, it will be recalled, were also being presented in languages other than Russian, mainly German or French, although, as Ulybyshev pointed out, this practice was discriminatory. The question of language in the teaching of music theory in Russia—i.e., the lack of sufficient opportunities to learn in Russian—remained one of the
barriers in the establishment of a Russian theory of music until the 1860s and the founding of the first Russian conservatories.

Other changes in Fuchs's second edition are more substantive. Whereas in the first edition the topics—thirty-nine in all—were each labeled separately and were not well-organized or grouped into chapters, in the second edition the twenty-seven topic headings are grouped into eleven chapters according to their subject-matter. The examples are integrated into the text—itself much clearer and more detailed—and their number greatly increased. Fuchs's approach, while still a practical one, is thus more logical and more clearly represented. The substance of the two editions remains similar, the most obvious change being the replacement of the supplement on the writing of church song with a supplement on counterpoint. Russian composition students were apparently more interested in learning Western methods.

One striking difference between the two editions concerns Weber's idea of fundamental harmonies. Fuchs places less emphasis in the second edition on this idea, preferring to separate the seventh chord from the triad and discussing it later, in a separate section, as Struisky had suggested. He still retains Weber's seven basic types of chord—three triads and four seventh chords—and uses them as the basis for the construction of other chords, but he does not emphasize their primordial nature. He interprets the seventh chords, in particular the two diminished types, in the same manner, but adds another means for deriving augmented sixth chords. In both editions, the formation of this chord results from the alteration of a seventh chord. But whereas
in the first edition the augmented sixth chord is formed from the raising of the sixth in the second inversion of the third essential seventh chord, in the second edition the augmented sixth chord may be formed in two ways—either from the lowering of the fifth (the bass note) of the second inversion of the (secondary) dominant seventh chord (on the second degree of the minor scale: B-D♯-F♯-A in Example 5.2a), or the raising of the sixth from the bass note of the second inversion of the third seventh chord (which occurs naturally also on the second degree of the minor scale: B-D-F-A in Example 5.2b). The latter derivation is, of course, that given in the first edition; the derivation from the (secondary) dominant-seventh chord is new to this second edition. In this interpretation the augmented sixth chord looks more like a dominant seventh chord with a lowered fifth in second inversion than a true augmented sixth chord. This view, of course, depends on the tonality of the example: For an augmented sixth chord we assume it to be A minor (if the key signature is any indication), with the E major triad of resolution as the dominant, although Fuchs does not specify this. If the E major triad were the tonic, then the chord in question would be a form of dominant. Chaikovsky approaches the augmented sixth chord in a manner similar to the latter interpretation in his textbook (discussed in Part IV). Fuchs's newer interpretation, in addition to recalling the contrapuntal origin of this chord, reflects contemporary compositional practice in its greater emphasis on chromaticism and half-step resolution. In all other aspects—the substitution of C for B (with the same figured basses as before; see Examples
5.2c and 5.2d), the interpretation of the fundamental bass, the variation using the third inversion (4-3, shown resolving to the dominant and not the tonic six-four chord in Example 5.2d)—the material is discussed similarly. Left out in the second edition, however, are any references to "basic" or "essential" seventh chords as the basis for the augmented-sixth chord. Instead, Fuchs presents a wider interpretation for the derivation of the augmented sixth chord—not only its chordal formation, from the third seventh chord, but also its contrapuntal origin, through the secondary dominant chord.

Example 5.2. Fuchs: a) formation of augmented sixth chord from dominant-seventh chord on B; b) formation of augmented sixth chord from third essential seventh chord; c) substitution of C for B; d) resolution of 4-3 chord with C.

Thus the evolution in Russian-based music theory—it cannot yet be properly called Russian theory—from a rather strict adherence to the concept of fundamental or essential harmonies to a freer interpretation
of this idea in conjunction with a more chromatic emphasis (influenced by Fétis perhaps?) can be observed in the writings of one theorist—Fuchs. Other theorists followed his lead, first accepting a strict interpretation of this concept and later elaborating upon it. But it proved useful as an antidote, so to speak, for the numerous uncategorized chord possibilities in the earlier figured bass studies, such as Hess de Calvé's pioneering yet very confusing work; and, as Ulybyshev stated, its application by Fuchs "facilitated and simplified a study, which was once a boundless ocean." Weber's legacy, though, remained for some years, and formed the basis for the harmony textbooks of some later theorists: a clearer and more understandable method of chord categorization and formation based on the simplest, most common and most representative types of chords.

Fuchs's Novaia metoda [New method]—that is, not considering those supplementary portions devoted to counterpoint and form—can be considered the first truly "modern" harmony textbook of the nineteenth century in Russia. Through its choice of subject-matter, its format, and its emphasis on harmonic theory—albeit practical—rather than thoroughbass technique, it established a pattern that for years was followed in the various works of this type published in Russia, whether by foreign or Russian authors. Fuchs, a teacher of composition with many Russian pupils, knew what his students needed and produced a system of theory pedagogy and a work based on that system that fulfilled their requirements, whether they studied by themselves or with a teacher. Although Fuch's book was written specifically for the self-
learner, because of the dearth of similar works and the popularity of its approach, it was readily accepted by all and its approach became a familiar and traditional one. Fuch's emphases on the simplicity of the study of harmony and on the practical study of harmony, with numerous exercises, were the main pedagogical characteristics of subsequent harmony textbooks that were well-received in Russia.

Encyclopedia Articles on Music. Fuch's influence can be observed most strikingly in the music articles written by his student and translator of the first edition, M. D. Rezvoi, for the Entsiklopedicheskii leksikon [Encyclopedic dictionary], the first of its kind published in Russia (1835-39), unfortunately left incomplete. In the seventeen volumes published, at least fifteen theory articles— and many others related to theory—were included. Eight of these articles are signed by Rezvoi; others (unsigned) may have been written by him as well, since he was the music editor for the first six volumes and compiled the list of musical terms to be included in the encyclopedia. He included in this Encyclopedia the same terms that he codified for Fuch's, such as lad [mode] and vvodnyi ton [leading tone], to name two terms that quickly entered Russia's musical vocabulary and remained. Three of the major theoretical articles, "Akkord" [Chord], "Bas" [Bass], and "Vedenie golosov" [Voice-leading], all written by Rezvoi, contain information that differs little from that found in Fuch's first edition. In the article on the chord, for example, Rezvoi repeats the Fuchs-Weber theory of ground chords:
The great difference of the composition and the placement of chords extends almost into infinity; the study of all these possible views would be for musicians as difficult as Chinese grammar, if Science had not discovered a means to classify and simplify the theory of all possible co-soundings. By this theory Chords, in whatever views they are presented to us, occur from only two basic Chords: 1) the triad and 2) the Chord of the seventh or the seventh chord. To these two sources it is possible to reduce any harmony, approved by our hearing,44

These basic chords consist of three triads and four seventh chords. Derivatives of these chords as discussed in the article include their inversions, major and minor ninth chord, the major ninth chord without the fundamental bass—which in sound is equal to the third seventh chord but in function is very much different—the minor ninth chord without a fundamental bass or the diminished seventh chord, and the augmented sixth chord. Rezvoi forms all these chords in the same manner as Fuchs in the first edition of his book.

In his article on the bass, Rezvoi discounts other harmonic systems—such as those by Rameau and Tartini—stating that "similar theorizing is insufficient for the composition of a full and indisputable theory. The system of harmony, stated by us in the article 'Chord,' is recognized to this day as the most satisfactory."45

Other theoretical articles not written by Rezvoi—either signed by other authors or unsigned—include the articles "Garmonia" [Harmony], written by Senkovsky, and "General-bas" [Thoroughbass] (author unknown), in which the subjects are defined more in general philosophical terms than in technical or theoretical terms. In the article on harmony, Senkovsky contrasts the concept of melody with the concept of harmony. He compares melody with design in painting and gives it
primary significance; whereas he compares harmony to color in painting, thereby relegating it to a secondary position:

As harmony today is called the contemporary simultaneous combination of tones, in conformity with the theory of sounds and necessary for the perfection of each musical piece. Melody, the opposite of this, is the gradual combination of tones in general, and in particular a row of such tones, which by means of the definite various raising and lowering of sounds captivates our hearing. Therefore melody in music is primary, and harmony is a secondary subject. . . . Melody includes in itself the entire thought of the composer: it is the content and sense of musical creation; and Harmony is only style and its elegant realization. If it would be necessary to compare music with painting, then the design may be called melody, and the coloring and tone of the picture is harmony. Consequently Harmony, by its essence, is subordinated to melody and serves it only as an auxiliary means of expressions. . . . If the goal of melody is to express feeling through tones by well-known rules of art, then the goal of Harmony is better and more clearly able to emphasize the nuances of these feelings with its means.47

This definition is similar to that put forth by Hess de Calvé, who also believed in the primacy of melody.

Thoroughbass, in the article on that subject (author unknown), is defined in two ways—in the commonly-applied meaning of figured bass, and in the more general application of the term to the whole area of harmony in its technical sense, as described in this excerpt:

In a wider sense, under the name of thoroughbass is meant sometimes in general the science of music composition or the system of rules, how to compose different musical pieces. This science may carry the name thoroughbass because the art easily, quickly, correctly and precisely to investigate figured bass and to be able to find for it the appropriate harmony is achieved only when one dedicates himself to the study of harmony acquires the fundamental knowledge in all parts of composition. Thus he will need to know above all everything that makes up the essence of music, that is, tones, their characteristics, intervals, or distances, diatonic, chromatic and enharmonic scales, the origin of chords, their inversions, suspension and resolution, their natural connections and orders, transfers from one tone into another, or modulation, rules, applicable to harmony for the correct and appropriate
progressions of the bass, on which lies the entire edifice of harmony, in a word, all grammar, all syntax of music and transfer to the study of the highest subjects of composition. . . . To join harmony and melody appropriately and in well-known conventional forms so that through their blending is formed a fantastic whole, satisfying the requirements of science and elegant feeling, is the problem that general-bass, taken in the wide sense of the work, should solve. Then thoroughbass signifies also the theory of music, or counterpoint, that is, the systematic statement of the rules of harmony, extracted from the practical part of art with such a goal, in order to indicate the means, the tools and guides, with which this art may achieve its true purpose.48

As appropriate guides to the study of thoroughbass, though, the author recommends only those works specifically devoted to thoroughbass in its more narrow interpretation, those by Mattheson, Heinichen, Marpurg, Kellner, Türk, and Bach, all written in the previous century and only one of them—the Kellner—ever having been available in Russian.

During the 1830s, then, music theory was still viewed mainly in terms of thoroughbass, which almost from the beginning—the eighteenth century in Russia, the thoroughbass era in Europe—had been a catch-all term applicable not only to figured bass but to composition as well. This application of the term in the ensuing years receded in favor of the use of more specific terms, such as composition, or harmony, the latter term coming to include thoroughbass as a particular practice, a means to an end. The change in textbooks in Russia may be observed in the two works of Fuchs; later authors writing on the subject of harmony or composition in general followed his example, and concentrated on harmonic theory rather than thoroughbass technique. However, as mentioned, textbooks on the subject of thoroughbass—all translations, incidentally—were still being published in Russia as late as 1864.
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Rezvoi was also the editor of the portions pertaining to music of the Slovar tservovno-slavianskogo i russkogo jazyka [Dictionary of the Church-Slavonic and the Russian language], published by the section of Russian language and literature of the Academy of Sciences in 1847. Initially, his task was to proofread the already translated portions of the dictionary pertaining to music, but instead, due to his genuine concern and interest in this matter, he did a complete reworking of the material, resulting in significant changes. He defended his actions by pointing to the deficiencies and inappropriateness of Russian musical language, due to the lack of a proper foundation and to indiscriminate
borrowing from other languages, which rendered Russians unable to converse about music or to express in their native language their feelings about music, for which they have an "innate passion," as Rezvoi stated. Also, music being such an abstract and ideal art, he continued, longer and more detailed definitions were needed for some terms that could not be adequately defined in a short statement. Thus, he felt that his changes and additions were justified, in order to give to the Russian people the means to speak and write in their own language about music, an art for which they had such deep feelings (M. D. Rezvoi, Letter to the Academy of Sciences, December 17, 1843, cited in its entirety in V. F. Odoevsky, Muzykal'no-literaturnoe nasledie [Musical-literary legacy], ed. G. Bernandt [Moscow, 1956], pp. 670-71).


M. D. Rezvoi, "Bas," Entsyklopedicheskii leksikon, 5 (1836), 60.

Other theoretical subjects covered include acoustics (E. Lents), alteration, leading tone (Odoevsky), scale, ground bass, diatonic progression of tones, diatonic mode, dominant, and others.

Osip Ivanovich Senkovsky, "Garmoniia v muzyke" [Harmony in music], Entsyklopedicheskii leksikon, 13 (1838), 317-18. Senkovsky (1800-1858) was a linguist, journalist, and publisher and editor (1834-47) of Biblioteka dla ochenienia [A library for reading], in which he also published this article: "Garmoniia v muzyke," Biblioteka dla ochenienia, 13 (1838). Ten years later, Senkovsky wrote another music article, which contained several ideas taken from Fétis (La Musique mise à la portée de tout le monde [Paris, 1830; Russ. trans. St. Petersburg, 1833]) and an impractical scheme of notation: "Osnovnyia poniatii o muzyke, kak iskusstve, neobkhodimia dla vsiakago" [Basic ideas about music, as an art, necessary for all], Biblioteka dla ochenienia, 86, No. 2 (February, 185-216 and 87, No. 1 (March), 69-110.


Oskar Kol'be, Kratkoe rukovodstvo k izucheniu generalbasu [A short guide to the study of thoroughbass], trans. Izdal K. Oppel (Warsaw, 1864).
Chapter 6

The 1850s: A Time of Transition

Joseph Karlovich Hunke (1802-1883). The theoretical works of Joseph Hunke signaled the end of the era of foreign-dominated music theory in Russia. At the same time a new generation of composers—Balakirev's group, the "mighty handful" or the "mighty five"—arose, indicating a new era in music composition in Russia. Thus the 1850s turned out to be a time of transition from the period dominated by Glinka in composition and foreign pedagogues in theory. In the new era beginning in the 1860s, native music theory and composition began to become the norm rather than the exception.

Beginning with the textbook on harmony in 1852, Hunke's theory texts were yet another significant improvement in the development of music theory in Russia. With these works Hunke also broke new ground, being the first to write works in Russian devoted specifically to harmony and form. Hunke too was a noted pedagogue, but unlike Fuchs, who wrote his theory book after many years of teaching experience, Hunke took a professional post as a teacher only after publishing his theory books. Czech by birth, he studied the organ as a youth. After teaching music in one of the Ukrainian provinces for four years (1823–
1827), he studied counterpoint with Limmer in Vienna for another four years (1827-31). Beginning in 1834, he worked in St. Petersburg, first as a performer on the violin and organ, then as head of the Music Bureau of the Imperial Theaters. After the publication of his theoretical works (1857-63), he became the theory teacher at the Court Choir in 1864. In 1872 he took on the additional job of the librarian at the St. Petersburg Conservatory. He also composed many works and gave private lessons in theory.

Hunke was a very unassuming man, his friend F. M. Tolstoi relates:

There are two kinds of artists in the everyday world.

1—There are artists for whom, it seems, all white light is created exclusively. From their first attempts in the artistic field, 1000 thoughtful hands clear a path for them, remove thorns, support still unsteady steps. For such an elite everything in life pleases; sympathy awaits them; honor, glory, and frequently, unfortunately, very frequently, all this is given not from achievement, but from the whim of contemporaries and by the particular influence of circumstances, or, more truthfully, to the particular luck of the elite.

2—For another category of artist, litteratuer, life is presented from the completely opposite point. From their earliest years heavy work becomes an inevitable companion for them. They do not meet cordial encouragement in life, they do not anticipate huge applause. All their life they modestly labor in shadow and oblivion; but, true to their calling, are not depressed, and with heavy feet pass down a prickly but useful path, destined for them in life.

Joseph Hunke belongs to the artists of the second category. His name is perhaps not well-known to many, but nevertheless, Hunke has lived in St. Petersburg more than twenty years, and for around forty years, if not more, has actively and with use worked in the artistic field. . . .

Hunke . . . is an intelligent man, educated, and knows his work perfectly. How many fugues, instrumental overtures, cantatas I recopied with him! . . . In our friendly discussions we looked at and studied all the musical works of the last centuries and of the present time. Hunke judges impartially; he finds the beautiful just where it is; from Dalayrac to Beethoven he finds fairly that with which one should be enraptured. In my opinion, the main achievement of Hunke (besides his openhearted modesty and true,
deep knowledge of music), is his affection towards Russians, not
depending on his German origin. . . . This phenomenon is rather
rare relative to musicians. Hunke meets each new remarkable work
of Russian composers with joy; he sincerely respects the talent of
Glinka, sincerely praises Dargomyzhsky, and is not averse even to
enjoy the numerous Russian romances.2

It is not surprising, then, that such a musician would devote so much
time to the writing of theory texts directed at Russian students.

Like Fuchs's works, Hunke's harmony textbook, Rukovodstvo k
izucheniiu garmonii [A guide to the study of harmony], is aimed at the
self-learner. Accordingly, it contains many problems and questions
interspersed throughout the text and a supplement with the solutions.
Hunke advises it may also be used with a teacher, whom he admonishes to
make the subject interesting, even if the instructor has "to attract
[the student] with interesting stories, obvious comparisons." Hunke
also notes that, in consideration for those students insufficiently
prepared in harmony, he begins his book with the subject of scales, a
topic usually covered in elementary theory books. The topics of inter-
vals and chords follow to round out the book's first section; the
topics of chord movement and connection, non-harmonic tones, modula-
tion, rhythm, and cadences constitute the second section. Each section
is nineteen pages long; the last seventeen pages are given over to
exercises and solutions. With the exception of scales, then, and
counterpoint— included in both of Fuchs's editions but not in Hunke's—
each theorist covers the same basic topics.

Hunke's work totals fifty-five pages—not a lengthy work, but this
brevity was an advantage, according to Tolstoi:
Of course, the Guide published by Hunke is not a powerful and huge work; this small brochure is no longer than fifty pages, but in it you will find a short and clear statement of all the necessary rules of harmony. The theory of different scales, the classification of chords, the resolution of dissonances—all this is stated intelligently and very understandably.

Attached to our Slavic dolce far niente (particularly in relation to the basic study of music), few enthusiasts for learning by rote and even reading from the first page to the last the multivolume works of the sort, for example, by Reicha are found; but to be acquainted with the Guide of Hunke, in which there are few pages but much [that is] sensible and fundamental, is very easy, and, we say affirmatively, very useful. . . . We advise amateurs to have under hand the new guide to harmony, which will give to them the pleasure, although externally, of becoming acquainted with the honorable Hunke.5

The Russian propensity for not studying music theory—for whatever reason, laziness or lack of sufficient opportunities or materials—must have been very great. Thus, in order to be successful, pedagogues such as Fuchs and Hunke found it necessary to condense the subject of music theory to a more palatable level.

Hunke considered the study of harmony very important, particularly preceding the study of melody, a topic he covered in a later textbook:

Similar to the words we produce, melody and harmony may be with or without meaning. There is no science that would be able to teach the means to give meaning to human speech, or to invent melody or harmony, full of meaning. But, owing to numerous experiments, well-known rules about which the joinings of sound produce clear, understandable and expressive melody and harmony have been collected. It would seem that it would be easier to invent and perfect melody than harmony, because the first consists of only a single row of sounds; attached to the second one needs to have in view the simultaneous joining of several rows of sounds. But this is not so. Any melody presupposes a harmony, otherwise melody would not have for us a meaning; therefore the study about harmony, as about the foundations of melody, should precede the study about melody, exactly so as Grammar [should precede] Rhetoric, as the development of a flower [is preceded by] the formation of its supporting stem. And so, the studies about harmony and melody make up two completely separate subjects. From them we choose now the first Study About Harmony, which consists of the knowledge of laws, by which 1) sounds in one row may naturally follow one
another, 2) how sounds may be joined simultaneously into co-
soundings, or chords, and 3) how the chords themselves may follow 
one another, not breaking the Euphony. Thus Hunke considers harmony to be primary, the foundation of melody, 
without which a melody could not be constructed. This is not an aes-
thetic view, though, but a purely practical one. With his analogy 
linking harmony to the stem and melody to the flower, he suggests the 
relatively greater aesthetic significance of melody, which, though, 
cannot be studied or understood without a proper foundation in harmony. 
Thus he corroborates Hess de Calvé, Senkovsky, and others who looked to 
melody as the primary aesthetic element.

Reflecting the general trend in harmonic theory in Russia away 
from thoroughbass technique—following the earlier trends in Western 
Europe—Hunke makes sharp distinctions between the science of harmony 
and that of thoroughbass, acknowledging in the process the often broad 
application of the latter term:

The science known under the name of Thoroughbass is nothing dif-
ferent than the knowledge of figured bass and the ability to play 
it. Frequently, but very incorrectly, by the name of Thoroughbass 
is understood the entire knowledge of Harmony. But a Harmonist 
not only needs to know figured bass, but also to be aware of 
progressions and chords. Between the Thoroughbassist and the 
Harmonist is the same difference as between the Translator and the 
Writer. Accordingly, Hunke devoted his textbook to the study of harmony and 
treated figured bass as just one aspect of that study.

Hunke's approach to harmony departs from that of his predecessors 
in Russia, both in his means of chord identification and construction, 
and in his method of chord progression. Although still practical and 
pedagogical, his work is based not on the ideas of one particular
Western theorist but on the general West European theoretical approach to the nineteenth-century compositional trend towards chromaticism. He thus substitutes more chromatic chords for essential chords and derives chord progression from leading-tone resolution (influenced by Fétis).

The first section on chords treats "three main, basic forms of chords. The first of these is the triad, the second chord the Seventh, the third chord the Ninth." Thus the earlier idea, prevalent in Kirnberger, Hess de Calvé, Weber, and Fuchs, that there are two essential chords—the triad and the seventh chord—has been expanded to the idea of "the basic forms of chords," and includes the ninth chord as well, which was not considered by some earlier theorists to be a chord. In other words, in Hunke's view, these chords are merely prototypical and are representative of their respective chord classes, whereas in Weber's earlier concept the three triads and four seventh chords were the bases for the formation of all other chords. Hunke does not apply that latter approach so strictly. The number of basic chordal "building-blocks" has increased in Hunke's interpretation to the point that it has become necessary for him to speak of "chord types" rather than the "essential chords" themselves.

Hunke's chords are of two sorts—similar and dissimilar. Similar triads include major, minor and diminished triads; dissimilar triads include triads on the dominant with a major third and either a lowered or raised fifth. Hunke labels these two triads as dissimilar "because there is no such scale that would contain for example E-Gb or C-G♯." (The examples given are C-E-Gb and C-E-G♯; see Example 6.1.) Yet his
rationale for distinguishing these two chord groups is unclear. Similar chords appear to be those chords that occur naturally within commonly accepted modes; dissimilar chords would then be chords constructed by artificial means. Granted, the diminished third does not occur naturally within the any of the varieties of major or minor modes (natural, harmonic or melodic), but the augmented triad may be constructed on the third scale degree in the melodic (ascending) or harmonic minor mode. One does not find, though, a naturally occurring augmented triad with an added minor seventh, which Hunke illustrates (Example 6.1). So, to be consistent with the rest of his presentation, which groups higher-level structures with their triadic bases, Hunke could not separate the augmented triad from the seventh and ninth chords constructed from it.

Hunke identifies, both by degree and intervallic content, four seventh chords—the dominant-seventh chord (major triad, minor seventh); the seventh chord on the second, third, sixth scale degrees, (minor triad, minor seventh); the seventh chord on the seventh scale degree (diminished triad, minor seventh); and the seventh chord on the first and fourth scale degrees (major triad, major seventh). All these chords are similar seventh chords, and are identical in structure to the essential and ground seventh chords identified previously by Kirnberger-Hess and Fuchs-Weber, respectively. In addition, Hunke identifies two dissimilar seventh chords constructed from the two dissimilar triads with minor sevenths added.

Although, as he points out, ninth chords may be constructed on any degree of the major scale, Hunke concentrates on the dominant ninth
chord with a major ninth. For the minor mode, he discusses only the
dominant ninth chord with a minor ninth. Dissimilar ninth chords occur
as well—a minor ninth chord with a lowered fifth, and a major or minor
ninth chord with an augmented fifth. Major ninth chords without roots
form, on any degree, seventh chords known as "imaginary" (similar to
Fuchs's imaginary seventh chords). Although in structure these imagi-
nary seventh chords are just like the usual seventh chords, their
resolution distinguishes them from this latter group, as in Fuchs. A
dominant minor ninth chord (in minor) without its root, for example,
forms a diminished seventh chord. The dissimilar ninth chords may also
occur without a root; Hunke assigns to them no special designation.

Hunke summarizes all the basic chord forms in a table (Example
6.1). As a supplement to the table, Hunke adds the chord of the
eleventh, which he places only on the second degree in both major and
minor modes.

In yet another departure from prevailing harmonic theory in
Russia, Hunke presents an approach to chord connection and progression
based on the basic principles of voice-leading, i.e., the step-wise
resolution of dissonances and leading tones. He identifies dissonances
as the diminished and augmented fifth, all three sevenths (major,
minor, diminished), both ninths (major and minor) and the eleventh. He
identifies consonant chords as having "movable centrifugal strength, as
if they require great development" and dissonant chords as having
"movable centripetal strength, they aspire to be joined with consonant
chords." Dissonant chords therefore require resolution: "We feel,"
Example 6.1. Hunke, "The Forms of the Basic Chords":
A) Similar Chords: 1) triads; 2) seventh chords; 3) dominant ninth chord; 4) ninth chords on major scale degrees (ii & vi, vii, I & IV, iii);
B) Dissimilar Chords: 1) with flatted fifth degree; 2) with raised fifth degree;
C) Supplement: Eleventh Chord, only on II in major and minor.

he says, "that to dwell on or to finish a piece with these [dissonant] chords is impossible; they reveal some kind of aspiration, require continuation—their resolution." He explains this resolution through the movement of leading tones. He defines a leading tone as any note that is a half-step away from another note in the scale, or, as he put it in his discussion of scale, half-steps that serve to join tones
between themselves, such as in the key of C, the tones E and F, and B and C. The lower of these pairs of tones, E and B, resolve up to F and C, respectively; and the upper tones, F and C, would then resolve down to E and B, respectively. For example, in F major, the dissonant dominant seventh chord (C–E–G–Bb) contains a lower leading tone, E, which resolves up to F, and an upper leading tone, Bb, which resolves down to A. In other words, the third resolves upwards, and the seventh—like all dissonances except the augmented fifth, Hunke notes—resolves downwards, a common practice for resolving a tritone then and today. In F minor, the Bb would still resolve downwards to the nearest scale tone, the Ab. From this Hunke derives the following rule: When the fundamental bass is raised to the fourth above or lowered to the fifth below, then the major third, the leading tone, is raised a half-step. But based on the manner in which he introduces the whole idea of chord progression, through the resolution of leading tones, his rule should actually read: When the major third, the leading tone, is raised a half-step, then the fundamental bass is raised to the fourth above or lowered to the fifth below. However, he uses this rule to illustrate the resolution of seventh (including diminished) and ninth chords of both the similar and dissimilar groups, and to illustrate the connections between the tonic triad and the upper and lower dominants (dominant and subdominant). Hunke considers the progressions according to this rule as the most natural: "The most natural progression of chords is that which follows the direction of the leading tone." Hunke provides little else by way of suggestions or rules for the progression
of chords. He does note some basic exceptions to his rule, as when a seventh may resolve upwards, and the like. Although his numerous examples within a given key illustrate chord progressions other than those of a fifth or a fourth, he does not explain them.

To explain chord progressions outside a given key, that is, chromatic progressions, he turns immediately to a discussion of modulation. He identifies two kinds—a transfer (перекход), a definitive move into a new key, and modulation, "an unbroken change of harmony, during which the main tone of the main scale is not lost from view." These two types of modulation are identical to Fuchs's types. Transfers may be into near or remote keys. For more remote transfers, he illustrates the utilization of the diminished seventh and augmented sixth chords.

Concerning the augmented sixth chord, Hunke explains not only his method for producing this chord, but also those of others, in a footnote preceding his own explanations:

The origin and formation of the augmented sixth chord is explained differently. Some produce it from the third seventh chord in the view of a four-three chord with the raising of the sixth [Example 6.2a]. Others—from the dominant seventh chord through the lowering by a half-step of the bass note of its four-three chord [Example 6.2b]. Substituting the fifth for the fourth in the four-three chord, A, produces a minor ninth from the fundamental bass forming an augmented sixth chord in the view of six-fives—B. In the four-three chord the arbitrary raising of the sixth or the lowering of the prime is called an alteration of the chord.14

The first explanation outlined above is the one used by Hess de Calvé and Fuchs in his first edition, the second by Fuchs in his second edition.

Hunke's own explanation is somewhat different, but is closer to the second one given above:
The augmented sixth chord appears in three views: in the view of the six-five chord, the four-three chord and the second chord. The augmented six-five chord constitutes the first inversion of the dominant ninth chord of the minor scale with a lowered fifth but without the fundamental bass [Example 6.2c]. The augmented sixth chord in the view of four-three occurs from the dominant seventh chord with the same lowered fifth [Example 6.2d]. In both these views of the augmented sixth chord, the augmented sixth is the leading tone, and the bass note is the lowered fifth of the basic tone. The bass note of the augmented sixth chord six-five and four-three is standing a half-step above the sound in the triad into which the augmented sixth chord is resolved [Example 6.2e]. The greater part of both these chords is resolved into the triad of the dominant of the given scale. The third inversion of the dominant seventh chord with raised fifth forms still one augmented sixth chord, appearing in the view of a second chord [Example 6.2f]. . . . The dominant seventh chord and the augmented sixth chord in the view of six-five sound the same but are written differently [Example 6.2g].

Example 6.2. Hunke: Augmented sixth chords: a) formed from third seventh chord; b) formed from dominant seventh chord on B; c) formed from ninth chord with lowered fifth in minor; d) formed from dominant seventh chord with lowered fifth on G; e) resolutions; f) formed from dominant seventh chord with raised fifth; g) enharmonic similarity between dominant seventh chord and six-five augmented sixth chord.
Hunke's first two "views" of the augmented sixth chord (Example 6.2c-d) conform to present German (IV 6#-5-3) and French (II 6#-4-3) augmented sixth chords. His third view, the four-two chord (Example 6.2f), though it contains the requisite interval (Bb-G#), is not an augmented sixth chord, but simply a dominant seventh chord with an augmented fifth (V 6#-4-2); as an augmented sixth chord it would consist of Bb-D-E-G# or Bb-D-F-G#. Although Hunke does not provide its resolution, as given it should resolve to its tonic, the harmony a 5th below its root. In the exercise and solution for the augmented sixth chord given later in the book, Hunke includes his first two views of the augmented sixth chord (IV 6#-5-3 and II 6#-4-3) but not the third view (V 6#-4-2). Furthermore, Hunke does not clarify the scale degree upon which the augmented sixth chord should be constructed. He only specifies the chord type, the dominant seventh chord, an explanation which, if taken literally, would mean the fifth degree of the scale as the basic note. From the examples, though, it is clear that the augmented sixth chord is constructed on either the second or fourth degree of the scale to which the chord of resolution belongs, but Hunke does not make this clear otherwise. Taking his explanation literally, one would be constructing the chords from the dominant of one scale and resolving them into the dominant of another. Clearly this is not Hunke's intention, but his inattention to this aspect reveals his overemphasis on "chord type" and leading tone resolution.

Hunke's formation of the augmented sixth chord, then, although it involves no subsequent alterations—for he begins with chords already
altered, the dissimilar dominant seventh and ninth chords with lowered (or raised) fifths—is nevertheless inconsistent and inadequate. The previous explanations of this chord given by Hess de Calvé and Fuchs, although also brief and inadequate by current standards, had involved alterations of tones in the basic chord chosen (the third essential seventh chord, or, in Fuchs's second edition, also a unaltered dominant seventh chord), but this chord was not an altered dominant seventh or ninth chord and, unlike Hunke's examples, was constructed consistently on the second tone of the scale, B, and resolved either to a tonic six-four chord (A minor) or root-position dominant chord (E major).

Hunke's theory of harmony, therefore, differs from those of his predecessors in Russia in several ways. Although his harmony guide resembles Fuchs's in format—excluding the section on counterpoint in the latter—in his approach to the classification and connection of chords, his work is unique: he expands the idea of essential chords to include the ninth chord and altered chords (the dissimilar chords) into a far-larger group of basic chords, and he emphasizes the principle of voiceleading through the concept of the resolution of upper and lower leading tones to connect chords. As will be shown in Part IV, Hunke's approach bears a certain resemblance to that of Chaikovsky, particularly in the emphasis on voiceleading and in the formation and resolution of one of the augmented sixth chords. But Hunke's book is not entirely without problems, as we have seen. He is often vague in his statements and altogether too terse in his presentations. Only a very gifted, intuitive student would be able to grasp the principles of harmony from
Hunke's book and apply them successfully in composition.

Hunke's other theoretical writings were also unique at the time. His next three books, published over a period of four years, 1859-1863, were all part of one large work, *Rukovodstvo k sochineniiu muzyki* [A guide to the composition of music]. The three volumes, or sections, are each devoted to different topics---melody (section I), counterpoint (section II), and form (section III).

Although theorists in Russia had written before about counterpoint (Manfredini and Fuchs) and form (Hess de Calvé, Gebel, and Lemokh-Marx; see ahead for discussion of latter two), no theorist had devoted entire volumes to these subjects, nor had any theorist written about these subjects in as much detail as did Hunke. With seventy-eight pages, the section on counterpoint, *O kontrapunkte* [About counterpoint] (1861), is the longest of the three sections. In it Hunke discusses imitation; counterpoint in two to eight voices; double, triple, and quadruple counterpoint; and numerous varieties of fugue and canon. He included examples from the literature, such as fugues by Bach, Mozart, Beethoven, and himself. In the section on form, *O formakh muzykal'nykh proizvedenii* [About the forms of musical works] (1863; sixty-three pages), he discusses briefly all types of instrumental and vocal music, from simple forms such as dances to complex forms such as the concerto and symphonic poem. He devotes forty pages to examples alone—whole pieces, including movements of shorter works by Schumann, Mozart, and Mendelssohn, and the complete first quartet of Beethoven, Op. 18, accompanied by its analysis.
Most theorists in Russia acknowledged melody to be the most important element in music, but few devoted any attention to its study. Hess de Calvé and others believed that melody was a "gift of nature," which could not be analyzed or taught. However, Hunke did not share this view. Having already written a harmony textbook that could serve as the basis for a study of melody, Hunke, in 1859, with his *Uchenie o melodii* [A study about melody], became the first theorist in Russia to attempt a theoretical examination of the essential properties of melody. Hunke was undoubtedly encouraged and influenced in his work by Reicha's important *Traité de mélodie* of 1814. Although Hunke's volume on melody is relatively short, he includes substantial discussions on melodic construction, melodic variation or change, and the aesthetic and expressive qualities of melody. To represent the formal structure of melody, he constructs a three-tiered hierarchy (similar to Reicha's)—two-bar section, four-bar sentence, eight-bar period—which may be expanded to five tiers if the smaller melodic constructions, motive and model (the smallest melodic figure, smaller than a motive) are included. Since Hunke's foremost aim in this volume was to present the information necessary to compose a melody, he devotes much of the text to discussions of the way in which motives and melodies may be varied—through rhythm and accent, syncopation, meter, figuration, transfers (modulation), accompaniment, change of voicing, mode change, and so on. Like Reicha, he was also concerned about the rhythmic structure of a melody, the number and grouping of measures in a period and the distribution of periods within a longer melody or piece of
music. Even his definition of rhythm as given in his harmony guide reflects this concern: "The study about rhythm explains how to join the parts of each melody between themselves, so that they make up one whole, acceptable to our hearing."

Although common in the West, such detailed and contemporary treatments of the topics of melody, counterpoint, and form were unique to Russian-language theoretical literature. Hunke was obviously acquainted with the theoretical works on form by Reicha, Marx and Lobe. Similar works by Russians did not appear until the 1890s, and translations of works by well-known Western theorists such as Marx and Bussler on form and counterpoint did not appear in Russia until the 1870s and 1880s, respectively. But even though Hunke's works were the only works on these topics appearing in the Russian language at this time, it is not known to what extent they were used in Russia. No doubt they were used by amateurs and others, for whom they were intended; and Hunke probably used them in his theory classes in the school of the court choir. They were not adopted for use in the Russian conservatories, newly-formed in the 1860s. However, their being reprinted in 1887 certainly testifies to their popularity.

Hunke, then, contributed a great deal to the development of music theory in Russia, having initially continued the brief but growing tradition towards original harmony textbooks in Russian and then having provided Russia's first internal publications devoted to form, melody and counterpoint. The necessity for and success of such works indicates a growing enthusiasm for books on theory topics. During the
nearly ten years he held his position at the Court Choir in St. Petersburg before the founding of the St. Petersburg Conservatory, Hunke probably came as close as anyone to being St. Petersburg's resident theorist. His unassuming nature would have prevented any promotion of himself or of his field. Whether he was asked to join the faculty of the new Conservatory is not known. He would have been about sixty years old at the time of the founding of the Conservatory. Had he been asked, he may have preferred to remain at the Choir.

As mentioned, his approach to harmony pedagogy bears some resemblance to that expounded by Chaikovsky over twenty years later. Hunke was teaching theory at the Court Choir during the years that Chaikovsky attended the St. Petersburg Conservatory (1861-65), but I know of no direct connection between them. Nonetheless, Chaikovsky had perhaps acquainted himself with Hunke's books either in St. Petersburg or later in Moscow before he undertook to write his own harmony textbook.

Other Foreign Theorists. Other works on harmony and form appeared during this time—the three works previously mentioned by K. Arnol'd, V. Lemokh and F. Gebel, all of which were published in Russia in the 1840s. However, there are questions or problems associated with each of these works. Gebel's book is the least problematic; its only difficulty is that it is unfinished and the available portion does not warrant much attention. Gebel was a well-educated and experienced performer, composer, and teacher. From 1810 to 1813 he was capellmeister of the "Leopoldstadt" theater in Vienna, where he became good
friends with Beethoven, whose music he championed all his life. After two other posts, he arrived in Moscow in 1817 where he taught music and gave concerts and "musical evenings" to further the cause of Beethoven's music and classical music in general in Russia. Gebel's own chamber music, oratorios, and arrangements of Russian folk songs were very popular among Russians. He gave music lessons to many who became leading music litterateurs, such as pianist Alexander Ivanovich Villuan (1804–1878), Tolstoi, Stankevich, Mel'gunov, and E. I. Herzen. The first part of Gebel's Rukovodstvo k sochineniyu muzyki [A guide to the composition of music] was published in Moscow in 1842. Unfortunately, Gebel died the following year and the remaining portions of the book either were never written or published. Included in this first part are sections on tones, scales and intervals, rhythm, performance, and form. His only discussion of a topic related to harmony or to thoroughbass is two pages devoted to the topic of modulation, particularly sudden shifts and unexpected cadences, in the section on performance. Judging from the title of his work, though, he must have planned to include much more in succeeding portions.

Karl Arnol'd's work is disputed as to its authorship. Arnol'd, also a German pianist, composer, and theorist who arrived in St. Petersburg just one year after Gebel moved to Moscow, studied with Fuchs, whose second edition of his book, it is generally acknowledged today, he translated. In 1840 he gave lectures on the history of music, simple counterpoint, and thoroughbass. From 1847 to his death (1873) he lived and worked in Khristianin as organist and conductor.
In 1841 he published his only book, a composition guidebook, *Kratkoe rukovodstvo k izucheniyu pravil kompozitsii* [A short guide to the study of the rules of composition]. Another Arnol'd, Yury Karlovich Arnol'd (unrelated), born in St. Petersburg in 1811, lived there until 1863, and also studied with Fuchs (harmony) and Hunke (counterpoint). His main theoretical work appeared in 1875 (and will be discussed in Part IV); he also wrote many pamphlets and articles devoted to church and folk music, music theory, and music criticism. In his 1875 work, Y. K. Arnol'd credits himself with the translation of Fuchs's work, to which he gave the title *Uchenie muzykal'nogo sochinenii* [The study of musical composition]—an unusual claim to make, considering that he was unable to translate his own book into Russian, having had someone else (one S. Yurev) do the task. In his autobiography, published 1892–93, Y. K. Arnol'd also lists himself as the author of a work entitled *Teoriia muzykal'nogo sochinenii* [The theory of musical composition], published in St. Petersburg in 1841, the same place and time of publication as K. Arnol'd's work. No current biography of Y. K. Arnol'd lists this work as his. Karl Arnol'd died in 1873; and from 1871 Y. K. Arnol'd lived in Moscow, where Karl Arnol'd was not known. Is it possible that Y. K. Arnol'd, whom some believe to be a questionable musical authority, "appropriated" the other Arnol'd's works and began passing them off as his own? Or was there some honest confusion between the names G. K. Arnol'd (Gerr or Herr Karl Arnol'd) and Yury (also known as Georgy) Karlovich Arnol'd? Given the limited information available, one can only speculate.
The question of honesty and true authorship also arises in connection with the book by V. O. Lemokh, a pianist and teacher who lived in Moscow from 1824; his place of birth and nationality are unknown. In 1848 he published under his own name a Russian translation of A. B. Marx's *Allgemeine Musiklehre* (Leipzig, 1839). Lemokh's version, titled *Obsochee rukovodstvo k izucheniiu muziki* [A general guide to the study of music], was, according to Lemokh, "published according to the guide-book of Marx," as he acknowledged on the title page. A comparison of Lemokh's book of 1848 with Marx's book of 1839 indicates that in form and substance they are very nearly identical. The major distinction between the two books is that Lemokh paraphrased and shortened Marx's text, while the definitions and explanations, as well as the order of their presentation, remain basically the same. Discrepancies occur mainly where Lemokh made errors of misinterpretation or omission. Lemokh took credit for the book above and beyond that given to a translator probably to underscore the fact that the book was not a verbatim translation but a slightly abbreviated version of Marx's book. Certainly he suffered no disgrace because of his decision. A complete translation (by Faminstyn) of Marx's work was finally published in St. Petersburg in 1872.

The Theory Education of Mikhail Glinka: Siegfried Dehn. Despite the steady proliferation of opportunities for Russians to study music theory in Russia during the first half of the nineteenth century, either privately with the many foreign music teachers who flocked to
Russia to make careers for themselves, in school (with some of the same teachers), or independently, using one of the theory texts designed for that purpose (and being published with greater and greater frequency), the best music education was still to be obtained abroad. Russia's most famous composer during this time, M. I. Glinka, received his most valued theoretical training not at home but abroad.

His early teachers were all foreigners living in Russia, beginning with a German governess who gave him his first piano lessons. He subsequently studied piano with John Field, A. Aumann (a pupil of Field's), Karl Zeuner (with whom theoretical studies—namely on the intervals and their inversions—did not progress too well), and Charles Mayer. He had a few lessons in theory with Fuchs, but for the most part, his studies in theory and composition were negligible, as he himself acknowledged:

As for composition generally, thoroughbass, counterpoint, and other conditions basic to a good method of composing, my ideas were so indefinite that I took up my pen without even knowing how to begin, nor how and where to go. . . . At that time the celebrated contrapuntist Miller* was in St. Petersburg, but somehow I did not meet him. Who knows? Perhaps it was for the best. Severe German counterpoint does not always mix well with sprightly fantasy.

*Translator's note: Johann-Heinrich Miller (1780-1827), student of music theory, composer, pianist and violinist. In 1803, he settled in St. Petersburg, where among his pupils in the theory of composition were A. A. Alyabiev, A. N. Verstovsky, A. S. Griboedov, Mikhail Y. Vielgorsky and V. F. Odoevsky.126

Later, in 1828, when Glinka decided he needed to study counterpoint and other theory subjects after all, he took lessons in composition with the son of an Italian singer in St. Petersburg, Zamboni:

He gave me an Italian text and forced me to write arias, recitatives and so on, also 2-voiced fugues without words. I was not
able to boast about these last experiments, though I was already acquainted with The Well-Tempered Clavier of Seb. Bach.27

Glinka's lessons with Zamboni were apparently not very fruitful. The fugues Glinka mentioned and some other contrapuntal exercises stemming from his lessons with Zamboni have been published. They indicate that while Glinka knew how to write simple counterpoint, he did not know how to write a good fugue.

During what turned out to be his last stop on his European journey, in Berlin in 1833, Glinka studied composition for five months with the theorist Siegfried Wilhelm Dehn. According to Glinka's description of his studies, writing "severe German counterpoint" turned out to be not so detrimental:

In a very short time he had discovered the degree of my knowledge and capacities and decided first to set me to writing three- and then four-part fugues, or, more exactly, skeletons, extracts of fugues without text on themes by well-known composers, requiring that I follow the rules adopted for this type of composition, that is, observance of exposition, stretta, and pedal. He put my theoretical knowledge in more orderly shape and wrote out for me in his own hand the science of harmony, or thorough bass, the science of melody, or counterpoint, and instrumentation—all in four little notebooks. I wanted to have them printed, but Dehn would not give his consent. There is no doubt that I am more indebted to Dehn than to any of my other teachers; as a critic for the Leipzig music journal he could bring some order not only to my knowledge of music but also to my ideas about art in general, and as a result of his lessons I began to work no longer in the dark but with understanding. Moreover, he did not torment me with pedantic nonsense or overstrict reliance on systems—on the contrary, nearly every lesson showed me something new and worthwhile.29

Glinka later loaned Dehn's theoretical notebooks to Dargomyzhsky, who also found them useful. Unfortunately, only the portion devoted to counterpoint and a segment of the portion devoted to instrumentation (the trombone) have survived to the present day, in a copy made by
Glinka; the portion on harmony has been lost. However, fifty chorale harmonizations by Glinka, done under Dehn's supervision, have been preserved; and they, along with the remaining notebooks, have been published as well. Included in the same volume is a short essay on the fugue, attributed—not without controversy—to Glinka. These theoretical exercises, fragments, and notes constitute the most complete information available on Glinka's early theoretical studies. Glinka studied again with Dehn, in the fall and winter of 1856-57; this time he concentrated on composition using the church modes. Many of the exercises he wrote at this time have also been published.

The notes on counterpoint by Dehn include the following topics: canon, double counterpoint (at the octave, ninth, tenth, eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth), triple counterpoint, quadruple counterpoint, imitation, and fugue (all aspects). It includes few examples, but makes general references to the works of Lotti, A. and D. Scarlatti, Bach, Handel, Joseph and Michael Haydn, and Mozart, and specific references to works of Bach and Mozart. It is a basic condensation of all information necessary for a complete study of counterpoint.

The essay on fugue attributed to Glinka, in contrast to Dehn's notes, contains numerous examples, both from the literature and otherwise, accompanying only basic information on counterpoint and the formal structure of a fugue. Complete fugues by Simon Fochter (organ), Hunke (four-part chorus), and Mendelssohn (piano) are given as representative examples for different modes of performance. Each of these examples is accompanied by a short explanation of its structure.
Glinka's chorale harmonizations are worked out strictly within the key; he used only triads and seventh chords (root position and inversions) on all degrees of the scale (no altered notes or chords). Within these limitations, though, Glinka exhibited variety and ingenuity, while adhering to the necessary voice-leading principles.

Under Dehn's guidance, then, Glinka carried out a traditional course of study, without, apparently, some of the constraints necessary for younger or less experienced students, which Glinka felt were disruptive to his innate compositional skill and talent. Although he was called back to Russia after only five months in Berlin because of a family problem, his studies with Dehn—however brief—put him on as sure a theoretical footing as he had ever been; he did not feel the need for further studies until twenty-two years later, when he returned to Berlin to study once again with Dehn.

Dehn had other Russian pupils, the Rubinstein brothers, Anton and Nicholas, both of whom studied with Dehn in the years 1844-46 at the recommendation of Mendelssohn, then the director of the Royal Academy of Music. Anton Rubinstein also judged Dehn's pedagogical approach very highly:

As to Dehn, my teacher in counterpoint, of whom Glinka afterward took lessons (Dehn outlived him, dying soon after 1860 [sic]), he was undoubtedly the finest teacher in harmony in Europe. Marks [i.e. A. B. Marx], another of my instructors, of whom in accordance with the advice of Mendelssohn and Meyerbeer I took lessons in the theory of music, was inferior to him. . . . Dehn was a fine scholar in his line, and had a facility for imparting knowledge. Dehn had other famous pupils besides Glinka, among whom were Friedrich Kiel and many others. He was really quite an original character. I took but few lessons from him, however, for in 1846, when but a youth of sixteen, I started alone for Vienna.
Rubinstein must have learned much from Dehn during his few lessons, for he subsequently taught some of the theory courses at the St. Petersburg Conservatory in the 1860s. Dehn's own theory text, *Theoretisch-praktisch-charmonielehre, mit angefügten Generalbass Beispielen*, published in Berlin in 1840, however, was never used at the Conservatories, nor was it ever translated into Russian.

Although Dehn's book is outside the mainstream of this present study, his influence through his pedagogical activity on the future course of Russian music cannot be overlooked. The irony of Dehn's pedagogical efforts with his Russian students lies in his involvement with the two opposing forces of Russian music of the nineteenth century, which culminated, on the one side—through Anton Rubinstein—in the European-cosmopolitan music of Chaikovsky and other conservatory-trained musicians, and, on the other side, in the Russian-folk-influenced music of the self-trained "five," who took up Glinka's mantle. This bifurcation was later resolved somewhat, in part due to the efforts of Rimsky-Korsakov regarding the necessity of conservatory training for composers; but during the 1860s and 1870s the divisions were all too clear-cut. Dehn was probably not the last foreign pedagogue abroad on whom Russian musicians depended for their education; his being known in this regard is due to the subsequent fame of his pupils. That his talents were needed at all underlines the still-inadequate Russian system of higher music education during this period. Only the wealthiest (Glinka) or the most precocious (the Rubinstein) could afford such an opportunity. And once educated, Russian musicians...
still faced more hurdles: they were paid less than visiting foreigners, their works were performed less in public, and they were regarded as nothing more than paid servants by the nobility who supported them. Anton Rubinstein was particularly galled by these inequities, and took steps to correct them, which ultimately led to the founding of the first Russian conservatory. Even so, it was some years after this accomplishment in 1861 that the foreign domination in education, composition, and performance was replaced by native traditions. Only after the first generation of conservatory graduates began to take their places as performers, teachers, writers, and composers did this change come about.
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Summary to Part III

Thus, during the period 1830-1860, Russia's musical world grew in both stature and sophistication, particularly in the areas of performance and composition. In the field of music theory, important steps towards the improvement and dissemination of music theory in Russia were taken: The number of classes in music theory and composition increased; theory pedagogues initiated public lectures on theoretical topics; answering to a definite need, theorists began to publish original, detailed and useful theory textbooks in Russian; and Russian journalists and scholars turned to writing critical, historical, and theoretical articles on music. Although foreigners living in Russia dominated many of these activities, more and more educated and talented Russians came to take part in them, thereby contributing to the musical life and education in Russia, and establishing the basis for the eventual appearance of a Russian discipline of music theory.

The German Fuchs and the Hungarian Hunke became the leading theory pedagogues of their respective times in St. Petersburg, Fuchs during the 1830s and 1840s, and Hunke during the 1850s and 1860s. Both theorists advanced the level of theory pedagogy in Russia through their concise and comprehensible approaches to harmonic theory and made
original contributions to theory pedagogy in Russia. Fuchs's most notable contribution concerns the simplification of chord construction, based on Weber's ground harmonies. Hunke's contribution may be attributed to his attention to the fundamentals of voice-leading, and to his expansion of the basic chord vocabulary. Despite certain problems with their works, their efforts nonetheless made considerable improvements over Hess de Calvé's earlier venture, and endeared them to their many students and colleagues. Through their books and lessons, these pedagogues promoted the study of music theory and, most importantly, made such study available to increasing numbers of music students, some of whom became prominent musicians, scholars, or writers themselves. They thus formed a crucial link between the earliest attempts to provide opportunities for theory study in Russia, beginning with translations and a few classes, and the successful effort to establish the first formal study of theory and other music subjects with the opening of the Conservatories in the 1860s. The prominent Russian musicians from the privileged classes only wanted to study music, not to teach it. For this they relied on Russians from the lower classes or on foreigners; the latter probably held more prestige and status than the former. Had they remained in their native countries, Fuchs and Hunke may possibly not have achieved much prominence in their field; but since they chose to work where their talents were so greatly needed, they acquired success while at the same time contributing much to the growth of music in Russia.

The last few years of this period, the late 1850s, encompassed a
time of great change in Russian society, change that was felt among the musical establishment as well. Russia's defeat in the Crimean War seriously impaired both Russia's military prestige and her foreign influence, and brought about a reappraisal of both foreign and internal affairs and policies. At the same time the death of Nicholas I and the accession to the throne of the new tsar Alexander II in 1855 ushered in a new era with many changes, not the least of which was the subsequent push toward modernization and the resulting abolition of serfdom, significant elements that contributed to a more liberal, freer atmosphere in the climate of the day, and helped to create conditions favorable to new developments in the musical world, such as the founding of the Russian Musical Society in St. Petersburg in 1859, the organization that two years later provided the foundation for Russia's first music conservatory. Also, Glinka died in 1857, just as a new generation of composers was rising up to take his place. (Among older composers, Dargomyzhsky and Anton Rubinstein were both active at this time, as was Serov, although he composed his most successful compositions—his operas—in the 1860s.) Thus, from a musical viewpoint, an era came to an end with the close of this decade. While in some respects the next decade, the 1860s, may be seen as the inevitable culmination of the previous thirty years, in many more respects it is the beginning of a new age, an age in which Russian musicians, composers, educators, writers and others came to reign in areas previously dominated by foreigners. The next forty years witnessed this achievement, which is explored in Part IV.
PART IV

THE CONSERVATORIES

AND

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A RUSSIAN MUSIC THEORY, 1860–1900
INTRODUCTION TO PART IV

The forty-year period from 1860 to 1900 encompassed the full reigns of two tsars, Alexander II (1855-1881) and Alexander III (1881-1894), plus nearly one-third of the reign of the last tsar, Nicholas II (1894-1915). The social, political, and economic changes brought about under the two Alexanders created within themselves a kind of social revolution. Not only the abolition of serfdom in 1861—and the accompanying land reform—but also the reform of the zemstvo (local government) and the courts in 1864, and the introduction of universal military service in 1874 affected the whole of Russian society, creating a more democratic society and more capitalist economy. These liberating elements essentially destroyed the "old order" of the nobility, eroding their power and privilege. In its place grew a new social class of intelligentsia, which at first consisted of intellectuals connected with the press and the universities, both of which grew during Alexander II's reign, and later was fueled by the growth of the raznochints, or individuals not belonging to any particular class—descendents of educated merchants or peasants, descendents of clergy or civil servants who desired different vocations, and descendents of once-grand noblemen. The leaders of this new class called for radical
political and social changes, and eventually succeeded in assassinating Alexander II. The reign of his son, Alexander III, therefore, was characterized by distrust and repression of the intelligentsia and their liberal views. Minorities, including Jews, were suspect, and an attempt was made to resuscitate the power of the nobility, an unpopular move among the other classes. But, despite further measures to improve the lot of the peasant, and to reform labor and finance, the resulting political opposition and social discontent among the people lead to disastrous consequences for the government in the twentieth century.

Developments of the greatest significance for Russian musical life and education took place within this forty-year period, resulting in the creation, finally, of a Russian musical culture that soon achieved a world-wide status. The eminent Russian composers, performers, teachers, critics, historians, and theorists of this period were all either early participants in or products of a culture that owed much of its impetus to the most profound change in musical education to date—the founding of the conservatories in St. Petersburg and Moscow in the 1860s. Without this vital step, Russian musical life and culture would never have been able so quickly to overcome its predominantly amateur level of music-making and rise to the professional standards it soon achieved. The more liberal era in the late 1850s and early 1860s provided an atmosphere conducive to such an important change in music education. In the field of music theory, the conservatories provided the opportunities necessary for the training of future Russian theorists. Indeed, the prominent Russian theorists of this period—Peter
I'lich Chaikovsky, Nikolai Andreevich Rimsky-Korsakov, Anton
Stepanovich Arensky, Mikhail Mikhailovich Ippolitov-Ivanov, Georgy
Eduardovich Conus, and Sergei Ivanovich Taneev—were closely associated
with the conservatories, first as students (with the exception of
Rimsky-Korsakov) and later as teachers.

But, as we shall see, the establishment of a higher-level music
education for Russians initially did not go unopposed. This division
among musicians concerning methods of music pedagogy gave rise to
heated debates specifically about theory pedagogy. The replacement of
the long-standing Russian tradition of the freedom of self-study or of
individual instruction in music theory and composition with large
classes, required courses, a foreign curriculum, more foreign teachers
and textbooks, an emphasis on written work and exercises based on
prescribed rules, and the granting of diplomas for music composition
seemed anathematic, threatening, and anti-Russian to those nationalists
who opposed such changes, such as the great critics Alexander
Nikolaevich Serov (1820–1871), Vladimir Vasilevich Stasov (1824–1906),
But, given the other changes taking place in Russian society, such a
step was inevitable, since the "old order" could no longer continue to
support the level of music education needed to entertain them and since
the new classless society demanded more equal treatment. Anton
Rubinstein was one of the latter, but even among his followers and
proponents of the Conservatory, educative methods for music theory
varied.
During this time, Russian music theory developed along original lines only in the pedagogical, rather than speculative, sphere. Most Russian theorists made no concerted effort to move out of the tradition of pedagogical theory established by their foreign predecessors into a more speculative, scholarly theory. The exceptions to this, interestingly enough, occurred mainly in the field of folk or native music, where scholars were less reticent to apply more unusual approaches, although these too were usually borrowed from the West. This provides an interesting contrast between an established native pedagogical music theory on one side, and a rudimentary scholarly- and Western-based folk music theory on the other. But also in the more speculative non-folk theory, there occurred some isolated cases of Western-oriented Russian theorists who borrowed and built speculative theoretical approaches on the theories of Western scholars (and who thereby worked much as had their earlier foreign counterparts in the pedagogical sphere). Although the work of these theorists was precient of future developments in Russian music theory, during this period it was not influential.

A contrast of a different sort may be observed between approaches to theory based on empiricism—mainly in pedagogical theory (as in Chaikovsky, for example), but also in folk music theory to some extent—and those based on scientific facts, on rationalism, namely, acoustics, which was applied in both speculative or folk music theory. Several theorists, including those interested in folk music, wanted to develop a music theory based on universal, scientific "laws," not the empirically-founded givens of current pedagogical theory; and so, stim-
ulated by Helmholtz's recent discoveries in the field of acoustics, they turned to acoustical theory in their search for this scientific foundation. But acoustics was able to provide only a portion of this foundation, eventually causing these theorists to look elsewhere for the remainder. The resulting mixture of proven scientific and unproven non-scientific approaches did not provide the universal "lawful" foundation for which they were searching. Nonetheless, their attempts stimulated to some extent the continuing development of a more scholarly, scientific Russian music theory, which eventually came to fruition in the twentieth century.

Thus we find during this period several trends, in what may be described as the second stage in the development of an original Russian music theory. In the first stage, encompassing the period 1770-1860, foreign pedagogues and foreign theory texts prevailed. During this second stage, from 1860 to 1900, native Russian theorists came to dominate, with a mixture of Western and original material. The emphasis on pedagogical theory continued, but, in contrast to the first stage, in which the theorists were independent foreigners who derived their theories from Western approaches, these later theorists were Russians working within the Conservatories and on original approaches. The search by Russian theorists for other non-pedagogical theoretical approaches—acoustical, speculative, folk, etc.—developed much the same as had the earlier pedagogical theory by foreign theorists—that is, based on Western-derived theory by theorists from outside the Conservatory establishment—but with the important difference of na-
tional origin, since the later theorists were all Russian. The third stage of development, dominated by Russian theorists working on original speculative approaches, began tentatively in the 1880s and 1890s, but the results did not appear until the first decade of the twentieth century. Therefore most of the period discussed in this chapter, 1860–1900, the second stage of development, is characterized by apprenticeship and experimentation in the speculative sphere of theory and by solid, long-lasting achievements in the pedagogical sphere of theory. As before, then, pedagogical theory makes up the bulk of the theory under discussion. However, because these were original and effective approaches developed by native theorists, their present and future significance for Russian music theory is far greater than that of previous pedagogical approaches imported from Europe.
Chapter 7

The 1860s: The Founding of the First Russian Conservatories

In music education, music theory, and composition, the decade of the 1860s was a transitional one. Concerning music education, the move to establish the two Russian conservatories engendered strong opposition chiefly among the nationalists (discussed in greater detail in the next chapter); consequently, many old methods of study and education, those antithetical to the ones being encouraged at the conservatories, continued to be utilized and promoted. In music theory, despite the numbers of theory students in the conservatories, only a few important theory books, Hunke's works and two works by Russians—all the culmination of previous research or trends—and some translations (five) were published. In composition, although Glinka was dead, Anton Rubinstein, Alexander Nikolaevich Serov (1820–1871), and Alexander Sergeevich Dargomyzhsky (1813–1869) were still actively composing; and Petr I'llich Chaikovsky (1840–1893) and the group later known as moguchaia kuchka, "the mighty handful" or "the five"—Mily Alekseevich Balakirev (1837–1910), Alexander Porfir'evich Borodin (1833–1887), Cesar Antonovich Cui (1835–1918), Modest Petrovich Musorgsky (1839–1881), and Nikolai Andreevich Rimsky-Korsakov (1844–1908)—were just beginning their
careers as composers in the 1860s. Music criticism was also still
developing. While Prince Vladimir Odoevsky had been writing criticism
since the 1820s, Stasov and Serov had just begun their careers as
critics the previous decade; and Hermann Avgustovich Larosh (1845–
1904), the third member of this "troika" of influential music critics
in nineteenth-century Russia, only began to write in the 1860s.

Anton Rubinstein and the Conservatories. The inadequacies of
musical education in Russia and the lack of professional standards for
musicians described by Hess de Calvé in 1818 and Struisky in 1830 had
not changed appreciably by the 1850s; and Anton Rubinstein in particu-
lar was distressed by this. It was through his efforts and the support
of his patroness, the Grand Duchess Elena, and other notables such as
Prince Odoevsky, that the first Russian conservatory of music finally
opened in St. Petersburg in 1861.

Rubinstein had personally experienced the degradation of being a
musician in Russia, unable to make an adequate wage and without any
social or legal status. Being the exceptional musician that he was, he
objected to the paltry attempts of "amateurs" who composed or performed
music and called themselves musicians. He also objected to the lack of
a system of higher music education in Russia and to the resulting
trouble and expense necessary to educate oneself in music. He and his
brother Nikolai had pursued their music education in Europe. Lack of
money or of the right opportunity was therefore a barrier to such an
education. Language was also a problem for many would-be music stu-
dents, especially those from lower-class families, as we saw in the previous chapter. The dearth of Russian music teachers and the abundance of foreigners, who most frequently gave lessons in their native languages, gave rise to this inequity. In addition, for nearly all amateurs—whether composers or performers—the subject most likely to be neglected in their music education turned out to be music theory. The reasons for this neglect were not just laziness, as earlier commentators had pointed out, but also opposition to any sort of pedantry or scholasticism, which theory with its rules certainly seemed to be, and chauvinism, aimed at the foreign pedagogues who brought in this predominantly German pedantry with them. As it turns out, Fuchs and Hunke were successful not only because they were the best theory teachers, but because they almost thoroughly integrated themselves into Russian society. Their theory was foreign, yes, but always written specifically for a Russian audience.

Most of these views Rubinstein expressed publicly, in an article entitled "O muzyke v Rossii" [About music in Russia], published in the journal Vek [The Century] in early 1861, eight months before the St. Petersburg Conservatory was finally opened. In Rubinstein's view, in Russia the study of music was taken up only by amateurs, that is, those who by their birth or social position do not make their daily bread from it, but study it only for their own pleasure. ... In Russia there are almost no artist-musicians in the usual sense of this word. This occurs because at this time our government does not give to the musical art the same privileges enjoyed by the other arts, such as painting, sculpture and others, [and] does not give to those who study music the title of artist.
Amateurs, then, studied only those aspects of music that pleased them; aesthetically, they did not involve themselves in the deep, serious side of the art of music, and technically, they ignored the study of the most fundamental aspects of theory and composition, which they associated with the worst sort of dogmatic, foreign (German) pedantism.

To illustrate the problem, Rubinstein composed a grim scenario:

Let an amateur succeed in composing one romance, with a more or less successful content, and he will consider himself already a musician. Woe to those who will want to persuade him that his melody, though easy and acceptable, does not correspond to the words of the romance, that in the accompaniment there are mistakes in harmony, that lengthy study is needed in order to compose even a small piece. The amateur will look with disdain at ill-intentioned criticism, publish his romance, compel some singer of the Italian opera to sing it, start to judge art and artists as the very best judge, will be made a musical celebrity of the town, will continually compose romances, not noting that they are repetitions of one and the same melody, will not wish to investigate thoroughly the rules of harmony and composition, will begin to show that only melody has merit in music and all the rest is German pedantism, and will finish with composing an opera. But, willy-nilly, having guessed, that for the composition of an opera still something besides melody is necessary, he will start to read Fétis, Marx, The Art of Instrumentation by Berlioz, and with the help of these books and some works of the great composers his opera will soon be ready.2

But, as Rubinstein points out, to write an opera requires a commitment greater than most amateurs were willing to make or even to understand.

There are, it is true, amateurs who study music theory, but also in this they do not act as true artists. To them the path is not the rules but the exceptions, and once having accepted these latter, they do not abandon them. Thus, for example, in some work of a great composer there is a progression of harmony of some false form—the amateur will make a rule of this, will write only false harmonies, not taking into consideration that in a great composer this occurred from an excess of inspiration, that in him this cry of despair or rapture is a logical consequence of the entire composition. The amateur will do this only for his own pleasure and will deeply study what in the theory of art is considered accidental.3
All this is not entirely the fault of the amateurs themselves, but also the fault of the educators and parents:

[Parents] know well that the intellectual education of man requires several years, but, in the matter of music education, submitting themselves to such conditions is distinguished by terrible impatience. The student takes several lessons and already they wish that he perform an effective piece; each month they hire a better teacher, do not turn their attention to the efforts of a conscientious teacher to instill in the pupil a taste and understanding for music, and thrust on him their own opinions, depriving the recalcitrant of their high favor. The majority of foreign teachers, settling in Russia in time, necessary for enrichment and wishing, as many earlier, to serve the disposition of the parents, very superficially pass by the boring, basic rules of music, and attempt only that the student study some fashionable piece; all the basic rules, without which it is impossible to make a musician, either are neglected by them completely, or are studied by them for a very insignificant time. 4

Parental pressure, then, could exert a harmful influence on a child's music education. Rubinstein's description provides an additional explanation for the reason why so few foreign pedagogues were as influential as Fuchs and Hurke. Other factors included isolation, the lack of talented pupils, and quite possibly their own inadequacies.

This article elicited, as might be expected, much unfavorable response, particularly by the eminent music critics Serov and Stasov (see below); but unfortunately the conditions described by Rubinstein did prevail at the time. The neglect of the study of music theory for whatever reasons—laziness, lack of interest, the mistaken notion of theory as overly pedantic, parental pressure, financial need, lack of opportunity, language barriers—is corroborated at that time by the small number of really good native composers, the very small number of good theory books published, and the almost complete lack of eminent Russian musicians qualified to teach or to write about music theory.
To solve these problems, Rubinstein proposed the founding of a conservatory. By the time this article appeared on January 4, 1861, he and others had already formed the Russian Musical Society in St. Petersburg in May 1859, and through the article he hoped to promote wider public support for the new conservatory that he knew would be instituted. The Society was formed in order "to assist the dissemination of music education in Russia, to promote the development of all branches of musical art and to encourage talented Russian artists (composers and performers) and teachers of musical subjects."

The Society sponsored concerts beginning in November 1859, and opened free classes in music fundamentals and singing in the spring of 1860. The following academic year, 1860-61, classes were expanded to include elementary music theory and practical composition as well as piano, violin and cello, and were held in the palace of the Society's patroness, the Grand Duchess Elena. A small fee was charged. These classes formed the basis for the St. Petersburg Conservatory, which Alexander II finally authorized in October 1861 with Rubinstein as its director. The conservatory formally opened in the fall of 1862.

The new conservatory provided professional training for instrumentalists, singers, and composers. Courses in solfeggio and choral singing, piano, music history, literature, and aesthetics were obligatory for everyone. Theory courses in harmony, counterpoint, fugue, composition, and instrumentation were proposed and offered as the students progressed; by 1865, the year of the first graduation, the full spectrum of theory courses had become available. The full conservatory
course was a six-year program, but credit for earlier courses taken at the Russian Musical Society was given so that those students who began in 1860 at the Society were able to graduate in 1865. Through graduation from the conservatory, Russian musicians received not only certification of their professional training, which for the first time was in their native language, but also acquired the rank of Free Artist, which gave them a social and legal standing commensurate with that of artists in other fields.

Since so few Russian musicians had sufficient training or knowledge to teach at the conservatory, most of the professors hired initially were foreigners. Many of those, though, had already lived in Russia for many years and were able to teach in Russian, a requirement that Rubinstein stressed. It was not long, though, before the faculty was predominantly Russian. Of the three theory professors who began teaching in 1862, one was Russian, one Polish and one Danish. The Russian, Konstantin Nikolaevich Liadov (1820-1871, father of composer Anatoly Liadov), a well-known conductor and choirmaster at the Russian Opera in St. Petersburg, received his own training at the St. Petersburg Theatrical School. He taught music theory fundamentals and choral singing at the conservatory for two years, 1862-64. Otto Ivanovich Diutch (1823-1863), a Danish musician who came to Russia after graduation from the Leipzig Conservatory in 1847, where he studied composition with Mendelssohn, was also a conductor, choirmaster, and composer, and taught at the St. Petersburg Theatrical School. He taught theory at the Conservatory for just one year, until his untimely
death. As head of the Department of the Theory of Composition, Rubinstein appointed a German-trained musician from Poland, Nicholas Ivanovich Zaremba (1821-79), who had already led the theory classes at the Russian Musical Society school from 1859. Zaremba had studied composition in Berlin with A. B. Marx, and followed his methods faithfully. For counterpoint, though, he used a textbook of Heinrich Bellermann's (at Rubinstein's wish, according to Hermann Larosh).

Rubinstein, for his part, was proud of his choice of Zaremba:

And surely it was surprising that the theory of music was to be taught for the first time in the Russian language in our Conservatory. Professor Zaremba, a Protestant and something of a fanatic, taught it in Russian. Hitherto, if any one wished to study it, he was obliged to take lessons from a foreigner, or to go to Germany. ... Zaremba understood his business thoroughly, and his services were invaluable to the Conservatory.

One of Zaremba's first pupils, first at the Russian Musical Society and then at the Conservatory, was Chaikovsky. According to the composer's friend Larosh, Zaremba did not influence Chaikovsky in any way:

Neither in Chaikovsky the composer, nor in Chaikovsky the professor, do we find any subsequent traces of Zaremba's teaching. This is the more remarkable, because the composer went to him as a beginner to be grounded in the rudiments of musical theory, so that he had every opportunity of making a deep and lasting impression.

Rubinstein hired two more theory teachers in 1863—Andrei Ivanovich Evgen'ev (1833-1890) and Ignatius Kasperovich Voyachek (1825-1916). Evgen'ev, a Russian who had studied theory with Hunke after his graduation in 1849 from the St. Petersburg Theatrical School, taught theory at the Conservatory for one year. Voyachek came to Russia in
the 1850s from his native Czechoslovakia. He had worked as a conductor, choirmaster, and organist in the Michaelovsky Theater in St. Petersburg; but from 1863 to 1912 he taught music theory, instrumentation, and score reading at the Conservatory.

Rubinstein believed in the strict Germanic approach to teaching, particularly of theoretical subjects, he having received instruction in a similar fashion from Siegfried Dehn in Berlin. In fact, he modeled the new Conservatory after such well-known German conservatories as the Leipzig Conservatory, and staffed it with Western-trained professors with similar views. As we shall see, Rubinstein's own musical outlook in general remained Western and conservative, a view some other musicians in St. Petersburg opposed. They considered the Conservatory to be a hotbed of Western conservatism and German pedantry.

**Anti-Conservatory Views: Stasov and Serov.** The critics Vladimir Vasilievich Stasov and Alexander Nikolaevich Serov numbered among the opposition to Rubinstein and his Conservatory, and expressed their views in print. They both rushed to publish articles in February 1861, replying to Rubinstein's attack on musical life in Russia the previous month; and they continued their opposition even after both Conservatories—in St. Petersburg and Moscow—were well established. In reply to Rubinstein's article, they directed much enmity towards Rubinstein himself, considering him to be, at the very least, a foreigner (his mother was a German and a Jew) and a court favorite, who held dangerous misconceptions about Russia and its musical life. Stasov states flat-
ly, "The entire article is composed of thoughts and reasonings, in which the truth and facts are so lacking, that it is impossible to wish it success in the reading public."

They both challenged Rubinstein's contention concerning amateurism among Russian composers, pointing in defense to their belief that Russia was no different from any other European country in this regard. Revealing his Slavic prejudice, Serov boldly claims: "And so—'summa summarum'—the musical life of Petersburg stands completely on the same level as also in other premier European capitals." Serov called Russian musicians not amateurs but "honorable professionals," the large majority of whom study music not for a piece of bread, not by an accidental necessity of life, but work in the artistic field strictly for the love of art and for an inner, innate attraction. . . . How bold these people are to be something in art not because of bread . . . how bold they are to compose music, not having learned it by all the scholarly methods, in some German school or French Conservatory, how bold they are to discuss music and its theory publicly, not having a professional patent!"

Serov felt so strongly about Rubinstein's accusations concerning the amateur musician's attitude, status, and education because he considered himself to be an "honorable professional" talented enough to compose operas and knowledgeable enough to write about theory without ever having studied it formally or systematically. Serov saw nothing wrong in pursuing the study and composition of music not for one's livelihood but for the sheer pleasure of it, and in fact considered the latter reason more noble than the former. He did not oppose lengthy study, though, only certain methods of that study:

Who stands to argue, that music, as any of the arts, has its technique, which a musical talent must completely master, feeling in himself the need to be made a true artist? Who stands to argue
that art does not dodge him with time, that it requires huge and constant study, work the entire life—ars longa, vita brevis? . . . Is it not funny to regret the non-existence of a musical "guild" in such a country where, of the circle of people taking up music, not for a piece of bread but only for one's own pleasure [quoting Rubinstein], appeared such melodically-rich talents as Varlam, Verstovsky—such original and completely worked out talents as Glinka and Dargomyzhsky?  

Russians, he continues, do not need a "pedantic ruler," "being satisfied with models, existing in art, and being developed normally, independently, without school directions." Serov's idea of a music education, particularly in theory, involves primarily the study of such models independently, without the distraction of a conservatory atmosphere. His views on theory education will be discussed shortly.

Like Serov, Stasov believed the founding of a conservatory to be unnecessary: "The founding of a conservatory and the success of art—still are not completely synonymous; the latter still depends on the former not at all." He saw conservatories and other similar institutions as being retrogressive and stifling to artistic growth:

Perhaps Mr. Rubinstein does not know the opinions taking root in much of Europe today, that academies and conservatories serve only as breeding-grounds for persons without talent and promote the affirmation of harmful ideas and tastes in art. Therefore the best minds also are searching for means in the matter of artistic education to manage without the higher teaching institutions. . . . Universities . . . communicate only knowledge; [conservatories] do not wish to be satisfied with this and meddle with very bad form in the creation of the artists being educated, extend despotic influence (from which nothing may defend him) in the mould and form of his works, attempt to give him their direction, derive them in well-known academic measure, transfer to him their well-known habits and, finally, what is worst of all, get their hands on the very concept of a young artist, thrust on him opinions about artistic works and their authors, from which it is subsequently impossible or infinitely difficult for a man, who has dedicated himself to art, to escape. In view of such capital insufficiencies of all academies and conservatories in general today, it is recognized correctly to consider them still more
dangerous than useful for the development of art; history shows too clearly, that they moved a whole generation not forward, but backwards.17

As further proof of the unnecessary existence of conservatories, Stasov points to the poor results obtained from the graduates of foreign conservatories teaching in Russia at that time:

Concerning teachers of music, ours are all foreigners; they all studied in their country in conservatories similar to those proposed by Rubinstein. Why, it is asked, in spite of a constant and huge influx to them into [our country], it occurs to Rubinstein all the same to complain about our bad music education? If the conservatories were such true means for the inculcation of music education, as Rubinstein believes, then the huge phalanx of teachers appearing here to this day through our borders from conservatories long ago should have brought enormous usefulness and produced a basic revolution. Why does Rubinstein assume that teachers coming from local conservatories would be better than those the foreign countries have sent here?18

Of course, the mere fact that the presence of conservatory-trained foreign pedagogues in Russia did not improve Russia's level of music education is not in itself sufficient reason for the condemnation of conservatories in general. As we have seen, other reasons, which Stasov does not mention—lack of motivation and interest, laziness, theory as pedantry, parental pressure, financial concerns, lack of opportunity, language barriers—are to blame for the poor state of Russian music education. However, attempting to bolster his argument, Stasov looks to Germany as an example, pointing out that there it was not just the conservatories, which other countries have as well, that made Germany first among nations in music: "Deeper elements took part in the creation of this first place, elements that succeeded in producing splendid results in spite of the existence of the conservatories." 19 Again, Stasov's argument is specious; he does not dare con-
sider Germany's musical fate—or that of any of the other countries—without any musical educative institutions such as the conservatories. He might have had to concede their desirability or even necessity. Stasov finally reaches the root of his opposition: He did not want just another "transplantation" of a foreign institution into Russia. He states, "It is time, it seems, to stop transplantations . . . and to think about what is truly useful and suitable for our country and for our nationality." This last statement, of course, reflects Stasov's well-known preference for Russian nationalistic concerns, and it was largely for nationalistic reasons that he—and Serov—opposed the founding of the Conservatory.

The Free Music School. The Russian nationalists resisted the acceptance of the Conservatory largely because, in their eyes, not only was it a foreign and not a native Russian institution, but also (so they believed) it ignored Russian national music culture, which was manifested in the vocal forms of church and folk song. To develop this aspect and to provide a form of education that corresponded to Russian cultural interests, Gavriil Ioakimovich Lomakin (1812-1885), a Russian choir director, singer, teacher, and composer, and composer Mily Alekseevich Balakirev, the leader of the "mighty handful," formed the Free Music School in 1862. Lomakin had studied theory with A. S. Sapienza, an Italian who at one time directed the choir of Count Sheremetev, into whose service Lomakin was born and whose choir he eventually directed himself. Although Balakirev was self-taught,
through his immense musical gifts he provided inspiration and training for the other, less experienced members of his "circle." The Free Music School specialized in the study and performance of choral music, particularly Russian, and offered instruction in singing and the elementary theory of music. Non-professional music lovers, those not likely to enroll in the Conservatory, were encouraged to attend. Balakirev was the main director of the school and conductor of the concerts until 1874 (when Rimsky-Korsakov took over) and again from 1881 to 1908. Lomakin taught the singing classes, which included instruction on the mechanics of singing and on enough theoretical details to enable the singer to read the score easily and to understand the mechanics of the music being sung. He adopted the method of Emil Cheve, a French instructor who developed a numbered system of notation. Lomakin himself wrote two books on the subject of vocal pedagogy.

Serov highly approved of this type of instruction, which turned the students's attention to the music and to its performance, not to prescribed rules of theory; he called it "true music education," since in many ways this method reflected his own views on music education:

G. I. Lomakin, engaged as a vocal choir master for a quarter of a century, developed a pedagogical ability in this matter with amazing results. Each choir entrusted to him is trained to read whatever choir music you like straight from the page—without error and so unmistakably to call each given musical sound by name.

In relation to musical literacy for choral singing this is a high degree. . . . Together with this is developed in singers, imperceptibly for themselves, the ability, inborn in almost all Russians, to harmony, to the true understanding of modulation, of counterpoint and of all the combinations on which very complex music is based.
The Free Music School was a successful venture. Through its classes and concerts, it promoted Russian and newer European music, and provided a basic music education and exposure to new music that many people might not have obtained otherwise. It continued to exist until the 1917 Resolution, after which music education was reorganized.

The Moscow Conservatory. While both Serov and Stasov remained opposed to Rubinstein and the idea of a Russian conservatory, other writers and musicians, among them Odoevsky and Larosh, supported Rubinstein and the fulfillment of the need for a system of Russian higher music education. Both men were directly involved in the St. Petersburg and Moscow Conservatories, Odoevsky as a founder and supporter of both institutions, and Larosh as one of the first graduates of the St. Petersburg Conservatory and then one of the first professors at the Moscow Conservatory, beginning in 1867.

When Larosh began teaching in Moscow, his fellow student and close friend Chaikovsky had already been appointed by Nikolai Rubinstein as head of the theory department at the Conservatory. Chaikovsky accepted the post after Serov turned it down, and began his duties in January 1866 immediately after his graduation from the St. Petersburg Conservatory. The Moscow Conservatory, based on a branch of the Russian Musical Society founded in 1860 in Moscow by Nikolai Rubinstein, formally opened on September 1, 1866.

Along with Larosh and Chaikovsky, other theory teachers in the first years of the Moscow Conservatory were the Russians Konstantin
Karlovich Albrecht (1836-1893) and Nikolai Dmitrievich Kashkin (1839-1920). Albrecht, a cellist who had studied music with his father, K. F. Albrecht, capellmeister of the St. Petersburg Opera Theater, was an inspector and teacher of choral singing and music theory at the Conservatory from 1886 to 1889. From 1883 to 1885 he was acting director of the Conservatory. He also wrote a book on solfeggio. Kashkin, who had already been teaching at the music classes of the Moscow section of the Russian Musical Society from 1863, continued to teach at the newly-formed Conservatory until 1906. He was also a noted music critic, theorist—being among the first Russian theorists to write a theory textbook—and translator of many valuable Western theory textbooks. Thus the Moscow Conservatory was staffed from the beginning with native teachers of theory, two of whom were among the first graduates of the St. Petersburg Conservatory. One of Anton Rubinstein's goals—to provide Russia with native teachers of music—was already in the process of being fulfilled.

Rubinstein's act of bringing a Western-style Conservatory education to Russian music students, even though opposed by the powerful faction of Slavophiles, started an enduring tradition. The opponents really had no secure foundation for their criticism. The world in which they matured was different from the world of the 1860s, the decade of emancipation and reform. Methods of music education had to evolve to keep up with the societal and political changes in Russia. Both Rubinstein and Odoevsky, men from very different backgrounds and upbringings, understood this and fought for change. This was just one
instance in which political and social trends influenced music education. Others followed in the twentieth century. But for the remainder of the nineteenth century, the conservatories maintained their status and success, and fostered tremendous growth in music composition and theory. Although some developments in theory occurred outside of the conservatories, nevertheless the existence of the conservatories contributed greatly to the general musical arena in which these outside developments flourished. Chapters 8, 9, 12, and 14 are devoted to discussions of these developments.
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Larosh also provided insight into Zaremba's personal musical tastes:

As became an out-and-out follower of Marx, Zaremba was a progressive liberal as regards music, believed in Beethoven (particularly in his latest period), detested the bondage of the schools, and was more disposed to leave his pupils to themselves than to restrict and hamper them with excessive severity. He taught on Marx's method, with one deviation; he followed up his harmony course by one on strict counterpoint, using a textbook of Heinrich Bellermann's. I do not think, however, that he taught this on his own initiative, but possibly at Rubinstein's expressed wish.

I have spoken of Zaremba as progressive. He was actually an enthusiastic admirer of Beethoven's later period; but he stopped short at Beethoven, or rather at Mendelssohn. The later development of German music, which started from Schumann, was unknown to him. He knew nothing of Berlioz and ignored Glinka. With regard to the latter he shows very plainly his alienation from Russian soil (ibid., p. 47).


Rubinstein himself taught instrumentation at the Conservatory. He had a formidable personality, according to Larosh:

The great personality of the Director of the Conservatory inspired us students with unbounded affection, mingled with not a little awe. In reality no teacher was more considerate and kindly, but his forbidding appearance, his hot temper and roughness, added to the glamour of his European fame, impressed us profoundly (Larosh, cited in Tchaikovsky, p. 48).

Larosh describes Rubinstein's pedagogical approach:

As a teacher of theory Anton Rubinstein was just the opposite of Zaremba. While the latter was remarkably eloquent, the former was taciturn to the last degree. . . . In Russian he often expressed himself fluently and appropriately, but his grammar was sometimes faulty, which was very noticeable in his exposition of a theoretical problem, demanding logical sequence. Yet . . . this deficiency in no way spoilt his lectures. With Zaremba, all was sys-
tic, each word had its own place. With Rubinstein, reigned a fascinating disorder. I believe that ten minutes before the lesson he did not know what he was going to talk about, and left all to the inspiration of the moment. Although the literary form of his lectures suffered in consequence, and defied all criticism, they impressed us deeply, and we attended them with great interest. Rubinstein's extraordinary practical knowledge, his breadth of view, his experience as a composer—almost incredible for a man of thirty—invested his words with an authority of which we could not fail to be sensible. Even the paradoxes he indulged in, which sometimes irritated and sometimes amused us, bore the stamp of genius and thought (Larosh, cited in Tchaikovsky, p. 48).

9 cited in Tchaikovsky, p. 47. Larosh continues:

I must, however, relate one occurrence which partially contradicts my statement that Zaremba had no influence whatever upon his pupil. When in 1862, or the following year, I expressed my admiration for the energy and industry with which Tchaikovsky was working, he replied that when he first attended Zaremba's classes he had not been so zealous, but had worked in "a very superficial way, like a true amateur," until on one occasion Zaremba had drawn him aside and impressed upon him the necessity of being more earnest and industrious, because he possessed a fine talent. Deeply touched, Peter Ilich resolved to conquer his indolence, and from that moment worked with untiring zeal and energy (ibid).

10 See Ridenour for a thorough study of this conflict.

11 V. V. Stasov, "Konservatorii v Rossii" [Conservatories in Russia], Severnaia pchela, No. 45 (February 24, 1861), p. 5.


15 Ibid.

16 Stasov, p. 9.

17 Ibid.

18 Ibid., pp. 9-10.

19 Ibid., p. 10.
20
Ibid.
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This "circle" included Cesar Cui, Modesto Husorgsky, Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov, and Alexander Borodin. Rimsky-Korsakov describes Balakirev's gifts:

Balakirev, who had never had any systematic course in harmony and counterpoint and had not even superficially applied himself to them, evidently thought such studies quite unnecessary. Thanks to his original talent and pianistic gifts, thanks also to the musical environment which he found at Ulybyshev's (who had a private orchestra which played Beethoven's symphonies under Balakirev's leadership), he somehow became at a bound a genuine, practical musician. An excellent pianist, a superior sight reader of music, a splendid improviser, endowed by nature with the sense of correct harmony and part-writing, he possessed a technique partly native and partly acquired through a vast musical erudition, with the help of an extraordinary memory, keen and retentive, which means so much in steering a critical course in musical literature (N. A. Rimsky-Korsakov, My Musical Life, trans. from fifth rev. ed. by Judah A. Joffe [1923; rpt. London: Ernst Eulenburg Ltd., 1974], p. 27).

Rimsky-Korsakov on Balakirev's method of teaching:

He was a marvelous critic, especially a technical critic. He instantly felt every technical imperfection or error, he grasped a defect in form at once. Whenever I or other young men, later on, played him our essays at composition, he instantly caught all the defects of form, modulation, and so on, and forthwith seating himself at the piano, he would improvise and show the composition in question should be changed exactly as he indicated, and frequently entire passages in other people's compositions became his and not their putative authors' at all. He was obeyed absolutely, for the spell of his personality was tremendous (ibid).

22 G. I. Lomakin, Kratkaia metoda peniia [A short method of singing], (St. Petersburg, before 1862); and Rukovodstvo k obucheniu peniia v narodnykh shkolakh [A guide to the study of singing in folk schools], (St. Petersburg, n.d.). Serov described Lomakin's first book in his article, "Zalogi istinnogo muzykal'nogo obrazovaniia v S.-Peterburge" [Pledges of true music education in St. Petersburg], Severnaia cheloba, No. 124 (1862); reprinted in A. N. Serov, Izbrannye stat'i [Collected articles], 2 (Moscow-Leningrad, 1957), 167-171.

23 Serov, "Zalogi . . .," Izbrannye stat'i, p. 170.

24 K. K. Albrecht, Rukovodstvo k khorovomu peniui po tsifernoi metode Sheve [A guide to choral singing on the numbered method of Cheve] (Moscow, 1866).
N. D. Kashkin, Uchebnik elementarnoi teorii muzyki [A textbook of the elementary theory of music] (Moscow, 1875). The Western theorists whose books Kashkin translated include L. Bussler, H. Riemann, and J. Lobe.
Chapter 8

Alexander Nikolaevich Serov and Music Theory: Pedagogy and Interpretation

As both a critic and composer, Serov was very much interested in music theory and theory pedagogy, subjects to which he devoted several of his articles. Even though his own theoretical education consisted primarily of self-instruction, and additionally some correspondence with Hunke, in his writings he appears knowledgeable and well-read in theory—mentioning the works by Reicha, Marx, Weber, Lobe, Fétis, and Berlioz—much as was Odoevsky, his predecessor in this area (whose views will be examined subsequently). His theoretical writings thus form an important element in the growth of a Russian music theory, and therefore must be examined. His own method of theoretical study, which he undertook during the 1840s while he worked in various government posts, involved the close scrutiny of masterworks of musical literature, reading full scores at the piano, and paying close attention to the details of composition and instrumentation. He began to compose also in the 1840s, when he wrote a symphonic Fantasia, piano and chamber works, a cantata and some dramatic accompaniments. But not until his first opera Judith (1861–62; first performed 1863) did he achieve any compositional success. He subsequently composed two other operas,
Rogneda (1863-65) and Vrazh'ia sila [Hostile force] (performed posthumously in 1871). His compositional legacy remains mainly these three operas, which are rarely performed today. Thus, since his own method worked for himself, he recommended the same sort of education he had undertaken, beginning with learning to read full orchestral scores, instead of a conservatory education, the value of which he questioned.

**Musical Science and Music Pedagogy.** Serov expressed his polemical views against the current state of "musical science" and music pedagogy in a two-part article that appeared in 1864. "Practical training in the art of composition," he states, "is one of the most absurd delusions in the world." Serov calls the current approach to music pedagogy "the study of musical wisdom by the scholastic method," which had reached its apex in Beethoven's time but which was still being used in Serov's time. This method includes the study of intervals, which he described as "without a logical system and lacking the most important ideas," the study of thoroughbass, and the study of counterpoint.

Although, as he points out, the keyboard appeared as an aid to the study of the science of harmony, the art of thoroughbass soon came to represent the entire science of harmony. This was true in Russia as well as in the West, as we have seen. Even so, Serov still considered the keyboard "the most useful guide for the study of the elements of harmony and of music in general." As for thoroughbass, "with such an advantage of outer covering (forms of writing) over the inner principle (the logical construction of harmony)... significant gaps and de-
fects crept in, namely from the insufficiency and illogicalness of several formulas of thoroughbass." In addition, the music academicians—he names Fétis in particular and also Sarti, whose unfinished treatise he had examined—have interpreted harmony within such narrow limits, with disallowed chords and the like, that they accuse the great masters Mozart and Beethoven of breaking the rules of harmonic writing. The Russian critic Ulybyshev also published similar accusations, and Serov chastised him for this in print several times. Serov considered such narrow-minded criticisms inconceivable; they ran counter to his own ideas about the very nature of musical science and its laws:

All grammars in print (including music) note down in their columns as rules only what is met in the best writers, and from this, namely, they make their conclusions. If some grammar is found in direct contradiction with a genius writer, when the combination used by this writer, in an anatomical analysis, may be explained completely organically, such a grammar is not science, but mystification, charlantism; such a textbook is not a book but pulp literature, in spite of its eleventh edition in the second half of the nineteenth century [a reference to Fétis and his Traité complet de la théorie et de la pratique de l'harmonie]. And, finally, if similar textbooks in our time are possible and do not give themselves up to general ridicule, then musical science still does not exist.9

To this he adds, "A Russian textbook, not extensive, but sufficiently full and clear, understandably stated, will be, of course, a book with extreme usefulness." Serov himself wanted to write such a textbook, but never realized his goal. And regarding his critical view of Fétis and his book, Serov wavered between outright condemnation, as here, and extreme praise for this work, a vacillation that reveals, perhaps, Serov's own insecurities about the subject of music theory.
Any science of harmony, then, that relies on outmoded rules and precepts and does not attempt to explain the innovative harmonic languages of the best composers becomes invalid and useless. The genius of a great composer is, in Serov's view, the only true guide for musical science:

The great composers created their harmony by an inner, harmonic feeling; they listen only to their inner voice--this voice is the very harmony, the very musical nature in man. . . . Between the laws of art, with true, that is organic requirements, arising from the very essence of the matter, and between the arbitrarily supplied rules is an entire abyss. . . . The majority of rules in musical science in the old textbooks, thoroughbasses, is almost as important and logical as the rule about tails. [Serov made the distinction between a rule and a law: Wearing tails for an evening social visit is a rule; walking with one's head up and feet down is a law dependent on the construction of the human organism.] . . . Science came to strive for the true laws of musical organisms gradually only in our time. . . . Music pedagogy is still encumbered with litter and rubbish. . . . It is necessary to reach the point where only the laws of art are taught. They will all fit in about twenty pages of a well-planned textbook.

Serov's view thus conflicts directly with Rubinstein's, who admonished young self-trained composers not to dwell on the compositional exceptions of the masters at the expense of the rules. Serov advocated the search for scientific "laws" of the musical art, which would accommodate both the rules and the exceptions to them, as the only true foundation for music theory. But nowhere does he explain exactly what he means by these "laws of art," that would, he says, fit into a twenty-page textbook.

Serov does not limit his condemnation of conservatory training just to harmony. He considers the study of counterpoint useless for the training of a composer, at least in its "scholastic" form, which is only "work and school exercises, decisively not having anything in
common with art." Furthermore, the study of counterpoint, he believes, interferes with the development of creativity in a true musician: "Attached to the bad school method of thoroughbass, pedagogues at least remained in the limits of elementary study, within the limits of grammar. With the study of counterpoint the triteness of the teacher's yard-stick, of dulling routine in the creative sphere, is begun." (He apparently was unaware of or chose to ignore Glinka's successful counterpoint studies with Dehn.) Serov's advice for the young composer remains the same—far better to study the great master-works and extract and learn the "laws" of counterpoint from example, and then to apply those "laws" in actual compositions.

An acquaintance with the models [of art] must be the first priority for the person wishing to work in art; all this, of course, they also advocate in the courses of the conservatory but in dull, pedantic formalism, still more onerous and inconvenient for the student than the seminary scholastics; they delay the living pursuit of art so that the student wears out under the ABC's and syllables stupifying to his spirit!

Serov adds that score reading can also clear up questions about the form of a musical piece, about its symmetry and its goal. He concludes: "The critical laws, in their application to thought, to ideas, are never broken in the great masters. All these laws he repeats 'instinctively'; they are invested in each musical talent from nature—otherwise it is not talent, not musicality." Again, Serov never divulges the exact nature of these "laws." Serov's method of education was, for the inexperienced and impressionable, probably far less useful than an organized series of classes at the conservatory.

Serov's nationalistic views also surface in this article. Russian
criticism takes priority, even though, he says, "Russians are not independent in musical matters." In his view, a great abyss between Russian music (chant and folk song) and music scholarship exists; in fact, he asserts, in Russia there is no music scholarship. Of course, in Serov's opinion, the state of music scholarship elsewhere fared not much better: "In the present, strict sense of the word, [musical science], as a logical system, still has not begun to exist." As evidence he points to the nonaccordance between theory and practice in music grammar: "In Beethoven, it is possible to point to ten such sound-combinations, which are explained or foreseen in none of the existing textbooks of music theory." Serov repeatedly calls for the development of a musical science based on the natural, organic laws of music, all of which could be stated well and succinctly in a twenty-page--preferably Russian--textbook.

Serov never described or explained further his desired goal for musical science; and in his own works he never fulfilled his ambitions in this area. The article just discussed, in fact, was to be part of a series of articles serving as "preparation" for a full musical textbook covering "musicology, from the technical, historical and aesthetic sides," but Serov never realized this project. Such a textbook, it would appear, certainly would take up more than his required twenty pages. Just the inclusion of all possible sound combinations--chord structures, progressions, modulations, etc.--used by composers up to his time, which Serov appears to suggest through his criticisms of existing textbooks, would require a rather lengthy work.
A Guide to Music Appreciation. Serov also left unfinished an earlier project in music theory, in which his expressed views contrast sharply with those just discussed. In St. Petersburg in 1856 there appeared a new journal, Muzykal'nyi i teatral'nyi vestnik [The musical and theatrical bulletin], "the first half of which is devoted exclusively to musical criticism, in the general sense of the work, that is to opinions about the musical art in general and from its different innumerable sides," as Serov, who was in charge of the musical portion of the journal, explained. Part of his task, he felt, was to enlighten the readers about the technical aspects of music so that they might better understand the true purpose, the main goal of the journal:

To acquaint readers of this journal with all sides of musical knowledge [musicology], sides necessary for the true evaluation of musical impressions, that is, to pass through with the reader of the journal both the aesthetics of music and the history of music in all the main fields, ... Such preliminary musical pedagogy—assuming in the reader a very elementary alphabetic knowledge of music in general, for example the reading of notes (at least in the two generally-used clefs, violin and bass) and their names (French or German)—concerns also the science of harmony in its main traits (in order to show that the notorious thoroughbass looks "like an angry bear" only in the old guides, and in fact is not terrible at all), and the science of counterpoint (in order to convince that this is only a continuation, a consequence of harmonie laws and that, of course, in practice this field is difficult and requires long, intent study, but which in the relationship of understanding is a very simple matter); states also the main laws of melody and rhythm, and in connection with them, the forms of musical pieces; finally, communicates the most necessary information from the technique of human voices and instruments used in our orchestras, also the main idea about the orchestra in general.21

His work, he states, differs from treatises on the composition of music, which also cover the same topics but in much greater depth (he mentions works by Reicha, Marx, Weber, Lobe, and Berlioz), in that they
are intended for the education of composers, while

in our journal . . . all the technique, all the musical pedagogy
will serve only as a guide for the achievement of the main goal
. . . [which is] to activate as far as possible the development of
the musical taste of the public . . . The scholarly theorists in
their treatises set themselves the problem: to teach to compose
music (to such persons, who already were born with a greater or
lesser strong ability for musical composition). For us . . . the
problem will be to guide the listening of music, and to give the
possibility truly to judge it.22

Thus, Serov planned to present, basically, a guide for the appre-
ciation of music that would teach the audience how to listen to and
judge music. This was a useful and novel idea for St. Petersburg of
the 1850s. So in April 1856 he began to publish in the journal a
series of articles covering the topics listed. Such a work fulfill-
ing his specific requirements did not exist, yet he felt compelled to
maintain that his own work would be original, since it would be the
first of its kind by a native Russian:

I have not yet found a single musical guide of the sort generally
acceptable to all, and therefore I consider it my duty to forewarn
the readers that all my articles on this subject are intended not
for professionals but for amateurs of music, and will be not a
translation, not a compilation of prepared foreign works, but a
special, separate work, in which, in as clear a statement as
possible, I will attempt to transfer the main results of my observ-
ations on music of the great masters, and in general, the results
of my theoretical and practical study with the art.24

After seven separate, small articles appeared, Serov suddenly
ended the series, even though he continued to contribute to the journal
through the duration of its existence, until 1860. Within the space of
these seven articles, of the elements he planned to cover—harmony,
rhythm, melody, homophony, polyphony, organology—he discusses only the
first few lessons in harmony, which include the basic ideas of sound,
rhythm, and melody; register; steps and half-steps; the keyboard; and the major ("normal") scale, its basic model on C and its construction on different notes.

Such information would appear to be non-controversial, but nevertheless a disagreement between Serov and another Petersburg critic, F. M. Tolstoi (Rostislav, he called himself in print, with whom Serov frequently argued over musical matters), arose regarding Serov's definition of rhythm as stated in the third of these articles. Serov defines rhythm as one of the three elements of music and describes its qualities in the general sense, as the alternation of strong and weak beats and the like. He points out, "The alternation of rhythmic figures in combination with a varied melodic progression of sound gives place to the invaluable wealth of melodic patterns." He also states, "The element of rhythm may be isolated from melody and harmony—for example, in the drumbeat—but this is still not music." To this Tolstoi replied,

Wise Mr. Serov mixes melodic pattern with rhythm, attributing the quality of the latter to an isolated drum beat! "The alternation" of rhythmic figures produces "melodic patterns," says Mr. Serov, but the matter turns out exactly the opposite. Here is the course of musical technique of the scholarly Mr. Serov. Tolstoi's own definition of rhythm, which he provides by example only, is apparently derived from A. Reicha's. Stated very broadly, Reicha's theory of rhythm concerns the grouping of measures into phrases and their subsequent grouping into periods. The rhythm measures the length of the phrase (antecedent); it and its "companion" (the second phrase, consequent) make up the period. Reicha thus separates the grouping
together of the measures of a phrase (the "rhythm") from the melodic content of the phrase (the "member"). It is the member that is divided into smaller melodic units, known as the "dessin." The rhythm is not subdivided. The ideal rhythm contains three qualities: equality of size and proportion, complementarity (a rhythm and its companion), and the resulting symmetry.

But neither Tolstoi nor Serov fully understood the implications of Reicha's theory of melodic rhythm. Tolstoi very simplistically illustrates it as beginning on one syllable and ending on another; he describes the answering four bars, the companion, similarly. He gives no additional explanations. Serov acknowledges that he and Tolstoi were each describing two very different concepts, but for Serov there was no room in music theory for two such different interpretations of the same word. Serov certainly did not want to eliminate his definition, especially since Tolstoi had either misrepresented or misinterpreted Serov's remarks and since Tolstoi himself had on occasion used the word rhythm in Serov's meaning. Serov justifies his own definition through testimony from the works of numerous theorists such as Berlioz, Joseph d'Ortigue, A. B. Marx, and J. C. Lobe. Yet Lobe's concise definition points to the very characteristic of rhythm that Serov was overlooking: "Zum Rhythmus in der Musik gehört: Geltung der Tone, Takt, Tempo, Accent und im noherem Sinne—Periode, Gruppen, Theile." In his writings Serov refers to symmetry only as being a manifestation of the form of a piece; he does not acknowledge rhythm in either Reicha's or Lobe's meaning.
Serov against Ulybyshnev. In 1856 Serov quarreled in print with yet another writer, A. Ulybyshnev, over the latter's interpretation of a harmony used by Mozart. This is an ironic occurrence, though, for here we have two avowed anti-theory propagandists, each utilising theory to make a point. I bring up this disagreement because it illustrates the type of theory pedantry that Serov abhorred and because it shows Serov to be more appreciative of the study of theory (and foreign theory at that) than he would later admit. It reveals his anti-theory bias to be a smokescreen for his real concern—the supplanting of Russian nationalism with European ideals. In this case, again, Serov brings in the authority of Fétis, with whom he was to find fault a few years hence, as we have seen. Ulybyshnev, in his biography of Mozart, criticizes Mozart's resolution of a particular chord in Idomeneo (shown in Example 8.1a [Serov's version] and in Example 8.1b [Ulybyshnev's version]):

The modulation is bold, so bold, that we do not dare to take responsibility for this boldness. From the first to the second chord the seventh (E) is raised, but the note "sensible" [the leading tone] (C#) is lowered. This is a very strange resolution.31

Ulybyshnev interprets the first chord only as the V of B and its resolution to a D minor triad as incorrect. In his view, only the tonic chord—or perhaps the submediant as a suitable substitution—is the correct chord of resolution.

Of course, Serov did not approve of this narrow textbook interpretation. Since the modulation was carried out by none other than Mozart, whom he would never dispute, he searched for an alternate interpretation. In Serov's view, then, the seventh chord acts as an
Example 8.1. a) Chord and resolution from Mozart's Idomeneo; b) corresponding portion of Idomeneo as given in Ulybyshiev's book.

altered dominant seventh chord of D in third inversion, which would be G–A–C♯–E. First, and quite commonly, the A was raised to B♭, the sixth of the minor scale (D), giving the chord the character of minor. (Serov does not mention that this chord might also be interpreted in D minor as a diminished seventh chord on VII.) As justification for this step, he cites the theory of

"altered intervals," excellently worked out by Fétis (Traité complet de la théorie et de la pratique de l'harmonie. Livre II. Section 3, Chapitre VIII.) and by all the new German theorists—in each progression of one note to another, at the distance of a whole tone, this distance may be brought together by a half-tone.32

In other words, from E to D there may be instead E–Eb–D. The simulta-
neous application of this theory to two or more intervals may result in "strange" or "unusual" chords; but, Serov replies, "No one of those who understands the essence of the harmonic laws, that is the organic flow of music, conditioned by the 'previous' and the 'following' takes it into his head to dispute the correctness of such combinations unusual to the ear." He illustrates further that such chromatically altered chords may also serve as a means for enharmonic modulation:

Take away this means of modulation through chromaticism and enharmonism and you shake the foundation of the entire harmonic side of music, as it was developed and strengthened in the end of the last century and in ours—you destroy a very important side of "contemporary" harmony, which Fétis very wittily called ordre omnitonique (Traité de l'harmonie, Livre II. Chapitre IV.), that is, the possibility, not abandoning the main given tonality, to concern the harmonic fabric of tones, if only very remote.

A second alteration of the chord G–Bb–C♯–E (originally G–A–C♯–E), the lowering of the G a half-step, produces Gb–Bb–C♯–E. By substituting for this chord its enharmonic equivalent F♯–A♯–C♯–E, which still resolves to D (with a slightly different voice-leading, the E up to the A), the disputed modulation is received. In this and similar cases, according to Serov, the usual rules of resolution either disappear or are superfluous: Because the chord of resolution is not the usual, expected one, the rules applying to that resolution may not be extended to apply to other unusual resolutions. Thus, with the aid of chromaticism and enharmonism, Serov explains Mozart's irregular resolution as a regular resolution. Serov concludes sarcastically, "The harmonic side of art would be rich if in it was had the use of such wise laws! Theoretical composition would be useful for art, if in it to this day reigned such a wide understanding about the rules of harmony!"
In the 1850s, when he wrote these articles on controversial points of theoretical interpretation, Serov unhesitatingly turned to other authorities on theory such as Fétis to bolster his arguments. During the 1860s, though, Serov turned against such authorities, castigating them and denouncing wholesale the study and application of the methods he used to prove his points. These forays of Serov into the world of theory reveal him to be not so much anti-theory as anti-Conservatory and all it stands for—the ruination of (for him) a comfortable way of life that was uniquely Russian and not European, i.e., the leisured, privileged class as persons who approached music not as a profession but solely as an art, not to be despoiled by such considerations as theoretical rules, monetary need, and the like; and also the fear that European conservatories would destroy native Russian music and traditions. In order to demonstrate that the conservatory was harmful, that it was "scholastic" and "pedantic," Serov needed to show that other institutions—and the figures connected with them like Fétis—were also "pedantic."

Serov's Legacy. Serov's writings on theory and theory pedagogy are actually less known and influential than his analytical works. In several important articles, Serov utilizes a method of musical analysis that concentrates on the connections between a work's thematic aspect (primarily melodic but also instrumental, rhythmic or harmonic) and its literary or dramatic content, thus fusing aesthetic analysis with thematic analysis. He applies his method of thematic analysis almost
exclusively to vocal-dramatic works such as operas, or other works that he believed were endowed with a strong programmatic content, by such composers as Glinka, Dargomyzhsky, and Beethoven. For example, in an article on Beethoven's "Leonora" Overture, Serov analyzes the thematic content of the overture and its representation of the dramatic action in the opera. He concludes that although the overture is perfect in the dramatic sense, the opera is less so. In an article on Beethoven's Ninth Symphony, he traces the development of the final theme of joy. This type of analysis, in which the thematic content is coordinated with the dramatic elements in the music, is once again popular in Soviet music theory as a manifestation of Marxist analysis in which the dramatic content of music is to be analyzed along with the music itself. Serov is thus viewed as the founder of an important Russian tradition in analysis that continues today.

Serov might have become a greater contributor to the development of music theory in Russia had he accepted the post as first head of the theory department of the Moscow Conservatory offered to him by its founder Nikolais Rubinstein in 1865, and had he completed the envisioned series of articles and the textbook devoted to theoretical and musico-logical topics. But he declined the post at the Conservatory because he felt St. Petersburg audiences were more receptive to his music and he wished to remain there. The conservatism of the Moscow critics and their reproaches of Serov's harmonic language probably also fueled his anti-conservatory, anti-scholastic rhetoric. He complains to Odoevsky:
After the "fiasco" of Judith in Moscow . . . one of Moscow's music critics publicly (again in Sovremennia letopis [Contemporary chronicle]) reproached me for not knowing thoroughbass (I) for the non-harmonic combination of two tones alien to each other [C-E-D in G minor, i.e., a phrygian cadence] . . . . The critic called this "C-minor" and next to it "D-major" (!) -- after all this -- I say -- I gave up Moscow as a bad hand. Let N. Rubinstein, with his particular urgency, "educate" the Muscovites in relation to serious music. I, for my part, do not feel myself able to do this.38

His interest in composition also probably caused him to give up some of his literary projects. To the end, then, he remained outside the conservatory establishment; but he appeared frequently in St. Petersburg with public lecture series, some of which were eventually published as articles and which took place in the years 1858-59, 1863-66, 1868, and 1870.

Through his articles, then, Serov made an important contribution to the development of music theory in Russia, despite the biased and polemical nature of much of his writing. He focused attention on important questions of theory pedagogy -- the efficacy of certain well-known approaches found in existing theory textbooks, the need to replace the study of thoroughbass with the study of harmony, and the value of certain methods of study such as score-reading (although not, as he advocated, to the exclusion of other methods). He also focused on questions of theoretical analysis and interpretation, which not many critics or other writers were capable or desirous of discussing at this time. As both critic and theorist he also wanted to educate the audience, and directed some of his theoretical writings in addition to his critical ones just to the listener. Most importantly, though, he brought up the need for additional scholarship in music theory, in his
call for the search for musical "laws," for the "organic nature" of music, and the like. Equally importantly, he directed attention to the study of musical science, as musicology, or more exactly, theoretical musicology, was most frequently referred to then; Serov, in fact, was the first writer to use the Russian equivalent for the word "musicology"—muzykoznanie, short for muzykal'noe znanie [musical knowledge], a rough translation of the German term Musikwissenschaft. Thus Serov's contribution goes beyond pedagogical theory and delves into areas of musical science and scholarship, which, as he pointed out, did not yet exist as such in Russia. Even though he himself made no specific discoveries in this area, simply drawing attention to it and attempting to define it became important for future research. Serov also attempted to define the theoretical foundations of Russian folk music. But before we can examine his views on this subject, it is necessary to discuss those of the prominent Russian writer and theorist Odoevsky, whose concern for and attention to folk music theory both precedes and overshadows Serov's. Therefore I will discuss Serov's views on this subject after I investigate Odoevsky's approach.
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Chapter 9

Prince Vladimir Fedorovich Odoevsky: Views on Music Theory

Prince Vladimir Fedorovich Odoevsky, a philosopher and litterateur who was greatly interested in Russian music, gave a dedicatory speech at the opening ceremonies of the Moscow Conservatory. Generally considered to be one of the founders of Russian classical musicology, Odoevsky supported Glinka's music from the beginning, recognizing immediately its significance in the development of a truly native Russian music. More importantly, his own research into Russian folk song and chant aided his successful efforts to define the national character of Russian music, and to establish the topics of folk music and chant as subjects for scientific research. In his speech at the opening, he praised the inclusion—at his own initiative—in the curriculum of a course on the history of Russian chant:

In our conservatory will be taught a science—astonishingly—new to us: "The history of church song in Russia"—new to such a degree that it is impossible to point to one published work, which might serve as a textbook or guidebook for this subject... This important subject existing in Russia is introduced by the teaching of a devout and scholarly man, Clergyman Dmitri Vasilevich Razumovsky, a tireless researcher on behalf of our musical anthropology, and whose recent research significantly illuminated this sphere of our native tradition, not well-known today.2
Odevsky then called for similar attention to the study of folk music:

I hope that with time the Moscow Conservatory does not remain without an artistic historical treatment also of a folk secular song, spread throughout Russia. Today this treatment is still impossible: we still do not have a correctly transcribed collection of our folksongs, with all their local variants and nuances. Today they attempt to place under the heading of general music a large number of our recorded songs, and they even allow themselves to correct in them imaginary mistakes, or characteristic deviations from generally-accepted rules. I am bold to think, that the correctors themselves are mistaken, for folk songs are a folk sacred object, which must be approached with innocent feeling, without any earlier pre-conditioned theory, not philosophizing slyly, but recording the folk song as it is heard in the voice and hearing of the people, and then must be endeavored to derive from the song itself, as it is, its theory.3

Odevsky asked for scientific research into the character of Russian folk song—to collect "our genuine folk song," "to translate into technical language the feeling, unconscious today," which identifies a folk song as Russian, and "to define such inner laws by which our folk song is moved. Allow me, ladies and gentlemen, to propose to you a toast for the success of Russian music, as an art, and as a science." 4

Odevsky and Russian Music. Odevsky's own scientific approach to Russian music involved pioneering studies in both musicology and theory in the course of his forty-seven years as a writer and critic of music. The theoretical aspect of his work involves his twenty-five-year study of the characteristics of Russian chant and folk song through analyses of the rules and principles by which they were composed, i.e., their theory, the very task he put before the guests at the opening of the Moscow Conservatory. He began the research in this
field in Russia, and in so doing, he showed that the theory of native
Russian folk and church song was nowhere similar to that derived from
contemporary Western music, that it was closer—in his opinion,
anyway—to the theory of Western music of the Middle Ages. In the
words of a younger contemporary of his, the theorist N. D. Kashkin,

He [Odoevsky] first defined theoretically the peculiarity both of
old church melodies and also of folk songs, differentiating them
from West-European music, undividedly ruling in the eighteenth and
the first half of the nineteenth centuries among our educated
society. . . . Prince Odoevsky remains the first music theorist to
have defined precisely the signs distinguishing old Russian melo-
dies from changed and false [melodies], with which he proposed a
firm foundation for all further research in this sphere, still far
incomplete.6

Odoevsky thus endeavored to liberate Russian music from the imped-
iments of Western theory in its most dogmatic and scholastic forms, and
to search for its unique qualities undistorted by Western concepts of
harmony and form. He was the first to separate Russian chant and folk
song from Western theory and among the first knowledgable musicians to
denounce dogma and scholasticism in Western theory. Unlike Serov,
though, Odoevsky's "nationalistic"—if his attitude can be so de-
scribed—concerns, his appeal for attention to chant and folk song,
those most Russian elements of Russian music, did not preclude the
establishment of Russian conservatories. Indeed, Odoevsky understood
the necessity for them and supported them in order to provide the study
of Russian music in the curriculum. In his own research he avoided
Western theoretical ideas and turned instead to acoustics, which con-
tains scientific givens unhampered by traditional or cultural
influences.
Odoevsky was particularly distressed by Russian folk music collections, which had been coming out since Trutovsky’s pioneering work in the 1770s, in which the folk songs were "distorted," in his words, to accommodate the application of Western theoretical principles through changes in melody, tonality, and accompaniment: "The first transcriptions and harmonizations of our folk song were done by people whose knowledge, naturally, was limited only to Western music theory; such were Trutovsky, Prach, Kashin, Shperevich." And many so-called Russian melodies being composed by Russian composers turned out to be not Russian at all, according to their theoretical foundations. In article after article Odoevsky states his aversion to these distortions and misrepresentations, and points out exactly how the native melodies should be represented, thereby establishing a theory of Russian song.

For Odoevsky, the choice for musicians was clear:

Either compose music on the foundations of theory, worked out by the great Western musicians, or write down Russian melodies as they are, by their own theory, not subordinating them to Western music; otherwise Italian music on a nizhegorodskii [a local region] mode comes out. A technical examination convinces us completely that this song [the Italian music] is not primordial, but borrowed.

For Odoevsky, Western theory was almost useless concerning the transcription and harmonization of native Russian song:

For the exact transcription of our old melodies and for their characteristic harmonization the many rules of Western thorough-bass, which we imbibed with [mother's] milk, should be renounced. Otherwise, distortions, so contrary to the artistic truth and to the Russian ear, will enter into the transcribed song. . . . Unfortunately, I am not able to name one published work of ours for the transcription of Russian song; its technique is pointed to only in the very rare manuscripts of the scholar Shaldur. Relative to harmonization I may point to only one foreign work (in the
entire huge Western musical literature) applicable to the harmonization of our song—it is by old Albrechtsberger. Here in particular the rules of harmonization sine quarta consonante (ohne consonierende Quarte) may prove useful. Through the observation of these rules it is possible sometimes to get out of difficulties frequently presented by the harmonization of Russian song.

In fact, Odoevsky disapproved generally of the study of Western harmonic theory, which he called thoroughbass:

Through these rules [of harmony, which are] very conditional and in large part have no rational basis, all sound phenomena are far from exhausted. So, for example, relative to melody exists the Western rule: to end the melody without fail with the first note or the tonic of the mode; then in the melody all possible intervals, only if they are comfortable for singing, are allowed. Relative to harmony—the rule of the leading tone . . . : on the basis of this rule, a major third from the dominant . . . without fail should fall on tonic. From here the so-called correct cadences; from here the so-called harmonic scale. . . . These are all separate, particular cases, not having any kind of general scientific significance; consequently they have the power to be or not to be. In an attentive examination of our old song (earlier than the eighteenth century), we find something completely different.

Thus Odoevsky agreed with Serov concerning the avoidance of the pedantic rules of harmony, which in his view had "no rational basis," no "general scientific significance." He found the confirmation for this view in Russian native music, in which such rules did not exist. He based his conclusions on a thorough study of all the available sources of both folk music and chant as they were preserved in the people (at least in such folk singers, whose ear was still not corrupted by the influence of Italian music, entering in the people by means of the theater and the street organ), and equally in our old manuscripts of music, located in the St. Petersburg Public Library, in the collections of Pogodin, Sakhalo (today the Count of Uvarov) and particularly belonging to me, principally Shaidur or his students, also Tikhon Makarevsky and Alexander Kamenets, where I found, it appears, technical information of what instinctly is observed by the people in their primordial song. A more detailed explanation about this subject the readers will find in the book specially published by me about old Russian song.
What many collectors perceived as "irregularities in relation to the rhythm and the movement of the melody" are, according to Odoevsky, "imaginary irregularities," which "make up the distinction of great-Russian music from Western." Differences occur in all the main areas of music—scale and mode, melodic patterns, harmony, and rhythm. Since Odoevsky utilizes the characteristics of Russian song in his general theoretical approach, an acquaintance with these distinctions is therefore important.

Concerning scale, "primordial Russian song revolves naturally in the diatonic scale, without flats and without sharps." Also, the idea of the leading tone, so "well-known in Western theory," "exists only accidentally in primordial Russian song and may not be elevated to a basic principle. . . . The famous attraction (Fétis) between the leading tone and the tonic does not exist in primordial Russian music." Consequently, he concludes, Russian song is neither tonal nor modal in the modern sense:

There does not exist in old Russian music what today they call the tone of a piece, that is, C minor or A minor, or C major or A major, etc., but poglasitsi (in church song glasi). . . . There do not exist in our old music also such ideas, which today carry the names of minor or major mode. Russian poglasitsi are not minor or major.15

Such poglasitsi or glasi are very similar to the church modes used in Western music. Odoevsky believed that, similar to Western music, "our song has its foundation in Greek song. . . . Under glas we mean . . . the system or scheme of sounds, entering into a song. . . . The Greek [modes] are the same as our glasi. And, "Glasi are not modes [tonal-
ities] and there is no single major or minor glas ... for it is not possible for ideas, which we ascribe to modes (tonarten), and consequently to their majorness and minorness, relative to glasi, to exist."

The melodic patterns of Russian song contain both leaps and stepwise motion, but nowhere "are there met leaps either on the false fifth, or augmented fourth, or sixth, or seventh. ... In these intervals already there is nothing Russian; Russian song is completely distorted by the introduction of them. Only seconds, thirds, perfect fourths, perfect fifths and octaves occur." "This exclusion of the intervals of the sixth, seventh and even the fifth is not simple chance, but is found as a theoretical rule in our old manuscripts about music."

Only major and minor triads (triestestvoglasii) and their inversions are used in the harmonic accompaniment of Russian song. Seventh chords or any other higher tertian structures are not used, "for with the seventh chord immediately appears the tone of pieces, [such as] C major and A minor, which is contrary to the fundamental basis of our music." The rhythm of Russian song also does not conform to the idea of Western rhythm in that it is assymetrical and irregular: "Symmetrical rhythm is met very rarely in our old songs, and a large part of the rhythm in them is first even, then uneven, and in this is their particular elegance."

As a result of Odoevsky's study and appreciation of chant azbuki, he came to prefer some of the old Russian theoretical terms over the
adopted Western ones when discussing either folk song or chant, for he used them frequently. Although he never openly espouses the use of such terms, he probably would have preferred their being utilized when discussing any truly Russian music (contemporary included). Such terms include гlossenное отдане for overtones, триествогласие for triad, погласность for modes in folk song and глась for modes in chant.

Odoevsky explains the difference between the terms погласность and глась (and their nearest equivalents in Western music) only in relative terms:

Glasy and погласность in Western languages are designated by the general name: Kirchen-Tonarten, Tone ecclesiatici, Modes or Tons d'Eglise; we differentiate them, conferring the word glas particularly on church music, and the word погласность on folk [song], mostly because not all folk погласность entered into the body of church глась.22

According to definitions of these terms accepted today, which have been derived from many years of study and observation by numerous scholars, глась and погласность are not equivalent to the Western church modes; in fact they are not scalar but melodic and motivic in nature. Nor are they segregated into church and folk categories, respectively. In ancient Russian chant глась are "the sum of the diatonic melodic motives (попевки) of the types of trichords and tetrachords, connected with definite spheres of church scales." Thus while they are similar to the church modes, they are not identical to them. Погласность are "memorized motives" with a text of non-liturgical or even social content to help singers remember the cadential patterns of psalms, which had limited note ranges and were not very original. They are therefore a special type of melodic motive forming a part of the глась. But
their modal structure is not always indicative of the glasy, and although poglasitsy may have a folk-like or folk-derived text, their purpose is definitely liturgical. These distinctions may explain why Odoevsky erroneously related them to folk music. However, Odoevsky's view of these concepts still must be recognized as an important contribution to the development of a Russian music theory, and to the theories of chant and folk music, through his pioneering attention to these topics and his attempts to discover the true theoretical nature of native Russian music.

Odoevsky and Music Education. As might be expected, Odoevsky had strong views on music education. Despite his disapproval of thorough-bass, to Odoevsky a music education lacking in theoretical study did not constitute an education. He decries the line of thought that led people to believe "that in music there is nothing besides singing and feeling, that everything else is only pedantism suitable for the scholarly study of music, for the fugue," and that "in an accompaniment it is possible to play whatever you like, if only to support the voice." To people with such beliefs, the words counterpoint, tonic and dominant were "barbaric".

This ignorance of the fundamental elements of art, of the alphabet of music, is the natural consequence of such musical teaching, which is practiced here by the majority of teachers and which, unfortunately, very frequently the parents of the students require. The parents require, and the teacher seeks, so that his pupil plays or sings some kind of song; repeating, like a parrot, the student aims at making it possible to play the selected song, and his musical education is ended on this.
Odevsky expressed this sentiment in 1854, seven years before Rubinstein revealed similar views in his article. Such a student as Odevsky described, it was generally believed, did not feel the need to study harmony or other theoretical subjects, which were only for composers, musicians with a special talent. (But even many would-be composers avoided the study of theory, according to Rubinstein.) For Odevsky, however, all music students needed to study harmony:

The study of the laws of harmony is necessary not only for composition, but without it it is impossible to become either a singer or an instrumentalist or even a mediocre listener. ... The knowledge of these laws may make very complex music sufficient and understandable for us, and may give us the possibility to read any type of score. ... The laws of harmony do not appear as a collection of arbitrary and artificial rules; ... they are based on the nature of the human spirit, on the physiological particularities of an organism, also on principles, which govern by sounding bodies. The laws of harmony exist in very nature—a great talent divines them instinctively, similar to how a self-taught mathematician derives very complex number combinations.27

Concerning the existence of the "laws of harmony," as opposed to the "arbitrary and artificial rules" of thoroughbass or "scholastic" theory—to use Serov's term—Odevsky and Serov agreed. Serov looked for these laws in the organic nature of music, "the laws of musical organisms"; Odevsky looked for them in "the nature of the human spirit, [in] the physiological particularities of an organism," and in the "divine instincts" of a great talent. But Odevsky also sought them in an additional source—acoustical science, in "principles, which govern by sounding bodies." Over the years, as he grew increasingly suspicious of the current interpretation of harmonic theory, acoustics became more important to him as a foundation for harmony. Like Serov, Odevsky underwent a change in his opinion of this theory.
Odoevsky and Western Theory. In a subsequent article, Odoevsky asks the question, "Who of musicians has not viewed with a feeling near to despair the existing theory of harmony?" In this article Odoevsky attacks scholasticism in music theory, in particular the predominance of the seventh chord, and the hegemony of four-part harmony. In his view the overuse of the seventh chord, for which there is no adequate explanation of origin, lead to a meager subsistence on only two modes. And concerning four-part harmony, Odoevsky points out that in fact there are eight different voice parts, or ranges. Four-part harmony is simply an unnecessary holdover from an earlier, less sophisticated, unscientific era, a tradition that theorists are reluctant to change:

Four-part harmony, based on an imaginary four-part construction of human voices [soprano, alto, tenor, bass], as also many other things in music, is a remnant of a mystical and enslaved time when scholasticism squeezed out its theory from several arbitrary works and not from the positive observations of natural phenomena. A strange matter, scholasticism, that is the denial of facts, having lost any merit in all the sciences, persistently held on to in the science of music. Even Félix, whose name is impossible to pronounce without sincere gratitude, Félix, who drove away the different contrapuntal ghosts with the happy thought about tonality, as the simple and deep foundation of any harmonic movement, Félix was frightened of his discovery and under the weight of scholastic theory and authority turned away from acoustical phenomena, because they by no means adapt themselves to the theory of the blessed four-part harmony.29

Here Odoevsky refers only to acoustical phenomena, "the positive observations of natural phenomena," as the foundation for theory.

The seventh chord receives Odoevsky’s enmity because, from the time of the introduction of the seventh chord into music, music was deprived of such a stable foundation by which lived the cantus firmus. The seventh chord proposed the end to the old modes, or, to our glasi, in which, in my opinion, is preserved the embryo of
the future development of music... Not remote is the epoch, when [the seventh chords] will so bore us with their monotony, that musicians will remember about the existence of other modes in nature.20

Odevsky foresees a return to the use of these "other modes," the modes used in folk and church music, as a positive step for the future course of music theory:

It is time, however, to advance the theory of music forward. Is it possible that it, alone of all the sciences, must remain in a scholastic binding and not search for its laws in bold, relentless conclusions from the positive observations of nature, and in them discover the truth[?]... We will return to nature, to this true ally of human understanding, without which it only withers away and sees only sickly signs.31

Odevsky cautions that the application of the eight glasi resulting in a rebirth of Russian music need not be restrictive, but on the contrary would be liberating for those music lovers bored by the old monotonous, "imaginary" idea of tonality, which to Odevsky is "nothing different than the disfigured remainder of glasi," and shocked by newer composers such as Wagner who

destroyed the pillars of the poglasitsy [here is meant the supporting, tonally stable sounds of the mode—G. B.] [with] innumerable rows of seventh chords of different sorts, which do not present any minutes of peace to our musical perception and what Fetis naively calls: musique omnitone... We by no means propose (secular) music in general to be limited only to the eight church glasi, but stress, that each melody and the harmony belonging to it, in order to be easily understood, should have unity, and this unity depends on the observation of the given poglasitsy of the glasi. Not at all is inhibited the freedom of musical fantasy, for such poglasitsy (outside the eight glasi) may be innumerable.32

As an example, he suggests that in the scale C Db E F G# A B C, each tone be treated as tonic, and that in such a "monstrous" melody as that in Example 9.1, which contains false fifths and fourths, a harmoniza-
tion may be devised that removes the "monstrousness" from the melody.

Example 9.1. A "monstrous" melody devised by Odoevsky.

Concerning this example, Odoevsky concludes:

I know that such poglasity, particular in the joining into one so-called tone (Tonart) of Db and G#, seems something monstrous for admirers of tonality, for such poglasity do not give the answer to the ridiculous question: what tone is it in?, but we already disagree with these people. It will answer one [question], namely, that real ugliness is included either in monotony or in the lack of any unity.33

In yet another article critical of Western music theory, Odoevsky asks:

On what is based all such rules, which we hold on to? Where is their rational secret? Are not many of these rules works of will, of fashion, of habit, of unsubstantiated repetitions of words of some kind of authority? Which of these rules induce strict criticism? From which way of the old rules sanctified by antiquity are now not only hopeless, but also with huge hope are violated by new works?34

Odoevsky specifies such anomalies as the stricture against parallel fifths and octaves, which is violated by composers from Bach on, the stricture against parallel fourths except when accompanied by the sixth, the impression of mode on hearing, and the difference between consonance and dissonance. He disapproves of the empirical approach on which so many pedagogues rely:
Textbooks do not give [the answers] to these essential questions; teachers refer to hearing, to taste, to what is acceptable. But there is not a place for references of such sort in science, for both hearing and taste and existing beliefs are conditional matters, variable not only in the passage of time, but also by separate persons; what pleases one, displeases another.35

Odoevsky believed that the answers lie in the immutable laws of nature, "the laws of musical phenomena," "the rational working out" of which the science of acoustics, starting with Euler and continuing in his day with Helmholtz, was just beginning to uncover.36

Is it possible that music alone ought to remain in the fetters of arbitrary rules and not require from them proof in the law produced by them[?] Thoughtful musicians are not surprised, if in my experiments and observations I limit myself naturally to directions in mathematical acoustics, and not in some thoroughbass. From the point of view selected by me without exception musical textbooks, as authorities, do not exist for me.37

Odoevsky's "Musical Grammar". Thus by the mid-1860s, when this was written, Odoevsky, as a result of his research and his own experience, accepted only acoustics, "the laws of musical phenomena," as the rational basis for musical science. His interest in acoustics led him in 1863-64 to construct a piano in which there were separate keys for each note in the enharmonic scale. Building this piano may have been part of an experiment to stretch his hearing facility to comprehend microtones, for at one point he wrote, "Music then only may be called all-sounding, when we find understandable to us the sounds between D and Eb."39

The culmination of Odoevsky's research into the theory of native Russian music, of his search for the natural laws of harmony, which led
him into the field of acoustics, and of his interest in music education, came in a short book published in 1868 entitled, Muzykal'naia gramota, ili osnovania muzyki dlia ne-muzykantov [A musical grammar, or the principles of music for non-musicians]. This work started out as a series of lectures that he gave in his home for musical amateurs in 1863-64. It was to have been just one of four volumes discussing the general theoretical bases of music, with a supplement on the history and theory of Russian music; but Odoevsky died after having completed only the first volume. His discussion of theoretical topics in this volume includes only the fundamentals, from intervals to modes and scales.

His goal in this "small book," as he expresses it, is to assist . . . such people who believe that it is already too late for them . . . to study music, but meanwhile would like to receive an understanding about its essence, in order either to write down songs heard by them, or in order more comfortably to read investigations in connection with the history of music, or finally, for special archeological and paleographic research of our old musical manuscripts, presenting such important given not only for Russian art, but also for the entire Russian history.41

Thus, Odoevsky intended this book not for young students at the conservatories, or for those young people just learning to play an instrument, but specifically for the general reader who was largely ignorant of technical information about music. By presenting to the public the basic ideas of music theory in an easily understandable method, Odoevsky hoped to dispel any fears of this subject and to popularize it to the point that Russians, armed with their knowledge of theory, would be able to read about, understand and appreciate their musical heritage, as presented in recent writings about chant and folk song, in far
greater numbers than had been able to do so previously. His goal in this endeavor thus echoes Serov's attempt in 1856 to educate the general reader-listener. Odoevsky assures his non-musical readers who fear the imaginary difficulty of musical science, that, on the basis of [my] many years and varied experience and observations, for comprehension of the technical, theoretical terms and to read and even to write music, to play on some kind of instrument or to sing arias is completely not necessary.42

He explains why this is so: "Music, as an art, is a matter of talent; but the laws of the acoustic phenomenon called music are nothing different than the application of mathematics, not even requiring, in a purely musical relation, a particularly wide mathematical knowledge."43

Only a knowledge of the first four rules of arithmetic and both simple and compound fractions, Odoevsky reveals, is needed in order to understand the physical basis of music, which he illustrates by means of a vibrating string, or monochord. Through four divisions of this string, he produces the ratios of four basic intervals—1 (prime), 1/2 (octave), 2/3 (fifth), and 4/5 (third). If the reader understands this process "both with the eye and the ear," then he has overcome the greatest obstacle of a full understanding, for "all music is nothing different than a series of links of these basic sound quantities [i.e., the four intervals] and their derivatives. . . . Who with his own experience is convinced of this simple truth will be able to read any book discussing music or singing."44

With these four intervals Odoevsky constructs the perfect triad (triestestvoglasie): "This link of sounds (chord) is not arbitrary; it is given by the very nature of sounding bodies, with which corresponds.
the construction of our ear and our throat, and therefore such a link plays a very important role in music." Odovsky returns to the idea of the triad and to its acoustical origin in the last chapter in the discussion of the overtone series, from which he derives both the triad and the diatonic, chromatic and enharmonic scales (through the circle of fifths, as derived from the second overtone). Odovsky had already produced the diatonic scale by means of the divisions of the vibrating string, but explains that the subsequent method was "simple and more practical."

Within the basic concept of scale (gamma), Odovsky distinguishes two types—the church tone (glas) and mode (lad):

These ideas [of church tone and mode] are frequently confused both in conversations and in books. . . . Glasy, briefly, are those parts of the diatonic scale where the locations of the half-steps depend on which of the seven tones the tonic or the basic tone (beginning) is located. Consequently we may form several series of tones or (in the old Russian terminology) poglobasity (tonleiter), which are distinguished among themselves both by the tonic, and, in particular, by the location of the half-steps. . . . A mode is also a part of a scale, with the difference being that in modes the intervals and half-intervals follow exclusively in the order that we find in the globasity [from C]. In it we find the following order of intervals: 1 1/2 1 1 1/2, 1/2.

Thus here again he relates the glasy to the church modes and here also he uses the term poglobasity to refer only to specific parts or fragments of scales, a usage more in keeping with its actual definition. He distinguishes two sorts (rody) of mode—major and minor. Concerning the latter, he illustrates only the melodic minor scale, adding, "The present globasity of the minor sort is still an argumentative point for theorists."
Odoevsky differentiates between scale and other similar concepts already discussed, again using poglasitsy as described above:

We recognize the names major and minor scale as inexact because the ideas about scale (Gamma-Tonleiter) are confused with the ideas about mode (Tonart) and sort (Tongeschlecht). There are only three scales, namely: diatonic, chromatic, and enharmonic. Modes, sorts, glasy—these are only poglasitsy, parts or variations of one of these three scales.48

In conclusion, Odoevsky asks the question, "Do other scales exist?" He answers:

The music world is subordinated to the conditions of these three scales: diatonic, chromatic, and enharmonic. No kinds of scales in other meanings exist. Frequently the names major or minor scale are given, as we noted above, to a well-known series of tones; now it is hoped that for the reader it is completely clear that such an expression confuses the idea, and even is simply absurd; not just any series of tones is a scale; this name belongs to such a series of tones, which join in themselves the acoustical conditions of one or another of the three scales named by us.49

Odoevsky was the first Russian theorist to attempt to clarify the distinction between the concepts of scale and mode. Other theorists used the terms—and continued to use them for many years—almost interchangeably. But in the twentieth century, when mode became an important subject of theoretical investigation, theorists of necessity adopted similar distinctions.

The most important aspects of Odoevsky's book are its twin emphases on acoustical phenomena as the basis for scales and triads, and on the theory of Russian chant and folk song as the basis for theory in general. Introducing the glasy first, then the major and minor modes, a novel approach in nineteenth-century theoretical literature in Russia, he explains the differences between them, and also emphasizes the old Russian musical terms, adding several new ones to those he had
already used, such as *pochin* for tonic. His dual approach constituted
new and even progressive ideas in the study of music theory in nine-
teenth-century Russia, yet they did not become established in Russian
traditional pedagogy and were hardly even noticed by his contempora-
ries. Only two comments concerning the book have been found in
Odoevsky's papers, one a letter from Hunke dated June 10, 1868, three
months after its date of publication:

Great is my happiness, that this subject finally appeared in the
greatest possible brevity, truth, and that future writers of the
theory of music will be able to base and develop their work on
this musical grammar. Even if the majority of the public also
does not suspect, that for the creation of a foundation for such a
subject, to this day very complex and obscure, much love and
energy was necessary, in order to collect its parts, scattered in
a great number of varied books; that for this a varied knowledge,
observations, the experience of practically an entire life was
necessary, but the more vital will be the gratitude and the thanks
of those students and lovers of the subject.50

**Odoevsky's Legacy.** To knowledgeable musicians such as Hunke,
Razumovsky, and Kashkin, Odoevsky's various contributions to native
Russian music and to music theory were readily apparent. His research
into folk music theory had potential repercussions not only for that
area but for general theory as well. He was the first Russian to
search for theoretical foundations outside of the Western-oriented,
somewhat outmoded harmonic theory accepted in Russia at that time. He
freed folk music of its Western harmonic fetters, and additionally
sought to free all music in a similar fashion. He hoped to do the same
for theory as well, providing it with a non-empirical, scientific
acoustical foundation—for the first time in Russia—that would erase
all memory of the old "scholastic" thoroughbass rules. But because of his death, he was not able to complete his work in this area. Nonetheless, Odoevsky provided an auspicious beginning for Russian music theory, one, though, that was not continued as immediately and fervently as he no doubt would have liked. Those who did follow in his tradition in the nineteenth century—Serov to some extent, Yury Arnol'd, and Mal'gunov—lacked his critical acumen and his scholarly resources and approach.

Serov and a Theory of Folk Music. Although Russian chant was becoming an accepted subject for scholarly research, thanks to the efforts of Odoevsky and Razumovsky, folk music still was not regarded in this manner, as Odoevsky pointed out in his dedicatory speech. Alexander Serov also lent his considerable skills to the promotion of folk song as a topic for serious study, and in the late 1880s and 1890s several other theorists began to study this subject seriously and publish their findings. (They will be discussed towards the end of Part IV.) Even so, during the nineteenth century, most Russian theorists were far too absorbed in assimilating Western theory and producing theoretical pedagogical works based on Western theory, rather than devoting their theoretical attention to the Russian themes and harmonies used by composers in their works. Even Rimsky-Korsakov, who both wrote a theory textbook and collected and utilized folk tunes, kept the two areas separate. A more proper merging of the two fields did not occur until the twentieth century.
Serov's contribution to the common goal that both he and Odoevsky aspired to reach, the establishment of Russian folk music as a scientific subject, was an article entitled, "Russkaia narodnaia pesnia, kak predmet nauki" [Russian folk song, as a subject of science], portions of which appeared over a period of three years beginning in 1869.

In the spring of 1868, Serov had presented a series of lectures on this topic and then published them in a general newspaper. These efforts of Serov apparently made little impression on the public, for, as he later wrote, they "passed by... without leaving a trace."

Regardless of the lack of support by the public or in the press for such scientific research in music, Serov nonetheless persevered:

I was convinced that the results of my observations on Russian song expressed by me then, in relation to artificial West-European music, must make up—and without a doubt will make up—a foundation of a strictly scientific view on this subject, a subject so important for the entire future development of particularly Russian music. We still do not have, and, probably, will not have for a long time a musical scholarly organization, for the judgment of which I would be able to present my work in its full working-out, in view of a dissertation, or brochure.* The publication of it in a separate small book here would be, again, almost aimless. Our public does not read detailed boring books on music, and the press avoids such works with silence, or greets them with slander.

*The Academy of Sciences, because of their complete lack of experts on musical subjects, probably, would not accept an examination of my work.53

Only in Muzykal'nyi sezon [The musical season], a critical newspaper for musicians in which musical examples could be printed, was Serov able to find a place suitable for what he considered to be a necessary publication.

Serov's starting point is the similarity between the theoretical foundations of Russian folk song and ancient Greek music.
Russian folk song . . . in its primordial forms . . . in its constitution reveals not only a relatedness, but a literal identity with ancient Greek music, with a constitution having come into being thousands of years earlier than Western "Kirchengattungen" and the musical scholasticism of the Neapolitan Conservatory of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.54

Thus, Russian folk music turns out, in his view, to be more ancient and, perhaps, more "pure" than Western music and certain of its proponents (Rubinstein and the other Western-oriented pedagogues), against which Serov by this time had developed a definite bias. His view of the theoretical foundations of Russian folk song therefore departs from that of Odicevsky, who held that the theoretical foundations of all native Russian music were akin to those of the church modes of the Middle Ages. This divergence in viewpoint is represented by one important difference, to be discussed shortly; in all other respects their theories coincide: Russian folk music is not constructed on the major or minor modes but on the diatonic scale, with no accidentals (unless transposed); Russian folk melodies contain no leading tones; Russian folk music never modulates; its rhythm is free and capricious; usual meters are 4/4 and 2/4, sometimes 3/4 and 3/8, but never 6/8, although sometimes 5/4 and 7/4 occur; and chords of harmonization are primarily the minor triads. Unlike Odicevsky, Serov does not deny the appearance in Russian folk melodies of leaps of a sixth; any interval, from the diatonic scale may occur, according to Serov. He did not stress this aspect as had Odicevsky. Also, although Odicevsky denied any sort of metric regularity, Serov does not rule it out, but names specific meters both common and uncommon in Russian folk song.
The most significant departure Serov made from Odoevsky's theory, though, concerns the difference between the ancient Greek modes and the medieval church modes. Greek music is constructed on a system of tetrachords. Whereas church modes— and the glas of Russian folk and church music in Odoevsky's theory—are based on the portions of the diatonic scale contained within the interval of the octave, Greek music is based on groups of tetrachords, combined either conjunctly or disjunctly. In Serov's theory of Russian folk song, two (diatonic) tetrachords are combined conjunctly, creating a seven-degree diatonic scale as its foundation. A disjunct combination also may occur, but "for a melodic constitution, [conjoined tetrachords] are richer with results, and with the Hellinists they also prevailed. As evidence of this serves the lyre with seven strings (in the order of a scale) and not eight." It also apparently prevailed in Russian folk music, at least in the examples found by Serov, for they all contain only seven-degree diatonic scales:

The triple tetrachords, from the same normally-diatonic scale and under the same very natural double means of grouping, appear identical with the Greeks. Conjunct tetrachords, joined with clusters:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{a b c d} & \text{b c d e} & \text{d e f g a} & \text{e f g a} & \text{a b c d} & \text{d e f g} \\
&\text{etc.}
\end{align*}
\]

give a very elegant constitution to the melodic organism, a thousand times more rich and natural for the ear than the melodic constitution of Western-European melody, where the chordal combination constantly is felt as a "skeleton."56

A melody may be made up of more than one seven-degree diatonic scale; in the examples given by Serov (two of which are shown in Example 9.2), each was formed from two such scales.
Example 9.2. Two folk melodies chosen by Serov: a) the well-known Russian song "Luchinushka"; b) No. 22 from Balakirev's collection.

In Example 9.2a, the second double cluster of tetrachords appears in the second half of the melody (second staff in example) from f'' (third note) down to g' (first half note) and then from e' (second half note) up to d'' (fourth note from end). In Example 9.2b, the melody is divided evenly between two different such clusters, one encompassing the whole first half, c'' down to d' (third staff in example), and the other in the second half, g' (second note and highest pitch) down to a (lowest pitch) in the second half (preserving the descending order,
which predominates in the given melody, as Serov points out).

In conclusion, Serov states:

Russian primordial folk song is based primarily not on the octave scale, but on the seven-tone [scale], consisting of conjunct tetrachords, sometimes similar, sometimes dissimilar. (Exactly the same seven-tone system [Heptachord] [sic] is the basis of all ancient Arabian and Persian music.) All three categories of the basic sound-combinations of a fourth, that is, the tetrachord c-d-e-f (which has become typical for the Western major mode), the tetrachord d-e-f-g (entering as a type for the first tetrachord of the Western minor scale), and, finally, the tetrachord e-f-g-a, having vanished completely from Western-European theory, and in practice creeping in rarely, have the full possession of equal rights in Russian folk song.57

(In this quote, "similar" and "dissimilar" refer to the inner construction of the tetrachords, which may consist of one of three patterns of whole and half steps—1, 1, 1/2; 1, 1/2, 1; or 1/2, 1, 1.)

Serov's observations regarding a quartal (tetrachordal) foundation of Russian folk music have been substantiated in part by other, later theorists, but his connection of the entire body of Russian folk song to Greek music and its limitation to a seven-note scale is an overgeneralization that does not correspond to practice. For one thing, we simply do not know enough about ancient Greek music to make such a definite correlation. Further, Serov's claim that Russian folk music, like Greek music (as far as we know), is solely monodic, is not true; here is further proof of a lack of correlation between them. And Odoevsky's attempt to relate Russian folk music to the medieval church modes may be substantiated only superficially, that is, the church modes themselves share only a common scalar pattern with the modes in folk music; similarities of other characteristics—cadences, melodic patterns, and the like—are lacking.
Summary. Regardless of the accuracy of their views, Odoevsky and Serov were pioneers in this area, for they were the first to devote serious attention to a theory of folk music. Their views constitute the earliest and only attempts at an original Russian theory of music of any sort. Yet despite their dislike for Western pedagogical theory, their approaches still rely considerably on ideas and methods from Western music history and science. Odoevsky's revival of Russian chant theory and his application of it to folk theory form an important effort to restrict his approach to native limits; but his turning to acoustical theory and Serov's to ancient Greek theory bring in Western elements that lessen their originality—but not, it must be emphasized, their potential influence. Future Russian music folklorists continued their methods to some extent, looking to acoustics and other extra-Russian—including both Western and Eastern—elements for corroboration of their research. It was not sufficient, it appears, to state simply and clearly the salient characteristics of Russian native music, to derive an original theory for it; these folklorists felt it imperative to look elsewhere for its origin and derivation. They found sources, too—acoustics, Greek rhythmic and modal theory, medieval theory, Chinese pentatonism, Indian modes, Western speculative theory, and the like. But in sum, their efforts may be viewed as the simultaneous occurrence of both the discovery of native elements and the discovery and assimilation of foreign ones; and both aspects formed one of the currents in this second stage of development of a native Russian music theory—the process of exploration in the speculative sphere.
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A quartal (or quartal-quintal) foundation for Russian folk song has been proposed by subsequent theorists as well, including Peter Petrovich Sokal'sky and, more recently, Eleonora Petrovna Fedosova, in her work *Diatonicheskie lad' ty v tvorchestve D. Shostakovicha* [Diatonic modes in the music of D. Shostakovich] (Moscow, 1980).
Chapter 10

Hermann Avgustovich Larosh: The Historical Approach to Music Theory

Hermann Avgustovich Larosh (1845–1904). Larosh, the third member of the "troika" of writers following Odoevsky who dominated Russian music criticism in the latter half of the nineteenth century, began his career as a critic while still a student at the St. Petersburg Conservatory. Over a span of thirty-seven years he wrote well over two hundred articles. A year after he graduated from the St. Petersburg Conservatory in 1866 (in organ and the theory of composition), he began teaching at the Moscow Conservatory. He taught both theory and history courses until 1870, and then again from 1883 to 1886. From 1872 to 1875 and again in 1879 he taught at the St. Petersburg Conservatory.

Larosh's contribution to the developing field of Russian music theory, in addition to his teaching activities, consists of his critical articles. In many of them he incorporated theoretical discussions and musical analyses in order to enrich the reader's understanding of the music and Larosh's own evaluation of it. Larosh began this practice, a natural consequence of his professional training as a composer, with his first serious article, "Glinka i ego znachenie v istorii muzyki" [Glinka and his significance in the history of music], and in
others that followed, such as "Kvartet E. Napravnika" [The quartet of E. Napravnik] and his survey of the romances of M. P. Azanchevsky.

As a theorist and teacher, though, one of Larosh's main concerns during the late 1860s and early 1870s was the current approach to the teaching of theory. Prompted by attacks from Serov and others—Cui, for example—Larosh defended the conservatories and their method of education. He considered the views of these conservatory opponents to be wrongful, prejudicial, and, above all, extremely harmful. They were harmful, he believed, because in Russia there were few proponents powerful enough to silence these opposing views, and because these criticisms were made in the name of progress, thereby making tradition—so vital and necessary in musical studies—suspect:

Attached to a general deficiency in Russia of people especially acquainted with the musical art and powerful to discuss correctly the problems and requirements of music education, any error, any one-sided and biased view, any result of dillitainment and ignorance, are used here with greater strength than in German and France, where they always may find a rebuff in serious and fundamental knowledge. But the strength of error appears ten times more dangerous when it takes the guise of liberal protest, when supporters of stagnation and decline are dressed in the clothes of fighters for progress, when elementary conditions of our instruction are branded as backward and pernicious hindrances of any development. . . . Under the banner of liberal direction, with a slogan of freedom and progress, here uncovers a path against the fundamental, necessary conditions of music education. Both institutions, intending to spread musical knowledge in our society, and also principles, methods, and traditions ruling in these institutions are exposed to blame and ridicule.

The chief target for these "pseudo-liberal attacks" was the course on strict counterpoint. Larosh pointed out that this course "is studied in our conservatories from year to year with unabated zeal" but is "very remote from what is made the foundation of all musical teaching
in Russia." Opponents of this course, though, looked upon it as "a form in which it is impossible to express any contemporary content, a dead language, in which scarcely anyone thinks, but admirers of musical antiquity write a few notes."

Larosh's defense of strict counterpoint rests on his argument that not only were the compositional achievements of the era of strict counterpoint great monuments of art, but also the study of the theory of strict counterpoint is the most essential part of a composer's musical education. It should therefore form the foundation for the entire pedagogical program of theoretical study. He called this "the historical method of practical teaching," because placing the study of strict counterpoint at the basis of theoretical training mirrors the actual historical development of music. The original laws of harmony, which, Larosh says, "are identical with our contemporary laws," were formed in the music of the sixteenth century:

All harmonic combinations, which the contemporary style possesses, consist of conclusions from beginnings placed in the sixteenth century; the style of this century contains the basic forms of our style, musical roots, from which the following development worked out more and more derivative forms. In the sixteenth century not only all the basic harmonies, simple and clear, were established, but also the perspective for all derived harmonies, not excluding the very complex and intricate [harmonies], was uncovered; the general laws of harmony, laws so judicious and fruitful, that their application, gradually expanding, lead harmony to such infinite variety, freedom and splendor, which make up its present distinction, were established.

Larosh later expanded upon this thought:

These laws [of harmony] are embodied in the great phenomena of the history of harmony, in the gradual arising of all simultaneous soundings ("chords") and the joining of them in time (the progression of chords), which, not making up the exclusive and ephemeral
signs of single composers, were established in practice and received the right of citizenship. The theory of harmony should explain the formation of these chords and the progressions of chords, in conformance with the origin of them in history, and the latter is easy to define, knowing the chronological order of their appearance in composition. . . . Nothing is so necessary for the teacher of the "theory" of music as a detailed knowledge of its history.9

The system of strict counterpoint is, according to Larosh,

constructed not on the acoustical fact of natural harmony, but on the idea of consonance and dissonance. . . . The theory of consonance and dissonance is easy to destroy from the abstract point of view, for example, on the basis of acoustics; it is impossible only to shake it as a historical fact.10

Thus Larosh preferred to interpret music theory from the empirical, historical point of view, rather than the scientific, acoustical point of view, and in so doing, disagreed with Odoevsky concerning the nature of the theoretical foundations of music.

For Larosh, then, the basic harmonic material available to the student is limited, and includes only major and minor triads, sixth chords, suspensions and passing notes, and also certain melodic intervals and figures, all within the framework of the church modes. This produces a theory of harmony in which "a single chord (triad) takes the place of many different chords and the system of melodic non-chord notes is under the command of strictly defined rules." In this theory dissonant chords are not independent entities, but "occur from some kind of melodic dissonance over a consonating chord." Through these limitations, the student eventually comes to know the origin of such formerly dissonant chords as the seventh and ninth chords:

The seventh chord on the dominant, when it occurs in a cadence, is explained as a passing note, but when it is found in a sequence of seventh chords—as a suspension; the ninth chord on the dominant
(both major and minor) is an undoubted suspension, and the nature of the suspension in them to this day is so strong, that the well-known school rule about the preparation of the ninth, which would not make any sense, if it were not a particular application of the general rule about the necessity of the preparation of the suspension, is still retained. The same may be said about the seventh and ninth chords on all degrees of the major scale; since they usually appear in sequences, one then prepares the other, and the preparation is the true sign of suspension. 13

Larosh also interprets the augmented sixth chord and the augmented triad as products of passing notes, adopting for the former the explanation given by Helmholtz, "deriving it from the sixth chord in the phrygian cadence, and not from an inversion of the dominant-seventh chord, as does Marx." As we have seen, this latter was one of Hunke's interpretations as well. (Larosh also criticizes Chaikovsky's interpretation of the resolution of this chord; see ahead.)

The true foundation for this style, then, is not chords, but individual voices:

In order to stand completely on the point of view of history, it is necessary to abandon the very basis of chords and to stand on the basis of voices. ... It is necessary to explain all the rules on the basis of consonances, to extract all chords from the context of melody, to begin certainly with two voices ... and to pass through the so-called categories of counterpoint. ... To the contemporary musician ... multi-voice music occurred from the progression of chords. In reality it occurred from the joining of voices. 15

In returning to the strictures and methods of sixteenth-century counterpoint, Larosh sees a solution to the problem of the interpretation of contemporary harmonic practice, which, as he and others before him—Serov, for example—pointed out, contemporary theory was not always able to explain. The new harmonic language of the Weimar school contained "a new application of passing and accessory notes, suspen-
sions and anticipations, pedals and enharmonic transformations," and church modes, the key to understanding of which is given in his hist-
16 rical method.

In [this method] unstable and infinitely flexible material (con-
trapuntal voices) are substituted for separate formations
(chords), and in the infinite variability of this material [one]
finds equally the explanation and the style of the sixteenth
century, when harmony flowed still in a narrow channel, near to
[its] source, and the style of the second half of the nineteenth
century, when it, in my opinion, overflowed into a boundless sea.
In this historical flow nowhere are there leaps, no stone walls,
separating one manner from another, one codex of rules from an-
other, and from here is the multisidedness of the historical view
and its general applicability.17

Larosh reveals that many professors were not teaching their students
about this rich harmonic language, "this gleaming and varied-colored
attire of sudden dissonances, unbroken remote modulations and enharmon-
ic transformations," for fear that the students would "abuse the
riches presented to them and go on a false path of unmotivated effects.

... A knowledge about Tristan would produce 'slaves of fashion.'"

This fear also prevented many musical scholars from any serious study
of this new style, for their "knowledge would remain pedagogically
infertile," since they would not be imparting it to their students.

Another benefit of the application of the historical method that
Larosh foresaw concerns then-current ideas about the minor scale. Most
theorists stressed that the basic form of the minor scale was the
harmonic minor scale and that the other two forms were mere "softenings
of this scale for the sake of the pleasantness of the melody."

Such a view, Larosh reveals, is incorrect both historically and pedagogical-
ly. Historically, the basic, original view of the minor scale is the
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melodic descending scale, the aeolian mode, which originated as such both in folk song and in the works of the strict style written in the church modes. Pedagogically, the acceptance of the harmonic minor scale as normal and basic leads to students using the "sharp and unhealthy interval of the augmented second" in the scale required by the theorists: "The student obeys, of course, and his hearing becomes dull to one of the very sharp effects, becomes indifferent to this effect and necessarily grows coarse. The effects of such a coarsening of hearing may be found in many contemporary composers." Exposure to Larosh's "historical method" would give the student the proper perspective towards this scale, and would prevent the student from abusing it.

The application of Larosh's historical method in the pedagogical curriculum would require first the study of counterpoint and only then the study of harmony. As Larosh points out, though, in most schools the order of study was the reverse—harmony followed by counterpoint. He blames this erroneous approach on the past popularity of thoroughbass, in which numbers and signs represent only one side of music—harmony—and ignore the melodic side. Larosh points to the synonymous usage of the terms "thoroughbass" and "music theory" as testimony to the importance of thoroughbass in music theory and the inattention by theorists to other theoretical subjects. Theorists looked upon harmony as the basis of music, and required its study before all else. One result, Larosh laments, was poor voice-leading in recent compositions.

Nineteenth-century textbooks reflect this order of study, harmony before counterpoint, as in the earlier works of Manfredini and Fuchs.
Only one, Larosh points out, Lehrbuch der musikalischen Komposition by August Rieseman, precedes the study of harmony with a short survey of two-part counterpoint, in a mixture of strict with free style. In still others, the subject of counterpoint is ignored completely, as in Marx’s Die Lehre von der musikalischen Komposition. Larosh does not mention Hunke’s counterpoint textbook, which covered free, not strict, counterpoint. (But Hunke favored beginning one’s theoretical studies with harmony, anyway.) He also points out that in all harmony textbooks, even though historically the seventh and ninth chords arose from the use of suspensions and passing notes, the chapters on the seventh and ninth chords precede the chapters on suspensions and passing notes. Both Fuchs and Hunke present this material in such a manner.

Aside from such general views and applications of the historical method to the teaching of music theory, Larosh observes two distinctions concerning Russian music and the particular importance of the historical method for Russian theoretical pedagogy. Both distinctions stem from the fact that at the time his views were expressed, Russia had not had and still did not have its own history of music comparable to that of Western Europe:

In our society the strict style of music not only is not a phase lived through by history, but also . . . is a phase which we still have not reached. . . . The "strict style" contains the basic forms from which the contemporary style of music developed. In the West, the musical art stands on firm roots and developed organically from the conditions of counterpoint. But the music of the West began to transfer into Russia only when the strict style already long ago had been made antique. We in the eighteenth century took prepared results from Italy and Germany, but did not transfer the roots from which they developed. . . . Our composers do not have under them ground in the centuries-long, organic development of the technique of art; they . . . began already very
late and owing to this appear all the disadvantages of the position of the Russian school of music. The process of the mastery of its forms and the turns of the musical lexicon is too easy, the value by which it acquired the mechanism of composition is too cheap, which very naturally engendered in many representatives of this school such an easy and contemptuous relationship to technique, such a disrespect to work and knowledge, which in the present time makes up nearly the main hindrance of our musical success. . . . Contrapuntists and theorists are our slaves, they worked long for us, and cleared for us a smooth and wide path by which we, fortunate people, not knowing work, remain only to rush in at full speed, and really sometimes for variety engage each other in a noble duel.23

The one person who epitomized this attitude was Serov (unnamed):

This contempt for work and knowledge, these polemical duels, for want of anything better to do, this lack of firm knowledge, and with it also firm convictions, this boastful and provocative self-assurance, all these regrettable and sickly signs of hasty and premature old age mainly appear in the critic, serving as an organ of the "young" part of our musical small world.24

Larosh points to other "signs of the disease" in practical works, all signs stemming from the wholesale borrowing of a technique already prepared—"dispairing searches for novelties and piquancy . . . the breaking of artistic form, breaking for breaking's [sake, not] by requirement of the inner content." From such signs,

it is impossible to erase the fact that in the general historical path of our musical education, we did not create harmony and forms of composition, but took them prepared from Western neighbors, and that almost always our musician does not himself make up harmony from particular contrapuntal etudes, but applies it prepared in the systematic theory of chords. And so, we are non-independent in technique.26

To Larosh, of course, the solution involves the application of the historical method so that each pupil might experience what his musical forbears had not:

In the small dimensions of musical pedagogy the great historical process of the formation of harmony needs to be repeated. The student himself needs to go through, needs independently to repro-
duce such a phase through which the development of harmony passed; he needs to find chords and their progressions by way of contrapuntal exercises, and the more intense, the more special will be his contrapuntal exercises, the richer will be the fruit of the music school. A superficial acquaintance and an encyclopedic survey is completely useless there. The knowledge of the names of the forms is not important, but the ability to produce the forms is; not communicating this ability, the school becomes a most dangerous hot-bed of dilettantism.27

The second distinguishing characteristic of Russian music that Larosh observes involves the relationship between theory and practice in the history of music. In Larosh's interpretation, the sixteenth century, the era of strict counterpoint, was the first era in which practice became more significant than theory. From antiquity, the theory of music, "the lexicon and grammar of musical language," because of its "specialness and exclusivity" acquired a "somewhat scholarly character, both in the ancient and middle ages. . . . The theory of music was a subject of scientific treatises, operating on mathematics, on philosophy, on theology, having endeavored to take a subject as wide and as abstract as possible, and to find for it general, unshakeable foundations." In the Renaissance, though, the gap between theory and practice began to close:

It is impossible not to see a narrow interaction between theory and practice, [and] it is impossible not to recognize the whole-some influence of one on the other. . . . Theory noticeably de-scends from philosophical and mathematical abstractions to parti-cular occurrences, to living examples. . . . In the end of the fifteenth century . . . the thought of the theorist acquired abundant material, which was necessary to master and to put into a reasonable system. The theory of music in the sixteenth century splendidly fulfilled this problem. . . . Theory recognized the vastness of completed successes and treated the great achievements of composition with such deep, objective attention, which communicated to its positions the character of vitality and fruitful-ness.29
The entire history of music has been the development of an art from its scientific foundations, according to Larosh. Until the fifteenth century, the theory of music, the scholarly, scientific side of music, predominated; but beginning with the fifteenth century, the theory of music began almost unconsciously "to yield practical fruit," while maintaining its basically abstract character. In the sixteenth century, however,

music loses its scholarly, scholastic character; having had a feeling for its huge young strength, artistic creation appears as the first priority and hides its abstract learning. . . . Theory, not long ago still having taken precedence, is confined within proper limits. From this time these limits basically are narrowed all the more, because the field of practical activity becomes more intense, attracts all the more attention and sympathy of the public, becomes all the more respected and more rewarding. In musical art, as it was formed now, theory preceded practice.30

Larosh sees parallels between this development and the state of Russian music at that time:

This trait, perhaps, is predestined to be repeated in the history of Russian music. If we exclude Glinka, then our practical activity in the field of music is insignificant. And moreover here in recent time musical pedagogy was revived: the founding of the two conservatories in St. Petersburg and Moscow gave it abundant food. In the number of subjects taught in the conservatories, the theory of music takes an important place. It is very possible, that in many Russian musicians of the near future, growing up on conservatory soil, the basic theoretical knowledge will outweigh practical fruitfulness, creative ability. If the great historical experience is predestined to be repeated, then this theoretical knowledge will serve as a fundament, on which practical activity will subsequently grow. In such a case, the study of the theory of music for contemporary Russian musicians is doubly important. Not only an educational guide, but also the historical condition, necessary namely in the present degree of our development and standing, so to speak, on the line in the history of our music, will have significant value for him. . . . For contemporary Russian music, pedagogical activity is more important, more urgent, and more valuable than creative [activity], and therefore the theoretical study of the subject, in my opinion, promises more sound and essential fruit.31
At the time Larosh wrote these words (1872-73), his prediction was in the process of becoming true, but not on such a wide scope as he had envisaged. It is not really possible as Larosh did to ignore the creative contributions of Glinka; his impact was far too wide to be discounted. Thus the activity in the practical arena was earlier and greater than Larosh pretended. And beginning in the 1860s, both pedagogical and creative activity increased manifoldly, and in two directions: One side proclaimed that long and arduous study in traditional subjects was the clear path to creative mastery and achievement in music composition; the other side disdained such work, preferring to learn through practice, and for technique, concentrating on the independent reading and analysis of scores of recent music. Until his death in 1871, Serov was the main proponent of the latter course; he championed the music of "the five," none of whom ever rigorously pursued his craft academically (except for Rimsky-Korsakov, who studied belatedly after he became a professor at the St. Petersburg Conservatory in 1871). Rubinstein and Larosh argued for the former course. In his articles, Larosh repeatedly criticizes Serov and his method of study as resulting in "servile imitation in content and form," "imitativeness and repetition of stale news to infinity":

Thus, not only teaching is locked up in the narrow circle of analysis and reading, but also the very reading in its turn is locked up in a narrow circle of fashionable contemporaneity, of the newest cream of musical progress. As a result of the pedagogical method, extolled by our musical liberals, appears a generation of composers, educated in disdain of great music of the past, in the ignorance of history, in the inability to write a vocal score, in the proud repetition of favorite places, in tasteless originalities, in vain ignorance. And if not all these sad sides
of our contemporary musical life have as a natural root a method of education, then it is impossible not to agree, that the introduction of another method, contrapuntal, serves as a powerful means for the removal of a large part of them, having given to the young mind a healthy musical means, having given to all education a sound, historical fundament.32

Larosh did not deny the value of score-reading and analysis, but believed that before they could be undertaken, strict, systematic instruction in the fundamental areas of counterpoint, harmony, and form was necessary. For score-reading to be useful, the student needed to be able to investigate and define the technique of the work, and to understand its spirit and inner content.

The analysis of musical works in the highest degree develops the critical ability and a feeling of grace; but the student, never having practiced the basic forms of his art, is unable to see anything in the investigated work, is unable to give himself an account of its construction, is unable to evaluate its detailed scope and to extract from the analysis some kind of use for his own development.33

Larosh's prediction came true to a certain extent: Only after the conservatories were established did creative practical activity flourish to an ever higher and greater degree than it had previously. And the fruits of theoretical training in the conservatories became ripe sooner than Larosh had anticipated. One need think only of Chaikovsky in this regard, and following him, in the theoretical arena, Taneev, Arensky, Conus, Ippolitov-Ivanov, and many others. But the first wave of "great" Russian composers—Glinka, Serov, Dargomyzhsky, Balakirev, Cui, Borodin, Musorgsky, and Rimsky-Korsakov—were not products of the conservatories. Their work was built on the achievements of lesser composers reaching back into the eighteenth century, when the first attempts at Russian composition in secular music were made. The strug-
gle for independence from Western technique and models had been going on for some time before Larosh formulated his solution; and the ultimately successful outcome of this struggle involved not only self-discipline and deep immersion into theoretical fundamentals, including strict counterpoint, but also a recognition of a uniquely Russian approach to composition, using native Russian music as models and inspiration. Larosh was correct in stating that only a development and nurturing of one's creative ability through the study and application of the general compositional principles formulated from the Renaissance on, and not imitation of current popular devices and colorings in vogue, could lead to the liberation of one's talent unencumbered by the need to enslave oneself to the usage of current popular devices due to lack of technique. He did appreciate and recognize that with sufficient talent and innate ability to discriminate good from bad, a composer might be able to put together a composition that was satisfactory and pleasing. This is what Balakirev and his group were able to do, aided by their own understanding and appreciation of native Russian music, aspects of which they included in their compositions (as well as other colorful devices "borrowed"—or perhaps better to say "attributed to"—Eastern and other exotic musics). Despite the successes of a small group of composers using this method, Larosh could not and would not accept the idea that future generations of composers would be able to survive as composers and produce great works of art on this method alone. It may have worked for a few, but it could not possibly work on a larger scale. The new Russian tradition of the superficial study of
theory by composers in Russia had to be broken and the old Western
tradition of study had to be introduced.

Music was the last of the arts to become established in Russia
with its own educational institutions, and their founding was long
overdue. Following their establishment, not only the composition of
music, but also the scholarly fields of theory and musicology began to
flourish in Russia. Larosh's axiom that theory preceded practice did
not always apply, though—perhaps to theory in the sense of theory
pedagogy, but not theory in the sense of theoretical scholarship.
Theory in the latter sense in Russia arose only after decades of peda-
gogical and compositional activity, and was made possible only after
the establishment of a system of higher music education in Russia. For
as has been shown here, Russian theoretical scholarship existed at only
a very rudimentary level. Larosh confused the philosophical, mathema-
tical theory of the ancient and middle ages with the practical, pedago-
gical theory of the Renaissance and beyond needed to train composers
and theorists.
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Chapter 11

Peter I'Ilich Chaikovsky: A Russian Harmony Textbook for the 1870s

Theory Books in the 1860s. Despite the growing attention to the study and development of music theory by Russian musicians in the 1860s, established trends in theory books in Russia did not alter appreciably. Eight of the ten theory books published in Russia during this decade were foreign works, either translations of existing texts or new works by non-Russian authors residing in Russia (Hunke, for example). Only two native works, those by Odoevsky and Glinka (Serov's compilation of his notes on instrumentation), were produced. Glinka's work was soon superceded by Chaikovsky's 1866 translation of A. F. Gevaert's textbook on instrumentation, used in both Russian conservatories. Odoevsky's work, in spite of its novel approach, continued the tradition of Russian theory books established by Petrunkevich—the brief brochure covering theory fundamentals or elementary harmony. From Petrunkevich to Odoevsky Russian authors wrote six such works. The writing of theory works in greater depth or detail on such topics as harmony, counterpoint, or composition, was for this decade still left to foreigners. The 1868 translated harmony textbook by Ernst Friedrich Richter was the best and most widely used in this regard.
Theory Books in the 1870s. Chaikovsky broke this practice by writing his own harmony textbook in 1871. Although Russians continued to write theory books of the more elementary sort—seven such works appeared during the 1870s alone—Chaikovsky became the first Russian to follow the example set by Fuchs and Hunke in the field of harmony. In all, twenty-one theory works, eleven translations and ten native works, were published in Russia in this decade. This figure was slightly more than twice the number of the previous decade; native works, including the seven elementary works, Chaikovsky's work plus a later abridged version of it, and a minor work by an unknown, M. Knopf, accounted for the greater share of this increase. A textbook on elementary theory that rivaled Chaikovsky's in popularity was Uchebnik elementarnoi teorii muzyki [A textbook of the elementary theory of music] (Moscow, 1875), by Nikolai Dmitrievich Kashkin, the first conservatory professor to write such a work. Although certainly not the first of its type to be written by a Russian, as we have seen, it proved to be the most useful, popular, and enduring, going through numerous editions, the last in 1931. Among translated works, Helmholtz's 1863 work, Die Lehre von dem Tonempfindungen, had already created a stir in Russia by the time it was published in translation in 1875. Other translated works on Helmholtz and on acoustics were also published in Russia during this time. In addition to his translations of Richter's theoretical works, which included his textbooks on counterpoint and fugue in addition to the harmony textbook, the composer and writer Alexander Sergeevich Famintsyn (a former pupil of Richter's) provided transla-
tions of Marx's 1839 book, Allgemeine Musiklehre, and a guide to modulation by the German Felix Draeseke. The one translated work published only in Russia, by the Russian-born Yury Arnol'd, will be discussed shortly.

Peter Illich Chaikovsky. By far the most consequential theory book of the decade, though, turned out to be Chaikovsky's Rukovodstvo k prakticheskому izucheniu garmonii [A guide to the practical study of harmony]. For some time in his harmony classes at the Moscow Conservatory, Chaikovsky had been using the 1868 translation of Richter's Lehrbuch der Harmonie, which he regarded highly. Eventual disenchantment with this text, however, and the lack of any other suitable text led him to write his own textbook. Yet, while he felt existing harmony textbooks to be inadequate, he denies that his own work would be ground-breaking or new in any way:

Starting the composition of the offered guidebook, I least of all had in mind to bring into musical science a new system, new views. Having been convinced that, judging by the growing musical abilities of the public, the need for textbooks has become more urgent with each day, I decided to assist the fulfillment of this necessity as much as possible. Lovers of theoretical research and musical philosophical reasonings will not find in my book food for their curiosity; beyond this I flatter myself with the hope, that the student generation finds in it the accomplice on the path of the practical study of the technique of art. It does not delve deeply into the essence and cause of musical harmonic phenomena, does not endeavor to discover principles connected with the scientific unity of the rule causing harmonic coloring, but states in possible succession the instructions introduced in an empirical way for beginning musicians, looking for an instructor in their experiments towards composition.

Neither does he have much faith in the theoretical science of his day:
I also resolve not to call my modest, specially pedagogical work by the fine-sounding name of theory. If also it is doubtless that musical science, gradually improving, will finally find the key to the theoretical explanation of harmonic mysteries, then certainly it may be doubtful that an acquaintance with the theories of harmony existing in our time, constructed on sand, may yield an important benefit to students. Nothing so confuses the beginner, nothing so weakens in him the energy and zeal to the study of music, as verbose, specious, prolix, though perhaps also witty or lofty phrases about harmony found in several textbooks and lavished by several teachers. And so, I repeat, my guide does not add a single note to the treasure of music theory; I know that in the rich musical pedagogical literature it would pass as an undiscovered phenomenon. But in Russia, having scarcely only one good translated work in this field (I speak about the Textbook of Harmony of Richter), I am bold to think that my work, pursuing serious practical goals in the matter of music, has some information to be useful; it is called forth by the obvious need for textbooks.

But while Chaikovsky disdained the attempt to introduce any new music theories, he nonetheless approaches the study of harmony in a unique manner. Built on the tenets of Western harmonic theory, his approach provided his students with a practical, empirical method that proved to be both useful and popular. Influenced by his friend Larosh's views on the historical method of theory pedagogy, which coincided with his own desire to impart to the students the need to develop their own abilities, their own musical tastes, unencumbered by difficult and unproven theories, he stresses voice-leading principles and follows an empirical approach presented in a logical manner. This latter consists in a thorough presentation and discussion of triads and seventh chords, their construction and connection, and modulation in the first part of the textbook before moving to the discussion of non-harmonic tones followed by the more complex, dissonant combinations, what he calls "accidental harmonic forms," in the second part.
To underscore his concern about voice-leading, Chaikovsky frequently and consistently emphasizes the melodic aspect in the study of harmony, the idea of melody as the foundation of music, as the true originator of vertical harmonies. Thus he stresses the independent treatment of the various parts rather than blind adherence to the rules of harmonic progression, which for Chaikovsky were at times only marginally useful. In a passage concerning the retention of the common tone between chords, for instance, Chaikovsky states, "The unconditional use of the rule is necessary in so far as it does not hinder us in the achievement of our main goal: a thorough development of the freedom of the voices." In a passage about the open position, he writes, "The true beauty of harmony requires the full independence of each voice." Thus, at times, melodic necessities may override harmonic laws:

Though deduced by way of experience and confirmed by musical feeling, harmonic laws are indisputable in their essence; but in a fully developed harmony, the melodic requirements of the voices are so strong that they frequently justify decisive deviations from [harmonic] laws. The predominance of the melodic element and the subordination to it of chord combinations are expressed particularly sharply in the incorrect resolutions of dissonant chords. In sum, he calls voice-leading "the entire essence of harmonic technique." In accordance with Larosh's suggestion, his "accidental harmonic forms"—which include augmented triads and augmented sixth chords—arise "from the melodic movement of voices, not containing the essence of the harmony . . . either from a non-simultaneous appearance or from sounds alien to the chord." He places suspensions and anticipations in the first category and passing or accessory notes in
the second. In addition to his numerous references to it here and elsewhere throughout the text, he devotes one chapter towards the end of the book specifically to the art of strict part-writing ("The Strict Style of Harmony") and one to a freer type of partwriting using all the harmonies available ("The Further Development of Voice-leading"). As we have seen, chapters on counterpoint have been included in works published in Russia by such theorists as Manfredini and Fuchs, but never has contrapuntal technique been so emphasized and integrated into all the segments of the work as here.

In his avoidance of high-sounding theories and postulations, Chaikovsky therefore does not attempt to explain or justify the various harmonic rules set forth in his book. He mentions only that they arose empirically, and therefore appeals to the musical instinct of the student to help him understand, for example, the correctness or incorrectness of a particular progression or leap. Harmonic laws are "deduced by way of experience and confirmed by musical feeling." He believed that the talented student with good musical instincts should have little or no difficulty in accepting these harmonic rules and developing them even further:

In general, theory is able to characterize voices only in general traits; attentive exercises, supported by musical instinct, best of all will elucidate to the student such subtle requirements and qualities of free voice-leading, which theory finds difficulty in formulating.

And:

But theory, generalizing and systematizing forms, in which most frequently of all appear harmonic combinations, is not able to foresee the majority of separate, isolated phenomena in musical practice. We leave to the talented student, by inner incentive
exceeding the limits of defined theory, to follow the suggestions of his instinct. From the other side, the less talented student, searching for firm support in theoretical formulas, will do well if he will not endeavor to release himself from difficult rules. 

As an important practical application of his pedagogical theories, one assured to encourage creative independence in his students, Chaikovsky includes numerous exercises in the harmonization of a given melody, as well as in figured bass. Unlike Richter, for example, who introduced some exercises in melodic harmonization but indicated the chord choices, Chaikovsky leaves the chord choice entirely up to the student. He does restrict the student at first only to triads and certain dissonant chords, but later allows the student full use of all available, justifiable harmonic combinations. This new emphasis on melodic harmonization was further encouraged by Rimsky-Korsakov in his textbook, and it soon became common practice in Russia.

Perhaps the most widely-discussed and even controversial aspect of Chaikovsky's theoretical views as set forth in his Guide concerns his introduction of the triads. At the beginning he gives at once all the triads of the major scale, and allows the student to use all of them from the very first exercise. This differs slightly from Richter's practice: at first Richter concentrates only on the three principal triads, but within the first two chapters gives and discusses the remaining triads from both the major and minor modes. However, Chaikovsky provides the names only for the three main triads—tonic, dominant, subdominant—explaining that they constitute "the essence of the harmony of the major scale" because of their deep inner connections:
Truly, including in themselves all the diatonic degrees of the scale, and being found in a deep inner connection between themselves, they fully define their tonality and already by themselves are sufficient for the harmonic accompaniment of each melody, not exceeding the limits of the given major mode. Their connecting inner relatedness is explained very easily, for we remember the relatedness of such scales, which they serve as representatives. The triads on the 5th and 4th degrees, taking part in the harmony of a given mode in the capacity of dominant and subdominant triads, are at the same time the tonic triads of the two modes nearest in the circle of fifths. And so: The inner connection of the three major triads of the major mode is the reflection of the relatedness (by the commonness of tetrachords) of the three modes lying side by side in the circle of fifths [his emphasis].20

In other words, Chaikovsky derives the inner connection of triads from the relatedness of tonalities, and not the other way around, as theorists usually do. He considers the minor triads to be less significant than the major triads because, even though they contain an equally close connection—representing three adjacent modes in the circle of fifths—their character is one of "relative weakness, of softness . . . they exist to serve as a beautiful contrast to the strength and might" of the major triads. The relatedness of the minor with the major triads reflects "the parallel relatedness of modes, since the chords of the first and sixth, the fifth and third, the fourth and second degrees are distant from each other at the interval of a minor third."

Chaikovsky thus groups these triads accordingly:

Thus we may divide the entire mass of major and minor triads of the major mode into three groups, with two triads in each: the tonic from triads on the 1st and 6th degrees, the dominant, from triads on the 5th and 3rd, and the subdominant, from triads on the 4th and 2nd degrees.23

He discusses the diminished triad on the seventh degree in a later chapter.
Taking into consideration the subsequent development of Russian and Soviet music theory, in which, beginning with Rimsky-Korsakov and later influenced by Riemann and other theorists, the idea of functionalism becomes a prominent feature of Soviet harmonic theory, it is important to determine exactly what Chaikovsky meant by this narrowing down of the six triads into three groups. Did he intend these groupings to be functional in any way? Considering his emphasis from the beginning on all the major and minor triads of the major mode, and the fact that he did not advocate either in his text or in his examples and exercises any functional substitution of one chord for another within the same group, it is difficult to read any functional intention into his groupings. The Soviet theorist A. A. Stepanov, who has studied this question in detail, denies categorically that Chaikovsky intended his groupings to be interpreted in a functional manner. He emphasizes that Chaikovsky's groupings of the triads of the major mode are only "a factual recognition of the parallel major-minor system, and also of the variable-functional connections of harmonies." However, Chaikovsky does occasionally utilize these groupings, as when explaining chord choice for cadences. As the initial chord in one type of cadence, he suggests that the student pick one of the chords from the subdominant group, which contains IV, IV, ii, ii, and ii 6/5, or from the tonic group, which contains I, I, vi, and vi. As Stepanov concludes, though, "It is difficult to recognize these joinings as particularly functional. The 'true role' of chords as representatives of some 'group' is not found in the textbook."
Chaikovsky also groups the seventh chords according to their inner construction, although differently, following the practice of earlier theorists such as Hunke. He treats the seventh and ninth chords as dissonances because they contain the dissonant intervals of a seventh or ninth. The ninth chord is "doubly dissonant," since it contains both. These dissonant chords are not independent; they receive their support and justification only in the following chord, the chord of resolution. He considers the dominant seventh chord the most important one, and separates it from the other seventh chords. He calls the remaining seventh chords "sequence chords," since they most frequently appear in sequence. Those in the major mode he places in three groups based on intervallic structure: I and IV (major triad with major seventh); ii, iii, and vi (minor triad with minor seventh; and vii (diminished triad with minor seventh). He regards the sequence chord vii in both major and minor as a ninth chord without the basic note, in order to determine its proper resolution.

Other innovative or controversial aspects of Chaikovsky's approach concern his treatment of modulation and of the augmented sixth chord. Theorists in Russia beginning with Hess de Calvé had identified three main types of modulation. The most general and one of the earliest definitions refers to modulation simply as chord changes within a given key. This definition occurs in works by Fuchs and Hunke (and in the translated works of Manfredini, Richter, Lobe, and Marx). A subsequent, more precise definition distinguishes between two types—a "deviation," a temporary sojourn into a new key, and a "transfer," a
definite change of key involving a lengthier process to move into and establish the new key. Fuchs, as mentioned, became the first theorist in Russia to identify these two types in print. Hess de Calvé mentions only the deviation; Hunke discusses only the transfer in addition to modulation as chord change. (Among translated works, those by Marx and Lobe also made these distinctions. Richter discussed only transfer in addition to chord change.)

Chaikovsky, in another departure from tradition, changes the nomenclature and definition of modulation, directing the emphasis more towards the means of modulation, i.e., how it is effected, and further refining the entire theoretical concept. He distinguishes between two types of modulation—"direct" and "passing." A "direct" modulation is completed by one chord, the dominant of the new key, that has the ability immediately to leave the previous key and move into a new key to which it belongs exclusively. It therefore does not function as a common chord. A "passing" modulation is completed by one or more secondary keys. He declined to set down any limits for the passing modulation, either concerning the choice of key into which to modulate or the length of time to spend in any of the secondary keys, leaving such decisions up to the personal taste and musical instincts of the student. In Chaikovsky's view, then, modulation is brought about either by a single chord, which is not a common chord, or a series of chords.

Chaikovsky also treats the augmented sixth chord differently from his predecessors. Theorists from Hess de Calvé to the present day—
regardless of how they actually derive the chord—usually place the augmented sixth chord on the lowered sixth degree of the scale and resolve it either to the dominant or to the tonic six-four chord. Chaikovsky, though, places this chord on the lowered second degree and resolves it to the tonic in root position. In addition, he constructs it not on the foundation of a seventh chord, as previous theorists in Russia had done, either on an essential or a dominant seventh chord, but primarily according to the principles of voice-leading. (He goes further in this regard than even Hunke, and completely avoids its secondary dominant flavor.) Thus, Chaikovsky considers to be in C major an augmented sixth chord that most theorists would consider to be in F major or F minor. But when analyzed in C major, his augmented sixth chord—Db-F-B, Db-F-G-B, and Db-F-Ab-B, equivalent in F major to the French, Italian, and German augmented sixth chords—are in fact altered V or vii chords (Example 11.1a–c). The French sixth chord, for example, is the second inversion of the dominant seventh chord in C major with a lowered fifth (Example 11.1b). The other two chords may be viewed as either incomplete dominant seventh or dominant ninth chords or as diminished chords built on 7 (Example 11.1a and c).

Chaikovsky claims the construction of these chords on the lowered sixth degree to be incorrect for this reason:

The use of chords with the augmented sixth on the lowered sixth degree is no more than a modulatory deviation into the mode of the dominant, which, not being a conclusively expanded cadence, does not produce the impression of a full modulation. But one has only to combine one of these chords with a triad on the dominant of an extended cadence in order to feel the modulatory character of the chord with the augmented sixth on the lowered sixth degree.
Example 11.1. Chaikovsky: augmented sixth chords, constructed on lowered second degree; a) augmented sixth chord; b) augmented three-four chord; c) augmented five-six chord; d) augmented three-four chord with doubly augmented fifth, constructed on lowered sixth degree.

He illustrates his point with a deviation into G major within the framework of C major contrasted with a true modulation into G major from C major. In Chaikovsky's view, the chord in question—Ab–C–D–F♯—belongs to G major, not C major (Example 11.2). Thus Chaikovsky considers the augmented sixth chord on the lowered sixth degree to be endowed with a strong modulatory character.

He does admit to one augmented sixth chord constructed on the lowered sixth degree and resolved to a tonic six-four chord—the augmented sixth chord with a doubly augmented fourth, Ab–C–D♯–F♯ in C (Example 11.1d). This chord occurs as a result of the passing chromatic alteration of three of the notes in the second inversion of the seventh chord on II preceding the tonic six-four chord in a cadence.
Example 11.2. Chaikovsky's view of a) deviation into G major within framework of C major; b) true modulation into G major from C major.

Needless to say, Chaikovsky's treatment of the augmented sixth chord regarding its resolution, with the exception of the fourth version, did not become part of Russian harmonic theory. Theorists at that time were apparently divided over this issue, according to Larosh; but most subsequent theorists—judging from their published works—agreed with Larosh, who points out that the practice of the great masters of the classical era does not uphold Chaikovsky's view:

It is remarkable that no one with a view similar to Chaikovsky's took the trouble to look at the works of Mozart, Gluck or Haydn from the point of view of the use of the disputed chord; they would have made certain, that in the classicists this chord never precedes the tonic triad, and that is why to explain it as the position of the fifth in the dominant seventh chord (as they do) has not the slightest foundation. The use of this chord as presented in their explanation begins in the history of music no earlier than Franz Schubert, and thus may not be considered basic; it is no more than a magical exception. 29

Nevertheless, the prestige and influence of Chaikovsky's guide was such that with it he helped to establish the "Moscow tradition" in the
teaching of harmony. He directly influenced the next generation of Moscow theorists, including Arensky, Taneev, Conus, and Ippolitov-Ivanov, and later theorists such as Liubomirsky, Rudolf, and Gliere. A number of significant elements from his Guide formed the foundation for this "tradition": the introduction of all the triads at an early stage in the study of harmony accompanied by greater freedom and flexibility on the part of the student, which is probably the most important aspect of his approach in terms of later influence, since it provided a distinct alternative to the system introduced some years later by Rimsky-Korsakov in his textbook; the harmonization of melody; the changed views towards modulation; and the study of "accidental" chords after the study of diatonic chords, modulation and non-harmonic tones.

Regardless of its innovations, though, Chaikovsky's Guide upholds a traditional view of harmony. Its harmonic language is not romantic but classical; in fact, he cautions the student against the overuse of chromatic harmonies and passing notes. Of the variations of the minor mode, for example, Chaikovsky treats only the harmonic minor, with strong attendant strictures regarding the interval of the augmented second, recalling an earlier period of harmony pedagogy. Concerning other types of minor mode, he states, "The other so-called melodic minor scale has no significance for harmony; for, as its name implies, it is merely a variation of the systematic [harmonic] scale, made in order to avoid the unmelodic step of the augmented second on the sixth degree." This restriction of the minor mode for melodic reasons does not readily coincide with Chaikovsky's emphasis on the melodic inter-
pretation of harmony. For these deficiencies and its strongly pedagogical approach, Chaikovsky's textbook was criticized as "dogmatic" by some of his contemporaries. A decade and a half later, his work was eclipsed in use and popularity by Rimsky-Korsakov's harmony textbook, but the more important of his views have been kept alive over the years. Recent evaluations of the Guide by Soviet theorists have reaffirmed its preeminent position, though, either through tracing its influence in subsequent published works (Miasoedov), or reassessing Chaikovsky's approach regarding functional logic, among other aspects, in light of the development of Soviet harmonic theory of the twentieth century (Stepanov). Miasoedov, for example, eschews the predominantly functional aspect of contemporary Soviet harmonic theory, which may be traced back to Rimsky-Korsakov, and looks to Chaikovsky's Guide for reaffirmation of a freer, less dogmatic approach:

The advantages of the system of the school of Chaikovsky are indisputable above all because this system operates on a wider circle of musical stylistic phenomena than the method of Rimsky-Korsakov. The latter, being based on the regulatory laws of the Riemann-type functional theory with its hyperbolizations of the role of the main triads, has as its support only one definite style. For European Romanticism and especially for Russian music, this system is poorly suitable, since it may not envelop the entire variety of the more free functional connections arising in these musical cultures... The school of Chaikovsky gives in this relation great freedom for the understanding of the varied and subtle manifestation of functionalness, only partially in the general positions contiguous to the functional theory of Riemann.

The teaching of harmony in the tradition of the school of Chaikovsky is conducive to the development of the musical ideas of the student literallly from the first steps of the study of harmony; already the first lessons require not only a logical comprehension of the subject, but also the active participation of the hearing. The methodological difficulties, arising at first, particularly attached to the transfer from the harmonization of the bass to the harmonization of the melody, is compensated with
interest in the following study of the course by the great ease of perception and, what is exceptionally important, a more conscious mastery of the material. These circumstances lead to a significant speeding up of the mastery of the subject and the economy of time, which with hope may be used for the development of the analytical side, with a scope of the different stylistic phenomena, and to the approach of the entire course to contemporaneity. The intensification of the study of harmony, achieved attached to the use of the method of all degrees, opens up such a possibility.

Stepanov, though, sees in Chaikovsky's work many views prescient of later harmonic theory, both functional and otherwise, and characterizes Chaikovsky's achievement as

having created a practical textbook of a new style... [which] directed the thought of the student on a path not limited by narrow restrictions, [but on a path] of the creative development of musical thought. ... The most important theoretical positions of the textbook were advanced not only for its time. Being distinguished by logical construction, artistic direction, [and] methodological progression, they anticipated essential moments of the further "movement" of musical science.

Among the "advanced positions" not specifically discussed herein are: Chaikovsky's approach to the definition of chord (see ahead on Rimsky-Korsakov), and his interpretation of the use of the subdominant, in major within plagal cadences, and in minor following the dominant.

Thus, in addition to being the first important theory textbook by a Russian, Chaikovsky's work has remained significant for its content as well. This has been corroborated both through practice and through theoretical examination. It provided an auspicious beginning for Russian pedagogical music theory, which developed rather rapidly during the next few decades.

Chaikovsky wrote a second harmony textbook, Kratkii uchebnik garmonii [A brief textbook of harmony], in 1874, at the suggestion of
the Society of Ancient Russian Art, of which he was a member. Through this work the Society hoped to promote a greater knowledge of choral music and of the technique for composing it. Chaikovsky himself hoped to foster a greater critical awareness and appreciation of musical masterpieces through the dissemination of theoretical knowledge among the more general public. This work differs from Chaikovsky's Guide in its brevity and conciseness, it being, in Chaikovsky's words, "no more than an abridgement of my Textbook of Harmony," and in its use, in addition to Chaikovsky's own examples, of musical examples drawn from the musical literature. He includes choral works chiefly by Bortiansky, but also by L'vov and Galuppi.

In his conclusion to this work, Chaikovsky expresses sentiments strangely reminiscent of those of Serov regarding theory and its study:

Ending our brief though complete study of the laws of harmonic sound combinations, we consider it a duty to say that neither this nor any other guide is able to exhaust all possible permitted and not permitted accidental combinations of tones among themselves. Based on pure empiricism, music theory rests on a very unstable basis, since in deductions about the euphony of this or that sound combination the individual taste of the observer unavoidably takes part, and individualities are varied to infinity. Therefore much that is rejected by different theorists is accepted and allowed by others. Only by a careful analysis of existing works and by the verification of one's own musical feeling of the suitability of the proposed rules is it possible to master oneself the difficult science of harmonization. Here is why the reading and analysis of the works of well-known composers will be far more useful than the learning by heart of the theoretical rules. The present book is only an auxiliary means to an intelligent, critical study of harmony in existing and more widespread models by us.35

Thus score-reading and analysis evidently took an important place in Chaikovsky's plan of theoretical study, but it by no means represented the only method of study as in Serov's. In addition, Chaikovsky's
average reader for this work would no doubt have been not a conservatory student with studies yet to be completed, but an amateur in composition or performance, who would benefit from such an approach to additional knowledge.

Chailkovsky wrote no other theory books, and left his teaching position in 1877, due to the financial independence granted to him by his patroness, Nadezhda von Meck. Yet his pedagogical influence remained strong for many years due to his unique position as the author of the first Russian harmony textbook and through the continued application of many of his ideas by his students and through the textbook.
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Chapter 12

Other Works from the 1870s: Yury Karlovich Arnol'd

Yury Karlovich Arnol'd. Among other theory books that appeared during the 1870s, one of the most intriguing and novel is a book by a Russian of German parentage, Yury Arnol'd, mentioned previously in connection with Karl Arnol'd. Arnol'd had originally planned on a career in the army, but took up the serious study of music in 1838, studying harmony with Fuchs, and counterpoint with Hunke. Throughout his life he worked in various capacities in music in both Russia and Germany as a composer, writer, critic, teacher, editor, and perhaps translator and lecturer. At one point, he wrote in his autobiography, he was considered for a position at the Moscow Conservatory, but this never came to be. During his stay in Leipzig as editor of the Neue Zeitschrift fur Musik from 1863 to 1871, he published some pamphlets on various musical topics—opera, tonality, Eastern music, and others. After his return to Russia, he published other works concerning the theory of native Russian music and its harmonization, but they contain factual errors and prejudicial views, and were eclipsed by similar, ultimately more important works by subsequent scholars. His one theory book, though, contains an original approach to theory not found
in other Russian works of the 1870s, and for that reason alone deserves
attention.

This book, *Nauka o muzyke na osnovanii esteticheskikh fiziologicheskikh zakonov* [The science of music on the basis of aesthetic and physiological laws], was only the first half of the first volume of a projected four-volume series that Arnold never finished. In these four volumes, he intended to present musical science—in line with views espoused by Larosh—following the historical path of the development of music: 1) sound combinations (triadic harmony, voice-leading, discords, i.e., exactly as in Chaikovsky's *Guilde*), 2) "the development of declamatory voiceleading" (rhythm and melody), 3) musical forms, and 4) instruments. The completed six chapters of volume 1 contain only the section on triadic harmony.

As his goal in this work, Arnol'd chose nothing short of "the establishment of a completely new system of learning . . . the laying of a new fundament and a new edifice of music theory." This new system, he confides, stemmed from his forty years work on the subject, and was influenced by the works of Hauptmann, Helmholtz, Von Oettingen, Ebrard, Leibnitz, Euler, the Swiss acousticians Johann and Jacob Bernoulli, the French physicist Felix Savart, Ernst Chladni, Scheibler, and others. Other existing textbooks—he mentions those by Fuchs, Hunke, Richter, Lobe, Marx, and Hauptmann, all (except the last) of the more important works available to Russians in those last forty years—were good for their type, in his opinion, but nevertheless out-dated and even harmful because of errors and insufficiencies regarding expla-
nations of the true nature of musical sounds and their combinations. Arnol'd made clear that his approach--both the content and the method--was not solely his responsibility, but resulted from the "Zeitgeist," the tenor of the time; he was only the "performer," who by dint of his "good will" and "unlimited devotion" to the topic was able to bring this work to light. In other words, the ideas and methods he used were not strictly his own; he merely compiled the various results of current research into an acceptable format, based on what he felt was needed at the time. From the point of view of Western music theory and the actual theoretical content of his work, then, it is not an original work. But within the sphere of Russian music theory, Arnol'd's work broached ideas too little discussed, and presented a scholarly, more speculative attitude that was generally lacking.

Arnol'd approaches theory from two different aspects--acoustics and aesthetics. Acoustics provides the general physical laws by which sound production, either singly, simultaneously, or consecutively (scales, chords, melody, harmony) is governed. Aesthetics, the "theory of the refined," on the basis of these physical laws, and "on universal laws of world order," examines the "logically refined use" of the sound material produced by these laws, "the allowed or disallowed use of this material that teaches the correct joining of sounds for the clear expression of some musical thought."

Acoustics teaches us the unchanged and positive laws of nature for the formation of the first sound forms; and without these laws no hard bases of the science about sounds are even conceivable. Aesthetics, making from the same positive physical laws further practical conclusions, and following together with such the su-
preme law of symmetrical correlations (in the wide sense), assists the discovery of entirely new ways to arrange sounds in such rows and groups, which form already its logically connected musical speech.

Acoustics—we may say—determines axioms of the absolute science about sounds, and aesthetics concludes from these axioms theorems and problems for practical art; and thus, both these sciences in totality affect the intelligent, based on physical and logical sources, theory of the language of sounds.  

The "language of sounds" is Arnol'd's term for music, because it transmits its thought to "the inner comprehension," the "spirit of man," through "articulate and accented" musical sounds, in much the same way that philological language transmits its thought through words, also articulate and accented, and music often joins with words in this transmission.

Arnol'd thus postulates an entirely new approach to the presentation and study of music theory in Russia. Arnol'd's goal was commendable because it ventured to take Russian music theory into realms not yet fully explored by native theorists, not even Odoevsky. Such a work had been called for time and again in Russia and was sorely needed. Despite their differing opinions, Serov, Larosh, and Odoevsky all wrote about the desire for a theory of music based not on prescriptions and rules but on natural laws and historical accuracy. Larosh in particular pressed for a historical theory of music. But no native work embodying such aspects had yet been produced. Arnol'd acknowledges that the work of his "opponents in the field of critical activity" had "excited" him and caused him to search for scientific verification of certain ideas.

Arnol'd therefore attempts to bring together the several different
aspects of music theory that had been suggested and written about as bases of the study of theory—the acoustical, the aesthetic, and the historical—into one cohesive whole that would provide the answers to all the current problems in music theory, as a science, as an art, and as a pedagogical discipline. The impossibility of this task, though, is underscored by Arnol'd's failure to complete it. As it turns out, his attempted theoretical synthesis is nothing more than a compilation of various ideas taken from past and current theoretical and artistic philosophies that together present a less than cohesive view of the elements under examination.

The six chapters available to us show the strongest influences from Rameau, Hauptmann, and Helmholtz. Arnol'd's primary focus is the origin of the major triad (tonic, dominant and subdominant), the chord connections between the three major triads, and the explanation of the existence of the major scale. His main premise is the mutual attraction and opposition—loosely borrowed from Hauptmann—between tonic and dominant, and between tonic and subdominant, and, ultimately, the opposition between subdominant and dominant, a premise he began to explore even as he introduced the various notes and intervals found in the harmonic series. But while Hauptmann rejected acoustical phenomena as the basis for harmonic theory as inadequate, Arnol'd views the overtone series as an essential element in his explanation of harmony.

The partial tones 1, 3 and 5, which form the octave, fifth and third, Hauptmann's only "directly intelligible" intervals, constitute the primary tones. The partial tones 9 and 15 are secondary; they are
derived from the third and fifth, respectively. However, they each strengthen the partial tone 3. Arnol'd thus divides the partial tones (excluding the problematic ones 7, 11, 13 and 14) into two groups—those belonging to the C triad (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, and 16), and to the G triad (3, 6, 9, 12, and 15). The relationship between these two triads is defined both as unity (through similarities in form and origin) and as thesis-antithesis, each struggling for hegemony. The dominant, at once the necessary supplement and antithesis to tonic, introduces the element of motion into the overtone series.

But able to derive only five of the seven tones of the major scale from the overtone series of tonic (namely, those belonging to the tonic and dominant triads), Arnol'd looks elsewhere for the scientific confirmation for the explanation of the two remaining tones in the C major scale, F and A. Empirical evidence remained insufficient for him:

Giving the necessary fairness to practice on such a basis, that in large part only through its means the great "masters" of our art were formed and developed, we may not, however, attached to the study of the theory of music, particularly ours, which is not routine but based on the very nature of sounds—we may not grant it any kind of different right, as only the right of acceptance or nonacceptance of scientific conclusions. . . . Practice alone, not preceded by a basic, strict study of theory, always is the result only of habit. But not always, and not all habits come through to us by tradition turn out to be good. Therefore a direct goal and the true purpose of theory consists of finding and considering the basic traditions, and then already either confirming the directions of practice by the laws obtained from science or refuting and correcting their errors with clear and strictly scientific arguments. 10

Thus he turns from acoustical givens to aesthetic laws, to the law of symmetry and uniformity in nature, and to the law of variety in unity, both of which "reign over the entire world of creation; without
the observance of both these laws any kind of truly artistic creation is impossible. Arnold observes the law of symmetry, for example, in the melodic (intervallic) symmetry between the first two groups of the tripartite division of the C major scale: CDE / FGA / BC. (He did not mention the asymmetrical third group, however.) Through the construction of the overtone series from F, Arnold confirms a harmonic similarity between the two groups as well. The tones F, G, and A, the partial tones 8, 9, and 10 from F, resemble in this regard the tones C, D, and E, the partial tones 8, 9, and 10 from C. Most importantly, C plays a role in both series—as tonic in one and dominant in the other. Therefore, in the major scale C D E F G A B C, the tone C functions as both tonic and dominant, thereby confirming Hauptmann's proposition, "Each sound at one and the same time has a dominant and is it." Thus the law of variety in unity is manifested through the aspiration to harmonic variety, i.e., modulation, in the move to F major in the second group from C major in the first group. This along with the aspiration to melodic imitation, the manifestation of the law of symmetry, is felt already with the appearance of the third member of the first group, E, which as the third of a chord (dominant) usually leads to the root of the chord (tonic), according to Arnold. Between the second and third groups, then, is the movement of the third of the tonic [A] to the third of the dominant of the previous tonic [B]. The change of harmony is a sharp nuance and gives the character of an opposition owing to which, following the appearance of the tonic triad and the octave in the melody, is not only desirable for our feeling but also completely satisfies it.
The fifth F–C (subdominant) antithetically opposes the fifth C–G (dominant): "Both are found in a hostile relationship, in a struggle for predominance in the harmonic sphere of prime." The appearance of the subdominant is more "enlivening" than that of the dominant:

this enlivening almost forcibly attempts to confer its hegemony over the scale, since the subdominant triad, attracting our hearing from the original sound unit, takes all our attention only to itself, and owing to this there also occurs a change of the sound unit or tonic; in other words, a modulation relative to the original significance of the sound masses appears.

Arnold calls the first group "tonic" or "thematic," the second "answer" or "imitation and modulation" and the third "finish" or "returning."

He summarizes the melodic and harmonic qualities of the C major scale as shown in Example 12.1. The top staff illustrates the "phonic rows and their movement," the bottom staff the "basic sounds of the separate chords"; the tonic of each group is shown underneath.

Example 12.1. Arnold's the melodic and harmonic qualities of the C major scale.
Thus, although Arnol'd avoids ending the scale on the submediant as Hauptmann did, he also avoids giving adequate explanation for the movement from subdominant to dominant, a succession Hauptmann viewed as unintelligible, since no commonality between the two triads exists. And, if the second group were so completely analogous to the first group as Arnol'd postulates, then the note A, the third of the third chord of the second group, would also aspire to variety (modulation) and symmetry (imitation) and resolve to its tonic, Bb. But this does not happen; it moves instead to B, the third of the dominant of the original tonic, C. Arnol'd does not adequately explain how in the final group the dominant regains hegemony over the attempted modulation to the subdominant.

Thus the presence of the tones F and A in the C major scale, which together with C comprise the subdominant triad in the key of C major, are justified and explained both acoustically (as arising from tonic F) and aesthetically (as arising from imitation and a requirement for variety). However, the clearly plagal nature of Arnol'd's scalar summation violates both acoustical and aesthetic laws regarding the strength of the dominant and the tonic. In his attempts to derive "lawfully" the notes of the subdominant triad, he ignores the role of the dominant and its relationship to tonic in establishing tonality.

As in Hauptmann, then, the scale is harmonically determined, seen as arising from the three major triads—tonic, dominant, and subdominant. All the melodic relationships within it are discussed in harmonic terms. The scale is viewed as a Hegelian conflict between the
tonic-dominant axis—the role of C as tonic—and the tonic-subdominant axis—the role of C as dominant. Arnol'd's main approach, as far as it is revealed in the first six chapters, may be viewed as a combination of Hauptmann's emphasis on the natural laws in general and his metaphysical approach in particular with the acoustical explanations of others. However, certain aspects of this amalgamation, the derivation of the subdominant triad in particular and its role within the scale of tonic, the use of two sets of different criteria—acoustical and aesthetic—to explain this derivation, are obviously problematic, and Arnol'd failed to deal with them adequately.

Yet within the annals of Russian music theory, his work is unique; and as such, forms part of the continuum of experimental, speculative, Western-derived Russian theory in this second stage of development. His work had no immediate impact, though, save on one of his students, Y. Mel'gunov, whose work will be discussed shortly. Some of the elements discussed by Arnol'd did receive further development, but only in the third and fourth decades of the twentieth century, some fifty years later. In particular, the acoustical derivation of the scale and the functional variability of the tonic were examined by the Soviet theorists Nikolai Garbuzov and Yury Tiulin, respectively. Yet they give no credit to Arnol'd for his work in these areas, since these ideas were not really original with him.

Rubinstein, Serov, Odoevsky, Larosh, and others had previously recognized the unwillingness of Russians to delve very deeply into the problems presented by music theory. Chaikovsky was guilty of this to
an extent and admitted it. Perhaps Larosh had correctly determined the solution in his call for a protracted period of theoretical study prior to the emergence of a Russian school of composition. More correctly, however, it would appear that Russia theorists needed to explore and establish their own pedagogical traditions before venturing into more speculative realms. In retrospect, this is exactly what happened.
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Chapter 13

Nikolai Andreevich Rimsky-Korsakov: The Harmony Textbook for the 1880s

Theory Books in the 1880s. Although Arnol'd's book has been treated here as a native Russian work, it comes closer to being a foreign work. Considering his German heritage, language (recall that his work was translated from its original German), contacts, and years spent working abroad, Arnol'd was in many respects more German than Russian. In language and influence his book thus may be grouped with those of Hess de Calvé, Fuchs, and Hunke, though in content and level of approach it falls into the very different category of experimental and speculative works. Chaikovsky's book, on the other hand, although based on Western concepts and modeled to some degree after the works by Fuchs, Hunke, and Richter, all of which had proved popular with Russians, exhibited more originality and had a significant impact on the development of a Russian theory of music, whereas Arnol'd's unfinished work did not. Chaikovsky's Guide provided a needed Russian model for a practical, pedagogical textbook, a type of theory book that continued to predominate during the next two decades of this period. Following Chaikovsky's example, Russian theorists began writing theory books in greater and greater numbers. Of the eighty-five theory books
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published in Russia during this period (1860–1900), fifty-eight, or nearly seventy percent, were by Russians. Nearly half of this number, twenty-eight, appeared in just one decade, the 1890s.

For the most part these native works continued to be pedagogical in nature. Many Russian theorists maintained the tradition established by Petrunkevich and Komendantov and produced textbooks of elementary theory. Beginning with Odoevsky's Grammar, twenty-nine works of this sort were published during this forty-year period. The harmony textbook ranks next in number; eighteen such works by Russians, beginning with Chaikovsky's work, were published. These two types of books account for eighty-one percent of all Russian theory books published from 1860 to 1900; of the foreign works published in Russia, only about one-third were of these types.

Of the twenty-one works published during the 1880s, seven foreign and fourteen native, ten of the native works were devoted to the topics of theory fundamentals or elementary harmony. The remaining four works consist of Rimsky-Korsakov's harmony textbook, a commentary on Westphal's Allgemeine Theorie der musikalischen Rhythmit seit J. S. Bach, a set of exercises to accompany Richter's harmony textbook, and another harmony textbook, Rukovodstvo k prakticheskomu izucheniu garmonii [A guide to the practical study of harmony] by Andrei Fedorovich Kazbiriuk (1845–1885).

Notable in Kazbiriuk's Guide is his inclusion of a variety of terms and definitions regarding modulation. Combining Chaikovsky's method of nomenclature with previous definitions and designations, he...
differentiates between a "decisive modulation or a transfer," and a 
"passing modulation or a deviation." He also examines other types of 
modulation not widely discussed in Russian theory: gradual, sudden, and 
progressive or circular, the last involving a series of short 
modulations that eventually direct the harmony back to the main key.

In a later work on elementary theory, Populiarnoe izlozenie osnovnykh 
nachal muzykal'noi teorii [A popular statement of the basic principles 
of music theory] (Kiev, 1885), Kazbiriuk recognizes different types of 
scales not usually included in Russian theory books of this time, such 
as the Hungarian scale (with an augmented fourth), the pentatonic or 
black key scale (the Chinese or Scottish scale), which lacks the sub-
dominant and the leading tone, and the whole-tone scale, which, he 
points out, was first used in Russian music by Glinka in his opera 
Russian and Liudmilla. Kazbiriuk quite possibly became the first 
Russian theorist to include unusual types of scales in his book.

Aside from a translation of a work by M. Lussy (his Traité de 
l'expression musicale), the foreign works of the 1880s consisted en-
tirely of translations of works by Ludwig Bussler. These works include 
a textbook of elementary theory, a harmony textbook, two volumes of 
counterpoint (translated by Taneev and Kashkin), and, most notably, a 
textbook of musical form (also translated by Taneev and Kashkin), the 
first such work published in Russia since Hunke's book of 1863.

Bussler's works were popular in Russia during this time; oddly enough, 
one of his teachers had been Siegfried Dehn, the celebrated teacher of 
Glinka and the Rubinstein brothers. His harmony textbook also exerted
some influence on Rimsky-Korsakov in the writing of the first version of his own harmony book.

Several native folklorists also published works devoted to theoretical aspects of folk music during this decade. As mentioned, these folklorists drew largely on extra-Russian elements for explanation, and their books form part of the experimental, more speculative current running through Russian music theory that began with Odoevsky and Serov. These works have not been included in the above calculations, which deal only with pedagogical works. And indeed, as the pedagogical—and soon speculative—works in the field of theory proper become more significant and influential, it becomes less necessary to discuss works such as these in the increasingly independent folk music sphere as evidence of theoretical research. However, the works of one folklorist in particular, Yuly Nikolaevich Mel'gunov, bear examination because of his contribution to theory proper as well as to folk music.

Nikolai Andreevich Rimsky-Korsakov. Continuing the practice of writing pedagogical works begun by Chaikovsky, Rimsky-Korsakov, another great Russian composer, made an equally innovative contribution to Russian music theory with his book, Prakticheskii uchebnik garmoinii [A practical textbook of harmony], published in 1886. With this work Rimsky-Korsakov dominated the 1880s just as Chaikovsky had dominated the 1870s with his.

Rimsky-Korsakov's textbook actually exists in two versions. The first version was printed in a lithograph edition, the first volume in
1884 and then the first and second volumes together in 1885, both
entitled Uchebnik harmonii [A textbook of harmony]. According to the
editors of Rimsky-Korsakov’s literary works,

it was intended for studies with students of the court singing
Capella, where Rimsky-Korsakov accepted the duties of the control-
ing assistant and taught, among other subjects, a course of
harmony (the widespread opinion that this textbook was written for
a special course of harmony for composers is mistaken, since in
the Capella there was no compositional class, and theoretical
studies were conducted only in singing, directing, and instrumen-
tal classes). At first A. K. Liadov took part in the preparation
of the first volume; the degree of this participation is unknown,
but it is mentioned both in the foreword to the Practical Textbook
of Harmony [the second, later version], and in . . . Chronicles
of My Musical Life.

Rimsky-Korsakov had only recently taken up this position at the Capel-
la, in 1883. After coming to the throne in 1881, Alexander III reorga-
nized the Court Cappella, and named Balakirev as its director. Rimsky-
Korsakov recounts the beginning of his own involvement:

Balakirev, who felt no firm theoretical or pedagogical ground
under his feet, took me as an assistant, since I had plunged into
the theoretical and pedagogical activity of the Conservatory. My
appointment as assistant superintendent of the Court Chapel took
place in February 1883.

Over ten years before this, though, in 1871, Rimsky-Korsakov had
accepted the post of Professor of Practical Composition and Instrumenta-
tion, and had also become the leader of the Orchestra Class at the
St. Petersburg Conservatory. In 1874, he began to teach harmony and
counterpoint as well. As he admits in his autobiography, he knew very
little about any of these subjects before he began teaching them at the
Conservatory; what he did know was the result of his intuition and his
talent. So, "Thus having been undeservedly accepted at the Conservato-
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ry as a professor, I soon became one of its best and possibly its very best pupil, judging by the quantity and value of the information it gave me!" He recalls his attempts at self-education:

During the ensuing season [1874-75] I came to be more and more absorbed in studying harmony and counterpoint, both of which I had taken up the season before. Steeped in Cherubini and Bellermann, equipped with a few textbooks of harmony (Chaikovsky's among them) and every imaginable sort of chorale book, I toiled assiduously, beginning with the most elementary exercises. I sat down so poorly informed that I found myself acquiring systematic knowledge even in elementary theory. I did many and various exercises in harmony, harmonizing figured bass at first, then melodies and chorales. Counterpoint I studied from Cherubini (in perfect major and minor) and from Bellermann, in ecclesiastical modes.12

The regard of his fellow musicians for him was somewhat altered when they heard about his efforts, which indicates the poor opinions some people still held concerning theory and its study:

Now, however, when my work in harmony and counterpoint had become known in the musical world, I was gaining the reputation of a "theoretician," despite the fact that in reality I always was a "practical" man, pure and simple. At the words "theory of music," "theoretician," in the minds of people without close acquaintance with these matters, and even in the minds of those who have musical talent, yet who have been spared that cup, there forthwith arises some conception of a quite absurd nature.13

At the time of Rimsky-Korsakov's appointment to the Court Cappella, Joseph Hunke was the teacher of music theory there. Sometime during 1883, Hunke left this post and died shortly thereafter. Rimsky-Korsakov took his class in harmony:

Upon the ancient Hunke's leaving the Chapel, I took over his class in harmony and grew exceedingly interested in teaching that subject. Chaikovsky's system (I followed his textbook in private lessons) did not satisfy me. From constant talks with Anatoli [Liadov] regarding this subject, I came to know his system and methods of instruction, and conceived the idea of writing a new textbook of harmony, according to a wholly new system as regards pedagogic methods and sequences of exposition. Essentially, Liadov's system was an outgrowth of his professor Y. I. Johansen's
system, and mine of Liadov's. . . . Until the beginning of summer [1884] I only thought over, but did not write my textbook; I tested my pedagogic methods on my Chapel pupils with considerable success. . . . While at Tayitsy, I set to writing the textbook of harmony, which was ready towards the beginning of autumn [1884] and published lithographically.14

In December 1884, Rimsky-Korsakov sent to Chaikovsky the first volume of the lithographed edition requesting him to look it over. Chaikovsky replied in April 1885, sending several pages of suggestions to Rimsky-Korsakov, who took to heart some of the suggested changes and totally revised the book. A second, printed edition appeared in 1886 with the title Prakticheskii uchebnik garmonii [A practical textbook of harmony]. This second edition differs from the first in both format and method, but not too much in theoretical conceptions. Concerning the latter, Rimsky-Korsakov replied to Chaikovsky:

The goal of my textbook is to train the student from the first time, first, to the harmonization of melody, second to the harmonization of the bass without number, and third, to the composition of proper problems, which to him in the highest degree proves useful attached to modulation. For this I give him greatly limited means, and then I expand his horizon gradually. I recognize also cases in which the doubling of the fifth and third serves, but I insist on the doubling of the basic tone, in order not to engender in the student many bad habits, which will be difficult to break; but secret fifths and octaves he will give up. I know by experience that the students I teach using the means presented in my textbook never bring to me problems overfilled with correct foolishness, and thus in them arises the understanding of the significance of the main traits and the correlations of tonic, dominant and subdominant to other chords.17

Judging from Rimsky-Korsakov's reply, Chaikovsky may have questioned Rimsky-Korsakov's method of progressive exposure to the student of triads, doublings, and different types of exercises.

In the foreword to the second edition, Rimsky-Korsakov enumerates what he considered deficiencies in the harmony textbooks of his day:
In a large portion of the existing textbooks of harmony we meet detailed investigations of all possible chords and their resolutions, the key to reading figured bass, little necessary in the present time, efforts to explain any sort of harmonic phenomenon, for example, reasons why parallel fifths are forbidden, etc., but we find little or almost completely do not find practical directions and gradual pedagogical methods for the harmonization of melodies and the good choice of chords. It is possible to say the same concerning the study about modulation. Textbooks, displaying as modulatory means different dissonant chords, avoid the main basis of modulation—the relatedness of keys and common chords. Having become acquainted basically with such textbooks, the student all the same does not know how to set about to the harmonization of melody, how to compose a prelude in several bars, and how to use modulatory means. Chords, even dissonant ones, turn out to be by him preposterous and absurd, and modulations sound rigid and unexpected; he arrives in despair or puts his examiner into despair from the awkwardness and disconnectedness of his musical speech. 18

He felt that his textbook, even though it might be deficient in other respects, succeeded "in stating the methods of the harmonization of melody and of modulation rather fully and gradually besides, moving from simple means to the more complex." 19 His basic goal, in other words, was to help the student think as a composer, not as a mere technician who can fill in figured basses but cannot write an effective progression or modulation.

Rimsky-Korsakov describes his approach:

Four scales were taken as the foundation of harmony; major and minor natural, and major and minor harmonic. The first exercises consisted in harmonizing the upper melodies and basses with the aid of the principal triads alone; the tonic, the dominant, and the subdominant and their inversions. With so scant a stock of chords, the rules of part-writing proved very accurate. Through exercises in harmonizing melodies, with the aid of only the principal steps, the pupil's sense of rhythmic and harmonic balance and tendency towards the tonic were developed. Later to the principal triads there were gradually added accessory ones, the dominant chord of the seventh and the other chords of the seventh. Figured bass was entirely done away with; on the other hand, to exercises in the harmonization of melodies and basses was added
independent writing of half-periods from the same harmonic mate-
rial. Later followed modulation, the science of which was based 
on the relationship of keys and the modulatory plan, and not on 
the external connection (through common tones) of chords foreign 
to one another. In this way modulation proved ever natural and 
logical.20

After modulation, taking an order similar to Chaikovsky's, came non-
harmonic tones, chromatically altered chords, and false progressions.

Rimsky-Korsakov's original approach thus involves four elements: 
1) a different scale system, 2) an initial restriction to the three 
principal triads, 3) an emphasis on melodic harmonization and indepen-
dent writing with no figured bass, and 4) an innovative approach to 
modulation, based on key relationships and a modulatory plan. Rimsky-
Korsakov's emphasis on melodic harmonization had already been foresha-
dowed by Richter and Chaikovsky; but Rimsky-Korsakov's contribution 
 involves not only an increased stress on melody and his use of actual 
chorales as melodic material, but also a more systematic approach to 
chord choice and to modulation. In opposition to Chaikovsky, who 
relies on an intuitive, empirical approach to harmonization and to com-
position generally, Rimsky-Korsakov does not hesitate to set forth 
additional rules and guidelines, although some of them—the stricture 
against parallel fifths and octaves, for example—he left out.

Rimsky-Korsakov's four modes include the newly introduced harmonic 
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major mode, which has a lowered sixth degree: C D E F G Ab B C.
Although he refers to the melodic minor mode occasionally in the text, 
he does not include it here. (He gives no reasons for not including 
it, but perhaps he too felt that a harmony textbook was not the place 
for it.) The use of the harmonic major mode in particular increases
the melodic and harmonic possibilities usually available to the composer, introducing to the major mode such chords as the minor triad on 4, the diminished triad and the half-diminished seventh chord on 2, and the diminished seventh chord on 7. But Rimsky-Korsakov remained conservative regarding the inclusion of chords with the augmented fifth, discounting the use of the augmented triad on 6 and the seventh chords on 4 and 5, which contain augmented triads.

He considers the principal chords to be the triads I, IV, and V, and the dominant seventh chords of the major and minor modes. He calls all remaining triads and seventh chords "accessory chords." For the first fourteen lessons, Rimsky-Korsakov restricts the pupil to the three primary triads. In his subsequent discussions of the accessory chords, he presents the following groupings: To the dominant harmony belong the diminished triad on 7 (first inversion), the half-diminished and diminished seventh chords on 7, and the V chord; to the subdominant harmony belong the minor supertonic triad (both fundamental position and first inversion), the minor subdominant triad, and the diminished supertonic triad (first inversion), the latter two from the harmonic major mode. These groupings carry a certain connotation of function, unlike Chaikovsky's groups of related triads, especially in the uses of the diminished triad on 7 and the minor triad on 2, which Rimsky-Korsakov illustrates in the position of—and therefore as substitutions for—the dominant and the subdominant, respectively. Given his emphasis on the primary triads and on these groupings, Rimsky-Korsakov's approach to harmony may be viewed as incipiently functional.
Rimsky-Korsakov changed the order and degree of key relatedness, which he then uses as a basis for modulation. Since Fuchs, nearly all theorists in Russia had discussed this question, some more elaborately than others. Fuchs and Chaikovsky, for example, merely distinguished between nearly related and remotely related tonalities; other theorists devised up to six degrees of relatedness, all determined generally through common tones and the similarity of key signatures. Over the years, with one exception, the tonalities differing from the main tonality by three or fewer accidentals in their key signatures came to be recognized as related. Usually the major dominant and subdominant, and the relative and parallel minor were considered in the first degree of relatedness. The minor supertonic and mediant, and the major supertonic and lowered supertonic were considered in the second degree. And the minor dominant and subdominant (the latter with a difference of four accidentals), and the major submediant and lowered mediant were considered in either the second or third degree of relatedness. These are illustrated in the top circle in Figure 13.1. Rimsky-Korsakov broke with this tradition, stating that the six tonalities whose tonic triads are included in the given tonality are to be considered as nearly related or in the first degree of relatedness. These include the usually accepted dominant, subdominant, and relative minor, as well as the minor subdominant, mediant, and supertonic, which had heretofore been considered in the second or third degree of relatedness. The minor subdominant is included as a result of the lowered sixth degree of the harmonic major scale. In the minor mode, a similar occurrence
takes place with the inclusion of the major dominant as well as the 
major submediant and subtonic (in the tonality of A minor, that would 
mean E, D, and G major). The parallel minor, generally considered to 
be in the first degree of relatedness, is relegated by Rimsky-Korsakov 
to the second degree of relatedness, as are a host of other tonalities 
ever before included in the second degree of relatedness, each one, 
evertheless, sharing at least one common triad with the given tonality. 

The two circle of fifths on the next page clearly illustrate the 
difference. In the top circle, showing the traditional degrees of key-
relatedness (indicated by the numbers), only twelve of the possible 
twenty-three tonalities are related to C major. In the bottom circle, 
representing Rimsky-Korsakov's system, six more tonalities have been 
25 added, two to the first degree and four to the second degree. 

The methods for modulating to tonalities in the first degree of 
relatedness revolve around the use of a common chord. For modulation 
involving tonalities in the second degree of relatedness, Rimsky-
Korsakov introduces the idea of the modulatory plan. Devising a modu-
Iatory plan consists of determining which triads are common to the two 
tonalities involved and then finding the most satisfactory choice and 
order of intermediate key(s), based on these triads as tonic chords. 
The choice of intermediate key(s) is then determined by the intervallic 
distance between the modulatory and intermediary tonalities. A variety 
of intervallic distances is the most desirable combination. 

Rimsky-Korsakov classifies all the tonalities not in the first or 
second degrees of relatedness to a given tonality, all of which do not
Figure 13.1. Top circle of fifths: traditional degrees of key relatedness. Bottom circle of fifths: Rimsky-Korsakov's system of key relatedness.
share any common triads with it, as remote tonalities (for example, in C major: Gb and B major, and Eb, G#, C#, and F# minor). A modulatory plan to arrive in these tonalities would use nearly related tonalities as intermediate tonalities. Rimsky-Korsakov gives some examples of good and bad modulatory plans involving remote tonalities. For example, in modulating from C major to Eb minor, the plans C major—F minor—Db major—Eb minor and C major—D minor—Bb minor—Eb minor are good plans, since the intervallic distances between the tonalities vary; the plans C major—F major—Bb major—Eb minor and C major—F minor—Bb minor—Eb minor are poor, since the intervallic distances between each adjoining pair of tonalities are perfect fourths.

Rimsky-Korsakov divides modulation into two categories—gradual and sudden. A gradual modulation is the type just discussed; a sudden modulation involves false progressions and enharmonism. Key relatedness may also be used to effect a sudden modulation, but it is not the primary means. Rimsky-Korsakov also discusses nonchromatic and chromatic modulation as subdivisions of gradual modulation. A chromatic modulation involves a change of mode in the course of the modulation. He discusses as well the previously accepted types, transition (transfer) and digression (deviation), as subdivisions of both gradual and sudden modulation. A false progression, used in a sudden modulation, is any pair of adjacent chords that belong separately to different tonalities or modes. The two most useful are the deceptive cadence (resolving to bVI in major, #IV in minor) and the false progression of a dominant seventh chord. The latter includes the joining of triads
and seventh chords a third apart, or the joining of seventh chords a fourth, fifth or a third apart. Although Rimsky-Korsakov gives no special explanation of false progressions, he does recommend that tonalities related no further than the second degree be used, leaving the more remotely related tonalities for gradual modulation.

The enharmonic means for a sudden modulation include augmented triads, augmented sixth chords, and the diminished seventh chord. The augmented chords constitute the second category of a group Rimsky-Korsakov called chromatically modified chords, which are independent chords formed from chromatic passing tones. These chords are akin to Chaikovsky's accidental chords, which arise in the same manner. The old chordal approach to the construction of these chords, achieved through chromatic alterations of inverted dominant seventh chords, found in the works by Hess de Calvé, Fuchs, and Hunke has long since passed from Russian harmonic theory. In addition to the usual augmented sixth chords, the so-called Italian, French, and German chords, all constructed on the sixth degree of the scale, Rimsky-Korsakov includes a new variety, the doubly augmented six-five chord (Ab-C-E-F# in C major). He correctly resolves all the augmented sixth chords either to the dominant or to the tonic six-four chord.

The first category contains three chords, the first two of which Rimsky-Korsakov introduced into Russian theory. The false dominant seventh chord on 2 of major and minor, similar to a secondary dominant, resolves either to I or V. The false diminished seventh chord of raised 2 of major, the same chord as the previous one but with a raised
root, resolves to I. Only the third chord, the major triad on b2, the Neapolitan sixth chord, had been mentioned by previous theorists.

The foregoing discussion has been based solely on the first printed edition, that of 1886. For the third edition in 1893, Rimsky-Korsakov made a number of changes that remained in later editions. In addition to changes in wording, sentence structure, and note examples, he also added discussions of the following topics: hidden fifths and octaves, semi-plagal cadences, the fundamental triad and seventh chord on 2, and ascending sequences. He added more chorale melodies as well. Beginning with the ninth edition, the first edition published after Rimsky-Korsakov's death in 1908, two of his students, I. Witol and M. Steinberg, undertook the editorship. The changes that they introduced do not alter in any way Rimsky-Korsakov's fundamental theories, but merely help to bring the information more up-to-date.

The greatest change of all between editions, though, was not between subsequent published editions, but between the lithograph edition and the first printed edition. Aided by Chaikovsky's suggestions and no doubt his own common sense, Rimsky-Korsakov virtually re-wrote the textbook. The lithographed Textbook of Harmony contains four major sections with fourteen chapters divided among them. The paragraphs are numbered, as they are in the printed edition; but whereas the printed edition contains ninety-three paragraphs (ninety-six if the supplement is included), the lithograph edition contains three hundred and three.

It is some sixty pages longer as well. In his efforts to make the book complete and comprehensive, Rimsky-Korsakov overcrowed it with infor-
mation and examples. Chaikovsky comments on this in his letter to

Rimsky-Korsakov concerning the book (April 8, 1885):

In essence: in conscientiousness, love for the subject, aspiration
to help the student in every way possible—your guide is very
good. In much I do not agree with you, as you will see; the
statement I find rather careless,—but I am not able to give the
proper justice to the serious, detailed, deeply thought-out plan;
but the main thing is the readiness of yours to foresee and remove
any bewilderment, any difficulty to the student. However, if I am
not mistaken, you are too generous in the rules; you treat each
detail too pettily and pedantically. If you continue on this
scale, then your guide will be colossal!!! And so, dear Nikolai
Andreevich, once again I ask you to forgive me for my capitious-
ness, and to believe that I am not guided by any bad feelings, and
any less the wish to give to you the feeling that I said, "My
guide is better." I consider my guide disgusting; I say this
completely bluntly and sincerely do not pretend to be an authority
in this matter.27

While Rimsky-Korsakov took to heart many of Chaikovsky's sugges-
tions, especially those concerning the literary side, and less so those
concerning the philosophical side (such as the definition of a chord),
others he did not accept, as revealed in his reply to Chaikovsky:

With many remarks of yours, concerning essence, I do not agree.
For example: a) concerning the minor subdominant triad, it is
mentioned in the beginning because it belongs to the main triads,
but about the major triad on the 3rd degree of minor it will be
mentioned later, when the matter reaches secondary triads. b) The
joining of the triads of the IV and V degrees is touched upon
somewhat later, in order for the student to become firmly estab-
lished in the use of triads, found in quintal relation! c) Con-
cerning secret fifths and octaves in the outer voices nothing is
said, because these ugly habits easily pass afterwards; it is more
important to lean on the intelligent use of chords. For me the
problem of being overfilled with secret fifths and octaves but
with the appropriate use of degrees is more acceptable than a
problem without secret fifths and octaves, but in which for no
reason at all the triad of the III degree, or the chord VI, or the
subdominant after the dominant, etc., is met. However, you do not
object to all this in writing. The study about leaps I consider
useful and not difficult at all. The essence is that the student
clearly conceives all the paths and the consequences of them.28
Chaikovsky, then, had expressed concern about the order of the material and about the inclusion of certain voice-leading rules. But Rimsky-Korsakov undertook to change only the style of his work, not the content. (Although, it will be remembered, in the third edition he finally did add information concerning the forbidden secret fifths and octaves.) As Chaikovsky suggested, for example, Rimsky-Korsakov omitted all the unnecessary details and preserved only the most essential information, both in the written text and in the examples. He did away with the practice of numbering and labeling "rules" as such—something that Bussler did occasionally in his textbook and from whom Rimsky-Korsakov might have gotten the idea—but he added a system of numbering to the models and exercises (also from Bussler), thereby making them more distinct from the text. A concrete example of one of the objections raised by Chaikovsky and the response by Rimsky-Korsakov involves the definition of a chord, given in the very first sentences of the book. Rimsky-Korsakov's definition in the printed edition, given here, differs little from the definition in the lithograph edition:

The simultaneous combination of three, four or five different tones, arranged in a well-known form, is called a chord. This arrangement consists of the following: if the given tones may be positioned between themselves so that between each two adjacent tones was the interval of a third, then the tones make up a chord. 29

Chaikovsky objected to this definition:

The definition is incorrect, for the tertian-formed construction is only a sign of a chord and not its essence. For example, it is impossible to say, that the pope is a man, wearing a cassock, and a sailor is a man, wearing a daggar, a court singer—a uniform. 30

Yet Rimsky-Korsakov did not change this aspect of the definition. And
in his *Guide*, Chaikovsky gave a very similar definition, which he later must have considered inadequate: "The simultaneous combinations of three, four or five sounds, arranged from each other at the distance of a third, are called *chords*." But neither Chaikovsky nor Rimsky-Korsakov provided a suitable substitute for this definition, for, in the words of the Soviet theorist Yury Tiulin,

This definition of chord essentially at that time was impossible to give (and even Chaikovsky did not give it); for this it was necessary to develop the theory of mode, which then did not exist, and on the basis of this theory to give the definition of a chord as a representative of the modal system.

One rather substantive change involves the relatedness of keys and the modulatory plan. In the lithograph edition, Rimsky-Korsakov distinguishes only two degrees of key relatedness, not the three of the printed edition; and he introduces the concept of the modulatory plan only in the later, printed edition.

Rimsky-Korsakov's textbook was a very valuable addition to the small but growing body of Russian theoretical literature, and continued to dominate other newer textbooks by virtue of its clear presentation of harmonic principles. The continued popularity of his teaching methods as presented in the textbook, aided no doubt by his lengthy tenure at the St. Petersburg Conservatory where he taught for thirty-seven years, helped to create the "St. Petersburg school" of harmony pedagogy. Later theorists, both in Moscow and in St. Petersburg, adopted and developed his ideas concerning the natural and harmonic modes, modulation based on the relatedness of tonalities and common chords, the modulatory plan, his emphasis on melodic harmonization, and
particularly his theory that the harmony student progresses more smoothly if confined in the beginning to exercises using only the three principal triads, an approach that was reinforced later by the adoption of functional harmony in Soviet music theory.

His book has gone through numerous editions, has been translated into many other languages, and is still highly regarded in the Soviet Union. This is all the more remarkable when one considers that Rimsky-Korsakov taught himself nearly everything he knew about theory in general and harmony and counterpoint in particular only after he became a professor of theory and composition.
FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 13

1. In my article, "Russian Music Theory: A Conspectus," (Russian Theoretical Thought in Music [Ann Arbor, 1983]), I listed the number of theory books published in Russia during the period 1860-1900 as eighty-three (p. 21). The correct number, however, is eighty-five. The number of Russian books (fifty-eight) and their percentage of the total number (almost seventy percent) are correct.

2. Three specialized works that might be considered in the first category of elementary theory textbooks deal exclusively with the writing of music or with rhythm. Muzykal'naia gramota legchaishago izobrazheniia i ispolneniia muzykal'nykh proizvedenii [Musical reading and writing of the easiest representation and execution of musical works] (Moscow, 1882) by I. Bryzgalov proposes a new system of writing music, following in the footsteps of Rousseau. Osnovnyia pravila muzikal'noi metriki i ritmicheskogo pravopisaniiia [The basic rules for the correct writing of musical metrics and rhythms] by Rudolf Avgustovich Gummert (Moscow, 1899) illustrates how to write all manner of rhythmic figures and combinations. O ritme. Opyt ratsional'nogo izlozeniia ucheniia o ritme, sinkope i melismakh [On rhythm. An attempt at a rational statement of the study of rhythm, syncopation and melismas] by Viktor Antonovich Checchott (St. Petersburg, 1890) is an advanced textbook of rhythm. Because of the narrow topics and specialized natures of these works, I have not included them in this category. A fourth work related to this category, Metoda prepodavaniia elementarnoi teorii i sol'fegzhio [A method of teaching elementary theory and solfeggio] by Alexander Ivanovich Rubets (Moscow, 1867) is not a textbook but a teacher's manual.

Included in the eighteen Russian harmony textbooks are five exercise books in harmony, written as supplements to other harmony textbooks. The authors of these works include Alexander Salomovich Razmadze, Anton Arensky, Georgy Conus, and Nikolai Ladukhin.

[The Russian philological herald], book 2 (1884); A. S. Razmadze, Zadachnik Harmonei [A book of harmony problems] (Moscow, 1880); Andrei Fedorovich Kazbiriuk, Rukovodstvo k prakticheskomu izucheniiu Harmonei [A guide to the practical study of harmony] (St. Petersburg, 1883).

Kazbiriuk, p. 123.

Kazbiriuk might have become an important theorist had he fulfilled his early promise. But, according to Rimsky-Korsakov, Kazbiriuk "was a talented individual who fell to drinking and went to the dogs subsequently" (Rimsky-Korsakov, My Musical Life, p. 118). Regarding Kazbiriuk's approach to theory and composition, Rimsky-Korsakov added, "Kazbiriuk... who graduated from the Conservatory two or three years after I had joined it, was also entirely Y. I. Johansen's pupil in harmony and counterpoint; if he learned anything from me at all, it lay in a certain taste in instrumentation and in the general tendency of his compositions" (ibid).

Matis Lussy, Teorija muzykal'nogo vyrazhenija [A theory of musical expression], trans. V. A. Chechott (St. Petersburg, 1888).

The works by Ludwig Bussler include: Uchebnik muzykal'nuyk form v tridtsatyi zadachke [A textbook of musical form in thirty problems], trans. Y. A. Pikhale'skaia (St. Petersburg, 1883); Uchebnik form instrumental'noj muzyki [A textbook of form of instrumental music], trans. N. Kashkin and S. Taneev (Moscow, 1884) (the two works cited are both translations of Bussler's Musikalische Formenlehre, but the later version by Kashkin and Taneev is the better of the two); Strogii stil' [The strict style], trans. S. I. Taneev (Moscow, 1885); Svobodnyi stil' [The free style], trans. H. D. Kashkin (Moscow, 1885); Prakticheskii uchebnik Harmonei [A practical textbook of harmony], trans. A. P. Berngard (St. Petersburg, 1885); Uchebnik elementarnoi teorii muzyki [A textbook of the elementary theory of music], trans. K. Beier (Kharkhov, 1886).

Rimsky-Korsakov was working on his own harmony textbook at the same time that Berngard was preparing his translation of Bussler's harmony textbook. Berngard, a former pupil of Rimsky-Korsakov's who had been teaching at the St. Petersburg Conservatory since 1878, presented Rimsky-Korsakov with a copy of his translation. Rimsky-Korsakov made many notes in the margins of his copy; some of these notes, those dealing primarily with Bussler's rules and choices for voice-leading, have been published (N. A. Rimsky-Korsakov, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii [A complete collection of works], 4 [1960], 436-442). It is clear even from these notes, though, that Rimsky-Korsakov felt Bussler's textbook to be not completely adequate.

Interestingly, although Bussler published at least eight books in Germany, five of which were subsequently translated into Russian, he is apparently better remembered in Russia than in his native land. MG contains no entry under his name, whereas the Soviet musical encyclopedia does. Bussler (1838-1901) was active in his native Berlin (from
1865) as a theory teacher (from 1879 at the Stern Conservatory), a conductor, and a newspaper columnist (from 1883 for Nationalzeitung). His three books not translated into Russian include *Elementar-Melodik zur Wechung und Forderung des musikalischen Talentes und Vorstellungs-
vermogens* (1879); *Praktische musikalische Kompositions-lehre* (1878-?); and *Lexikon der musikalischen Harmonien* (1889).

The full title of the first volume (1884) is *Uchebnik garmonii. Kurs Pridvornoi kapel'sy, vypusk pervyi. Garmonizatsiia akkordami v predelakh lada* [A textbook of harmony. A course of the Court capella, first volume. Harmonization with chords in the limits of the mode].

"Ot redaktory" [From the editors], in Rimsky-Korsakov, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* [A complete collection of works], 4, V-VI.


Ibid., p. 119.

Ibid., p. 150.

Ibid., p. 167.

Ibid., pp. 271-273.

These pages have been lost. However, Chaikovsky's personal copy of the book with his marginal notes still exists. Sections from this book with the accompanying notes by Chaikovsky have been published: "Zamechania na poliakh Uchebnika garmonii N. Rimskogo-Korsakova" ["Notes in the margins of The textbook of harmony by N. Rimsky-
Korsakov], in Chaikovsky, *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* [A complete collection of works], III-A, 226-249.


N. Rimsky-Korsakov, in letter to Chaikovsky, April 15, 1885, cited in Sovetskaia muzyka [Soviet music], No. 3 (1945), p. 135.

Rimsky-Korsakov, *Praktitcheskii uchebnik garmonii* [A practical textbook of harmony], *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii* [A complete collection of works], IV, 237. All of the quotes from this textbook are in my translation, based on this edition.

Ibid., p. 238.

Vladimir Protopopov, in his article, "Ob uchebnike garmonii Rimskogo-Korsakogo" [On the textbook of harmony of Rimsky-Korsakov] (Sovetskaia muzika [Soviet music], No. 6 [1958], 56-57), established that the majority of the melodies in the textbook "were taken by [Rimsky-Korsakov] from collections of authentic chorales" (p. 57). Previously it had been believed by Soviet theorists that the melodies in the textbook were only modeled after chorales.

Glinka used this mode frequently. (See Viktor O. Berkov, Garmonia Glinki [The harmony of Glinka] [Moscow-Leningrad, 1948].) But although Rimsky-Korsakov, along with Glinka, Chopin, and Liszt, also used unusual modes in his music, he did not include them in his textbook. He occasionally referred to them in his autobiography, though, for example: "The conclusion [of the third movement of Antar] is a diverging passage of chords on an ascending eight-step scale (tone, semitone, tone, semitone, etc.), which I had once before used in Sadko" (My Musical Life, p. 93).

See Teoriia diatonichekikh gann [The theory of diatonic scales] by G. Aristov (Kazan, 1871); Kratkaiia muzikal'naia grammatika [A short musical grammar] by A. I. Rubets (St. Petersburg, 1871); and Prakticheskoe rukovodstvo k izucheniiu elementarnoi teorii muzyki [A practical guide to the study of the elementary theory of music] by V. Y. Villuan (Nizhnii Novgorod, 1878).

One precedent exists: Fuchs, in 1830, included the minor supertonic and the mediant as related keys.

The top circle represents the maximum number of related keys. Very often theorists restricted the first two or three degrees of relatedness to just six or eight keys, leaving out the more distantly related keys; this widened the gap between their systems and that of Rimsky-Korsakov even further. Previously, even though the minor subdominant was the most remote key from the given key according to the circle of fifths, it was always included in the second degree of relatedness, never the third degree.

These changes and additions beginning with the third edition are duly noted and variant wordings are included in footnotes in the scholarly edition of the textbook published in volume IV of Rimsky-Korsakov's complete works.

Sovetskaia muzika [Soviet music], No. 3 (1945), p. 134.

Ibid., pp. 134-135.

Rimsky-Korsakov, Prakticheskii uchebnik garmonii, p. 240.

31
Chaitovsky, Rukovodstvo k izucheniju garmonii, p. 9.
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In the 1940s, the Soviet Union's xenophobic attitude towards the West caused Soviet theorists to credit Rimsky-Korsakov with the "discovery" of functionalism. See Chapter 35.
Chapter 14

Yuly Nikolaevich Mel'gunov: A Theory of Folk Music

Yuly Nikolaevich Mel’gunov (1846-1893). Continuing the work begun by Odoevsky and Serov towards the establishment of a theory of Russian folk music, several Russian music scholars, among them Petr Petrovich Sokal'sky (1832-1887), Alexander Sergeevich Famintsyn (1841-1896), Evgeniia Eduardovna Lineva (1854-1919), and Yuly Nikolaevich Mel'gunov, turned their attention to this subject during the last three decades of the nineteenth century. The bulk of their research was published during the 1880s. As with previous theorists, in the continued absence of a tradition of a non-pedagogical, more speculative theory of music in Russia, developments in the field of folk music theory take on added interest. This is particularly so with Mel'gunov, who in addition to his studies in folk music, which resulted in some important discoveries, ventured as well into other theoretical realms, namely, rhythm. Thus, for a complete picture of Russian music theory in the latter nineteenth century, it is necessary to examine his work in both folk music and rhythm. For reasons mentioned earlier, the works of Sokal'sky and Famintsyn will be discussed only briefly.

From the mid-1870s until his death in 1893, Yuly Nikolaevich
Mel'gunov devoted much energy to his attempts to elucidate the true nature of folk music and to extract a comprehensive theory of this music from his observations and explanations. He was trained initially as a pianist, having made his debut in St. Petersburg in 1864. However, beginning in 1875, due to his growing interest in ancient music, he undertook the study of acoustics and the harmonization of chant with Yury Arnol'd for a year. Also at this time he became acquainted with the German philologist and theorist Rudolph Westphal (1826-1892), who during the late 1870s was teaching at the Katkovsky Lyceee in Moscow. For two years Mel'gunov studied and worked with Westphal on the subject of the theory of rhythm of Aristoxenus. In 1878 they published a rhythmic edition of some of the Bach fugues from the Well-Tempered Clavier, edited by Westphal and prefaced with an article by Mel'gunov, "The Rhythmic Performance of Bach Fugues." To disseminate their views on music rhythm and the correct performance of classical music, Westphal and Mel'gunov subsequently undertook a concert tour of Germany. Westphal returned to Germany in 1880, where he published his Allgemeine Theorie der musikalische Rhythmik seit J. S. Bach, based in large part on his joint work with Mel'gunov.

Mel'gunov, meanwhile, in addition to his work with Westphal, began to study Russian folk song, and published a collection of them with commentary in two volumes, in 1879 and 1885. His knowledge of acoustics, based on his studies with Arnol'd, and of rhythm, based on his studies with Westphal, and his discoveries concerning the polymelodic nature of Russian folk song, let him to develop a comprehensive theory
of folk music that differs sharply from those of other Russian theorists. He expounded on this theory in subsequent writings, only one article from which was published during his lifetime, however. He also planned to write two textbooks on rhythm, and in preparation for these works expanded his research to include not only the music of Bach and Russian folk songs, but also the music of Romantic composers such as Beethoven, Schumann, Paganini, and other folk music—Ukrainian, Polish, and Czech. At the time of his untimely death in 1893, he had completed one textbook, an elementary textbook on rhythm (1892), but had only just begun work on a second planned book, a more specialized work on rhythm and form for musicians.

In his work with Russian folk song, Mel'gunov utilized his knowledge of acoustical theory, Greek rhythmic theory, and Greek music in general to produce correct and authentic written transcriptions of an oral tradition, which he then used as evidence for the feasibility of such application. From the standpoint of ethnomusicology, Mel'gunov's contribution with his published collection was threefold. Since the end of the eighteenth century, the standard means of the publication of folk songs had been as monodic melodies with accompaniment. Mel'gunov, first and foremost, reveals the true polymelodic nature of Russian folk song, which reflected actual performance practice of the peasants: "From the included variants of the songs (without harmonizations), it is obvious that their style is polyphonic, that is all the voices are independent, all take an identical part in the whole, and each melody taken separately by itself is beautiful." In his collection Mel'gunov
published all the variants of a given melody, one with harmonization and the others without. Second, Mel'gunov was the first to have "approached the given material from a scientific point of view." This approach involved the written transcription of all the extant variants of a particular song (as performed by native musicians). It was his attention to these simultaneously performed variants that led Mel'gunov to his conclusion concerning their polymelodic nature. Further, these variants became the basis for the accompaniments in the collection, and were utilized by subsequent researchers to trace the process of oral folk song creation. Third, Mel'gunov's collection became "the prototype of contemporary scientific publications of folk songs (with a full transcription of the oral and musical text).

But the establishment of methodological principles used in the collection of material, although necessary, interested him less than did the discovery of a strictly based theory of Russian folk song. For Mel'gunov the former was only a means to the latter: Without songs correctly transcribed regarding their melodic, harmonic, and rhythmic elements, a true theory could never be developed: "Because of their incompleteness and incorrect harmonizations, collections of Russian songs published heretofore are not able to give an exact idea about what folk music is." Mel'gunov was in complete agreement with Odoevsky regarding the inapplicability of contemporary music theory to Russian folk song, in both theoretical explanations of this music and in attempts to harmonize it.
Russian folk music has characteristics sharply distinguishing it from Western music. The technical signs of this distinction are not researched. Contemporary music theory is not only not in a condition to give a satisfactory answer regarding the secret of Russian folk music, but, on the contrary, more rapidly obscures the essence of the matter with its explanations.

Folk melodies, adorned by all the rules with fanciful constructions of counterpoint, harmony and rhythm, lose their true character and become completely not understandable for the people.

Many musicians propose that the people are insufficiently musically developed, in order to comprehend in this case all the beauty of the musical combinations, constructed on the bases of contemporary theory; but it is not difficult to be convinced that the reason for similar discord with the people lies in the groundlessness of our musical knowledge, and mainly in the insufficiently attentive study of folk songs. It is necessary to study the poetic creation of the Russian people in their present view, without any embellishments. "Folk song is also a sacred object, as is folk tale," said the well-known lover of Russian music, Prince V. F. Odoevsky. In my opinion, this thought is not recognized by our musicians, who as previously continue to publish folk songs with accompaniment not prepared for Russian music, and, in the majority of cases, finally destroying the sense of the melody. Numerous attempts of the harmonization of Russian songs by the existing musical laws do not answer to the authentic content of the song and lead us to the necessity to abandon generally accepted musical means. For the receipt of a true view towards Russian folk music and towards the laws of music in general we must give up the old glasses and equip ourselves with others.11

Mel'gunov points to the "discord" between theory and practice, between theory and acoustics, and between contemporary Russian composition and the practice of folk songs, but reveals the reluctance of the majority of regular musicians . . . to be reconciled with the thought that music for its further development should resort to the aid of science, and that only attached to the completely conscientious and thorough study of the monuments of folk creation is it possible to find the path to the development of a national music. . . . What concerns the laws of rhythm, in the exact significance of this word, then not in a single sphere of musical knowledge are there such unstable and wrong ideas.12

Thus to explain the true theoretical nature of folk song, Mel'gunov turned to acoustics, that is, to scientific theory, which he substituted for the other, older, "unscientific" approaches, and to
Greek rhythmic theory, which provided a theory of rhythm where none had yet existed. He considered the correct transcription of Russian folk music possible only when the transcriber was knowledgeable in both acoustics and rhythm. Mel'gunov's emphasis on acoustics may be traced to the influence of his predecessor in the study of folk song theory, Odoevsky, and to his former teacher Arnol'd. Like Arnol'd, Mel'gunov attempts to provide a sound acoustical basis for music, folk song in his case, based on the theories of a Western theorist, von Oettingen. He rejects not the idea but the specific application of approaches such as that of Serov:

The view that Russian folk melodies are based not on the Western musical system, and that they require special harmonization was also well-known earlier: many came to the conclusion about the necessity to treat Russian melodies on the system of Greek tonalities. Really, Greek scales more closely approach Russian stroi than Western scales, but it is sad that what was known about Greek music was what Glareanus communicated in his Dodecachordon... The attempts to work out Russian folk music by his distorted theory inevitably should also be recognized as incorrect and be rejected, moreover, when the practice of folk song clearly confirms the mistake.14

Mel'gunov bases Russian folk songs on two scales—the "natural major scale," which "corresponds to the old Greek Ionian or Hypophrygian (from sol to sol)" ascending with tonic do, and the "natural minor scale, not having a major sixth and seventh," which corresponds to the ancient Greek "Dorian (from mi to mi)" descending with tonic la. "To these... two modes, that is to the major and minor, belong the great part of Great Russian folk songs." He labels these scales, following the practice of von Oettingen, "tonic" and "phonic" scales, respectively. The ancient Dorian (phonic) is, descending, the exact intervallic
inversion of the ancient Ionian (tonic), ascending.

In a later statement, Mel'gunov expands this interpretation:

The majority of Russian folk songs are based on four keys—the scales: 1) Dorian, 2) Phrygian, 3) Lydian, [and] 4) Locrian. Songs in the contemporary major key are also met. . . . Professor R. Westphal considers [these] scales basic in the study of sound. . . . [He] called these scales 'the all-subordinating fundament of Greek melos.'

The names of these scales correspond to the ancient Greek modes. Thus to major and to ancient Dorian already mentioned (the intervallic inversion of the major scale with the tonic on la), Mel'gunov adds the ancient Phrygian (medieval Mixolydian with tonic sol), the ancient Lydian (medieval Lydian with tonic fa), and the ancient Locrian (medieval Dorian with tonic re, the intervallic inversion of ancient Phrygian). Mel'gunov saw no discrepancy between this and his earlier statement. He names the four modes as bases founded on Westphal's research of Greek song, and as a reply to Peter Petrovich Sokol'sky, who criticized Mel'gunov for wanting "to chain Russian music into the bonds of only two . . . combinations: Hypophrygian and Dorian."

Mel'gunov replies:

In these words there is a clear distortion of everything I said about sound in my preface to the first edition of Russian songs. The question lies not in the chaining into bonds, but in the explanation of musical phenomena with the laws of acoustics, that is with the natural laws of the sound world. Only incorrectly written songs turn out not corresponding to what was stated earlier about the key of scales.

Thus Mel'gunov saw no incompatibility between the modal acoustical foundation of Russian folk song and the actual modal similarities to Greek song.
Just as in the "tonic" scale the overtones 4:5:6 form the main triad, the "tonic" triad do-mi-sol, so in the "phonic" scale do the undertones 1/4:1/5:1/6 form the main triad, the "phonic" triad mi-do-la. In fact, all the triads of the natural minor correspond inversely to the triads of the natural major. From this correspondance arises the possibility to substitute a progression of minor triads for a progression of major triads. Mel'gunov found evidence for such: "Particularly interesting is the correspondence of the concluding cadences in Russian songs of natural minor with the same cadences of the major key." These include full and half cadences in major, which in minor become plagal and Phrygian, respectively. Such cadences are frequent in the songs contained in the collection. Mel'gunov concludes: "In general Russian songs serve as brilliant evidence of the veracity and appropriateness of acoustical conclusions for musical practice and confirm the observation about the onesidedness of contemporary musical development."

In accordance with the approach taken thus far, Mel'gunov views the dominant seventh chord, "unarguably the most important of the dissonant combinations," as "the joining of two elements: the triads of the dominant and the subdominant, aspiring to one tonic." He treats the ninth as a suspension. The "minor seventh chord" in major (a half-diminished chord, "ti-re-ma-la") resolves to tonic; in minor ("fa-re-ti-sol") it resolves to tonic, creating what sounds in major like a deceptive cadence. Mel'gunov was skeptical about the "so-called sequence seventh chords" (the non-dominant seventh chords so named by
Chaikovsky); he doubted their aesthetic value. He concludes: "The harmony of the two examined scales is distinguished not by the novelty of the chords, but by the order of the movement of the triads (particularly important cadences) and by the characteristic quality of the resolutions of the dissonant chords."

Mel'gunov accepts as acoustical given the theories of Rameau and von Gettingen. Certain of these—the derivation of the major triad from overtones, for example—are theoretically acceptable; but of course many others—the undertone theory, the derivation of elements of minor from the inversion of major, the construction of the dominant seventh chord from dominant and subdominant—are theoretically problematic. Nonetheless, Mel'gunov's observations concerning the nature of the harmonic language of Russian folk song, regardless of his theoretical speculations regarding the origin of this language, are more exact and theoretically useful than those of his predecessors. One may conclude generally from his observations that the harmonic characteristics of Russian folk song are dominated by diatonicism constructed from the natural major and minor modes (Greek Ionian and Dorian modes) and from certain variants (the Greek Phrygian, Lydian, and Locrian), that the cadences in major are authentic, both half and full, and in minor plagal or deceptive. An examination of the songs in his collection confirms Mel'gunov's conclusions concerning mode and general cadential patterns; however, the songs in minor contain very many half authentic cadences, more so than plagal or deceptive. The songs in major contain few plagal cadences.
Mel'gunov also examines the rhythmic and melodic properties of the songs in the collection. He observes that the melody, the rhythmic period, the harmonic cadence, and the text all end simultaneously. From this he concludes that the melody, harmony and text are subordinated to the laws of rhythm, which reveals his belief in the hegemony of rhythm over the other elements. Concerning specific melodic characteristics, his observations are similar to those of Odoevsky. In addition, he comments on the general descending direction of the melody. In songs in the minor mode this is explained of course by the descending motion of the scale. Songs in the major mode also exhibit a descending melodic direction, most frequently within the pentachord from dominant to tonic, for which he had no ready explanation.

Mel'gunov confirms the presence of modulation in Russian folk songs, thereby hoping "to dispel forever the delusion of theorists [such as Serov] denying the ability of the Russian folk to modulate." Although, as he points out, most of the Russian songs in the collection remain within the limits of one mode or key, "there are songs also with modulation, which by their originality, naturalness and beauty are worthy of attention. These modulations are completed most frequently of all with the aid of inverted chords, and not by means of the dominant seventh chord." Thus he explains modulations in a manner derived from von Oettingen, by means of the relationship between major and minor triads. Accordingly, the acoustical relatedness between the modulatory keys involves not only the intervals of the perfect fourth and fifth, but also—most predominantly—the interval of the minor
third. Therefore, the alternation of major with its relative minor, and vice versa, is the most important factor in the modulations in these songs: Approximately half of the songs display this alternation. Modulations to the dominant or the subdominant, in either major or minor are much less frequent, occurring in approximately one-fourth of the songs. Mel'gunov concludes, "Russian folk music by its purity, naturalness and non-artificiality may serve as interesting and rich material for the observation of acoustical phenomena and for the confirmation of the correctness of acoustical conclusions."

Westphal shared Mel'gunov's views. He writes approvingly about Mel'gunov's collection and the conclusions he reached:

Thanks to this edition, the music of Russian folk songs will have an immeasurably important significance as a consequence of the rhythm of the melodies themselves, as also in the particularities of the consequence of their special original harmonization, not created on the soil of some kind of harmonic doctrine. We do not meet such harmonies in any other people. To understand them is a matter of acoustics and of the natural quality of the scale based on acoustics.

But while Mel'gunov does not apply any kind of "harmonic doctrine" to the songs themselves, allowing their natural characteristics to come forth, he certainly does not avoid the application of an unproven and unreliable acoustical "doctrine" to the explanation of the nature and origin of these characteristics. Mel'gunov's attempts to apply acoustical "givens" to folk song and from this derive the correct theory of folk song—an approach in the tradition of Odoevsky and Arnol'd—fell short of providing a suitable basis for this theory. In addition to his valid conclusions regarding the harmonic, melodic, and modulatory characteristics of Russian song, his most valuable contribution remains
the correct observation of the polymelodic nature of Russian folk song.

However, this assessment does not diminish his contributions in the study of rhythm, which were the first such studies in either Russian music theory in general or in folk music theory in particular. In this area, his work was not limited to the arena of folk music, for he applied his theory of rhythm to classical music as well, from Bach to Schumann. And even though his basic approach was derived from his studies with Westphal, he made important original contributions to it. Chief among these are additional types of stops, the character of accentuation in Bach and Mendelssohn, and the expansion of the application of rhythmic theory to folk music, for instance in his recognition of what he called "metabolic rhythm," which is the mixing together of different forms of stops, a type of rhythm found in folk music.

Westphal's theories have been adequately analyzed elsewhere. An analysis of Mel'gunov's contribution to their joint effort would be appropriate at this point, but, with the exception of the aspects just mentioned, which Mel'gunov included in his own writings in addition to his explications of the theories already set down earlier by Westphal, it is impossible, lacking the proper evidence, to determine exactly the extent of his contribution to this effort. The point to be made here is that such a collaboration did occur, and Mel'gunov should be credited appropriately.

Sokalsky and Faminsyn. Other contributions to the field of folk music theory at this time include those by Sokalsky and Faminsyn, who
also to some extent based their approaches on extra-Russian elements such as Oriental pentatonicism. Famintsyn in his works concentrated on the pentatonic nature of Russian folk song. Sokal'sky, in his major work on the melodic and rhythmic construction of Russian and Ukrainian folk song, examined the nature and means of the quartal and pentachordal (including pentatonic) constructive principles of these songs.

Within the purview of the present work it is not possible to investigate further the developing theory of Russian folk music; that should be the topic of a separate study. Yet to separate completely the theory of folk music from the theory of serious music in Russia and the Soviet Union is not possible. One purpose of including such information on the initial focus of Russian musicians on this subject was to illustrate the level of attention to theoretical matters in general, of which a theory of Russian folk music was one. Another purpose was to provide a theoretical background for studies of topics related to both folk and serious music, such as mode. Therefore, although no further discussions of research specifically into Russian folk music theory will be included, such an approach does not preclude the discussion of theories connected to or derived in part from studies of folk music.
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4 Y. N. Mel'gunov, "K voprosu o russkoi narodnoi muzyke" [To the question of Russian folk music], *Etnograficheskoi obozrenie* [The ethnographic review], 6, No. 3 (1890), 115-136. Westphal also published an article in Russian on Russian folk music: R. G. H. Westphal, "Russkaia pesnia" [Russian song], *Russkii Vestnik* [The Russian bulletin], No. 9 (1879), pp. 111-154.
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of folk song and music (with musical supplements and illustrations)], Trudy, 1 (Moscow, 1906).

As historical confirmation for the polyphonic and harmonic nature of Russian folk song, Mel'gunov relied on Westphal's opinion of the similar nature of ancient Greek music:

Contrary to the established opinion, considering ancient melody to be monodic, without harmonic accompaniment, we may stress, based on the research of Professor R. Westphal, that the ancients combined among themselves sounds of different pitch, and that is why the harmonic phenomena, as a consequence of these combinations, may not in any way be called unisons, just as music, containing in itself a combined performance of intervals, may not be called monodic. Acoustics discovered the existence of different harmonic overtones, and thereby stresses that the harmonic combinations formed by these overtones are not the invention of the most recent music theorists, but should be attributed directly to a spontaneous phenomenon of nature. We really do not have monuments with harmonic accompaniment in the contemporary sense; however it is impossible to propose that the most ancient melody was not subjected, attached to a joint performance, to changes. It is not possible to allow the thought that the vocal means of the performers and their spiritual mood attached to the performance was as by one man. Russian folk songs, preserving antiquity, consist also of melodies and are not accompanied by chords in the sense of Western music, but variants of songs always point to the harmonic origin of the melodies. Is it not more correct to conclude that true creation did not deny the laws of proportion of relations, that is the laws of aesthetics, and that in folk creations there is the unconscious manifestation of a secretly active law. Observations of Russian folk melodies led me to the conclusion, that they are constructed on a harmonic basis (Mel'gunov, Elementarnyi uchebnik muzykal'nogo ritmiki, p. VII).

One can observe also the influence of Mel'gunov's teacher Arnol'd in this passage, in his reference to "laws of aesthetics."


Mel'gunov states, "The remaining songs [other than numbers 55 and 56, which are played on horns] are harmonized without the help of the varied voices, in analogy with previous songs of the same key" (Russkie narodnye pesni, 1, XXV). This statement does not correspond with the harmonizations presented in the collection. An examination of these harmonizations shows an accompaniment clearly and strongly related to the variants.
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Chapter 15

The 1890s: Theories of Ippolitov-Ivanov and Kurdiumov

Theory Books in the 1890s. Despite the large number and variety of theory textbooks published in Russia during the next twenty years, few surpassed Chaikovsky's or Rimsky-Korsakov's work in popularity or distinction. Thirty-six theory textbooks, eight foreign and twenty-eight native, were published in the 1890s alone. While the number of foreign translations remained fairly constant in comparison with those published in the previous decade, the number of native works doubled. Again, as in previous decades, textbooks devoted to theory fundamentals or elementary harmony constitute the greatest proportion (fifteen) of this number, followed by harmony textbooks (six, a significant increase), exercise books (four), and miscellaneous works (three). The harmony textbook again remained the most important and significant type of theory book. Some of the new generation of theorists, including Georgy Eduardovich Conus (1862-1933), Nikolai Mikhailovich Ladukhin (1860-1918), and Anton Stepanovich Arensky (1861-1906), wrote harmony textbooks that generally reflect the influence of either Chaikovsky or Rimsky-Korsakov. These three Moscow theorists provided the main contributions to practical Russian music theory in the 1890s. Through
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their adherence to the fundamental harmonic principles and approaches developed by Chaikovsky and Rimsky-Korsakov in the 1870s and 1880s, they underscored the significance of the textbooks of these two great Russian theorist-composers. Others, such as Yury Vladimirovich Kurdiumov (1859–1936) and Mikhail Mikhailovich Ippolitov-Ivanov (1859–1935), wrote harmony books of a different sort that were at once novel but overly complex, and therefore far less useful than might have been expected. Arensky's textbook on form, the first such work by a Russian, constituted one of the more innovative Russian contributions of this decade. Arensky's textbook on form and the works by Kurdiumov and Ippolitov-Ivanov are discussed below.

Anton Arensky. In his harmony textbook, Kratke rukovodstvo k prakticheskому izucheniiu harmonii [A short guide to the practical study of harmony], Arensky maintained in varying degrees the traditions of both Chaikovsky, his predecessor at the Moscow Conservatory (chord groupings and modulation, for example), and his teacher Rimsky-Korsakov (key relations and modulatory plan). (Arensky graduated from the St. Petersburg Conservatory in Rimsky-Korsakov's class of composition in 1882, after which he began his teaching career at the Moscow Conservatory.) But in the publication of his textbook on form in 1893–94, Arensky departed from tradition. Previously, conservatory students had to rely on either Hunke's Guide or on translated works by Ludwig Bussler for use in their classes on form. Since no one existing book combined information on both polyphonic and homophonic forms, Arensky
sought to correct this deficiency in his two-volume Rukovodstvo k izucheniiu form instrumental'noi i vokal'noi muzyki [A guide to the study of the forms of instrumental and vocal music]. In volume 1, he discusses polyphonic forms in both strict and free styles; in volume 2, he discusses homophonic forms, beginning with the motive and ending with the sonata allegro form and vocal forms. The influence of the German theorist Hugo Riemann, whose works began to be translated into Russian in the 1890s, is noticeable. For instance, Arensky mentions accent in his definition of motive: "The basis of each musical work, both homophonic and polyphonic, is the motive. By this term is implied a series of notes in a given work of which one has the greatest accent. The usual length of the motive is one or two bars." Amazingly, Arensky's Guide remained the only such Russian form textbook until the 1930s. Taneev had planned such a work, but never wrote it. Apparently, theory teachers relied on translated works on form by Ebenezer Prout, as well as those by Riemann.

Mikhail Mikhailovich Ippolitov-Ivanov. In the mid-1890s, two other theorists, Mikhail Ippolitov-Ivanov and Yury Kurdiumov, produced theory works that deviated from the established traditions of the Russian theory of harmony; but these works, probably because of their unorthodox approaches, were far less successful than the more traditional textbooks. Yet, while failing to achieve their intended purposes, these works served as signals of a new era in Russian music theory. For in their attempts to create a more comprehensive approach
to the complexities of contemporary harmonic language, Ippolitov-Ivanov and Kurdiumov helped to open the way towards viewing music theory less simply as a pedagogical tool and more as a scientific discipline.

Both Ippolitov-Ivanov and Kurdiumov focus on the study of chords in their respective works—Ippolitov-Ivanov concentrated on the construction and resolution of chords, Kurdiumov on the classification of chords and chord progressions. Ippolitov-Ivanov, a graduate of the St. Petersburg Conservatory (1882), where he studied with Johansen (harmony and counterpoint) and Rimsky-Korsakov (composition), taught at the Moscow Conservatory (1893-1905) and later became its director (1905-1922). In his work, *Uchenie ob akkordakh, ikh postroenie i razreshenie* [The study of chords, their construction and resolution], Ippolitov-Ivanov also classifies chords, based partly on his own system of dissonance classification. Dissonances within the key are the nonconsonant intervals formed between the notes of both the major and minor modes. For consonances, he adopts Helmholtz's classification: a) absolute: doubled prime or unison, octave, duodetsima or double octave; b) perfect: fifth and fourth; c) middle: major sixth, major third; and d) imperfect: minor third, minor sixth. "Artificial" dissonances are formed from the chromatic changes of one or both tones of an interval—consonant or dissonant—in the tonality; and "accidental" dissonances are formed from a chromatic change of one or both of the tones of an interval in the tonality.

Ippolitov-Ivanov then classifies chords, according to their intervallic structure, as "basic," "compound" or "derivative," "artificial,"
or "accidental." A basic chord is included within the limits of the octave and consists of tones from the key. Basic chords include therefore all triads and seventh chords naturally occurring in both the major and minor modes—a somewhat advanced version of Kirnberger's and Weber's essential or ground chords. A compound or derivative chord is formed from a compound interval such as a ninth or an eleventh, and is therefore dissonant. An artificial chord is formed from artificial dissonant intervals; among these are the augmented-sixth chord, and chords with a doubly augmented fourth or doubly diminished fifth. Accidental chords are formed from chromatic changes in the inner voices—i.e., from chromatic nonharmonic tones such as passing tones or suspensions—in any of the basic or derivative chords in the tonality. This group resembles Chaikovsky's accidental chords in name and method of formation but not in content, since Chaikovsky's accidental chords encompass both the artificial and accidental chords of Ippolitov-Ivanov. For each of these categories, Ippolitov-Ivanov discusses and illustrates nearly all possible chordal formations and their resolutions as found in the harmonic practice of his day; this adds up to an excessively large number of chords.

Ippolitov-Ivanov also devotes chapters to other topics such as cadences, voice-leading, nonharmonic tones, modulation, organ point, and figured bass. Concerning modulation, he follows the tradition of Chaikovsky in a broad sense, distinguishing between a "basic" modulation—similar but not identical to a "direct" modulation—and a passing modulation. A basic modulation is brought about by one of the chords
belonging to the dominant group preceded by a common chord between the two tonalities, not just by the dominant chord as in Chaikovsky's definition of a direct modulation. A passing modulation joins tonalities that share no common chord by means of related tonalites that do. In Ippolitov-Ivanov's view, the dominant group, including the dominant triad and seventh chord, the diminished triad and seventh chord on 7, the rarely used minor seventh chord on 7, and the dominant ninth chord, defines the tonality. While this grouping resembles Rimsky-Korsakov's, Ippolitov-Ivanov also places II and IV in the subdominant group and II and VI in the mediant group, the latter a new designation in Russian music theory. As in Rimsky-Korsakov's groupings, an incipient functionalism is evident.

Ippolitov-Ivanov's subject matter resembles that of a harmony textbook, but his approach is far too complex and detailed to have been pedagogically useful. However, his and similar works (Comus's, for example, which has an equally complex approach) indicate an attempt by theorists to provide a firmer, more extensive foundation for studies in harmony based on contemporary harmonic practice and with less emphasis on the empirical approach. Nevertheless, they failed to provide an adequate alternative; The Study of Chords, for example, resembles more a catalogue of late nineteenth-century harmonic practice with an emphasis on chordal construction than a textbook designed to teach harmonic principles. Ippolitov-Ivanov's static approach to harmony, based on intervallic construction and figured bass, was soon to be eclipsed in the twentieth century by functionalism.
Yury Vladimirovich Kurdiumov. Yury Kurdiumov, an 1887 graduate of the St. Petersburg Conservatory who became a teacher, critic, and composer, took a more novel but still unsuccessful approach to harmony in his major theoretical work, *Klassifikatsiia garmonicheskikh soedinenii* [The classification of harmonic combinations]. Kurdiumov aimed in this work to establish general principles on which may be founded harmonic combinations, through what becomes clear from the classification of these combinations. The author attempts to show that the very order which is basic to the most usual harmonic progressions of the consonant triads of the key (ordinary progressions) is expressed in the mass of other unusual harmonic progressions, consisting not only of consonant chords but also of all kinds of dissonant chords and different tonal combinations.

As a secondary goal, Kurdiumov invented a system of chord representation through such nonmusical means as letters, numbers, and punctuation marks. Such a system, he rationalized, could be useful for transmitting song harmonies, for example, over the telegraph.

The harmonic foundation for his classifications consists of the consonant triads of the major and minor modes. Following Rimsky-Korsakov, Kurdiumov includes both forms of major, the harmonic major and the natural major, in his concept of the major mode. He treats the relationship between major and minor as one of correspondence and not of imitation, minor resulting only "by means of" the imitation of major. He refers the reader to the works of A. von Oettingen in this matter. Simultaneous combinations—called "linkages"—of these simple triads result in complex, sometimes dissonant, harmonic tonal combinations such as seventh chords; consecutive combinations of these
triads result in harmonic progressions, sequences, and modulation. Kurdiumov devotes most of the text to the classification of these consecutive combinations, or progressions. "Ordinary," "active" progressions, for example, are those progressions most characteristic of a given tonality. "Tonal," "active" progressions are those most characteristic of a combination of two tonalities. "Modally active" progressions possess the capability to effect a modulation. He classifies this group according to which keys they may join through modulation.

Kurdiumov views these progressions as links in a harmonic chain. The aspiration to a definite harmonic center of gravity (tonic) is what Kurdiumov calls an "active source." In correspondence with this active source, the links of the harmonic chains are unified and connected. But in the opposite phenomenon, a "passive source," these links are varied and isolated:

The more narrow and unbroken the links of the harmonic chain, the more they, so to speak, lose their individual quality, being subordinated to the single aspiration to merge with tonic, then the more the element of activeness is present in harmony. But if the connection between the links of the harmonic chain are weak, if each of them aspires to make itself a center of gravity, to establish its own tonic, then the more the harmony will carry a similar sporadic character, the more the element of passiveness will be present in it. This is defined by the general tonality of the harmony of a given work and not by the presence in it of one passive progression.13

Thus it is the "active" progressions that characterize either tonalities or combinations, or effect modulations. But a harmony with a passive character does not necessarily mean the presence of something "sluggish or flaccid":

Frequently the reverse [is true]: a grandiose and fantastic harmonic content frequently directly requires the predominance in
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harmony of the passive source; an active harmony may not always obediently meander with all the twists of the fantasy of genius. . . . In a musical work [in which] the harmony is passive . . . the strict logic of the harmonic combinations obediently yields directly to different artistic requirements of a higher order. . . . In general, these artistic requirements of a higher order influence . . . not only harmony, but also melody, [and] finally, the general coloring (instrumentation, nuances).14

Although Kurdiumov's system contains within it many interesting and even forward-looking ideas such as the psychological (non-acoustical) approach to chord progression and tonality, an emphasis that gained prominence in the twentieth century—ideas derived from approaches of such Western theorists as Hauptmann and von Oettingen—unfortunately they are obscured by his emphasis on classification and his new method of chord representation, neither of which is at all practical and did not find a place in Russian music theory. However, his approach undoubtedly influenced certain aspects of Russian music theory. He began to raise important questions about musical language, such as the nature and function of tonality, of harmonic progressions, and of higher tertian structures, questions to which Russian theorists soon turned their serious attention in the twentieth century. Also, some of his many new terms crept into Russian theoretical language largely through the work of Boleslav Yavorsky, who developed a very different but also psychological approach. Terms that Kurdiumov applied in a harmonic context, Yavorsky later applied in a modal-melodic context (discussed in Parts V and VI of the present work). Kurdiumov also initiated the practice of identifying intervals through semitone content, a practice Yavorsky continued.
Despite their deficiencies, the works of both Kurdiumov and Ippolitov-Ivanov pointed towards new directions. Kurdiumov's towards the emergence of a more speculative form of music theory, and Ippolitov-Ivanov's towards the expansion of the pedagogical theory of harmony beyond that embraced by Chaikovsky and Rimsky-Korsakov and their followers. However, within the nineteenth-century practical, pedagogical tradition that prevailed in the conservatories, Chaikovsky and Rimsky-Korsakov stand out as the most innovative and influential theorists of their time. The pedagogical foundations that they established have been maintained and developed by succeeding generations of theorists. The progress made in the development of independent Russian theoretical thought, the decrease in foreign influence, the large numbers of conservatory-trained composers and theorists, and the large increase in the number of native theory books produced in Russia from 1860 to 1900 all testify to the efficacies of the conservatories and of these pedagogical traditions. These traditions have subsequently been enriched by various new approaches of both practical and speculative origin in the twentieth century.
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Summary to Part IV

Thus in the pedagogical sphere of Russian music theory the aspect of harmony received the most attention prior to 1900. What were the main trends in the study of harmony? Harmony may be divided into two approaches—the horizontal or contrapuntal, which includes concentration on the principles of voiceleading and the stepwise motion between chords, and the view of chords as the result of horizontal motion; and the vertical or chordal, which includes concentration on chord construction and categorization. The horizontal approach occurs essentially on the foreground level. This characteristic distinguishes it from a vertical approach that may concentrate on horizontal connections on a middleground or background level, i.e., modulations.

Beginning with Diletsky and ending with Kjurdumov it is possible to align each theorist with one approach or the other. Although such a categorization risks oversimplification, it is nonetheless applicable and will facilitate the present discussion. Of course, these two categories are not mutually exclusive; but the distinguishing feature of each of the textbooks discussed herein generally belongs to one group or the other. On the contrapuntal, horizontal side we find Hunke, Chaikovsky (and his followers) and to some extent Kjurdumov.
This approach is characterized by influence from the contrapuntal sphere and by attention to voiceleading principles and the means by which tones of one chord progress to tones of the next chord. Hunke's leading-tone resolutions and Kurdiumov's concern with chord progression on a foreground level therefore fall into this category. Even though Diletsky was not overly concerned with harmony but with part writing in itself, he may also be included in this group in order to emphasize the historical precedent for this approach. Philosophically, Larosh advocated this approach. On the vertical, chordal side, we find Hess de Calvé, Fuchs, Rimsky-Korsakov (and his followers) and Ippolitov-Ivanov.

This approach is characterized by attention to chord structure and groupings; if present, attention to chord progression in this approach is usually on a higher level, e.g., modulatory plans, key relatedness, and the like. Hess de Calvé's essential chords, Fuchs's fundamental harmonies, Rimsky-Korsakov's functional groupings, and Ippolitov-Ivanov's classifications all fall under this rubric. Hunke's chord classifications also belong here. This dichotomy continued in twentieth-century Russian music theory within both the speculative and pedagogical spheres.

The Russian study of harmony, and indeed all of nineteenth-century Russian music theory, may also be characterized by a conflict between empiricism and rationalism. Such a distinction is not meant to pit Chaikovsky, the main practitioner of empiricism, against all the others; but it symbolizes the search of some theorists for scientific answers to questions of theory. Many theorists disliked the over-
abundance of rules in theory, which they labeled scholasticism or
dogmatism, a trend more noticeable among non-Conservatory theorists
like Serov and Odoevsky. Chaikovsky was unique among Conservatory
pedagogues in this aspect, which may be explained by his distaste for
theory and pedagogy, in spite of his excellent record as both theory
student and teacher. His empirical approach may be viewed as a direct
descendent of the attitude among earlier dilettantes that taste and
aesthetics were all and that learning rules would overwhelm and ulti-
mately destroy one's talent. This trend towards empiricism was offset
by the call for a more scientific attitude towards music, which arose
as an answer to those amateurs who decried all existing theory because
so much of it was dogmatic and overfilled with rules for no true
reason. Thus the dilettante attitude gave rise to two offshoots—
empiricism, an attempt to relate the rules of theory to one's personal
taste and experience, and rationalism, an attempt to find the under-
lying natural, scientific and lawful reasons for these rules. For a
factual foundation, the science contingent turned to acoustics, the
most "scientific" sphere related to music. However, they used acous-
tics only as a means to an end, as a way to explain harmonic or modal
phenomena; they carried out no original research in the field of acous-
tics itself during this time. Some theorists like Arnol'd and
Mel'gunov looked for a more scientific approach in aesthetics as well,
citing "the laws of aesthetics" as evidence for explanations of certain
phenomena. But as we have seen these attempts led nowhere in terms of
real results. As experiments, though, such endeavors represented the
non-pedagogical, more speculative side of theory. As theorists became more familiar with the research of Helmholtz, Hauptmann, and von Oettingen, for example, they began to search for ways to apply this new material in their own work. That they were unsuccessful is less significant than their attempts at application. For as a result of their experiments, the boundaries of theory began to expand beyond the pedagogical realm into the speculative arena. Their efforts bore fruit not immediately, but later, in the twentieth century.

In non-pedagogical spheres, primarily folk music, the element of mode became the main topic of discussion. No one disputed the diatonic foundation of folk music; the question was, what was the exact nature of this diatonicism. Theorists related it to the church modes (Odoevsky and Mel'gunov), ancient Greek music (Serov), Chinese music (Famintsyn), and a host of extra-Russian elements. It was not within their realm of suggestion to devise an original theory, apparently; the practice at this time was to relate the explanation to some existing or historical practice. But these individual approaches gradually began to build up a body of truths that contributed eventually to a genuine theory of folk music. Chief among these is the recognition of its diatonic foundations. But as it turns out the exact nature of this diatonicism is unique to Russian folk song in its various manifestations and is not to be equated with other systems, even though there exist shared elements between systems. Another important step was the recognition of the non-Western nature of Russian folk song, and, therefore, the need for accurate transcriptions. Only when accurate ver-
sions of folk songs devoid of superimposed Western elements began to be recorded could a true theory begin to develop. During Serov's and Odoevsky's time, for example, the lack of proper materials was a real hindrance to their work. Mel'gunov realized this deficiency, and his own transcriptions of folk song led him to the recognition of the polyphonic nature of folk music, yet another significant step. It was not strictly monodic, as Serov had asserted. Mel'gunov also discovered that Russian folk song modulated, and that such modulations were very often modal in nature (major to minor, etc.). All of these discoveries contributed to the development of a theory of Russian folk song. But more importantly in terms of the present discussion, these research forays into folk song theory also helped in the development of a non-pedagogical, speculative Russian music theory. The process of research itself into theory outside of the pedagogical sphere helped to set in motion the drive towards theory as an intellectual, striving discipline.

Regarding the question of mode, some theorists made unique contributions. Odoevsky's separation of the definition of scale from that of mode was significant. Such a distinction today is accepted without question, but Odoevsky initiated it. His and Serov's recognitions of the diatonicism of the modes of folk music has already been mentioned. Serov's tetrachordal divisions of the scale brought out a useful distinction that is being applied yet today. Mel'gunov, although he too compared the modal language of Russian folk song to that of ancient Greek music, was much more exact in his comparisons than either
Odoevsky or Serov, naming specific modes or variants thereof, and examining their use through cadences, modulations, and the like.

In spite of the wide gulf between the somewhat naive attitudes towards theory in the nineteenth century and the more sophisticated approaches of the twentieth century in Russia, it is possible to find precedents in the nineteenth century for almost every prominent area of important theoretical research in the twentieth century. These areas include mode; acoustics (particularly dual foundations); functionalism; counterpoint and the principles of voiceleading; the psychology of harmony, progression and tonality; form; rhythm; and thematic and content analysis. All were topics of investigation at some level, whether pedagogical or speculative.
Summary to Section I

From 1680 to 1900, then, we have traced the development towards and, finally, the establishment of the discipline of music theory in Russia. What began as merely music theory in Russia—the period encompassing the works of such foreign theorists in Russia as Diletsky, Manfredini, Hess de Calvé, Fuchs, and Hunke—ended as Russian music theory, the period encompassing the works of such native theorists as Odoevsky, Chaikovsky, Rimsky-Korsakov, Ladukhin, Conus, Arensky, Mel'gunov, Ippolitov-Ivanov, and Kurdiumov. This developmental process was lengthy, at times erratic, and dependent on other factors, most importantly the availability of a system of higher-level music education in Russia. Without such a system, the formal study of music theory in Russia was not able to be undertaken by most Russians, for social, monetary, and linguistic reasons. Furthermore, the formal study of music theory was considered unnecessary and even undesirable by many Russians, including musicians. They viewed music as a commodity of the emotions, one capable of stirring the soul but not the mind. Lacking any formal requirements for the study of music theory, lacking sufficient Russian textbooks for its study, lacking native teachers, and lacking any incentive for studying it for any length of time, many
Russian musicians and would-be musicians simply ignored the study of music theory. Those who did recognize a need for it were able to pursue their goal, but only through foreign means—study abroad, with a foreign teacher in Russia, or from one of the theory texts available, a few of which were translated into Russian. But without widespread recognition for the necessity of its study, no attempts by native musicians were made to supply it. It took a powerful personality like Anton Rubinstein, backed by his benefactress and other supporters, to implement the inexpensive, accessible, and resultant means to pursue the study of music. And this occurred really rather late, only after a native school of composition had begun to emerge.

Once the conservatories were established and the obligatory study of music theory was included in the curriculum, the discipline of Russian music theory that did emerge was largely practical, pedagogical and Western. Within this singular emphasis, though, Russian theorists developed individual approaches that were distinguishable from those in Western theory pedagogy. Chaikovsky emphasized voice-leading principles, and Rimsky-Korsakov emphasized the scalar foundation, functionalism, key relatedness, and the means of modulation attached to it. Their works provided the foundation for subsequent theorists through the late nineteenth and well into the twentieth century.

However, beginning as early as the 1860s but with greater emphasis in the 1880s, theorists began to cultivate a more speculative approach to music theory; the results of their initial forays appeared first in the realm of folk music theory. The results of subsequent efforts in
theory proper began to appear only in the first decade of the twentieth century, in the third stage of the development of a Russian music theory. At this point the focus of our investigation shifts from the practical sphere of music theory to the speculative sphere. The year 1900 thus provides a convenient juncture between two eras—one concentrating on the practical side of theory, the other on the speculative side.

The elements that helped to bring about this shift in emphasis will be examined in Part V. However, several contributing factors that cannot be overlooked should be mentioned here. One is the development still in the nineteenth century of a rudimentary Russian theory of folk music. Odevsky, Serov, Mel'gunov, Sokal'sky and Faminatyn all approached folk music from a more speculative theoretical perspective than was being applied to music in general. Although their studies in essence belong more to the field of ethnomusicology than to that of music theory, they cannot have failed to have had some impact on the latter. Indeed, the theory of folk music and music theory in general are, in twentieth-century Soviet musicology, closely interconnected. Another factor is Western research, particularly by Helmholtz, in the field of acoustics, which prompted an interest in acoustics among some Russian musicians, such as Odevsky and Mel'gunov. A third factor is the increased attention among Russian musicians to Western harmonic theory, as in such works by Hauptmann and von Oettingen. This influence and derivation from Western theory, so prevalent all during most of the nineteenth century, began to abate in the twentieth century as
theorists, building on a strong, individual pedagogical tradition, began to originate speculative theoretical ideas as well. But, of course, these nineteenth-century Western influences can only have taken place within the proper receptive atmosphere—among educated, talented, and intellectual Russian musicians, most of whom had received strict conservatory educations in Russia. The exceptions were Odoevsky and Serov, but they were indeed exceptions. From this it may be generally concluded, then, that the conservatories produced the greatest impetus towards the development of a Russian theory of music. However, as we shall see in the twentieth century, this impact of the conservatories faded as other additional elements were introduced and began to contribute to the continuing growth of the discipline of music theory, this time within the speculative realm.
SECTION II:

RUSSIAN AND SOVIET MUSIC THEORY, 1900-1950
INTRODUCTION TO SECTION II

Entry into the 1900s signaled in Russia not only the beginning of a new decade and a new century, but soon came to represent a new era in Russian music theory as well. The years 1900–1950 saw tremendous growth and progress in Russian music theory. Alongside the already established tradition of pedagogical theory developed the even more significant tradition of speculative theory. During this time the ideas of such prominent Russian and Soviet theorists as Sergei Ivanovich Taneev (1856–1915), Boleslav Leopol'dovich Yavorsky (1877–1942), Georgy Eduardovich Conus, and Georgy Lvovich Catoire (1861–1926), followed by Boris Vladimirovich Asafiev (1884–1949), Nikolai Alexandrovich Garbuzov (1880–1955), Viktor Abramovich Tsukkerman (1903– ), Yury Nikolaevich Tiulin (1893–1978), Lev Abramovich Mazel (1907– ), and many others, came to fruition and had an enormous impact on the establishment of music theory as a legitimate subject of scientific research.

During the nineteenth century, music theory, both in its practical and pedagogical aspects, was most commonly referred to as the theory of composition. In the twentieth century, though, it acquired the addi-
tional connotation of the science of music, i.e., speculative theory. Serov in the nineteenth century had referred to it in this manner, but, like his use of the term musicology, this understanding of theory gained more widespread acceptance only after the turn of the century. Theorists attempted to answer questions that had been largely ignored by earlier Russian theorists, questions concerning the very foundation of music—its structure, perception, and underlying laws. They turned their attention to such topics as mode, formal and harmonic analysis, counterpoint, the process of music, comprehensive analytical approaches, acoustics, harmonic systems, musical energy, harmonic and modal functions, microtonal systems, and the like. Yet, although music theory gained respectability as a separate discipline, it was still considered a part of the field of musicology, as it was in Germany. Theoretical musicology, as it came to be called, gained acceptance primarily in the postrevolutionary period. Its progress was slowed somewhat by the introduction of the doctrine of Socialist Realism and by the necessity to conform to Marxist philosophy during the Soviet period, and was temporarily halted in the late 1940s by the Communist Party's criticisms of musicians and scholars. By 1950 theoretical musicology had lost whatever separate identity it may have achieved during the 1920s. The necessity for musicology to adhere to political doctrine further deprived it of any significant independence. Developments of the last thirty years, though, have helped it regain some of its former prominence.
This section, then, is divided into four distinct parts. Part V covers the pre-revolutionary period of the twentieth century, from 1900 to 1917, which is distinguished by both ground-breaking and ground-laying advances in the speculative sphere. Without these developments, the growth in succeeding years would not have been so rapid and varied. Part VI covers the period from the revolution to the introduction of Socialist Realism, that is, from 1917 to 1932. This is the period of the greatest experimentation and progress in music theory. Part VII covers the period from the introduction of Socialist Realism and the establishment of the Composers' Union until Russia's entry into World War II, from 1932 to 1941. These years witnessed the mandatory incorporation of Marxist doctrine into the musical sphere. Part VIII comprises the post-War years up through an All-Soviet Musicological Conference in 1950. Although ostensibly this period begins in 1941, since the War years were atypical and for the most part devoid of significant scholarly publications, this era in effect covers just the latter half of the decade of the 1940s.
PART V

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A RUSSIAN MUSICAL SCIENCE, 1900–1917
Introduction to Part V

The revolutionary fervor of period in Russia from 1900 to 1917 was felt in all quarters. The insufficiencies of the nineteenth-century reforms and counterreforms, beginning with the abolition of serfdom in 1861, as well as the repression of dissent and the changes in class and economic structure, led to political and social unrest, which first culminated in the 1905 Revolution. The liberties granted in the October Manifesto of that year, including civil liberties, democratic franchise and legislative consent, did not completely stop the revolutionary activity, which quieted down only after the election of the third Duma, the legislative body created in the wake of the revolution, in November 1907. Further reforms were enacted in 1912, which finally granted full rights to all citizens in Russia.

By this time, though, the Bolshevik party with Lenin at its head had already been established and had taken part in the revolutionary activity. The problems attendant to Russia's involvement in World War I, the unpopularity of and eventual disintegration of the Imperial Government of Nicholas II, the popular uprising in March 1917, and the weaknesses of the new government allowed Lenin an opportunity to take charge. This was the October Revolution, which created a government and system still in effect today.
Although the 1917 Revolution resulted in greater and more far-reaching consequences than the 1905 Revolution, the latter was not without its effects in the cultural sphere. Both the St. Petersburg and the Moscow Conservatories suffered through this period with resignations and internal political battles. Many musicians spoke out against the January 1905 massacre of peaceful demonstrators. In addition, the liberal factions at both conservatories resented their respective authorities and took action to stem their influence. At the St. Petersburg Conservatory, Rimsky-Korsakov's dismissal after protesting the treatment of student strikers and demanding internal autonomy for the Conservatory led a string of sympathetic resignations among the faculty. Rimsky-Korsakov, having become a symbol of defiance for the Russian intelligentsia, was put under surveillance, and performances of his music were banned. Some type of official harrassment of Rimsky-Korsakov persisted until his death in 1908. The conservatories were eventually granted limited autonomy with a director of their own choosing. In December 1905 Glazunov was elected to the post and he persuaded Rimsky-Korsakov to return to his duties. In Moscow, Taneev led the liberal faction, which protested the autocratic methods of the director Vassili Safonov. Taneev resigned in September 1905 and never returned, even though Ippolitov-Ivanov took over the directorship. Taneev subsequently took part in the founding of the People's Conservatory in 1906, a more democratic venture similar to the Free Music School of the nineteenth century (which, incidentally, survived until 1917).
An important accomplishment for musical scholarship during this period was the founding of societies devoted to the pursuit of research in music. These societies provided an important foundation for future research. They are investigated in Chapter 16. Influences contributing to the rising interest in music research are also explored in that chapter. A separate chapter is devoted to each of the two more important native theorists during this period—Taneev (Chapter 17) and Yavorsky (Chapter 18). Other developments and research, such as the founding of the People's Conservatory, the growing interest in the science of music, and theories of ultrachromaticism, are examined in Chapter 19.
Chapter 16

Initial Steps: Establishment of Means and Forums for Research

Native and Foreign Influences. Even with the unrest and political events, the years of this century prior to the 1917 Revolution were for Russian theorists fertile and formative ones; these first two decades of the twentieth century produced many of the elements that brought about the transformation from a practical pedagogical theory to a more speculative scientific theory. Many of the ideas formulated by Russian theorists during this seventeen-year period served as the foundation for much of their own subsequent work, as well as that of others. As we have seen, Russian practical music theory had already reached a rather sophisticated level, particularly when compared to what it had been just forty years earlier. By 1900 a sizable body of practical theoretical literature existed, a number of conservatory-trained composers and theorists were working professionally or teaching in the same conservatories, and traditions of composition and theoretical study had been established. These developments contributed the necessary foundation for continued progress in the field. Also, certain individuals, both in Russia and abroad, were instrumental in stimulating new levels of theoretical thought in Russia. The Russian theorist and composer
Sergei Ivanovich Taneev became so influential through his theoretical work and his pedagogical and organizational activities that he was later referred to as the founder of music theory in Russia. Other theorists such as Yavorsky, Conus, Lecnid Leonidovich Sabaneev, and Arsenii Mikhailovich Avraamov developed original theoretical approaches as well during this period.

From abroad the theoretical and historical works of Hugo Riemann and the general scope of musicological activity being undertaken in Germany and Austria also influenced the development of Russian music theory. The wide disparity between such activity in those countries, for instance, and similar activity in Russia was made clear to Russians in the article "Nauka o muzyke" [The science of music] from the Russian translation of Riemann's *Musiklexikon*, published in Moscow in the years 1901-1904. Concerning musical science in Germany and Austria, the article states:

The science of music is only recently beginning to gain for itself an independent place alongside the rest of the sciences. . . . The combining of the different spheres of mathematical, physical, physiological and psychological acoustics, musical aesthetics, musical archeology and paleography, and in general all the special historical research in music and the different branches of the theory of music, such as the study of composition, instrumentation, etc., into one aggregate idea [called] "the Science of music" (musical science) was accomplished in Germany particularly through the efforts of F. Chrystal and P. Spitta. . . . [In] 1902 lectures on certain segments of the science of music were given in all German and many Austrian universities.

In contrast to this, the author (presumably Yuly Dmitrievich Engel, the editor of the Russian edition) describes the situation in Russia:

In Russia the science of music is in a very rudimentary state, and it is difficult even to foresee when it will emerge from [this
Musical Societies: The Musical Scientific Society. Engel's rather grim analysis of the conditions in Russia did not reflect the entire status of musical science there, as we have seen; but even so, additional steps were soon taken to improve the situation. Already in 1902 in Moscow a musical society was founded as a forum for the dissemination of new theoretical ideas. The "Musical Scientific Society," founded by a circle of Moscow musicians gathered around Taneev, sponsored lectures on contemporary research in music, particularly in music theory. At their monthly meetings for the years 1902–1904, the members, including Viacheslav Alexandrovich Bulychev, Alexander Tikhonovich Grechaninov, Mikhail Vladimirovich Ivanov-Boretsky, Mikhail Nikolaevich Kurbatov, Emiliia Karlovich Rozenov, D. S. Shor, Taneev, and others, heard lectures on such topics as acoustics, musical form, musical perception, and the theories of Riemann. Of all the lectures, the most interesting from the theoretical point of view are Rozenov's lecture on the golden section in music, Conus's lecture on formal analysis, and Engel's lecture on the theories of Riemann.

In his lecture on the golden section (read January 28, 1904), Rozenov, an 1889 graduate of the Moscow Conservatory in theory and piano who taught piano for a living, discussed its application to the temporal arts. In music its role is varied:
1) as a means for the establishment of the refined correlation between the whole and its main parts; 2) as the most beneficial moment for the satisfaction of a prepared expectation; 3) as the most beneficial moment for any sort of prominent moments (culminating points in the whole and its parts); [and] 4) as a means for the establishment of the accordance or correlation between the main ideas (themes) of the composition.

To support his thesis, the application of the golden section in music, Rozenov furnished examples from the music of Bach, Beethoven, Mendelssohn, and Chopin. In the second movement of the Third Symphony of Beethoven, for example, he found that the golden section agrees with the beginning of the recapitulation, "that is, with the prepared appearance of an anticipated basic theme." To other works he applied, in addition to chromatic and harmonic criteria, the criteria of range and dynamics to determine the golden section. Rozenov concluded: "In each of these works almost all of the main subdivisions and the places of culminating points (the points of modulatory aspiration, the high melodic points, the point of highest strength) are submitted strictly to the law of the golden section." He invited the members of the Society to participate in similar calculations of the use of the golden section in music, which, when classified systematically, would turn his hypotheses into "definite aesthetic laws, capable of receiving no small significance in the theory of music composition."

Yuly Engel, the translator into Russian of many of Riemann's works, devoted his lecture, entitled "The Bases of the System of Harmony of Riemann" (read November 12 and December 17, 1903), to a discussion of Riemann's theories on the nature of tonality, mode, and function, and on the acoustical bases of the harmonic system (under- and
over-tones). So many scholars in the audience questioned him, particularly concerning the theory of under-tones, however, and raised doubts about the efficacy of the very system, that the lecture took on the form of an interview. But in the end, as the reviewer put it,

Both by the lecturer himself, and also by other scholars of the Society, it was recognized that in spite of many strained interpretations of Riemann, it would be rash to deny any merit to his system; one should not close one's eyes to the fact that his system, on the one hand, gives an explanation to many turns and rules of harmony, which remain to this day without any theoretical basis, and on the other hand, significantly broadens the harmonic horizon, enriching the sum of possible harmonic combinations.11

Thus, although these scholars were receptive to some aspects of Riemann's theories, they were wary of other, more questionable ones.

Georgy Conus's lecture, "Musical Form and its Analysis" (read March 12, 1903), constitutes his first public statement of his newly-developed method of formal analysis, which he had discovered—quite by accident, he later reported—some years earlier while teaching at the Moscow Conservatory (1891-99). Conus had studied with Taneev and Arensky at the Moscow Conservatory and graduated in 1890. He later taught at the Conservatory from 1920 to 1933, during which time he became well known for his theory of "metrotechtonic," his theory of architectural symmetry in music. From 1922 to 1929 he served as dean of the scientific compositional faculty. His theory books before 1900 consisted of pedagogical works written for use in his classes at the Conservatory. During the years 1902-06 he was teaching composition at the Musical-Dramatic School of the Moscow Philharmonic.

In his unique approach to formal analysis, he sought to expose the inherent formal symmetry of each and every musical composition. In
Conus's view, this symmetry occurs at each hierarchical level of a composition. In his lecture he related his analytical system to those of Riemann, Prout, and others; he concentrated on the criteria for grouping at the various levels, the resulting types of constructions, and certain relations between constructions, both in his and in the other systems. He illustrated his points with a graphic analysis, which also constitutes a unique feature in his analytical approach, of the first movement of Beethoven's First Symphony. He discussed in particular several formal constructions, or constructive units: "a) incomplete beginning constructions; b) periodicity in the alternation of constructions; c) the spilling-over of one construction into the limits of another; and d) the possibility of the dual breaking-up of one and the same construction (Mehrdetig der Form)." A complete critical analysis of Conus's theory will be given in Part VI.

Other lectures given at the Musical Scientific Society during the years 1902-1904 dealt mainly with acoustical topics. Unfortunately, the activities of the Musical Scientific Society ceased in 1905. The members considered themselves unprepared to carry out further scientific research in music because of the inadequacies of their own education in music theory; yet while attempting to supplement their theoretical knowledge, they were hindered by a paucity of source materials and literature in music theory:

Russian musical theoretical and historical literature, as is well known, is almost nonexistent; and West European literature was inaccessible to us both by its remoteness and expense, and particularly by its language. The majority of libraries, private, public and state, general and specialized, which West European
musicians have at their disposal, are comparatively rare here; and special music libraries, available to anyone who wishes, did not exist at that time.\textsuperscript{14} Even those lectures that had been given at the Society were viewed as insufficiently detailed or scholarly: "The majority of the lectures read in the Musical Scientific Society carried either a compiled character, or the character of the personal view on the subject without sufficient scientific foundation."\textsuperscript{15}

The Music Theory Library Society. In the summer and fall of 1908, several members of the Society, Taneev and Bulychev in particular, thus came to see the necessity for a special music theory library in which all the necessary scores and theoretical literature could be collected so that vital research could be successfully carried out. Bulychev presented a plan for the organization of such a library. He stressed the importance of founding a library that would serve not only as a repository for valuable materials, but also provide a reading room for scholars and the public alike:

Such a founding [of a public library reading-room] will not only unite and give significance to the activity of the Musical Scientific Society and give it the possibility to work more productively on questions of interest to it, but also should appear for all Moscow as a public music education center for which, in view of the extremely superficial level of scientific music education among not only the public and connoisseurs of the musical art, but also musicians themselves, a serious need will begin to be apparent.\textsuperscript{16} Thus a plan of rules for a new society dedicated to the founding of a music library was drawn up, signed by the founders of the society Mikhail Nikolaevich Kurbatov, D. S. Shor, Taneev, Emili Karlovich
Rozenov, Mikhail Vladimirovich Ivanov-Boretsky, and, later, Alexander Tikhonovich Grechaninov. Most of the members of the Musical Scientific Society also became members of the new society, which was later named the Music Theory Library Society.

For the next two and one-half years, the members applied themselves to various tasks—publicity, soliciting new members and donations, collecting volumes, and finding an appropriate site. Newer members included Reinhold Moritsevich Gliere, S. I. Bogomolova, Nikholai Razuminovich Kochetov, M. A. Ertel, Peter Nikolaevich Renchitsky, Sergei Grigorevich Kondra, Evgeny Ottovich Gunst, V. I. Pol, Gennrich Albertovich Pachulsky, and Panteleimon Ivanovich Vasiliev. To house the library, the Russian Musical Society, which oversaw the Conservatory, donated a room at the Conservatory, underneath the organ of the Great Hall. The facility was ready for unofficial use by October 25, 1910, when members of the Society began to meet casually every Monday night for "musical discussions." The "Mondayites" of the Society, as they were called, played a large role in the life of the Society, "uniting the members and giving them the possibility, escaping the official foundation of the General Meetings, to speak and discuss matters and needs of the Society."

The formal opening of the reading room took place March 11, 1911, the thirtieth anniversary of the death of Nicholas Rubinstein, for whom the library was named. The head of the library, musicologist and pianist Evgeny Vasilievich Bogoslovsky (1874-1941), gave a short talk, "The Significance of N. G. Rubinstein in the Development of a Musical
Theoretical Science in Russia." This opening celebration constituted
the first of three ceremonial meetings held by the Society in the early
years of its existence, dedicated to prominent musical figures or
events. Another ceremonial meeting a year later was dedicated to the
Society itself, and included accounts of its activities by Bulychev,
Bogoslovsky, and S. G. Kondra, and a lecture by Rozenov on the newly-
formed piano pedagogy department of the Society. A third ceremonial
meeting, actually the second in sequence since it was held on December
11, 1911, was dedicated to Stepan Vasilievich Smolensky and his re-
search on Russian church music.

Although initially formed in support of theoretical research, the
Society's focus soon became more comprehensive; it encouraged research
in other areas as well, such as music education and history. This more
general approach set the stage for similar approaches in the Institutes
established in the 1920s and the Composers' Union founded in 1933. (In
our current American frame of reference, it may best be related to the
American Musicological Society, with elements of the Society for Music
Theory and the College Music Society thrown in.) The Society sponsored
other activities in addition to the ceremonial meetings—the organiza-
tion of scientific talks and lectures, performances of little-known
works of classical music, and the publication of scientific works. For
the first lecture, given April 30, 1910, G. Khokhlov spoke on "The
Commonality of the Laws of Harmony with the Laws of the Formation of
Crystallized Forms on the Basis of the Theory of Professor V.
Goldschmidt (Beiträge zur Harmonielehre and Ueber Entwicklung der
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Krystallformen)." In the first four years of the existence of the Society, twelve lectures in all were given on such topics as Bach's B Minor Mass (Bulychev), Beethoven's chamber music (D. S. Shor), and music education (Bulychev).

To encourage and facilitate scientific research, in 1912 the Society was formally divided into three departments—music theory, music history, and music pedagogy. Within these departments, sections dedicated to research in some special branch of the department were established, the first being the piano pedagogy section of the pedagogy department. Two lectures in the history department were given that year—"On Rameau" by Rozenov, and "On the Development of the Organ Fugue" by Bogoslovsky. The latter lecture included illustrations at the piano by Bogoslovsky and Boleslav Yavorsky on fugues by Gabrielli, Frescobaldi, Pachelbel, and Buxtehude, and performances of Bach organ fugues in piano transcription by Bogoslovsky and Taneev. Within that department a commission for the editorship of articles by Hermann Larosh was formed. Members of the commission included Bogoslovsky, N. D. Kashkin, Taneev, Modeste I. Chalkovsky, and Y. D. Engel.

Although the music theory department presented fewer significant lectures than the other departments, the impact of the Society on the continuing and future development of Russian music theory was very important. Bulychev, writing in 1913, foresaw great results from the scientific activity of the Society:

It is difficult at present to calculate all the results of the division of our Society into departments and sections, but it is not impossible . . . to foresee that this exerts a very decisive influence on its inner musical intellectual system and in the
future will give to it the possibility to influence culturally the
musical life of Moscow and perhaps of Russia. Having been organ-
ized for artistic scientific work and operating on a rich book and
music depository, the Society abandons the sphere of assumptions,
personal views, and unfounded judgments. It is acquainted with
such spheres of music and its science, which in our time are
represented either by the hardly-known or the completely unknown,
thanks to which the musical artistic historical and theoretical
horizons in the Society are expanded into unrecognizable dimen-
sions. The departments and sections, organizing the systematic
work of the Society and studying and investigating some sphere of
musical science, will put the results of their work either into
the form of the publication of their scientific works, into the
form of periodical publications, or, finally, into the form of the
establishment of a faculty for the systematic study of whole
courses of musical science.22

Bulychev summarized the goals of the Society:

In a word, it is difficult to envisage the entire varied activity
resulting from the systematization of [the Society's] scientific
musical activity, but three urgent problems now appear in outline
at the basis of such activity: 1) the development of a national
musical science, 2) the creation of periodical publications on
various musical questions, and 3) also the establishment of musi-
cal scientific institutes, equivalent to the departments of music
in foreign universities, from which it would be possible to gradu-
ate our musical scholars.23

Not all these goals were fulfilled by the Society itself, which
formally ceased to exist after 1924, when its library was joined to the
library of the Moscow Conservatory. But it must be noted that all of
its goals were eventually accomplished. Regarding its immediate goal
of establishing a library and reading room, by 1913 the collection of
the library numbered 11,600 volumes, and the membership of the Society
stood at 261. The goal of developing a national musical science was
not adequately fulfilled until the 1920s. But without the activities
of the Library Society, there would have been much less of a foundation
upon which to build such a science. Regarding the establishment of
musical periodicals, already by 1915 three music periodicals, two newer
ones in addition to the Russkaia muzykal'naia gazeta [The Russian musical newspaper] already in existence since 1894, Muzyka [Music], published from 1910 to 1916 in Moscow, and Muzykal'nyi sovremennik [The musical contemporary], published from 1915 to 1917 in St. Petersburg, were serving as the main forums for theoretical ideas. And concerning musical scientific institutes, these, too, were established during the 1920s and fostered and promoted a great quantity of theoretical research. Thus the Music Theory Library Society in particular played a significant role in the development of Russian music theory. It was a forerunner of the Institutes founded later. Its organization served as a model for them, and its library provided the necessary source material. Its members then joined these Institutes, and their research provided the foundation for the research conducted within the Institutes. Their initiative displayed in the founding of the theory library resulted in a great asset for future theorists in Moscow, where the tradition of theory grew and continued to be strong. Thus, as with the Rubinstein and the Conservatories some fifty years earlier and the development of the pedagogical aspect of Russian music theory, official support and organization provided the means, the materials and the methods for the establishment and development of another important aspect of the discipline of music theory—that of speculative theory.

Research in Other Societies. Other, non-musical societies also sponsored musical activities, such as lectures on musical topics, particularly during the period 1905–1908, when the Musical Scientific
Society was inactive and before the Music Theory Library Society was founded. So, for example, Conus appeared before the Moscow Literary Artistic Society on February 13, 1908, with the lecture, "Symmetry as a Principle of Musical Form." Conus's lecture was considered significant enough to be reviewed at some length in the Russian Musical Newspaper by the composer Pavel Karasev, from which I have drawn my summary.

In this lecture Conus attempted to demonstrate more fully his view that musical compositions are innately symmetrical. His "proof" involved the breaking down of musical works into smaller and smaller units. Using the measure as the basic, indivisible unit, Conus grouped the measures of a piece of music into construction units of varying sizes, from two to thirty or more measures. As criteria for this grouping, Conus used almost any means, from an unbroken series of eighth-notes in the bass to an organ point on the dominant, as long as it exhibited a common character. The system is hierarchical, that is, the construction units may be grouped into other, larger construction units (simple construction units into complex construction units) just as measures are grouped into construction units. In addition, the limits of these construction units have more to do with rhythmic and metric divisions than with melodic contours: just as a measure is divisible into its various parts, according to the rhythmic accent within that measure, so construction units are divisible into metric parts (usually measures) depending on the rhythmic accent within that construction unit. Here Conus introduced the idea of the influence of the upbeat on the rhythmic interpretation of the following measure, and
how a trochee, for instance, can exist independently of the construction units that divide it.

After illustrating thirty examples, Conus concluded that "the formation of construction units is strictly subordinated to the law of symmetry either of the type a + b / a + b (simple symmetry) or a + b / b + a (smooth symmetry)." This principle of symmetry works both for small construction units and for large movements of symphonies, and is evident even within hierarchies of construction units, as Conus illustrated with his analysis of the Entre-acte in D minor from Bizet's Carmen (Figure 16.1). According to Conus, the Entre-acte is symmetrical both on the lowest and the highest levels. Each construction unit (ranging in size in the example from 2 to 12 measures) is symmetrical (which kind, he does not specify), and the piece as a whole exhibits a "smooth symmetry." He represents this "double symmetry" with an axis. The long center horizontal line in Figure 16.1 represents the twelve-measure construction unit (5 + 2 + 5) at the center of the piece; it illustrates that the smaller central two-measure construction unit in the middle of the larger center twelve-measure construction unit divides the entire Entre-acte into two symmetrical halves:

```
10--2--6-------12----6--2--10
|      |     |
10--2--6--[5--2--5]----6--2--10
```

smooth symmetry: (a) (b)(c) (d) (c)(b) (a)

Further, this horizontal line representing the symmetry of the entire piece, forms an "axis symmetry" with the vertical line, which cuts
through each horizontal line (representing each construction unit) and therefore represents the symmetry of each individual construction unit.

Figure 16.1. Conus's analysis of the Entre-acte (D minor) from Bizet's Carmen.

Karasev quoted Conus's conclusion:

The formal creation is free only in the first half of the work. In the second half the author unconsciously reproduced the form of the first half, a symmetrically arranged construction unit. The idea of symmetry so draws music together with architecture that the idea expressed in the beginning of the nineteenth century, that music is fluid architecture, is so close as to be indisputably true.
Karasev objected only to the lecture demonstrations. The examples (shown on lantern-slides) could not be seen. Since for many of these examples Conus showed only the schemes and not the music, the audience found it difficult to follow them when the music was played. Also, Conus did not illustrate the larger construction units, which left a feeling of incompleteness on the part of the listener, according to Karasev. Concerning this last omission Karasev concluded: "This deserves regret, for, as is well-known to the author of this note, Conus's analyses of Beethoven symphonies and of large works of other authors up to and including Rakhmaninov appear as more brilliant and convincing evidence of the just idea of symmetry." Karasev clearly was impressed with Conus's analytical approach.

Although Conus continued to conduct research in attempts to substantiate his theory, he furnished no published statement of it until 1924. Only then did he provide a name for it as well. As a result, his theory came to be widely known and studied only during the 1920s. Thus these early public appearances, while they generated some interest, may be considered only as preliminary reports of his work-in-progress. The same may be said of Rozenov's work on the golden section, a topic that received much greater attention from Rozenov and others during the 1920s.

It was during this same period also, in 1906-1907, that the Musical Ethnographic Commission of the Society of the Lovers of Natural Science, Anthropology, and Ethnography published posthumously the manuscripts of Yuly Mel'gunov on folk music and on rhythm. His article, "O
ritm' i garmonii russkikh pesen' [On the rhythm and harmony of Russian songs], and his book, Elementarnyi uchebnik muzykal'noi ritmi [An elementary textbook of musical rhythm], as well as some folk songs not included in his collection were published. Appended to Mel'gunov's book on rhythm were two critical articles concerning his theories by N. D. Kashkin and philologist Fedor Evgen'evich Korsh (1843-1915), plus an additional related article by Korsh, reprinted from another source.

The Commission undertook this publication in order to emphasize Mel'gunov's original contributions not only in the field of folk music but also in the sphere of rhythm. Within the discipline of music theory, the Commission's efforts constitute the first scholarly publication, complete with full supporting material and critiques, of previously unpublished works. It might therefore also be labeled the first venture into the field of the history of Russian music theory. Because of the relative youth of Russian music theory, such publications were as yet rare at this time; but more began to appear more frequently as the discipline grew. To this day Soviet theorists have remained attentive to their history, which is an area of important concern to them.

Summary. In the first two decades of this century Russian music theorists had thus taken the first steps towards eliminating the inequities existing between Russian and European music theory. The conservatories having already been established, the next logical move was to provide the incentive and the means for additional research. This
was accomplished through the organization of various sponsoring societies, a practice with a long tradition in Russia. The immediate results included the dissemination of research through public presentations and journal publications, and the acquisition of a research library. Already in the very early years of this century, topics such as acoustics, the innate properties of musical form, and the theories of Riemann were already receiving serious attention. All three topics continued to receive attention through the 1930s and 1940s. Thus the stage was set in this period for several of the developing trends in Russian and Soviet music theory. Add to these topics the question of mode, which had begun to interest theorists as early as the eighteenth century (or even earlier if one considers Diletsky), and functionalism, rudimentary elements of which started to creep into Russian music theory through the works of Rimsky-Korsakov and Ippolitov-Ivanov, and a more complete picture of the main topics in Russian and Soviet music theory for the years 1900 to 1950 emerges. In addition, the linear emphasis we have observed is exploited—in the best sense of this word—by Sergei Taneev through his rational approach to invertible counterpoint. We turn now to an examination of this approach.
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Chapter 17

Sergei Ivanovich Taneev: Theories of Counterpoint and Form

Sergei Ivanovich Taneev: Moveable Counterpoint. The new emphasis during this period on the science of music and the widespread interest in fostering serious research in music actually resulted in few published works. Not many theorists of this era were able or ready within such a short time to produce works representative of their expectations. Two theorists exceptional in this regard, though, brought out works of such seminal importance that they overshadowed the work of all other theorists in Russia during this period. Sergei Taneev, with his Podvizhnoi kontrapunkt strogoi pis'ma [Moveable counterpoint in the strict style] (1909), and his pupil Boleslav Yavorsky, with his Stroenie muzykal'noi rechi [The construction of musical speech] (1908), established new directions in theoretical thought in Russia. Yavorsky directed his attention to the formation of mode as a temporal process resulting from his theory of "auditory gravity," and Taneev simplified and at the same time universalized the study of moveable counterpoint—both horizontal and vertical—through the application of mathematics. Although Yavorsky's work was published first, Taneev's work was given the major credit for contributing to the founding of a new science in
Russia, as Yavorsky explains in a congratulatory letter to his former teacher Taneev:

I rejoice and celebrate. Finally what I always considered as one of the very outstanding events in our musical life has been made general property. I attach such significance to your work, because in my opinion this is the first work that transfers musical art, that is, something unconscious, intangible for the human intellect, into the sphere of science. This is the first theoretical work based on precise laws, the logical application and development of which create a constructed edifice. Only since the appearance of this work is it possible to look at the cultural development of musical art in that area with which your work is concerned. All works on the history of music up to this time appear only as more or less successful biographical sketches, frequently illuminating the influence of the general culture only on the direction of the creation of composers, not at all explaining the process of creation in its most concealed secrets. Only when the sufficiently fantastical so-called theory of composition is turned into a musical science that examines the laws directed by musical thought and expressions, and on the basis of these laws constructs an edifice of musical creation and also makes it possible to guess, to predict, and to explain the impossibility of several phenomena, will there appear the history of musical art.

Of all the prominent Russian and Soviet theorists in the years 1900–1950, Taneev is probably the best known to Western theorists. His reputation as both composer and teacher, and the availability in English of his major work on moveable counterpoint have resulted in an acquaintance among Westerners with his achievements not possible with lesser-known theorists. Nevertheless, aside from some articles in English by former pupils regarding his counterpoint method, little has been written in the West about Taneev's theoretical views. Yet his theories of counterpoint and of form, including his theory of unifying tonality, profoundly influenced the growth of music theory in Russia, the development of theory pedagogy, and the compositional and theoretical abilities of his numerous pupils.
Taneev was born in the year of Mozart's centennial, a coincidence that later must have pleased him, as he had high regard for Mozart's music. He valued most highly the works of the masters—Palestrina, Bach, Mozart, and Beethoven—and used them as models for his own compositions and as sources for his theoretical studies. Indeed, as one of his later projects he traveled to Salzburg to examine Mozart's counterpoint notebooks. Among Russian composers, he admired and performed works by Chaikovsky, his teacher and friend. Taneev also admired and encouraged the compositions of his own numerous pupils; yet he stopped short of accepting Scriabin's later works, for example, considering them to be beyond the acceptable limits of tonality. His own compositional output includes the opera *Orestia* (1894), four cantatas, four symphonies (No. 1 in E minor, 1874; No. 2 in Bb major, 1877–78, unfinished; No. 3 in D minor, 1884; and No. 4 in C minor, op. 12, 1898), eleven string quartets, five trios, three quintets, some miscellaneous other chamber works, piano works, and numerous vocal and choral works. He often is viewed as the "Russian Brahms" for his conservative romantic style.

Taneev, perhaps the leading teacher of his day, was revered by students and colleagues alike, not only for his brilliance, but also for his devotion to music and to his students. During his twenty-seven-year tenure at the Moscow Conservatory (1878–1905), he taught a variety of subjects: harmony, instrumentation, piano, elementary theory, composition, counterpoint, and form. In later years he concentrated on counterpoint (both strict and free, beginning in 1886) and
form, a course he initiated in 1897; these two subjects became his specialties. Among his students were Rakhmaninov, Scriabin, Medtner, Liapunov, Gliere, Vasilenko, Conus, Yavorsky, and Yury Engel.

During his lifetime Taneev published only one book, his treatise on moveable counterpoint. But he had completed a sequel, *Uchenie o kanone* [The doctrine of the canon], which was published posthumously. He never carried out his plans for six other counterpoint works. He had also hoped to write a book on form, and to that end made analyses of Bach fugues and Beethoven sonatas; but this project, too, remained incomplete. Many of these analyses and his letters have been published in recent years; from them it is possible to obtain some insight into Taneev's views on the subject of form.

In his approach to theory pedagogy, Taneev was influenced to a great extent by the writings of Hermann Larosh, to whom Taneev dedicated his counterpoint treatise. Taneev fully concurred with Larosh's idea of the historical approach to the study of theory, and eventually provided the practical fulfillment of Larosh's views. Thus his courses in strict and free counterpoint, fugue, and form, in the words of one student, "compelled students to experience for themselves the entire historical process of the evolution of music, taught them to separate in art the essential from the secondary, [and] also to evaluate the strong, the fantastic, and the eternal in the past."

Taneev himself had not undergone such a regimen of instruction with his teacher Chaikovsky at the Moscow Conservatory, where he enrolled in the year of its founding, 1866; only after his graduation in
1875 did he begin to study counterpoint in earnest. During the 1880s he began to work out more systematic methods for such studies, which he applied in his classes and eventually published in his treatise. Therefore he did not derive his pedagogical methods from his professors; rather, he developed them according to his own needs and aspirations as a composer. He passed them on to his students, hoping to prevent in them deficiencies such as he had experienced.

Taneev's rationalist approach to the study of counterpoint countered the empirical method, the "trying-on method," as one student put it, that prevailed in the conservatories during Taneev's student years and later. Such a trial and error method is part of the legacy of Chaikovsky's approach to teaching such aspects as melodic harmonization and the writing of counterpoint. Taneev's approach was also flexible yet historically accurate:

The rules and norms of music were not "absolute" or self-sufficient . . . but were only conditional rules, characteristic of a particular style, which was studied at a given time. What was not acceptable in one style was completely acceptable in another. And the observance of these rules is not the observance of the rules of music in general, but only the practical study of music of some particular style.

In his theoretical studies and teachings, Taneev aspired to one basic goal: the enrichment and improvement of compositional technique. This, he believed, could be achieved not so much through the development of new harmonic means, which composers were rapidly exhausting in their search for original ideas, but through counterpoint, which was capable of providing endless opportunities for the derivation of new and interesting material. As substitutes for the hyperbolic chroma-
tic excesses and the gradual dissolution of tonality in music of his
day, Taneev advocated two techniques—the application of more contra-
puntal methods, resulting in a more varied thematic design, and more
attention to the overall structure of a composition, expressed through
the use of a modulatory plan coordinated with the thematic design.
These are the two areas in which he made his most original theoretical
contributions. I will discuss first counterpoint and then form.

**Moveable Counterpoint in the Strict Style.** Taneev believed that
in polyphonic music, the forms and methods of counterpoint, unlike
melodic and harmonic elements, which are influenced by contemporary
settings, national considerations, and the individuality of composers,
are universally valid. He therefore believed that the technique of
counterpoint could help provide some of the "virile strength" that new
music of his day lacked:

As for the music of today, the harmony that has gradually lost its
virility would be greatly benefited by the strength that the
contrapuntal forms can infuse. Beethoven, who in his later works
reverted to the technical methods of the old contrapuntalists,
sets the best example for composers of the future. The music of
today is essentially contrapuntal. Not only in large orchestral
works, where the abundance of independent parts often results in
obsccurity, or in opera, where leitmotifs are worked out contrapun-
tally, but even in pieces of insignificant dimensions, can coun-
terpoint be employed to the greatest advantage. The study of free
counterpoint is therefore indispensable for the technical training
of composers, but because of its melodic and harmonic intricacy it
cannot be studied first. The foundation must be laid by counter-
point of the strict style, more accessible because of its
simplicity.14

Thus he devoted his first work to one aspect of the strict style, that
of moveable or shifting counterpoint, for him the most important and
"extensive" phase of what he calls "complex counterpoint"—"counterpoint in which an original combination of melodies yields one or more derivatives." In moveable counterpoint, the intervallic relationships between voices—usually imitative—are changed, resulting in new combinations that equal or rival the original combination of voices in euphony and design. Taneev utilized moveable counterpoint in three ways—vertical, which is the usual method and involves the inversion of voices so that the intervallic (spatial) distance between them is different; horizontal, a new means in which the altered distance between the voices is temporal, not spatial; and horizontal and vertical together. In his book Taneev analyzes exhaustively the concept of voice-shifting, both vertical and horizontal, following the principle that in complex counterpoint both the original and the derivative combinations must satisfy the requirements of simple counterpoint. The analysis of the concept of shifting governs the general plan of the book and it includes in its scope shifting counterpoint in all of its many phases, where each form has a definite place, irrespective of whether or not it is used. The consistent application of these principles gives the system of rules for shifting counterpoint.17

This application of the principles of moveable or shifting counterpoint to the sphere of rhythm as well as to the sphere of pitch or intervallic distance, an aspect not addressed by previous theorists, characterizes the comprehensiveness with which Taneev treated his subject, and constitutes one of Taneev's more important innovations.

Moveable Counterpoint in the Strict Style actually fulfills two functions: On the one hand, it is a scholarly treatise presenting a detailed study of the technical achievements of the masters of the
strict style in the sphere of moveable counterpoint; and on the other hand, it is a textbook for the systematic exploration and mastery of moveable counterpoint with the goal of developing the compositional technique of composers of any era. Thus it may be studied with a view towards enriching one's knowledge, one's technique, or both.

Taneev's stated objective, though, was not so much analytic, that is, "to analyse and classify examples from musical literature," as pedagogic—"to develop the deductive faculty":

The deductive method can be applied without difficulty in a given case, owing to the fact that . . . [the] capacity [of the voices] to shift and the resulting relationship are completely subject to mathematical treatment. Basing the study of shifting counterpoint on elementary algebra renders possible exhaustive statement together with a conciseness otherwise unobtainable. . . . Only on the basis of mathematics can be built a clear and rational theory of shifting counterpoint [my emphasis—E.C.]; . . . it is no longer possible to revert to the redundant, vague, inaccurate, and confused explanations of former times, . . . Only the method of mathematics can rend the veil of semi-mystical secrecy that for such a long time has obscured the study of convertible counterpoint. 18

Taneev adds that this approach renders possible many examples of shifting counterpoint never before used in music.

Taneev based his application of mathematics to counterpoint on an elementary but very important procedure: He designated the diatonic degrees of the scale not by ordinal numbers as they are usually named (second, fifth, etc.) but by cardinal numbers, from 0 for unison to 7 for octave. This practice measures the actual diatonic intervallic distance between pitches—a fifth, for example, contains only four diatonic intervals between its two pitches, and is thus designated with the number 4. Mathematical calculations with this method are accurate;
for example, a seventh minus a fifth is a third (6-4=2). Furthermore, it eliminates having to use the number 9 as the sum of inverted intervals that actually occur within the octave. All inverted pairs thus equal the octave: 1+6=7 (second and sevenths); 2+5=7 (thirds and sixths); and 3+4=7 (fourths and fifths). Taneev applied these designations to the measurement of time, i.e., temporal distances, as well as to intervallic (spatial) distance. This practice enabled Taneev to formulate simple algebraic equations representing original and derivative contrapuntal combinations, thereby lending what one student calls an "audio-visual approach to the subject." Numbers representing intervallic distances of either time (for example, the number "1" to represent one temporal unit or beat such as a quarter-note) or pitch (for example, the number "4" to represent a perfect fifth) can be easily added to or subtracted from these equations to represent new possible combinations. This practice has been extended by contemporary Western theorists in application to the entire chromatic—as opposed to diatonic in Taneev's usage—scale, or in modern terminology, the entire spectrum of pitch-class sets, from 0 to 11. To Taneev, though, must go the initial credit for instigating this practice of the "distance-conscious perception of intervals."

Another important device that Taneev developed involves the graphic representation of dissonances, which in strict counterpoint must be carefully controlled, with various symbols: the line, "—-," which Taneev calls the "tie-sign" or "sign of syncopation"; the line with parentheses, "(--)"; or the line with an x, "—-x." Used in conjunc-
tion with the intervalllic numbers, these symbols designate which intervals are dissonances, the type of dissonance, and the appropriate treatment of the dissonance. The first symbol indicates a suspension, therefore forbidding the free use of the interval on an accented beat. The second symbol indicates that the note to which it refers cannot be used as a suspension, or as a passing or auxiliary note. The third symbol designates the note of resolution and its use as a passing or auxiliary note. Placed above the number, the symbol refers to the upper voice (voice I); below, to the lower voice (voice II). For example, the number three with a dash over it, $\overline{3}$, represents a suspension of a fourth in the upper voice and its resolution one step downward. These symbols, together with Taneev's attendant simplification of the rules regarding dissonances, greatly facilitated this aspect of strict counterpoint.

Two-voice counterpoint is the basic principle of the strict style. Since Taneev regards multi-voice counterpoint as "the union of various combinations of two-voice counterpoint," the two-voice contrapuntal combination thus forms the foundation for multi-voice counterpoint:

From this principle may be deduced both the conditions of simple multi-voice counterpoint, beginning with the first species, and the conditions of complex counterpoint in all of its many phases. . . . To know the rules [of two-voice counterpoint] is to possess the key to the whole domain of strict counterpoint. . . . Due to the simplicity on which it is based, counterpoint of the strict style is an art unique with symmetry, naturalness, and logic as its foundations. All its infinite variety is but an evolution from the basis, easily comprehensible, of two voice counterpoint.22

In two-part counterpoint, the upper first voice is designated by I and the lower second voice by II. Adding them together, I + II, gives the
formula for the original two-voice combination. The formula for a derivative combination, the result of the shift of one or both of the voices, results from the addition to the original formula of superscripts denoting the intervallic distance shifted, designated by the interval numbers, and the direction of the shift, designated as positive or negative. Voice I moving up and voice II moving down are both positive shifts. Movements in the opposite directions are negative, as shown: \( I^{+} \quad II^{-} \). In the superscript, the letter \( v \) indicates a vertical shift. Thus, the formula \( I^{+} II^{-} \) designates a combination in which the upper voice has moved down a third (−2) and the lower voice has shifted up an octave (−7). The formula for the derivative combination will differ depending on the size and direction of the shifts.

The algebraic sum of the vertical shifts of the two voices (\( I^{+} II^{-} \)) equals the index of the vertical-shifting contrapuntal combination, indicated \( J_v \). The formula for the example given is \( J_v = -9 \). As Taneev states,

Adding the value of the index to an interval of the original combination gives the corresponding interval of the derivative. . . . The important idea implied by the use of the symbol \( J_v \) simplifies the study of vertical-shifting counterpoint; it yields numerous possibilities of voice-shifting with a comparatively small number of indices.

Example 17.1 illustrates an original combination and three derivatives obtained from it. The formula for the original (a) is \( I + II \). The formula for derivative (b) is \( (I + II)^{-} \) \( J_v = 3 \); for derivative (c), \( (I + II)^{-} \) \( J_v = -2 \); for derivative (d), \( (I + II)^{-} \) \( J_v = -9 \). Adding the
Example 17.1. Vertical-shifting counterpoint: a) original combination: $v=3$

Original

\[ I + II; \]

Derivatives

\[ (I + II) Jv=3; \]

\[ (I + II) Jv=-2; \]

\[ (I + II) Jv=-9. \]

\[ Jv \]

to the intervals in the original results in the intervals in the
derivative; for example, in (d):

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{original:} & & 4 & 7 & 6 & 5 & 4 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\text{Jv:} & & -3 & -3 & -3 & -3 & -3 & -3 & -3 & -3 \\
\end{align*} \]

Here the shift is inverse: both voices change their relative positions.

Therefore, the intervals in the derivative are represented by negative
numbers. Taneev identifies two additional types of shift: direct and
mixed. In a direct shift, the two voices retain their relative posi-
tions. A mixed shift indicates both direct and inverse shifts.
Horizontal-shifting counterpoint involves derivative combinations achieved through the temporal shifting of voices, that is, through changing the relationship between the time-intervals of their entries. The formula for a horizontal-shifting contrapuntal combination is represented similarly to that for a vertical-shifting combination. In the superscript, $h$ represents a horizontal shift, the cardinal number indicates a measure (or fraction, if a portion of a measure) as the unit of distance, and the shift direction is for I, positive to the left, negative to the right, $+ I -$, and for II, the reverse: $- II +$. The positive and negative directions of voices I and II for both vertical- and horizontal-shifting counterpoint may be summarized in this way: $+ I - II +$. The algebraic sum of the two voices is $Jh$, the index of horizontal-shifting counterpoint.

Example 17.2. Horizontal-shifting counterpoint:

$$h = -\frac{1}{2}$$

a) derivative: (I $+ II$) $Jh = -\frac{1}{2}$;

$$h = -1$$

b) derivative: (I $+ II$) $Jh = -1$. 

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Example 17.2 illustrates two versions of horizontal-shifting counterpoint based on the original in Example 17.1a. In the original, all derivative voices start at the half-bar. In the derivatives in Example 17.2, the derivative voices start either at the next bar \( h = -1/2 \) or \( h = -1/2 \) \( \text{II} \) \( Jh = -1/2 \); in Example 17.2b, \( I + II \) \( Jh = -1 \).

Double-shifting counterpoint combines both vertical- and horizontal-shifting counterpoint. Example 17.3 illustrates several derivatives, again based on the original in Example 17.1. The formula for Example 17.3a is:

\[
\begin{align*}
  h &= -1/2 \\
  v &= 9 \\
  I + II \ Jh &= -1/2, \ Jv = -9;
\end{align*}
\]

for Example 17.3b:

\[
\begin{align*}
  h &= -1 \\
  v &= 5 \\
  I + II \ Jh &= -1, \ Jv = 5;
\end{align*}
\]

for Example 17.3c:

\[
\begin{align*}
  h &= -1/2 \\
  v &= 0 \\
  1/2 \ Jh &= -1/2, \ Jv = 5.
\end{align*}
\]

Taneev represents three-part counterpoint as three separate two-part combinations. The third, lowest voice is indicated by III, resulting in three different formulae: \( I + II \) (index \( Jv' \) or \( Jh' \)), \( II + III \) (index \( Jv'' \) or \( Jh'' \)), and \( I + III \) (index \( JvS \) or \( JhS \)).
Example 17.3. Double-shifting counterpoint:

\[
\begin{align*}
&h=-1/2 \\
&v=-9
\end{align*}
\]

a) derivative: \((I + II) \ Jh=-1/2, Jv=-9;\)

\[
\begin{align*}
&h=-1 \\
&v=5
\end{align*}
\]

b) derivative: \((I + II) \ Jh=-1, Jv=5;\)

\[
\begin{align*}
&h=-1 & h=0 \\
&v=0 & v=5
\end{align*}
\]

c) derivative: \((I + II) \ Jh=-1/2, Jv=5.\)

Horizontal-shifting counterpoint involves an element not encountered in vertical-shifting counterpoint—the addition of a voice in canonic imitation with one of the original voices. Taneev labels this derivative, imitating voice \(R\), for risposta (Italian for answer of reply). He calls the original voice \(P\), for proposta (proposal), and
the non-imitated voice, CP, for counterpoint. This combination of three voices is the "basic version," which "serves as the basis for horizontal-shifting counterpoint," with canonically imitation as its "indispensable attribute." The basic version contains both the original two-voice combination, P + CP, and the derivative combination, R + CP. Example 17.4 illustrates horizontal-shifting counterpoint as created by Palestrina. In the basic version, Example 17.4a, P is imitated by R and accompanied by CP. In Example 17.4b, P + CP make up the original combination, and CP + R, the derivative combination. A further development of this approach leads us to Taneev's work on the canon.

**Doctrine of the Canon.** The principles and rules formulated by Taneev in *Moveable Counterpoint in the Strict Style* remain essentially the same for his sequel, *The Doctrine of the Canon*. Since they are not repeated in the later work, study of this volume should be preceded by study of *Moveable Counterpoint in the Strict Style*. In *The Doctrine of the Canon*, in which he investigates the application of shifting counterpoint to canonically imitation, Taneev concentrates first on the two-voice canon, which forms the basis for the multi-voice canon, and then the three- and four-voice canon. He distinguishes two types—the "finite" canon, which breaks with a cadence, and the "infinite" canon, in which the voices may be repeated from their beginnings. Each type of canon contains two categories, depending on the rhythmic distance between the voice entries and, consequently, the method of shifting counterpoint applied. Canons in the first category contain the same
Example 17.4. Horizontal-shifting counterpoint: 
a) basic version by Palestrina; 
b) original combination (top) and derived 
\[ h=0 \quad h=-2 \]
combination (bottom): \( \text{I} + \text{II} \) \( \text{Jh}=-2 \).
temporal distances between the entries of the voices; thus they are written by the rules of vertical-shifting counterpoint. Canons in the second category contain different rhythmic distances between the entries of the voices; thus they are written by the rules of horizontal-shifting counterpoint. In four-voice canons mixed cases may occur; therefore the simultaneous application of both vertical- and horizontal-shifting counterpoint is met.

In both categories, Taneev differentiates between the infinite canon in which P (proposta) repeats on the same degree or the infinite canon in which P transfers to different degrees. He calls the latter occurrence a canonic sequence. In sum, we meet these varieties:

I-Finite

1. First category: temporal distances unchanged.
   a. Intervallic distance unchanged (repetitions on same degree).
   b. Intervallic distance changed (repetitions on different degrees).

   a. Intervallic distance unchanged (repetitions on same degree).
   b. Intervallic distance changed (repetitions on different degrees).

II-Infinite.

1. First category: temporal distances unchanged.
   a. Intervallic distance unchanged (repetitions on same degree).
   b. Intervallic distance changed (repetitions on different degrees); canonic sequence. Greatest compositional significance.

   a. Intervallic distance unchanged (repetitions on same degree).
   b. Intervallic distance changed (repetitions on different degrees); canonic sequence.
The infinite canonic sequence of the first category, in which the
temporal distance remains constant but the intervalllic distance
changes, has the most significance for composition. In general, the
multi-voice canon has greater possibilities for practical application
than the two-voice canon. Multi-voice finite canons and infinite
canonic sequences of the first category are met most frequently in the
literature. As Taneev points out, the remaining types of infinite
multi-voice canons, those in which the intervalllic distance remains
constant regardless of whether or not the temporal distance changes,
and those in which both the intervalllic and temporal distances change,
belong more in the realm of theory. To illustrate Taneev's methods, I
will examine only the infinite two-voice canon of the first category.

As in Moveable Counterpoint in the Strict Style, Taneev applies an
audio-visual approach to the study of canon, utilizing schematic dia-
grams and the like to illustrate visually the various characteristics
of the canonic schemes—distance, direction, and the number and combi-
nations of the various entries. Example 17.5 illustrates an infinite
two-voice canon of the first category in which \( P \) repeats on the same
degree. He represents the "distance of entry" between \( P \) and \( R \), and \( R \)
and \( P \) (the repeated imitation of \( P \)) with vertical slashes on a hori-
zontal line (Example 17.5c). He designates the "interval of entry,"
the interval at which \( R \) enters in relation to \( P \), by a cardinal number,
and the "direction of entry" by an arrow accompanying the interval
number. In Example 17.5a, the downward-pointing arrow and the number 7
indicate that the appearance of \( R \) is an octave below \( P \).
Example 17.5. a) Infinite two-voice canon of first category; b) distance, direction, and interval of entry of the voices; c) equal length of the distance of entries.

This canon requires the application of vertical-shifting counterpoint. To accomplish this, the original and derived combinations must be determined. For this purpose Taneev divides the canonic voices into motivic segments which, when combined initially, represent the original combination, and when shifted, the derived combination. For instance, in Example 17.5a, $P$ is divided into the segments $A$ and $B$, $R$ into $A'$ and $B'$. The original combination, which in the two-voice canon occurs beginning with the entry of $R$, is $B + A'$; the derived combination, which occurs beginning with the entry of $P$, is $A + B'$. Figure 17.1 illustrates the resulting combinations in a two-voice infinite canon of the first category with $P$ repeating on the same degree. Since this type of canon contains equal distances between the entries, the number of segments equals the number of voices. The algebraic sum of the
Figure 17.1. Two-voice infinite canon of the first category with $P$ on the same degrees.

Intervals of entry (designated $m$) of the two segments equals the vertical index ($Jv$). In Figure 17.1, both $ms$ are negative because the voices are moving in directions opposite to their usual placement. Consequently, $Jv= -2m$ represents the general formula for a two-voice infinite canon in the first category with $P$ repeating on the same degree. Example 17.5, a canon at the octave ($m=7$), illustrates one of the most frequently used $Jvs$, double counterpoint at the octave, also equivalent to $Jv= -14$. The $Jv$ may be reduced by 7, an octave. If $Jv$ is not an even number, then in order to find $m$ one must add 7 and then divide by 2. Other frequently used $Jvs$ include -9, double counterpoint.
at the tenth (canon at the ninth: $m=8$; $Jv=-16$), and -11, double counterpoint at the twelfth (canon at the tenth: $m=9$; $Jv=-18$).

The second type of the infinite two-voice canon in the first category, in which $P$ transfers to different degrees, either in ascending or descending order, is the canonic sequence of the first category. The most frequent instance of this occurs when $A$ (the original segment of $P$) is transferred in the direction opposite to the direction of its first imitative entry, shown in Figure 17.2. Taneev designates the letter $m$ for the original interval of entry, as in the previous case, and the letter $n$ for the derived interval of entry, which in this type of canon differs from the original interval of entry. The formula $Jv=-m-n$ therefore becomes the general formula for all infinite two-voice canons in the first category in which the intervals of entry have

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{(R)} \\
\text{(P)}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
A' & B' \\
A & B
\end{array}
\]

\[\text{etc.}\]

Figure 17.2. Two-voice infinite canon of the first category with $P$ on different degrees.

different direction. The formula $Jv=-\infty$ designates a partial case of the formula $Jv=-m-n$; since $P$ is repeated on the same degrees, the
derived interval of entry \( (n) \) equals the original interval of entry \( (m) \). If the direction of both of the intervals of entry (the original and the derived) were the same—a case rarely met because the upper voice would get too high—the formula would be \( Jv = -m + n \). Thus, the general formula for all canonic sequences must be \( Jv = -m \) \( (-n) \). In Example 17.6, which illustrates a canonic sequence such as that diagrammed in Figure 17.2, the formula is \( Jv = 3-4 \) or \( Jv = 7 \); in other words, the original combination should be written in double counterpoint at the octave. As an example of a canonic sequence in free style, Taneev quotes an excerpt from Mozart's *Ave Verum*, shown in Example 17.7. He stresses that the infinite canonic sequence has wide application in composition, and is found both in works in the strict style, particularly of the Netherlands composers, and in works in the free style.

Example 17.6. Canonic sequence: \( Jv = 7 \).
Example 17.7. W. A. Mozart, Ave Verum (Taneev's version).

Thus, these elements constitute the basic application of vertical-shifting counterpoint to the two-voice infinite canon of the first category. In expanded versions, they apply also to multi-voice canons of the first category. The application of horizontal-shifting counterpoint to the two-voice infinite canon, for example, again requires the addition of a third voice (R...), which carries the same intervalllic relationship to P as P does to R. The original combination thus becomes P + R... and the derived, R + P. Only through this device is it possible to determine, as one is composing P, the correctness of further combinations, in this case R + P. Taneev followed this basic procedure as well for the application of horizontal-shifting counterpoint to multi-voice canons.

As in two-voice canons, three-voice canons require separate applications of either vertical- or horizontal-shifting counterpoint, de-
pending on the category. The four-voice canon, though, may require the simultaneous application of both types of shifting counterpoint in mixed cases in which both equal and different distances of entry appear, designated as \( \text{aba}, \text{aab}, \text{or abb} \). The letter \( \text{a} \) refers to the original distance of entry between \( P \) and \( R \) and all subsequent equivalent distances; the letter \( \text{b} \) refers to subsequent different distances. Other four-voice combinations are \( \text{aaa} \) and \( \text{abc} \).

**Summary and Evaluation.** The principles for moveable counterpoint and canon presented here constitute just some of the unique features of Taneev's methods for composing and deriving contrapuntal combinations. Within the confines of this study it is not possible to delve further into the more detailed applications of these principles and approaches. Nonetheless Taneev's achievements in this field may certainly be appreciated even with such a brief introduction. The pedagogical significance of his discoveries is undoubted. His methods enable Russian counterpoint students to learn more easily what had previously been a very difficult subject. As one student testifies, "Now there are no 'difficult' and 'more difficult' double counterpoints—since they are all equally easy." Taneev's systematic, logical, and thorough approach to contrapuntal composition, aided by the application of mathematics, gave composers an invaluable compositional tool, one which, if applied properly, would reap wide benefits for musical composition.

Although Taneev intended his approach for pedagogical use, his unique systematization of the subject has great theoretical signifi-
cance. The application of mathematics to counterpoint to represent a myriad of possibilities with a few basic formulas, the codification and quantification of the rules of counterpoint, the recognition of horizontal-shifting counterpoint, the degree/interval designations, and the audio-visual approach are innovations that reach beyond the topic of counterpoint into other realms of application, either directly or through example. Taneev's attention to the temporal aspect, for instance, provided a stimulus for application in other areas. His pupil Yavorsky emphasized the temporal aspect as a most important component of his theory of modal rhythm, as we will see. As already noted, his degree/interval designations prefigured the means for designating degrees of the chromatic scale. His mathematical applications illustrated that at least certain aspects of music outside of acoustics were also verifiable and capable of being explained through select algebraic means, thus proving the scientific approach and providing a needed model. His accompanying simplification of the rules of dissonances proved to be both pedagogically expedient and theoretically useful as models for similar approaches in other areas. The same may be said for his audio-visual approach. Also significant is the universality of Taneev's methods. Although he derived them from sixteenth-century contrapuntal practice, he considered them applicable to a wide variety of tonal styles.

The drawbacks to his approach concern primarily its pedagogical application. In Russia, for example, teaching counterpoint with Taneev's methods is a tradition; but in the West as a pedagogical
system it is merely a novelty. Without the support of a knowledgeable instructor, its application is restricted to those capable and desirous of plowing through Taneev's text, which is difficult at best. It is not for the average music student, only for those who could logically apply the lessons learned, mainly composition students or advanced theory students. I have not yet had the opportunity to put Taneev's approach into practice in my teaching; that would be the ultimate test of its efficacy. If one does learn Taneev's approach, though, the results can be rewarding, in both theoretical understanding and compositional application. But as with any system involving mathematics, accuracy is paramount.

Yet this drawback in application does not overshadow the great importance and prescient nature of Taneev's achievement. Quite simply, he was far ahead of his time in the application of mathematical procedures to musical composition (and its theory), which today we take for granted. In 1909 it was a most unusual development, not satisfactorily developed for many years. More immediate and equally important, Taneev's creative and scholarly methods set an example for numerous young Russian theorists at a time when he was most in a position to be influential, the time when Russian music theory was beginning to expand beyond its pedagogical, practical origins into scientific and speculative realms. Taneev's work in counterpoint, containing as it does both pedagogical and scientific significance, helped Russian music theory to make this transition.
Taneev on Tonality and Musical Form. Had Taneev written his proposed book on form, he might be known today not only as a master of polyphony but a master of form as well. Certainly his students saw him in that light, owing to his conservatory course in form, which he initiated in 1897 and upon which he placed great importance. The content of this course ranged from small forms such as the sentence (phrase) and the period to large forms such as the song, rondo, and sonata. Taneev emphasized particularly the sonata form, which, in his view, embodied all the elements contributing to the artistic unity of a successful musical composition—thematic transformation and development, a reliance on tonality and a tonal scheme, and a logical structure. The sonata form provided an important compositional model primarily because of the delicate interrelation between thematic content and tonality inherent to the form.

By the time students arrived in his class on form, they had already taken two years of counterpoint, also from Taneev. Thus they were able to work out problems of thematic development and variation with little difficulty. Taneev therefore concentrated on the modal-harmonic and rhythmic-structural aspects of form. For Taneev, the foundation of diatonic tonality serves as the principle means of formal organization in instrumental music. He outlines the contribution of tonality to the development of form:

The free style enables entire groups of harmonies to be consolidated into one organic whole and then by means of modulation to dissect this whole into factors that are tonally interdependent. This characteristic, . . . provided the conditions for the development of the free forms of instrumental music. . . . This new tonal system made possible the writing of works of large dimen-
sions that possessed all the qualities of effective structural style and that did not have to be reinforced by texts or by imitative forms per se, but contained within themselves the necessity for the latter. By degrees this system widened and deepened and its spreading circle embraced newer and newer resources and laws governing the relations between remote harmonies. Such were the broad horizons opened up for harmony; the creative activity of Beethoven then appears, and he, by a further expansion of the modulatory plans as they stood at the end of the eighteenth century, showed how much variety of key-relationship a composition could exhibit, both in its larger and smaller aspects.30

He thus considered Beethoven's music the apogee of the application of diatonic tonality to formal unification. Taneev did not approve of the chromatic harmony that followed:

This tonal system was in turn affected by a new one that tended to endanger key sense by the substitution of a chromatic for a diatonic basis; this led to a transformation of musical form. Applying the principle that by the use of chromatic progression any chord may follow any other, and pushing it too far, is likely to compromise key-relationship and to exclude those factors by which the smaller units of form are grouped and amalgamated into one organic whole.31

This new "omnitonal" harmony--so named by Fétis, as Taneev points out--"is inimical to the logic of tonality and form"; while it may add "to the resources of composition," it nevertheless "lacks the virility of the diatonic method." 32

To remain for a time in one key, as opposed to more or less rapid modulation, the contrast afforded by passing gradually to a new key, with a return to the principal key--all this, by contributing to the clearness of long movements and enabling the listener to comprehend their forms, has little by little disappeared from contemporary music. The result has been the production of small works and a general decline in the art of composition. Unity of construction appears with less and less frequency. Works are written not as consistent organisms but as formless masses of mechanically associated parts, any of which might be replaced by others.33

Therefore, the disintegration of the diatonic tonal framework has led to the disintegration of formal logic and unity as well. In his
counterpoint treatise, Taneev advocates the infusion of contrapuntal technique to revive music, following the example of Beethoven, who utilized counterpoint more and more in his later works. He considers the music of his day to be "essentially contrapuntal":

Not only in large orchestral works, where the abundance of independent parts often results in obscurity, or in opera, where leitmotifs are worked out contrapuntally, but even in pieces of insignificant dimensions, can counterpoint be employed to the greatest advantage.34

At the same time, though, Taneev urges young composers not to ignore the benefits—the necessity, even—of formal logic expressed through tonality, i.e., modulation:

I believe that in the sphere of modulation we have made a great step backwards compared with the musicians of former times and, having complicated its means, have become entangled in this complexity and have lost the sensitivity to modulation that nearly correctly guided previous masters, creating logical and expedient modulatory plans.35

For Taneev the modulatory plan also needed a unifying principle; so he conceived of the idea of a unifying tonality to provide it:

As a tonality brings a connection and a unity to the series of chords belonging to it, so a series of tonalities may be joined into a tonality of a higher order. We call such a tonality unifying. If, for example, in the cadence in C major [Example 17.8a], deviations into the tonality corresponding to its separate chords are made [Example 17.8b], then these tonalities preserve among themselves the same connection that the chords of the cadence had, and so their unifying tonality will be C major [Example 17.8c].36

Taneev's idea of a unifying tonality is similar to Riemann's idea of a Nebencentrum, as discussed in Systematische Modulationslehre.

Taneev derived this principle of a unifying tonality, as he derived all his theoretical ideas: from his observations of actual prac-
Example 17.8. Formation of a unifying tonality: a) C major cadence; b) C major cadence with deviations; c) unifying tonality of C major.

tice, particularly in Beethoven's music. He analyzed twenty-one modulatory passages from transitional, developmental, and episodic segments of various movements in Beethoven piano sonatas. The various tonalities touched upon in these modulations (which include deviations and passing modulations) "belong to" (in the sense that individual chords "belong to" or are "in" a certain tonality) or are related to, a unifying tonality. "The relation of tonalities of the middle part [of a work] to the main [tonality] and between themselves (the juxtaposition of tonalities) is the same as for separate chords. . . . If one takes a row of tonic chords, they should form a satisfactory progression." For example, in the Trio from the Piano Sonata, Op. 2, No. 3, measures 9-16 (the "B" section) exhibit in clear succession the tonalities C major, D minor, and E major, all of which are subordinated to the unifying tonality of the tonic A minor (Example 17.9).
Example 17.9. Ludwig van Beethoven, Sonata for piano, Op. 2, No. 3, Trio, mm. 9-16.

As in this example, the unifying tonality is often the main tonality; this occurs in nine of the twenty-one passages. The unifying tonalities of the other passages are related to the main tonality, either as parallel minor (seven passages), relative minor (two), the dominant (two), or the minor dominant (one). The subordinate tonalities vary in their relationship with the unifying tonality. Most of their tonic triads may be found among the chords of the unifying tonality; others may be found among the chords belonging to the parallel major or minor mode of the unifying tonality. Such altered harmonies as the lowered II and the lowered VI, which occur often, are borrowed from the parallel minor mode. Frequently, Taneev explains, these altered harmonies, occurring in the context of a major mode, recall the minor mode so strongly that the parallel minor mode unexpectedly becomes the unifying tonality, as in Example 17.11 below. Also, the
lowered submediant frequently substitutes for its minor tonic. The passage shown in Example 17.10, from the Rondo (third movement) of the Sonata, Op. 14, No. 1, "presents an example of the juxtaposition of the major and minor subdominants in the capacity of unifying tonalities."

Here, Taneev regards F major as a substitute for A minor, the minor subdominant of E major.


In the passage shown in Example 17.11, from the Rondo (fourth movement) of the Sonata, Op. 2, No. 2, "the deviation into the major tonality a major third below may be explained as an aspiration of the harmony to a unifying tonality equal to the parallel minor." In this case also, F major, VI in A minor, substitutes for its tonic.

In two of his analyses, Taneev carries the hierarchy of tonalities one step further, to what he calls "a unifying tonality of a higher
Example 17.11. Ludwig van Beethoven, Sonata for piano, Op. 2, No. 2, Rondo, mm. 139-148 (third return of theme).

order." From the Scherzo of the Sonata, Op. 2, No. 3, the passage shown in Example 17.12

represents a unifying tonality of a higher order. We will use this name for the case when a tonality, subordinate to the unifying [tonality], itself becomes unifying. So, for example, the deviation from Ab major and the deviation into G major following it point to the unifying tonality, C minor. At the same time the tonality Ab major is a unifying tonality in relation to the progression of tonalities: C minor, Bb minor, Ab major.42

The similarities between Taneev’s schemes of unifying tonalities and the structural harmonic outlines of Schenker are striking. Both are hierarchical, both emphasize tonal logic and direction, and both rely on the technique of harmonic reduction. Taneev did not consider melodic motion or voice-leading as did Schenker, nor did he attempt to restrict the harmonic possibilities to a few set patterns. But he does correlate the harmonic structure with the thematic and rhythmic struc-
tures, as we will see. An outgrowth of Rimsky-Korsakov's idea of the modulatory plan, Taneev's theory of a unifying tonality has a practical application as a compositional tool; also, implicit in it is Taneev's plea for the preservation of tonality built on a diatonic foundation.


As may be observed in the examples presented here, Taneev notated the rate of harmonic change only in a general way, with whole notes and fermatas for lengthier occurrences. The other harmonies, although notated identically, actually vary in length from one beat to five measures. He certainly was not unaware of this aspect, according to his students. But he apparently preferred to concentrate on correlating harmonic change and important moments in the other elements of the music. In a letter to the young Russian composer Nikolai Nikolaevich
Example 17.13. Ludwig van Beethoven, Sonata for piano, Op. 2, No. 2, Scherzo, mm. 9-32 (B section): a) tonal plan; b) mm. 26-31; c) mm. 15-17.

Amani, for instance, Taneev points to the correspondence between the elements of melody and rhythm and significant occurrences in the modulatory plan in his explanation of a passage from the Scherzo from the Sonata, Op. 2, No. 2, shown in Example 17.13:

[In this passage] the dominant is the unifying tonality [Example 17.13a]. After the appearance of E major, all the whole having been prepared by the previous tonalities, a deviation into D major follows directly. This juxtaposition of E [major] and D [major]
points to a new expected tonality of A major, and the appearance of the 4/3 inversion [of the dominant] of A major is the result of the entire previous movement of the harmony [Example 17.13b]. We turn attention to the fact that the important moments of the modulatory plan are marked thematically. When the development begins, the first two tonalities [E major and F# minor, in measures 9-13] still do not point to the unifying tonality (E major); they both could belong also to A major. But the appearance of G# minor [measures 15-25] points without a doubt to E major as the unifying tonality, and this moment is marked by a change in motion (eighth-notes in the accompaniment) and by a new theme [Example 17.13c].

This illustration becomes clear when compared to Taneev's earlier analysis of the modulatory plan of the same passage, shown in Example 17.14. He defines E major as a lower-level unifying tonality and A major as a unifying tonality of a higher order.

In another, more complicated example, given in Example 17.15, Taneev shows that the modulation plan of the development section of the first movement from the Sonata, Op. 14, No. 2, is influenced by the rhythm, dynamics, and theme:

The first five modulations belong to the unifying tonality of Eb major. The moment where this tonality is defined as a unifying tonality is marked; the sudden shift from pp to f, the introduction of the motion [of sixteenth-note triplets] and the appearance of the main theme [measure 81]. Another important moment of the approach [of Eb major] after the prolonged preparation is marked by a long stop on its dominant, with a fermata; a change in the motion (a cessation of the triplets) and the appearance of the main part coincide with the appearance of the tonic triad E-flat major [measure 98]. The tonalities [C minor and G minor] following Eb major are apportioned little space (two bars) [measures 104-106], but then great significance is given to the pause on the D major triad (dominant of G minor, preparing for the appearance of G major in the recapitulation). The movement of thirty-second [notes], hitherto absent in the development, is introduced on this chord [measure 107]. The triad itself is repeated faster. A new section with triplets in the left hand appears [measure 115]. Thus, the attention of the listener is concentrated on the juxtaposition of Eb [major] and D [major], which attracts the main tonality [Example 17.15b].

Example 17.15 resembles Example 17.11 in that the unifying tonality is the parallel minor of the main tonality of the movement, reinforced by the appearance of lowered VI.

Taneev calls the modulatory plan in Example 17.15 "a model of logic and expediency." Yet any modulatory plan with a unifying tonality exhibits these characteristics to some degree. A unifying tonality is manifested only when the tonalities making up the modulatory plan are chosen and grouped in such a way that they point inexorably and logically to a definite tonality, the unifying tonality, frequently also the goal of the modulatory plan. But which factors or
Example 17.15. Ludwig van Beethoven, Sonata for piano, Op. 14, No. 2, first movement, mm. 64-124 (development section): a) unifying tonalities; b) juxtaposition of unifying tonalities in development leading to main tonality of G major.

which harmonies contribute to the creation of a unifying tonality? What governs the choice of a unifying tonality? Taneev revealed the important role of the interval of the tritone in this regard. He repeats the thought, "expressed by Fétis . . . that the augmented fourth, the tritone, which was so feared in the epoch of the strict style, was made a foundation of our harmonic system." The two notes of the tritone, the fourth and seventh degrees of the diatonic scale, "mutually pushing away and attracting us to tonic, bring to harmony an element of movement or aspiration" (Example 17.16a). Fétis says:

Modern tonality resides in the attractions of certain intervals towards intervals of repose, and in the linkage of these with others which, although devoid of the character of attraction, do not however have that of conclusion.

The attractive intervals are the major fourth [augmented fourth], the minor fifth [diminished fifth] and the natural dissonance of the dominant with the fourth degree [which forms a tritone with the seventh degree, the third of the dominant].

The fifth and the octave are the only intervals of repose.

The intervals devoid of the character of conclusion, although not attractive, are the fourth and the sixth.
The chords that form the tritone interval, which in Taneev's illustrations are either ii and V or IV and V, aspire to tonic. From their juxtaposition, a given tonality may be sensed before the appearance of its tonic triad (Example 17.16b and c). According to Taneev, the same effect occurs between unified tonalities:

When a similar tritone relationship does not occur in a succession of tonalities, the harmony develops smoothly, quietly, and does not aspire to a definite point... In such a case the unifying tonality is not expressed clearly, and frequently a succession [of tonalities] might belong to two or more unifying tonalities. But when a tonality carrying the above-mentioned tritone relationship occurs, the harmony aspires to a definite point that is expected by the listener. It is customary... to modulate into the dominant of the dominant of the secondary part [of a sonata form, for example], so that a progression is formed in which the beginning tonality is in a tritone relationship to the concluding tonality. [This custom] is rooted in the essence of the harmony itself (Example 17.16c).50

Example 17.16. Tritone relation: a) resolution to major sixth; b) tritone between chords; c) tritone between tonic and dominant of the dominant.

Thus the juxtaposition of the original tonic, in this case C major, with the new dominant, D major, creates the tritone C-F#, which
aspires to the new tonic, G major, the unifying tonality. This progression may also be identified as IV-V-I. Within a tonality, this tritone juxtaposition occurs between the subdominant (II or IV) and the dominant, as in the progression T-S-D-T. Taneev points out that the augmented second between the lowered sixth degree and the leading tone may substitute for the tritone to a certain extent. Such is the case in Example 17.15, in the juxtaposition of the Eb major and D major triads preparing for G. The augmented second Eb-F♯ resolves to D-G. The tritone in this progression, Eb-A, would lead to the tonality of B♭ if it were regarded as the subdominant and the leading tone.

Taneev graphically illustrates this juxtaposition of the subdominant and the dominant in his tonal schemes of the development of sonata movements from the Beethoven piano sonatas. Figure 17.3 illustrates the development section of the first movement of Sonata, Op. 13.

\[\text{Figure 17.3. Ludwig van Beethoven, Sonata for piano, Op. 13, first movement, development section.}\]
The straight line represents the main tonality of the movement, C minor; all tonalities above it are on the dominant side, below it, the subdominant. Approximately in the middle of the development, the tonalities of the subdominant and the dominant are directly juxtaposed, indicating the tonic as the eventual goal. Here again, the lengths of the tonalities are not represented accurately. But subdominant actually takes up about one-fourth of the development, and the major dominant, one-half. Nevertheless, Taneev clearly depicts the interaction between the dominant and subdominant "spheres" in the development section, which culminates in their juxtaposition and the aspiration towards tonic. Taneev's "dualistic" approach may be related to similar approaches by Hauptmann and Riemann, yet Taneev's concentration on the tritone is his unique contribution. Western theorists have recently underscored the unique significance of the tritone, the rarest interval in the diatonic collection, in determining tonality. Although their research is more sophisticated and thorough, utilizing recent procedures and terminology developed for atonal music and conducting controlled psychological experiments, nonetheless they reach the same basic conclusion Taneev arrived at through his observations of Beethoven's music nearly eighty years previously.

Outside of the modulatory plan and its attendant unifying tonality, attention to structural logic, particularly as manifested in the thematic and harmonic development within a movement, also concerned Taneev. For the development section of the sonata, for instance, Taneev differentiates seven types of formal sentence structure. Each
type he isolated (such as the modulating sentence repeated sequentially in the first movement of the Sonata, Op. 14, No. 2) illustrates the coordination between the sentence structure and the variations of the thematic and harmonic material. He also compares the recapitulation of the sonata form with the exposition to determine the types of structural changes in the recapitulation. His findings reinforced his propensity for variety in structure as well as in melody, harmony, and rhythm within the limits of a recognizable form such as the sonata.

Taneev carried out his theoretical studies of both counterpoint and form with a practical goal in view—the education and development of composers and theorists. Through his meticulous work, he removed some of the old empirical habits from music theory and also some of the mystical aura surrounding musical creation. He provided students with precise methods and models that coincidentally gave to the development of Russian music theory a much needed impetus. Although his studies on form did not lend themselves to the kind of mathematical verification applied to his counterpoint studies, they nonetheless benefited from his unerring observations and deductive reasoning. His innovations and discoveries reveal him to be a true theorist of the twentieth century, which is ironic considering his preferences for tonal music and classical structures and procedures.
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1 Sergei Ivanovich Taneev, Podvizhnoi kontrapunkt strogoj pis'ma [Movable counterpoint in the strict style] (Moscow, 1909); Boleslav Leopoldovich Yavorsky, Stroenie muzykal'noi rechn [The structure of musical speech] (Moscow, 1908). Taneev's work has been translated by G. Ackley Brower as Convertible Counterpoint in the Strict Manner (Boston, 1962). All quotations and citations are from Brower's translation.


4 Taneev published his observations in an article: "Der Inhalt des Arbeithetos von W. A. Mozarts eigenhandig geschriebenen Uebungen mit den Unterweisungen durch seinen Vater in strengen Kontrapunkt und reinen Satz (41 Blatter Querquart gebunden)," XXXIII Jahresbericht der "Internationalen Stiftung Mozarteum" fur das Jahr 1913 (Salzburg, 1914). This article was first published in Russian in 1947: "Soderzhanie tetradi sobstvennoruchnykh uprazhnenii Motsarta v strogen kontrapunkte" [The contents of the notebook of Mozart's exercises in strict counterpoint done in his own hand], Pamiati Sergieva Ivanovicha Taneeva, 1856-1946. Sbornik statei i materialov k 90-letiiu so dnia rozhdenia [In the memory of Sergei Ivanovich Taneev, 1856-1946. A collection of articles and materials for the 90-year anniversary of his birth], ed. Vladimir Protopopov (Moscow; Leningrad, 1947), pp. 182-195.

5 The correspondence between Taneev and Chaikovsky has been published in two separate editions: Modest Tchaikovsky, ed., Pis'ma P. I. Chaikovskogo i S. I. Taneeva [The letters of P. I. Chaikovsky and

6

Sergei Ivanovich Taneev, Uchenie o kanone [The doctrine of the canon], ed. Viktor Beliaev (Moscow, 1929). Beliaev's greatest difficulty in preparing this work for publication was the coordination of the musical examples with the text, since Taneev had left few indications. Beliaev spent about two years on this project (p. VII).
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In 1906 Taneev worked out a grandiose plan for future work, which he envisioned completing by 1913 and which included the following titles: Tsvetistyi kontrapunkt strogo pis'ma [Florid counterpoint in the strict style], Imitatsiia v prostom kontrapunkte [Imitation in simple counterpoint], Obratimyi kontrapunkt [Invertible counterpoint], Fuga v strogom pis'ma [The fugue in the strict style], Fuga v svobodom pis'me [The fugue in the free style], and Kanonicheskie formy na osnove podvizhnogo kontrapunkta [Canonic forms on the basis of moveable counterpoint] (Arzamanov, "Zavety S. Taneeva," p. 31).
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Yuly Engel, "S. I. Taneev, kak uchitel'" [S. I. Taneev as a teacher], Muzykal'nyi sovremennik [The musical contemporary], No. 8 (1916), p. 52.
In a letter to Chaikovsky dated August 18, 1880, Taneev writes:

Having finished study in the conservatory, I wanted to find out some things hitherto unknown to me. I began with double counterpoint in all intervals and wrote, it turns out, 140 small six-voiced exercises, using a Russian song for a cantus firmus. Then, wanting to master the rules of the strict style, I wrote in the church modes 32 small fugues having no relation to Russian songs.

For some time I studied the writing of exercises on melodies from church collections and wished in time to be able to write on these cantus firmi something sufficiently appropriate... not as a contrapuntal exercise but as a composition. This is my wish in this area—rather modest, as it turns out. Why do I do all this? Simply because I want to make myself a composer... In order to know something thoroughly, be it harmony, counterpoint, or instrumentation, some painstaking and dry work, which should precede artistic creation, is necessary. I am attracted to the elegance and well-roundedness of Mozart's forms, to the freedom and expediency of Bach's voice-leading; I try to penetrate, as far as I am able, into the secrets of their creation; I see that they knew much that I do not know (P. I. Chaikovsky, S. I. Taneev: pis'ma [Moscow, 1951], p. 59).


Engel, "S. I. Taneev, kak uchitel'," p. 43.

Taneev writes:

Skill in the handling of counterpoint is of such advantage in composition that the beginner should devote part of his time to its study. . . . The result will be greater assurance and freedom in part-writing, skill in improving the musical content of the individual voices, the development (of special value in thematic work) of the ability to extract derivative combinations, the profit to be gained by acquaintance with an infinite variety of contrapuntal forms as means of artistic expression, and the subordination of the whole realm of tonal material to the creative imagination (Convertible Counterpoint, p. 300).

Ibid., pp. 18-19.

Ibid., p. 19.

In addition to shifting counterpoint, there is also duplicated counterpoint and metamorphosed counterpoint. In shifting counterpoint, a derivative is obtained by shifting the voices either vertically,
horizontally, or a combination of the two. In duplicated counterpoint, "a derivative combination is obtained by duplicating one or more voices in imperfect consonances," thereby increasing the number of voices. "Each duplication is nothing but the vertical transference of a voice at an interval equal to an imperfect consonance" (p. 21). Metamorphosed counterpoint is also known as "mirror counterpoint." Taneev concerned himself mainly with shifting counterpoint, less with duplicated counterpoint, and not at all with metamorphosed counterpoint.

Ibid., p. 301.
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Taneev created a table that allowed him and his students to see at a glance the possible consonances and dissonances for a given combination and, via a moveable chain of numbers, to determine which combinations were possible. It is reproduced in Muzykal'nyi sovremennik [Musical contemporary], No. 8 (1916), opposite p. 60.

Convertible Counterpoint, pp. 169-170.

Taneev referred to the vertical index as IV, for Index verticallis, but to avoid confusion with voice I, Brower substituted JV.

Convertible Counterpoint, pp. 37-40.

In the last case, Taneev accompanied JV and JH with the Greek symbol for sigma, meaning sum. I have substituted the letter S. The index of the combination I + II is always equal to the sum of the first two indices: JV' + JV'' = JVS.

Convertible Counterpoint, p. 208.


One theorist who refers to Taneev is Hugo Norden, in his Fundamental Counterpoint (Boston: Crescendo Publishing Co., 1969).

Taneev wrote, "The degree of technical maturity of a composer is verified best of all by the ability to have command of the sonata form" (cited in F. Arzamanov, "Zavety S. Taneeva," p. 36).

Convertible Counterpoint, pp. 18-19.
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35 Taneev to N. N. Amani, November 7, 1903, S. I. Taneev. Materialy i dokumenty, 1:226.
36 Ibid., pp. 226-227.
37 Riemann, Systematische Modulationslehre als Grundlage der musikalischen Formenlehre (Hamburg, 1887), pp. 202-203.
38 Viktor Beliaev, "'Analiz moduliatsii v sonatakh Betkhovene' S. I. Taneeva" ["The analysis of modulations in the sonatas of Beethoven" by S. I. Taneev], Russkaia kniga o Betkhovene [The Russian book on Beethoven], pp. 191-204. Taneev chose segments from fifteen movements of ten of the first thirteen piano sonatas.
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43 Although no writings by Taneev on this subject have appeared, he apparently discussed the rate and duration of harmonic change in his classes on form. Arzamanov refers to this occasionally in his work, Taneev--prepodavatel' kursa muzykal'nykh form.
44 Taneev to Amani, November 7, 1903, S. I. Taneev. Materialy i dokumenty, 1:227-228.
46 Ibid., p. 230.
47 Taneev to Amani, November 8, 1903, S. I. Taneev. Materialy i dokumenty, 1:231. This view held by Fétes was pointed out to Taneev by his pupil B. L. Yavorsky, who later commented:

The assertion of Fétes that modulation occurs only after the appearance of six half-steps to one of the tones of the tonic triad was communicated to me in the '90s by the director of the Kiev music school V. V. Pukhalsky. I in turn showed this to S. I. Taneev approximately in February 1900 in a statement written by me.
specially for him on my thoughts about internal auditory tuning and about the structure of modes. After this S. I. Taneev several times urgently asked me to find the corresponding place in the theoretical works of Fétis (Boleslav Leopoldovich Yavorsky, "Pisma S. I. Taneeva k N. N. Amani" [The letters of S. I. Taneev to N. N. Amani], Sovetskaia muzyka [Soviet music], No. 7 (1940), p. 67).
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Taneev to Amani, p. 231.

Taneev did not discuss this aspect any further; neither did the Soviet authority of Taneev's theories of form, Arzamanov. Rather, he concentrated on the contrast between the "authentic" character of a modulatory plan containing a tritone aspiring to a tonic and the "plagal" character of a modulatory plan lacking this tritone. A plagal modulatory plan is tranquil and placid whereas an authentic modulatory plan is dramatic, active, and in motion. (See Arzamanov, Taneev—
prepodavatel', pp., 67-71.)

These schemes are reproduced in Arzamanov, Taneev—
prepodavatel', p. 85, example no. 30.

Richmond Browne, "Tonal Implications of the Diatonic Set," In Theory Only, 5, no. 6-7 (1981), pp. 3-21; Helen Brown and David Butler, "Diatonic Triads as Minimal Tonal Cue-Cells," loc. cit., 39-53. My thanks to Gene Narmour for directing me to this research.

Taneev's notes on the development section are published in Arzamanov, "Zavety S. Taneeva," pp. 36-37.

S. I. Taneev, "Zametki o sonatnykh reprisakh Betkhoven" [Notes on sonata recapitulations of Beethoven], S. I. Taneev. Iz nauchno-
pedagogicheskogo naslediia [S. I. Taneev. [From the scientific-
pedagogical legacy], pp. 150-154.

Beginning in 1897, those students at the Moscow Conservatory who completed three years of study, including Taneev's courses on strict counterpoint, fugue, and form, received the "diploma of a master of music theory. The more gifted students will be allowed to continue the course in the class of free composition" (Directions from the Artistic Council of the Conservatory, cited in Arzamanov, "Zavety S. Taneeva," p. 33).
Chapter 18

Boleslav Leopol'dovich Yavorsky and Modal Rhythm

**Boleslav Leopol'dovich Yavorsky.** Yavorsky, one of the most notable and influential figures in the development of Russian music theory in the twentieth century, followed in the footsteps of his teacher, Taneev. Yet he formulated his ideas quite independently of Taneev's teaching. By the time he began taking Taneev's course on counterpoint during his second year of study at the Moscow Conservatory, 1899-1900, (his first of three with Taneev, followed by canon and fugue in 1900-01, and musical form in 1901-03), he had embarked on the path of theoretical research that was to occupy him for the remainder of his life. Yavorsky's notebooks preserved from this time indicate that he had already developed the basic principles of his theories and defined many of the terms that later appeared in *The Construction of Musical Speech.*

Also during that year he began to present his ideas and experiment with their efficacy among different audiences of friends, colleagues, and teachers. At the beginning of that academic year, for example, Yavorsky organized a group of students known as the "Mondayites" (not to be confused with the group of the same name that met in the library
of the Music Theory Library Society), who met at his apartment for the purpose of sharing new ideas and testing new theories. Its members included S. V. Bel'sky, Nadezhda Yakovlevna Briusova (1881–1951), and O. I. Sibeleva, in addition to Yavorsky. Taneev himself was so impressed by his new student and his independent ideas and approach that he invited Yavorsky to lecture on his new theory to a group of Taneev's friends and students. These lectures took place at Taneev's apartment on three occasions the first year, May 19, 20, and 22, 1900, and once again in January 1901.

Like his teacher Taneev, Yavorsky did not indulge in theoretical research merely for its own sake; throughout his life he applied his theories to his compositions, his teaching, and his performing. As with Taneev, then, a strong link between pedagogical or practical theory and speculative theory exists in his work. In fact, Yavorsky wished to replace traditional pedagogical theory, which he considered inferior, with his own theories and pedagogical methods. His goal was nothing less than to restructure music theory according to his system—essentially, to build a universal theory of music based on specific new ideas, approaches, and methods. Yet at the same time, Yavorsky always insisted that he discovered nothing, but merely defined and gave shape to what was already existing in life, in practice.

After graduation from the Moscow Conservatory in 1903 in theory and piano, Yavorsky supported himself through teaching. In 1906 he took part in the organization of the Moscow People's Conservatory, being the major force behind the compilation of its student plan (see...
Chapter 19). He subsequently taught theory, choir, and piano at this new conservatory until 1916, when he took a teaching post at the Kiev Conservatory. In addition to his teaching duties, during the years 1906-1907 he worked on putting his book into its final shape.

Yavorsky's Letter to Taneev. A letter to Taneev from this time, dated April 17, 1906, constitutes one of the first—if not the first—existing written statements of his theory outside of his notebooks. This letter, in which Yavorsky reveals several important aspects of his theory, quite possibly formed the response to Taneev's question concerning the commonly-used modes, including the church modes, and their formation within and relation to Yavorsky's concept of mode and modal formation. It may serve as an introduction to his theory.

The main thesis of Yavorsky's theory, most frequently called "modal rhythm," concerns the temporal formation of mode, the unfolding of modal thought within a temporal framework, which thus affects not only the resulting mode in its melodic and harmonic manifestations but also the proportion, size, and appearance of the resulting formal constructions. Central to this thesis are two elements: 1) the symmetry of a tritone and its resolution, which is an unstable interval (in fact, the most unstable interval) resolving into a more stable interval and which takes the basic role in this formation; and 2) the melodic or temporal cells, or intonations (intonatsia), created during this formation. Taking his cue from Fétis, who stressed the resolving tendency of the tritone and its important role in the formation of modern tonal-
ity, and who also wrote about the scale as the foundation of tonality and the role of certain notes within the scale as reposing notes (see quote in Chapter 17), Yavorsky proceeded to build an entire system on this one interval and its resolving notes in various combinations. Yavorsky and his teacher Taneev thus were equally influenced by Fétis's observations regarding the tritone, but manifested this influence in very different directions. Yavorsky derived his theory in part from his studies of both folk music and human speech, both being in his view primordial forms of what he called musical speech. Interesting in this regard are entries in his notebooks, dated 1899-1900, "of shouts of street peddlers, of merchants with berries, fruits, greens, of grinders, of junkmen, etc.," indicating yet another source, a "living" source, as Yavorsky might say, for intonations in both human and musical speech.

In his letter he explains the tritone-resolution pair to Taneev:

From my research in folk music I reached the conclusion that the tritone and its resolution is the basic cell of musical speech. As soon as two notes forming a tritone sound simultaneously, consecutively or even [separated] by a space (but in one whole), our senses immediately feel an irritation, disappearing only after both sounds of the tritone noticeably, in the same significant place as the very appearance of the tritone, are resolved oppositely by a half step into a major third [or into a minor sixth] [Example 18.1].

Yavorsky later named each single tritone with its accompanying resolution "the single tritone system." He also combined two single tritone systems at the distance of a half-step (Example 18.2a), which he called "the double tritone system" (Example 18.2b). He subsequently labeled the unstable tritone in the single system "D" for dominant, and the
resolving stable major third (or minor sixth) "T" for tonic. He labeled the two combined tritones of the double system "S" for subdominant and their resolving minor third "t" for subtonic (subtonic being the tonic of the subdominant).

Example 18.1 The tritone and its dual resolution into a major third or minor sixth in both melodic and harmonic renderings.

Yavorsky then formed numerous types of modes through various combinations of either or both of the "single" or "double" systems. Many of the modes thus formed resemble modal patterns already known in traditional theory or compositional practice, but many of them were at that time totally new. For instance, the familiar Hungarian mode, the formation of which Yavorsky illustrates for Taneev, consists of the combination of two single tritone systems at the distance of a major third (between the two lower resolution tones) (Example 18.2c). The combined pitches from the two intervals of resolution create an augmented triad, while the two tritones together form a French augmented sixth chord. The addition to this mode of a third single tritone system, again at the distance of a major third (the single tritone system in Example 18.2d), creates a new nine-tone mode that Yavorsky called an "augmented mode." Not surprisingly, the pattern of its whole
(W) and half (H) steps is periodically repetitive: \( \text{H W H H W H H W H.} \)
Its stable resolution pitches remain an augmented triad; the unstable tritone pitches make up a whole-tone scale (Example 18.2d). Regarding the instability of the latter, Yavorsky comments to Taneev, "Clear, of course, is the unpleasant impression produced by the whole-tone scale and by works written in this scale--the ear constantly is irritated without satisfaction."

Example 18.2. a) Two single tritone systems at distance of half-step;
b) their combination into a double tritone system;
c) combination of two single tritone systems at distance of major third: Hungarian mode; d) addition of third single tritone system at distance of major third: "augmented mode."

In this and in all subsequent examples illustrating Yavorsky's theories, the black notes indicate the unstable tones, the white notes, the stable tones. (In Example 18.2a, the stable G\# in the first "T" and the stable Eb in the second "T" are represented with black rather than white notes because each equals enharmonically one of the unstable
pitches of the other tritone in the double system; thus, when the two single tritone systems are combined, the instability proves to be stronger than the stability. Taken singly, each "T" is equally stable.) The bar line denotes the "boundary," i.e., the line of separation, similar to a bar line, between the unstable and stable portions of each system. The horizontal brackets outline the conjunct tones from each system, that is, the unstable tones together with their accompanying tones of resolution a half-step away. The simultaneous occurrence of two tritones from two single systems is notated with a "double D." Yavorsky's symbols may thus be summarized as follows:

Single Tritone System:

| Instability: | D |
| Stability:   | T |

Double Tritone System:

| Instability: | S |
| Stability:   | T |

Two Single Systems:

| Two Instabilities: | DD |

Yavorsky also illustrates for Taneev the formation of an even more familiar mode, the "natural" major mode, for which he combines one single and one double tritone system, again at the distance of a major third (between the two lower resolution tones). He remarks that it is better known without D♯ and Ab from the tritone pairs D♯-A and D-Ab (Example 18.3a). He combines the same single and a different double
tritone system a fourth higher—a minor third between the lower resolution tones—to form the "natural" minor mode (Example 18.3b) (again, better known without Db and G§). Here Yavorsky arrives at the natural major and minor modes only through the elimination of certain pitches in the complete mode formed from the combination of complete systems. The Hungarian mode is derived from the complete "augmented" mode in the same manner. Thus each complete mode formed in this manner may contain within it secondary modes. Regarding these secondary modes, which include not only the natural and other forms of major and minor such as the harmonic forms as well as the Hungarian mode, but also the church modes when formed according to Yavorsky's theory, he states:

In my opinion, the harmonic [and other incomplete] modes may exist as the fulfillment of only a part of the tonal gravitation. All non-free [i.e., unstable] sounds, not entering into the constitution of the basic triad, should be resolved during a [musical] speech, which is concluded on the rests of the expositions of that part of the tonal gravitation that makes up the essence of the given mode [that is, the stable portion of the gravitation].

Example 18.3. Yavorsky: a) natural major mode; b) natural minor mode.
In other words, the modes we accept today—including major, minor, and the church modes—are, in Yavorsky's system, incomplete, leaving unfulfilled some portion of their overall tonal gravitation, i.e., tritone or resolution. However, a listener untrained in Yavorsky's system would perceive these modes as incomplete only if a necessary resolution were lacking. For this listener the lack of one half of a tritone generally does not constitute a problem. But within Yavorsky's system, a melodic linkage (see below) would be incomplete, and the listener trained in his system would be aware of this.

Within modes and/or systems, the individual tones may combine into small constructions in which the idea of tonal gravitation or equilibrium—either towards or away from stability—is manifested monodically. Yavorsky refers to these constructions as "intonations" [intonatsiia]. He describes to Taneev the concept of tonal equilibrium as expressed in two types of melodic intonations—basic and intermediate:

The sounds of resolution are free, independent. The break of tonal equilibrium by the transition of a free sound into a tritone [sound] linked with it or the restoration of tonal equilibrium by the transfer of a tritone sound into a free [sound] linked with it makes up (forming a minor second, and in an incomplete scale also a major second) the first basic intonation of the human voice (question, answer) [Example 18,4a]. The break of tonal equilibrium by the transfer from a free sound into a tritone sound, linked with its third [Example 18,4b] (forming a perfect fourth) makes up the second basic intonation of the human voice.

These two intonations (in a usual, intensified or weakened view) accompany in words the appearance that we call accent. All intonations of the break of tonal equilibrium by the transfer from a free sound into a tritone sound of a different third also serves for apportionment, but not so clearly. The rotation in the limit of only dependent sounds [Example 18,4c] or only of free sounds [Example 18,4d] (forming the third and fifth) creates an intermediate intonation, fulfilling the space between accents.
Example 18.4. a) First basic intonation: break of tonal equilibrium; 
b) first basic intonation: restoration of tonal 
equilibrium; c) second basic intonation: break of tonal 
equilibrium; d) dependent sounds; e) free sounds.

The intonation is thus similar to a melodic motive, except that it 
embodies within itself specific aspects inherent to Yavorsky's theory— 
symmetry and gravitation, with an inflection similar to a spoken 
accent.

Yavorsky's letter to Taneev thus introduces several important 
aspects of his theoretical approach: the primacy and engendering 
quality of the interval of the tritone and its resolution, the con-
struction of modes through combinations of tritones and resolutions 
(the "single" and "double" systems), the ideas of tonal gravitation and 
equilibrium, and the monodic aspect called intonation. Yavorsky left 
out the temporal aspect.

"The Construction of Musical Speech". The foregoing explanation 
serves as only a very brief and partial introduction to the precepts 
set forth by Yavorsky in his major published work from 1908, Stroenie
muzykal'noi rechi [The construction of musical speech], and in later works also published during this period, such as the 1915 Uprazhnenii v obrazovanii ladovogo ritma [Exercises in the formation of modal rhythm]. Unfortunately, the 1908 book itself is incomplete, since Yavorsky as its publisher was able to publish only the beginning sections of each of its three parts. Consequently, in many cases the ideas introduced in the course of the book do not receive the amount of attention necessary for full comprehension and practicality. One needs to turn to later works such as Uprazhnenii for additional explanations. A complete exposition of Yavorsky's ideas came still later in 1930, in a book prepared by one of his students. Thus my discussion here is derived solely from the 1908 and 1915 books. A discussion of the 1930 book is in Part VI, Chapter 25.

Perhaps Yavorsky's most basic concept is that "music is a natural phenomenon, one natural to man who is able to understand it and express himself through it. Therefore music is auditory and should have demonstrable auditory principles." His approach is thus psychological, in that music is an expressive phenomenon, composed and perceived by man according to certain identifiable laws. These are not the empirical laws of pedagogical theory, but laws that answer the questions of cause and effect, that attempt to explain the exact process whereby music both expresses and satisfies human emotions. Each aspect of his theory has its counterpart in some human characteristic—speech, pulse, breathing, walking, balance and so on—and in some natural characteristic of earth experienced by man, such as gravity. Therefore
Yavorsky groups all forms of human sound together; music is only a higher form of human speech, hence the term, "musical speech." He accordingly derived his theories from the study of all forms of music, but predominantly those of human speech and of folk music, as mentioned in his letter to Taneev. The technical side of music, the physical properties of sound and the production of sound (acoustics), did not interest him nearly so much as the relations between sounds. As he said, "There are no exactly defined sounds, there exists only the relation between sounds."

Yavorsky's "psychological," empirical, and non-technical approach to music theory was at odds with most other theoretical approaches of his generation and later, even Taneev's. Nonetheless, the two held great respect for each other's work, as we have seen. But Yavorsky's attempts to provide answers for questions that had not even been previously addressed by other Russian theorists did as much as if not more than Taneev's more systematic approach to propel Russian music theory forward into the speculative sphere.

For Yavorsky, the most basic "sound relation" is that of six half-steps, the tritone. (Like Kurdiumov, Yavorsky measured intervals through half-steps.) All remaining relations (intervals) are reached as a result of the action of this one interval. It is the supreme—and only—representative of instability. All other intervals are stable; however, they are categorized further according to consonance or dissonance. Seconds and sevenths are dissonant; the prime, octave, thirds, fourths, fifths, and sixths are consonant. Thus the existence of a
stable but dissonant interval or sonority is possible. Yavorsky rightly recognized the separate existence of these two concepts. The unstable tritone gravitates inversely, that is, by opposite motion, towards the nearest stable relation, either coming together (as a diminished fifth into a major third) or separating (as an augmented fourth into a minor sixth). Yavorsky describes the resulting two "linked" intervals—a tritone plus its resolution or the single tritone system—as "the basic manifestation of gravitation and equilibrium in musical speech"—gravitation because of the action from tritone to resolution and equilibrium because of the balance between instability and stability. He refers to modcs, which are formed from the combination of single and/or double tritone systems—the latter being the combination of two single systems at the distance of one half-step with the same gravitating direction—as "sound systems of a higher order."

Yavorsky's sound sphere, which he illustrates with a spiral (shown in Figure 18.1), consists of the six different types of tritone (one on each tone of half of the chromatic scale; the other half of the scale contains the inversions of the same tritone intervals). The spiral consists of the twelve chromatic tones endlessly repeating themselves in an open circle, and arranged step-wise chromatically; each pair of tones 180 degrees apart makes up a tritone. Each "spoke" of the spiral represents in a sense one of the twelve pitch classes (each octave represented with a different symbol—do, do, Do, Do, etc.), yet each is restricted to one pitch name only, i.e., no enharmonic equivalents. Each type of tritone may be twofold—moving inversely apart or togeth—
er. Within this sound sphere, Yavorsky points out, "there is no absolute stability, but there exists a definite aspiration of unstable relations." Each sound in the sphere is either stable or unstable, depending on whether it is accompanied by the sound with which it makes an unstable relation. In other words, if both tones of a tritone pair occur, they are both unstable. But if just one of the tones occurs, without its accompanying tritone, it is stable. Even so, a single system, one unstable tritone and its resolution, forms only a "relative stability" of the general sound sphere, since it consists of the sounds of three relations, one unstable, that is, the tritone, and two possibly unstable, that is, its resolution, the two tones of which may each belong to two other unstable relations (or tritones). (See spiral, Figure 18.1.) Thus, a single tone, such as la, without its corresponding opposite tone re#, is stable. Together, though, the two tones create a tritone and are thus unstable. Each tone may move to either side in the spiral. If the two tones in a tritone relation move together in the same direction (parallel motion), for instance la to sol# and re# to re, only another tritone results. If they move together in different directions (oblique motion), for instance la to sol# and re# to mi, either a major third or minor sixth results, each tone of which has the capacity to form a tritone with its opposite tone, such as sol# with re or mi with si. Thus Yavorsky speaks only of relative stability and the lack of absolute stability.

Modes—"the sound systems of a higher order"—are formed by combinations of two or more systems, single, double or both. Mode becomes,
then, in the definition of Soviet theorist (and Yavorsky student) Viktor Abramovich Tsukerman, "the totality of the gravities of the unstable sounds of a given whole into their resolving stable sounds."

Within every mode thus formed, each systemic gravitation maintains its structure. Tsukerman explains further Yavorsky's concept of mode:
The idea of mode therefore greatly exceeds the limits of its earlier "sound-order" treatment, in which we see only the outer sounds of its constitution and the intervals between neighboring sounds, but we do not understand the inner structure of mode (or, at best we have only a partial, fragmentary idea about it). The theory of modal rhythm in every possible way emphasizes that non-organized sounds possessing only physical characteristics—speed, amplitude and form of fluctuation—are turned into material for the harmonious building of musical speech only when these sounds receive in modal gravity important moving strength, when they meet in a mutual relation between themselves and are perceived by us as constituent elements of a modal organization.18

In other words, mode is not just a collection of pitches, but a functional hierarchy of pitches. I will discuss this notion subsequently.

Modes may be complete or incomplete. However, since Yavorsky begins with only complete modes, the method of their formation represents the starting point for the formation of all modes. For a mode to be complete, each of the six types of tritones, either one or both tones, must be represented in it. Since each single system contains four tones from three different tritones, and each double system contains six tones from four different tritones, as few as two systems, single, double, or one of each, may be combined to form a mode. However, Yavorsky isolates only four complete modes constructed from two systems—two modes consisting of one single and one double system (the full major and full minor modes), and two modes consisting of two single systems (the major-minor or "chain" mode and one of the unstable modes from Group III [see below]). He constructs the remaining modes from three or four systems. The Hungarian mode shown earlier (Example 18.2c), constructed from two single systems, is not a complete mode, since it contains tones from only five of the six different tritones—
B–F, C–(F♯), Db–G, (D)–Ab, and E–(B♭). (The missing pitches are in parentheses.) The addition of the full missing tritone, D♯–A, creates a complete mode, the "augmented mode." Thus the Hungarian mode in Yavorsky's system is only an incomplete "secondary" mode derived from the complete augmented mode. Of the remaining three- and four-system modes, though, fourteen of the three-system modes and all of the four-system modes are created from the addition of what Yavorsky calls "a half-stable system," in which one of the tones of the tritone does not resolve (discussed below).

Yavorsky groups the thirty-five complete modes he identifies in The Construction of Musical Speech according to the stability and/or consonance of the tonic chord, which contains the resolution tones.

Group I consists of modes in which the tonic chord is both stable (containing no tritones) and consonant (consonant intervals: prime, octave, fourth, fifth, third, and sixth); this is the largest category, with twenty-seven modes. Group II consists of modes in which the tonic chord is consonant but unstable, that is, it contains tritones but no seconds or sevenths (one mode). Group III consists of modes in which the tonic chord is both dissonant and unstable (containing seconds and/or sevenths, and tritones) (seven modes).

The modes themselves may also be stable or unstable. For a mode to be considered stable, each stable tone within each constituent single or double system must maintain its stability within the resulting mode. This means that a stable tone in one system may not be duplicated by an unstable tone from another system within the mode.
(i.e., be enharmonically equivalent), for the stable capability of a tone is less powerful than its unstable capability and the latter would prevail. Modes that do not meet this condition are either less stable or unstable modes. For instance, in Example 18.5 below, the complete major mode (Ex. 18.5a-1) is stable; none of its unstable tones (in black) is enharmonically equivalent to or duplicated by any of its stable tones (in white). But the first variable mode (Ex. 18.5e) is less stable, since two of its stable tones (A and G) are duplicated by two of its unstable tones, G in the first double system and A in the second double system. However, like the idea of stability itself, Yavorsky's concept of modal stability is relative. Only four modes in Group I, with stable and consonant tonic chords, may be considered totally stable; the remainder are generally less stable or stable only partially. Three of these totally stable modes-major, minor, and augmented (see Examples 18.5a, b, and c)—form one subgroup. Because they are stable, they are characterized by common tones only between the stable tones of different systems within the mode. (Common tones between stable and unstable tones of different systems within a mode create unstable modes. Common tones between unstable tones of the same system or between unstable and stable tones of the same system do not occur, the former because each instability within a mode occurs only once, thereby eliminating the possibility of common tones; common tones between unstable tones of different systems could occur but are not significant.)
Example 18.5. Modes from Group I: a) Major mode; 1-complete, 2-natural, 3-harmonic; b) minor mode; 1-complete, 2-natural, 3-harmonic; c) augmented mode; d) "chain" mode; e) first variable mode; f) second variable mode; g) half-stable mode.

A fourth totally stable mode, the so-called "chain" mode (Example 18.5d), belongs to a second subgroup of modes in Group I. Its tonic sonority contains no common tones but is a triad with both major and minor thirds created from two interlocking single systems. Yavorsky
groups it in this subgroup with the two modes he calls "variable"
because of the presence in all three of both the major and minor modal
capabilities. The "chain" mode tonic contains essentially both major
and minor tonic triads on the same pitch, whereas tonics of the other
"variable" modes contain tonics of both major and minor triads on
different pitches. (Russian folk songs frequently contain elements of
both major and minor. Yavorsky's identification of and name for this
phenomenon—"variability"—have become a very common part of contempo-
rary Soviet music theory.) These two "variable" modes are less stable
in that each contains two tones that are unstable in one system and
stable in another (A and G in Example 18.5e and C and B in Example
18.5f). These modes are formed from the joining of the major and minor
modes through one central system—single in one, double in another.
Even though the resulting full tonic chords of the chain mode and the
"variable" modes are dissonant (they contain seconds, Eb–E in the chain
mode, or sevenths, mm7 and MM7, in the variable modes), Yavorsky places
them in this first group, probably because of the stability of the
tonic sonorities, that is, lacking tritones. Yavorsky's inconsisten-
cies in categorization emphasize one of the problems in his theory at
this point, which is the lack of correlation between methods of deriva-
tion and application. He later simplifies this categorization, basing
it only on formation rather than the resulting stability/instability
and consonance/dissonance, which, as we see, is not practical.

The other twenty-one modes in Group I, which make up a third
subgroup, are less stable still. They are created from the addition to
the major, minor, and augmented modes of one, two, or three half-stable systems, so named because only one of the two tones of the tritone in the half-stable system resolves (Example 18.5g). The other, nonresolving tone—called the half-stable tone and represented by a half-white, half-black pitch—agrees with one of the stable tones of the previously formed modes to which it is added. In their complete form these modes are consonant but only relatively stable. Because the resulting tonic sonority contains no tritones, even though the half-stable tone agrees with one of the stable tones of the mode, thereby reducing its stability, Yavorsky apparently considers these modes more stable than unstable, and thus includes them in the first group.

Yavorsky's Group II, modes containing an unstable tonic sonority, consists of just one mode, the diminished mode, formed from three double systems (Example 18.6a). Its tonic chord is a fully diminished seventh chord; therefore it contains tritones between the tones of the tonic sonority, causing it to be extremely unstable, in contrast to the modes in Group I, which lack this characteristic and are either completely stable or only relatively stable.

The seven modes of Group III, those containing an unstable and dissonant tonic sonority, all contain either one or two tritones among the intervals in the tonic sonority. Three are formed from single systems only (two or three), two from one double and two single systems, and two from two double and one single systems. Example 18.7 illustrates several examples of modes from the third group.
Example 18.6. Group II: diminished mode: a) complete version; b) three incomplete versions.

Example 18.7. Group III: a) mode with intervals of resolution a minor seventh apart (two tritones in tonic sonority); b) mode with intervals of resolution an augmented second and a diminished fourth apart (one tritone in tonic sonority); c) mode with intervals of resolution a perfect fifth apart (one tritone in tonic sonority).

Although Yavorsky identifies only thirty-five complete modes, in addition he identifies and illustrates twenty-two incomplete modes derived from the complete modes. So, for example, as shown in his letter to Taneev, the "natural" major scale is one type of incomplete mode derived from the full major mode. As with the other modes, a "harmonic" major mode—containing the altered tones of the double system D♯ and Ab instead of D-natural and A-natural—may also be de-
rived (see above, Example 18.5a). Each incomplete variant contains a complete tonic sonority, and a complete single tritone system; only the content of the unstable tones of the double systems is varied. Therefore, because the double system alone may contain five variants, four incomplete and one complete, each mode constructed from a double system theoretically also contains five variants, two in addition to the complete, natural, and harmonic variants. Such is the case with the major and minor modes. Modes constructed from two double systems, such as the first variable mode, could theoretically have twice that number, although in this case Yavorsky illustrates only the three basic ones, the complete, natural, and harmonic.

For the remaining modes, Yavorsky creates the variants differently. For the diminished and augmented modes, made up of three double and single tritone systems respectively, Yavorsky derives incomplete variants simply from the elimination of one of the systems; thus each has three incomplete views. Example 18.6b shows the three incomplete versions of the diminished mode, formed from the resulting combinations of two of its three double systems. However, for these incomplete variants Yavorsky includes complete tonic sonorities, even though as in the diminished mode the elimination of one of the outer systems would mean the elimination also of one of the pitches of the tonic sonority. So, in Example 18.6b, for the two incomplete diminished modes formed from one outer and the middle system, Yavorsky adds the missing tonic pitch, either the C or the D#, to make a complete tonic sonority. For the modes of Group III, in which Yavorsky also forms the incomplete
variants through the elimination of one of the systems, he allows the tonic sonority to remain incomplete as well. In some cases (Example 18.7a) this also alters the tritone content of the tonic sonority, but Yavorsky does not comment on this occurrence. These inconsistencies unfortunately undermine Yavorsky's arguments for his system, which, in order to be accepted as a system, should have a certain degree of consistency and logic, otherwise it will not be accepted.

All the modes are transposeable and theoretically may occur on any of the twelve pitches of the chromatic scale. To designate modes that occur on a specific pitch, Yavorsky initiated the term "modal-tonality," a very useful term which was readily adopted and is today used widely in Soviet music theory. Some modes, however, because of their intervallic construction, may be transposed only a limited number of times. This is just one element of commonality between Yavorsky's modes and Messiaen's modes of limited transposition.

Yavorsky limits his interpretation of the historical development of the use of mode to the nineteenth century and later. He identifies most of his modes as the basic modes of folk song. Liszt, along with Chopin, Wagner, Grieg, Saint-Saens, and Debussy, according to Yavorsky, developed the use of harmonic major and minor and introduced both augmented and diminished modes, as well as modes with dissonant tonics such as variable modes. Glinka initiated this modal expansion in Russia, but Yavorsky credits Rimsky-Korsakov and Scriabin with consciously continuing Liszt's approach. Scriabin's works in particular "testify that music flows more and more into new sound spheres in which
occur new powerful phases of its development, for which the entire preceding period was only preparatory."

Yavorsky devotes a large portion of the text to a catalogue of vertical and horizontal constructions within several of the modes, specifically, major, minor, and augmented. The one principle governing the formation of vertical sonorities concerns the use of conjunct tones, which may not sound simultaneously; to do so would destroy the sense of gravitational pull between them. The sonorities for the natural major and minor modes are illustrated in Example 18.8. The six groups within each mode reflect the increasing relative instability of the sonorities, from I (least unstable) to VI (most unstable). The column of sonorities labeled "S" contains the subdominant sonorities. They are determined by the presence in them of 6, which Yavorsky calls—the first time this tone has been so recognized—the subdominant leading tone. The column of sonorities labeled "D" contains the dominant sonorities, which are determined by the presence in them of the VII degree, the dominant leading tone. The three columns of sonorities labeled DS illustrate the joined sonorities, determined by the presence in them of both 6 and 7. However, the sonorities in the first group contain no leading tones, only tones from the "inverse conjunction," that is, the unstable tones linked not to the stable tones present in the sonority, but to the missing stable tone.

Yavorsky also illustrates just the triads from the major and minor modes according to their tertiary composition within tonic, dominant and subdominant functional groups and according to their increasing insta—
Example 18.3. Vertical sonorities in the natural modes of C major and A minor. I = least unstable; VI = most unstable.
bility (Example 18.9). The fewer the number of tonic pitches in the triad, the more unstable it is. The direction of the arrows in Example 18.9 indicate the direction of increasing instability. According to this view, though, the supertonic, for example, is as unstable as the subtonic or leading tone triad, a position that does not reflect their differing intervallic structures, which in traditional theory greatly affects their relative instability.

Each mode exhibits a definite but limited hierarchy, expressed through the combination of systems to create "a system of a higher order." Within each mode the constituent systems and tones are ranked according to stability and instability and further according to the degree of clarity of the unstable tones. Each tone within the mode maintains a definite role within that mode, based on its gravitation (stable or unstable) and position (leading tone, conjunction, disjunction, or inverse conjunction) within the originating system. Within each system each unstable tone resolves to and is irretrievably linked with a particular stable tone; this forms a "conjunction." Within each mode, however, frequently there occur stable tones that become linked with more than one unstable tone, i.e., they act like "common tones," in standard theoretical terminology. Yavorsky originated the term "inverse conjunction" to refer to the phenomenon of two unstable tones linked, one ascending, one descending, with one common stable tone (Example 18.10b). Yavorsky borrowed the term "leading tone" from standard theory to denote one unstable tone linked to one stable tone that takes part in no other conjunction (Examples 18.10a
Example 18.9. Arrangement of triads from a) natural major and b) natural minor modes.

and 18.10c). Yavorsky's "leading tones" on 6 and 7 are of this type. In terms of clarity, then, the leading tones are the clearest (first D, then S), followed by the the inversely conjunctive tones (first D, then S). Each mode also expresses a gravitational equilibrium between the unstable and stable tones, which is expressed at each level save the lowest. This lowest level, which Yavorsky calls "modal moments," consists of the separate members of a conjunction, either the unstable or the stable tones on either side of the equilibrium "equation" (S, D, T, DD, SS, DS, etc.) (Examples 18.10a and c).

Example 18.10. Horizontal combinations: a) leading tone: "D"; b) "inverse conjunction"; c) leading tone: "D".
Thus, all the unstable tones within modes acquire the aspect of direction, of mobility, in that they aspire to a more stable tone. They take on a new element of purpose and function, which previous theorists attached primarily to the leading tone. All such unstable tones thus act somewhat like leading tones, even though Yavorsky designates only specific tones with this function.

In a strictly atemporal "sound" context, then, modal formation consists of moments--(tritones)--(tritones with resolutions)--systems--modes. However, Yavorsky considered the temporal element, in both music and speech, as important as the sound element. He says, "Sound in time [my emphasis--E.C.] is the material from which musical speech is created." Mode then is a musical phenomenon that exists in time as well as in space. It is horizontal and temporal as well as vertical and harmonic, and its content is revealed only through the passage of time. Therefore the temporal element becomes an integral key to the complete understanding of Yavorsky's theory of modal rhythm.

The metric-rhythmic aspect of mode is embodied on the lowest level in what Yavorsky terms "intonatsiia," or intonation, the monodic formation mentioned earlier. In phonetics this term refers to "the expressiveness of speech, the transmission of its thought and character," but in Yavorsky's theory "intonatsiia" becomes "the smallest basic sound form in time, . . . the juxtaposition of two sounds (or moments) of a tritonal system different in gravitation. . . . By its very origin intonatsiia is bipartite."

The two parts of this bipartite juxtaposition are called anacru-
sis, the part before the boundary, and ictus, the part after the boundary. This second part, the ictus, carries greater significance "by the definition of the logical significance of the intonation itself," that is, it determines the entire character—stable or unstable—of the intonation. Thus one can characterize his theory of intonation as retrospective, that is, the intonation is recognized only in retrospect. Yavorsky also admits the existence of a monpartite intonation, which may consist of one of more "moments" (S, D, T, etc.) of the same sound gravitation type (stable or unstable). A modal (or systemic) moment also forms each one of the halves—anacrusis and ictus—of a bipartite intonation. The bipartite intonation may be stable (+), in which an unstable sound is juxtaposed with and resolves into a stable sound (D/T, called "authentic" in single; S/T, "plagal" in double), or unstable (−), in which a stable sound is juxtaposed with and moves into—in what Yavorsky calls "an inverse resolution"—an unresolved unstable sound (T/D, called "half-authentic" in single; S/T, called "half-plagal" in double).

Yavorsky identifies six basic types of bipartite intonations, depending on the linkage and systemic origin of the participating moments. The tones within the intonation may be either linked tones (conjunction) in the same system, unlinked tones (disjunction) within the same system, or each from different systems (therefore also unlinked). These combinations make up the three types of "simple" intonations. Various consecutive combinations of "derived" combinations—complex, compound, and mixed—are also possible. Within one single
tritone system (Example 18.11a), three types of bipartite intonations, two "simple" and one "derived," are possible: 1) an authentic, linked intonation (Example 18.11b-1); 2) an authentic unlinked intonation (Example 18.11b-2), and 3) a "complex intonation," which is formed from the combination of two or more simple intonations of one type (either stable or unstable) from one system (Example 18.11b-3).

Example 18.11. a) Single tritone system; and b) intonations constructed from it: 1) an authentic linked intonation; 2) an authentic unlinked intonation; 3) a complex intonation, formed from the combination of two or more simple intonations of one type from one system.

In the example, the curved line encompasses the length of the intonation; the bar line marks the boundary between the anacrusis and the iocus.

Using two different systems, such as the single tritone system and the natural double tritone system from the natural major mode (Example 18.12a), three types of intonations between systems ("intersystemic" intonations), one "simple" and two "derived," are possible: 1) a half-authentic, unstable (-), intersystemic, simple intonation (Example
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18.12b-1); 2) a "compound intonation" (in this case stable: +), which combines intonations of the same type from different systems (Example 18.12b-2); and 3) a "mixed intonation" (here, an unstable one: -), which combines intonations of different types from different systems (Example 18.12b-3). In The Construction of Musical Speech, Yavorsky catalogues in great detail, as with the harmonies, the myriad possibilities for simple intonations within the single and double systems and for complex intonations within the more common incomplete types of the major and minor modes (the natural and harmonic major modes, and the harmonic minor mode). This whole idea of "linkage," which Yavorsky applies in both modal and temporal aspects, may be considered an extension of Fétis's realization of the significance of the leading tone in tonal resolution. Recall that Hunke was also influenced by the resolving properties of the leading tone in his explanation of chord resolution and progression. Yavorsky continued to develop this promising line of thought, which I will discuss in Part VI.

The "derived intonations," the complex, compound, and mixed types, are formed from the consecutive or horizontal combination of intonations. The simultaneous or vertical combination of simple intonations occurring in several voices—chord progressions—results in the formation of progressions of modal sonorities that Yavorsky labels collectively a "turn" [oborot]. Essentially, a turn may be likened to a cadence, and this is in fact what Yavorsky calls them under certain circumstances. Like a cadence, a turn embodies a change in harmonic function; but unlike a cadence, its placement is not restricted.
Example 18.12. a) A single tritone system and the natural double tritone system from the natural major mode; b) the three types of intersystemic intonations: 1) half-authentic, unstable, simple intersystemic intonation; 2) "compound intonation"; and 3) "mixed intonation."

Within the major and minor modes Yavorsky identifies three stable turns and twelve unstable turns, some of which he gives familiar cadential labels from standard theory. The stable turns include an "authentic" turn (D/T) (Example 18.13a), a "plagal" turn (S/T), and a "full" turn (DS/T). The tonic sonority takes part in only three of the unstable turns—"half-authentic" (T/D), "half-plagal" (T/S) (Example 18.13b), and "half-full" (T/DS). The remaining unstable turns consist of only unstable moments: the exchange of S and D ("half" turn, S/D: "interrupted" turn, D/S) (Example 18.13c), the exchange of S or D with a joined combination, and the joining of moments of just one gravitation (subdominant turn: S/S; dominant turn: D/D; and joined turn: DS/DS). In his book of exercises (Uprazheniia), Yavorsky concentrates on the turns, their periodic construction (two-part, four-part or phrase), and higher-level constructions involving modulation, which he termed "confrontation" or "juxtaposition."
Example 18.13. Turns: a) authentic stable turn: D/T; b) half-plagal
unstable turn: T/S; c) "interrupted" unstable turn: D/S.

The temporal side of modal rhythm rests initially in the length of
the intonation or turn and of their component parts, down to each sound
or moment making up the anacrusis and the ictus (measurement, essen-
tially, which Yavorsky called meter) and in the relation between these
lengths, both within and between the anacrusis and the ictus (proportion,
which Yavorsky called rhythm). These concepts—measurement/
meter and proportion/rhythm—occur at all levels of a musical composi-
tion. The length of each component part is measured in metric pulses,
the smallest common divisor [multiple] of all metric units. The length
of this pulse may vary, but it generally equals the beat length, some-
times the division of the beat, depending on the meter. The intonation
itself corresponds in length to a human component—"the greatest and
smallest length of breathing and of unbroken consciousness." In
simultaneously combined bipartite intonations or turns, the beginning
of the ictus—the point of resolution, either straight or reverse—in all intonations should agree; it is determined modally. But intona-
tions in turns need not agree metrically; they may differ in length either between or within moments. The differing metric correlation between the moments of an intonation, together with the modal signifi-
cance of the moments in the ictus (stable or unstable), determines the character of the intonation. As Yavorsky puts it, "The stability or instability of the intonation acquires a more expressive character depending on the metric correlation of the anacrusis to the ictus."

In the same hierarchical manner that moments may be combined and juxtaposed to create, in a modal interpretation, systems that are then combined into modes, so then are moments—representing now both pitch and meter, the number of pulses—juxtaposed to created, in a melodic-
temporal interpretation, intonations that are then combined vertically into turns and horizontally into higher metric forms, all occurring within systems or modes. This process of juxtaposition, intonational and modal, continues until the complete form, what Yavorsky calls "the self-sufficient or connected whole," is manifested. Each level ex-
hibits a type of symmetrical arrangement based on the formal principle of "the equilibrium of cause with its effect, of action with its reac-
tion." A periodic juxtaposition or arrangement is also possible.
The resulting form, then, represents the combination of activity in all aspects, modal (encompassing all sounds both melodic and harmonic), and temporal (encompassing all rhythms and meters, proportion and length), from all levels beginning with the simplest and ending with the most
complex, from monopartite moments and intonations to the completed whole.

Yavorsky illustrates numerous varieties of possible combinations—periodic, symmetric, or other—of monopartite constructions (moments and monopartite intonations) and of bipartite constructions (intonations or turns). These varieties may be determined through harmonic content or through rhythmic or metric content. For example, combinations of turns may be symmetrical either harmonically (S/T D/T D/T S/T) or metrically (S/T S/T S/T S/T). One of the more interesting metric correlations involves what Yavorsky terms "juxtaposition with result" [sopostavlenie s rezultatom]: the juxtaposition of two turns resulting in a third, so that "metrically the result should be equal to the sum of the meters of the juxtaposed turns, [and] rhythmically [it] should be the relation of their rhythm." Two different manifestations of the "juxtaposition with result" are shown in Example 18.14. In each case, the sum of the metric lengths of the first two turns equals the sum of the metric lengths of the third turn.

If four moments are juxtaposed so that the two outer moments agree according to their modal significance—stable or unstable—and the two inner moments also agree according to their modal significance, and these four moments form a complete modal statement, then they make up "the symmetry of moments called phrase (sentence)." In essence, a phrase consists of two turns opposed by modal significance: T/D D/T, or T/S S/T, or S/T T/S, or D/T T/D. The stability of the phrase is determined by the stability of the final turn. Yavorsky labels this
Example 18.14. "Juxtaposition with result": a) $2 + 2 = 4$; b) $3 + 3 = 6$.

"turn the "cadence," and the first turn the "precadence"; "between them is found the dividing caesura of symmetry." From this phrase "standard," however, Yavorsky derives many varieties, and uses it also as a basis for higher-level symmetries—symmetries of turns or of phrases or of entire sections of forms. Sonata form, for example, is a symmetrical structure represented as T/D D/T, the exposition followed by the development (T/D), and the development preparation for the recapitulation followed by the recapitulation (D/T). In Yavorsky's usage a phrase symmetry may also be found in other metric-rhythmic forms, for example, the juxtaposition with result. As an example, he
supplies a case in which a four-moment phrase is juxtaposed with a two-moment turn, resulting in a three-moment complex turn (like a complex intonation but stated polyphonically) (Example 18.15).

![Diagram of musical notation](image)

Example 18.15: "Juxtaposition with result": four-moment phrase (symmetry) juxtaposed with a two-moment turn results in a three-moment complex turn: $4 + 2 = 6$.

This process of juxtaposition occurs not only between phrases or turns or other constructions within modes but also between modes, in which case it is similar to what we call modulation. Yavorsky defines a "juxtaposition of modes or tonalities" as "any progression of different modes or different tonalities of one mode." This juxtaposition may lead to a result, i.e., to a different mode or tonality, or to the simple predominance of one of the juxtaposed modes or tonalities. As earlier theorists had done with modulation, Yavorsky discusses both the relatedness of the juxtaposed modes or tonalities, and different types of juxtaposition. The relatedness of modes or tonalities is determined
by the presence or absence between their tonics of any unstable relations, i.e., tritones. The presence of tritones between tonics indicates that the modes or tonalities are unrelated, and that "their juxtaposition should attract a result resolving the received unsteadiness in the audible perception of form; moreover, the order of the juxtaposition in time defines the direction of the gravity." For example, the juxtaposition of G major followed by Db major gives an order of tones leading to the tonic A minor as result (Example 18.16a); but the juxtaposition of Db major followed by G major gives a different order leading to the tonic Eb minor as result (Example 18.16b). In this sense, both Yavorsky and Taneev accede to the tritone form-generating powers, i.e., its manifestation creates an implication that expects a subsequent realization. Yet their methods for calculating the realization differ, based on their respective systems. Taneev juxtaposes subdominant with dominant, or tonic with dominant of the dominant, i.e., between chords (or tonalities) a whole-step apart, in which the tritone relation is between the tonic pitch of one chord and the third of the other chord, whereas Yavorsky juxtaposes tonalities whose tonics are a tritone apart. For related modes or tonalities having no tritones between their tonics, a juxtaposition may lead either to a result or, because of the lack of the motion-generating tritone, to the predominance of one of the modes or tonalities. As to type, the juxtaposition may be either "connected" (only related tonalities) or "unconnected" (related or unrelated tonalities), cases that are similar to "gradual" or "sudden" modulation, respectively, in traditional theory.
Example 18.16. Order of juxtapositions: a) G major + Db major = A minor; b) Db major + G major = Eb minor.

The juxtaposition with its result may characterize entire forms:

"The juxtaposition and the metric-rhythmic modal result directly following from it make up one connected whole, filling an entire form limited by dividing caesuras." The juxtaposition takes the first half of the whole and the result the second half, the stability or instability of which determines the gravitational outcome of the whole. All the elements of the result itself—mode, rhythm, meter, etc.—are fully dependent on the elements of the confrontation. So, the mode of the result is the inevitable, expected issue of the juxtaposed modes or tonalities; the rhythm of the result should be equal to the correlation of the juxtaposed rhythms; and the meter, that is, the temporal length, is equal to the sum of the juxtaposed meters. If any of these elements of the result is incomplete, the form itself becomes incomplete. In this case the listener is compelled "to expect its completion in the further course of the work; if such completion is found in the last construction of the work, then it is called a coda. The juxtaposition itself is expressed most fully if all the sounds of the mode of
the result or at least all the instabilities of the result mode are given in it. For example, the juxtaposition Gm-Dm-Am-Fm-G♯m gives the full mode of C major (Example 18.17a), whereas the juxtaposition Dm-G♯m gives only the unstable tones indicating the direction of the gravity of those tones in the double system (Example 18.17b).

Example 18.17. Juxtapositions of modes or tonalities: a) giving the full mode of C major; b) giving only the instabilities of C major.

Another form of juxtaposition is the monopartite juxtaposition, in which only one mode, which takes up the first half, is, as it were, juxtaposed with its result in the second half. A symmetrical juxtaposition of modes is also possible, as in sonata form (T/D D/T).

Yavorsky devotes much of Parts I and II of The Construction of Musical Speech to a straightforward presentation of his theory and to illustrative catalogues of the modes and their possible sonorities and intonations. In these portions, he includes no examples from the musical literature. The book of exercises is also straightforward in the same manner, with many examples but, again, none from the musical
literature. For any concrete examples of the application of his theory, we must turn to the second section of Part III of Construction, in which he departs from this strict theoretical exposition of his approach and devotes the discussion to two topics—a historical overview of the development of modal thought, and his assessment of numerous "errors" in the modal thought of past music. He enumerates twenty-nine errors in all—eighteen errors in mode, five errors in intonation, and six errors in meter. Here he utilizes examples from the literature.

In general, as did his predecessor Odoevsky, Yavorsky disparages developments in the traditional, "scholastic" theory of music, considering them to have hampered "the natural development of musical consciousness." In his view only Bach in the eighteenth century and Chopin and Liszt and their followers in the nineteenth century exhibited any aspirations towards "the creation of the logically correct fulfillment of modal content"; this occurred in Bach's use of the chorales, and in the influence on Chopin and Liszt of folk music, which regarding scholastic theory is "'ignorant,' free as a bird, and to this day preserves the truth within itself."

As for the errors that arose from "the non-understanding of mode and the laws of its metric-rhythmic fulfillment," it is possible to mention here only a few. Errors in mode include the exclusive use of the incomplete natural major mode, and the "false conviction" that the first chord of a work was the tonic chord of the mode of the whole work, which caused either a discrepancy between the true mode of a work and the author's original intention, or a rather quick "modulation"—to
use, in Yavorsky's opinion, an expression of scholastic theory—away
from this initial "tonic" chord. Beethoven, Grieg, Chopin, Liszt, and
Rimsky-Korsakov indulged in this latter error, the discrepancy between
their intent and what turned out to be the true mode of a piece,
according to Yavorsky.

As an example of this discrepancy between the true mode and the
composer's intention, Yavorsky singles out the first movement of
Beethoven's Piano Sonata, Op. 57, which, he says, although it carries
the key signature of F minor, is in the first part a juxtaposition of
the key of F minor and Gb major, resulting in the key of Db major. He
adds, "In further, Beethoven persistently rotates around Db major,
giving it in the second movement in an exceptionally simple view, as a
result for the first movement." This juxtaposition is shown in
Example 18. For natural Db major, only the Eb is missing from the
combined tones of the tonic triads of F major and Gb major. However,
while such a juxtaposition with result looks possible in Yavorsky's
theory, it is disproved by the actual harmonic content of this move-
ment.

The key of Db major is significant in this movement but not to the
extent that Yavorsky would have us believe. It would be more to the
point to juxtapose Db major with C major to achieve F minor. A com-
bination of the tonic triads of those two keys would lack only the Bb of
the harmonic F minor mode. The Db functions most prominently as the
Neapolitan to the dominant of F minor. In the first movement, the key
of Db major appears in both the development and the coda, accompanying
a statement of the second theme (mm. 109–113 and 210–213). In both cases its purpose is similar—to lead back to the original key of F minor. In this sense it functions in the capacity of the Neapolitan, since it anticipates the entry of the dominant. In the development, the key of Db major is prepared by a lengthy section in Ab major, with hints of Db as a new temporary tonic but also as the subdominant of Ab major. In this appearance, the second theme in Db is restated first in Bb minor, and then in Gb major, after which a significant point on Db is again reached, but this time in conjunction with the leading tone diminished seventh chord in the tonic F minor. Here, although it can be viewed as part of the diminished seventh chord E–G–Bb–Db, it still acts more in the capacity of the Neapolitan or upper leading tone to the dominant in its thematic usage from the first theme (mm. 10 ff.). In the coda, the appearance of the second theme in Db major leads to more development, which again becomes a retransition preparing for the final return of tonic. Thus in both cases the Db, both harmonically and thematically, signals a return to tonic. Gb major functions as the lowered second (Neapolitan in a harmonic sense or perhaps Phrygian in a modal sense) of the tonic F minor, and, outside of its appearance in the first theme, it occurs in short sections in the development and the coda shortly after the segments in Db major (but not in the capacity of the tonic of the latter). The second theme in the exposition is, appropriately, in Ab major, which, although it may be analysed as the dominant of Db major, does not function as such until the development. The conflict between the tonic and its upper leading tone (Gb major,
the Neapolitan) in the first theme, and between the two key areas of the exposition, tonic and relative major, is won overwhelmingly in favor of the minor tonic, as the coda testifies, with its statements of both themes solely in F minor. The key of Db major, then, while one of the constructively significant keys in this movement and related strongly to both F minor (submediant), C major (Neapolitan), Gb major (dominant), and Ab major (subdominant), is certainly not the key of the movement. Because of its relation with each of the main keys stated in the exposition, Beethoven placed Db major in a prominent position in both developmental areas. The juxtaposition between F minor and Gb major is one of Yavorsky's non-tritone related juxtapositions in which the result is not a new key but the predominance of the stronger tonality. Interestingly, Felix Salzer's Schenkerian analysis of the development section of this movement gives prominence to Db as the Neapolitan to the dominant, from measure 109 to the beginning of the recapitulation (25 measures), which enters on a dominant pedal. But he differentiates between the key of Db major and Db as part of a diminished seventh chord, and sees the main significance of the development in the "tonal tension" created by "the bold and imaginative prolongation" of the incomplete neighbor note Db as the supporting bass of two different chords. However, he apportions the primary significance in the development to the prolongation of III, first minor, then major.

In terms of temporal weight, Yavorsky's conclusion also lacks merit. If the second movement is viewed as the result of the juxtaposition between F minor and Gb major of the first movement, then, ac-
cording to Yavorsky's own criterion for "juxtaposition with result," the two sections, "juxtaposition" and "result," should be metrically proportionate. But the two tonalities forming the "juxtaposition" are only metrically proportionate to the tonality in the "result" given the "proper" tempo for each. Furthermore, the tonalities in the first movement alone are disproportionate. The first movement (262 measures) contains roughly 120 measures in F minor (or related passing keys) and about eight measures in Gb major, for a total of 128 measures in 12/8 (divided into four groups of three) at a relatively fast tempo. The sections in Db major amount to eight measures for the second theme accompaniment and fifteen measures for the retransitional areas for a total of 23 measures. The second movement, a theme and variations all in Db major, has 97 measures in 2/4 at a relatively slow tempo. The pulses for the two movements, though, are fairly close, so that the temporal lengths of the measures in each movement could be similar, that is, the half-measure dotted-half note in the first movement may take approximately the same time as the half-measure quarter-note in the second movement depending on one's interpretation. Thus, the two measured segments, "juxtaposition" and "result," could approximate temporal equilibrium but only if the second movement is interpreted at a pace slower than that for the first movement. Adding the Db major sections from the first movement to the second movement would result in greater equilibrium, but this does not make musical sense. But the length of the Gb major section compared to the other two is too short for it to be considered on an equal basis, as a significant "juxtaposi-
tion." It is a significant "juxtaposition" both thematically and structurally to the tonic, as we have seen, but the "result" is not Db major but F minor. On a low level, juxtaposing just the first theme and its sequential statement with the result of Db major in the development would be 4 + 4, but it is impossible to get an eight-bar result. Therefore, even by the standards of his own system, Yavorsky's explanation lacks substantiation.

Example 18.18. "Juxtaposition" of tonic triads of F minor and Gb major, leading to the "result" of Db major.

The six metric "errors" concern metric displacement, metric incompatibility between the anacrusis and the iotus, and non-symmetry within a particular form. Beethoven's Pathétique Sonata, Op. 13 in C minor, provides an example of metric displacement, in which the lengths and boundaries of the measures as Beethoven wrote them do not correspond to the lengths and boundaries of the component parts according to Yavorsky's theory of modal rhythm. To illustrate his point, Yavorsky regroups the first four bars of the first movement so that the unstable
portions are separated from the stable portions with "boundaries," or bar lines. This regrouping creates three bars of four beats each and two bars of two beats each, plus the "pick-up" of two bars. He also doubles the length of the last two bars of measure four of the original. As a result, each of the four quarter-note suspensions (mm. 1–4) and the F "resolution" chord from the third beat of measure 4 fall onto the first beat of the bar, the latter thus lasting as long as the suspension chords, and the final dominant preparation, the Bb in the bass, is doubly emphasized (Example 18.19). Yavorsky's rewriting of Beethoven's music serves not as an end, to prove the great master did not know how to write his music correctly, but as a means—an illustration of how the tenets of modal rhythm may be utilized and the benefits resulting from this use. It differs greatly in both purpose and result from Conus's attempts to rewrite music according to his theoretical approach, as we shall see in Part VI.

For non-symmetry within a particular form, Yavorsky points to the Minuet from Beethoven's Piano Sonata, Op. 2, No. 1. Counting the number of quarter-notes in each section of what he calls sonata form—but which is actually a rounded binary form—he concludes that the stability of this movement is based not on the unequal equilibrium between the exposition and development (-72) and the recapitulation with its preparation (+48), but on the periodicity of the stability of the main part of the exposition plus the recapitulation with its preceding preparation (+60) and the instability of the secondary and concluding parts of the exposition plus the development (-60). However
Example 18.19. Beethoven, Pathétique Sonata, Op. 13, C minor, first movement, mm. 1–4: a) as Beethoven wrote it; b) as Yavorsky interpreted it.

Logical this approach may appear, it smacks of Conus’s metrotechtonic approach—counting pulses—and represents little of significance. Furthermore, it is not universally applicable. For instance, when applied to a large form such as the first movement of Beethoven’s Third Symphony, Op. 55, there occurs within the second (i.e., Yavorsky’s) method of calculation a far greater discrepancy between the stable and unstable sections, with the former far outnumbering the latter (counting measures: +390/−301), than the first method, in which the stable and
unstable sections are more equal in length (-337/+354). Unlike the
Beethoven Minuet, in both methods the stable portions outnumber the
unstable portions.

Despite the manifestation of all these "errors" in past music,
Yavorsky nonetheless marvels at those composers who were able to tran-
scend such an "artificial style," as he put it, and foresaw a time when
the inspiration from folk music would foster a "new epoch" in music,
which would be aided by a new era in music theory, or, rather, the
"science of music," as well:

The enumerated erroneous methods created a fabricated, artificial
style, superimposing by acoustical and school tradition its un-
healthy imprint on the inspiration of future composers. Therefore
in many examples it is necessary not to see in models how musical
speech should be stated, but to see how all the imperfections of
speech of very different composers of different times did not
prevent them from submitting, even if in a rough view, to the
invariable laws defining the manifestation of musical speech. The
contemporary period of compositional technique, beginning with the
appearance on the compositional field of persons, the hearing of
which was developed on folk songs, which they treated not as
"ethnographic" details, but as the true source of musical wisdom,
leads to perhaps a not-too-distant time, when free creation,
recognizing the laws of musical speech, is salted with the means
of folk creation and in its new free movement creates a new,
grandiose epoch of the revelation of the human spirit and promotes
new geniuses, the creation of which theory will be to help, and
not to hinder, changing from the "theory" of music into the
science of music.41

Yavorsky's last sentence could be treated as a manifesto for contempo-
rary Soviet music composition, if one interprets "the laws of musical
speech" and "the science of music" as following the leading philoso-
phies of Soviet art, i.e., Marxism–Leninism and Socialist Realism.
Yavorsky further called for a new history of music, the history of the
origin and development of the construction of musical speech, which
would concentrate not on genre, biography, historical chronology, philosophical reasonings, etc., but on the growth of modal thought in all its aspects. Yavorsky himself was working on such a study involving Russian composers when he died.

**Evaluation.** Few Russian or Soviet theorists have matched Yavorsky in the sheer originality and breadth of his views. Yavorsky attempted to reflect in his theory the true nature of musical language in all its historical guises. Although he concentrated in his analyses upon more recent music, beginning with Beethoven, Chopin and Glinka, he believed that his theories were more widely applicable, since folk music has a history longer than that of classical music, and since the two have been interconnected at other times as well. However, his attempts to restructure all areas of theoretical thought and to substitute his new, comprehensive, all-embracing approach for the old "scholastic" theory fell short of his actual goal; but his views were directly influential in Russian theory until the 1930s. Even then, and continuing to the present time, many of his ideas still engender interesting theoretical approaches or analyses. And certain of his ideas have entered the mainstream of Russian music theory and remained there to this day. Boris Asafiev, whose theories are discussed in Part VI, Yuri Tiulin, whose theories are discussed in Part VII, and his student Varvara Dernova, still currently active, are among those who have transmitted or developed many of Yavorsky's ideas.

The most accessible aspect of his theory concerns the idea of mode
itself—his emphasis on it, his definition of it, and the various unique modal forms he derived. Although, as Yavorsky mentioned, Russian and other Slavonic composers had been using various modes in their music for many years, no theorist—Russian or foreign—had written extensively of their usage, or even bothered to mention all of them, much less attempt, as Yavorsky did, to provide a viable explanation for their origin, formation, and manifestation. Prior to Yavorsky, theorists either interpreted mode as a scale, as a particular order of tones, or concentrated on the chords produced by modes. As already noted herein, only occasionally did theorists mention in their pedagogical treatises the existence of such modes as the Hungarian scale or the whole-tone scale. Just Yavorsky's emphasis on mode itself, regardless of any specific formations, drawing attention to it and in effect raising it to an important level among theoretical topics for discussion and analysis, would have served sufficiently to create a place for him in the annals of Russian music theory. But his legacy is far greater. His "discovery" of new modes and his identification of known but infrequently-used modes helped to broaden the sphere of modal thought beyond the range of the hegemony of the major and minor modes. And he provided the foundation for the very idea and definition of mode used today in contemporary Soviet music theory. As one Soviet theorist puts it, "The general idea of mode accepted ... in Soviet musicology today, as a highly-organized, regulated law of a dynamic character, of solidly joining sounds and subtly differentiating them by significance, was worked out and introduced namely by Yavorsky." Additionally, his
method of relying on folk music as a viable source for theory applicable to serious composition—bridging the gap between folk and "regular" theory—follows the tradition begun by Odoevsky, Serov, Aron'ld, and Mel'gunov and has today almost become the rule rather than the exception in Soviet music theory.

Other aspects of Vavorsky's theory that became accepted into Soviet music theory include the idea of stability and instability and the separation of this concept from that of consonance and dissonance, the role of 6 as an indicator of subdominant function, the idea of variability, the approach to form as the embodiment of certain processive principles rather than as the fulfillment of particular models or schemes, and the division of form into its component parts according to the same principles. Also, his emphasis on harmonic functionalism, not just on the obvious use of the three main categories of tonic, dominant, and subdominant, but on the understanding of mode as a dynamic process involving opposing strengths, helped to emphasize this predominant line of harmonic and melodic theoretical thought in Russian and Soviet musicology. His recognition of the importance of the tritone, too, is significant as well—though not to the extent he assumed.

These positive aspects of Vavorsky's theory of modal rhythm were generally overlooked by his critics, who concentrated on the more negative elements. This criticism reached a pinnacle in the 1920s, and will be covered in Part VI. But during this pre-revolutionary period little was published on modal rhythm by anyone other than Vavorsky. In addition to writing and publishing, Vavorsky was busy teaching his
theory, conducting additional research, and gathering around him disciples, who helped to spread his theory in other schools and communities. Even so, modal rhythm was at this time probably not sufficiently known or well understood to generate much published commentary.

But the defects in Yavorsky's system are not minor; they in fact prevent it from becoming the all-embracing, universal theory that Yavorsky envisioned. For example, Yavorsky's very derivation of mode is questionable. The use of the tritone to generate instability is of course well-known, but the use of the tritone as the primordial genitor of music in all its embodiments runs counter to historical fact. We certainly cannot discount the significance of the tritone in other capacities; even the great Taneev was impressed with the generating capabilities of the tritone in the establishment of tonality on various levels. Russian composers beginning with Glinka had been fascinated with modes and harmonies encompassing the tritone—Glinka with the whole-tone mode, Rimsky-Korsakov with the octatonic mode, Musorgsky with tritone juxtapositions in works like Boris Godounov, and Scriabin with his overt use of tritone-related progressions and tonalities. Yavorsky must have been influenced by these developments, and found justification for its primacy in the words of Fétis. But he exaggerated its importance in modal generation and other areas. Even his student and follower Tsukkerman later admitted the impossibility of recognizing the tritone as the "initial instance" of modal formation; he more correctly considers it as "a manifestation of different factors of modal formation." In fact, he places in doubt Yavorsky's entire
foundation for the explanation of modal formation, but gives Yavorsky no less credit for discoveries resulting from this foundation: "Even if this discovery [of modes other than major and minor] was not made in the correct way, its significance is not destroyed. We will not forget that Columbus discovered America in the capacity of 'India'."

Yavorsky's rejection of what he called "scholastic" theory led him to regard such harmonic explanations as non-harmonic tones, particularly passing tones and neighbor notes, and accidental combinations of chords as anathemas, heresy against life itself, against the source of our collective musical consciousness—i.e., modes. But in fact, it is his failure to account for just such harmonic occurrences that contributes to the overall deficiencies of his system, which purports to be a total replacement theory for all previous theories. In his book, he includes few examples from the musical literature illustrating his approach; most past music was written from the incorrect point of view. Therefore, although he commends Chopin, Liszt, Rimsky-Korsakov, and Scriabine, he gives no concrete evidence of any similarities between the modes they used and the modes from his system. Nor are there any examples from folk music, from which he supposedly derived his principles. The temporal aspect of his theories usually receives less attention than the modal aspect, both in his book and elsewhere. But it is an essential element, though one not sufficiently developed in subsequent Soviet music theory. Corresponding approaches in the temporal sphere may be more easily found in Western theory in recent years—Cooper and Meyer's book, for example. To combine into one usable
system all three elements of music—melody, harmony, and rhythm—was an admirable goal, but unfortunately one not reached either by Yavorsky or his successors. However, Yavorsky's scope of attention continued to broaden in the post-revolutionary period; these additional developments will be discussed in Part VI.
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By the word meter, Yavorsky meant length: "The absolute length in time both of the entire musical speech and also all of its parts to its separate sounds inclusively" (Stroenie, Part I, p. 8). He derived this definition from what he believed to be the original significance of the word, related to measurement. By the word rhythm, Yavorsky meant proportion: "The correlation of the lengths of all the parts of a musical work to the correlation of separate sounds between themselves inclusively" (ibid).

Yavorsky writes:

Any idea is obtained from the juxtaposition (periodically or symmetrically) of the same or different conditions of one manifestation (for example, cold and hot, light and dark, stability and instability, great or small instability, etc.); this idea appears as the result of a previous juxtaposition, moreover joins all the parts of juxtaposition into one idea embracing all the characteristics of the juxtaposed phenomenon, that is, appears for them as the smallest multiple (Part III, section I, p. 4).
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Instead of the main theme in the tonic, though, Beethoven
substitutes the second theme in tonic, that is, in F minor, a marked
contrast to its appearance in the recapitulation in F major. This
singular statement of the second theme in tonic minor, the key in which
Beethoven ends the movement, serves to bring the movement to a close by
virtue of its being more stable and more closed than the first theme.
Beethoven "closes" it further by altering its ending to emphasize the
expectation of the cadence in tonic. The movement ends with final
closed fragments of the first theme.
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Measures are used as the unit of measurement.
First method:
+337 (exposition and development up to the transition)
−354 (retransition, recapitulation and coda)
Second method:
+390 (1st theme, retransition, recapitulation and coda)
−301 (2nd and concluding parts of exposition, development)

In the second method, the stable portions far outweigh the unstable
portions. This interpretation causes the coda to appear almost super-
fluous. But in the first method, the coda and retransition balance the
development section. In fact, this movement really is in five parts--
exposition, development, retransition, recapitulation, coda: 152 +
(185 + 60) + 159 + 135. This first two parts balance the last three.
(For verification such as this, Conus's metrotechtonic approach seems to
provide some help; yet it still does not explain why such a propor-
tion is necessary.)
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Chapter 19

1909-1917: Other Developments

During these pre-revolutionary years, the topic of the science of music, or music theory as some preferred to call it, continued to be examined by theorists directly—its definition, nature, methods, procedures, etc.—or applied in some fashion. The forums for such research were, as mentioned, the Music Theory Library Society, and several journals—The Russian Musical Newspaper, Music, and Musical Contemporary. One popular subject was the music of A. N. Scriabin, who wrote his most advanced compositions during this time. Theorists became fascinated, even somewhat obsessed, with attempts to explain his music according to theories often as mystical and unusual as the music itself. His music, in fact, inspired new theoretical vistas, some leading nowhere, but others, like Yavorsky's, continuing to be developed even today. Unfortunately, some of the misinterpretations in which theorists indulged at this time have persisted and are repeated as "fact" simply by virtue of their being printed as such (lacking any suitable alternatives). I speak here, of course, of the chordal approach to Scriabin's music, including the so-called "mystic" chord.
But interest in his music did help to spawn further investigations into acoustics as the basis for an expanded tonal vocabulary, a research trend that continued into the 1920s and, in one case, into the 1940s. In other directions, the formation of a folk- or peoples-based conservatory foreshadowed the socialist philosophy of the October Revolution, with repercussions for the study of music theory as well.

The People's Conservatory. In the wake of the general uprising of 1905–07 in Russia, which severely disrupted classes at the Moscow and St. Petersburg Conservatories, and created conflicts among the students, faculty, and directors, a Moscow People's Conservatory was organized. In both intent and structure, this new conservatory recalled the Free Music School of the late nineteenth century. Taneev had resigned from the Moscow Conservatory in protest; and both he and Yavorsky, as well as A. T. Grechaninov and Y. D. Engel, took part in the organization of the new conservatory. Yavorsky was the main compiler of the student plan of the conservatory. Taneev, Yavorsky, and Engel all taught there, as did A. B. Goldenveizer and N. Y. Briusova. The main goal of this People's Conservatory was to provide a general musical education to a larger and more diverse proportion of the population than could be served at the Moscow Conservatory. Besides giving a general musical and theoretical education, this new Conservatory stressed performance, both collective (choral) and individual (singing and instrument playing), and the study and performance of Russian folk song as well. Yavorsky taught theoretical subjects, choir, and piano,
and applied his theories in all three areas.

Another musician who took part in that organization was Alexander Leont'evich Maslov (1876-1914), a music journalist, folklorist, and teacher. From 1907 he taught courses in the theory of music at the People's Conservatory, and in 1909 published a book titled, Narodnaia konservatoriiia. Muzykal'no-teoreticheskii i obshcheobrazovatel'nyi kurs. Stat'i i lektsii [The people's conservatory. A musical-theoretical general-educational course. Articles and lectures]. Although Maslov is listed as the sole author of this work, which was primarily for self-study, it is possible to detect Yavorsky's influence, as in the heading for Chapter II, "Elements of musical speech and of musical form." Most of the book, though, is devoted to a very traditional presentation of the elements of form and of diatonic harmony.

This approach is somewhat surprising, considering not only Yavorsky's contribution but also the almost revolutionary slant of some of the statements given in the introduction, entitled "The sociological element in musical art." Here Maslov clarifies the ideological aims of the People's Conservatory. After establishing that "music is the instrument of social unity and agreement," Maslov states, "A very strong means for the development of several sides of the human spirit, namely the unity of the aspiration to perfection, a quickness of consideration, and many other qualities, is included in music." He continues, "If we trace the historical picture of the development of musical art, then we see that all the main moments of cultural self-consciousness and raisings in social life of the people coincided with
the development of folk poetry and music." He charts this "correspondence of the cultural-social movement with the progress in the sphere of art" in Russia, beginning with the two worlds of peasant art, "the despondant-happy native songs on the one side and the false classicism, then the romanticism of higher layers on the other side," and ending with the "mighty handful," who "opined folk treasures and pointed the way to a Russian musical art, advancing it to hitherto unheard-of heights among the art of our Western neighbors." He concludes:

And so, a whole row of facts show us how the musical art reacts to all prominent phenomena of social life and is found in a narrow dependency with it. Now to us it is not surprising that prominent musicians and composers of Moscow and Petersburg in their petition of fall 1904 on the occasion of political freedoms declared: "if life is not free, then art may not also be free, since feeling is only part of life." In these words the connection between art and life is established clearly and simply, and from these words it is clearly evident that social slavery impedes and hinders the development of noble feelings and detains the high flight of musical art.

Maslov contrasts the primitive art of the people, which can be performed by anyone, with the "bourgeois" art in the cities, which requires professional artists. This dichotomy results from class subdivisions and capitalism. The latter type of art is nothing more than a "chaos of sounds" to many who do not understand it; in order for this art to be more accessible to the people, it is consequently the task of the institutions of music education to widen "the dimensions of music education so that anyone may consciously hear any musical work and by a measure of strength perform it individually or in huge choral masses." The idea of music as a tool for social reform and the betterment of mankind reflects the socialist leanings of Maslov and the others in-
volved. Thus a redress of musical history—the inclusion of the "daily primitive" folk music as well as the "bourgeois festive" professional music, the "two views of musical art"—involved the promotion of folk music to a status equal to that of professional music. Emphasis was placed upon the development of the ear, the ability to listen and analyze aurally, on analysis (melodic, harmonic, rhythmic, and formal), and on performance. In the Soviet era, or, more correctly, the Stalinist era, this line of thought was turned into a dictum to the composers to write music that everyone would understand; the emphasis was shifted from the institutions to the composers themselves.

To fulfill this goal, Maslov stresses the importance of musical training, particularly the development of hearing, from a child's early years. Because music is so intimately connected with life, sensitive training in this area is beneficial, "in contrast to the injurious mechanical construction. . . . Less technique and more understanding and a thoughtful relationship is better." Thus, his book is not difficult or complex. He concentrates only on diatonic harmony, using simple examples he probably composed himself, and for melodic examples, obviously stressing the folk origin of music, he quotes very simple folk-like melodies from the music of Baksirev, Rimsky-Korsakov, Chaikovsky, Weber, and Beethoven. This emphasis on folk music and on the folk origin of music, as well as the more "democratic"—i.e., socialist—approach to music education and the possibility to utilize his theories in some fashion, attracted Yavorsky to teach in this new conservatory. An understanding of its goals is important, too, for
similar goals surfaced after the 1917 revolution. Both topics, Yavorsky's theories, and the Soviet attitude towards music, music education, and music theory, will be discussed in Parts VI and VII.

The Science of Music. The works by Taneev and Yavorsky illustrate brilliantly the newer, more sophisticated, more speculative approaches in Russia to music theory, or the science of music as it was called during this period. In addition, the topic of musical science itself received special attention. References to the presence or lack of such an approach in Russia have been observed already in several early sources from this time, such as Riemann's Musiklexikon and Yavorsky's congratulatory letter to Taneev. Lacking any common approach or clear-cut methods for this new science, theorists devoted considerable space to various attempts to define it, determine its scope and methods, and to examine both its historical contribution and future potential. A wide range of views surfaced during the years 1910-1915.

The adoption of the term science of music, rather than the terms "theory of composition" or "music theory" with their applied connotations, reflected the interest of theorists in applying to musical research the methods and approaches borrowed from the natural sciences and from mathematics, and through their application discovering music's underlying laws, processes, structures, etc., as in the other sciences. Thus music came to be viewed for purposes of research either as a biological organism—picking up on the approach of organismism begun in the nineteenth century—or as a purely physical (acoustical) occur-
rence, as a mathematical phenomenon, as a psychological phenomenon, or as a sociological phenomenon. Even though Odoevsky, Serov and others in the nineteenth century had advocated the development of a musical science, only at this time were theorists attempting to define it and to uncover its limits, methods, goals, and subject matter within the context of Russian musical studies.

One of the first efforts in this direction was made by Nadezhda Yakovlevna Briusova, a follower of Yavorsky's, in a small brochure, Nauka o muzyke, eia istoricheskie puti i sovremennoe sostojanie [The science of music, its historical path and contemporary state]. Briusova defines the material and method of musical science in this manner:

[The act of] sounding, which gives an auditory touch to temporal forms, of such is the world of musical embodiment. The science of music researches this world, its nature, and its life. The results of scientific research should give exact knowledge about the laws that direct the sounding, temporal life of this world. The method of the science of music is the same as the method of all natural sciences that study the physical construction of whatever the world may be.8

Thus, music as an aspect of science was something that could be measured and understood exactly. For Briusova, Yavorsky had already revealed the true nature and essence of mode, thereby enriching the science of music. In this brochure, she traces the development of research into mode and expounds, in language derived from Yavorsky's theories, on the present state of knowledge about it.

While Briusova believed that the science of music had made great strides by 1910, based on Yavorsky's discoveries, other authors con-
ceed that it was still in its infancy. In 1912, the composer and writer Leonid Leonidovich Sabaneyev (1881–1968) wrote, "Essentially—musical science . . . really is just born." Like Briusova and Yavorsky, who considered that any previous science of music was encased in a "period of scholastic dogmatism," during which the essential questions of mode were ignored, Sabaneyev held a very low opinion of music science before his time. "Everything that previously existed was one continuous uncultured misunderstanding, musical sorcery . . . , the writing of prescriptions, devoid of any hint of system as a basic sign of a 'scientific' discipline." Theorists, he states, "were untalented people, musical failures, who did not have the more visible career of performer or composer." But if this is true, then how would he explain a talent like Taneev, who had successes in all three areas—theory, performance, and composition?

Sabaneyev's goal for music science is simple—to study musical "organisms." Yet he does not advocate the study of musical organisms as a biologist, say, would study organisms in nature; his approach relies too heavily on subjective elements. His methods are to study the given facts (how the facts are gathered he does not elaborate) and to evaluate those facts on the bases of taste, intuition, and musical understanding. Thus a music scholar judges partly on the basis of feelings and emotions, which are subjective and empirically-founded, whereas other scholars would be objective, their judgments based on verifiable facts and precise observations. Sabaneyev thus takes an intermediate stance between music as a science and as an art. He
likens the true music scholar to a "fully-armed researcher," with a full knowledge of music and physics, an ability to feel, an analytical mind, and the ability to generalize. In addition to ordering and reevaluating the past, this researcher must also discover new horizons, new possibilities. But Sabaneev saw little hope of progress for music science, since in his view such a researcher did not exist. (Nonetheless, he persevered in his own musical research!)

A third but completely negative view of the value of the science of music was expressed during this time by the composer and aesthetician Konstantin Romanovich Eiges, who wrote that in Germany, "the living spirit of music has died away and in its place exists 'the science of music;' instead of composers, [there are] musicologists, musical scholars, and bibliophiles." He describes the situation in Moscow as of 1913:

Lately in Moscow lectures about music have become popular. There has appeared among us a completely new type of musician, who is interested not so much in music as in the theory of music, and not so much in the theory of music (as a practical discipline) as in the natural scientific basis of the musical system and theory, with the questions "why?" and "from what?", without the answers to which (in his opinion) it is impossible to proceed to the study of music as art. . . . The manifestation of such musicologists in Russia, where music and musical creation are found in blossoming strength, is completely inopportune and may be understood only as an imitation.14

Eige's criticism stemmed from his beliefs that musical creation is a supernatural process, scientifically unexplainable, and that music— including its theory—was an art that should be kept separate from science. At this time in Russia, then, opinions supporting a range of views regarding music as a science or as an art or both may be found.
Eiges's view, fortunately for the future course of theoretical thought in Russia, was in the minority.

Each of these writers—Briusova, Sabaneev, and Eiges—discusses music science from the viewpoint of their personal biases. None offers an objective appraisal of the state of music science, nor do they attempt to solve any of its attendant problems. One who does, though, is the theorist and ethnomusicologist Viktor Mikhailovich Beliaev (1888–1968). In a series of short articles called "sketches" published in 1915, Beliaev discusses the interrelation between music theory and composition; the goals and methods of research in music theory; contemporary theorists; the relationships among theory, art, and science; and the scientific qualities of music theory. Beliaev defines music theory, a term he preferred to the nebulous "science of music" in its opposition to practice; in that sense it denotes the "objective observation" of musical creation. He also mentions several other incorrect interpretations of theory—as a "game of imagination" that attempts to influence practice rather than be derived from it; as a "universally recognized law" (in contrast to "hypothesis"), and as "supposition" (in contrast to "experiment").

The goal of research in music theory, according to Beliaev, is the elucidation and proof of the laws of musical creation; the order of the methods of research is observation, description, classification, the construction of hypotheses or suppositions, the confirmation with facts, and finally the establishment of laws. For the individual application of these methods, Beliaev uses the term "methodological
plan." As a model of the application in music research of such a plan, Beliaev could point to none save the "mathematical" plan of Taneev in his Movable Counterpoint in the Strict Style. He attributes the "lack of developed methods in music theory research" to "the relative youth of music theory, which, in spite of the antiquity of its origins, is at present in the infantile period of observation, of description, and of classification." As might be expected, he holds Taneev in the highest regard as a prominent representative of contemporary theoretical thought. He also values Prout for his descriptive and detailed analyses, and Riemann for his designation of tonal functions.

Beliaev did not believe in the ability of the science of music to "forecast," as did Briusova. In his view, that was the task of musical creation, which grows from theory and is eventually justified by theory, thus establishing a circle of interactivity between theory and creativity. To Beliaev, theory and composition comprise but two sides of the same coin. Music is an art, and its main element remains its spiritual nature. Consequently, theory is a part of art, not of science. Up to his time, the practice had been "to reject the scientific qualities of the theory of art and in particular of the theory of music and to be satisfied with theories having applied significance." Yet he saw danger in the move to replace the theory of music with the science of music, out of the fear that science would ignore the spiritual aspects of art:

Therefore one must consider the significant aspiration in our time to create a so-called "science of music" instead of the theory of music to be harmful and, fortunately, even impossible for our art. First of all, the limits of the "science of music," in the sense
of science as such, are so narrow and artificial, and second, ...
scientific research has completely different problems than artistic theoretical [research]. Let no one think, however, that this view rejects the participation of science in artistic theoretical research. Scientific discoveries and conclusions also have value for art, but their significance in this case is secondary—they are only the material, which artistic creation uses.20

Like Sabaneev, then, Beliaev embraced a more moderate and realistic interpretation of the relationship between science and art and of the application of science within art than did Eiges, for example; but Beliaev's discussion of the subject is more penetrating and to the point, more convincing and more thorough than Sabaneev's. His views towards theory and its role in music scholarship, and towards the possible overly scientific approach to theory unfortunately did not always coincide with those of some of his contemporaries; and in subsequent years an overemphasis on music's scientific aspects at the expense of its special aesthetic properties did characterize the work of some theorists. But in the heady days of the 1920s, many new approaches were attempted and examined, if for no other reason than their novelty in an area that had no strong tradition outside of pedagogy.

Sabaneev and Avraamov: Ultrachromaticism. Apart from the attempts to define music science and discover its methods, much of the theoretical interest in the immediate prerevolutionary years centered on methods of analyzing the late music of Scriabin. Unfortunately, few of the many efforts directed at this problem brought forth fruitful results. One theorist who understood the harmonic language of Scriabin's music was Yavorsky, but many years passed before anyone applied his theories
properly to Scriabin's music. In the meantime theorists attempted to explain his music by a variety of pseudoscientific means.

Of these means, an acoustical explanation, whereby the notes of the so-called "mystic chord" (C-F♯-B♭-E-A-D) were said to be derived from the overtone series, specifically from partials 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, and 14 (or 7), gained the most notoriety. Sabaneev, the main author and propagandist for this view, put forth this explanation as early as 1910. His critics, though, quickly pointed out the tuning inconsistencies inherent in this view—that just one of these notes (partial 8, the octave) is found in equal temperament, and that the piano, Scriabin's main instrument for composing, was tuned in equal temperament. Sabaneev evasively answered that this chord, and the harmony of Scriabin in general, was consonant, but "only for those people who understand it." Since for the time being it was impossible to play Scriabin's music in the proper "acoustically correct" tuning, for lack of the proper instrument, one must listen to it while "correcting the mental defects of intonation." Thus, the burden fell on the listener, who had to make tuning corrections in his own mind, and who, if he considered the music to be dissonant, obviously did not understand it.

In later articles, Sabaneev expanded his acoustical interpretation of Scriabin's harmony to include a chordal approach, in which a central chord served both as the sole foundation for a piece of music and, drawing here from Scriabin's mysticism, as a symbol, an "astral body," of its psychological "secret look," which had to be comprehended before a full understanding of the musical work became possible. Building
on his interpretation of the "mystic chord" as made up of overtones, he also advocated the harmonic development of music following the "acoustical direction" of theoretical thought," i.e., the widening of the sphere of consonance through the inclusion of successive partial tones. He pointed out other historical directions of harmonic development as well, including voice leading, which caused accidental chords that eventually were considered consonant and independent, and mode, in which the harmony arose from an interaction of the tones of the mode. He did not give this latter, modal direction in theory—an oblique reference to the modal theories of Yavorsky—much scientific credence: "The acoustical direction still is more well-founded scientifically than the newer direction—modal."

The final stage of Sabaneev's theories was his theory of "ultrachromaticism." Ultrachromatic music was the music of the future; it lay outside the bounds of equal temperament, and necessitated its destruction. Ultrachromatic sounds, which required a new "polyphonic instrument" for their realization, so far existed only in the "creative imaginations of some people more progressive in this realization." In the overtone series, which Sabaneev called "the basic consonant harmony" for ultrachromatic music, there could be no dissonances, only degrees of consonance. Sabaneev predicted that ultrachromatic music would use harmonies united with tone colors, called "harmony-timbres," which would exist in three progressive orders of combinations of various overtone series. He foresaw the existence of a fifty-three-tone octave formed by joining the harmonic systems of these three orders.
Sabaneev believed that Scriabin in his music helped to pioneer ultrachromaticism. But Arseny Avraamov (1886–1944), who also embraced ultrachromatic music as the music of the future and proposed how to build an instrument for its realization, rejected the interpretation of Scriabin's music as ultrachromatic; he preferred Fétis's term "omnitonality." Omnitonality, which accepts equal temperament, is the antithesis of ultrachromaticism, which destroys equal temperament. In defense of his position, Avraamov pointed out the various ways in which Scriabin's music is rooted in the equal-tempered system—for example, Scriabin's careless enharmonic writing (which in truth is not so careless; see Chapter 30), his extensive composing for the tempered piano (over 90% of his output), and the incompatibility of his "mystic" chord with the upper overtones.

In response to Avraamov, Sabaneev replied that "all music is ultrachromatic. . . . The intention of every composer (of this I am convinced) is always ultrachromatic, . . . [and] every ear is ultrachromatic." He based his argument on the interpretation of ultrachromaticism as an aural-mental exercise founded only on one's intuition. He confessed that at this point he himself did not know the future path of ultrachromaticism, or even whether its tones would consist of the upper overtones. He did believe, however, that the first step towards the creation of a tonal language for ultrachromaticism was the creation of "natural ultrachromatic scales," which he imagined intuitively but not concretely:

And so my path is not from harmony, but from scales, which embrace and include harmony. This question demands an intuitively analy-
tical treatment, and I have to point out that a number of investigators (including that extremely profound and interesting theorist Yavorsky) altogether repudiate the priority of acoustic relations in the matter of the formation of scales.31

Yet this view reverses his earlier stance on the near exclusive role of harmony in ultrachromaticism, as in the harmony timbres. In his earliest writings on Scriabin's music, Sabaneev derives scales from the higher overtones. Here, though, he contradicts that approach: "It is my profound conviction, based on intuition, that the scale, as a scheme of tones on which the thought of the creator is projected, was not formed from overtones at all." 32

Ultimately, Sabaneev's theory of ultrachromaticism had no solid scientific or theoretical foundation. Perhaps the final word on Sabaneev and this aspect of Russian music theory came from Alexander Filipovich Samoilov, in his article, "Natural 'nya chisla v muzyke" [Natural numbers in music], concerning the acoustical qualities of 33 Scriabin's harmony. Although he thought Sabaneev's theory on the origin of Scriabin's harmonies in the overtone series to be interesting, he nevertheless pointed out the lack of evidence from the scientific literature on both acoustics and music history, and cautioned Sabaneev not to confuse timbre with harmony. Even so, he foresaw the development of new acoustical tuning systems, but only if derived from the intent of the composer, who was to create such music, which on the basis of our usual compromised tempered tuning, would transer our musical consciousness from the context of a modern harmonic tuning into the direction of a tuning with a large number of natural numbers. And the fact that Scriabin pulls us in the direction of new natural intervals facilitates the possibility of a step forward.34
Samoilov thus directed the attention away from the creation of instruments with pure tuning and left the matter up to the composers. But during the 1920s, numerous and varied scientific laboratory experiments regarding expanded tonal systems and the feasibility and use of such instruments by both composers and acoustical researchers were conducted. Sabaneev's efforts in this direction, then, however misguided, may be viewed as the initial steps in this growing area of interest, which reached its apogee in the 1920s.

Not all musical scholars advocated such radical ideas, though. Nicholas Kashkin in 1917 came out against the modernistic tendencies in composition and theory, and against Sabaneev's ideas of ultrachromaticism and expanded tonal systems in particular. As a countermeasure, he proposed the study and analysis of music beginning with Wagner's operas on a scientific theoretical basis, and the systematization of the results. The conclusions would then serve as guiding norms for further development, particularly of harmony. To accomplish this, he proposed the founding of a department of contemporary harmony. He advocated research into the bases of music science, including not only the study of the newest harmony, but also studies of melody, rhythm, and the criteria for the aesthetic evaluation of music. Being of Taneev's generation, Kashkin believed in the value of established practices and preferred to base future work on the tradition of the past, rather than breaking with those traditions. Ironically, his and Taneev's anti-modernistic views eventually triumphed in Soviet music theory, but not before a period of further experimentation had taken place.
Pedagogical Works. Numerous additional but less significant or innovative theory works also appeared during this period. These consist primarily of practical, pedagogical works that either continue or expand somewhat the nineteenth-century Russian textbook traditions. They include textbooks on elementary theory (ten), harmony (fourteen), and counterpoint (four); collections of harmony exercises (six); and other works (six), including a textbook on melody. This book, Teorii melodii [The theory of melody], by M. Popov-Platonov, is basically a primer for writing melody either freely or to a text, and contains discussions of three elements of melody—scale, meter, and rhythm. Notable are the illustrations of various unusual scales—gypsy, Eastern, pentatonic (Indo-Chinese)—along with the three variants of major and minor and the church modes. Among the more prolific authors of textbooks were Ladukhin, Aleksei Il'ich Puzyrevsky (who taught at the St. Petersburg Conservatory), Nikolai Nikolaevich Sokolovsky (who taught theory from 1906 at the Moscow Conservatory), Gregory L'vovich Liubomirsky (from Kiev), and Nikolai Feopemptovich Solov'ev (a professor at the St. Petersburg Conservatory). Many of their works resemble their counterparts from the nineteenth century. Others are more specialized, such as the works from the harmony category devoted exclusively to modulation, of which there were three.

One of these works on modulation is worthy of mention. In Postroenie moduliatsii na osnove rodstva stroev [The construction of modulation on the basis of the relatedness of keys], Vladimir Pavlovich Stepanov (1890–1954), provides not only a useful discussion and review
of all the different approaches, definitions, and methods of modulation, such as those introduced by Rimsky-Korsakov, Chaikovsky, and Ippolitov-Ivanov, but expanded Rimsky-Korsakov's approach to modulation through the relatedness of keys by applying to it the principle of functional chord substitution, advocated by both Taneev and Riemann. Distantly related chords substitute for nearly related chords with which they have a quintal or tertian relationship. Stepanov illustrates this "principle of the substitution of chords" with a diagram shown in Figure 19.1. He adds, "Chords, appearing to be remote from the given tonic triad and appearing to be without a sign of modulation, should be examined as chords substituting for the chord nearer to the given tonic. Such chords may mean only a change of triad." In other words, the tonalities in the "second cycle" of related keys are related to the main tonality through those keys in the first cycle; "second cycle" tonalities, then, are indirectly related to tonic.

Keys in the second cycle may substitute for the keys in the first cycle within the sphere of the tonic triad. Moreover, these second-cycle keys may combine with dissonant chords, which are related by common tones either to these keys or only to each other. Also, due to the principle of substitution, they can join these varied chords—Stepanov mentions "nonindependent, passing, artificial, accidental, mixed, chromatically-changed" chords—with the tonic chord and consequently "elucidate the idea of tonality." He illustrates this principle of chord substitution with a passage from Liadov's Op. 17, No. 10, shown in Example 19.1. In this passage the "triads D F A and Bb D F,
Figure 19.1. Stepanov's illustration of the principle of chord substitution in modulation.

related to the major dominant and the parallel tonic in the key of Bb minor, appear as substitutes for these chords." Retaining the term "false progression" because of its prevalence, Stepanov defines it as the combination of chords of a given key with substituting chords, and also as the combination of substituting chords with each other, which "opens a new richness of harmonic combinations and widens still more the sphere of tonality."

Concerning key relatedness itself, those keys represented by their tonic triads in the first cycle in Figure 19.1 are directly or most nearly related to a given key, those in the second cycle are indirectly

related, and the remaining five keys (in C major: Gb major, and Eb, Gb, Ab, and Db minor) are alien to the given key and therefore remotely related. This differs from Rimsky-Korsakov's degrees of relatedness by only one key, B major, which Stepanov includes in the second degree and Rimsky-Korsakov did not. In fact, Stepanov was most certainly influenced by the teachings of Rimsky-Korsakov, in his preferred techniques of modulation, his choice of terminology and scales, his emphasis on the modulatory plan—he called it "the guiding source, ... most necessary for the study of modulation"—and the idea of modulation based on the relatedness of keys. Stepanov himself studied only at
the Moscow Conservatory, which indicates that Rimsky-Korsakov's influence was not restricted solely to the St. Petersburg Conservatory. Taneev, for example, in his own work, enthusiastically promoted the use of the modulatory plan, and also utilized the principle of chord substitution, as we have seen. Thus Stepanov's book may be viewed as an exhaustive compilation of all the practices relating to modulation, both past and present, and as the first written statement in Russia of the principle of chord substitution, which had probably already been in use but not formally identified.
FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 19


2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., p. 4.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid., p. 5.

6. Ibid., p. 6.

7. (Moscow, 1901).

8. Nadezhda Briusova, Nauka o muzyke, eia istoricheskie puti i sovremennoe sostojanie [The science of music, its historical path and contemporary state], p. 1. Briusova originally read this material as a lecture at the Society of Free Aesthetics on November 11, 1909. It was first published in the journal Ves' [Libra], No. 10-11 (1909). Another lecture, Vremennoe i prostranstvennoe stroenie formy [The temporal and spatial construction of form], read on February 1, 1911, was published in Moscow the same year. Briusova (1881-1951), a fellow student of Yavorsky's at the Moscow Conservatory from where she graduated in piano in 1904, directed her later writings towards the topics of music education and folklore.


10. Briusova, Nauka o muzyke, p. 3.

K. Eiges, "Nauka o muzyke" [The science of music], Muzyka [Music], No. 154 (1913), p. 725.

Ibid., pp. 725-726.


Ibid., p. 190.

Beliaev later edited Taneev's manuscript, Uchenie o kanone [The doctrine of the canon] for posthumous publication in 1929. The works of both Prost and Riemann were influential in Russia at this time.


Ibid.

The musicologist Varvara Dernova, whose work Garmonia Skriabina was written during the late 1940s but not published until 1968.

Leonid Sabaneev, "Prometei" [Prometheus], Muzyka [Music], No. 1 (1910), pp. 5-10; and "Sovremennaya techeniia v muzykal'nom iskusstve" [Contemporary trends in musical art], Muzyka [Music], No. 2 (1910), pp. 38, 42; and No. 4-5 (1910), pp. 85-88.

Leonid Sabaneev, "Poslednii otvet" [The last answer], Muzyka, No. 20 (1911), p. 457. This article constituted the last in a series of exchanges in the pages of Muzyka between Sabaneev and Pavel Karasev, a composer and author, who became the first to question Sabaneev's views in print.

This chord was not always the so-called mystic chord of Prometheus, but often a "deformation" of that "synthetic" chord, caused by the raising or lowering of one or more of the partial tones. See Sabaneev, "Sed'maia sonata Skriabina" [The seventh sonata of Scriabine], Muzyka, No. 64 (1912), pp. 195-201. Later, Sabaneev derived these changes from the seventeenth and nineteenth partial tones.


Ibid.
27 Leonid Sabaneev, "Muzykal'nuye besedy, XXI. Ul'trakhromaticheskaja orientirovka" [Musical discussions, XXI. Ultrachromatic understanding], Muzyka, No. 121 (1913), p. 194.

28 Arseny Avraamov, "Smychkovyi polikhord" [The bowed polychord], Muzykal'nyi sovremennik [The musical contemporary], No. 3 (1915), pp. 44-52. Taneev, in the introduction to his Moveable Counterpoint in the Strict Style, discussed omnitonal harmony—the term (but not the definition) derived from Fétis—as that based on chromaticism rather than diatonicism. He disapproved of it because in his view it destroyed the logic of tonality and form, and contributed to the decline of the art of composition.

29 See Arseny Avraamov, "Ul'trakhromatism' ili 'omnitonal'nost'" ['Ultrachromaticism' or 'omnitonality'], Muzykal'nyi sovremennik [The musical contemporary], No. 4-5 (1916), pp. 157-168.

30 Leonid Sabaneev, "Ul'trakhromaticheskaja polemika" [The ultrachromatic dispute], Muzykal'nyi sovremennik, No. 6 (1916), p. 104.

31 Ibid.

32 Ibid., pp. 107-108.


34 Samoilov, p. 49.

35 Nikolai D. Kashkin, Muzyka i muzykal'naia nauka" [Music and musical science], Russkaia volia [Russian will], No. 10 (January 11, 1917). See also G. Glushchenko, N. D. Kashkin (Moscow, 1974).

36 M. Popov-Platonev, Teorii melodii (Moscow, 1913).

37 (Moscow, 1909).

38 Stepanov, pp. 11-12.

39 Ibid., p. 12.


41 Ibid., p. 66.
Summary to Part V

Thus within the span of a few years, major events in the development of Russian music theory changed it from a predominantly practical, pedagogical sphere into a speculative, scholarly one. Theorists and other music scholars took the first steps towards the recognition and establishment of a national music science. They collected source material, founded supporting societies, initiated training, issued publications, and in general encouraged and supported essential activity in the field. Two theorists in particular, Taneev and Yavorsky, by virtue of their original and innovative works, affixed the stamp of legitimacy on this new science and gave it much-needed "food for thought"—in Chaikovsky's words—and valuable impetus. In addition to writing seminal works that profoundly affected the respective fields of counterpoint and modal research and provided needed models for scholarly works, they contributed to the growth of music theory in other ways; they were at the forefront of the founding of new research-oriented societies and a new conservatory; they were active in pedagogy, thereby disseminating their ground-breaking ideas and approaches and supporting new generations of theorists; they encouraged the development of "the science of music"; and they each provided enhanced means for music
composition—Taneev with the rejuvenation of contrapuntal technique, and Yavorsky with the enrichment of modal language.

Such an evaluation does not diminish the contributions of other theorists and writers; but it does emphasize the unique positions and abilities of these two scholars. Their research, though, did not simply "happen." Our examination of the trends of Russian music theory before 1900 has shown us that they carried out their work within a basic framework of established traditions. The significant factors distinguishing their contributions were the sheer depth, breadth, and originality of their achievements. One can trace the emphasis on voice leading principles and attention to counterpoint, which I have characterized as the more "linear" approach of nineteenth-century Russian harmonic theory; both Taneev and Yavorsky fall under this line of thought. Although Yavorsky also emphasized the functional element in his theory of modal rhythm, this element is basically the result of the melodic or horizontal approach, beginning with the smallest element, intonation.

The subject of music science itself became a topic of study; theorists were interested in providing definitions, exploring limits, and establishing methods and procedures for the new discipline. Most theorists welcomed this change in emphasis from the pedagogy and practicality of the last century to the science and speculation of the new. This departure from past tradition echoed social and political events, which were soon to have results that would effect every aspect of life in Russia, including the new discipline of music science.
PART VI

MUSIC THEORY AFTER THE REVOLUTION:

EXPANSION AND EXPLORATION, 1917–1932
Introduction to Part VI

The October 1917 Revolution affected all areas of Russian life. The civil war that erupted in its aftermath brought such hardship and privation to the Russian people that a normal life was impossible. Already adversely affected by its involvement in World War I, Russia suffered even greater losses while most of its citizens became entangled in a struggle for political power. When the civil war finally ended in late 1920 with the Bolsheviks victorious, Russia's economy was in a state of collapse. A drought and subsequent famine during the years 1920–1922 had further disastrous results. Only through extraordinary measures such as agricultural and industrial reforms under the New Economic Policy was Lenin able to set the country back on the road to recovery.

During this time, music scholars were forced temporarily to suspend their work. Teaching and concert activities continued, but the publication of music journals and books ceased for the most part, due to a lack of means. Those organizations that had promoted research in music were dissolved, leaving no forums for the dissemination and exchange of scholarly views.

Only a handful of scholarly works appeared during the first several years, mainly in Petrograd, such as Boris Vladimirovich Asafiev's
collection of articles entitled Melos. Two volumes were produced in 1917 and 1918, the first containing five scholarly articles and six reports on musical life, the second containing five articles and two reports. Articles of theoretical interest include a rambling discourse on the nature and characteristics of rhythm by Sabaneev, and Samoilov's acoustical analysis of Scriabin's harmonic language using natural numbers. Other works include two collections published in 1919 containing the results of and reports on academic activity in Petrograd. Both contain articles, for example, by Jacques Handschin, who worked in Russia from 1909 to 1920, and by physicist V. Kovalenkov on acoustics.

Within a few years, though, the situation improved and scholarly activity in music resumed, soon growing to greater proportions than had ever before been achieved. Such growth became possible largely through the establishment of research institutes by the new government. Scholars enthusiastically joined these institutes, gave lectures and reports, and published their findings in bulletins, journals, and books. This activity continued unabated through the 1920s and early 1930s.

Because the research institutes played an essential role in the growth and development of music theory during this period, it is necessary to examine them in some detail, rather than concentrate on the results of their activities. Each institute exhibited a different emphasis and focus, and volume of output; their organization as well informs us about the attitude towards theorists and theoretical research during this time. Thus I devote the first chapter in this part to an examination of the institutes.
In the following chapters, I examine each of the important theorists of this period individually. In addition to Yavorsky, these theorists are Georgy Lvovich Catoire (1861-1926), Georgy Eduardovich Conus (1862-1933), Nikolai Alexandrovich Garbuzov (1880-1955), and Boris Vladimirovich Asafiev (1884-1949). Amid the proliferation of numerous diverse studies and approaches in music theory in the decade of the 1920s, by 1930 four main lines of theoretical thought had become prominent, each very different from the others and each based on the works and teachings of one theorist—Yavorsky's modal rhythm, Conus's metrotechtonicism, Garbuzov's multi-based theory of modes and chords, and Catoire's functional theories. Yet in spite of their unique approaches, these theorists were concerned with some of the same general topics. For example, Yavorsky and Garbuzov both examined the generation of mode and the resulting types of modes and chords. Catoire, and to a lesser extent Yavorsky and Garbuzov, concentrated on functional harmony. Catoire, Conus, and Yavorsky were all concerned with musical form, various types of formal symmetry, and metric groupings. A fifth line of thought came into prominence in 1930 with the publication of Asafiev's *Musical Form as a Process*. This important work, the culmination of Asafiev's distinguished and prolific musicological activity of the 1920s, greatly influenced Soviet theoretical thought, both through his approach to the processive side of form and through his theory of "intonatsiia" [intonation]. Also in 1930 Yavorsky's theories received a more systematic explication in Sergei Vladimirovich Protopopov's *Elementy stroeniia muzykal'noi rechi* [The elements of the
structure of musical speech], edited by Yavorsky. The works of these five theorists—Garbuzov, Catoire, Conus, Yavorsky, and Asafiev—essentially define the discipline of music theory during this period. In addition, Garbuzov and Asafiev each headed separate institutes and influenced the respective theoretical directions of these institutes through their own research.

This first period in Soviet music theory up to 1932 has been called by one Soviet theorist "a time of search and revision, a period of formation." This it was, but, more importantly, it was also a time of great flexibility and individual creation, as we will see—almost a "Golden Age in music theory," one that thrived on new ideas and new interpretations. Although in some quarters the newly adopted political ideology was influential, in others it was simply ignored. In the institutes and among most theorists, the topics and methods of research were chosen initially less on the basis of the development of ideology than on the basis of the diverse research interests theorists had developed prior to the revolution. This happened with Conus and Yavorsky, some of whose works we have already examined, and also with Garbuzov and Catoire, who formulated their interests before the revolution but published the results of their research only afterwards. Asafiev and others in Leningrad were more taken with the tenets and goals of Marxist philosophy, but overall the task of establishing a completely Marxist methodology and approach in Soviet theoretical musicology was not accomplished during this period.
FOOTNOTES FOR INTRODUCTION TO PART VI

1 Melos, ed. Igor Glebov [Boris Asafiev] and P. P. Suviainsky, 2 vol. (St. Petersburg, 1917-1918). Some of the articles include: L. Sabaneev, "Rit"m [Rhythm], 1:35-72; N. Briusova, "Dva puti muzykal'noi mysli (Shopin i Shkriabin)" [Two paths of musical thought (Chopin and Scriabin)], 1:73-77; Alexander Filippovich Samoilov, "Natural'nye chisla v muzyke (Po povody akusticheskikh osobennostei garmonii A. N. Shkriabin)" [Natural numbers in music (Concerning acoustical particularities of the harmony of A. N. Scriabin)], 2:3-49; A. Kastal'sky, "Prostoi iskusstvo i ego neprostye zadachi" [Simple art and its complex problems], 2:122-133; and I. Glebov, "Soblazny i preodoleniia" [Temptations and overcomings], 1:3-27; __________, "Vpechatleniia i mysli" [Impressions and thoughts], 1:78-100; __________, "Puti v budushchi" [The path to the future], 2:50-96; and __________, "N. A. Rimskii-Korsakov i vospominaniie o nem V. V. Yastrebstov" [N. A. Rimsky-Korsakov and memories about him of V. V. Yastrebstov], 2:142-159.

2 Zhak Gandshin [Jacques Handschin], "O zadachakh nauchno-teoreticheskoi sektii akademicheskogo podotdela" [Concerning the tasks of the scientific theoretical section of the academic subsection], Lad [Mode] (Petrograd, 1919); __________, "O namechalushchemia perevorote vo vzgliadakh na polifonicheskui muzyku XIV, XV i XVI vekov" [About the emerging upheaval in views towards polyphonic music of the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries], Izvestiia akademicheskogo podotdela Muzykal'noi otdeli N. K. P. [News of the academic subsection of the Musical section of N. K. P. (Narkompros)], 1 (Petrograd, 1919), 1-31; __________, "Lektsii 'Is istorii organa i organoi literatury,' prochitannye v muzykal'noi zale Konservatorii v aprele i mae 1919 g." [The lecture "From the history of the organ and organ literature," read in the music hall of the Conservatory in April and May, 1919], loc. cit., pp. 36-40; V. Kovalenkov, "O temperatsionnykh gamakh" [Concerning tempered scales], loc. cit., pp. 32-35; __________, "Lektsii 'Osnovy akustiki,' prochitannye v fizicheskom kabinete Solianogo Gorodka v aprele i mae 1919 g." [The lecture "Foundations of acoustics," read in the physics room of the Salt Center in April and May, 1919], loc. cit., pp. 41-54.
3 Boris Vladimirovich Asafiev, "Muzykal'naia forma kak protsess [Musical form as a process] (Leningrad, 1930). Volume 2, entitled Intonatsiia [Intonation], which Asafiev wrote during the war, was published in 1947.

Chapter 20

The Institutes

Introduction. Support for the many lectures, reports, publications and other research activities that were initiated in this era came largely from the various institutes, which were made possible through the organizational power and control over the arts by the new Bolshevik government. Already on the day after Lenin seized power in Petrograd, he appointed Anatol Lunacharsky as the head of the People's Commissariat of Public Education or NARKOMPROS [Narodnyi komissariat prosveshcheniia], and placed all the arts under his control. Eventually all the cultural institutions, including theaters, publishing firms, music schools, and libraries, were nationalized. The conservatories were promoted to the status of an institution of higher learning, or VUZ [Vyshee uchebnoe zavednie], and later reorganized.

During the early years of their existence, the various institutes underwent several reorganizations. For most of the 1920s the main institutes were GIMN (Gosudarstvennyi institut muzykal'noi nauki [The state institute of musical science]) and GAKhN (Gosudarstvennaia akademiia khoduzhestvennykh nauk [The state academy of arts sciences]) in Moscow, and RIII in Leningrad (Russkii institut istorii iskusstv
[The Russian institute of the history of the arts]) in Leningrad. The first, however, was the AK MUZO. In Narkompros, each of the arts was given a special subdivision; the music division, MUZO [muzykal'nyi otdel], established control over all areas of musical activity. In 1919 in Leningrad an academic subdivision (AK MUZO) was formed. A similar subdivision formed in Moscow in 1920 divided its activity into four areas of musical research—history, theory, experimental, and ethnography. In 1921 AK MUZO of the Moscow Narkompros absorbed the music sections of a defunct Moscow organization devoted to the promotion of proletarian culture PROLETKULT [Proletarskaia kul'tura], and formed three new subsections: a scientific theory subsection (headed by E. K. Rozenov), a scientific experimental subsection (Nikolai A. Garbuzov), and an ethnography subsection (V. A. Fedorov). The scientific theory subsection was further divided into two smaller sections—a theory methodology section (Georgy Conus), and a history and aesthetics section (L. Sabaneev).

Research was undertaken almost from the beginning. During the year 1920-21, for example, the Scholarly Council heard around forty lectures, nine of which were later accepted for possible publication. Among these, six addressed theoretical subjects, four on the same topic—new tonal systems. None of these lectures was ever published under the sponsorship of AK MUZO, however, for it soon ceased to exist. By fall, 1921, a new institute was being planned; the State Institute of Musical Science, or GIMN [Gosudarstvennyi institut muzykal'nyi nauki], was formally opened November 1, 1921.
The Early Years of GIMN. GIMN, according to its director Nikolai Garbuzov, was to be "a scholarly and scientific artistic institution, intended for the thorough development of musical scientific questions." Although it was devoted to the study of all aspects of musical science, theoretical research took a prominent place. Garbuzov himself was a theorist and composer with training in the natural sciences. Many of the theorists who had been members of the Musical Scientific Society and later of the Music Theory Library Society, such as Rozenov, Conus, P. Renchitsky, Eiges, Yavorsky, and Briusova, also joined the new institute; their research interests influenced the work of GIMN. Also, the extensive book and score collection of the Music Theory Library Society was placed at the disposal of GIMN. In 1925, though, it was transferred to the Moscow Conservatory, where it remains. Within GIMN were four permanent associations, each devoted to a separate aspect—theory, history, ethnography, and philosophy. The theory association included a number of temporary commissions devoted to separate problems such as timbre, architectural acoustics, mind perception, vocal methodology, musical endowments, new musical systems, and the legacy of Scriabin. Separate laboratories and workshops were also established. In addition to an acoustical laboratory headed by Garbuzov, a laboratory of metrotechtonic analysis of musical works, headed by Conus, was founded.

The work done by the commission on the development of new musical systems is of particular interest. Sparked by research from the last decade on this topic and by reports from Prague on the quarter-tone
works of Alois Haba, theorists considered new systems an important current theoretical topic. This interest reached its peak during the 1920s. Several systems were demonstrated at GIMN:

1) the natural overtone-undertone seventeen-degree modulatory system, presented by the chairman of the commission E. K. Rozenov, with a plan for a harmonium with three manuals and transpositional adaptations; 2) a moveable twenty-eight-degree, tertian-quintal modulatory system with a plan for a keyboard and a moveable roller for transposition; and 3) a fifty-three-degree equal-tempered system with a plan for a harmonium and a four-manual keyboard, presented by L. L. Sabaneev.

Other topics at GIMN included new means of musical nomenclature and notation, Yavorsky's theory of modal rhythm, Conus's theory of metrotechtonicism, musical logic, and acoustics. For future work, Sabaneev proposed to begin a scientific study of musical style using the "biometrical methods" of natural science. Thus, from the beginning, theoretical research at GIMN embraced a wide variety of topics.

The Founding of GAKhN. Also in Moscow in 1921, a research institute devoted to all the arts, the Russian (later State) Academy of Arts Sciences, or GAKhN [Gosudarstvennaia akademiia khudozhestvennykh nauk], was founded. Its music division opened January, 1922, with Sabaneev as head. The theorists who joined the Academy, generally the same as those in GIMN, studied various areas of music theory and acoustics, as well as aesthetics, history, psychology and physiology of musical perception, and artistic technique. A commission for the study of new scales was also formed. During its first year, from February to December 1922, eight members of the music division gave eleven lec-
tures; those by Conus and Briusova addressed questions of musical form and analysis, a topic singled out from other separate questions of music theory as meriting special consideration.

**GIMN After 1923.** In 1923 GIMN and GAKhN attempted a merger, which lasted only nine months. As a result of their subsequent break-up, both institutes underwent reorganization. GIMN's history and philosophy associations were given over to GAKhN, while GIMN retained the theory and ethnography associations. However, some theorists, including Yavorsky and his followers and Conus, chose to remain affiliated only with GAKhN. This failure to unite the two institutes successfully indicates a division among the scholars as to research methods and scope which continued throughout the decade. The secretary of GIMN describes how this changed the Institute:

Thus, the thorough and complete scope of musicology, which so advantageously distinguished GIMN from West European music research institutes, was violated. But, having lost its universal scope, GIMN used this circumstance to concentrate work in natural scientific and experimental methods.

The ethnography section of GIMN remained unchanged, and four new sections were created from the remaining theory association—a physics technical section (headed by Garbuzov, still GIMN's director), with commissions on acoustics and instrument studies; a physiology psychology section, with commissions on perception, musical endowments, and experimental aesthetics; and two experimental pedagogy sections on vocal and piano methodology. There were various subsidiary laboratories and workshops as before, minus Conus's metrotechtonic laboratory.
Much of the research in music theory in GIMN was now concentrated in the commission on acoustics. Garbuzov, also head of the commission, was interested primarily in the acoustical foundations of music theory; he believed that through the application of acoustics music theory could be made more exact and more contemporary. Besides Garbuzov's study, the commission on acoustics continued to develop and evaluate new tonal systems. Work was carried out by Rozenov, Pavel Leiberg, Renchitsky, and Avraamov. Over twenty lectures on new musical systems, including newly devised instruments and notation systems for them, were read at GIMN meetings.

Each researcher advocated a different system. Sabaneev continued to lecture on a fifty-three-degree equal-tempered system, which was obviously not the ultrachromatic system he had proposed earlier, since that system opposed equal temperament. Rozenov, who had earlier devised a seventeen-degree system, developed a nine-degree "harmonic" mode, with a pattern alternating both single and paired whole (W W) and half (H H) steps:

\[
\begin{align*}
C \quad Db \quad D \quad E \quad F \quad G \quad A \quad Bb \quad C \\
H \quad H \quad W \quad H \quad W \quad W \quad W
\end{align*}
\]

Renchitsky investigated quarter-tones, in addition to new methods of notation and nomenclature. Leiberg proposed a forty-one-degree tempered system and devised an instrument for it. Avraamov invented what he called the "Universal System of Tones," which contained forty-eight tones to the octave, a number Avraamov considered sufficient to reproduce all folk-song modes and "the timbral-harmonic complexes . . . familiar to inhabitants of industrial centers of production [i.e.,...
factories]." Concerning the tuning of all these new tonal systems, Garbuzov concluded:

The work of A. M. Avraamov, P. B. Leiberg, and E. K. Rozenov has conclusively shown that it is possible to solve the problem of the expansion and transformation of the tonal system only with the aid of some form of equal temperament (21- 41- 41- and 53-degree), [and] that pure tuning is technically unrealizable.15

The first public demonstration and concert of quarter-tone music in Moscow was given in 1927 by Georgy Rimsky-Korsakov, a grandson of the composer and chief exponent of this music in Leningrad.

Garbuzov's research in acoustics, the preliminary results of which he published in numerous separate articles, culminated in the formulation of a new method for the analysis and derivation of modes and chords, published in his two-volume work, Teoriiia mnogoosnovnosti ladov i sozvuchii [The theory of multi-based modes and chords]. He postulated the origin of modes and chords not just in one but in two or more overtone series related through the acoustical proximity of the fundamental tones of each series. His acoustically based approach to mode opposed Yavorsky's "psychologically" based approach to mode, and Garbuzov wrote several articles attempting to prove the fallibility of Yavorsky's theories from an acoustical point of view. This opposition of two such prominent theorists to each other's approaches undoubtedly contributed to the rift between GAKhN and GIMN, and led to further dissension within the discipline later in the decade.

The connection between acoustics and music theory continued to dominate research in the physics technical section throughout the remaining years of GIMN's existence (until 1931), owing to Garbuzov's...
interest in the topic. Plans for GIMN's final year, for example, included research topics directly related to his work. Topics related to music theory were also researched in the physiology psychology section. Researchers here, such as Ekaterina A. Maltseva and Sofia J. Beliaeva-Ekzempiarskaia, were influenced by the work on music psychology of Carl Stumpf, an honorary member of GIMN; they virtually initiated research on this topic in Russia. Their studies included the perception of various musical elements such as form, melody, and rhythm, and musical expression. Rozenov continued research on the golden section in music, a topic he first took up in the early 1900s for the Musical Scientific Society. He published the results of his later studies in 1925.

Theory Research at GAKhN. In the music section of GAKhN, following its break with GIMN in 1923, music theory continued to be important, especially since Yavorsky and Conus had elected to remain there exclusively. One of the three new subsections of the music section was devoted entirely to music theory. The other two subsections—music history and music psychology—gave attention to related aspects. Within the theory subsection three special commissions were created: music aesthetics (headed by Rozenov), metrotechtonic analysis (Conus), and the "biometrical" method of research (Sabaneev). In the biometrical method of research, Sabaneev attempted to calculate scientifically the characteristics of a given musical style through the determination of the frequency of the "type-elements," such as individual chords, harmo-
nomic density, tonal changes, etc.—a stylistic quantification of com-
positional elements, something more easily done today on the computer. Sabaneev's goal was to create a "Laboratory of the Exact Science of Music"; since "musical science is a type of natural science," the method of investigation should be similar: "the discovery and description of its laws." His approach here thus contradicts to some extent his earlier aesthetic distinction between music and the "other" sciences; perhaps this aspect would be called upon for application of the discovered "laws." Regardless, this commission lasted only until 1926, when Sabeneev emigrated.

The theory subsection proposed the following research topics for the year 1925–26: the structure of musical works, research into different musical systems, an explanation of the essence of revolutionary music, style, color hearing, and new currents in music. From 1925 to 1928, for example, lectures on such topics as modal analysis, revolutionary music, contemporary music, Kastalsky and folk polyphony, metrotechtonic analysis, atonality, bases for harmony, rhythmic perception, motivic analysis, and musical theoretical categories were presented.

In 1927–28, Rozenov nearly dominated the theory lectures with the presentation of ten chapters from his unpublished work, The Scientific Foundation of the Study of Harmony.

During this same period (1925–28), the various commissions and subgroups covered a wide range of topics. The Commission on Metrotechtonic Analysis undertook a study of all the sonatas and symphonies of Beethoven. The Commission on Music Aesthetics turned its attention to
questions of motivic variety and unity, the perception of musical symmetry, melodic and intervallic perception, rhythmic perception, and the emotional aspects in formal analysis. The Group for the Research of Mode, formed in 1927, focused on aspects of Yavorsky's theory of modal rhythm, for example, the psychology of modal perception and intonation (Yavorsky and Beliaeva-Ekzempliarskaia), modal aspects of folk song (Sergei Y. Protopopov), acoustics (G. Rimsky-Korsakov), and complex modes (Tsukkerman).

The Music Psychology Subsection investigated connections between psychology and music theory. Rozenov, in conjunction with his work in the Commission on Musical Aesthetics, carried out research on the perception of musical symmetry and of unity, and Yavorsky and Beliaeva-Ekzempliarskaia worked on the perception of mode and the principles of melodic construction and motion, the results of which were eventually published. In the Music History Subsection, music theory was studied as a historical phenomenon. Maria I. Medvedeva reported on the theories of Anton Reicha, and Beliaev prepared manuscripts of Taneiev for publication. A special commission for the editing of Taneiev's *Uchenie o kanone* was formed in 1926.

GAKhN's music section occasionally undertook joint research with other sections. For instance, in 1927 the music section and the sociology department of GAKhN formed a joint plan to investigate problems of musical form, contemporary musical creation and sociological bases, metrotechnic evidence of static elements in musical form, and the sociological basis of modal formation. Reports indicate that most of
the earlier musical sociological research was limited to music history, except for a lecture by Sabaneev given in 1924, "The Analysis of Sociological Elements of the Musical Phenomenon." In GAKhN's theory subsection, the only topic directly influenced by Marxist philosophy was that of revolutionary music, suggested and researched by Briusova. With this exception then, Marxist elements in theoretical research were rare during much of this period.

The Russian Association of Proletarian Musicians (RAPM). Much interest did exist in topics related to revolutionary or political philosophy in the Russian Association of Proletarian Musicians or RAPM, which encouraged a proletarian ideology that today is considered "vulgar" by the Soviets. This group opposed the musicological factions dedicated to contemporary music and promoted a simplistic style of music that would appeal to the masses. For example, in the article "Atonal'naia muzyka" [Atonal music], published in the RAPM journal Muzykal'naia nov [Musical virgin soil], G. L. Liubomirsky, the author of several theory textbooks, wrote that atonal music may be suitable for the specialists but not for the masses, who could not perceive atonal or illogical music. They required logical—hence tonal—music. Avraamov expressed similar sentiments: "Really 'healthy' logical music for workers should be written on the formula of the first problem in Rimsky-Korsakov's harmony textbook (I-IV-V-I)." Such an attitude was to create problems for theorists and musicologists in the late 1920s; and the dominance of the proletarian faction eventually
caused the Soviet government to dissolve this movement and instigate changes of great significance for all musicians in the early 1930s.

Research in Leningrad: GIII. In Leningrad, the Section of the Theory and History of Music, OTIM [Otdel' tehii i istorii muzyki], of the Russian (State) Institute for the History of the Arts, RIIM, later GIII [Russkii (Gosudarstvennyi) institut istorii iskusstv], which opened on February 19, 1920, emphasized the sociological and philosophical aspects of music history and theory. Initially, RIIM, which at first was little more than a central meeting place for musicians and scholars, lacked a unity of purpose and ideology. Despite Boris Asafiev's reconstruction of OTIM in 1921 after he was elected Dean, the divisiveness between those scholars who wished to continue their prerevolutionary work and those who wished to created a new sociologically based approach continued. Semyon L'vovich Ginzberg (1901–), a member of the Institute, describes the two lines of research:

- a line of prerevolutionary "scientific figurative" study of music (the predominance of biographers outside of sociological aspects, an idealistic speculative aesthetics of music, complete isolation from living music, etc.) and a line of new, concrete, and relevant musical science, connected with the questions and ideology of contemporaneity.

For example, the journal De Musica and then Muzykoznaniye [Musicology], OTIM's chronicle of its work from 1923 to 1928 edited by Asafiev, reflects a strong philosophical and speculative approach to music theory and history that could be interpreted as less than ideologically pure, if judged from the viewpoint of revolutionary Marxism.
Of its 43 articles, almost half were contributed by five scholars. Besides Asafiev (four articles) they include Georgii Mikhailovich Rimsky-Korsakov (1901–1965) (three), Roman Il'ich Gruber (1895–1962) (seven articles), Aleksei Vasil'evich Finagin (1890–1942) (five), and Ginzberg (two). The last three studied with Asafiev at RIII and graduated from there in music history in 1922. Fourteen of the articles are in the fields of music philosophy, aesthetics, and psychology, and include most of the articles by Asafiev, Gruber and Finagin.

Asafiev, in his 1925 article on the tasks facing contemporary Russian musicology, states the basic research problems of musicology as presented in the first issue of De Musica in 1923: "the theoretical cognitive value of music, the process of the design of the sounding matter, and musical embodiment," as well as "the basic position of the theory of musical historical knowledge" and "the foundation of the systematics of musical theoretical knowledge." His methods rely on approaches derived from dialectical materialism:

The study of concrete material; conclusions not on the basis of the opinion of taste, but on the foundation of observations of changes and processes of interrelations and connections of elements making up the given sounding fabric; a full break with the methods, deductions and theses of rationalistic aesthetics; a recognition of the principle of contrast (opposition) as the moving and designing strength in the dialectical process of thematic development and in the formation of musical form.

Thus, he advocates a material basis for music, emphasis on change and process and on interrelations and connections, form as a dialectical process, and a renunciation of rationalism. Further, music is to be studied as an important "physical, biological, and social factor," as a language, "as an everyday phenomenon, any manifestation of which should
be observed, described, recorded and summarized." As we will see, Asafiev's approach is more flexible in the interpretation of Marxist principles than the approach subsequently sanctioned.

Finagin, in his article on the systematics of musical theoretical knowledge, is far less oriented towards Marxism. He takes music theory out of its applied realm and places it in the speculative realm of philosophy. He traces the development of speculative theory from psychophysics, through the study of intonation and rhythm, up to the current phenomenological aesthetic approach, that is, from the knowledge of the psyche of the creator, to the aesthetic object, and finally to the realization of the perceived. This can be related to Asafiev's musical trilogy of composer--performer--listener (discussed in Chapter 25); but as Finagin presents his views as a general aesthetic argument rather than a Marxist one, it too lacks revolutionary fervor.

He states flatly that the studies of intonation and rhythm are the most important disciplines of musicology. He defines intonation as "that element of design, which directly influences the correlation of the psychic state of the creator and the outwardly sounding elements of musical form." In the study of intonation, he points out, musicology "on the one side borders on psychophysics, since in a similar vein the history of musical expressive methods is used, and on the other side, leads us to the theory of poetry, using the material of speech intonation." In other words, intonation is the expressive element of the physical sounds. He mentions Asafiev in connection with the study of intonation and--astonishingly--points to other studies as "approaching
the tasks of intonational character," such as Schoenberg's theory of
harmony, Yavorsky's theory of modal rhythm, and "the attempts to sys-
tematize the sound contemplation of Scriabin." None of these ap-
proaches, I might add, has subsequently been correlated with Asafiev's
concept of intonation. Finagin defines rhythm not as symmetry or
length of tones but as embracing the entire work, that is, the study of
rhythm "as the law of musical artistic intonation," and further as the
"law of the beautiful." In other words, rhythm is the expression of
intonation through musical form. Finagin, although heavily influenced
by Asafiev in his views, in this and other works still straddles the
fence between materialism and idealism. His approach is therefore not
ideological, but merely speculative.

Of the other 43 articles in De Musica and Muzykoznanie, ten are
devoted to the physical side of music—acoustics, microtones and new
notation methods, and electronic instruments. Fifteen articles are
concerned with topics from music history or organology. Four arti-
cles focus on the analysis of isolated elements in composition, such as
Rimsky-Korsakov's use of leitmotives (P. Grachev), Borodin's choice of
keys (S. Dianin), quartal harmonies (M. Machinsky), and the logic of
Bach's language (I. A. Braudo). Most of this "theoretical" research
came out of one of GIII's three sections, the section of musical lan-
guage headed by the theorist Anatolii K. Butskoi, which contained the
acoustical laboratory headed by Lev G. Nemirovsky. G. Rimsky-Korsakov
conducted research on quarter-tone music in this laboratory, directed
an ensemble of quarter-tone music from 1925 to 1932, and investigated
the acoustical properties of Yavorsky's theory of modal rhythm.

These articles do not reflect the sum total of the research undertaken at GIII, but they are very representative. It is interesting to note one unpublished contribution to the papers read at OTIM in 1925 by one I. M. Shilinger on the technique of homophonic writing and improvisation. This is the same Joseph Schillinger who in 1928 (after three years at GIII) emigrated to this country and advocated a mathematical, rational approach to composition, which he taught to many pupils.

Thus scholars in GIII undertook a variety of research, not all of which reflected a strict ideological application of Marxist principles. In 1927, though, a second reorganization resulted in a new plan that crystallized the guidelines and goals of the Institute more strongly in favor of Marxism. The new guidelines offered few compromises:

1) The work of MUZO [Music section] should be fully joined with musical contemporaneity and its proposed problems, both in the sphere of the theoretical thought of music, and also in the sphere of living musical practice. 2) Music itself in its sounding and movement should be the material and foundation of all research work of MUZO. 3) MUZO ... has no right ... to delve into the past for its own sake. 4) The examination of music as a sociological phenomenon should be the basic point of view of MUZO. Therefore, however attractive and interesting may be the independent development of a discipline that analyzes music as a physical, biological, or some other phenomenon, it may not have a place in MUZO. 5) As far as music ... is at the center of attention, no sectional sphere of musicology may conduct research in MUZO outside its connection with other research in MUZO. The complexity of the scientific approach must bring about a unity of objective. 6) Finally, the slogan of research practicality should be the basis of the work of MUZO, in order to have the possibility of concentrating on the urgent problems of contemporary musicology and musical society.

RIII, in other words, was moving in the direction of a Marxist musicology, stressing the collective, all-embracing, sociological, and
practical aspects of research, particularly of contemporary musical society. Point number four quoted above, the examination of music only as a sociological phenomenon, contradicts Asafiev's interpretation of the various factors of music and specifically excluded many theoretical approaches already taken by Russian theorists such as Sabaneev's "biometrical" approach, Yavorsky's theory of modal rhythm, and Conus's theory of metrotechtonicism. Partly as a result of these directives and partly as a result of the dearth of theoretical research in pre-revolutionary St. Petersburg, less research on theoretical topics was carried out at RIII than in the Moscow institutes. Leningrad musicologists concentrated instead on founding an ideologically-based philosophical guide for musicology in general. The guiding force and its most prominent theorist was its dean, Asafiev, who, as mentioned, published his theoretical views in the first volume of his monumental work, Musical Form as a Process, in 1930.

The Conservatories. Thus three institutes, GIMN and GAKhN in Moscow and GIII in Leningrad, provided for the continuing growth and development of Russian thought in music theory. Coupled with zealous enthusiasm from the music scholars, this support of scholarly activity resulted in numerous innovative studies. Garbuzov credited the success and versatility of post-revolutionary musical science to its connection with the natural sciences and to the new conditions of collective work coupled with the application of laboratory methods. The change in emphasis from a practical, applied music theory to a scholarly, specu-
lative musical science was accepted from the beginning; Finagin in one of his reports as secretary of OTIM points out that prerevolutionary musical science had "neither school, nor method," whereas after the revolution scholars consciously retreated "from purely teaching activity to the tasks of a scientific research character."

Nevertheless the study and cultivation of the more "practical" aspects of music and music theory were still considered important parts of musicology. Marxism in fact dictates the necessity for "practicality," as point number six in the quote above demonstrates. Accordingly, the conservatories also contributed to theoretical research through the teaching and publications of their professors, many of whom were also members of the institutes. In 1925 postgraduate departments of musicology were added to the conservatories as a result of the transfer of the teaching and training of musicologists from the institutes.

That same year the Moscow Conservatory began to publish its own journal, _Muzykal'noe obrazovanie_ [Music education], which during its existence (until 1930) included many theoretical articles, such as on the theories of Garbusov, Yavorsky, and Conus. Georgy Lvovich Catoire, a theory professor at the Moscow Conservatory who did not take part in the activities of the institutes, published his two-volume harmony textbook, _Teoreticheskii kurs garmonii_ [A theoretical course of harmony], in 1925-26. His theories on functional harmony, based on those of Riemann and Gevaert, influenced the future development of harmonic theory in the Soviet Union. Yury Nikolaevich Tiulin of the Leningrad Conservatory wrote a textbook on harmonic analysis based on
the Bach chorales in an effort to provide a more practical basis for theoretical work. Many of the theories recently developed or researched at the institutes were also used as bases for various courses at the conservatories. For example, during one year at the Moscow Conservatory, Catoire's functional theories, Conus's theory of metrotechtonicism, and Yavorsky's theory of modal rhythm (taught by Briusova) each received a separate course. Also at the Moscow Conservatory from 1925 to 1931 Ivan Petrovich Shishov (1888-1947) offered a course on melody, which was innovative in subject matter but derivative in method, as he based his approach on Conus's theory of metrotechtonicism.

1929-1932: A Critical Period. The years between 1929 and 1932 became critical ones for Soviet music theory and musicology in general. During this time the proletarian musical organization RAPM acquired almost total control over musical activities, resulting in the suppression of those not in agreement with their radical ideas. For example, no journals but those supervised by RAPM, such as Proletarskii muzykant [Proletarian musician], published 1929-32, and Za proletarskuiu muzyku [For proletarian music], published 1930-32, appeared. Muzyka i revoliutsiia [Music and revolution], begun in 1926, ceased publication in 1929 when its organization, an offshoot of RAPM, was dissolved; and Muzykal'noe obrazovanie [Musical education] stopped publication in 1930 as a direct result of the influence of the proletarian movement. Sovremmenaia muzyka [Contemporary music], the publication of the Moscow
Association for Contemporary Music (ACM), begun in 1924, also stopped publication in 1929. The institutes were also affected. In 1931, GIMN was liquidated. In 1929, GAKhN became GAIS, the State Academy of the Arts, which existed until 1932, when it apparently was transferred to Leningrad. To fill in the void, a Scientific Research Institute was established in 1932 at the Moscow Conservatory, and an acoustical laboratory, where Garbuzov worked, was founded in 1933. GIII remained in existence in Leningrad at least until 1930, when Asafiev stepped down as Dean. The current GIII was established in Moscow in 1944, with Asafiev again serving as the first director of the music section. The RAPM policy, advocating a simplistic approach to music aimed at the masses, naturally alienated many of the composers and musicologists, who preferred the more advanced contemporary trends and chafed under this dogmatic, inflexible authority.

The RAPM movement also focused attention on the philosophical aspects of music theory. Several theorists felt the effects of this increased politization and artistic subjugation. Garbuzov, for example, altered his theories substantially before publishing volume two of his *Multi-based Theory of Modes and Chords* in 1932. In 1930 and 1931, at a conference on modal rhythm and later during unannounced discussions in GAIS, Yavorsky endured a barrage of criticisms aimed at his theory, which forced him to resign from GAIS. And Asafiev turned away from musicology, apparently seeing little support for his views.

The internal quarrels between the proletarian and the more modern factions of the musical world ended, though, in April 1932, when the
resolution of the Communist Party's Central Committee "On the Reconst-
struction of Literary and Artistic Organizations" banned all proletar-
ian organizations, including those in music. A musicians' union, 
Soliuz sovetskikh kompozitorov [The union of Soviet composers], was 
formed, with the best composers and musicologists as its members. The 
following year the union began to publish a journal, Sovetskaia muzyka 
[Soviet music], the only journalistic forum for scholarly work in music 
both then and now. While the main musicological task of the Compo-
sers' Union, as stated in the first issue of Soviet Music, was to 
develop a Marxist-Leninist musicology, it also vowed to remain moder-
ate. But the new directives turned out to be no less dogmatic than 
those of RAPM. "Socialist Realism," adopted in 1934, became the watch-
word, and those who did not follow Marxist-Leninist philosophy were 
branded "formalists." Thus ended an era of freedom and enthusiasm in 
musical activity.
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Mikhail V. Ivanov-Boretsky, Piat let nauchnoi raboty gosudarstvennogo instituta muzykal'noi nauki (GIMN'a) 1921-26 [Five years of scientific work of the State Institute of Musical Science (GIMN) 1921-26] (Moscow, 1926), p. 15.
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double systems of B. Yavorsky], Muzykal'noe obrazovanie [Music
education], No. 1 (1930), pp. 18-22; and "Zavisit li garmonicheskoe
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tal research in the golden section in musical constructions in the light of the general analysis of form], Muzykal'noe obrazovanie [Music education], No. 2 (1930), pp. 24-33. A later study on the golden section by the acoustician and instrument expert Petr Nikolaevich Zimin (1890- ), "Zakon zolotogo sechenii v proizvedeniakh A. N. Skriabin" [The law of the golden section in the works of A. N. Scriabin], finished in 1941, was never published. A number of Rozenov's articles, including "Zakon zolotogo sechenii v poezii i muzyke" were recently published in E. K. Rozenov, Stat'i o muzyke [Articles about music], comp. with commentary by N. N. Sokolov (Moscow, 1982). See A. Novosel'skii, "Veteran muzykoznaniia" [A veteran of musicology], Sovetskaia Muzyka [Soviet music], No. 9 (1983), pp. 91-94.
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Leonid Sabaneev, "The Biometrical Method in its Application to the Question of the Study of Style," trans. S. W. Pring, Pro Musica Quarterly, 8, No. 11 (December 1927), 22. See Faubion Bowers,
Scriabin, 1 (Palo Alto: Kodansha International Ltd., 1969), 89–90, for a discussion of biometrical research as applied to Scriabin's music.

24 The titles for some of these lectures include: N. Briusova, "Modulatsionno-ladovy analiz 'Sbenty i Il'men-ozera' iz 'Sadko' Rimskogo-Korsakova" [A modulatory modal analysis of "Scenes at Il'men Lake" from Sadko by Rimsky-Korsakov] and "Revoliutsionnaya muzyka" [Revolutionary music], published in Muzykal'noe obrazovanie [Music education], No. 1–2 (1926); Viktor Beliaev, "Sovremennaya muzyka v Evrope" [Contemporary music in Europe] and "A. D. Kastalsky i ego russkai polifonial [A. D. Kastalsky and his Russian polyphony]; Georgy Conus, "O nezbylemnosti vremennykh osnov khudozhestvennoi muzykal'noi formy" [On the stableness of temporal bases of artistic musical form], "Ob absolutnom ravnovesii v muzykal'nom stroitel'stve i ob uklonennii ot nego" [On the absolute equality in musical organization and on a deviation from it], and "Priroda muzykal'nogo sintaksis" [The nature of musical syntax]; Pavel Leiberg, "Ob atonal'nosti" [On atonality]; E. K. Rozenov, "Kriticheskii analiz osnov uchenii o garmonii" [A critical analysis of the bases of the study of harmony] and "Muzykal'nyi ritm i svoistva ego vospriiatia" [Musical rhythm and the characteristics of its perception]; Sergei S. Skrebkov, "Analiz finala sonaty Betkhoven i Op. 31 No. 2 d moll" [An analysis of the finale of the Sonata of Beethoven, op. 31 no. 2 in d minor]; and A. F. Losev, "K vposroku o sistematike muzykal'no-teoreticheskikh kategorii" [On the question about the systematization of musical theoretical categories] (Aleksei A. Sidorov, "Muzykala naia Sektsia" [The musical section], Biulleteny GAKhn [Bulletins of GAKhn], No. 45 [1926], pp. 48–53; No. 6–7 [1927], pp. 46–50; No. 8–9 [1927–18], pp. 45–48; No. 10 [1928], pp. 40–44; No. 11 [1928], pp. 48–51).
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33 G. L. Liubomirsky, "Atonal'naia muzika" [Atonal music], Muzikal'naia nov [Musical virgin soil], No. 6-7 (1924), p. 12.
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These articles include: Igor Glebov [Boris Asafiev], "Tsennost' muzyki" [The value of music], *De Musica* (Petrograd, 1923), pp. 5-34; Boris Asafiev, "Sovremennoe russkoe muzykoznanie i ego istoricheskie zadachi" [Contemporary Russian musicology and its historical problems], *De Musica*, 1 (1925), 5-27; Roman I'lich Gruber, "Problem muzykal'nogo voploshcheniia" [The problem of musical embodiment], *De Musica* (Petrograd, 1923), 35-110; ________, "Ustanovka muzykal'no-khudozhnoi poniatii v sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoi plokosti" [The tenets of musical artistic understanding in social economic spheres], *De Musica*, 1 (1925), 28-51; ________, "O muzykal'noi kritike, kak predmete teoreticheskogo i istoricheskogo izuchenii" [On musical criticism, as a subject of theoretical and historical study], *De Musica*, 2 (1926), 43-59; ________, "O formal'nom metode v muzykoznanii" [On "the formal method in musicology"], *De Musica*, 3 (1927), 39-53; ________, "O vozmozhnosti i predelakh ispol'zovaniia v muzykoznanii ekonomicheskikh kategorii" [About the possibilities and limits of the use in musicology of economic categories], *Muzykoznanie*, 4 (1928); ________, "Iz oblasti izuchenii muzykal'noi kul'tury sovremennosti" [From the sphere of the study of musical culture of contemporaneity], *Muzykoznanie*, 4 (1928); Boris Zotov [Aleksii Vasil'evich Finagin], "Problema formy v muzyke" [The problem of form in music], *De Musica* (Petrograd, 1923), pp. 111-143; Aleksii Vasil'evich Finagin, "Sistematika muzykal'noto-theoreticheskikh znani" [The systematics of musical theoretical knowledge], *De Musica* (Petrograd, 1923), pp. 182-191; ________, "Forma kak tselostnoe poniatie" [Form as an unified ideal], *De Musica*, 1 (1925), 79-90; Semen L'vovich Ginzberg, "Osnovoploshchenii teorii muzykal'no-istoricheskogo znani" [The basic position of the theory of musical historical knowledge], *De Musica* (Petrograd, 1923), 165-180; S. Kreshchev, "Fiziologiia muzykal'nogo vospriiatia" [The physiology of musical perception], *De Musica*, 3 (1927), 183-190; Y. K. Belyi, "Problema 'ob'ektivnogo' v evoliutsii protsessa muzykal'nogo formoobrazovaniia" [The problem of the "objective" in the evolution of...

38 Boris Asafiev, "Sovremennoe russkoe muzykoznание i ego istoricheskie zadachi," pp. 5-6. For German translation of this article, see Igor Glebow, "Die gegenwartige russische Musikwissenschaft und ihre historischen Aufgaben," *Melos*, 6 (1926), 175-182. This entire issue of *Melos* is devoted to reports of research done at OTIM. It also contains articles by Finagin ("Form als Wettbegriff," pp. 201-205) and Gruber ("Der musikalische Gestaltungsprozess und seine Erforschungsmöglichkeiten," pp. 188-200).


41 Finagin, "Sistematika muzykal'no-teoreticheskikh znaniie," p. 188.


45 These articles include: Georgii Mikhailovich Rimsky-Korsakov, "Obosnovanie chetvertitonomovoi muzykal'noi sistemy" [The foundation of the quarter-tone musical system], *De Musica*, 1 (1925), 52-78; __________, "Rasshil'rovka svetovoi stroki Skriabinskogo 'Prometey'" [The decipherment of the color lines of Scriabin's "Prometheus"], *De Musica*, 2 (1926), 94-102; __________, "O vysote kombinatsionnykh tonov" [On the pitch of combination tones], *De Musica*, 3 (1927), 155-165; __________, "Akusticheskoe obosnovanie teoriy ladovogo ritma" [The acoustical basis of the theory of modal rhythm], *Muzykoznание*, 4 (1928); Sergei Aleksandrovich Dianin, "K voprosu o matematicheskom notopisaniie" [On the problem of mathematical note-writing], *De Musica*, 2 (1926), 77-93; L. G. Nemirovskii, "Akusticheskaya priroda intonatsii smyuskovykh instrumentov (problema natural'noi intonatsii)" [The acoustical nature of the intonation of bowed instruments (the problem of natural intonation)], *De Musica*, 3 (1927), 126-134; __________, "Ednit'sy izmereniia zvukovykh velichin" [Units of measurement of sound sizes], *Muzykoznание*, 4 (1928); V. Kovalenkov, "Avtomaticheskaia zapis' zvukov" [The automatic recording of sounds], *De Musica*, 3 (1927), 135-139; Y. Otto, "Trezzvuchia i septakkordy v formulakh matematicheskogo notopisaniia" [Triads and seventh chords in the formulas of mathematical note-writing], *De Musica*, 3 (1927), 174-182; Y. Kaufman, "O novoi sisteme interferentsionnykh elektricheskikhmuzykal'nykh instrumentov" [About a new system of interference electric musical instruments], *De Musica*, 3 (1927), 198-210.
These articles include: Viacheslav Gravilovich Karatygin, ""Rekvim liubvi' N. N. Ladyzhenskogo" [(The Requiem of Love) of N. N. Ladyzhenskii], De Musica, 1 (1925), 91-99; Boris V. Asafiev, "Liulii i ego delo" [(Lully and his cause)], De Musica, 2 (1926), 5-27; __________, "Muzyka k kruzkam russkich intelligentov 20-x 40-x godov" [Music in the circle of Russian intelligentsia in the 1820s-1840s], Muzykoznanie, 4 (1928); Aleksei Vasil'evich Finagin, "Ot misticheskogo idealizma k nauchnomu realizmu" [(From mystical idealism to scientific realism), De Musica, 2 (1926), 28-42; __________, "O vzaimootnoshenii khudozhestvennoi i bytovoi pesni" [(On the interrelations of artistic and everyday song), De Musica, 3 (1927), 62-69; Antonii Viktorovich Preobrazhenskii, "Greko-russkie pevcheskie paralleli XII-XIII v." [(Greek and Russian song parallels in the 12th and 13th cc.), De Musica, 2 (1926), 60-76; __________, "Russkaia muzykal'naia azbuka XVII v." [(Russian musical azbuki of the 17th c.), De Musica, 3 (1927), 54-61; Roman I'lich Gruber, "'Rossica' v germanskoi muzykal'noi periodii. Literature vosemmadsatogo i pervoi polovine devitnadsatogo veka" [("Rossica" in German musical period. Literature of eighteenth and first half of nineteenth century), De Musica, 2 (1926), 103-129; Shishmarev, "Ronsar i muzyka" [(Ronsard and music), De Musica, 3 (1927), 5-38; A. Rimsky-Korsakov, "'Iz pokhozhdenii Pakhomycha" [(M. P. Mussorskogo)] [(From the adventure of Pakhomych) of M. P. Mussorgsky], De Musica, 3 (1927), 70-75; Vs. Prokofiev, "Iz istorii russkogo prosveshchennogo muzykal'nogo diletantizma. K materialam o sem' Shitovykh" [(From the history of Russian education of musical dilettantism. On the material of the Shitov family), De Musica, 3 (1927), 97-116; D. Machig, "O drevnei evreiskoi muzyki i psalmodii evreev" [(On ancient Jewish music and psalmody of the Jews), De Musica, 3 (1927), 140-154; E. Sholpo "K voprosu o mekhanicheskoi fiksatsii forteplanoogo ispolnenia" [(On the question of the mechanical fixation of fortepiano performance), De Musica, 3 (1927), 166-173; Semyon L'ovich Ginzberg, "Osnovnye voprosy srovitel'nogo uzychenii muzykal'nykh instrumentov indeitsov Iuzhnoi Ameriki" [(The basic questions of the comparative study of musical instruments of the Indians of young America), Muzykoznanie, 4 (1928); V. E. Fekhner, "Tekhnika strunnykh instrumentov v sovremennyi muzyke" [(The technique of string instruments in contemporary music), Muzykoznanie, 4 (1928).

P. Grachev, "Leimotiv v operakh Rimskogo-Korsakova" [(Leimotives in the operas of Rimsky-Korsakov), De Musica, 3 (1927), 76-96; Sergei Aleksandroviich Dianin, "O znachenii chuvstva tonal'nosti v protsesse tvorchestva Borodina" [(On the significance of the feeling of tonality in the process of creation of Borodin), De Musica, 3 (1927), 117-125; M. Machikinskii, "Opyt klassifikatsii garmoni. Kvartovyie garmoni" [(An experiment of the classification of harmony. Quartal harmonies), De Musica, 3 (1927), 191-197; I. A. Braudo, "K voprosu o logike bakhovskogo iazyka" [(On the question of the logic of Bachian language), Muzykoznanie, 4 (1928).
Rimsky-Korsakov's dissertation at GIII (1929) was "Evoliutsiia muzykal'nykh zvukoridov" [The evolution of musical scales].


Ginzberg, p. 46. MUZO here refers to the Musical Section of GIII. The term "practicality" (in Russian praktitsizm) means, in Leninist political philosophy, an emphasis on practice as opposed to theory.

N. A. Garbuzov, "Novye techniia," pp. 31-33.


Georgii Lvovich Catoire, Teoreticheskii kurs garmonii [The theoretical course of harmony], 2 vols. (Moscow, 1924-26).


See Schwarz, pp. 54-60.


Today scholarly articles on music and music theory are more likely to be located in collections of articles devoted to special topics. Soviet music deals with musical activities in the USSR.

See Viktor M. Gorodinsky, "K voprosu o sotsialistichekom realisme v muzyke" [On the question of socialist realism in music], Sovetskaia muzyka [Soviet music], no. 1 (1933), pp. 6-18.
Chapter 21

Georgy L'vovich Catoire and Functional Theory: Harmony and Form

**Georgy L'vovich Catoire (1861-1926).** Georgy Lvovich Catoire never received a formal music education; he originally studied mathematics, graduating from Moscow University in 1884. But in 1885, on the advice of Chaikovsky, Catoire went to Berlin for a year to continue piano lessons (begun in 1875) and to study composition with Tirsh and Rufer. Later he took private lessons in counterpoint from Liadov in St. Petersburg and in Moscow consulted with the esteemed Taneev, who, like Chaikovsky, came to value Catoire's compositions and his friendship. After Taneev's death, Catoire assumed his unofficial role as leader of the theory and composition "schools" in Moscow. He composed most of his works—including two symphonies, a cantata, a piano concerto, and chamber and vocal works—during the years 1888 to 1916. For the last nine years of his life, from 1917 to 1926, he taught theory and composition at the Moscow Conservatory and devoted his attention more towards theoretical matters than towards composition. His interest in theory resulted in two books, *Teoreticheskii kurs garmonii* and *Muzykal'naia forma*. With these two works Catoire made such fundamental contributions to Soviet music theory that a student of his later
commented, "Practically no new book on questions of music theory manages without mention of and reference to the works of Catoire."

Catoire's primary achievement as a theorist rests in his adaptation, enrichment, and, in certain aspects, correction of the tenets of the functional school of music theory developed by Riemann. Incipient functionalism in harmony had already entered Russian music theory through Rimsky-Korsakov's textbook, and thus Russian theorists were congenial to its acceptance. Catoire, though, was the first Russian theorist to adapt Riemann's approach to a practical, pedagogical use, and to publish textbooks based on it.

Catoire's Theories on Harmony. As a starting point for Teoreticheskii kurs garmonii, Catoire borrowed from the treatise of the Belgian theorist François August Gevaert, Traité d'harmonie théorique et pratique, which incorporates Riemann's theory of harmonic function into a tonal scheme that encompasses chromaticism as a natural extension of diatonicism. Catoire adopted Gevaert's four-tiered hierarchy of harmonic systems—protodiatonic, diatonic (major and minor), diatonic major-minor, and chromatic—and also Gevaert's system of chord nomenclature based on function and formation, which differs from Riemann's. Catoire made extensive changes and additions to Gevaert's system based on harmonies in Romantic and modern Russian music, such as Scriabin's, and incorporated numerous examples of it in the text. So whereas Gevaert had concentrated in his examples on the music of Wagner and Beethoven as well as music from French and Italian opera, Catoire
also included Scriabin (6) and Metner (2), in addition to Wagner (16 examples) and Beethoven (14). He took most of his other examples from Western music, from Bach (6), Chopin (6), Schumann (3), Mozart (2), Grieg (2), Brahms (2), and Liszt, Gounod, Weber (1 each), and from Russian music, only Rimsky-Korsakov, Borodin, and Liadov (1 each). Unfortunately, Catoire's system of chord designation is cumbersome and difficult, and thereby reduces the overall efficacy of his approach.

Catoire devotes the first volume of his book to the explanation of the four harmonic systems and the resulting chord groups. This volume is the more theoretical of the two. In the second volume Catoire turns to the more traditional topics of sequence, non-harmonic tones, and modulation. Here he illustrates the practical application of his theories of harmonic function. Here also is where he departs most radically from Gevaert, in his utilization of a more Russian—and simpler—approach to modulation in place of Gevaert's complex one.

The fundamental principle of Riemann's functional harmony provides that the three principal triads, tonic, dominant, and subdominant, give rise through their transformation or substitution to all other chords, which are therefore closely connected to the principal triads and may share their functions. This principle is basic to each of Catoire's systems beginning with the diatonic. Even more basic to Catoire's approach, though, is the degree of relationship of tonalities and harmonies through the circle of fifths: "The fifth is the first degree of the relationship of tones... The major third is the second degree of the harmonic relationship of tones." Catoire used the
circle of fifths to determine intervallic content within the various systems, which themselves are formed from segments apportioned along the circle (or chain) of fifths. The number of fifths separating any two tones determines the nature and frequency of the occurrence of the interval. The greater the number of fifths between them, the more chromatic the interval and the less it occurs. The frequency of occurrence is determined by the number of tones in a given system minus the number of fifths between the tones of the interval. For example, the tones of the interval F-F♯, an augmented prime, are separated by seven fifths on the circle of fifths. Assuming ten tones within the system beginning with F (calculated along the circle of fifths), which is the number of tones in the diatonic major-minor system, the interval of the augmented prime occurs three times within that system. Diatonic intervals from the unison to the tritone contain from zero to six fifths between their tones. Chromatic intervals contain from seven to twelve fifths; they include all augmented and diminished intervals except the tritone. Ultrachromatic intervals—so named by Catoire—contain from thirteen to fifteen fifths and beyond; they include all doubly augmented and diminished intervals, for example, C-F♯♯, a doubly augmented fourth, which contains thirteen fifths. Knowledge of the frequency of occurrence of intervals allowed Catoire to determine the frequency of occurrence of chords containing the intervals. Since he constructs chords based only on the superposition of thirds, this task proved to be not as cumbersome as it might appear. Catoire calls any group of tones not constructed from thirds an "accidental combination."
The four systems occur within boundaries along the ascending and
descending chain of fifths, as shown in Figure 21.1. Although Catoire
uses Roman numerals throughout to refer to both scale degrees and
chords, to avoid confusion I have substituted Arabic numbers for scale
degrees, as is common in Western contemporary theory.

Proto-diatonic:      \[1 5 2 \] \[6 3\]
Diatonic major: \(\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
    & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\
\hline
\end{array}\)
Diatonic minor: \(\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
    & b6 & b3 & b7 & 1 & 2 & 3 \\
\hline
\end{array}\)
Diatonic major-minor: \(\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
    & b6 & b3 & b7 & 1 & 2 & 3 \\
\hline
\end{array}\)
Chromatic: \(\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
    & b5 & b2 & b6 & b3 & b7 & 1 & 2 \\
\hline
\end{array}\)

Figure 21.1. Catoire's Diatonic and Chromatic Systems.

The protodiatonic system corresponds to the pentatonic scale. The
diatonic system corresponds to the major or minor mode of the diatonic
scale, and consists of the tones of a major triad, tonic (\(t\)), and of
the two major triads most closely related to it, dominant (\(d\)), and
subdominant (\(s\)).

The chord \(t\) appears as the center of the system, as the moment of
full equilibrium, from which we make deviations in the direction
of chords adjacent to it [in the circle of fifths]; each time the
equilibrium is broken, a conflict and an attraction back to the
center, to full equilibrium, is created. Such deviations from our
basic chord to the chords adjacent to it and the return form an
embryo of our art, the essence of our music.6

Catoire illustrates the relationship between tonic and the adja-
cent dominant and subdominant, as well as between these triads and
secondary triads, with a method of chord formation based on the "displacement of voices," which gives rise to harmonic deviations from the originals. Thus, the displacement of either the root or the fifth of any of the major triads _t, _d, or _s, by the tone below the root or above the fifth, leads to the formation of the secondary triads, iii, vi, ii, and vii. For example, the substitution of B for C in a tonic C major triad (t), results in the chord E-G-B, or iii. The substitution of A for G in the same chord results in the chord A-C-E, or vi.

These substitutions result in the secondary triads most closely related to the main triads; the minor triads iii and vi are the secondary triads most closely related to _t. Although these secondary triads carry an indecisive, indefinite character, they may serve as substitutes for the main triads from which they are derived and as such fulfill their functions. These functions are summarized in Figure 21.2 below; the Roman numerals refer to chords. As shown in the top part of Figure 21.2, the triads iii and vi in major are each equally related to two of the main triads; therefore they have dual harmonic functions and must carry a designation as to which function they are performing, _t or _d in the case of iii, and _t or _s in the case of vi. The triad iii, though, is primarily tonic, unlike the triad vi, which is shared equally by tonic and subdominant. The triads in minor, shown in the bottom part in Figure 21.2, function the same as in major. For substitution in the other systems, Catoire says only that chromatically altered chords may substitute for their diatonic counterparts, such as VI for b vi, III for iii, minor _s for _s, and minor _d for _d.
Chord Functions in Diatonic Major

- **tonic (t):** I \( \text{vii} \) \( \text{vi} \) \( \text{ii} \) \( \text{I} \)
- **dominant (d):** V \( \text{II} \) \( \text{I} \)
- **subdominant (s):** IV \( \text{ii} \) \( \text{I} \)

Chord Functions in Diatonic Minor

- **minor tonic (t):** i \( \text{III} \) \( \text{i} \)
- **minor dominant (d):** V \( \text{II} \) \( \text{I} \)
- **minor subdominant (s):** iv \( \text{ii} \) \( \text{I} \)

Figure 21.2. Chord functions in diatonic major and minor systems.

The secondary triads are reached through the displacement of just one tone of any of the main triads. The displacement of two tones of the tonic triad illustrates the relationship between \( t \) and \( d \), and between \( t \) and \( s \). For example, the displacement upwards of the two upper tones in a tonic C major triad, E and G, results in the subdominant, F-A-C. The displacement downwards of the two lower tones of the same triad, C and E, results in the dominant triad, G-B-D. The total displacement of all the tones of all the triads illustrates the relationship between \( t \) and \( d \), \( t \) and \( s \), and \( s \) and \( d \). Example 21.1 illustrates these various displacements and relationships.

The combination of results from this displacement-relationship process leads in turn to the formation of chordal groups—the tonic group from the subdominant, the subdominant group from the dominant,
Example 21.1. Displacement of voices: a) tonic-dominant; b) dominant-subdominant; and c) subdominant-tonic.

and the dominant group from the tonic. These functional groups contain within them the different higher tertian structures of the main triads \(t, s, \) and \(d,\) as well as the secondary triads related to \(t, s, \) and \(d.\) An exception occurs in the dominant group; it does not contain the triad \(iii,\) which is primarily tonic and may be found only in that group. Thus the dominant group is the only group that uses the fundamental tone of its group to represent its basic function. Figure 21.3 below illustrates the chord content of the three groups—the dominant group encompassing a major ninth, \(9D^1,\) and the tonic and subdominant groups each encompassing an eleventh, \(11T^1 \) and \(11S^1,\) respectively. In all groups the \(^1\) superscript indicates a major ninth. The large vertical brackets outline the tones of each chord. The brackets around a letter indicate that a tone of the group other than the putative root is the bass tone; one pair of brackets for the second tone of the
column, two pairs for the third tone, etc. For instance, in the dominant group a chord with the 7 scale degree in the bass is designated with one pair of brackets. As before, triads are designated with small letters, higher tertian structures with capital letters. The dominant group contains five scale degrees encompassing a ninth (9D ), from which five chords can be constructed—the dominant triad D, the leading-tone triad [d], the dominant seventh chord D, the dominant ninth chord D, and the half-diminished seventh chord [D ]. The tonic group (with 6 as the root) contains six scale degrees encompassing an eleventh (11T ), from which eight chords can be constructed—three triads, t, vit, and iit; three seventh chords, T, [T ], and [T ]; and two ninth chords, 9T , and 9[T ]. The subdominant group (with 2 as the root) also contains six scale degrees and eight chords—three triads, s, iiS, and viiS; three seventh chords, S, [S ], and [S ].

These groups occur in the diatonic major system. In the diatonic minor system the groups are derived differently and therefore differ somewhat in makeup. Like Riemann and Gevaert, Catoire derives the minor triad and mode from the undertone series. But calling this method of derivation only a hypothesis, Catoire wisely concludes, "We hear the harmonic foundation [of the minor triad] not in the upper but in the lower voice of the chord." However, although Catoire prefers to designate the triads of the minor mode by their bottom pitch, he persists in constructing them inversely symmetrical to the major triads. Thus, he forms the chordal groups of the diatonic minor system in the manner shown in Example 21.2: the intervallic content of the
Figure 21.3. Chord groups in the diatonic major system. The 1 superscript indicates a major ninth. The brackets around a letter indicate that a tone of the group other than the putative root is the bass tone. Triads are designated with small letters and Roman numerals, higher tertian structures with capital letters.
Example 21.2. Inverse relationships between functional groups in major and minor.

minor groups is inversely identical to that of the major groups (shown by the arrows). Only the tonic group is inversely symmetrical with its own modal counterpart, though. Both the subdominant and dominant groups are inversely symmetrical to the opposite function in the other mode, that is, major dominant to minor subdominant and major subdominant to minor dominant. Since he constructs the seventh chords of the major mode by adding an additional third to the top of the triad, in the minor mode he constructs the seventh chords by adding an additional third to the bottom of the triad. In Example 21.2 above, then, the major subdominant group (the first group), $115'$, coupled with its
resolution to dominant and then to tonic, is inversely symmetrical to the minor dominant group. The major dominant group, $D^1$, coupled with its resolution to tonic, is inversely symmetrical to the minor subdominant group. The major tonic group (the third group), consisting of six notes encompassing an eleventh, $11T$, is inversely symmetrical to the minor tonic group.

In the major-minor diatonic system, the chord groups (Figure 21.4) retain their fundamental construction as in the major diatonic system. In all three groups the additional altered tones—$b\#3$, $b\#5$, and $b7$—create new chords within each group, although $b7$ is not included in the dominant group, thereby eliminating the possibility of a minor dominant. In Figure 21.4, in all groups the $2$ superscript indicates a minor ninth (as before, the $1$ superscript indicates a major ninth). The letter $2$ in the subdominant group indicates a diminished fifth, from $\hat{2}$ to $b\hat{5}$. In the tonic group the flat attached to both $T$ and $Q$ refers to $b\hat{5}$ and $b\hat{7}$; the letter $Q$ refers to $b\#3$. The brackets indicate the four different diatonic systems contained within each mode of the diatonic major-minor system. Each consists of the tones of three chords, with the center chord acting as tonic, within each mode. The primary major diatonic system contains $I$ as tonic; all other systems therefore become "subordinate tonalities." A deviation into such a subordinate tonality, an "inter-tonal deviation," may occur, but only into the four major diatonic systems and the minor system equivalent to the parallel harmonic minor. The remaining three minor systems are natural minor and, according to Catoire, deviations into them are not
### DOMINANT GROUP

```
6   b6
4   4
2   2
7   7
5   5
1   2
D   D
```  

### TONIC GROUP

```
2   2
7   b7
5   5
3   3
1   1
6   b6
1   1
1T  11bT
1Q  11bQ
maj. mel.
min. min.
```  

### SUBDOMINANT GROUP

```
5   5
3   3
1   1
6   b6
4   4
2   2
1   2
11S 11S
11Z 11Z
maj. mel.
har. min.
min. maj.
```  

**Figure 21.4.** Chord groups in major-minor diatonic system: Superscript 2 indicates a minor ninth. The letter 7 in the subdomi-
nant group indicates a diminished fifth, from 2 to b6. In
the tonic group the flat attached to both T and Q refers
to b6 and b7; the letter Q refers to b3. The brackets
indicate the four different diatonic systems contained
within each mode of the diatonic major-minor system.
possible, since no major dominant triad for them exists in the diatonic major-minor system. However, partial intretonal deviations into tonalities not completely within the system—b6, # and minor 4, 5, 2, 6, and 3—are possible.

The major-minor diatonic system contains six major and six minor triads:

major: bVI bIII bVII IV [I] V
minor: iv [i] v ii vi iii

Figure 21.5. Triads in major-minor diatonic system.

Chromatic major scales:

(7-tone diatonic system)

1. 4 1 5 2 6 3 7  #4 #1 #5 #2 #6
2. b7 4 1 5 2 6 3 7  #4 #1 #5 #2
3. b3 b7 4 1 5 2 6 3 7  #4 #1 #5

Chromatic major or minor scales:

4. b7 b3 b7 4 1 5 2 6 3 7  #4 #1
5. b2 b6 b3 b7 4 1 5 2 6 3 7  #4
6. b5 b2 b6 b3 b7 4 1 5 2 6 3 7

(10-tone major-minor system)

Figure 21.6. Chromatic major and minor scales in seventeen-tone chromatic system.
Catoire's chromatic system, the last of his four systems, goes beyond the twelve-tone chromatic scale to contain five enharmonic duplications—♯♭/♭♯, ♯♯/♭♭, ♯♭/♭♯, and ♯♭/♭♭♯—for a total of seventeen tones. It therefore encompasses and may be divided into six different twelve-tone chromatic scales, shown in Figure 21.6. All six scales contain a nucleus of the seven degrees of the diatonic system, which forms the central portion of Figure 21.6. None of the tones in any of the scales duplicates enharmonically any of the other tones in the scale, especially these seven central diatonic tones. Catoire excludes ♯♯,♭♭, ♯♯, and ♯♭ for this very reason, since each of these tones would enharmonically duplicate a tone in the central diatonic system. In addition, the last three scales (numbers 4-6) each contain the major-minor ten-tone system. Thus Catoire labels these three scales as either chromatic "major" or "minor" depending on which tones are used. The first three scales (numbers 1-3) Catoire calls chromatic major scales, since they lack entirely or partially the three minor tones ♯♭, ♯♭, and ♯♭. These tones also may not be substituted by their enharmonic counterparts, because of their exclusive role in the formation of a minor mode. To ensure this, none of these three tones occurs in a scale that also contains its enharmonic equivalent. Thus scale numbers 4, 5, and 6, each of which contains these three tones, may be either chromatic major or chromatic minor, depending on if and how these tones are used; whereas scale numbers 1, 2, and 3, which either lack completely or partially these minor tones, may only be chromatic major. The most common major chromatic scale (no. 2) substitutes ♯♭.
for $b\flat$ and $\#\bar{2}$ for $b\flat^3$ of the diatonic major–minor system, and adds $\#4$ and $\#\bar{4}$. The most common minor chromatic scale (no. 5) adds $b\flat^2$ and $\#\bar{4}$, two frequently used chromatic degrees, to the ten degrees of the diatonic major–minor system.

The existence in the chromatic system of thirteen major thirds (17–4=13, i.e., the number of tones in the chromatic system [17] minus the number of fifths between the two tones of the given interval [major third: 4] equals the frequency of its occurrence [13]) gives rise to twenty-six triads—thirteen major triads and ten minor triads, plus three minor triads of secondary significance, $\#i$, $\#v$, and $\#ii$. With the exception of the three secondary minor triads, which do not enter into the construction of diatonic systems because of their remote position within the circle of fifths, these triads may be grouped into nineteen diatonic systems—the major triads into eleven diatonic systems, one main and ten subordinate; and the minor triads into eight diatonic systems, one main and seven subordinate.

In the chromatic system, the functional equilibrium of the diatonic systems becomes disturbed: "In the chromatic [system], the tonic and the subdominant functions of our diatonic system retire into the background; they are substituted for by dominant [functions]," that is, essentially, secondary dominants. By virtue of pitches found only in the chromatic system, $\#4$ and $\#\bar{4}$, for example, tonic and subdominant chords from the diatonic system are transformed into secondary dominants. (See Example 21.3.) One need only look at the chord structures introduced by the chromatic system (see Figure 21.7) for evidence of
this. Catoire distinguishes twenty-three different chords, only two of which belong to the subdominant group; the remaining chords belong to the dominant group. Within this dominant group, though, six chords exhibit subdominant function, but only if constructed from 2 as the dominant of the dominant. The rest carry exclusively dominant function, and in fact are all derived from \( D^1 \) and \( D^2 \) in the dominant group in the major-minor diatonic system. This overriding dominant function may be seen in the music of Scriabin, from which Catoire took the majority of his examples for this portion of his text.

\[
\text{In diatonic system} \\
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{D} & \text{T} & [S'] & \text{D} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\text{In chromatic system} \\
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{D} & D_{\Pi} & D_{\Pi} & [D^1]_{\Pi} \\
\end{array}
\]

Example 21.3. The substitution of dominant function for tonic and subdominant in the chromatic system: secondary dominants.

\( D^{\Pi} \) (\( II \) meaning secondary dominant) for \( T \), and \( D^{\Pi} \) and \( [D^1]^{\Pi} \) for \( \{S\} \).
To form these chords, Catoire turns to "the intervals of higher order:" the chromatic interval of the diminished third, and the ultra-chromatic (doubly diminished or augmented) intervals of the doubly diminished fifth and the doubly augmented unison. Catoire did not choose these intervals arbitrarily, but based upon his stated premise of chord construction by the superimposition of thirds, and upon his observations of contemporary harmonic practice. Other chromatic intervals also occur, namely the diminished fifth and the augmented fifth. The chromatic chords may therefore be reduced to five basic types, each identifiable by the most prominent chromatic or ultra-chromatic interval in its construction. For example, the interval of a diminished third occurs in three types of chords distinguished from one another by the position of that interval within the chord—what Catoire calls the $\$S$ and $\$Z$ chords in the chromatic subdominant group, and the $U$ and $J$ chords in the chromatic dominant group. As bases for these chords, Catoire uses chords from the diatonic major-minor system, $S$ and $Z$ from the major-minor diatonic subdominant group and $D_1$ and $D_2$ from the major-minor diatonic dominant group (Figure 21.4). In $\$S$ and $\$Z$ of the chromatic subdominant group, the diminished third occurs between

**SUBDOMINANT GROUP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>b6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$#2$</td>
<td>$#2$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$$S$</td>
<td>$$Z$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Figure 21.7. Chord groups in the chromatic system.)
DOMINANT GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>6</th>
<th>b6</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>b6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b2</td>
<td>b2</td>
<td>b2</td>
<td>b2</td>
<td>b2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>[U ]</td>
<td>[U ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6</th>
<th>b6</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>b6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td>#2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>J</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UJ</td>
<td>UJ</td>
<td>UJ</td>
<td>[UJ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBDOMINANT FUNCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3</th>
<th>b3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b6</td>
<td>b6</td>
<td>b6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>#4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>[U ]</td>
<td>[U ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3</th>
<th>b3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>#6</td>
<td>#6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>#4</td>
<td>#4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>[J ]</td>
<td>[J ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 21.7. Chord groups in the chromatic system.
the raised basic tone (#2 in #S and #Z, raised from 2 in S and Z) and
the third (4) of the seventh chords from S and Z of the major-minor
diatomic subdominant group. In the U chord (chromatic dominant group),
the diminished third occurs between the third (7) and lowered fifth
1 2
(b2) of D and D (major-minor diatomic dominant group). In the J
chord, the diminished third occurs between the raised fifth (#2) and
1
the seventh (4) of D. Ultrachromatic intervals also occur. The
interval of a doubly diminished fifth occurs in Z2 between the raised
basic tone (#2) and the fifth (5), and in J2 between the raised fifth
2
(#2) and the ninth (6) of the chord (from D). The UJ chord (chromatic
dominant group) is distinguished by the interval of a doubly augmented
prime between the raised and lowered fifth (#2, b2) of D, D, and D.
These three chords, the Z chord from the chromatic subdominant group
2
and the J and UJ chords from the chromatic dominant group, constitute
Catoire's "ultrachromatic" chords, so named because of their doubly
augmented and diminished intervals. Catoire added these ultrachromatic
chords to Gevaert's basic designations of U, O (D in Catoire's ver-
sion), and I (J in Catoire's version). Catoire also added varieties to
the U and J chords and designated their occurrence on 2 as a subdomi-
nant function (secondary dominant). Even though he created this
category, Catoire provides no illustrations of ultrachromatic chords
from the musical literature. However, he furnishes examples of U, 1
U, and [J ] chords from Scriabin's Poeme Satanique, Op. 36 (Example
II
21.4). He analyzes the opening chord of Wagner's Tristan und Isolde as
a U chord in second inversion (G# is nonharmonic) resolving to the
II
dominant; in this sense it carries a subdominant function. He notes, though, that it is also interpreted as a French augmented sixth chord. In first inversion the $\text{[U]}^2$ equals a German augmented sixth chord.

Example 21.4. Alexander Scriabin, Poème satanique, Op. 36:

- a) mm. 13-14;
- b) mm. 17-19;
- c) mm. 29-31.
Catoire examines or mentions the occurrence in harmony of all but two of the chromatic and ultrachromatic intervals found within the span of sixteen fifths: the augmented prime or diminished octave, and the doubly diminished fourth or doubly augmented fifth. He left these out intentionally, concluding, "The possibilities of further enrichment of our music with new chromatically altered correct chords is almost exhausted." He therefore turns to "another source of enrichment of our harmony... the sphere of 'accidental combinations,'"—"harmonies formed by suspensions so that in their resolution the function of the chord is not changed." Yet, since Catoire viewed accidental combinations as simply "enharmonically correct chords," differing only in their treatment and resolution, these accidental combinations resulted in no new harmonies, only in new contexts for correct chords.

Aside from his discussion of nonharmonic tones used to create accidental combinations, Catoire, in the application of the diatonic and chromatic systems and the functional chord groups, concentrates on the topics of sequence and modulation. Concerning the latter, he departs from Gevaert's example by substituting for Gevaert's classes of tonalities, progressive and regressive modulatory directions, and modulatory models a less rigid system more consistent with Russian harmonic theory. So he combines chord function and the hierarchy of systems with Rimsky-Korsakov's modulatory means—modulation through a common chord based on the relatedness of keys, and through enharmony.

Both methods require the presence of a connecting or intermediary chord, which changes function and which signals the switch from one
tonality to another. This chord belongs to both tonalities of a common chord modulation, and therefore occurs only between related tonalities. In Catoire's approach, related tonalities differ in their key signatures by one to six accidentals. Depending on their system—diatonic, diatonic major-minor, or chromatic—these tonalities have in common certain chords that fulfill more than one function. Therefore, only bifunctional or multifunctional chords, which Catoire identifies as triads and dissonant chords (such as augmented and diminished triads and certain seventh chords), may serve as common chords. In general these chords originate either from the diatonic system or from the harmonic mode of the diatonic major-minor system. The original tonality should preferably be in one of these systems; the second tonality may be in any of the three systems. However, the reverse situation—originating from any of the three systems and modulating to either the diatonic system of the harmonic mode of the diatonic major-minor system—may also occur, as long as one of the tonalities is predominantly diatonic. Catoire recognizes only two dissonant chords from the chromatic system that fulfill a dual function—the major seventh chord with a lowered fifth, from the $\text{II}_1$ chord, which equals the leading-tone seventh chord with a raised third, a $[\text{III}_1]$ chord; and the diminished seventh chord with a lowered third, a $[\text{II}_2]$ chord, which equals the minor seventh chord of II with a raised basic tone, a $\text{#II}_2$ chord. All four chords are from the chromatic system. The other chromatic and ultrachromatic chords usually do not have more than one function. Since they are unifunctional, so to speak, they may not successfully be
used as common chords. For modulation by means of enharmony, no such restrictions apply. Diatonic, chromatic, and ultrachromatic chords and accidental chords may all be used.

Example 21.5. Richard Wagner, Prelude to Parsifal: a) mm. 28-33; b) analysis of chord, m. 30.

The "intertonal deviation," which involves a brief sojourn into a tonality subordinate to the main tonality within the limits of the diatonic or major-minor system, usually is effected by means of a
common chord. It occurs most frequently within a period or in a two-part or simple three-part form, such as the Chopin or Scriabin preludes, which adhere to one main key. The second type of modulation identified by Catoire establishes a new, temporary, main tonality, which in its relation to the main tonality may be subordinate, closely related, or remotely related. Either common-chord or enharmonic means may be used. As a short modulation into a more remote key within the limits of a period, this type becomes a substitute for an intertonal deviation. Such a substitution takes place in the third and fourth appearances of the opening theme in the Prelude to Act I of Wagner's 2 Parsifal: A [J] chord with no fifth in Ab, a tonality that falls within the major-minor system of C minor, is replaced with an E minor triad (Example 21.5).

Evaluation. Catoire's Teoreticheskii kurs garmonii lies within the tradition of Russian harmony textbooks established by those of Chaikovsky and Rimsky-Korsakov. But whereas they each emphasized the practical approach in both their titles and methods, Catoire stresses a more theoretical approach. In that his book presents a detailed description of chord construction based on intervals and of chord classification, it resembles especially in its complexity Ippolitov-Ivanov's 1897 textbook, Uchenie ob akkordakh, ikh postroenie i razreshenie. But Catoire's focus on chord function within an organized framework, the diatonic-chromatic hierarchy, provides an organization lacking in Ippolitov-Ivanov's and other similar textbooks of the early twentieth
century that attempted to provide a comprehensive examination of chromatic harmony. Nevertheless, Catoire's mixture of a theoretical approach with a practical application was not successful. The latter is clearly insufficient for the former.

One basic problem concerns his systems. As theoretical categories they represent splendidly different levels of pitch collections based largely on the major and minor modes and their combination. But the pitch collections in each of the systems are abstract and are rarely strictly observed in reality. To adhere strictly to these systems would mean placing the bulk of Western musical literature, and not just later nineteenth- and twentieth-century music, into the chromatic system. How does one treat the Neapolitan sixth chord, augmented sixth chords, or secondary dominants within the framework of a basically diatonic approach? The notes that make up these entities occur entirely within the chromatic system. There surely are distinctions between the harmonic usage of Mozart, say, and that of Scriabin, but Catoire does not account for them.

Another problem is his chord groupings and designations. Within the diatonic major system there are twenty-one possible chords among the three groups. This includes eight major, minor, or diminished triads, eight seventh chords of all types, and five major ninth chords. Measured another way, the dominant group has five chords, and the tonic and subdominant groups have eight chords each. And yet all these chords are designated only with the representative letters T, S, or D, modified by brackets, superscripts and numbers. As an extreme example,
let us take the seventh chord on \( \hat{3} \)--a minor-minor seventh chord (mm7) designated \([T]\). The \( T \) indicates its relationship to tonic, the double brackets indicate the bass tone, which is twice removed from the root (\( \hat{6} \), not \( \hat{7} \)), and the superscript indicates a major ninth from the root (not the bass tone, since the chord is only a seventh chord). It is confusing and time-consuming constantly to have to refer to the basic chord group in order to interpret a particular chord. To know that a chord may form part of a larger functional class and that its function may be derived from or related to that functional class is useful information, but beyond that, Catoire's designation is too unwieldy and unrepresentative. A method of designation that would combine both local function and functional relationships—for the two are often separate—would be superior to Catoire's method. Furthermore, to designate the seventh chord on \( \hat{6} \) as \( T \) and the seventh chord on \( \hat{7} \) as a derivative of this is counterproductive. The opposite designation would have been preferable—to concentrate on \( \hat{7} \) as \( T \) and to regard \( \hat{6} \) as a variant. Simply because \( \hat{6} \) occurs a third below \( \hat{7} \) in a system where chords are built through the superimposition of thirds is not justification enough for this practice. The same would apply to \( \hat{7} \) and \( \hat{2} \) in the subdominant group.

Catoire's overall approach, then, is not a very practical one. But in the context of Russian music theory it was perhaps a necessary one, an antidote to the seemingly endless stream of possible chordal combinations catalogued by other theorists. In this sense it resembles Fuchs's improvement (utilizing Weber's fundamental harmonies) over Hess
de Calvé's muddled integration of Kirnberger with a thoroughbass approach. At least Catoire was able to provide a framework in which these chord choices could be better understood. And he wisely substituted some practical aspects of current Russian tradition, such as his approach to modulation, that proved to be simpler and more accessible than Gevaert's more theoretical approach.

The introduction to the theory of functional harmony in Catoire's textbook was unique among Russian textbooks of this time. Although Catoire invented neither the idea nor the method of its presentation, his adaptation of the principles of Riemann's theories as interpreted by Gevaert nonetheless became a permanent part of the Soviet theory of harmony. Various aspects of Catoire's approach may be found in almost any contemporary Soviet harmony textbook, as well as in a number of recent Soviet studies devoted to questions of harmonic language or analysis. The most prominent aspects of Catoire's theoretical legacy include the five systems, from proto-diatonic to ultrachromatic, and the idea and general application of harmonic function and chord groups, that is, the more practical elements. Not used by later theorists are the speculative elements—the cumbersome chord nomenclatures, the method of chord derivation, and the manner of chord grouping.

Thus Catoire's concentration on functional harmonic theory became influential among a receptive audience. But no doubt his position as a professor of theory and composition at the Moscow Conservatory contributed to the wide influence of his theories. His teaching career at the Conservatory coincided with the first nine years of the new Soviet
regime, which turned out to be formative years for Soviet music theory. During those years Catoire taught a number of students, who, after having become teachers themselves, continued and developed Catoire's tradition of theory pedagogy. Several of his students collectively wrote a harmony textbook containing a simpler but more extensive application of his theories for pedagogical use. Several other of his students completed and published his Muzykal'naia forma, also for pedagogical use. In this way Catoire's views were widely disseminated in conservatories and other music schools during the 1930s and later.

Catoire on Musical Form. Before his death Catoire had prepared for publication only the first volume of his Muzykal'naia forma, in which he discusses the elements of musical form. So his students Lev Abramovich Mazel, Dmitri Borisovich Kabalevsky, and Leonid Alekseevich Polovinkin, working from Catoire's analyses and notes and from their own extensive notes of his lectures, put together volume 2, on particular musical forms. They completed only those chapters that Catoire himself had outlined—those on two- and three-part forms, the rondo, and the sonata. Catoire had already outlined the general approach and scope of the work in his introduction to the first volume. As he saw it, the two basic problems in any study of musical form involved "the study of the laws of metrical structure of the sound fabric forming musical speech," i.e., "the study of metrics"; and "the study of the laws by which musical structural units are combined together and create one artistic whole," in short, "to establish the regulating laws
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of the structure of an artistic work." Thus his goal was not simply to catalogue and describe various archtypical forms, but rather to discover the essence of the temporal structure of lower-level formations and how these formations combine to create a unified composition.

Again, as a starting point, Catoire used books of form by others, namely Bussler, Riemann, and Prout. But, as in the harmony book, while he adopted many of their ideas, he also supplemented or changed many others, those he found too "one-sided" or that distorted "the musical thought of the composer." Thus he rejected, for example, Riemann's more dogmatic approaches to metrical construction and form, such as those concerning the omnipresent upbeat and the iamb, and the eight-measure period. He accepted the motive as the musical embryo from which form grows, but resisted the arbitrary breaking up of phrases into motives.

Catoire defines the study of metrics as "the study of the interrelation of tones by the great or small weight with which they are perceived, [and] of the division of musical speech into bars and the grouping of [these bars] among themselves." Metrics is based on "symmetry in time," the "juxtaposition of two moments directly following each other; the weight normally lies in the second [moment], which answers the first." The concept of the iamb would most closely conform to this definition. Catoire differentiates between symmetry in time and symmetry in space, in which, again, he focuses on the iamb:

Whereas symmetry in space represents the correspondence at any distance of identically constructed parts of a building, symmetry in time . . . represents the juxtaposition of two absolutely
adjacent, but not always identically constructed parts, answering each other as thesis to arsis; moreover on the second (that is, on the answering—that is, the thesis) lies the weight. Obviously, this idea is a completely different category. Here we will apply together with Riemann the term "symmetry" in this new, metrical significance.22

This symmetry is expressed at each level of Catoire's hierarchical metrical organization—the motive, phrase, small structural unit, and large structural unit. Although its most basic manifestation takes the form of the iamb, other manifestations such as the anapest and amphibrach are also recognized. Catoire frequently disagrees with Riemann's "artificial interpretations," as he calls them, of joining an unaccented beat following an initial accented beat to the following accented beat or motive; so he accepted as well the metrical grouping of the trochee. He mentions the dactyl as a possible grouping, but never illustrates it. Thus he theoretically agrees with all of the basic forms of rhythmic manifestation—iamb, anapest, trochee, dactyl and amphibrach. Figure 21.8 illustrates the hierarchical relationships of Catoire's architechttonic levels up to the period, expressed in end-accented groupings.

The motive, "the smallest musical symmetry" is equivalent to "a musical embryo," since it provides the foundation for all succeeding levels and, ultimately, the form of the music itself. Catoire interprets the next level, the phrase, not as a "structure," but as "an element of musical structure." He names as the smallest structure in music the "small structural unit," a symmetry of two phrases. A symmetry of two small structural units forms "a large structural unit." He writes, "All musical structures may be reduced to a row of small and
large structural units, which also may be accepted therefore as bases of our analyses."

Figure 21.8. Hierarchy of formal units, expressed in end-accented groupings.

Catoire distinguishes three basic forms of large structural units—one iambic and two trochaic (Figure 21.9). The iambic structural unit is a normal structural unit made up of iambic phrases. The trochaic structural unit, type 1, consisting of trochaic phrases, ends with a cadence in the penultimate measure. The trochaic structural unit, type 2, contains an abbreviated first phrase; the remaining phrases are iambic, or, in certain cases, amphibrachic. Catoire considers this last form to be trochaic because, as in type 1, all odd bars are accented. The last uncompleted phrase of this type concludes in
Figure 21.9. Types of structural units.

the following structural unit, forming what he called "an intruding
cadence," since it intrudes into the next structural unit. As illus-
trations, Catoire cites well-known examples from Beethoven, the first
movement (mm. 19–27) of the Piano Sonata, Op. 13, a large structural
unit of eight measures, and Mozart, the first seven measures of the
Overture to The Marriage of Figaro, in which the small three-part
structural unit consists of seven bars, the last intruding into the
next structural unit with new musical content. Aside from his idea of
the intruding cadence, which merits notice, Catoire's type 2 is arbi-
trary in that it does not allow for the possibility of a mixture of
motivic or phrase types within a unit—in this case a trochee turning
into an iamb (what Cooper and Meyer call "pivoting"). Throughout,
Catoire provides metrical groupings only for the phrase level, as
illustrated in Figure 21.9. Concerning the higher-level structures, he
states that at each level the metric weight lies in the last segment of
the structure, whether it is two-part or three-part. Thus large and
small structural units may normally be regarded as end-accented group-
ings, such as the iamb or anapest. This too is arbitrary for it
reduces the possibility of beginning-accented higher-level groupings.
Catoire labels these groupings "iambic" or "trochaic" depending only on
the metric grouping at the phrase level, not on the metric relationship
between the small structural units within the large structural unit.
Thus although his groupings are hierarchical, his interpretations are
not; they remain on the phrase level.

The elements and structural units shown in Figure 21.9 may be
mixed, abbreviated, or expanded. In general, each level may be expand-
ed by the addition of one element or unit from the previous level.
This results in expanded three-part structures instead of the normal
two-part structures. A three-part large structural unit, for instance,
generally contains three small structural units. On the lower levels—
motive and phrase—such additions frequently take the form of repeti-
tions, either exact or varied, and are represented through the repeti-
tion of numbers. A phrase expanded through the repetition of an unac-
cented motive thus becomes 1 1a 2. The repetition of an accented
motive would result in a change of metric grouping. A repeated phrase
would be represented as [1 2] [1a 2a]. For the large three-part
structural unit, the additional small structural unit is represented by
the numbers 1 2 3 4 added to the original eight (Figure 21.8). In
other words, Catoire never ventures beyond the number 8 in his number-
ing of metric units or motives. Twice he adds the number 9 to account for a final unaccented bar after an accented cadence in the eighth bar, but those are exceptions. These procedures are mostly consistent with those of Prout, who was less insistent than Catoire about exceeding the number 8. But Catoire's numberings are not so much measurements of quantity as they are designations of definite metric function. Thus Catoire's adherence to the number 8 for large structural units results from the practical, functional significance of using number repetitions to denote expansions and number deletions to denote abbreviations, not from a preconceived notion of the hegemony of the eight-bar structural unit. The accented number 8, for example, generally represents the concluding cadence.

In the Haydn excerpt shown in Example 21.6, for instance, Catoire illustrates the expansion of the first phrase through the addition of a motive (3a) and the expansion of the second phrase first through the addition of one motive (5a) and then through the addition of two adjacent motives from two adjacent phrases (6a/7a). (Catoire indicates the low-level groupings with brackets above the staves. Thus here the order is iamb, anapest; anapest, iamb, iamb.) However, these are less repetitions than they are "extra" motives; that is, if they are left out, the result would be a straightforward—and very dull—4 + 4 phrase structure. The Haydn excerpt thus consists of a five-bar two-part small structural unit and a seven-bar three-part small structural unit. Overall, it is iambic. That this segment is iambic and its phrase structure is 5 + 7 is unarguable. The problem lies in those "extra"

measures, particularly measures "5a" and "6a". Measure "3a" is not so problematic; it can be viewed as an extension of measure 3, albeit a necessary one to supply the dominant harmony. The measure labeled "6a"
is not a repetition or extension of measure "6"; nor is measure "5a" related to measure "5." Rather, measure "6" is an extension of measure "5a" and measure "6a" is an extension of "7." And measure "7a" is a natural extension of measure "6a" but so much stronger in intensity that it dwarfs the preceding measures. Catoire's analysis reveals none of this.

The excerpt from the third movement of Mozart's Symphony No. 40, K. 550, shown in Example 21.7, contains two large structural units six and eight measures long, respectively. Both contain abbreviated phrases (indicated with the large "V" and a bracketed accent mark) and the second contains an expanded small structural unit. An abbreviated phrase occurs when the unaccented portion of the phrase has been omitted; in such a case the number of the omitted motive is left out as well. Thus, here numbers 1 and 5 are left out in each of the large units. Since both begin with an abbreviated first phrase followed by iambic phrases, they are trochaic structural units, type 2, but with one difference: each ends with an accent as part of an iambic phrase. Thus the beginning accent is not paired with an ending nonaccent as in the type 2 trochaic structural unit, and these units turn out to be a combination of the type 2 trochaic and iambic structural units. The pattern is abbreviated-iamb-abbreviated-iamb; abbreviated-iamb-iamb-abbreviated-iamb. Surely this aspect of his interpretation, with almost as many abbreviated as regular phrases, is unacceptable. Since he is counting only whole measures as units of measurement and given that there cannot be a greater number of accents than nonaccents in a
phrase, the missing nonaccents must therefore be accounted for. Cooper and Meyer interpret this Mozart passage overall as an anapest (3 + 3 + 6), with iambic groupings in general on the lower levels, which is a more logical interpretation, since it adds or deletes nothing and also corresponds to the thematic structure whereas Catoire's does not. Although Catoire consistently interprets the first half of the hemiola pattern which begins each statement (variation) of the theme as the abbreviated phrase, he assigns the fourth abbreviated phrase to a thematically different portion of the theme. Catoire indicates additions, but only to the second large unit ("3a" and "4a"). By leaving out two numbers and adding two numbers, Catoire achieves an eight-measure phrase, which, however, was eight measures to begin with.

![Example 21.7. W. A. Mozart, Symphony No. 40, K. 550, Minuet, mm. 1-14.](image)
In his metrical analyses, Catoire considers not only the metrical
division and motivic content of the melody, but also other factors such
as harmony, cadences, the type of accompaniment, and the movement of
the other voices. He also stresses the cohesion and indivisibility of
structural units in those cases where the seamless texture of the
melodic line disallows any low-level divisions. The large structural
unit at the beginning of Scriabin's Mazurka, Op. 25, No. 9, for exam-
ple, allows only a "theoretical" division into two small structural
units. "The half cadence serves as a direction to us that this eight-
measure musical thought still is not expressed; one or more such struc-
tural units should follow it" (Example 21.8). But although the
melodic line may be seamless, there are elements of closure in measure
four—in the bass, the resolution of the chromatic ascending line on
the tonic pitch Eb; in the melody, the resolution of the appoggiatura
on F to the tonic, which resolves an octave higher the F from the first
two measures; and the first significant cadence, albeit on the subdomi-
nant, which itself calls for further motion but which is a logical
conclusion from the preceding motion, the tenor Bb up to the C and the
soprano Gb up to the Ab, in addition to the Eb. However, other ele-
ments contribute to its continuation: the cadence on the subdominant on
the weaker beats two and three, the crescendo, the dotted rhythm of the
appoggiatura, the sudden rise in pitch, and the introduction of a leap
in the melody. Certainly Catoire is right about the necessity of
continuation following measure eight. What occurs is a varied repeat
of the first phrase leading into a different eight-measure phrase.

Catoire rejects the more "traditional" interpretation of the period:

Theorists usually call any eight measures a period, by virtue of which a musical work is broken up somehow mechanically into a row of periods; such a simplistic view helps us little in explaining the principles of musical form.28

In contrast, Catoire identifies a period as

a symmetry of two musical structural units, completed with a full (in exceptional cases half) cadence, and having the significance of a more or less self-sufficient whole. . . . The musical thought (theme) from which the work is created always is stated as a period.29
Thus for Catoire the musical content of the period had an importance equal to that of purely formal considerations. The smallest period consists of two small structural units; if one large structural unit satisfies the requirements of a period—a cadence and self-sufficiency—it may be considered a period. Two sentences, the stressed part of the symmetry on the answering sentence, make up the component parts of a period. In a simple period they equal the small structural units; in larger periods, the large structural unit. In more complex periods, the sentences may be compound, consisting of several large structural units. The resulting period, in Catoire's view, may therefore be nearly any length, depending on its interval structure, ranging from 8 measures to 140 measures, as in the Scherzo of Beethoven's Fifth Symphony. Amazingly, Catoire analyzes the latter as one period.

Many of the preludes of Chopin and Scriabin, he says, are written in such expanded periods. This is apparently because such pieces lack a full cadence until the end. But Catoire states (see quote above) that in exceptional cases a half cadence may suffice. Why he does not invoke this exception in the case of the Beethoven is not clear. Within the compound sentences, Catoire analyzes the structural units as serving various functions—modulation, supplement, cadence, introduction, and transfer.

Catoire devised a system of symbols to designate graphically the structure and function of these various components of form. When combined, these symbols make up representative formulae depicting the content of a period. Some of the more commonly used symbols include:
The Haydn excerpt in Example 21.6 would be represented in this manner:

\[
\text{m exp} + \text{m3p expf}
\]

(1) (1)

The Mozart excerpt in Example 21.7 is more complicated:

\[
\text{b [m abb + m abb] + m expf abb + m abb]}
\]

(1) (1) (1) (1)

This attempt by Catoire to devise a graphic representation for metric analysis proved to be the least successful aspect of his approach to form. Like his chord symbols, these structural symbols are too complex to be pedagogically or theoretically useful, and were not widely used.

Catoire does not apply metric groupings beyond the phrase level within the large structural unit. But he does apply the concept of metric symmetry to higher levels such as the simple two-part form,
either independently or as part of a larger form, for example the exposition of the sonata allegro. Since he views the simple two-part form as having generated other, higher-level forms such as the three-part form and the sonata allegro, then perhaps he intended his application of metric symmetry to be broadened to include these more complex structures as well.

He focused his study of larger forms on their evolution. He discerned two directions in this development: On one path, new structures were joined to the simple two- or three-part forms, leading to the complex three-part form and to the simple rondo. On the other path, the two- and three-part forms were expanded from within, leading to the formation of the sonata form. The inner expansion of the simple two-part form, through a new middle section at the beginning of the second section, gave rise to the simple three-part form. In tracing this evolutionary development, Catoire observes the subtle stages between forms, such as between the simple two- and three-part forms. He classifies these connecting links as "intermediary forms" that arose during this evolution. For example, between the simple three-part form and the sonata form exists an intermediary form that contains an abbreviated exposition, a tonally unstable middle section, and a recapitulating section. The difference between this form and the sonata form lies in the first and third sections, which, although they contain the tonal pattern of a sonata form, lack the thematic differentiation expressed in the transitional and secondary parts of the exposition and the recapitulation. Catoire cites the final movement of Beethoven's
Piano Sonata, Op. 10, No. 2, as an example of this form. He considers the sonata without a development section not an intermediary form but an abbreviated sonata, which developed directly from a simple two-part form. Other notable features of Catoire's theory of form include his derivation of the rondo form from the complex three-part form, his analysis of the sonata-rondo form, and his observations on the use of form, particularly the unusual manifestations of the rondo principle, in the works of Romantic and modern Russian composers.

In one type of romantic rondo described by Catoire, for instance, the main section does not always occur in the main tonality of the rondo but in different tonalities in succeeding statements. In another type, while its outward appearance resembles rondo form, short development sections that work out the main material in a manner similar to the middle sections of simple three-part forms occur in the place of episodes with new material. As an example of the latter type, Catoire points to Chopin's Prelude in Ab major.

Catoire's views on music and music theory closely resemble those of his friend and colleague Taneev. Both remained opposed to the loss of tonal structure and the breakdown of form in the music of their day, and reflected these views in their research. Although functional distinctions become blurred in Catoire's chromatic system, it is nevertheless firmly rooted in the lower-level diatonic system. And Catoire's examinations of form presuppose the participation of tonality in those forms. Both also applied some aspects of mathematics in their research. Taneev was more successful in this regard; mathematics
actually verified his findings and simplified the results, whereas mathematics merely illustrated and at the same time complicated Catoire's findings.

Catoire built his theories upon the foundations laid by Riemann, Prout, and Gevaert. In all, though, his most valuable contribution remains the introduction into Soviet music theory of several concepts. The most prominent of these include the specific application of the idea of chord function, the hierarchy of systems, and the general approach to formal analysis. All of these remain important elements in contemporary Soviet music theory. Catoire's own contributions stemming from these ideas include his development of the chromatic system and "ultrachromatic" chords, his harmonic and formal analyses of modern Russian music, his discussions of certain types of form such as the rondo, and his detection of "intermediary" forms. These concepts, too, remain in Soviet music theory. Missing, though, are the more cumbersome aspects of his theory, such as the chord designations, the derivation of minor from major, the formulas representative of metrical processes, and the arbitrary interpretations of phrase-level structure. In fact, the metric approach to formal analysis has not been widely developed in the Soviet Union. Some attempts to utilize it were made, but by and large it has been ignored.

Such problems, however, did not prevent Catoire's works from being widely used and accepted. During the 1920s and 1930s, when these works were written, a real need for such books existed. Just such a need for a textbook on form led Soviet theorists in the 1930s to complete
Catoire's manuscript. That they chose to complete and publish his work rather than write a new text testifies to his prestige. In addition, aside from his lack of attention to "the musical art as a part of social practice," Catoire's views conformed with those of Soviet theorists attempting to build a Marxist musicology. For example, his treatment of form as a manifestation of "artistic content" as well as of purely formal delineations and functional (dialectical) properties rendered his approach acceptable to Marxists. Catoire writes in the Introduction to his book: "Any musical work . . . is undoubtedly always embodied in a definite 'form.' This form is created together with content [and is] closely connected with it. For each artistic work, essentially a new form is created." His emphasis on the practical and pedagogical applications of his views was also significant.

It is probable that Riemann's theories of harmonic function and of metric analysis would eventually have entered Soviet music theory through other means, but Catoire's more logical and accessible presentations of them accelerated their widespread acceptance, in spite of the problems inherent to his approach. He must be viewed then as the founder and chief representative of the functional school in Russia, the main tenets of which, largely through his efforts, were accepted into the mainstream of Soviet music theory.
FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 21

1 In addition to Teoreticheskii kurs garmoinii, Catoire also wrote Muzykal'naia forma [Musical Form], 2 vols., ed. L. A. Mazel, D. B. Kabelevsky, and L. A. Polovinkin (Moscow, 1934-36).

2 Sergei Vasilevich Yevseev, "Georgii L'vovich Katuar," Sovetskaia muzyka, No. 5 (1941), p. 48. Biographical information is also included in Montagu-Nathan's Contemporary Russian Composers (London, 1917). For additional sources in Russian, see: Viktor Belyaev, G. Katuar (Moscow, 1926), and Vladimir Georgievich Fere, "Georgii L'vovich Katuar (1861-1926)," Vydaushchiesia deistel'me teoretiko-kompozitsionnoo fakulteta Moskovskoi konservatorii [Prominent figures of the theoretical compositional faculty of the Moscow Conservatory] (Moscow, 1966).
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Catoire also investigated the occurrence of the augmented fifth and the diminished seventh, mainly in augmented triads and diminished seventh chords. The diminished second, he pointed out, does not enter into the construction of chords, and the augmented third is equivalent to the perfect fourth, which occurs only in accidental combinations. He did not mention the augmented unison or the ultrachromatic interval of the doubly diminished fourth (doubly augmented fifth).

The UJ chord is the same chord used as the basis for Scriabin's harmony system as analyzed by Varvara Dernova (Garmonia Skriabina [The harmony of Scriabin] [Moscow, 1968]).

Teoreticheski kurs garmonii, 1;101.

Ibid.

For example: Nikolai Nikolaevich Sokolovsky, Rukovodstvo k prakticheskomu izuchenii garmonii [A guide to the practical study of harmony], 3 vols. (Moscow, 1906-11).

The harmony textbook by Teodor Fridrikhovich Muller, Garmonia [Harmony] (Moscow, 1976), is based on the diatonic-chromatic hierarchy. An example of a recent article utilizing the functional theory of harmony is: Yury Kholopov, "Funktsional'nyi metod analiza sovremennoi garmonii" [The functional method of analyzing contemporary harmony], Teoreticheskie problemy muzyka XX veka [Theoretical problems of music of the twentieth century], 2, ed. Yuri Tulin (Moscow, 1978), 169-199.

Iosif Ignatevich Dubovskii, Sergei Vasil'evich Evseev, Vladimir Vasil'evich Sokolov, and Igor' Vladimirovich Sposobin, Prakticheski kurs garmonii [A practical course of harmony], 2 vols. (Moscow, 1934-35). This work is discussed briefly in Chapter 29.

Kabelevsky completed chapters 6, "simple two- and three-part form" (which Catoire himself had begun), and 6, "Complex three-part form"—continuing in number from the first five chapters of volume 1. Mazel completed chapters 8, "Sonata form," and 9, "Form of the rondo and the rondo-sonata."

Muzykal'naia form, 1:12.

Ludwig Bussler, Musikalisches Formlehre (Berlin, 1878); Hugo Riemann, System der musikalischen Rhythmik und Metrik (Leipzig, 1903); Ebenezer Prout, Musical Form (London, 1893) and Applied Form (London, 1895).

Muzykal'naia forma, 1:11.
Ibid., p. 14. Catoire distinguished the study of metrics from the study of rhythmics, which he defined as "the study of the interrelations of tones by their comparative length."

Ibid., p. 13.

Ibid.


Ibid., p. 28.

Ibid., p. 35.


Musykal'naia forma, 1:35.

Ibid., pp. 68-69.

Ibid., p. 68.

The Scherzo of Beethoven's Fifth Symphony is a compound three-part period, containing three sentences, each between 40 and 50 measures and each consisting of two large structural units with various extensions and an addition. However, the metrical unit equals not one measure but two, thereby making the period only 70 units long, and each of the sentences between 20 and 25 units long. Catoire's analysis: Sentence 1 (mm. 1-44): two large extended structural units (mm. 1-18 and 19-38) and one expanded supplement (mm. 38-45). Sentence 2 (mm. 45-97): one large structural unit (mm. 45-60); one small structural unit (mm. 60-70); one large structural unit (mm. 71-90); and supplement (mm. 90-97). Sentence 3: two extended large structural units (mm. 97-115; 116-132) and supplement (mm. 133-140). His analysis has a few measure additions, but on the whole it is remarkably straightforward. He notes each unit as to stress, but provides no groupings. Most of the structural units are iambic, though. Five times an accented measure "8" elides (or intrudes) into a trochaic unit. Twice these beginning accents turn into end-accented units.

I have retained the transliterated letters f, b, m, and d, which represent the Russian words fraza [phrase], bol'shoi [large], malyi [small], and dopolnenie [supplement]. But I translated the longer terms, such as exp for expansion, which in Russian is ras for rashirenie, and abb for abbreviation, which in Russian is sok for sokrashchenie.
32 Donald Francis Tovey, in A Companion to Beethoven's Pianoforte Sonatas (London, 1931), described this movement as "a sonata form with archaic (or melodic) exposition, but considerable development and expanded recapitulation" (p. 53).

33 Lev Abramovich Mazel, "Predislovie" [Preface], in Catoire, Muzykal'naia forma, 1:8. Mazel also referred to Catoire's method of statement as being "frequently revealingly formalistic" (p. 9).

34 Catoire, Muzykal'naia forma, I:12.
Chapter 22

Georgy Eduardovich Conus and Metrotechtonicism

Georgy Eduardovich Conus (1862-1933). Georgy Eduardovich Conus first published an article on his theory of "metrotechtonicism," his method for detecting the manifestation of the laws of architecture in 1 musical form, in 1924. At this time he was nearly 62 years old, and a professor and dean of the composition faculty at the Moscow Conservatory. This was not the first public presentation of his theory, though, as we have seen. His lectures from the 1900's presented an earlier and as yet unnamed version of his approach to the analysis of musical form. 2 After his return to Moscow in 1919 from a seven-year teaching position at the Saratov Conservatory, he began lecturing again on his theory, which he now called metrotechtonicism, and took part in the research activities then being initiated in Moscow. In 1920 he was appointed director of the department of the analysis of form, the first such department in Russia, at the Moscow Conservatory; in 1922 GIMN established a laboratory of metrotechtonic analysis, with Conus as the head. Clearly by the time his article was published, then, Conus's theory had already received a certain amount of attention. During the next nine years (until his death in 1933), Conus published three
articles and two books on metrotechtonicism; in addition, several of his manuscripts were published posthumously.

Conus began to develop his theory of metrotechtonicism after his graduation from the Moscow Conservatory in 1890, during his years there as a teacher from 1891 to 1899. He places its discovery in 1894:

Having come upon [the theory of metrotechtonicism] accidentally 30 years ago (1894), thanks to a special technical method of writing that put very remotely distant parts of a musical whole into a single field of vision in a striking regularity of musical structures absolutely unknown to science, I dedicated myself to the laboratory testing of the laws I discovered for a quarter of a century (until 1919). Almost 1000 musical creations of different epochs from the fifteenth century to our day were subjected to precise analysis. I researched in detail whole cycles of works: all 48 fugues of Bach, all the Chopin études, all the songs of Mendelssohn, all the sonatas and symphonies of Beethoven, etc. And only in 1919 on the basis of a great amount of accumulated factual material did I allow myself to undertake the first presentation of the theoretical bases of the method and of the details of separate cases.

As mentioned, Conus did not remain totally silent about his theory during those twenty-five years of research. By 1902, even before his early lectures for such groups as the Moscow Scientific Musical Society, he had already revealed some of its secrets in discussions with Arensky and Taneev. Although his interpretation of it at this early stage does not differ greatly from that given in the 1924 article, in later writings he refined, revised, and elaborated on his views.

I should say at the outset that Conus's theory of metrotechtonicism is in its totality not a viable, workable theory. The related ideas that each and every piece of music is innately subordinate to the laws of architecture, that each piece or movement is inherently symmetrical from the highest to the lowest levels according to its temporal
length, and that therefore temporal symmetry in music exhibits the same characteristics as spatial symmetry in architecture, are not substantiated by the music itself. Yet during the 1920s this theory received a great deal of attention, and Conus was given numerous opportunities to do research, to present his results, and to teach his theories to his students, more so than other theorists whose work was perhaps more plausible. Why all this attention? Perhaps because Conus already had a good reputation as a theory teacher and composer; because his theory was, after all, original and thought-provoking—some would even say intellectual—regardless of how far-fetched; because he dressed his theory in very elusive and elliptical language—much like the symbolist poets—so that on a superficial level it sounded very high-flown and prestigious, thereby rendering it almost incomprehensible on a speculative level to all but those knowledgable theorists who saw through him; because underneath the pomposity of his approach lie certain useful aspects; and because he actually expressed some valid criticisms of Hugo Riemann's approach to musical form. His views on the latter reveal that he had a blind spot only regarding his own theory, criticism of which he could not accept (as we shall see). Therefore, because of Conus's reputation and the amount of attention lavished on his theory, and in order to reveal those useful aspects of his theory, it is necessary to investigate it. Herewith I present a brief overview of his theory of metrotechtionicism, followed by discussions of his own views on Riemann, of some of his colleagues' critical views towards metrotechtionicism, and of a theory of melodic analysis influenced by Conus.
Metrotechtonicism. Metrotechtonicism's basic principle has two aspects: first, the graphic representation of a musical composition allows all segments of its form, notated according to temporal size, to be seen at once; second, the patterns that these schemes exhibit shows that each composition, or at least each movement of a composition, is inherently symmetrical. The term "metrotechtonism" means "measured construction," from the Greek words metron (measure) and tektonikos (constructor or builder). Since a musical work exists in time, its temporal limits may be measured exactly. Fundamental to a metrotechtonic analysis is "the discovery of the temporal coordinate, to which the structure of any musical work is unconsciously subordinated." This temporal coordinate is nothing less than "symmetry in time"; it reveals the temporal symmetrical relationships within parts, between parts, and between the parts and the whole. The temporal coordinate is the point in time that divides a symmetry into its component parts. The discovery of the temporal coordinate is accomplished by measuring in time the various segments of a composition and grouping them hierarchically: "First we divide the organism into parts, and then, as a synthetic collection of parts, we mentally restore the whole."

As the basic unit of the measurement of time, Conus designates what he calls at various times either the "cell," or the "structural pulsating wave," comparable in size, usually, to the musical measure. He defines both the wave and the cell as "the largest common measure of all the component parts of a given musical creation." Conus considers them equal in measurement and in size, but not in concept. But even
though he attempts to define them so that they appear to be different, they are essentially the same thing—the basic unit of temporal measurement. The structural pulsating wave is the largest common measurement of a regularly occurring phenomenon, akin to a wave in physics or a pulse in the human body. In metrotechtonicism, it most frequently equals the measure in length, sometimes a half-measure, or sometimes two measures. Conus describes it variously as "the length of time, limited by the two nearest pulsating stimuli of uniform frequency," a "form of musical cell." In an earlier description, he defines it as "the primary temporal cell, the most elementary form," the "embryo" of musical organism, "from which the entire musical piece is constructed and grows." An accented wave is "a supporting wave." The cell, by comparison, is "the concrete sound content of the wave," not the wave's thematic content, but its metrical or temporal content.

Conus stresses that the idea of the structural cell, which in one of his works receives more emphasis than the pulsating wave, was a new theoretical idea. Neither the term "structural cell" nor the idea of it as "the sound content of the structural wave," as "the greatest common measure of all the organic parts of a given musical organism," even existed previously, he insisted. "Not knowing the origins of musical creation (not knowing the structural cell) deprived theory of the possibility not only of solving the problem of musical form, and of even raising rational questions concerning this problem."

To designate the next higher unit of measurement, the intermediate level, Conus invented a number of terms which he used at varying times:
simple and compound structural units, "metrically pulsating accents," "structural musical meters," "measures of higher order," "organic part of the whole," and "musical creative volitional act." In his earlier writings, Conus used the term "measures of higher order," for which he later substituted the term "musically creative volitional acts." Here again, Conus attempted to create an impression of novelty and complexity using flowery, sometimes meaningless language for simple, basic elements. Three of these terms—measure of higher order, organic (or architectural) part of the whole, and musical creative volitional act—came to represent three different aspects of the same phenomenon:

The psychological conception—the creative volitional act—is synonymous with the structural conception—the architectural part—and both of these are synonymous with the musical technological conception—the measure of higher order. This triad of terms illuminates a single object from three different sides.15 He subsequently increased this "triad" to a tetrad by adding the well-known syntactical term "musical phrase," which identifies for most of us the real significance of this concept.

Conus forms the musical creative volitional act by grouping together the pulsating waves or cells, as shown in Example 22.1, measures 3-22 of the Chopin Ballade, Op. 52, in F minor. Here the structural cell equals a dotted quarter-note, one-half of a measure (meter: 6/8). Conus groups the twenty-nine pulses into seven creative volitional acts of three, four, or five pulses each. He then groups these seven musical creative volitional acts into three larger groups, containing nine, eleven, and nine pulses, respectively. These groupings form a nearly symmetrical equilibrium, broken only by the reverse order of the musi-
cal creative volitional acts in the outer nine-pulse groupings:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
4 & 5 & 4 & 3 \\
9 & \ldots & 11 & \ldots \\
\end{array}
\]

However, in order to follow the pattern established in the first three volitional acts, in which the phrasing coincides with the grouping of the pulses, he should have appended the second half of measure 16 with the Bb minor cadence to the previous volitional act. The shortened F major cadence in measure 18, which elides in the first half of the measure with the beginning of the next phrase, would then leave the fifth volitional act with only three pulses instead of Conus's four. But such action would destroy his near-symmetry on the lower level:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
4 & 5 & 4 & 3 \\
9 & \ldots & 11 & \ldots \\
\end{array}
\]

Conus chose instead to shorten the previous phrase to create a more symmetrical grouping.

Conus's criteria for forming the musical creative volitional acts, the grouping of the pulsating waves or cells into the volitional acts, vary and are often indefinite. But whatever the criteria, they must exhibit what Conus called "elements of community," "cementing traits" of a collective relatedness, "distinguishing signs joining groups of 16 measures into a metric structural unit." A metric structural unit, or a musically creative volitional act, therefore, exhibits a certain completeness, which allows it to be viewed as an "isolated part of the work. . . . The musical completeness of a structural unit is confirmed by the formula of some kind of cadence completing it." As noted above, Conus violates this criterion in his analysis of the Chopin
Ballade in Example 22.1. Here the elements of community range from an unbroken series of eighth notes in the bass to an organ point on the dominant. In one of his earliest analyses, he applied a variety of criteria, including cadence type, pauses, repetitions, the introduction of new thematic content (differences in melodic phrasing, accompanying rhythm, etc.), harmony (stable, unstable), and tonality.

Example 22.1. Fredrich Chopin, Ballade, Op. 52, F minor, mm. 8-22.
In his later writings, though, Conus pays little attention to this matter, never explaining why a certain grouping was formed. One fact becomes certain, however: each musically creative volitional act begins with an accented wave or cell. Invariably the pulsating waves form trochees, dactyls, a mixture of the two, or a combination of one with a single cell (accented or unaccented). The three basic possibilities—
one cell, two cells (trochee), and three cells (dactyl)—occur universally: "In the end all music of all epochs and all genres breaks down 19 into these three basic forms." Conus applies the term "metric accent" to the beginning (normal) accent of these forms, and "episodic accent" to one "manifested in an inappropriate place," that is, not at the beginning of a phrase. Such an "inappropriate place" occurs in Varlaam's song from Musorgsky's Boris Godunov (Example 22.2).

Here the accent, which is episodic, falls on the fourth beat instead of the first beat of the phrase. In Conus's view, though, misplaced accents were no obstacle: "Metrotechtonicism worked out the idea of supported points in music irrespective of the accent sign." Conus firmly rejects Riemann's view of the iamb as a type or ur-meter, substituting for it the beginning-accented meter, which he considered 22 "the true nature of musical structural meter." Of course, Conus is just substituting one arbitrary interpretation for another. This phrase of Varlaam's song is definitely end-accented, an interpretation that cannot be ignored and explained as merely an aberration of the "norm" of beginning-accented groups.
Example 22.2. Modest Musorgsky, Boris Godunov, "Varlaam's Song," mm. 1-5.

At the next level of the hierarchy, Conus groups musical creative volitional acts to form larger and larger units. The highest level usually represents the division of the composition (or movement) into two or three parts. Inevitably, this level also exhibits some type of symmetry—what he calls "the law of reflected size," or later, "the law of the equilibrium of temporal size." This reflection or equilibrium occurs in three types, shown in Figure 22.1. Since this law may be observed in all levels of a musical work, Conus concludes, "The principle of equality lies, thus, at the foundation of musical architecture." Here, then, is the basic misconception under which Conus labors.
1. Symmetry, or mirror similarity: 
   \[ 2-3-4 \quad \Rightarrow \quad 4-3-2 \]

2. Periodicity, or direct similarity: 
   \[ 2-3-4 \quad \Rightarrow \quad 2-3-4 \]

3. Mixed order, partly symmetrical, partly periodic: 
   \[ 5-4 \quad \Rightarrow \quad 4-5 \]
   \[ (2-3)-4 \quad \Rightarrow \quad 4-(3-2) \]
   or
   \[ 2-7 \quad \Rightarrow \quad 2-7 \]
   \[ 2-(3-4) \quad \Rightarrow \quad 2-(4-3) \]

Figure 22.1. Types of equilibrium.

Conus's analysis of the Adagio from Beethoven's Sonata, Op. 13
(Figure 22.2), shows a mixed order of symmetry. It is partly symmetrical
and partly periodic, if one disregards the extra measure at the end
(m. 73), which lies outside the symmetry. The scheme reproduced here
combines two different schemes Conus made at different times. The
earlier version (1902) includes lower-level groupings and individual
24 cells that the later version (approximately 1932-1933) omits. The
meter of the movement is 2/4 and each cell equals a measure.

Concerning this movement, Conus concludes:

The varied structural units, both in their interrelation and also
in their relation to the whole, are subordinated to the laws of
symmetry and identity. In respect to form, the composer creates
one half freely. For the other half he unconsciously reflects the
form already created in the first half.25

However, while this movement may be divisible into two nearly equal
parts, thematically and harmonically this reflected symmetry does not
exist. Although Conus's six- and eight-cell volitional acts are
grouped correctly, his groupings on the next level—and on the highest levels as well—do not properly represent the musical content.

Figure 22.2. Ludwig van Beethoven, Sonata for piano, Op. 13, Adagio: metrotechtonic analysis.

Most analysts would see in this movement a rondo (Tovey) or perhaps a three-part form with an abbreviated return (Figure 22.3).

Measure nos.: 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8+8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8+6</td>
<td>8+8</td>
<td>6+1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rondo: 

A    | B       |
A    | C       |
A    | coda    |

Three-part: 

A    | b       |
A'   |         |

Conus: 

a    | b       |
b'   | a'      |

(Key: 

Ab    | Eb      |
Ab    | ab-E    |
Ab    | Ab      |

Figure 22.3. Form of Beethoven's Piano Sonata, Op. 13, Adagio.
Conus's analysis agrees with at least one of the other two possible analyses in all junctures but one. The measures in dispute are measures 23-28, which, according to Conus, belong to the following eight measures, measures 29-36, the return of A (and tonic) in the rondo form. Harmonically on the dominant, measures 23-28 merely anticipate the return of A and the tonic. Thematically, these measures are not related to the main theme in A and should not be grouped with it. Conus does not adequately demonstrate any thematic connection between measures 23-28 and the main theme, but merely states, "Both melodically, harmonically, and also by the unbrokenness of the movement, the concluding measures of the fragment examined by us [measures 23-28] are as if instilled into the main theme." Instead, he dwells primarily on the differences between the two six-bar fragments in measures 17-22 and 23-28 in order to justify their separation. Metrically, he divides the first segment (mm. 17-22) into two separate dactyl groups, 3 + 3, which do not reflect their true metrical or formal natures. His general observations concerning the first segment, though, are accurate:

We have here not a twelve-measure [phrase], but two independent six-measure phrases, isolated from each other. The first of these, possessing a full close in the dominant and a completely independent beginning, by no means aspires to join either the previous or the following [phrase] in a single large structural unit; the second, on the contrary, shows an inclination through many signs to join with the following eight-bar [phrase].27

Separating measures 23-28 from measures 29-36, though, would result in a disproportional grouping of measures and would spoil the near-symmetry of Conus's analysis. Because of this discrepancy, Conus's symmetry has less significance than the other analyses, and his letter
designation "a b b' a'" reflects only his arbitrary groupings.

Although Conus concentrates less on naming the higher levels of the hierarchy than the lower levels, he does relate all levels to the measure of higher order: "The parts of a musical organism are measures of a higher order of different degrees. The organism as a whole is a huge measure of higher order, the measured portions of which are those measures of lower orders of which it is constituted." The boundaries of these upper-level measures of higher order, as seen in the analysis of the Adagio, must coincide with existing boundaries of measures of lower order: "The partition of a musical work should be made exclusively at the points of union of its composite parts, that is, at the idea boundary where the preceding measures of higher order come into contact with the following [measures of higher order]." Not only do the boundaries of the upper-level groupings coincide with certain of those of the lower-level groupings, but they also occur before an accented cell, since Conus used trochees and dactyls exclusively. This concept of hierarchical grouping on different levels of metrical units may be broadly related to Schenker's structural levels. Taneev and Catoire attempted to apply this concept at the lower levels, to harmony and metrics, respectively; but Conus was the first Russian theorist to develop this concept and apply it in a systematic fashion.

The division of a musical composition into its temporal components—the discovery of its temporal coordinate—results in what Conus called "the techtonic skeleton" of the work, its "autonomous musical architectural" "structural skeletal" aspect, which forms Conus's prima-
ry analytical interest. Antithetical to this "techtonic skeleton" is the "external sound covering," the "integumentary, syntactical" aspect, which has its own "metric fabric" in which the meter may differ. In fact, these two aspects usually do not agree metrically: while the skeletal meter is always trochaic or dactylic or a mixture of the two, the covering meter may be iambic, amphibrachic, anaplectic, or some other type. In Conus's view, Riemann and others were unable to separate these aspects, leading Riemann to insist on the hegemony of the iamb. This internal/external, frame/covering, or skeletal/skin dichotomy essentially represents the distinction between meter, which begins on the first beat of the measure, and motive, which may begin on any beat or portion thereof. Thus to say that the meters of these two aspects do not agree is incorrect; rather, it is the initial beats that do not agree. This justification for Conus's symmetrical, beginning-accented approach merely provides an explanation for those moments when the music does not begin on the first beat of the measure.

Conus provides illustrations of agreement and nonagreement between the integumentary (covering) whole and the skeletal whole. Although for him agreement between the two aspects is normal and nonagreement abnormal, the latter occurs more frequently (which raises the question, if nonagreement occurs in the majority of cases, why is it abnormal?). As an example of agreement, Conus selected the first two measures of the second movement of Chaikovsky's Sixth Symphony (Example 22.3), which exhibit a symmetrical equilibrium of two volitional acts, each five quarter-note pulses, agreeing therefore with the 5/4 meter.
Example 22.3. Petr Il'ich Chaikovsky, Symphony No. 6, second movement, mm. 1-2.

As an example of non-agreement, Chaikovsky's *Elegie*, Op. 55, No. 1, measures 1–3 (Example 22.4), displays in its integumentary structure an anapestic anticipation of the six-part skeletal meter. In the diagram accompanying the example, the primary accent is distinguished with two small horizontal lines over the beat number (1), whereas the secondary accent is distinguished by one small horizontal line over the beat number (4).

Conus relates the breaking-up process of analysis, the uncovering of the boundaries of the various groupings, to the skeletal aspect of a composition:

Metrotechtonicism establishes that the breaking up of musical bodies should be done by the principle of a skeletal and not an integumentary division, since the second may give an arbitrary and particularly irrational relation of parts, while the first reveals the structural regularity of the interrelation between parts and of the parts to the whole. Here is why one ought to divide musical creations at the boundary points of their skeletal parts. . . . These are chronometric points, not having a dimension—equal to zero—-and mathematically agreeing in the musical body with the rudimentary pulsating stimuli of the first supported cells of any musical creative volitional act. In view of the unbroken continuity of a musical body in time, the concluding point of each previous volitional act is at the same time also the beginning points of the following [volitional act]. These points, invariably supported, we call points of the skeletal (or architectural) union of parts. They are the points of origin of the bars of higher order.31

These points of the skeletal union of parts are found between succeeding volitional acts; they correspond to the seams of the musical fabric but without any overlapping, since they have no dimension. The skeleton of a musical organism consists of "a regular system of points, intuitively formed in musical time, in which parts [of the organism] are joined with parts."
Dividing up a composition at the skeletal points tends to break up the thematic content unnaturally, for example, severing upbeats (as in Example 22.5) or downbeats (as in Example 22.1) from the thematic material to which they belong. Conus insists, though, that an upbeat, while appearing to be the beginning of an integumentary phrase, is "in reality the architectural end of the previous skeletal part of the musical organism"; the downbeat, the integumentary end, is "in reality the architectural beginning of the following skeletal part." The upbeat and downbeat are severed from their respective beginning and ending integumentary positions by the points of skeletal joining, the points appearing as the boundaries of measures of higher order. When no upbeat exists, the integumentary and skeletal limits of the grouping agree. When an upbeat precedes the first pulse (accented) of Conus's grouping, the integumentary and skeletal limits diverge.

The value of the discovery of the skeletal structure of a musical work had a wide application for Conus:

The revelation of the skeletons in musical organisms clearly shows the crystallike structure of the temporal plan of sound architecture. Having at one's disposal the skeleton of a musical organism, one obtains a firm basis for definitive and exhaustive judgments about its metrics, rhythmmics, melodicities, harmony, modulatory plan, factors of its presentation, its thematics, instrumentation, etc. All these factors are closely connected with the skeleton of the organism, since they all agree in the points of temporal division. . . . Dissecting the musical body, defining the mutual disposition and correlation of the organic parts of the whole in time, we may diagnose their functional purposes.34

Yet he never illustrated the exact application of the skeletal structure in assessing various factors such as melody, harmony, etc. And as we have seen, more often than not Conus's interpretations are at odds with
the music itself, and he had to invent some unusual explanations to justify these discrepancies. Despite his assertions, the factors he mentions do not always "agree in the points of temporal division" with the skeleton.

For Conus, the significance of his theory was very great:

The discovery of the temporal coordinate . . . solves the complex . . . problem of musical form. The solution is expressed in the following highly valuable scientific generalization: The form of an audible creation is defined by the measurement of its temporal coordinate just as the form of a visual creation [is defined] by the measurement of its spatial coordinate.

The discovery of temporal coordinates in musical architecture firmly established that intuition in the process of creation secretly is based on sober equality (mechanics), on perfectly measured computation (mathematics), and on pure deductions (logic). The existence of musical coordinates in each audible creation irrefutably points out that even the most emotional audible phenomenon is in its inner constitution servilely submissive to the eternal laws of impassive numbers.35

Conus apparently wanted to do for musical form what Taneev had done for moveable counterpoint, that is, relate musical form to the laws of mathematics (as well as the laws of architecture, mechanics, and logic!). He must have taken Taneev’s dictum regarding the verification through mathematics too much to heart.

The practical advantages of his system, Conus determined, narrow down to two areas: practices of orthography, and methods of study. Conus wanted to enrich orthography with a system of punctuation marks, which he did not divulge, with the invention of "a syntactical codex" that would establish the "architecturally strictly proportionate nature of musical speech," and with a new form of writing bar lines, as dotted, unbroken, double, etc., that would reflect the syntactical
thought of the composition. Conus in his works often rewrote pieces of music according to his own orthographical system in order to demonstrate the correctness of his system over the means of orthography chosen by the composer. He believed that the republication of the masterpieces of world musical literature using these new notational practices would result in changes in study methods, such as decreased time needed for memory work, less difficulty in understanding a composition, and increased accessibility to the formal aspect of compositions for research purposes. Conus also suggested that students be educated in metrotechtonic analysis and in the metrotechtonic methods of notation, resulting in the correct notation of new compositions. Thus for the first time, in his view, music would be provided with its own language, its own syntax.

Conus views musical form as a strictly temporal embodiment:

The form of a musical creation is a kind of method that limits its creation in time. Metrotechtonic research established that musical forms belong to the category of regularity. . . . Form is a necessarily copresent component part of a unified whole, which finds its expression in a temporal projection and illuminates the organization of its parts in time. Form is perceived as unified because the participation of all available factors of music content is concentrated collectively in its formation. . . . [Form is] the side of living musical content that is imprinted on the passive temporal substrata.37

Conus's attention to the significant element of time in music was unusual for his era; in the United States, for example, only recently have theorists begun to study the significance of this aspect in greater detail. In Conus's interpretation, the realization of the musical syntactical process unfolds in stages beginning with "pure time," which is calm, impassive, and is symbolized by a straight line, and ending
with "musical time," essentially, a musical form. This development of musical time from pure time involves four steps: (1) the rise of the concept of "measure" (not a musical measure, but a means of regular measurement; the cells or waves in metrotechtonicism), symbolized by points equidistant from each other on a straight line; (2) the rise of "supported points," accented cells occurring periodically from within one to three cells, functioning as natural borders between the musically creative volitional acts and measured by whole numbers representing the cells; (3) the rise of "architecturally measured parts," designated by brackets, by numbers reflecting the numbers of cells, and by letters identifying parts; and (4) the rise of "the regularities of symmetrical, periodic, and mixed orders. Music, formed in time, is invariably subordinate to one of these regularities." Conus calls these regularities "the laws of sound architecture," which "are the greatest relation among the parts of a musical organism but by no means should be applied to the sound content of the cell." These laws thus apply to all the parts except the cell: "One and the same general structural law of proportionality directs the creation both of small parts (in their details) and also large [parts]."

In his last work, Conus distinguishes between the "technical content of musical creation," consisting of "all the varied material used for its manufacture," and the "artistic content of musical creation," consisting of its influences on the listener, caused by tonal perceptions of the psychic experience. . . . The technical content of musical creation is a phenomenon of the first order, perceived by our ear from
the artistic content of musical creation is a phenomenon of secondary order, perceived by our psyche from within as an echo, a reflex.41

Naturally he places the technical content of music first, since it is elements of this aspect with which metrotechtonicism is concerned, rather than artistic content. He includes four kinds of factors in the technical content—the factor of time, factors of physical order (acoustics), factors of physiological order (music perception), and factors of psychological order, which include such concrete elements as mode, rhythm, polyphony, and such abstract elements as stasis or kinesis, similarity or contrast, etc. Thus metrotechtonicism is concerned with aspects of two of these factors—time and psychological order. Yet most modern-day theorists would exchange Conus's interpretation of physiological order with that of psychological order, the latter having more to do with music perception, and the former with such physiological, organic elements as kinesis, contrast, etc.

Conus's most detailed and comprehensive example of the metrotechtonic approach is his analysis of the first movement of Beethoven's Piano Sonata, Op. 90, shown in Figure 22.4. In it he illustrates graphically the syntactical division of the movement, from the lowest level, the grouping of the structural cells, to the highest, the three parts plus codetta, of the sonata form. To this scheme he appended a portion of the movement printed in his metrotechtonic notation, shown in Example 22.5. In this notation, he separates the cells with dotted bar lines, the volitional acts with solid bar lines, and the measures of higher order with double bar lines separated by a blank space be-
tween them, one line indicating the end of one grouping, the other indicating the beginning of the next grouping.

Conus also made a detailed survey of the musical creative volitional acts of this movement, from which it appears that changes in tonality and cadences were the determining factors in the groupings. Certainly the thematic content did not contribute. The nonagreement between the integmentary and the skeletal aspects is evident from the excerpt shown in Example 22.5. Frequently, as in the sixteenth and eighteenth cells, for example, an upbeat at the beginning of a phrase or a downbeat at the end of a phrase falls outside the joining points, and is excluded from the volitional act containing the theme to which it belongs. The metric analysis poses no problem, even though Conus does not indicate it: the two- and four-cell groupings may be interpreted as one or two trochees, or perhaps, in the case of the four-cell grouping, a dactyl with an extra unaccented cell; the three-cell groupings may be interpreted as dactyls. The constructive cell equals one measure, a dotted half note.

Although the movement contains 245 measures, the total number of cells is 253. The discrepancy exists because of Conus's practice of interpreting fermatas as extra cells (from one to three), as in measure 16 (Example 22.5). While this approach may appear to be a practical one since time, not space, is being measured, in application it becomes a subjective matter. In this analysis, Conus adds eight cells in all, two to measure 16 and its equivalent, measure 159 in the recapitulation, and in the codetta, one to measure 237 and three to the
Figure 22.4. Ludwig van Beethoven, Sonata for piano, Op. 90, first movement, "Metrotechnic plan of the syntactical motion."

The final measure of the movement, measure 245. However, he omits from consideration the fermatas in measure 24 and its equivalent in the recapitulation, measure 167, which mark the end of the first theme and the beginning of the transition to the second theme. Consequently, it becomes difficult not to believe that Conus manipulated these lengths so that the various sections of the composition would become more nearly equal in length to support his "laws of sound architecture."
Example 22.5. Ludwig van Beethoven, Sonata for piano, Op. 90, first movement, mm. 12-17.

Conus's metrotechtonic plan illustrates the symmetry of the movement, the tripartite division which coincides with the three main sections of the sonata form—exposition, development, and recapitulation. Symmetry also occurs at each level within these sections. Only the development section contains minor discrepancies between its first and third segments. The exposition and recapitulation also exhibit a tripartite division, which, according to Conus, coincides with the first theme, the transition, and the second theme. In order to determine the validity of Conus's analysis, I have compared it with the analysis of this movement by Donald Francis Tovey (Figure 22.5)

Conus's interpretation agrees with Tovey's at many of the major structural points, namely, the beginning of theme 2 (m. 55), the begin-
ning of the recapitulation (m. 144), part 3 of the development (mm. 100-109), and the concluding phrase of the codetta (mm. 238-245).

Concerning the other major structural points, such as the beginning of the transition and the beginning of the development, Conus’s analysis differs from Tovey’s by four and three measures, respectively. In both instances, the disputed measures are ambivalent thematically, and could belong either to the previous grouping, as in Conus’s analysis, or to the following grouping, as in Tovey’s analysis. Harmonically, these

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposition:</th>
<th>Theme 1</th>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>Theme 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conus:</td>
<td>1-28</td>
<td>29-54</td>
<td>55-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tovey:</td>
<td>1-24</td>
<td>24/25-54</td>
<td>55-81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conus:</td>
<td>85-95</td>
<td>96-99</td>
<td>100-109</td>
<td>110-119</td>
<td>120-129</td>
<td>130-133</td>
<td>134-143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tovey:</td>
<td>32-91</td>
<td>92-99</td>
<td>100-109</td>
<td>110-117</td>
<td>118-----</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132-143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recapitulation:</th>
<th>Theme 1</th>
<th>Transition</th>
<th>Theme 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conus:</td>
<td>144-171</td>
<td>172-197</td>
<td>198-227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tovey:</td>
<td>143/144-167</td>
<td>168-197</td>
<td>198-221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codetta:</th>
<th>Part 1</th>
<th>Part 2</th>
<th>Part 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conus:</td>
<td>228----</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>238-245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tovey:</td>
<td>222-231</td>
<td>232-237</td>
<td>238-245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 22.5. Comparison of Conus’s analysis of Beethoven Piano Sonata, Op. 90, with D. F. Tovey’s analysis.
measures should be considered as belonging to the previous grouping; however, structurally, they belong to the following grouping, since they occur after important strong cadences, in the tonic and dominant, respectively. Thus, although Conus successfully demonstrates a certain degree of symmetry in this movement, the extension of that symmetry to the rigorous proportions he claims remains in doubt.

Conus's Criticisms of Riemann. Conus strongly criticizes other methods of formal analysis, particularly those of Riemann and his followers, who made up a large segment of the group of theorists Conus calls "traditional" (which included virtually all theorists from Reicha up to Conus's time). Conus attempts to prove the validity of his theory by pointing out the faults of this school and offering metrotechtonicism as the correct alternative. His list of fifteen criticisms, concerned primarily with the metric division of music, includes the following: the hegemony of the number two and its multiples in analysis; the dogma of the iamb; the insistence on an accented concluding cadence; Riemann's idea of the "bar triplet"; the inability to separate form from content, skeletal meter from integumentary, and episodic accent from metric; the inability of one measure to possess dual function as both the beginning of one phrase and the end of another; and the concepts of expansion and contraction within a metrical analysis. Regarding musical form in general, Conus's criticisms include: the nonexistence in traditional theory of general guiding principles concerning the formal articulation of music; traditional-
ists' inattention to general laws concerning the relation of the parts to the whole and the structure of the whole, and to the laws of proportionality; the inadequacy of the existing classification of forms; the secondary status of vocal and instrumental forms in traditional theory; and the overabundance of unnecessary syntactical terms.

To some extent Conus's criticism are valid, but his theory does not provide all the solutions to the problems. In certain respects his theory merely replaces one dogmatic approach with another, such as its insistence on trochees over iambics. In addition, in his haste to condemn traditional theory for its faults, Conus neglects to consider the many areas where his theories coincide with—and perhaps were influenced by—the theories of Riemann concerning formal analysis. One can see similarities in several areas: the grouping of these measures into larger units (Riemann: symmetries of higher order; Conus: measures of higher order); the application of Greek metrics to these measures (for Riemann the iamb was omnipresent; for Conus, the trochee), and so on. In addition, Conus applied Riemann's statement that "musical metrics is, consequently, the study of symmetries," to the work of music as a whole. For Riemann, though, the law of strict metric proportionality applied only to small structures, such as the period: "The largest forms are constructed not with the aid of purely metrical structure, but on the basis of the grouping of their thematic content." Conus, apparently, had in mind phrases such as this one when he criticized the traditionalists for confusing form with content and integumentary structure with skeletal structure.
Conus and Catoire. Conus also shares with Catoire some similar approaches to questions of musical form: denouncements of Riemann and his one-sided interpretations; attention to the metric analysis of music; dissatisfaction with certain aspects of traditional theory (different for each, however); and a hierarchical approach to formal analysis. Yet Conus did not approve of Catoire's more traditional approach to formal analysis; nor did Catoire approve of Conus's revolutionary method, as he implies in his book. For example, Catoire makes an obvious reference to Conus in the introduction to Muzykal'naia forma:

A further problem [of musical form] is the study of the laws by which musical works are combined to create one artistic whole. To establish regularities in the structure of an artistic work is a problem of a higher order; this regularity undoubtedly exists, but it is very complex and in any case may not be reduced to a simple measurement of time, to a purely arithmetic calculation of measures [emphasis mine—E.C.].

Further on in the text Catoire also has Conus in mind in his distinction between two kinds of symmetry—temporal and spatial:

One ought, of course, strictly to differentiate such symmetry in time from spatial symmetry, which we see in the fine arts, mainly in architecture. Schopenhauer, in carrying out a detailed parallel between time and space in the beginning of the second volume of his book The World as Will and Idea, says, "Rhythm (meter) exists only in time; symmetry exists only in space."

Whereas symmetry in space represents a correspondence at any distance of identically constructed parts of a building, symmetry in time... is the juxtaposition of two absolutely adjacent, but not always identically constructed parts, answering each other as thesis to arsis.

Overall, the differences between the two theorists far outweigh their similarities.

However, despite the attention given to Conus's theory of metro-techtonicism in the 1920s and 1930s, it turned out to be less signifi-
cant for Soviet music theory than Catoire’s approach. Conus’s attempts to prove the existence of universal laws of architecture in music led him to disregard much that is useful in distinguishing one form from another, such as thematic content and tonality. And yet in his analysis of Beethoven’s Sonata, Op. 90, Conus reconciles somewhat the traditional approach with the metrotechtonic approach. Although he had nearly 1,000 analyses to his credit, he never grouped them according to general characteristics, except those of symmetry or periodicity on the lower levels and proportionality on the higher levels. He only wished to prove that each piece of music was inherently subordinate to the laws of architecture.

Criticisms of Conus. Conus’s unilateral and frequently illogical approach proved unacceptable to many musicians. When Conus demonstrated his method to Arensky and Taneiev in 1902, applying it to their own works, they both reacted unfavorably. Taneiev wrote to his former student: "You must recognize that the 'schemes' of the system of calculation represent an imperfect instrument so poorly worked out that by means of it you not only fail to reach the truth but also become entangled in very simple things." Arensky complained to Taneiev about Conus’s "absurd" theory:

The qualities ascribed by Conus to the forms of works are the qualities of numbers, of figures, and not at all of musical structures, since his graphic structures bear a completely arbitrary character.

It is possible to see this from the following:
1. Conus arbitrarily takes 2, 3, 4, etc. measures (sometimes 1 and sometimes none) and designates this the middle.
2. He is not able to say whether there is equality or symmetry and ascribes one or the other to the form arbitrarily.
3. He divides movements not on the basis of their logical meaning, but completely arbitrarily, beginning with whichever measure he pleases.
4. Along with this he sometimes still uses neither equality nor symmetry.
5. If one considers that the majority of musical structures consists of an even number of measures, it becomes understandable that one can easily determine such a combination of numbers in which it is possible to find either equality or symmetry.

It seems to be that this fascinating work in the analysis of form may also do essential damage to the weak health of Conus, and absolutely will not be useful to art.50

In his reply to Arensky, Taneev reveals how Conus reacted to criticism:

George [Eduardovich] relates very strongly to those who do not agree with him. For example, in the concluding part of my symphony, he did not observe the place where the main sentence finished, but placed the boundary earlier than its conclusion; when I protested, he said that his division does not have anything in common with the division into sentences, periods, and such. When you ask him what criteria guide him in placing the boundaries, he evades the answer, saying that theoretically he himself does not understand this.51

Taneev also points out Conus's illogic:

Frequently in his discussions one meets what in logic is called petitio principii, or, "false circle." ... For example, he says, "Look, what symmetry! On one side of the center there are 8 and 6 measures, on the other, 6 and 8," etc. When you ask: "On what basis is the 8 measures divided from the 6?" he frequently answers: "Because otherwise there would not be a symmetry!" Thus in order to show the essence of symmetry, he operates on a given division of measures into groups, and in order to justify this division, he operates on symmetry.

When you point this out to him, he is dissatisfied and answers that whoever has not drawn as many schemes as he may not criticize him, for he has been studying this for two years.52

Leonid Sabaneev first criticized Conus's theory of metrotechtonicism in print, in an article appearing one month after Conus's first article. Sabaneev disputes nearly every point made by Conus, from
Conus's "hypertrophy" of time to his disregard for other elements.

Sabaneev may not have been much of a theorist himself, but he understood all too well the problems with Conus's theory:

Form is the result of the complex interaction of all the elements of a musical whole. . . . The method of Conus is completely saturated with scholasticism—it is the living negation of art. Besides, it is completely unscientific—for it is based on a priori structures . . . and therefore does not give an idea of the true structure of a musical organism. One should be more objective. This is why we consider that the method of Conus is not useful and is also in many ways harmful. 54

In a subsequent article defending his theories, Conus appended testimony from prominent musicians who praised his analytical approach. Yavorsky's remark (made February 2, 1922) typifies these laudatory comments: "The Metro-architectonic method of research of musical works appears to be a solution for one of the more important problems related to finding the processes of thought in the sphere of musical poetry." 55 Yet Yavorsky actually did not approve of Conus's system, which casts doubt on the validity of the other statements in the article and makes one wonder as to their source.

Other critics of Conus's theories tended to express more moderate views, both positive and negative. In a 1928 article, the musicologist Valentin Eduardovich Ferman, for example, approaches the analysis of musical form from a materialistic, i.e., Marxist, point of view, and divides it into organic and historical aspects. In his opinion, the organization of the tonal artistic process takes place in several directions: the intonational melodic, modal harmonic, textural instrumental, metrical rhythmic, and structural temporal directions. He agrees with Conus that "the organization of the musical material by
temporal means is the primary organization in both biophysical and
historical relations; it makes possible all other types of organiza-

"Therefore, in the narrow sense, musical form may be under-
stood generally as "the metric structure of a given piece," expressed
through the organization of the musical pulse. But Fermin disagrees
with Conus concerning the method of measuring these pulses:

Essential [elements] in the temporal structure of a work are the
number of pulsating units being measured, the number of strong
beats, and the principal kind of succession of strong and weak
parts, not the isochronism of the distances between them, and not
the mathematically equal lengths of the structural pulsating
waves.58

Ferman stresses that irrational tempo changes, including fermatas, do
not allow exact calculation, but may be subject to various interpreta-
tions. While admitting that in music, as in all art and in nature,
there exists a definite tendency towards equilibrium, towards structur-
al proportionality expressed in a work's temporal structure and also in
its thematic structure, Ferman emphasizes that "in music, as in the
other arts, symmetry is manifested not mathematically exactly, but only
as an aspiration to equilibrium that arises on a biological basis."
This view is more in line with Yavorsky's approach to symmetry and
equilibrium.

Most important, he states:

A different type of musical, architectural symmetry characterizes
each historical epoch. . . . But it is possible to reveal the
individual particularities of separate authors and whole schools
only when seen from a historical viewpoint, from the viewpoint of
living activity, of gradually changing facts and phenomena.60

Sociology, and not biology, becomes the center of gravity for this
approac!., since "art is a social-historical category, a category subor-
dinated to the laws of the historical process in all its dynamics, in
all its varieties." Ferman, of course, follows the Marxist line of
thought. Nonetheless, he praises Conus "for shaking loose many old
pseudo-scientific ... positions of the old German School of musical
theorists," for arousing greater interest in the problem of musical
form, and for playing a great revolutionary role in musical science.

Lev Abramovich Hazel, the foremost interpreter of Conus's theory
during the 1930s, saw both positive and negative aspects in it. He
criticizes its lack of attention to the dynamic aspect of music and its
neglect of formal elements other than meter: "One should not construct
a closed, finished, and 'absolute' theory of form on the basis of the
study of one element." He also disapproves of metrotechtonisms's
equating spatial symmetry with temporal symmetry, and its inability to
reveal anything about the evolution of musical form, style, or struc-
ture of a musical work. Again, these are criticisms from a more
Marxist point of view, but even so they emphasize some of the major
problems in Conus's theory. He points to Conus's failure to provide
definite criteria—except perhaps that of symmetry—for the division of
works into measures of higher order. He concludes that, given all the
"apparatus" of Conus's method, all the variables Conus allowed in his
analyses, it would be "completely improbable" to find a work that

... in order to fulfill one of the many
possible schemes of "equality." There is nothing "miraculous" in
this; only the laws of probability are demonstrated here, and thus
the "law of equilibrium" in its absolute form says nothing about
the specifics of musical art."
However, Mazel does reveal a positive side of the theory:

Very many metrotechtonic analyses turn out to be very satisfactory and uncover essential correlations; without knowledge of these, the understanding of the structure of a given work would be incomplete. This is explained by the fact that all the arts are related, and in particular, many musical works demonstrate architectural properties. . . . Metrotechtonicism, undoubtedly, enriches our perception and calls attention to these architectural correlations in musical works; in this lies its merit.65

He adds that it is not necessary "to develop the entire cumbersome theory of metrotechtonicism" in order to show these architectural correlations:

These correlations should be studied not in opposition to musical syntactical correlations, but in close connection with them. . . . The perceived structure of a work in an architectural plan should be only one component element in our perception of form and should not be the principal one; this should be the perception of the development of musical thought.66

In a later work, Mazel developed more fully his interpretation of the positive aspects of metrotechtonicism. He points to Conus's "brilliant and witty criticism of the traditional school and of Riemann's conception of form, and to the "possibility of a similar sort of opposition among various 'layers' of the musical fabric" as between Conus's idea of "skeleton" and "integument." He thus sees merit in the hierarchical approach to musical analysis. In addition, Mazel gives examples of metrotechtonic analyses that help to illustrate the structure of certain forms, such as the sonata form without development.

Later Soviet Marxist musicology in general, though, was mostly critical of Conus for ignoring the historical, philosophical, and sociological aspects of musical analysis, as in this comment from 1935:

The outstanding trait . . . of Conus's work is the attempt to find some common principles of structural order in the variety of
musical forms. . . . However, the musical creative process is examined by [Conus], not as a sociologically conditioned, complex ideological process . . . but as an immanent, outer historical act, subordinated to the self-sufficient abstract laws of numbers and relations. Instead of establishing the connections of cause and effect and the interdependence of musical forms in the concrete social historical conditions, Conus considers it possible to speak about "the beginning in musical time of the important regulatory laws of symmetrical, periodic and mixed orders," and about the fact that "compositional geniuses are servilely submissive to all of the same laws of impasive numbers."68

Conus replied to such criticisms with a bold affirmation of the exclusive role of scientific research in music: "I consider musical creation the object of exclusively scientific research, and refrain absolutely, by incompetence, from a judgment of [its] sociological and philosophical bias." He similarly justified his distinction between the technical and artistic content of musical creation by stating that the interpretation of the artistic content of music takes place in the listener's psyche and is secondary to the technical content. But Conus failed to acknowledge most of the valid criticism directed against his theories; he only grew stronger in his conviction that metrotechtonicism as he developed it was a valid analytical method.

Had Conus overcome the deficiencies in his approach, had he developed the possibilities inherent in his methods and ideas, rather than blindly adhering to tenets established before he had conducted sufficient research, his theory of metrotechtonicism might have found wider application in Soviet music theory. Even so, his reputation remains secure. He is remembered as the creator of one of the more original theoretical concepts of the early twentieth century, who showed the significance of temporal proportions . . . to musical form as a whole. . . . Conus illuminated one aspect of the musical
manifestation of general aesthetic laws—measurement, symmetry, . . . harmony . . . order—and substantiated one of the so-called precise musicological methods that helps to disclose structural regularities in music.71

More recently, Soviet theorist Ivanka Stoianova, while acknowledging that Conus's "metrotechtonic schemes frequently deform the musical reality of works" and confine music "in a straitjacket of symmetrical constructions," nevertheless admits that they often reveal formal relations in a work that otherwise might remain unnoticed. She places Conus's general theoretical contribution more in the realm of methods of thought, as an intellectual attitude towards analysis:

Conus's metrotechtonic schemes are based . . . on a way of thinking, which uses the comparative method instead of the descriptive method. Each scheme is the result of a process of thinking and not purely of an "objective" reading and description of the score. A metrotechtonic analysis is based then in spite of all the mistakes on a specific musical theoretical tendency, a certain intellectual interpretation of the form of works as an unbroken network of relations. In this sense the theory of metrotechtonic has its true place not only in the history of Russian and Soviet music theory, but in the development of musical thought in general.73

Thus on the practical level Conus joined Taneev and Catoire in directing attention in Russia to questions of formal analysis and to the impracticality of many elements of Riemann's approach. Conus's preoccupation with the temporal side of music—however limited and arbitrary in scope—nonetheless predates Asafiev's emphasis on this aspect, the realization of which took a far different path than metrotechtonicism, however. On a more philosophical level, Conus, also like Taneev, influenced the very method of theoretical thought, away from description and more towards true analysis. Therein lies his main contribution to the development of Soviet music theory.
Support for Conus: Ivan Petrovich Shishov and Melodic Analysis.

Ivan Petrovich Shishov (1888-1947), a teacher at the Moscow Conservatory from 1925 to 1931, developed a method of melodic analysis that might have been more noteworthy had he not relied so heavily on Conus's metrotechtonic approach. In 1927 he published a two-part article, "K voprosu ob analize melodicheskogo stroeniia" [On the question of the analysis of melodic structure], which was the first such work devoted specifically to melody in Soviet music theory. Shishov studied with Conus before the 1917 revolution and subsequently worked with him on metrotechtonicism at both GIMN and GAKhN during the 1920s. The main distinction of his approach from metrotechtonicism is that whereas Conus measures temporal symmetry, Shishov measures intervallic symmetry. Shishov also concentrates on lower-level monophonic constructions, that is, melodies, whereas Conus most often extends his search for symmetry to an entire movement or piece. Echoing Conus, Shishov states, "Any artistic melodic organization is subordinated to the natural laws of equilibrium, irrespective of the infinite variety and change of the separate elements in it." He considers the basic question in the analysis of melody to be that of form, which enters into his definition of melody: "a musical thought, expressed monophonically and having a completed form." A melody thus contains both content ("musical thought") and form and is monophonic. Yet what he means by "completed form" is not clear, for he frequently analyzes melodic fragments or phrases lacking closure, as we will see. To illustrate melodic form, he divides a melody temporally and hierarchically.
ally into segments with names derived from the Greeks (and used also by Mel'gunov)—mora (the smallest, most basic unit of time, which is equal to the shortest note in the melody), stop, colon, period, strophe. The stop level is the motivic level. Shishov also recognizes a sub-motivic level, which he calls "half-motives." Figure 22.6 illustrates this hierarchy.

In order to measure melodic symmetry, Shishov measures the distances of the intervals in the melody. He assigns the numerical values 0 through 7 to the intervals (identical to Taneev's method in his counterpoint text), interprets them as plus or minus depending on their ascending (+) or descending (−) motion, (again, like Taneev), and then compares these values within the course of the melody. He groups notes

![Figure 22.6. Shishov's schematic form of melody.](image-url)
together depending on their symmetrical tendencies. For symmetry, an interval or interval group must have a corresponding interval or interval group either immediately or at a distance. He identifies three types of symmetry—strict or mirror symmetry, in which an interval or group of intervals is matched by its polar opposite in reverse order \( (+1 -2 \ 0 \ +2 -1) \); reverse symmetry, in which an interval or group of intervals is matched exactly \( (+1 -2 \ +1 -2) \); and coordinated symmetry, which contains combinations of strict and reverse symmetries. What is interesting about Shishov's method for revealing symmetry is his application of the technique of reduction to the melody in conjunction with his numbering procedure. His analyses then become hierarchical, capable of displaying symmetry on one or more levels. Unfortunately, like his groupings, his reductions are tied to an arbitrary search for symmetry; in other words, symmetry determines the reduction, not the opposite. He calls the reduction the "framework," "the melodic undercover base, which represents a series of strong moments of different degrees and directions, subordinated to the law of symmetry," and the melody itself the "fabric," "the material cover of the framework" which "really serves as the guide of the moving strength of the melody." 77 This distinction resembles Conus's integument/framework dichotomy, which unlike Shishov's approach is uniplanar. Local occurrences on the "fabric" level determine the character and design of the melody: "The direction and the form of the line of the melodic fabric gives it its character. . . . The stable character and relation of the lengths of the fabric may be examined as its design." 78 These distinctions
strongly resemble Schenker's foreground ("fabric") and middle- or back-
ground levels ("framework"). Yet the means of reduction to achieve
these levels—as well as the purpose and results of the method—remain
very different. Shishov's method for determining the reduction is
purely arithmetic, without any consideration of rhythm, meter, or
harmony; he simply adds together the numerical values of adjacent
intervals or intervals within a designated grouping, following the
rules of simple arithmetic. For example, intervals with like signs
within the same grouping are added together, thus creating a larger
interval with the same direction, whereas intervals with opposite signs
but equal values in the same grouping are eliminated. The resulting
numbers thus represent the intervals in the reduction, and form what I
term a note reduction by value, or just a value reduction, as opposed
to the actual note reduction represented by the value reduction, both
of which Shishov uses.

Example 22.6 illustrates a melodic segment that exhibits a coordi-
nated symmetry; on the lower level it produces a reverse symmetry but
\[ d \rightarrow c \rightarrow d \]
\[ / \rightarrow \rightarrow / \]
on the higher level it becomes a strict symmetry: a b c a b. Here,
though, Shishov eliminates some polarly opposite but equal adjacent
intervals (-5 +5) and retains others that should be eliminated (+4 -4),
all in an effort to create a symmetry. Moreover, his note reduction
does not relate to his value reduction. According to his value reduc-
tion, the notes should read D F# D A D F# D. In order to make a nicer
symmetry, he has replaced the two inner D's with E's, which does not
reflect the melody or his value reduction.
Example 22.6. Johann Sebastian Bach, Well-Tempered Clavier, I, Prelude No. 5, D major, m. 1.

Shishov also claims to include a method for the rhythmic analysis of melody, which in reality merely illustrates in graphic form rhythmic changes between measures (iambic inter-measure) and phrases, and within measures (iambic or trochaic intra-measure). He notates iambic stress changes (weak to strong) at any point (intra- or inter-measure) with an arch; but if the iambic change is intra-measure, he substitutes a dotted-line arch for the full line arch indicating inter-measure changes. Additionally, Shishov treats this iambic intra-measure change like an inter-measure change and inserts a bar line. He notates trochaic intra-measure changes with a straight line. Apparently he does not consider the possibility of a trochaic inter-measure change. This approach therefore follows Riemann's line of thought more than Conus's. He does not identify inter-phrase junctures as to placement of stress, and merely notates them with a dotted-line box. He first applies this "rhythmic analysis" to the "fabric" of the melody and then carries over
those of its elements that accompany the numbers reached in the value reduction (representing the "framework"). In other words, these rhythmic distinctions have no influence on the note reduction.

Shishov analyzes the opening phrase of the third movement of Beethoven's Sonata for Piano, Op. 7, Eb major, shown in Example 22.7, as a strict symmetry in each of its three parts, A, B, and C. Part C, though, is actually a reverse symmetry, since its outer intervals exhibit the same number and sign \((-1)\). (Example 22.7a and b). Here he closely adheres to his own methods regarding the reduction of intervals. In addition to intervallic symmetry, he also finds a "rhythmic" symmetry, in that the middle and outer sections of each symmetry are reverse as to rhythm—in graphic terms, a line-arch-line (the symmetry beginning and ending with trochaic intra-measure intervals) in Parts A and B, versus a arch-line-arch (the symmetry beginning and ending with iambic inter-measure intervals) in Part C.

Example 22.7. Ludwig van Beethoven, Sonata for Piano, op. 7, Eb major, third movement, Allegro, mm. 1-8
A further example of Shishov's arbitrary search for symmetry is shown in Example 22.8, an ancient Greek song, "Seikila." Here his value reduction is also strict, as in the Beethoven example, that is, he adheres to the values reached through the groupings, all of which are intra-measure, either in whole or part. The melody, or its reduction, consists of four basic motives, a, b, c, and d, with a shorter addition, motive e. Shishov divides the melody into three larger units articulated with cadences (indicated with the dotted box). He does not

Example 22.8. Ancient Greek melody, "Seikila."
explain the significance of the dotted lines and arches drawn underneath the reduction. These apparent large-scale groups perhaps correspond to his idea of strophe, but they are not represented according to his initial diagram, shown in Figure 22.6 above. Here Shishov's value reduction results in a note reduction that is at odds with the melodic process itself. For example, in measure four, the significant melodic motion is the motion down to the G, not the motion up to the E. His interpretation of this measure is inconsistent with his interpretation of the similar motion in measure 6. Thus, Shishov interprets the inner portion of the melody as a strict mirror symmetry; and he interprets the two outer portions of the melody as a coordinated type of symmetry.

In the second part of his article, Shishov discusses the energy potential in a melody, the development of "active moments" at the beginning of a melody, and the "passive moments" at the end of a melody. He states, "As far as the first aspires to develop in itself the energy of motion to a final goal, the second acts oppositely." Similarly, each melodic step or interval within the framework, represented by one number, consists of two points—a repulsing point that stimulates motion, and an attracting point. The strength of the energy of this initial repulsing point is determined by the size and length of the interval extending from the initial tone: the longer and larger the interval, the greater the energy. A similar development of energy may be achieved by the repetition of the initial tone or its "inner expansion" by neighboring tones. The degree of attraction of the second tone depends on the position in the symmetry of the group to which it
belongs, beginning or answering. In beginning groups, tonal function is more "active," so that the ability of tones to attract is greater in the beginning portion of a melody than in the ending portion. Thus all the strong elements appear to be clustered towards the beginning of the melody, an interpretation that corresponds to Conus's insistence on beginning-accented units. Yet in his rhythmic "analyses," Shishov tends to prefer end-accented groupings. Shishov does not mention the possibility of energy increasing over the course of the melody. This "energetic" view of melody of course may be related somewhat to Kurth's theories of melodic energy, which were known and discussed at this time in the Soviet Union. Shishov does not elaborate on these views, though; but turns instead to questions of elision and displacement of accent within and between melodic figures, a discussion that is more descriptive than illuminating.

Thus, some of the same problems encountered in Conus's theory of metrotechtonicism also plague Shishov's method of melodic analysis—an arbitrary view of melodic structure based solely on the principle of equilibrium or symmetry, corresponding arbitrary numerical calculations to represent this symmetry, a distinction between layers ("fabric" and "skeleton" or "framework") that misrepresents the true hierarchical foundations and functions in the music, and the application of a method of rhythmic analysis that merely illustrates the position of strong and weak beats on the lower levels. On the positive side, though, Shishov's attempt at a method of melodic analysis makes use of tech-

iques—however misapplied—currently in vogue in Western music theory.
today, such as reduction, determination of rhythmic accent, hierarchical approach and the determination of the various levels, the motive power of generating intervals, and the classification of melodic types (not just types of symmetry). His discussion of melodic energy reveals his approach to include some consideration of the process of melodic unfolding and of the generative potential of certain melodic gestures, and not to be concerned solely with the outer formal characteristics of melody as a crystallized form. Yet his attention to this aspect is vastly insufficient. He claims his articles are just part of a much larger work on melody, which he never published.

Although this particular type of analysis did not gain prominence in Soviet music theory, nonetheless Shishov is credited with being the first Soviet theorist to write a work on melodic analysis. In the article "Melodiia" in *Muzykal'naia Entsiklopediia*, Iurii Kholopov recognizes Shishov for his method of the analysis of formal symmetry in melody and for utilizing the Greek principle of the temporal division of melody. Shishov is the only Soviet theorist from the pre-war period to whom Kholopov devotes any attention regarding melody; he ignores Yavorsky and Kulakovsky, both of whom published separate works on melody (discussed in Chapters 24 and 27, respectively). And although Kholopov applies reduction techniques to melody throughout this article, such an approach has not been utilized in Soviet music theory until recently. Shishov's methods were undoubtedly deemed too formalistic in the years following the publication of his article, which may explain why he never published his major work on this topic.
Shishov, then, turns out to be the only Soviet theorist who attempted to develop any type of analytical system stemming from Conus's theory of metrotechtonicism. In addition, he was the first Soviet theorist to develop any type of analytical system devoted specifically to melody, and to apply reductive techniques to melody. He was also the first and only Soviet theorist of this period to teach a course devoted to melody (1925–1931 at the Moscow Conservatory). The final year of this course, 1931, coincides with the instigation of the integrated approach to analysis (see Part VII) in Soviet music theory; as with other analytical approaches devoted to separate elements of music, Shishov's approach to melodic analysis was seen as a violation of the comprehensive Marxist approach to analysis. Thus what might have become fertile ground for the development of a Soviet theory of melody was eliminated.
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Chapter 23

Nikolai Alexandrovich Garbuzov: The Theory of Multi-Based Modes and Chords

Nikolai Alexandrovich Garbuzov (1880–1955). Nikolai Alexandrovich Garbuzov, a prominent Moscow music theorist and acoustician, like Catoire turned to the serious study of music only after he had completed his education in another field, the physical sciences. After graduating from the Gorny Institute (The College of Mines) in St. Petersburg in 1906, he taught inorganic chemistry at a Moscow technical school from 1911 to 1921. During this time, he began to study music composition at the Musical Grammatic School of the Moscow Philharmonic Society, and received his degree in 1916. His abilities in both music and science led to his interest in acoustical research. In 1921 he became the director of GIMN, taking an active part in acoustical research there. After it was disbanded in 1931, he continued to conduct research, from 1931 at the Gosudarstvennaia akademii iskusstvoznanii [The state academy of the arts] and from 1932 also at the Nauchno-issledovatel'skoi institut pri Moskovskoi konservatorii [The scientific research institute at the Moscow Conservatory], which he directed from 1934 to 1937. He also taught at the Moscow Conservatory (1923–1954) and directed its acoustical laboratory (1933–1948). When the Institut
istorii iskusstv [The institute for the history of the arts] was organized in Moscow in 1944, he directed the musical section.

Like Taneev, Garbuzov believed in the rationalist approach to knowledge, and in the mathematical verification of all sciences, including musical science. However, he found the realization for this belief in a field very different from Taneev’s—in the application of acoustics to music theory, still at this time not a strong area in Russian music theory. Unlike the pseudoscientific efforts of such researchers as Leonid Sabaneev and Arseny Avraamov in acoustics, Garbuzov advocated a more rigorous approach and established acoustics as a legitimate branch of Soviet music theory. This constitutes perhaps his most important contribution to Soviet theory. During the 1920s and 1930s, he advanced a theory of the acoustical basis of harmony, which he used to analyze the harmony of such modern Russian composers of his day as Scriabin, Prokofiev, and Stravinsky. He published his theories in a two-volume work, _Teoria mnogoosnovnosti ladov i sozvuchii_ [The theory of multi-based modes and chords]. He also published a number of articles on this and other topics related to acoustics. Since he wrote each volume separately and took somewhat different approaches in each, it is necessary to examine them individually. However, the basic premise underlying each, as the title implies, is the derivation of modes and chords from multiple foundations. The generating factor is the overtone series, or portions of it, that is, either singly or in combination with up to five other overtone series. However, this creates a system of modal formation that is
unnecessarily complex and basically unworkable. But, like Conus, Garbuzov was a prominent theorist and his theories and research received much attention. Also, Garbuzov's two volumes are symbolic of the two very different directions of Soviet music theory, first in the 1920s and then in the 1930s—a freer, more open atmosphere followed by a restrictive, closed one. This change is readily apparent in Garbuzov's change of approach between volumes I and II. Thus, again, his theories merit investigation for reasons that go beyond the mere value of his approach.

The Theory of Multi-Based Modes and Chords: Vol. I. Garbuzov's theory of multi-based modes and chords rests on several assumptions: (1) all the tones of modes and chords are derived from tones in the overtone series; (2) only certain tones of the overtone series contribute to these constructions; (3) more than one overtone series may enter into the formation of modes and chords; and (4) the various overtone series contributing to such constructions are related. Obviously, the third assumption is the most controversial, but it is this belief that distinguishes Garbuzov's approach from other acoustical theories.

Garbuzov developed his theory while attempting to determine scientifically whether chords do originate from the overtone series, and specifically to explain harmonic constructions used by such composers as Scriabin through the application of the higher partial tones. He pointed in particular to the acceptance by some theorists, such as Sabaneev and Avraamov, of the partial tones 7, 11, and 13, which pre-
viously had been excluded. With the aid of a five-octave harmonium, Garbuzov determined that "the uselessness of the overtone series as a whole [my emphasis—E.C.] for the purpose of harmonic construction was completely clear, and the inaccuracy of explaining all chords as parts of an overtone series [i.e., one overtone series] proved convincing." In other words, the use of just one overtone series to explain all chords was insufficient. He also subjected Ernst Kurth's theory of the contrapuntal origin of chords to the scrutiny of acoustics and found it insufficient as well.

Therefore, in an attempt to determine the true origin and structure of modes and chords, he began a systematic examination of modes, beginning with simpler ones such as the church modes. His attempt to define mode reveals his uncertainty about the true acoustical principles by which modes are generated: Modes are "scales, which are created by man according to the laws of psychological acoustics not yet established, and on the basis of which both folk and serious music were and are being constructed." Thus Garbuzov does not distinguish mode from scale and defines it essentially in terms of its usage and not its origination, function, or content. His term "psychological acoustics" appears to be contradictory, for in his interpretation acoustics is a phenomenon of physics, unrelated to psychology. Yet he clearly utilizes the psychology of perception to a limited degree in his approach.

Garbuzov concentrates on the Ionian mode in his examination as the most historically complete and the simplest in construction. Perceiving that the first tetrachord of this mode from C gives the impression
of F major, while the second tetrachord that of C major, he sensed a modulation from F major to C major. He therefore assumed that the tones of the Ionian mode were a combination of certain partial tones from the overtone series on C and on F. To determine which partial tones from these two series made up this mode, Garbuzov followed this path of rationalization: The tones F and A of the Ionian mode do not belong to the overtone series on C; moreover, the fractions corresponding to the coefficients of these two tones are not multiples of 2 (Example 23.1a). Therefore, only the tones C, D, E, G, and B in the Ionian mode belong to C. By reducing the fractions of these tones by the lowest common denominator, which is 8, the resulting numbers are identical to the numbers of the corresponding tones in the overtone series from C (Example 23.1b). He obtained this order of tones in the

![Example 23.1. a) Ionian mode; b) partial tones from C used in construction of mode.](image)

overtone series by eliminating lower octave duplications (the partial tones 1-6), and the approximate partial tones 7, 11, 13, and 14. By taking the same pattern of notes from F in the overtone series on C,
dividing their fractions by $\frac{4}{3}$ (the relation of F to C) and multiplying the results by 8, he obtained the same pattern from F (Example 23.2). Both these pentachords are what Garbuzov calls "natural pentachords," that is, they exhibit the same structure with the partial tones 8, 9, 10, 12, and 15. Garbuzov concludes, "The natural major or Ionian mode originated therefore from the connection of two natural 5 pentachords in the relationship of a perfect fourth" (Example 23.3).

![Example 23.2. Partial tones from F.](image)

![Example 23.3. Construction of Ionian mode from partial tones on C and F.](image)

Garbuzov analyzes other church modes in a similar manner. The Aeolian mode (on A), for example, originates from three pentachords on C, F, and Bb, related to each other through the intervals of the perfect fourth ($\frac{4}{3}$) and perfect fifth ($\frac{3}{2}$). He does not include in
this calculation the relationship between C and Bb, since he always looked for the closest acoustical relationships, in this case the fourth and fifth. He adds the Bb pentachord because only from it could he obtain the correct coefficients (from Bb, F is 8/5 and D is 4/3) (Example 23.4). Like Yavorsky, Garbuzov calls this mode "an incomplete mode," since not all of the tones produced by the three pentachords participate in the actual constitution of the Aeolian mode. Garbuzov explains the one nonparticipating tone, Bb, by citing its use in the Neapolitan sixth chord, as in the cadence I-bII -V-I. He also calls the Aeolian mode a "commatic mode," because it contains degrees—two D's—separated by a comma (81/80), which occurs in pure tuning.

Example 23.4. Construction of Aeolian mode from partial tones from F, C, and Bb.

Garbuzov also shows that the remaining church modes and the harmonic major and minor modes originate from the joining of pentachords—specifically, from two, three, or four pentachords related by the
intervals of a perfect fourth, a perfect fifth, a major third, a major second, and a minor seventh. Since all the modes he examines result from the combination of two or more pentachords, he calls them "multi-based modes." More specifically, he refers to each mode by the number of pentachords it employs, such as "duple-based," "triple-based," or "quadruple-based." Ionian (C and F), Dorian (C and Bb), Phrygian (C and F), and Lydian (C and F) are duple-based modes; Mixolydian (G, C, and F) and Aeolian (F, C, and Bb) are triple-based modes; and harmonic major (F, C, Bb, and A) and harmonic minor (F, C, Bb, and A) are quadruple-based modes. Garbuzov designates the fundamental tones of each pentachord in the modes as its "acoustical bases." Within each mode the pentachord most closely related to the other pentachords serves as the main pentachord; its base is usually tonic.

Depending on the degree of acoustical relatedness between its constituent pentachords, determined by the number of common tones between them, each mode exhibits a certain level of stability or instability. Modes with pentachords sharing the maximum number of three common tones, indicating relatedness by a perfect fourth or perfect fifth, exhibit the highest degree of stability. Modes with pentachords containing two common tones, a relatedness by major or minor thirds or sixths, exhibit a lesser degree of stability. Modes with pentachords sharing one common tone, a relatedness by major or minor seconds or sevenths, are unstable. Of the modes examined, only the Dorian mode, with one common tone between its pentachords on C and Bb, fits into this last category. Even though the pentachords from C and Bb appear
to share two common tones, the two C's in pure tuning turn out to be separated by a comma. Thus only the D is common to both pentachords. These modes in their complete forms are shown in Example 23.5.

Example 23.5. Church modes and harmonic major-minor mode: complete.

Garbuzov classifies modes in three groups according to the number of common tones between the constituent pentachords and the agreement between the tonic and the basic tone of the main pentachord. Among the modes with three common tones between constituent pentachords, Garbuzov distinguishes two types—"primary modes," whose tonics equal the basic tone of the main pentachord, such as the Ionian and Lydian modes, and
"derived modes of the first order," whose tonics equal the third of the main pentachord, as in the Aeolian and Phrygian modes. This latter characteristic occurs mainly in modes with minor quality. Among the modes with fewer than three common tones between constituent pentachords, Garbuzov distinguishes only one type, "derived modes of the second order," or "modes with unstable tonic," whose tonics agree with the basic tone of the main pentachord, as in the harmonic major and minor modes and the Mixolydian mode. Thus, modes in each of the derived groups share one characteristic with modes in the primary group. Garbuzov should have designated a fourth category for the Dorian mode, whose pentachords share only one common tone and whose tonic equals the third tone of the main pentachord, but he chose to overlook its instability and include it with the derived modes of the first order.

He also names modes according to the intervallic relationships between the acoustical bases of the modes. The derived modes of the first order, whose tonics equal the third of the main pentachord, are named relative to the mode whose tonic equals the basic tone of the main pentachord, as shown below. The major or minor in the name of the mode refers to the quality of the second, third, sixth, and seventh intervals above the basic or tonic note.

1. Ionian: quartal mode (complete)
2. Dorian: third derived from major secundal mode (incomplete)
3. Phrygian: third derived from quartal mode (complete)
4. Lydian: quintal mode (complete)
5. Mixolydian: minor quartal-sextal mode (incomplete)
6. Aeolian: third derived from quartal-quintal mode (incomplete)
7. Harmonic major-minor mode: minor secundal-tertial-sextal mode (incomplete)
Garbuzov applies the same methods to the synthesis of modes:

Using the theory of multi-based modes and chords, I would be able to construct these modes through the analysis of the chords encountered in the works of contemporary composers, but I preferred the path of the synthesis of modes, since it made it possible to show that theory may go ahead of practice. 7

He constructs all the possible stable modes up to sextuple-based modes inclusively, adhering to the following rules: (1) joined pentachords should contain no fewer than three common tones; (2) each higher multi-based mode (from four to six pentachords) should be formed from lower multi-based modes (from two to three pentachords); and (3) the main pentachord of the primary mode should be the natural pentachord sharing the most common tones with each of the other constituent pentachords. Including most of the modes already analyzed, Garbuzov constructs 42 different modes, each consisting of from seven to fourteen notes, some with commatic parts (counted here as one note). In equal temperament, this number would be reduced to 34 different modes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of bases:</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary modes:</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derived modes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first order:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second order:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 23.1. Garbuzov's modal classifications.

For example, one of the three primary sextuple-based modes, the minor-major-minor secundal-tertial-quartal-quintal-sextal commatic mode, contains fourteen different notated pitches with one commatic
pair (A natural). Its acoustical bases are C Db, E, F, G, and A b
(Example 23.6).

Example 23.6. The minor-major-minor secundal-tertial-quartal-quintal-
sextal commatic mode.

Garbuzov realizes chords in a manner similar to his realization of
modes. He analyzes or synthesizes mono-based, duple-based, and triple-
based chords. He designates the chords as "full" if all the notes of
the pentachord(s) are present and in ascending order, "derived" if the
same tones are present but in a different order, and "incomplete" if
tones are missing. Example 23.7a–c illustrates three different mani-
festations—full, derived, and incomplete—of a mono-based chord on C;
Example 23.7d–f illustrates the full, derived, and incomplete manifes-
tations of a triple-based chord with bases on C, E, and Bb.

If the base(s) is present in the chord, Garbuzov calls it a "real"
base; if the base(s) is missing from the chord, he calls it an
"imaginary" base. The minor triad exemplifies a chord with an imagina-
ry base. The base of the minor triad from E, for example, is C; it is
an incomplete mono-based chord (Example 23.8a). The major triad may be
Example 23.7. Mono-based chord on C: a) full; b) derived; c) incomplete. Triple-based chord (C, E, and Bb): d) full; e) derived; f) incomplete.

Example 23.8. a) Minor triad, imaginary base C; b) major triad, imaginary base F.
analyzed as having a real or an imaginary base. The C major triad such as in Example 23.7c, constructed from the pentachord on C, has a real base (C); but if constructed from the pentachord on F, it has an imaginary base, as shown in Example 23.8b, and is an incomplete mono-based chord. This practice of deriving incomplete chords and/or modes from a complete "model," so to speak, may also be found in the theories of Riemann, Catoire, and Yavorsky.

The chords studied in harmony courses, Garbuzov discovered, usually contain from one to four bases. All of the chords he analyzes are incomplete, and the majority of them are unstable and therefore dissonant. The mono-based chords (containing five types plus inversions) include triads and some seventh chords; they contain no tritones, augmented intervals, or diminished intervals. The duple-based chords (eleven different types plus inversions) are more diverse; they include such chords as the diminished triad, the dominant seventh chord, other seventh and ninth chords, and augmented chords. The triple-based chords (twelve different types plus inversions) include reinterpretations of some duple-based chords, and many altered chords. The two quadruple-based chords Garbuzov borrows from Catoire's harmony textbook. Catoire's $\frac{8}{2}$ chord, the minor ninth chord with a raised fifth from the chromatic dominant group, here constructed on G, has two real bases (G and F) and two imaginary bases (Db and E) (Example 23.9a). Catoire's $\frac{2}{2}$ chord, the minor ninth chord with both raised and lowered fifth from the chromatic dominant group, here constructed on G, has three real bases (G, Db, and F) and one imaginary base (E) (Example
23.9b). The simplest mode in which these chords are found is the primary sextuple-based minor-major-minor secundal-tertial-quartal- quintal-sextal commatic mode with bases C, Db, E, F, G, and Ab, already illustrated in Example 23.6. In fact, Garbuzov discovered that all of the "textbook" chords he analyzed, including some "accidental combinations," may be found in just seven modes: the duple-based quartal mode (the natural major mode), the triple-based quartal-quintal mode (C D E F F# G A B C), the quadruple-based minor tertial-quintal-sextal mode (C D Eb E F F# G Ab A Bb B C), the quadruple-based major tertial-quintal-septal mode (C G# D D# E F# G G# A B C), the quintuple-based minor secundal-quartal-quintal-sextal mode (C Db D Eb E F F# G Ab A Bb B C), and the mode in Example 23.6, the sextuple-based minor-major-minor secundal-tertial-quartal-quintal-sextal mode.

Example 23.9. a) Catoire's $\frac{1}{2}$ chord on G; b) Catoire's $\frac{2}{2}$ chord on G.
For additional chords not out of textbooks, Garbusov concentrates on the music of such contemporary composers of his day as Scriabin (the late sonatas), Debussy, Ravel, Prokofiev, Stravinsky (The Rite of Spring), and Schoenberg (Erwartung):

The progress of the newest music compared with the music of past epochs derives not so much from the complication of modes as from the complication of chords. Research into the models of past music and folk music shows that these works frequently were constructed using very complicated modes, but their authors used similar modes for the creation of complex melodic designs (the horizontal development of bases); the newest composers use them for the construction of complex chords (the vertical development of bases).

According to Garbusov's analyses, Scriabin, Debussy, Ravel, and Prokofiev used only a small number of triple-based chords, mainly four types from the dominant group (in the functional sense). In addition Prokofiev employed triple-based chords from the subdominant group (on the lowered second degree), and Stravinsky, triple-based chords from the tonic group that included some perfect fifths. For example, Garbusov analyzes the bitonal chord from the "Dance of the Adolescents" in The Rite of Spring as a triple-based, incomplete major quintal-septal chord, with acoustical bases Fb, Cb, and Eb (Example 23.10). It may be found in a quadruple-based major tertial-quintal-septal mode on Fb (bases Fb, Ab, Cb, and Eb). Two characteristic chords from Scriabin's Piano Sonatas are the beginning chords of the Seventh and Eighth Sonatas. Garbusov analyzes the first of these as a triple-based incomplete diminished-minor quintal-septal chord (Example 23.11a). It occurs on the fifth degree of the quintuple-based minor secundal-quartal-quintal-sextal mode on F (bases F, Gb, Bb, C, and Eb).
Example 23.10. Igor Stravinsky, Rite of Spring, "Dance of the Adolescents," bitonal chord.

He analyzed the beginning chord of the Eighth Sonata as a triple-based incomplete major-minor tertial-septal chord (Example 23.11b). It occurs on the fifth degree of a quintuple-based major tertial-quartal-quintal-septal mode on F (bases F, A, Bb, C, and E). Garbuzov observed the greatest variety of chords in Schoenberg's Erwartung, in which triple-based chords from the dominant group prevail, and in Stravinsky's Rite of Spring.

Garbuzov rejects the construction of chords by like intervals, such as by thirds, fourths, or fifths, since no stable acoustical basis for any such constructions exists: "All chords constructed on these principles in reality turn out to be multi-based chords, the acoustical bases of which have different intervallic relations." He also rejects the idea of polytonality or atonality, considering polytonal or
Example 23.11. Alexander Scriabin, a) Seventh Piano Sonata, beginning chord; b) Eighth Piano Sonata, beginning chord.

atonal chords to be multi-based chords. Even though he admits that some existing chords do not lend themselves to analysis by his theory, he sees no place for them:

Only the most universal recognition of the thought that, in music, as in living nature, organisms are formed thanks to the relationship of their elements (in nature—chemistry; in music—musical acoustics), may overcome the antinature principle of the purely mechanical construction of modes and chords, and banish them once and for all from musical art.
The Theory of Multi-Based Modes and Chords: Vol. II. In the second volume of Teoriia mnogoosnovnosti ladov i sozvuchii, published four years after the first, Garbuzov tempers his approach, undoubtedly because of increasing political pressures. Describing the approach of volume I as too static, he reformulated certain aspects and added a new dynamic dimension to the theory of multi-based modes and chords. However, as he describes in the preface to this volume, he did not alter the basic premises and analytical methods presented in volume I.

Though both works [volumes] concern multi-based modes and chords, between them there exists a very essential difference: in the first work modes and chords are examined irrespective of the processes occurring in them, that is, in their static state; in the second modes and chords are examined as more or less complex processes, that is, in their dynamic state. The understanding of modes and chords as processes led to a series of essential changes in those views that I established after my first experiments; in spite of this, I consider that the path taken by the theory of multi-based modes and chords was completely correct. The novelty and complexity of the material with which I was concerned in the first period of my research, the series of working hypotheses, which I needed to construct for the explanation of many phenomena, compelled me in this period to be limited to studying the collected material in the static state and only then, after several years, to get down to studying this material in the dynamic state. But the change in views on several musical phenomena, which took place in me owing to a change of conditions, causing me again to study the material I had collected, did not destroy such basic principles on which my theory operated.12

The "change of conditions" mentioned by Garbuzov does not refer to his move to different research institutes after the disbanding of GIMN in 1931, for, as he stated, he had by this time completed some of the research that he had not yet presented. The sense of Garbuzov's statements leads me to believe that he resuscitated this material out of political necessity. Yet he refused to recant his previous views. He also includes in his second volume more detailed analytical applica-
tions of his theory, written by his students Saul Grigorevich Korsunsky and Sergei Sergeevich Skrebkov.

Undoubtedly Garbuzov's most fundamental alteration concerns the natural pentachord. Although he retains it as a measure of acoustical relatedness between overtone series, for the purpose of practical analysis he reduces it to a major triad consisting of the partial tones 1, 3, and 5. In the same manner in which he derives tones 3 and 5 from the partial tone 1, he derives the remaining tones 9 and 15 of the pentachord from the partial tones 3 and 5, respectively. He thus reverts to a more acceptable acoustical interpretation. This more "classical," less "modern" emphasis permeates the entire volume. The reduction of the natural pentachord to a triad alters some of the details of analyses presented in volume I, usually resulting in a greater number of acoustical bases for most of the modes and especially for the more complex chords. In volume II, though, Garbuzov analyzes only the chords forming the harmonic language of the classical style, i.e., tertian structures up to and including the ninth chord, and modes containing from five to eleven pitches and from two to six bases.

The change from analysis in a static state to the analysis of a dynamic process leads Garbuzov to discuss intervals, chords, and modes according to their process of formation, the manner of their generation, in addition to their static constitution as formed by multiple bases and the upper partials 3 and 5. He categorizes these processes as "timbral," "timbral-harmonic," "harmonic," and "modal." These categories refer to the generation of individual tones (timbral); of inter-
vals or chords through tones of coincidence (i.e., common tones between overtone series) or combination tones (timbral-harmonic); of tones, intervals, or chords through partial tones (harmonic), all of which are simultaneous occurrences; and of the generation of modes through the same processes and through the formation of cadences characteristic to the individual modes (modal), a consecutive occurrence. The bases are usually generated separately. For example, in both volumes Garbuzov analyzes the dominant-seventh chord in F as a duple-based chord with bases on C and Bb. In its dynamic state, though, it is a complex process of harmonic formation of the base C through the partial tones 3 and 5 from C (E and G), and a timbral-harmonic formation of the base Bb though a tone of coincidence (D) between partial tone 5 of Bb and partial tone 3 of the partial tone 3 of base C (originally partial tone 9 of C). The same process occurs in both high and low registers (Example 23.12). He analyzes all the intervals and the chords of classical harmony and their inversions in a similar manner.

Concerning chords and tones analyzed individually, Garbuzov reaches conclusions using his own theory that are not always universally applicable. For instance, he postulated that harmony but not timbre is affected by register. This constitutes, in Garbuzov's estimation, the main difference between harmony and timbre and reveals the role of equal-tempered tuning, which makes possible wide changes in register. Such a contention is not borne out by our perception, however; timbre can most definitely be affected by register changes.
Example 23.12. Formation of dominant seventh chord on C.

He also discovered that inverted positions of chords possess characteristics in addition to those of the root positions of the same chords; this phenomenon is brought about by the different forms of generation of chords in different positions. In terms of function, this is true; but chord generation does not cause such differences.

Garbuzov also concluded that the generation of mode constitutes only a higher form of sound generation. Therefore, no real difference in method exists between the simultaneous generation of sound and the consecutive generation of sound, "since the aural memory makes the process of modal formation of sounds occur as though it were simultaneous, and the realization of chords requiring some interval of time makes the process of harmonic and timbral-harmonic formation of sounds occur as though it were consecutive." He defines mode, then, as "the formation of bases in consecutive time." Thus Garbuzov in this
volume moves closer to the position of Yavorsky regarding the formation of mode as a dynamic process occurring in time. But of course, the nature of this process remained different for each theorist.

Of the twenty multi-based modes Garbuzov examined, eight of them do not contain a tonic. Each of these eight modes also lacks one or the other of two sonorities—the dominant or the subdominant. Based on his discoveries connected with the generation of sound, a base, C in the quartal-quintal mode, for example, becomes tonic only when formed by the two opposing motions of subdominant (G to C) and dominant (F to C) (Example 23.13a). This occurs partly as a result of acoustical relatedness. The higher the number of common tones between overtone series, the greater the degree of their acoustical relatedness. A series separated by a perfect fourth or fifth (four or five common tones) thus forms the first degree of relatedness. Series separated by major and minor thirds and sixths (two or three common tones) form the second degree of relatedness; and series at the distance of major and minor seconds and sevenths (one common tone) form the third degree of relatedness. Series at the distance of a tritone (no common tones) form the fourth degree of relatedness, or more accurately, are unrelated. Therefore, because of the high degree of acoustical relatedness between tones a fourth or fifth apart, and also because the intensity of the timbral-harmonic formation of each pitch in these intervals is either the same (the fourth) or very close (the fifth), their modal formation may take place either through the top tone of the interval or through the bottom tone, i.e., in two directions. When the tone gener-
ated by the top tone of one fourth equals the tone generated by the bottom tone of another fourth, as in the minor seventh G–F to C, then the generated tone is doubly intensified. The resulting tonic thus contains characteristics of both base (in relation to the dominant) and overtone (in relation to the subdominant). This, then, is the modal formation of tonic, and is possible only with the presence of both the subdominant and the dominant. Garbuzov recognizes the triad of resolution, a major triad in Example 23.13b, as tonic because it meets these requirements: (1) The cadence progresses from the smallest degree of relatedness (the minor seventh) to the greatest degree of relatedness (the unison); (2) the quartal quintal progressions in the cadence exhibit the first degree of relatedness; and (3) the subdominant is raised to the tonic as a fundamental tone to the overtone in the "dominant" direction, and the dominant is lowered to the tonic as an overtone to the fundamental tone in the "subdominant" direction, with tonic serving as a central point between the two directions.

Example 23.13. a) Tonal generation by fourth; b) modal formation of tonic.
Garbuzov's interpretation of tonic generation may be related to views expressed by two other Russian/Soviet theorists—Taneev and Yurii Nikolaevich Tiulin (discussed in Chapter 29). Taneev, it may be recalled, defined the tritone relationship created between pitches in the subdominant and dominant chords as creating the necessity for a resolution to tonic. Tiulin recognized the ability of one function, the dominant, say, to aspire to and become another function such as tonic. In the same way that one tone in Garbuzov's theory may function as both base and overtone, in Tiulin's theory one tone or chord may potentially function as both tonic and dominant, or tonic and subdominant. He called this phenomenon "variable function." Garbuzov thus attempted to provide the acoustical foundation for this idea.

The same process, essentially, takes place in the minor mode. In this volume, minor generally maintains a more independent position relative to major than it did in volume I. Garbuzov no longer derives the minor mode from the third tone of a corresponding major mode, but produces it autonomously. The fullest minor mode, capable of forming all three types of minor mode and containing the S-D-T cadence (iv-V-i) is the minor tertial-quartal-quintal-sextal mode with bases C, Eb, F, G, and Ab, shown in Example 23.14. Also, to construct the minor triad, Garbuzov had to include a major triad a minor third from the chord root; thus the minor triad becomes a duple-based chord, with bases on, for example, C and Eb for the triad built upon C. In the minor triad, Garbuzov points out, the major element produced acoustically by partial tone 5 from the root, in this case C and its partial

tone E, is overpowered by partial tones 2 and 4 from Eb (two Eb's) and by the reinforcement of C and Eb through G, a tone of coincidence occurring as partial tone 6 (and 3) from C and partial tone 5 from Eb. (See Example 23.15). Garbuzov's derivation of the minor triad recalls both Helmholtz and von Oettingen, although he cites neither.

Garbuzov's turning from a static, rigid interpretation of chords and modes to a more flexible, dynamic one also affected his approach to analysis within a musical context. Whereas he originally based the analysis of a chord primarily on its structure, he later stipulated

Example 23.15. Formation of minor triad.
that, in a more dynamic analysis, the interpretation of a chord also depends on its context, particularly the chord to which it resolves. In the analysis of romantic and modern music, additional contextual factors influence the interpretation. For example, in the opening two beats of Scriabin's Prelude, Op. 11, No. 9, shown in Example 23.16a, the chord on beat two may be analyzed as a single-based chord on A, or as a duple-based chord with bases C# and A. However, the notes preceding the chord, C# and B#, emphasize the base C# and led Korsunsky to accept the latter interpretation. The analysis of the horizontal as well as the vertical aspect of the music also accounts for the modal presentation and development in the music, which Garbuzov had not examined in Volume I.

Earlier Garbuzov had advocated choosing the simplest analysis possible in cases where several possibilities existed. Here he stipulates choosing the analysis most justifiable from the point of view of

Example 23.16. Alexander Scriabin, Prelude, Op. 11, No. 9: a) m. 1; b) mm. 33-35.
correct chord resolution by fourths or fifths, i.e., the highest degree of relatedness, as in the cadence $\underline{\text{S-D-T}}$. In the same Scriabin Prelude, which fluctuates throughout between the tonality of E major and its relative minor C#, the concluding cadence is in E major, but elements of C# minor are also present. The first chord of the cadence has two bases--F# and A--and the second chord also has two bases--G# and B. Following the pattern of the $\underline{\text{S-D-T}}$ cadence, the bases A and B resolve to the base E of the final chord; but the bases F# and G# do not resolve to the expected base C# (Example 23.16b). The missing pitch C# is represented only by the tones most closely related to it--the tones F# and G#--and by the tone E, which not only is part of the triad on C#, but also is the other tonic base. The final chord, therefore, because of the missing C#, renders the resolution incomplete.

Yet this analysis does not address several necessary considerations. First, a C# in the final chord would create a minor-major seventh chord; but Scriabin does not end any of the twenty-four Opus 11 Preludes on any tertian structure other than the triad. Second, although C# minor does appear in this Prelude, it is only as a secondary tonality or as vi of E major (as at the beginning). Third, the bass line in the last five measures follows a strict circle-of-fifths progression, beginning with C#: C#-F#-B-E. Thus the expectation of E as the final bass pitch is very great. Fourth, the chord substitutions also build up the expectation of E. The first (C#) and last (E) chords are triads in root position; the chord on F# is a minor-minor seventh chord on ii (ii'), and the chord on B is a iii chord. In terms of
functional harmony, the ii substitutes for IV, and the iii substitutes for V. The E in the ii chord anticipates the tonic, and the G# in the iii chord (instead of the F# for the V chord) anticipates the third of the tonic. Fifth, the third note in the final chord, the B in the melody, is expected due to the preceding melodic line, which progresses in the final phrase stepwise from E up to A, which is then emphasized, back down to G# in penultimate chord and finally up to B in the last chord. Finally, Taneev's tritone juxtaposition occurs between the A of the ii chord and D# of the iii chord, leading to the expectation of the E major triad as tonic. In sum, there are many other more important factors that override any expectation of a C# from the F# and G#. Garbuzov's narrow interpretation ignores the very context he considers so important.

Garbuzov writes concerning the application of his theory to analysis,

At its present level of development the theory of multi-based modes and chords gives methods of analyzing musical works from the point of view of formal construction and harmonic and melodic "language." Of course, while the theory of multi-based modes and chords appears at times as a theory of modes and chords and may not provide methods of the detailed analysis of musical works with the full consideration of all their metric, rhythmic and other characteristics, even now it makes possible a very wide analysis and a sufficiently deep understanding of many musical phenomena. Therefore, I felt that this work should be included both as a theory and also as practice, that is, both the result of theoretical research and also the application of them to the analysis of musical works.20

Garbuzov's emphasis on the practical application of his theory and his concession that his theory does not provide a comprehensive analytical approach are consistent with developments in Soviet music theory during
the 1930s, which advocated both practicality and comprehensive analy-
sis. In general, however, the analyses carried out by Korsunsky and
Skrebkov in the second half of volume II succeed more as general analy-
ses than as special analytical applications of Garbuzov's theory of
multi-based modes and chords. They do not maintain the level of detail
in evidence in the analysis of the Scriabin Prelude, for instance,
which perhaps is preferable, considering the analytical oversights in
Garbuzov's approach.

In its entirety, volume II of Teoriiia mnogoosnovnosti ladov i
sozuichii fails to live up to the promise of volume I. It constitutes
a retreat from earlier positions and may be said to contain merely an
apologia for volume I. It points up the dilemma of Soviet theorists
who during the 1930s faced a more restrictive political climate and
fewer opportunities for the expression of wide-ranging views. Garbuzov
evidently felt sufficient pressure regarding his earlier theoretical
views that he refined them to conform to prevailing political ideas.

**Evaluation and Legacy.** The value of Garbuzov's theory of multi-
based modes and chords lies not in the theory *per se*, but in its
acoustical verifications and explanations of known phenomena. The idea
that a mode or chord has more than one acoustic generator was not
readily accepted into Soviet music theory. Garbuzov, in fact, was not
the first theorist to advocate such an approach; Helmholtz, for exam-
ple, preceded him. Other theorists closer to Garbuzov's time such as
Georg Capellen also challenged the various dualistic approaches of von
Oettingen and Riemann with monistic interpretations of chords as being derived from two fundamentals, the minor triad, for example, with the same two foundations as Garbuzov, thus emphasizing two simultaneous functional implications.

But some Soviet theorists, Tiulin, for instance, did subsequently apply some of Garbuzov's findings. And Garbuzov's explanation of the unfolding of mode and the definition of tonic through the presence of both dominant and subdominant reinforced the already strong emphasis in Soviet music theory on functional harmonic thought. In his evaluation of Garbuzov's theory, Iosif Ryzhkin concludes that Garbuzov, in developing his theory, had drawn closer and closer to positions taken earlier by Rameau (the acoustical basis of the triad) and Riemann (functional harmony), and had merely provided "a new argument for a previously given solution to an earlier presented problem."

One can also find striking similarities between Garbuzov's and Yavorsky's respective theories. It is clear that Garbuzov modeled his approach to modal generation and synthesis on Yavorsky's; in many cases similar terminology and method are more than coincidental—e.g., in the concept of complete and incomplete modes, the classification of modes according to stability (as one criterion), the use of several systems (Yavorsky) or pentachords (Garbuzov) to form modes, and the use of functional symbols (S, D, T) and concepts. However, Garbuzov remained opposed to Yavorsky's theories and attempted to prove them false, stating, "The basic thesis of the theory of modal rhythm opposes the givens of acoustics." He did not attach primary significance to the
tritone, as did Yavorsky, but only secondary significance; he determined that the tritone is not "the carrier of instability in music in all possible conditions." He believed that Yavorsky's double system, which he considered nonexistent and artificial, should be replaced with two single systems. He explained the resolution of the tritone to the major third as a progression of two tones with no acoustical relatedness to the closest interval with a stronger degree of acoustical relatedness. The constituent tones of the tritone themselves progress to tones with which they share the highest degree of relatedness: in the case of the tritone F-B, the F moves a fourth down to C, the dominant direction, and the B moves a fourth up to E, the subdominant direction. In its acoustical properties, therefore, this progression of the tritone to the major third resembles the classical cadence S-D-T. Ryzhkin also reveals similarities between the results of the analytical applications of the two theories. He views the main difference between the two theories in this light:

The theory of multi-based modes and chords in contrast to the theory of modal rhythm takes the position that it examines functional relations of new modal-harmonic formations as acting on the model of the classical major and minor modes, while the theory of modal rhythm examines the classical major and minor modes, arising from new modal-harmonic formations.26

From this he concludes that as its main strength Garbuzov's theory "aspired to create a bridge from classical modes and harmonies to new modes and harmonies and to establish the continuity of the second relative to the first."

Regardless of the fate of his theory, though, Garbuzov's legacy in
Soviet music theory remains secure through his main contribution: the
development of acoustics as an important field in Soviet music theory,
and the development and application of strict research and laboratory
procedures borrowed from scientific methods.

Garbuzov published a final work on his theory of the multi-based
modes and chords in which he analyzed Russian folk song. His later
work reached even further into the area of acoustics. During the 1930s
he developed a theory of "zone," upon which he concentrated exclusively
for the last decade of his life. Beginning in 1948 he devoted all his
writings to the explication of this theory, which has since been
accepted into Soviet acoustics more readily than his earlier work. In
fact, for his centennial in 1980, only his works on "zone" were pub-
lished in a commemorative volume. Nevertheless, the importance of
his earlier work and his influence and role in the development and
growth of Soviet music theory during the 1920s and 1930s remains undis-
puted. His portrait, taken during that time, still hangs in a promi-
nent position in the fourth-floor acoustical laboratory of the Moscow
Conservatory, a testimony to his enduring influence in both theory and
acoustics.
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Chapter 24

Boleslav Leopol'dovich Yavorsky: Additional Research on Modal Rhythm

Boleslav Leopol'dovich Yavorsky. During the revolution and the resulting civil war, Yavorsky remained in Kiev, teaching composition and piano at the Kiev Conservatory and, beginning in 1918, at the Lysenko Institute. He also organized a People's Conservatory there in 1917, similar to the one he had helped organize in Moscow earlier. From 1921 to 1930 he worked for Narkompros in Moscow, and taught in several schools in Moscow as well. In 1930 he began to lecture at the Moscow University as a member of the faculty on the arts, a position he held for three academic years. In 1932 he became a senior editor at Muzgiz, the Soviet music publishing house. His final position was as a professor at the Moscow Conservatory from 1938 until his death in 1942 in Saratov, the wartime location of the Conservatory. In 1941 he was awarded the degree of doctor of the science of art studies without having to defend a dissertation.

"The Basic Elements in Music" and Duplex Modes. As an active member of GAKhN during this period, Yavorsky continued his research, the results of which he published in several important articles. In
In them he focuses more on the melodic element and cognitive aspects in his theory, and develops some significant additions to it. Both his writing style and the theory of modal rhythm itself became increasingly complex and even dense. Fortunately in 1930 his pupil Sergei Vladimirovich Protopopov (1893-1954) set forth the essential elements of Yavorsky's theory in a two-volume book, Elementy stroenii
muzykal'noi rechi [The elements of the structure of musical speech]. Since Yavorsky was the editor of this work, we can be sure that the thoughts and ideas expressed in it are his, and not just someone else's interpretation of them. Thus through Protopopov's book, the theory of modal rhythm becomes somewhat more approachable.

In his 1923 article "Osnovnye elementy v muzyke" [The basic elements in music], Yavorsky discusses some physical, sociological, and psychological aspects of various elements of his theory of modal rhythm—auditory gravity, sound, mode, rhythm—in a more expansive approach than that taken in his Stroenie muzykal'noi rechi. He does not alter any of the main tenets of his theory—and even adds an important concept—but he does enlarge their scope and enhance their significance. For example, he describes the fundamental tritone relationship as, essentially, the musical manifestation of the portion of the gravitational force perceivable in the auditory consciousness of man. Together with its resolution, it "forms a system of sounds, appearing as the smallest cell of the auditory sensation; other basic units of the sound sensation do not exist in our contemporary consciousness, and all the great sound combinations are formed from the
coordination of such systems." Thus he relates the generating force of modal rhythm and of music itself—the tritone and its resolution—even more strongly to the cognitive perceptive abilities of the human consciousness.

Yavorsky also published in this article a further development in his theory of modal formation—the "complex" or "duplex" modes. In Stroenie muzykal'noe rechi Yavorsky describes only the joining of systems gravitating in one direction, into one side of the sound spiral (reproduced in Part V), representing "one principle of the formation of the coupling of sound systems." This principle results in the formation of five simple modes—four completely stable (major, minor, augmented, and chain) and one relatively stable (diminished). In this article, he describes a second "principle of formation":

the possibility to give to gravity an outcome in both sides of the spiral, that is to feel gravity, attraction from different sides, the aspiration of its force of attraction to the opposing points of support, as a result of which is received relative equilibrium, the sense of the existence in the sound sphere, analogous to flying in the air, the soaring between opposing sources of attraction, the direction of force of its attraction into the coordination of the forces of attraction surrounded from all sides—a principle, analogous to the simultaneous addition and subtraction of colors in the visual sphere. Many modes may be formed by this principle; five modes, formed by the application of this principle to the five simple modes, will be the most common—double major, double minor, double augmented, double chain, and double-diminished modes.

Yavorsky first illustrated these modes in a letter to Briusova dated October 4, 1920, and called them "complex modes," in comparison with the "simple modes" formed by the first principle. Here he describes these modes not in terms of the sound spiral, but as consisting
of either one or both forms of the six different possible tritones in a
twelve-tone octave, each of which Yavorsky refers to as a "type." Each
tritone "type" has two forms, depending on its inversion and pitch
content. For example, in Example 24.1a, the first tritone, B-F, would
resolve inwardly into a major third, C-E. Its "enharmonic inversion," so to speak, E#-B, with E# in place of F, would resolve inwardly to the
major third F#-A#. The roots of the intervals of resolution are them-
selves a tritone apart. Yavorsky defines a mode as "that joining of
systems in which all types [of tritone] are touched upon" (Example
6
24.1a). He distinguishes two sorts of mode—"simple modes" and
"complex modes." In the "simple modes" only one form of each tritone
type takes part (Example 24.1b). In the "complex modes" both forms of
each view of tritone type take part (Example 24.1c)." In other words,
the inclusion of both forms of each tritone results in modes with
stabilities a tritone apart. These modes are "double major" (stabilities
C-E and F#-A#, E-G and A#-C#), "double minor" (stabilities C-E and
F#-A#, D#-F# and A-C), "double augmented" (stabilities C-E and F#-A#,
A#-Cx and E-G#, G#-C and Cx-F#), and "double diminished" (stabilities
C-Eb and F#-A, Eb-F# and A-C).

This aspect of Yavorsky's theory turned out to be particularly
fruitful. Regardless of the manner and means of modal production in
the Yavorsky's theory, the idea of one complex mode consisting essen-
tially of two simple modes a tritone apart gave rise to a significant
theory regarding the music of Scriabin developed by the Soviet theorist
Varvara Dernova. Yavorsky himself understood well the theoretical

foundations of Scriabin's music as seen through his theory of modal rhythm, and Dernova built on and expanded Yavorsky's approach.

Example 24.1. Yavorsky: a) 6 tritone types, 2 forms each; b) simple modes; c) complex modes.

Yavorsky viewed the appearance of new modes not just as a new means of composition, but serving as the index of the coming of the epoch of the exposure of new spiritual values, appearing as a consequence of new social correlations; and in the future the process of the exposure and development of modal elements will make up one of the essential parts of the history of music itself.
Thus he foresaw the coming of a new, "modal" era in music as part of a new historical era; and, while the subsequent "development of modal elements" that did take place had as much or less to do with his own theory than it did with other approaches, nonetheless he correctly predicted the growing importance of the element of mode itself as an integral force in Soviet music, both in composition and theory.

The process of sound into mode is just one aspect of Yavorsky's theory; the other is rhythm. If sound reveals "the existence of gravity" (through tritone relations), then rhythm displays the "process" of the realization of gravity, for which the "partitioning of the feeling of gravity" and "the mastery of its force" are essential. "The rhythmic process of the mastery of the feeling of gravity, displayed by sound, perceived through sound--here is the true origin of musical poetry." Modal rhythm becomes "the sole essence of musical speech"; through it all life processes (movement, work, feeling, emotion, thought, creation) are imprinted in music. Thus, Yavorsky foresees, the study of the development of the modal rhythm of musical speech in the monuments of the musical art will give material for a history of sound psychology, since, tracing the development of modal rhythm, it will be possible to recreate the path of development of the processes of human experiences, feelings, thoughts, and ideas.11

This hyperbolic view of the extra-musical powers of music and the idea that all such psychological elements could be revealed through analysis—in Yavorsky's view, using modal rhythm—is a Soviet view and will be discussed in Part VII. Music itself may hold such powers—and man has been trying to reveal them and their expressive means for cen-
turics—but modal rhythm does not adequately provide the means to uncover them. For one thing, modal rhythm is not as musically all-encompassing as Yavorsky claimed it to be. For another, it and its basic cell the tritone do not hold the power Yavorsky attributes to them. The tritone is not the sole generating factor of music, as pointed out previously (Part V), and it does not affect all elements of music. But the search for a means to accommodate extra-musical factors into music theory and analysis is an overriding concern of Marxist musicology. However, although Yavorsky appears to correlate his theory with socialist leanings—his references to an "epoch of new spiritual values, appearing as a consequence of new social correlations"—his theory as a whole did not provide the foundation for this Marxist approach, even though certain aspects of it were readily absorbed into Soviet music theory.

As we saw in Chapter 18 (Example 18.11), the feeling of gravity may be partitioned into two different aspects—"monopartition" and "bipartition," expressed first and foremost at the level of the intonation. Monopartition is "an unbroken, immovable perception of gravity by one center, limited by dividing cadences," "the feeling of any manifestation of gravity without the participation of the will to action, an impersonal, passive feeling." In other words, the feeling of gravity does not move, does not act, does not resolve. Bipartition is the opposite of this:

[It is] the unbrokenness of the connected transference of the feeling of gravity from one center of perception into another; the transfer itself from center to center signifies itself a joining cadence. . . . [It] is the feeling of the gravity of realized
energy—the will, able by its own inducement coherently to change the view and application to itself of gravity, to give borders with a feeling of this gravity; bipartition is an active, personal feeling.\textsuperscript{13}

Thus the monopartite intonation is passive and cut off from its environment through the lack of any interior connection, thereby having a border or cadence imposed on it; whereas the bipartite intonation is active with interior connections, thereby creating its own border and cadence.

Since Yavorsky considers mode and rhythm to be basic, primary, qualitative ideas, he classifies other aspects of music, such as meter, harmony, and voiceleading, as secondary, derived, and quantitative ideas. Meter and harmony, for instance, are only the "consequences" of the realization of modal rhythm. In contrast to his interpretation of rhythm as proportion, he interprets meter essentially as the measurement of time, "the duration of time both of the entire whole, and also of all its parts, to the smallest parts inclusively; in the understanding of meter enters neither the order of succession of these temporal dimensions, nor the schemes formed by them."\textsuperscript{14}

Because in the theory of modal rhythm there exists no qualitative difference between the simultaneous or consecutive appearance of the sounds of the mode—a stable sound is always stable, an unstable sound always unstable—harmony as an independent entity has little significance. However, one essential difference, which affects the resulting harmonies, does exist. Yavorsky makes clear that the only principle governing "the outer design of the sounding of mode," i.e., its harmonies, is "the impossibility of the simultaneous perception of gravity
and its support, that is, the cosounding of unstable sounds and the stable sound joined with it." Thus, whereas linked or unlinked sounds may occur in any consecutive combination, any chord or other simultaneous sonority within a given mode may not contain both an unstable sound and its linked stable sound. Because a modal moment may consist of either one or more voices, mode is also indifferent to voicing; it is "an indissoluble whole," regardless of the number of voices. "The evident sounding of one sound does not mean the absence of other sounds of the mode; all the remaining constituents of mode coexist in the inner hearing with this evident sound and therefore monody as feeling and perception does not exist." Thus in Yavorsky's view, mode acts like the overtone series; the "remaining constituents of mode" become like upper partial tones that co-sound with the fundamental tone. But how is one to know which mode is represented by the one sound? Further, carrying this interpretation to its logical extension, technically the existence of timbre—determined largely by the upper partials—would in turn nullify any sense of monody and replace it with a form of heterophony. But this interpretation is not in accord with the accepted definitions of music theory in the West, which include monody as a legitimate phenomenon. Yavorsky's criterion for harmony in modal rhythm—the impossibility of unstable sounds cosounding with stable ones—is logical within the context of his theory, but his statement regarding the nonexistence of monody is not credible.
Research on Melody. Yavorsky's other articles of this period are directed towards the melodic side of his theory. The first, "Vospriiatie lavovykh melodicheskikh postroenii" [The perception of modal melodic construction], coauthored with Sofia Nikolaevna Beliaeva-Ekzempiarskaia, is a report of research conducted in 1924-25 by Yavorsky, Beliaeva-Ekzempiarskaia and others in the Commission on Music Psychology in the Psycho-physical Laboratory of GAKhN. Using Yavorsky's theory of modal rhythm as a basis, their task was "the establishment of the characteristics of melodic motion, more favorable to musical formation, and the existence of psychological conditions of this formation." The testing material consisted of tetrachords from some of Yavorsky's modes, played under special conditions. The examinees were tested both singly and in groups concerning their perception of mode in melody (inevitably regulated), the sense of completion of certain tones and fragments, and the like. Their conclusions did not contradict any aspects of Yavorsky's theories.

"The Structure of Melody". In 1929 Yavorsky and Beliaeva-Ekzempiarskaia again collaborated on a publication, each one contributing an article to a book entitled, Struktura melodii [The structure of melody]. Beliaeva-Ekzempiarskaia, in her article, "Vospriiatie melodicheskogo dvizheniiia" [The perception of melodic motion], continues the examination of melodic perception begun earlier. Yavorsky's article "Konstruktsiia melodicheskogo protsessa" [The construction of the melodic process], provides a welcome explication of melodic struc-
ture and analysis according to his theory of modal rhythm.

The title word "construction" provides the basis for his discussion. He defines it as "the basic principle of creation, which consists of the mastery and well-balanced argument of the manifestation of the forces of gravity for the realization of the creative act. The unfolding in time of the construction of a musical work is its modal rhythm." It is the first stage in the creation of an artistic work. The succeeding stages are "composition" ("the division of the construction of an artistic work for the purpose of the revelation of the creative task") and "design" ("the fulfillment of the composition of a given construction by means of the standardized material of a given art for the purpose of the expression outside of the creative task"). In other words, "construction" refers to the building blocks, as it were, of modal rhythm. "Composition" is the combining of these building blocks, the act of creation; and "design" is the final result of the individual application of means and material of the art to the "composition."

For the first stage, construction, Yavorsky outlines six "principles" governing its manifestation, which in succeeding order trace the development of the correlations of its component forces of gravity, i.e., stability and instability. These "principles" are misnamed, though; rather, they resemble stages on a continuum between stability and instability. These six "principles" conform to the six categories under which Yavorsky classified chords from each of the modes in his 1908 book.
Principle:
I
II
III
IV
V
VI
-----------------------------------------------
stability----------------------------------><--------------------------------instability

Figure 24.1. "Principles" of construction: stability to instability.

They range from total stability (Principle I) to equilibrium between
them (Principle III) to total instability (Principle VI). Principles
II and IV, the intermediate stages between equilibrium and total satu-
ration of either stability and instability, correspond generally to the
manifestation of the golden section, with a preponderance of stability
in Principle II and of instability in Principle IV. Principle V,
unstable like Principle VI, differs from the latter in its degree of
the complexity of instability, which is less. The historical develop-
ment of music reflects the succession of these principles from I to VI.
For instance, the shift from the Baroque to the Classical era reflects
the transfer of the "constructive thought" of composers—in Yavorsky's
terminology—from the second principle to the third, that is, from a
stage of relative stability to a stage of equilibrium; and the period
of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century resulted in the
development from the fourth principle to the fifth, that is, a shift
from a stage of relative instability to one with still more instabili-
ty. However, Yavorsky does not prophesy how, when, or even if total
instability will manifest itself. Such an occurrence would, it would
seem, lie beyond the realm of his theory of modal rhythm, the effec-
tiveness of which would cease in a completely unstable musical style.
A style of complete stability would also be impossible in his system.

In this article, as a result of his recent research, Yavorsky focuses even more strongly on the human psychological perception of mode. He describes melodic formation in terms of the development of "inner auditory tuning," his term for the innate human capability to perceive the process of modal formation, beginning with the "partition of the auditory sphere into gravitating auditory cells" (the tritone). Together with their stable resolutions, their "nearest auditory correlation," these cells form "a symmetrical sound system." The "allocation" and "juxtaposition" of a definite number of these cells results in the formation of "a coordinated complex whole," or mode. Thus occurs the "possibility to organize sound thought," the ability to perceive this process, the juxtapositions and the inevitable results.

This process of sound thought, for which the presence of inner auditory hearing is essential, is completed only through the "attention" of this inner hearing, "the ability to establish, to express unbrokenly, and to aspire actively to the corresponding inner tuning in the course of a definite interval of time." Thus mode becomes "the organization of sound attention." Accordingly, the length of "an entire melodic process" is defined as the length of attention necessary for the realization of "the possible resolution of all unstable sounds, met in the unfolding of the given process"; similarly, the length of a "separate undivided melodic construction" is defined as the length of attention necessary for the realization of "the direction of the gravity of all
unstable sounds met in this construction." By "possible resolution of all unstable sounds," Yavorsky means the resolution of an instability into its linked stability, that is, in the single tritone system F-B resolving to E-C (D-T), F resolving to E or B to C. By the resolution of "the direction of the gravity of all unstable sounds," Yavorsky means a partial resolution—the resolution of an instability into a stability not linked with it, that is, F down to C instead of E, for example, or B up to E instead of C. Thus, our span of attention is determined musically, by the length of time necessary for closure. On the upper, melodic level, we hear closure only when all unstable sounds are correctly resolved, both by direction and by pitch; and on a lower, say, motivic, level, we experience closure—or a degree of it—only when the direction of the gravity of all unstable sounds is realized.

Yavorsky describes these lower-level melodic constructions according to three characteristics—completeness, stability, and conclusion. A melodic construction will be complete only when all sound correlations are realized completely clearly, that is, the direction of the gravity of all unstable sounds is realized, and when it is stated in a temporally, i.e., symmetrically (D-T or S-t), complete scheme. A construction is symmetrical when the point of resolution is in the T position, either on the second or fourth moment of the construction. The first condition also defines stability. But a construction is concluded only when it is both complete and stable, and when the stable and unstable moments are either equal metrically or unequal metrically in favor of the stable moments. Yavorsky provides examples of these
conditions, based on the single tritone system D–T (unstable moments B and F resolving to stable moments C and E). The constructions in Example 24.2a exhibit all three characteristics—completeness, stability, and conclusion. All the unstable moments (B or F) resolve in the proper direction and to the proper pitches and do not outweigh the stable moments metrically. Example 24.2b illustrates a concluded construction in which the stable and unstable moments are metrically equal and resolve properly. In Example 24.2c, also a concluded construction, the stable moments (the two half notes on C) outweigh the unstable ones (the two quarter notes on B). In Example 24.2d, which is an uncompleted construction, the unstable moments (the two half notes on C) outweigh the stable ones (the two quarter notes on C).

Example 24.2. Melodic constructions from single tritone system:
a) complete, stable, concluded; b) complete, stable, concluded (with equality of stable and unstable moments); c) complete, stable, concluded (preponderance of stable moments); d) complete, stable, uncompleted (preponderance of unstable moments).
The constructions in Example 24.3 are all complete (gravitational direction and symmetry are realized) and stable, but at the same time uncompleted, since one unstable sound remains unresolved in each construction, i.e., the instabilities metrically outweigh the stabilities (B should resolve to C and F to E).

Example 24.3. Melodic constructions: complete, stable, uncompleted.

According to Yavorsky, these four-note lower-level constructions contain yet another characteristic, either connectedness or nonconnectedness. Connectedness correlates with instability, with the lack of gravitational resolution, the unbrokenness of gravitational force. Nonconnectedness correlates with stability, since gravitational resolution creates borders, which cut off the succeeding moments from the preceding ones and thus break the connectedness. Example 24.4 illus-
trates connected symmetries, in which the first unstable moment is not resolved "and with its gravity gives rise to the unbrokenness of gravity in inner auditory tuning." In Example 24.5, the constructions are non-connected, since the first unstable moment is resolved quickly in the second moment.

Example 24.4. Melodic constructions: complete, unstable, uncompleted, and connected.

Example 24.5. Melodic constructions: complete, unstable, uncompleted, and non-connected.

The constructions in Examples 24.2-24.5 are all symmetrical, that is, the point of resolution occurs in the T position, on the second or
fourth moment of the construction. Those shown in Example 24.6, though, are not symmetrical and are therefore incomplete, since the first unstable moment is resolved in the third moment. This "shifts the borders of the four-moment symmetry, replacing the axis of symmetry with a stable border."


Taken one level higher and applied to combinations of constructions, to a melody, this characteristic of connectedness becomes "the joining principle." Constructions are connected unbrokenly when an unstable moment in one construction is resolved into a stable moment of another construction. This may occur between just two constructions, resulting in a joined intonation (Example 24.7a), or between two, three, or four constructions, resulting in two, three, or four joined intonations (Example 24.7b, c, d). In Example 24.7, the plus sign indicates a construction that ends on a stable moment; the minus sign indicates a construction that ends on an unstable moment. The pattern in all these constructions is "+ -- +." The dotted lines connect an unresolved unstable moment in one construction to its resolution in a subsequent stable moment in a different construction.
Example 24.7. Connected combinations of melodic constructions, resulting in: a) one joined intonation; b) two joined intonations; c) three joined intonations; d) four joined intonations.

To some extent, Yavorsky's invention of joined intonations exhibits what Leonard Meyer has labeled implication-realization, that is, an expectation and its subsequent fulfillment. In these joined intonations, an instability sounds but is not immediately resolved; within the context of modal rhythm, resolution to the appropriate stability is expected. The subsequent—but not immediate—realization of that resolution contributes to the cohesiveness—what Yavorsky calls "connectedness"—of the melody. It invites closure; and if all other elements of closure are present, it will occur.
Concerning the stable notes in a melody, Yavorsky points out their relative significance:

The stable sound of a mode in a melody acquires for inner auditory tuning a factual stability . . . only when it is found in a stable moment of a construction. Therefore the final stable moment of a stable construction (the tonic of a stable mode) is not a return to the original rest, since such did not exist. The final rest of a stable concluded construction is the result of the influence of the construction. The impression of rest is created by the approach preceding it with the unfolding in time of a stably conditioned construction, attached to the condition of the stable conclusion of the entire unstable energy, provoked in the inner auditory tuning in the course of the unfolding of the construction.26

In other words, as Yavorsky himself clarifies it, "A stability becomes a part of the musical process only when it is caused by instability. 27 An independent stability appears only as 'a sounding state.'" The final stability and its impression of rest are generated by—and result from—the preceding gravitational approach, since instability, and not stability, is the originating norm in the theory of modal rhythm. This actually is a Marxist position, since in dialectical materialism all matter is constantly in motion, and instability implies and requires motion. And, as discussed in Part V, stability itself is only relative; it could turn into an instability given the proper juxtaposition. This, too, is Marxist—the process of change resulting from motion, which is constant and progressive.

As examples, Yavorsky chose thematic excerpts mainly from Bach fugues, but also isolated examples from the piano music of Beethoven and Liszt, as well as one folk song. Yavorsky's analysis of the theme from Bach's B-major Fugue from Book 2 of The Well-Tempered Clavier, shown in Example 24.8, provides an instructive view into his approach.
The mode is the natural view of major, consisting of one single system and part of one double system (Example 24.8b). The construction of the theme is symmetrical (T/S, D/T), and the design of the two constructions is expressed with compound intonations, or interlinked bipartite intonations, that is, bipartite intonations from two separate systems linked together (Example 24.8c). The theme also contains three joined intonations, illustrated in Example 24.8a with dotted lines. The solid brackets indicate linked intonations. Each note of the first ictus resolves on a note in the second ictus (G#-F#, E-D#). Each in fact reappears in the second ictus with its linked resolution.

Yavorsky refers to these notes as "basic sounds of the creative designing thought." Only one pitch in the second ictus remains unresolved, the second A# (NB), which gives to the theme the characteristic of nonconcludedness. Intensifying this nonconcludedness and contributing also to the characteristic of incompleteness is the final note, D#, which lies one quarter-note beyond the limits of metric equality (symmetry), as Yavorsky indicates with the designation "T4+1." one of the requirements for completeness. Both of these methods—an unresolved note (A#) and an extra note (D#) in the second and final ictus of the theme—"convey a construction of connectedness and unbrokenness" and create not a complete, stable and concluded melody, but an incomplete, unstable, and uncompleted part of a larger construction. This allows the piece to continue with the second statement of the subject.

In Yavorsky's view, then, the "melodic process" is "such a sound design of a complete construction (which may be stable or unstable,
Example 24.8. Johann Sebastian Bach, Fugue in B major (Well-Tempered Clavier, II): a) Subject; b) modal configuration; c) compound intonations.

concluded or unconcluded), in which intonations of a particular living impressive human speech appear as elements of the design." He de-

fines "melody," then, as "a monodic fulfillment of construction, compo-
sition and design in view of the connected complete sound whole." In this article, Yavorsky's language becomes almost as repetitive and obtuse as Conus's. The difference is that the essence of Yavorsky's thought is far more significant. But one wonders about his intentions when he offers a definition of "intonation" like this:

[Intonation is] the disclosure of the expressive possibility of sound cells, that is, the unfolding in time of the potential energy of a system under the influence of an actively influencing process, in which connection the system reveals the constructive schemes of such simple processes, which it is possible to reveal.31

His subsequent definition of melody is similar:

[Melody is] the revelation of the expressive possibilities of inner auditory tuning, that is, the unfolding in time of the
potential energy of a definite mode under the influence of an actively influencing process, in which connection the definite mode reveals the constructive schemes of such complex processes, the construction of which may be transmitted to an analogous construction of mode.32

From his discussion, though, one may conclude the following: The unfolding of melody is a temporal process, the components of which both make up and are revealed by a definite mode. Its hierarchy is moment—cell—intonation—construction (mode)—(composition)—(design)—melody. Without mode, there can be no melody:

Melody exists only in mode, since mode is organized attention. And since mode is the organization of the nature of attention, the mode defines the sphere of the melodic processes possible in it; but mode does not predetermine the individual view of the melodic design. One and the same standardized modal-rhythmic scheme, having a basic psychological significance, may have a huge number of compositional solutions and sound designs (for example, the symmetrical scheme T/D D/T).33

In order for a melodic process to be considered a melody, certain conditions must be met: completeness, stability, and concludedness (also connectedness). In other words, a melody is a closed form. Its instabilities are resolved within the melody, and it is rhythmically symmetrical (or, at the very least, gravitationally proportional).

Yavorsky attributes to melody an added psychological dimension:

A tonally complete melody (or a melodic construction in general) is not a process of motion, of the active expression of activity, but is the revelation of the essence of a definite idea as a subject phenomenon. Melody (a melodic construction) expresses, unfolds in time a state, uncovers the personality of man (single or collective, as, for example, in folk song) in a given moment of his psychological state. Therefore one may consider melody (a melodic process in all its designs) analogous to the portrait process in painting, sculpture, characteristics in literature. In literature this is understood only in the case when characteristics are given from the point of view of an idea about a personality in one present moment, not concerning the possible combined characteristics, by way of the juxtaposition of many moments of
the manifestation of this personality attached to the different conditions of its living past and possible future. Thus here Yavorsky turns away from a materialistic point of view, that is, viewing melody as simply matter in motion, towards an aesthetic viewpoint that embodies music with a definite content. Marxists, though, see no contradiction between these two viewpoints, and allow them to coexist. This aesthetic approach dovetails, as we shall see, with some of the general ideas of Asafiev and with some of the more specific but exaggerated views of the Socialist Realists of the 1930s. Although Yavorsky's ideas in many respects agree with or foreshadow many important developments in Soviet music theory, in other respects his ideas were not acceptable to orthodox Marxists. These aspects will be discussed shortly.

Protopopov's "Elements of the Structure of Musical Speech." S. V. Protopopov's two-volume 1930 book on Yavorsky's theory of modal rhythm has both pedagogical and theoretical value—pedagogical because of its purpose and its graduated approach of increasing complexity to the subject matter, and theoretical because Protopopov had access to Yavorsky's unpublished works in addition to those already known and thus was able to include material as yet unpublished at that time. This work is, therefore, a complete and accessible presentation of the theory of modal rhythm, a description that cannot be readily applied to Yavorsky's previous writings.

Volume One is dedicated to a discussion of the various components of modal rhythm; Volume Two combines these components, puts them into
their proper perspectives, and illustrates their application. Thus in Volume One we find chapters devoted to intervals, the single and double systems, moments, modes, intonations, meter, chords, and, in preparation for the analyses in Volume Two, a chapter on folk song. Volume Two contains analyses of examples from both folk and serious music, and discussions of the more complex aspects of modal rhythm, such as multinode textures and combinations, and the duplex systems and modes.

Since most aspects of Yavorsky's theories have already been discussed and need not be reviewed here in their entirety, I will discuss here only those aspects that reflect a change from a previous position or that are completely new. One of the more interesting portions in this work is the analyses of music from the literature, and I will include several of those.

Protopopov now calls the single tritone system "a symmetrical system" and defines it as "the smallest cell of auditory sensation, the smallest simple tone organism, and the instrument of thinking in tones." It also represents a process embodied in sound, as well as a "juxtaposition with result," a designation Yavorsky had previously used only in reference to larger forms. The double tritone system, now called "the double symmetrical system," is "a complex, derivative auditory phenomenon, tightly knit into one whole."

Yavorsky had defined a phrase as a symmetrical arrangement of four moments. He later identified "an axis of symmetry" inherent in each symmetry:
The axis of symmetry is that imaginary division that cuts the symmetry into two parts that are symmetrical by structure. In a symmetry constructed from an even number of moments, at the axis of symmetry of the phrase (between the second and third moments in a four-moment symmetry), there exists a small caesura. In a symmetry consisting of an odd number of moments, the axis of symmetry passes through the middle moment.38

This terminology and definition is very similar to Conus’s interpretation of the same phenomenon (discussed in Chapter 22), however with very different applications and results. For Yavorsky the axis of symmetry is only a means to an end; for Conus it is both means and end.

With regard to a phrase symmetry, Protopopov also discusses the unity and contiguity of such a phrase. In this context, they introduce the principle of "crossover" or "coupling" to explain what Yavorsky had earlier called simply "joined intonations." Essentially, this principle involves the interlinking of two, three, or four delayed resolutions between moments in the phrase. Either the second unstable moment resolves in the final moment, giving rise to no additional crossovers (Figure 24.2a), or it resolves in the sixth or tenth moment, giving rise to two or three additional crossovers (Figure 24.2b). The numbers refer to the moments; and each pair of numbers is an intonation. Again, the stable constructions are labeled with a "+" and the unstable with a "-". The possible points of resolution are also labeled with a "+" underneath. The dotted lines show the path of resolution; the arrow indicates to which stable moment the unstable moment resolves.

What I said earlier about implication and realization in discussing joined intonations applies here as well; the principle is the same.
Figure 24.2.  a) One crossover: second moment resolved into stable fourth; third moment resolved into stable sixteenth;  
b) Two crossovers: second moment resolved into stable sixth; third or fifth moment resolved into stable tenth;  
eighth or ninth moment resolved into stable sixteenth.

In contrast to the three-group mode classification in his 1908  
work, in which modes were grouped according to the stability/instabili- 
ty and consonance/dissonance of their tonic sonorities, Yavorsky subse- 
quently devised a somewhat simpler four-group classification, based on  
the principles of their formation. He also provides a more expansive  
definition of mode, beginning with the six tritone types, each with two  
forms depending on inversion and pitch composition. Each type there- 
fore contains three different tones. Each form has a different resolu- 
tion, thus forming twelve symmetrical systems (Example 24.9).
Example 24.9. Twelve symmetrical systems, each made up of one of the two forms (original and inversion) of six tritones with its resolution.

Protopopov defines mode in this manner:

The simultaneous perception of this internally organized tonal material is partially intelligible to our ear provided that the principle of its organization, i.e., the systemic gravitation, is undisturbed. Those cases of the combination of systemic gravitations into one auditory perception, in which a standardized number of types of instabilities for a certain era are touched upon partly in complete form (both tones as unstable intervals) and partly in incomplete form (one tone as part of the stable result) bear the name mode. 39

Yavorsky thus forms modes from systems using two principles: the maintenance of systemic gravitation, and the utilization of either both or one of tones in each type of tritone (for simple modes, this would be just one form; for complex modes, both forms). This results in three groups of simple modes—the 1) "stable modes" (Group A), 2) "variable modes" (Group B), and 3) "unstable modes" (Group C) already familiar to us—and one group of complex modes, the new category, 4) "complex variably unstable modes" (Group D). (I have labeled these
groups with letters to distinguish them from the other, earlier groups designated with Roman Numerals.) In stable modes (Group A), shown in Example 24.10, the unstable tones are not duplicated in any of the tones in any of the other systems, and the stable tones that make up tonic form no tritones with any of the other tones in the other systems. This group contains the augmented and chain mode (formed from single systems only), and the major and minor modes (formed from both single and double systems).

Example 24.10. Group A. Stable modes: a) augmented mode; b) chain mode; c) major mode; d) minor mode.

In variable modes (Group B), shown in Example 24.11, the stable tones of the constituent systems form no tritones among themselves, but the stable tone of one system can be an unstable tone in another system. Protopopov calls this latter condition "the principle of the variable significance of a tone." This group contains what Yavorsky earlier called "the first variable mode" and "the second variable mode." Yavorsky thus separates the chain mode from the two variable modes, whereas earlier he had grouped them together as a subgroup of stable modes.
Example 24.11 Group B. Variable modes: a) first variable mode; b) second variable mode.

In unstable modes (Group C), shown in Example 24.12, the stable tones of the constituent systems are not duplicated among the unstable tones, but the stable tones of different systems can form tritones between themselves. In other words, as before, the stable sonority of an unstable mode may contain tritones. In Protopopov's explanation, "A stable sonority of such a mode does not possess absolute stability, but represents a relative stability, forming an instability of a higher order (similar to phenomena of nature, in which absolute stability does not exist)."

This group contains the "x-chain" mode (formed from three single systems) (Example 24.12a), the diminished mode (formed from two double systems) (Example 24.12e), the "y-chain" mode (formed from a single and a double system) (Example 24.12b), and the "z-chain" mode (formed from a single and a double system) (Example 24.12c). Of these modes, only the diminished mode was previously identified by Yavorsky. Even so, it is different here, being constructed from only two double systems rather than three, as it was presented in the 1908
book. The three new chain modes share a structural characteristic with the original chain mode (Example 24.12d), in that the lower tones of the resolving thirds are either two or three half-steps apart. This creates a "chain" effect not found in the other modes.

Example 24.12. Group C. Unstable modes: a) x-chain mode; b) y-chain mode; c) z-chain mode; d) chain mode; e) diminished mode.

Thus Protopopov constructed and illustrated only ten complete, simple modes in Elementy—six stable and four unstable modes—in contrast to the thirty-five complete modes identified earlier. In each of these modes, each of the six types of tritone is touched upon, either as a stability or instability. Additionally, he derived twenty-four incomplete modes, based on variances within the constituent double systems, from those modes containing double systems—the major, minor, first variable, second variable, diminished, y-chain, and z-chain modes only. This leaves only complete forms for the augmented, chain, and x-
chain modes, since they are constructed from single systems only.

In complex variably unstable modes (Group D), shown in Example 24.14, the stable tones of one system may be duplicated among the unstable tones of other systems, and the unstable tones of different systems can form tritones among themselves. This group includes the duplex modes, to which Protopopov devotes considerable attention in Elementy, and which are formed from different combinations of duplex systems. A "duplex single system" is constructed from the two forms of one type of tritone and the resulting double resolution (Example 24.13a). Three of the seven different constituent tones are unstable and four are relatively stable. For all duplex systems, the moments are designated as for the simple systems, but with the addition of a small "d" in front, thus "dT" and "dD" for the duplex single system. The "duplex double system" is constructed from the two forms of the two types of tritones a half-step apart (Example 24.13b); its moments are designated "dS" and "dt". Concerning the modal significance of these duplex systems, Protopopov states:

The significance of the matter, consisting of the duplex instability and its duplex stability, is various. The duplex instability is an embodiment in sound of the law of gravitation in our ear and, as a cause, evokes the necessity of further motion. The duplex stability is a temporary support of the gravitational movement and the coordination of the forces, owing to which the very motion of the force acquires fluency, and, as a consequence, has no self-contained significance outside of its cause; it may not exist independently.43

Thus, because of the nature of the duplex stability (actually a contradictory term because it contains tritones), all forms of duplex modes are unstable.
Example 24.13. a) Duplex single system; b) duplex double system.

In duplex modes, systemic gravitations are combined "into one auditory perception, in which all types of the instability are simultaneously touched upon in two forms completely or partially." Because all duplex modes are unstable, Yavorsky groups them according to the type of their constituent systems: all duplex single systems only (duplex group one), a combination of duplex single and duplex double systems (duplex group two), or all duplex double systems only (duplex group three). Duplex modes are constructed analogously to the simple modes, with the substitution of a duplex system for every simple system. Thus, duplex group one consists of the duplex augmented mode and the duplex chain mode (Example 24.14a), and duplex group two consists of the duplex major and duplex minor modes (Example 24.14b). Duplex group three (Example 24.14c), which is formed from unstable simple modes, theoretically consists of the duplex x-chain mode, the duplex y-chain mode, the duplex z-chain mode, and the duplex diminished mode;

however, all three duplex chain modes essentially duplicate other existing duplex modes, the duplex augmented (x-chain), the duplex minor (y-chain), and the duplex major (z-chain), which leaves only the duplex diminished mode in an original form in this group. For further discussion of these and of the simple modes, we turn now to the analyses included in Elementy.
Protopopov concentrates his analyses of music in the simple modes on examples from Liszt (12), Chopin (8), Scriabin (2), Rimsky-Korsakov (3), and Grieg (1). For analyses in the duplex modes he concentrates on just two composers—himself and Scriabin. His examples include most frequently short segments from larger pieces or, occasionally, entire short pieces. One of the Chopin analyses, for example, which we will examine here, consists of just four measures from the Nocturne in F# Major, Op. 15, No. 2 beginning with measure 21 (Example 24.15a).

Writing out the tones in ascending pitch order (Example 24.15b), Protopopov determines the mode to be Yavorsky's fourth form of F# major, a nine-tone mode characterized by the addition of the augmented second (Gx) and the minor sixth (D) to the natural, more common form (Example 24.15c). In this manifestation, the usual second tone of the scale (G#, the first lower conjunctive tone from the constituent double system) is missing. Protopopov points out, though, that these same tones can also result in an incomplete augmented mode (missing the G of the third system) (Example 24.15d). But Protopopov argues for the major mode, pointing to the stable A# in the bass, and the unstable conjunction D#–D (or, D#–Cx) resolving to the stable C# briefly in measure 23 and for a longer period in the following "Doppio movimento" section (measures 25–32). The unresolved D–D#, which Protopopov labels "a held unstable tone," is, he observes, a device used by composers "to create an unstable construction. After the unstable tone [D–D#] has been sufficiently held out, a conjunctive stable tone [the C#] usually appears." The sonorities in this segment, all unstable, make up
three turns. The combined sonority on the anacrusis of the third turn, indicated in brackets at the NB in Example 24.15a, reveals the combination of the tone E♭—not sounding but as yet unresolved from its earlier appearance—with the tone D#. Thus, in Protopopov's view, "The schema of modal rhythm consists of a periodicity of three turns with symmetry of meter" (Figure 24.3). The symmetry of meter is indicated with the three brackets in Figure 24.3.

Example 24.15. Fredrich Chopin, Nocturne in F# major, op. 15 no. 2:
  a) mm. 19-24; b) tones in ascending order; c) one single, one double system: major mode, fourth form; d) three single systems: incomplete augmented mode.
Protopopov's analysis is acceptable insofar as its purpose is to illustrate the manifestation of a particular mode, here a form of major, and the formal structure according to that manifestation. Even though in the first half of each of measures 22–24 the augmented triad or seventh chord on F# is clearly audible, and the C# is heard only very briefly (as an upper neighbor to B in m. 23), Protopopov's rejection of the augmented mode is understandable, given the context. However, his analysis reveals neither the formal purpose of this section (a transitional, preparatory, and therefore unstable section), nor the function of any of the tones outside of their modal state and conjunctive position (the entire piece is rife with non-harmonic tones), nor any kind of harmonic, melodic, or modal logic that it might display.

```
21\ | 22\ | 23\ | 24\  
| |  | |  
S | DS | (DS)S |  
4\ | 2\ | 2\ |  
| | | |  
|DS | DS | DS |  
2 | 2 | 4 |  
| | | |  
```

Figure 24.3. Modal rhythm schema for Chopin, Nocturne, op. 15 no. 2.

For another example, four measures (8–12) from the first section of Scriabin's Etude, Op. 8 no. 8, written in 1894, Protopopov determines the mode to be the diminished mode in complete form with the tonic on C (Example 24.16). This I find difficult to accept. For one
thing, his conjunctions do not reflect what actually occurs in the music. Not once, for instance, does Db move up to Eb, either with or without E as an intermediary; it moves more strongly down to the C. For another, the supposed diminished tonic triad, C-Eb-Gb, occurs once, buried on the first half of the second beat in measure 11, yet Protopopov does not acknowledge its appearance. Also, he analyzes only those function changes that occur over the bar line, and indicates the intervening changes only metrically. He summarizes these four measures as "a periodicity of four unstable turns; the metrical numbers in the turns are arranged in a composite periodicity" (Figure 24.4). The resulting constant instability—a series of subdominant chords, arranged in a metric periodicity both between and within sonorities, according to Protopopov—ignores the relative stability of the triads in measures 10 (on Eb) and 12 on (Bb).

By traditional standards, the key of this piece is Ab major. The Etude is in three parts, the second contrasting, the third an embellished return of the first part with a short coda. The section Protopopov analyzed is from the first section, which ends in tonic. Measures 8–12 begin as though repeating the first eight measures, which end on the dominant, but Scriabin transposed the music down a fifth beginning in the second half of measure 10 in order to end in tonic in measure 16. This close in tonic is the first tonic cadence in the piece; the previous 15 measures are tonally ambiguous. Although the first and fifth chords in measures one and nine are the tonic chord in root position, they each last for only one eighth-note (the meter is
a) mm. 8-12; b) tones in ascending order; c) complete diminished mode.

Figure 24.4. Schema of modal rhythm of Scriabin, Etude, Op. 8, No. 8, mm. 8-12.
3/4), and immediately move to other harmonies. The five cadences prior to the tonic cadence end on Eb, F, Eb, Eb, and Bb, in that order. These all exhibit an impression of relative repose or stability, which Protopopov does not acknowledge.

Protopopov analyzes examples of duplex modes in musical literature in greater detail. Here he concentrates exclusively on examples from either his compositions, written in the 1920s (using Yavorsky's theory as a basis), or later compositions of Scriabin's, written between 1907 and 1914. His analysis of Scriabin's Prelude, Op. 74, No. 3 (1914), one of Scriabin's last works, is both instructive and comprehensive, the latter since it embraces not just a section of it but the entire 26-measure piece (Example 24.17).

Protopopov calls this work an example of the duplex chain mode. He determined this in the following manner: The tones written out in an ascending order of pitch (Example 24.18a) form a chromatic scale, characteristic to all duplex modes (Example 24.18b). The tones used in octaves (other than contra, great and small) form the octatonic scale (Example 24.18c), the remaining tones a diminished seventh chord (Example 24.18d), both characteristic of the duplex chain and duplex diminished modes. In the duplex chain mode, the octatonic scale is formed from the stable tones, and the diminished seventh chord from the unstable tones. In the duplex diminished mode the process is reversed. Thus the stability or instability of these two constructions determines the mode of Scriabin's Prelude.
(Example 24.17. Alexander Scriabin, Prelude Op. 74, No. 3 [1914].)
The stability or instability of each tone, then, must be determined separately. Protopopov divides the chromatic scale into four groups of three tones each (notated in brackets in Example 24.18b). Within each group, Protopopov defines two stable tones and one unstable tone, based on the proximity to each tone of adjacent tones a half-step away in either the great or small octaves, in other words, in the bass. Thus in this Prelude the tones from the octatonic scale are stable, the remaining tones unstable. Protopopov forms conjunctions within each group from the one unstable tone descending to the neighboring stable tone. In this way he arrives at four single systems, two different ones with their tritone counterparts (Example 24.19).

Protopopov summarizes Scriabin's application of this mode:

Consequently, the whole composition of Scriabin is written in f♯-duplex chain mode, which introduces the four unstable tones of the descending conjunctions of the four single systems with the eight-tone tonic.

In the very refined statement of the eight-tone tonic in this composition, Scriabin very briefly makes use of the introduction of the four unstable tones. In all, ten unstable tones appear, each time for the duration of one eighth note.

Four times the tone g♯ of the fourth system appears (measures 1, 5, 15, 20); four times the tone d of the second system appears (measures 3, 8, 13, 17). The tone e♯ (f) of the third system appears once (measure 7); the tone b of the first system appears once (measure 19).

These ten unstable tones form ten authentic intonations that, because of their short durations, cannot affect the general stable construction of the entire work. These intonatsiyas are moments of temporary coloration in the general tonic monopartite unit of the entire work.

As is apparent from Protopopov's summation, the octatonic scale clearly reigns in this piece. But one does not need Yavorsky's theory to determine its use; many Western analysts, in fact, not using Yavorsky's theory, have noticed this. Amazingly, though, Protopopov
Example 24.18. Alexander Scriabin, Prelude op. 74 no. 3: a) ascending order of pitches; b) pitch content: chromatic scale; c) octatonic scale; d) diminished seventh chord.

Example 24.19. Double chain mode: four single systems, one from each group.
characterizes this mode as "the general tonic monopartite unit of the entire work." In other words, since the tonic pitches appear almost constantly, the function of the entire piece is tonic, and the form is monopartite, that is, static. That the dissonant harmonic coloring of this piece is relentlessly similar and therefore somewhat static is unquestionable, but that this coloring is primarily tonic—even a tonic in Yavorsky's interpretation—is certainly debatable. In terms of the duplex chain mode, an eight-tone tonic is too nondifferential to be useful. The lack of articulation inherent in a monopartite construction is unsuitable for a twenty-seven-bar piece in which there are clear repetitions, textural differences, and the like. But these elements do not figure prominently in Yavorsky's definition of articulation. In a piece like this, and in similar expressionistic works of other composers, different criteria need to be—and have been—applied.

Evaluation and Criticism. These analyses point up ever more clearly the deficiencies of Yavorsky's theory of modal rhythm as a universal, comprehensive, all-embracing theory. However, the problems such as those discussed here were hardly addressed by Yavorsky's contemporaries. By one account, most critics of modal rhythm were insufficiently acquainted with the theory to judge it fairly. For example, critics wrongly accused Yavorsky of an unnatural hypertrophy of mode in relation to the other elements of music, and of focusing too much attention on the negative aspects and supposed "mistakes" in past music and theory. These critics either did not know of or chose to
ignore the positive aspects of Yavorsky's theory, such as his dynamic interpretation of mode, his views on melodic closure, and his emphases on rhythmic proportion rather than on metric length and on the process of the temporal unfolding of music rather than on static schemes. At the same time, these critics failed to appreciate the progressive, innovative nature of his approach. But few addressed these or other more relevant problems in print. As we have seen, even Yavorsky himself published just a few books and articles on his theory. And, despite the attention given to modal rhythm in the institutes and elsewhere, his proponents and followers published little during most of this period.

Yet the value of Yavorsky's theory both for research and for pedagogy became an important but controversial issue by the late 1920s, when it began to come under closer scrutiny. Before Protopopov's work was published, a conference devoted specifically to modal rhythm, held in Moscow February 5–8, 1930, attended by delegates from all over the Soviet Union, was organized by Narkompros with Lunacharsky presiding. Its purported purpose was to examine the theory of modal rhythm primarily in light of its significance for Marxist musicology and its practical pedagogical applications; but it actually was organized as an effort to counter strong attacks on Yavorsky and his views by an increasingly vocal group of opponents. The various reports of this conference, as well as some other writings resulting from this increased attention, enable us to assess somewhat the contemporary reaction to Yavorsky's theory. However, the political nature and purpose
of this conference virtually eliminated the possibility for an evaluation of modal rhythm purely on its theoretical, rather than philosophical, merits. Unfortunately, due to the inherent difficulty of Yavorsky's theory, which was exacerbated by the paucity of available and understandable written materials on it, and the push towards a new, Marxist-oriented music theory at the very time when a greater and more tolerant understanding of modal rhythm was within reach, no serious critical theoretical evaluations of the theory were published during this period.

At the conference, nineteen reports, including Yavorsky's opening and closing statements, were given. Thirteen of these reports focused on the practical, pedagogical or perceptual aspects of the theory, given by students and colleagues of Yavorsky's such as Protopopov, Lev Vladimirovich Kulakovsky, Viktor Abramovich Tsukkerman, and Briusova. The remaining four, three by prominent theorists and musicologists and the fourth by the chairman Lunacharsky, provide the most interest, philosophically and polemically. Two spoke in favor of modal rhythm, the musicologist Arnold Aleksandrovich Al'shvang (1898-1960, a former student of Yavorsky's and from 1930 to 1934 professor of music history at Moscow Conservatory) and Lunacharsky; and two from GIMN led the opposition—Garbuzov (the head of GIMN), and Ivanov-Boretsky (formerly secretary of GIMN, and from 1922 professor of music history at Moscow Conservatory). Lunacharsky summarized the proceedings of the conference and gave his own views in a paper prior to Yavorsky's concluding remarks. Lunacharsky's various reports, plus other published reports
on the conference, which I am using as a basis for the following
discussion, reveal a definite bipartisan bias in the proceedings.
Other speakers after Garbuzov either pitted Garbuzov's theory against
Yavorsky's or attempted to return to the basic problem of the confer-
ence, which supposedly was the Marxist evaluation and future develop-
ment of the theory of modal rhythm and its pedagogical usefulness. But
apparently the rivalry between the acoustical interpretation and the
psychological interpretation of modal formation was very strong, so
strong that the adherents of the former wished to discredit Yavorsky to
the extent that his theory would be considered useless for Marxist
musicology. Garbuzov and his colleagues at GIMN thus appear to be the
source of the attacks on Yavorsky, although the proletarian faction
probably joined in the struggle against Yavorsky.

In his lengthy opening remarks (either three or four hours, de-
pending on the source), Yavorsky reviewed many aspects of his theory of
modal rhythm, including the concept of auditory gravity, and the six
constructive forms, concepts about which he had recently published
articles. According to one report, Yavorsky, "by no means being lim-
ited to a statement of the theory of modal rhythm in the narrow sense
of the work, very widely developed his views on the essence of musical
speech and the place taken by it among other arts and views of human
speech." Alshvang, in his paper entitled "Ladovoi ritm i
dialekticheskii materializm" [Modal rhythm and dialectical material-
ism], attempted to provide modal rhythm with the proper philosophical
foundation by relating it to dialectical materialism. He evaluated it
as "a monistic doctrine, dialectical by its very nature and appearing on a materialistic psycho-physiological foundation." To make his point, Al'shvang relied on modal rhythmic analyses of musical works to arrive at conclusions and characteristics of a sociological nature. He also made a survey of the theory of modal rhythm according to its inner correspondance with the philosophical viewpoint and methods of dialectical materialism. In his view, according to one report, the theory of modal rhythm "arose as a direct reflection in music of the flowering of dialectical materialism that is connected with the growth of class opposition in a capitalistic society and with the struggle of the proletariat for socialism. . . . [It is] 'dialectic both as a whole and in part.'" Al'shvang also opposed Yavorsky's theory and its view of musical laws as factors of social and psychological development to other theories of the past and present, most notably Garbuzov's theory of the multi-based foundation of modes and chords, which views musical laws as immutable physical acoustic givens.

Ivanov-Boretsky, in his paper entitled "Kritika metodov prepodavaniia, osnovannikh na teorii ladovogo ritma" [A criticism of the methods of teaching, based on the theory of modal rhythm], attacked the theory of modal rhythm from the opposite viewpoint, that is, its nonaccordance with Marxist theory. He denied the originality of Yavorsky's idea about the instability of the tritone, attributing it instead to theorists of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. In his view, Yavorsky's main contribution was in the general conception of the theory, which he saw as only the "collected expression of the
artistic ideology of impressionism" and as "reflecting, as the impressionistic art itself, the world view of the bourgeoisie in the period of its decline and decay." Although the theory of modal rhythm "in recent years became 'overgrown with Marxist phraseology,' ... this process was purely an outer accommodating device, not touching on the very essence of the theory."

Garbuzov, in his remarks, as is obvious from the title of his paper, "O teorii mnogoosnovnosti la dov" [About the theory of the multi-based foundation of modes], concentrated on criticizing the theory of modal rhythm from the acoustical point of view of his own theory of multi-based modes and chords. He also argued against the conclusions of Al'shvang. During this time Garbuzov published several articles espousing the same views.

The remaining reports given at the conference, as mentioned, either sided with Garbuzov against Yavorsky or attempted to discuss modal rhythm according to the purpose of the conference. Because the arguments made by the latter group were similar, Lunacharsky summarized them collectively. Judging from Lunacharsky's evaluations of these reports, although the conference succeeded in countering the attacks on Yavorsky made both prior and during the conference with a generally favorable outcome, it ultimately failed to provide an adequate estimation and evaluation of the Marxist and dialectical properties of the theory of modal rhythm. In Lunacharsky's view, those who favored Yavorsky's theory related it to Marxist tenets in approaches that were essentially too subjective and formalistic in nature. What was needed,
Lunacharsky asserted, was "a dialectical analysis of its inner content, of such ideas with which it operates. Such an analysis establishes a row of essential gaps and weak places of this theory." Regarding its weaknesses, Lunacharsky bristled particularly at the definition of the metric side of music as contained in the theory of modal rhythm:

Meter as such, as an independent objective regulatory law, based on the uniformity of temporal units, completely slips away in the theory of modal rhythm. The necessity of the temporal division of musical speech is derived by it from the subjective requirement of our perception; moreover this division completely must not possess a sign of uniformity. This opposes the idea of dialectical materialism about time, as about the objective form of all processes, the main part of which is included precisely in the uniformity of all parts, irrespective of their content.

He also points to the idealistic, rather than materialistic, nature of its monistic philosophy, that is, basing the theory entirely on the phenomenon of auditory gravity as a universal cosmic law. He states, "Materialistic monism completely does not eliminate the richness and variety of forms of practical reality, but only subordinates their connection to a dialectic unity."

A strong philosophical methodological criticism of the basic ideas of modal rhythm, Lunacharsky believes, would also lead to criteria for the definition of its ideological roots. For example, using the connection between modal rhythm and impressionism brought out by Ivanov-Boretsky, Marxist criticism would be able to illustrate and explain this connection in much greater detail. He adds,

For the full and comprehensive evaluation of this theory one must consider that it constitutes not only a method of the formal analysis of musical works, but [also] a well-known artistic world view, a sum of views on the essence of the musical process, having grown on definite social soil and having reflected the psyche of a definite social group.
From his own vantage point as a literary and art historian knowledgeable about music but not so intimately or exclusively involved with music theory as the other participants, Lunacharsky was able to provide the fairest and most unbiased interpretation both of Yavorsky's theory and of the presentations given by others. From his remarks, he appears to have understood Yavorsky's system about as well, perhaps even better in its philosophical tenets, as the musicologists themselves. He certainly understood the necessity for a logical approach to both sides of the question, and applied his reasoning uniformly.

For example, in his own paper given at the end of the conference, he reproaches Ivanov-Boretsky for several of his conclusions regarding modal rhythm, but accepts several of his other interpretations. Specifically, to Ivanov-Boretsky's criticism that modal rhythm is only a recent convert to Marxism and is artificially linked to it by virtue of its having adopted Marxist phraseology, Lunacharsky replies that Yavorsky's transition to the use of a more Marxist terminology was a positive step, and that, in fact, his theory was far better able to effect such a transition than was traditional theory. To Ivanov-Boretsky's claims that modal rhythm exhibits the primacy of theory over practice and that modal rhythm opposes the music handed down to us throughout history, Lunacharsky responds,

Any theory arises from preceding practice; but, in its turn, it makes it more mature and conscious, formulates general laws arising from it and transforms them into a directive, into an applied science, beginning, thus, to correct and direct future practice. In no way does it follow that Yavorsky, considering the theoretical laws obtained by him illuminating the path to practice, encroached upon historical principles and condescendingly slighted,
as mistaken, the entire past of musical practice existing up to his time.62

Ivanov-Boretsky also reproached Yavorsky for relying on such an elementary definition (the "single system") to use as the basis for the construction of all music. Lunacharsky defends such a definition, pointing out the difficulty of devising one that would be more comprehensive. In his view, such elementary categories are necessary:

If Ivanov-Boretsky were able to point out that the definition of Yavorsky is inwardly contradictory in its logic and that it opposes real music, given to us by history, then this is a different matter; but he does not point this out, and I believe it is impossible to show this. The correlation of two unstable and two stable sounds in the "single system" defined by Yavorsky is correct from a logical point of view; and on the basis of a single principle these systems lead to the understanding of modes, as they were formed historically, as they developed and evolved in centuries and in varied musical practice in connection with its social content. The matter is not that these systems were given originally and then already from them developed all music. On the contrary, the "systems" themselves and their varied connections into modes theoretically were derived by Yavorsky from musical practice, in the process of which this principle was formulated, placed and differentiated.63

Regarding Ivanov-Boretsky's doubts about the originality of Yavorsky's approach and its suitability for current musicology, Lunacharsky reminds his audience of other successful theories based on preceding work, such as Darwinism and the development of chemistry from alchemy. He labels any completely new theory, one without any precedents, as "suspicious." However, Lunacharsky did find merit in two observations made by Ivanov-Boretsky—that modal rhythm was as yet an incomplete system, that it was still "searching for lawful and clear expression" and was "more legend than writing," and that it may be related to the musical style of impressionism.
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Garbuzov's recurrent criticism—both at the conference and in his published articles—concerns the lack of any acoustic basis for Yavorsky's theory. In light of Marxist philosophy, Lunacharsky saw no necessity for such a foundation, at least in the sole sense defined by Garbuzov. Rather, he criticizes Garbuzov in his own theory for incorrectly transferring chemical phenomena into acoustics. Specifically, he points out that the chemical law of cohesion—that two identical things are related and require a huge expense of energy to divide—cannot apply to non-chemical phenomena such as musical sounds. Further, according to Lunacharsky, this approach ignores the division between the objective physical aspect of acoustics and the subjective psychological aspect. While the physical aspect remains immutable in nature, the psychological aspect, exemplified by our musical hearing, the evolution of which is defined by the laws of social evolution, historically develops and changes. Thus, he asserts, "The method of Yavorsky therefore is richly above any formal or physical acoustic theories, since for the explanation of any sort of constructive forms in music he transfers the center of gravity from physics into the psyche, and the psyche is subordinated to society."

Garbuzov also objected to Yavorsky's transfer of the law of earthly gravity into music, calling it merely a metaphorical expression in its application to music. In his view, the law of earthly gravity cannot be equated with that of musical gravity, that is, examining sound as moving in space, because "such a changeable correlation, which exists between sounds, as the material of music, does not have anything
in common with the motion of sound waves." Although Lunacharsky
66 criticizes Garbuzov for incorrectly correlating "weight" and "equilib-
rium," he does accept as possible Garbuzov's interpretation of the
67 transfer of this law into music as a metaphorical expression.
Lunacharsky returns to this question in his own evaluation of modal
rhythm, to which we shall now turn.

From the standpoint of Marxist philosophy, Lunacharsky sees much
that was valuable in modal rhythm. He defines sound as socially mate-
68 rialistic, that is, the social significance of sound is interpreted as
a signal, which in spoken speech becomes logical understanding and in
musical speech becomes emotion. Man thus perceives music as containing
"an inner order, a complex and necessary inner dependency . . . a deep
thought related to life itself." To Lunacharsky this content has not
yet been defined "with sufficient persuasiveness," but, he asserts,

modal rhythm made the first attempt at locating the social sense
in the purely musical sphere and this attempt was made completely
in the spirit of Marxism. . . . I find the materialistic approach
to this side of music first in his theory. . . . Until Yavorsky
there were no similar theories. . . . I find such a sort of
consciously accepted principle first in him. . . . Even very
apparently 'pure' constructions, following only purely musical
logic, have a vital, spiritual, psychological social content. In
the theory of modal rhythm there is the approach to the under-
standing of the construction, which is the basic essence of a
musical work.69

In light of Yavorsky's interpretation of music as the embodiment of
auditory gravity, Lunacharsky, returning to the criticism leveled by
Garbuzov, asks the question, "Do the basic physical and physiological
devices for orientation in the material world also have significance
70 for phenomena from the sphere of consciousness?" Seeing analogies in
other areas, thought and speech, for example, Lunacharsky concludes that the two spheres are connected through our sense of hearing:

"Music is connected with static and dynamic principles through hearing." He sees in this one of the more positive aspects of Yavorsky's theory:

The sense of a musical construction is included in transfers from thesis (static moments) to antithesis (to the break of stability) and from antithesis to synthesis (to a higher rest), etc., to infinity. . . . Relatively unstable and stable moments in different musical modes are joined into the force of inner regularities; mode exists, thus, as some kind of whole, which is characterized also by a special make-up and by the correlation of these moments, and thanks to this also by a special character, as artistic material for the creation of a musical work. Thanks to the discovery of Yavorsky we see what was for us covered by the veil of secrecy—the inner connection between sounds and modes, the law, directing the motion of sound, defining the related and unrelated sounds. And this law we will find not only in acoustics—[the strong beat of the tritone defining the idea of instability]—but also in how objective acoustic phenomena, influencing our organ of perception, form our feeling and reflection of the objective world in our musical thought. In this I see one of the victorious traits of his theory.71

Lunacharsky points out the usefulness of modal rhythm for Marxism:

Music depicts forms of dynamic processes and interrelations, and it depicts them in greater measure than concrete mundane and psychological facts. It represents a vivid play of forces, taken through sounds, and in this vivid play of forces man attempts to guess the laws of strong interrelations important for him. He finds here, even unconsciously, vast entire collections of his experiences, of his ideas, of his feelings, of his searches, of his needs. Thus, first, a musical construction itself (that is the strong dynamic interrelation of music), not expressing the social content in concrete logical ideas, receives in this theory a materialistic foundation, and second, to us is opened the possibility, to research objectively, scientifically, such characteristics of musical thought, of musical idea, of style, which make the given construction the reflection of social reality. Here is why I say that Yavorsky uncovered in theory for us, Marxists, a whole huge sphere of music, which is one half of the spirit of music (the second half I consider direct emotional content). Here is why I say that the theory of modal rhythm opens new possibilities for the sociological interpretation of musical phenomena.72
Based on Marxist views of historical development, though, Lunacharsky disagreed with Yavorsky's interpretation of the evolution of music as one of an increasing degree of instability, from total stability to an equilibrium of stability and instability to total instability, with graded variants in between. Yavorsky viewed this increasing "chaotization," to use Lunacharsky's description, as progress. Lunacharsky, though, sees otherwise and prefers to present the evolution of society and art as moving towards greater freedom, with accompanying technological and artistic advances, but not totally without the order of forces such as gravity. The influence of imperialism on music, following the collapse of capitalism into confusion and chaos, has led to the appearance of "neoclassicism, that is, to an artificial, imaginary stability;" but socialism, "the highest unity of freedom and order," influences music in a different way, the determination of which is helped greatly by Yavorsky's theory:

We receive [with the help of Yavorsky's theory] an exceptionally fruitful point of view in these constructions, resting on strong interrelations and, mainly, on the law of gravity. Social psychological content, truly social emotions, are joined in them. We may to a well-known degree predict and direct the path of the development of our music. Moreover, both columns, that is, emotional content and form of construction, will move forward uniformly, for, as Yavorsky says, social structure will dominate both over psychology and over constructions of musical thought, and the victory also over lethargy and anarchy [in feudal and capitalistic societies] and the transfer to other new forms of the orderliness of forces will be reflected in music. This deep philosophical and social idea represents a great achievement in music theory.73

Thus Lunacharsky interpreted Yavorsky's psychological emphasis, the participation of human hearing—not just the hearing mechanism itself but also man's emotional reactions and thought processes—in the per-
ception of music and the influence on it for the understanding and interpretation of music, as an important sociological factor that transfers societal progress and human emotion into music. By utilizing Yavorsky's theory, then, both the emotional and formal content—both important elements in Marxist analysis, as we shall see in Part VII—can be determined. However, Lunacharsky stops short of declaring modal rhythm a complete Marxist, dialectical system . . . Does it follow that from the recognition of its great value, that it also is a Marxist theory of music? No, it only leads to a worked-out Marxist theory as a vital and important element. . . . I believe, that a working out of a Marxist theory and history of music is a lengthy process, which we find now in its preparatory period. . . . It is difficult to expect that long before its meeting with Marxism, a rising (and what is particularly important, in the conditions of the disintegration of bourgeois culture) system would be so pure as would foresee all the conclusions, which are possible to make from dialectical materialism by way of the skillful application to the entire scope of musical historical material, so that we would be able to say, yes, this is alpha and omega. . . . This theory deserves to be examined as an interesting object, and it is necessary to say, that it must be examined namely as a possible main support, as a possible column—in any case one of the main columns, on which finally we will erect a dome of musical science. . . . It is still too early to recognize the theory of Yavorsky as this dome.74

Since his talk was on the whole favorable towards Yavorsky, Lunacharsky criticized his theory in only a few specific areas. Agreeing with Ivanov-Boretsky, he emphasizes that Yavorsky's theory is not yet as finished and completely developed as Yavorsky would have others believe. He questions in particular Yavorsky's assertion of a constant connection between spatial and temporal directions, and his definition of musical rhythm. He also criticized Yavorsky's appearance before the conference, pointing out that his paper was too long, too
verbose and comprehensive, and confused even those musically literate persons present. His own favorable recommendations mirrored those of the conference.

At its conclusion, the conference issued a resolution, stating that by virtue of its dialectical and scientific foundations, the theory of modal rhythm surpassed traditional theory pedagogy and could serve as one of the approaches to a Marxist musicology. However, it would not be given the advantage over other musicological research; instead, attention would be given to the publication of needed scientific works and textbooks on the theory. Here is the abbreviated text of the resolution:

1. The theory of modal rhythm . . . [sic] undoubtedly is a prominent phenomenon in the sphere of musical culture. It opens new free horizons and appears as one of the approaches to a purely materialistic and dialectic theory of music and to Marxist methods of the research of its history.
2. The theory of modal rhythm, however, may not be examined as an already complete musical world contemplation.
3. The conference considers important the critical study of the theory of modal rhythm and work on its further development in the spirit of dialectical materialism.
4. The conference recognizes as very useful the introduction of this theory into programs of musical high schools and technical schools, and particularly in the pedagogical sections of the schools.
5. It is inadmissible to place any kind of hindrance for the further dissemination of musical pedagogy based on the theory of modal rhythm.
6. The conference considers the theory of modal rhythm also as a completely acceptable base for the construction of methods of work on mass music education . . . [sic] but it considers necessary that GPF and NKP of the Soviet Republics place in the order of the day the question about the critical study and advanced training . . . [sic] of the methods of work in musical education and perception on the basis of the theory of modal rhythm . . . [sic] both in the schools of all degrees, and also in mass educational institutions.
Shortly before the conference on modal rhythm took place and in preparation for it, two of Yavorsky's students and followers, Tsukkerman and Kulakovsky, each published a brief, favorable article about Yavorsky's theory. Each was offered by the editors of the journal in which it appeared as material for "discussion," indicating the views contained within each article did not necessarily reflect those of the editors, and each was accompanied by other articles on opposing systems. The article by Tsukkerman was included in a group of three "discussions," each dedicated to a particular theory of the day, the other two being metrotechtonicism and the multi-based foundation of modes and chords. Kulakovsky's article was followed by one of Garbuzov's articles critical of modal rhythm.

Both theorists approach modal rhythm from the point of view of its superiority over previous music theory, but with quite different results. Tsukkerman, calling the theory of modal rhythm "one of the most prominent achievements of contemporary musicology, even by comments of people, far from amicable towards its positions," concentrates on presenting a summary of its principal advantages: the new definition of mode, concentrating on its inner essence and structural components rather than its outer characteristics, which revealed the diversity and richness of the major and minor modes and also overcame the theoretical hegemony of "the vicious circle of major and minor" over other types of mode; the original principles of "variable" and "duplex" modes; the connection of modal structure with musical expressiveness and thus with "the social psyche"; the identification of the "smallest unit of musi-
cal form ('intonation,' 'turn'),' making possible the study of form through the division and then rebuilding or synthesis of a musical work; the importance of the temporal aspect for such division and synthesis; the significance of the idea "juxtaposition with result"; and the possibilities to expand compositional technique, pedagogy, and scientific research. In broader terms, he emphasized in a positive fashion its monistic character--"the entire edifice of the theory of modal rhythm is developed on the basis of a single basic principle of sound gravitation"--coupled with its all-embracing approach, both of which place it over other theories by virtue of its "scientific sense of logic and [its] unity." He also underscored the application of modal rhythm in a Marxist musicology:

The theory of modal rhythm gave the possibility to clarify the construction of a large number of works, inaccessible from the point of view of other theories; analysis came to clarify the inner dialectical sense of organization of a work, and not just to describe, to state its outer, secondary signs.

Thus, there is created the possibility to study the evolution of musical speech, to establish characteristics of "musical style" and--finally--to connect the evolution of musical speech with the evolution of the social psyche. Kulakovsky, in his article, "O teorii ladovogo ritma i ee zadaniuakh" [On the theory of modal rhythm and its tasks], also emphasizes the superiority of modal rhythm over "the traditional science of music . . . and [its] 'formal' requirements." Like Ivanov-Boretsky, some of whose remarks at the conference he anticipates, he views the theory of modal rhythm in its historical perspective:

The conclusions of Yavorsky were the last logical link in a chain of views and achievements of his predecessors. . . . From the theoretical side "modal rhythm" was, consequently, completely prepared. This theory gives a fantastic example of the transfer
of a "quantity" of accumulated ideas, of positions, into a "quality," when the latest effort of thought unexpectedly uncovers for us new perspectives and illuminates all past levels with a completely new light.80

As precursor, he points to Riemann's idea of the "feigned consonance," and to the ideas of such nineteenth-century theorists as Busse, Bazevi, and Rozatti concerning sound gravity and the tritone. However, unlike Ivanov-Boretsky, Kulakovskiy views this positively: "The full preparation of the theory of modal rhythm by the achievements of Riemann and others does not contradict the independence of Yavorsky in his working out of the basic principles of his doctrine." Like Tsukkerman, Kulakovskiy evaluates modal rhythm in terms of its ability to explain and interpret musical phenomena:

The urgent task of musicology in such a transitional epoch is to find the method, which would allow us to understand: where before us is the occurrence of the degeneration of musical language, the disintegration of old logic (modal in the given case) without the replacement of old principles of organization of sound material with new [principles], and where are the beginnings of the manifestation of such new principles. The theory of modal rhythm gives such criteria in the relation of the tonal logic of musical works. The possibility to distinguish the appearance of "a new mode" from a simple clogging up of modal statement, the very establishment and research of the category of "outermodal elements"--is, in our opinion, one of the most valuable acquisitions of modal rhythm.82

Kulakovskiy determined the presence of two "illnesses" in music theory, both past and present--including modal rhythm—which have not yet been fully eliminated:

These illnesses are, on the one side, the nondifferentiated approach to all elements of musical speech, and on the other--the aspiration to put vital musical works into the dead, static limits of new-found "laws of architectonics" or schemes: illnesses of unclear, primitive thought and of too quick, incompetent generalizations.83
The first illness, caused by the emphasis in theory on its applied aspect, i.e., composition, and on the use of only one foundation, the church chorale, for its study, is completely overcome by modal rhythm. The second illness, which he calls "dogmatic scholasticism" and is characterized by Conus's theory of metrotechtonicism, is addressed by modal rhythm only partially:

"Modal rhythm" studies only one component of musical form (formant, in our terminology). . . . The huge significance of this formant in the entire length of the evolution of musical speech we already emphasized in other articles. . . . However, it would be a dangerous mistake to reduce all laws of the construction of musical speech to the manifestation of only this formant, or to consider it as the "main [one]," conditioning all the others. A modal-rhythmic scheme is only one aspect of a work, though produced in a very important direction. Therefore it follows now to caution against a hasty "monism," which sees the "essence" of musical speech in the "discovery" of sound gravity, the struggle of instability with stability, and the role of other formants leads only to the "formation" of this "main" process.84

Kulakovsky thus argues against interpreting modal rhythm as a monistic philosophy, contrary to the approach of many others. To overcome the possible schematic tendencies of modal rhythm, this "one-aspectness," Kulakovsky suggests that "modal rhythm should be expanded from the formal study about the construction of musical works to the study about musical speech." He explains the necessary approach:

Examining music as a specific musical speech, sociology is correct to require that its theoretical analysis give the possibility to throw across another bridge from "the sounding fabric" of a musical work to the psyche of the author, to understand the definite "thought" of all the elements of musical form as symbols of some experiences, which the composer expressed in his language. . . . Analyzing the symbolism of musical speech, we involuntarily are compelled to study music in the process of its formation, [its] development. And this in its turn draws us to a comprehensive analysis, to the essential embrace of all the "formants" of the musical fabric.85
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In his view, therefore, modal rhythm does not provide a complete link to the "social psyche," to use Tsukkerman's phrase. To reveal the symbolism connected to the underlying thought of music, which of course reflects the life experiences of its composer—in Marxist terms, socially determined, which Kulakovsky does not point out—musical analysis needs to include all elements ("formants"); however, Kulakovsky does not explain what these other formants are. He concludes:

The theory of modal rhythm already overcame the statics of classical principles of writing, but its enrichment through the study of all other formants, as autonomous means of musical expressiveness, by the study of their interrelations, their complexities in musical constructions, still lies ahead. Only such an expansion allows the theory of modal rhythm to understand the entire depth and variety of the content of musical language: the main source of this variety also consists in the autonomous nature of all the means of sound expressiveness. This autonomous nature causes the inexhaustible richness of the possible combinations of separate "formants"—already not as formant, but as "symbolant" in real musical symbols.

Thus, even among Yavorsky's supporters, viewpoints differed. They can be divided into two groups—those who unquestionably approved the theory of modal rhythm with no changes, and those who, although accepting the basic tenets of the theory, saw the need, in light of political necessity, for significant additions to it. However, no one was able to specify exactly how modal rhythm needed to be improved; only general recommendations were given. In his paper for the conference, Kulakovsky discussed a very different problem related to modal rhythm—"Fizicheskie osnovy teorii ladovogo ritma" [The physical bases of the theory of modal rhythm]; but this published article of his must have been typical of the bulk of the papers at the conference that Lunacharsky criticized for being long on ideas and problems and short
on practical approaches and solutions. Kulakovsky offers no applicable
solution to the question of the task he outlined, which nonetheless
effectively presents the severe problem facing Soviet theorists at that
time. Having just recently—within the last twenty-odd years—found
its voice in the scholastic world, with such innovative theories as
modal rhythm, metrotechtonicism, multi-based foundation of modes and
chords, and with other novel approaches to such areas as functionalism
and moveable counterpoint, all of which were formulated in the pre-
revolutionary years and were therefore fundamentally apolitical, Soviet
music theory, under increasing political pressure, was now having to
reorder its priorities and reevaluate its brief heritage according to
political theory. With only the philosophical tenets of Marxism and
dialectical and historical materialism to guide Soviet theorists
through the maze of their diverse legacy, it is no wonder that they
became lost and temporarily floundered. The conference on modal rhythm
is keen testimony to their inability to provide a strong new direction
for their discipline. They could not even agree on the most fundamen-
tal questions presented at the conference: Is modal rhythm Marxist or
not? If so, how do we apply it? If not, judging from its value
heretofore, how can we improve it? This failure was partly due to the
very factionalism that led to the conference in the first place, but it
underscores the very real dilemma facing Soviet theorists at that time.
Al'shvang made the incredible observation that because of its inherent
value for music theory, modal rhythm must be Marxist; otherwise it
would not be valuable. Lunacharsky correctly pointed out the illogic
of Al'shvang's assessment. Such faulty judgments would only postpone the resolution of the problem. Kulakov'sky's emphasis on the expansion of modal rhythm to include all formants was just a small step in the direction towards the formation of a Marxist musicology, the ideal for which would include as comprehensive and all-embracing approach to musical analysis as possible. This formation and its practical implementation will be discussed in greater detail in Part VII.

The quarrel over the theoretical value of modal rhythm was, unfortunately, not settled by the conference. Yavorsky's opponents persevered with their criticisms, and eventually won, albeit in a different setting. On May 8, 1930, the proceedings from the Conference on modal rhythm were formally embraced by the musical section of GAIS (the successor to GAKhN). A year later, almost to the day, on May 10, 1931, Yavorsky read a paper for members of the musical section of GAIS entitled, "O razlozhenii lada" [On the degeneration of mode]. Ten days later Yavorsky gave a report to the plenary session of GAIS on the preparation of his paper. At this session, a new and unexpected attack on Yavorsky was initiated. A young student, Iosif Yakovlevich Ryzhkin (b. 1907), who that year graduated from the Moscow Conservatory, replied to Yavorsky's report with a criticism not of the report but of questions related to the general methodologies of his theory of modal rhythm. Others followed suit and thus began an unannounced discussion about Yavorsky's theoretical views. This discussion continued in the musical section of GAIS for a total of eight sessions from late May throughout June. On June 28, 1931, Yavorsky appeared before the mem-
bers with a concluding paper on his theory, answering in detail the comments of the other participants in this discussion, and presenting much evidence supporting his views. His appearance here lasted even longer than his presentation at the conference earlier—five hours. Unfortunately, the hostile atmosphere within the discussions and the innappropriate means with which they were begun and continued forced Yavorsky to withdraw from active membership in GAIS. Lunacharsky, who apparently was unaware of this action at the time, completely disapproved of these unorthodox maneuvers. He later wrote,

However, soon after this [the conference] in the limits of GAIS a new attack was made on Yavorsky, under a disgraceful disparity of conditions, with the direct intimidation of students of Yavorsky, as a result of which several of the students faint-heartedly betrayed their teacher. . . . [sic] Unfortunately, this occurred far from the authority of the party strength, which would have stopped this unjust matter.88

This action effectively stopped any institute-sponsored research on modal rhythm. Yavorsky continued to work on his own, though, al-

89 though he published nothing on modal rhythm. In 1938 he was invited to become a corresponding member of GIII in Leningrad, where he delivered a speech on the principles of musical thought. In 1941, on February 1, he was awarded the degree of doctor of the science of art studies from the Moscow Conservatory without having to defend a dissertation, an action first suggested in 1935. The awarding of this degree was sponsored by Ryzhkin (who began teaching at the Moscow Conservatory in 1930 and became professor in 1939), Mikhail Fabianovich Gnesin (1883–1957) (from 1925 to 1935 a professor of composition and theory at the Moscow Conservatory, and Ryzhkin’s teacher), and the composer
Nikolai Yakovlevich Miaskovsky (1881–1950) (also a professor at the Moscow Conservatory from 1921). Their references recommending this honor were exceedingly laudatory. For example, Ryzhkina—who must have felt guilty about his role in Yavorsky's ouster from GAIS—placed him on a level with Zarlino and Riemann from the past, and Asafiev and Kurth in the present. With the theory of modal rhythm, Yavorsky brought to light "a new epoch in the study of mode and harmony" and had "a deep influence on the entire sphere of musicology. Many musicologists, now creating special directions and schools, for example, Professor Tsukkerman, A. Al'shvarg, L. Kulakovsky and others, came from the school of Yavorsky." Gnesin emphasized Yavorsky's significance for the growth of Russian music theory in the twentieth century, overcoming the descriptive, static theory of the nineteenth century, and the wide scope of his influence on Soviet music theory:

All works on music theory realized in the present time in the USSR, attached to all their differences between themselves and attached to all their distinctions from the doctrine of B. L. Yavorsky, in some degree are connected with him, borrowing from his doctrine sometimes extremely essential, sometimes secondary elements, sometimes appropriate terminological innovations.91 Miaskovsky in his comments compared Yavorsky's theory, which he called "one of the most progressive doctrines, attempting to realize the entire aggregate of musical-creative phenomena," to those in the West, and wondered about his impact on Western theory, had his works been better known there:

That the theory of Yavorsky arose as a result of observations of such purely organic phenomena as intonational sound gravitations protects it in significant measure from a mechanical application, and this theory is wider and more inwardly regular than
many West European theories. Neither Riemannian attempts of the substantiation of musical phenomena, arising from purely physical (acoustical) prerequisites, neither the mad-mechanistic twelve-tone system of A. Schoenberg, nor improvisations on tertian and quarter tones, on the one hand, do not embrace all phenomena of musical creation, and on the other, do not give any kind of natural paths of their mastery, of development. This is shown by the contemporary state of musical creation in the West, which (even in the person of the same Schoenberg), as it turned out, was forced to turn back to very primitive modal feelings—essentially, to the same major-minor, from which creative practice long ago departed, but [which] in no way is it possible for theoretical thought in the West to leave alone.

I think that if the theory of B. L. Yavorsky had been well-known in the West, many of their theories, arising exclusively from the noncorrespondence of the state of theoretical thought and creative practice, would have acquired a different bias and would not have caused the appearance of such ultimately unfruitful theories as atonalism, polytonalism, etc.92

Missakovsky also acknowledged the influence of Yavorsky on his own creative work, more so than his own teachers, Liadov, Glazunov and Rimsky-Korsakov.

Summary. Such high praise and honors, coupled with the obvious evidence of his wide influence in the body of theoretical literature being produced in the Soviet Union during the 1930s—literature of far greater significance and import than anything in the acoustical realm—must have vindicated his theory sufficiently to Yavorsky to make up for the earlier attacks on it.

Yet the complete acceptance of his theory as he created it never did occur; only separate elements and aspects entered Soviet theory. Such borrowings and emphases will become clear as we discuss later Soviet theory in Parts VII and VIII; but for the present we will review those elements with the greatest importance or impact. The general
areas of influence include mode, musical expressiveness, the dynamics of music, harmonic functionalism, and musical form.

Yavorsky altered forever the Soviet concept of mode. After he presented mode as a dynamic, organized entity containing components of varying significance and strength, Soviet theorists could never return to the old scalar or harmonic approaches. He introduced new modes, and demonstrated the diversity of already known modes, such as major and minor. And his logical pairing of mode with its temporal organization provided theorists with a new way of interpreting modal organization—dynamically, rather than statically. Other dynamic aspects include the ideas of stability and instability and their distinction from the separate ideas of consonance and dissonance; the idea of variability, which may be applied both to modes and to individual sounds or chords within modes; and the idea of auditory gravitation. Regarding harmonic functionalism, Yavorsky strengthened a tradition already begun by Rimsky-Korsakov. Additionally, he introduced the idea of $\hat{\sigma}$ as the leading tone of the subdominant chord.

In the area of musical form, Yavorsky stressed general principles of form development rather than the outlining or filling-in of specific schemes as found in previous theory. Such occurrences as "juxtaposition with result," to name just one, reflect his emphasis on procedure and process rather than scheme or outline. His methods of analysis call attention, for example, to the dissection and subsequent reunification of a musical work as a means to discover its specific and unique formal manifestations, and to the determination of the degree of clo-
sure in a particular segment or aspect. Regarding musical expressiveness, Yavorsky was the first Soviet theorist to introduce the human factor into a theoretical process. What one heard was either related to or determined by human characteristics or experiences. Within the context of the development of a Marxist musicology, this aspect became crucial. Asafiev developed the definitive Soviet theory in this regard, working largely from concepts first realized by Yavorsky. We will turn now to his contribution.
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Chapter 25

Boris Vladimirovich Asafiev: The Process of Musical Form

Boris Vladimirovich Asafiev (1884-1949). Like so many other Russian musicians, Boris Vladimirovich Asafiev turned to the serious study of music only after beginning studies in another field. In 1903 he entered St. Petersburg University to study history and philology. But after meeting V. V. Stasov and N. A. Rimsky-Korsakov that year—both of whom became his "mentors," but in different ways—he decided to study music as well, entering the St. Petersburg Conservatory in 1904. Working simultaneously on two degrees for a time, he finished his course of study at the University in 1908, and then completed his studies in music composition at the Conservatory in 1910. At the Conservatory he studied composition with Anatoli Liadov and orchestration with Rimsky-Korsakov; his desire to study composition with the latter was thwarted when Rimsky-Korsakov died in 1908. However, Stasov, though dying earlier (in 1906), probably had the greatest influence on Asafiev, who carried into the Soviet period Stasov's traditions as music critic and propagandist with works characterized by wide erudition, range of interests, and positive views of Russian music as a national art form.
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Asafiev began to devote serious attention to his literary career in 1914, some time after his graduation from the Conservatory. In the intervening years he worked as a rehearsal accompanist for the corps de ballet of the Mariinskii Theatre (now known as the Kirov), and also made several summer trips to Europe as part of his study of the arts. His first literary effort, a survey of the 1913–1914 season of the Mariinskii Theatre, appeared in the journal Muzyka [Music], under the pseudonym Igor' Glebov. He subsequently wrote for Muzykal'nyi sovremennik [Musical contemporary], and in 1917 planned and became co-editor (with P. P. Suvchinsky, an editor of Muzykal'nyi sovremennik) of Melos, a series of article collections. They planned three volumes, but only two appeared (December 1917 and early 1918), both prepared before the October 1917 revolution.

The revolution affected Asafiev profoundly; almost immediately he became a spokesman and propagandist for the new regime. He was not a Marxist per se at that time as much as a Hegelian. He subsequently studied Marxism and his writings soon began to reflect its influence. During the early years of the revolution, he wrote informative articles and leaflets, was a member of both MUZO and TEO (teatral'nyi otdel [theatrical section]) of NARKOMPROS, propagandized the folk elements in Russian opera, and also composed ballets. His one-act ballet Carmagnole, for example, based on music of the French revolutionary period, is considered the first Soviet ballet. At the end of 1919 Asafiev joined the music division of Rossisskii institute istorii iskusstva [The Russian institute of the history of the arts] becoming
Dean of the division in 1921 (see Chapter 20).

During the fertile 1920s Asafiev undertook a wide range of activities. In addition to his duties as Dean at RIII, he also was a strong supporter of modern—even avant-garde—music, first through the Assotsiatsia sovremennoi muzyki [The association of contemporary music] or ASM, and then through the Kruzhok novoi muzyki [The circle of new music]. In 1925 he organized the new musicological section of the Leningrad Conservatory (when the training of musicologists was transferred from the institutes to the conservatories). Finally, he continued and expanded his literary efforts during this period, producing great quantities of significant writings. According to one calculation, "Of his total lifetime catalog of 940 separate titles, more than half (489) date from the single decade, 1921–1930, and over 300 (almost one-third of his lifetime output) are listed for the four-year period from 1925 to 1928." Among the more significant works from this decade are Kniga o Stravinskom [A book on Stravinsky], Russkaia muzyka: Ot nachala XIX stoletiya [Russian music from the beginning of the nineteenth century], Simfonicheskie etudy [Symphonic etudes], and Muzykal'naia forma kak prosess [Musical form as a process]. The latter is the first of a two-volume work that will serve as the basis for the present discussion of Asafiev's theoretical views. He also wrote for and edited the collection De Musica, and contributed to many other journals and collections published during this period.

The rise of the proletarian faction in the late 1920s essentially put an end to Asafiev's efforts on behalf of modernist music, for which
he was criticized, and contributed to his turning away from any important musicological projects during the next decade. His bibliography contains only fifty-one entries from the period 1929–1932 (twenty for 1929, sixteen for 1930, eight for 1931 and seven for 1932), compared with fifty for the year 1928 alone. Some of these entries are encyclopedia articles and publications of books written previously. For musicological activity he substituted musical composition; his most successful ballets date from the 1930s. These include Plamia Parisha [The Flame of Paris] (1932), Bakhchisaraiskiy fontan [The fountain of Bakhchisarai] (1933), and Kavkazskii plennik [The prisoner of the Caucasus] (1936). Concerning Asafiev's true intentions during this period, James Tull, translator of Asafiev's Muzykal'nai︠a︡ forma kak protsess, concludes,

It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Asaf'ev moved toward musical composition, during the 'thirties, as a defensive maneuver, primarily because he was convinced that his useful productivity as a musical scholar was at an end. Musical composition was the pursuit toward which his conservatory training had been directed, and his practical experience in the theatre had prepared him well to handle its technical and practical considerations, but there is reason to suspect that musical composition represents his first love only chronologically rather than in terms of major commitment. Through it, he was able to continue his activities and achievements in the field of music at a time when his real aspirations were temporarily frustrated.9

However, Asafiev's talent as a composer was somewhat limited, and pales in comparison with his overall impact in the field of musicology. But, as Tull points out, he made his mark in composition as well:

Nevertheless, Asaf'ev the composer, like Asaf'ev the musicologist, had great influence on his contemporaries and successors. Just as, in his musicological and critical activity, he defined tasks and methods for implementation by others, so, in musical composi-
tion, he devised a formula and a methodology for producing acceptable creations under the guidelines of Socialist Realism which served as a model for other composers.10

This methodology included writing music to a program, using subject matter either from history, from the classics of Russian literature, or from historical exotic and oriental locales.

During World War II Asafiev endured the blockade of Leningrad, allowing his evacuation from that city only towards the end of February 1943. Wishing to serve his country as best he could and to preserve in writing his thoughts on music in the face of possible imminent death, he resumed his scholarly activities and worked almost feverishly under the worst conditions. During this time he wrote three significant works—Intonatsiya [Intonation], the second volume of Muzykal'naia forma kak protsess, (to be discussed herein), and two works on operas by Russian composers, Chaikovsky's Evgenii Onegin and Glinka's Ruslan i Liudmilla. The consequences of his work and devotion were impressive, resulting in wide veneration towards him and his election to full membership in the USSR Academy of Sciences in 1943, an "unprecedented (and unduplicated) achievement for a musical scholar."

Asafiev's last years coincided with the period in Soviet cultural history known as the "Zhdanovshchina," after A. A. Zhdanov, the arbiter of culture for the Communist Party (see Part VIII). There is some confusion and controversy among scholars in connection with Asafiev's role in the preparation of a statement read in Asafiev's name at the Composers' Congress held in April 1948, in which he appeared to endorse the denunciations of composers (whose work he had previously admired)
in the February 1948 resolution of the Central Committee. Asafiev was in poor health at this time, unable to attend any of the meetings or conferences, and his statement was, according to Soviet sources, "prepared collectively, with the participation of other Soviet musicians. However, a draft of the statement, preserved in manuscript, testifies to the large role played by Asafiev in its preparation." Although many of Asafiev's long-held beliefs formed the basis for the statement, they were apparently transformed for a purpose he had not envisioned. Tull conjectures, based on a close reading of the source material and additional evidence, that Asafiev was "exploited as the voluntary, but unwitting instrument of the Party's design, who had no idea of the mischief which would be done in the name of principles which he advanced in all good faith." Asafiev died not long after this, on January 27, 1949.

Marxism. In order to understand fully Asafiev's theories, it is necessary to review some of the guiding thoughts behind Marxist and Hegelian philosophy. As noted, many of Asafiev's Marxist views may be more directly related to Hegelian philosophy. Specifically, Asafiev was familiar with Hegel's Lectures on Esthetics, in which Hegel discusses music—a topic Marx, Engels, and Lenin did not directly address. For Hegel, only poetry was superior to music in its expressive capabilities. In addition to its varied levels of nuance and expressiveness, music, in contrast to the passive visual arts, depicts, as Tull points out, "through its dynamic nature, not just a single frozen moment of
an emotional experience, but the entire experience in its course of development from beginning to conclusion." Tull continues:

Thus, the unity of music, as an art form perceived in time rather than space, is in the process of evolutionary quality of its occurrence, which stimulates the dialectical nature immanent in the human consciousness. Hegel considered elements of music such as stress and accent, rhythmic variation, and the interaction of dissonance and consonance as abstract but perceptible reflections of human experience, as a background to which the underlying rhythmic pulse sustained the consciousness of unity in diversity. Hegel regarded music as an exclusively human phenomenon, the only thing in nature which is inherently musical being the human voice. Thus, the human tone emerges as the clearest expression of man's inner being.17

This philosophy, most particularly the ability of music to reflect the entire experience of human emotion, the temporal and processual or evolutionary qualities of music, the "humanness" of music, and the sole inherent musicality of the human voice, forms the basis of Asafiev's approach. Asafiev also utilized Hegelian dialectics, which emphasizes "the dynamic interconnectedness of things: the inevitability of continuous, qualitative change as a fundamental element of existence." The Hegelian triumvirate of thesis-antithesis-synthesis rules this approach. When applied to materialism—matter not thought as the only reality—Hegelian dialectics becomes part of Marx's philosophy of dialectical materialism. The materialistic aspect concerns itself with matter's physical properties, its functions, and its immanent ability to change. Change thus becomes the norm, and any stability is only temporary. Matter is therefore constantly in the process of change.

Another facet of Marxism involves the human element. Since intellectual and emotional processes are products of matter, they too may be examined in the same dialectical light. But human consciousness, in
distinction from purely material elements, takes an active role in the examination of existence, of reality. In the Marxist scientific method of examination, three laws are applied:

Strife, Interpenetration, and Unity of Opposites (change caused by the opposition and interrelation of internal forces as an intrinsic quality of all things, balanced by sufficient unity to permit their existence as coherent entities); Transition from Quantity to Quality (accumulation of changes of degree as the sole and inevitable means of achieving changes in essence); and Negation of Negations (the inevitable subsequent cancellation, through qualitative change or "negation" as it is called, of each new state resulting from a previous "negation," proceeding in a never ending succession). 19

Asafiev accepts all three of these laws, which are founded on the principles of Hegelian dialectics.

Without going into more detailed explanation here (Marxist philosophy is covered more fully in Part VII), several additional points need to be made in connection with the Marxist approach to research: 1) the Marxist view of truth is based on objective reality and is confirmed by application and practice; 2) content rather than form is the more important object of investigation; and 3) Lenin's Theory of Reflection ("Just as man's knowledge reflects nature, . . . so man's social knowledge reflects the economic system of society") is applicable to music as a reflection of man's social knowledge. Asafiev applied points one and three but concerned himself less with point two.

Musical Form as Process. This two-volume work constitutes the major statement of Asafiev's theoretical views. Not only the content but also the style and form of this work differ from those same aspects
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of previous Russian theoretical works. Regarding style, both the
nature of the language and the method of its presentation are unusual.
Somewhat like Yavorsky, Asafiev employs a unique but complex theoreti-
cal terminology, full of inconsistencies, obscure explanations, and
"neologisms." The most plausible explanation for this language attri-
butes it to Asafiev's search for a new Marxist-oriented language, one
that would reflect the new ideals and would not recall previous common-
ly used terminology that might be labeled "dogmatic." Asafiev him-
self puts forth this view, more or less, in the second supplement to
volume one. In his reworking of terminology he acknowledges indebted-
ness to the initiative of the Swiss theorist Ernst Kurth, whose views
in some respects parallel those of Asafiev's and who in his recent
works—which were read, studied and even translated in the Soviet
Union—applied many new terms to accepted concepts, replacing "earlier,
static, formal terms" with "a whole series of dynamic definitions," to
use Asafiev's description. Asafiev deems new terms
necessary in order to pick out what is new in the content of
musicology and to delineate this new within the old... It is
not at all a matter of an intentionally destructive policy in
relation to the old terms, but rather of their insertion into a
new, more generalizing circle of definitions.(540)
Essentially, then, a new theoretical approach requires new terms, terms
that would not connect new concepts and approaches with existing ones:

Contemporary musicology strives toward the formation of terms
which would reflect, not a crystallized and congealed property,
but a living process, the very formation of the phenomena to be
defined. In music nothing exists outside aural experience. For
that reason, not a single definition can arise from "mute",
abstract premises, lying outside the material of music, but only
from the concrete perception of that which sounds. In other
words, the recognition of music as the movement of sound in the
intonational and rhythmic formation of the forces which organize it becomes the basic premise of contemporary musical terminology. (542)

He also uses neologisms, old words with new definitions, "tonicness," "intervallics," etc., not because, as he says, "we live in the midst of an 'influx of neologisms,'" but because of the necessity to emphasize some unfamiliar nuance in a very common and unassuming term." (607)

Of course, several prominent theorists of this time were also employing inconsistent and oftentimes obscure theoretical terminology—not only Yavorsky but also Conus and Garbuzov come to mind—in connection with their search for new theoretical systems and means of analysis. Asafiev's practice of using terminology with numerous possible interpretations was a device also employed by Yavorsky—and more successfully, as Tull points out—for purposes of historical connections. Also in common with Yavorsky is Asafiev's presentation of his ideas in a manner akin to that of musical development—what he called "intonational arches" or "sound arches." This concept identifies incomplete musical ideas presented early in a composition that are later picked up, developed, and eventually completed. Yavorsky utilized a similar device, which he called "intonational crossings," on the phrase level, while Asafiev applied it to larger forms, entire movements and whole works as well. Tull labels the literary application of this device, "thought arches." This device also applies to the overall form of each of the volumes of this work. Since Tull discusses this aspect in sufficient depth, it need not be repeated here.
Musical Form as a Process: General Approach. Asafiev takes up Yavorsky's view of music as a temporal, processual phenomenon and applies this approach both to form and to music history. Yavorsky in fact is the only contemporary Soviet music scholar—musicologist or theorist—to whom Asafiev pays any allegiance. He rejects most of the then-current musicological and theoretical approaches to music. He sees no benefits derived from non-Marxist musicological approaches in general, i.e., biographical, stylistic, genre, and the like. Nor does he agree with the tenets of such theoretical approaches as the architectonic analysis of music (Conus), the strictly acoustical approach to mode and harmony (Garbuzov), functional harmony (Riemann and Catoire), or even figured bass. His criticisms of contemporary musical research are aimed at those theorists and musicologists (mostly unnamed) for whom form is merely a collection of models to be followed or who promote vertical harmonic principles over or to the exclusion of horizontal melodic ones. Outside of Yavorsky, he mentions just one other Soviet musicologist, I. A. Braudo, whose work on Bach he cites. He is more generous with Western musicologists. In addition to his several references to the theories and vocabularies of Ernst Kurth, he refers to the works of some sixteen other Western musicologists, including Carl Stumpf, Curt Sachs, A. Machabey, Knud Jeppesen, and Alfredo Casella, whose works, primarily from the 1920s, provided Asafiev with some research on which to base his theories. This dominance by Western research in no way reflects Asafiev's own preferences; it just underscores the current state of Soviet musicology—
inexperienced and still striving to catch up with the West.

His disdain towards contemporary attitudes on musical form, towards theorists who prefer to view musical form as a scheme to be perceived and analyzed visually rather than a process that is perceived and analyzed aurally is evident throughout. His comments pertain particularly to Conus and his theory of metrotechtonicism, which is the final and most extreme development of this line of theoretical thought. For example, he rejects "the purely visual-architechtonic concept of [form] as a quantity of time units" (205) and speaks about the ear as "the measure of things in music," with "no abstract architectonics, no abstract, visual form-schemes."(561) He explains his position:

The abstract comprehension of form as a scheme for the visual analysis of soundless horizontals and verticals . . . leads to false, antidualistical views of the nature and meaning of musical forms and to the complete isolation of form from content, for form as a non-sounding, architectonic scheme does not permit an understanding of music and is transformed into a neutral medium, filled with indiscriminate content.(390)

Thus only a dialectical, processual view of form allows for the true understanding of music and its related content. He sees the historical basis of the visual-schematic view of form "in a rationalistic aesthetic based on the figurative arts. In our time, they are the heritage of lazy Philistineism in musicology, the fruit of an inert consciousness and the belief that all music finds its place in schemes."(390-391)

One is freed from such a view only by regarding form as a flexible and changeable process directed from without by operating stimuli and forces and, at the same time, controlled by properties of organization inherent in musical material. These properties in their turn do not at all pertain to music as mechanical motive forces lying outside the organizing human consciousness. They have been formed in the
evolution of the perception of flowing musical material and are conditioned by perception. In this sense, there is a profound difference between sound as a phenomenon of physics and sound as a musical [or, more properly, psychological—J.T.] phenomenon. (391)

In another reference he writes, "Music is perceived by the eyes only by musical 'architects,' those who measure visual projections of musical formation, not concerning themselves with the music by which these projections are generated." (546)

Asafiev's views on music, though, did not result solely from Hegelian philosophy, Yavorsky's influence, or from a reaction against Comus and others of his ilk. Soviet theorists have traced other important influences on Asafiev from music, linguistics, and theater, such as Stanislavsky from the theater, and Serov, Rimsky-Korsakov, Taneev, and Kashkin from Russian music theory. In turn, Asafiev became a very influential figure in Soviet musicology, and an understanding of his views is crucial for a complete understanding of future developments in Soviet music theory. The full impact of his influence, that is, not just the assimilation of his ideas but also their further development, came, though, not in the 1930s and 1940s, but after his death, beginning in the 1950s and most prominently in the 1960s up to the present. However, almost as soon as it was published in 1930, volume one of Musical Form as a Process came to be used as the foundation for the teaching of "musical form" at the Leningrad Conservatory, contributing to the development of the intonational approach to musical analysis. But because of the war, the denunciations in the late 1940s, and the resulting confusion and lack of direction in Soviet music theory, which lasted well into the 1950s, further work based on Asafiev's theories...
was subsequently delayed. So that these specific influences both on Asafiev and emanating from him will be more fully appreciated, I will postpone discussion of them until after an examination of his major ideas.

One additional reason for this delay in the application of Asafiev's ideas is that his writings frequently present difficulties to the reader. In fact, the main stumbling-block to a comprehensive and sympathetic evaluation of Asafiev's writings is Asafiev himself. His views underwent their own evolution, not only between works, but also within works; and to trace this evolution, to determine the proper sequence and final stage, is a formidable task. Also, the resulting contradictions and errors inherent to his works—which regarding Musical Form as a Process are not emphasized herein but which are pointed out by Tull in the translation—create problems for the reader and lead to questions about the veracity and substance of his theories. In order to substantiate a particular view or theory, Asafiev will sometimes stretch or belabor a point, use examples that do not adequately illustrate the theory or are incorrectly analyzed, or attempt what Soviets call "vulgar socialism," that is, making bald comparisons between economics or the "labors of production" and an artistic element, as Asafiev does when attempting to relate the energy of a musical composition to the work energy of the composer as he composed the music. Such incongruent justifications at times undermine the viability of his theories. On the whole, though, Asafiev's writings are refreshingly free of any of the heavy politicization or overemphasis on
materialism that afflicts so many other Soviet works. And his theories are of sufficient import to warrant detailed examinations, accompanied by the necessary awareness of these problems.

The views Asafiev expresses in this volume have greater significance for music theory than those in the second volume, which apply to music in a more general fashion. As Asafiev himself explains it,

The leading thread of the presentation [in Volume I] was to show how the organization of sound occurs, by what intonational causal forces (understood as essential properties of music) it comes into being, and how the motion of music—its development in time—proceeds. In other words, I tried to limit myself to a study of how music runs its course, how, having arisen, it continues, and how its motion is brought to a stop. (600)

Thus in part one Asafiev discusses the basic principles, "factors," and "motive forces" or "causes" of musical form and organization. Such factors include temporal motion—the successive interrelation of pitches—and memory, the accumulated perception of motion in our collective consciousness, as two basic phenomena that enable the understanding of musical process and influence the forms in which musical motion is fixed. The principles that organize this motion and form our memory are those of identity or repetition and contrast. The motive forces or causes of musical organization are those elements or factors that provide a "stimulus" or "impetus" to further motion. Asafiev
discusses these in detail throughout part two. In part three Asafiev focuses on the principles of organization through examination of the "crystallized forms" that result from their application.

Asafiev reveals his Marxist orientation from the outset of volume one, in explaining his concept of "musical form as a socially determined phenomenon." It is perceived "first of all, as a form (i.e., a condition, a method, and a means) for revealing music socially in the process of its intoning." (184) This process is a search for "the most 'intelligible' expression," which he defines as those intonations "assimilated by the environment through the most productive possible forms of music-making," and also as "the forms of intoning in which music manifests itself, and especially the system of intonations characteristic for any given epoch (from scales to harmonic functions, from the simplest instrumental melody to symphonic variations." (184-85) He adds that this system of intonations is not static but in constant evolution and change, "in living practice." (185)

Asafiev's use of terminology requires a slight digression. By "intoning" he means the actual process of sounding with intonations. "Intonation" does not refer to tuning (i.e., just intonation), to playing in tune, or even to melodic inflection. Nor does he use it in the same sense as Yavorsky. Initially Asafiev defined it as an "organized sound conjugation, exposed in the process of sounding." (510) However, this definition addresses only two aspects of music—its organization and performance; it lacks any reference to the aspect of perception, which for Asafiev was very important. He subsequently
refined his definition of intonation to include perception as well:

[It is] the actual basis, or the realization of sound, whether within the hearing, with the voice, or with the help of an instrument. Intonation does not merely signify the mechanical overcoming of the resistance of material, and is not merely the passive reproduction of visually projected marks. Thus, intonation is a factor of the highest degree of importance—the interpretation of sound. . . . Without intoning and apart from intoning there is no music. The intonation of speech is the interpretation of sounds not musically fixed, not stabilised in musical spaces nor in the invariable relations of sounds which have become tones. Musical intonation is the interpretation of sounds already placed in a system of sound relations precisely fixed by the memory—a system of tones and tonalities.(543)

This definition reveals intonation as a general concept, but it also has a more specific meaning. In practice Asafiev also uses the term intonation when referring to a specific arrangement of sounds; an intonation may mean a melody, theme, harmonic progression, motive, i.e., a small or a large musical entity, but one that is perceived or interpreted by the human consciousness. These definitions are from the two supplements to volume I. Since the concept of intonation becomes the main topic of volume II, I shall reserve further discussion of it until examining the second volume.

Musical form, then, is not so much the end result of creation, what composers achieve as the result of their labors, as a means to an end, a process for revealing both the creative material itself ("the system of intonations characteristic for any given epoch") and its organization or manifestation ("forms of intoning"). Thus form is not just "a constructive scheme," a model to be followed, but also a process, "the organization of musical motion."(185) "Form as a process, and form as a crystallized scheme (or, more precisely, as a construc-
tion) are two sides of the same phenomenon—the organization of the motion of socially useful (expressive) sound combinations."(188) And this organization is based not on "principles of individual creation" but on "social principles":

[These principles] grow out of practical demands; the environment assimilates them and selects the most necessary. The practical demands expand their limits according to the degree of development of the culture. . . . No aspect of music survives if it is not socially assimilated—if the means of expression inherent in this aspect do not represent the results of social selection and further variants of these essential qualities. . . . Classical forms are the result of prolonged social selection of the most stable and useful intonations.(186)

Thus the process of musical formation is an ongoing, "dialectical process." As a medium of expression, Asafiev likens form to a musical instrument:

Form is the same sort of medium for the manifestation or exposure of the social existence of music as a musical instrument. . . . The fact that an instrument is tangible, but forms are intangible, does not alter the matter. An acoustical medium which is not organized by the human consciousness does not, indeed, constitute music.(187)

Form in all its guises, that is, both "the form of a musical composition as a whole and the forms of the elements which constitute it," then becomes "the instruments (or tools) of the collective human consciousness, which reveal music as an organized medium."(188)

All aspects and procedures of musical form are socially determined—not just the selection of material and its organization, but also its performance and perception. Musical form is a dialectical process in which human participation in its organization, performance, and perception is essential. Human perception organizes music through
the "interaction of the principles of its formation . . . worked out through a prolonged process of selection."(189) In this process, memory plays a fundamental role: "Without the 'exercise of memory' there is no progress in the perception of music and no evolution in musical culture."(192) Memory "presupposes in the human consciousness an 'intonational reserve,' a certain sum of sound combinations, crystallized since ancient time."(190) Asafiev calls the process of the mnemonic assimilation of music a Darwinian "struggle of intonations for existence."(192) Perception becomes possible through the "exercise of memory" and "the activity of comparison, of the differentiation and isolation of sound combinations in the process of their interchange;" it "secondarily organizes motion which was initially organized by the composer."(192)

The process of formation in music contains a "two-faced quality," "the simultaneous co-existence in it of two tendencies":

the tendency toward crystallization—toward the exposure of similar intonations, similar and parallel constructive landmarks such as cadences—and the tendency toward a progressively more intensive feeling of unstable equilibrium, i.e., toward the destruction of identical and repeated features by the introduction of unfamiliar, unexpected capricious intonations, and by means of the breaking down or expansion of structural norms.(194)

The first tendency, made up of similar elements, makes up "the base or landmarks of the memorization of music"; the second tendency contains contrasting elements.(195) The juxtaposition of these two tendencies creates a struggle between the factors that stimulate motion, i.e., the contrasting elements, and the more traditional compositional schemes, i.e., the similar elements. What initiates and continues musical
motion, though, thereby prolonging the form, is not itself constant, for "in music everything is measured by correlations which are always unstable. . . . Musical formation . . . is felt always as a condition of unstable equilibrium; no single aspect of intoning is evaluated as self-contained, but always as a stage of transition into the following one."(194–195) This view can be related to Yavorsky's theory in which stability is only relative. Asafiev appears to embrace Yavorsky's Principle VI, total instability; viewed in the light of Marxist philosophy, from which Asafiev's approach is derived, this principle becomes not anarchy or total chaos, but the highest level that could be achieved, i.e., the triumph of dialectical materialism. But since Marxists view the state of disequilibrium, of constant change and motion, as normal, and not a state to which one aspires, then there would be no room for Yavorsky's Principles I–V, and Principle VI would be the norm. However, this is not Yavorsky's interpretation.

Thus, "to understand the form of a musical composition means to understand the logical basis of motion in a flow of sound as it is perceived by the hearing—to be aware of why motion continues as it does, sometimes shortened, sometimes extended."(207) However, "in order to focus greater attention on the characteristics and the principles of organization of music which result from the rules of its motion and the methods of its memorization," Asafiev asserts, it is necessary to ignore other factors which influence but do not essentially alter "the character of motion and organization."(202) These factors include the role of breathing of man in the formation of both vocal and instru-
mental, oral and written, music; "the place and the environment, the
tempo of life and the social milieu"; musical instruments themselves
and instrumentalism; and decorative or ornamental elements. The first
two factors particularly influence "the dynamics of melos," Asafiev's
term for the horizontal aspect of music, of which melody is just one
part. He discusses all these factors, including melos, in volume two.

Asafiev's idea of process with relation to musical form manifests
itself both on a small temporal scale, that is, formally, within the
unfolding of the music itself, and on a large temporal scale, that is,
historically, between forms and groups of forms that make up a particu-
lar era. In both cases musical formation is unstable, transitional;
and although a musical composition may end formally, historically it is
still evolving, still changing. Asafiev therefore analyzes change on
all levels. Within each epoch this includes also what he calls the
"highest" and the "lowest" intonations, that is, both great and humble
musical works. His explanation revealing the interrelationship between
the two provides a virtual primer for the Marxist attitude towards the
roots of musical composition:

The process of organization in music not only must be examined in
the "horizontal," in the consecutive evolution of forms crystal-
lized in the consciousness, but also in each given, historical
moment, in a reciprocal stratum from the top down and the bottom
up. The great classic composers always reflected in their crea-
tion, within an enormous scope, music belonging to their epoch.
And before many of the intonations of Bach, Haydn, or Beethoven
became "universal," they "existed" within the petty, burgher envi-
ronment which engendered them. The composers—nurselings of this
environment—transformed material grasped from childhood into the
fabric of their compositions. This is the source of the populari-
ty, in the very best sense of the word, of classical music. It is
not a matter of simplicity of forms—the forms are far from sim-
ple—but in the broad prevalence of the elementary and more com-
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plex instrumental intonations by which this music was conditioned. The burgher culture created them, and, having become bourgeois culture, carried them out into the broad social arena.(501-502)

Thus composers do not create their materials; the social conditions of the culture or environment create them, i.e., they arise out of social necessity. Composers utilize existing intonations—perhaps transformed but still recognizable—assimilated since childhood; their creativity enters through their selection and treatment of the material, the methods of which are also socially determined. Composers and their music are therefore products of their environment, of their culture, of their social condition. How well this material is selected and utilized depends on the ability of the individual composer.

Asafiev introduces the idea of "musical dynamics," which is the observation of the stages of motion in music or the processes of its organization, and from observation to the study of the forces which serve as causes or stimuli of motion. . . . In terms of musical dynamics, the evolution of musical form appears as the striving of human thought to achieve the maximum extension (within established norms) of musical motion, to intensify the effect of the stimuli which stir the growth and continuation of motion (and with it the energy of a given sounding mass), and to postpone, as long as possible, the approach of the moment of equilibrium.(241-242)

This evolution is a dialectical process characterized by the conflict between the two tendencies mentioned above—the tendency toward equilibrium, the previous methods, and "the no less strong impulse toward the postponement of the achievement of equilibrium and of the complete crystallization of given correlations," the new elements.(257-58)

Therefore the first task in the study of the formation of music as a dynamic art must be "the observation of motive causes (forces) which organize motion and the study of their operation."(243)
Asafiev breaks down the forces stimulating musical formation into three types, similar to a psalmodic formula:

an impetus, or starting point of sound, and a displacement; the motion or condition of unstable equilibrium; a return to the source, to the condition of equilibrium (to the basis), or the closing of motion—i.e., the correlation of \( \text{initium} \) (beginning), \( \text{movere} \) (to move), and \( \text{terminus} \) (close, ending).

Because, as Asafiev points out, research into impetuses is far scarcer than that into closing motions, he devotes considerable space to developing a theory of the impetus. He defines impetus not as an intonation but as "the function of a tone or series of tones . . . in a given formation, in the capacity of the initial stimuli of motion."(254) An impetus in its "musical dynamic significance . . . becomes a force which evokes motion"; "it draws our consciousness into a system of sound relations."(250) It is therefore a factor of formation, and either evokes or intensifies motion, thereby preventing inertia. It may engage the listener immediately or at a distance, that is, "accumulate energy" in preparation for a resolution or "discharge" or "gather energy" before the accent on any important feature in the formation of music.

An impetus may occur not only at the beginning of movements or large sections, but also at internal points, at the beginning of melodies or themes, anywhere motion is initiated. The impetus or initial feature of musical motion may be manifested as the first sound, the first group of sounds ("the first conjugation of sounds characteristic for all further motion, which determines both rhythm and tonality"), a theme or an entire introduction.(266) Asafiev therefore distinguishes
several types of impetuses—beginning impetuses as motivating forces of music that anticipate the main theme, the melody, or a whole movement of a composition (introductions, for example) or that establish the tonal sphere of the following formation; the internal impetuses or "stimuli which transfer motion from one stage into another or 'shake it up'" (for example, the pedal or organ point before the sonata recapitulation, the accumulation of energy preparing for its discharge); and the primary impetuses or "stimuli of motion in the predominating motives, themes, parts, and melodies" (the last assuming that the "signaling" introductions exist independently from the center section of the intonational formula).(278) In this way he moves from a broad comprehension of the concept of impetus to a study of "the primary stimuli of thematic motion."(278-279)

An interesting and unusual example of the impetus as stimulator of thematic motion, in this case the entire theme as impetus, may be seen in the beginning of Schumann's Third Symphony in Eb major. Asafiev describes the initial impetus, which enters without any preparation, as an ascending theme with wide leaps followed immediately by a descending theme that fills in the gaps stepwise. The interruption of a new thematic idea during a restatement of the original theme in the basses breaks the inertia, but does not destroy the theme as an impetus:

Time after time its rhythmic aspect emerges, now in a succession of minor chords, now in a still more elementary rhythmic nature—in the intonation of the single tone, G. Thus the unity of the scheme and its execution are preserved; thus features of identity are firmly established in the midst of a strenuous development, and the return of the theme is prepared, for it is not revealed till the end and does not close in a cadence. In view of all
this, the new intensive execution of the theme (measure 57, horns, etc.) appears as completely organic. . . . But Schumann does not complete the development of the theme and again interrupts it with a previously used device (sforzando). Motion parallel to the preceding is formed, but in another tonal scheme which leads to the secondary theme in G minor. (281-282)

He summarizes the impact of this theme as impetus:

Nowhere does the completed exposure of the first theme become the predominating stimulus for any further development of the music of the first movement of this remarkable symphony. The theme passes as an identical element through the most diverse stages of formation making its presence felt everywhere (now in the form only of the rhythmic design, now clothing itself in new material, now coming forth as a cadence intonation, closing the exposition) and everywhere remaining unfinished, thereby preserving its function as an impetus or a persistent dynamic stimulus. (282-283)

In order to illustrate how motion is initiated or generated, Asafiev analyzes the the C# minor fugue from Book I of The Well-Tempered Clavier. Example 25.1 reproduces the first twenty measures of this fugue. He describes the subject of the fugue—C#-B#-E-D#-C#—as evoking "a tense expectancy in the ear" between each intervallic progression. (236) Each progression either moves contrary to the expected motion or adds an unexpected element to a more predictable motion, thereby creating "a series of extremely unstable intonations" within the theme. (237) In the initial progression, C#-B#, the tonic moving to its leading tone already displays an atypical succession. The next progression, B#-E, the leap of a diminished fourth, so undermines the significance of B# as a leading tone that in our hearing the interval becomes its enharmonic equivalent, a major third. To Asafiev, this progression creates an aural "duality." The progression B#-E without the C# is perceived as consonant, just as the progression C#-E without the B# is perceived as consonant. But the progression C#-E through the
B#$ "gives a feeling of instability and demands continuation." (236)

Complicating the relation is the next progression, E-D#, in which the D# is twice the length of either B#$ or E, "as if it were the initial tonic according to its duration." (236) Like the C#, the D# further emphasizes the unstable, dissonant character of the interval B#$-E; it also upsets any feeling of equilibrium in the subject because of the close intervallic relations between it and the other tones. Although the D# resolves to C#, at the moment of this resolution, which balances "the whole formula, the answer [G#] enters, begins to intone the theme a fifth higher, and thereby, picks up the motion." (237) This real answer, which repeats the subject exactly a fifth higher, reinforces the instability of the subject. Thus, throughout this subject the reappearance of tonic is first avoided, through the leap from the leading tone to the mediant, and then delayed, through the lengthy rest on the supertonic. When tonic is reached, the simultaneous entry of the answer a fifth higher diminishes its power. This delay of tonic thus becomes a primary initiator of further motion.

Asafiev perceives the initial tone of the answer, the G#, "as an extremely active impetus and an accent because it 'takes up' the motion of the leading voice." (251) At that moment, the beginning of measure four, the subject has reached a supporting point, and achieved a state of equilibrium through the motion from D# to C#, a progression that functions, in Asafiev's view, as upper leading tone to tonic. (Tull considers the designation "upper leading tone" to be "inappropriate," since it in no way conveys the sense of urgency, the need to resolve to

the tonic, as strongly as does the lower leading tone.) But just at
the moment when a close could occur, the G# "converts the motion into a
new stage."(251) Comparing the next entrance of the subject on C# in
measure seven with this answer on G#, Asafiev observes that any delay
in the entry of the answer would have reduced the force of the G# as an
impetus. However, such a delay in the next entrance, which occurs a
half-measure after the theme "exposed" by the answer has attained a
resting point, has no adverse effect. This is due to the F# suspension
in the lower voice against the final tonic of the answer, G♯, which thwarts the achievement of equilibrium in the theme. Thus, the "dynamics" of this entry at that moment are "not only not reduced, but are reinforced."(251) Also, simultaneously with the entry of the subject in the second half of measure seven, the lower voice sounds with D♯, which contrasts with the C♯ in the subject. Asafiev gives to this D♯ the same function as the previous one, that of upper leading tone, and it leads to the tonic on the fourth beat of measure seven. However, the appearance of tonic in the lower voice on this weak beat of the measure and the feeling of rest imparted to the previous D♯ on the third beat "compromises" the significance of the tonic C♯, beginning the subject in the upper voice, "as the point of departure."(252) The motion of the lower voice to D♯ again (measure eight) clashes with the upper voices, but its return to tonic in the second half of measure eight appears to attain stability. Two occurrences take place at this point: the "inertia of motion" in the lower voice, "which evokes a suspension similar to the preceding ones (measures 4-5, 6-7, 8-9) with a 'recoil' downward after the resolution," and the E in the upper voice, the functional significance of which in Asafiev's view undermines the stability or consonance of this part of the measure, since it requires further motion, having created a diminished fourth with the preceding B♭. In addition, the vertical consonant sonority (E-G♯-C♯) on the third and fourth beats of measure eight, a relatively weak part of the measure, creates what Asafiev calls "a passing equilibrium," because there exists a "conflict" between the vertical and horizontal
aspects at this point—between the functional harmonic signification of this chord and the melodic function of each individual tone. He calls this conflict "a characteristic example of the dialectical trend of musical motion, in which the 'horizontal' and the 'vertical' occur as functionally conflicting coordinates."(253) A different conflict occurs between the "intonational significance" of the same chord "as a tonic foundation" and its relatively weak "rhythmic-constructive position."

Thus, Asafiev concludes,

all these causes together evoke further motion and the development of sound energy. With each new impetus, each new entrance, the force of sound tension is increased and the size of the sound space is expanded. In relation to the further development of the fugue, the entire exposition is a process of the accumulation of energy.(253)

Essentially, then, the main "cause" of motion, based on this example, is the avoidance, postponement, or delay of resolution, or, in Asafiev's terms, the non-attainment of equilibrium (disequilibrium) or stability. The devices that bring about this state are many, but include progressions that are contrary to the usual or predictable ones, non-harmonic tones (suspensions, passing tones, etc., which have the effect of postponing resolution or equilibrium or placing it in a less significant position), both vertical and horizontal dissonances (a horizontal dissonance would be the diminished fourth Bb-E), and rhythmic accents (or non-accents in this case) or displacements.

Asafiev's view towards the conflict between the horizontal and vertical coordinates, which he brought up in discussing the Bach fugue, leads him to a general conclusion concerning the process of form:
In the intonational-dynamic scheme a conflict is continually felt between the functional dependence and role of each individual tone as a point in the mobile horizontal (melodic scheme) and the function of this same tone as a consonance belonging to some vertical complex. In other words, any given conjugation of tones can be regarded in two coordinates, that is, in the scheme of interaction both of the rhythmic-tehthonic (or constructive) principles and of the intonational-dynamic principles of formation. The totality of these phenomena and the forces ... which operate within the given modal tendencies, permits [sic] one to examine the process of the formation of music as a dialectical process with the continuous coexistence of opposites.(254)

But whether vertical or horizontal complexes dominate, "the effect of the forces is directed toward overcoming the resistance of the material—one might say toward the transformation of an acoustical phenomenon into the emotionally expressive language of music—and toward the organization of motion."(255) At this point, Asafiev has expanded his discussion to include not just motion on the small scale, within a form, but also motion on the large, historical scale.

Thus, study of the occurrence of the stimuli of musical motion and of the energy of motion, in the history of musical development, indicates the necessity for regarding this motion as a dialectical process in which the tendencies toward equilibrium are, simultaneously, refuted by the no less strong impulse toward postponement of the achievement of equilibrium and, along with it, of the complete crystallization of the given correlations.(256)

This view forms part of the idea concerning the evolution of music that Asafiev later called "intonational crises." This concept will be discussed in the context of volume two, where he develops it at length.

Returning to the small-scale form, Asafiev reduces the essence of musical motion to one condition—that of unstable equilibrium:

Any musical motion, which, both as a whole and in any given feature, is perceived as a formation of its organizing forces—as an act of organization—must be considered as a condition of unstable equilibrium, enclosed between the first impetus (point of
support, starting point, or point of departure) and the final formula (conclusion or cadence) which closes the motion. (258)

Seen "in the light of the dynamic study of musical forms," this essence thus becomes "a prolonged struggle to fill, as intensively as possible, the ever increasing space of the 'course' between the point of departure and the point of restored equilibrium [sic] by utilizing the energy of sound conjunction and gravitation." (259)

Asafiev's frequent references to "energy" require here an examination of this concept and his usage of it. The term "energy" was first utilized in a philosophical context by William Ostwald (1853-1932), who substituted energy for matter as the basic element of reality. Ernst Kurth applied the term to music, which he viewed as the expression of "psychic energy." He further distinguished "kinetic energy," the release of energy in melody, and "potential energy," the vital force within a tone or chord. Asafiev was not influenced by Kurth in any direct way, for he formulated his ideas independently of Kurth. But in several respects—the view of music as predominantly linear and as a dynamic process, and dissonance as a correlative of tension and release—Asafiev's views coincided with Kurth's and he felt free to borrow terminology from him. But Asafiev's idea of energy is colored by his Marxist views regarding society and the perception of music, whereas Kurth's concept of energy derives from Schopenhauer's idealistic (hence, non-materialistic) view of the Will as the essence of man. Music expresses the Will and is directed by it.

Asafiev relates the concept of energy initially (but not very successfully) to "the fact of work, the fact of the transfer of some
expend force into a series of sound movements."(247) The composer
works, expends energy, and transforms that energy into a musical compo-
sition. When performed, this "potential" energy converts to "kinetic
sound energy (reproduction)," which converts "in its turn, in the act
of listening to the music, into a new form of energy—'emotional experi-
ence.'"(248)

This series of transformations constitutes the necessary path of
music from the first steps of its conception in the composer's
imagination, under the influence of his environment, to its per-
ception by a sensitive listener. . . . The kind of energy, by
which musical motion manifests itself, is intonational energy,
unfolded in the motion of sound.(248-249)

This "intonational energy," which to the listener is translated into
"emotional experience," separates Asafiev's view of energy from
Kurth's, who was not so much concerned with the communicative power of
music. However, this is just one form of the transformation of energy.

Sound energy also manifests itself as temporal length and as the pro-
cess of the organization of sound material. Asafiev illustrates this
point with the leading tone as an example:

The leading tone is a force which draws sound, as a given rela-
tion, into a certain motion. But the work or effect of this
motion is felt as the gravitation of the leading tone to the
tonic. In this sense, it is possible to speak about the energy of
the leading tone, and in just the same way, about the energy of
the tritone interval, and in general, about the qualitative dif-
fences of the distances between tones (but not about their
mechanical displacement) in systems of sound correlations other
than those used exclusively in the European system.(250)

Both the forces that initiate motion—impetuses—and those that main-
tain it are the consequences of the energy of motion. Thus when
Asafiev writes about the "energy of sound conjugation and gravitation,"
he means the energy resulting from intervallic links and their resolving tendencies which provide motion, as in Yavorsky's tritone-resolution pair.

Asafiev subsequently summarizes four basic methods that condition the intertonal correlations that cause and engender forces of motion: 1) the dynamics of intervallic distance (Weber's Distanz-Prinzip) and their resulting interaction ("comparative pitches"), i.e., the dynamics of dissonance and consonance; 2) the "rhythmic-intonational" contractions or expansions of "sound components" (lines and verticals); 3) the interchange of different types of voice progression, either by step or by leap; and 4) modulations or tonal shifts. These methods are among the basic factors that stimulate progression in a musical work. In fact, Asafiev refers to the third method, "the alternation of a 'leap' and 'smooth, filled-in motion'" as "the basic law of musical formation."(350) It may occur on both the small scale, in an immediate melodic context, or on a large scale, in which "tonal elisions demand restoration" and "distant comparisons require smoothing out," that is, modulations to remote tonalities require an eventual filling-in with the previously omitted tonalities.(350) This is, of course, another manifestation of the implication-realization model, which on the melodic level can be manifested as Meyer's "gap-fill" type.

The dynamics of consonance and dissonance, given above under number one, has an important effect and stimulus to sound motion. Asafiev enumerates the essential properties of dissonance:

In the first place, [dissonance] evokes a feeling of intona-
tional impetus and displacement sharper than that which occurs in
the juxtaposition of consonant combination. . . . In the second place, dissonance sharpens the feeling of contrast. . . . [Third], the phenomena of consonance and dissonance as strictly rationally measured correlations of the stability and instability (the degrees of gravitation) of the elements of the mode and as a contrasting manifestation of these correlations are transformed into their own opposites, into the display of a sort of musical chiaroscuro. (338–42)

Asafiev illustrates the first two points with the analysis of the Bach fugue. His third point brings up what is normally a powerful stimulus for the motion and organization of musical formation—the transfer of a function into its opposite. Here, though, he is referring to a relatively recent development in which the effect of this "stimulus" is less than powerful—the music of Scriabin and the Impressionists, in which color overtakes function and both the feeling of dissonance itself and its relation with consonance are changed. Tonic becomes passive rather than dynamic; and, as a result of the softening and expansion of the distinction between consonance and dissonance, motion is reduced to "little more than the interchange of verticals." (342)

Other means for the continuation or stimulus of motion on a small or large scale include sequence, a "powerful factor of formation" in Romantic music but a "passive," "negative" factor in relation to the musical development and formation of ideas, "not a medium for overcoming the resistance of inertness inherent in the material" (313); "degrees of gravitation," i.e., relationships of separate tones or tone complexes to supporting "points" or "knots." such as a delayed resolution to tonic; "overexposures" or "retentions" of tones, that is, the delaying of an expected sound until the strong part of the measure; the injection of an unexpected tone or chord into a clear tonal con-
text(314); melodic shifts and "opevanie" ("the rotation of a voice around any of the basic tones"), which Asafiev considers "the two principal kinds of melodic formation," and in which intoning occurs in the alternation of leaps and filled space (stepwise motion or glissando) (319); parallel constructions of material, which continue motion and expand the scope of music but which are unsatisfactory as a stimulus of motion; and modulation, which regardless of the method is still a powerful factor of formation and means for the continuation of motion.(344-50)

Aside from the important points made by Asafiev already brought out here—the dialectics of form as a process, the factors and means of its unfolding, etc.—Asafiev devotes the bulk of volume one of Musical Form as a Process to detailed discussions of his approach to the principles of the construction of musical form, both as a process and as a scheme, and the resulting classification. He divides the entire process of musical formation and of all crystallized formal schemes into two groups, depending on which principle of organization, identity or contrast, "gives shape to this 'insubstantial' material."(353) The "principle of identity, i.e., the succession or periodic recurrence of similar or even completely identical combinations," predominates primarily in imitative forms (canon and fugue) or variation forms (including rondo).(353) The "principle of contrast, i.e., a succession of intonations opposed to preceding sound complexes," predominates primarily in the sonata allegro form, but also in other more dramatic forms such as opera overtures.(353) Originating in dialectical logic, one principle
inevitably evokes the other, but the predominance of one of them in a particular group of forms does not inhibit the influence of the other principle, although it may not be apparent. Asafiev interprets this as "a manifestation of the law of the coexistence of opposites." (354) The application of either principle in pure form is "absurd." "In music we are always concerned with the interconditionality and interaction of both of the basic principles of formation." (381) The main factor influencing the construction of formal schemes and indeed the whole process of musical formation, Asafiev reveals, is our memory, "the most active factor in the assimilation of music." (380)

Asafiev traces the application of the principle of identity from the earliest "primitive correlation of a strong and a weak beat (the simplest form of repetition, independent of the qualitative aspect of material)" to complicated variations in which the theme, the element of identity, is less recognizable and engenders new contrasting formations discernable only to the experienced listener. (354) Between these extremes his discussion ranges from the use of the cantus firmus ("a significant landmark") to nineteenth-century programmatic works and leitmotif operas. He calls the leitmotif "a reformed, leading cantus firmus," and assesses its mnemonic function in unifying prolonged motion (characteristic of forms organized by identity); he also admits that the structure of Wagnerian operas "represents a process of organization intermediate between the strict execution of the principle of identity (fugue, canon), and the equally strict execution of the principle of contrast (sonata, symphony) as manifested in the coordinated
comparison of thematic spheres."(371-73) He sees in the works of Liszt, the B minor Sonata for example, the principle of identity carried through to the highest degree by the attempt . . . to coordinate the fabric to the greatest extent on the basis of the principle of identity by applying the art of variation and the combining of variants to the construction of themes and leitmotifs. He forms themes from a single general premise, which differ according to the functions assigned them (the most popular example is the thematics of the b minor sonata); he substitutes the variants and transformations of a single theme in diverse guises for a series of juxtaposed and contrasting leitmotifs.(374)

Although Asafiev concentrates primarily on thematic or even harmonic identity, he illustrates how this principle may be applied even further, to features of identity in tempos, timbres, dynamics, intonations, rhythms, texture, and cadences. For timbre identity, to pick one element as an illustration, Asafiev points to the music of both Weber and Debussy:

The skillfully executed return time after time of some characteristic timbre gives a piece an appropriate mood and evokes watchful expectation, i.e., it becomes a coloristically identical factor, connecting different phases of motion. . . . The characteristic phrase of the flute in the Prelude a l'apres-midi d'un Faune of Debussy expressively formulates the "lazy, languorous" motion of the music. The timbres of the horns and clarinets in Der Freischütz, typical of Weber, unify many moments of the opera and impose a peculiar imprint on the music with each of their returns. The role of timbre in this relation is not inferior to the role of the leitmotif, although timbre is not linked with the same melodic outline or harmonic motion.(378)

This expansion of the principle of identity to non-thematic elements was expanded upon by subsequent theorists, mainly Mazel (see Part VII).

In the second group, those forms constructed according to the principle of contrast, for Asafiev the highest expression of this
principle is the form of the sonata-allegro. His enthusiasm for this particular form is almost boundless and is rooted in its embodiment of so many elements supportive of Marxist philosophy—a dynamic, dialectical form full of development and change. He views it as an organism developed from the microcosm of the formula of the perfect cadence (I IV V I), which represents the process impetus (exposition)—breaking of equilibrium (development)—restoration of equilibrium (recapitulation).

The dynamics of its process of formation arises initially with the two contrasting thematic parts in the exposition. The thesis "evokes" its antithesis, and their juxtaposition gives rise to the possibility of further motion. Another important segment of the exposition, the concluding part, has a dual role, i.e., becomes its opposite, in Marxist terms. It both closes the motion and yet, because it affirms and intensifies the instability created by the introduction of new thematic and tonal material, provides a powerful stimulus for further motion. Asafiev in fact sees "the features of connection and transition (connecting passages) and of conclusion and affirmation (the closing theme)" as determining "the character and intensity of the contradictions revealed in the development of the sonata movement; in a word, these are 'explosive' features."(387) The repetition of the exposition injects the principle of identity into the process so that the thematic contrasts may be reinforced and assimilated by the human consciousness, fixed in the memory.

The sonata exposition embodies one particular manifestation of the dialectical quality in music. The first theme (thesis) contrasts with
the second theme (antithesis). A third part, the final synthesis, is expected but does not occur; rather, in juxtaposition to the following development section, the exposition is perceived in retrospect as a synthesized unity, and becomes a thesis to the development's antithesis. Asafiev describes the process in this manner:

A musical composition may be examined as a whole, perceived in motion, in which all the links (all stages, all features) are dialectically correlated with one another in such a way that each moment of the exchange of thesis and antithesis (a given sound complex and the sound complex opposed to it) is perceived by the ear dualistically. In the process of the first exposure it is perceived as a contrast, but immediately after that, when each of these comparisons is grasped, it becomes in its turn, a unity in relation to the following stage of motion, i.e., a compound thesis complex opposed to the new complex, etc. Consequently, the complex of thesis and antithesis, as a combination of opposites in its exposure (intoning), is transformed for the ear into a synthesis, immediately following the exposure. The new (and longer) correlation of sound then engenders a new comparison and a new synthesis.(403-404)

This analytical process encompasses a difficult task—the revelation of the correlations of consecutiveness and simultaneity in a composition which exists both as a "dynamically mobile formation, saturated with contrasts," and as the unity resulting from this formation.(404) Asafiev adds that this "dialectic of consecutiveness and simultaneity" leads to "the dialectic of formation and crystallization."(404)

The development section emphasizes the instability formed by the thematic contrasts in the exposition, and causes the entire formation to become more intensive. In it the principle of contrast emerges as the most dynamic factor. Because of the varying nature of each development section, which differs from work to work, Asafiev declines to identify any causes that form the development other than a general
cause—"the striving to reveal the dialectic of themes."(393) He does recognize two basic courses along which the dialectical formation of themes is directed—either a "dynamically contrasting 'play' of thematic fragments, without clearly pronounced changes of ascent (accumulation) and discharge" or "a unified line of intensification of forces toward a projected limit."(393)

If on a large scale the exposition is the thesis and the development the antithesis, then the recapitulation becomes the synthesis:

If the establishment of the basis propositions occurs in the exposition, and their development and conflict in the working-out section, then there occurs in the reprise a reduction to unity. Actually, by its position the reprise is a synthesis—that feature in which, out of the comparisons of the exposition and working-out section, a new unity must rise. In the reprise, a process must be realized similar to the formation of a new quality. Thus, the scheme of the symphonic sonata allegro ceases to be merely a rational construction.(427)

This is the second manifestation of the dialectical quality in music.
The synthesis is a new combination of previous elements, a new stage in the music—a "new unity," a "new quality." This concept applies best to the sonata allegro form as Beethoven interpreted it, thus influencing its further development. The classical sonata allegro, up through Beethoven and his Second and Third Symphonies, does not embody this dialectical quality so well. Asafiev describes the problem:

The difficulty lay in the fact that a single tonal unity of the principal and subordinate parts did not alone realize a synthesis as a negation of negation, did not give a "new quality," but most often merely completed the formation, firmly, but in a mechanical way. Thus, an organic conclusion could not be drawn from all the preceding intonational conflicts.(428)

Beethoven found the solution in the enlargement of the coda, in which "the elements making up the working-out section had to transfer into
their opposites, into forces completing the motion, rather than stimulating it." The coda provides the synthesis; and the merely "tonally regulated" motion of the reprise "evokes the coda as a new affirmation of the basic propositions."(429)

Thus, the exposition and the development become the first half of the sonata, "a powerful expansion of motion," an "onslaught," which is opposed by the recapitulation, "in which the repeated music of the exposition loses its function as an impetus and is transformed into a massive support," and the coda, which, "based partly on elements" from the development, together with the recapitulation forms "the second huge section" of the sonata.(430) Asafiev emphasizes that, although "in a formal sense" the sonata's tri-partite nature is destroyed, "in essence" it remains intact. He does not discuss the dialectical nature of pre-classical and early classical sonatas without codas.

Asafiev sees great variety of character and great drama in the sonata allegro, and identifies several "types"—among them the song-like sonata, the program sonata, and the operatic sonata.

As a form which is chiefly dramatic and rises from the formation of contrasting thematic ideas, the symphonic sonata allegro turned out to be an extremely flexible medium, capable of assimilating programs of the most diverse nature, as a result of which the mutual fertilization and organic interaction of music, poetry, literature, philosophy, and painting became possible (Liszt, Strauss, Reger, Mahler).(442)

For Asafiev, though, Beethoven made the greatest contribution: he "brought out the dialectic of the sonata and intensified the functional interconditionality of the formative elements of the sonata and symphony to the highest degree of expressiveness."(438) Asafiev's analysis
of the first movement of the Ninth Symphony reveals an even further synthesis of contrasting elements—the two principles of formation. In this movement, "the development of music through a series of variational 'transformations' of image-bearing ideas nowhere else rises to such a wise treatment of the correlation of identity and contrast and the organization of unity through the exposure of opposites."(435-36) The motion, as Asafiev sees it, is developed in four consecutive "variant stages . . . . Each of the stages has a common impetus or initial stimulus and the leading ideas are intoned in various gradations of sonority."(434) The exposition is followed by the development (first variant), recapitulation (second variant), and coda (third variant), "with a synthesizing intensification which closed the motion and a final statement of the basic thesis in the form of a melodic cadence instead of merely the chords of the tonic."(434-35) He continues:

In each of the stages, all the basic thematic ideas or operating forces (in the dynamic sense) take part, each time in a changed form, as if being enriched from each execution in its turn and by each mutual contact. Such parallelism or consecutive stratification of the stages of an essentially unified development is completely natural in such a gigantic conception; the listener grasps the music thanks to just this parallelism which integrates a complex formation, and thanks to the varied quality of identical material in each of the stages—grasps it in spite of the scope of the conception, the multitude of contrasting juxtapositions, the splintering and permutation of the thematic material. Thus, musical development which is contrasting in its essence is summarized by means of the repeated exposure of similar or identical operating forces in their varied formation or interrelation.(435)

Utilizing again his "formula of sound formation," i : m : t, in which "i" signifies the beginning, the initial impetus, "m" the intermediate motion and "a series of correlated elements (a : b : c ...),"
and "t" the conclusion, the final limit of motion, Asafiev summarizes
the dual dialectical nature in music:

The consecutive perception of a musical composition, from the
initial stimulus to the final closing complex engages the con-
sciousness in a chain of sound correlations. Each successive
correlation emerges for the ear with several meanings: either it
contrasts with (opposes itself to) the preceding one, or it sums
up and unifies it. But at the same time it must be the starting
point for succeeding complexes, because within the composition
there may not be a full close. . . . In the system of European
music, the formula of sound formation, i : m : t, will have to
represent, not only each individual stage of motion, but also the
complete perfect cadence which finally completes this motion—not
only a composite link in the chain of conjugations, but also the
entire composition as a whole (the composition itself as the
result of the interaction of all elements).(405-06)

Thus the functions of the units in the formula are constantly shifting
during the process of musical unfolding, and this process occurs on all
levels. The third unit, t, may be perceived both as a conclusion and
simultaneously as the first unit, i, an impetus. In relation to the
final cadence of the entire composition, all the internal cadences, or
transient t's, are, as Asafiev puts it, "to a considerable degree
 coordinative," that is, they link and "coordinate" various internal
sections.(406) He illustrates this process with a procedure frequently
used by classical composers to begin the development section in which
the concluding phrase of the exposition is immediately repeated, but in
another key, to signal the beginning of the development. With changes
of key and function, a terminus, t, becomes an initium, i. Such
changes, as we have seen, may occur at any level, from the note-to-note
level all the way up to the large-scale movement level.

Such an approach in other spheres of music is not uncommon in
Russian music theory. One might, for example, refer to this phenomenon
as the "variational functional aspect" of form, to utilize a term
applied by Yavorsky (and later Tiulin, as discussed in Part VII) to the
tonal sphere. Another, more direct link with an idea of Yavorsky's may
be seen in Asafiev's idea of "intonational arches," which is related to
Yavorsky's "intonational crossings," in which unstable tones in one
intonation are resolved in a subsequent intonation. Asafiev defines
this idea, "in connection with the continuous transfer of functions and
their transition into their opposites," as "a complex network of mutual
gravitations operating on one another at various distances and with
varying force."(412-13) He explains his choice of terminology:

There is definitely nothing abstractly formal nor subjective in
the term mutual gravitation of sound elements; there is not a
single system of sound relations in the world . . . in which there
is not a purposeful organization of connection, and an intonation-
ally dynamic dependence between the tones included in the system.
. . . Music . . . is a system of organized motion; it is not an
anarchistic succession of sound complexes, but rather, their
strictly mutually conditioned exposure in the process of intoning.
Form is heard, is perceived, as a formation, and is crystallized
in the consciousness as a unity (or, music is remembered and fixed
in the consciousness as the result of the exposure of intonational
contradictions).(413)

Thus, the "system of crossing, intonational arches" enables one to
understand the correlation i : m : t "as a constructive principle of
any organic musical composition and as an effective intonational ele-
ment of each stage of musical formation. This correlation permits a
constant transformation of the functions of each of its constituent
members as a sort of continuity:" i : m : t(si) : m : t, etc.(414)
Asafiev points to the form of the sonata allegro as "the most intensive
expression of this correlation" and to the development as "the most
important stage of formation of this form, embodying in itself the musical development," which "displays, especially significantly, the motor and dialectically dynamic nature of music."(415)

Asafiev illustrates his theory of intonational arches in connection with his formula of sound formation with a discussion of portions of the exposition and development of the first movement of Beethoven's C major Sonata, Op. 2, No. 3. The first thirteen measures and the unifying rhythmic formula are shown in Example 25.2. Asafiev identifies the unifying rhythmic formula (Example 25.2b), "with its characteristic swing," as "the natural impetus for the entire motion," owing to which he perceives the whole fragment "in the form of a coherent

Example 25.2. Ludwig van Beethoven, Sonata for piano, C major, Op. 2, No. 3; a) mm. 1-13; b) unifying rhythmic formula.
complex with identical elements.

The first member of the correlation \( i:m:t \), the \textit{initium} (i), proves to be the predominant one. The cadence (t) [m. 12] flows directly into a new section and serves as a point of departure for it (t=i), thanks to which the motion does not end on the thirteenth measure.

The temporal and functional predominance of the tonic in this passage is interrupted only briefly by the contrasting \( F\# \) (mm. 11-12) and, "to a small degree," the \( C\# \), both of which introduce into the music "an element indicating the further possibility of forward movement." This is borne out in the appearance of a new theme in another key beginning in m. 26, in which these pitches figure prominently (the second theme, stated first in G minor, then repeated in D minor). The appearance and subsequent reappearance of these pitches constitute one illustration of Aafiev's theory of "intonational arches," or, as he calls it here, "a system of connection at a distance."

The harmonic pattern of the first four measures, I V V I, when correlated with Aafiev's formula of sound formation, becomes \( i(I):m(V):t(I) \). Despite its apparent completeness, in Aafiev's view this section demands further motion because of the fact that the verticals or columns of the tonic do not suppress the intonational tension formed between them (V occupies a two measure segment with the alliterative \( C\# \) within it), and this is evoked by the fact that the basic rhythmic formula [Ex. 25.2b] is repeated, and by its repetition reinforces the instability.

In other words, the repetition of the bulk of the "theme" in the dominant (m. 3), with the "alliterative" \( C\# \) sufficiently disturbs the hegemony (by virtue of its position and function) of the tonic and the
equilibrium of the phrase to warrant further motion. ("Alliterative" is a literary term Asafiev uses to denote the exact reproduction at another pitch level of the halfstep between B and C in measure 1.) Also, in the melodic line, which alternates between stepwise and ascending "sliding" motion and between leaps of a fourth (m. 2) and a sixth (m. 4), the first leap is filled in by subsequent motion; but the second leap remains unfilled and requires further motion. "Thus, the four measures would seem to be architectonically closed (I:iV:iV:iI) thanks to the strict symmetry, but, in fact, in the living sound, in intoning, it proves to be far from closed and demands further unfolding and completion."

In retrospect measures 1-4 become the, with measures 5-6 making up and measures 7-8 making up t, forming a seemingly closed eight-measure passage. In measures 5-6, both the tonal and thematic instabilities are emphasized. Beethoven "catches up" the unfilled sixth, gives it the significance of a 'local' point of departure and compresses" the tonic-dominant correlation from measures 1-2 and 3-4 into a repeated one-measure construction.(420) As Asafiev points out, "the ear senses an extremely unstable correlation."(420) At this point in his analysis, though, Asafiev makes a curious observation, stating that the unstable correlation of measures 5-6 "is intensified further by the fact that the sixth does not remain unfilled to the end."(420) This filling-in is accomplished in measures 7-8, which end with an imperfect authentic ii-V-I cadence. But how can the filling-in of a leap intensify instability? It usually contributes to closure, not the reverse.
In fact, the sixth is not totally filled in melodically; the F is missing. It occurs only harmonically, as an inner voice in measures 5-6 and in the bass in measures 7-8. (The B is also missing from measures 7-8; but it occurs repeatedly in measures 5-6, and makes a sufficient impression there to carry it over into measure 7.) As further proof of closure, he points out, "the melodic arc—the ascent from e to d and the descent to e—receives a full close."(421) Thematically, and even harmonically, then, considering the cadence in measure 8, which, says Asafiev, "somewhat restores the equilibrium," this eight-measure phrase achieves a certain degree of closure. However, other factors prevent it from being completely closed. The primary elements of instability, according to Asafiev, are the asymmetry of the tonal structure (eight beats on the tonic and six on the dominant), and the rhythmically weak cadence on beat three in measure eight, which "proves to be intonationally unsatisfactory."(422) Asafiev considers another "motive force," the connecting chromatic phrase in the bass in the second half of measure eight, to be of less importance. He does not fully explain how the more stable aspects of this four-measure phrase—the (almost) filled-in sixth and the closed melodic arc—contribute to the need for further motion; he merely states that the filled-in sixth (mm. 7-8) "intensifies" the instability of the m unit (mm. 5-6), and that the closed melodic arc counterbalances the harmonic asymmetry of measures 7-8. In a note he explains the latter observation: "The non-coincidence of the 'completions' of simultaneously operating factors is usually an indication of the instability of a formation and serves as a
dynamically striking stimulus to the progression of music." (421) In other words, non-congruence in closure, that is, closure in one voice and non-closure in another (or, as in this case, a lesser degree of closure) together, creates the need for further motion. Considering that the filling-in of the melodic sixth—a stable factor—coincides with the tonic-subdominant approach to the cadence and the cadence itself—actually another relatively stable factor—this explanation cannot apply there as well. Asafiev does not clarify this matter satisfactorily, but leaves it unresolved.

The next four measures, mm. 9-12, contain a "variant" of mm. 5-8, "with extremely important intonational and rhythmic displacements":

When the perceiving ear compares the "original" with the "variant" there arises a new intonational "conflict," tensely demanding resolution or completion. This completion appears in the thirteenth measure; the tonic is intoned ff on the strong beat of the measure and authoritatively seizes the attention. Tension is quickly evoked, so intensively that the subsequent six-measure "stand" on the tonic, in the form of an arpeggiated run, up and down [mm. 13-18], does not evoke a feeling of inertness. (422)

This is the extent of Asafiev's discussion of the opening measures of Op. 2, No. 3. From here he moves to the development, the beginning of which is given in Example 25.3.

Example 25.3. Ludwig van Beethoven, Sonata for piano, Op. 2, No. 3, mm. 91-93, beginning of development.
Asafiev makes two points about the development, one thematic, one
tonal. Thematically, the development begins with a "theme" from the
concluding part of the exposition (Example 25.3):  \( T \) becomes \( i \), in other
words. However, this "clear-cut melodic image" is soon dispersed by "a
virtuoso, arpeggiated run—a device employed several times in this
sonata—and also by means of elisions" (mm. 97-108).(423) The main
theme of the sonata reappears in the middle of the development, mea-
sures 109-113; the rhythmic formula of this theme, which in a condensed
form unifies the entire motion of the sonata allegro, forms a a transi-
tion to the recapitulation. Tonally, the development moves away from G
major, in which the exposition ended, through C minor, F minor, Eb
major (from concluding theme to arpeggiated runs), C minor, F minor
(six-four chord only), F\( \# \) minor, to D major. In this key the main
theme (mm. 1-5) is restated. Utilizing motivic fragments from this
theme, the tonal scheme moves through G minor, C minor, F minor (com-
pleting the previous "abandoned" six-four chord in this tonality from
mm. 105-106), and then to preparation for the recapitulation on G
major. Asafiev calls the reappearance of the main theme in D major in
mid-development "the sharpest tonal juxtaposition . . . with the basic
tonality of the entire allegro (C major). The sharp displacement,
having occurred, is soon filled-in" (by the keys mentioned above).(424)
By the time F minor is reached, "the 'demonstration' of the first theme
in the contrasting key of D major is effectively forgotten."(424)

This analysis effectively charts the progress in the development,
but, again, there are puzzling aspects to it. For example, he does not
explain the "sharp tonal juxtaposition" between C major and D major, when in fact Beethoven spends more time in the development passing through keys more remotely related (according to key signature and placement on the circle of fifths) to either C major or D major than these two keys are to each other (D major is only two fifths away from C major). (Since these intermediary keys are with one exception either minor or, again with one exception, on the flat side, they are more closely related to C major than to D major.) How these keys "fill-in" the gap between C major and D major is unclear, since the tonalities listed above do not fill in the gap between C major and D major either diatonically (on the scale) or quintally (on the circle of fifths). Either C♯/Db (major or minor) or G major, respectively, would perform those functions. Perhaps Asafiev is referring to the filling-in of our memory: the intermediary keys cause the listener to forget the "new" key of D major and prepare for the return of the "old" key, C major. The restatement of the theme in D major in the development occurs beginning in measure 109, which is very nearly half-way through the development section prior to the dominant preparation for the recapitulation. Therefore, equal time is expended moving both to and away from D major. But when including the preparation, the D-major theme occurs at a point slightly less than two-fifths of the way into the development. Given this proportion, there is sufficient time to blot out its memory through both intermediary keys and the dominant. But, again, Asafiev leaves this unclear.

In addition to revealing the forces at play within the structure
of the sonata, Asafiev discusses its historical manifestation and
growth. Not surprisingly, given his Marxist orientation, social causes
contribute heavily to its evolution. In the atmosphere of the "Sturm
und Drang" era of the eighteenth century, an "epoch of bold darings and
contradictions," "music had to follow after contemporaneity, . . .
creating a form in which the principium concidentiae oppositorum [the
principle of the destruction of opposites] and conflict, as operating
forces, revealing themselves in contrasting images, became the leading
stimuli of motion."(438) Beethoven and Hegel were contemporaries, and
Asafiev sees this as no mere coincidence. "The growth of the symphon-
ic, sonata form coincided with the growth of social contradictions and
conflicts of ideas which gave rise to a mighty upheaval [the French
Revolution], and . . . the symphony attained the apex of its develop-
ment in the creative work of Beethoven, a contemporary of Hegel."(492)
The recognition of the dialectical principle, the ideas of development
and contrast as stimuli to motion, gave rise to the sonata allegro
form; other forms not embodying this principle could not develop, could
not grow. Asafiev traces this development:

The idea of development made musical formation on a large scale
possible. . . . Only the gradual recognition of the principle of
thematic contrast—not just the functional conditionality of all
elements of formation, but also of opposition as a motive stimulus
of music—led to the spectacular rise of the idea of development
and opened new, rich perspectives before the evolution of music.
The idea of thematic development, in conflict and in the overcom-
ing of contrast, as the path to unity permeated all the highest
manifestations of musical creation. The theme became the opera-
ting force, the nucleus. . . . The symphonic sonata allegro ad-
vanced the concept of thematic formation. A composition became an
organically and psychologically motivated unity, unfolding in
growth and development.(488-490)
The perception of a unity "results only from the 'grasp' of an extended process of struggle between sound complexes. Each of them, before becoming a unity for the consciousness, reveals itself in opposition, in contrast. From these revelations new unities are engendered, from them new oppositions, etc."(491) Asafiev summarizes the manifestation of contrast and contradiction in music:

Dissonance, in the classical style, evokes consonance and vice versa. Or, in more general terms, instability is followed by stability, an elision (of intervals or tonalities), by its filling in, the ascent of a line of melody, by its descent, or, from another viewpoint, a stretching is followed by a shortening or gathering together, a complete execution of a tune or theme, by a fragmentary statement, an accumulation, by a discharge, a saturated fabric, by a transparent and mobile one, quick motion, by slow, etc. But each of these "paired" intonations, being opposed by the next in succession, after its exposure forms with the next a unified complex, which, in its turn, is again defined through new opposition (through its negation).(491)

Along with these consecutive contradictions occur also simultaneous contradictions, "the transfer of the function of a given intonation into its opposite."(491) A cadence, for example, becomes an impetus, or a consonant, stable sonority in one situation may become in another a stimulus to further motion.

Thus, in Asafiev's dialectical approach to motion in music, further motion is brought about mainly by contrast, which for Asafiev can be as simple as the manifestation of opposites. This explains some of the unclear portions of his analyses as already discussed. To a non-Marxist, the juxtaposition of an interval and its eventual filling-in, for example, usually—without considering other factors—evokes closure, stability; the interval itself creates motion, a need for further
resolution, which is satisfied by the filling in of the interval. But to a Hegelian, such a contradiction of actions, the second of which effectively negates the first, provides a stimulus to further motion by becoming a unity again seeking its opposition, a process which could continue ad infinitum. It is ended, one assumes, through the manifestation of a simultaneous contradiction, in which an element becomes its opposite, an instability turning into a stability, an element arbitrarily ending the process through becoming a higher unity as the summation of the preceding motion, the second manifestation of the dialectical principle as identified by Asafiev.

The preceding material forms the sum and substance of the introduction and twelve chapters of volume one of *Musical Form as a Process*. There are two supplements in this volume. Supplement 1 contains a summary of the basic positions previously discussed. Supplement 2 not only provides definitions and explanations of important terms and approaches used throughout volume one, but also becomes in retrospect the foundation for volume two. Thus it will be discussed in conjunction with volume two. Also, most if not all of the main ideas Asafiev presents in volume two receive their genesis in volume one; thus some of the material discussed within the context of volume two may refer back to volume one.

*Musical Form as Process, Vol. II: Intonation.* If in volume one Asafiev illustrates the how of musical organization, of musical process, then in volume two he addresses the question of why:
I touch on questions of intonation, the wellspring of music, on the hypotheses, dealing with the question of why the form of music comes into being in one way and not another. In this study, I will... try to link the development of the means of expression of music with the principles of human intoning as a manifestation of thought, with musical tones in their manifold conjugations, and with verbal speech. (600)

The focus of this volume, then, is the concept of intonation in all its aspects, why music developed as it did, that is, the causative forces in music history, and the links between the development of the means of musical expression—musical form, for example—and the principles of intonation, the music itself (its theoretical aspects), and speech.

Asafiev himself describes the structure of volume two as exposition logically followed by development. Like the supplements in volume one, the "Conclusion" and "Epilogue" at the end form a sort of recapitulation. In examining volume two, I have consequently focused on individual subjects and topics, thus bringing together these various sections, rather than attempting to follow Asafiev's line of thought chronologically (either chapter to chapter or through music history).

I will first define and examine the main concepts developed throughout this volume—the primary concept of intonation and its associative concepts "intonational crises," "intonational vocabulary," "intonational or sound arches," and "melos." Following these definitions I will summarize the intonational significance of the theoretical aspects of music. To close I will examine Asafiev's views on and relationships with other theorists and their ideas, past and present, in order to place his theories in a historical perspective.
Intonation. The term intonation and its meaning are probably the best-known aspects of Asafiev's legacy in Soviet musicology. Having gained wide acceptance, this concept has spawned numerous additional studies in the Soviet Union, even up to the present time, and no doubt will continue to influence future works. To Asafiev it was a crucial concept: "Apart from intonation and the realization of the process of intoning, I see no possibility for the study of music as a dialectical formation, nor of its dynamic essence, for music is above all an intonational art."(536-537) And: "Music is always intonational, or otherwise it is 'inaudible.'"(631) It enters into his very definitions of music: "Music is an art of motion revealed in intonations."(554) "Music is an art of intoned meaning."(904) Music "is above all an art of intonation, and without intonation it is only a combination of sounds on which, in essence, the Hanslickians may 'make a play on words.'"(744)

In Asafiev's adaptation of the term, intonation does not signify simply tuning (as in "just intonation"), singing or playing in tune, or inflection (as in language), or "the smallest sound formation in time" (as in Yavorsky's usage). Its meaning is more comprehensive, more fundamental, and embraces several important elements—the reflection of human thought, the realistic foundation of music, and the interpretation and impression of music. Because of its all-embracing nature, one can speak of many things in reference to intonation—technical, theoretical aspects; psychological aspects; aesthetic aspects, etc. It is fundamental to expression in both music and speech: "The intonation of
man has always been the most sensitive guide in the disclosure of his ideational world in musical sound and verbal speech."(885) In its fullest sense, intonation is the actual basis, . . . the realization of sound, whether within the hearing, with the voice, or with the help of an instrument. Intonation does not merely signify the mechanical overcoming of the resistance of material, and is not merely the passive reproduction of visually projected marks. Thus, intonation is a factor of the highest degree of importance—the interpretation of sound and not the simple ascertaining of deviation from the norm (the pure or impure presentation of sound). Without intoning and apart from intoning there is no music. The intonation of speech is the interpretation of sounds not musically fixed, not stabilized in musical spaces nor in the invariable relations of sounds which have become tones. Musical intonation is the interpretation of sounds already placed in a system of sound relations precisely fixed by the memory—a system of tones and tonalities.(543)

Thus intonation encompasses the three basic procedures in music—the organization, performance and perception of sound, or what Asafiev repeatedly refers to as "the 'three motive forces' of the common process."(801) The third "force," perception, reveals the significance of Marxism for music: "The concept of intonation as the interpretation of sound correlations in the process of sounding, assumes societal conditionality or social justification, as the highest criterion of any musical phenomenon. The ear becomes the measure of things in music."(560-561) Because of its comprehensive nature, the concept of intonation enters into almost every discussion of Asafiev's views. Also, because this concept is so broad, this same comprehensiveness may be interpreted as being vague or imprecise. But that is the nature of the idea of intonation—it is open to interpretation, based on its application, and Soviet theorists have devoted much effort to determining its meaning according to each application. In a specific applica-
tion, it may refer to a particular melody with certain expressive qualities, or to a group of such melodies. Or it may refer in general to the concept of music as a dynamic process, with intonation providing the dynamic source of motion.

Melos. Another term Asafiev employs frequently is "melos," which he borrowed from its German usage in his search for a term "to define that quality of music or musical formation in the occurrence of which the interchange of pitches, not separate 'points,' but in their inter-conditionality and their interconnection through 'breathing,' appears as the chief operating force." (541) He adopted the term "melos" because to him it had a more universal application than the more familiar term "melody," which he considered limited and insufficient "to unify all the properties and possibilities of melodic formation."

This concept [of melos] embodies the quality and functions of melodic formation; it is the catchword of music which is vital, real, emotionally responsive. . . . Melos, first of all, includes that which is primary in music—melodiousness, connectedness, and dynamic quality, as the operation of forces which condition the sound experienced in the correlations of pitches, in the purposeful interchange of tones, and in their conjugation. (541)

Thus "melos" embraces not only melody but also linkage, cohesion, and dynamics, all of which are primary in music. These elements also embody the horizontal aspect of music, which arises from melos:

Melos is . . . an essential element of music and . . . the most important intonational sphere. Melos unifies everything which concerns the formation of music, its fluidity, and its extent. From melos is born the idea of the horizontal. As an intonational sphere, [it] decisively unites all manifestations of horizontal-ness: in a droning song, in a measured dance melody, in declama-tory intonations, in ornamentation or a supporting voice, in the
thematically and leitmotif area, in the specific melody of the Italian opera (i.e., that which is chiefly called melody), etc. Thus, melody turns out to be a particular case of the occurrence of melos, or simply a technical term. Melos is peculiar not only to melodies or to the polyphonic style. Melos permeates the sound fabric as a whole. (561)

"Melos," then, encompasses essentially the temporal, processual, and therefore dynamic and interconnected, side of music; whatever does not occur in simultaneity but over time could come under this concept. But although "melos" supposedly encompasses strictly the horizontal aspect in music, in music where the horizontal aspect predominates—polyphonic music, for example, although he states that it is not confined just to polyphony—Asafiev uses the term to refer to both horizontal and vertical aspects in music, the whole fabric. Understandably, there is no specific "Asafievian" term that solely denotes the vertical aspect.

Intonational Crises. "Intonational crises" is Asafiev's term for those periods in music history characterized—or even dominated—by momentous change initiated by societal upheavals of various degrees—the codification of Gregorian chant, the "discovery" of polyphony, the development of major-minor tonality, the genesis of opera, the style of Beethoven, etc., in short, each musical milestone in history. "Music moves forward in interrupted evolution, amid 'crises of intonations' of broad social scope and significance." (802) Asafiev compares these crises "to changes and transformations in human speech and languages, which lead to the reform and replenishing, not only of vocabularies, but of the whole inner structure of the language." (802)

A new intonation, that is, an expressive, dynamic musical entity,
begins its existence through a sudden mutation ("a leap") of preceding intonations, thereby eventually replacing the old intonations. Asafiev identifies three stages of the existence of intonation—its formation, flourishing (its period of greatest expression), and dying out (a gradual loss of expressiveness). These three stages may exist simultaneously as long as the older intonations continue to be socially necessary. The "discovery" of a new sound complex "emerges as the transformation of quantity into quality—as a leap, both confirming, and at the same time exploding the evolutionary course of things."(386) This view, of course, conforms to the Marxist view of history—obsolescence precipitating change, a qualitative transition, which creates periods of social revolution or what Tull calls "dialectical leaps." The new intonations battling for prominence in a period of intonational crises, though, may not be completely "new;" they may be reinterpretations of older intonations, which may achieve new significance and be relevant for the new epoch through the transference to them of new meaning, brought about, of course, through social conditions or necessity.

Asafiev outlines the life-spans or "stages" of an intonation. Although both "the selection and interconnection of musical elements" and "the means of musical expression" are determined "through intonation," the stages of intonation are defined by "the people, the culture, and the historical epoch."(613) Asafiev summarizes the stages of an intonation in this way: "a vital intonation, the stylistic selection of expressive media, and finally, form as a process (the disclosure and organization of sound-idea images), and then as detached form—
schemes and constructions."(617) Tull reduces this evolutionary pro-
cess still further: "invention, selection, assimilation, systematiza-
tion, standardization." Following this would be either vulgariza-
tion, "exhaustion," or simply the end of its expressive ability. "Ex-
haustion" occurs when the vital content of the intonations of a certain
music is exhausted, this content having been transformed and trans-
ferred into new intonations of a new era. "The true life of the
'sounding art' of each composer . . . lasts while its intonations live
and operate, while its creative experience continued to function, being
transformed and converted. Such is the real history of music."(782-83)

In each operatic reform, for example, each "intonational crisis"
in the musical theater, obsolete, dead intonations are replaced "by
compositions of a new intonational structure, as bearers of contempora-
ry thoughts and sensations."(707) Thus, although the well-known opera-
tic reformers such as Gluck, Gretry, Wagner, Dargomyzhsky, and
Musorgsky "formulated their reformatory ideas separately," "the essence
of their work remained the same. The 'differences,' were contained in
differences of epoch, place, time, and historical situation."(707)

**Intonational Vocabulary.** The "intonational vocabulary of the
epoch," another Asafievian term, is that sum of intonations of a parti-
cular period or epoch, those intonations that characterize the epoch
and reflect its collective consciousness. Asafiev describes the
concept:
When a musical composition answers the tastes and various needs of the listeners, then the most stirring and pleasing fragments, portions, ... and sometimes whole episodes, receive wide distribution[,] becoming firmly fixed in the consciousness. ... These "memoranda" become the measure of evaluation and recognition, and through them the composition as a whole is "assimilated"; like guides, they lead the thoughts and feelings of the listeners to a grasp of the entire artistic conception and form, to an analysis of the ideational content, and to an esthetic evaluation.(722-23)

In sum, he concludes, "These ... 'memorable moments'--fragments through which one gains access to the heart [of music]--are guides for the memory, evaluative indicators, and norms of judgment."

After a time, such intonations begin to take on a life of their own:

But, most importantly, being often reproduced and flowing into everyday life, they begin to live a kind of independent artistic life, so to speak, within the oral tradition. They sound everywhere, and enter into thought; they are not abstract presentations, but living intonations. ... These are not abstract formal categories, but are a complex of musical thoughts, persistently occurring in the consciousness of a given social environment.(725)

These intonations could be compiled into a "dictionary," "a guidebook to the favorite, most interesting sound combinations of a given epoch."(725) Asafiev divides this "oral vocabulary of intonations" into two types—what he calls "intonational stereotypes," which contain durable and stable elements, and are difficult to overcome; and those that are very mobile, always in a formative process, always struggling with the familiar. Everyone for whom music is a "living, irresistible, cultural necessity," both listeners and music professionals, participates in creating this vocabulary.

But these intonations are selected on the basis of social factors: "The very selection of certain "devices," and not others, for the organization of a moving, variable, melodic fabric, is conditioned by
the practice and intonational experience (constant evaluation by the ear) evoked by a given environment."(320) And those intonations that become "necessary and habitual ... prove to be the most stable and intelligible in the given conditions. ... They are ... some sort of 'aural signals.' In this process of the search for and adaptation of intonations we have the prerequisites of form."(321) Asafiev acknowledges drawing from the hypothesis of Carl Stumpf (Anfange der Musik) for this theory of social selection and adaptation of intonations.

Composers draw inspiration from this vocabulary, inevitably incorporating "commonplace intonations" of the era into their works. This practice aids the public in the acceptance and subsequent comprehension of these compositions, particularly large works, the significance of their underlying construction not being immediately understood. The longevity and durability of a composition, in fact, depends on the choice and usage of these everyday intonations. But, he points out, "whether these intonations turn into pearls of art or are reduced to vulgarisms is a matter of intellect, conscience, mastery, genius, and artistic sensitivity and taste."(729)

Asafiev denies that this intonational vocabulary is an abstract vocabulary of musical terms; he calls it a "reserve of musical intonations, intoned by every man ... which are expressive for him, and which 'speak to him.'"(936) However, those intonations that are too subjective or too personal render music more difficult and short-lived. But, "the more strongly a circle of expressive musical intonations,
summarized by a given epoch, is felt, even in the most intellectually complicated musical compositions, the more unconditional is the vital capacity of this music." (946) Overly subjective music—"those 'hot-house plants' of music," Asafiev calls them—is not "audible" at all; it "lacks vitality and is perceived as formal" if it contains no "kernels of intonational thought" that are revolutionary and progressive. (947) Good composers, though, are intonationally attuned to the vicissitudes of society.

**Intonational Arches.** In volume two, Asafiev gives what is perhaps his clearest explanation of his idea of "intonational arches":

The logical unfolding of music attracts the ear, and thus, any unexpectedness, obstacle, or simply technical awkwardness is perceived as a breach of meaning. But if this unexpectedness is calculated, occurring with the full consciousness of the composer, is only unexpected in the context of immediate succession, and is justified in further motion by some logical development, peculiar to music, the attentive ear reacts sensitively to such a "leap of thought." A sort of "arched system" of sound complexes is formed, in which a response to any of them may arise at a distance, but not immediately. This is a phenomenon of extraordinary significance. (652-653)

Asafiev likens this phenomenon somewhat to melodic leaps being subsequently filled in, but this system of sound arches, in terms of its active perception, "forms a much more complex formation of music," "belongs to a higher artistic culture, and is the bearer of a more intellectual, creative mastery than intonations which exhaust themselves in naive direct succession, telling the whole story 'in the immediate vicinity.'" He continues:

In the same way, the medieval, western European polyphony, the Russian, peasant, choral polyphony, . . . and the multiform,
intellectually refined music of the contemporary city with its expressive dynamics and meaningful language of timbres, have all contained this system of compositional development or exposure of intention based on "sound-arches"; one intonation answers another here, not side by side, but at a distance, achieving both emotional tension and intensification of meaning. In such a formation, the sound idea is grasped by the hearing in connection with a whole series of internally engendered sprouts, juxtapositions, "structures," and "hints of the future," in a word, it is recognized (analyzed) and is enriched by acquiring derivatives. Thus music becomes a more and more sensitive and profound embodiment of artistic experience.(653-654)

As is obvious, Asafiev's various concepts—"intonation," "intonational crises," "intonational vocabulary," "melos," and "intonational arches"—are all applications of abstract ideas that derive from a Marxist-Leninist approach to music and to music history—the dialectical interpretation of progress as constant change and fluctuation, quantity into quality, the interconnectedness of things, revolutionary change through leaps, and so on. Asafiev's interpretation of music history, therefore, focuses not on individual composers—except in the case of Beethoven—or schools per se, but on the qualities that demonstrate these ideas or "principles." He concentrates on musical elements and theoretical concepts as manifestations of the growing processual development of music on all levels, high and low.

**Theoretical Concepts.** Thus, to discuss Asafiev's ideas in this volume cogently and from a theoretical point of view, I find it most expedient to present his views in relation to the basic elements of music—melody, harmony and rhythm—and to other theoretical concepts such as interval, leading tone, and mode, and the process of development. Aside from the practical considerations of such an approach,
Asafiev himself provides numerous justifications for it. For instance, at one point he defines intonation as "the aggregate of all the elements of music in the process of sounding."(772) Earlier he identifies "the interval, the leading tone, development, and the unity of rhythm and intonation" as "the essential qualities of intonation."(715) The "factors of form" include rhythm and intonation, whereas the "intonational factors of form" include melos, harmony, timbre, and tempo.(510,517) In terms of its interpretation, then, Asafiev equates intonation with these other theoretical elements. Thus to receive a complete picture of the concept of intonation, we need to examine each of these elements individually, to redefine and reinterpret them in light of Asafiev's theory of intonation. Asafiev himself does this, but always within the many contexts of history, sociology, anthropology, linguistics, biology, aesthetics, philosophy, psychology, and, occasionally—as a true Marxist—economics. His approach is therefore comprehensive (again, a Marxist dictum), or at least as comprehensive as it can be given the subject matter, which seems appropriate when the proposed topic is as penetrating as why music developed one way and not another. By concentrating on theoretical concepts, though, other elements and aspects are in no way excluded, for Asafiev writes about each subject with such thoroughness that other aspects cannot be ignored. That, essentially, is the nature of the concept of intonation—comprehensive, all-embracing—and by following through with this approach, Asafiev provides the best evidence for his theories.
Interval. He approaches interval, for example, much like Yavorsky, not as an quantitatively measured acoustical phenomenon, or simply as the distance or relation between two sounds, a definition he considers "static," but rather as an "expressive" element of music:

[Interval is] one of the primary forms of music, for the consciousness of man, as it has sought to express itself in sound (i.e., has been intoned), has inevitably worked out stable base points of tone and pitch ("knots") with connections ("arches") between them, for the manifestation of intonational "constants" or precise degrees of tension.

Thus, intervals, as a form of expression in any given system of tones, any scale, comprise intonational indicators which are in constant operation (stability, pitch range, the degree of tension of a tone, all of which are qualitatively different for different instruments).(615-616)

As an "intonational indicator," then, the interval becomes "the smallest intonational complex," and consequently "the bearer of intonational tension," "the index of the degree of tension of intonation."(626,713)

Asafiev stresses, though, that the prevalence of any interval in the music of any epoch or genre is "a consequence of intonational selection, occurring under the influence of the public consciousness, and becomes a manifestation of style."(616) During an epoch in which musical intonation has revolved around some interval characteristic for that epoch, the interval becomes "like an intonational center around which both the simplest and the most complicated intonational relations are deposited."(907) He cites as examples various manifestations of the use of the sixth in nineteenth-century Russian romances and arias, the fourth in French revolutionary melodies, the tritone in works of the Russian "Five," and the perfect fifth in works of the French Impressionists. But such occurrences are not just "formal factors;"
"the 'purposefulness' of the employment of intervals as intonationally expressive 'influences'" reflects "in the composer's intellect a fully conscious 'control' of the emotionally meaningful effect of certain intervals."(908) The content or expressiveness of a given interval "is no less consistent and precise than the content of a word;"

it is always in a correlation, in process, in meaningful, concretely historical conditionality. . . . In other words, the expressiveness of each interval is conceived of as limitless and eternal, but it is limited by historically concrete and psycho-realistic factors. The fourth of the Marseillaise and the fourth which is the characteristic interval in the figure of Don Juan in Dargomyzhskii's Stone Guest are qualitatively different, for their intonational aims are different.36

For Asafiev, the development of intervals, "their influence and role as indicators of intonational tension (the quality of 'ponderability' [vesomost', literally, weightiness—E.C.] of intervals, their differences in utterance and perception)" had great significance:

It is not accidental, therefore, that a certain complex of sound relations occurs in any musical culture. More than that, only the occurrence of a prolonged and complicated struggle for the place, the system of relationships, and the meaning of the sound of each interval in a modal system, i.e., for the quality of intervals, as this occurred in the history of European music, could have evoked such an intensive growth of musical art and could have conditioned its ideological significance.(667)

Asafiev's reference above to the "ponderability" of intervals, "their differences in utterance and perception," signifies "the particular musical tangibility of a given sound space, its tension and the difficulty or ease of its attainment (its reproduction by the voice or an instrument)."(650) Those intervals that are more difficult to reproduce exhibit greater tension and "ponderability."

Asafiev relates the birth of polyphony in twelfth-century Paris to
the development of a new interpretation of the interval, from the interval "as the bearer of expression and adduction (the opposite of that which is substantiated by the thinking)" to the perception of "the new quality of the consciousness of 'intervallics' as a phenomenon of thought revealing itself in music," as "a system of interactions of tones (intervallics) for the construction of music."(822,972) This gave rise to a new quality in music, the unity of succession and simultaneity:

The movement away from the intonationally expressive toward the constructive realization of intervals, [i.e., from expressive employment in chant (almost exclusively intonational, as expression of thought in connection with text), toward their use in vertical, as well as horizontal contexts in fixed rhythm--J.T.] this stage of hearing the interconnections of tones, made European polyphony possible, not as a heterophonic complex, but with voice-leading distinctly differentiated according to the auditory qualities of horizontal and vertical, in the unity (or combination) of succession and simultaneity, which apparently struck the imagination and the intellect as an absolutely new quality.(822)

The development of this new quality, based on a certain degree of intervallic independence, made the future evolution of music possible.

The quality of the "vocal" element, the human, anthropocentric quality of the interval, which forms part of Asafiev's "ponderability of intervals," is a very important element of intonation:

If one does not train oneself to perfection in the "vocal," i.e., the "tangible," feeling of the tension of intervals and their interrelations, their resiliency, their resistance, it is not possible to understand "what intonation in music is"; it is not possible to understand the processes of the historical evolution of music (of music, not the history of musical compositions) nor the principles of development (not simply of [evolutionary] "working-out") and form, comprehended in the unfolding of meaning, i.e., in process. More than that, it is not possible to cultivate in oneself the composer's internal ear.(633–634)
Asafiev's sees in the singer's feeling of each vocal tone and its relation to the other tones of his vocal motion "the true key to the understanding of everything in music, and especially of the processes of the composer's activity:

The humanity of purely instrumental compositions and their ability to penetrate the ear of a wide circle of listeners, depends to a great extent on the presence . . . of the "vocal intonation" essence (I am speaking not of "vocal melodies," but of "vocal ponderability," of the tension of intervalics," i.e., the presence of this nature in the hearing and creation of a composer.(634)

This vocal quality or "vocalness" signifies "the special nature of the comprehension and feeling (the 'muscular sensation') of intervals and of each tone. Only by having mastered this quality . . . could instrumentalism, with its added power of timbres, attain its gigantic psychological and intellectual achievements."(636) In twentieth-century music instrumentalism goes a step further in "abandoning the culture of 'instrumental vocalism' as the heritage of Romanticism, i.e., the culture of feeling," for the pure, "antivocal" nature of instruments and their basic quality of timbre, which "is becoming the bearer of the new comprehension and hearing of the interval."(637) Interestingly, despite Asafiev's concentration on this vocal quality as the carrier of man's intonation, he does not decry this new "antivocal," timbral approach in twentieth-century music. He views it as "completely overcoming the 'infirmity' (from the point of view of contemporary demands for expressiveness) of the human voice and of the whole art of singing."(637) For Asafiev the ultimate intellectual compositional medium that expresses this "culture of timbre" and reveals the consciousness
of the contemporary composer is electronic music—"electrified 'de-
VICES' as the bearers of expressiveness."(637) He refers to this
compositional medium and method several times, and apparently sees it
as the music of the future. This view is in keeping with his interpre-
tation of music as the reflection of "the socially determined con-
sciousness of mankind."(668)

The interval, then, is the "indicator," the "barometer" of intona-
tional tension, an expressive musical element that may through its
prevalence represent the musical style of a particular era. It is not
a mechanistic, static phenomenon, but a more active expressive medium
that carries a tangible tension ("ponderability") indicating its intona-
tional quality.

Rhythm. From Asafiev's viewpoint, the interval is closely aligned
with the concept of rhythm, another key element in his intonational
interpretation of music and music history. The interval, an "expres-
sive" factor, is "governed" by rhythm, an organizing factor:

The interval, as a system, is one of the primary expressive
unities—a summarized intonation. The interval, governed (organ-
ized) by rhythm, forms the simplest, shortest, and most persis-
tently expressive rhythmic intonational form (a metric foot)—
either iambic or trochaic, depending on the distribution of dura-
tions (quantitative rhythm) [i.e., agonic rhythm—E.C.] or accents
(tonic rhythm) [i.e., dynamic rhythm—E.C.].(619)

Just as the development of the concept of "intervalics" in both simul-
taneous and consecutive occurrences provided the foundation for the
further development of music, so did the growing independence of music
rhythm, which eventually freed itself from verbal speech and poetic
metrics, contribute to the growth of music. "Music could not develop
in terms of its intonational nature, nor of its timbres, without the
stabilization of its fluidity (its development in time) by means of
firm rhythmic-constructive and rhythmic-accentual norms, which would
discipline the motion (the intoning) of sounds."(661) This "struggle
for 'its own rhythms'" brought music rhythm into collision "with the
interacting rhythms of poetry and the dance (in essence, with the
rhythms of the human body, both in statics and in dynamics)."(661) The
development of new European languages in place of medieval Latin "ac-
celerated the independent rhythmic formation of music."(661) But the
struggle for independent music rhythm is "equally a struggle for the
principle of musical development, and not a purely formal and construc-
tive phenomenon":

Intonation is so dependent upon rhythm, as a factor which disci-
plies the exposure of music, that without the standards of rhythm-
ic formation there is no musical development. . . . This work of
generations [through the Renaissance] led European music to such
freedom of "rhythmic intonational speech" (which, essentially, is
what music is, as an art of communication), that now, when we
compose music, we no longer think of rhythm as a discipline of
musical development, but only mark off quite roughly and in a
general way the "mileposts of musical motion," i.e., the meter
(measurement of equal divisions of a given piece).(662)

Rhythm is the "intonational core" of music: "There is no unin-
toned rhythm in music and cannot be."(829,828) "The idea of 'musical
rhythm' as a factor of form is inconceivable apart from intona-
tion."(510) Rhythm shares significance with intonation as "the chief
bearers of musical expressiveness and persuasiveness":

If both these stimuli of expression operate, not just accidental-
ly, nor mechanically, and if this occurs when intonations and
rhythms correspond to the content of ideas and the inclination of
feelings of the ruling strata of the people, then perception in
its turn becomes natural and unrestrained; music is heard as true
"speech" and felt as reality, as truth. When, moreover, both
rhythm and intonations are generally known and generally assim-
ilated, then the hearing does not have to overcome unfamiliar
impressions; it only notices how, and with what mastery, the
familiar elements are transformed. The consciousness compares
"similarities" and distinguishes esthetically different qualities
in them and the variety of life beyond them. That is why, in any
epoch, sometimes in the course of several generations, a very
small number of basic intonations comes to light, on the basis of
which an intricate complex of creative musical phenomena is
created. (711)

To Asafiev rhythm "as a factor of form" is not simply a numerical
entity, a means for measuring duration, except when distinguishing it
from sound, from the object of measurement:

Meter and bar are gauges of measurement, but rhythm is that which
is measured, that which in meter and bar reveals itself as a
quantity, i.e., "the purposeful motion of material, repeatedly
performed with equal intervals between separate acts of the mo-
ton." ... The bar ... [is] not at all ... the sole index
to the varied manifestations of the rhythmic nature of musical
formation. The sum of the bars ... does not determine the
interrelations of durations nor the "product" of durations in a
complex whole ... Only a study of the functions of durations,
similar to intonational studies of the functions of chords, tones
of a mode, etc., reveals to us the true role of rhythm in musical
formation.37

Thus like Yavorsky Asafiev understands "the rhythmic-constructive fac-
tors of musical formation (repetition, periodization, symmetry) in
their dynamic essence." (514) Other definitions of rhythm are too
static. The qualities of equality and repetition "affirm, not rhythm,
but the inertia of rhythm." (514) There can be no equality without
inequality, no symmetry without asymmetry: "Rhythm exists only in the
mutual conditionality of contradictions." (514) Thus all previous for-
malistic attempts to reduce music
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to a placid balance of all elements, as if to a uniform ideal, have been broken up against the reality of music as a condition of unstable equilibrium. Form, as a formation, includes rhythmic-constructive elements in juxtaposition with their opposites. . . . In this formation rhythmic-constructive factors reveal themselves, not in isolation, but functionally, in interconditionality and in opposition. . . . Rhythm, understood dialectically, indicates the correct path to the cognition of constructive factors as the highest "unification of the elements of purposeful sound motion" in the interaction of the opposing tendencies which form them.(514-516)

As a "stimulus of expression and living development," rhythm becomes in Beethoven's "symphonism" the "primary motive force."(712-713) "Only rhythm," he says, "as an organic, organizing, and disciplining principle, fused with the intonational content of all music, emerges as the 'motive force' of music and the 'builder of form in time.'"(748) Rhythm becomes the "developer" of Beethoven's ideas, stimulating the growth of musical development. In Beethoven's music, "development as the basis of symphonism and as the key to the fantastic possibilities of thinking in music and by means of music, is manifested for the first time in the totality of its media."(713)

At the same time the significance of the interval grows, from its role "in the motion and formation of melodies and in the statics and dynamics of chords, i.e., in harmony"—its simultaneous and consecutive occurrences—"into the interrelation of tonalities and their mutual conjugations." The interval thus enters into the realm of form and "overcomes the constructive sketchiness tied to music by poetic metrics and by the dance-quality with its regular, mechanical 'division into measures' of musical motion, paralyzing music's function in the conception and development of ideas."(713)
To Asafiev, Beethoven's unique development and application of rhythm occurs on both the large scale—proportion and gradation of tension resulting in form—and the small scale, the "striking variety" of "the rhythmic activity within the bar."(749) Beethoven's rhythmic intonations reveal a return to the original "primal nature" of music; they invoke images of the revolution—orators, masses, drum rolls, military heralds.

Asafiev concentrates particular attention on Beethoven's "transformations" of the "two basic rhythmic 'stresses,' duple and triple," entering "into continuous contrasting interaction, not as the opposition of meters ... but as rhythmic, intonational images."(753) These two stresses are embodied in Beethoven's marches and scherzi. The "march quality" in Beethoven's music evoked not only military music but also "the iron tread of the advancing masses"; it "summarized the meaning of the movements of man and its introduction into the music of Beethoven with such an intention was a natural phenomenon."(754) Thus this "march quality" in Beethoven's music was the product of a "natural" evolution. But Beethoven's scherzi, his "dramatized" triple meter with "the peasant element," which introduced "a completely new quality" into music, arose not as a "peaceful" "uninterrupted evolution" of the "minuet quality" but as a "brokenness of evolution," that is, as a result of an "intonational crisis."(756–757) This difference in origin is the essence of the "conflict" between duple and triple meters as "rhythmic, intonational images"—"Beethoven's play of imagination with rhythms as intonationally significant 'qualities.'"(758) Another meth-
od of Beethoven's involving contrast that impressed Asafiev was his carving of "figuratively striking rhythmic intonations... out of the 'opposition of rhythmic rudiments'—"the bringing together and juxtaposing of iambic and trochaic feet, now in their metric-syllabic [agodic] aspect, now in their tonically accented [dynamic] treatment; such 'development' of the rhythmic quality is just one of the noteworthy features of rhythmic musical development."(759-760) He points to the scherzi of the Third and Ninth Symphonies as examples, and concludes, "Beethoven, as no one else before him, established and developed rhythm as an organic element of music, as musical rhythm, linked by interrelations with its surrounding reality."(760)

To Asafiev, then, rhythm may connote both broad and narrow interpretations. On all levels, though, it is an organizing factor, whether it governs an interval or a whole movement. On the lowest level, it may involve accent and duration; on the highest level, it involves proportion and the methods of organization—repetition, symmetry, and periodization. These levels of organization may be traced through history, beginning with musical rhythm's unity with the metrics of poetry and ending with its involvement with phrase structure and large-scale interrelations. The concept of development, and of intonation itself, depend on rhythm for their existence.

**Melody** ("Melos"). Because melodic intonations predominate "as the most organic exposure in music of the intonational quality (the 'tonus of speech') corresponding to every human 'utterance' of sound (in tone
or in word)," melody is "the principal manifestation of music and its most clearly expressive element. . . . Melody is the soul of music because it is a sensitive reflection of the principal quality of human, 'vocal speech,' of utterance in tone, in vocal continuity."(935) Music is neither purely mechanical (acoustical) nor purely emotional (the "art of interjection"); "like any activity of man which apprehends and reorganizes reality, music is directed by the consciousness and represents rational activity."(904-905) Thus, "melody, in its emotionally meaningful expressiveness, is wholly a creation of the human consciousness, and its basis is a strictly rationalistic system of intervals."(905) Asafiev relates "spontaneous" intoning to a glissando, "i.e., the indistinguishability of separate tones and their connections or correlations."(907) Melody, in contrast to this, "is an intellectualized reflection of this continuity of sound exposure; the indistinguishability of tones becomes a tightly cohesive fusion, i.e., both continuity and lack of continuity simultaneously, which is the art of vocalization," either vocal or instrumental.(907)

Asafiev identifies two basic rules in "pure" melodics with no harmony. The first is the rule of the shifting of tones within the mode. A modal tone that attracts adjacent modal tones to it, thereby forming the center of this group of tones, may lose its significance and be overcome and drawn into a new group of tones with another tone as the center. Such a tone, then, is not always able to maintain constant influence and power within the mode; these characteristics will fluctuate. This differs from Yavorsky's interpretation of con-
stant stabilities and instabilities within the mode, yet agrees with his larger view of relative stability. Tiulin subsequently develops this rule in his theory of "variability" (see Part VII).

The second rule is "the rule of the strict economy and selection of tones within the mode." A leap or gap followed by its filling-in "leads to intonational symmetry and the interpretation of the repetitions of certain tones."(643) Asafiev considers this gap-fill model (which, again, may be related to Leonard Meyer's origination of the same concept in Western theory) a prime motive force in music.

Asafiev derived his stress on a new theoretical language largely in connection with the recent interpretation of the horizontal coordinate as a melodic formation. He justifies the insertion of new terms ("line, design, linear, focal point, mode, melodic fabric") "to divert thought from the customary, narrowly scholastic associations connected with the terms, melody, voice, counterpoint, tonic, note, etc." "The concepts of line and design suggest a feeling of plasticity in melodic motion and its direction; they impart a nuance of independence to the motion of the voice and, very importantly, stimulate dynamic perception of the musical horizontal as incessantly changing."(547) He aimed to "liberate" melodic thought in music from "alien analogies" such as period and phrase with new concepts that could not relate melodic thought to "predetermined theses of formal esthetics and theory."(548)

Asafiev decries the influence of functionalism in theory and composition. He believed that functionalism, along with homophony and figured bass, eventually "killed the melodic feeling, destroying or
depriving of potency the basic rules of the selection of tones and their shift in the melodic formation of the mode."(644) Yet strong melodic impulses in Soviet music have continued to co-exist with Soviet pedagogical functionalism in spite of this "scholastically mechanical voice-leading" induced, one assumes, by such pedagogical approaches.

The melodic element, "the most human medium of expression of all the elements of music," predominates in two historical eras—the era of the chorale beginning in the sixteenth century and the era of Italian bel canto singing beginning toward the end of the seventeenth century. Thus melody became "the chief motivating force of music from approximately the end of the seventeenth century."(850) Music then began "to sing," with breathing as its "fundamental principle."(844)

In his promotion of the melodic, horizontal aspect as the primary intonational aspect in music, Asafiev follows his illustrious predecessors in the field of Russian music theory from Hess de Calvé to Yavorsky, including Odoevsky, Larosh, Chaikovsky, and Taneev. The evolution of beliefs in melody's superiority through the nineteenth and twentieth centuries—from the ideas that melody is superior to harmony, that voice-leading principles are superior to harmonic ones, that the linear aspects of mode, which provides source material for melody and harmony, dominate over the vertical ones, etc.—reaches in Asafiev a point where "vocalness," by its very nature a monodic force, provides the supreme model for all of music—human singing (emotion with a realistic, social, i.e., human base), phrased and punctuated by natural breathing pauses. By extension, then, instruments, and the harmony
they produce, become "resonators" of human "vocalness." Thus in
Asafiev's view European harmony, "from a modal intonational point of
view, i.e., as a meaningfully expressive reality, and not as an
acoustical phenomenon," developed as "a unique system of resonators for
the tones of the mode." (918) He explains:

Man in his struggle for existence, and in the difficult recon-
struction of reality, through the prolonged stages of experiencing
it, "out of necessity" takes to himself, first of all, whatever is
closest to his experience. It is quite possible that, in creating
sounding instruments, he was governed by the experience of his
own, personal intoning, reproducing in these instruments both the
process of breathing and the phenomenon of "resonance." A primiti-
tive instrument, with the bass continuously droning under a primiti-
tive melody, represented, in this "organ point," a reflection of
the continuously tense vocal formation which conditioned the pro-
cess of intoning, i.e., sound expression on the basis of a given
style of tone and pitch. Through long series of transformations
this "droning bass" became a complex system of resonators for
melos, i.e., it became European harmony. (918)

Asafiev relates this evolution of European harmony "as a system of
resonators and intensifiers of the tones of the mode, i.e., the pro-
cess, easily traced historically, of the exposure of overtones," to
"the processes of 'resonance'" in singing, as "a more and more
'humanized' quality of singing," and, in instrument building, "the
search for more and more sensitive intensifiers." (919–920) He links
these two phenomena—the construction of instruments and the develop-
ment of homophony—through their identical "aspiration toward the crea-
tion of music as a manifestation of intellectualized humanity." (920)

Thus melody—or more properly, the aspect of "melos"—reigns in
music as the primary element because it represents the human quality of
"vocalness." Harmony developed as the "resonator" for this vocal
formation, for "melos." Instruments also reflect this vocalness; any
good instrumentalist will seek to emulate the phrasing and breathing techniques of the best singers. The derivation of new terms such as "linear" derives from a need to reveal "melos" as a more expansive, dynamic concept that is "plastic" and changeable, and capable of a multitude of expressive directions.

Leading Tone. For Asafiev, the leading tone has great historical and theoretical significance. He calls the quality of the leading tone both "one of the most important stimuli of the growth of European music," "the chief motive force of European music," and "the basic quality of the European mode," "the essential determinant of the mode—its high point of tension."(638-39, 762) The distinctive quality of the leading tone in the intonational nature of European music revealed the qualitative (intervallic) variety of sonorities and conditioned their grouping according to the principle of their greater or lesser tension and their degree of striving toward the fundamental tone, toward the tonic."(880) Its influence caused the medieval modes to disintegrate, and to be absorbed into its sphere, resulting in their crystallization into one "synthesized" European mode, characterized by the leading tone as its "prime mover," "its 'verb.'" Within this "synthesized" mode, major and minor are only "trends." The leading-tone quality was then introduced into the major mode on degrees other than the seventh, either intensifying the dominant (the raised fourth) or the tonic (the lowered second), for example, a process which was both accelerated and opposed—according to Asafiev—by the reintroduc-
tion and continual metamorphosis of the medieval modes in musical practice, in the music of such composers as Glinka and Chopin. This "intonational 'testing' of the expressive qualities of the leading tone" was opposed by an intensification of the influence of diatonicism, through the "cross-breeding" of the major mode and "its 'tonal metamorphoses'" with the most varied modes, both ancient European and exotic.\(^{(882)}\) Asafiev observes one aspect of this process, "a complex connection and interchange of an intensified leading tone quality and a refined dominantness, with folk-modal diatonicism" (in which the leading tone plays less of a role) in the works of Chopin, in which "everything—each intonational detail—organizes the mode as if it were reinterpretating it."\(^{(882-883)}\)

The "intonational force of the 'leading tone'" is manifested in two directions: both as a "tendency, a purposefulness toward the tonic," and as a "delay, a 'prolongation' of the tension of this tendency."\(^{(890)}\) During the course of the nineteenth century, one direction leads into another, from the reaffirmation of the tonic to a moving away from the tonic into the sphere of the dominant. The interaction of dominant and tonic is "one of the most characteristic indices . . . of the quality and degree of emotional and intonational tension," with the leading tone the "high point" of that tension.\(^{(761-762)}\) In Beethoven's music, the tonic and its sphere dominate "as unconditional affirmation, persuasiveness, confidence, and rationality."\(^{(763)}\)

But in the subsequent music of the nineteenth century the "intonational significance" of the tonic is reduced and the sphere of the
"bloating dominant" governs. \(91\) The delaying tendency of the leading tone is exaggerated, imparting "nervousness and instability" to the chords linked with it, those on the fifth and seventh degrees of the mode, which become "the bearers of an emotionally tense tonus." \(762\)

Thus the leading tone, as an "intonational force," helped both to define the "synthesized European" mode, through its sense of purpose leading to tonic, and, eventually, to destroy it, through its "prolongation" and "bloating" of the dominant. Its quality was expanded to other tones of the mode and was therefore "tested" through the use of varieties of other modes in music of the nineteenth century.

**Mode.** Although Asafiev defines mode more as an intonational quality than a theoretical concept, his interpretation of mode recalls that of Yavorsky's:

A mode is not a theoretical generalization, and, indeed, is not even conceivable as such; if there is nothing more than a series of sounds, a scale, or a set of "functions," the quality of the mode vanished into thin air. A mode is always experienced as a formation . . . ; but its generalization involves the most characteristic operating intonations of the epoch. \(640\)

And:

A mode is not a mechanical totality, but an intonational totality of melodic and harmonic links—the manifestation of the phenomenon of intervals in both the horizontal (melodic) and vertical (harmonic) sense . . . —rooted in the public consciousness. A scale is a step-wise, graphic representation of the tones which comprise a mode, but the mode is defined only by the quality of the conjugations of intervals of the given system. \(760\)

Thus Asafiev defines mode not in terms of a specific interval such as
the tritone, as did Yavorsky, but in terms of all intervals, melodic and harmonic, as intonational, socially determined links. Asafiev does address the question of the tritone briefly—"the intonationally meaningful essence" of "the important struggle, in the formation of the European modal system, for its inclusion of the 'tritone' as a sound combination of equal rights."(668) The problem of its acceptance, as he sees it, is not the tritone as a dissonance, as is usually thought, but its connection with the leading tone. In destroying the "intonational habits" in church music, the tritone was a "progressive phenomenon for European hearing;" it "sharpened and confirmed in the consciousness the feeling of the semitone as the leading tone."(669) In intensifying this leading-tone feeling, the tritone

organized the scale in a tense ascent as an unquestionable intonational unity. Into this unity, however, thanks to the insistent, sharply emphasized "ambiguity" of its motion, the "tritone" introduced an "uneasiness," a peculiar intonational instability, which the hearing had to smooth out. Thus, this interval, which is "ponderable" on the basis of its tension, organized the mode, synthesizing its component elements and at the same time intensifying their mutual conjugation and making up, out of the degrees of the mode, not separate sounds, simply adjoining one another, but tenaciously connected links, conditioning, by their seemingly limited independence, a limitless variety of intonational "expressions."(670)

Asafiev therefore does grant to the tritone a certain influence in the initial organization of the mode, but this influence is conditioned by the tritone's link with the leading tone on the seventh degree of the mode. With this link, "tritoneness" affected first melodics, imparting to it heightened expressiveness and a greater variety of possible melodic motions; then through the equalization of tonalities on the model of the major scale, "tritoneness" affected both the inter-
action of tritones of different tonalities and the intensification of harmonies. Then followed the growing independence of the tritone as a "self-determined element of the mode," the tritonal juxtaposition of tonalities, and "a new summarization of the mode, a new synthesis," according to Yavorsky's theory of modal rhythm, to which Asafiev refers. He adds, "In this formative process, the significance of Russian music is immense."(572)

Thus Asafiev sees in Yavorsky's adoption of the tritone as the basis for modal formation the confirmation of his own interpretation of the tritone as an intensification of the quality of the leading tone and as one of the steps in its current development. But he stops short of accepting wholeheartedly Yavorsky's interpretation of mode solely in terms of the tritone, except in the case of more recent music.

Asafiev attempts to define "the life of a mode." It begins first "in the consecutive interchange or the simultaneous combining of its intervals—from the leap of the voice to the filling-in of the given series, and conversely, from the filling-in to the leap."(912) This "basic law of any melodic speech, the filling-in of a leap with an uninterrupted series of tones, is the natural striving of the auditory apparatus of man to return from separateness (syllable, word, tone, interval) to continuousness of vocal sound utterance."(913) Its subsequent growth is observed "in the formation and transformation of its bases, in their adjoining and the drawing to themselves neighboring sounds, and in the formation of new bases or characteristic 'instabili-

lines,'" the leading tone and the tritone being the "maximum instabili-


ties."(914-15) Thus his two rules of melodic also define the life of a mode. Here he does identify certain tones as instabilities—the leading tone and the tones of the tritone—which brings his interpretation closer to that of Yavorsky.

Like intervals, modes are "the expressive realities of music, not formally structural elements."(909) In charting the development of mode in music contemporary to him, Asafiev recognizes first the coexistence within the all-embracing major mode of the "processes of modal differentiation and integration," which are constantly reflected in musical compositions.(909) The influence of the leading tone quality has led to the extension of the leading tone feeling to other modal degrees, thus entailing more subtle intervallic distinctions, and the expansion of major to include tonalities formerly considered remote. Then the "tonally neutral" chromatic scale ("glissando") becomes transformed into "a semitone mode of differentiated components. The 'tritone,' having become a free leap of the voice, i.e., almost a consonance, yields, when filled in, a 'compressed' mode of six semitones, which has achieved great significance in contemporary music."(909)

Another, earlier modal manifestation is the "revival and firm consolidation of the hexachord, now as a mode" in the nineteenth century, arising from the "increasing persistence of the major sixth as a 'full consonance.'"(909-910) This phenomenon occurs frequently in Russian music, where it appears either as an independent mode or as what Asafiev calls an "internal" or "inner" mode, a characteristic occurrence in minor, "where it is transformed into a minor sixth (espe-
cially from the fifth to the third or from the third downward to the fifth) with the 'engagement' of the semitone before the fifth as the leading tone to it (the beginning of the aria of Lenskii, etc.)."(910)

Asafiev's interpretation of mode, then, draws much from Yavorsky's theory of modal rhythm---the idea of linkage, intervalllic quality, the significant role of the tritone, its melodic foundations, and its expressive nature. He is not against the expansion of the idea of mode to include twelve tones, but recognizes the need still for "differentiated components" within that "semitone mode." He also recognizes the use of modes encompassing intervalllic distances smaller than the octave, such as the hexachord or tritone.

**Harmony: Views on Figured Bass and Functionalism.** Asafiev considers the vertical aspect of harmony to be the result of horizontal combinations; it is the "resonator" for the tones of the mode, a horizontal concept. In fact, he holds rather low opinions of such concepts as figured bass and functionalism, both of which he interprets as harmonically-based (contrary to the Schenkerian view of figured bass as a linear phenomenon). He views figured bass almost pejoratively, as "the mechanical harmony of the 'bass of fourths and fifths' . . . with its structure based on the disposition of chords (indifferently to the melody) and 'ornamentation' (figurations) by means of arpeggios."(627) He incorrectly aligns Rameau with this figured bass practice, interpreting the Rameau/Rousseau quarrel as a "radical contradiction between harmony drawn 'from keyboard execution' [i.e. Rameau] and "harmony
drawn 'from melody,' from breathing, from the feeling of the degree of 'tension' or the 'tenacity' of any given interval" [i.e., Rousseau]. (627) The technique of figured bass, which Asafiev concedes was "in its own time, to a great extent, a progressive phenomenon," evolved harmonic norms only of performance, not of "creative" composi-
tional practice. Asafiev views the difference between the two

as between the process of thinking and its reproduction, between a philosopher, the creator of a world view, and the philosophers of scholastic systems, etc. Medieval theorists understood this dif-
ference in music as a difference between thought, which was both compositional and theoretical, and musica-pratica [sic] (training and performance). (681)

Thus to rely on and develop figured bass technique as a foundation for compositional practice was antihistorical, unproductive and stifling.
Nonetheless, he recounts, during its history figured bass technique contributed significantly in four areas—whether for good or bad—to the growth of harmony: Most importantly, it brought in the adaptabili-
ty of melodic harmonization, and along with this, homophony; it also promoted the growth of dance music, liberated the keyboard style, and standardized the authentic cadence, which, he says, unfortunately promoted the dominant quality over the tonic.

But the process of continuo "inevitably mechanized the voice-
leading, and led it to a 'functionalism' which was remote from the kind of harmony which is always engendered by voice-leading as an intona-
tional process." (678) In Asafiev's view, the "notorious" Riemann sys-
tem of functional harmony, in which all harmonies are reduced to just three functions and in which the melodic aspect is subsequently deval-
ued in favor of the harmonic aspect, is "a sad heritage" of figured bass technique in its concentration on "the 'vertical' as the basis of the musical fabric," which "mechanizes its development."(643,672-673) Functionalism, then, "subordinates melodic motion to an abstract, acoustical principle, to the mechanical coupling of chords under the dictatorship of the bass voice" and "even impoverishes the harmony!"(643-44) Essentially, Asafiev is saying, functionalism is static, not dynamic; mechanical, not human; predictable, not spontaneous; fixed, not free; disjointed, not continuous; and, perhaps most importantly, vertical, not horizontal. And, in addition to mechanizing continuo technique and promoting the independence of vertical, pre-determined harmony, it harmonizes "by spots," that is, it brings "harmonic (chordal) voices to separate points of the melody."(679) This results in the breaking up of melodic intonations into abstract "features" of emphasis, and simultaneously the sharp isolation of the elements (melody, rhythm, harmony) which make up the musical fabric. Normally the hearing perceives this fabric, in the aggregate of elements, as motion formed by voice-leading and disciplined by rhythm . . . Music is perceived as a whole, and not merely as a series of harmonic "spots." The elements are not differentiated unless a conscious isolation and emphasis of the significance of one of the elements . . . enters into the intention of the composer.(679)

By thus "isolating 'points' of the melos," functionalism opposes polyphonic, harmonic voice-leading and "heterophonic" harmony based on a complex of timbres, for 'functionalism' fixes timbre by means of its rationalistic pre-determination."(679)

He was also opposed to the "notorious linearity" of Schoenberg's twelve-tone system, which along with vertically-based harmony is
"alien" to "the intonational nature of music":

The intonational nature of music as an art, first and foremost of
tuneful, melodious "speech," ... is alien both to notorious
linearity [Schoenberg's dodecaphony] and to vertical harmony "fol-
lowing in the footsteps of a lifeless bass" [functionalism], but
it does not at all contradict harmony as a sphere of moving
voices, always forming, in the aggregate, a melodic stream organ-
ized by rhythm. Melos creates this harmony as intonation, for
only living intonation both moves and spiritualizes music.(675)

Also, functionalism opposes folk music, "which is always intonationally
created within the rules of 'vocalness,'" and, by extension, Russian
music in general, so much of which is based on folk music.(675) Thus,
"in the contemporary enthusiasm for Riemann's functional harmony,"
Asafiev sees "an impediment to the development of the national folk
bases of Russian music (development, not archaization)."(677)

He sees harmful effects on young Russian composers from the con-
centration on functionalism in contemporary pedagogical theory:

Intonational music demands incessant activity of the hearing, in
its creation as well as in its perception. Functions, which are
learned by rote by the intellect, demand of the ear only a passive
"accounting" of chords—their mechanical comparison and accomoda-
tion. It is not necessary to intone them. Everything is given;
everything is calculated. In recent years the study of Russian
music has advanced almost not at all because of the persistent
concentration of theorists and musicologists on "function"—a
system alien to the evolution of Russian music with its rhythmi-
cally polyphonic melos, in essence, but not "pre-determined," and
with its development which fundamentally rejects a mechanical
working-out. The technique of youthful composers, infected by
"functionality," is, to a great extent, limited and even
impotent.(675)

The essential characteristics of Russian music in this regard are "a
cautious use of the dominant quality," the tonic as "the chief resting
point of intonational striving," and the promotion of the subdominant
quality to a position equal to the dominant, thus avoiding "the hyper-
bolism of the dominant quality." (675-676) This more balanced approach coincides with the primacy of *melos*, of intonational melody, in Russian music. He credits Glinka with "upgrading" the subdominant to equality with the dominant.

**Summary.** As viewed through its "essential qualities," then, intonation emerges not strictly as a theoretical phenomenon but also as a sociological and a historical phenomenon. The music of each era or epoch in music history is dominated or has been transformed by a particular theoretical quality—interval, rhythm, melody, mode—which has, through the force of change brought about by social necessity, emerged anew, with a fresh interpretation. The intonations that exhibit this quality (and others) that constitute the "oral intonational vocabulary" of the epoch and the "intonational crises" that reflect the change in intonational vocabulary make up Asafiev's "real history of music," that is, music history from the intonational point of view. This history, which attempts to answer the question of why music developed as it did, is entirely in keeping with the tenets of dialectical and historical materialism. To Asafiev, no other approaches to "the life of music as art" are comprehensible.

**Musical Realism and Musical Content.** Asafiev also addresses the questions of musical realism and musical content, which he relates to his concept of intonation. Realism is an important topic for two reasons. Not only is realism—Socialist Realism in the context of the
Soviet Union of the 1930s and 1940s—the primary (and only, if following the party line) ideological approach for creativity in any artistic field in this and succeeding eras in Soviet history, but also realism is linked with intonation and is revealed through it. Engels interpreted reality as "social necessity": "A concept or institution could be considered real and rational so long as it filled a necessary place in the evolutionary process." Asafiev utilizes the term in this sense, as in this statement: "Systems of intoning, which have been justified by the experience of centuries, undoubtedly possess immanent properties of organization (which continuously 'readjust' to reality, as the highest criteria of their significance or force of influence)."(554) But to Asafiev the concept of reality has several meanings, depending on its application.

It is important to remember that when a composer is guided by the intonational "capital" of the epoch, by the "sum of the music" which is well settled in the public consciousness, in the thoughts and emotions of his contemporaries, he reveals the realistic quality of his method. But, in the selection of intonations of an epoch, it is necessary to distinguish reality, i.e., the concreteness of existence, the presence of the "sum of music" in the social consciousness, from the realistic intonations proper within this "sum," i.e., the vitally necessary ones.(757)

Thus, "reality," applied in a very broad sense, is the objective existence of the sum total of music in the collective human consciousness (mind as material reflected in music). This differs from the more narrow application of "realistic," which when applied to quality of method denotes the source of the composer's intonations as being rooted in this reality, but which when applied to intonations selected from this reality denotes them as socially necessary, thus reflecting
Engels's interpretation. Using the term in the broad sense outlined above, Asafiev therefore calls intonation "thought about reality, transformed into sound."(740) At another point he states, "In the highest stages of its development, music, as meaning, becomes a reflection and a realization of its surrounding reality, perceived and transformed or reorganized by man, and is equal to all other manifestations of human consciousness."(654) As a particular case, let us examine Asafiev's views on Beethoven's music. According to Asafiev, "reality and his reflections on it" form the essence of Beethoven's music, which in its aggregate Asafiev conceives of "as an intonational formation":

Beethoven . . . is still indebted for what he became . . . to a profound recognition of the effective intonations of his epoch as the foundation of his creation, and in this lies the essence of his contact with realism . . . . Beethoven is the most convincing example, to me, of the exposure of European music as the reflection of reality through intonation, and in this lies the force and persuasiveness of his art as an art well-grounded in reality."(744-745)

Thus Beethoven's music reflects reality both through his method and through his utilization of "the effective [socially necessary] intonations of his epoch."

Asafiev makes further distinctions between his concept of intonational realism and realism in music composition as judged by contemporary critics:

When I state that the sources and roots of the realistic in music lie in the intonational communication of people, and in the recognition of these socializing elements of music in the compositions of the musical past and present, I am trying to base the problem of musical realism on the unquestionability of the experience of musical communication, on the continuously occurring process of assimilation, evaluation, recognition and non-recognition of the music of one's environment. In recent times, evaluation, both
positive and negative, of realistic musical compositions from the "viewpoint of the feeling of the critic" is more and more finding a place for itself in our criticism. (729-730)

But these evaluations, according to Asafiev, are all too frequently made on insufficient bases—"plot or program indicators," "condensed emotionalism, or 'this pleases me,' or sometimes even the promising title of a composition." (730) In addition, contemporary critics fail to distinguish between "the concept of realism as an artistic method, school, or trend," and "the realistic roots or bases of a given art, which, in the creative experience of a given master, may become either romantic or abstractly academic, if his world view (his, i.e., the creator's, the author's) is not realistic." (730-731) With this statement Asafiev thus distinguishes between Socialist Realism as "an artistic method" and intonational realism in the meanings given above.

He compares Mozart and Haydn regarding their "realistic tendencies, in terms of the substantiation of their creation by means of intonations of the environment," and finds the presence of these tendencies to be "unquestionable." (732) "Through this, their music is linked with the ideas of their time." However, he observes a profound difference between them. In Haydn,

Realistic tendencies in the selection of material develop, in his mastery, in his "how," in the "representation" of material, into a striking revelation of "visible" reality. In this, he is a realist, in spite of all the narrowly mediocre, patriarchal character of his outlooks and beliefs. . . . But Haydn's realistic powers of observation and the trend of his art did not develop into a creative method, nor become his world view. (732-733)

Mozart, in contrast, was more of an individualist, almost a Romantic:

In Mozart there is no emotional balance, none of the sensibleness of reason. . . . His art borders on psychological realism. . . .
Alongside him, Haydn is a monolith, a model of "sensible meaning." But the creation of Mozart is always an art of experiencing, the experiencing of a limitless world of sensations, and, through it, of objective reality, but not the reverse. (734-735)

Thus, "intonational analysis reveals the whole depth of the difference in the art of the two great contemporaries, who so respected one another's mastery." Although they both used "intonations of the surrounding society,"

the meaningful quality of the intonations chosen was different; and, in this respect, the more consistent idealist, Mozart, moved toward psychological realism, through the artistic experiencing of the most authentic feeling of love, while the more objective, "sensible meaning" of Haydn, for all the realistic figurativeness and Flemish picturesqueness of his symphonism, did not "carry" this art beyond the limits of optimism and complacency, somewhat sharpened by his sense of humour. (736-737)

Asafiev's comparison of these two masters in the intonational aspect arose from "the desire to show what care is demanded by determinations of realism in music and the realism of music," that is, the immanent realism of music in the broadest application of its meaning and the specific compositional application of realistic tendencies, methods, and intonations in music, and to clarify his views "about intonations which are accumulated by the public consciousness as a complex of characteristic indications of the music of the epoch." (737)

Regarding the latter, Asafiev distinguishes between using familiar intonations or stating unfamiliar intonations with familiar methods. By selecting intonational material from the "intonational vocabulary of an epoch," a composer acts with a realistic method. But due to the subjective tastes and feelings of the composer, which will affect his choices, "the realistic method of selection of intonational material
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associations of content—"poetic images and ideas, . . . concrete sensations (visual or muscular-motor), or . . . the expression of affects and various emotional conditions."(562) Thus "a sound image—an intonation which has taken on the significance of a visual image or concrete sensation—evokes an accompanying idea."(562) As Tull points out, "Asafiev does not suggest that figurative content is an immanent property of music, but rather, it is an associative phenomenon, related to extra-musical concepts." Asafiev identifies this phenomenon as "the process of concretization of musical images and the transformation of music into living figurative speech, full of significance."(563) In volume one he called this concept "musical semantics," but in volume two he renounced this term but not its significance:

I have renounced my term "musical semantics," which has become established, but, alas, not in the same sense as I conceived it. The preeminence of content in music has always existed for me. But I am accustomed to hear that content in a musical composition which has been organized by the composer, and not to "listen to a symphony" under an idea, pre-determined for it from outside—an idea which is philosophically valuable, perhaps, but which is not in the given composition of the given composer, and never could be. I have in mind opinions of the content, which are given out as principles and as norms for evaluation, though I am not at all prejudiced against witty and subtle observations, thoughts, and opinions which arise "to music" in any of us as listeners, and which are always evoked by a composition in any art.(608)

Thus Asafiev does not separate form, either the process of its perception or its concretized result, from content, from the emotional aspect of music, "as does the alleged 'formalist.'"(247) But he does not accept any notion of content as something superimposed from without, even though, as he says, it may be "philosophically valuable"; he prefers to let the music speak for the composer.
Influences. Within the context of this study it is not possible to trace the full extent of Asafiev's influence in Soviet music theory. Although nearly every Soviet theorist has been influenced to some degree by Asafiev, I can mention here just a few of the important theorists who developed his theories to a greater extent: Mazel on melody, Tiulin on timbre, Orlova on Asafiev and intonation, the numerous contributors to Intonatsiia i muzykal'nyi obraz [Intonation and musical image] (including, in addition to Orlova and Mazel, Iv. Kremlev, B. Yerustovsky, Ryzhkin, and Tsukkerman, as well as Zofia Lissa from Poland and J. Jiranek from Yugoslavia), and N. Shakhnazaryan on intonational vocabulary and other related topics.

Without doubt, Asafiev was a powerful influence in the development of Soviet music theory. The question of influences on Asafiev is also one that needs to be addressed. I will discuss briefly some of the trends in music theory, theater, and linguistics that influenced Asafiev. His ideas, as original as they are, did have some precedents in Russia and elsewhere. The term intonation, for example, has precedents in both its wide and narrow application. We recall Yavorsky's use of the term in the latter sense. The French linguist A. Meillet and the Russian linguist Marr each used the term in their respective writings on language, and Asafiev was familiar with their works. In its wider application, music as an intonational art, precedents may be found in both linguistics and theater—in Vladimir Ivanovich Dal's Russian dictionary, first published in 1863-66, and in applications by the Russian director Stanislavsky. Dal defined intonation as "a
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particularly strong emphasis on something," that is the relation of who pronounces a word or phrase to the sense of what is pronounced." Asafiev himself referred to Dal's approach as "the Russian language as a manner of speaking [govern], that is, intonation." Intonation for Stanislavsky meant "the revelation of thought, of feeling, of the essence of image [manner], the discovery of the semantic 'underlying theme' of a word," and intoning—"the revelation of the inner life of man, his psychology, his mental [and] emotional state." He called intonation "'primarily the expressor of feeling, the organ of the soul,'"; without intonation "'speech is unfeeling.'" The strong correlation between his views and Asafiev's are obvious. If there is any doubt, I repeat this statement of Asafiev's: "Intonation, as an emotionally meaningful tonus of sounds uttered by man, is felt both in the word and in the musical sound, for intonation is, above all, a quality of interpretive utterance."(707)

But aside from Yavorsky these influences fall outside the discipline of music theory. This raises the question, exactly how does Asafiev fit into the mainstream of pre-revolutionary Russian music theory? I have already mentioned the tradition in Russian theory concerning the primacy of melody; Asafiev continued this tradition. It is also possible to find precursors of Asafiev's views of intonation and of form as a process in varied writings of Serov, Rimsky-Korsakov, Taneiev, and Kashkin.

Elena Orlova, the Soviet authority on Asafiev, points to writings by Serov that anticipate Asafiev's views on intonation, on the distinc-
tion between form and process in music, and on the primacy of the vocal quality. More specifically, Serov's thematic analyses of Beethoven's Leonora overture and Ninth symphony anticipate Asafiev's "perception and comprehension of music by means of . . . intonational analysis and the introduction of the idea of intonational arches. Serov also distinguished the poetic side of music from its acoustical foundations (as in intonation) and from its theoretical, technical side (form versus process). To illustrate the latter distinction, Orlova quotes from Serov:

[Music] should be simultaneously: 1) a poetic language, penetrating directly into the soul and heart, and 2) an art, grouping sounds for the erection of a building almost immaterial, organic not in space but in time—a building, which would win over the hearing with its symmetry, [its] pleasantness of melodic, harmonic and rhythmic forms.47

Thematicism and its transformation as a basis for musical development is also a prominent concept in the views of Rimsky-Korsakov. In his memoirs, Rimsky-Korsakov discusses his system of leitmotives, which, unlike Wagner's leitmotives, come to signify different meanings as the result of various changes, for example, in the tempo:

In vain do people seek in my suite [Scherezade] leading motives linked unbrokenly with ever the same poetic ideas and conceptions. On the contrary, in the majority of cases, all these seeming leitmotive are nothing but purely musical material or the given motives for symphonic development. These given motives thread and spread over all the movements of the suite, alternating and intertwining each with the others. Appearing as they do each time under different illumination, depicting each time different traits, and expressing different moods, the same given motives and themes correspond each time to different images, actions, and pictures.48

It is the significance of this alteration of musical material with its
concomitant change in meaning in the process of the composition that
anticipates Asafiev's views towards intonational development. Rimsky-
Korsakov also held a view of form that anticipates Asafiev's. He was
less concerned with adhering to a particular scheme than in following
the logic of the musical material itself. He discusses the form of his
Symphonic Suite Antar:

When I examine the form of Antar now, after the lapse of many
years, I can affirm that I did well with this form, exclusive of
outside influences and hints. If the form of the first movement
flows from the form of the very narrative, the tasks of depicting
the joys of revenge, power, and love, on the contrary, are purely
lyrical tasks, calling for no fixed form; they merely denote moods
and their changes, and thus allow complete freedom of musical
structure. Where I got, at the time, this coherence and logic of
structure, this knack of inventing new formal devices, it is hard
to explain; but now that I examine the form of Antar with an
experienced eye, I cannot help feeling considerable
satisfaction.49

Kashkin, who after Stasov played an important role in Asafiev's
life, also held views similar to Asafiev's. He interpreted music as a
temporal art, like poetry, prose, and dance; accepted the primacy of
melody in music; recognized music as a creation of the "intellectual
and in general spiritual activity of man"; and saw the necessity to
study folk music and Russian classical music.

Concerning other influences, Orlova found a statement by Taneev in
which he presents an idea resembling Asafiev's "intonational vocabulary
of an epoch." And, as pointed out in Part V, Taneev also championed
voice-leading principles, the thematic and thematic developmental ap-
proaches to music and composition, and a dynamic, almost dialectical
approach to form (recall the juxtaposition of subdominant and dominant
in the development section which leads to a unified tonality). She
also mentions but does not explore views by Chaikovsky, Larosh and Stasov that resemble certain views of Asafiev's (Chaikovsky's views on the musical creative process, Larosh's views on the imagery of sound, and Stasov's views on the process of hearing music).

**Evaluation and Summary.** Thus it is clear that Asafiev was in the mainstream of Russian thought about music. His contribution, though, consists in promoting various of these ideas and coupling them with other prominent ideas of the day, thereby creating effective, provocative and important theories from them. He also—and this is perhaps even more important—provided Soviet musicology with useful Marxist approaches which it so urgently needed in order to progress. But Asafiev was not pleased with the direction of much of Soviet musicology during the 1930s, and this is reflected in his own concentration on composition rather than musicology. During the 1940s he returned to musicology more out of a sense of fate and desperation than anything else. Others, in turn, were not immediately impressed with his contributions. He was criticized, for instance, for concentrating too much on the processual side of form and ignoring the constructive schematic side in *Musical Form as a Process*. Such criticism ignores the very purpose of his work, though, and results from an insufficient grasp of his theories.

He was also criticized from the opposite side, for not emphasizing enough the materialistic aspects of his views, for example. However, others have done this for him. Mazel, for example, writing in the
1950s, characterizes the theory of intonation as "the doctrine about
the materialistic essence of the basic preconditions of musical expres-
siveness." Mazel explains that these "materialistic" preconditions
are the characteristics of voice and breathing, what Asafiev called the
"ponderability of intervals" and the "vocalness" of melody, which form
the material "substratum" of the melodic process. Along with this
Asafiev was criticized for too easily accepting the views of Kurth, a
patent idealist. However, one need only examine Asafiev's views care-
fully to conclude that there exists a basic philosophical gulf between
the views of the two theorists. Kurth is concerned not at all with the
question of perception, with the interpretation of organized musical
sounds, whereas for Asafiev—and for Marxism in general—this question
is paramount. Also, although Kurth concentrated on the melodic, hori-
zontal aspect of music, he did not develop the vocal, song-like source
of "melos" that is so important to Asafiev. If Asafiev concentrated on
the positive aspects of Kurth's "energetics" to the exclusion of the
negative ones (according to Marxism), he merely wanted to emphasize and
substantiate his view of the process of form, which during the 1920s
was a new theory, one that contradicted (and corrected) the then-
current schematic view of form. However, in his preface to the Russian
translation of Kurth's book on linear counterpoint, Asafiev clearly
sets forth his theory of intonation as a counterbalance to Kurth's
theory of energetics.

Asafiev's theories thus form an important foundation for contempo-
rary Soviet music theory. And Asafiev as scholar provides a role-model
for budding musicologists everywhere; his erudition, breadth of knowledge, and persuasive style are worthy of emulation. The availability of several of his works in English translation, along with other evaluations of his theories by Western theorists, make possible more than just a passing acquaintance with his work. It is hoped that his works eventually reach a wider audience.
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6 Boris Vladimirovich Asafiev, Simfonicheskie etudy [Symphonic etudes] (Petrograd, 1922); _______, Kniga o Stravinskem [Book on Stravinsky]

7 See Chapter 20, footnote 38, for mention of some contributions to De Musica. Asafiev contributed the following to volume one: "Sovremennoe russkoe muzykoznание i ego istoricheskie zadachi" [Contemporary Russian musicology and its historical tasks], De Musica, 1 (1925), 5-7. This article is based on a lecture Asafiev gave to the history section of the music division of GIII on November 21, 1925.

8 Asafiev wrote eight articles in 1930 for the Bol'shaia sovetskaia entsiklopediia, four in 1931. Several of the works published in 1930 were actually written earlier, such as Musical Form as a Process and Russian Music from the Beginning of the Nineteenth Century.

9 Tull, pp. 68-69.

10 Tull, p. 70.

11 Tull writes:

His . . . subjects were most often drawn either from history or from the Classics of Russian literature, both of which served as officially tolerable expressions of Soviet nationalism, with numerous precedents in the Russian Classical tradition of music. A third area . . . was the depiction of exotic, especially oriental, civilizations which have figured in Russian history, and the remnants of which remain in certain areas or within certain ethnic groupings now incorporated into the [USSR]. . . . His historical subjects included, in addition to the French Revolution, ballets dedicated to Ivan Bolotnikov (1938) and Stepan Razin (1939), and a 1936 opera on Minin and Pozharskii. . . .

Most of Asafiev's musical subjects are escapist in nature and reflect a reluctance on his part to deal with contemporary problems. . . . Only one of his ballets, the 1935 Partizany [Partisans]. . . [or] Partizanske dni [Partisan days], set in the Russian Civil War period, is concerned with . . . a "contemporary theme"(71-73).

analysis of style and musical dramaturgy] (Moscow, 1944); ______, Glinka (Moscow, 1947).

Tull, pp. 78-79.

Orlova, Put' issledovatelia i publitsista, p. 392.

Tull, pp. 97-98.

Ibid., p. 142.

Ibid., p. 143.

Ibid., p. 109.

Ibid., p. 120.

V. I. Lenin, cited in Tull, p. 128.

Volume One, 1930; Volume Two, 1947. All quotations are taken from Tull's translation. In order to present the flavor of Asafiev's style I have taken the liberty of quoting him rather extensively at times. Therefore, to avoid an unreasonable number of footnotes, I have given the page numbers of each quotation directly in the text. Any page numbers after page 600 are from volume two. When additional commentary is required following a quotation, I will use a footnote and will give the page number of the quotation in the footnote along with the supplementary information.

Lev Abramovich Mazel, "O muzykal'no-teoreticheskoi kontseptsii Asafieva" [On the musical theoretical conceptions of Asafiev], Sovetskaia muzyka [Soviet music], No. 3 (1957), pp. 73-82.

Asafiev, p. 542. Kurth's book, Grundlagen des linearen Kontrapunkte (1917), was translated by Z. Evald and published under the editorship of Asafiev in 1931. Kurth's theories were the basis for several Soviet studies, such as P. V. Akimov's Vvedenie v polifoniю na osnove energeticheskikh uchenii (Ernst Kurt) [An introduction to polyphony on the basis of the study of energy (Ernst Kurth)] (Leningrad, 1928).

Tull comments further on Yavorsky's and Asafiev's use of another literary device, the "exploitation of the multi-significance of terminology:"

This basically rhetorical usage was the apparent manifestation of advocacy, persuasive, and rhetorical motivations. . . . Yavorsky was particularly interested in emphasizing links between ancient and modern music by tracing the historical evolution of concepts and terms. Being an accomplished pianist, as well as a theorist,
his ultimate aim was the achievement of breadth and historical authenticity in performance practice. In Asafiev's case, the results of such a device are uneven and often questionable, and in some contexts his true meaning becomes hopelessly obscured in what degenerates into seemingly capricious literary mannerism. Such is the case, particularly, in his virtually incomprehensible discussion of the "quality of play" (or "playing") in the secular, instrumental polyphony of the Renaissance [696-700] (104).

25 Tull, p. 102.
26 This device also applies to the overall form of each of the volumes of this work, but differently, the first volume being more neatly organized than the second. However, the seventeen-year separation between the writing of the two volumes does not affect the continuity between them, either in form or content. Asafiev himself called the second volume a "development" of the first, which is readily apparent in his treatment of such important ideas as "intonation" and "intonational vocabulary," and the very idea of "musical form as a process." And the two volumes are quite similar in structure. Each contains 12 chapters, preceded by an introductory chapter and concluded with two supplementary chapters, the first of which in each summarizes the content of the preceding chapters and the second of which resembles a glossary. However, Asafiev's greater attempt at organization in volume one resulted in the division of the main body of the work into three sections, of three, three and six chapters, respectively, each of which deals with a separate approach to the main topic. Since Asafiev viewed the sonata-allegro form as the highest musical achievement of the embodiment of the principle of contrast, a guiding force in the development of musical form, it is difficult not to see this organization plus the supplement as its literary counterpart, as the exposition of ideas (Introduction and Chapters I-III), their development (Chapters IV-XII), and recapitulation and resolution (Supplements I and II).

The organization of volume two is much less strict, rather conveying a feeling of "stream-of-consciousness:" it reflects the tenuous conditions under which it was written. Asafiev's device of "thought arches" is more apparent here, and works in tandem with his own description of the format as exposition and development (the two supplementary chapters serving somewhat as a recapitulation). In both volumes, though, there are portions that are much more in the nature of an exposition (and its companion, recapitulation), and others that fall under the category of development. In volume one, the Introduction, Supplement I and Supplement II are much more expository in nature than the twelve chapters themselves; in fact, these sections present the main ideas of the work in such conciseness and completeness that Tull wonders whether the main body of the work [both volumes] is not largely superfluous" (ibid., p. 150). But how Asafiev develops his ideas is just as interesting and important as the ideas themselves, and from this viewpoint the rest of the work is certainly not superfluous. The "Conclusion" and "Epilogue," the two supplementary chapters in intonatsiya,
are also summarizing and recapitulatory, not only in relation to this
volume but to the first one as well. The introduction to this volume,
actually entitled, "In Lieu of an Introduction," serves to connect the
two volumes; the real introduction to volume two may be found in Chap-
ter I. The remaining chapters may be more or less strongly related to
the device of development, although the degree to which Asafiev em-
ployed this device is debatable.
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I. A. Brahno, "K voprosii o logike bakhovskogo iazuka" [On the
question of the logic of Bach's language], Muzykoonanie [Musicology]
(Leningrad, 1928).

28

In addition to the Stumpf work cited below (footnote 34),
Asafiev makes references to these works, among others: Stumpf,
"Tonsystem und Musik der Siamesan," Sammelbande fur vergleichende
Musikwissenschaft (Munich, 1922); Curt Sachs, Geist und Werden der
Musikinstrumente (Berlin, 1929); A. Machabey, Histoire et evolution des
formules musicales du I-er au XV e siecle de lere chretienne (Paris:
Payot, 1928); Knud Jeppeson, The Style of Palestrina and the
Dissonance, trans. Margaret W. Hamrick (London: Oxford University
Press, 1927; orig., 1923); and Alfredo Casella, L'evoluzione della
musica a traverse la storia della Cadenza perfetta (1924).
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Asafiev, pp. 252-253. Although Tull rightly labels Asafiev's
statement regarding the suspensions as confusing, he incorrectly iden-
tifies the similar and dissimilar suspensions. Tull states that the
uspension in mm. 8-9 is a sequential repetition of the one in mm. 6-7,
an observation with which I disagree. Such an observation related more
to the suspensions in mm. 4-5 and 6-7. In my view, the suspensions in
mm. 4-5 and 6-7 are similar; the one in mm. 8-9 resembles that in mm.
6-7 only through its descending motion after the resolution. However,
Tull correctly points out the conflict between Asafiev's two expres-
sions, "inertia of motion" and a "'recoil' downward," used in a context
intended to be mutually exclusive (Tull, Commentary, p. 574).
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rationalen und soziologischen Grundlagen der Musik (Munich: [Drei
Masken Verlag], 1921). Tull provides this commentary on Weber:

Max Weber (1864-1920), a German economist, turned in later
life to the study of sociology and social philosophy. The basic
conclusion of this, his one book on music, is that the chordal-
harmonic nature of Western or Occidental music demands an extreme-
ly rational foundation. The opening section of his book, accord-
ingsly, is devoted to an explanation of how the tones of the diato-
nic scales are derived from the tones of the three principal
triads (tonic, dominant, subdominant) of any given tonality. The
"distance principle," or, more precisely, the principle of inter-
valic distance or tone proximity, constitutes his explanation for
the presence of "irrational" melodic elements within this chordal-
harmonic system. Indeed, the tension resulting from the insertion of melodic intervals, not explained in terms of triads, into this essentially triadic system, provides the principal dynamic element in music, and serves as a medium of expressiveness, offsetting the harmonic rationality (579).


31 p. 419. Here Asafiev, in emphasizing the value of his approach to musical form as opposed to other, more schematic approaches, makes a pointed reference to an unnamed approach, but which can only be Conus's theory of metrotechnicism:

Here before us is one of the simplest and most obvious examples [Beethoven's Op. 2, No. 3] of the difference between the formal, abstract, architectonic view of musical form as a mute scheme, removed from the intonational formation, removed from its actual sounding, and the study of form as a process, always perceptible to and verified by the ear. But the concept of form as the process of organizing music which is crystallized in the consciousness is not thereby disaffirmed, but is filled out and enriched. The study of interrelations which are only spatial (the interaction of symmetrical and assymetrical constructive elements) without the perception of intonational musical gravitations, i.e., the very act of organizing music, hangs in the air in the form of very clever visual projections of rhythmic divisions [my emphasis-E.C.]. (419-420)

It is the assimilation of these projections, Asafiev points out, that separates form schemes from music and creates a gulf between living musical speech and its forms. It then appears as if this living musical speech for some reason fills prepared, architectonically irreplaceable form schemes (as water and wine fill vessels of different sizes and types), while actually music itself can exist splendidly without any schemes (ibid).

32 These works are just some of those influenced by Asafiev's theory of intonation: Lev Abramovich Mazel, O melodii [About melody] (Moscow, 1952); Intonatiia i muzykal'nyi obraz [Intonation and musical imagery], ed. Boris Mikhailovich Yarustovsky] (Moscow, 1965); N. G. Shakhnazaryova, Intonastionnyi "slovar" i problema narodnosti muzyki [An intonational "dictionary" and the problem of the folk quality of music] (Moscow, 1966); Evgenii Vladimirovich Nazaikinskii, Psihologiiia muzykal'nogo vospritiatiia [The psychology of musical perception] (Moscow, 1972).

33 Tull, Commentary, p. 956.

35 Such a measured, static approach "is not at all what is important in the history of music, where only the intonationally qualitative significance of an interval and its place in a system of conjugate tones (a scale or a mode) determine its vital capacity in music" (quantity into quality: a Marxist precept). (602-603)

36 Asafiev, p. 908. Asafiev earlier gave an example:

In vocal music, in that type where a very close intimacy of the rhythms and intonations of words and musical tones is observed (for example in the so-called recitativo-arioso style), music almost becomes speech, and the intonational quality of the tone-word reveals, not only the emotional meaning of what is expressed but the character of the given personage. A striking example of this is in the Dargomyzhskii opera, The Stone Guest. The prevalence of certain intervals, revealed in word and tone, in the singing of each of the characters—Don Juan, Leporello, Donna Anna, the monk—reveals their characteristic habits, temperament, manner of speech (slyness, ingratiating manner, wonderment, passion), even their secret thoughts, in a word, a completely living image is created. But such detail is conceivable only in the chamber style. (761)

Tull comments on Asafiev's observation: "However, Mozart achieves just such a clear and detailed delineation of character in his opera on the same general subject Don Giovanni, which can hardly be characterized as 'in the chamber style'" (968).

37 Asafiev, pp. 512-513. His quotation is from the article by O. Ermanski, "Problemy trudovogo ritma" [Problems of the rhythm of labor], Vestnik Sotsialisticheskoi akademii [Herald of the Socialist Academy], No. 2 (1923), p. 103.

38 Asafiev explains Glinka's approach to "functionality":

The ear of Glinka sought and found a means of overcoming this hyperbolism [of the dominant quality] by the "upgrading" of the subdominant for equilibrium, especially in pauses and conclusions of motion of the music. This explains his plagal cadences. Glinka, with his sensitive melos, founded on the song-style of Russian folk music and its subsidiary voice system, understood that excessive exposure of the dominant quality in harmony ran counter to the essence of his melodics. Beside that, as a stylistic device, the balancing of dominantness with plagalness (particularly when plagal harmonies appear after dominant ones, and even
after the tonic) imparts to music a measuredness of pace, an epic quality, a narrative cast..."Functionality" is all the more alien to Glinka...In the process of combining the Russian song style with the foremost aspirations, for his epoch, of western European harmony, Glinka naturally favored harmony conditioned by voice-leading as an intonational process, i.e., the stylistics of Mozart and Cherubini (pp. 676-677).*

However, Asafiev declines to call Glinka's music particularly "plagal," calling "the famous plagalness," supposedly inherent to Russian folk music and also to Glinka's music, "largely the fabrication of Laroche, echoed by Stasov."(676) While admitting Glinka's plagal cadences "do constitute a characteristic quality of his style," he protests that "it is far from an indigenous and compulsory feature of Russian national harmony."(676)** However, such an attitude as Asafiev's regarding the source of Glinka's "plagalness" is contradicted by the evidence. Russian folk music, as previous theorists have pointed out, contains a definite plagal quality, which when harmonized becomes emphasized. Glinka's usage of folk music—either quoted or invoked—certainly would reflect any inherent qualities such as plagalness.

*Evidence of Glinka's interest in voice-leading per se may be seen in his studies in counterpoint with Siegfried Dehn, about whom Asafiev comments: "It is interesting that one may observe a line from Cherubini and Catel, through Klein, to Dehn (in his extremely curious manual); and thus it is possible to explain why Glinka identified with Dehn. This was his contact with the French conception of harmony."(678) Regarding Glinka and Dehn, see herein, Part III.

**Larosh's first important musicological contribution was a series of articles on Glinka: "Glinka i ego znachenie v istorii muziki" [Glinka and his significance in the history of music], Russkii vestnik [Russian Herald], no. 10 (1867) and nos. 1, 9, 10 (1868). Mazel, in his 1957 article on Asafiev, explains the characteristic subdominant in Russian folk song as arising from the gravitation of unstable tones to their adjacent stable tones, which results in the alternation between stable and unstable tones in the scale and the arrangement of like tones in thirds. Since the main stable tone is the lowest tone in the scale (tonic), then the stable tones—first, third and fifth degrees of the scale—make up the tonic triad and the unstable tones—second, fourth and sixth degrees—make up a chord with subdominant function. In this arrangement, the function of the leading tone (ascending to tonic) is greatly reduced. The apparent motion of gravitation from unstable tone to stable tone is descending. See Part VIII for discussion of additional research on Glinka's harmony.

39
Tull, pp. 122-123.
40
Ibid., Commentary, p. 598.
See above, footnote 35. The Czech theorist Jaroslav Jiranek has also written on Asafiev's theories: Asafjevoj teorie intonace, jeji geneze z vyznam [Asafiev's theory of intonation, its significance and outline] (Prague: Academia, 1967). Among the contributions to Intonation and Musical Image are: Iu. Kremlev, "Intonatsia i obraz v muzyke" [Intonation and image in music], pp. 53-94; J. Jiranek, "Nekotorye osnovnye problemy marksistskogo muzykovedeniia v svete teorii intonatsii Asaf'eva" [Some basic problems of Marxist musicology in light of Asafiev's theory of intonation], pp. 53-94; I. Ryzhkin, "Obraznaya kompozitsiia muzikal'nogo proizvedeniia" [The composition of musical works using imagery], pp. 187-224; L. Mazel, "O sisteme muzikal'nykh sredstv i nekotorykh printsipakh khudozhestvennogo vozdeistviia muziki" [About the system of musical means and several principles of the artistic influence of music], pp. 225-263; V. Tsukerman, "Tselostnyi analiz muzikal'nykh proizvedeniie i ego metodika" [The integrated analysis of musical works and its method], pp. 264-320; and Zofia Lissa, "Problema vremeni v muzikal'nom proizvedeniie" [The problem of time in a musical work], pp. 321-353.

Orlova, p. 414.


Orlova, B. V. Asafiev: Put' issledovatel'ia i publitsista, p. 412.

Ibid.

Ibid., p. 416.

Serev, quoted in Orlova, p. 417.

N. A. Rimsky-Korsakov, My Musical Life, p. 293.

Ibid., p. 94.

Orlova, B. V. Asafiev: Put' issledovatel'ia i publitsista, p. 422.

Orlova, p. 420.

Mazel, "O muzikal'no-teoreticheskoi kontseptsii Asafieva," p. 78.

See, for example, the article by Gordon McQuere listed in footnote 1, and Malcolm H. Brown, "The Soviet Russian Concept of 'Intonatsia' and 'Musical Imagery'," The Musical Quarterly, 60 (1974), 557-567.
Summary to Part VI

The period just discussed remains to this day the most inventive and uninhibited in the history of Russian/Soviet music theory. Clearly, the restrictive philosophy of and policies behind Marxism and Socialist Realism did not adversely affect theoretical research until after 1930. The research institutes provided a measure of support unequaled in pre-revolutionary Russia, in which research and the acquisition of needed materials was undertaken only on the initiative of private individuals. Yet without these early individual efforts, the Soviet government would have had little to build on after 1917.

The agendas at the various institutes also was determined by factors pre-existent to the revolution. Of the five major theorists discussed in Part VI, only Asafiev could be said to be influenced by Marxist elements, but, as we saw, much of his work has a decidedly Hegelian cast to it. Garbuzov was affected by the necessity for political indoctrination of his theoretical views, but this appears to have been an external rather than internal influence. Yavorsky and Conus both carried over into the Soviet period their work begun in the first decade of the century, and Gatoire constructed his major works on theories dating from the same or an even earlier time.
Yet the very idea of revolution, of overthrowing the old and inaugurating the new, did spill over into music theory. Yavorsky, Garbuzov, and Conus all wanted to replace existing theory with their own methods. It is perhaps too facile to correlate the growing political and ideological fervor with an equally ardent fervor among music theorists to replace the pedagogical theory of the nineteenth century with something fresh and new, but nonetheless a new and original system is what they wanted. However, this was happening elsewhere as well. Composers and theorists in other countries not rocked by revolutions and dreams of new governments were advocating their own answers to the problem of where to go next after late nineteenth-century chromaticism. The post-war era in Europe and America produced a plethora of new and even avant-garde compositional approaches. So it is not so unusual for it to have occurred in the Soviet Union as well.

This desire to replace existing theory with something new was fulfilled to some extent by the works of the more conservative Catoire, whose functional harmonic and formal approaches were utilized long after the other theories were cast aside. But this did not entail a very radical change.

The main areas of focus, the generation and analysis of mode, formal symmetry, functional harmony, and processive formal elements, resulted in new ideas and approaches in Russian and Soviet theory still being utilized today. Yavorsky's temporal and dynamic view of mode, the theory of function—which is applied to many different aspects, not just harmony and form—the temporal, processual view of form, and
Asafiev's theory of intonation and its attendant ideas (intonational vocabulary and crises, for example) are all ideas that form a part of the tradition of Russian and Soviet music theory. It is fairly obvious that these theories are compatible with Marxist and Socialist Realist philosophies. This superimposed, selective view of music theory contradicts our more "natural" process of selection and survival in the West based on the feasibility and workability of an approach through application and practice; but it does not immediately invalidate the selected ideas. These ideas all received scrutiny and were subjected to application during the next period under examination, 1932-1941.

Thus more idealist and rationalist approaches to music theory predominated during the 1920s. The attempt to infuse music theory with more scientific approaches resulted in the rationalist cast to many theoretical works beginning with Taneiev's and culminating with Garbuzov's and Conus's and their preoccupations with the numerical justification of theory. A more idealist approach characterizes Yavorsky's and Catoire's approaches; Asafiev straddles the fence between Hegelian dialectics and Marxist theory. The materialist approach of Marxism subsequently accepted only those approaches compatible with both materialism and dialectics. Any static approaches such as those by Garbuzov and Conus—despite the materialistic essence of acoustics in Garbuzov's theory—were deemed unsuitable.
PART VII

MARXIST MUSIC THEORY: 1932-1941
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Introduction to Part VII

Transition. The dissolution of the proletarian associations, the centralization of musical authority in the Composers' Union, and the solidification of definite political and philosophical directives brought about a new era in Soviet music theory in 1932. This era ushered in the politicization of music theory, for from 1932 on, not just a few theorists undertook to incorporate Marxist-Leninist philosophy into their works, but all theorists were virtually required to do so. Yet, as we have seen, most of the prominent theorists of the 1920s—Catoire, Conus, Yavorsky, and Garbuzov—had already established their theoretical approaches and methods before the revolution. As a result, their works were in many respects incompatible with the more stringent Marxist-Leninist directives affecting music theory, and their influence began to wane during the 1930s. Also, by the end of 1933, two of them, Catoire and Conus, were dead. Of the remaining two, Yavorsky and Garbuzov, Yavorsky's theory of modal rhythm had undergone close scrutiny in 1930 and had been found deficient in light of Marxist philosophy, and Garbuzov had gone through a significant change in the direction of his research when he realized the futility of his earlier course. Although Yavorsky continued his research during this period,
he published nothing. Garbusov remained active, teaching at the Moscow Conservatory and directing its acoustical laboratory, but he too published little. Incidentally, all these theorists—Catoire, Conus, Yavorsky, and Garbusov—worked in Moscow, where the push towards Marxism among theorists was less evident than in Leningrad. The Leningrad theorist Asafiev, meanwhile, continued on the path he had established in the 1920s, and with his Muzykal'naia forma kak protsess became the main architect of the foundation to support the edifice of Marxist musicology. However, as we have seen, during the 1930s Asafiev concentrated on his composing and published little in musicology.

Thus it was left to a new generation of theorists in the 1930s to undertake the enormous task of incorporating Marxist-Leninist guidelines into music theory. During the 1920s and extending somewhat into the early 1930s, many of the younger theorists, among them Viktor Abramovich Tsukkerman, Lev Abramovich Mazel, and Iosif Yakovlevich Ryzhkin in Moscow, all of whom graduated from conservatories after the revolution, concentrated their research on the theories of the more established theorists such as Garbusov, Conus, and Yavorsky. After 1932, after the rise and fall of the RAPM movement and the subsequent establishment of the doctrine of Socialist Realism, they found it necessary to evaluate the earlier theories more according to political precepts than according to inherent usefulness or value. As a result, they came to consider much of the work of these older theorists too "one-sided": Music could not be explained solely on the basis of its acoustical foundations (Garbusov), its modal formations (Yavorsky), its
functional properties (Catoire), or its symmetrical, architectural embodiment (Conus). They began to search for new approaches that would, following Marxist-Leninist thought, integrate theoretical analysis with the analysis of the historical, sociological, aesthetic and philosophical aspects of the music. In Leningrad, Asafiev was already well along this path; consequently, his theories became important cornerstones of Soviet musical thought. However, this did not occur immediately, but took place over a period of years. This left a temporary void that had to be filled by other theorists. This period has been called "a time of search and positive judgement, a period of affirmation," by which is meant the affirmation of the Marxist-Leninist approach to theoretical musicology, the coordination of music theory with the principles of historical and dialectical materialism, and with the concept of Socialist Realism.

Soviet theoretical thought after 1932 thus became less innovative in a purely theoretical sense than it had been previously, since it concentrated on the development of the philosophical direction of music and its analysis at the expense of the purely theoretical direction. Theorists avoided more radical theoretical ideas and approaches, and instead relied on proven and accepted analytical approaches and techniques, expanding them if warranted, to serve their purpose—the formation of a Marxist theory of music. This included also avoiding the excesses of the radical proletarian movement; one theorist in 1936 characterized the forging of Soviet musicology as "overcoming the influence of the formalists on the one side and the vulgarizers of
2

Marxism on the other."

Yet some works published during this period continued to reflect trends of the past decade, such as Catoire's book on musical form (completed and published in 1934-36 by his students Mazel and Kabalevsky), Conus's three works from the years 1931-35 (one published posthumously), and Garbuzov's study of folk song using his theory of modal formation. But the newer concerns took precedence over these works, therefore greatly diminishing their effect. Catoire's work was necessary for teaching purposes, though, since no other similar work was available; but its theoretical importance was not as great as it might have been under different circumstances.
FOOTNOTES TO INTRODUCTION TO PART VII


Chapter 26

The Impact of Marxism on Music Theory: Philosophy and History

- **Socialist Realism and Marxist Ideology.** The doctrine of Socialist Realism came to dominate the arts during the period from 1932 to 1941. It affected all areas—literature, painting, sculpture, and architecture as well as music, in which music theory, history and criticism were affected no less than music composition. For present purposes, it is necessary to define Socialist Realism and illustrate the extent of its influence on music theory.

How do the Soviets define Socialist Realism? Here is a recent (1981) definition given in the *Musical Encyclopedia*:

Socialist Realism is a creative method, based on the truthful, historically concrete artistic reflection of reality in its revolutionary development. Operating on the experience of the entire preceding artistic culture and above all on realistic art, Socialist Realism appears as its new, highest historical level; it is manifested in nationally distinctive forms. Socialist Realism is an international phenomena; however a special role in its formation belongs to Russian literature and above all to the works of M. Gorky. This is conditioned by the world-wide significance of the revolutionary movement in Russia, to where the center of the world revolutionary liberation struggle was transferred in the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century.1

Socialist Realism thus assumes as fact the Marxist view of history ("revolutionary development") and Lenin's "Law of Reflection," as well
as the theory that reality can be revealed in art in a truthful, objective manner. Put simply, Socialist Realism is "the reflection in the arts of the struggle for the victory of socialism." Not mentioned in the definition is the role of the Communist Party as arbiters and maintainers of the "creative method" of Socialist Realism.

Socialist Realism is not something dreamed up by the architects of Soviet Marxism simply to keep artists under their control. It is the apogee of a historical development begun in Russia towards the end of the nineteenth century that was influenced by significant social changes affecting both society and culture. The Soviets trace its roots to the realist art of the nineteenth century; in music its historical antecedents are no less than Glinka and especially Mussorgsky. It was designed in retrospect, based on these earlier developments and filtered through Marxist-Leninist ideology; "it was an attempt to codify those developments and project them into the future, transforming the artist's 'tendency' into a conscious program." Thus Socialist Realism was transformed from a purely artistic development to a political doctrine, and what was in the nineteenth century the social role of art became, within the context of Lenin's party, a political role.

When discussing Marxism-Leninism in general, it is necessary to emphasize the importance and predominance of Lenin's contribution to this philosophy. For example, his view concerning the essential continuity of artistic traditions was particularly influential. Unlike his ideological opponents—those in RAPM and similar proletarian organizations—Lenin did not want to destroy the past in order to create a new
society; he valued tradition and developed his version of Marxist
theory in close combination with the native Russian tradition: "Only
by a precise knowledge of the culture created by the whole development
of mankind, and by a reworking of this, will it be possible to create a
new, proletarian culture." This attitude of honoring and preserving—
yet at the same time reinterpreting—past tradition is especially
noticeable in music theory, where much valuable work is devoted not
only to the history of the discipline itself, but also to the histori-
cal development of numerous contemporary methods and approaches.

There are three basic principles of Soviet aesthetics that have
essential places in the context of Socialist Realism:

narodnost' (literally people-ness)—the relationship between art
and the masses, klassovost' (class-ness)—the class characteris-
tics of art, and partiinost' (party-ness)—the identification of
the artist with the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU).

Narodnost' governs the accessibility of art to the masses. Art is good
only when both its content and aesthetic value are understood by the
people. This understanding arises from the familiarity of the people
with the sources of art, i.e., themselves, their folk art and customs.
Thus, the Soviets' adherence to the principle of narodnost' explains
their strong and incessant emphasis on folk music as a creative medium
in composition and as a subject for research in theory and musicology.

The second principle, klassovost', interprets art as the objective
reflection of class ideology, of the reality of the epoch. Thus, a
work of art that adheres to the doctrine of Socialist Realism will
reflect in an objective fashion the class contradictions in the society
in which the composer lives.
The third principle, partiiinost', recognizes the political, propagandistic function of art—that it must promote and enhance the cause of socialism. Art is therefore placed under the watchful eye of the Communist Party in order to ensure the fulfillment of this function.

Thus, all three principles affect the meaning, interpretation, and application of Socialist Realism in the arts through their influence on content, aesthetic value, form, attitude, function, and approach, to name just a few aspects. How do these principles pertain to the application of Socialist Realism in music? Narodnost' is invoked through the emphasis on folk music, both in and of itself and in serious music composition, as well as in musicology and theory; klassovost' helps to determine the social content of musical works and how that content is analyzed and criticized ("Marxist analysis sets out to show that art has profound social significance even when it has no obvious or direct concern with social problems"); and partiiinost' influences the goals and functions of music and its practitioners in all areas (composition, education, research, performance, criticism, etc.).

No exact methodology for the implementation of Socialist Realism in any artistic medium including music exists; therefore no precise methodology for the theoretical analysis of Socialist Realism in music exists. However, in both its implementation and analysis there are general guidelines. For its implementation, composers, theorists, and musicologists should consider the following aspects: the objective view of contemporary (historically concrete) reality and its social significance; the progress towards the building of a new society; the
working-class struggle towards socialism; the critical development of classical traditions; the educative role in developing social awareness of the people; and the objective, not subjective, originality and individuality of the artist. It goes without saying, then, that anything that opposes these aspects, anything that might be considered decadent or degrading (not uplifting or progressive), too esoteric (not accessible to the masses), too technical (art for art's sake), too worldly or cosmopolitan (not Russian), and the like, would not be acceptable. This would include in music composition, for example, any methods that would alienate the listener, such as dodecaphonic and aleatoric techniques, extreme dissonances without purpose, and atonal music. The analysis of a socialist work of art is concerned with revealing any or all of these qualities and how well they are represented. Consequently, socialist analysis is concerned primarily with content, and only secondarily with technique, or form.

Anatol Lynacharsky and Marxist Criticism. Anatol Lunacharsky makes this point in a 1928 article entitled "Theses on the Problems of Marxist Criticism," in which he addresses the question of Marxist analysis. Although Lunacharsky directs his comments solely towards literature and literary criticism, his views apply equally well to music and its analysis. In fact he brings out several points that are crucial for an understanding of the Marxist approach in criticism and analysis, whether in literature or music. These points concern the goals and methods of Marxist criticism.
Initially he points out that what distinguishes Marxist criticism from all other types of literary criticism is its sociological nature, in accordance with the philosophy of Lenin and Marx. He illustrates his point:

Sometimes a distinction is made between the tasks of a literary critic and those of a literary historian; this distinction is based not so much on an analysis of the past and present, as, for the literary historian, on an objective analysis of the origins of the work, its place in the social fabric and its influence on social life; whereas for the literary critic, it is based on an evaluation of the work from the point of view of its purely formal or social merits and faults.

For the Marxist critic such a distinction loses nearly all its validity. Although criticism in the strict sense of the word must of necessity be a part of a Marxist's critical work, sociological analysis must be an even more essential fundamental element.9

Thus the distinction between historian and critic becomes blurred; in Marxist criticism their tasks become essentially one and the same—sociological analysis.

Content thus becomes the object of analysis, because in art content determines sociological connections. Lunacharsky identifies it as "the decisive element of the work as a whole," and defines it as "the flow of thoughts and emotions in the form of images or connected with images." Form follows content, since for each given content there is just one best form:

Thus the Marxist critic takes first of all as the object of his analysis the content of the work, the social essence which it embodies. He determines its connection with this or that social group and the influence which the impact of the work can have on social life; and then he turns to the form, primarily from the point of view of explaining how this form fulfills its aims, that is, serves to make the work as expressive and convincing as possible.11
This does not mean that the analyst ignores the form, for other elements in addition to content—certain class and social phenomena—help, in a subsidiary manner, determine the form of a given work. However, these elements affect the form, though, they too should be socially interpreted.

It is not enough in Marxist criticism for a critic to apply the methods of Marxist analysis and to establish and analyze the facts; he must also objectively evaluate those facts. This entails the more traditional role of the critic, plus one very crucial to Marxist criticism—that of the influential evaluator, one who espouses the goals and ideals of a Marxist society. But what are the criteria for such an evaluation? From the point of view of content, according to Lunacharsky, the basic criterion is based on proletarian ethics: "everything that aids the development and victory of the proletariat is good; everything that harms it is evil." Specifically, "The Marxist critic must try to find the fundamental social trend in a given work; he must find out where it is heading, whether this process is arbitrary or not. And he must base his evaluation on this fundamental, social and dynamic idea." For this the critic needs a sensitivity to social issues and knowledge of opposing views, which, if they do not lead to significant conclusions, can at least add to our knowledge.

After content comes form. What, then, are the Marxist criteria for the evaluation of form? The form must derive from the content and correspond to it as closely as possible, thereby ensuring its expressiveness and effectiveness. The most important formal criterion is
that literature is the art of images and every invasion of naked ideas or propaganda is always detrimental to the given work. . . .
The critic has every right to speak about the inadequacy of the literary digestion of the content by the author if this content, instead of flowing freely in the work of art in images of brilliant molten metal, sticks out of this stream in large cold [propagandistic] lumps.\textsuperscript{14}

This criterion, then, supports imagery and eliminates propaganda as an effective formal consideration. However, Marxists are selective in their determination of what constitutes "propaganda." The notion of "imagery" takes on a special significance in music, as will be shown.

The second criterion for the analysis of form as defined by Lunacharsky concerns the originality of the form. The form must be new each time, since each genuine work of art should contain new content, and form, being indivisible with its content, should also be new. This genuine originality of form lies somewhere between overly-familiar, stereotypical forms and overly inventive and ornamented forms, which attempt to compensate for content devoid of meaning. Thus any work of art in which the form is too familiar, too enfeebled, or too overpowering may be judged inadequate by this criterion.

The third criterion concerns the "universality" of a work of art, which, Lunacharsky stresses, must be approached and treated with great care. An artist must take a medium course between over-specialization and over-simplication; such a path ensures that both the specialist and the average reader or listener would benefit from his output. Even so, Lunacharsky still sees merit in works addressed to a small elite:

One should not deny the value of works which are not sufficiently intelligible for every literate person, which are addressed to the upper stratum of the proletariat, to the sophisticated Party members, to the reader who has attained a considerable level of
culture. Life presents many burning problems to this part of the population which plays an immensely important role in the construction of socialism; and of course these problems should not be left without an artistic answer simply because they have not yet faced the vast masses or because they cannot yet be worked out in universal form. 15

This attitude provides a way out for the Marxist analyst who still wants to pursue sophisticated research.

A Marxist critic, Lunacharsky asserts, must also be a teacher, in relation both to the writer and to the reader. For the writer, the critic must be a strict Marxist and a cultured, learned person with impeccable taste, capable of learning from many sources, including from the artists he criticizes. He must point out the formal faults in their work, and draw attention to any flaws in social attitudes, and in their understanding of social life, of the epoch, etc. As for the reader, the Marxist critic must guide the reader's consumption of artistic materials and teach him to read selectively:

The critic as a commentator, as the person who warns of poison which may taste sweet, as the person who cracks a hard shell to reveal the pearl inside, as the person who discovers the treasure buried in the shadows, as the person who dots all the i's, who makes generalisations on the basis of artistic material—this is the guide who is essential now, at a time when so many valuable but as yet inexperienced readers have appeared. 16

Marxist critics/analysts, then, need never lack for direction and purpose when conducting their work. Analysts are now not only critics, but also publicists, propagandists, teachers, commentators, guides, and historians. They are less concerned with the intrinsic value of a work than they are with its content and its value for society. They must evaluate and interpret works according to Marxist principles and criteria, which dictate the manner and method of their evaluations.
V. M. Gorodinsky on Socialist Realism. Lunacharsky's "theses" apply equally well to music and its "critics" (which given his definition would include both musicologists and theorists as well as critics) as they do to literature. Indeed, of all the other arts, music is considered the one most closely related to literature, and therefore what applies to literature applies also to music. This includes both Socialist Realism and the related approach of Marxist criticism, as Viktor Markovich Gorodinsky, a musician who from 1929 to 1934 was the chairman of the Moscow regional committee of the Professional Association of the Workers of the Arts, asserts in his 1933 article, "K voprosu o sotsialisticheskom realisme v muzyke" [On the question of socialist realism in music]. He places the problem of Socialist Realism in music right after literature and theater.

Essentially this question [of Socialist Realism] is about creative self-determination, a question about style, direction, and, what is particularly important, about the basic tendency of the development of the Soviet musical art. . . . The special nature of music does not lose its connection with the social economic base of ideology. Music is an art, being developed by the same laws as all the other arts. The presence of a distinctive quality in its development does not eliminate, but emphasizes the universality of the regularities both for music and for all the other arts. . . . The decision of [the Communist Party] on April 23, 1932, having awakened theoretical and creative thought in art with new strength, served as a powerful stimulus to the further working out and study of the art-study legacy of Marx-Engels-Lenin . . . The requirement of an unconditional realistic quality, of the truthfulness of artistic reflection, is the basic pivotal expression of Marx-Engels and Lenin on the question of art. . . . Music, in all such cases when it rose to the realization of its social function, always turned to literature, as to the source guiding, directing its thought.18

In his article, Gorodinsky explores several approaches to the problem of Socialist Realism in music in an attempt to discover its
true basis in music. He rejects Musorgsky's realism, which is derived
from the aesthetic views of the Russian writer and philosopher
Chernyshevsky, as "unarguably tendentious." Returning to his contem-
poraries, he concludes that the current theory of "sound image"—
advanced by the proletarians—is insufficient to serve as the basis for
Socialist Realism in music. The RAPM theorist Yuri Keldysh had defined
a musical work as "an expression of ideas by means of the correlation
and dynamics of sound images." Gorodinsky does not reject the notion
that music as an art is thought in images, but he does reject it as a
foundation for musical Socialist Realism, since this idea does not go
far enough in explaining the nature and origin of the "image."

Gorodinsky turns next to the question of the means of expression
in Socialist Realism. Emphasizing that Socialist Realism is not a
"prepared standard form of musical creation," he points out the "inex-
haustible riches" of the folk music of the 180 nationalities in the
Soviet Union. Thus, although the form of Socialist Realism may not
be ready-made, its expressive means are.

The crux of Gorodinsky's rather wide-ranging and rambling discus-
sion comes when he recognizes Asafiev and his law of intonation, the
significance of which Gorodinsky calls "immeasurable," as giving "the
key to the solution of the question about the realistic language of
music. For the question about realism in music is above all the ques-
tion about musical expression, about language." He quotes from
Asafiev's forward to Kurth's Grundlagen des linearen Kontrapunkts,
which Asafiev translated and published in 1931:
Music as a whole is an intonational language and therefore the real connection between, say, two tones already is an intonational essence, a form, appearing in a formation, in an essential intoning. Thanks to this, in our consciousness is imprinted not two separate points and a quantitative relationship (the distance, the interval) between them, but a sound-unit of a certain degree of tension. Of what degree is this tension? It depends on the relative position of the given intonation in the general intonational system of a concrete historical epoch. In its turn this general system of sound relations appears as a sphere of intonations, conditioned . . . by the structural given of the social formation. The intonational system becomes one of the functions of social consciousness.23

In other words, Gorodinsky adds, intonation is a function that develops historically; "the process of intonational formation [depends] on its social historical factors." This explains why music from past epochs (Gorodinsky uses the ancient Greeks as an example) is no longer of artistic interest to us. (Scholarly interest is another matter, as is the artistic interest in other arts, which may continue to delight us.)

He explains:

Having appeared as one of the functions of a given social formation, each intonational unit represents an expressive unit and remains as such until a different social formation finds a different sound combination answering more to its needs. The previous [unit] dies, and becomes rigid; the quantitative givens in it remain unchanged, but as a quality, as an intonation (what makes "a melodic curve" not a sum of motives, and a motive "not a sum of separate tones), it already expresses nothing and excites no one and inspires no one."25

This is, of course, Gorodinsky's interpretation of Asafiev's theories of "intonational crises" and "intonational vocabularies." Music relates to its epoch, as a function of and as an expressive means of that epoch alone. For Gorodinsky the theory of intonation addresses a very important aspect of realistic music—its social and historical foundations and contexts, which are revealed through analyses of content. He
touches on the question of content in discussing whether realistic music should be programmatic or nonprogrammatic:

A realistic musical work **always** should be programmatic. . . . Socialist realism in music is truthfulness and sincerity of musical expression. But truthfulness of expression is applicable only to a definite concrete idea, to the phenomenon of the theme. Here also arises the basic question in the creation of the method of socialist realism in music. This is the question about the content of a musical work. Realistic music may be nonprogrammatic, but it must not be deprived of content. Otherwise a musical work is turned into a shallow game with musical formulas and methods. Does socialist realism limit the content of music to definite themes? No. But the approach to a theme must be strictly defined. The working out of his particular musical speech is the task of every Soviet composer. We also appear here as zealous and consistent enemies of any depersonalization in creativity. A copier, deprived of creative individuality, is not an artist and is not a realist. This to us seems indisputable.

A true artist always is inclined towards realism, because falsity and insincerity disgust any true artist and also because a true master of music knows perfectly how to use his art; he derives a maximum of the means of expressiveness for creative ideas. In music there are no indifferent elements. Rhythm, melody, harmonic constructions, modal basis, timbre—nothing here is indifferent.26

Socialist Realism in music, "truthfulness and sincerity of musical expression . . . applicable to a definite concrete idea," thus limits not so much the theme or idea itself expressed in the music as it limits the means of expression. "Depersonalization in creativity," which undoubtedly refers to atonality, dodecaphony and the like, which are impersonal and unrealistic means of expression—according to realistic aesthetics—are forbidden. This view essentially coincides with Asafiev's analysis of realism in music, as expressed in volume two of Musical Form as a Process (see Part VI).

The ideas of intonation, Socialist Realism, content, and imagery are thus linked together within the broader scope of socialist aesthe-
tics, but each one signifies something different, ranging from the more abstract--Socialist Realism--to the more concrete--intonation. Imagery and content are somewhere in between. However, these comparisons are only relative; total abstractions are not allowed. A Marxist music theorist can no longer write about the elements of music in an abstract, purely theoretical fashion, and ignore the sociological, historical, philosophical, or even economic reflections within those elements--their intonations. Nor can the content itself be discussed abstractly, by itself or in images. The idea of intonation provides to Soviet theorists the opportunity to express musical content--according to the tenets of Socialist Realism--in more concrete terms, in the expressive units of intonations.

Gorodinsky concludes with a propagandistic, overwhelmingly optimistic statement typical of Marxist writers:

Using all the means and possibilities of our art, we, Soviet musicians, penetrated with the spirit and ideas of the working class, with the methods of socialist realism, may create the highest models of musical creation, reflecting the huge scope and pathos of socialist construction. We can--and consequently must.27

The government's imposition of the philosophy of Socialist Realism on all of the arts therefore had a strong impact not only on music composition, but also on the research fields of musicology and theory. Exactly how that philosophy was implemented varied from theorist to theorist. In examining the major developments during the 1930s, the segments in the remainder of this chapter will, as an important byproduct of their main purpose, illustrate those variances.
A Marxist History of Theory. At the conservatories, theorists began to develop new courses that combined Marxist philosophy with certain elements of their Russian theoretical legacy. Particularly among the young Soviet theorists in Moscow, the transition towards a Marxist musicology became a high priority. (In Leningrad, Asafie was already well along this path.) They felt keenly the need to establish both a historical foundation and a basic contemporary approach for a Marxist music theory; and they thus concentrated their efforts on the history of theory, analysis, and harmony.

An important precipitating event in the history of theory was the publication in the Soviet Union in 1931 of a Russian translation of Lucien Chevaillier's "Les Theories Harmoniques" from volume II, part 2, of Lavignac and de la Laurencie's Encyclopédie de la Musique et Dictionnaire du Conservatoire, originally published in Paris in 1925. The translation was titled, Istoriia uchenii o gamonii, or The History of the Study of Harmony. Chevaillier divides the history of harmonic theory into five parts—"Harmony before Rameau," "Rameau," "Rameau and the Eighteenth Century," "Harmony in the First Half of the Nineteenth Century," and "Harmony in the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century."

Because Chevaillier's interpretation of the history of harmonic theory relied on Western philosophy and harmonic theory, it did not sit well with the Moscow theorists, who decided to write their own version of this history. Their purpose was essentially twofold: to provide an interpretation of the history of theory—in general, not just of harmonic theory—according to the basic tenets of Marxist-Leninist thought,
and to update this history to include the works of Russian and Soviet theorists, which Chevallier, of course, had not included, with the exception of a brief mention of Rimsky-Korsakov. The reinterpretation of this history was important to the Soviets because, as we have seen, Russian and Soviet theory shares a common origin with Western theory. For the Soviets, theory began specifically with the works of Rameau. For the establishment of a Marxist music theory, the Marxist interpretation of this shared theoretical background and the historical justification of current Soviet theory was essential.

The first published Soviet reaction to Chevallier's history came in a review of the Russian translation by the Soviet theorist Iosif Yakovlevich Ryzhkin in the periodical Proletarian Musician in August 30 1931. In his article, Ryzhkin goes beyond a simple review of Chevallier's work to a statement and an evaluation of the main schools of theory according to Marxist-Leninist thought. His arguments are essentially the same as those he later expounds in a subsequent version of this history, but are more strongly anti-Western ideologically, an approach that matches the outlook of the powerful polemic proletarian group, RAPM, the Russian Association of Proletarian Musicians, which published the periodical where his article appeared.

Ryzhkin summarizes the necessity for the reevaluation of the history of theory:

The bourgeois legacy, and in some respects the feudal legacy (Fux's study of the strict style, for example), in the sphere of theoretical musicology is by no means rich, but it is still necessary to turn it upside down and review it critically. In the process of research we should understand from where each system arose and where it is going, in order to discover its sociological
equivalent. By understanding the historical development of theory, we will comprehend its contemporary state.31

Although Ryzhkin acknowledges that Chevallier provided interesting and valuable material, in his view Chevallier's own approach to this material was too arbitrary and formalistic--arbitrary in his classifications of various lines and schools of theory, and formalistic in its almost complete avoidance of the historical process of musical practice. Regarding the latter, Ryzhkin openly admits that one cannot "expect from a bourgeois musicologist, venerated by the authorities of the traditional school, that he examine the theory of music in an indissoluble connection with the practical experience of the class struggle."32 But, he laments, "Chevallier tears away the theory of music and its development even from the musical-historical process itself. . . . The author did not master the material, but the material subordinated the author."33 However, in light of Marxist research, according to Ryzhkin, the material presented by Chevallier raises a host of interesting problems—questions about the connection of musicology with the materialistic philosophy of the progressive and revolutionary bourgeoisie in the eighteenth century, about the reactionary turning point in the first half of the nineteenth century that led to the hegemony of the traditional school, and about the interrelationships of later studies of harmony with the traditional school and with classical theory of the eighteenth century.

Although Ryzhkin discusses these questions concisely in his review, they are covered much more fully and interestingly in the two-volume study of music theory that Ryzhkin wrote together with his
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Conservatory colleague, Lev Abramovich Mazel, entitled, _Ocherki po istorii teoreticheskogo muzykoznaniya_ [Essays on the history of theoretical musicology]. The questions Ryzhkin raises in his review essentially define the content of his contribution to this work. The first volume (1934), which covers theory through the nineteenth century, contains three essays, each focusing on one school of theory—"Klassicheskaia teoriia" [Classical theory (J. P. Rameau)] and "Traditsionnaia shkola" [The Traditional School], both by Ryzhkin, and "Funktional'naia shkola (G. Rimann)" [The Functional School (H. Riemann)] by Mazel. Volume 2 (1939), which focuses on twentieth-century theory, contains a more individual approach to theory, with essays devoted to the Swiss theorist Ernst Kurth by Mazel, and to the Soviet theorists Nikolai Alexandrovich Garbuzov and Boleslav Leopoldovich Yavorsky, both by Ryzhkin, as well as an introductory essay by Mazel, "Obshii obzor teoreticheskogo muzykoznaniia posle Rimana" [A General Survey of Theoretical Musicology After Riemann], which covers contributions by Catoire and Conus, among others.

As the authors state in their preface, this work differs from analogous Western works in that the essays attempt "to examine the history of the theory of music not as an immanent process, but in connection with the general historical process, particularly in connection with corresponding socially-conditioned artistic, scientific and philosophical directions." This, of course, agrees with the Marxist approach to history. A secondary goal for the authors was to provide a textbook for the course in the history of music theory they were giving
at the Conservatory. This course was given initially during the academic year 1931-32, by Mazel; Ryzhkin gave the course the following year, 1932-33. It is probably safe to assume, though, that regarding these essays the authors received much advice from their other colleagues. Not only did Ryzhkin read the essays from the first volume before members of the State Academy of the Arts in 1932 and 1933, but he also published them first in Soviet Music in 1933 and 1934 in rather different form than they appear in the book. Mazel also published early versions of his articles on the functional school and on Kurth; this latter article contains many of the ideas that subsequently appeared in his article on the later impact of the functional school.

As a preface to the following discussion, a brief review of some of the principles of dialectical materialism should be useful: the world is material and is made up of what current science would describe as matter-energy; the material world forms an interconnected whole; man's knowledge is derived from objectively existing matter; the dialectical development of human knowledge is socially acquired in the course of practical activity; the world is constantly changing and thus there are no truly static entities in the world; the changes in matter occur in accordance with certain over-all regularities or laws; the motion present in the world is explained by internal factors, and therefore no external mover is needed.

Classical Theory: Rameau. In his essay on classical theory, which focuses almost exclusively on Rameau, Ryzhkin investigates Rameau's
theoretical ideas both in light of the subsequent development of theoretical thought and in light of the political, scientific, philosophical, and general musical climate of the eighteenth century. Rameau, in Ryzhkin's words, is "unconditionally the most prominent figure of bourgeois theoretical musicology." He reflects the "dual and contradictory position" of the bourgeoisie, which he represented, at a time when it was still being influenced by the aesthetics of the nobility but also was taking an independent path in the realm of art. In Ryzhkin's interpretation, all of Rameau's theories are penetrated by two tendencies that are connected but that lead in different directions—either to an "idealistic rationalism," or to "materialism of a metaphysical understanding." Not surprisingly, Ryzhkin dwells on the latter direction at the expense of the former.

Thus he begins his discussion of Rameau's contributions to theory with the latter's acoustical research, in which "Rameau raises the physical—mathematical characteristics of the material (sound) to the essence of music." But more importantly he sees Rameau's basic importance to the development of music theory in that he was the first "to join into a single whole [all of] the harmonic phenomena described by his predecessors as isolated, unconnected cases." He also was the first to attempt "to establish cause-and-effect relations in musical works." He provides evidence of these achievements in his discussions of Rameau's origin of the major triad; his theory of inversions; his theory of fundamental bass; his views of tonic, dominant and sub-dominant; the seventh chord and its construction; his views of disso-
nance and harmonic motion; and his definition of mode.

According to Ryzhkin, Rameau developed his theories in accordance with the practical musical experiences of his day. For example, as particular evidence for Rameau's explanation of the tonic-dominant relation, that tonic potentially includes in itself the dominant, Ryzhkin points to Rameau's instrumental works, specifically the *Pieces de clavecin en concerts* and *5 Concerts* (1741). These works are more representative of the early bourgeois classicism of the Italian instrumentalists rather than those of the aristocratic French clavecinists such as Couperin who preceded Rameau. The difference between these two groups lies in the formative significance of the dominant sphere in the early Italian sonata form, its opposite position to the sphere of tonic as a compositional principle:

The aspiration to the dominant never played in [the French clavecinists] the significance of a magnetic arrow, pointing the path to the north, as in the classical composers. And it is because the clavecinists did not aspire to the organic development of the whole, being satisfied with some mechanical juxtaposition of separate parts. . . . They avoided the Italian sonata, which unfolds in a single movement with an incomparably higher level of cause-effect interrelations.45

Thus in Rameau and in the Italian classicists, the basic tendency is "the overcoming of the metaphysical nonconnectedness of the parts of the whole."46 And Rameau's view of the relation between tonic and dominant was based on the practice of early classicism.

In his explanation of Rameau's theory, Ryzhkin touches on three aspects of Marxist musicology: 1) the progressive historical aspect, that is, Rameau's tendency away from the so-called "aristocratic"
French clavecinists towards the bourgeois classical ideal; 2) the practical aspect, that is, the interconnection between theory and practice, that the latter precedes but also is based on the former (at different historical levels), and that Rameau followed this procedure; and 3) the unified formal aspect, that is, the development away from an unconnected string of movements and the equal treatment of tonalities (the dominant included) in the French rondo, towards a more unified, constructive form in the Italian sonata. These three aspects—the progressive historical, the practical, and the formally unified—are all important elements in Ryzhkin's Marxist analysis and justification of Rameau's prominent position in the history of theory.

Another important invocation of Marxist materialistic philosophy occurs in Ryzhkin's discussion of Rameau's understanding of dissonance and its role in harmonic motion. The significance of the dissonance is that it compels the selection of a definite progression; it causes harmonic motion, as in the progression V—I, in which the seventh in the dominant chord is the dissonance. As Ryzhkin explains it, "The dissonance for Rameau is not only a means of the definition of the direction of harmonic motion, but also the means of the creation of this motion. The dissonance is as an expiditer—from cadence (rest) to cadence, by means of the breaking of rest, leading again to it."

Ryzhkin then connects Rameau's understanding of harmonic motion with Cartesian and Newtonian philosophy, both of which interpret the source of motion as originating from without. But materialism understands motion as immanently inherent to the material world, i.e., motion is
not introduced to matter from without, but exists within it. Matter is brought into motion only by itself, and the state of being at rest is simply a partial case of motion. Rameau, then, in Ryzhkin's view, "did not rise to this [materialistic] point of view. For him motion is considered as something more powerful to be introduced from the side: 'Now, when harmony is already well-known, it remains only to endow it with motion." Thus in this important Marxist aspect Ryzhkin found Rameau's theoretical approach to be insufficient.

Ryzhkin places Rameau close to the more advanced ideas of his time, to the progressive and advanced world-view of humanity held by the French bourgeoisie in the early eighteenth century. In this sense Rameau, more than some of the bourgeois theorists succeeding him such as Riemann, "stood on a level of culture contemporary to him." Ryzhkin asserts that regardless of their philosophies, all ideologies of the eighteenth century agree on two basic approaches—the establishment of general regulatory laws and the clarification of cause and effect connections. These traits are characteristic both for Rameau's theoretical activity and for eighteenth-century French ideology in general. But Rameau's idealist views overcame the "inconsistent" materialist foundation of his theory:

So Rameau comes to the sole initial principle of harmony—to the phenomenon of a unified sounding body. But that he makes acoustical phenomena as the initial point of his theory is unremarkable; in this the materialistic direction of his method was manifested; however an inconsistent materialism (but only dialectical materialism appears solely as consistent) in the biophysical sphere always is supplanted with idealistic views in the social sphere. From this initial point he constructs his system . . . 50
Ryzhkin enumerates Rameau's achievements in theory—the chord, inversions, tuning, mode, fundamental bass, and cadences—and summarizes Rameau's significance for contemporary theory:

Classical theory, now not having any practical significance in the pedagogical sphere, turns out to have a deep influence (not always recognized) on theoretical thought in very recent times. Many ideas, appearing as new in the traditional school, functional theory and in the most recent theoretical systems, were already noted, and sometimes also clearly formulated in classical theory. Turning to Rameau and to theorists contemporary to him, we thus turn to the original source; from him derived all the figures of bourgeois theoretical musicology. Soviet theoretical thought also must not pass him by.51

Thus, Ryzhkin's view of Rameau portrays him as an incipient Marxist who joined together previously unrelated phenomena into a single whole and who searched for general laws and cause and effect relations, an "inconsistent" materialist who based his theory on matter (acoustics) but who failed to apply materialist principles (immanent motion), and a budding realist, a progressive but bourgeois figure who was sensitive to the musical practices and philosophies of his day and applied them in his theories. Yet this by no means constitutes Ryzhkin's complete portrait of Rameau as theorist; I have selected only those aspects that best illustrate Ryzhkin's Marxist interpretation of Rameau's theories. But even though he appreciates Rameau's contributions to music theory, because of the latter's seeming lack of commitment to materialist and realist principles, Ryzhkin is not able to grant him the same level of prominence in Soviet theory as in Western theory. Ryzhkin's "retrospective" criticism of Rameau according to philosophies he never publicly embraced seems unfair, when according to other, more relevant approaches—rationalism, for example—his theory
appears more consistent. Ryzhkin's attempts to align Rameau with the more "progressive"—i.e., anti-aristocratic—elements of early eighteenth-century music and society and to make him appear as nothing more than a vehicle for eighteenth-century practices and views—reflecting the reality of his time—diminishes Rameau's unique contributions in both composition and theory.

The Traditional School. Ryzhkin's second article is devoted to the traditional school, which flourished during the first half of the nineteenth century. He divides his discussion into four general categories—the origins of this school, its development in Germany, its manifestation in Russia, and what he calls the "anti-authoritarian direction" in France, which lay down the preconditions for the functional school that followed.

In his view the traditional school is the "offspring" of the Paris Conservatory, established in 1795. He begins with Catel's Traité d'harmonie, written in 1802 and accepted as the basic harmony textbook for the Conservatory. Ryzhkin criticizes Catel's empiricism, his overdependence on the natural major scale as the basis for all constructions, and his theory of alterations, which the traditional school interpreted negatively, using it as a justification for turning any complex combination into a diatonic chord. In short order he dispenses with the subsequent works of Anton Reicha, Augustin Savard, and Alexandre Choron. Although he recognizes Reicha's greater connection with classical theory than Catel's and his attention to the study of
musical form, he nevertheless criticizes Reicha for separating instrumental forms from vocal ones, an approach to form subsequently adopted by the traditional school. He criticizes Choron for depending on empirical rules at the expense of scientific and auditory approaches.

Ryzhkin thus finds little praiseworthy in this direction of theoretical thought, and characterizes it as academic. This academism "expressed in the musical sphere the ideological precepts of the prominent bourgeoisie," and was "the direct continuance" of "the advanced bourgeois classicism of the eighteenth century." Ryzhkin writes:

If musical academism was the artistic justification and the assertion of the existing social order, then we may say that the traditional school was the justification and the assertion of academism both in the selection of the musical material, and also in the interpretation of its regulatory laws, elevated to unquestionable dogma. And the halo, preserved to this time around the work of Catel, is based not on its notable characteristics, but more on the timeliness of its appearance, with the role that it played in the assertion of the traditional school.

From the Germanic line of development of this theoretical current, Ryzhkin elects to discuss the works of Gottfried Weber, Adolf Bernhard Marx, Ernst Friedrich Edward Richter, and Ludwig Bussler, all theorists whose works, as we have seen (Parts III and IV), were known in Russia, either indirectly (Weber/Fuchs) or through translation (the others). None of the works of the French theorists discussed was translated into Russian. Ryzhkin stresses that the development of the traditional school in Germany, as in France, was narrowly interwoven with the development of professional music education. However, unlike France, Germany had no conservatories until 1843 in Leipzig and 1850 in Berlin. But, he points out, "In France the traditional school was created
within the walls of the conservatory; in Germany the representatives of the traditional school with other musicians exerted no little effort in order to create these conservatory walls." In other words, the same attitudes towards music theory and education prevailed within these "imaginary" walls as within the real walls. And when the German conservatories were founded, in a decade "critical for the social role of the bourgeoisie [the 1840s, that is], . . . [they] were created in an atmosphere of social enthusiasm and hope towards the realization of liberal ideas and views." But the shift that occurred in German social life after 1848 caused the conservatories to become "a breeding-ground of conservative academism." So the traditional approach continued to flourish in Germany.

Ryzhkin cites A. B. Marx as representing the "progressive stream" in the traditional school. Is it merely coincidental that the four volumes of his Die Lehre von der musikalischen Komposition were published in the years 1837-1847, during the time of "social enthusiasm" preceding the revolution of 1848? Ryzhkin apparently thinks not. This stream contains what he calls "an elemental materialistic tendency," embodied in A. B. Marx's statements "about verification with experience, as about the general verification of the correlations of causes and effects, actions and reactions," and in his aspiration "to uncover a musical work as a specific expression of the 'full human'—his feelings and aspirations, and not as a 'formal creation,' not having anything to express." These views, as well as Marx's insistence on the necessity of the historical examination of art and his attacks against
formalism, which, in Ryzhkin's words, "profess a dogma of 'timeless,' 'pure' art," naturally endear him to the twentieth-century followers of that other Marx, Karl. A. B. Marx also treated the various aspects of music theory—harmony, polyphony, form, etc.—as just different elements of the single study of composition, an approach favored by Soviet theorists of the 1930s and later. According to Ryzhkin, "The strict division and the detailed working out of the separate theoretical disciplines occurs in the 'conservatory' [post-1848] period of the German traditional school." Regarding this development, Ryzhkin points to the works of Richter, who beginning in the 1850s wrote textbooks specifically for the Leipzig Conservatory on harmony, counterpoint, and fugue, the first two of which were translated into Russian.

Besides Richter, another typical representative of the traditional school in this regard is Ludwig Bussler, who also wrote textbooks on harmony, counterpoint, and form, most of which were translated into Russian. His counterpoint book is based on the system of Fux, an approach characteristic for the entire traditional school. Also characteristic for the traditional school is the "canonization" of the seven-degree scale as a certain model of harmonic and melodic progressions. Comparing Bussler's scalar harmonization with Rameau's, which differs from Bussler's not in result but in purpose and method, Ryzhkin states, "Such outer continuity attached to a fundamental change in the essence of the matter is typical for the relation of the traditional school to classical theory." In quoting Bussler, Ryzhkin points out how he and the other traditionalists isolated and separated "the rules
of the theory of composition" from both "the laws of art" and the "science of music."

Thus from the traditional school in both France and Germany the only theorist to whom Ryzhkin accords any value is A. B. Marx, whose approach in his theory book coincides with certain Marxist approaches—his views on aesthetics and expressiveness in music, on the role of historical analysis, on anti-formalism, on causal and experiential verification (materialism), and on the comprehensive approach to theory. That Marx published his work at a time of political unrest and "progressiveness" in Germany may also have been a contributing factor to Ryzhkin's favorable interpretation.

In Russia the traditional school consists of the harmony textbooks of Chaikovsky and Rimsky-Korsakov, which formed two streams, or, more appropriately, two nuances, in nineteenth-century Russian theory, and the works by the followers of these two great composers in the field of harmony pedagogy. Ryzhkin criticizes them not only for their antihistorical approach, but also for their dogmatism. In his view, Chaikovsky was worse in this regard than Rimsky-Korsakov. His reliance on the student's intuition and instinct represents, according to Ryzkhkin, "the nobleman's aesthetic, maintaining "inspiration" as a means of the comprehension of the 'eternal beauty' in creation and—unavoidably—the impure elements of dilettantism in education." Rimsky-Korsakov's more strictly expressed limitations resulted not so much from a dogmatic approach to theory as from a more systematic approach to teaching. Chaikovsky focused "on talent and instinct,"
Rimsky-Korsakov "on talent and experience." Ryzhkin examines further the different approaches of the two composers to the questions of major and minor modes, modulation, and the relatedness of the three major triads. Regarding the modes, he points out that Rimsky-Korsakov treated major and minor as equal modes, a view advanced for his time which approached the understanding of Georgy Catoire's major-minor mode in his 1926 harmony treatise. Regarding the three major triads, their connection and relation, Ryzhkin perceives on the part of both theorists a precursor of functional theory. Citing Chaikovsky's observation that the inner connection of the three major triads of the major mode reflect the relatedness of the three modes lying adjacent in the circle of fifths, Ryzhkin asserts, "From here to the establishment by the functional school of the relation of subdominant-tonic-dominant between the three modes pointed out (for example, F, C, G) is one step." Rimsky-Korsakov's initial limitation of the student to the three major triads and his explanations regarding the connections and relations between chords form, according to Ryzhkin, "a rather strict system of 'secret functionality,'" the latter a definition of the Soviet theorist Viktor Tsukkerman.

Ryzhkin singles out two traits of Rimsky-Korsakov's theoretical views that characterize and distinguish them from those of Chaikovsky. The first is Rimsky-Korsakov's tendency to explain certain phenomena, to reveal their regulatory laws and to classify them rationally, as in his approach to chords. The second is his "concern about pedagogical expediency, which forms a colorful thread through all Rimsky-Korsakov's
activities in the conservatory." In this regard he had high hopes for the role of the conservatory as a center of musical culture in "the backwards manorial bureaucratic Russia" of his time, but instead the conservatories became formalistic and routine. Ryzhkin's comparisons between the theoretical approaches of Rimsky-Korsakov and Chaikovsky inevitably favor the former, since his approach comes closer to Marxist materialistic principles than does Chaikovsky's.

Of the nineteenth-century followers of Chaikovsky and Rimsky-Korsakov, Ryzhkin mentions only Arensky, who in his works on harmony and form took formalism, routine, and dogmatism to new heights, in Ryzhkin's view. For Ryzhkin, Arensky's theoretical works and his compositions reflect graphically the Russian musical culture of the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Ryzhkin labels the work of Arensky and others, "a style without 'style'," which exhibits "a lack of a clearly expressed creative line, a lack of a struggle for this line, eclecticism and a readiness to all sorts of artistic compromises, [and] the depletion of content attached to a lack of outstanding formal achievements." Lacking any clear differentiation in later theory, then, says Ryzhkin, the two nuances in traditional Russian theory were eventually drawn together. This is true; few distinctions between the two approaches were made in late nineteenth century pedagogical theory. Ryzhkin's negative assessment of Arensky's works—along with those of most other theorists from this period, for they all followed the same pattern—is also verifiable to the extent that they were repetitive, unoriginal, and frequently lacked clear methods or purpose.
Last but certainly not least in his discussion of the traditional school, Ryzhkin investigates what he calls "the anti-authoritarian direction in France," which established the preconditions for the functional school that followed. He places in this group F. Biusse, Gilles-Louis Chretien, Jerome-Joseph de Momigny, and Abramo Basevi. From the ideas of these theorists, Ryzhkin indicates not only those that suggest further developments in the functional school, but also those that preview ideas of the Soviet theorists Nikolai Garbuzov, Boleslav Yavorsky, and Georgy Catoire. He has done this throughout both articles, but here his efforts become more pronounced, as he inches closer chronologically and theoretically to the Soviet era.

Ryzhkin discusses briefly Biusse's acceptance of the augmented triad as "maximal," Chretien's emphasis on melody and his idea of "mixed melody" based on a triadic mixture—prefiguring here the major-minor mode of Catoire and the chain mode of Yavorsky—Momigny's emphasis on the semantic significance of harmonic configurations, and Basevi's ideas about the relation of the "imaginary-tonal" triads (the subdominant and the dominant) to the truly tonal triad (tonic), about the gravitating tendency of certain tones, and about inner-tonal deviations. All of these theories prefigure in some respect certain elements in the differing theories of Garbuzov, Catoire, or Yavorsky. He points particularly to the idea of tonal gravitation or attraction between neighboring tones, discussed by several of the theorists in this direction, and to the idea of musical equilibrium, both developed by Yavorsky, as musical applications of the universal laws of gravity.
and equilibrium. This tendency of theorists to search outside music in the related spheres of the natural sciences for answers to questions concerning musical phenomena was a conscious effort typical for this era, the late nineteenth century. Ryzhkin describes this circumstance as the "intervention," "invasion," even, of the sciences into related spheres such as musicology. This invasion brought into musicology not only methods and materials from the natural sciences, but also the scholars themselves, such as Helmholtz. And it was in this atmosphere that the functional school was formed, Ryzhkin says.

The functionalists described the traditional school as being descriptive but not explanatory, and nonattentive to the compositional achievements of the pre-Bach and post-Beethoven eras. But they did not ignore the traditionalists' achievements in theory. As Ryzhkin puts it, the functional school "did not destroy the building of the traditional school; it just provided a more solid foundation and new floors above." For example, in the sphere of musical form, the functional school sought to overcome the traditional approach to form, in which the rules or patterns of a musical work were "isolated, static givens, coexisting in the work but not the interacting sides of a unified whole." Ryzhkin relates the functionalists' efforts in this regard to positivism, which, though remaining within the limits of metaphysical idealism, opposed the static view towards things. Even so, the views of classical German idealism, by way of imitative neo-Kantians mixed with positivistic views, still exerted some influence on the functional school, namely in the apriority of form. And despite his
criticisms of the fragmentation resulting from the traditionalists' approach to form, Ryzhkin considers the development of the study of form itself one of the merits of the traditional school. The end result, though, was a schematic knowledge of form, which came from the processes of description and classification; however, at the very least, this approach reflected the actual position of things and was not a distortion of reality. When Ryzhkin compares the traditional school with more recent Soviet theoretical systems in the sphere of form, such as metrotechtonicism and modal rhythm, he finds the latter systems frequently deficient. In his words, they "distort truly existing relations in the name of idealistic speculation." In the sphere of harmony, the traditionalists' achievements, according to Ryzhkin, may be found in the nomenclature of chords, the study of figuration, the related nature of tonalities, and the harmonic nature of polyphony.

Ryzhkin finds elements of the traditional school still at work in the theory of his day: "It is most easy of all to hide the traditional school, not placing before itself the problem of scientific order (as in metrotechtonicism, for example), not searching for the content of musical works (as in modal rhythm, for example), behind the concealment of pure 'technology.'" He asks, "Where are the battles with formalism on the musical front?" Acknowledging that the battle is over regarding the area of music history, he sees battles in music theory still looming large before Soviet music theorists, primarily in the area of form and content, in prevailing views of the immanent laws of art, independent of any content. This approach led to ideas about
"neutral formation" and about "pure technology," which Ryzhkin calls "the last citadel of formalism." Thus, the basic negative significance of the traditional school, as a formalistic system, is still alive, "thanks to our insufficient ability to oppose to it a true Marxist-Leninist theoretical musicology." Ryzhkin summarizes the historical development of the traditional school:

Its conservativism, and even at times its truly reactionary tendencies, were defined not only during the last quarter of the nineteenth century, when the more advanced functional theory was formulated, but were present in it from its very first steps. The bourgeoisie, preserving still a progressive social significance, gradually loses in the first half of the nineteenth century its revolutionary role and is inclined towards a moderate conservatism, or maybe to a truly extreme conservatism, both in politics, and also in the sphere of scientific-philosophical works. The elements of effective, revolutionary knowledge, included in the works of advanced people of the eighteenth century, became all the more unacceptable to the bourgeoisie. . . . This metaphysical extreme conservatism produced the traditional school in the sphere of music theory.

Ryzhkin is a perceptive theorist who understands all too well the development of music theory; but his Marxist slant detracts from his interpretations. His articles must be read with a great deal of scepticism. His attempts to cloak everything in the garb of Marxism, to distinguish aristocratic, baronial influences from various bourgeois revolutionary trends, as he has in his discussions of both the classical and traditional schools, and to search for elements of materialism everywhere lead to conclusions that to non-Marxists are unacceptable.

Mazel on Riemann. From Ryzhkin we turn now to Lev Mazel, who wrote the articles on the functional school and on music theory after
Riemann. Riemann holds an important position in Soviet music theory. In Mazel's interpretation, he is both the "concluder" of the great level of "bourgeois" music theory begun by Rameau that encompasses the classical, traditional, and functional schools, a role that Riemann himself espoused in his *Geschichte der Musiktheorie* (1898), and the founder not only of functional music theory but of contemporary music theory as well. He is a "concluder" in the sense that the functional school unites, synthesizes, and further develops the experiences and achievements of both the classical and traditional schools, and a founder in that the basic theoretical ideas and positions of the different contemporary theories, up to the mid-1930s, that is, develop various—and often contradictory—aspects of Riemann's theories. Thus, says Mazel, the classical and traditional schools hold no direct practical interest for contemporary music theory, since their achievements were filtered through those of the functionalists, from which they reach contemporary theorists today. In sum, then, Mazel interprets Riemann and his position in the history of music theory as "some kind of historical 'center,' to which gather and from which then disperse the rays of the different musical theoretical directions."

But Mazel evaluates Riemann's theories not only in light of their relation to past and future developments, but also in light of their intrinsic interest, based, of course, on materialistic philosophy. He considers the most valuable basic achievements of the entire legacy of "bourgeois" music theory to be collected in the works of Riemann and the functionalists. Therefore a very important problem for Soviet
music theory turns out to be "the genuine critical mastery and working out of the theoretical legacy of Riemann on the basis of the dialectical-materialistic method." For despite the prolific attempts of Soviet theorists up to 1934 to construct a Soviet theory based largely on ideas gotten from Riemann, such an ideologically proper approach applied to Riemann's theories had not yet been achieved.

During the time of its development, functional theory exerted no direct influence on Russian music theory. Mazel says that Riemann's ideas were not well-known to Russian theorists. This may be true, but the evidence shows that there was a concerted effort beginning in the 1890s to acquaint Russians with Riemann's theories. Mazel mentions only that two of his harmony textbooks and his dictionary were translated into Russian. However, works of Prout on form were also translated, and a Russian pupil of Riemann's, Anna Ivanovna Charnova, wrote articles and probably lectured on his theories. Yuly Engel, the translator and reviewer of his works, also lectured on Riemann's works. But still no Russian theorist immediately took up the mantle of functionalism as promoted by Riemann and his followers. Only later did theoretical developments related to various of Riemann's ideas and also rebuttles and reforms of certain other ideas appear in Russian and Soviet music theory. And these developments, Mazel says, were on an entirely different, higher level of music theory.

Of course, Mazel manages to find in Riemann's theories examples of several basic faults of bourgeois music theory—that certain theories are either anti-historical, dogmatic, or formalistic. Anti-historical
is his failure to coordinate his various theoretical approaches with the particular historical styles for which they are appropriate. Riemann was inclined to endow universal significance to theories derived from the study primarily of the classical and early romantic styles. Dogmatic is his insistence, for example, on the hegemony of the iambic metric construction and on the mirror symmetry of the major and minor modes. And formalistic is his acceptance of the separation of form and content, that they only "influence" each other. In a more general sense, according to Mazel, expanding upon Ryzhkin's statements concerning philosophical influence, Riemann was influenced negatively by German idealistic philosophy in his a priori approach; his overdependence on reason, logic, and purely rational constructions; and his ignoring to a certain degree the practical side of music. But on the other side, this influence gave Riemann the opportunity to rise above the solely natural scientific, purely positivistic method in music theory. However, if Riemann did not reduce the critical aesthetic categories of art to the sciences of physics, acoustics, psychology, and biology, which he correctly examined as natural preconditions of music, then he at the same time was not able to rise to the understanding of art as one of the forms of social ideology, connected with the entire social practical experience.77

These criticisms aside, Mazel sees merit in many of Riemann's theoretical conceptions—most importantly, his working out of the bases of harmonic logic, and his overall approach to musical form, as well as his later, more psychological interpretation of consonance and dissonance. Not coincidentally, all these ideas turn out to be connected with aspects of subsequent Soviet theories deemed acceptable according to the tenets of Marxism. Regarding functional harmonic theory, Soviet
music theory today retains in the majority of its harmony textbooks the
main tenets of that theory. This includes, for example, the importance
and functions of, and correlations between, the three main triads in
the major mode, and the functions and correlations of the secondary
triads. The functional approach to harmony contains many elements
agreeable with aspects of dialectical materialism. The very idea of
function, for example, manifests a dynamic, contextual nature—that the
functions can change relative to the course of the music. These ideas,
though, did not enter Soviet theory directly through the works of
Riemann, but through the works of his follower Gevaert, whose approach
was subsequently developed and refined by the Soviet theorist Georgy
Catoire during the 1920s. During the 1930s, these functional concepts
were further refined for Soviet theory by the "brigade" of Moscow
theorists who wrote the first truly Soviet harmony textbook—first not
only chronologically, but also in its approach and the manner of its
execution—and by the Soviet theorist Yury Nikolaevich Tiulin.

Riemann's views towards harmony and form come together in several
respects, most prominently in his approach to modulation, which he saw
as the basis of large-scale musical form. Mazel contrasts this view, a
consideration of the tonal whole that arises as a result of the juxta-
position of tonalities that establish and consolidate the main key—
similar to Taneev's concept of "unifying tonality," to which Mazel does
not refer—much as a cadence within tonal limits, with that of the
traditional school, which approached modulation merely as the technique
of the transfer from one tonality into another. Mazel criticized
Riemann for the "mechanistic methodology" of this approach, referring to the lack of immanent motion, a deficiency that dates back to Rameau, but praised it nonetheless for its aid in the understanding—albeit statically—"of a musical work as a logical, completed unity."

This understanding highlights what Mazel considers to be the most fundamental merit in Riemann's approach to form. His approach "attempted to create a logical general theory of the elements of musical form and in particular attempted to explain the laws of the connection of the separate elements of the musical whole (for example between harmony and melody, harmony and meter, etc.) between themselves." Thus the traditionalists' attempts to distinguish and to examine separately the various elements and compositional techniques both pedagogically and theoretically was countered somewhat by Riemann, who took a more comprehensive, synthesizing approach to these aspects.

Still, Riemann viewed smaller-scale musical form as being constructed largely from only two elements—harmony and meter, specifically, the harmonic construction of the cadence, and rhythmic symmetry. He defined the content of music, its aesthetic and spiritual side, largely through the characteristics of the third element melody, such as its direction, duration, intervallic content, and dynamic strength. Melody as part of a mode he understood and analyzed in terms of its harmonic content. Thus, Mazel points out, Riemann considered as the main formative factors those elements of the whole that are accessible to mathematical research, to "measurement," leading to "rational knowledge." Harmony may be understood according to acoustical phenomena.
and mathematical expressions, rhythm and meter may be reduced to mathematical relations; but melody, since its features were not considered measurable, was not accessible to such rational knowledge (a view not unlike the majority of nineteenth-century theorists in Russia). Although Riemann recognized the necessity of both content and form in art, in Mazel's view, he stressed the achievement and fulfillment of form; its completeness and perfection, at the expense of content. Thus Riemann realized insufficiently the unity of form and content, which led to Mazel's charge of formalism.

Despite Riemann's significance in the history of music theory as designated by Mazel, he still compares poorly with Rameau, in Mazel's opinion. Not only, says Mazel, did he misinterpret Rameau's chief value for theory, stressing not his acoustical research but his "establishment of the significance of harmony for musical logic"—an incorrect assessment by Mazel—but in relation to his time he stood on a level lower than Rameau did in relation to his time:

If we value in the works of Rameau the elements of materialism, leading to the assertion that the relation between our feelings corresponds to the relation between their engendering causes, to the discovery in the objective rules of the sound material the bases of musical logic of a definite style (early classicism), then Riemann severs this connection. . . . If the views of Rameau were advanced for his time, for the French bourgeoisie of the eighteenth century was a rising class, then in the time of Riemann already existed a more advanced class with a more advanced world outlook. Rameau sometimes in his mathematical operations on the numerical significances of intervals still was not able to be free from the influence of dogmatic rationalism, but Riemann already was not able to manage without a similar influence.80

Thus although Riemann was very attentive to the leading scientific discoveries of his day and strove to incorporate them into his own
research—this defining the positivistic traits of his scientific methodology, according to Mazel—he still did not reach a philosophical and sociological level commensurate with the more advanced trends of his day. Those positivistic traits "are constantly interlaced with speculative constructions of a purely idealistic order." Mazel characterizes his approach in this manner: "An original bridge was created between the opposing traits of Riemann's methodology: In the natural scientific rules (acoustics and psychology), their numerical, purely mathematical sides are singled out and emphasized, which then leads Riemann to the process of purely logical reasoning." To Riemann's credit, though, Mazel points out that, despite the achievements of the subsequent directions of bourgeoise music theory, these later theorists were not able to succeed to the same extent as Riemann in embracing musical form as a complete unity, based on the interrelations of all its various elements. As interpreted by Mazel, Riemann's theories are neither as formalistic as those of some of his successors, such as Conus and even Kurth, nor as purely idealistic as those of Kurth and Yavorsky. Also, Riemann retained the proper perspective regarding the givens of the natural sciences, which he examined as natural preconditions to music. His successors, though, tended to ignore these preconditions, and assumed among them or somewhere between them the presence of some specific musical "category," or some specific musical "strength," as Kurth and Yavorsky did with their differing theories of motion, which appear as "pure idealistic abstractions."

Mazel's analysis of Riemann's theoretical contributions is in
greater depth and detail than revealed here. I have concentrated on those aspects that separate his discussion from others better known to Western readers, and this of course entails concentrating on the Marxist elements. But again, as with Ryzhkin, Mazel's Marxist conclusions are questionable to the non-believer; they inform us only as to the attitudes and outlooks of Marxist theory, not to those of the theory or theorist under discussion. It is anathema to us in the West to adhere to a political philosophy through which everything is filtered. Marxists call this very attitude "dogmatic," but only when it occurs outside of Marxism; applied using Marxism, it is the only method that reveals the objective truth about human consciousness, reality, and society.

The Post-Riemann Period. Already this brings us to the post-Riemann period. In their essays, although Mazel and Ryzhkin purport to be examining the entire legacy of music theory, in fact their investigation of music theory after Riemann focuses almost exclusively on the achievements of Russian and Soviet theorists. Only Ernst Kurth is accorded a position equal to that of native theorists. Of other Western theorists, they mention only Leichtentritt and Mersmann. Thus, in addition to Ryzhkin's separate essays on Garbuzov and Yavorsky, and Mazel's on Kurth, Mazel in his introductory essay discusses more briefly the works of Sergei Taneev, Georgy Catoire, and Georgy Conus. Mazel explains the exclusivity of his approach in this way: "The relatively large place that the works of Russian authors take in this survey
defines the exclusive role which Russian scholars as the creators of
original musical theoretical conceptions played in the present centu-
ry." His statement, of course, implies that Western theory of the
first third of the twentieth century was not original, a view that we
no doubt find very surprising, given the prevailing Western view of
this period. But his approach provides a necessary corrective to our
own one-sided view of theory.

In general, all the theorists analyzed by Mazel and Ryzhkin--
Taneev, Catoire, Conus, Garbuzov, Yavorsky, and Kurth--were influenced
to some extent by Riemann. They generally took one particular approach
of Riemann's and either developed it exclusively, remaining within the
confines of that approach, or developed a wider, more comprehensive
theoretical approach in an attempt to solve basic principal questions
of theory raised by Riemann. Taken jointly, their theories represent
in Mazel's view a new level in music theory, in relation to which the
three previous theoretical schools may be examined as one large level.
Mazel uses the various connections within this new level to the pre-
vious one as a means of classifying them. Based on these connections,
then, he distinguishes two basic directions in twentieth-century music
theory up to 1930.

The first direction "develops the elements of the 'architectural,'
'constructive' approach to a musical work, contained in the conceptions
of Riemann." The main representative of this direction is Conus,
with his theory of metrotechtonicism. Conus seized on Riemann's analo-
gies of music with architecture and metrics, and raised them to a level
far out of proportion to their importance to music. Thus he concentrated on the crystalized nature of musical form, on its proportionality, symmetry, and constructiveness, which he applied to all levels of music, not just to the smaller ones as did Riemann, and ignored the questions of development and process in form. Also into this direction falls the golden section theory, which had been utilized by several theorists, including Mazel, but mainly by E. K. Rozenov. Mazel characterizes this entire direction as "static."

The second direction, according to Mazel, "raises mainly the question about musical motion and the attempts to understand its essence." He connects it to Riemann's attempts "to raise the problem of development in musical works," and "to operate on the given psychology of perception." The leading representatives of this direction are Kurth and Yavorsky. Asafiev should also be in this group, but, oddly enough, Mazel does not include him. Apparently Kurth's views were better-known at this time. It could be, too, that Mazel considered Asafiev somewhat outside or on the fringes of Soviet music theory, being more of a historian. But his influence eventually supplanted that of either Kurth or Yavorsky. Regarding perception, Riemann attempted to distinguish between the "musical" and the "physical" ideas of consonance and dissonance, by way of the introduction of the ideas of the "imaginary consonance" and "the dissonance of perception." In this approach, according to Mazel, Riemann very nearly substituted for the problem of consonance and dissonance in the acoustical sense the psychological problem of stability and instability. In this he antici-
pated Yavorsky's theory of modal rhythm, in which Yavorsky completes the process and totally divorces the idea of stability and instability from the problem of consonance and dissonance; Yavorsky in addition introduces the tritone as the natural source of auditory instability. Mazel characterizes this direction as "dynamic," and, not surprisingly, considers it to be more significant and fruitful for music theory than the first direction. Thus, Mazel concludes, "Following the functional school the important level of theoretical musicology is connected primarily with the names of Ernst Kurth and Boleslav Yavorsky."

However, not all of the contemporary music theories belong exclusively to one direction, nor do some of these theories even fit into either of the directions. For example, Yavorsky's theory of modal rhythm also contains within it some elements of the constructive approach to music form, and the golden section theory also contains both static and dynamic elements. Garbuzov's theory of the multi-based foundations of modes and chords does not fit easily into either category. Garbuzov's theory concentrates on the natural-scientific, acoustical approach to music begun by Rameau and developed further by Riemann, but within this approach he focuses on both static and dynamic aspects.

Taneev, to whom Mazel accords great significance but little attention, does not fit into any of the Mazel-Ryzhkin categories. Essentially, his subject matter, the study of the creative practice of the masters of the strict style of counterpoint, is typical for the traditional school, but his methods of investigation, the scientific systematization and enrichment of the previous empirical approach, belong
more to the functional school. Taneev approached counterpoint from the same perspective that Riemann approached musical form, according to Mazel, as consisting of elements that could be understood only through mathematics, through measurement. He stated, "Only on the basis of mathematics can be built a clear and rational theory of shifting counterpoint." In his article Mazel declines to investigate the political appropriateness of Taneev's philosophical or sociological approach, calling it too technical and outside the scope of his article. This to me indicates his desire not to tamper with a figure revered as the father of Russian music theory. Yet Taneev, too, could be criticized for his idealistic views and his overly rational constructions in the same manner that Riemann was criticized. But no less a figure than Lunacharsky, Lenin's Commissar of Education, in a 1925 article, eloquently rationalized away Taneev's idealistic and formalistic tendencies, praising his counterpoint work and calling for a reevaluation of his music.

Many of Riemann's ideas and theories were accepted and developed by Soviet theorists, not in their original state but only after considerable changes and alterations. Put another way, it was not so much the solutions put forth by Riemann to pertinent theoretical questions as the questions themselves that influenced Soviet theorists, who then came up with their own solutions. This occurred regarding the theories of Kurth, Yavorsky, Catoire, and Conus. Ideas from other theorists were also very influential. Garbuzov's theories, for instance, may be related more to those of Rameau, Serre, and Helmholtz, as well as to
those of Riemann. Yavorsky's theory of auditory gravity may also be traced in some aspects to certain developments in the "anti-authoritarian" direction, which, however, Ryzhkin saw as initiating the functional school.

In the separate articles devoted to the theories of Kurth, Yavorsky and Garbuzov, Mazel and Ryzhkin analyze their works in great detail. They discuss the theories of Catoire and Conus only in the introductory survey and refer to them at times within the other essays. It is interesting to note that, by 1939, when the essays on these theorists were published, few of the views of these theorists retained a significant position in Soviet theory. Kurth's influence was becoming superseded by the work of the Leningrad theorist Boris Asafiev; Conus's metrotechtonic approach was deemed too one-sided and formalistic; the relevant portions of Catoire's functional approach had been taken over and developed by other theorists; interest in Yavorsky's theory of modal rhythm was also on the wane, although certain aspects of it continued to be utilized and developed; and Garbuzov's reworking of his acoustical multi-based approach to modal construction and analysis also met with less favor, largely because it was impractical and because Garbuzov himself turned to other research.

Kurth appealed to Soviet theorists because of his emphasis on process and dynamics in musical form (which in its view of musical motion in a state of continual change relates to Asafiev's dynamic approach to form as a process), on a unified approach to melody, and on his historical approach to theory. While appreciating the elements in
Kurth's views that attempted to correct previous unilateral approaches, Mazel still faults him for his overcompensation in these matters. Among his criticisms are Kurth's divorcing music from its acoustical bases and drawing musical motion only from "psychic energy" (which Mazel calls "fictitious"), from seeing in musical form only process and not the complete result of this process, and for viewing history in relativistic terms.

Concerning Garbuzov's theory of the multi-based foundation of modes and chords, Ryzhkin concentrates on the more conservative aspects of Garbuzov's theory as they are presented in volume 2 of Garbuzov's work explaining this theory, published in 1932. In volume 1, published in 1928, Garbuzov presented a more radical explanation for contemporary harmony, the analysis and synthesis of chords and modes according to the simultaneous occurrence of different acoustical pentachords, each with its own fundamental bass. Ryzhkin ignores the more sensational aspects of Garbuzov's earlier approach and stresses the elements of continuity between Garbuzov and his predecessors, Rameau, Serre and Riemann. He states that the natural scientific direction taken by Garbuzov was an effort to counteract the idealistic, "energetic," "psychological" direction—meaning Kurth and Yavorsky—with a more materialistic approach. Garbuzov's incomplete and limited realization of this approach in his first volume, which resulted in a overly static examination of harmonic phenomena due to his insufficient mastery of dialectical materialism, led him in his second volume to rework his approach according to a more dynamic interpretation. However, in
Ryzhkin's view, although Garbuzov overcame the limitations of his first volume, he still did not succeed in overcoming the limitations of the natural scientific method itself. To paraphrase Ryzhkin, the natural scientific method carries out a materialistic goal, but lacks a corresponding social historical goal. "The struggle for dialectics at the same time is a struggle also for a truly scientific historicism."

In the 1930 conference on modal rhythm, Vavorsky's theory had already been deemed insufficiently compatible with dialectical materialism. In his discussion of this theory, Ryzhkin goes even further. The theory of modal rhythm is too subjective and idealistic in its reliance on perception, antimaterialistic in its denial of the acoustical foundation of music and its view of motion, and antihistory in its elevation of the laws of music from the late Romantic, impressionist and symbolist eras to universal application. Ryzhkin also focuses on Vavorsky's ties with the past, primarily the functional school, pointing out both the similarities and differences between the two approaches. But Ryzhkin did not deny the positive aspects of the theory of modal rhythm. Indeed, Vavorsky's recognition of the importance of mode, his working out of important but previously unrecognized modal types and their applications, his introduction into music of the idea of intonation, and his attempts at an all-embracing approach to music have all had an impact on subsequent theoretical developments.

The value of these essays by Mazel and Ryzhkin for the official recognition, justification, and historical foundation for the establishment and continued development of a Marxist music theory is unde-
niable. The authors affirm with unmistakable clarity those aspects of past and present theoretical approaches that conform to or at the very least approach the tenets of dialectical and historical materialism, and reproach those that do not. Their value as pedagogical—or more properly propagandistic—material is also very great. Both Mazel and Ryzhkin frequently exhort their readers to take the correct, i.e., Marxist, theoretical path in their studies and research. The following statement by Mazel is typical:

A new significant music theory usually does not arise as a direct 'application' of some 'philosophy' to music, but grows in a narrow connection with the corresponding musical practice, having general class roots with a definite world outlook and appearing with such concrete material, through which this world view with its methodological principles is also manifest in music theory.91

Despite this overt proselytizing, these essays are often informative and illuminating, given the time and circumstances in which they were written. Mazel and Ryzhkin have contributed some useful correlations, particularly regarding the post-Riemann Soviet developments. Their division of the lines of thought after Riemann into two groups, one dynamic, the other static, is one way of viewing the dichotomies in the theory of that era. A dynamic view of musical motion is not limited to Marxism alone; the notion of process, of the changeable nature of music as a temporal phenomenon, is certainly not foreign to Western, non-Marxist theory, but is in fact a central thesis of it. Mazel and Ryzhkin admit, though, that such a division is not hard and fast; yet they do not offer any alternatives. The major drawback to their approach is its sole reliance on Marxist philosophy as the guiding method with which the history of music theory is assessed. It
is, as Gorodinsky wrote about Musorgsky's realism, "unarguably tendentious." Many elements of their reasoning are superficial at best and consist of stock phrases and philosophies that can be found in any Marxist-oriented textbook. Wading through this ideological "swamp" is often tedious. Outside of their interpretations of post-Riemann Soviet theory, their methods and conclusions are instructive only for the insights into the nature and application of Marxism, no more. However, for the present study, such an introduction to Marxist theory provides a suitable background for the remainder of the discussions herein.

These essays, then, played an important role in the history of Soviet music theory. They provided a sort of "clearing-house" for theory, in which ideas and approaches were classified as to their philosophical attributes and then distributed accordingly, either to be accepted and utilized further or viewed merely as historical relics. Regarding the latter, despite the negative properties according to Marxism of some of these theories, such as Conus's idea of metrotechtonicism, Soviet theorists continue to study them as valuable theoretical contributions, as an important part of their theoretical history. This attitude is, of course, in accordance with Lenin's edict concerning the building of a new culture only on the basis of a complete understanding of the old culture.
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3. Vaughn James, p. 84. Concerning music, Vaughn James writes:

   In music as in painting the new realism took its aesthetic inspiration from Chernyshevsky, and the peredvizhniki [literally, "travelers," a group of young artists from the 1860s and 1870s who took everyday people and life as their subjects—E.C.] had something of a parallel in the [mighty handful]. . . . Balakirev, Kui, Musorgsky, Rimsky-Korsakov, [and] Borodin . . . took their music to the public, via their Free Music School, just as the peredvizhniki brought their pictures to them in their travelling exhibitions. Like the painters, the musicians sought their subjects in the life of Russia, past and present, and in its literature—Snegurochka, Sadko, Boris Godunov, Khovanshchina, Prince Igor . . . . Musorgsky . . . might well have been speaking for the entire group when he echoed Chernyshevsky in defining the purpose of his art: "Artistic depiction of beauty alone is grossly infantile, childhood art . . . . You cannot get by with just pretty sounds. That is not what the modern man wants from art, nor does it justify the artist's efforts. Life, wherever it manifests itself; truth, however bitter; boldness, sincere speaking . . . that's my taste, that's what I want" (quoted in Zerchaninov, Raikhin, Strazhev, Russkaya literature [Russian literature] [Moscow: Uchpedgiz, 1948], p. 146) (Vaughn James, p. 29).

4. Lenin, cited in Vaughn James, p. 44. This view helps to explain the Soviet attitude, at times near reverential, towards tradition and the past, and why they concentrate so much effort on the history of theory, among other things.
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New Courses. During the 1930s, the goals and objectives of the discipline of music theory in the Soviet Union, then, were directed more towards Marxism. However, there arose the problem of how to implement these goals. Initially, in 1931, what is referred to as "traditional" music theory—the separate treatment of the various theoretical subjects—was discarded in favor of a more comprehensive approach connected with other musical disciplines. The "reform" of 1931 joined the history and theory disciplines into a "history-theory 'complex,'" something akin to what we call comprehensive musicianship. However, this approach was found to be incompatible with Marxism. In the opinion of one theorist, it resulted in "the denial of the independent scientific and pedagogical study of the theory of music." Theory literally was dissolving into history. Consequently, the original, more traditional approach was reinstated. However, the correct Marxist position regarding music theory and history lies somewhere between the two extremes, between the completely separate, traditional approach, and the fully integrated but ultimately impractical approach: "Present theoretical research is not able to generalize the material of history,
it should be penetrated with the spirit of historism. Present historical research is not able to be successful, if it renounces theoretical armaments. 2 Within each discipline, though, each approach must be fully integrated, that is, the subject under examination, a part of the whole, must be related to the whole:

Theoretical research is not able not to be occupied with the examination of separate sides of the musical art. But, studying separate elements of music, research should remember their connection with the whole. Temporarily isolating these separate aspects, research should in the final analysis give us an idea about the role they play in the development of the whole. 3

Theory, then, may be studied and researched separately, and elements within theory may be examined separately, but only if placed within the larger contexts not only of theory but also of history and aesthetics.

Thus, although the "marriage" between history and theory in pedagogy was unsuccessful, both history and aesthetics began to play much larger roles in what used to be strictly theoretical domains. Their inclusion into theoretical studies was mandated by Marxist tenets, and was particularly noticeable in the area of theoretical analysis. Beginning in the early 1930s, several Moscow theorists, chief among them Mazel and Tsukkerman, in their efforts to establish a Marxist theoretical musicology, contributed to a new course in musical analysis in which various methods from existing analytical approaches were combined to form a type of analysis that would lead to conclusions not only about the technical side of music but about the expressive and programmatic sides as well. Initially the inclusion of content analysis in addition to the usual subjects for analysis (form, melody, harmony,
rhythm) was emphasized; the analysis of historical and stylistic elements was added subsequently. This new approach to analysis, in which many various elements—form, melody, harmony, rhythm, content, history, and style—were integrated, substituted for the earlier more limited, often unilateral approaches, which were no longer considered adequate. Soviet theorists thus attempted to fuse into one integrated whole three different types of analysis—critical analysis, stylistic analysis, and aesthetic analysis. Yet this integrated approach tended to blur the distinctions between these analytical types, thus lessening their effectiveness without in turn strengthening their collective impact.

Nevertheless, the Soviets persevered with this approach and still consider it the norm today. It resembles in many respects the type of thematic/content analysis initiated by Serov in the nineteenth century—one reason why the Soviets have elevated the status of Serov to that of a founder of modern musicology.

Tsukkerman describes the approach:

No one will doubt that a music theory course by itself, without the help of the history of music, should put at the head of the list the study of the content of musical works. A music theory course has its task—the study of the construction of musical works, a difficult task, deserving very deep attention; it is as necessary as the study of the grammar of native speech. However from here it does not follow that, studying form, studying the structure of musical speech, a music theory course may forget about its content.

A music theory course should create the necessary preconditions for the disclosure of content through the systematic study of musical speech; it should connect the study of the regularities with the styles engendering them, uncovering the historical development of these regularities; it should examine music as expressive musical speech.
Thus, during the academic year 1931-32 at the Moscow Conservatory, after the failed reform and the return to a more independent discipline of music theory, Tsukkerman pioneered lectures on analysis that focused more on content, on the expressive aspect of music. He used the overture to Alceste by Gluck as the basis for his analysis. According to Mazel, Tsukkerman's lecture on Alceste "played a huge role in the development of a method of the analysis of the means of musical expressiveness." He concentrated initially on two lines of analysis, one old and one new: "on the one side, a burning interest in structure, construction, in the regularities of rhythm, of melodic design; on the other—a constantly growing interest in the problems connected with the content of music." The actual development of this and another later, more general course on analysis was not easy for Tsukkerman, a disciple of Yavorsky's. He characterized the process as a difficult, even painful reorganization from modal-rhythmic courses to the analysis of musical form (then—musical works). I was not sufficiently prepared for this new level and therefore with all possible means attempted to expand [my] knowledge and, of course, to work out the limits of the course independently, to the extent of my power. The book of B. V. Asafiev, Muzykal'naia forma kak protsess played an exclusive role in this. But, naturally, I attempted to preserve all the best from the theory of modal rhythm."7

He later criticized his general course as containing "an exceptional fascination with dimensional development (which one of the students called 'bar-counting'), with metrorhythm, with melodic design," but was proud of the historical and stylistic parts of the course, which included the study of "musical language (from Bach to the beginning of the twentieth century) and of separate composers, of
Russian and Ukrainian folk songs." These aspects of the course had been part of the general Soviet approach to analysis since 1933. Mazel later described how they approached the problem at that time:

In 1933-35 our analysts found before them a row of important tasks. It was necessary to pose principal questions about historicism in analysis, about the problem of style, etc. It was necessary to catch up with Western musicology in relation to the very technical level of analysis. It was necessary to continue the development of a theory of musical forms: to study how to analyze the structure and development of complex works not subordinated under traditional schemes of classical form. Finally, it was necessary to give to student theorists and to peripheral pedagogues some kind of textbook of the new and heightened type of analysis, capable of creating a statement about the contemporary level and methods of this science.9

To answer the need for a textbook, Mazel offered a solution more expedient than the actual writing of a textbook, which would have been a long and laborious undertaking—his analysis of Chopin's F minor Fantasia, in which all the necessary questions would be posed and which would then serve as a concrete example of the type of analysis that was being developed. Mazel's analysis, written in 1934 and published in 1937, provided the most complete and far-reaching analytical paradigm for this entire period.

Beginning in 1936, Mazel, Tsukkerman, and Ryzhkin began a three-year lecture course of analysis, which enabled them to convert this subject into a strict scientific discipline of the university type, and to make with its important component elements a historical stylistic analysis. Analysis in the wide sense—the analysis of separate works, of styles, the analysis of separate aspects and elements of the musical whole (harmony, polyphony, etc.)—naturally turned out to be the center of theoretical musicology.11

Vladimir V. Shcherbachev, Yury Tiulin, and Boris A. Arapov also taught a similar course in Leningrad. But Tsukkerman and Mazel are usually
credited with the primary development of this comprehensive course in analysis. Testimony to the importance of this course comes from no less a personage than Dmitri Shostakovich, written in 1952:

One of the most important achievements of Soviet theoretical science was the course of the analysis of musical works, read in the Moscow Conservatory. Created in the beginning of the 1930s by L. Mazel and V. Tsukkerman, it is distinguished fundamentally from the old course of the analysis of form, which was limited to the study of formal structures and schemes. . . .

L. Mazel and V. Tsukkerman created an independent, original method of analysis, the mastery of which helps the comprehension of the basic regularities of artistic, musical thought, the discovery of individual originality and of stylistic characteristics of musical works. Different means of artistic expressiveness are examined in interaction; it is shown scientifically that the character and concrete application of them are conditioned by the content of the music, by the aesthetic tendencies of such or other epoch. Historicism and dialectics are the most important traits of the analytical method of L. Mazel and V. Tsukkerman, stressing (in opposition to the aesthetic views of bourgeois scholars) the principal cognoscibility of the phenomena of the musical art.

Tsukkerman later admitted being influenced in his analytical approach not only by Asafiev, but also by Kulakovsky, Mazel, and Ryzhkin. Although their individual methods varied somewhat, all three theorists pushed for the establishment of a Marxist musicology, and in general advocated this newer, more integrated analytical approach. Tsukkerman labeled the method advocated by Kulakovsky as tselostnyi, by Mazel as kompleksnyi, and by Ryzhkin as vsestoronnyi. All these terms mean roughly the same thing—unified, composite, all-round, integrated, comprehensive. Tsukkerman denied originating any of these specific approaches: "Not one of these names [of the individual methods] belongs to me, though frequently people undeservedly ascribe them to the author of these lines."
But in denying the origination of these terms, Tsukkerman ignores his own usage of them—unacknowledged—during the time of the development of this method of analysis. The term "tselostnyi analys" [integrated analysis] came to be used most often. All through the 1930s Tsukkerman argued for the wider implementation of this approach in theory pedagogy, which already in 1933 was criticized for being too technical and formalistic and for ignoring questions of ideological content. In 1936 he advocated a reconstruction of the theory discipline incorporating the integrated approach:

It is possible to understand the musical language of a given composer or of a given work only through an analysis that embraces the different regularities of the structure organically, that is, in greater or lesser measure it is an "integrated" [tselostnyi] analysis. . . . If an integrated analysis by itself does not give any guarantee against formalism, then the lack of this analysis in the first years of theoretical education is a true guarantee of the absolute hegemony of formalism. . . .

If from the study of the formal structure it is impossible without a historical stylistic approach to expect conclusions about content, then already in any case a formal analysis should possibly more frequently and more widely touch on the study of expressive means, of which one or the other elements of structure are the carriers. Namely such a method allows us more easily to throw a bridge across to the study of content; namely this method gives the possibility to make conclusions, directly affecting the performing art.15

Thus integrated analysis must be included in theory studies from the very start; this method would emphasize, in addition to the analysis of the various components of the formal structure itself, the means of expression and an historical stylistic analysis.

Mazel describes how integrated analysis is realized in Tsukkerman's works:

Integrated analysis, as it took shape in the works and lectures of V. A. Tsukkerman, embraces with great completeness all
aspects of musical form of a work, all elements of musical speech in their interactions and on this basis characterizes exactly the nature of the whole and the parts using imagery, their individual expressiveness in their very different and subtle nuances. In connection with this, any verification, concerning one or the other technical method, is connected with its artistic meaning, and any judgment about the expressiveness of music is based on references to corresponding means.16

Theory and aesthetics are thus combined into a symbiotic whole, one reinforcing the other.

In essence, then, during the 1930s, theory, or more specifically analysis, came to be recognized as the study of musical content through form. The discipline of theory became "softened" with aspects from history and aesthetics—historical significance, philosophical or narrative content, expressive means, and the like. It is possible, then, to distinguish between "hard" theory, which utilizes only its own means and goals to uncover the theoretical significance of a composition, a group of works, a composer's oeuvre, a method of composition, or an analytical approach—what the Soviets call alternately "bourgeois" or "traditional" theory, which we in the West continue to promulgate and develop—and "soft" theory, theory used only as a means to an end, to discover the non-theoretical sides of a composition, its historical significance, expressive nature, or programmatic content, which the Soviets promote based on the tenets of Marxism and Socialist Realism.

Each theorist interpreted this approach individually. I will discuss here some of the more representative or interesting interpretations written by the leading theorists of this period—Lev Kulakovsky, Kristofor Kushnarev, Yuli Kremliev, Vladimir Protopopov, Viktor Berkov, and, of course, Mazel, Ryzhkin and Tsukkerman.
Lev Vladimirovich Kulakovsky. Although Mazel, Tsukkerman and Ryzhkin each published analytical studies during this period, only Kulakovsky, in two articles written early in this period, directly addresses the question of theoretical methodology in connection with the establishment of a Marxist musicology. Most other theorists making attempts in this regard, including Tsukkerman, Mazel and Ryzhkin, as well as Vladimir Protopopov, Viktor Berkov, and Yuli Kremlev, merely illustrate their approach through direct examples of complete analyses. These analyses range in their adherence to strict Marxist principles from complete compliance to casual avoidance. Finding the path that would satisfy both Marxist and theoretical principles was a thorny problem for theorists. Some tackled it head-on, others ignored it (with future consequences, however). The analytical articles published during this period thus reflect this range in application. They serve as the only published sources for the newer method of analysis, since no true textbook of analysis save Mazel's work was ever published during this period, despite the many courses developed on this topic.

In his 1933 articles on melodic and modal analysis, Kulakovsky stresses the analysis of content in establishing a Marxist theoretical musicology, and in this he must have influenced Tsukkerman. He repudiates any tendencies towards theoretical universality by the authors of such "bourgeois formalistic," "one-sided," "monomorphic" systems as modal rhythm, multi-based modes, metrotechtonicism, energetics, and even traditional theory. He attributes to them little value except their capability to "simplify greatly the problem, . . . to reduce the
exclusive richness, the complexity of the structure of musical works to a row of the simplest schemes, formulas, series, etc., for the understanding of which is sufficient the knowledge of elementary arithmetic. Such approaches simply do not fulfill the requirements of a dialectical materialistic approach to analysis:

The methodological defectiveness of the isolated examination of some one "aspect," "section" of musical works, one of "the elements of music," opposes all the directions of the dialectical materialistic study of musical speech, resting upon purely idealistic, formalistic pre-requisites, and leads, naturally, to a corresponding conclusion: to a full non-understanding of the content of music, its many-sided expressiveness, its class condition.\(^\text{18}\)

Opposed to "the narrow formulas of formalistic theories," Kulakovsky therefore defines melody in a different fashion, as "a musical thought, stated monodically. . . . To research melody means above all to study its musical content." The study of melodic content is for Kulakovsky "one of the relevant themes of Marxist musicology, to which should be given much force, time and attention. . . . Only by uncovering the general content—the expressiveness of melody—may we completely understand the role of its modal structure, the role of applied intervals, of modal elements, of all the windings of the melodic line, of the metron-rhythmic statement, etc. It is time to understand finally that the isolated, 'independent' resolution of these problems—'the problem of mode,' 'metron-rhythm,' and others—is absurd from the genuinely scientific, that is the dialectic-materialistic, point of view.\(^\text{20}\)

Thus by ignoring melody, a theorist also ignores content, for which Mazel criticized Riemann. Only through the revelation of content is the analysis of other elements rendered complete and understandable.

According to Kulakovsky, the dialectical approach to melodic analysis must proceed from the criterion that every musical entity, even
the simplest melody, represents a dynamic, variable process, not a passive state, and must include considerations of its historical perspective and its social and cultural milieu. A preliminary general study would consider, for example, all the elements of musical construction and all their correlations available to observation, and their resulting expressiveness. He stresses particularly the possibility of what he calls "conscious, systematic experimenting," that is, changing melodic details and evaluating the results, a process that would allow the analyst to understand better "the thought, the role of separate sounds and of entire constructions." The acceptable form of analysis would not be a scheme, but "a lengthy description of the melody in its temporal unfolding, with an evaluation of the means used for it." He uses as an example the folk melody "O tatarskom polone" (Example 27.1).

Example 27.1. Folk melody, "O tatarskom polone" [About Tatar captivity].
In his analysis Kulakovský concentrates on several melodic aspects: form (two parts, each containing two "constructions"), the size and expressiveness of the intervallic content (triadic outline and "energetic" perfect fourths in the first half), and the direction and expressiveness of the melodic motion ("energetic, cheerful, active" ascending motion in the first construction, "quiet, recoiling, disruptive" descending motion in the second construction). He points out the "secret outlining" of the minor triad E–G–B "hanging in the air" (on the half notes) in the first half. By altering the melody of the second construction slightly and eliminating this minor triad (Example 27.2), resulting in a more "finished" and "flat" melody, he illustrates the intention of the transfer from the first construction to the second, i.e., allowing for the further continuation of the melody and the necessary logic of the triad. Through this process he evaluates the inner logic by which the D minor triad outlined in the second half of the melody (again the half notes, emphasized by the perfect fifth and falling thirds) is the secret "mirror" of the E minor triad in the first half. (He does not mention the obvious rhythmic stress on these pitches provided by their half-note length, and their metric placement on the strong first and fourth beats of the measure; nor does he point out the modulation in the melody from G major to D minor, or, more properly, from Mixolydian on G to Dorian on D.)

He further changes the melody, raising the second half a minor second to conform tonally with the first half (Example 27.3), to illustrate the overall logic of the original melody. The tonal independence
and the directional differentiation of the second half are in contrast to the first half, through "the accenting of the new D minor triad;" but at the same time the unity between the two halves is expressed through "the secret triadic mirror" and the identical beginning and ending pitches. Both these latter occurrences "emphasize the wholeness, the completeness of the stated musical thought."

Example 27.2. Kulakovskv's alteration of second construction of first part of folk melody, "O tatarskom polone."

Example 27-3. Kulakovskv's alteration of second half of folk melody, "O tatarskom polone."
Kulakovsky emphasizes that his analysis is only the first step towards a dialectical material approach to melodic analysis, and that such isolated analyses would receive confirmation, concretization, and elaboration only in comparison with similar analyses of other works related historically, socially, and culturally. Such comparisons and groupings would in turn lead to knowledge about the means of musical language in each stage of its development and about concrete definitions of particular social or historical groups of musical works. However, simply arbitrarily changing certain elements in the melody to illustrate the "completeness," the "wholeness" of the original musical thought does not explain the significance of the original elements that were altered. He relates the two parts of the melody only through the "secret triadic mirror" and the return to the beginning pitch at the end. This does not adequately address the question of the continuity between the two parts and how the second part realizes the implications of the first part—for example, the complete filling-in of gaps both within and between both parts on various levels, the most significant being the very first gap, which is only partially filled in the first part but is satisfactorily filled in the second. The principle Kulakovsky applies—altering pitches in order to understand better the theoretical nature of the melody—can, if used properly, contribute to the explanation of the logic of the melody. But Kulakovsky errs in the nature of his application.

In his article on mode, Kulakovsky attempts to illustrate the superiority of dialectical analysis over such "monoformantic" ap-
Example 27.4. Ludwig van Beethoven, Sonata for Piano, Op. 57, F minor, mm. 1-16.

approaches to mode as those by Garbuzov, Yavorsky, and the traditional school. He uses the beginning of Beethoven's Appassionata sonata as an example (Example 27.4). Rather than reducing the first sixteen mea-
sures to the opposition of two tonic bases and their resolution (Garbuzov) or to a basic modal cell arising from one tritone or a juxtaposition leading to a result (Yavorsky), or even to a tonic and its deviation (traditional), Kulakovsky focuses on the musical manifestation of the content, which he describes as "the energetic overcoming of the initial somberness of coloring, of the light touch of minor-ness." In the first phrase (mm. 1-2), he concentrates on "the melodic motion, the flight 'by registers," and on "the dynamics of modal functions" in the second (mm. 3-4). In his description of the second phase, he attempts to illustrate how the initial "minorness" is overcome, how the Db major triad in measure 7 is anticipated by the diminished-seventh chord from B in measure 3, and why the repetition in measures 5-8 is not a "mechanically exact repetition."

After the major—but still unstable—C sixth-chord, the sharply unstable diminished seventh chord, including in its construction two sounds of the F minor triad [F and Ab], destroys the tuning in F minor. The resolution of it into the same C major sixth-chord sounds already as the stable, final ictus [m. 3]. F minor didn't "deviate" into C major but dialectically crossed over into it, in connection with the requirement in the brightly major, cheerful final to express the 'overcoming' of any touches of the initial minorness. The latter was a "reminder," which still was preserved in the end of the first phase, when the somber lower register was already overcome by the quick motion of the melodic line. With different, though also elementarily simple means, this musical thought received consequently, a full design, a wholeness, a purposefulness. And that is why the repetition of the theme a half-step higher and more full of tension is not just a mechanically exact repetition; but in view of the bright assertion of the already achieved effect, there is no minor here. From the very beginning the figuration of the Db major triad is given.

Kulakovsky summarizes the benefits of his analysis: "Thus, being oriented to the expressiveness of a musical construction, defining the purpose of its thought, we at the same time receive also the correct
idea about its modal structure, about the role that it plays in the 
general content of musical thought, hand in hand with the other ele-
ments of music." But this analysis tells us nothing except the 
motion from F minor to C major is a dialectical crossing over from the 
assumed oppressiveness of minor to the bright, cheerful major. Fur-
ther, Kulakovsky does not explain adequately how the first-inversion C 
triad in measure 3 is unstable whereas the same chord one measure later 
is stable. Presumably the resolution from the unstable diminished 
seventh chord—which he says destroys the "tuning" in F minor because 
of the presence of the F and Ab, an opinion with which one cannot 
agree—contributes to its greater stability. It may be relatively less 
unstable as a result of this juxtaposition, but it is certainly not a 
"stable, final ictus." It leaves the entire phrase still up in the 
air; further motion is indicated and expected. Kulakovsky's "analysis" 
illustrates the problem of attempting to interpret music according to 
Socialist Realist principles.

Kulakovsky uses his analysis not only "to refute the speculative 
[spekuliativnye] constructions of 'abstract' [umozritel'nye] modal 
theories," i.e., Yavorsky and Garbuzov, but also to discuss certain 
problems raised by his analysis that musical acoustics had as yet 
either solved unsatisfactorily or simply avoided. He challenges 
acousticians to find solutions to such questions as the modal identity 
of the octave, the expressiveness of separate intervals, and particu-
larly the specific foundation for the instability of the tritone. And 
regarding the procedures and methods of research on these problems, he
calls on the new Marxist musicology "to nip in the bud all the mech-
nistic feeble impulses of musical acoustics," and not to substitute
musical experience with only laboratory research. Kulakovsky's
analyses, though, do nothing to inspire confidence in his own methods.

Khristofor Stepanovich Kushnarev. Another exercise in the metho-
dological application of Marxist philosophy to musical analysis is an
article by the Leningrad theorist and ethnomusicologist Khristofor
Stepanovich Kushnarev (1890–1960), "K probleme analiza muzykal'nogo
proizvedeniia" [To the problem of the analysis of a musical work].
Kushnarev's article could have been the basis for a textbook on melody
and its analysis according to Marxism, since he focuses almost exclu-
sively on the melodic aspect. Kushnarev defines music as "the art of
the differentiated [either reduced or exaggerated] reproduction of
reality," and a musical work as a dialectical unity of form and con-
tent. Further, he views melody not only as "one of the forms of the
reproduction of reality in sounds and rhythms, that is, one of the
forms of musical thought," but as "the most natural and simplest form
of musical thought, . . . its basic form." He enumerates the basic
melodic materials with which a composer operates: (1) intonation ("the
relation of the separate tones of the melody, differentiated in their
pitch"); (2) the direction of the intonation; (3) the size of the
intonational steps and their correlation; (4) mode and modal intonation
(the latter "an intonation penetrating into the modal basis"); (5)
rhythm; (6) meter; and (7) motive ("a semantic unity, formed by way of
the connection of two and more moments of intonation, different by the
strength of sounding, of different time and by length"). Melodic
content is thus revealed by the correlation of all these separate
elements. Stylistic and historical elements are on a higher plane.
Musical style is "the regularities of the correlation of all sides and
moments of form and content, ... the regularity of the reproduction
of reality in art." It must be approached historically, for style
is "a historically conditioned process, ... defined for a given
class, on a given level of its development. Thus, Kushnarev
reveals himself to be not only a Marxist, but also a follower of
Asafiev and even of Yavorsky. His emphasis on melody was conditioned
by his interest in folk music, which is predominantly melodic, and in
polyphony, also melodic in nature. His textbook-like definitions and
explanations perhaps came from his classes on analysis and polyphony at
the Leningrad Conservatory, where he began teaching in 1925.

Analytical Studies: Tsukkerman on "Sadko". The analytical studies
published during this period that helped to develop this new approach
to analysis are devoted to the discussion of either one particular work
or the works of one composer. The Moscow theorists Tsukkerman, Mazel,
Berkov, V. Protopopov, and Ryzhkin, and Yuly A. Kremlin in Leningrad
were the main contributors of such studies. Tsukkerman published two
articles devoted to specific pieces, Rimsky-Korsakov's Sadko and Boris
Semyonovich Shekhter's Turkmenia suite. He also wrote an article on
Rimsky-Korsakov's use of folk music and a more critical article devoted
to Prokofiev's *Semyon Kotko*. Each of these will be discussed in turn. Because Tsukkerman continued to develop the concept of integrated analysis throughout his lengthy career, it is not possible to examine his views in the desired depth. His major works and textbooks on analysis were published only beginning in the 1960s. His most recent work, an analysis of Liszt's B minor Sonata, appeared in 1984. However, the significance of his works from the 1930s compels me to examine them in some detail.

Tsukkerman's eleven-segment article on Rimsky-Korsakov's opera *Sadko*, an opera in seven scenes written in 1896 and based on the symphonic poem of the same name, is what might be called a complete musicological article, since in it are aspects not only of theory and aesthetics, but also of history. Tsukkerman devotes six segments (the first five segments and the final eleventh segment) to the opera's compositional history, subject matter, content and its place among Rimsky-Korsakov's other works, and five segments (segments six through ten) to the music and its theory. I will concentrate here on the analysis of the music.

In lieu of taking the reader through a detailed analysis of the music of the entire opera, Tsukkerman instead concentrates on one representative portion of the opera that embraces the fundamental characteristics of its musical language—the fifty-measure orchestral intermezzo between the fifth and sixth scenes, the "underwater" music, as he calls it. This intermezzo portrays Sadko's descent into the sea kingdom, his immersion into the bottomless ocean depths; and it does so
with brilliant musical means, which Tsukkerman describes in detail. For example, the tremolo chords, unstable modes (diminished and augmented, through which is apparent the octatonic scale), the beating of the drum, and the 6/8 meter with the amphibrach predominating all contribute to the impression of a "seething and subsiding water surface, ... an amorphous vibrating body of water." In fact, Tsukkerman reveals, the basic characteristics of this music are dictated by its programmatic content. The idea of immersion is depicted by steady descending motion in each of the intermezzo's four distinct segments—the introduction (eight bars), the "tower" theme (twenty bars), the "fish" theme (ten bars), and the conclusion (twelve bars).

The unbroken tremolo (sometimes substituted with quick repetitions) and the constant pp serve for characteristics depicted by Rimsky-Korsakov of the atmosphere of a trembling, a rippling, a silence, a "range" of action; the narrow, creeping rows of sounds should recall a sliding, a penetration through a continuous mass; the banishment of all sharp sounds of the orchestra (no tuba, no higher register of the woodwinds, with the utmost caution applied to trombones and trumpets) is for the purpose of transparency.

Rimsky-Korsakov did not concentrate solely on orchestral color—which, Tsukkerman points out, he placed on a level commensurate with melody, harmony, and rhythm—and programmatic depiction; he was also concerned with formal musical logic, with structural traits that arise from the requirements of the music. These traits include "four-measure constructions, a clear modal organization of separate constructions and the connection of large sections between themselves, the clarity and regularity of melodic depiction, the rhythmic relatedness of themes, and others," all of which Tsukkerman discusses. Regarding modal
organization, for example, despite episodes of chromaticism and colorful harmonies and modes such as the octatonic and its accompanying diminished chords, Rimsky-Korsakov always returns to a more stable tonal framework. While the introductory and closing segments of the intermezzo are tonally nebulous above pedal points on G and E respectively (Example 27.5), the "tower" theme, shown in Example 27.6, is stated sequentially, in the keys of Eb, Ab, Db, and Gb (i.e., following the circle of fifths), before preparing for the "fish" theme in E major. From this sequence Tsukerman extracts a whole-tone underpinning, Ab-Gb-E, which, he points out, nonetheless is reinforced within each key with evidences of subdominant and dominant support. In addition to the dominant reinforcement from the preceding tonality in the sequence, each tonality is "anticipated" within the segment by its subdominant—Ab in the Eb sequence, Db in the Ab sequence, and so on.

Example 27.5. Nikolai Andreevich Rimsky-Korsakov, Sadko, Intermezzo between scenes V and VI, mm. 1-4.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Example 27.6. Nikolai Andreevich Rimsky-Korsakov, Sadko, Intermezzo between scenes V and VI, mm. 9-16.

Tsukkerman also examines one of Rimsky-Korsakov's most distinctive traits—the "aspiration to architechtonic clarity and balance in such maximum proportions as allowed in operas and programmatic symphonies." An example of this in Sadko is the arch-like, symmetrical construction of the first scene, consisting of Sadko's central aria and scene flanked by recitatives, contrasting material, and choruses at either end; chorus—insertion (epic poem about the sorcerer Vseslav'ich)—central episode with Sadko (recitative of arrival, aria and scene, recitative of exit)—insertion (dance and song of the clowns)—chorus. Tsukkerman refers to the clear architectural outlines in the second half of the first chorus in this scene as exposition,
recapitulation, fugato, development and coda. Other examples include the beginning and end of the second scene (picture of nature—swans—their transformation/transformation—swans—picture of nature), and the "architectonic" first half of the fourth scene, which according to the composer resembles a rondo. Tsukkerman's observance of these symmetries strongly resembles Conus's metrotechtonic approach, but one can assume here a more strict adherence to compositional intent. Unlike Conus, Tsukkerman does not count measures or insist on strict symmetry. Tsukkerman also brings out the coordination of one of the most important moments in the opera with the point of the golden section. Having done so, though, Tsukkerman defends Rimsky-Korsakov against charges of "mechanical treatment" and "cold rationalism" by characterizing this aspect of his style as being aimed against the decadent trends of the end of the nineteenth century, but admitted that his tendencies in this regard were "refracted through a prism of the elements of mechanism and a fear of wide, free development." 41

Rimsky-Korsakov's overall use of harmony and harmonic coloring falls somewhere between the programmatic and musical requirements of the opera. Tsukkerman points to the fundamental trait of Rimsky-Korsakov's synaesthesia, his reflection and transformation of colors in nature into musical colors or tonalities, which enabled him to chose, for example, the tonal character of Sadko as D major—F major (which choice Tsukkerman does not explain). Further, he divides Rimsky-Korsakov's modal-harmonic language into two types: "one for folk, everyday, real scenes and characters, and another for fantasy, both
'personal' and also atmospheric and decorative. Common traits include
an absence of vagueness, a quality of logic, even some schematicism,
[and] a lack of wide motion and development (namely, modal-harmo-
ic)." Rimsky-Korsakov derived the first type, Tsukkerman deter-
mines, from the enrichment of the traditional natural major with ele-
ments of Russian folk song. As for the second type, Rimsky-Korsakov
had already used such "fantastic" harmonies as complex modes (including
augmented and diminished modes, the octatonic and whole-tone scales),
augmented and diminished chords, tritone-connected tonalities, higher
tertian structures, and the like; but here they appear more organically
and logically connected, more richly expressed, more vividly depicted,
and more interestingly developed than in his previous works, according
to Tsukkerman. In both these types, each of which reflects a basic
trait of the opera, that of a retreat either to the remote past or to
fantasy, Tsukkerman sees reverse sides of the same phenomenon—"the
withdrawal of the creative subject matter from the practical reality
contemporary to Rimsky-Korsakov." This, of course, runs counter to
Marxist philosophy, but Tsukkerman does not condemn the great composer
for lack of foresight. Instead, he focuses on how Rimsky-Korsakov
reflects the reality of the opera's actual subject-matter by concentra-
ting more on the question of folk influence than on the fantastic
elements (which were, after all, derived from Liszt).

Tsukkerman also addresses the questions of development and con-
trast in Sadko. Stated briefly, there is development, thematic and
otherwise, but only that required by the drama, which is not very
great. In this, Tsukkerman concludes, the music completely reflects reality (the reality of the opera, that is). The element of contrast is similarly not so sharp or defined, but rather more soft, refreshing, and conclusive, as required by its subject matter.

Overall, Tsukkerman concludes that the aspects of the music most important to Rimsky-Korakov were "the coloring and graphic detail on the one hand, and a consideration of the formal musical logic on the other." In his analysis, Tsukkerman uses some of Yavorsky's terminology, such as "unstable modes (diminished and augmented)" and "tritoneal juxtaposition of modal-tonalities," but this is his only concession towards Yavorsky's theories. Clearly, the theoretical analyses or descriptions of the music are subordinated to the dramatic and expressive requirements of the opera. Through examinations of analyses such as this, we can gain a better idea of what exactly constitutes an "integrated analysis." This approach may seem to Western theorists simply "watered down" stylistic analysis on the one hand, or subtle proselytizing on the other; but the fact remains that this method is what constitutes a good share of Soviet music theory of the 1930s and later, and in this sense it must be examined and understood. Thus, although Tsukkerman's analysis breaks no new theoretical ground musically, his combination of the analysis of expressive and philosophical aspects with the musical analysis, and his inclusion of the aspects of compositional history and content, is a new and unusual feature in Soviet music theory of the 1930s.
Tsukkerman on "Turkmenia". Tsukkerman's analysis of the Turkmeniia suite by Shekhter (1900-1962) integrates theory with aesthetics and criticism. This suite from 1932 holds historical significance as the first Soviet symphonic work based on Turkmen folk melodies; it therefore became an important topic for analysis, from both theoretical and critical viewpoints. Shekhter used as the basis for his composition some of the 115 Turkmen folk melodies collected by Viktor Aleksandrovich Uspensky (1879-1949) on his several expeditions into Turkmen during the years 1925-29. Uspensky, with V. M. Beliaev, published a description of the first of these expeditions in Turkmenskaia muzyka [Turkmen music]. Tsukkerman utilizes this work in describing the characteristics of Turkmen folk music, which forms the background for his analysis of the suite. He devotes the first half of his article to the analysis, and the second half to the aspects of expression, stylistic development and content.

As a Marxist theorist, Tsukkerman subscribes to the view that theory and analysis cannot be separate from criticism. The job—the obligation—of a Marxist theorist is not just to analyze but also to criticize, to show whether or not the proper path has been followed and to praise or advise accordingly. This view is applied particularly to contemporary works, which might serve as models for others. Therefore, in this article he concerns himself with the questions of how Shekhter utilized or adapted the melodies and characteristics of Turkmen folk music and whether or not Shekhter succeeded in his interpretation. Among the characteristics of Turkmen music he mentions are complex and
subtle compositional methods, a severity and sincerity of statement, the use of string instruments (the "dutar" and "gydzhak"), the lack of percussive instruments and of purely dance music, wide melodic development, metric and rhythmic richness, use of modes (major, minor, medieval and variable), the prominence of the interval of the fourth as the basis for harmony and polyphony, the dependence of instrumental music on arrangements of vocal music, and a programmatic nature.

Each of the three movements of the suite is based on a different folk song. Much of the thematic material in the first movement comes from a broad development of the song for the dutar, "Chekty." Example 27.7 shows the main theme of this movement and the folk song on which it is based. In the second movement, Shekhter presents the song "Zokhré dzhan" in a slower tempo and augmented, thus changing it "qualitatively" and "dialectically" into representative pastoral, landscape music. Example 27.8 contains both the folk theme and its transformation. Shekhter bases the finale on just small fragments of the lengthy song "Yar kara gezli," the melody of which had already been adapted for a Soviet Pioneer song. He develops particularly its rhythmic dynamic character. Example 27.9 shows the folk theme of the finale and its transformation in the third movement, labeled "Allegro marciale."

Shekhter employs several characteristics of Turkmen music, prominent among them the pedal point and the interval of the fourth, to which he gives a significant role. Throughout Turkmenia Shekhter utilizes "lengthy 'garlands' of fourths; they follow each other in the
Example 27.7. Boris Semyonovich Shekhter, Turkmения: a) main theme of first movement; b) folk song "Chekty."
Example 27.8. Boris Semyonovich Shekhter, Turkmeniia: a) folk theme used in second movement; b) second movement, mm. 1-12: transformation of this theme.

melody and climb up on each other, forming chords consisting of three, four and even five quartal intervals. (See Example 27.10.) Initially Tsukerman calls this "hyperbole" an "immoderate emphasis of one method . . . an impoverishment of the expressive means of the suite; the monotony of the quartal-quintal motions are manifest negatively in the sense of the monotony of coloring, particularly in the first and
Example 27.9. Boris Semyonovich Shakhter, Turkmenia: a) folk theme of finale; b) third movement, mm. 1-16.

Yet subsequently he balances this negative view with the recognition that "the expressive possibilities of the fourth are used masterfully in the entire diapason from a musical 'nothing' (the end of the second movement) to the 'steel' chords in the finale, which completely harmonize with its march rhythms." Tsukkerman calls Turkmenia "The Poem of Fourths," and labels it "a model of healthy quartal music, in contrast to many office-harmonic inventions.
Shekhter's quartal and quintal chords are "simple" and "pure," without augmentation or diminution; in this sense they recall Borodin rather than Scriabin.


Another means of development used by Shekhter that Tsukkerman questions is his inclusion of percussion instruments into the orchestration, particularly in the third movement, which, as he already mentioned, are not indigenous to Turkmen music. But in defense of this method, Tsukkerman points out that certain other instruments of the modern orchestra are not found in Turkmen music either, and that Shekhter's use of percussion instruments gives "a completely artistic effect, not dissonant with the general character of the music." He
concludes that, since the percussion instruments are able to represent more brilliantly the rhythmic subtleties in the melody and to form rhythmic polyphony, Shekhter did not so much copy the methods and sounds of folk music as "transfer the most typical traits of this music into the means and proportions accessible to his art." This observation applies also to the means and traits that Shekhter did not use; the inclusion of all characteristics without regard for other elements—such as the adaptation to the modern orchestra and the artistic content of the music—would in his view reduce the work to a parade of formal methods without any ideological or artistic significance.

In a discussion of the principles of development in Turkmenia, Tsukkerman explores the overall unity and expressive plan of the work. To reveal the unity he traces motivic connections and melodic similarities among and within the movements and explores Shekhter's application of the principles of composition of classical music. Shekhter's methods of thematic transformation—derived also from Turkmen music, since in it unchanged repetition is lacking—illustrate the expressive aspect of the work. The successive transformation of a theme results in what Tsukkerman calls "the triumphal conducting of a theme," in which the theme exhibits a gradual change of character from its earlier appearances, resulting in a theme labeled, for example, maestoso or con brio. This characteristic occurs in the finale, which Tsukkerman outlines in some detail. The last appearance of the theme is given in Example 27.11. In this movement, "Shekhter displays great art in the strict coordination of expressive means, directed towards the achievement of a
single goal—towards the unfolding of a grandiose upsurge, culminating in the theme of the Maestoso." He characterizes the three-part form of the finale according to its two great "waves of growth"—the first at the beginning and the second at the end, the upsurge leading to the culmination of the entire suite. Overall, eight appearances of the main theme in the finale alternate with intermediate episodes, creating shades of emotional increases and decreases and resulting in the impression of a mosaic. Tsukkerman, therefore, sees in this finale "significantly more upsurge than unity."

Example 27.11. Boris Semyonovich Shekhter, Turkmenia, third movement, "Maestoso": final transformation of theme, mm. 125-130.
Shekhter's modal thought belongs, according to Tsukkerman, more to a constructive than a destructive type of thought: "This constructive-ness . . . is joined with an outstanding modal flair and, what is particularly valuable, gravitates to dynamic, living forms of the unfolding of mode." Tsukkerman views Shekhter's modal thought as a compromise between the principles of Turkmen music and those of the European modal system, but intensified with certain modal structures of Turkmen music, and still concerned with function. This last is manifested particularly in the last movement. Shekhter never relies purely on natural major or minor modes, but uses instead variations, particularly of minor, a characteristic of Turkmen music—Phrygian minor with sometimes other lowered degrees, "flattened" modes, and variable modes—as well as varieties of the diminished mode (including the octatonic pattern). Tsukkerman explains "flattened" modes, which occur in the first movement:

Here there are incomplete triads, both on the fourth and on the third lowered degrees. In a word, the principle of the construction of the mode is such: all unstable sounds, serving as a base for the construction of triads on them, are lowered and together with them also the fifth degree, as having double function. Un-touched remain only the basic tones of the two other triads, which are constructed on the stable sounds of A minor—on its first and third degrees.56

Thus flattened modes result from the lowering of both the unstable fundamental pitches and the fifth degrees of the triads. Tsukkerman does not elaborate on this feature, unfortunately. Others have written more extensively about Shostakovich's use of a similar device, the lowering of tones in a mode, as we will see in Part VIII.
Also in the first movement—as in the other two movements—occurs what Tsukckerman calls "the mode into dynamics," the gradual emergence of a mode, resulting either from a transformation of a previous mode or the new formation of a mode. In the first movement A major is transformed into A minor (flattened); in the beginning of the second movement, G major (paired with E minor to create a variable mode) gradually is formed from an unstable origin connected with the diminished mode. In the third movement, G major emerges from G major and ends the piece. Thus, in general, Tsukckerman condenses the modal tonal plan of the suite into "the growth of the dynamic quality of functions from S (A minor), through S--D [E--G] of the second movement and a clearly expressed D [G] of the third movement to T [C]."

Tsukckerman devotes the last quarter of his article to a discussion of the content of Turkmeniia and a comparison with other contemporary works also based on Turkmen music. Turkmen music is programmatic, but Shekhter's Turkmeniia is less so. Tsukckerman relates the first movement to "a restrained dance, sparing in movements." But since, according to Uspensky and Beliaev, Turkmen music contains no dance music, this again poses a problem for Tsukckerman. But surprisingly he is unconcerned, and merely replies, "The very attempt of the enrichment of a national artistic culture with elements new for it is very valuable." The second movement is characterised by the composer himself as "a love song, a lyric poem, night." Tsukckerman had already observed the pastoral quality of this movement and discussed the thematic formation in this movement growing out of "indefinite night
sounds," and a sort of "'dialectics of tempo,' transforming vocal music into graphic music." He sums up this movement as expressing disillusionment and melancholy, feelings inherent to old Turkmen music. He has high praise for the music of this movement, "as an excellent country picture and as a model in its own way of an expressive and wide melodic development." In the third movement he sees "revolutionary enthusiasm," reached not through quotes or other such "outer" means, but through "the methods of inner growth, gradually transforming the basic musical image." Yet certain drawbacks of the finale—its incessant motor rhythm and its basic monothematism—disallow its full-fledged representation of "the process of the active construction of a new life." Viewing the suite as a whole, Tsukkerman senses a conflict between the first two movements and the third. The first two movements represent individual pictures and contain few elements characteristic either for "the transfer from an old life into a new" or for Soviet Turkmen. None of the movements in fact represents this transfer. The sudden unprepared introduction in the third movement of a folk song on which is based a Soviet Pioneer march appears to Tsukkerman as a "deus ex machina":

If to assume that Shekhter had in mind to give the transfer from the old Turkmen into the new, then it is given only through the juxtaposition of movements between themselves, but not within, and the "hooking on" of the finale sticks out even more. Obviously, the composer had in mind a series of separate pictures, as this appears from the name "suite."66

Because the first movement of Turkmenia contains no element of struggle, an opposition of themes, Tsukkerman calls the suite a symphony without a first movement.
In comparison with other pieces on Turkmen themes by Mosolov, Vasilenko and Knipper, Tsukkerman evaluates Shekhter's \textit{Turkmeniia} rather highly. In the process of this comparison he covers the gamut of compositional approaches to folk music and places \textit{Turkmeniia} in its proper perspective with regard to these approaches. Shekhter's method consists of combining the national characteristics of the music with the principles of European classical composition, all the while aspiring "to overcome the lethargy and stasis of the original material, to enrich its methods and expressive means and to create a flexible, dynamic musical language on its foundation." Yet he complains that \textit{Turkmeniia} penetrates insufficiently the spirit of Turkmen national music, and reveals an inadequate knowledge of the life of the people. Further, he hesitates to identify \textit{Turkmeniia} as "a model of a mass symphonic work: its harmonic language is insufficiently simple, the subject of the first two movements is not completely understandable; to Turkmen this music, probably, appears very remote from their national music." Nonetheless he views the work positively:

\textit{Turkmeniia} has great significance as an attempt not only to show Turkmen national music in all its distinctive traits preserved to our day, but also to show how one of the oldest musical cultures in the SSSR may be developed further, overcoming its secludedness and limitedness of means.

The Soviet composer aspires not to the destructive exploitation of the riches of national music, but, taking from it its valuable sides, he... aspires to a conscious creative influence on it, with the goal of its enrichment with the achievements of other cultures, with the goal of its dynamization. It would be premature to stress that \textit{Turkmeniia} already presents itself a type of such a work, but, being the first step, it reveals the widest perspectives in this direction.
In addition to his integrated analytical approach, in which he stresses the "dynamics" of the formal elements, the programmatic content of the work (directed towards Socialist ideals), and the utilization of folk song, Tsukkerman thus presents a didactic analytical approach, full of hints and warnings for young—and not-so-young—Soviet composers as to the proper course. As we shall see, this method is not agreeable to all Soviet theorists, Mazel chief among them; and this issue becomes an important one during the crack-down on the arts in the 1940s. Lunacharsky laid down the foundation for this approach already in the 1920s; but many theorists, in fact the vast majority, chose to ignore it. In Tsukkerman's analysis the theoretical foundations of Turkmenia are glossed over in deference to the expressive means and to the content. He is more critic than theorist. For the analysis of contemporary works, this approach is de rigueur, since for the building of the new Soviet state, new, uplifting works are needed immediately, and since the builders of this state cannot trust the weight of public opinion and the test of time to determine the acceptability of a work of art. Therefore it is the task of the musicologists and theorists to interpret the general guidelines established by the state; composers are less reliable in this regard because of the personal nature of their work. They are supposed to be objective, but this is difficult for an artist.

Tsukkerman on Prokofiev and Khrennikov. Tsukkerman's other article in this vein, "Neskolk'ko mysele o sovetskoi opere" [Some thoughts
on Soviet opera], discusses two contemporary operas—Prokofiev's *Semyon Kotko* (op. 81, 1939) and Khrennikov's *V buriu* (1939) [In the storm]. This article was often cited during the 1940s as a model of sorts of the type of critical analysis espoused by Lunacharsky, Zhdanov and others. Here Tsukkerman is even less theoretical and more "critical" than in his previous article; however, his blend of the two aspects contributes greatly to its "model" image. The task of building a suitable repertory of Soviet—as opposed to Russian—operas became an important issue during the 1930s and 1940s. The question arose, What makes a good Soviet opera, that is, what is acceptable (according to Socialist Realism and Marxism) and what is not? In answering this question, though, Tsukkerman rarely stoops to the topics of politics and ideology; rather he prefers to make his judgments on more purely musical grounds. However, he does devote considerable space to the question of folk music, an important element in the consideration of Soviet music. And he frequently applies the criterion of availability, of understandability, i.e., accessibility to the masses, also a significant prerequisite for Soviet opera, to the works under examination. He focuses his attention primarily on *Semyon Kotko* and only secondarily on *V buriu* as a contrast to Prokofiev's opera.

The element that concerns Tsukkerman the most is the melody. *Semyon Kotko* is not a "number" opera; its melodic texture is seamless. Therefore, is the melodic line predominantly recitative or aria, declamation or song? Prokofiev's approach to melody lies somewhere in between—it is not completely declamatory nor is it lacking in a cer-
tain amount of melodic richness. Yet despite moments—at times lengthy—of both vocal and orchestral "cantilenas" and many recitatives that approach this cantilena quality, Tsukkerman still feels a "shortage of melos." He gives several reasons for this. First, the boundaries of constructive articulation and the episodes of song do not coincide. The cantilena portions depend more on dramatic development than they do on inner construction. Tsukkerman attributes this characteristic to Prokofiev's reluctance "to sacrifice the principle of continuity" and his willingness "to abandon the principle of unbroken declamation" in favor of a more song-like texture. Thus arises a contrast between the aspiration to saturate the opera with melos and the aspiration to avoid a splitting of the musical dramatic fabric into parts. As a result, irrespective of the abundance and the high musical achievements of the song themes, they produce the impression of episodicness, of fragmentedness. Second, very often the singers are given only "residues" of orchestral melodies or incomplete themes, which in their complete form occur only in the orchestra. However, in a subsequent brief discussion of the general language of the opera, Tsukkerman more positively interprets Prokofiev's concentration on "short intonational formulas," a reference that could be applied as well to these incomplete themes: "The insufficiency of large melodic forms has here as its reverse side a masterful use of small flexible motives." Short expressive and chromatic motives such as that given in Example 27.12 are representative of this type. Third, some song-like moments are less perceptible because they occur simultaneously with recitatives or rhythmic speech in other vocal parts. Fourth, the melodic symmetry of the opera is poorly planned,
with most of the melodic and thematic richness concentrated in the first act. These, then, in Tsukkerman's view, are "the aggregate of reasons, by virtue of which the opera, essentially rich melodically, does not use its melos to full effect."

Example 27.12. Sergei Prokofiev, Semyon Kotko, Motive of Tkachenko, "Sperva, Kotko, Menia ty uvazhil" [At first, Kotko, you humored me].

Regarding the expressive aspect of the opera, Tsukkerman sees in it a lack of lyricism, and specifically of subjective, personal lyricism. Prokofiev's brand of lyricism is what Tsukkerman calls "oblique lyricism"—"means of soundings themselves, which with their purely phonic effect create something 'near-lyric,' 'near-tragic' and only by associated paths lead to the sought-after emotion." But in its own way, Tsukkerman admits, this oblique lyricism is "very expressive and varied; it is at times tender and radiant, then morose and severe." He gives an example:
In the mourning chorus from Semyon Kotko a muffled and constricted sounding, monotonous recitative, accompanied by an ominously snaking with a chromatic popevka somewhere on high, produces a completely distinctive impression; namely thanks to the "circu-
tousness" of the method chosen by Prokofiev this chorus does not immediately reach the point and turns out to be, as a result, one of the most discussed episodes of the opera.79

Another expressive element that Semyon Kotko lacks, according to Tsukkerman, is heroism, which in general is not characteristic to Prokofiev's music. But on the whole Tsukkerman views the expressiveness of his music in this opera as "great and varied. In it many traits of Prokofiev's style considered complex for a long time found new justifi-
80 cation." Tsukkerman mentions the "energetics," which previously revealed its significance only within itself but which here serves the dramatic action with "cyclonic power and vital pulsation"; the exempla-
81ry brevity; "the ability to present the complex in musical language as simple, to moderate the complexity of one element with the emphasized simplicity of others, simultaneously acting with it"; as well as the humorous and grotesque currents in his music, all of which preserved the original character of Prokofiev's music and "helped to deliver this

Tsukkerman briefly discusses the harmonic, melodic and rhythmic language of Semyon Kotko, its dramatic construction, the nature of the recitative and dialogue, and the folk-song element. The harmonic language, for example, fluctuates between the simple and the complex, between modal regularity and atonality. He notes Prokofiev's penchant for half-step juxtapositions, both vertical and horizontal. He points out that the more dissonant episodes are dramatically justified, and he
cites the example of Rimsky-Korsakov, who also combined varying levels of harmonic complexity in his operas. Nevertheless, he is disturbed by the width of the gap between the simple and the complex, between "models of extremely elementary harmonization" and "models of great harmonic complexity." "It is impossible to forget that the task to create a harmonic language that is understandable for many and that is at the same time original is immeasurably difficult; Prokofiev already did much in this direction, but he may do still more."

Tsukkerman devotes some attention to the folk-song element in Semyon Kotko. Prokofiev's "gift" in this regard is his ability to alter the "modal-intonational structure" of models of folk music—such as introducing unusual intervals or chromatic means—while at the same time preserving the character of folk song, as shown in Example 27.13.

Example 27.13. Sergei Prokofiev, Semyon Kotko, "Skazka o shute" [A story about a jester].

In Tsukkerman's words, "The composer possesses emotional assonance, that is, the ability, not applying folk intonations, to approach the emotional world of folk song by means of a different intonational structure, his own." Prokofiev is also able to approach folk song
through characteristic traits he shares with folk song, for example, his method of repetition, and through the composition of folk-like melodies without sharp changes. But occasionally Tsukkerman senses a discrepancy between Prokofiev's personal style and that of folk music, particularly Ukrainian. He attributes this discrepancy to Prokofiev's acquaintance with just one basic "layer" of Ukrainian folk song, "the sadly or sweetly melodious, even sentimental." Tsukkerman feels Semyon's phrase, "Do svidan'ia, moe serden'ko" [Goodbye, my serdenko], shown in Example 27.14, does not fit its context. The assumption here is that Prokofiev's wider familiarity with different types of folk song would have expanded his personal compositional approach.


Tsukkerman sums up both the good and the bad elements in Semyon Kotko:

The music abounds in fantastic melodic thoughts, in melodious or, in any case, declamationally-justified recitatives; in it are many harsh forces and an intenseness, a genuine lyricism, picturesque scenes, distorted laughter and wicked satire; almost nowhere does it lose its original character; conciseness, intensity and flexibility distinguish its unfolding; and it is deeply sustained with folk music and intonations emotionally close to folk language.
But the other side of the scales is also heavily weighted down: the embryonic nature of much of the melodic material, the exceptional rigorism in the question about "numbers"; "the decreasing" planning of the thematism by acts; the melodic prevalence of the orchestra over the singers; the drabness and artificiality of some parts of the recitative; a backwards quality and a waning of several aspects of expression; the impression of many lyrical tragic situations in a circuitous manner or through an elementary outer effect connected with them; the exceptionally sharp difference of levels of simplicity; the well-known inconsistency in individual language and language of folk-song origin; and finally the serious dramaturgical insufficiencies.  

But on the whole he sees the opera as a step forward for Soviet music, as "the new word in our musical theater," and "as a school for opera." He places it on a much higher level than other works: "It is incomparably more valuable than many formal-song—but essentially uninspired, though available to all—and in practice faceless operas."

Tsukkerman's analysis of Khrennikov's opera is less thorough and may be summarized briefly. Although Khrennikov possesses a certain lyric gift, which is expressed in V buriu, his emotional breadth is limited. His type of lyricism, at its best when expressing sorrow or melancholy, is in "real danger of a collapse into banality." He concentrates too much attention on the "number" system and "scorns" the music lying between these numbers, thus creating too many "platitudes." An attempt at simplicity results in primitivism, particularly in the harmony. Tsukkerman provides a warning to Khrennikov:

A young composer frequently finds himself in the face of a dilemma: originality—at the cost of lost spontaneity, or expressiveness—at the cost of the cast-aside criterion of discretion. Khrennikov, apparently, prefers the second path; his talent might allow him to be more demanding of himself; exploiting, as now, the unrefined ore of his natural lyricism, not developing and not enriching it, he scarcely will be able to go forward as far as he
should. Though I will not be understandable in the sense that
hinders Khrennikov in his aspiration to simplicity; when under the
pretext of simplicity is obliterated the difference between good
and bad, between the artistically valuable and the banal—the
critic is obliged to raise his voice.90

In comparing the two operas by Prokofiev and Khrennikov,
Tsukkerman sees similarities primarily in their deficiencies. Both are
lacking in expressiveness, for example; but where Khrennikov is overly
melodramatic, Prokofiev approaches sincere feelings in a roundabout
manner (his "oblique lyricism"). They each prefer their individual,
favorite yet monotonous expressions. Tsukkerman also sees a similarity
in their approach to folk music, which each attempts to enhance with
his individual intonations based on personal experience. This brings
up the larger question of the treatment of folk music in contemporary
Soviet opera. The period in which "independent creation in the spirit
of folk song already by itself signified merit to the composer . . .
should be considered finished." The next stage involves a more
individual approach, what Tsukkerman refers to as "organic transforma-
tion"—"the synthesis of an objective folk music language and emotional
world with a subjective, individual world." But, he asserts,

the task of the individualized transformation of Russian and
Ukrainian song in Soviet opera only draws near to a solution.
. . . To this day layers of Russian song remain unused—and they
are very many; to this day composers are not resolved to encroach
upon the richness of the Russian song, highly organized modally
and polyphonically, being limited only to its simple and more
simple varieties.93

Both Semyon Kotko and V buriu, though, "contain such that is instruc-
tive in this direction."94

Although Tsukkerman stops short of calling these two operas "clas-
sics" of Soviet opera and recognizes that they do not solve completely
the problems of Soviet opera, nonetheless he hopes that their appear-
ance will put an end to the creation of such "ephemeral" works that
incur huge production expenses and then disappear, operas that are "so
bad that they do not even arouse the desire to swear at them." He
concludes, "But if V. buriu, attached to all its negative characteris-
tics, signifies a well-known turning point in the matter of the crea-
tion of Soviet lyric opera, then Semyon Kotko should deservedly be
examined as one of the high achievements of Soviet musical dramatic
art."

Once again, theoretical elements are used only as a means to an
end—the critical evaluation of two contemporary Soviet operas. If it
were not for the fact that such an approach is an integral part of
Soviet music theory, particularly during the 1930s and 1940s, then this
article would carry little significance here. In the absence of "hard"
theory works from important theorists such as Tsukkerman, such "soft"
contributions must be examined. As with Turkmenia, Tsukkerman attempts
to find Socialist Realist ideals—the quality of heroism, for example,
of which he finds little in Prokofiev's works.

Tsukkerman on Rimsky-Korsakov and Folk Song. The question of the
application and utilization of folk music in Soviet composition occu-
pies considerable space in both of Tsukkerman's articles just dis-
cussed. In his analysis of Sadko, he also addresses briefly the topic
of folk music in its utilization by Rimsky-Korsakov. He expands on
this subject in a subsequent article from 1938, "Rimskii-Korsakov i narodnaia pesniia" [Rimsky-Korsakov and folk song]. The purpose of this article is to explore Rimsky-Korsakov's application of folk music in his works, but in so doing to justify his compositional approaches to this sphere and to refute various criticisms directed towards his relation to folk music—that he relied too much on folk music for melodic inspiration, that he turned to it for aesthetic reasons, or that his development of it was too conventionally stylized and not close enough to its true expressive nature.

In this endeavor Tsukkerman follows up on observations he made in his earlier article on Rimsky-Korsakov's Sadko. Recognizing the dualism between the everyday and the fantastic in Rimsky-Korsakov's music, Tsukkerman again stresses that "the fantastic element of Rimsky-Korsakov most frequently of all originates from folk fairy-tale epic literature, and completely does not present a product of an unhealthy decadent imagination." In this article he expands his viewpoint: "Under the influence of folk song is found not only the fantastic element of Rimsky-Korsakov, but also the entire sphere of real images, where the means in a modal-harmonic relation near to fairy-tale, magical pictures are used." Thus, not only do such characteristics as familiar intonations of folk music (the use of the intervals of major second, minor third, and perfect fourths and fifths, and well-known rhythmic figures), patterns of repetition of single notes as well as whole lines and phrases (the latter, which Tsukkerman calls "pairs of periodicness," a a b b or a a' b b, for example, is an important
element in Rimsky-Korsakov's musical syntax), and variable modes testify to the influence of folk music on Rimsky-Korsakov, but also such Lisztian characteristics as unusual scales and modes, tertian relations and other harmonic innovations may be related as well to folk music, to the gypsy roots of Liszt's so-called "Hungarian" scale and also the Eastern types of folk music that were catching the attention of composers and musicologists such as Pamintsyn during the latter part of the nineteenth century. Tsukkerman observes Rimsky-Korsakov's frequent correlations between the augmented mode and "Eastern" elements, particularly in "The Golden Cockerel," an opera in which, in Tsukkerman's view, Rimsky-Korsakov attempted to realize complex principles of modal thought from the modal structure of folk music.

Further, Tsukkerman relates both aspects of Rimsky-Korsakov's style to one source—his penchant for nature:

Nature, expressed through a human source, is realized musically with folk-song intonations; nature, expressed through the poetic animation of any of its different living inhabitants and spontaneous elements, is realized musically in a language which we conditionally call "fantastic." These two aspects may provide an exterior contrast but they may also coexist peacefully in Rimsky-Korsakov's music. In this latter sense they really represent but two sides of the same coin:

The fairy-tale aspect of Rimsky-Korsakov almost never gives up a realistic source; the acts, the deeds, the thoughts, the causes and consequences are also as simple and clear as in real life; only the circumstance is displaced, the personified phenomena of nature are involved in the action; "the usual in the unusual" is given.

The fantastic element may also be justified from a moral point of view; it frequently represents in its ideological content "a triumph of the
idea of justice." In another type of correlation, oftentimes the fantastic elements will grow out of a folk song source.

These two aspects are not only juxtaposed horizontally, in connection with their respective attributes, but are also often combined vertically, usually in the form of the accompaniment of folk-song intonations with harmonies usually reserved for more fantastic moments. Tsukkerman points out how such combinations are thoroughly justified by the expressive requirements of the drama. Tsukkerman thus underscores in some detail the important significance of the intersecting of the folk-song—everyday aspect with the romantic—fantastic aspect. There is no impenetrable wall between them:

The spirit of the folk quality clearly is felt also in the fantastic music of Rimsky-Korsakov—whether by way of varied interweaving, or by way of the emphasis of common, related elements in folk-song and fantastic music.

In Rimsky-Korsakov's music the folk quality almost always subordinates itself to the fantastic, bringing into it its ideological content, its order of events, its habitual genres. In its turn the fantastic element in its own way set off the folk source, connected it with nature, with the strength of its expressive means enriched the folk lyricism, drama and humor.

The historical significance of the connections of the fantastic and folk elements is included in the fact that into some abstract romanticism of the Lisztian type Rimsky-Korsakov injects the fresh stream of folk realism—both in musical language and subject.104

For Tsukkerman all this puts to rest the negative interpretations of the role of the fantastic element in Rimsky-Korsakov's music—that it is unrealistic, motoristic, formulaic, unproductive.

However, in turning his attention to Rimsky-Korsakov's treatment of folk song, Tsukkerman finds that Rimsky-Korsakov under-utilizes some of the characteristic traits of folk-song structure. In this context
Rimsky-Korsakov's adherence to logic and organization—which Tsukkerman praises in connection with his fantastic music in order to deflect charges of decadence—serves him less well: "Rimsky-Korsakov did not see that the very ideas of logic and organization find in different styles their different expression, that what is not understandable, 'dirty' from the point of view of one style, is strong, intelligent in another historically placed style." He explains further:

Rimsky-Korsakov aspired to reconcile his opposing aspirations to speak with the pure language of Russian folk music, on the one side, and possibly to disrupt less several rational sources of music, which seemed to him universal and obligatory. He sincerely accommodated folk song with an open spirit, but from timidity stopped on lifelong traits, for which arbitrariness and recalcitrance raged. This is why Rimsky-Korsakov was able to call the collection of Mel'gunov "barbaric"; this is why he also avoided "exceptional harshnesses" of the folk-song structure or smoothed them over; this is why he also went sometimes to exceptional compromises with the musical language of West European classicism and romanticism,106

Such an attitude also helps to explain Rimsky-Korsakov's version of Musorgsky's Boris Godunov.

Thus, this article, too, falls under the heading of musicological criticism, in that Tsukkerman makes judgments and evaluations beyond the usual theoretical musicological levels, and uses his theoretical findings to corroborate his evaluations. Tsukkerman's brand of integrated analysis, therefore, frequently becomes a tool for criticism; and this criticism emanates from prevailing Soviet views towards music composition—that music be "dynamic," programmatic, realist, socialist, true to the folk tradition, assessable, and understandable. But also and perhaps most importantly for Tsukkerman, a composition must be
musically coherent and express a unity that can be revealed through analysis. Therefore, his analyses are not overtly political; such a "vulgar" approach as promoted by the proletarian theorists ultimately was dropped in favor of a more moderate approach.

Tsukkerman's integrated analytical approach can be useful in several ways. For the Soviets it provides for the combination of the elements necessary from both political and musical points of view. On the musical side it provides the opportunity for the analyst to consider all the theoretical elements—form, melody, harmony, rhythm, voicing, leading, polyphony, instrumentation, dynamics, timbre, etc., all those aspects that normally should be considered in a general analysis. This interpretation of "integrated analysis" is instructive even for Western theorists. On the political side it necessitates the inclusion of the aspects of expressiveness, content or programmatic significance, historical background and placement, dialectics, Socialist Realism, and any other aspect emanating from Marxism-Leninism. In addition the analyst must criticize and evaluate the music, not only the music itself—in terms of its assessability, understandability and intent—but also the music's folk-music interpretation, socialist ideals (uplifting, heroic, progressive, etc.), historical significance, and inherent value.

Given all this, it is understandable why the theoretical elements begin to be overshadowed by the other aspects and why music theory becomes deprived of much of the significance it held throughout the 1920s. However, this is just one factor contributing to its decline. Others include near-absolute official disfavor towards the more modern
tendencies in twentieth-century music, which immediately restricts theorists as to subject matter and approaches; a divisive attitude towards theory pedagogy among theorists themselves, which hinders the training of future theorists; the general downgrading of theory research ("theory for theory's sake" is unacceptable), and the substitution of criticism for research. Music theory cannot thrive and grow in such a restrictive, circumscribed atmosphere as developed in the 1930s and 1940s, dictated as it was by political philosophy. Some theorists, Tiulin and Mazel, for example, tried not to allow politics to dominate their work, but found they had to accommodate it nonetheless. The ideal would be not just to accommodate these changes in political orientation, but to transcend them, to create something new and vital in spite of them. Asafiev found a means of accomplishing this, but few Soviet theorists were able to match his originality.

Tsukkerman on the Dynamics of Form. Tsukkerman was very much influenced by Asafiev, by his own admission. He incorporated the aspect of musical dynamics in form into his concept of integrated analysis, and also devoted separate attention to it. He lectured on the topic at the Moscow Conservatory in 1935, and in 1970 published an expanded version—more than twice the size of the original—of these lectures. A brief examination of this article will provide some insight into another important area of Tsukkerman's theoretical work during the 1930s and also will illustrate how Asafiev's views influenced another significant theorist of the time.
The purpose of this article, entitled "Dinamicheskii printsip v muzykal'noi forme" [The dynamic principle in musical form], is "to research the influences exerted by dynamics in development on musical form, on the correlation of its large segments." However, Tsukkerman does not abandon his integrated analytical approach for this study: "By no means will dynamic relations be traced separately from content, the character of images, genre types." Thus throughout the article he closely links his concept of dynamics to the concepts of content, imagery and genre.

By "dynamics" Tsukkerman means "above all tension, completely manifested and clearly perceptible." He outlines the various levels of the significance of the term. In its widest meaning, dynamics in music signifies "the totality of the processes of development, of motion, in which the 'life' of a musical work, irrespective of its borders or of the degree of its aspect of revelation, is felt." More concretely, dynamics means "the degree of the activeness or passiveness of development." But these gradations of development concern not only the active or passive aspect, but also "the greater or lesser continuity of development... the idea of 'through-development'-the process of development, which occurs through the entire work (or its large parts), imparting to it unity and, in large part, a progressive, rising direction." The reverse of dynamics is a static state, invariability, a minimum of development. In "a still more narrow but then definite sense dynamics is a synonym for tension, ... 'dynamicness' signifies high tension, staticness is low [tension]."
Its most narrow interpretation concerns simply the level of volume, its most familiar meaning—what Tsukkerman calls at times either dynamic "nuances" or "volume" dynamics. This last, most obvious manifestation shows "the outward appearance of inner processes." Although Tsukkerman interprets dynamics in all its meanings, he focuses predominantly on the senses of tension and development, the opposite of statics. He narrows his subject further to the study of the relation of recapitulation to development, in other words, how the dynamics of form are achieved through—or perhaps one should say, in spite of—repetition, which in and of itself is more static than dynamic, and which creates "a potential barrier for the free course of dynamic streams." He limits his investigation to small or mid-scale forms, for in them these dynamic regularities may be clearly observed.

But, Tsukkerman asserts, recapitulations are rarely static and contain much that is potentially dynamic. He categorizes them in four broad groups according to the type and degree of change within them—thematic development, variation, intensification, and reincarnation, that is, from relatively simple changes to a complete transformation. Recapitulations with thematic development or variation provide rather expected types and degrees of changes. The latter two categories, intensification and reincarnation, require some explanation. In an intensified recapitulation, the level of tension is raised; this type forms what Tsukkerman calls "a dynamic recapitulation." This upsurge of tension distinguishes the intensified recapitulation from simply thematic variation, which only introduces variety or refreshment. The
process itself of intensification and subsequent transformation is
called "dynamization." These terms, introduced by Tsukkerman in 1935,
have come into general use in Soviet music theory. The type of recapit-
tulation called "reincarnation" is a qualitative leap beyond intensifi-
cation; it results not so much from the degree of dynamic strengthening
as from the method and type of intensification. Tsukkermanacknowl-
dges the existence of intermediate levels between these types, but he
does not discuss them. And since only the two categories of intensifi-
cation and reincarnation result from the infusion of the dynamic prin-
ciple—the raising of tension—into musical form, Tsukkerman discusses
the first two non-dynamic categories only in connection with the latter
two. Thus, once having established these theoretical categories, in
effect he abandons them. Concentrating on such categories might in
itself be considered "static."

Tsukkerman explores all areas in connection with the phenomenon of
the dynamic recapitulation—its historical development, its formal
preparation, its realization and means (both outer and inner), and its
course or progress. In keeping with his processual, dynamic approach
to form, his approach to the statement of his theory is therefore more
dynamic than static; following the analysis of the historical process,
he discusses in turn the preparation, realization, and course of the
dynamic recapitulation. He concludes with an investigation of the
phenomenon he identifies as the "weakened recapitulation," and a gener-
al summing-up.

He traces the development of dynamization from Mozart and Haydn to
Beethoven, who created the first significant models of dynamization. Outer means of dynamization include the elements of volume, texture (orchestration and register) and tempo. Inner means include compression or extension of material; harmonic, melodic and polyphonic changes; and order of material. The "textural intrusion" of material is also a means of dynamization; when it involves thematically significant elements, Tsukkerman calls the result a "dynamic-synthetic recapitulation."

The dynamic recapitulation presents two different views of unity: either an interior blending of elements within the recapitulation or, in a wider manifestation of unity, a combination of the recapitulation with the coda. Still another type of dynamic conclusion—not a recapitulation—is the "culminating coda," which substitutes for a non-dynamic recapitulation.

Tsukkerman also takes a larger view of the dynamic principle and turns his attention to questions beyond those involving just the recapitulation, such as the correlation of dynamization between the various segments and the movement or piece of music as a whole, the problem of the dynamic function of separate parts in connection with their location within the larger whole, the problem of "progressive dynamization" (the repeated consecutive upsurge of tension), and the question of dynamization in multi-recapitulatory forms such as the rondo and other cyclical forms and in concentric forms. In all Tsukkerman discusses a very wide spectrum of formal types that are affected by the dynamic principle—"three-part and two-part, simple and
complex, expanded and compressed, progressive, concentric, rondo, sonata, synthetic." As references and examples he concentrates on the literature from Beethoven to Scriabin and Medtner, with some references to more recent music by Prokofiev and Shostakovich through the 1940s. But because of the nature of the subject matter, he includes a multitude of references with only a few concrete examples, which, because of their brevity, unfortunately do not serve their purpose well.

For Tsukkerman the significance of the dynamic principle goes beyond mere formal considerations:

But the significance of the very ideas "dynamization," "dynamic form," "dynamic recapitulation," it seems to us, is not exhausted by these concrete facts; it is wider also in a generally fundamental relation. The paths of the overcoming of schematicism in the understanding of musical form are varied. One of them is the introduction of the category of development into the sphere of form; in this connection it is impossible not to name Asafiev, whose contribution here is very great—even the understanding of form as a process signifies namely the ability to judge about it in development, in formation. The sphere of musical development is exceptionally wide and multi-faceted. One of its most important aspects is the problem of the quality of tension, its levels, its changes, the artistic role of dynamism. This problem should not be joined to the constructive schematic understanding of form "from without," as a sort of addition. It should be studied as the most inner aspect of musical form itself, potentially inherent to it, realized flexibly and diversely.

Essentially, Tsukkerman aspired to place at the foundation of the study of form and the approach to analysis the search for the inner, psychological aspect. This includes in a very broad sense the psychology of the musical form itself—dynamics—and the psychology of the representation of the music—expression and content. The previously hegemonic outer, constructive approach may be utilized not as an end in itself but as a means to an end, in the same way that all other
theoretical elements are viewed as means to an end in his integrated analytical approach. But the importance of the schematic aspect of form was not so much diminished as the significance of the processual, dynamic aspect was augmented. It became intertwined with the aspects of expression and content and in raising these several aspects to the highest levels in analysis, Soviet theorists transformed the areas of "form" and "analysis." However, merely examining the "dynamization" of a recapitulation, for example, does not ensure that the true significance of these "dynamic" occurrences are understood. In the same way that he pointed out the metamorphosis of the folk theme in the last movement of Shekhter's Turkmenia, Tsukkerman would duly note the "dynamized" elements, and thus understand the "process" of the movement to be fulfilled. But this understanding does not explain why such changes take place, such as the need for closure. Marxist philosophy provides the answers, unfortunately, and prevents further exploration.

Tsukkerman did not publish any sort of general article similar to the one just discussed until 1965; a second article appeared in 1967. The year 1967 also marks the appearance of the first textbook of his approach to form. Of course this places Tsukkerman's further works outside the purview of this present study but raises an important question: Why did it take over thirty years for such works to appear? The possible reasons for this are two: the instability and uncertainty in the discipline of music theory in the 1930s and 1940s, and the opposition among some quarters to Tsukkerman's ideas. A third reason may have been simply the overwhelming enormity of the task of writing a
textbook or guide on this subject using a new approach and the resulting uncertainty or divisiveness as to how to proceed. The final result published in 1967 was co-authored by Tsukkerman and Mazel. Mazel himself during the 1930s declined to provide a textbook and merely produced an analysis as a model for future applications of the method. Mazel and his colleagues instead concentrated on preparing Catoire's work on form for publication, which although essentially formalistic in nature was readily available. The picture one receives from this is a general reluctance on the part of Tsukkerman and others to create a definitive statement of views which over time may have turned out to be not satisfactory to others or to the authorities. As we shall see, the climate of the 1940s was even less conducive to the publication of such a work than was the 1930s.

Ryzhkin on Taneev's "Menuet". Other theorists besides Tsukkerman utilized the concept of integrated analysis in their works. In his 1934 article, "'Menuet' Taneeva (O khudozhestvennom obraze)" ["The Minuet" of Taneev (About artistic image)], Ryzhkin applies the concept to Taneev's song "Menuet" [Minuet] for voice and piano, Op. 26, No. 9 (from "Immorteli," ten short poems from a collection of translations by Ellis), composed in 1908. His analysis is revealing from several points of view—didactic, because it presents a model of sorts for an integrated analysis in which content takes precedence; philosophical, because it concentrates on the fulfillment of Marxist principles; and theoretical, because Ryzhkin does analyze the thematic design and
formal structure of the song. Ryzhkin outlines two goals in this work:

First—to break the "plot of silence" around the questions of concrete analysis, to give impetus to the development of cross arguments and to the revelation of very different points of view, carefully preserved "at home"; second—to place several problems, relevant for the development of Soviet musical culture, in the material of legacy.123

In other words, according to his first goal Ryzhkin hoped to promote a public discussion about integrated analysis, since some theorists were apparently reluctant to present their differing opinions.

His interpretation of Taneev's "Minuet" centers on the conflict between two different images:

Taneev's compositional methods in the first part are used to reproduce the essential traits of aristocratic art of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and through this to introduce us into the idealized world of the French aristocracy (first image); in the second part—to oppose to this a distorted image [the second image] of the French plebian revolutionary movement of the end of the eighteenth century; in the third part to give the development of the conflict of these two sources.124

He asks three questions, which broaden the focus of his inquiry beyond that of a simple exercise in analysis:

(1) How did the composer treat the use of folk songs (more widely—the question about musical "citations"); (2) is the correspondence of the musical and literary text a sign of realism; (3) is it possible to speak about the presence of images in this work and is not music an abstract art, not using imagery.125

Thus Ryzhkin, like Tsukkerman and most Soviet theorist/critics, is concerned with the composer's treatment of folk song. But beyond this issue Ryzhkin also addresses the timely issues of realism and imagery and whether in fact they do exist in Taneev's "Minuet."

The poem "Minuet" contains thirty-six lines, which Taneev has divided into three parts. The first sixteen lines of the first section
evoke the minuet and its era, a happy time; but in the last four lines, the mood turns sorrowful. Ominous echoes of the past appear, and the second and third sections, four and twelve lines, respectively, contrast the gaiety and heartlessness of an aristocratic ball where the minuet is danced with ultimate despair and the fate of death by the guillotine. Taneev's setting follows closely the mood changes and underlying disaster of the poem's theme. He introduces the French revolutionary theme "Sa ira" in the second part in an energetic and excited rendering to illustrate the reason for the change in mood. It returns at the end of the piece in a more subdued fashion. It is, no doubt, no coincidence that Ryzhkin chose a piece with the French Revolution as its background.

Ryzhkin's analysis is technical and theoretical only so far as this type of analysis supports his general conclusions about its content. He describes the musical means through which Taneev evokes the eighteenth-century aristocratic world in the first part—closed symmetry, the type of thematic development, the very character of the melodic and harmonic aspects, and the ensemble statement. Further, he illustrates the methods Taneev applied to the French revolutionary song "Sa ira" to produce the impression of disorder and destruction in the second part, resulting in the completely unstable statement of the melody, the contrapuntal juxtaposition of the two parts of the song resulting in the break of its linear development, and the narrowly focused and mid-register orchestration. Finally, he traces the means Taneev used to produce the subsequent conflict between these two forces.
in the final segment—the repetition of thematic elements from the first part of the song coupled with an inertness, a lack of motion, and an open construction. Ryzhkin sums up this final section, "The internal order is broken, the tragic finale is inevitable."

For the first part of "Menuet," Ryzhkin concentrates on illustrating Taneev's tight thematic construction, in which four basic thematic elements ("A," "B," "C," and "D") are stated in the first two measures (Example 27.15). These four elements are then utilized and developed throughout the thirty-six measures of this first part. A new element, "E," appears in mm. 6-7 and is also developed subsequently, with particular concentration in the vocal part. Example 27.16 illustrates several manifestations of these elements.


Ryzhkin characterizes Taneev's method of establishing thematic unity and integrity as a formal division of elements and their mechanical combination, rather than the preferred method of deriving unity
a) m. 4; b) mm. 7-8; c) mm. 11-12; d) mm. 15-16.
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from the organic growth of the musical material, with a qualitative transformation and the preservation of the inner relations. He compares Taneev in this regard with Beethoven, whose music illustrates the latter method. However, Ryzhkin says, the formal method characterizes French clavichord music, and helps to give this segment its "aristocratic" air. Such a method would seem to be completely foreign to Taneev, given what we know of Taneev's own views on the subject of development and thematic transformation; so Ryzhkin's interpretation that it is Taneev's conscious evocation of the past does seem more plausible.

The introduction and working-out of the thematic elements are carried out primarily in the first half of this segment; for in its design, according to Ryzhkin—reminiscent of Conus—the second half constitutes a mirror reflection of the first, creating an overall symmetry. The mid-way point is measure 18. Ryzhkin calls the new material in measures 19–20 and its repeat in measures 23–24 a "ritornello"—a reference to the word "ritornello" in the text in measures 21–22—which is followed in measures 21–22 by descending sequential material and in measures 25–26 by ascending sequential material. Ryzhkin does not relate this material in measures 19–26 to the rest of the section. In fact, neither it nor the material immediately preceding it, measures 15–18, recurs in the piece. Figure 27.1 reproduces Ryzhkin's rendition of this symmetry. This symmetry and the mechanical means of development are not formalistic, in Ryzhkin's interpretation, but express the idea of the work—in this part to establish the image of the eighteenth-century world of aristocratic order and refinement.
Figure 27.1. Sergei Ivanovich Taneев, "Menuet," first part, mm. 1-36.

The second part concentrates on the song "Sa ira." Its first portion is shown in Example 27.17a, and Taneev's treatment of it is shown in Example 27.17b. He uses it only in the accompaniment; the vocal part continues undisturbed by this "intrusion." The song is divided up and played against itself, and the unstable tonality moves through various keys and modes—the dominants of the melodic minor modes of D, F, Eb, E and A, then the Phrygian and harmonic major modes on E as dominant preparation for A major and the return to beginning material in measure 54. Also, there are some unclear harmonies and no resting cadences in the sense of Rameau. Ryzhkin points out two thematic elements in common with the first part—the element "A" and the rhythmic figure from the upper part in measure 8 (Example 27.16b). Taneев obviously derived these elements from the song.
a) the revolutionary song "Sa irs"; b) mm. 38-41.

In the third part, according to Ryzhkin, the voice reestablishes its leading significance, but the order from the first part does not return. The vocal melody takes on a tragic tone. From its culminating high point, the Ab in measure 79, it slowly declines, and in the upper
register leaves the half-step G–Gb unresolved. Following the vocal
cadence in F minor in measures 93–94, fragments of "Sa ira" appear in
the accompaniment in a low register, and gradually fade away.

Having thus completed the analysis, in answer to his questions
Ryzhkin makes several points relative to contemporary Soviet music.
First, musical citations and the use of folk and revolutionary songs in
contemporary music are useful only if presented from a contemporary,
realistic point of view. Composers should not use them simply to
present an earlier view, for that view would represent an unrealistic
perception from an earlier epoch. Taneev, for example, did not merely
"cite" the song "Sa ira," but he "distorted it, showed it in a crooked
mirror—as chaos, as the spirit of resolution and destruction, not
knowing moments of supporting, positive, architectural order. How
Taneev used 'Sa ira'! . . . If Taneev also distorts it, then . . . he
judges it better than this world judged itself—he idealizes it."

In answer to the second question, Ryzhkin states, "The realism of
a musical work, connected with a text, is defined not by the correspon-
dence of the idea of the musical work to the idea of the literary text,
but by the correspondence of the idea of the musical work and of the
literary text to actual reality." He describes how Taneev deals
with this aspect:

The work of Taneev distorts historically existing reality; and if
there are elements of realism in it, then they are revealed in
defiance of the idealization in the first image, in defiance of
the distortion in the second image—by virtue of such a display of
elemental materialism, which is manifest in each idealistic (phil-
osophical or artistic) system, distorting reality, but having as
its starting point a component part of this same reality.129
In other words, Taneev's fundamentally idealistic approach is realistic insofar as each idealistic system contains kernels of materialism and of the very reality that it distorts. Ryzhkin avoids the issue here.

Concerning the third question, Ryzhkin from the very beginning asserts the presence of images in Taneev's "Minuet," following the thought that, like painting and literature, all music, even abstract music, uses imagery. Since in the Soviet view, art (including music) must reflect reality, then even abstract music will contain images of this reality; and because of their abstract nature, these images will be more profound, more complete, and more truthful than more concrete ones, such as those found in specifically programmatic music.

An artistic image contains a deeper, truer, more complete reflection of reality, characteristic to abstraction, with such a profusion of the unique, the unrepeated, which is characteristic to a separate phenomenon. The abstract and the concrete, the typical and the individual are contained absolutely in an artistic image; the same belongs also to a musical image.

Thus, in analyzing a prerevolutionary work, one with a text, Ryzhkin manages to make several points far more relevant to contemporary Soviet music than to the music he is actually analyzing. This approach in essence fulfills his second goal. Ryzhkin's interpretation of integrated analysis thus contrasts with that of Tsukkerman by concentrating far more on aesthetic principles than on musical ones. He is, in general, a more strict interpreter and applier of Marxist philosophy than Tsukkerman and even Mazel, as we will see.

Such didactic philosophizing formed part of the effort to reshape Soviet music and music theory according to Marxist principles. It is
therefore difficult to judge Ryzhkin's analysis on purely theoretical terms, for to give such an analysis was never his intention. There are a number of theoretical elements he does not address, for example the tonal plan of the piece, about which Taneev was most sensitive; the invertible counterpoint he uses in treating the song "Sa ira"; the agogic, dramatic and harmonic culminating points (he mentions the final Ab); the overall form of the piece and the formal shapes of the second and third sections; the details of the changes, the "conflict," in the third section and how this conflict is resolved, and so forth. But the subject matter and questions of a general philosophical nature occupied Ryzhkin to the exclusion of these more technical matters. This, of course, is a general preoccupation of Soviet theory during this period, and those theorists who did not actively undertake this approach were criticized for their omissions. Such was the case with Yuli Kremlev.

The Analyses of Yuli Kremlev—Debussy, Liszt, Musorgsky. During the 1930s, Yuli Kremlev wrote several analytical articles, each one devoted to the music of one composer—Debussy, and two of his more important predecessors, Liszt and Musorgsky. A brief examination of each article will illustrate Kremlev's move away from more theoretical, "formalist" concerns towards more aesthetic, Marxist ones. His 1934 analysis of the music of Debussy, "Ob impressionizme Kloda Debiussi" [About the impressionism of Claude Debussy], the first extended analysis of Debussy's music or impressionism in general in Soviet theory, is a fairly interesting and revealing work by Western standards for its
time. Yet the editors of *Soviet music* considered it too formalistic and not attentive enough to the Marxist goal of integrated analysis:

[Kremlev's article] still preserves a significant number of formalistic tendencies in its analysis of musical works.

At the same time, there is a positive side to the author's subjective intentions, undoubtedly showing that he aspires to place artistic phenomena on the path of Marxist analysis. Unfortunately, in the present stage of his development the author was not able to carry out his subjective intentions on the matter. After declaring a whole row of correct sociological conclusions about the essence of impressionism, Kremlev begins the construction of a system of formal signs and even simple technical methods (for example in the sphere of instrumentation) corresponding to the impressionistic world view.

Turning to concrete musical works, he almost completely forgets about their content and directs the entire analysis towards the enumerated characteristic formal technical signs of impressionism established earlier.

The resulting mechanistic quality and the entire oversimplified schematicism significantly reduce the value of many apt observations and remarks. His incorrect opposition of the style of impressionism to the world view of impressionism (the definite relation of man to the surrounding reality and the aesthetics defined by this relation) lies at the basis of his mistakes.

In spite of all these insufficiencies, Kremlev's work undoubtedly is worthy of a very wide critical discussion, which will contribute to the further growth of comrade Kremlev as a Soviet musicologist.

Essentially, in addition to "forgetting" to analyze the content of the works he discussed, Kremlev fails to treat the various technical means Debussy used in the same critical manner that he treats impressionism in general, which he described as lacking "a realistic reflection of reality" and "a realistic creative method." He analyzes Debussy's compositional technique in some detail, using numerous descriptions and examples of melodic variation, amorphous rhythmic leitmotives, metric ambiguity, unusual modes and modal juxtapositions, and harmonic and instrumental color to point out the "afunctional" quality of impressionism, the tonal vagueness, and the transfer of function.
into color. But rather than analyzing the content expressed by such
techniques and relating it strongly to the Socialist-Realist, Marxist-
Leninist view of content, he merely places the technical accomplish-
ments of impressionism within the context of the development of bour-
ggeois musical culture of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.
Kremlev's noncoordinated assessment of the philosophy of impressionism
and its technical implementation in music, a dichotomy echoed in his
rather equivocal closing statement, led to the editors' charge of an
opposition between these two aspects in Kremlev's analysis.

Kremlev devotes the first part of his article to a lengthy discuss-
ion of the history of impressionism and its sociological environment,
following the principles of Marxism. For example, he points out
impressionism's primary contributing role in music history, its de-
struction of logic and functionality, each a creation of the revolu-
tionary bourgeoisie:

the unusual color enrichment and through this the destruction of
the system of musical logic, created by the revolutionary bour-
ggeois epoch of Beethoven... . . the destruction of the central
nucleus of Beethovenian harmony—the clearly contradictory "func-
tionalism," reflecting the progressive heroic spirit of the revo-
lationary bourgeoisie.134

He prefaces his technical analysis with the identification and dis-
cussion of four interconnecting lines of development in the nineteenth
century, elements of each of which may be found in impressionism:

1) musical expressionism, "through the exceptionally altered intensifi-
cation of modal connections and through the sumptuous modulatory join-
ings of modes to modal amorphousness and the destruction of all modal
contradictions" (Wagner and Schoenberg); 2) the use of higher and more complex tertian structures, which "led to the indifferentiation of modal tensions and to the absorption of dissonances by consonances" (Scriabin and symbolism); 3) the discovery of new, nondifferentiated modes and the rediscovery of old modes (impressionism); and 4) polytonality and "constructivism" (Stravinsky).

In the second part of his article, a technical analysis of "Prelude a l'apres-midi d'un Faune" and "La Mer" in which he focuses on various elements from the four lines of development he identified, Marxist-oriented language and content analysis is noticeably absent. It reappears only on the last page:

The correct evaluation of impressionism is possible only on the basis of the consideration of the deep contradiction of the musical historical process, leading from Beethoven to Debussy. Over the period of the nineteenth century the descending line of bourgeois art occurs in complex dialectical interactions with the artistic impulses of the rising proletariat.

A contemplative sensualism is in general characteristic to bourgeois thought.

In the epoch of Debussy, on the verge of the decay of capitalism, ... this contemplative sensualism, finally being torn away from social practice, becomes subjective, idealistic.

Here appears more vividly the historical tragedy of bourgeois culture, consisting in the fact that the flowering of bourgeois individuality is possible only on the basis of exploitation, parasitism, the onerously constrained isolation of the subject from society and of the alienation of it from the forward movement of history. In the context of the consideration of the sharp contradiction between the unusual diversity and the brilliant colorfulness of the sensations of the outer world, and the subjective idealistic nucleus of the world view—in this context also should flow the critical mastery of Debussy.

Having cast aside as a whole his creative method hostile to us, the musical culture of socialism may not ignore the number of individual achievements of this method, by the tremendous skill of Debussy in the sphere of the fixing of the smallest changes of reality, finding his concrete fulfillment in all his narrowly differentiated technology of harmonic, melodic, rhythmic and timbral orchestral colors.
Thus even in his closing remarks Kremlev continues his tacit approval of the particular technological elements of Debussy's impressionism while at the same time condemning all of bourgeois culture—and impressionism as a product of that culture—in usual Marxist terms. This, coupled with his omission of any significant analysis of the expressive content of the music, resulted in a less-than-integrated analysis according to the requirements of a truly Marxist musicology.

In his second article in this vein, which is devoted to the music of Liszt, Kremlev focuses on just one aspect of Liszt's style, his harmony. The scope of his topic, following a Marxist historical approach—fortified by the obligatory quotes from Engels and Lenin—is not to investigate the entire historical evolution of Liszt's harmonic language, a necessary but too lengthy undertaking, but to characterize the main traits of Liszt's harmonic style within a historical framework, using only some of his piano pieces and symphonic poems from various periods. Unfortunately, here Kremlev has allowed ideology to dominate, and the observations he makes and the conclusions he draws are, to a Western sensibility, incompatible with each other.

He discusses two broad aspects of Liszt's harmonic language, the external and the internal. Its "external side" concerns the harmonic texture of his music. This involves not just harmony, but other factors as well, such as register, dynamics, instrumentation, orchestration, timbre and even polyphony. Liszt's piano works are characterized by the "elegance," "brilliant coloristic mastery," a "romantically cultivated semantics," and "some superficiality" in their harmonic
But the greatest contrast in Liszt's works, according to Kremlev, is that "stubbornly adhering to the sentimental romantic criticism of capitalism, Liszt, at the same time, adopted the entire showy brilliance of the truly capitalistic art of the epoch of the July monarchy." In their harmonic texture his orchestral works are characterized by "brilliance" but with "purely external decorative-ness," and "boldness" but "limited by risky schematicism. . . . Liszt . . . transfers back into the orchestra the 'orchestra quality' of his piano." Liszt also compartmentalizes "the entire orchestral 'sound field' into separate groups of timbral registral effects and with deliberate contrastness, mechanically combines and alternates these effects."

The internal aspect includes those harmonic traits that characterize "the process of bourgeois musical history of the nineteenth century—the process of the transformation of modal richness into poverty, of complex 'functionality' into the denial of function, of modal crystallization into modal amorphousness, of harmonic complications into simplification." Kremlev divides his discussion of this process into the vertical, "the process of the indifference of function," and the horizontal, "the process of the indifference of the tonal plan." Under vertical characteristics, Kremlev mentions the melodic avoidance of tonic within chords; the functional "obscuring" of chords through the use of inversions and the like; and the obscuring and "swelling" of chords through added layers, non-harmonic tones, and polyfunctional and polytonal combinations. Horizontal characteristics include excessive
chromatic alterations; excessive modulating with atonal tendencies; sequences; "the destruction of the functional logical system of the seven-degree mode" through the avoidance of the leading tone and the introduction of amorphous (both new and old) modes; and "the subordination of the dialectical triad of functions (T-S-D-T) at first by the onesidedness of dominant (T-D-T) and particularly plagal (T-S-T) and 143 then tonic (T-T-T)," both between and within tonalities. Kremlev discusses each of these points in some detail. He takes special note of Liszt's "masterful modernistic revival of the 'natural' modes," despite their amorphous functionality: "The narrow merge in Liszt of the modernism of natural modal turns (having so captivated 'the Russian school') with a romanticized cultivated semantics is very curious." 144

In sum, Kremlev concludes that although Liszt's harmony is "individually specific," it also represents "a definite level of development of bourgeois harmonic thought. Liszt firmly established the tonicness of tonal plans and goes far on the path of the preparation of tonic 145 afunctionality within the mode." With this tonicness and "the bold destruction of the rationalistic [classical] norms of polyphony, voice-leading, registers, etc.," Liszt anticipates many impressionistic traits. Kremlev sees the development of harmony in the nineteenth century as becoming increasingly abstracted and under the weight of a traditional constraint of thought. This "constraint," this "musical scholasticism" led to the "exhaustion" of the harmonic system, to "the impasse of an all-consuming tonicness" in the impressionists and eventually to "neoclassical cacophony." 147 Soviet music, Kremlev asserts,
must renounce this scholasticism, these ossified traditions, and chose from the past the best of what arose in spite of these traditions. From the harmony of Liszt he recommends "many keenly grasped models of ideas and feelings, the mastery of the solution of some coloristic problems," but cautions against his philosophical views and his "amor- phous hedonistic system." Thus it is primarily the external side of Liszt's music, the textural, coloristic side, and not the internal side, the tendencies towards amorphous, afunctional, atonal language— with the exception of the old modes—that Kremlav sanctions. Kremlav does not reconcile his contradictory approach towards Liszt's revival of the old modes—contributing to afunctionality, yet termed modern and taken up by the Russian classicists. Thus, although his analysis of the salient features of Liszt's harmonic style holds interest for the non-Marxist, Western readers would no doubt find his renunciations and proselytizing offensive. This approach must have wearied many a theorist, who constantly had to search for and denounce the decadent elements in Western "bourgeois" music.

In his 1939 article, "O muzykal'nom iazyke Musorgskogo" [On the musical language of Musorgsky], Kremlav avoids controversial topics and detailed analysis altogether. Here he merely summarizes the originality of Musorgsky's philosophical thought as embodied in the melodic and harmonic characteristics of his music, and refers to specific musical examples only in footnotes. Kremlav depicts Musorgsky as fighting against more traditional schemes of music. Musorgsky took "a new creative path . . . into the truth of direct observation and
experience," both in his philosophical views and in his music." In his melodic style this created an unavoidable but very characteristic contradiction between folk music on the one hand and speech intonations on the other. In his later works, such as "Khovanshchina" and "Pictures at an Exhibition," this contradiction led to the creation of a new melodic style, "a great achievement in the history of Russian music—a true synthesis of the folk precepts of Glinka and the ideas of Dargomyzhsky."

An even greater achievement, though, was Mussorgsky's creation of a new level of harmonic thought, which influenced both Russian and European composers. Many of Mussorgsky's harmonic tendencies are characteristic only of his music, such as the major seventh chord, "for the fulfillment of the malicious, tragic, sarcastic or hideous," the "Tristan seventh chord," which he uses "more as a means of dramatic expressiveness than as the image of romantic 'langour,'" the "collision of remote harmonic tones," altered subdominant harmonies, augmented triads "in the view of independent 'colorful highlights,'" altered dominant seventh chords with a raised third, plagal cadences (from Glinka but imbued "with great independence and clarity"), tertian juxtapositions of tonalities, and so forth. Kremljev attributes to Mussorgsky's originality of musical thought the manifestation of a new understanding of musical logic, as the logic of the folk realistic style, bringing to the West an emancipation from the binding metaphysics of Wagnerism. Using the richness of romantic harmony, Mussorgsky subjected it to new creative tasks. He first began to write with pure harmonic colors, on the basis of the coloristic unity of tonalities. With this he marked a world-wide level in the development of musical thought.
Thus by focusing on aspects acceptable to Marxist musicology, Musorgsky's use of realistic and folk elements, his innovative role in the development of European and Russian music, the philosophical and expressive content of his musical language, Kremlev was able to avoid any possible controversy. Even so, he discusses in footnotes the influence of Musorgsky's music on Debussy and refers the reader to his earlier article on impressionism. From this and other analytical articles from this time, it is apparent, though, that the earlier intensity directed towards integrated Marxist analysis had abated somewhat. The analysis of content, for example, is not ignored but neither is its role exaggerated. The same may be said for the analysis of music history and society according to Marxist principles. In fact, the presence of Marxist philosophy is much less obvious and much more subtle that it was previously. Direct references to the thoughts of Marx or Lenin, which were present in the earlier articles, are lacking altogether, although discussions of such aspects as realism, folk music, intonation, etc., coupled with the analysis of content and expressive means, testify to the influence of the integrated approach.

One of Kremlev's last articles from this period examines the nineteenth-century West European (non-folk) influence on certain melodic intonations in Chaikovsky's music. While ostensibly theoretical, this article deals more with aesthetic concerns. Kremlev focuses on the "emotionalization" of music in late nineteenth-century Russia—to which he contrasts West-European music of that time as less directly emotional than sensual—resulting in the application of intonations
similar to those in human speech. This produces a confluence of rom anti-cism and realism that is characteristic of Chaikovsky's music.

Kremlev discusses three concrete applications, examples of all of which may be found in music of Chaikovsky's predecessors: suspension, a clearly expressed ascending or descending melodic line, and the use of larger intervals. He cites numerous examples, accompanied, however, by analyses of emotional content rather than theoretical structure.

Other Analyses. The remaining analytical articles from this period are too numerous to discuss in detail here. Only two examples, each by a distinguished theorist of Soviet musicology, will be mentioned. In his article, "Muzykal'nyi izyuk 'Zolotogo petushka" [The musical language of "The Golden Cockerel"], Vladimir Protopopov discusses the theme of political satire in Rimsky-Korsakov's opera, the composer's use of leitmotives "as condensed musical characteristics, including everything essential for the transmission of image," and how "the carefully thought-out construction of The Golden Cockerel—from the smallest details to the basic structural parts—is the expression of the ideological dramatic thought of the opera." Protopopov thus coordinates content analysis with strictly theoretical analysis. The theme of this opera, the satire of tsarist rule, was obviously an acceptable topic.

Viktor Berkov's analysis, "Uvertiura k 'Ruslanu i Liudmile" [The overture to "Russian and Ludmila"], focuses on discussions of both the classical and romantic traits of the overture, its thematic develop-
ment, and its form and overall development. Not forgotten, though, is the content of the overture, which is revealed through the statement and development of various themes from the opera.

The analysis of content and the expressive qualities of music thus became an indispensable part of every analysis, and cannot be over-looked when judging Soviet analytical techniques. Purely technical analysis became only one aspect of this integrated approach. These methods revert to the same ones utilized by Serov, and, to a lesser extent Stasov, in their evaluations and reviews from the nineteenth century. Although in these more recent articles the theoretical sophistication is greater, the basic intent remains the same—to reveal the aesthetic or dramatic strengths of the music, rather than to investigate the music on its own merits, as a composition, and not as an artistic—or political—statement. This strain of musicology, initiated with Odoevsky and Serov, never really died out; but from the late nineteenth century, efforts were undertaken to create new strains, which tended to supplant this one. Because it suited their purpose, the Soviets revived this strain and emphasized its merits to such an extent that the newer strains were diminished. Thus, with this renewed consideration of content and the resulting devaluation of technical and speculative theory, most of Soviet music theory became enmeshed in analytical mediocrity; no new approaches were attempted, no new analytical means were introduced. Only the theorists Mazel and Tiulin were able to inject interest into this seemingly moribund discipline—Mazel with his book-length analysis and Tiulin with his ideas on harmony.
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Chapter 28

Lev Abramovich Mazel: Analysis of Chopin's F-minor Fantasy

Lev Abramovich Mazel (1907— ). Mazel, in his book, Fantaziia f-
moll Shopena. Opyt analiza [The Fantasy in F minor by Chopin. An
Experiment in Analysis], carries out the most ambitious undertaking in
1 integrated analysis. For over fifty years, since 1930, Mazel has
been a leading Soviet theorist. After receiving a degree in musicology
from the Moscow Conservatory in 1930, he taught intermittently at the
conservatory and other music schools in Moscow such as the Gnessin
Institute until 1957. He received his doctorate from the Moscow
2 Conservatory in 1941. During the 1930s and 1940s, he devoted his
research primarily to the topics of melody, musical analysis, and the
history of theory. Mazel's early work consisted of a series of arti-
cles on various musical theoretical systems, such as metrotechtonicism,
multi-based modes and chords, and analysis by the golden section, in
addition to his articles on Kurth's theory of energetics, functional
harmony, and his group of articles for his joint venture with Ryzhkin
3 on historical theory.

Mazel's interest in theoretical systems, outside of their intrin-
sic historical value, lies in their application to musical analysis.
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His work in this area resulted in his comprehensive analysis of Chopin's Fantasia, Op. 49, his major work from this period and a work highly regarded and suitably rewarded in the Soviet Union. Calling analysis "the main vital nerve of musicology," Mazel considers "the problems of the analysis of a musical work and of musical style" to be "the central problems of our musicology." He established two goals for his work: to examine the Fantasia in detail, and to provide thereby a model demonstration of analytical methods. For the first goal, he approaches the Fantasia on two levels. On one level he analyzes the technical and compositional aspects of the work--its formal structure, the thematic (melodic and rhythmic) interrelationships, and the tonal plan. On another level he approaches the work from the aspects of style and context, investigating the content and significance of the Fantasia, Chopin's style in general, Chopin's place among the other romantic composers, and the evolution of the later instrumental forms of the romantic composers. He succeeds to a certain extent on both levels; but since, as we have seen, the integrated method of analysis leads to results more on the side of stylistic and contextual analysis, it is in this area that Mazel's efforts also dominate. Yet Mazel's analysis is still superior to the other attempts in all areas, mostly because of its book-size length, which allowed Mazel to indulge more fully in his analysis of theoretical aspects than other theorists had been able to do.

Mazel sees a relationship between the technical and the stylistic aspects of analysis:
The analysis of a concrete work is impossible without considering the regularities of a given style, which are generally historically formed; finding the content of the work is impossible without a clear idea about the expressive significance of the formal methods in this style. . . . The analysis of a concrete work and the study of the general characteristics and regularities of style represent two problems that are directly connected.

In other words, a technical formal analysis cannot be undertaken without investigating the work's stylistic background, its context; and insight into the content of a work cannot be approached without attention to the expressive aspects of this form in this style. This attention to style and context as influencing the interpretation of form and to stylistic and formal aesthetic expression as influencing content reveals Mazel's Marxist approach. But Mazel does not attempt to impose a specific program on the Fantasia, a work that he chose largely because of its nonprogrammatic nature. However, he does analyze the general content of the work, discussing the functions of various segments according to their expressive content, and drawing analogies with literary and artistic ideas.

In general, following the integrated analytical approach, Mazel considered it necessary not only to analyze separate elements such as form, harmony, rhythm, and melody, but also to examine the interaction of these elements and how they are joined together into an artistic whole that represents the general thought and content of the work. He singles out melody as the most ignored element in theoretical research, and although he does not remedy this situation particularly in this work, he did devote his next two works to the topic. He relates this approach to the true meaning of "analysis" in music:
Thus, analysis of a musical work includes the factor of the synthetic scope of the whole. Expressions such as "analysis of form," "musical analysis," etc., arose only to distinguish the study of a musical work from its composition, that is, from musical creation, but not as the opposition of the analytical scientific method to the synthetic. In connection with this, musicologists sometimes use expressions that appear at first glance to be paradoxical (for example, "integrated analysis").

Mazel, therefore, approaches analysis in a manner philosophically reminiscent of Conus, but whereas Mazel includes all musical elements, Conus concentrated only on the temporal element in its most formal—not processive—aspects. In addition, Mazel concerns himself less with adhering to a specific methodology; he uses various methods only as means towards an end: the integrity and totality of a musical work, both by itself and in ever-widening contexts, and of the analysis itself, which he considers as important as the product of the analysis. Some methods he borrowed from other theorists; others he developed himself. From Yavorsky he borrowed the ideas of the anacrusis and the ictus (in a broad sense—the anacrusis as dominant preparation before the recapitulation), variable mode, certain distinctions between the major and minor modes, intonation, monopartiteness, and turn. From Ernst Kurth, he borrowed the theory of harmonic color, and the ideas of "energetics" and of the "general form of movement," specifically, the clarifying and obscuring alteration. From Catoire, he borrowed certain formal schemes and the application of metrics. Mazel applies these means not as their inventors, in a "formalistic" and unilateral manner, but—more in accordance with Marxist theory—in a restrained way, taking only what he considered essential to illuminate the music.
The use of ... different systems is allowable only so far as these positions reflect (though in hypertrophic form) different sides of objective reality, may be treated as unopposed to each other, and may be included in a single conception, methodologically opposed to all formalistic systems.

That Mazel used parts of various systems successfully is significant, for in the 1930s it had to be demonstrated that their use was practicable and consistent with Marxist philosophy. This Mazel did by combining rather strictly formal ideas with purely dynamic ideas into a new more dualistic, dialectical (using the language of the time) unity, which was more acceptable.

Mazel approaches style analysis from the general to the specific:

One must proceed above all by determining those historically formed regularities typical of a given style or styles, be they characteristic rhythmic, melodic, or harmonic turns, the principles of the development of musical thought, or the definite types of musical statement (texture, etc.). Only then, in examining the particular manifestation of these typical regularities in a corresponding concrete case, can one draw conclusions about specific traits of the style of the composer and the work being examined.

In order to do this, Mazel examines fragments of both classical and romantic works. Following the historical process, he traces within these works compositional and stylistic devices through eras proximate to that of Chopin's, thereby placing Chopin within that process.

Having thus examined the Fantasia in terms of the classical and romantic aspects of its structure, Mazel concludes that "the general scheme of the Fantasia, beginning with its exposition, displays the fullest expression of the confluence" of the classical forms of sonata and rondo-sonata, as interpreted by the romantic composers. New characteristics in this amalgamated scheme preclude its being consi-
dered either sonata or sonata-rondo. For instance, the contrasting middle episode (C) in sonata-rondo form generally does not differ in either tempo or meter from the other sections; but in the Fantasia the middle episode changes both tempo and meter, thus functioning like the slow part of a cyclical form. Also, the transitions, instead of being derived from the basic theme as in Beethoven, for example, result primarily from a triplet theme that originates in what Mazel terms the introduction (mm. 43-67), which connects the prologue (the opening "march" of the Fantasia) and the exposition (mm. 68-142). This triplet figure does not occur in the other themes, and "the completely special material 'derived from it' ... very significantly ... plays a great and independent role in the entire work." The third special distinction between this structure and its classical predecessors is the special role and character of the prologue, which in the Fantasia makes up an independent, complete part that is never repeated in its entirety. This does not rule out the possibility, though, of particular thematic connections between the prologue and the main theme of the exposition. Considering these distinctions and peculiarities, Mazel allows himself "to speak about the elements of cyclical form ... anticipating the compression of a cyclical work into one movement in later composers."

Mazel relates the special role of the prologue and the introduction to the corresponding function of the introduction in literary poetic works, in particular ballads. The basic contrast developed in the exposition would be imperceptible if it and the general direction
of the thematic and tonal development of the exposition were not contained in the prologue and the introduction: "Thus, the presence of the prologue and the introduction makes it possible to state the basic content of the exposition more directly and to concentrate its significant dramatic development in a comparatively brief time." Specifically, the prologue states in embryo the thematic material used in the main theme (mm. 68-76), the concluding theme of the exposition (mm. 127-142), and the central episode of the development (mm. 199-222). Mazel does not mention that these three themes are the only extended
Example 28.1. Fredrich Chopin, Fantasia, Op. 49: a) Prologue, mm. 1-4; b) main theme, F minor, mm. 68-70; c) main theme, Ab major, mm. 73-75; d) main theme, Ab major, mm. 77-78; e) concluding theme of exposition, mm. 124-29; f) central episode of development, mm. 199-206.

melodies in the Fantasia, and represent a progressive softening and redirection of tension through each successive statement. The tonalities move from F minor to Ab major to B major, interspersed with E minor and Bb minor, and finally Ab in the coda. This thematic material from the prologue consists of three main motives: the descending leap of a fourth (a in Example 28.1), which usually occurs at the beginning.
of a theme and which may be expressed variously as an expansion or contraction of the original fourth, a two–note descending stepwise motive (b) that usually occurs between beats and frequently in conjunction with a, and a filled-in descending fourth (c).

The introduction, of an entirely different character from the march–prologue, supplies harmonic material for the Fantasia. It contains a "diatonic tertian chain," Mazel's term for a closed chain of tonalities consisting of two separately stated but adjacent diatonic chains. This chain (Figure 28.1) anticipates the modulatory plan of the entire Fantasia (lower–case letters represent the minor mode):

Prologue

f-------Ab------c-------Eb------Eb------Gb------bb------Db------f------Ab------

(Theme) 1  2  3  1  1  2  & coda

Exposition-----------Development----Recapitulation--------------

Figure 28.1. Fredrich Chopin, Fantasia: tertian chain of tonalities.

Mazel observes that the minor mode usually appears alongside or in close proximity to its relative major. This occurrence results in a form of "variable mode," which here encompasses not major and minor modes simultaneously, its usual meaning as developed by Yavorsky, but consecutively, as movement from the minor to its relative major. In the Fantasia five pairs of variable modes appear.

Mazel was also intrigued with the functional relations exhibited
by the tonalities in the modulatory plan of the Fantasia. From the
tonick (f–Ab), the Fantasia moves to the dominant (c–Eb), through the
parallel minor of Eb to the subdominant sphere (Gb as II, bb–Db as IV
of f), and back to tonic. Appropriately the Fantasia ends with a
plagal cadence, db–Ab. In other words, the Fantasia displays a clearly
functional plagal tonal direction: T–D–S–T. The plagal element in this
plan, reinforced by the final cadence, may be related thematically to
the fourths appearing prominently in two of the motives (a and c) from
the prologue. Although Mazel refers to the tertian chain in the modu-
larly plan and its anticipatory role as "a completely new principle,"
he nonetheless points to the use by previous composers of separate
elements of this principle, such as beginning the recapitulation in the
subdominant, beginning the development in the parallel minor of the
major tonality ending the exposition, and basing the modulatory plan of
the exposition on a diatonic tertian chain, such as I–III–V. But only
Chopin initiated this new principle by combining these elements.

Throughout the analysis, Mazel refers to the "first element" and
the "second element," two contrasting elements identifiable in the
first few measures of the Fantasia. The first element is expressed as
a deep register and a dark sound, a dotted rhythm, a disjointed thema-
tic pattern, and unison or octaves—similar to the first two measures
(Example 28.1a). The second element contains a smoother melodic line,
higher register and brighter sound, and chordal harmonies, as in the
third and fourth measures. These contrasting elements appear in dif-
ferent guises throughout the work and contribute to its overall expres-
sive sound. Each may be represented by what Mazel terms the "character of sounding," the result of which makes it possible to speak about not only a "thematic reprise" or a "tonal reprise," but also a "registral reprise" or a "reprise by the character of sounding." In other words, Mazel connects many seemingly unrelated sections through elements not previously coordinated in analysis. For example, he connects measures 93-94 with measures 109-110 through their "energetic" eight-note movement in octaves, considering the second idea to be a logical development of the first, despite the lack of common melodic ideas between the two figures (Example 28.2).

Mazel comments further:

Such a concrete character of presentation (register, "unison" or "chordal" statement, the presence or absence of chromaticism in the melody or harmony, unity or great divisiveness of presentation, the general speed of sound progressions, "the general form of the movement," the character of the accompaniment, etc., etc.), that is, the concrete character of the very sounding, acquires here in a particular sense a more or less independent formative significance.\textsuperscript{15}

Mazel also relates material by the principle of "analogy in correlations," which is evident when

the correlation between elements in one theme is analogous to the correlation of elements within another theme. So, frequently . . . in a series of themes, a contrasting juxtaposition of the first element, in the majority of cases in the lower register, and the second [element] ("chordal"), usually in the higher register, is present. The direct relatedness of the corresponding elements of the different themes (the relatedness of basic forms of motion, even the registral relatedness) may by itself be extremely insignificant. . . . However, the character of the juxtaposition of the first element of the prologue with the second is analogous to the juxtaposition of the f minor theme and the Ab major theme of the exposition [the first and second elements of the main theme, shown in Example 28.1].\textsuperscript{16}

According to Mazel, this principle of "analogy in correlations" has great significance for the romantic style:

Owing to this principle, one motive or one theme may by its presentation in the work, its role and significance, functionally "substitute" for another, which it does not resemble at all. . . . This principle of "analogy in correlations" of "substitution of motives" is very characteristic . . . of Wagner.\textsuperscript{17}

As an example in the Fantasia, Mazel points to its two concluding chords (see Example 28.5), which, from their position and functions, substitute for the motive of the "octave exclamations" of measures 153-154 and 197-198 (and also measures 52-53 and 233-234, to which Mazel does not refer), shown in Example 28.3. This substitution occurs in
spite of an insignificant thematic connection—two chords instead of three octaves, ascending movement instead of descending, harmonic change instead of motion by octaves, and so on. In observing and pointing out these connections—"character of sounding" and "analogy in correlations"—Mazel had to have been influenced by Asafiev, who in volume 1 of *Musical Form as Process* mentions the possibility of the extension of the idea of thematic identity to other elements.

Mazel had already pointed out the connective similarities between these same octave exclamations and the concluding chords. He also shows that the octave exclamations of measures 153–154 exemplify the "displacement of a thematic element in the repetition of a section." These measures should have appeared during the second diatonic chain, approximately in measures 66–67, but were "displaced" until measures 153–154, where they appear in their original context (as in mm. 52–53) (Example 28.4). An analogous situation occurs in the coda, where the octaves, which should have occurred approximately in measures 316–317, are displaced until the end. There, although they are preceded by material similar to an earlier occurrence (mm. 197–198), thus pointing to the correlative connection, they appear in a different guise which acts as a substitute, ending the work (Example 28.5).

The various octave exclamations, which always occur at the end of a particular section that begins with a sudden attack on an unstable harmony, usually involve a diminished-seventh chord, occasionally a major-minor seventh chord that is interjected into the middle of what was to have been a full cadence, thereby thwarting the resolution, as
Example 28.3. Fredrich Chopin, Fantasia, Op. 49: a) mm. 52-53; b) mm. 153-154; c) mm. 197-198; d) mm. 233-234.
in measures 142-143 (Example 28.6). Mazel relates this technique to
the influence of operatic, dramatic principles on Chopin’s style. The
interjected chords, though, often exhibit a special bifunctionality,
that is, they can be interpreted functionally in two ways, depending on
the surrounding characteristics. For example, the beginning of the
development section is signaled by a broken cadence, in which the
dominant of E and an agitated unstable section follows the dominant of
Eb (Example 28.6). The question arises whether the second chord, the
dominant of E, is actually a diminished seventh chord on VII in Bb (V
of Eb) with a lowered third (respelled: A-C#-Eb-Gb), relating it to the
following chord, a diminished-seventh chord on VII in Bb (A-C-Eb-Gb),
or whether it is a secondary dominant of the lowered second degree in
Eb major. Defending the first interpretation, Mazel points to the use
of all the notes of the E-major scale, both in the chord (B-D#-F#-A)
and in the surrounding thematic material (E, C#, and G#). Regarding
the second interpretation, he observes that if this chord were a domi-
nant of Fb (Cb-Eb-Gb-Bbb), the upper neighboring note to Eb (D#) would
be F and not E. Usually such a chord as this one with dual function
signifies a modulation or deviation, but here none occurs. Mazel
senses only a resemblance to a deviation into D major. The harmony,
unstable for twelve measures (mm. 143-154), finally settles back into
the diatonic chain with the eb/Gb variable mode, bringing with it a
delayed resolution of the dominant seventh chord on Bb from measure
142. Therefore the bifunctionality of this chord is exploited only so
far as it effects a change from a stable tonality into an area of
unstable harmonies. In other words, its bifunctionality is not fully realized. Nevertheless, the interpretation of this specific chord turns out to be less significant than the idea of dual function. As Mazel later pointed out, his concept is simply the idea of "variable function" introduced by Yury Tiulin. This aspect of bifunctionality also appears in Catoire's Teoreticheskii kurs garmonii, in his discussions of common chord modulations. Mazel and particularly Tiulin expanded this idea beyond its original conception and use in modulation.


Another interpretation of this chord that Mazel does not mention is as a German augmented sixth chord in Eb. While not spelled correct-
ly, in relation to the previous harmonies (Eb6–Ab–Fb7–Bb7), it could be a "reverse" German augmented sixth chord, which, instead of resolving to a Bb chord, is preceded by it. A smoother resolution would involve Eb in second inversion. Mazel does note, at a different point in the analysis, the importance of the augmented-sixth chord. He points to its occurrence preceding the exposition (mm. 64–66), where it is neither spelled correctly nor resolved properly. It receives a delayed resolution to the proper tonality, but not in the right register or to the right notes.

Mazel derives the programmatic content of the Fantasia in large part from two of the seven segments within the development section. Of the other five segments, three consist of the three parts of the main theme from the exposition stated consecutively in C minor (mm. 155–163), Eb minor (mm. 164–171), and Gb minor (mm. 172–179). The remaining two segments, derived from material in the Introduction, demarcate the development section: the twelve-measure agitated unstable segment just discussed occurs at the beginning (mm. 143–154), and a slight variation of this segment an augmented second lower (mm. 223–234) occurs at the end of the development. The material in these two segments derived from the introduction consists of continuous triplet figures, sharply accented and rhythmic harmonies, and the octave exclamations. Until its appearance in the coda, this material always precedes the main theme of the exposition. These segments make up the first, second, third, fourth, and seventh segments of the development section. The fifth and sixth segments contrast markedly. Mazel points
out the pastoral, pentatonic nature of the fifth segment (mm. 180–198) and compares it to similar themes in early and late romanticists. The sixth segment, the "central episode" of a sonata-rondo form (mm. 199–202), is also characterized by a quiet, pastoral nature, presenting particularly in its tempo (Lento sostenuto) and meter (3/4) a decided contrast to the rest of the Fantasia. Mazel describes it as a "metrically closed (8 + 8 + 8) independent part with its own inner structure, contrasting with the entire preceding development and presenting a completely different world, a different plane. ... The chorale and organ character of the episode is combined with elements of recitative." A harmonic reduction of it is given in Example 28.7.


Since this episode occurs after the fifth segment in eb/Gb, Mazel views it as a deviation from Gb into its subdominant, Cb, the enharmonic
equivalent of its notated key of B major. Thematically, it is related to elements from the prologue and the main theme. Concerning its expressive content, Mazel comments:

The "new plane" turns out to be in this sense something ephemeral, transient, deprived of a stable fundament; this is "a divine vision" or a conversion to the other, unreal world. In this [segment] is one of the "prayer" episodes from the many "organ" episodes of Liszt (for example, the first secondary part of the B minor sonata), having a more solemn, grandiose, and at the same time stable character.21

This central episode acquires even greater significance at the end of the coda, where its first two bars are stated in Ab and developed subsequently into a type of cadence (mm. 320-332; Example 28.5). Mazel derives the general content of the Fantasia largely from this episode:

Through the entire development section, recapitulation, and coda, the basic content of the exposition never finds resolution. The development section gradually slows down, becomes still, and is transfigured onto a different plane: the B-major episode, the material of which turns out to be the central moment in the coda, is given. Unlike many codas (Beethoven's in particular) in which the material of a contrasting episode is introduced only so that it may be subsequently overcome by the final triumph of the basic thought, in the coda of the Fantasia neither the recitative, nor the subsequent triple figure, nor the concluding plagal cadence may be seen as overcoming or as a denial of the "episodic" choral phrase; they, rather, arise from this phrase, appear as its logical continuation and completion, and together with it present the final conclusion.22

Thus the transfigured material presented in the B-major episode of the development turns out to contain the ultimate resolution of the main themes of the Fantasia. Mazel does not mention, though, that the feeling of resolution is heightened by the occurrence in the preceding measures of most of the twelve-measure agitated unstable section which heretofore always preceded the main theme. Here, the main theme is
expected, but instead the theme from the B major episode is substituted, indicating the close thematic connection between the two segments. Thus the harmonic, melodic, and rhythmic conflicts in the Fantasia are resolved and the piece is concluded.

Mazel observes that this resolution of a basic conflict on a different plane, signifying religious elevation onto a higher plane, is characteristic of many works by the romanticists. The resolution of the conflict cannot occur in the same plane as the conflict itself, just as the "realization of the cherished dream is impossible on earth, but only in a different, better world and on a completely new plane." He sees a similar opposition and transfiguration from the "human" to the "divine" in the Fantasia.

Yet Mazel stresses the differences in treatment between Chopin's romantic ideals and those of another romantic composer, Liszt. Chopin, for example, did not dwell on general philosophical problems in his works, as Liszt did. The "transfiguration" idea does not dominate the work or its artistic content: "It is not given in as pure and general a form as are the basic ideas in the works of Liszt, but is expressed through the totality of a great number of concrete and varied musical forms that provide a unified line of aspiring sonata-ballade development." But because of this development and the variety of concrete musical forms, which typify Chopin's music no less than the transfiguration idea, Chopin's nonprogrammatic Fantasia is richer than many programmatic works of Liszt.

Throughout his analysis, Mazel devotes much attention to the
questions of form and thematic development, and to the relationships between the style of the Fantasia and Chopin's works in general and the styles of other romantic composers. He devotes the least amount of attention to and is least successful in, as he himself admits, discussing Chopin's melody and harmony. But he reveals that he deems such separate elements less significant for this work than in other works, overshadowed by larger aspects of form such as development and contrast and by its general romantic traits and anticipation of the melodic and harmonic characteristics of later composers. For example, many of the traits characteristic for Chopin's music—the variable mode, tertian chains, chains of cyclic modulations, the colorful role of chromaticism (contrasted in the Fantasia with "pure" diatonicism), and bifunctionality—not only characterize romantic music in general but also anticipate the harmonic language of Wagner and even of the impressionists. Mazel began his analysis with the goal of not dwelling on the separate elements but stressing their interaction and contribution to the whole; therefore, it is not too surprising that he should have chosen a work where this type of analysis was not only possible, but necessary.

Mazel does distinguish two large groups of new, characteristic harmonic methods employed by Chopin: those connected with purely pianistic effects, and those connected "with the altered strengthening of the modal gravity, with the enrichment of function, and with sudden enharmonic modulations based on these enrichments." To the first group belong the special arrangement of chords by the natural scale, the special use of registers, the coloristic use of the pedal point.
either as a single function or as a combination of two simple functions (tonic or dominant, for example), and also those colorful harmonic methods not connected with conditions attached to the second group, such as the juxtaposition of major and its parallel minor, and parallel seventh chords (which, incidentally, do not occur in the Fantasia). Examples from the second group occur more frequently in the Fantasia than examples from the first. Even so, they do not carry the static and schematic qualities and the loss of functional significance resulting from the process of enrichment and exacerbation of harmonic gravities that took place during the course of the nineteenth century. Harmony in Chopin's music had not yet taken a preeminent place, although some coloristic, "functionally simple" harmonic devices from the first group anticipated certain characteristic methods of impressionism, transferred through the music of the late romantics.

Mazel examines the cadence of the second theme (mm. 119-126), in which the harmonic element "subordinates" the other elements, as though 'absorbing' them (Example 28.8). In this passage, a chain of cyclical deviations progressing by minor thirds (Eb-C-A-f# [gb]-Eb) is begun without warning and continues quite rapidly. However, the functional sense of the cadence (and of the entire period) remains completely clear. Moreover, it acquires a dynamic significance through its sudden, rapid, nonmelodic and repeated rhythmic motion, creating "the restrained pressure of a 'dam,' through which then 'break' the concluding chords of the Eb cadence." This dynamic significance is so great that a further sixteen measures, containing the concluding
part of the exposition (mm. 127-142), are needed to overcome the inertia created by the "exploding" cadence: "Here the colorful deviations within the expanded cadence and the special emphasis of the role of harmony at this moment (with the other elements subordinated to it) only strengthen the functionally dynamic significance of this cadence and do not oppose it." But, he points out, cyclical modulations in Liszt and Wagner, though, are connected with strengthening the coloristic element at the expense of the functional dynamic element.

From this and other examples, Mazel concludes the greater functional significance of the second group:

The harmonic methods of the "second group," if they also lead to the relatively independent role of harmonic complexes in short fragments, . . . still do not lead to a weakening of the functional connections, and they also preserve the functional dynamic significance side by side with the coloristic significance. Only the methods of the second group, connected with moments of a static quality, may acquire a purely coloristic significance. This position, it seems to us, is a general characteristic of the harmony of Chopin as a whole.

Mazel, then, shows the Fantasia to contain strictly applied formal principles and a unified integrity, more so than had been previously believed. He confirms and strengthens the deeper, more progressive outlook towards Chopin's work that was just beginning to appear in the 1930s, and he succeeds in making a number of important contributions to the general knowledge about romanticism as a musical style and its role in the development of music. But whether he succeeds in fulfilling his goals of analysis is another question. He left many problems concerning the Fantasia unsolved. Some of the inadequacies of his analysis, such as the deficiencies in the harmonic and melodic analysis and the

disappointing analysis of the expressive content of the Fantasia, result, Mazel says, from the character of the Fantasia itself. Other issues, such as a metrical analysis, he simply does not address. In addition, his methods of stylistic analysis prove to be less than comprehensive. For example, he neither defines the term romanticism, nor explains which composers manifest this style (he concentrates almost exclusively on Beethoven, Liszt, and Wagner); nor does he verify his literary dramatic analogies or many of his musical analogies.
However, to accomplish what he actually set out to do would have involved a work of tremendous size; his analysis as it is takes up 135 pages. But given the apparent limits he imposed, the results do not lack merit. For Soviet music theory in the 1930s, Mazel's work, as a model for comprehensive analysis, provided an important step forward. Until the early 1930s, the study of separate elements was accepted in Soviet music theory almost as a given. Mazel, along with Tsukkerman, Kulakovsky, Ryzhkin, and Asafiev, as we have seen, was at the forefront of efforts to direct analysis on a more unified path. And this effort was due largely to the changed political climate: Mazel's requirement "to understand the work being analyzed as part of some general socially determined complex of ideological phenomena" testifies to this.

Mazel particularly was in a position to do this, for, as a result of his studies concerning different theoretical systems and his own inclination for analysis, he was well qualified to judge the efficacy of existing systems and to devise new methods where necessary. He remained unwilling to discard the legacy of Russian and Soviet music theory even though he did not wholeheartedly embrace all existing methods of analysis. For example, he makes no use of Garbuzov's system, nor does he develop in any way a rhythmic or metric analysis based on the theories of Catoire (and Riemann). His application of Conus's idea of metrotechtonicism to the prologue and exposition reveals little about those sections metrically or architecturally except to show a tendency towards proportion. Mazel is most successful in applying principles of form developed by Catoire, certain aspects of
Yavorsky's theory of modal rhythm, and some ideas, mostly psychological in nature, from Kurth.

Mazel's contribution to Soviet music theory during this period thus lies in his synthesis of varied analytical elements into a cohesive whole, resulting in an approach that was at once practical and theoretically useful. His amalgamation of the technical aspects of analysis with questions of both style and content joined previously disparate elements into one aggregate, and provided a model for other similar large-scale analyses where before none had existed. His incorporation of historical, sociological and expressive elements into the analysis answered the requirements of a Marxist musicology, while his use of existing and newly invented theoretical methods demonstrated the enduring validity of those older, more unilateral theories and the necessity for additional approaches not covered by those theories.

With his development of a comprehensive analytical approach, Mazel began his life-long contribution to the growth of Soviet music theory. His analysis of Chopin's F minor Fantasia therefore constitutes only the first of his major theoretical works. He continues to be interested in analysis, and has devoted several additional books to it, including his latest.

Criticism. As necessary and useful as Mazel's work became for Soviet musicology of the 1930s, his "Experiment in Analysis" did not escape criticism. This criticism centers on Mazel's inability to fulfill the goals he himself set forth in his work. Arnol'd
Aleksandrovich Al'shvang (1898-1960), in his review of Mazel's work, points out Mazel's nonresolution of "the most important question about the problems of analysis—about the discovery of content," and his circumventing of "one of the cardinal questions of musicology—the problem of the subject matter of the musical art." 33 Mazel, according to Al'shvang, does not supply a specific enough program for the Fantasia, nor does he even develop any kind of "model formula of musical content" or concrete nonmusical language for the description of the content. Mazel instead sought some kind of "nonspecific," "nonqualitative" language to express the general ideas, categories, images, ideologies, and so forth, in the music, but succeeds only in providing a formula for such language that is virtually meaningless. Al'shvang considers the development of such a language to be impossible, since Mazel obviously fails to provide any successful application for it in his own work.

Al'shvang also faults Mazel for the same criticisms presented herein—the insufficient cultural, historical, literary, and sociological background discussions and comparisons. He criticizes Mazel for the circumlocutory arguments he presents in defence of the arbitrary limits he imposed on his analysis, as well as the very imposition of those limits. However, he finds no fault with Mazel's technical analysis, contained as it was within his imposed limits. Most significantly, he asks whether such a unified, universal, all-embracing analysis as Mazel proposed is even possible. He concludes that it is not:

Each musical work—as also every phenomenon in art and in life—allows an infinite variety of analysis, depending on the goal the
researcher places before himself. A unified, universal analysis, exclusive in itself and not directed towards a definite goal, but all at once towards all conceivable goals, is essentially impossible.

If it were possible, then such an "infallible," perfect, universal analysis would serve as the absolute norm. A performer, for example, would not be able to perform a work until the theorist had "prepared" a corresponding analysis. And since analysis is a difficult and painstaking matter, requiring a great expenditure of strength, then the performer would spend years in the expectation of similar instructive analyses.  

Further, he considers that by giving analysis such importance in musicology, Mazel both overvalues and undervalues it:

He overvalues it because he essentially considers analysis as the only means of acquaintance with music. With this he compromises the entire performing culture and the competence of the mass listener. He undervalues analysis because he never brings to it the full disclosure of content.

Al'ashvag's own views towards musical analysis reflect a strict application of Marxist principles:

The true study of musical works, with whatever goal it carries out, assumes not only the division into constituent elements, but should find its completion in synthesis. This means that the found elements of music as such are examined simultaneously in their concrete connections with all culture, with history, that is, with all reality. Only by such a path may we uncover the content of a musical work or groups of works, joined between themselves with an inner communality. Such is the dialectical nature of any science, including musicological thought.

Our Soviet musicology, in distinction from Western bourgeois formalism, places before itself the task of uncovering by way of strict scientific analysis the ideological content of musical styles, of understanding the expressive significance of methods used in music, of interpreting the creation of some composer, some musical work. However, not all our musicologists cope with this difficult task.

Yet Al'ashvag's call for an examination of "the found elements of music" in connection "with all reality" seems just as impossible as he judges the comprehensive analytical goal to be. Really, his fundamental criticism of comprehensive analysis rests on its supposed lack of a
definite goal, that is, the goal of Marxism. Further, he is not against analysis *per se*, just musical analysis. "Scientific analysis" based on ideology is legitimate, of course. Needless to say, the veracity of Al'shvang's last sentence quoted above has already been illustrated in the previous discussion of other theorists' analyses.

In additions to criticism directed at Mazel, Al'shvang is also critical of the contemporary state of Soviet theory in general. He charges that much of what passes for analysis in Soviet musicology should more correctly be called "measurement" or "description," and even much of what passes for the analysis of musical content is nothing more than a "'poeticized' survey of a musical work." Such inaccurate interpretations of the purpose of analysis do not surprise him, though, since from school days musicians are exposed to similar inconsistencies, being taught to consider sounds as "notes," periodicity as "symmetry (an idea opposed to periodicity)," and "theory" as "the practice of the technical skills of musical writing (for example problems on harmony)." He criticizes the conservatories as well for not being receptive to new ideas. Al'shvang also singles out Western bourgeois musicologists of the last thirty years, citing Schenker as a concrete example, for

equating the specifically musical form of a work with its content, [which is,] essentially, the denial of content. . . . Schenker, abandoning the problems of the connection of music with reality, removes the infinite cultural historical relations between art and life, and replaces it with relations between notes finite in their restrictions.39

Of course, this charge could be leveled against almost any non-Marxist
theorist, whether a Schenkerian or not. And, for being so "finite in their restrictions," Schenker's "relations between notes" certainly have engendered enormous interest among Western theorists.

From Al'ashvarg's criticisms and from the discussions of analyses already presented herein, it is clear that very few theorists were producing ideologically correct analyses. Several wrote about methodology, but not all were willing (or able) to put it into practice. It would be presumptuous to think that theorists could within a short period of time change their methods completely and switch over easily to a completely different philosophy. However, the important point to remember is that the change from a purely theoretical, ideologically free approach to musical analysis to a blend of a theoretical and an aesthetic approach, both saturated with a definite ideology, was made. The degree of utilization of this ideology varied widely, but its effects were felt everywhere nonetheless.
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Mazel apparently was unwilling here to delve into the problem of a metrical analysis. Elsewhere he stated, "A really critical mastery and study of Riemann's concept [of metrical analysis] remains one of the problems of our Soviet theoretical musicology" ("Predislovie," in Catoire, Muzykal'naia forma [Musical form], p. 10).
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Chapter 29

A New Harmony Textbook and the Theories of Yury Nikolaevich Tiulin

A Practical Course of Harmony. In addition to the development of a new analytical approach and the necessary courses for it during this period, the creation of new textbooks that reflected the new philosophical orientation also took priority. The first effort, a harmony textbook, was carried out collectively by a group of Moscow theorists, Iosif Ignat'evich Dubovsky, Sergei Vasil'evich Yevseev, Igor Vladimirovich Sposobin, and Vladimir Vasil'evich Sokolov, all former students of Catoire's. Existing harmony textbooks were holdovers from the pre-revolutionary era. These works, in the opinion of the authors, were too much like recipe books, with very narrow interpretations of harmonic phenomena, no emphasis on musical literature, no attention to the dynamics of harmony or to the process of the interaction of the elements of musical language, and no clear methodological basis. In their work, Prakticheskii kurs гармонии [A practical course of harmony], the authors took a different approach: "to study all harmonic phenomena . . . through the prism of dynamics," that is, to study "not only the purely outer form of harmonic movement, but also the corresponding intensiveness of its inner tension." This approach was
best represented by functional theory, which adhered to a more "dynamic" view of harmony—as opposed to the more "static" view of traditional theory; therefore, "the primacy of the theory of functionality ... permeates our entire book." The authors adopted the basic premises of the Riemann/Gevaert/Catoire theory of functionality, thus making their book the practical counterpart to Catoire's *Theoretical Course of Harmony*. They simplified Catoire's approach by using only three of his five harmonic systems—diatonic, major-minor, and chromatic—and by combining the traditional Roman-numeral system of chord designation with that for harmonic function. This synthesis of function with Roman numerals is still used today by many Soviet theorists:

Principal triads:  \[ T \quad D \quad S \]

Secondary triads:  \[ S \text{ III} \quad ST \text{ III} \quad TS \text{ VI} \quad D \text{ VII} \quad S \text{ II} \quad \text{etc.} \]

Secondary dominant:  \[ D \text{ III} \quad D \text{ VI} \quad D \text{ VII} \quad D \text{ II} \]

Secondary subdominant:  \[ S \text{ III} \quad S \text{ VI} \quad S \text{ VII} \quad S \text{ II} \]

In connection with their avowed "study of the dynamics of the harmonic language," the authors also intended to devote "attention to the process of the interactivity of the elements of musical speech, essential for harmonic imagery, namely, melodies, metrorhythm, and architectonics." They also allotted "to rhythm and to all views of rhythmic enlivening ... a significant place and role."

The authors' nearly exclusive reliance on examples from the musi-
ocal literature, mainly from the classical era, but also from the romantic era up to Wagner, constitute another important innovation of this textbook. They still included specially written examples of voice-leading and chord illustration, but only where necessary. And, although the authors intended this book for practical use, they did not ignore the theoretical side; included are statements about the theories of Helmholtz, Riemann, Garbuzov, and Yavorsky. These additional theoretical explanations were included mainly for the benefit of provincial music teachers, who may not have been aware of such advances in theoretical thought. In a subsequent version of their book, *Uchebnik garmonii* [A textbook of harmony], published three years later, the authors deleted these references and simplified the book further. The textbook as it exists today remains a totally practical one.

**Review and Criticism.** In the forward to the first volume of *A Practical Course of Harmony*, the authors acknowledge the difficulty of their task, mainly the development of harmonic principles according to new methodological bases and the selection of the proper musical models for them, and admitted the resulting unevenness and lack of sufficient foundation. They even request some constructive criticism from those interested in the question of harmony. In a review of the textbook, their colleagues Mazel and Tsukkerman respond to their request, and offer some useful and interesting criticisms and observations.

Their general criticisms concern in essence those aspects with which the authors themselves were most concerned—the new theoretical
foundation for harmony and the examples. Regarding the latter, although they approved of the practice of using actual music as examples, they nonetheless consider the choice of examples to be too serendipitous, too numerous, and in some cases simply wrong. They also criticize the boundaries of some examples, which did not correspond to actual points of articulation in the music, and the lack of examples from Soviet music. While maintaining a high level of praise for the book's new approach and for other innovative aspects, Mazel and Tsukkerman still view several definitions and formulas resulting from its new approach with scepticism. Most of these are from the introduction to the first volume, which as a result they consider the least successful part of the book, and concern statements that are too categorical or exaggerated in their scope. Regarding the book's dynamic approach to musical form, for example, they observe:

It is easy, for example, to agree with the statement that "in music in general it is not the separate, isolated sounds and chords that play a decisive role, but their interrelations ... [sic] not the statics of them, but the dynamics." But to agree with the following assertion, that "this is categorical and immutable for all elements of musical language," is more difficult: there are entire musical styles (and not only "elements of musical language") in which "statics" predominate, and in which separate chords, and not their interrelations, play a decisive role.7

Moreover, despite their hyperbole, the authors themselves, Mazel and Tsukkerman point out, do not adhere in every aspect to a strict interpretation of functionalism as developed by Riemann and Catoire. In several cases, such as the discussion of harmonization, the authors revert to a more traditional approach. In others, as in their discussions and definitions of harmonic logic, mode, instability, modal
function, and chordal construction, they make use of ideas obviously borrowed—without acknowledgement—from Yavorsky. For example, here is their definition of mode:

The logic of harmonic development is a manifestation of the modal nature of chords, that is, their interconnections, displayed in the process of the origin of some progression or other. Thus, we above all conflict with the necessity to define exactly the understanding of mode and to elucidate the basic interrelations of its elements. Mode is a system of sound interrelations, joined by a common center of gravity. If the question about the dependencies between separate sounds of mode may for the time being be considered completely solved, then the views towards the interrelation of the chords of the mode were formed more or less, in any case, in conformity with major and minor. From the point of view of harmony, mode is the system of interrelations of groups of chords, joined by a common gravity to one of them—to the central [chord]. This central chord, called the tonic triad or simply tonic creates an aural impression of rest, of stability, being located in corresponding rhythmic conditions. All remaining chords of the mode are unstable and are subordinated to tonic, gravitating to it.8

Such language indicates clearly the influence of Yavorsky's own "dynamic" approach. Mazel and Tsukkerman find no fault with this borrowing; in fact, they wish that the "brigade" had made more use of Yavorsky's ideas, such as "turn," "anacrusis [predict]," and "ictus [ict]," and "modal-tonal juxtaposition with result." They add,

A more attentive relationship to the achievements of the theory of modal rhythm would have revealed the error of this assertion: "In music of the classicists the augmented and diminished triads are not tonics, may not be either temporary tonics and may not have their own secondary dominants.9

But as a result of this mixture of approaches—traditional, functional, and modal-rhythmic—they view the book's theoretical foundation as less than uniform:

The scientific methodological basis of the textbook is heterogeneous: being found basically on the level of the functional school and even using several achievements of the most recent theories,
at the same time in a whole row of questions (both practical and also principal) it still is not able to use all the achievements of the functional school and not everywhere is able to be raised to such a methodological level, on which stood the works of the founder of this school—Hugo Riemann.10

"Borrowings" from other theorists—following a strict line of tradition in Russian theory—not noted by Mazel and Tsukkerman include the concentration on the three principal triads in the beginning, the practice of Rimsky-Korsakov that helped to give to his book an element of functionalism, and the use of the exact same type of figure developed by Taneev for the depiction of the tonal plans of Beethoven sonatas. However, their illustration differs from Taneev's in both purpose and interpretation. Rather than illustrating the sonata development's local dominant–subdominant juxtaposition, the brigade—as they are most frequently called—uses the graph to illustrate the overall tonal plan of a work, Mendelssohn's "Songs Without Words," Op. 67, No. 3, as a means of indicating key relatedness and areas of tonal stability and instability. Thus the top half of the graph is reserved only for sharp keys, the bottom half only for flat keys.

Mazel and Tsukkerman also point out the nonfulfillment of several promises made by the authors, namely, their intention to discuss non-harmonic elements and the interaction of all musical elements. In most cases their cursory discussions of these aspects are insufficient for Mazel and Tsukkerman, who, in accordance with their own interest in comprehensive musical analysis, would have preferred a much broader approach as well as the inclusion of material devoted specifically to musical analysis. Tsukkerman latter admitted to trying to persuade his
colleagues to adopt a more comprehensive approach. He recalls:

My belief about the necessity to consider the musical expressive means in their interaction did not always find a sufficiently organic form of expression. So, during the period of the creation of the textbook on harmony of the "brigade" of the MSC [Moscow State Conservatory] I persistently advised its authors to introduce into the course of harmony (as is presented now—somewhat mechanistically) information from the sphere of syntax and form. Obviously, therefore, I. B. Sposobin, giving me a copy of the textbook, made in it a rather sarcastic inscription: "To the enthusiast of a system on natural humility." 11

In the second part of the book from 1935, though, the authors acknowledge this lack of attention to musical analysis and promised to issue later a special brochure dedicated to harmonic analysis. As far as can be determined, this brochure was never published. Also, the question of ear training is not addressed at all, which Mazel and Tsukerman judge to be a serious omission for a practical harmony textbook.

Thus the first Soviet harmony textbook contained a less unified and less complete approach than had been intended. This inconsistency in focus is not surprising, given the problems inherent to a collective effort and the lack of direction in Soviet music theory at this time. The implementation of Marxist philosophy and the resulting changes required to produce a clear-cut, homogeneous approach based on that philosophy turned out to be a monumental task, one not easily and successfully completed even during the 1930s. For the second edition of their book, then, the authors considered Mazel and Tsukerman's suggestions and incorporated most of them. These changes gave to the book a stronger foundation and a more practical focus. Interestingly, the relation between the first and second editions of the brigade's textbook brings to mind a similar relation between the first (litho-
graph) and second (printed) editions of Rimsky-Korsakov's textbook resulting from Chaikovsky's criticisms: the same material is covered in both editions, but the second is simplified, with reordered material, numbered subheadings and simplified definitions. The brigade's second edition also contains exercises for ear training, in addition to written and keyboard exercises, and a section devoted exclusively to harmonic analysis. They place greater emphasis on Russian and Soviet music, with a section on diatonic modes in Russian music, for example, and elsewhere bring the approach more in line with the general functional school.

Judging from the lasting continuity of this textbook, which has gone through numerous editions and is still in print, this collective "experiment" ultimately seems to have been a success. It answered the most important requirements of a Marxist musicology: that its basic approach conform to Marxist materialistic philosophy (the "dynamic" possibilities inherent to functionalism as a basic premise and the resulting interaction between chords, tonalities, and even separate elements) and that it reflect reality (musical practice).

Yury Nikolaevich Tiulin (1893-1978). Tiulin's Uchenie o garmonii [A study of harmony] contrasts sharply with this collective work by the so-called brigade of Moscow theorists. Tiulin's work, as scholarly as the brigade's textbook is practical, contains the major theoretical statement of one of the important theorists of this period. From 1925, when he began teaching at the Leningrad Conservatory, Tiulin figured
prominently in the development of Soviet music theory. His career spanned more than fifty years; he published his last work in 1977. In 1917 he graduated from the Petrograd Conservatory in composition and also received a degree in law from Petrograd University. At the Leningrad Conservatory, he taught harmony, the analysis of form, and composition. From 1933 to 1948 he headed the theory faculty of the Conservatory. He received his doctorate in 1939 for his dissertation, Uchenie o garmonii. It was published in 1937, and is his major work from the period.

In his first work, Vvedenie v garmonicheskii analiz na osnove khoralov Bakha [An introduction to harmonic analysis based on the chorales of Bach], a textbook he wrote in 1927 for an introductory course on harmonic analysis, Tiulin substitutes Bach chorales for the usual written exercises in beginning harmony. This new approach of using examples from the literature formed part of a new theoretical study of harmony, the basic principles of which Tiulin had developed beginning in 1925. Through his teachings at the Conservatory and lectures elsewhere (such as at the Moscow Conservatory in 1932, where he may have influenced the "brigade" in the development of their own textbook), his ideas became better known; but full recognition came twelve years later when Tiulin published his Uchenie o garmonii.

Tiulin's "Study of Harmony". Tiulin had originally planned a three-volume series that would have encompassed chords and modulation as well as harmony, but he wrote only the first volume, subtitled
"Osnovye problemy garmonii." Tiulin based his theory of harmony of the ideas of mode as the primary foundation of musical thought and of the generation of the basic melodic and harmonic connections by their respective functions in that mode: "The study of harmony is above all the study of musical logic, manifested on a definite level of historical development as the modal functional harmonic system of musical thought." According to his acknowledgments, Tiulin's theories of function were stimulated by those of Riemann, and his theories of mode by those of Yavorsky. In Tiulin's view, both theorists, while raising important questions, developed theories that were formalistic in nature and that reached incorrect conclusions. Nevertheless, Tiulin credits Yavorsky as being the first "to raise musical theory from the sphere of pure empiricism to a scientific level and to create an integral and original theoretical conception, arising from a basic revision of existing theoretical conceptions." Tiulin recognizes the problem of mode as "the basic problem of theoretical musicology," and Yavorsky's raising of the question of mode as "the most significant achievement of the last decades." Tiulin not only borrows terminology from Yavorsky, but, more importantly, also shared his views concerning the primacy of mode. Tiulin also draws on some of the theoretical ideas of Ernst Kurth.

Tiulin's coupling of the theory of mode with the theory of function, two very important aspects thus far in Soviet music theory, provided an important basis for the future of Soviet theory. He extracted from existing theory the most applicable concepts and reworked...
them into a more useful approach. With this one important step, Tiulin’s legacy in Soviet music theory was assured.

Tiulin’s prerequisites for a theoretical system require that it be logical, that it reflect and be verified by musical practice, that it represent phenomena of a sociological order, and that it be based on concrete material and not on abstract conceptions. These premises underlie Uchenie o gamonii. To begin, he discusses the various elements and processes that constitute the structure of music, or the sound fabric, as he refers to it. The warp and woof of the "fabric" are pitch, the vertical aspect, and duration, the horizontal aspect. These coordinates come together in a sort of "pitch-metric grid":

Music by itself contains neither spatial volume, nor spatial length, but possesses specific characteristics that we associate with spatial forms: a diapason of sounds is associated with the spatial volume (from this arises the idea of "aural space"), [and] through the visual representation of the sound fabric, temporal length is converted into spatial length—the horizontal of the sound stream.19

The vertical coordination of points (a minimum of two) of different pitch corresponds to the idea of harmony in a very broad sense, but is possible only in the consecutive movement of tones. The horizontal coordination arises as a result of the energy of tone connection (also a minimum of two tones), "which appears as a necessary prerequisite for the sensed side of melody." The energy of tone connection—the phrase is derived from Kurth—denotes the intensity of the motion from one tone to another as it forms a melodic line. Two basic connections thus exist—a coordination of pitch, engendering harmony, and the energy of tone connection, engendering melody. This notion of linear
energy also recalls Asafiev's interpretation of melos, which he subsequently utilizes.

Melody and harmony therefore constitute the basic factors of the sound fabric. Melody contains two coordinated elements, dialectically opposed: "the song principle, which arises from durations in the sound line and aspires to overcome rhythmic boundaries" (melos) and "the motor principle, which arises from the alternation of supported moments of movement, and aspires to chain the melos into rhythmic limits.

Tiulin used rhythm here in the sense of "motor rhythm," which is characterized by the accentuation of the supported moments of movement."

Harmony is perceived in two ways, either through the modal function of chords, or through the character of sound derived from the chord's intervalllic construction. The perception of modal function depends on whether the purposeful direction of a chord to a modal center is confirmed or not. If it "is confirmed by a harmonic succession, then the motion closes in a cadence; if it is not confirmed, then there is cause for further motion. This is the essence of the modal function of chords. The "character of sound" represents the "color function," the "phonetic function," or simply, "phonism" or sonority. Color function acquires an active significance either when a break of melodic connections occurs or when contradicting modal functions. Tiulin cites two moments when the color (phonetic) and modal functions are correlated:

(1) The intensification of sonority owing to a break of natural modal connections, the contradiction of functional direction of a chord . . . (2) the neutralization of sonority by the modal functions of chords: the more neutral the chord is in a modal functional relation, the more vividly its color function appears, and,
in reverse, modal functional activeness neutralizes its harmonic function. To this he adds: "In modal functional harmony the conflict of phonic and modal functions of chords is manifested in a dialectical unity: phonism and modal functionality may not exist separately. . . . [They] are opposite sides of a single phenomenon."

Tiulin's idea of harmony, although basically a vertical phenomenon, embraces horizontal aspects as well:

Harmony is above all the sphere of musical thought, coordinating the relation of tones in the vertical aspect, that is, in the plane of their combined quality. . . . This combined quality of tones inevitably arises in any simultaneous sound; consequently, each dissonant combination belongs to the sphere of harmony, whether it is subordinated to special harmonic regularities or not ("accidental" combinations). But the feeling of the combined quality of tones may arise also from their successive movement in such cases, when this succession is subordinated to special harmonic regularities. . . . Consequently, the idea of harmony belongs not only to the phenomenon of the simultaneous sound of tones, but also encompasses several phenomena of linear movement. . . . Harmony includes the entire sum of dynamic characteristics. . . . In sound movement harmonic regularities may not be uncovered without considering the elements arising in the process of movement—melody and rhythm.

Tiulin summarizes the interaction of the basic factors of sound fabric and their components in the diagram shown in Figure 29.1. Texture results from "the totality of the methods of statement, and the general structure of the sound fabric, seen from the point of view of this interactivity of factors" shown in the diagram. In a definition obviously derived from Asafiev, form then becomes "the process of the development of the musical content as a whole."

Tiulin considered acoustics to be significant to music only if examined in connection with artistic practice and confirmed by it. On
Figure 29.1. Basic factors in sound fabric.

this basis he confirms acoustically certain elements such as the quartal-quintal foundation of diatonicism, the harmonic relatedness of tones based on the interval of a fifth, and the construction of triads, seventh chords, and ninth chords. He divides overtones into two groups, "constructive" overtones—those we hear—and "color" overtones—those we do not hear. Only the constructive overtones, those up to the tenth partial tone, take part in chord formation. Chords are constructed by the "stratification of thirds," which, ultimately, when coupled with chromatic alterations, became one of the means of their...
destruction. This destruction occurred mainly in the sphere of the dominant, as in the music of Scriabin. The "mystic" chord evolved from the ninth chord. The second and third paths of destruction evolved from the horizontal aspect—the melodic cluttering of chords with neighboring melodic tones that became stabilized secondary chord tones (caused by the treatment of harmony as color by the romanticists), and the stratification of harmonic entities, brought about by the stratification of the chord itself and the polyphonic motion of various harmonic layers.

Tiulin found no basis for including upper partial tones in the structure of dissonant chords: "The aural adjustment of composers and listeners is directed towards tonal movement and least of all to the acoustical refinements of single sound groups. Tiulin therefore agrees with Garbuzov on several points: the principle of acoustical relatedness, the formation of the triad, and the rejection of upper partial tones in chord construction. But, rather than considering acoustics as the only means of verifying musical science, as did Garbuzov, Tiulin relies in addition on psycho-physiological explanations.

Tiulin defines mode as "the gravitation or attraction of tones, [which] either overcome the energetics of melodic movement . . . or emphasize the energetics, closing the melody with a cadence." Mode, "a semantic system," is "a logically differentiated system of joining tones on the basis of their functional interrelations." Tiulin thus distinguishes the idea of mode from any other linear or similar forma-
tions, such as scale, tonality, key, mood, or modal tonality. The last term, one of Yavorsky's, signifies "the totality of tones peculiar to the mode of a given tonality." Tonality alone is "the pitch level of a tone as the main supporting point of the mode, defining the functional significance of all remaining tones." All these definitions are now fairly standard ones for Soviet music theory, a fact that reveals the significance of Tiulin's interpretation and reworking of Yavorsky's basic premises.

Although modal thought developed along many different paths, Tiulin reduces these to three basic principles, which were not separate developments but freely intermixed: (1) the "melismatic accumulation of tones" by seconds, expanding the diapason from a single tone to a major third at the most, with the original generating tone as the main supported point; (2) the "groping for intonational possibilities through some intervallen space," usually a fourth, leading to the quartal-quintal frame of the scale, with a second supported tone formed from this leap; and (3) a graduated melodic filling in of the intervals thus formed with seconds. The melismatic accumulation of tones centered around the beginning tone, from which "arose the original functional connection—the dependence of tones, the original views of modal gravity. . . . Modal stability and instability in this case directly result from the rhythmic richness of tones." Thus he applies another of Yavorsky's ideas. In the second path, modal stability arises from the intonational supporting points, from the fourth and the fifth. The third path introduces unstable tones, filling in the gaps.
between the stable points. But even as he applies Yavorsky's ideas, he opposes Yavorsky's fundamental interpretation of the origin of mode (see below).

This development of mode engenders melodic connections (seconds) and harmonic connections (quartal-quintal): "From secundal melodic connections arose the system of the melodic gravitation of tones on the basis of the harmonic framework of mode (triad). From the quartal-quintal connections arose the system of basic and variable functions of tones."

Tiulin traces the historical development of modal thought from its premodal, nondifferentiated origins through the Greek modes, the church modes, the triadic framework, the period of the "centralization of mode," to the period of the "decentralization of mode" (the late romantics) and to Schoenberg's twelve-tone system, in which the mode completely disintegrated. Tendencies of Soviet music, though, have led in the opposite direction, "to the organization of new intonational possibilities in all capacities of modal connections on a stable, centralized diatonic basis. Thus the main theoretical problem as Tiulin sees it is "to uncover the modal regularities of harmonic functional thought governing the musical legacy," specifically, the Soviet musical legacy.

Tiulin also investigates the relationship between diatonicism and chromaticism. Diatonicism is based on the Pythagorean system of successive fifths. Chromaticism, embodying the principle of the subdivision of tones, in turn, arises from diatonicism in three ways: 1)
from changes of diatonic tones (the intensification of gravitational attraction, modal alterations); 2) from modal modulation, that is, the simultaneous layering of different diatonic systems in parallel tonalities; and 3) from tonal modulation, that is, the combination of diatonic systems of different tonalities, which leads to an expansion of the tonal sphere. Artificial scales, such as the semitone-tone scale, are neither diatonic nor chromatic, but comprise "a half-tonal system," in which chromaticism would lead to quarter-tones.

In his views of melodic (modal) function, Tiulin was clearly influenced by both Yavorsky and Kurth. The idea of the stability and instability of tones of the major mode, and their gravitating tendencies, is basic to Yavorsky's theories, although Tiulin notes recognition of these tendencies by theorists even from the eighteenth century. But Tiulin views the gravitational instability of certain tones of the mode as a consequence of formation and not, like Yavorsky, as a formative constituent of mode. The tones belonging to the tonic triad—the "harmonic tonic"—attract unstable tones, which tend to gravitate to the nearest stable tone. The term "linked tones" (derived from Yavorsky) describes the connection of stable and unstable tones on the strength of gravity. Only one tone of the mode has absolute stability—the tonic. Furthermore, stable tones play the leading role in modal organization. They form the essence of "modal centralization," while the unstable tones form the essence of "modal decentralization," as, for example, in the last works of Scriabin. Tiulin contrasts this view with Yavorsky's system of "modal gravity":
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The formation of stabilities in this theory turns out to be a derived moment, a consequence of gravity from the relationship of tones a tritone apart. . . . Such a system does not correspond either to the historical development of folk song . . . or to the historical development of modal functional thought.43

Tiulin also contrasts the idea of modal attraction, or gravity, with Kurth's idea of energetics, which he considered useful as "an emotional factor in musical semantics":

The tension of (melodic) movement depends on the conflict of energetics with modal gravity, in the process of which energetics in overcoming gravity engenders new phases of melodic movement. The conflict of energetics and gravity conditions the semantic significance of musical phenomena. . . . Melody as a sensed unity . . . may arise only in the process of the conflict of feeling of a different order: the feeling of the tension of gravity and of the tension of energetics.44

Thus the significance of melody as perceived by the senses is recognized as a struggle, a conflict, in which only the overcoming of gravity by energetics gives rise to new phases of motion.

Four factors influence the direction of motion: (1) the inertia of melodic motion, (2) motion by orbit, (3) occupied tone (hindering motion), and (4) intervals (resolution of the dissonance of the tritone, for instance). The second factor, motion by orbit, expands the idea of the linkage of tones developed by Yavorsky. It entails the motion around a stable center of both unstable tones adjacent to it; these tones are connected with each other and with the center tone, in the directions shown in Example 29.1. Interpreted broadly, in a melodic sense, this factor resembles Eugene Narmour's idea of "axial melody."45 Applied locally, it merely governs the immediate motion of unstable tones around a stable adjacent tone.
Example 29.1. The movement of tones by orbit.

An occupied tone, the third factor, involves the melodic motion from an interval of a second or a seventh to a unison or an octave, respectively, thereby hindering further movement because of a lack of tension.

Tiulin considers Riemann's theory of undertones and the origin of the minor mode to be groundless: It "does not correspond either to the physical nature of real sound, or to the regularities of our psychological perception." Also contrary to Riemann, Tiulin more sensibly views the minor triad as directly and not inversely analogous to the major triad, "since the modal indications (stability, the basic tone; the fifth to stability, embracing the harmonic function of the dominant; the tertian tone) are arranged in them in the same order and are completely equal in their functional significance." The two triads—major and minor—also exhibit equality in modal relation, position, and consonance. However, in its arrangement of intervals, the minor triad relates inversely to the major triad and does not equal it with regard
to its phonic, or color, character, because of their respective positions in the overtone series. Tiulín concludes:

Thus it becomes clear that the attempt of theorists to prove the equal value of minor in an acoustical relation, by including it in the undertone or overtone series, is directed on a false path; namely, the unequal value in this relation serves as the only reason for its dependence on the major [mode] (with full equality in all other relations), which is an essential trait of our harmonic thought and runs through all musical literature. 48

Rimsky-Korsakov long ago put the minor mode on a more equal footing with major; after dully investigating the situation, Tiulín upholds that tradition.

Tiulín identifies three types of minor mode—natural, harmonic, and melodic; together they form the "full" minor mode. The melodic minor mode (ascending), though, does not have independent value, because the raised sixth degree (the "dorian sixth") arose from purely melodic motion: it constitutes a "melodic modal turn," not "a constructive harmonic turn," and forms therefore a "modal dissonance." 49

Essentially, then, the full minor mode consists of two "basic" modal constructions, the harmonic, or the main minor mode, and the natural minor mode. Similarly, there are three modes in major—natural, harmonic, and melodic. The latter two, which are similar to the comparable minor modes but with a major third degree, join the dominating natural major to form the full major mode. The lowered seventh ("mixolydian seventh") of the melodic major mode, like the lowered sixth of the melodic minor mode, forms a "modal dissonance."

A "modal modulation" results simply from a change of one mode to another within the limits of one tonality. Many theorists, according
to Tiulin, confuse this type of modulation with tonal modulation, which brings about a change of tonal center and corresponding functional changes of chords, whereas in a modal modulation the center and the functions remain unchanged. The application of modal modulation brings about the unification of parallel major and minor modes, forming a major-minor ten-tone mode, shown in Example 29.2, whose interrelated tones form independent coordinated modal systems, firmly uniting the common quintal framework of the mode. This expanded mode is identical to Catoire’s ten-tone major-minor system.

Example 29.2. The major-minor ten-tone scale.

Thus far we have concentrated primarily on the melodic functional properties of mode. Harmonic functional thought, based on the quartal-quintal connection of tones, is, in Tiulin’s interpretation, equally important. In each mode the primary acoustical dependence established between the tonic (producer) and dominant (derivative) creates a functional tonic-dominant interrelation of tones (T-D). The same acoustical relationship occurs between tonic and subdominant, creating a
"functional modal cell, consisting of three basic functional points of the mode and forming a sphere of the first degree of harmonic relatedness around the modal center" (Example 29.3).

Example 29.3. The functional modal cell.

The acoustical dependence from T to D is direct, from D to T—reverse; similarly, from S to T—direct, from T to S—reverse. The subdominant brings about a conflict resulting from its subordination to tonic within the logic of the mode, and the subordination of tonic to subdominant arising from their acoustical relationship. The strength of the subdominant results from this conflict, in which the logical modal dependence of S on T eventually overcomes the acoustical dependence, and actually strengthens tonic as a tonal center, since the subdominant as a function exists only in its relation to tonic. The progression T-S-D-T, which Tiulin calls a "cadential circuit," reveals and confirms the tonic of the mode.

But the acoustical significance of the subdominant, its position
relative to tonic, and its absence in the overtone series of the tonic, Tiulin explains, "compels it to attract the tonic function of the modal center. All our functional harmonic thought is based on this phenomenon." If a change of function in conflict with the basic modal arrangement occurs, then Tiulin's "variable functions," which eventually are overcome by the basic functions in order to retain the basic modal arrangement, also occur. Variable functions, though, are never destroyed by basic function, since they always exist potentially in the mode. If the reverse situation occurs and the variable functions overcome the basic functions, then a "tonal modulation" takes place.

The duality of tonic rests in its basic tonic function coupled with its variable dominant function (in relation to the subdominant); the duality of the subdominant rests in its basic subdominant function and its variable tonic function. Tiulin points out how close Riemann came to this idea:

Riemann in his work *Musikalische Logik* (pp. 51-53), analyzing the functional interrelations of chords in the cadence, at one point comes close to the idea of variable function: he correctly observes in the interrelation of T and S their contention to tonic significance.

Unfortunately, Riemann dwells on this phenomenon only as a particular case, and does not draw general conclusions. The variable functional relations that arise in any progression of chords remained outside his perspective, owing to which his functional theory suffers from one-sidedness and from essential gaps in explanations of musical phenomena.

In this regard, Tiulin also refers to Simon Sechter (*Die Grundsätze der musikalischen Komposition*, 1853), Gevaert, and Heinrich Schenker (*Harmonielehre*, 1906). Schenker's theory of tonicalization is similar to Tiulin's theory of variable function. Schenker writes:
Not only at the beginning of a composition but also in the midst of it, each scale-step manifests an irresistible urge to attain the value of the tonic for itself as that of the strongest step. If the composer yields to this urge of the scale-step within the diatonic system of which this scale-step forms part, I call this process tonicalization and the phenomenon itself chromatic.\textsuperscript{54}

This theory of variable functions defines the connections between the modal periphery and the modal center. Within the mode any two tones separated by a fifth can acquire a variable tonic or dominant function; these "peripheral tones" form a series of secondary modal support points, and in turn are directed towards the basic tonal center through intermediate secondary tonics and subdominants (Example 29.4).

Example 29.4. Variable tonics and dominants.

Tiulin singles out the dominant of the dominant—DD or secondary dominant—as acquiring special significance, being drawn into the central modal cell by the first dominant. These secondary tonics and dominants, along with the secondary subdominants that inevitably arise, ultimately form a series of "secondary modal cells, similar to the basic cell of the mode" (Example 29.5). But not all the secondary
tonics and dominants are equal; the tonic functions of the sixth degree in major and the third degree in minor are significantly stronger than their dominant functions. The full scheme of basic and variable functions of the tones of the mode, "the system of harmonic attractions, is shown in Example 29.6. The overlapping areas of attraction are indicated by the oval-shaped enclosures.

Example 29.5. Secondary modal cells, subordinated to the basic cell of the mode.

Example 29.6. Scheme of all basic and variable functions of the tones of the mode.
Example 29.7. Cells of melodic attractions of tones within the mode.

Variable melodic functions also exist in two different categories. The first, based on the idea of motion by orbit examined earlier, consists of the variable tonic accompanied by its upper and lower neighboring tones within the mode, creating a "cell of melodic attractions of tones" (Example 29.7). The boxes at the bottom and top in Example 29.7 indicate the outer boundaries of the diatonic system. The second category exists within wider, more chromatic limits, and consists of the upper and lower leading tones to the basic and variable quintal frameworks. These leading tones serve as distinguishing signs of the variable functions (Example 29.8). Special significance is accorded the lower leading tone of the dominant.

Tiulin provides a number of examples of this phenomenon, three of which will be illustrated here. In Bach's Prelude No. 8 in Eb minor (from Book 1 of The Well-Tempered Clavier), the variable function appears attached to the "Neapolitan subdominant" (the Neapolitan sixth
Example 29.8. Leading tones to quintal framework of each tonality.

chord) (Example 29.9). Here the Bbb, "the attraction of a melodic turn from the subdominant modal sphere," clearly belongs to the Neapolitan subdominant chord on Fb (m. 26): "The appearance of the Bbb, alien to Eb minor, is explained by the variable tonic function of this Neapolitan subdominant, which is tonic of the Fb tonality and reveals

Example 29.9. Johann Sebastian Bach, Prelude no. 8, Eb minor, (Well-Tempered Clavier, I), mm. 25-27.
the gravitation of the leading tone [Bbb, shown by the star] to the third of its harmonic framework." Schenker also noted this phenomenon; he states, "The major triad [Fb–Ab–Cb] ... confers upon itself, without further ceremony, the rank of a tonic."

In the case of Chopin's Etude Op. 10, No. 6, also in Eb minor, the Neapolitan subdominant attracts "not only a complex and completely independent melodic turn, but also a harmonic turn," which draws the tonal feeling away from Eb minor, only to return to it after a measure and a half (Example 29.10).

The final example illustrates an instance of polyfunctionality, in Bach’s Brandenburg Concerto No. 1, second movement (Example 29.11). Tiulin identifies the melodic motion in the upper voices as delineating G minor, while the bass alters its function to dominant and moves to C minor.

In this measure [m. 9] even the tonal unity is broken; each tonality temporarily acts by itself, disputing each other’s functional predominance. Here occurs not a struggle of tonic with dominant ... but a struggle of two independent tonic centers, an obvious case of polytonality.50

In the next measure the tonal center becomes more clear, as C minor asserts itself through the melodic motion in the bass and causes the upper voice to modulate to its sphere, thus establishing tonal unity in C minor.

Example 29.11. J. S. Bach, Brandenburg Concerto, No. 1, second movement, Adagio, mm. 9-11.
The development of the theory of variable functions carried great significance for Tiulin:

This disclosure reveals the secret springs on which the logical interconnections of the elements of musical speech, the dynamics of structural formation, and . . . the dramaturgy of the development of musical form are based. It is exceptionally important to understand the principle of the conflict of basic and variable functions, which the regularities of the connection of musical speech uncover.

The theory of variable functions has great significance in the study of chords, since it gives . . . the key to revealing the functional connections of chords.

This theory adds new light to the process of modulation, reveals the genesis and regularities of polyfunctional and polytonal formations, and, through this, extends right up to the problem of contemporary musical thought.61

Tiulin identifies variable functions not only between tonic and dominant spheres, tonic and subdominant spheres, and subdominant and dominant spheres, but also between tonic and mediant spheres. He divides the triads of a mode into principal—I, IV, and V—and secondary triads—I, III, and VI. He relates the diminished triad VII to the dominant seventh chord, and therefore does not include it here.

Separated by fifths and then correlated, the two groups form a terton series creating two functional spheres, subdominant and dominant, revolving around the tonic sphere (Example 29.12). The two mediant chords, $M_N^{(VI)}$ [N=lower mediant] and $M_V^{(III)}$ [V=upper mediant] contain the most functional ambivalence, belonging, in the case of $M_N$, to $I$ and $S$, and, in the case of $M_V$, to $T$ and $D$. Then accompanied by functional bass tones, they acquire a more definite functional significance as substitutes for the main degrees. Subsequently, the tonic group consists of I and VI; the subdominant, IV and II; and dominant,
V and III. In acting as a substitute for I (as in interrupted cadences), VI acquires a "mediant function," introduced by Tiulin specifically for this degree. (In minor, both mediants play more essential roles—III as a variable tonic and VI as a false tonic.) Thus the tertián connection $T \rightarrow N$ creates a prototype for all tertián correlations, "forming variable functions of tonic substitutes. A new series of variable functions arises: IV-II, VI-IV, I-VI, III-V, V-III." 

Example 29.12. The tonic (T), dominant (D), and subdominant (S) spheres.

The theory of variable functions, like nearly all of Tiulin's ideas presented in Uchenie o garmonii, almost immediately won a permanent place in Soviet music theory. Indeed, his theories have become so
generally accepted that very often they are used in Soviet theoretical
works without acknowledgment, the ideas themselves having outstripped
their author in importance. In this work Tiulin touches upon so many
different areas that is is difficult to find a theoretical work written
subsequently in the Soviet Union that does not include—acknowledged or
not—some aspect of Tiulin's work.

Much of the success of Tiulin's theories may be attributed to
their basis in musical practice. In addition, they form a logical
conclusion for much of the work of previous theorists—Yavorsky,
Catoire, Garbuzov, Riemann, and Kurth. Tiulin combined the most fruit-
ful aspects of the work of these theorists in the areas of mode and
harmonic function, and also melodic motion and function, with his own
theories and refinements that, like Mazel's comparable work in analy-
sis, carried both theoretical and practical application. Moreover, his
analysis of the development of mode from historical and sociological
viewpoints, and his investigation of the dialectical properties of
function brought these theoretical concepts further into the sphere of
Marxist-Leninist thought. His main contribution, though, lies in his
definitive amalgam into a unified concept of the theoretical topics of
mode and function—two of the more important aspects of Soviet music
theory. As a result, although he contributed a number of additional
works to Soviet theoretical literature, Uchenie o garmonii remains his
most significant work. In a similar vein, his article on the histori-
cal origins of modern harmony, published in 1967, has nearly reached
the status of a "classic" in Soviet musicology. Of his later work,
Natural'nye i alteratsionye lady [The natural and alterable modes], is of interest, for in it he delves more deeply into the question of modal formation and analysis.

Thus through the works of Mazel and Tiulin were transmitted many of the most fruitful and useful ideas of previous theorists. The combination of these earlier ideas with their own unique perspectives and with the introduction into music theory of aspects of historical and dialectical materialism contributed to the development of a more unified Soviet music theory during the later 1930s.
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Again he refers to Soviet music:

A firm diatonic basis, undoubtedly, should be a condition of the creation of Soviet musical style, in connection with an aspiration to solid modal organization. This must by no means be understood as a self-limitation to the diatonic sphere, but as the organization of chromatic and altered possibilities on a modal diatonic basis (ibid., p. 83).

He referred in this capacity specifically to the treatise of Anton Bemetrieder, _Lecons de clavecin et traite de musique_ (Paris, 1776). He also referred to Ryzhkin’s article on the traditional school in _Ocherki po istorii teoreticheskogo muzykoznaniia_ [Essays on the history of theoretical musicology], I:110-113.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Chapter 30

Musicology: Discussions and Arguments

Georgy Nikitich Khubov. Despite the efforts of theorists such as Mazel and Tiulin, though, Soviet music theory by the end of the 1930s was far from unified or even well-developed, according to its supporters and critics alike. Its supporters, mainly active theorists like Mazel, Tiulin, and Tsukkerman, believed that, although Soviet music theory was on the right path, it still had far to go. Its critics, who came from the non-theoretical ranks of Soviet musicology, charged that Soviet music theory was still mired in the "formalistic," "schematic" approaches and attitudes of much of pre-revolutionary Russian and contemporary Western (bourgeois) theory. For example, Georgy Nikitich Khubov (1902–1981), the deputy main editor of Sovetskaia muzyka from 1932 to 1939 and the first to teach a course on the history of Soviet music at the Moscow Conservatory, in a short article in Sovetskaia muzyka in March, 1939, expresses the view that contemporary Soviet musical science was not accomplishing its goals, either by following the examples provided by its nineteenth-century founders, or by fulfilling the requirements of contemporary Soviet musical culture. He viewed the nineteenth-century origin of Russian musicology—what he and
other Soviet musicologists then and now refer to as "classical" Russian
musicology—in purely Marxist terms:

Russian classical musical science was created in the struggle with
the anti-folk, reactionary formalistic tendencies [of Zaremba].
The remarkable Russian musician-scholars A. Serov [and] V. Stesov
were the first heralds of the ideas of narodnost [nationality,
national character, or national roots] and realism. All their
activity was organically connected with the development of a
progressive national musical culture. Along with the talented
collectors and researchers of folk music, along with such promi-
nent musical theorists as S. Taneev—they lay a secure foundation
for musical science in Russia.1

To build on this foundation, Khubov believed, Soviet musical science
needed to address certain specific tasks directly connected to its role
in Soviet musical culture:

[The tasks are:] deeply and carefully to work out and to summarize
this colossal creative experience [of national composers and
ethnographers in creating a fund of folk musical culture], to make
it in the full sense of the word the common property of a wide
musical public, [and] . . . in direct connection with the study of
folk art and of the creative legacy of the classicists to raise
and to solve the most important, relevant problems of Soviet
musical style—in opera, symphony, song. For Soviet musicology is
a living, organic part of the socialist musical culture, a direct
and mighty stimulus of its creative growth.2

But according to Khubov, Soviet musicology had not succeeded in
carrying out these tasks. The published musicological works were either
too narrow in focus or simply not important. He laments in his arti-
cle, "Frequently in this theoretical research pompous "scholarly" phra-
seology takes the place of musical analysis [and] formal schemes [take
the place of] living scientific thought." He considered the problems
he saw in Mazel's analysis of Chopin's "Fantasia," for instance, to be
symptomatic of Soviet music theory as a whole:
Essentially, this book represents very painstaking, "anatomical" research of the musical form of a Chopin work. And in this relation the work of Mazel is not deprived of interesting, though also narrowly theoretical, formal observations. But again the problem of artistic content, that is, the most important thing, remains unrevealed and cautiously avoided in Mazel's book. The theoretical observations and remarks, valuable in themselves, are deprived of a great generalizing creative thought. All this defines the narrowly school-like, abstract theoretical character of the book.

In general, theoretical musicology almost has not touched upon the still deep layers of the ideological artistic content of music, and has not worked out the most important questions of Soviet musical aesthetics—on the basis of the in-depth study of the remarkable models of folk art, of the music of the prominent masters of the past and of Soviet composers.

The theoretical thought of musicologists usually skims the surface of phenomena, or is limited to the dismal and dull description of formal signs in music.4

Thus Khubov wanted to see in Soviet music theory greater attention to music's aesthetic content instead of to purely theoretical aspects, and to base this "aesthetic" analysis primarily on studies of nationalist art—art "of the people" (popular mass and folk music), and the music of Russian and Soviet composers. He blamed the scientific research institutes for the "intolerable lag" in Soviet musical science behind ethnomusicology and composition—mentioning in particular those attached to the Moscow and Leningrad Conservatories—and called for the organization of a central research institute dedicated to "the serious and systematic study of the entire history of the development of musical culture of our multinational country."5

Khubov's preference for aesthetic, ethnographic, and nationalist concerns over more clearly theoretical or historical ones, and the resulting devaluation of the latter two areas, must have troubled someone like Mazel, who, despite his post-revolutionary training, still saw an important place for theory and musicology in the traditional
sense of these terms alongside the new ideology. And he must have bristled at Khubov's expressed view that Soviet musicology, including theory, lagged behind the study of folk music and the creation of contemporary music.

**Mazel's Defense.** In an article published in the December 1940 issue of *Sovetskaia muzyka* in response to Khubov and other critics, Mazel both defines and defends his field. He targets his initial discussion at Khubov's remarks, and points out two very important circumstances, both misinterpreted by Khubov. (Although he does not mention Khubov by name, it is obvious to whom he directs his remarks and for what reason.) First, in spite of certain achievements in pre-revolutionary music theory—he mentions Chaikovsky, Rimsky-Korsakov, Taneev, and focuses particularly on Yavorsky and Comus—a Russian music theory "as an independent and developed science" comparable to Western theory did not exist. Musical composition, on the contrary, was equal to or in certain respects even exceeded Western composition in its level of achievement. Therefore, if contemporary Soviet musicology does lag behind Soviet composition, it is because, Mazel contends,

... Soviet musicologists—not considering here any other difficulties before them—were not able to operate on such a rich tradition as were Soviet composers. But, if we are to represent correctly the general perspective, we recognize that the difference between the level of composition and of musical science was noticeably diminished and continues to diminish.8

The "other difficulties" mentioned by Mazel were considerable—the virtual reordering of theory according to marxist principles.
Mazel was not alone in this view; Kulakovsky had expressed a similar evaluation in a summary of Soviet musicology he wrote in 1937 for the twentieth anniversary of the October Revolution. Although he stressed more than Mazel the formalistic nature of pre-revolutionary musicology and the lag between it and the "most essential requirements of musical life," and downgraded the achievements of Western musicology, he concurred with Mazel's general perspective: "If Soviet musicology still has not caught up with the creation of Soviet composers, then in any case it grew immeasurably, and greatly reduced the huge distance that separated pre-revolutionary musicology from pre-revolutionary musical creation."

Having thus defended his field, Mazel then proceeds to discuss the nature of musicology, its problems, possibilities, and expectations from it, based on this premise:

The musical art, as any other phenomenon of the real world, is principally knowable and may (and should) be an object of scientific research... Being a science, having music as an object of its research, musicology may (and should) become an organic component part of the music culture itself."

This is, essentially, a pre-revolutionary view; it coincides with the arguments made during the early years of this century for a Russian musical science. However, Mazel's Marxist background distinguishes his view from those made previously. His references to the "real world" (matter is a phenomenon of the real world) and to musicology as "an organic component part of the music culture itself" reveal a materialist, socialist attitude towards music not present in the earlier views.

As a means of defining it, Mazel compares musicology with perform-
dance and with criticism. He sees a stronger correlation between musicology and performance in that the goals—interpretation of content, among other things, either through analysis or performance—are similar for both. In this sense musicology becomes a special aspect of "music-making."

Mazel sees a greater distinction between musicology and criticism. In his view, this distinction concerns the influence of an analysis, whether a critical or a musicological one—the path by which the influence is obtained and the very character of that influence. Regarding the power of a musicological analysis to influence, he states,

Genuine musicological analysis, being a scientific work, is at the same time a creative musical act both in its results (the influence on the content and the value of a work), and also in its initial moment. . . . The analysis of a work of art is its knowledge and simultaneously (as far as the content and the value of the work is subject to an objective historical development) an influence on it.11

Thus a musicological analysis may influence both the content and the value of a work, although that is not its main purpose. A musicologist generally does not inject his personal values into his analysis, but instead accepts "already recognized, noncontroversial values"; his primary goal is

not a new verdict, but a knowledge of the artistic phenomenon, the intensification of its nature and—through this knowledge and intensification—the enrichment of the phenomenon, the augmentation of its significance, the raising of its objective value for his contemporaries and succeeding generations.12

In contrast, the main task of a critic is to evaluate and pass judgement on a given piece of music and therefore to have a direct influence on public opinion.
The critic is a judge, having to apply his aesthetic "law"—a firm and definite artistic conviction, in each concrete case. The goal of the critic is to influence directly the taste and opinion of the public concerning the following works of the same author (or other authors), and sometimes also concerning a given work (to induce the author to make changes).13

A musicologist, then, analyzes music from an impersonal, cognitive approach, whereas a critic analyzes music from a personal, more intuitive approach. But only through knowledge resulting from scientific research can a musicologist truly illustrate the significance and value of music to the public. And by accepting the circumstance that such an analysis will provide only positive interpretations such as "enrichment," "increased significance," and "raised value," Mazel shows that he has already accepted current favorable public opinion concerning the work to be analyzed. Thus musicologists have no role in deciding which compositions are worthy of such treatment; this has already been decided for them. There can be no room for a "negative" analysis, for what would be the purpose of analyzing a work generally considered to be bad. Such an analysis would not lead to "enrichment" in any case. However, were a musicologist to analyze a work favorably—and analysis usually is undertaken to show or prove the positive aspects of a musical work—that the critics had already deemed unworthy of analysis, it would reveal the musicologist in a critical role that Mazel denies. Yet it is unrealistic to think that a theorist is going to accept at face value all the pronouncements of the leading critics of the day. Indeed, a successful analysis or other theoretical study could reveal the makings of a masterpiece that had been totally misunderstood by contemporary critics. Mazel does not recognize that such situations
have arisen over the course of musical history. In this sense he is completely acceding any of his considerable authority to popular opinion. Even so, as we have already seen, Mazel's viewpoint regarding criticism runs counter to prevailing Marxist-Leninist thought as interpreted by Lunacharsky and others, including Mazel's colleague Tsukkerman, and created trouble for Mazel later in this decade.

To illustrate what progress had been made in Soviet music theory up to 1940, Mazel includes a short historical survey of its contributions, in which he focuses almost exclusively on the achievements in analysis of the Moscow group of theorists consisting of himself, Tsukkerman, and Ryzhkin. As for other contributors, he mentions only the Moscow theorists Catoire and Ivanov-Boretsky, and the Leningrad theorists Asafiev, Kushnarev, and Tiulin. He valued Catoire for his contributions to harmonic and formal theory, Ivanov-Boretsky for his insistence of historicism in theoretical works, Kushnarev for his work in polyphony, and Tiulin for his works in the sphere of harmony. He equivocated regarding Asafiev, calling him "a great musicologist," but finding "the positive significance of his work . . . difficult to 1 evaluate." Essentially, then, he had not made up his mind about Asafiev, which explains why he ignored him in his Chopin analysis. For the future, he saw the necessity to develop "several basic, leading lines":

It is necessary to perfect the application of the method of historical stylistic analysis. It is necessary schematically and carefully to study musical language and the general principles of thought and of musical imagery of different composers and styles (particularly Russian classical music, folk music, Soviet composi-
tion). In connection with this it does not mean to be limited to works dedicated to the analysis of separate works or the music of separate composers. It is necessary also [to include] works of the "all-around" type, for example, those dedicated to the characteristics and the evolution of sonata form in Russian music, the conversion of the principles of romantic (classical, "Glinkian") symphonism in Soviet composers, the conversion in Soviet music of the elements of impressionism and expressionistic harmony, the characteristics of polyphony, the orchestration of Soviet composers, the characteristics of their modal thought, etc.

Finally the time has come for the creation of wide, summarizing theoretical conceptions of a new type, containing both the separate elements of musical language (melodic aspects, for example), and also the principles of imagery or some other general correlations between formal means and musical expressiveness.15

Notice that Mazel refers exclusively to Russian and Soviet music as research topics; perhaps Khubov's directives influenced him here. Although most of Mazel's recommendations for future work are interesting, necessary and viable, his suggestion to create general theoretical conceptions that would combine both formal and expressive means was probably the most vital, judging from the confusion and arguments during the 1930s regarding analysis. The creation of such concepts would indeed be a most important step for Soviet music theory, but to the present time such a task has not yet been adequately resolved.

As part of his summary, Mazel did not forget the requisite ideological goals, only in conjunction with which these new concepts could be worked out:

The struggle for historicism in the theory of music is combined with the struggle against relativism and pure empiricism. . . . The creation of general theoretical conceptions of a new type are unthinkable without serious work on questions of the general aesthetic order, without the possession of Marxist-Leninist methodology. These new conceptions, based on concrete material and by no means avoiding generalizations of a technological character, should, at the same time, contain in themselves elements of the philosophy of music.16
Music theory, then, combines historicism, aesthetics, a Marxist-Leninist methodology, philosophy, and concrete and general technological aspects. However, although here Mazel appears to minimize the significance of the technological aspect of theory, in his analyses and theoretical works this has not always been the case. But at times the other elements do tend to take precedence, as we will see in his analysis of Shostakovich's music from the 1940s (Part VIII).

Criticism: Kulakovsky. Mazel engendered much criticism with this article. No one questioned his basic ideas towards analysis and the future of musicology; rather, the critics focused on Mazel's interpretation and definition of musicology in conjunction with the comparisons he made. Kulakovsky, for example, in the March 1941 issue of Sovetskaia muzyka, is not able to agree with Mazel's distinctions between musicology and criticism:

Even from the formally logical side, any judgment of a critic is an act of cognition, and therefore any truly critical work always is an achievement of musicology. Soviet musicology (even if only "theoretical") is unusually wide in its problems and purpose. The entire sphere of Soviet musical criticism as a whole enters into the sphere of Soviet musicology as one of its vital organs. To oppose criticism and musicology in whatever context is not only incorrect logically, but is extremely dangerous from the point of view of the perspectives and achievements of theoretical musicology itself. The very limited tendency of L. A. Mazel--to accent in musicology only the cognitive moment--is incorrect and dangerous. Interpreting this tendency consistently would exclude from the sphere of musicology not only criticism, but also all practical student textbooks, intended for the working out of definite skills, for example, auditory and written [skills].

For evidence, Kulakovsky points to Tsukkerman's article on Soviet opera, which "[refutes] Mazel's thesis with each paragraph":
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How many new, still not worked out musicological problems arose, when "a pure theorist" undertook the resolution of a concrete critical task—a survey and evaluation of two of the newest Soviet operas. It would be very annoying if this article was evaluated only in its critical aspect; many interesting themes, posed in passing by V. Tsukkerman, deserve a more intense working out. [For example, the study of the methods of "oblique lyricism," the analysis of the two paths of "musicmaking" of the prose in "Semyon Kotko" (a summarizing of the text and a summarizing of the underlying theme); the most interesting theme of individualization in the treatment of folk melodies, not speaking already about a row of concrete observations, valuable for each opera composer, but, then, also for researchers of opera forms.] ... Should a musicologist lag behind in the rear, quietly waiting (if the question is about the creation of his contemporaries), until the time when some work or other becomes "generally accepted"? The article of V. Tsukkerman shows the reverse: a musicologist may (and, then, also should) evaluate a work, still not having received the final evaluation of the musical public.18

According to Kulakovsky, musicologists studying the past also should not limit themselves to those works "generally accepted" by the public, nor should they limit themselves to larger works, ignoring such "small forms" as mass songs. "Theoretical musicology would make a big leap forward if it would not limit itself exclusively to monumental phenomena, [but] would give attention both to small genres and even to completely unacceptable, controversial artistic phenomena. Kulakovsky sees numerous possibilities in the expansion of musicology into "adjoining arts," which would create new problems to tackle and new working methods. He summarizes his views in this manner:

Therefore the maximal "excursion" of musicology, along with the attentive consideration of all problems, arising in separate, even in imperceptible fields of musical culture, are the main conditions of the rapid growth of Soviet musicology, of its transformation into an exact science. Musicology is an important form of creative participation in the construction of musical culture. Further it promises to become an exact science if it will unceasingly perfect its methodology and will not be in a hurry to create prepared conceptions, even if "on a new basis" [quoting Hazelt]. For the apology of musicology this is completely sufficient; there
is not the necessity to create doubtful theories about the real
enrichment of the content of a musical work attached to its analy-
sis. The matter is not in the enrichment of a work, but its
perception: it would follow to pose the problem of the perception
of music to the fullest—a problem, which as such is not carried
in musicology. This problem again would return us to theoretical
musicology and to pedagogy, having posed the task to develop in
musicians by no means the outer intellectual (in essence—hedo-
nistic) realization of a musical work, but the emotional responses
to its content, responses, arousing in the consciousness all its
creative chords.20

Thus Kulakovsky brings yet another element into the field of music
theory in addition to those already included by Khubov—the psychology
of musical perception. According to his view, one cannot learn to
appreciate music or to perceive its content through the factual know-
ledge of it, that is, in an impersonal cognitive manner such as Mazel
described for musicologists, which Kulakovsky called "hedonistic," but
through one's emotional reaction and responses to the music, that is,
in the very intuitive, personal manner of a critic, using Mazel's
distinction. Thus, each listening experience produces both criticism
and knowledge, in that perception is also knowledge, "a cognitive act,"
as Kulakovsky stated. If perception makes up the basic knowledge about
music, then, all musicologists must become critics.

Kulakovsky sees a very important role in Soviet musicology for
criticism (and also pedagogy in which critical response is taught).

Soviet musicology clearly needs to recognize the interconnec-
tion of all spheres of our musical culture and to aspire possibly
to the more rapid use of all the givens of practice both in the
posing of the problems, and also in the methods of their resolu-
tion.

In this namely is the most important guarantee of the rapid
growth of theoretical musicology. To consider criticism or even
pedagogy as practical supplements to theory is dangerous and
harmful; only a narrow connection of pedagogy and criticism with
musicology may provide methodological progress to the latter.
Expressed even more clearly: in our time musicology should not for a minute forget its official role in the general expanse of Soviet musical culture. Only constant verification of each theoretical achievement with its practical results may guarantee to musicology the development into a truly "exact science," the givens of which will present the most valuable material for history, for psychology and for the whole group of adjacent art study disciplines (poetics, dramaturgy, etc.).

Ultimately, Kulakovsky is saying, music students must be guided in the development of their critical apparatus; only then will they "know" how to perceive music, to respond to it and to criticize it, not according to their personal perception or interpretations but according to Marxist-Leninist tenets.

Kulakovsky expresses here several approaches of Soviet musicology derived from Marxist philosophy—that theory (or any aspect of musicology) may not be studied merely for the sake of study itself or of gaining knowledge (too "hedonistic"), that it must have a purpose within the context of Soviet musical culture; that all areas are related, that a study concentrating in one area should be combined with aspects from other areas; and that theory should not only be derived from practice (i.e., perception), but should be verified by it, and in fact should be developed in close contact with it.

Criticism in "Sovetskaia muzyka". In a Sovetskaia muzyka article the following month (April 1941), the editors of that journal also disagree strongly with many of Mazel's remarks. They do not dispute Mazel's positive evaluation of the progress made in the area of analysis: "The significance of this work [in methods of music analysis] increases today especially in connection with the raised professional
requirements of Soviet musical creation, in connection with the problems of the truly deep and thorough mastery of the classical legacy."

But they do dispute what they saw as his "underestimation" of the role of analysis in connection with the research he outlined for the future.

It is scarcely possible to subject to doubt the position that the deep analysis of musical speech should be a component part of any detailed research of a musical phenomenon, [that it] should make up the equipment of any figure of musicology—be he theorist, historian, critic, [or] popularizer.24

Even so, they do not agree with Mazel's promotion of "'the objective enrichment' of an artistic work through its analysis" to a central thesis and the main musicological goal:

Placing an accent on it and dedicating the central part of his article to it, comrade Mazel limits the circle of tasks and the social significance of musicology. From a science with exceptionally extensive tasks, from a science, not only knowing and explaining but also forming—musicology, in the treatment of comrade Mazel, becomes a distinctive aristocratically refined music-making (comrade Kulakovskiy correctly detected a hedonistic element in the conceptions of Mazel), where analysis is inexhaustably laborious, infinitely absorbing and becomes a goal in itself. The main problem of the musicologist, comrade Mazel stresses, is "the knowledge of the artistic phenomenon, the intensification of its nature and the enrichment of the phenomenon." This conception, excluding perception, extremely limits the goals, scales, and perspectives of the science about music. Essentially [comrade Mazel] departs from the problem of musical aesthetics, the science about the beautiful, about the formation of artistic ideals; [and he] departs from the diversity of problems, standing before musicology, the diversity of methods, forms, genres, with the help of which these problems need to be resolved.25

They too point out his exclusion of perception and aesthetic content, without which, as they see it, musicology is diminished and impoverished. The editors are particularly disturbed by Mazel's distinction between criticism and musicology. In their interpretation, there is no distinction.
[Mazel paints] a rather orderly, but very dismal picture: on one side stands criticism; it may not analyze anything, may not pretend to a scientific foundation, that is to say may be dilatory, arbitrary, but it has the broadest powers—to judge, to evaluate, to influence practice. On the other side stands "especially" musicology, scientifically based, possessing a method of analysis, able to show to any composer what he did not observe in a particular [piece of] music, but attached to all this, principally not going into everyday, mundane matters, not evaluating, not judging, that is, impassive, isolated from life, [and] ultimately, socially useless.26

They concede little of value in this "theoretical" portion of his article:

Comrade Mazel's incorrect remarks about the main and secondary tasks of musicology [and] his attempts of the delimitation of criticism and science are extremely unconvincing; speaking in the language of Mazel, they "are deprived of a scientific foundation," [and] they are not based on "the givens of analysis" of historical and contemporary experience. They oppose the real tasks, standing before Soviet musical thought.27

The editors also take Mazel to task for concentrating on his own circle of Moscow theorists at the expense of Asafiev and Yavorsky, whose influence in the Soviet era he undervalues, and for ignoring many others, like Al'ishvang, who, even though they worked primarily in the field of historical musicology, still contributed to theoretical musicology. They positively bristle at his lack of attention to Yavorsky:

What does Mazel say about B. L. Yavorsky? Only that he was determined before the revolution, and that his ideas were formed in antihistorical, abstract conceptions. This onesidedness, tendentiousness, is mistaken! For the entire 23 years of the revolution, Yavorsky fruitfully works, influences Soviet musicology, leads pedagogical work, has many manuscripts and published works, deserving, in any case, no less attention than manuscript works of other graduate students and assistants of the Moscow Conservatory, encouragingly mentioned in Mazel's article. Even irrespective of the fact that the scientific work of Yavorsky does not carry a completely systematized character, his ideas were scooped up by the handful by many, many musicologists; in his works exist traits, which are sometimes lacking in the works of younger schol-
ars: a breadth of cultured horizons, a boldness of generalizations, a purposefulness, a connection with the interest of vital musical creation. Enumerating his students, Mazel was not able to keep quiet about the most prominent scholar, with whom he himself studied and learns.28

They also criticize his view that Russian music theory prior to the revolution had not developed sufficiently to be viewed as an independent discipline, and accuse him not only of undervaluing the contributions to Soviet musicology of the "progressive" critics Stasov, Serov, and Larosh, thus "essentially crossing out the Russian musical scientific legacy," but also of "bowing and scraping before West European musicology, not finding for it a word of criticism:"

It is possible to regret the fact that the methodology of these critic-publicists and artist-scholars was not sufficiently systematized and therefore suffered definite contradictions and defects; but it is impossible not to see that for the most part their opinions were completely authoritative and that they helped to comprehend musical creation and moved it forward, that is, were progressive. However, in Mazel's opinion, the presence of publicistic spirit, obviously, is incompatible with the scientific [spirit]. Otherwise it is difficult to explain his relation to this genius musical scientific legacy. It is characteristic that, essentially eliminating the Russian musical scientific legacy, Comrade Mazel considers it his duty to bow and scrape before "Western European musicology," not finding for it a word of criticism.29

In sum, the editors see only one use for Mazel's article—as the last straw, so to speak, that would help rid Soviet musicology once and for all of any strictly cognitive, unmotional tendencies.

The article of L. A. Mazel demonstrated the most complete theoretical groundlessness of attempts to oppose science to practice, to tear away "pure" knowledge from critical commentary, from the service of the present. It, contrary to the thought of the author, should help our musical science to be cured of academic impassiveness. In the process of discussion, it is necessary to believe, the clear unsoundness of his views will become clear to comrade Mazel.30
Even so, they see hope for Mazel and others of his group:

L. A. Mazel and individual companions close to him in a whole row of cases do valuable and useful work for Soviet musicology and pedagogy. In recent years the practical work of comrade Mazel, and in a still greater degree the practical work of V. A. Tsukkerman, proceeded to a well-known degree in spite of the theory, which Mazel promulgated here. Their works about Soviet music (Mazel on Shostakovich, Tsukkerman on Prokofiev, Khrennikov and Shekhter) are the first testimony of their turning to the present, to the tasks of critical commentary. Exposing all mistakes and errors, we should at the same time in every way support this new [trend] in the work of our theorists. . . . Working in isolation from the present, they not only do not realize in full measure their social scientific duty, but deprive themselves of creative perspectives, that the application of the method of theoretical analysis they developed to the timely phenomena of the present is the very true verification of the expediency, the reality, [and] the vitality of that method.

Here are their hopes for the future of Soviet musicology—a united front with a common purpose: to serve Soviet musical culture, to enable it to achieve its goals, supported by the highest Marxist-inspired ideals:

It is necessary in every way to place the strengths of musical science in the service of the most important problems of the development of Soviet musical culture. The empirical, blind search for "the particle of truth about the beautiful," which comrade Mazel declared the highest reward for theorists working in isolation from practice,—or a science great, bold, multi-embracing, posing and solving historical problems, moving Soviet music to the heights of the classical style? Uncoordinated groups of musicologists, working separately,—or a wide unified front, based on a common sense of purpose, on the principles of mutual aid, mutual creative fertilization? So stand now the questions concerning the immediate tasks and paths of Soviet musicology. A basic transformation of all areas is required: the further scientific professional arming of a group of critic-commentators, the essential saturation of science with the commentative spirit, with the urgent spirit of contemporary social struggle and construction.

Obviously theorists like Mazel were thwarting efforts to construct a Soviet musicology based fully and completely on Marxist principles.
The quote given above is only a partial revelation of the ideal Soviet musicology, it being a response to the shortcomings of Mazel's article. How, then, did the Sovetskaiia muzyka editors view Soviet musicology in its most perfect embodiment? As a preface to their comments on Mazel's article, they provide a view of Soviet musicology that is very instructive in that it minces no words concerning the ideological goals and aspirations of Soviet musicology. I give here a rather extensive quote because it summarizes the official side of the arguments presented in this chapter. It thus also provides a suitable conclusion, since it is this view that prevails during the next decade.

Before scientific musical thought stands a huge and most crucial task. Never in the history of humanity has the need for the creatively active, intellectual realization of the phenomena of art been felt with such strength as namely in our time. Helping to sense music as a phenomenon of socially cultural life, propagandizing everything most valuable and progressive, musical scientific critical thought is called upon to promote the formation of new ideals of the beautiful, is called upon to promote the fastest fulfillment of these ideas in the creation of Soviet composers, is called upon to be a powerful instrument of communist education of the folk masses and the growth of their artistic culture. In this sense Soviet musicology, Soviet musical critical commentary, is one of the important branches of ideological work. In this is its actively guiding, directing role.

The problems standing before Soviet musical scientific thought are inexhaustible. Above all are directly commentative, musical critical tasks: the analysis and evaluation of the contemporary phenomena of creation, the generalizing and comprehension of the most valuable achievements, the fearless conviction of all inaccuracies, mistakes, hindrances. These tasks also define the true connection of musical science with the present, its timeliness, its purposefulness. Critical, commentative activity by is no means exhausted by the genre of newspaper reviews. Attached to all importance of similar direct responses, they must be fortified and supplemented with commentary of large genres—with journalistic essays and even series of essays (such as the cycles of articles by Belinsky, Serov, Larosh) and, absolutely, special books on Soviet music.

Historical problems organically lead into the circle of the tasks of socialist aesthetics. The analysis of the world artistic
experience, the vital interpretation of all musical values, created by humanity, the scientific discovery of the essence of the creative method of the classicists, the characteristics of historical style in their formation—all these questions are vital, important, enriching contemporary artistic creation. So important and directly connected with the general tasks of Soviet musical science and critical commentary are musical theoretical problems—from the very particular and "small" technological problems to the generalizing and affecting complex of musical expressive means. . . .

Socialist science about the beautiful is developing in exclusively favorable conditions. It is directed by party instructions, oriented to the creation of Soviet classicism. It is equipped with the Marxist-Leninist world outlook, with a very exact and perfect instrument of knowledge and revolutionary alteration of the world. On this basis, using the richest legacy of Russian musical classical commentary, comprehending the achievements of Soviet creation, the strict, multi-embracing, multisided equipment of musical aesthetics of our time is formed.33
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Summary to Part VII

This, then, is the official interpretation of Soviet musicology, including theoretical, in 1941: an instrument of the Communist party, armed with ideological weapons to promote and propagandize that same ideology among the masses. Music theory per se, as a means of explaining and interpreting the technical, compositional aspects of music—as we in the West understand it to be—no longer exists. It may explain and interpret, but the focus is not the music itself, but the content, the message of the music. The technological side of music is to be analyzed not as an end in itself but as a means to the uncovering of the aesthetic side of music, its content, how it is perceived. The theorist who succeeded to the greatest degree in incorporating this view of theory during this period was Ryzhkin, in his analysis of Taneev's "Minuet."

Ironically, Ryzhkin's complaint concerning the pedagogical reform of 1931, that the discipline of music theory lost its identity by being absorbed into the discipline of music history, turned out to be prophetic. During this period music theory did lose its identity by being overtaken by the related disciplines not only of history but also of aesthetics, psychology and philosophy. The Marxist bias towards the
all-embracing, comprehensive approach did not enrich music theory; it weakened it. Music theory was pressed into service to fulfill higher goals—the attainment of the perfect Marxist society, where art and culture must serve social needs, the needs of the masses. A music theorist no longer becomes a specialist but a generalist; musicologists, theorists, critics—all become one and the same. And an analysis is no longer just theoretical but also musicological and critical. Fortunately, the exigencies of pedagogy maintained certain theoretical distinctions. Students still needed to acquire compositional, aural and analytical skills, and these needs were met. It is probably these very requirements that allowed Soviet music theory to maintain some measure of autonomy, which enabled it to continue—albeit in a limited fashion—and develop once again beginning in the early 1960s. The push away from "hard" theory towards "soft" theory begun in the 1930s eventually culminates in the late 1940s, with dire results, as we shall see. But, although the words and actions of the protagonists in this drama may have seemed shocking at the time, the stage had already been set in the period just discussed. Words of warning had been issued not only to theorists but to composers as well, so that in the xenophobic post-war atmosphere, what seemed to be non-compliance or even half-hearted compliance became punishable offenses. The controversies surrounding such topics as the role of criticism in musicology, the goals of music theory, and the introduction and implementation of Marxist-Leninist tenets into musicology and composition, topics that were first brought up in the pre-war period, grew into a major campaign, supported
by ideological over-zealousness, against any hint of opposition to Marxism.

On the positive side, the theoretical work of Mazel, Tsukkerman and Tiulin during the 1930s provided the foundation for the discipline of Soviet music theory. Looking beyond the debacle of the late 1940s into more recent times and even to the present day, the approaches and ideas implemented by these three scholars have enormous impact. Each of these theorists has been lauded with special studies and tributes, and for good reason. The contemporary approach to analysis may be traced back to Tsukkerman and Mazel, and the current emphasis on mode and function received its impetus from Tiulin, working on the theories of Yavorsky and Catoire. Although not discussed in this chapter, Asafiev comes to mind here, too, since he provided a theoretical basis from which both Tsukkerman and Mazel developed. Granted, the scholarly reputations of these theorists were all greatly enhanced by their work in the decades of the 1950s through the 1970s and even into the 1980s, but their contributions of the 1930s remain major ones, nonetheless. They "set the tone" for the future. Nevertheless the ideological excesses of the 1940s caused a major dip on the line of development, and the lessons learned from that era were not soon forgotten.
PART VIII

"MUSICAL UPROAR" IN THE SOVIET UNION:
CRITICISM AND REASSESSMENT IN SOVIET MUSIC THEORY, 1946-1950
Introduction to Part VIII

World War II and Afterwards

Russia's entry into World War II in June 1941 brought with it a sharp decrease in research and publication in music theory. Indeed, the Great Patriotic War, as it is called in the Soviet Union, affected every aspect of Soviet life. Those scholars who continued to pursue their research and writing did so often under conditions of fear and privation—scholarly and otherwise—with no certainty of publication or even completion of their work, particularly in Leningrad during the blockade. Even in Moscow, which experienced more normal conditions than did Leningrad, theoretical activity was curtailed. Educational activity was disrupted in both cities. The Moscow Conservatory evacuated its operations to Saratov for a time in 1942 (Yavorsky died there), and the Leningrad Conservatory moved to Tashkent for the duration of the war, 1941-45. Publication activities were severely restricted. Monthly publication of the journal Soviet Music was suspended from 1941 to 1946; instead, six annual collections of articles carrying the name Soviet Music were published during those years. But only the sixth volume contains any serious theoretical material, a brief survey of the theories of A. S. Ogolevets. During the war just
a few minor theoretical works were published. Not until 1946 did the publication of more significant scholarly works in music theory resume on a regular schedule.

For some theorists, though, the war did not seriously impinge upon their scholarly activity. Three of the theorists whose works we shall be examining completed their doctoral dissertations during the war, two of which were subsequently published. And, as we know, Asafiev continued to work during most of the blockade of Leningrad and managed to write several works that were later published, most notably *intonatsiia*. But from all indications, as a result of the disruption of normal educational, research and publishing activities caused by the war, the years from 1941 to 1946 were lean ones for scholarly work in music. Therefore in this part I will concentrate on the post-war period from 1946 to 1950.

This period coincides with the period in Russian cultural history often referred to as "Zhdanovshchina," after the Politburo member Andrei A. Zhdanov (1896–1948), Stalin's cultural "tsar." In the field of music this period culminated in the Meeting of Moscow Composers and Musicologists in January 1948 and the resulting Resolution of the Central Committee of February 10, 1948, followed soon after by the First All-Union Congress of Composers in April 1948. In music theory specifically the culmination—or more accurately, the nadir—of this period came amid the attacks on musicologists (including theorists) and critics at the conference of the musicological members of the Composers' Union a year later (February 18, 21, and 22, 1949). Alexander
Werth's book, *Musical Uproar in Moscow*, gives a detailed account of the January 1948 Meeting, which provided a forum for the discussion and criticism of Soviet music. His title, with a substitution of Soviet Union for Moscow, supplies an apt name for this period.

As a result of the shake-up in the musical world surrounding these Congresses and the Party Resolution, research and publication in music theory again came to a standstill. As during the war, no significant works were published in either 1949 or 1950. Thus, with just a few exceptions (a 1941 book by Ogolevets and some unpublished war-time studies by Berkov), the current discussion is limited still further to the important works published during the years 1946-1948. The primary focus here, then, is on the theories of Aleksei Stepanovich Ogolevets (1891-1967), Anatolii Konstantinovich Butskoi (1892-1965), and Viktor Osipovich Berkov (1907-19__). Examinations of the major articles from this period, mainly analyses of Shostakovich's music by Lev Abramovich Mazel and Aleksandr Naumovich Dolzhansky (1908-1966), will follow; and discussions of the 1948 Resolution, the 1948 and 1949 Meetings and Congresses, and a final conference held in 1950, the All-Soviet Scientific Session on Musicology, will conclude this chapter.

Several interesting and significant pedagogical works were also published during this period, a book on modulation by Andrei Fedorovich Mutli (1894-1954), a book on double canon by Semyon Semyonovich Bogatyrev (1890-1960), and a textbook on form by Igor Vladimirovich Sposobin (1900-1954); but these books fall outside the purview of this study in that they are not speculative and build on existing founda-
tions created by an earlier theorist or theorists. Although worthy of mention, they will not be discussed in detail herein. Sposobin was a prominent theoretical figure, though. He was one of the authors of the "brigade" harmony textbook (see Part VII); and he was head of the theory department (from 1942 to 1947) and also dean of the theory and composition faculty (from 1943 to 1948) at the Moscow Conservatory, where he had been teaching since 1924. Because of his position as head of the theory department at the Conservatory, his name will crop up during the discussion of the events of the late 1940s.

Theoretical activity in this period tended to follow established trends, that is, with but a few exceptions, theoretical research remained on the "soft" side, crowded out, as it were, by infiltrations from other disciplines as demanded by Marxist methods. Theorists continued to utilize the method of integrated analysis, but with generally unremarkable results. Having made the point about this type of analysis in the previous part (Part VII), I need not include any specific examples here. But the question of applying analysis as an accepted method of Marxist musicology continued to occupy theorists as a useful option to more speculative, but more dangerous, avenues. Thus we find books on such topics as Glinka's harmonic style (Berkov) and form analysis (Butskoi and Sposobin) at the forefront of publications at this time. Another safe and acceptable approach was to build on the work of a previous, preferably pre-revolutionary, theorist; Rimsky-Korsakov (Mutli) or Taneev (Bogatyrev) were two such theorists whose views were expanded in a particular way. Theorists began to encounter
difficulties when they turned to more modern subjects, such as the
music of Shostakovich (Mazel and Dolzhansky) and Prokofiev (Berkov),
whose positions in the musical world at this time were not entirely
secure, or new modal systems, particularly if that new modal system
promoted microtonal music (Ogolevets). Of course, these latter topics
are of infinitely greater interest to Western theorists than the other
less controversial topics. Nevertheless, it is still necessary to
examine all approaches, in order to receive a clear picture of the
state of music theory during this time, and particularly in order to
understand fully the significance and impact of the events of the late
1940s. The emphasis on a Marxist theoretical musicology begun in the
1930s was exaggerated to such an extent that it destroyed any vestiges
of the autonomy that music theory still had at this time. The Marxist
"ideal" became like a cancer, mutating and ultimately destroying every-
thing from within. The situation as it developed, though, was, in
every sense of the word, extra-ordinary; it is hard to follow the
events and believe that they actually occurred. Since they did, it is
necessary to acknowledge them and the damage they caused; for to do
otherwise would be to ignore a significant portion of history. The
Soviets tend to gloss over these events and their impact. But if we
are to understand the course of the history of Soviet music theory, we
must examine them.
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Chapter 31

Aleksei Stepanovich Ogolevets: Modal Theory and Expansion

Aleksei Stepanovich Ogolevets (1894-1967). Ogolevets published two works during the 1940s—Osnovy garmonicheskogo iazyka [The foundations of harmonic language] in 1941 and Vvedenie v sovremennoe muzykal'noe myshlenie [An introduction to contemporary musical thought] in 1946. Although in terms of its 1938 completion date and 1941 publication date the first book belongs more properly to the previous period, because of the attention it and its companion volume attracted in the post-war period, I have chosen to include the discussion of Ogolevets and his works in this chapter.

Like a number of his contemporaries, Ogolevets initially pursued his studies in both music and other fields. As a youth he studied theory with the composer Leonid Leonidovich Lisovskii in Poltav and then from 1912 to 1916 studied composition with Yavorsky at the People's Conservatory in Moscow. In 1912 he began his studies at Moscow University in physics and mathematics, but subsequently changed to law, graduating in 1917. From 1915 to 1923 he taught music theory, first at the Conservatory and then at other schools. During his years of study he also began to concertize as a pianist, playing some of his own works.
(influenced by Taneev and still unpublished). From 1923 to 1941 he worked as an editor, first for the literary journal Gyulistan and then for various publishing houses. At the same time he began research on temperament and mode. In 1935, with financial help from the government, he built a keyboard instrument with seventeen tones to the octave. From 1940 to 1945 he was a research assistant at the Leningrad Institute of Theater and Music. From 1945 to 1948 he organized and directed a laboratory-office of tonal systems, where he continued his work on new systems of temperament. This laboratory was sponsored by the Composers' Union, in which he was active during the 1930s and early 1940s. But after he was severely criticized in the late 1940s for his views, he turned in the 1950s to other topics such as aesthetics and the connections between words and music in vocal works. From 1952 until 1962 he was general editor of the publication Voprosy muzykoznaniia [Questions of musicology].

His two major works from the 1940s, Osnovy garmonicheskogo yazyka [The foundations of harmonic language], finished in 1938 but published in 1941, and Vvedenie v sovremennoe muzykal'noe myshlenie [An introduction into contemporary musical thought], finished in 1944 but published in 1946, promote his ideas for the establishment of new tonal systems. Because of their length—970 pages in the first work, 469 in the second—it is not possible to examine these works here in depth; but the essential features of his views will be presented.

Most of Ogolevets's ideas had little immediate impact on the development of Soviet music theory, partly because of the timing of the
appearance of these works. In the heady atmosphere of the 1920s, his work would have thrived and received more support. But we have seen that attention to the microtonal approach—various manifestations of which were promoted by several Soviet theorists—waned during the 1930s, for which the growing politicization of music theory was largely responsible. Despite the enthusiasm for research in the field of microtonal music in the 1920s, the topic was incompatible with the political trends of the 1930s. But Ogolevets persevered, and was able to promote and maintain a certain enthusiasm for it and his views in general among his colleagues. His interpretation, though, differs from that of his predecessors in this field in both method and, frequently, result. He calls the work of Rozenov, Avraamov, G. M. Rimsky-Korsakov, Busoni, and Haba "scientific failures," since it is all based on what he considers to be the incorrect positions of either quarter-tone thought or the overtone series, both of which Ogolevets rejected as foundations for the microtonal approach. Nonetheless, Zhdanov and the post-war nationalistic paranoia he promoted effectively eliminated this area—and many others—as an acceptable topic for research or performance. As the author of the most advanced works of his time in Russia, Ogolevets was singled out for criticism. According to Olkhovsky, though, he was merely a convenient scapegoat in theory as Muradeli was in composition. But Ogolevets was aligned with the more "formalist" faction at the Moscow Conservatory; and this, combined with his "progressive" views, made him a convenient target for such criticism. Thus Ogolevets's two books from the 1940s shared the same fate.
as Garbuzov's two-volume work on mode did earlier—consigned to oblivion, deserved or not. One can only speculate as to what might have been, had these and similar works been allowed to flourish unimpeded by political considerations.

Ogolevets tried to circumvent such criticism from the beginning by making it clear that, concerning his goals and the realization and development of his ideas, he was working within the limits of Soviet, i.e., Marxist, music theory. Furthermore, with regard to the origin of his ideas, he placed himself firmly in the tradition of Russian music theory, since he aligned himself not with any twentieth-century theorists, Russian, Soviet, or otherwise, but with the so-called traditional Russian school of the nineteenth century. But whether Marxist theory inspired the inception of his ideas is another matter; nonetheless Ogolevets attempts to justify his approach to theory and the realization of his approach through the application of the Marxist-Leninist tenets of dialectical materialism. He relies particularly on the writings of Engels. But he was subsequently faulted for the misapplication or misinterpretation of some of these tenets, certain aspects of which, his critics charged, he freely interpreted so as to accommodate his own ideas.

"The Foundations of Harmonic Language". Overall, Ogolevets attempts nothing less than the synthesis of all of music theory—past, present and future—into one unified approach based primarily on his "scientific" confirmation of empirical evidence and some acoustical
givens. In The Foundations of Harmonic Language, he applies this synthesis to the very fundamentals of music—temperament, mode and harmony. Subsequent volumes were to tackle other theoretical subjects such as melody and rhythm. In his 1946 volume on contemporary musical thought he expands on his interpretation of the historical development of the musical language itself, whereas here he concentrates on providing the basis for the language of the future. Ogolevets accepts none of the leading theories of his day, including functionalism (Riemann-Gevaert-Catoire—the "brigade"), multi-based modes (Garbuzov), modal rhythm (Yavorsky), linearity (Kurth), and the modal approach of Tiulin; indeed, he devotes a goodly proportion of his text to refuting these theories in favor of his own. As a starting point, he dusts off the empirical approach of Chaikovsky, that is, the traditional approach, which musicologists at that time were interpreting as dry and scholastic, and attempts to prove its positions scientifically, that is, through acoustical and mathematical verifications.

Ogolevets's main idea in The Foundations of Harmonic Language promotes the concept of a "global music," with an umbrella-type system of temperament that would unite all the various musical systems in this global music. Ogolevets thus attempts to unite the theory of serious or professional music with the theory of folk music, and the theory of Western music—including here Russian and Soviet music—with the theories of music of other cultures, most notably Middle-Eastern and Eastern cultures such as the Indian, Indonesian and Arabic cultures. In fact, he interprets folk music as the basis for all music, past, pre-
sent and future. He envisions a tiered microtonal modal system growing out of the twelve-tone system that would continue to develop as the twelve-tone system had developed from the five- and seven-tone systems and in the process encompass the music of all world cultures—in other words, a hierarchical modal approach beginning with the simplest two-note "modes" to the modes formed within the most complex microtonal systems. This theoretical umbrella would therefore accommodate many seemingly disparate acoustical temperaments and prove the interconnections among diverse musical cultures, both simple and complex. Each musical system would occur during one of the stages in this vast modal development:

All musical cultures are successive, appearing in their musical language only as different stages of development of a single tonal system; into each stage may be transferred the laws of development of any other stage. . . . Temperament is only the outer universal substantiation of some or other part of the tonal system having independent significance.5

Yet, although temperament possesses only external significance within a tonal system, it is temperament upon which Ogolevets lavishes the most attention. Following a strict mathematical formula of his own invention he postulates sixty-four different possible universal temperaments, ranging from twelve to two hundred tones to the octave, each tone equal in size. But only four of these, he says (without substantiation), the 12-, 17-, 29-, and 41-tone systems, are within the limits of human comprehension. The other sixty temperaments "remain in vain for the development of music attached to the given level of perceiving capabilities of man."
Ogolevets's ideas resemble those proposed by Joseph Yasser in 1932 in *A Theory of Evolving Tonality*, at least in concept and method if not in detail. Both see the future of music in terms of microtonal temperaments, which they view as the only logical alternative to atonality; both promote progressive hierarchical systems in music, with each system growing out of or building on the achievements of the previous system; both liken music to a living organism undergoing evolution from lower forms into higher forms; both apply dialectics to their approach (Yasser, for instance, applies the dialectical model to his view of musical evolution); both reject the automatic division of the octave into quarter tones or some other mechanical division; both interpret Scriabin's music as anticipating this new musical language; both reject the idea of chromaticism, preferring instead to expand the idea of diatonicism; both promote pentatonicism as a precursor to 7-tone diatonicism; both treat folk and professional music as part of the same overall musical evolution; and so on.

The actual realizations of their views take different forms, though. While for the formation of microtonal systems Ogolevets relies on the chain of fifths and the division of the whole tone initially based on the comma, thus promoting tone additions initially in increments of five (7+5; 12+5; 17+5), Yasser advocates the addition of tones following an established pattern that partially resembles the Fibonacci sequence (2+3; 5+2; 7+5; 12+7, or the number sequence 2,3,5,7,12,19). (The true Fibonacci sequence is 1,1,2,3,5,8,13,21, etc. Yasser's pattern breaks this sequence between the 5 and the 7.) Thus, whereas the
next logical level for Ogolevets is a 17-tone system, for Yassar it is
a 19-tone "supra-diatonic" system. However, the solution of an equal-
tempered system remains the same for both. But Ogolevets does not
mention Yasser in either of his works, and in fact makes no claims of
direct influence by any contemporary theorists.

Yet it is difficult to believe he was not aware of Yasser's work.
The two theorists must have known each other, for they both lived and
studied in Moscow at the same time and on the whole led rather similar
lives until Yasser emigrated to the United States in 1921. Just a year
apart in age, they both studied music at conservatories in Moscow,
Ogolevets at the Peoples' Conservatory (from 1912 to 1916) and Yasser
at the Moscow Conservatory (graduated 1917). They both had the same
piano teacher, A. F. Gedike, and both studied theory or composition,
Yasser with N. S. Morozova and Ogolevets with Yavorsky. Both performed
as concert artists, Yasser as an organist and choir director, Ogolevets
as a pianist. They obviously were both influenced by the developments
in folk-music research and microtonal advances from the first few
decades of the century, but any other common influences or threads are
difficult to ascertain.

Ogolevets divides his lengthy work into five segments. In the
first part, chapters 1 through 10, he focuses on questions of the
acoustical basis of theory, intervallic relations, modal sensation
(major and minor), diatonicism and chromaticism, dissonance and conso-
nance—in short, some of the basic foundations of music theory. Here
he lays the groundwork for his system of twelve-tone tonality and of
tonal expansion. In the second part, chapters 11 through 22, Ogolevets presents his own interpretation of the tonal system, both fundamental and expanded. In the third part, chapters 23 through 33, he concentrates on the chord structures of his tonal system. In the fourth part, chapters 34 through 46, he examines the modal content of his tonal system, as well as some other harmonic manifestations such as modulation, suspensions, and tonal logic. In the fifth and final part, chapters 47 through 77, he discusses various manifestations of the expanded tonal system.

The Periodic Tonal System. At the foundation of Ogolevets's approach is the idea of "the periodic tonal system." This concept falls somewhere between the two extremes of 12-tone chromaticism as practiced in late romantic and early expressionistic music (in which all twelve tones are used while still maintaining some semblance of pitch hierarchy based on the functions of seven-note diatonicism) and atonalism (in which all twelve tones are equal). It is akin in this sense—although not identical—to such twentieth-century coinages as Slonimsky's "pandiatonicism" and Reti's "p pantonality." George Perle's "12-tone tonality" comes to mind here, too; but his concept includes pitch order as well as pitch content, and Ogolevets's system does not. Ogolevets's periodic system could be called a "one-interval" (i.e., generation by a perfect fifth) 12-tone diatonic set. The periodic system of C major, for example, is equal to a twelve-tone tonality, consisting of twelve diatonic tones, arranged by ascending or
descending fifths and identified according to their placement (the
number equals the degree, raised [v] or lowered [n]) in relation to the
tonal center:

| Minor: 4v  7v  3v  6v | 2  5  1  4  7  3  6  2n |
| fa#  si  mi  la  re  sol  do  fa  si  mi  la  re |
| b  b  b  b  b  b  b  b  b  b  b  b |
| Major: 4v  7  3  6  2  5  1  4n  7n  3n  6n  2n |
| superdiatonic major |

Figure 31.1. Ogolevets's 12-note periodic diatonic system: major and
minor.

This is a diatonic periodic system—diatonic rather than chromatic
because in Ogolevets's view each tone has a function in each tonality.
In a chromatic system certain tones lie outside, i.e., do not function
in, a given tonality, which is restricted to only seven diatonic tones.
What we usually refer to as C major, the seven tones from si to fa,
becomes "superdiatonic major," "the segment of diatonicism most mani-
ifested tonally" (also shown in Figure 31.1), and C minor is "superdia-
tonic minor." The system is periodic because, according to
Ogolevets, in the movement of tonalities around the circle of fifths
each tone or sound has a "period of distribution," that is, functions
differently in each tonality. Here is the entire "period" of do:
Major tonality: sol re la mi si fa do sol re la mi si
Sound do as degree: 4v. 7 3 6 2 5 1 4 7n. 3n. 6n. 2n.

Figure 31.2. Functions of note do in twelve major tonalities.

Thus, "our diatonic major and minor are particular cases of the super-
diatonic manifestation of segments of the twelve-tone quintal chain,
making up the periodic system." Such an approach eliminates the need
to consider sounds such as F# and Db in either major or minor as
"accidental," since they clearly are a part of Ogolevets's diatonic
periodic system. Chromaticism thus refers only to the alteration of a
tone, its being raised or lowered to a tone not present in the original
periodic system—C to C#, for example.

Ogolevets bases his periodic tonal system on Pythagorean tuning,
not equal temperament. "The logic of modal harmonic and melodic
thought is based on the nontempered system; temperament is something
close to it, however, by virtue of its particular features, not hinder-
ing logical thought." The Pythagorian comma takes on a special sig-
nificance and becomes a cornerstone for his method of tonal expansion:

Only the law of the further intonational diminishing of the diato-
nic half-step leads to the expansion of the tonal system, creating
the preconditions for the inclusion of the music of all the peo-
ples of the globe in a common stream of world culture. . . . Only
the true idea about the existence of the comma remains the basis
of musical logic.11

Ogolevets rejects Yavorsky's notion of gravity and the attraction
of certain notes towards others as the primary formative element in
music. For gravity, which he considers only a secondary phenomenon, he substitutes repulsion as the primary phenomenon. As proof he cites the recognition by Engels that in dialectical theory repulsion is equally important to attraction:

Usually it is accepted that gravity is the most common sign of materialism, that is, that attraction, and not repulsion is the necessary characteristic of matter. But attraction and repulsion are also as inseparable from each other as positive and negative, and therefore it is possible, on the basis of the principles of dialectics, to predict that the true theory of matter should allot repulsion the same important place as attraction, that the theory of matter based only on attraction is false, insufficient, indecisive. And really, there are sufficient phenomena, pointing to this. . .12

Further, Engels considers repulsion to be the active side of energy, whereas attraction is the passive side of energy. Ogolevets applies this to music:

Repulsion and attraction have meaning . . . only in their unbroken interrelation and interaction—the moment of the accumulation of energy and its manifestation, the fading of energy, then its new birth. Here is the true cause of the simplest melodic process. . . . These interrelations are manifested sometimes in an exceptionally intricate view, acquiring such form of motion in which all these moments are interwoven. Melody moves after some sound by leaps, greater than energy is inserted in the previous sound. One still has to understand all these processes (the same belongs also to repetitions of sounds). In the simplest modes the relation of repulsion is lacking; the superdiatonic of both major and minor is established on the same link of the system, which already introduces into the mode the first relation of repulsion.13

In the periodic tonal system repulsion occurs between the two commaic pitches (those pitches separated by the comma), between what Ogolevets calls chromatic half-steps, for example, Db and G#: and attraction occurs between diatonic half-steps, for example, C and Db, ("V" equals repulsion):
But in the 12-tone periodic system, only one tone--either re or do--exists between the two tones of the whole tone do-re. Therefore, the re would be attracted to do (a diatonic half-step) and repulsed from re (a chromatic half-step; "+" equals attraction):

\[
\text{do} \quad \rightarrow \quad + \quad \text{re} \quad \leftarrow \quad \text{V} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{re}
\]

And the do\# would be attracted to re (a diatonic half-step) and repulsed from do (a chromatic half-step):

\[
\text{do} \quad \leftarrow \quad \leftarrow \quad \text{V} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{do\#} \quad \rightarrow \quad + \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{re}
\]

Ogolevets sees in these schemes "the primordial laws of the logic of melodic thought." Thus the comma becomes "the condenser of potential energy"; "any change in it attached to the retention in sizes commensurable with the half-step leads to an instantaneous expansion of the tonal system, where the number of the degrees of the 'scale' depends directly on the size of the comma."

"Latent Harmony." Another important component of Ogolevets's system is what he calls "latent harmony." It is based on several assumptions, all of which, unfortunately, are problematic: that tonic (do) and dominant (sol) are equal in significance; that they form the central arch from which the circle of fifths expands in each direction, ending with fa\# on one side and re\# on the other; that the "flat" side
from do to re is the "beta" ("b") or minor side and the "sharp" side from sol to fa♯ is the "alpha" ("a") or major side; that each pitch may be represented by a numerical coefficient that indicates its degree of gravitational tension; that this gravitational tension increases for each additional fifth distant from the central arch and is measured in increments of one for each fifth; and that these qualities—major or minor—are absolute, i.e., "do" is always minor, etc. Figure 31.3 summarizes the qualities of this approach. The arrows point in the direction of the gravitational attraction and increasing tension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;alpha&quot; or major side</th>
<th>&quot;beta&quot; or minor side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fa♯ 5a 4a 3a 2a 1a 1b 2b 3b</td>
<td>fa 5b 4b 3b 2b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>si 5a 4a 3a 2a 1a</td>
<td>si 2b 3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mi 5a 4a 3a 2a</td>
<td>mi 3b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la 5a 4a 3a</td>
<td>la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>re sol do</td>
<td>re</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 31.3. Gravitation and modal properties of pitches of 12-tone diatonic system.

The upwards direction of the gravity of the pitches on the left side expresses the major quality (the sharp side, with ascending pitches); the downwards direction of the gravity of the pitches on the right side expresses the minor quality (the flat side, with descending pitches). Tonic (do) and dominant (sol) gravitate in both directions, since they are the only pitches with adjacent diatonic half-steps on both sides (marked with asterisks):
The higher the coefficient, the greater the degree of "majorness" or "minorness." Therefore chords are either major or minor depending on the predominance of pitches from one side or the other. I will return to this question of chords after further background explanations.

Figure 31.4. Acoustical size, gravitational direction of 12-tone diatonic system.

Ogolevets's method of tuning includes consideration for the Pythagorean comma, as shown in Figure 31.4. Those pitches closer in tuning proximity, that is, the diatonic half-steps lacking the comma between them (90 cents rather than 114 cents), have greater attractive power. Only two pitches, sol (dominant) and do (tonic), have the gravitational power of attraction in both directions, from the pitches located on either side, because of the lack of the repulsing comma between them and these adjacent pitches. To illustrate their dual power, Ogolevets places them twice in the graph. When arranged in the chain of fifths, the pitches result in the arrangement shown in Figure 31.3.
The degree of the complexity of intervallic content between the pitches in the system—augmented or diminished intervals—increases from the center to the perimeter; the most extreme pitches make up the most complex intervals with the other pitches. Also, according to Ogolevets, on the "alpha" side the minor and diminished intervals predominate, and on the "beta" side the major and augmented intervals predominate; but this interpretation depends of course on the direction of the interval. The center, again, consists of sol and do. The two sides ("alpha" and "beta") are equal in the number and proportion of complex intervallic relationships—augmented (a) and diminished (d)—formed between them, as Figure 31.5 illustrates. The numbers in the columns with a or d prefixes refer to intervals. Each vertical column of such numbers above or below a pitch name identifies half of the intervals formed between that pitch and each of the pitches of the other ("alpha" or "beta") side; the horizontal columns identify the other half. For example, the extreme left vertical column identifies the diminished intervals formed between the most extreme alpha pitch fa♯ and each of the six beta pitches, from diminished fifth (fa♯-do) to diminished sixth (fa♯-re); and the lowest horizontal column identifies the augmented intervals formed between fa♯ and each of the beta pitches.

Ogolevets calls the dual tonic-dominant basis of the 12-tone periodic system "the polar sides of the single nucleus of the tonal system." Emanating from this polar pair of pitches (numbered "1" in Figure 31.6) is a series of modal constructs, each reached through the
Figure 31.5. Intervalle relations in 12-tone periodic system.

cumulative addition of a non-contiguous pair of pitches (numbered "2" through "6" in Figure 31.6). Each pair of pitches adds one intervallic pair (an interval and its inversion) to each side of the series, beginning with the P4/P5 (do-fa and sol-re) and ending with the m2/M7 (sol-b fa# and do-re).

Figure 31.6. Arrangement of intervallic pairs in tonal system.
Here is the resulting scalar order of these groupings:

1: do- sol- (do)
2: do- re- fa- sol- (do)
3: do- re- fa- sol- la-si- (do)
4: do- re-mi -mi-fa- sol- la-si -si-(do)
5: do- re-mi -mi-fa- sol-la -la-si -si-(do)
6: do-re -re-mi -mi-fa-fa-sol-la -la-si -si-(do)

Figure 31.7. Arrangement of intervallic pairs in scalar order.

The first pair is "the basic simplest harmonic cell of each mode, consisting of absolutely balanced sounds of the system, the nucleus of the tonal system, which assumes (in disintegrating view) the function of the basic fundamental bass path of all tonal music." The second grouping (the first and second pairs) is "a three-four combination, which in its two modifications is the original tonic in several Russian folk songs (re-sol-do and sol-do--fa). All four sounds are more supporting ... and they give together a quartal tonic of the system." The third grouping contains two types of simple pentatonicism, from la to fa and from re to si. The fourth is "the so called major-minor mode, characteristic, frequently being met in folk songs in tonic triad of two thirds, major and minor; the leading tone is lacking." The fifth is the ten-tone "major-minor system," and the sixth is the entire 12-tone system. These groupings in fact represent Ogolevets's interpretation of the process of the historical development of music, which he discusses at length in his second work (see below). Of the
four cycles he envisions, the groupings above constitute cycles two
(groups 1–3) and three (4–6).

Ogolevets stresses the lack of absolute intervallic categories:

Any sound, any interval or chord is not equal to itself, is not
identical to itself in different tonal systems. It is changed
imperceptibly for the organ of hearing, but in a musical relation
these changes are decisive.

In the metaphysical view of this phenomenon, any interval
remains itself (being changed only really, acoustically, arithme-
tically, depending on the physical conditions, for example the
number of vibrations of each sound), as some immanent category.
We see that any interval in each separate system consists princi-
pally not of one and the same sounds. Each of them takes in
different systems a different place in the conditionally finite
chain of fifths and, consequently, fulfills a different function
in its system.20

Thus, because each interval is unique in terms of both its pitch con-
tent, internal distance, and placement in the chain of fifths, the
possibilities for variety in both intervallic and chordal construction
are increased substantially. Each transposition of a chord therefore
must be treated individually and not merely as a transposition. This
attitude towards the individuality of intervals within a particular
system is only recently being adopted by some Western theorists in
their investigations of diatonic set theory. Ogolevets's approach is
tempered by his notion of "latent harmony," in which each interval is
represented by a different combination of numerical coefficients.

With this additional information, we can now return to the con-
cept of "latent harmony" introduced above. Ogolevets defines it as
"the sum of opposing tensions." The coefficients associated with
"alpha" and "beta" in Figure 31.1 above play the role of "indicators"
of this latent harmony. Thus Ogolevets further identifies "latent
harmony" as "the number of equal coefficients":

In all cases, thus, latent harmony is the element of opposing
tensions, having the same degree of intensity; the alpha and beta
coefficients in separate harmonies play the role of indicators of
the intensity of the latent harmony. The interaction of these
oppositely directed tensions leads not to their cancellation, but
to the fusion into a harmonic unity.23

This situation applies when the coefficients are equal. Ogolevets
explains the treatment if these coefficients are not equal:

The tension existing in excess is released. If the tones 3a and
5b are joined, for example, then the equal tensions (3a and 3b)
are fused in proportion, that is, into a harmony. We will desig-
nate it ar [for the Greek word for harmony] . . . and with the
number attached to ar we will show the number of opposed coeffi-
cients having been fused—in other words, the units of tension
having been neutralized or fused. Thus we designate the simple
case mentioned above as ar3. But in this case three alpha and
five beta were joined, and only three units of tension from each
side were fused. Two beta units remain in excess. In the process
of the birth of latent harmony such excessive tension remains un-
cancelled and is released in the view of a major or minor excess,
indicating an influence on the coloring of the sound-combination.
We will show this released tension joined to ar3 with a plus sign.
Thus the formula of the transformation of tensions in the two-note
example here will be: 3a+5b +2b [actually 3a + 5b = ar3 +2b =
E,C.]. The number attached to ar is not a dead number of coeffi-
cients; it shows the weight of the given harmonic complex asso-
ciated in perception with the weightiness, the saturated quality
of the harmony.24

b

Thus the interval in question, la -1a (5b and 3a, respectively), has an
excess of two beta, which gives it a minor coloring or sensation that
coincides with its traditional designation of minor second.

In Ogolevets's system, there are six "absolutely balanced" harmo-
nic intervals (with their inversions): the perfect fifth 1b-1a (fourth
1a-1b), the "minor" third 2a-2b ("major" third 3b-3a), the "minor"
second 3a-3b ("major" seventh 3b-3a), the augmented prime 4b-4a (dimin-
ished octave 4a-4b), the augmented second 5b-5a (diminished seventh 5a-
5b), and the augmented third 6b-6a (diminished sixth 6a-6b). Ogolevets arranges them in two circular segments in scalar order (the numbers refer to the same intervallic pairs introduced in Figure 31.6):

![Diagram of intervallic pairs with equal coefficients]

Figure 31.8. Intervallic pairs with equal coefficients.

For Ogolevets, these intervallic pairs have "huge significance for the creation of the science of melodics, for the understanding of all the modes of the system." The significance of this arrangement concerns how Ogolevets forms modes, by pentachords and tetrachords (see below).

As with the intervals, the major or minor quality of a chord—that is, a construct with three or more notes—depends on the "excess" of either beta or alpha coefficients. The same is true for modes. Take, for example, what we call the major mode: do-re-mi-fa-sol-la-si. The coefficients are 1b+2a+4a+2b+1a+3a+5a, or 13 alpha and 3 beta. The tonic triad is 5 alpha and 1 beta. Therefore, both the mode and the
tonic triad are overwhelmingly major. For the natural minor mode, \( b \) do\-rei\-mi \( b \)-fa\-sol\-la \( b \)-si\-b, the coefficients are \( 1b + 2a + 4b + 2b + 1a + 5b + 3b \), or 3 alpha and 15 beta. The tonic triad is 1 alpha and 5 beta. Both the mode and tonic triad are overwhelmingly minor. An example of a seeming contradiction Ogolevets uses is the "Neapolitan" sixth chord, which in traditional theory is considered a major triad; in Ogolevets's system, \( b \)-fa\-la \( b \), or 6b + 2b + 5b, contains a coefficient sum of 13 beta, or minor. This explains why a chord that is major in structure but minor in sensation appears most frequently in the minor mode:

The artistic literature of the epoch of classicism and romanticism gives innumerable examples of the application of this 'major' (by construction) triad in the capacity of a carrier of conflict, for a short-term deviation into the sphere of darkness, for the introduction into a statement of the emotions of grief, of despair. The aesthetic influence of such a method is perfect.26

He thus labels the coefficients as "major and minor coefficients," and the resulting preponderance of one or the other "sensations of major-ness and minor-ness." The combinations of coefficients of tones may range from \( 21a + 21b \) (all the tones of the periodic system) to \( 1a + 1b \) (tonic and dominant). However, in the traditional school, the maximal beta coefficient of triads is \( 13b \) (Neapolitan triad: \( 6b + 2b + 5b = 13b \)); the maximal alpha coefficient is \( 11a \) (major triad on II: \( 2a + 6a + 3a = 11a \)).

In a horizontal or melodic succession of tones—rather than a vertical simultaneity as in harmony—the distance between tones, measured in "steps," is as significant as the value of the coefficient of the single note. A certain number of steps may express the same effect and clarity as its equivalent coefficient. For example, from re to
la, a diminished fifth, is six steps, which is relative to faß or 6a; therefore the melodic distance from re to la may be equal in effect and clarity to the single note faß. Further, the intensity of sensation of a note in a melody may be increased to supernormal proportions if it is accompanied by other notes in its class (alpha or beta). Thus the tension of a note in a melody may be increased either through surrounding notes or accompanying notes. These effects occur in addition to the tension of the coefficient itself.

Ogolevets presents Chopin's Mazurka, Op. 50, No. 3, as an example (Example 31.1). In the opening four measures, the F#♯, with a coefficient of 6a (in the key of C♯ minor), occurs twice. The most intense note preceding its first occurrence is A, which is 5b; and as accompaniment for the measure in which it first occurs are the notes B♯ (5a) and G♯ (1a). Thus, according to Ogolevets, the significance of the F#♯ is emphasized in three ways: its coefficient (6a), the notes preceding it (A=5b, a distance of 10a), and the notes "accompanying" it (B♯ and G♯, which with the F#♯ create a supernormal tension of 12a). The cumulative effect of the notes in measure two creates an "even, open, intensively major impression." He does not comment on the second occurrence of the F#♯ in measure four, where the cumulative effect is only slightly diminished by the C♯ (1b). The intervening measures (1, 3, and 5) are more minor in sensation.

Ogolevets calculates that from the dynamic point of view of all combinations in music, from separate sounds to 12-note combinations, there are 4,095 intervals and chords in a tonal system; of this number,

12 are separate sounds and 66 are intervals. In the twelve tonal systems of European music there are a total of 49,140 (or 12 x 4,095) combinations. He also calculates, irrespective of the number of sounds, a total of 473 "indices of latent harmony," which he adds parenthetically may also be referred to as the "major-minor index," "index of tension," "index of color," "dynamic index." He does not explain how he arrived at this number, but it indicates the different possible combinations of the numerical coefficients, and includes combinations of alpha and beta coefficients regardless of intervallic content or note arrangement (i.e., thirds or fourths). However, in his constructions of chords, he limits himself to tertian construction, to the four types of thirds—major, minor, augmented and diminished. He also approves of and utilizes the quartal construction of chords, particularly augmented and diminished fourths, but chooses to concen-
trate in this volume on tertian construction. More detailed coverage of his approach to chords will follow the discussion of mode.

Ogolevets's entire notion of latent harmony must seem preposterous to Western readers, but he was completely serious. Placing a numerical value on pitches and then manipulating the combinations of these values to indicate qualities that have nothing to do with such values is completely arbitrary and lacking in significance. Yet Ogolevets was a theorist of some importance, and his ideas were discussed and investigated during the 1940s, with disastrous consequences, as it turns out. Therefore it is important to understand his approach both for a complete picture of music theory during the 1940s and in order to put the later attacks against him in perspective. I will illustrate his application of this notion of latent harmony both in his formation of mode and in examinations of analyses from his second book, and will evaluate it further at those points.

Mode. Ogolevets's idea of latent harmony also affects his interpretation of mode, as does his application of the idea of repulsion. He classifies modes according to the amount or type of gravitational tension in each, and he forms modes based either on avoiding the occurrence of repulsion, on the expansion of the tone content via the chain of fifths, by one-tone alterations of existing modes, or by combinations of characteristic portions of existing modes. Some modes can be formed by more than one of these methods. He bases his definition of mode in a narrow sense on the principle of repulsion, which in a very
basic way also may be viewed as a means of classification, i.e., those modes that contain repulsing tones form one group, those that do not form another:

Any row of sounds of a tonal system, outside the dependency on the absolute pitch of sounds, but in a strict dependency on their pitch correlations, arising from the regularities of the construction of the tonal system is called mode in the particular sense of this word. According to this the harmonic state of each sound defines exactly its place in the tonal system. In a given row of sounds the tonic of the system is the basic degree. (Under harmonic state we mean here the coefficient of the tension of the sound.) Between sounds of a given row should not arise the relations of the first repulsion, attached to the rise of which the idea of mode in the particular sense of the word is violated.28

Modes that qualify under this definition range in size from two to ten tones. The simplest modes range from two-tone modes (tonic and dominant) to seven-tone modes. The first repulsion in the chain of fifths creates the interval of the augmented prime, which occurs with the eighth tone in the chain. With its introduction into the mode "the unity of the mode is destroyed." Since the augmented prime can be avoided in modes with fewer than eight tones, most of the modes answering this definition contain seven tones. Ogolevets identifies a total of thirty-two seven-tone modes within his twelve-tone diatonic system that lack the augmented prime, i.e., repulsing tones. Not all altered tones result in the augmented prime, though, and in Ogolevets's seventeen-sound system, some eight- to ten-tone modes contain two altered tones on the same pitch, or the doubly augmented prime, which do not result in a repulsion.

Ogolevets's wide interpretation of mode embraces essentially the twelve-tone periodic system, which does not exclude tones that repulse:
Modes with the presence of the relation of repulsion are modes in the wide sense of the word. . . . We call mode in the wide sense of the word . . . both the full tonal system that lies at the basis of the diatonic 12-sound [system], and also its separate manifested superdiatonic fragments (modes in the narrow sense of the word). . . . We will call the main mode in 12 sounds the periodic system and name it mode. One single sound, always being found in a strictly defined tonal center of the system, plays the role of tonic in any mode (on the basis of a 12-sound mode). We therefore expand the idea of mode to the 12-sound [system], which does not consist of sounds equally distributed by pitch, but is strictly defined by the succession of sounds (outside the dependency on absolute pitch and the name of tonic), in strictly defined pitch correlations and the regularities of their interaction arising from here. We also will give the name of mode to the remaining modes containing sounds fewer than 12 but being subordinated to the regularities of the 12-sound system.30

This more general category, then, contains modes not only with twelve tones but also shorter modes ranging in size from eight tones (five) to eleven tones (two). There are four nine-tone modes and three ten-tone modes. Ogolevets forms these modes through the addition of tones along the chain of fifths. Another way of expressing this method of formation is through the combination of neighboring (along the chain of fifths) church modes.

Each of the eight-tone modes, formed by the joining of two neighboring church modes, contains one doubled tone or augmented prime—the original tone plus one altered version of it—not tonic or dominant but still located within the limits of the 12-note periodic system. Thus the five pitches on the five tones other than tonic or dominant, that is, pitches on the second, third, fourth, sixth and seventh degrees, may be doubled; hence, there are five eight-tone modes. The first mode joins the Lydian and Ionian modes, resulting in the addition to the latter of the raised fourth degree, fa♯. The second mode joins the
Ionian and Mixolydian modes, which results in the si-si pair. The third mode joins the Mixolydian and Dorian modes, resulting in the mi-mi pair. The fourth mode joins the Dorian and Aeolian modes, resulting in the la-la pair. The fifth mode combines the Aeolian and Phrygian modes, resulting in the re-re pair. Ogolevets summarizes these modes as a "consistent superdiatonic expansion." They are illustrated in Figure 31.9.

The larger modes are created in a similar fashion. The four nine-tone modes are created from the joining of three adjacent church modes: (1) fa♯-si (Lydian + Ionian + Mixolydian); (2) si-mi (Ionian + Mixolydian + Dorian); (3) mi-la (Mixolydian + Dorian + Aeolian); (4) la-re (Dorian + Aeolian + Phrygian). The first nine-tone mode would therefore consist of the nine tones from fa♯ and si, encompassing the Lydian, Ionian and Mixolydian modes (refer to Figure 31.9). The three ten-tone modes are formed from the joining of four adjacent church modes: (1) fa♯-mi (Lydian + Ionian + Mixolydian + Dorian); (2) si-la (Ionian + Mixolydian + Dorian + Aeolian); and (3) mi-re (Mixolydian + Dorian + Aeolian + Phrygian) (see Figure 31.9). The two eleven-tone modes then contain five church modes each. Essentially, each eleven-tone mode is the 12-tone system minus one of the extreme notes—fa♯ or re.

These fourteen modes containing augmented primes and ranging in size from eight to eleven tones result from the combination of adjacent groups of the church modes. To form seven-tone modes that lack an augmented prime, Ogolevets either combines the main characteristics of
Figure 31.9. The five 8-tone, four 9-tone and three 10-tone modes containing augmented primes within the 12-tone periodic system.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
non-adjacent church modes or substitutes the altered version of one pitch within an existing church mode for its unaltered version. He calls these modes "artificial." With the latter procedure he creates the harmonic major and minor modes plus two other modes that also incorporate the interval of the augmented second. In the first one, fa♯ is substituted for fa in the Dorian mode:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
fa^\# & si & mi & la & re & sol & do & fa & si & mi & la & re \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

result: do-re-mi-fa♯-sol-la-si-do (No. 14; see below)

In the second mi is substituted for mi in the Phrygian mode:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
fa^\# & si & mi & la & re & sol & do & fa & si & mi & la & re \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

result: do-re-mi-fa-sol-la-si-do (No. 20)

In all, there are only three augmented seconds within the 12-note periodic system—la—si (as in harmonic major and minor), mi—fa♯ (in the first mode above) and re—mi (in the second mode above).

From the combination of non-adjacent church modes, Ogolevets creates twelve modes, two of which recreate modes already formed, the harmonic major and harmonic minor modes (both Ionian-Aeolian combinations). Other known modes formed in this manner include melodic major (Mixolydian-Aeolian) and melodic minor (Ionian-Dorian). All twelve modes are included in the complete list of thirty-two seven-tone modes shown in Figure 31.10. They are identified with double asterisks and include numbers 1, 2, 10, 13, 15, 17, 18, 22, 25, 28, 29, 31.

In addition to the fourteen modes already formed, Ogolevets iden-
tifies eighteen other seven-tone modes for a total of thirty-two seven-tone modes within his twelve-tone diatonic system. Of these thirty-two modes, fourteen (not the same fourteen just discussed) are familiar to us and eighteen were in 1941 unknown, according to Ogolevets. He forms and classifies these modes according to their division into pentachord and tetrachord, using the two points of equilibrium—tonic and dominant—as structural points. This division has already been illustrated in Figure 31.8. Each segment of this arrangement contains one of the two pairs of the most extreme notes in Ogolevets’s calculation of major-minor tension—6a and 6b in the pentachord, and 5a and 5b in the tetrachord. Ogolevets sees great significance in this resulting distribution of pairs and bases his favorite method of modal classification on the presence of one or both of the most extreme notes or their complete absence. He constructs the modes according to the pitch content of the segments and their combination. The thirty-two modes result from various combinations of the eight varieties of pentachord and the four varieties of tetrachord. In these varieties of pentachord and tetrachord, though, only the inner pitches may be changed; the outer or bordering pitches of the pentachord and tetrachord—tonic and dominant—remain unchanged. The augmented primes of tonic and dominant do not exist in Ogolevets’s twelve-tone diatonic system.

He begins with the classification of the tetrachords:

1—the balanced-tense tetrachord (harmonically acute):

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{sol} & \text{la} & \text{si} & \text{do} \\
\langle---\rangle & \langle--\rangle & \langle--\rangle & \langle---\rangle \\
      5b &      5a \\
\end{array}
\]

Excess 0
2-the balanced peaceful tetrachord (harmonically balanced):

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
sol & 1a & si & do \\
<--- & --- & <--- & <--- \\
3a & 3b & & \\
\end{array}
\]
Excess 0

3-the major tetrachord (melodically major):

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
sol & 1a & si & do \\
<--- & --- & <--- & <--- \\
1a & 3a & 5a & 1b \\
\end{array}
\]
Excess 8a

4-the minor tetrachord (melodically minor):

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
sol & 1a & si & do \\
<--- & --- & <--- & <--- \\
1a & 5b & 3b & 1b \\
\end{array}
\]
Excess 8b

Obviously, the first two tetrachords are balanced as to their sensation of tension, i.e., an excess of 0, since the alpha and beta coefficients cancel each other out; but, as the coefficients indicate, the first is more tense than the second. The tetrachords in the second pair are not balanced, with excesses of 8a and 8b, respectively, but are predominantly either major (alpha) or minor (beta).

Ogolevets classifies the pentachords in a similar fashion and groups the thirty-two modes into four families of eight modes each, based on the composition of the pentachord. The term "synchronous" indicates a symmetry in the numerical coefficients in the pentachord. The term "asynchronous" therefore indicates a lack of symmetry in the coefficients in the pentachord. Not all asynchronous pentachords are labeled as such, only those with low numerical excesses. Those with higher numerical excesses are called "intensive." The first family (group A, modes 1-8 in Figure 31.10) is based on a balanced-tense pentachord that contains both of the most tense tones and that is
either major or minor depending on the middle tone:

major pentachord (acute major synchronous):

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{b} & \text{do} & \text{re} & \text{mi} & \text{fa}\# & \text{sol} \\
1b & 6b & 4a & 6a & 1a & \text{Excess 4a}
\end{array}
\]

minor pentachord (acute minor synchronous):

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{b} & \text{b} & \text{do} & \text{re} & \text{mi} & \text{fa}\# & \text{sol} \\
1b & 6b & 6b & 4b & 6a & 1a & \text{Excess 4b}
\end{array}
\]

In the second family (group B, modes 9-16 in Figure 31.10), re \( \text{b} \) (2a) substitutes for re \( \text{b} \) (6b), leaving the tetrachord still with one of the most tense notes, F\# \( \text{b} \) (6a), and the choice of mi \( \text{b} \) (4a) or mi \( \text{b} \) (4b):

intensive major pentachord:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{do} & \text{re} & \text{mi} & \text{fa}\# & \text{sol} \\
2a & 4a & 6a & \text{Excess 12a}
\end{array}
\]

major asynchronous pentachord:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{b} & \text{do} & \text{re} & \text{mi} & \text{fa}\# & \text{sol} \\
2a & 4b & 6a & \text{Excess 4a}
\end{array}
\]

The modes in the third family (group C, modes 17-24 in Figure 31.10) are analogous in design to the modes of the second family, but contain beta notes instead of alpha and in reverse order:

minor asynchronous pentachord:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{b} & \text{do} & \text{re} & \text{mi} & \text{fa} & \text{sol} \\
6b & 4a & 2b & \text{Excess 4b}
\end{array}
\]
intensive minor pentachord:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{do} & \text{re} & \text{mi} & \text{fa} & \text{sol} \\
6b & 4b & 2b & & \text{Excess 12b}
\end{array}
\]

In the fourth family of modes (group D, modes 25-32 in Figure 31.10), both re and fa are unaltered, thereby creating a balanced pentachord with the least amount of tension of the four:

major synchronous pentachord:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{do} & \text{re} & \text{mi} & \text{fa} & \text{sol} \\
2a & 4a & 2b & & \text{Excess 4a}
\end{array}
\]

minor synchronous pentachord:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{do} & \text{re} & \text{mi} & \text{fa} & \text{sol} \\
2a & 4b & 2b & & \text{Excess 4b}
\end{array}
\]

The modes are given here as identified by Ogolevets. The number given as the excess is the difference between the alpha and beta totals in the mode. Those modes identified with one asterick next to the mode number are familiar to us; Ogolevets supplies the generally known name of each of these modes. In addition to the original six church or medieval modes, which names are underlined, the known modes include the Scriabin Prometheus mode (D10), a gypsy mode (D13), two European folk modes (D14 & 18), harmonic major (D25), melodic major (D28), harmonic minor (D29), and melodic minor (D31). The church modes are Lydian (D11), Phrygian (D24), Mixolydian (D26), Ionian (D27), Dorian (D30), and Aeolian (D32). Those modes identified with two astericks on the line below the mode are those that may also be formed through the combination of characteristic portions of these church modes.
A: (1) Acute major: do-reb-mi-fa♯-sol-lab-si-do
   (Lydian-Phrygian)
   ** 4a
(2) Acute minor: do-reb-mib-fa♯-sol-lab-si-do
   (Lydian-Phrygian)
   ** 4b
(3) Acute-peaceful major: do-reb-mi-fa♯-sol-la-sib-do
   4a
(4) Acute-peaceful minor: do-reb-mib-fa♯-sol-la-sib-do
   4b
(5) Acute-intensive major: do-reb-mi-fa♯-sol-la-si-do
   12a
(6) Acute-intensive minor: do-reb-mib-fa♯-sol-lab-sib-do
   12b
(7) Acute major-minor: do-reb-mi-fa♯-sol-lab-sib-do
   4b
(8) Acute minor-major: do-reb-mib-fa♯-sol-la-si-do
   4b

B: (9) Lydian harmonic: do-re-mi-fa♯-sol-lab-si-do
   12a
   ** 4a
(10) Lydian balanced: do-re-mi-fa♯-sol-la-sib-do
   (Lydian-Mixolydian) (Scriabin mode in Prometheus)
   ** 12a
   (Lydian mode: do-re-mi-fa♯-sol-la-si-do (supermajor)
   20a
(11) Lydian melodic: do-re-mi-fa♯-sol-lab-sib-do
   4a
(12) Minorized Lydian harmonic: do-re-mib-fa♯-sol-lab-si-do
   (Lydian-Aeolian) (gypsy mode)
   ** 4a
(13) Minorized Lydian balanced: do-re-mib-fa♯-sol-la-sib-do
   (European folk mode)
   ** 4a
(14) Minorized Lydian major: do-re-mib-fa♯-sol-la-si-do
   (Lydian-Dorian)
   ** 12a
(15) Minorized Lydian melodic: do-re-mib-fa♯-sol-lab-sib-do
   4b

C: (16) Majorized Phrygian harmonic: do-reb-mi-fa-sol-lab-si-do
   (Ionian-Phrygian)
   ** 4b
(17) Majorized Phrygian balanced: do-reb-mi-fa-sol-la-sib-do
   ** 4b
   (Mixolydian-Phrygian) (European folk mode)
(18) Majorized Phrygian melodic: do-reb-mi-fa-sol-la-si-do
   4a
(19) Majorized Phrygian: do-reb-mi-fa-sol-lab-sib-do
   12b
(20) Phrygian harmonic: do-reb-mib-fa-sol-lab-si-do
   1b
(21) Phrygian balanced: do-reb-mib-fa-sol-la-sib-do
   12b
   (Dorian-Phrygian)
(22) Phrygian melodic: do-reb-mib-fa-sol-la-si-do
   4b
(23) Phrygian: do-reb-mib-fa-sol-lab-sib-do (superminor)
   20b

D: (24) Major harmonic: do-re-mi-fa-sol-lab-si-do (harmonic major)
   (Ionian-Aeolian)
   ** 4b
(25) Submajor: do-re-mi-fa-sol-la-sib-do (Mixolydian mode)
   4a
(26) Major: do-re-mi-fa-sol-la-si-do (Ionian mode)
   12a
(27) Major melodic: do-re-mi-fa-sol-lab-sib-do (melodic major)
   4b
   (Mixolydian-Aeolian)
(28) Minor harmonic: do-re-mib-fa-sol-lab-si-do (harmonic minor)
   (Ionian-Aeolian)
   ** 4b
(29) Minor: do-re-mib-fa-sol-la-sib-do (Dorian mode)
   4b
(30) Subminor: do-re-mib-fa-sol-la-sib-do (Ionian-Aeolian)
   ** 4b
(31) Minor melodic: do-re-mib-fa-sol-la-si-do (melodic minor)
   (Ionian-Dorian)
   ** 4b
(32) Minor: do-re-mib-fa-sol-lab-sib-do (Aeolian mode)
   12b

Figure 31.10. Thirty-two 7-tone modes.
The excess sums of the coefficients within the pentachords and the tetra-
chords are limited. Within the pentachord this excess number is ei-
ther 4a, 4b, 12a, or 12b; and within the tetra-
chord, it is either 0, 8a or 8b. The total sums of either the alpha and beta coefficients 
within the mode range from 4 to 21. The total excesses, though, are 
reduced to just three numbers in both alpha and beta—4, 12 and 20. 
Ogolevets identifies the resulting tension, then, as minimal (4), 
normal (12) or maximal (20). Thus, the Lydian mode, which he calls 
supermajor, has an excess of 20a; and the Phrygian mode, which corre-
spondingly should be superminor, has an excess of 20b. These two modes 
are the only modes with "maximal" tension. Twenty modes (ten alpha  
[##1, 3, 8, 12, 13, 14, 19, 25, 26 (Mixolydian), 31] and ten beta [##2, 
4, 7, 16, 17, 18, 23, 28, 29, 30 (Dorian)]) have "minimal" tension; ten 
modes (five alpha [##5, 9, 10, 15, 27 (Ionian]) and five beta [##6, 20, 
21, 22, 32 (Aeolian)]) have "normal" tension. These tension indicators 
coincide with the location of these modes on the chain of fifths, as 
shown already in Figure 31.9—for example, Lydian mode on the extreme 
alpha side, and Phrygian on the extreme beta side. The Mixolydian and 
Dorian modes lie in the middle, so their tensions are minimal.

In sum, by using the alpha-beta tension indicators, Ogolevets 
classifies the modes in three ways: 1-quantitatively, by the number of 
alpha or beta tones in the mode; 2-qualitatively, by the acuteness of 
the tension in the mode, which depends on the presence or absence of 
one or both of the most tense tones; and 3-harmonically, by the process 
of the neutralization of the tensions between tones in the mode (he
calls those modes in which tense tones balance each other or in which they are in proportion "harmonic"). This last method is not very practical, for very few of the modes within Ogolevets's 12-tone diatonic system are perfectly balanced as to tension. Only the third eight-tone mode and the second ten-tone mode (from Figure 31.9) are so balanced. Six of the modes from Figure 31.10 are labeled "harmonic" and four are labeled "balanced," but none of these is perfectly balanced.

The first method of classification produces six categories:

I- five alpha sounds: one mode (Lydian) (#11)
II- four alpha sounds and one beta sound: five modes (#05, 9, 10, 15, 27)
III- three alpha sounds and two beta sounds: ten modes (#01, 3, 8, 12, 13, 14, 19, 25, 26, 31)
IV- two alpha sounds and three beta sounds: ten modes (#02, 4, 7, 16, 17, 18, 23, 28, 29, 30)
V- one alpha sound and four beta sounds: five modes (#06, 20, 21, 22, 32)
VI- five beta sounds: one mode (Phrygian) (#24)

These groups coincide with the minimal-normal-maximal tension groups given above. Groups I and VI contain maximal tension; groups II and V contain normal tension; and groups III and IV contain minimal tension.

For a more general means of classification, though, Ogolevets prefers the second method. Thus, as we have seen, modes of the first family (group A) are all labeled "acute," and contain the most tense notes re (6b) and fa# (6a); modes of the second and third families (groups B and C) contain only one of these notes; and modes of the fourth family (group D) contain neither. The differing results reached by these three methods of classification testify to the inadequacies of Ogolevets's idea of latent harmony. If it was a true indicator of
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tension—a term that Ogolevets uses in several capacities without distinction—then these respective categories within the various methods of classification should agree. Those modes from Group A that contain the most tense tones, for example, should also have the maximal tension; for if the most tense tones can be "balanced" or neutralized harmonically through the alpha/beta distinction, then what is the point of distinguishing those modes that contain them? For Ogolevets, harmony does not mean simply note combinations (chords), or the science of such, but more concord or agreement. Obviously context is more important than inherent content; and the sums of $1 + 1$, or $6 + 6$, if each number of the pair belongs to the opposing side, equals $0$. This may suffice for electricity, which is a purely physical phenomenon, but not for musical tones, which are imbued with too many notions determined from history, aesthetics, and practice. Indeed, arbitrarily to assign numerical coefficients to tones based on their distances from tonic and then further to oppose one side of the chain of fifths to the other side defy both musical logic and common sense. The idea that tension increases as the distance from tonic along the chain of fifths increases has been proven through the musical practice of many centuries and cannot be disputed. But to quantify and position it as Ogolevets has done is questionable.

**Chords.** We return now to the question of chords. Ogolevets devotes most of his attention on this subject to seventh-chords (six chapters), with separate chapters devoted to each of the following
types of categories of chord: augmented triads, quartal chords, ninth chords, mixed chords, and chords with the diminished octave. His goal is to lay to rest once and for all the idea of "accidental chords" by first classifying and then explaining all seventh chords possible in the 12-note system, and therefore to uncover the regularities governing the logical development of harmony from the classical to post-romantic periods. He probes the latter goal in great detail in his second book; here he concentrates on the identification and classification of seventh chords.

He accepts the principle of tertian chord construction, since combinations of other types of intervals can be reduced either to tertian or quartal chords and quartal chords came to be used only beginning in the middle of the nineteenth century. He aspires to "the discovery of all finite possibilities of the construction of tertian chords, actually existing in the limits of the tonal system," and to the study of all the varieties of these chords. He reduces the task to two parts—systematization and explanation. Here he applies the term "overt harmonies," which defines both "exactly the position of these chords in the system . . . and the line of development of chords of the tonal system." These "overt" harmonies fall more into the category of what we normally consider harmony, that is, combinations of tones resulting in chords, in contrast to the "latent" harmonies, which rely on the interpretation of harmony as concord or agreement.

Ogolevets utilizes thirds of all types—major (eight in the system), minor (nine in the system), diminished (two in the system) and
augmented (one). In all he calculates fifty-six seventh chords, which he classifies according to the type and number of thirds in their construction. The first class contains chords consisting of major and minor thirds. Within this class are two subclasses, chords with a majority of minor thirds, and chords with a majority of major thirds. This class contains all thirty-eight seventh chords. The second class contains chords that incorporate the diminished third (ten chords). The third class contains chords that incorporate the augmented third (eight chords).

Figure 31.11 summarizes Ogolevets’s chord classification. He designates the tertian content of seventh chords according to their intervallic content, as do many Western theorists. For convenience’s sake, the Western method of designation is used here: M (Major), m (minor), d (diminished), a (augmented). Therefore the dominant seventh chord, for example, would be Mmm, a major third (M) followed by two minor thirds (m). The first class, then, made up exclusively of chords formed from major and/or minor thirds, contains seven types of seventh chord. Its two subclasses, in which either the minor (subclass I) or major (subclass II) third predominates, contain four and three types of seventh chord, respectively (the fourth type in subclass I is the dominant seventh chord). The second class contains five types of seventh chord, each with one diminished third; and the third subclass contains eight types, each with one augmented third. The degrees listed are those degrees upon which these various chords may be constructed within the 12-tone diatonic system. For example, the very
Figure 31.11. Classification of seventh chords in 12-tone diatonic system.

First chord, a $m_m$ chord from the first subclass of the first class, may be constructed on each of the degrees listed—$\#4$, $7$, or $3$. On $3$, the degrees making up the chord would be $3-5-b7-b2$. A chord from the third class, $d_m$, on degree $7$ would be $7-b2-\#4-6$. As Ogolevets points out, twenty-two or the fifty-six seventh chords, or almost 40%, occur outside of the superdiatonic portion—equivalent to our major scale—of the twelve-tone diatonic system. His method of systematization is to
project all possible transpositions and resulting intervallic varieties of a particular chord, and then to explain the usage or non-usage of each. This procedure will be illustrated in discussing his second book (see below).

**Expanded Tonal Systems.** We now come to one of the more discussed aspects of Ogolevets's theories—his interpretation of an expanded tonal system. After the 12-tone diatonic system, the next step is the 17-tone system, which has some affinities, or so he says, with pitch temperament in Arabic music. A further subdivision of the octave results in a 22-tone system, which Ogolevets relates to the twenty-two Indian *sruti*. Still further subdivisions result in 29, 41, 53 and 65, etc., tones to the octave. But Ogolevets does not simply divide the octave arbitrarily to form denser and denser systems. He attempts to form and justify each system of temperament through inner regularities: "The acoustical moment is only the outer expression of deeper regularities."  

He uses three methods in general: (1) tonic and modal function; (2) attractions and repulsions; and (3) the grouping of smaller tonal systems into larger ones. He concentrates on the second and third methods, though.

He begins with the expansion of the whole-tone. The 17-tone periodic system is based on the inclusion of both of the tones separated by a comma within the whole-tone, rather than just one as in the 12-tone diatonic system, in other words, the one repulsion and two attractions within each of the five whole tones. Thus there are in all
five sharp and five flat tones, in addition to the original seven superdiatonic pitches. It may also be reached through the combination of six 12-tone systems with the tonal centers of fa, do, sol, re, la and mi, which are represented in Figure 30.12 in capital letters.

\[
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\]
Figure 31.13. Acoustical values in the 17-tone periodic system.

However, Ogolevets asserts, in order for this chain of seventeen tones to become, in his words, "universal," the acoustical value of each pitch must be uniform. Only then will it be equal in significance to the 12-tone system. Thus the distance between each pitch becomes 70.6 cents (1200 divided by 17 is 70.6, approximately). Such a temperament gives to this tonal system the same regularities of the 12-tonal system, such as infinite repetition. He compares the acoustical values of the diatonic seven-tone scale in three ways: his original method, the 12-tone equal temperament, and the 17-tone temperament (Figure 31.15).

What are the modal possibilities in the 17-tone system? Obviously the number of possible modes is far greater than in the 12-tone system. According to Ogolevets’s calculations, there are 216 seven-tone modes, 72 (or 168; see below) eight-tone modes, 28 nine-tone modes, and 8 ten-tone modes. In all these modes, do♯ is never used, in order to pre-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>do</th>
<th>re</th>
<th>mi</th>
<th>fa</th>
<th>sol</th>
<th>la</th>
<th>si</th>
<th>do</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Original</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-tone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-tone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>211.8</td>
<td>423.5</td>
<td>494.1</td>
<td>705.6</td>
<td>917.6</td>
<td>1129.4</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 31.15. Relative acoustical values of 7-tone diatonic scale.

serve the strength of tonic. In 72 of the seven-tone modes, sol also
remains unchanged; but in the remaining 144, sol or sol♯ may be sub-
stituted. Thirty-two of these modes are the seven-tone modes described
previously in the 12-tone diatonic system. Thus there are 40 new modes
with sol and 144 without it. Ogolevets represents the choices in the
method shown below. (The numbers represent the number of possible
degree variations—re, for example, occurs in three versions, re, re♯
and reb. Their multiplication reveals the total number of possible
varieties of mode.)

\[
\begin{align*}
do & \quad \text{re}$ & \quad \text{mi} & \quad \text{fa} & \quad \text{sol} & \quad \text{la} & \quad \text{si} \\
\text{re} & \quad \text{mib} & \quad \text{fa} & \quad \text{la} & \quad \text{sib} & \\
\text{reb} & & & \quad \text{lab} & \\
(1 \times 3 \times 2 \times 2 \times 1 \times 3 \times 2) & = 72
\end{align*}
\]

The three choices for sol triples the number of possible modes to 216.

The eight-tone modes each contain one of the three pairs of notes
for which there are two alterations: reb—re♯, sol —sol♯, and la —
la♯. Ogolevets illustrates only the first group, in which there are 24
modes:
do reb re♯ mi fa♯ sol la♯ si
    mib fa       la sib
    lab

(1 x 1 x 1 x 2 x 2 x 1 x 3 x 2 = 24)

b

The tones do♯, re, sol, sol♯ are not allowed, for they would create an
augmented prime leading to a repulsion that would destroy the mode.

    Following his example, the second group should be represented in
    this manner:

    do re♯ mi fa♯ solb sol♯ la♯ si
    re mib fa       la sib
    reb lab

(1 x 3 x 2 x 2 x 1 x 1 x 3 x 2 = 72)

Here the tones do♯ and sol are not allowed. Ogolevets does not indi-
    cate which of the two pairs, re♯—re or la♯—la, should be eliminated
here, if at all, for they do not belong to the family of the dominant
as in the first group. Eliminating one or the other would in fact
create three subgroups within this group—one containing sol and re♯—
re, one containing re and sol -sol♯ or re and la♯—la, and one con-
taining la and re♯—re or la and sol -sol♯. The second and third
groups would still contain 48 modes each. Since re and la lack the
special properties of sol, it appears necessary to consider the possi-
ble number of eight-tone modes in the 17-tone system to be 168
(72+72+24).

The nine-tone modes are also divided into three groups. The first
contains the pairs re -re♯ and sol -sol♯; the second, sol -sol♯ and
la -la♯; and the third, re -re♯ and la -la♯. However, the second group
exists only theoretically, since the two pairs of alterations are
adjacent and contain no satisfactory resolution. (See Example 31.2.)

The ten-tone modes contain all three pairs. Example 31.3 illustrates what Ogolevets considers to be the "best" ten-tone mode (for reasons he does not explain).

In similar ways Ogolevets forms and analyzes tonal systems of even greater complexity: 22-, 29-, 41-tone temperaments, etc. The 22-tone system results, for example, from the division of the whole tone into four parts. Whereas the 17-tone system contains attractions to only the seven superdiatonic tones, the 22-tone system contains attractions to all twelve diatonic tones. It also may be reached through the grouping together of six adjacent 17-tone modes (along the chain of fifths). All of Ogolevets's microtonal systems are equal-tempered. They are distinguishable from such systems conceived by other theorists only by the number of tones and the method of their derivation. That

Example 31.2. 9-tone modes: a) first group: example; b) second group: example only theoretically possible; c) third group: example.
Example 31.3. 10-tone mode: "best."

Ogolevets attempts to justify the size of his systems through faulty means throws doubt on his entire system, for he may have derived it with the purpose of matching such doubtful entities as the 22-sruti Indian system, which he interprets as a mode, and the 17-tone Arabic mode. Also, for numerical coefficients in these microtonal modes, he assigns numbers of decreasing value beginning with the limit of 6 reached in the 12-tone periodic system. This practice in itself illustrates the peremptory nature of many of Ogolevets's ideas.

"An Introduction to Contemporary Musical Thought." Ogolevets's second book operates from the same concepts as the first but differs from it in content and style. It contains fewer criticisms and polemics, which helps reduce its size to less than half of that of the first book. Here he emphasizes not so much the future expansion of the tonal system, a topic he fairly well exhausted in his first book, as the past and current state of the tonal system—the genetic and historical
process of the development of the tonal system and its harmony, including its prehistory, as it were. His ultimate purpose is to show that contemporary musical thought... is a completely regular stage of the many-centuries development of the musical art. Thus, as the product of historical development, contemporary musical language carries within itself the well-known traits of all the previous stages, repeated in this language as in a higher stage of the organic process of development.35

This idea of historical inevitability, similar in certain respects to Mazel's interpretation of Shostakovich's music as developing seeds planted long ago, opposes Marxist views towards history, which postulate social origins and revolutionary results rather than the smooth evolution of elements regardless of environmental or social factors.

This emphasis on the past, then, complements the emphasis on the future in the first book. A large proportion of this book is therefore given over to "the construction of a historical science of music—namely not a history of music-making (it exists), but a history of the very substrata of music." Ogolevets thus tends towards a synthesis of historical and theoretical approaches—a history of music in terms of its theoretical growth and development. He also emphasizes the links between folk and professional music: "The research of the regularities of the manifestation of definite norms in the practice of musical expression, the establishment of their universality in both folk and professional art, is the basic direction of this work." By establishing consequential, undeniable, and inevitable links between contemporary music and the music both of the past and of the people, Ogolevets attempts to provide a means whereby Marxist critical and theoretical musicology can more readily accept modern music and its
theoretical concepts without having to resort to labeling them "formalist." However, this approach ultimately was not sanctioned for Marxist musicology, and both Mazel and Ogolevets soon found their views subject to harsh criticism.

In the first fourteen of thirty-nine chapters Ogolevets reviews the approach taken in the first book. In chapters 15 and 16 he discusses the question of intonation, with references to Asafiev, and provides the basis for his interpretation of the growth and development of the musical language. Ogolevets devotes chapters 17-38 to an outline and discussion of his version of the development of the modal language of music. In the last chapter (39), he examines twentieth-century music with an eye on the past but also looking towards the future: which characteristics in modern music are the result of historical development and which achievements in modern music are leading us towards the fulfillment of his prophecy of microtonal music. His history of music is both cumulative and evolutionary. Old elements are not merely replaced by new ones, but are both maintained and transformed, the results coexisting and constantly enriching and enlarging the means of musical composition. He stresses historical continuity and development:

The specific means with which contemporary musical thought operates, creating true works of art, have not appeared on the historical scene as a "deus ex machina"; their appearance is a completely regular level of the many-centuries development of musical art. Thus, appearing as the product of historical development, contemporary musical language carries within itself the well-known traits of all the previous stages, being repeated in this language as in the highest stage of the organic process of development.
Ogolevets's somewhat schizophrenic concentration on the past and the future in relation to contemporary music, though, tends to omit one important consideration: the present. If contemporary music is always being examined as a carrier of the past or a herald of the future, then what is "contemporary" about it? How does it relate to the various strata of today's society? What are the features unique to it and to it alone? Microtonal music cannot be assumed to be the only musical language of the future. Ogolevets does not provide adequate answers to these and related questions. In short, his system does not provide suitable means for the analysis and understanding of tonal or modal contemporary music. This is a problem with other Marxist-oriented theorists as well; their absorption with justifying the present in terms of the past—call it tradition, legacy, whatever, which they jealously guard against criticism—often overlooks the unique values of the object or state under examination. And, as we have seen, Ogolevets will adopt any means to prove his point, regardless of its significance or validity. Of course, for a Marxist the state of change, of constant motion, of continuous striving and of coming-to-be is (or should be) the normal state of the world. So, that Ogolevets should contrive a theory that embraces this state of perpetual change reveals his Marxist orientation. But his rejection of strict Marxist views towards history separates him from other Marxists. A historical perspective is just one aspect of Marxist historical methods; yet this perspective is not one of inevitability but one of social and environmental context and revolutionary change. In the following discussion, I will first summa-
rize his views towards the historical development of music and its elements, and then devote some space to an examination of his analyses.

Ogolevets sets forth certain premises. He bases "the intonational development of music" clearly on the dialectical conception of development, as he reveals by quoting from The History of the Communist Party:

"Dialectics examines the process of development not as the simple process of growth, where the quantitative changes do not lead to qualitative changes, but as a development that transfers from the insignificant and latent quantitative changes to overt changes, to basic changes, to qualitative changes" which "come not gradually, but quickly, suddenly, in the view of the uneven transfer from one state into another state, come not accidentally, but regularly, come as a result of the accumulation of imperceptible and gradual quantitative changes.

Therefore the dialectic method considers that the process of development follows to understand not as motion by a circle, not as a simple repetition of the past, but as motion forward, as motion by an ascending line, as the transfer from the old qualitative state to a new qualitative state, as the development from the simple to the complex, from the lower to the higher."39

I give this quote in full as Ogolevets presents it because it provides the foundation for his entire concept of modal history. To the standard Marxist-Leninist views expressed here—quantity into quality, the suddenness of change from one state into another, the inevitable progressive march forward from old to new and simple to complex, etc.—Ogolevets subsequently adds negation of negation. His ideas of latent and overt harmonies may be traced to the views expressed here as well. But Ogolevets's attempts to incorporate these interpretations failed, as far as his contemporaries were concerned, since he ignored other, equally significant factors regarding Marxist historical methodology.

Ogolevets does not accept Asafiev's view of intonation, which he considers too wide and indefinite. And he calls Yavorsky's interpreta—
tion of intonation "nonsense." Yet he defines intonation as

the smallest indivisible modally formed unit of weight of interpreted melody in the sense that it appears as a separate moment of expressiveness, able to contain in itself (or containing) separate emotional motion, placed in it by the composer in the act of composition.40

Thus he imbues intonation with both theoretical and aesthetic characteristics, deriving elements of definition in fact—despite his criticisms—from both Yavorsky ("the smallest indivisible modally formed unit") and Asafiev ("unit of ... interpreted melody ... , able to contain ... separate emotional motion").

The Four Cycles of the History of Music. Ogolevets divides the intonational development of music into four cycles. These cycles and the different stages or circles within them are formed and defined by the chain of fifths. Just as the twelve-tone periodic system may expand through the addition of tones along the chain of fifths, so did the early development of music also follow a more limited expansion along the chain of fifths.

The chain of fifths is not only postulated by us speculatively as a scientific abstraction, but is also shown as a completely natural result of the organic intonational development of music. The chain of fifths represents simply the speculatively unfolding system of such quintal coordinations, which appeared (beginning with the appearance of the basic system—the quartal leap, having been modified in the quintal cell of the system) directed in the process of the intonational development of the system.41

This expansion follows Ogolevets's intervallic pairing with equal alpha and beta coefficients. Beginning with the center fifth, each succeeding level progresses one fifth on either side. The first of the four cycles embraces the period preceding the initial development of the
tonal system, its "prehistory." The second cycle embraces pentatonism and the hexachord; each of its three circles adds two quintal relations to the chain: the initial fifth C-G, then F on the beta and D on the alpha side (second circle), then continuing the pattern with Bb and A (third circle). The third cycle completes the twelve-tone tonal system: first circle Eb and E, second circle Ab and B, and third circle Db and F#. At this point we reach the state achieved in late romantic music. Figure 31.16 graphically illustrates these circles.

The fourth cycle is the future—the expansion of the tonal system as presented in the 1941 book. It contains two stages. The first, the seventeen-tone system, already exists, Ogolevets says, in an embryonic stage in Arabic, Iranian, and Azerbaidzhanian music; the second, the twenty-two-tone system, is found in Indian music. Twentieth-century music, i.e., tonal music up to the 1940s, is in the embryonic stages of the fourth cycle. Figure 31.16 illustrates cycle four as well.

Ogolevets discusses at length the growth of the intervallic content of our musical language stemming from the initial fifth. Each circle adds one "purposeful" [tselevoi] element or interval and one "barrier" [bar'er] interval. The added tones in each circle relate first to the existing tones and then to each other. The purposeful interval results from the new intervallic relationship between the newly added tones and the tones already present. For example, in the second circle, the purposeful interval is the major second (minor seventh) formed between C and D, and F and G. In the fourth circle it is the diminished fourth (augmented fifth) formed between E and Bb or
Second Cycle: (----------------Alpha side||Beta side----------------->

Circle 1: sol || do
Circle 2: re sol || do fa
Circle 3: la re sol || do fa si

Third Cycle:
Circle 4: mi la re sol || do fa si mi
Circle 5: si mi la re sol || do fa si mi la
Circle 6: fa# si mi la re sol || do fa si mi la re

Fourth Cycle:

First Stage (17-tone):
la# re# sol# do# || fa# si mi la re sol || do fa si mi la re || sol

Second Stage (22-tone):
(alpha)
mi# la# re# sol# do# fa# si mi la re sol

betas; || do fa si mi la re sol do fa si mi

Figure 31.16. Cycles 2-4 in Ogolevets's view of music history.

between Eb and A. Each of the purposeful intervals provides primary characteristics for each circle, or historical era. The barrier interval results from the intervallic relationship between the two newly added pitches. In the second circle, this interval is the minor third (major sixth) between D and F. Once this barrier interval is reached, the expansion into the next circle begins, hence the name "barrier."

Figure 31.17 illustrates the purposeful and barrier intervals for each
circle. Perfect, major, and minor intervals are introduced in the second cycle, augmented and diminished intervals in the third cycle.

Throughout Ogolevets illustrates with musical examples how previous cycles and stages contain the sprouts of succeeding cycles and stages, how each lower stage is still represented in the higher stages, and how the significance of the tonal center remains strong in each stage. The bulk of the text, in fact, is given over to discussions and explanations of the past and present development of music. Let us take as an example the diminished seventh chord and briefly trace its formation through Ogolevets's view of the historical process. This will then provide the background for two of his more detailed analyses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Notes Added</th>
<th>Purposeful Interval</th>
<th>Barrier Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second Cycle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Circle</td>
<td>do, sol</td>
<td>P5/P4</td>
<td>P5/P4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Circle</td>
<td>fa, re b</td>
<td>M2/m7</td>
<td>m3/M6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Circle</td>
<td>si, la b</td>
<td>M3/m6</td>
<td>m2/M7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third Cycle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth Circle</td>
<td>b mi, mi b</td>
<td>d5/a4</td>
<td>a1/d8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fifth Circle</td>
<td>la, si b</td>
<td>d4/a5</td>
<td>a2/d7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixth Circle</td>
<td>re, fa# b</td>
<td>d3/a6</td>
<td>a3/d6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 31.17.* Added tones and resulting intervals in the six circles of the second and third cycles.
Evolution of the Diminished Seventh Chord. The diminished seventh chord B-D-F-Ab, the first such chord to appear naturally along the circle of fifths beginning from C and following Ogolevets interpretation of expansion, began its genesis in the hexatonic third circle of development, which contains the tonic fifth C-G and the middle third D-F of the diminished seventh chord (Bb-F-C-G-D-A). The fourth circle introduces the tones E and Eb, which form the two thirds of the tonic triad, and the fifth circle introduces the tones B and Ab, the diminished seventh itself. Ogolevets postulates three stages of development for the chord itself—(1) the melodic interval, (2) the harmonic interval with its resolution (B-Ab to C-G), and (3) the full seventh chord with its resolution. The connections between the inner tones of the chord with their resolving tone (E or Eb) had been established in the fourth circle. The full complement of chord with resolution then appeared in the fifth circle but reached its full potential only in the sixth circle. This was due, according to Ogolevets, to the emergence in the sixth circle, perhaps because of the tension arising in the full complement of the twelve tones—Ogolevets does not adequately explain this point—of the instability of the third D-F, which then engendered the need for resolution. This particular diminished seventh chord, B-D-F-Ab, resolves to tonic. Ogolevets designates this diminished seventh chord, which resolves to tonic, as "→T," a symbol that represents the sensation of "moving towards tonic." Two additional diminished seventh chords arise in the sixth circle as a result of the addition of the tones Db and F♯—the diminished seventh chord...
F♯-A-C-E♭, which resolves to the dominant ("→D," or "moving towards dominant"), and the diminished seventh chord E-G-B♭-Db, which resolves to the subdominant ("→S," or "moving towards subdominant"). Initially the diminished seventh chord was used with its resolution; but in the nineteenth century it came to be used alone. Further, other diminished seventh chords arose, from the assimilation into the major mode of the alpha tones of the relative minor (going beyond the limits of the twelve-tone system)—do♯, sol♯ and re♯. In Ogolevets's view, these diminished seventh chords are the product of what he calls the "splitting" of the three parallel minor triads of the degrees 2, 3, and 6 in major. The "splitting" of the triad into a diminished seventh chord is the opposite of the diminished seventh chord resolving into the triad.

A split may be narrow (a half-step) or broad (a whole-step). The triad d-f-a "splits" to become the diminished seventh chord G♯-E-G-B♭; the triad A-C-E into diminished seventh chord G♯-B-D-F; and the triad E-G-B into diminished seventh chord D♯-F♯-A-C. All are combinations of narrow and broad splits. It is through this "splitting" that the extra alpha tones are brought into use, creating in effect the 15-tone mode used by the Romantics. The tones resulting from such "splits" are called "hybrids" until they become independently established.

The "free" application of the diminished seventh chord without its resolution in the nineteenth century gave rise not only to particular styles but also to special modes. As an innovator in this area, Ogolevets cites Franz Liszt, who used the diminished seventh on 7 as tonic, on 3 as the subdominant and on 4 as the dominant. Taken togeth-
er, he points out, the two diminished seventh chords $\rightarrow D$ and $\rightarrow S$
create what we call the octatonic scale, in which whole (W) and half
(H) steps alternate and which Liszt used in *Inferno*. It is incorrect,
Gogolevets asserts, to consider this mode as lying outside the sphere of
tonality; here he shows it to have originated completely within the
regularities of the development of the tonal system. In his own system
of modes, it is the acute pentachord of the first family with both
thirds joined to the balanced tetrachord, that is, a combination of the
major and minor modes Nos. 3 and 4 (from Figure 31.10).

$$
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
  b & b & \text{do} & - & \text{re} & - & \text{mi} & - & \text{mi} & - & \text{fa} & - & \text{sol} & - & \text{la} & - & \text{si} & - & \text{do} \\
  H & W & H & W & H & W & H & W & H & W \\
\end{array}
$$

This eight-tone mode cannot be formed solely by progressive additions
along the chain of fifths, since it lacks the tones of the $\rightarrow T$ dimin-
ished seventh chord, which consists of two pairs of equivalent links,
5a and 5b (la + si) and 2a and 2b (fa + re), and consequently when
placed along the chain of fifths, every third tone is omitted (Figure
31.18). However, the chain-of-fifths expansion method may be used if
combined with modal substitution. The basis is his third eight-tone
mode (refer to Figure 31.9), with the two tense tones fa# (the Lydian
5a 2a 2b 5b
Missing tones: lab fa re si

Octatonic scale: re _ mi si _ do sol _ la mi _ fa#

[third 8-tone mode] (Fig. 31.9)

Figure 31.18. The 8-tone mode formed from two diminished seventh
chords, known as the octatonic scale.
fourth) and re (the Phrygian second) substituted for fa and re, respectively.

Scriabin's Seventh Sonata. Ogolevets illustrates the use of this mode by Scriabin in his Seventh Sonata. He compares this mode to the seven-tone mode in Prometheus, which he says he discovered in 1935 and which he calls the "Lydian balanced" mode (♯10: do re mi fa♯ sol la si do). The octatonic mode differs from the Promethian mode by substituting re (6b) for re (2a) and adding mi, in effect doubling the third of the tonic triad (with two different thirds). Interestingly, like the third eight-tone mode from which it may be derived, which is perfectly balanced as to its sums of numerical coefficients (10a + 10b), this mode is also perfectly balanced, with an excess of 0 (14a + 14b).

(This is logical, since the substituted pitches are equal but opposite in coefficient value and significance.)

Scriabin's principal innovation is not so much the use of this mode, Ogolevets contends, as it is the construction of quartal chords, projected upwards from the bass tonic. The Prometheus chord is a continuous projection of five fourths (of all types—augmented, diminished and perfect) from the tonic (C-F♯-Bb-E-A-D); the seventh tone in the mode, the dominant (G), is omitted. The initial chord in the Seventh Sonata contains some of the same tones, C-F♯-E in the bass and Bb-A in the treble, but the additional tones in the treble, Db and F♯, and their placement make this chord different: (C-F♯-E)-Bb-Db-F♯-A.

Ogolevets interprets the treble aspect of this chord, two thirds at the
distance of a fourth with its bottom pitch a minor seventh from the bass tonic, as derived from the two different diminished seventh chords that make up the octatonic scale: \( \rightarrow S (E-G-Bb-Db) \) and \( \rightarrow D (F\#-A-C-Eb) \) (Example 31.4).

He emphasizes that each of these chords in Example 31.4b is "absolutely" harmonic: Chord C is the tonic triad with two thirds; chord A is a very dynamic seventh chord with an augmented third and is "fundamental" (its indicator of weight is 9); and chords B and D each consist of tones having a latent harmony weight of 7. But in reality these chords do not all belong to the octatonic mode on C. Only chord A does; the remaining transpositions belong respectively to the octatonic modes on Eb, F\# and A. Although these tonic pitches with C outline the \( \rightarrow D \) diminished seventh chord, this is not an indicator of chord origin. Throughout his late works Scriabin modulated or moved through keys at the distance of the minor third, creating in effect what one Soviet theorist calls "interlocking tritones." Ogolevets himself observes this characteristic, but does not apply it properly. He simply points out that the minor ninth in the bass construction results from the ubiquitous minor third in this mode, in which every note belongs to a diminished seventh chord and each chord \( \rightarrow \) each part of a chord may be transposed a minor third without going out of the limits of the octatonic mode. But Scriabin consistently places the four treble notes of this chord on the same degrees in relation to the bass pitch--b7 (si), b2 (re), \( \#4 \) (fa\#), and 6 (la). Thus he uses the correct orthography for each transposition, as if he were modulating to
Example 31.4. Alexander Scriabin: Sonata No. 7: a) mm. 1–8; b) diminished seventh chord inversions; c) derivation of new chord from one-half of "S" and one-half of "D."
its mode, regardless of whether the bass pitch is present. Several
versions of the chord may appear over a static bass pitch (see mms. 13-
16 in Example 31.5 below), but Scriabin writes them in relation to
their own mode and tonic bass pitch. As can be seen from Figure 31.18
above, these degrees are among those that occur in the octatonic mode.

Ogolevets analyzes the beginning of the Sonata (Example 31.4) as
being in the mode of C, followed by a modulation to the mode of D (end
of m. 2) and then a return to C (m. 10, shown in Example 31.5). This
analysis has no basis other than an orthographic one—the pitches in
measures 1-2, for example, match half of the twelve pitches of the
periodic system using C as tonic:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
C & D\# & E & F\# & A & Bb \\
* & * & * & * & * & *
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
re & la & mi & si & fa & do & sol & re \\
\end{array}
\]

However, his analysis of the mode of D for measures 2-9 is incorrect.
The correct mode sequence is Ab (mm. 2-3), D (mm. 5-6), Bb (mm. 7-8),
and C (m. 9). This analysis corresponds both functionally and ortho-
graphically, for the pitches in these measures match absolutely the
pitches of their respective octatonic mode notated according to
Ogolevets's periodic system. Scriabin has often been criticized for
his unusual enharmonic pitches, but here his usage is correct.

Example 31.5 illustrates the segment (mm. 10-24) encompassing what
Ogolevets says is the return to the mode of C. Ogolevets has marked
with a small "x" those notes incorrectly written according to the
Example 31.5. Alexander Scriabin, Sonata No. 7: a) mm. 9-23; b) octatonic mode.
correct orthography of the mode (Example 31.5b). But each transposition of the treble chord originally spelled Bb-Db-F#-A is correctly written if the correct modal transposition is considered. Thus the segment begins in C (mm. 10-16), with several transitory deviations over a relatively stable bass (moving through keys A, F# and Eb in portions of mm. 13-16), settles down in F# in measure 17, and continues in this key until the end of the example and another modulation (this time to D) in measure 23. Example 31.6 illustrates Ogolevets's preferred orthography of the transpositions (Scriabin's versions are given in black notes in parentheses, Ogolevets's in white notes).

In conclusion, Ogolevets complains about the "meager" means of this sonata; in spite of the originality of its musical thought, Scriabin utilized only 32 tonal harmonies and did not even make use of the full twelve-tone system. But the "means" of this sonata are

Example 31.6. Ogolevets's preferred orthography of transpositions from Scriabin's Seventh Sonata (white notes, Ogolevets; black notes, Scriabin).
"meager" only by Ogolevets's methods of analysis. Scriabin did use a limited selection of harmonic materials, but in a system that was new and unique. Ogolevets's superficial analysis overlooks most of what is theoretically meaningful in this work.

Stravinsky's "Rite of Spring". In the final chapter Ogolevets discusses "The Fourth Cycle of the Development of the Tonal System and of Musical Thought." Here he analyzes works by Stravinsky, Prokofiev, Miaskovsky, Khachaturian and Belyi to demonstrate the presence of historical cycles and the emerging fourth cycle in contemporary music. His analysis of parts of Stravinsky's *Rite of Spring* will serve to illustrate his approach. He covers the topics of modal content, chord construction, latent harmony, rhythm, motivic content, and structure, the last topic concerning not so much form as voiceleading, or, rather, "chord-leading." A portion of the "Spring Rounds" segment is shown in Example 31.7. Its pitch content consists of the fifteen tones from A to Abb on the chain of fifths. Despite its key signature of five flats, Ogolevets interprets the fifteen tones as the Eb 12-tone system (based on the Dorian mode) with three tones as minor "overlays" [nasloenie]—Ebb, Bbb and Abb (Example 31.8a). (In Example 31.8a, the white notes represent the pitches from the basic Dorian mode; all other pitches are black.) He considers this 15-tone segment as an intermediate level between the diatonic 12-tone system and the 17-tone microtonal system. But these minor "overlays" are merely enharmonic equivalences for the extreme "alpha" tones in the 12-tone periodic system of
Eb—A, D, and G. Further, Ogolevets provides no firm basis for considering these tones as anything but enharmonic equivalences. Stravinsky does not draw attention to them in any way, or "retune" them. Ogolevets utilizes them simply because, according to this interpretation, there turn out to be no orthographical "mistakes" in this segment.

Example 31.8. a) Pitch content of "Spring Rounds"; b) chord transpositions and modifications of chord from "Spring Rounds."
Ogolevets then isolates a characteristic chord construction from this segment, which occurs initially as Cb-D-F-Bb, and examines all 26 of its possible transpositions and resulting intervallic modifications according to modal and latent harmonic content in order to explain Stravinsky's choice of chords. These chords fall into five groups according to their intervallic content. Of the ten chord transpositions Stravinsky used, seven of them are restricted to tones from the original 12-tone system; the additional three utilize the tones from the minor overlays. These ten transpositions are spread out over four of the five intervallic groups. Stravinsky chose not to use chords from the fifth group containing the interval of the diminished fifth. Example 31.8b summarizes the possibilities. The chords on each staff comprise a separate group. The chords are numbered according to their origin. The first to be numbered are those that originate from the 12-tone system (numbers 1–12), beginning with the first group (top staff). The remainder, which contain notes from the minor overlays, are numbered from 13 to 26 beginning again with the first group. Stravinsky used the chords numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, 22, and 24, all indicated with a large dot and individual circles. The notes are coordinated with the system above: white notes for the tones of the progenitor dorian mode, black notes for the others. The chords enclosed in the larger circles contain notes from the minor overlays; Stravinsky used just three of these chords—13, 22, and 24.

The latent harmonic content of the chords he used is overwhelmingly minor; only two chords have major coefficients, numbers 1 and 11.
The tension of the minor chords ranges from 2\text{b} to 13\text{b}; the tension of the two major chords is 3\text{a} and 6\text{a}, respectively. Chord no. 11, in fact, with a tension of 3\text{a}, appears first and most frequently. From a diatonic major point of view Ogolevets views this chord (C\text{b}-D-F-B\text{b}) as a "major dominant triad," that is, a minor ninth chord (minus the seventh) on the dominant B\text{b} (B\text{b}-D-F-C\text{b}). "It would seem," he says, "that the application of it in a work written in the Dorian mode, destroys the purity of the modal style." (Neither D nor C\text{b} occurs in the Dorian mode from E\text{b}). However, its coefficient 3\text{a} is equal to the coefficient of the tone C, the characteristic Dorian sixth of the mode on E\text{b}, to which Ogolevets attributes great significance. Another chord that appears frequently is No. 22, with coefficient 5\text{b}, which carries the same intervallic structure as No. 11. From a narrow modal point of view Ogolevets sees it as a modified subdominant triad (B\text{b}\text{b}\text{b} [A]-C-E\text{b}-A\text{b}, or A\text{b}-C-E\text{b}-B\text{b}\text{b} as subdominant triad with minor ninth): "This chord in all conditions was necessary to be applied by the author in the limits of a work in the Dorian mode—and it is applied. (And so, this is not an 'accidental' combination, but an unavoidable one!)

This chord in Allen Forte's nomenclature is labeled set 4-18 [0,1,4,7]; as Forte points out, it acts as a prominent subset in this section. Forte, though, is not concerned with enharmonic differences, assuming instead enharmonic equivalence. Whereas Ogolevets assumes fifteen pitch-classes, Forte posits only twelve. Therefore, in set theory Ogolevets's transpositions and intervallic variances are insignificant except to illustrate the transpositional levels of the
set 4-18, which through octave, inversional, and enharmonic equivalency are reduced from Ogolevets's 26 to the usual 12.

Ogolevets's attempts to derive significance from these intervallic transpositions in accordance with his theory of latent harmony are problematic, since the theory itself is questionable. That Stravinsky restricted his orthography to only 15 different pitch notations out of a possible 35 may be useful information in some quarters, but it hardly merits the extent of Ogolevets's endeavors to illustrate it.

Slightly more interesting is Ogolevets's interpretation of the thematic structure of this segment, which he examines in three layers beginning with the lowest and relates to the circles of historical development (refer back to Figure 31.16). So, the tonic-dominant open fifth that begins the bass ostinato makes up a layer of the first circle of development. The pitch content of it and the following parallel fifths comprise the Dorian mode. The ostinato itself represents a "modal identifying layer" of the fourth circle of development; its parallel fifths, a characteristic of elementary polyphony, are "one of the means of the archaization of statement." He relates the upper line of the lowest stave, a completely closed progression in the limits of the balanced archaic tetrachord of the secoed sphere of the system ([Bb]-C-Db-Eb; Forte's number 4-10 [0,2,3,5]), to the upper "basic" melody in the second measure. This "modally unclosed" lower line ("A") reaches only the fourth degree (Ab: 2b), which for the "archaized thought is sufficiently dynamic and clear according to its tension." Thus,
For the intuition of the author, the entire musical sense of this part is reduced to the fact that each bar remains a permanent persistent dynamic track in the view of 2b. Here is an explanation of the fact that the author applied three of the four modifications (nos. 3, 6, and 9) that have this dynamic coefficient. The possibility of an accidental occurrence is here excluded; here is the keenest action of creative intuition; in the middle layer succeeds material, equal in a dynamic sense to the foundation.

Further, in a bar-by-bar analysis, Ogulevets reveals that in measure three, in which chords numbered 11, 22 and 3 occur, the sum of the coefficients of the first two chords equals 2b, the exact coefficient not only of the third chord but also of the final note in the bass ostinato. He exults, "Separate moments are reduced organically to modal unity." However, this "modal unity" is apparent only according to his theory of latent harmony, which, as we have seen, is problematic at best.

The upper line forms "a curious fusion" of two layers of development—the third and the fifth circles. The thematic formation of the melody, a variation of the balanced tetrachord, "appeals" to the third circle of development. This is indicated by the tones C and Db, which in the Eb system arose in the third circle and which are unified not only by their equal temporal length but also by the fusion of their tension (3a and 3b) into a latent harmony. Thus, he claims (erroneously), "the equal weight of the progression is emphasized in every way." But at the same time the parallel accompaniment by open thirds "appeals to the fifth circle of development, when the motion by parallel thirds categorically replaces any hints towards parallelisms of fourths, fifths and seconds in polyphony."
In his summary of "the counterpoint of the three spheres of the musical fabric," Ogolevets relates the "fundamental bass" of the organ point" in the lower layer with the fundament of the earth:

The lower layer with its "fundamental bass" of the organ point—this is the foundation of world polyphony, its infantile state of quintal voiceleading. In a semantic relation this is, unconditionally, the element of "earth-ness," the fundament of the cosmic order, of the earth, on which is unfolded the dance action, connected with the cult of the earth. Here is a normal association: the fundamental bass—fundament—earth.52

In the upper layer, "the archaism of the modal thought, ... the first and basic tetrachord of world modal formation" is balanced by its filling-in with the two sounds of the third circle, a "'younger' expression" that intonates "with ecstatic rapture." He asks, "Is a method for the dynamization of 'profound antiquity,' which here 'is entered into the dance,' possible to be better invented?"

He calls the middle layer "coloristic":

This is the ultracontemporary layer, turned towards the future of music. ... If in the extreme lines is accomplished the archaization of the action, then in the middle line it is de-archaized: in this is the dialectical nature of the music of the Rounds, revealed by modal analysis. ... The middle line transforms the element of the [Dorian] mode by means of arch-contemporary thought.55

The chordal modifications in this layer are the means of this thought; they enhance the mode with brilliant color and nuances of shade. He relates the "de-archaization" in this middle layer to folk music:

The "de-archaization" of the modal essence of the chosen mode represents a principally important phenomenon: here occurs the discovery of the artistic potential of folk music with the help of the means arising from its very nature; this is not the dressing of folk melos in clothes uncharacteristic to it; here the naive folk-musical forms are raised to a higher degree of generalization, placed on a high pedestal of world art. This picture of folk life, in its remote legendary, half-mystical past, in its
archaism, . . . is written with true and undying colors, for they are organic, they are the quintessential of the modal, that is, musical, element.

The skill of Stravinsky, of his art, is that under the view of the "constructive" method, under the view of uniform "constructions" he gives a rich palette of refined modal colors, which in their dynamic essence function outside this "construction"; this method serves only as a means of the revelation of the innermost comprehension of the modal nature of the musical material.56

Ogolevets's interpretation, although interesting, is not particularly original. Asafiev in his Book About Stravinsky (written 1929) also points to the "dance proper" as being "massive, restrained, rooted in the earth," and refers to the "archaic melodic fragment" in the upper register. But he does not refer at all to the harmonically complex middle layer; it is as if for him it does not exist. Ogolevets does not correlate his view with the actual "content" of "Spring Rounds" at all; he seems too intent on justifying Stravinsky's modal language, which he admits is "constructive" (i.e., formalist?), in terms of both his theories and folk music.

Ogolevets projects how the usage of his seventeen-tone system would have affected this portion of the Rite of Spring. He calculates a growth of resources in a geometric progression: no fewer than eighty-five chords as a possible "arsenal of means" in a 17-tone system, as opposed to only 12 chords in a 12-tone system and twenty-six (as analyzed) in a 15-tone system. However, until a different system of temperament that reflects seventeen different tones, that is, seventeen tones with different acoustical values, is introduced and actually applied, Ogolevets's efforts to illustrate varieties in a 15-tone system lack significance. Such a system would acquire significance.
only if the "extra" three tones actually caused a retuning of the entire system.

Ogolevets also analyzes a portion of the "Abduction Ritual," which precedes the "Spring Rounds" just discussed. Again, he argues, there is nothing "atonal" or "accidental" about this portion. Here he concentrates not so much on chord structure as on chord genesis. The octatonic scale of the first two measures, for example, is formed from the $\rightarrow D$ and $\rightarrow T$ diminished seventh chords, the tones of which, though, Ogolevets interprets as hybrids of the tonic triad. The resulting mode is therefore C-D-EB-F-F#-Ab-A-B-C. It contains tonic, a minor mediant, and no dominant. The notes in the first two measures are C-B-G#-D#-F#-A. Initially he uses the minor tonic triad as the generating factor because of the presence of the Eb in the mode; but subsequently he states that the $\rightarrow D$ diminished seventh chord is nothing more than "a special transformation of the major triad" (see below).

(Example 31.9a.)
(Example 31.9b.)

Example 31.9 contains 10 measures from the "Abduction Ritual."

Example 31.9a is in Stravinsky's original rendering; Example 31.9b is the same fragment rewritten in Ogolevets's orthography. Example 31.10a illustrates the genesis of the chordal elements from the first two measures of the fragment. The chord tones of the → D chord (F♯-A-C-Eb), which occurs in these measures in its entirety (as D♯-F♯-A-C; Ogolevets interprets Stravinsky's D♯ as Eb, which he also uses), consist either of tones from the tonic triad (C and Eb [D♯]) or of hybrid tones resulting from splits of the dominant (F♯ and A). Thus the F♯ and A, as well as the Ab (G♯) (and the F, which does not occur here) from the → T chord (B-D-F-Ab), all result from the splitting of the dominant.

In Ogolevets distinction, the half-steps from G to Ab and to F♯ are narrow splits, and the whole-steps from G to A and to F are broad
splits. The B results from the narrow splitting of the tonic tone. The Eb (D♯) generates no additional tones. In Example 31.10b Ogolevets projects all the possibilities of tone generation in this manner, through the narrow and broad splitting of the tones of the minor triad. Tones used by Stravinsky are marked by "xx." For unexplained reasons, Ogolevets does not mark the Eb (D♯), which Stravinsky uses; nor does he explain if the D and F shown on either side of the Eb may also be considered hybrids of that tone. Perhaps the Eb itself is a hybrid split from the E-natural of the tonic major triad.

Example 31.10. Igor Stravinsky, Rite of Spring, "Abduction Ritual," mm.18-27: a) genesis of tones in chord, m. 18; b) complex possibilities of the generation of tones.
The latent harmonic content of this initial chord is 4a. It is derived solely from the $\rightarrow D$ chord ($F\flat-A-C-Eb: 6a+3a+1b+4b=9a&5b$, or an excess of 4a), since the hybrid displacements Ab and B are bound together in a latent harmony (5a+5b). Ogolevets explains the significance of this latent harmony:

Without the violation of the genetic essence of the chord it is possible attached to each sound to take its hybrid or it itself, which gives 16,875 chords of a different sound constitution and latent harmony, but united by genesis and mode. [Stravinsky has] chosen a chord that not only anticipates the appearance of the mode but gives the dominating tension 4a, which is inherent to the diminished seventh chord of the mode ($F\flat+A+C+Eb = ar5+4a$) and appears as the normative tension of the major system in general [mi=4a]. Thus, this is nothing different than a special transformation of the major triad.50

But this conclusion, like Ogolevets's entire system of latent numerical coefficients, is arbitrary and contrary to practice. Ogolevets's "leap of faith" from diminished seventh chord to major triad is just one more example of the extravagant claims he makes for his system. Even within his system Ogolevets jumps too easily to conclusions. The tension 4a refers either to the mediant of the major mode or to the tonic triad itself ($C=1b + E=4a + G=1a$; a total excess of 4a). The octatonic mode has neither. The excess tension of the major mode actually is 12a. The excess tension of the octatonic mode used here is also 4a. This is the same as the $\rightarrow D$ chord mentioned above because the $\rightarrow T$ chord has an excess of 0 ($E=5a, D=2a, F=2b, Ab=5b$). Does this mean then that this entire octatonic mode is a transformation of the major tonic triad? Ogolevets himself used the minor tonic triad (the dominant of which does not even exist in this octatonic mode) to produce the tones.
of the octatonic mode in the first two measures. It may be recalled that with regard to the historical formation of the diminished seventh chord, he also used the splitting of the minor triad to achieve the diminished seventh chord. Of these three major triads that can be formed within that scale (using the version applied here to the "Abduction Ritual"), D-F♯-A (11a), F-A-C (0), Ab-C-Eb (10b) (B-Eb-F♯ is not a true major triad orthographically), none has an excess of 4a, and obviously none of their tones equails 4a. So even within the context of his system the point of making this connection is not significant.

Ogolevets discusses further the chain of alternating inverted dominant-seventh-type inversions and movement by sixths in measures 18-20, the expanded content of these chords in the following measure amounting to little more than vertical fragments of the octatonic scale, the emphasis on tonic in measures 18-20, the outlines of diminished-seventh chords in measures 22-27, and the horizontal and vertical appearances of major triads transposed at the distance of a minor third in measures 20-27. He interprets the latter as being derived from two diminished seventh chords, the upper minor third from ---S and the bass note from ---D (Example 31.11). He compares this "mechanical construction" with that used by Scriabin "in the same mode in his Seventh Sonata. Here is a different stylistic use of the same mode, but with the help of the same methods in principle." But this is just another application of triads transposed at the distance of minor thirds within the octatonic scale, and really has little in common with Scriabin's formation and use of a new sonority (3-5-3 by half-steps; see Example
31.4), although it too is transposed by minor thirds. Neither use can be said to be derived from two different diminished seventh chords.

Example 31.11. Scheme of major triads as used in "Abduction Ritual."

Ogolevets examines the entire Rite of Spring from "the modal point of view," that is, from his modal point of view, and concludes that "there is not one outside-modal or atonal moment" in it. But this conclusion is tenable only if one accepts Ogolevets's view of twelve-tone diatonicism, and if one accepts his theory of latent harmony. Some theorists agree that there is a modal/tonal underpinning to this work; Pieter C. van den Toorn, for example, posits an octatonic foundation for The Rite of Spring relieved by moments of an octatonic-diatonic combination or by segments of diatonicism alone. Allen Forte, though, sees a far greater resemblance to atonal music in its unification by unordered pitch class sets. Whichever is correct, there certainly are better means for demonstrating the modal-tonal/atonal language of The Rite of Spring than Ogolevets has fashioned.
Evaluation and Criticism. One need not subscribe to Ogolevets's theories to recognize certain advantages to his approach. Chief among these are the expanded view of diatonicism (up to 12 tones), his elimination of the idea of "accidental," his joining of major and minor into one system, his classifications of modes of varying sizes, and his classifications of seventh chords. Many of these aspects have been a part of Western theory for some time, based on twentieth-century compositional techniques. Additionally, his method of dealing with enharmonicism is an interesting if limited way of approaching the topic. The main problems inherent in his approach include the idea of latent harmony, and his interpretation of modal history and contemporary folk theory. These aspects maintain certain arbitrary concepts that simply cannot be proven or are simply not true. The idea of latent harmony, although an intriguing theory, is without substantiation. While it is true that the tones most remote from tonic generate greater tension in the form of dissonant intervals; that according to orthographical norms and practical tradition, flattened altered tones generally resolve downwards and sharpened altered tones generally resolve upwards; and that raised tones generally depict major or more major (melodic minor, for instance) modes and lowered tones generally depict minor or more minor (harmonic major, for instance) modes, these indications do not justify arbitrarily assigning number values or modal sensations to tones in the chain of fifths. His assigning numbers of decreasing value for the tones added in the 17-tone, 22-tone and larger systems testifies to the arbitrary nature of this invention. The coincidences rampant in
Ogolevets's justifications for this approach must be rendered simply that--coincidences. And some of Ogolevets's explanations for the sensations of "minorness" or "majorness" really damage his credibility. Nor does the equal position of the dominant to the tonic regarding the lack of adjacent commatic tones— in Ogolevets's choice of pitches—and their intervalllic equidistance from augmented and diminished pitches, with which Ogolevets explains their frequent use together (and separately) as pedal or organ points, justify their equal numerical stature in his system. Such an approach preempts the primacy of tonic, which he goes so far to establish.

His arbitrary interpretation of music history and the development of the 12-tone musical language also stretches credibility. One cannot deny, for instance, the "historical" elements in Stravinsky's Rite of Spring—the open fifths, the dorian cast, etc. But to separate the progressive accumulation of pitches into our language by groups of two following the expanding chain of fifths is an overly-neat interpretation of history. The pitch hierarchy pentatonicism—>7-tone-diatonicism—>12-tone chromaticism provides a neat historical categorization; but all such pitch collections exist in various musics of the world even today, so that one cannot say that a certain pitch collection is more primitive than another. There have been recent attempts, though, to substantiate and develop Yasser's theories regarding the development of tonality and pitch classes using quintal relationships and pentatonic sets. Further, the various tuning systems of the world are disparate enough to discourage any attempts to universalize any one
method. Ogolevets's incomplete and erroneous knowledge of the world's music has led him to untenable assumptions, both about music history and its future.

As far as his microtonal approach is concerned, because of its inherent impracticalities and assault on the commonly-accepted musical practice of 12-tone equal temperament in Western music, his system seems to be just as feasible as any other equal-tempered microtonal system. That he accepts increasing the number of tones by increments of five, whereas Yasser, for example, accepts increments resembling the Fibonacci sequence, each claiming historical precedence for such maneuvers, does not measurably affect the result. In each case, new or retuned instruments are required; new music would have to be written; and our abilities to comprehend and reproduce accurate pitch would have to be retrained. These practices have happened and are still happening in today's contemporary music. But the microtonal faction is just one small aspect of the entire musical world. Ogolevets advocates a worldwide, aggressively comprehensive, progressive and inevitable approach that many would no doubt find threatening. And his interpretation of the music in different countries is incorrect. Specifically, his acceptance of a 17-tone tuning system for Arabic music is unfounded, as is his use of a 22-tone equal temperament system for Indian music. The Shruti of the latter are not equivalent to equal-tempered tones within the octave, nor is there any proof of a 17-tone system to the octave for Arabic music. Such crediblity gaps damage any claim to historical legitimacy for Ogolevets's microtonal system.
The only article on Ogolevets's theories to appear before the critical ax fell was a totally favorable review by one K. Shchedrin in the sixth volume of the war-time Sovetskaia muzyka. He emphasizes Ogolevets's commitment to dialectical materialism and his struggle against formalism, his application of scientific methods to prove the tenets of music theory established empirically, and his boldness in the creation of a new approach in Soviet music theory. I am providing a rather lengthy quote from his article in order to demonstrate sufficiently his overly flattering and uncritical attitude towards Ogolevets. He states:

I am deeply convinced that The Foundations of Harmonic Language placed the basis of a new—Soviet—period in the development of world musicology. At the same time this work truly unprecedented in originality in musicology is a deeply and typically Russian phenomenon. The name of Ogolevets should be placed alongside those active in culture who formed and built new paths, giving the impetus to progress in many decades. The works of Ogolevets look, like the dual-natured Janus, both into the deep past of musical language, and into the future of the world musical process, at the same time revealing the essence of the phenomena of contemporary music. . . .

The significance of the work of Ogolevets is indisputable. The boldness of the raising of the questions and their solution, the novelty—in combination with the respect to tradition, the high level of analysis, in combination with the synthesis, systematizations and strength of generalizations of material truly gigantic in its scale, places the work of Ogolevets in one of the outstanding places in musical science. Its significance in the struggle with formalism in creation and in scientific research, its role for composers, musicologists and historians does not yield at times to exact definition, so deep and serious is the tendency of this remarkable book, so vital and true the foundations on which it is created. It wakes creative thought and calls it forward.

The main thing in this work is its high methodological level. The success of the research is the best indicator of the significance of the introduction into Soviet musicology of the method of dialectical materialism. This work is one of the outstanding phenomena of Soviet progressive science.
Schedrin devotes only one paragraph to the insufficiencies in the work, which he claims are insignificant but nonetheless unavoidable in a work of such originality and size. He mentions only editing problems, some repetitions, and a quarrel with some of Ogolevets's modal analyses of Bach fugues. The basic premises and conclusions of the work he accepts without equivocation.

Thus, until Zhdanov and Khrennikov took over as arbiters of Soviet culture, Ogolevets's research was favorably received, even to the extent of having his own laboratory set up for him by the Composers' Union in 1944, as mentioned. But by 1947 the growing resistance to such "formalist" approaches led to a meeting to discuss his theories. The results of this meeting and the subsequent, progressively bitter critical attacks on Ogolevets in 1948 and 1949 are discussed at length in the chapter entitled "Criticism, 1946-1950." It is difficult to determine just what would have happened to Ogolevets's theoretical views had they been allowed to be discussed and studied freely, without subjugation to political necessities. However, in a book published posthumously in 1969 entitled Spetsifika vyrazitel'nykh stredstv muzyki [The specific character of the expressive devices of music], Ogolevets returns to many of the ideas he first advanced in his 1941 book--latent harmony, microtonality, the connections between European and Eastern modal systems, and the like. This time, though, he treats such theoretical ideas as expressive devices that provide antidotes to the decadent Western dodecaphonic music. This work doesn't seem to have made much impact on subsequent Soviet music theory; nevertheless, its
being published in 1969, two years after Ogolevets's death, testifies to the respect with which he was regarded. It was not prepared for publication posthumously, though, as it contains a undated forward from Ogolevets regarding the specific articles included in the book. He may have prepared it some time before and had it accepted for publication only in the more liberal atmosphere of the late 1960s.

The heartbreak of the 1948-49 debacle in Soviet music and culture is that not just some ideas but all ideas save those guided by narrow Marxist-Leninist interpretations were squelched. The setback to Soviet music is incalculable. Clearly, many of Ogolevets's interpretations of musical practice and history would have died a natural death, rooted as they are in misconceptions and arbitrary systematizations. However, to be denied the opportunity to flourish or die based on the immanent soundness or lack thereof, to be subjected to political censureship, robs a discipline of the opportunity to develop and grow based on the free exchange of ideas. Ogolevets's views were fostering and would have continued to foster such an exchange and would have helped Soviet music theory progress in some measure, even if it meant the negation of all of his views. The very nature of the discussion of the issues he raised would have contributed to lively debates and, no doubt, further research. But such opportunities were denied. The resulting damage took many years to overcome and may never be completely repaired. For example, a full ten years after the first attacks on Ogolevets's theories, during the Khrushchev thaw, Soviet theorists were just tentative-ly beginning to recapture some of the earlier initiative with arguments
over how to interpret such basic concepts as diatonicism and chromaticism, atonalism and polytonalism, and whether any aspects other than diatonicism were even considered suitable for use. At the time of this writing, such fundamental conflicts of interpretation have weakened and wider applications are tolerated, thus leading to more advanced theoretical work. Such lags in the development of music theory in the second half of the twentieth century recall the previous lags in nineteenth-century music theory when Russian theorists were striving to establish some sort of parity with the accomplishments in Western theory.
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Chapter 32

Anatolii Konstantinovich Butskoi: Theories of Form

Both Anatolii Konstantinovich Butskoi and Viktor Osipovich Berkov (discussed in the next chapter) completed their dissertations during the early years of the war and published them in 1948. Despite the supposed acceptability of their respective topics, Glinka's harmony (Berkov) and the analysis of form and content (Butskoi), they each received criticism for these works during the events of 1948-49, not so much for their topics, though, as for their methods and conclusions. Apparently neither followed Marxist methodology closely enough, and as a result they reached some of the wrong conclusions. I group them together here because their cases illustrate the extent to which the authorities were willing to go in order to make their point. Butskoi and Berkov endured criticism largely because they had the misfortune to publish books in 1948, and were therefore used as examples for others. Their books have little in common otherwise, except a tendency to try to work within the prescribed limits, i.e., those elements already known and accepted. Neither work approaches Ogolevets's works in originality—and Ogolevets certainly cannot be faulted for a lack of originality!—but they fit well within traditions of Soviet music.
theory. Neither theorist is difficult to understand, and at times they are even boring in the regularity of their statements and observations. Broadly characterized, Berkov's book is an analytical study and Butskoi's book is a study of analysis.

Anatolii Konstantinovich Butskoi (1892-1965). Butskoi received both a musical and a general education. He graduated from the Lysenko Music School in Kiev in piano and theory in 1913, and from Kiev University in physics and mathematics in 1915. For the next two years (1916 to 1918) he studied composition at the Kiev Conservatory with Gliere and Yavorsky. From 1920 to 1925 he taught at the Lysenko Music School in Kiev, and from 1925 taught theory at the Leningrad Conservatory. He published his first work, Neposredstvennye dannye muzyki (Opyt vvedenii v muzyku) [The direct givens of music (An attempt of an introduction into music)], in 1925. He completed his doctoral dissertation in 1941, and published it with some changes in 1948. This dissertation, Struktura muzykal'nogo proizvedeniia, Teoreticheskie osnovy analiza muzykal'nykh proizvedeniii [The structure of a musical work. The theoretical bases of the analysis of musical works], forms the basis for the present discussion. Aside from a few articles and his 1925 book, Butskoi published no other major work.

The Structure of a Musical Work contains few original ideas; its uniqueness derives from Butskoi's combination, organization, and systematization of existing theories of the analysis of musical structure as applied to the determination of content—a study of form and its
relationship to content. Butskoi's attempted synthesis of the two areas—theory and aesthetics—produces a less than satisfactory effect and does not fully succeed in its stated purpose. Also, although his approaches are obviously derived from such theorists as Yavorsky, Asafiev, and Conus, he gives no credit to these earlier theorists, and in fact allows the reader to reach the distinct impression that their works are not that important. In a historical survey of theoretical books on form, he lumps Asafiev together with A. B. Marx, O. Reissman, and H. Riemann and labels their works "wide generalizations of rich historical experience, aspiring each in its own way to the creation of a strict system of views on the structure of a musical work." He groups Yavorsky and Conus together with Kurth and reveals only that they approached the question of the structure of musical works from "the point of view of their particular musicological positions." Nonetheless, his book is worth investigating because after Asafiev and Mazel, Butskoi is the only Soviet theorist at this time to address the question of the analysis of form together with content, a prominent direction of Soviet music theory. Also, his attempts to derive a syntax of musical grammar contain some interesting applications of ideas more recently and successfully applied in Western music theory.

Butskoi's goal is to investigate the nature of content and imagery in musical works—"the concrete form of the revelation of artistic images in works of art," using "the musical work as the real object of music." In his view this question at that time had not adequately been addressed. However, the most he can ever say about musical con-
tent—and he says it repeatedly—is, "The content of any art is the transformed human consciousness of reality: ideas, feelings and aspirations of human society, revealed in a system of artistic images."

This is the standard Marxist approach to the subject of musical content. But discussions of the nature of reality, the identification of artistic images, and so forth, topics that he should discuss and define, are not to be found in his work. Instead he travels over a well-worn path, identifying all the elements in a musical work that can and do affect its style and represent content.

His philosophical approach is founded on Marxist-Leninist principles, chief among them being that "art is a complex social ideological superstructure," that "the social existence of people defines their consciousness," and that the content of art is "a material world, reflected by consciousness and transformed into ideas, feelings and aspirations of human society." He identifies and investigates three basic problems in musicology in connection with the understanding of music as a social ideological superstructure: 1) the nature of musical content, 2) musical language (both its expressive means and its grammar), and 3) the laws of the "architechtomics," or form, of a musical work. He follows the given order of these problems, tackling the question of content first and that of form last, with the grammatical aspects in between. This order follows the Marxist dictum that content determines form.

Among the methodological principles he employs in his investigations are those of the interrelation of phenomena, that is, "to examine
phenomena in their interconditionality, in their interconnections"; the historical method: "everything in the world is found in motion, [and] has its beginning, development and end, that is its history," and "therefore it is necessary to study all facts of reality in their concrete historical condition"; and the unity of theory and practice. All three of these methods have relevance for music theory. For instance, Butskoi warns musicologists against avoiding the principle of interrelationship:

Musicologists should remember about this most important methodological principle, since they are exceptionally susceptible to the isolated study of one sphere of musical phenomena and to the transformation of particular laws found in this process into general and universal laws, to which would be subordinated music as a whole.

He applies the historical method by prefacing the three problems listed above "with an analysis of such motive powers which take part in the formation of [a] musical work [as a real object of music] and in its historical destiny."

The unity of theory and practice is particularly important for music theory: "Each theory is defined first by the degree of practical knowledge of reality, and the correctness of theoretical conclusions is tested by the concrete results of their practical application." The practical verification of a theory "requires that it aid the composer to compose the best musical works, the performer—to reproduce it more deeply, the listener—to perceive it as fully as possible." One sees the influence of Asafiev in this "triumvirate" of musical perception. He decries the concoctions of a "laboratory" musicologist; a theory so
conceived, he says, "will turn out to be directly harmful, because it will distort ideas about the true nature of musical phenomena and thereby will complicate and hinder the development of musical culture."

Butskoi declines to take credit for providing singlehandedly the answers and solutions to the problems he outlines in his book, calling the task too "exhausting" for one man. Such a task must be a collective effort of Soviet musicologists, based on the tenets of Marxist-Leninist thought. The results of this collaboration will be far-reaching, culminating in the participation in the construction of Soviet music culture.

The final result will be a logical system of views on the nature of a musical work, revealing the dialectics of musical phenomena and tested by practice.

Such a system gives the key to the deepest understanding of musical images, to their clearer performance and to a fuller use of their social practice. Thereby such a system fulfills its basic cultural social role—directly and organically to take part in the construction of the music culture of our great and fantastic country.15

Artistic Content. The structure of Butskoi's work is organized according to the three problems he outlines: chapters I-II delve into the question of content, chapters III-IV discuss the genesis and vocabulary of musical language, and chapters V-VI cover the architectonic aspects—formal structure and design—of a musical work. Chapter I attempts to justify, according to Marxist-Leninist principles, as its title reveals, "The Artistic Work as a Material Object of Art."

Butskoi states, "Any artistic work presents itself as a material object
of art—a material phenomenon, created by man and endowed with concrete content: . . . a musical work is constructed from specially organized sound relations." He divides the genesis of an artistic work into four links: 1) the society in which it is created, 2) the culture of this society, 3) the individual creative traits of the artist, and 4) the process of the "ripening" and final formation of the artistic work into a concrete material object of art. These phenomena are connected into an indissoluble whole and form what is generally called "the life of an artist," in which "the individual particularities of the artist, the interaction of the social and personal, the human and professional, are inalienable from the social basis, as man is inalienable from his society."

In a temporal art like music, the last link, the process resulting in the material work of art itself, begins another chain of links outlining the history of the existence of a temporal work of art from the moment of its creation by the composer through its performance and finally to its perception and evaluation by the listener. Again, these links are more or less identical to Asafiev's trilogy of composition—performance—perception. By the time the work of art reaches the listener, whatever subjective elements or aspects may have gone into it, for example, the composer's relation to reality, "defined by his world view and feelings," and the performer's interpretation of the work of art—a process of secondary creation—for the listener "the artistic image given by the performer, however subjective and remote from the composer's original conception, always is an objective fact . . . . an
integral objective phenomenon." Thus, the performance will have a significant effect on the perception of the listener, who may or may not be able to separate the "secondary" creative instincts of the performer from the primary results of the composer's actions.

In Chapter II, "The Nature of Musical Content," Butskoi identifies the problem of music content as one of the most difficult and undeveloped problems of musicology. This problem has "not only not been worked out, but essentially scientifically has not been raised... In it... are intersected all the most important questions of musical science and musical practice." In Marxist theory, of course, content is the most important aspect of an artistic work. That the question of content on a scientific basis, that is, a systematic foundation with laws and measurable regularities, has not yet been raised is essentially true, as we saw in the last chapter. Whether aesthetics can be treated as a science is another matter. However, although Butskoi himself may have identified the problem for Marxist musicology, he does little to solve it. In this chapter he discusses the characteristics of content, the nature of matter and motion, and the notion of the artistic image.

Butskoi summarizes the distinctive features of artistic content. He relates it first of all to society and to the real world:

At the foundation of the content of art, as also at the foundation of any content of consciousness, lie ideas--sensory reflections in the consciousness of subjects and phenomena of the real world. Artistic thought attached to the refining of these ideas preserves their primary sensory form which is given with sensations, managing here without the necessary direct means of verbal ideas. The refining of ideas in art is defined by an entire group of complex relations of man to reality and first of all (but far from only)
with the feelings that arouse this reality in the consciousness of people; and since the relation of man to the world is defined by social existence, then art, in the final analysis, expresses the world view and senses of such a society, in the innermost depths of which the artist created his artistic work.20

Content is revealed through "the artistic image":

As a result of the refining of sensory reflections of reality by human thought is created the artistic image, which is the sensory reflection of the real world, refined by thought on the basis of the definite relation of man to reality and reproduced in the form of an individual phenomenon by means of art. Therefore the artistic image includes both a definite relation to reality, and also a typified representation of an objective phenomenon. Artistic images receive their expression in an artistic work—a material subject or phenomenon of art, in which the sphere of artistic images, their interrelations with each other and their development are defined by the unified design and unified idea of the created [work of art]. The concrete form of the revelation of artistic images in a work of art is the subject of this work.21

Thus, since artistic content is revealed through artistic images, which represent the reflection of the "individual phenomena" of reality, in order to discover artistic content Butskoi deems it necessary first of all to define the essential characteristics of these "individual phenomena," and second to explain how these phenomena are transformed into artistic images.

The first step involves the recognition of the essence of the real world around us, which is matter in constant motion. This is the foundation of dialectical materialism, the basic position of which Butskoi summarizes as follows: "The unity and struggle of contrasts is the basic motive force of development. . . . Motion and matter are inseparable. Motion is the internally inherent quality of matter. . . . So, in any subject or phenomenon of the real world matter and motion are joined together." Consequently, the inseparability of
matter from motion conditions analysis to the extent that the exhaus-
tive study of the characteristics of any individual subject or phenome-
non must include descriptions of both their material signs and signs of
motion.

For research into the nature of musical content Butskoi considers
the knowledge of the signs of motion extremely important. "These signs
are the outer expression of the complex contrasts that arise both
within the phenomenon itself and also in its interrelations with the
surrounding reality and that lead this phenomenon to the given mo-
tion." Signs of motion include proportion or size; division; trajec-
tory; rhythm; tempo; intensity; and "massiveness" ("the quantity and
complexity of the content of the phenomenon"). These characteristics
may not exist isolated from each other; a change in one results in a
transformation of the entire phenomenon. Nor are these signs equally
significant; some are more important than others and this must be
assessed. Motion may arise either as a result of inner conflicts
between separate qualities of a given object or as a result of the
conflicts between different independent phenomena of reality. Regard-
less of the method, though, synthesis or breakdown, one object is
transformed into another. Thus to explain the essence of motion, it is
necessary to solve three problems: 1) to define the nature of the
matter that engenders the given motion; 2) to uncover the characteris-
tics of all of the signs of concrete motion; and 3) to reveal the inner
conditions that determined these signs and produced the given motion as
a whole.
The characteristics of the artistic image are conditioned by the definite relations of man to reality. These characteristics may be divided into two groups—those that reflect the objective properties of the phenomena of the real world, and those that are conditioned by the interrelations of man with the surrounding world. The first group would include

both the inner properties (complexity, scale, concentratedness, degree of stability), and also the motions typical for them with all the above described signs (proportions of motion, its breaking up into stages, temporal correlations of these stages, quickness of course, intensity, degree of completion). 25

The second group would include "the world view and sensations of man, defining the character of the refining of phenomena of reality into the artistic image, the degree of knowledge by man of these phenomena, the spatial or temporal perspective."

Butskoi discusses the relationship between music and reality as reflected through artistic images. He states, "To research the nature of content of each art means above all to define the spheres and sides of reality that are the direct vital foundation of this content and to study the methods that the given art uses in the formation of its artistic images." However, music, unlike painting or sculpture, does not directly reflect subject matter:

It reproduces directly and first of all the motion characteristic for subjects of phenomena, and already by specific characteristics of motion revealed in music the listener receives an idea about the subjects or phenomena with which the given motion is unbrokenly connected. Music is unable to depict pure subjectness. . . . Music is connected with the subject side of reality mainly through the means of reflection of the material characteristics of a phenomenon in given concrete motion. 26

But music is not an art of pure or abstract motion, motion that is
independent and isolated from matter. Motion reflects the material
characteristics of a subject or phenomenon with which it is narrowly
connected. Thus music also reflects directly the material characteris-
tics of the phenomena of reality—"their material mass, spacial corre-
lations of proximity and remoteness, etc." Butskoi explains the
nature of the artistic image in music (because of the importance of
this topic for Soviet musicology, I give a rather lengthy quote):

Like any art, music gives a generalized image of reality. So, for example, Beethoven in his overture to the tragedy "Egmont" gave an image not of a concrete historical personality, but of heroic conduct and sensations in their generalized forms. Therefore this music is freely connected with the image of any other hero with similar conduct and sensations.

The generalized form of a musical image is not a sign of the lack in music of vital content... In music a definite group of particular phenomena, similar by the forms of their existence, are connected with artistic image. So, the pastoral in the Russian style... in one listener gives rise to a picture of summer weather with its coolness, stillness and mildness, another recalls a young boyar's daughter, dreaming by an embroidery frame in an secluded tower, a third connects this music with his personal enjoyment from rest after tiring work, etc. By "subjectness" these three associative images are completely different... Nevertheless,... [they] are very close by the forms of their existence: they all have slow tempos, mild transitions from one state into another, they are all static, full of tranquillity, etc.... [Therefore] the systematics of the phenomena of reality according to the principle of commonness of motion does not agree with their classifications by subject similarity.

Therefore for a musical image, while the subject matter invoked is
generalized and non-specific, since it may differ for each listener,
the actual characteristics of the motion in the image will be similar,
at least for a familiar group of phenomena. But if common motive
qualities do not give rise to similar content, how is the content to be
expressed or determined? Since musical images are so personal and
therefore different for each listener in spite of the common motion and material characteristics that the music may exhibit, how can Marxist musicology ever agree on an interpretation of content that will be significant for each listener? This is a major stumbling-block. Either content is determined to be so general and non-specific so as to be applicable for everyone, in which case it is rendered practically meaningless, or it is determined to be so individualistic and direct that only a few could ever agree with such an interpretation. Thus, the process of determining content becomes an empty, useless means of applying Marxist ideology.

The Genesis and Vocabulary of Music Language. Butskoi turns next, in Chapters III and IV, to the question of the expressive means of music, that is, the specific characteristics of musical language, which help music to "refine images of real phenomena" and to "materialize them in their artistic works." The material nature of sound, that is, acoustics, music's physical characteristics, together with the auditory sensations, the character of the influence of sound on man, music's physiological characteristics, are objective preconditions for the formation of the expressive means of music. These expressive means are conditioned by and change according to the change of "the sphere of vital images" used by art in a given historical moment, and the degree of the development of artistic thought and language. Therefore, Butskoi points out, it becomes necessary to study any expressive means in the corresponding historical environment. Each expressive means
exists by itself and possesses definite content; but when combined with other expressive means, as is usually the case in a musical work, these means lose their independent significance and create new expressive possibilities. Therefore, Butskoi divides the research of any expressive means into two parts: the study of its own specific characteristics and the study of its interrelations with other expressive means.

Butskoi divides these expressive means into four groups: the isolated sound, simultaneous sound combinations, consecutive sound combinations, and consecutive correlations of chords. The simplest expressive means is the isolated sound. It too is made up of separate qualities that Butskoi calls "expressive elements." They include:

a) definite pitch, reflecting the size and tension of a real phenomenon; b) timbre and register, reflecting the same characteristic of the real phenomenon and broadening it with new qualities: heaviness or lightness, sharpness or mildness, softness or boldness; c) definite power, reflecting the intensity of the real phenomenon; d) temporal organization, reflecting the temporal organization of the moment of the real phenomenon; [and] e) definite modal nature, reflecting the degree of completeness and direction of the changes of phenomena.32

The next group, simultaneous sound combinations, includes intervals, the combination of two sounds, and chords, the combinations of intervals. The expressive significance of the interval is above all the degree of its complexity as determined by its pitch content. In other words, the more complex an interval is—which Butskoi does not define—the more expressive it is. All other expressive elements are the same as for the single sounds of which it is made up.

Chords contain expressive elements both similar and in addition to those for intervals: a) intervallic content (type and quantity);
b) chord size (doublings or omissions—"the 'quantity' of content");
c) chord density (size of intervalllic spaces between notes of chord);
d) range of extreme pitches of chord; e) timbre and register; f) functions of chord tones ("modal nature"); g) dynamics; and h) attack and release of chord ("the character of the capture, course and cessation of sounding, reflecting the characteristics of the flowing of the corresponding moment of the phenomenon"). Because the expressive significance of a chord is the synthesis of the expressive significances of its elements, and a change in one alters the quality of the whole chord, then the definition of the expressive significance of a chord must be made on the basis of the analysis of the interrelations of all of its elements. According to Butskoi, an isolated chord made up of all these characteristics, the "essential material characteristics of any real phenomenon," "gives a distinctive but sufficiently full characteristic of the material nature of the phenomenon. In this . . . is the first connection of music with matter."

To designate a consecutive sound combination, Butskoi adopts the term "intonation" (for which he credits neither Yavorsky nor Asafiev, but which nearly all theorists were using by 1948 anyway), which he defines as "the simplest consecutive correlation of sounds." Because an intonation is made up of sound changes, which invoke motion, its expressive elements are very similar to those characteristics of motion examined earlier: a) size of motion; b) direction of motion; c) rhythm; d) tempo; e) sound intensity; f) modal nature; and g) timbre and register. These are the elements of a simple, two-sound intona-
tion. For a complex intonation, made up of three or more sounds, which is characterized by "the homogeneity of its melodic motion, not allowing a natural division into smaller, logically semantic parts," Butskoi includes not only the beginning and end of motion characteristic for a simple intonation, but also the intermediate sounds, the trajectory of motion.

The final category of expressive means is the expressive elements of the consecutive correlations of chords, or, as Butskoi calls them, harmonic turns [oboroty], to use a phrase coined by Yavorsky (to whom, again, Butskoi gives no credit). Harmonic turns contain essentially the same elements as do intonations; Butskoi mentions particularly rhythm and tempo, which arise due to the temporal nature of both intonations and harmonic turns. He divides harmonic turns into three basic types, based on three basic types of motion: 1) immobile turns, which reflect "the relative equilibrium of inner motions"; 2) turns subject only to quantitative changes, their essence intact; and 3) turns transformed "into a new, qualitatively different object." Each type of motion—static, quantitative, or qualitative, all Marxist-derived terms—affects a harmonic turn accordingly: its expressive characteristic may either remain unchanged, grow or degenerate, or be transformed. Butskoi examines each type.

The first would consist of chord repetitions, which would intensify the already existing basic qualities of the chord. The second type occurs when the expressive chordal elements either grow or degenerate. One of the more interesting examples Butskoi presents to illustrate
this type is from Beethoven's Piano Sonata, Op. 106 (Example 32.1). He points to "the gradual growth of subdominantness" through the gradual progression from a "very weak" subdominant, the first inversion of bVI (Db6), through the first inversion of IV (Bb), to a "very tense" subdominant, the first inversion of bII (Gb). The lowered second and sixth degrees strengthens even more the functional quality of this progression.


The third type of harmonic turn occurs when chords contrasting their expressive characteristics are juxtaposed, resulting in the uneven transfer of one quality into another. Functional contrasts of chords, such as dominant-tonic, subdominant-tonic, etc., are well-known turns of this type. Butskoi cites the beginning of Beethoven's First Symphony, a forte dominant-seventh chord on C moving to the piano tonic chord on F, in which three areas are contrasted--function, chord type, and intensity (dynamics).
These three types of progression may also appear together, for example, one portion of the expressive elements of the chords remaining unchanged, another undergoing a quantitative change, and a third appearing as antithesis. He chides his discipline for lack of attention to this aspect: "Musicology not only has not created a lexicon of expressive meanings of harmonic progressions, but still has not even begun this musical work important for scientific comprehension."

Butskoi criticizes the proponents of a strictly linear view of music for ignoring the dialectics of the vertical combination:

Some theorists examine harmonic turns only as the simultaneous existence of several intonations and as a result see the expressive significance of a chordal progression in a mechanical joining of characteristics of the intonations making it up. However this is . . . a mistake. . . . Attached to the joining of separate intonations into a harmonic turn, there occurs a dialectical leap: the quantitative accumulation transforms into a new quality. In the same way the coexistence of the sounds in the chord itself engenders new expressive possibilities, distinct in their nature from the expressive characteristics of intonations.

Thus, it is impossible . . . to ignore the distinctiveness of the expressive nature of a harmonic turn as a special category of the expressive means of music.

He also applies his three types of harmonic progression to modulation: the preservation of a tonality, the gradual transfer of one tonality into another, and the direct contrast of tonalities.

The Architectonics of Music. In Chapters V and VI Butskoi discusses the architectonic structure of music, from the smallest level, the motive, to the largest, the overall form of entire movements. He eschews traditional approaches to "musical speech," in favor of one based on a combination of Yavorsky's and Asafiev's approaches. He
defines musical speech as "the materialization of musical content in
the consecutive statement of varied sound constructions." Thus, in
the process of form, content becomes matter. He criticizes traditional
theory—Marx, Lobe, Reicha, Bussler, Riemann, and Prout—for attempting
to oversimplify the analysis of musical structure. Specifically, he
accuses them of separating "grammatical divisions" of music from "poeti-
cic divisions," by which he means that the motivic designations of many
theorists do not accurately reflect the thematic content of the music.
This accusation resembles Conus's criticism regarding integumentary and
episodic accents; only his distinction reflected the separation of the
theme from the pulse groupings of metrotechnicism, which were arbi-
trary and non-musical. Secondly, as did Conus and Catoire before him,
he denounces the practice of restricting all varieties of groupings to
paired constructions—two motives make up one phrase, two phrases a
sentence, etc. Under this category falls also the practice of some
theorists, Prout, for example, of calculating only eight measures in a
phrase, based on repetitions, variations, etc., regardless of the
actual number of measures (1 2 3 34 4 5 6 7a 8 instead of 1-10, or 2
3 4 6 7 8 instead of 1-6). Butskoi's third criticism concerns "the
full ignorance" of theorists "of the musical content of analyzed
works," of "the syntactical correlations between musical material that
also convey the inner regularity, the comprehension to the entire
construction." His final criticism accuses theorists of failing to
distinguish "the qualitative difference" between grammatical construc-
tions and the architectonics of a musical work:
If the division of a musical work into phrases, sentences, periods is conditioned by the division of the very process of musical thought and performance, then the differentiation of a musical work into separate parts (exposition, development, recapitulation, main, secondary, connecting part, "coda" and others) depends above all on thematic material, on its content and character of application in a musical work. Only the simplest—if one may say so, "strophic"—musical forms give models of agreement of grammatical formations with the form of an artistic work. . . . A composer names his work sonata, symphony, poem, variations above all because of the characteristics of the development of the thematic material, because of the characteristics of its content.\textsuperscript{43}

Thus the varieties of formal construction in a work reflect the content and must be treated individually.

As a result of his analysis of traditional theory, Butskoi reaches two conclusions, which define the further direction of his book. First, musical speech may be divided into two qualitatively different categories—a grammatical division, or the grammar of music, and a music poetics division, which involves the aspect of proportion. The interrelationships between these two divisions give to composers "a special category of expressive possibilities, strongly enriching the arsenal of the expressive means of music."\textsuperscript{44} Second, he further distinguishes these two categories from the architectonics of a musical work. Their merger during the creation of a musical work results in definite thematic material, which in its "regularity of development and differentiation" in turn defines the general form or architectonics of the work. He thus investigates three subjects: the laws of musical grammar, the nature of proportion in a musical statement, and their merger into musical form.

Under the grammar of musical speech Butskoi investigates two different but organically connected categories: a category that depends
on the activity of the consciousness, and one conditioned by the technique of performance. I will concentrate here on the first category. The division of a musical statement reflects the division of human activity into separate efforts forming the simplest acts of man; each act corresponds to the simplest grammatical construction in music, the motive. It contains three basic stages, which Butskoi borrows from the physiology of muscular activity: "the stage of the growth of energy, the mobilization of strength for the completion of useful action; a stage of culmination, of maximal tension of strength; and a stage of calming, the decline of energy." Butskoi reminds the reader that this division of human behavior is not only a physiological process, but is "always subordinated to the organizing source of social existence."

The motive, therefore, reflects these three stages of human activity. Each component part of the motive has a special theoretical designation: the "anacrusis," "the stage of the growth of energy," which leads to the "ictus," "the moment of the culmination of energy," and the "post-ictus or weak ending," "the decline of energy." The three-part form "anacrusis-ictus-weak ending" is the most developed form, that is, it contains the basic elements of all forms; but there do exist other varieties in which one of the component parts may be missing. Moreover, the relative length and strength of each part varies. Each variety contains at least one definite component, the ictus, "which plays the role of the center of the construction and around which the remaining links are grouped." Therefore, "Any
simple construction has only one stressed moment, one grammatical accent, one ictus." If more than one such accent is present, then the construction becomes a complex, rather than simple, construction.

Butskoi's whole approach to musical grammar and the motive may be directly related to the method of rhythmic analysis developed by Grosvenor W. Cooper and Leonard B. Meyer in *The Rhythmic Structure of Music*. Like Cooper and Meyer, Butskoi expands his application beyond the lowest, motivic level, simple constructions, to encompass more complex constructions; but he stops short of applying his method beyond large segments of works or even whole movements. Also, he does not analyze the rhythmic structure of the higher level constructions, which therefore take on the appearance of the various components of the usual phrase structure. However, because of this close analogy with the Cooper–Meyer method, particularly on the lower levels, when discussing Butskoi's analyses I will refer to the designations adopted by Cooper and Meyer—iamb, trochee, dactyl, anapest, and amphibrach. Although Butskoi does not utilize these terms in practical application, i.e., in analysis, he does refer to them in his comparison of poetry with music (see below).

Butskoi distinguishes four basic groups, which encompass all the varieties of groupings mentioned. In addition to the complete three-part form (the amphibrach), he discusses the "one-moment ictus construction," the "anacrusis and ictus" form (iamb and anapest), and the "ictus and weak ending" form (trochee and dactyl). The one-moment ictus construction acts like an impulse to further motion, for example,
separate chords, as the C-minor chord at the beginning of Beethoven's Piano Sonata, Op. 13.

Butskoi places the construction of anacrusis—ictus (iamb) with "the more active grammatical forms, since it reflects the process of the growth of energy with its natural conclusion into a culmination." Butskoi gives several illustrations of this construction, among them the opening measures of Beethoven's Piano Sonata Op. 2, No. 2 (Example 32.2a) and a melodic fragment from Chopin's first Ballade (Example 32.2b).

Example 32.2. a) Ludwig van Beethoven, Sonata for Piano, Op. 2, No. 2, mm. 1-8; b) Fredrich Chopin, Ballade No. 1, mm. 82-83.
The construction is clearly evident in the Chopin Ballade, but not so obvious in the Beethoven excerpt. Although Butskoi has marked the motivic fragments with brackets, in the text he does not explain his markings (a fault that carries throughout his book, unfortunately). To illustrate his ideas better, I have added my interpretation of a rhythmic analysis using the principles of the Cooper-Meyer approach. Does each fragment represent a anacrusis--ictus construction? This may certainly be so on the two lowest levels for the first four fragments, but the last one, the downward arpeggiation of the dominant seventh chord, does not contain a strong accented point even initially and certainly not in retrospect. Taken as a whole, these eight measures may be considered a dactyl, but in relation to what follows they become one long upbeat or unaccented portion.

Example 32.3. a) Ludwig van Beethoven, Piano Sonata, Op. 81a, second movement, m. 1; b) Modest Petrovich Musorgsky, Pictures at an Exhibition, "Tuileries" movement, m. 1.
The third variety, the ictus—post-ictus (trochee), is a "retrospective" form; it reflects the gradually diminishing reaction to some impulse in the view of a beginning ictian moment." Butskoi's examples of this construction include the beginning of the second movement of Beethoven's Piano Sonata Op. 81a (Example 32.3a) and the opening of the "Tuileries" from Musorgsky's Pictures at an Exhibition (Example 32.3b).

An example of the full three-part form anacrusis—ictus—post-ictus (amphibrach) would be the beginning of Chopin's Ballade No. 3, shown in Example 32.4. This example is somewhat more complex than a simple amphibrach. On the lowest level, the first measure contains one accented beat (the Eb) and a prolonged unaccented segment leading to the accent on the first beat of the second measure. The entire first measure is really a long upbeat, but the accent on the initial Eb cannot be discounted. This grouping therefore may be interpreted as a trochee pivoting into an iamb. On the next level, the first measure carries an accented beat that in retrospect becomes unaccented.

Example 32.4. Fredrich Chopin, Ballade No. 3, mm. 1-2.
Butskoi joins separate simple constructions into one complex construction, in which the ictus of the central simple construction becomes stronger and the remaining ictuses become weaker. In an illustration from Mozart's Fantasy, K. 475 (Example 32.5), four simple constructions merge into one complex construction:

The first [construction] consists of an ictus and a weak ending; the second, repeating basically the structure of the first, is enriched by an anacrusis; the third develops the emerging activation of the statement . . . ; the fourth has a developed anacrusis, ictus and weak ending. The third simple [construction] is the central focus of the complex construction; in relation to it the first two play the role of an anacrusis, and the remaining (the fourth)—the role of a weak ending.53

In other words, this four-measure phrase consists of iamb—amphibrach—???—amphibrach, which taken as a whole results in an amphibrach.

Example 32.5. Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Fantasy, K. 475, Andantino, mm. 1-4.
Butskoi's intentions for the third construction, which he calls simply "emerging activation" but which becomes "the central focus of the complex construction," is unclear. It actually consists of two rhythmic units, an anapest (in retrospect) pivoting into a trochee. On the next level the whole phrase may be viewed as an iamb--trochee pairing, resulting on the next level in an iamb. More in keeping with Butskoi's interpretation would be to consider the phrase as an anapest (again, in retrospect) pivoting into a trochee.

Taken further, this process of combining simple constructions into complex constructions form, as Butskoi calls them, "complex constructions of the second, third and higher orders." Butskoi discusses these complex constructions more fully in connection with his investigation of the thematic element (see below). He derives his higher-order constructions from a combination of the phrase structure with the actual rhythmic structure.

Butskoi acknowledges difficulties attendant to the definition of simple constructions and the explanation of grammatical structure, the chief one being the degree of fragmentation of a musical statement. The type, direction, speed, and stress of the motion in a given construction, in essence the periodization of the rhythm in the unaccented portions, the anacrusis and the weak ending, are among the factors that affect its comprehension as a unified whole or fragmentation into smaller units. However, this aspect, in Butskoi's opinion, is an individual matter and results in varieties of interpretation and therefore performance: "In this is rooted one of the reasons of individual
peculiarities of phrasing. . . . Our point of view . . . gives an objective explanation to subjective performance treatments, and does not lead to abstract and formal recipes, depriving the performer of a creative source. The most desirable interpretation, of course, and the one to which each performer must strive, is that which reflects the composer's vision. Butskoi illustrates this viewpoint with the opening two measures of Scriabin's Etude, Op. 2, No. 1 (Example 32.6):

Let us assume that a performer transforms each eighth note into an independent grammatical unit—into an iactus construction. Then the listener during the length of the two bars cited receives 12 independent effects. If the same performer places two eighth notes into a grammatical unit, then his performance at once becomes "easier," since now at the same time only 6 effects will be produced for the listener. However Scriabin understood this two-bar unit as a simple whole, consisting of a anacrusis (first bar), iactus and a weak ending (second bar). The construction consequently aspired here to give to the listener only one effect. Thus, in the first case the performance in 12 [units] and in the second in 6 [units] became heavy in comparision with the thought of the composer.55

Thus as twelve units these two measures would be a series of one-stress units. As six units, they could be considered as six trochees. But Butskoi has wisely grouped the six eighth note chords in the first measure into one long upbeat, forming a anacrusis of an amphibrach grouping. Unlike the Chopin examined earlier, the initial accent—the tonic triad on beat one—has little significance except as part of a longer upbeat leading to the subdominant resolution in measure two.

Butskoi is unable to venture further into the grammar of musical language, into what he calls "the syntax of musical speech," the logical interconnection of separate grammatical constructions, irrespective of their complexity and degree of continuity, conditioned by general laws of human thought. This is, he states, a "completely undeveloped" sphere of musicology:

The study of the logical correlations of musical grammatical constructions in the process of their consecutive statement has huge theoretical and practical significance for music, since it must give objective scientific bases for musical declamation—for what musicians call phrasing. It is time for Soviet musicology, finally, to place in line the creation of a new musical theoretical science—the syntax of musical language, which must substitute for the ancient theory of meter-rhythm with its abstract and formal regularities.56

Soviet theorists, though, in spite of attempts in their history that point in this direction, beginning with Mel'gunov and continuing with Yavorsky and now Butskoi, have not continued to develop this sphere.

In a section entitled "The Measurement of Musical Speech," which Butskoi defines as the measurement of musical speech into the correct pulsation of strong and weak portions, he applies the principles of poetic construction to music. Citing a long tradition in musicology of
such application—beginning with August Apel's Metrick (Leipzig, 1814-1816)—Butskoi foregoes a lengthy discussion in favor of dwelling on several complex questions. The principles of poetic construction include the metric principle, based on the alternation of long and short syllables, and the tonic principle, based on the correctness of the alternation of the accented and unaccented syllables irrespective of their length, and the syllabic principle, based on the equal number of syllables in a poetic line. A bar of music synthesizes into itself both the metric and tonic principles: For music, "the equal length of each of its beats and the correct alternation of accented and unaccented moments are equally important." However, unlike poetry, in music there is no opposition between the metric and tonic principles. Also, he says, a bar of music always begins with a strong beat, whereas a poetic foot may begin with an unstressed foot. Therefore such poetic constructions as the iamb, the amphibrach, the anapest, and the "peon of the third type" (unaccent-unaccent-accent-unaccent), for example, are represented musically with an upbeat, according to Butskoi.

The basic units of construction in poetry are the foot, the joining of accented and unaccented syllables; the poetic line, the joining of a definite number of feet; and the stanza, the joining of poetic lines. Butskoi discusses their application in music and justifies higher constructions in music based on the poetic model:

In music these poetic feet—bars—also are joined into definite groups. Each such group forms a musical poetic line, forming at the end a cadence, which, thus, plays here the role of a musical rhyme.
In other words, it turns out that the notorious four-bar
sentence of classical theory of musical form is, essentially, a musical poetic formation, and not a grammatical [one]: it is nothing different than a poetic line. This is the best evidence of such mixing of phenomena and ideas, which authors of theories of musical metrics and the doctrines of musical form achieved.

But we go further. Similar to how poetic lines are joined into a stanza, musical lines also form their musical-poetic stanza. From this point of view the sixteen-bar period, or double sentence, is nothing different than a musical quatrains: in it four cadences (=rhymes) agree between themselves the same as in a poetic stanza.58

In applying this thought to music Butskoi illustrates musical phrases—by Haydn, Beethoven, Schubert, and Mozart—that contain uneven numbers of measures and chides Prout for making "surgical operations on music," that is, forcing musical phrases to conform to four- or eight-bar units. One example he mentions but does not illustrate is the "six-strophe" scherzo of Beethoven's Sonata, Op. 106, which alternates between seven- and nine-bar strophes in this pattern: 7-7-9-7-9-7. (The actual pattern given in Butskoi's book is 7-7-9-9-7; the reversal of the inner two numbers must be a typographical error, for the phrasing is too consistent and obvious to be so mistaken.) Acknowledging that the study of the musical bar as a musical foot has already been studied in detail, Butskoi calls for further research into the study of musical rhymes and poetic lines, and the study of poetic musical form.

The relationship between the grammatical structure of music and its poetic measurement takes two forms: either they agree, in which case the ictus, the grammatical accent, agrees with the accented, that is, strong or relatively strong, portion of the bar, or they do not, in which case syncopation occurs. Butskoi does not investigate this
relationship beyond the level of the bar/foot. But his examination is significant in that only here does he actually apply the symbols for accented and unaccented beats to his examples. Unfortunately, his application is simply illustrative and utilitarian, rather than illuminative. He follows the beat pattern of each meter faithfully, using two parallel lines over the note (\(=\)) to designate the stronger of the two accented beats in a four-beat measure and a single line over the note (\(-\)) for the weaker of the two accented beats. He does not group any of the beats together. Thus, here he designates the accented and unaccented beats but ignores the grouping; whereas in the previous chapter he indicates the grouping but ignores the accent designations. Thus, unlike Cooper and Meyer, he failed to see the value of combining these two approaches with the principle of hierarchical grouping and the rhythmic analysis on each level.

In his final chapter, Butskoi investigates "The Architectonics of a Musical Work." He discusses first the musical theme and then the general characteristics of musical form. Butskoi equates the musical theme, to which he imparts primary significance, with the content of a musical work:

At the foundation of any musical work, however great and complex it is, always lies definite thematic material, the statement and development of which make up the content of this work. . . . In a musical work there is not one sound outside of the thematic material. . . . A musical theme, in the literal sense, . . . [is] such definite, more or less clearly formed material, from which the musical work mainly is constructed.59

The "simplest structural unit" that lies at the foundation of any theme is what he calls "the thematic element" or the motive, which he defines.
as "the synthesis of different expressive means, realized in the simplest grammatical construction." Thus the thematic element may consist of the same grammatical constructions outlined earlier—"one-moment ictus, etc.

The joining of thematic elements into a more complex thematic formation creates what Butskoi calls "a primary thematic construction"; these may be combined into "secondary thematic constructions," and so on. Example 32.7 illustrates a "multi-tiered" complex theme from Mozart's F major Piano Sonata, K. 547a. Its four levels consist of what is generally called motive—phrase—sentence—period; in Butskoi's terminology these groupings become "thematic element," "primary construction," "secondary construction," and "tertiary" construction. In his analysis Butskoi points out the contrast of the three more static, more gradual thematic elements of the second primary construction to the four "energetic" and descending thematic elements of the first primary construction. The aspects of sound, rhythm, and voicing in the two constructions also contrast. Thus he cites the contrast making up the primary constructions as the "formative principle" of the secondary construction. The latter is then repeated, forming the second secondary construction, with the substitution of an authentic cadence for the half cadence of the first secondary construction. The theme as a whole forms a tertiary construction. Butskoi credits the "great complexity and inner unity" of this theme to the "several different formative principles" present in it.
Example 32.7. Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Sonata for piano, F major, K. 547a, mm. 1-16.

These "formative principles" of primary constructions to which Butskoi refers are well-known: repetition, repetition with development, and the juxtaposition of different thematic elements. Butskoi discusses and illustrates these principles in some detail. Most are quite obvious thematic manipulations, but one of his examples is of slightly greater interest, Debussy's Prelude "Danseuses de Delphes," an example, he says, "of complex changes of grammatical structure together with intonational, rhythmic and dynamic changes." But Butskoi gives
only the evolution of a portion of its basic thematic element, from measure 15 to measure 24 (Example 32.8):

[2nd staff:] At first the construction is shortened, losing its initial sounds of the anacrusis. [3rd staff:] Then occurs a mixing of the ictus from the sound d2 to g1 with the simultaneous rhythmic aggravation of the anacrusis sound e2. The sound e2, earlier entering into the make-up of the anacrusis, now forms a weak ending, and the tempo of the statement is slowed down: the motion of eighth notes is mixed with the motion of quarter notes. Since the energy of the statement is exhausted on this sound e2, then the motion already does not reach the sound d2, earlier having appeared as the central sound. [3rd staff at p:] But then from it is begun a new construction, which after two repetitions is transformed into the anacrusis of a more developed construction [5th and 6th staves].63

But this description only traces the evidence of the changes themselves, i.e., how they occurred; it does not delve into the important question of why these changes took place, their significance and ultimate effect.

Secondary constructions may be formed similarly to the means for primary constructions, but the main principle is that of contrast. Here ButskoI reveals his "discovery" that the more structurally complex a thematic formation is, the less varied are its formative principles. He calculates that Mozart, who used around 50 such formative methods in his symphonies, applied over 30 to the formation of primary constructions, 25 for secondary, 15 for tertiary and only 8 for quartary. He found the principle of repetition, either exact or altered, more frequently in the complex rather than in the simple constructions. But sometimes here also, ButskoI points out, original methods of thematic organization crop up, as in Debussy's fourth Prelude of the first notebook, "Les sons et les parfums," the first twenty-three measures
Example 32.8. Claude Debussy, Prelude No. 1, Premier Livre, "Danseuses de Delphes."

(Example 32.9). His analysis focuses on the harmony, which he singles out as the distinctive feature of the thematic element of the first measure, the amphibrach. Beginning with this first measure, which in addition to the tonic A major also brings out elements of D minor (in A major, the flatted 2 and 7), the entire segment reproduced here
reveals a "dual modality"—the relative keys of A major and F# minor, and F major and D minor. The mode of F# minor first appears with the introduction of the perfect fourth F#-C# in the second measure. F major then appears in measure 4, in the melodic figure C-G-Bb. Further, the augmented tonic triad in measure 9 forms "an original 'middle arithmetic'" between the tonalities of A major (the third A-C#) and D minor-F major (the third E#(F)-A). The episode beginning in measure 18 juxtaposes two dominant seventh chords, one from F# minor (m. 18) and the other F major (m. 19). Butskoi concludes, "Thus, the basic method of the development of the thematic material here is the method of the stratification of the complex tonal nucleus of the first construction, the gradual uncovering of the modal contrasts placed in it." He does not comment on the whole-tone flavor of the portion beginning in measure 9, indicated by the presence of D# and E# in the key of A major. He explains the E# as indicating the key of either D minor or F major. He does not mention the D#. Beginning in measure 9, the D# carries through in either thematic or ostinato form to the beginning of measure 24; it is clearly foreign to either F major or F# minor, the juxtaposition of which Butskoi points out in measures 18-23. Like his other analyses, this one is clearly insufficient.

As a final thought for this section, Butskoi expresses the notion that independent and integral themes are clearer and richer in content than accessory material, which plays a secondary, subordinative role. But, Butskoi points out, "a theme may directly, without sharp borders, transfer into the material following it, and play in this case the role
Example 32.9. Claude Debussy, Prelude No. 4, Premier Livre, "Les sons et les parfums," mm. 1-23.

of a primary impulse for further motion. The theme of the Debussy Prelude just examined is an example of such a sort." This notion,
expressed by Butskoi as an afterthought without much connection to the preceding section, strongly reflects the influence of Asafiev. He obviously is referring to the theme from the first measure, which contains both melodic and harmonic impulses for further motion.

The following section, Butskoi's last, is dedicated to "The General Organization of a Musical Work." It is the character of the treatment of the thematic material, its statement and development, that determines the organization of a musical work. The size and scale of the work itself, its proportions, which Butskoi calls "its first and most general architectonic element," are determined by the "scale of the artistic design and [by] the degree of development of the artistic images, making up the content of this musical work." Butskoi is careful to distinguish between spatial and temporal conceptions; for this reason, he avoids the use of the term symmetry in application to music.

He defines the architectonics of a musical work as "the presence of regularities in the interrelations of separate thematic constructions with each other and with the work as a whole or, speaking briefly, the regularity of relations of the parts and the whole." Therefore, for research into the architectonics of a musical work he proposes three basic areas: 1) "the regularities of the use of each structural element," 2) "the regularities of different structural elements between themselves," and 3) "the interrelations of all structural elements in relation to the entire musical work." Chief among such regularities are those involving thematic material, "since [it] is the
carrier of the musical content and directly depends on the character and degree of the development of the ideas and images of a musical work. All other architectonic regularities directly or indirectly are subordinated to this basic [one].

In forming the foundation of the architectonics of a musical work, thematic material may be utilized according to five principles: 1) exposition, 2) repetition, 3) antithesis, 4) reprise, and 5) development. By "appearing between themselves in definite logical interconnections," these principles make up the form of a musical work; and "since the categories of such interconnections is small, then all musical forms are grouped around a small number of basic schemes." Butskoi identifies five basic architectonic schemes: 1) strophic forms (simple and complex two- and three-part forms); 2) simple and complex couplet forms; 3) theme with variations; 4) rondo; and 5) sonata allegro. His discussions of these forms are unremarkable except that he posits the origin of the sonata allegro form as the three-part form rather than the rounded two-part form. He calls the sonata allegro form "the most synthetic form," which contains "all the basic architectonic principles." He also recognizes but does not identify the existence of mixed forms.

Butskoi also discusses secondary thematic material, which he groups into three categories—introductory, connecting and concluding (similar to Asafiev's "i : m: t"). In a semantic sense introductory material expresses the "primary impulse of a musical work." This impulse may range from single moment sound impulses to cadential con-
structions to entire introductions, which may be independent in both
content and form; and the impulse may either agree or contrast with the
main theme that follows. Connecting and concluding material will also
vary in derivation, scope and independence, depending on the overall
form of the musical work.

To conclude his work, Butskoi attempts to place musical form in
its sociological and aesthetic contexts. Here he expresses typically
Marxist ideas that he probably derived from Asafiev. To begin, he
relates the process of content to forms of both musical and human
thought:

The analysis of the character of the use of thematic material
in a musical work is, essentially, the analysis of the logical
principles of the disclosure of the content of musical thought.
But musical thought, as any thought in general, is a process,
which possesses not only its content but also the definite form of
its course. These forms of musical thought turn out to be a very
essential influence on the structure of a musical work.

The forms of human thought are defined, in the first place,
by the interrelations that are established in a definite moment of
the historical development of human society between the conscious-
ness of man and the reality surrounding it. . . . The social
existence of people defines their consciousness. The reality
surrounding man endows consciousness with concrete content, di-
rects its development and defines the forms of thought
activity.74

There are several conditions of social existence that define these
forms of thought: "the complexity of social existence, the realization
of this existence, [and] the direction and degree of the concentrat-
ness of consciousness." He then reduces all the varieties of parti-
cular forms of thought to four basic groups: "empirical linear, empi-
rical diverse, logical linear, and logical varied thought." These
general regularities of the thought process are reflected completely
also in musical thought, and are revealed in a dual manner: "in the character of the reflection of phenomena of reality and in the character of the development by the consciousness of the 'raw' vital material into specifically musical images." Butskoi names four basic types of musical thought, based on the groups of thought outlined above: "primitive monodic thought, associative polyphonic thought, constructive polyphonic thought (in two forms—monothematic and heterothematic polyphony), and developed, utterly concentrated homophonic thought, differentiated into basic melodic line and the different complexity of the accompaniment."

The degree of the development of this "'raw' material of reality," from which musical content is derived, is different; it is ultimately conditioned by "the relation of the artist to life." Art may be representative, naturalistic, or it may be realistic. In the latter case the artist "aspires to transfer into his art a generalized image of the real world, to reveal the inner regularities of the latter." Other types include romantic, mystic and formalistic ("pure") art. In formalistic art "an artist plunges into a process of the organization of the specific material of his art and transforms the expressive means of the latter into self-contained material, and their interrelations—into an end in itself." Thus, Butskoi concludes, "The character of the development of living material into artistic images is directly connected with the world view of the artist, that is, with his understanding and his relation to reality."

Butskoi summarizes his approach, placing content at the forefront.
of musical organization:

And so, the organization of a musical work is conditioned by the complex interactivities of varied architectonic regularities, which may be joined into three groups: First, these are the regularities of the revelation of musical content, defining a sphere of living images, placed at the foundation of this content, of the degree of their generalization and of the characters of the their development in specific musical material; these regularities are reflected in the number of musical basic themes, in their distribution in a musical work, in the characteristics of their development. Second, these are regularities of form of musical thought, defining the degree of complexity, of concentratedness of statement of musical statement. Third, these are regularities of musical language, having been revealed in a definite vocabulary of expressive means, in the characteristics of grammatical and poetic construction of musical speech.

Musical form, then, is created from the synthesis of these different correlations, with content playing the leading role. Butskoi defines musical form according to this approach as "the totality conditioned by social practice of the regularities of the revelation of musical content, expressed in the complex outer division of statement in view of the inner unity of the artistic image and idea."

Butskoi discusses the relationship between form and content. Ideally, the two should correspond and be in complete unity. This unity is what is meant by the idea of the classical in art. But more often form and content clash, due to the relative immaturity of form in new states, unable completely to reveal artistic image. So it changes, searching for new means of expression and new methods of its organization, in the process perfecting itself and adapting itself to content, until the necessary unity is achieved. This process in turn affects the content. Therefore the entire "process of the maturation of form is a complex dialectical process of elimination of the contradictions."
between form and content, in which both elements represent variable values and mutually influence each other." This opposition between form and content arises when old forms clash with new content. Sooner or later the revelation of this opposition between form and content "advances a crisis of form, completed by a revolution, a sudden and quick casting aside of the old form and the substitution for it of a new form, corresponding to the new content." This "crisis" is similar to Asafiev's "intonational crises," and derives from Marxist theory in general.

His definition of artistic style is similar to that of Asafiev's as well:

Each epoch in the moment of its flowering, in the moment of stabilization, develops a particular art. This art possesses its typical sphere of artistic images, its expressive means, its type of thought and its forms. The synthesis of all these special features, typical for the given epoch, is what is called artistic style.87

**Criticism and Legacy.** Butskoi's work was in the process of being printed when the February Resolution of 1948 was issued. He remarks on this in the foreword, and, as he relates, was reluctant to delay the publication of the book in order to include in it "a full illumination of the problems advanced in the resolution." Instead he hoped to mollify any unfavorable impression the book might make by stating,

[My] book, posing a number of the most important questions of musicology, plays its positive role in the working-out of the foundations of Marxist aesthetics, at least as material for a creative scientific discussion. Any research of new phenomena, as also any application of new methods of scientific analysis always goes through an initial stage of preliminary conclusions and
generalizations. The offered work also represents a system of such preliminary conclusions and generalizations. Further research of the author and of other musicologists will test the correctness of the positions stated in the book, will deepen and expand them, and will reject the mistaken [ones]. As stated by the author in the introduction, a full and comprehensive interpretation of problems raised in the work is not for the strengths of one man: this is a matter of the combined efforts of a collective of Soviet musicologists. The author appeals to his comrades in art for such collective work on the creation of firm foundations of Marxist musicology.89

Unfortunately for Butskoi, though, his work did not escape criticism by his colleagues. At the 1949 Congress, he was criticized for overemphasizing Western theorists at the expense of Russian theorists, for quoting German modernistic music (Strauss!) and neglecting Soviet music, for ignoring the content of musical works, and for quoting Marx and Engles only to cover up the "poverty" of his "formalistic" work. These are typical criticisms that reflect the xenophobia and zealousness of the time. Yet, considering the actual origin of so many of his ideas, his almost complete disregard for his fellow Russian and Soviet theorists is a huge oversight. And for all his political and philosophical theorizing, Butskoi fails to fulfill his goal for this book, that is, to reveal methods for the analysis of both the form and content of artistic images in musical works. He concentrates on the former at the expense of the latter. As for definite content, he goes not much further than the eighteenth-century doctrine of Affektenlehre. I have omitted any discussion of this aspect because Butskoi's own coverage of it is so meager and unremarkable. This is a major stumbling-block for Soviet theorists, of course, as we saw in the last chapter. Of course, the development of a true "theory of musical
content" that would provide a usable and consistent approach to the analysis of content in the same systematic manner that form itself is analyzed would be a major achievement in the annals of Soviet music theory. But given the subjective nature of music and the diversity of its styles and forms of expression such a goal is unattainable. Soviet music's close ties to folk music perhaps provides something in this regard, provided, of course, the intention of the composer is to invoke the feelings or events connected with the use of a particular folk song. This whole question is beyond the scope of the present study, but it is one that certainly requires additional investigation.

Butskoi's work is most successful as a broad compendium of stylistic and formal characteristics capable of being analyzed. It is not completely comprehensive, though, in that certain aspects are neglected. For example, he overemphasizes the melodic thematic aspect of form at the expense of the harmonic foundation. This is apparent particularly in his all-too-brief and misleading discussion of sonata form, in which he ignores completely the tonal contrasts inherent in the form (as well as its binary nature, as I already pointed out).

Butskoi's most useful contributions lie in his attempts at a syntex of musical grammar, including rhythmic analysis, derived from and yet distinct from poetic interpretations of music, and in his hierarchical approach to phrase structure. Yet in many cases his discussions and analyses are incomplete and all too frequently he leaves the reader in the dark as to the actual application of a structure to a particular motive or theme.
Butskoi's work was one of the first in Soviet musicology specifically to address the relationship between form and content; yet it had little immediate impact on Soviet music theory, largely due to the timing of its appearance. The existence and publication of a work on such a topic illustrates the level to which Soviet theory was reduced following the changes implemented in the previous two decades. Innovation, particularly in the theoretical sense but even in the application of Marxist theory, fell off to such a degree as to be almost nonexistent. Also, the issues Butskoi attempts to investigate were still in the process of being definitively formulated. Indeed, Butskoi irritates the reader by constantly repeating the same maxims but without the benefit of their actual application. Its methodical approach tends to classify it more as a textbook, but Butskoi did not specify it as such.
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Chapter 33

Viktor Osipovich Berkov and Theories of Harmony

Viktor Osipovich Berkov (1907-19). Berkov is a prominent Soviet theorist who wrote his most important works after 1950; these include a study of the relationship between harmony and musical form, and a study of Rimsky-Korsakov's harmony textbook. Nevertheless, his works from the late 1930s and 1940s are significant and instructive as well, for they help to reveal the prevalent topics and trends of theory, the attitude towards theory, and the climate surrounding it during this period under discussion. Further, Berkov, like most of his colleagues, willing or not, had a role in the events of the late 1940s; and therefore knowledge of his place in the general picture is essential. His analytical study of Glinka's harmonic language forms the main part of our focus, with attention also to smaller works preceding it.

Berkov graduated in 1929 from Moscow University in economics. He later studied at the Moscow Conservatory and graduated in 1937 in history and theory. From 1935 to 1944 he taught theory at various schools. From 1938 to 1949 he taught theory at the Conservatory and worked on a graduate degree, first as assistant to I. V. Sposobin and later as an assistant professor in the theory department. He again

His one published article from the 1930s, "Uvertiura k 'Russlanu i Liudmila'" [The overture to *Russlan and Liudmila*], was discussed in Part VII. He wrote some popular guides to Rimsky-Korsakov operas and a work devoted to Glinka's *Ruslan i Liudmila* during the late 1930s and 1940s, but his only theory book from this period is *The Harmony of Glinka*. In 1977 Berkov published a collection of his articles, some of which date from the 1930s and 1940s and had never before been published. The works completed between the years 1939 and 1948 consist mainly of research conducted in connection with his graduate studies at the Conservatory or at various institutes. Two concern the music of Prokofiev, one the artistic views of Glinka, and one the question of functional theory in pre-revolutionary Russia. The last-named article is of particular interest. I will investigate these articles before turning to his major work on Glinka.

**Articles, 1939-1948.** The first such work, "Instrumental'noe tvorchestvo S. Prokof'eva" [The instrumental work of S. Prokofiev], which Berkov presented in 1939 to the Leningrad State Institute of Theater, Music, and Cinema, consists of proposed theses for a work analyzing some of Prokofiev's instrumental works. Although the Institute approved the work, Berkov never wrote the work as planned.
Instead, he incorporated many of these theses into later works. This research makes up one of the first attempts by a Soviet theorist to study the works of Prokofiev. No less a personage than Asafiev read this work; his comments made on a copy of the manuscript have been published along with the theses.

Berkov presents thirteen theses in all. The first seven deal with general traits of Prokofiev's music and with those predecessors who influenced him either positively (Scarlatti, French clavichordists, Mozart, Schubert, Russian music, folk song, and contemporary music) or negatively (Scriabin). The next five theses trace the evolution of Prokofiev's creativity, beginning with the "Classical Symphony," and continuing with "Scythian Suite," "Sarcasms," and various piano works. Berkov refers here to specific traits in Prokofiev's music as embodied in these compositions, such as the aspects of irony and grotesqueness in "Sarcasms," lyricism in the Piano Sonata No. 2, and so forth. The thirteenth and final thesis is dedicated to the theoretical analysis of the special features of Prokofiev's music—form, harmony, melody, rhythm, and other factors—along with a discussion of the general characteristics of his style. Berkov planned to conclude his study with a complete analysis of the Piano Sonata No. 2. Among the special characteristics of Prokofiev's music that Berkov observes are the clarity and classicism of form, the novel harmonic features (the combination of chromatic with diatonic chords; its functionality, bold deviations and harmonic displacements; and the use of both simple and complex chords), melodic types (angular with leaps, smooth diatonicism, and smooth
chromaticism), and rhythmic favorites (duple meters, clarity, foursquareness).

Asafiev's remarks illuminate several aspects of Berkov's assertions. For example, in the first set of theses, Berkov states that Prokofiev is a carrier of the classical musical tradition. Asafiev asks if he is being sarcastic. Also, Asafiev points out the influence of Grieg, whom Berkov does not mention. In connection with Berkov's outline of the path of Prokofiev's creative development in the next set of theses, Asafiev several times mentions important anecdotal or other information needed for a discussion of the history and genesis of a particular work. Alongside Berkov's analytical observations Asafiev corrects Berkov regarding rhythm, pointing out Prokofiev's accented and not formally-measured rhythm, and asks for attention to questions of instrumentation, orchestration, symphonism, and pianistic and orchestral writing. In conclusion he points to insufficient attention to the historical aspects of Prokofiev's creativity, to his place in contemporary music, and to his abilities as a performer and how this influenced his style.

Berkov wrote the other work on Prokofiev published in this collection, "Sonaty dlia fortepiano Sergeia Prokof'eva (I-IV)" [The sonatas for fortepiano of Sergei Prokofiev (I-IV)], in 1945 in fulfillment of the plan of the Commission on Soviet Music, directed by R. I. Gruber, in the Scientific Research Cabinet of the Moscow Conservatory, under the general direction of Asafiev. But between this work and the preceding one, Berkov wrote several other papers (as yet unpublished)—
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"Nekotorye osobennosti stilia Prokof'eva" [Several special features of the style of Prokofiev] (read at the Central Correspondence Musical Pedagogical Institute in Moscow in 1940), "Voprosy stilia Prokof'eva" [Questions of the style of Prokofiev] (read at a Scientific Session of the Moscow Conservatory during its exile in Saratov in 1942), and a work on the same theme for the Composer's Union in Moscow, 1943. He used material from all these papers in his study of the sonatas.

The four sonatas discussed are Sonata No. 1, Op. 1, F minor (1909), Sonata No. 2, Op. 14, D minor (1912), Sonata No. 3, Op. 28, A minor (1907–1917), and Sonata No. 4, Op. 29, C minor (1908–1917). In the introduction to the analyses of these works, Berkov emphasizes Prokofiev's historical roots, mainly eighteenth-century classicism, nineteenth-century Russian music, and French impressionism, and discusses the main traits of his pianistic works, for example, vertical and horizontal voicing, the individuality of the voices, motion in parallel thirds, the use of seconds, ostinato, and organ point. For each sonata Berkov analyzes the usual elements—form, melody, harmony, tonality, rhythm, meter, theme, methods of development (contrapuntal, variational, and modulatory means), types of statement and motion, and imagery, an obligatory part of every Soviet analysis. His methods of analysis are on the whole unremarkable, and regarding the purely theoretical aspects differ little from a Western descriptive-type analysis. Occasionally, though, he uses terms and approaches derived only from Russian and Soviet theory, for example, the term "anaclausis" to describe the dominant preparation before the recapitulation in the sonata.
form (Yavorsky), his reference to "the symphonic principle of its development" in discussing the "variants, the transformations of basic images," "the constant growth, renewals in the first movement of the Second Sonata," (Asafiev) and the term "intonational" (Asafiev).

Berkov's explanations of Prokofiev's well-known tonal and modulatory leaps and displacements are of interest. As he points out, these sudden leaps often may be better understood in a formal context. For example, in the first movement of the Second Sonata, the recapitulation begins with a tonal displacement. This arises because in the immediately preceding anacrusis section, Prokofiev uses not the customary dominant of the key, but the dominant of the key a minor second lower from the main key, so that a leap of a tritone from the key of the anacrusis to the key of the recapitulation is effected. Berkov calls this a "minor-second substitution," which Prokofiev uses frequently enough to be recognizable as "the Prokofiev dominant." But in another discussion, this time of the one-movement Third Sonata, Berkov appears shocked by Prokofiev's tonal displacement from A minor to Eb minor at the close of the first construction of the main part, when in fact this too may be explained as another occurrence of "the Prokofiev dominant." The Eb minor substitutes for the dominant of A minor, which usually would appear in a similar spot. A slightly different minor-second displacement crops up in this same sonata at the juncture from the connecting part to the secondary part:

The impression is created that C# minor is the goal of the tonal development of the connecting part and that in this tonality the secondary part will be stated. However, unexpectedly it
becomes clear that the true tonal goal is C major, the traditional parallel [relative] tonality for the secondary part. Here an analogy with a false and a true recapitulation arises. The Prokofievian deviation, the displacement is usually clear. But the modulatory process in large sections in Prokofiev frequently is deprived of a definite functionally perceptible task.¹⁰

Berkov's analysis of the Scherzo of the Second Sonata is also interesting; he analyzes it not according to "its intonational structure, its harmony" but from the sole point of view of its "motorness," its rhythm. His method in this type of analysis is to treat rhythmic figures as thematic motives, in order to show "the unity, the unbroken-ness of the rhythmic motion of the Scherzo... the rhythmic monolithic nature of the Scherzo." Essentially the rhythm of the Scherzo consists of a background of equal eighth-notes, against which the figure eighth-note—quarter-note flares up like a fire, to paraphrase Berkov. The trio is similarly hypnotic, but lacks the equal motion of the eighth-notes. Many of Berkov's observations regarding Prokofiev's music subsequently served as a foundation for the growing body of writings in Russian theory about his music, particularly his harmony, to which much attention has been devoted in the last thirty years.¹³

More intriguing is Berkov's article, "К вопросу о функциональной теории в России (Stasov, Serov, Larosh, Taneev)" [On the question of functional theory in Russia (Stasov, Serov, Larosh, Taneev)], written in 1948 at the initiative of S. S. Skrebkov and included in the plan of work for the kafedra of music theory of the Moscow Conservatory. Berkov wrote this article, a history of the development of views on functional theory in Russia before the revolution, according to his editor, "to substantiate the organic nature of functional conceptions
in general, and in Russia in particular." Berkov thus continues the work of Mazel and Ryzhkin on the history of music theory in Russia. His article appears to be part of an effort to claim Russian hegemony in the development of functional theory (see Chapter 35 also).

Berkov outlines the main concepts of functionality as follows:

the idea about groups of chords of subdominant and dominant, about the abundance and variety of ideas of separate functions, about the varied filling out of the basic circular turn $T\rightarrow S\rightarrow D\rightarrow T$, about the principle of the interconnection of chords in development (the role of "environment"), the shifting of functional connections in tonal relations and about the inner development in tonality.  

He also emphasizes the limit of functionality's application to the era of major-minor thought. Yet in spite of the existence of these basic positions, Berkov concludes that functionality has no "united core," no "basic, essential, primary position," no "united genuine foundation, a clear originating 'central' point, from which all remaining [points] would logically arise." He laments the inattention to melody and its connections with harmony, even though this is not, he points out, endemic to functionality. And because of "its ability to regulate the variety of harmonic phenomena thanks to its unification around three functions," functionality poses "the potential threat of the leveling of individuality in chords and their connections."

Berkov investigates the views of Stasov, Serov, Larosh, and Taneev as proponents of functional harmony in pre-revolutionary Russia. However, Berkov points out, these critics and theorists did not use functional terminology specifically; they only applied the ideas implicit in functional theory. The actual terms "function" and "functionality"
applied to harmony were not used in Russia until the 1920s and 1930s. Also, the idea of functional theory that Berkov discusses here is not limited to the positions outlined above, but represents the special Russian version of functional theory developed in the 1920s and 1930s.

For Stasov, Berkov focuses on his 1958 article, "O nekotorykh novykh formakh nyneishnee muzyki" [On several new forms of present music], in which Stasov examines the application of the church modes and Eastern elements in mid-nineteenth century European music, mainly Beethoven and Chopin. Along with Odoevsky, Stasov was one of the first Russian musicologists to analyze the modal aspect in music. Berkov summarizes Stasov's basic conclusion, which he calls "far-sighted" and "original for his time": "The old [church] modes, and also the different traits of "Eastern" music represent not an exclusive quality of a certain kind of music, but belong to the entire musical art [and] penetrate works of different character." Thus, church modes in particular may be utilized not just in church music, but in all forms of music, "instrumental and vocal, dramatic and lyrical."

With particular relevancy for functional theory, Stasov devotes some attention to the question of plagal cadences in the music of Beethoven, Chopin, and Glinka. He considers Beethoven's music the originating point for the development of the plagal quality in European music at that time. Berkov points out the relevance of this approach for Soviet music theory:

Functional analysis, which goes deep into the sphere of plagal relations, acquires in our musicology special coloring. Having possibly received the first push in the works of Stasov,
Russian theoretical thought in the future was not able to avoid this theme; even the musical practice of the Russian school itself advanced the theme of plagal quality to a prominent place.22

As we saw in Part IV, Larosh also advocated the study and application of the church modes, in his articles on the historical approach to the study of music theory. Berkov observes the significance of this for functional theory:

According to the thought of Larosh, the penetration into the special features of old modes [and] into their interrelations with major and minor ought to fertilize [and] improve our general harmonic knowledge. And really—here this is appropriate to stress—such functionalism in the sphere of harmony, which in agreement with Stasov and Larosh takes into account in full measure the significance of old modes [and] of musical practice itself, is induced to flexibility; alongside the more usual formulas of functional relations, special original formulas in the sense of both the succession of functions and the choice of chords are noticed and fixed.24

Berkov considers Larosh's historical approach in general valuable for functionalism: "Functional concepts are near to the historical method. Functionalism in Russia received stimuli for progress in Larosh's works."

As does Larosh, Serov advocates the study of melody as well as harmony, and emphasizes the vocal, contrapuntal genesis of harmony in his theoretical articles written in the 1850s and 1860s, also discussed in Part IV. And he criticizes general-bass practice for ignoring the melodic side of composition and points to the inattention of general bass to the question of the logical structure of harmony. About these views Berkov remarks, "Essentially here is had in view functionalism, which is raised to the highest degree, when in the analysis of harmony the melodic factor will be involved, as far as this is possi-
Serov also observes the importance of the consideration of the surrounding chords in making a harmonic analysis, which is a well-known functional position—the role of the environment for the correct understanding of harmony.

The functional harmonic orientation of Taneev, his "modal tonal, deeply functional conception" and "the application of this conception to a wide musical historical reality," is clear from his statements made in the introduction to his book on moveable counterpoint and from his analyses of Beethoven sonatas as discussed in Part V. Berkov quotes Taneev's views as expressed in the introduction rather extensively, dwelling in particular on his statement regarding the grouping of chords around one central chord and the interrelations between chords and tonalities within and between sections. Berkov summarizes Taneev's functional approach:

From the words of Taneev it follows, first of all, that he represented a radius of activity of the tonic chord in a very wide plan, [and] he points to numbers of chords, grouped around tonic; second, Taneev speaks about one central tonic chord, thereby not accepting the thought about a tonic group of chords, understanding the center in the strict sense of the work and in correlation with actual artistic practice; third, Taneev in connection with questions about modulations and deviations speaks about a varied tonal whole, [and] essentially states the thought about functions of a higher order—statements about the grouping of secondary tonalities around the main [tonality]; fourth, Taneev emphasizes the inter-influence of tonalities in the process of development of the whole, in which connection [he] observes the extensive diapason of this interactivity (the influence of the beginning of a song on its end).29

Berkov also summarizes Taneev's views towards contemporary harmony and compositional practices, which would eventually cause "the entire modal functional tonal superstructure, and at the same time the entire artis-
tic, speaking with the words of Taneev, 'organic whole'.... to collapse." In his analyses of Beethoven sonatas, Taneev reveals the existence of joining tonalities and joining tonalities of a higher order, "possessing functional dependencies and cementing the varied tonal whole."

Berkov summarizes the contributions of each of these theorists:

Stasov, then particularly Larosh attracted attention to the enriching ideas about major and minor (the old modes), [and] (Serov and Larosh) persistently propagated the approach to harmony "from the side" of melody. With this they pointed the way to the improvement of the functional conception, of methods of harmonic analysis on its basis. Serov and Larosh promoted the task of research into the history of harmony. Taneev formulated major positions of the functional theory of harmony in the generally accepted significance of this idea. Functionalism is contained in the textbooks of harmony of Chaikovsky and Rimsky-Korsakov, though the terminology of these guides does not always reveal this. Thus the prerevolutionary Russian theory of music introduced a valuable contribution to the evolution of functionalism.

Thus for Berkov the main functional contributions of the critics Stasov, Serov, and Larosh involve the modal, melodic and historical aspects of functionalism. However, even by Berkov's own oblique admission, these aspects are less significant as major positions of functionalism than the more purely harmonic aspects that he initially describes. In the latter sense, Taneev (and Stasov in his discussion of the plagal element) is closer to functionalism than the others, who anticipate functionalism only in its more Russian embodiment. In other words, the melodic, modal, and harmonic aspects pointed out by Berkov constitute Russia's contribution to their unique brand of functional theory, which differs from Western interpretations. Berkov makes this clear when he mentions in the above quote "the improvement of the
functional conception, of methods of harmonic analysis on its basis."

As a result, when discussing nineteenth-century Russian functional theory, one is not referring to precursors of functional theory as developed in the West by Riemann and others, but to unique threads of thought that eventually were woven into the fabric of Russian functionalism, which is a particular blend of modal thought derived from Yavorsky and functional harmonic thought derived from Riemann (through Gevaert and Catoire). A feeling for purely harmonic function did exist, though, in nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century Russian theory—witness Stasov, Rimsky-Korsakov (as pointed out in Part IV), Taneev, and Yavorsky. In this sense it is possible to view the adoption of Western ideas of functionalism as merely the expression of a tendency already present in Russian music theory. Had it not already existed, the Russians would have had to "invent" functionalism. Functionalism as it developed in Russia, then, turns out to be a melding of the two strands of thought in Russian theory—the linear and the chordal. Yet one cannot say that the Russians "invented" or "discovered" functionalism in its specific manifestation; this remains Riemann's contribution, despite what the Soviets may have claimed.

Berkov's "Harmony of Glinka". Berkov's major work from this period, Garmoniia Glinki [The harmony of Glinka], is the first such large-scale work of its kind in the Soviet Union. It is representative of a genre of Soviet works published since—the theoretical study of the harmonic language of a specific composer. Several articles of
this sort were written in the 1930s, and are investigated in Part VII.
The value of these works is directly proportional to the innovative style of the composer investigated and to the analytical skills of the theorist undertaking the study. In Berkov's case this work is on an intermediate level. It is thorough but rather predictable. But, as mentioned, it is worth examining because of what it and reactions to it reveal about the state of Soviet music theory in the 1940s.

Berkov's basic goal in this work is to analyze the harmony of Glinka and to establish its more distinctive characteristics. His secondary goal is to formulate several general theoretical opinions about harmony. But he admits to a lack of originality on his part: "If these theoretical opinions do not pretend, on the whole, to a particular novelty, then they, in any case, seem to us necessary for the explanation of the theoretical point of view of the author." In the ensuing discussion I will reverse the order of Berkov's intentions and concentrate primarily on Berkov's methods of analysis and his general conclusions on harmony and secondarily on the specifics of Glinka's harmonic language.

As to general philosophical methods, Berkov outlines the basic Marxist positions already familiar to us—the historical method, the interrelation of elements, the derivation of theory from practice, attention to content and expressiveness and the like. He justifies his concentration on harmony, which he considers "one of the most important factors of musical speech in the creation of a composer," rather than a comprehensive study of all the elements, in this manner:
The theme of our work is justified, in our view, not only theoretically, but also by the huge role [of harmony] in Glinka's music. It is true that in Glinka's music we almost do not know a work, do not know even separate episodes, in which harmony would subordinate to itself the remaining components (melody, rhythm). Such a full reign of harmony, as is well-known, is met in the Impressionists. In Glinka's music the striking, active saturated harmony is found usually in a proportional correlation (in the sense of the significance in a general musical context) with a song-like, wide, rich melody, with a varied, inspired rhythm. This classical even temper of Glinka corresponds to his general aesthetics.35

Thus, although the main topic is harmony, Berkov is careful to include attention to other elements. However, he cautions that his study is neither exhaustive nor complete (a typical Soviet disclaimer); he mentions in this regard instrumentation and polyphony, to which he devotes less attention than other elements. Under harmony he includes such topics as the vertical aspect, tertian constructions, mode, gravitation, stable and unstable chords, harmonic motion, the functional relations of all other chords to tonic, and the harmonic content of the melody and voiceleading. As in his article on prerevolutionary Russian functionalism, he points to the extreme in functionality of the leveling of the specific nature of separate harmonies, which in his application he hopes to avoid.

Berkov focuses his study on the works of Glinka's mature period, which begins with the compositions from the years 1834–1836. To establish Glinka's influences and to trace his creative path, he devotes the first chapter to a discussion of Glinka's early works. He posits three general sources of Glinka's harmonic language—Russian folk song, Russian music and musical life, and classical and romantic culture. He
considers Russian folk music the most important source of Glinka's musical language, an influence more evident in his melody than in his harmony. He lists the following general traits of the harmony of Russian folk song as observed by Soviet theorists: diatonicism; old modes, particularly Aeolian (natural minor); variability of diatonic modes; and plagal harmony. Of these Glinka used most typically modal variability and plagal harmonies. And the harmonic minor is more characteristic for Glinka than the natural minor. Berkov sees the need to expand the current ideas about the characteristics of folk song in music. He points out that the old modes do not constitute the only indication of Russian folk harmony; that other factors of music, particularly melody, must also be evaluated when judging the extent of the folk element in harmony; and that one must consider "not only the basic peasant folklore, but also the so-called urban folklore." Berkov proposes that the folk harmonic traits in Glinka's music are also found in Western Romantic music contemporary to Glinka and that such traits appear in Glinka's music "in a romantic shell. . . . In Glinka's music Russian folk song and general romantic tendencies are mixed together." His suggestion that the folk elements in Glinka's music may have entered his style filtered through Western romanticism was not popular among Berkov's contemporaries, as we shall see.

Berkov investigates three main categories of harmonic thought: mode, chord structure, and function, which may include both chord and tonal function and tonal organization. Chord structure is possibly the least innovative and interesting category, for Glinka used tertian
chords exclusively, triads, seventh and ninth chords, and limited his chromatic alterations to just a few instances, namely the Neapolitan, augmented dominant and augmented sixth chords. His chordal repertory therefore is basically classical. His originality lies in their application and connection, which derives from folk music, and will be discussed in connection with harmonic function.

Glinka and Mode. Glinka's modal language derives from the early romantic manifestation of the major and minor modes. For Glinka this consists of the hegemony of the major mode, in both natural and harmonic views, with the addition of certain chords derived from corresponding minor modes. This results in what Berkov (and other Russian theorists beginning with Catoire) calls the major-minor mode, which holds the intermediate position between the other two systems in the harmonic language based on major and minor modes, the diatonic and chromatic systems. Because the reigning major mode is penetrated by the parallel (and sometimes relative) minor mode subordinate to it, Berkov refers to this occurrence as the "minorization of major." Berkov explains Glinka's preference for the harmonic minor over the natural minor as the influence of urban folklore, for which the harmonic minor is characteristic, over peasant folklore, characterised by the natural minor. But the harmonic minor is equally characteristic for Western classic and romantic music, which Berkov acknowledges was a potent source for Glinka's language, so his attempted derivation of it from the so-called "urban" folklore, whatever that is, seems exaggerated.
Berkov discusses separately each significant aspect of Glinka's modal language—the harmonic major; the major triads in the major mode derived from the parallel minor (bIII, bVI, bVII); harmonies from relative tonalities such as III in major (the dominant of the relative minor) and vi in minor ("Schubertian"); and the major third cycle, which involves the use of some of these derived harmonies (III and bVI, for example). Berkov divides these chords very broadly into those with subdominant function (those on 6) and those with dominant function (those on 3 and 7). Use of the harmonic major mode, with the lowered sixth degree, affects chords of both dominant and subdominant function. Dominant function chords include the diminished seventh chord and the minor ninth chord on the leading tone; subdominant function chords include the minor triad on 4 and the seventh chord on 2. In discussing Glinka's applications of each of these harmonies—those derived from both major and minor modes—Berkov attempts to generalize about their specific location, function and expressiveness. For example, he points out that Glinka applies the harmonies of the harmonic major in several ways: a direct juxtaposition of both the natural and harmonic forms of a triad as a softening of the major mode; a direct manifestation of an altered triad after tonic, particularly in the beginning of a theme; and as part of concluding turns and in additions. Berkov also notes some special effects in the use of the minor subdominant on 4, a particular favorite of Glinka's: "a) a 'running to' of the minor subdominant, the intensive expressiveness in these cases, their connection with culminations; b) a subsiding, an "appeasement" in
conclusions; [and] c) the application of the minor subdominant after triads of the natural second degree."

To illustrate another case, Berkov observes two ways in which Glinka uses the major triad bVI, either mostly in concluding turns, not in an interrupted cadence, but as one of the subdominant chords in the tonality with no modulatory deviation into the lowered sixth degree, or as a local tonic, arising in the process of a modulatory deviation, that is, with its own dominant and subdominant. As one of the subdominant chords it is preceded primarily by tonic.

The idea of the variability of modes, which is a specific folk idiom, appears widespread in Glinka's music. Berkov defines this idea:

Under the variability of modes we understand the change of modes within one regular construction, for instance a period, in which connection the tonics of the modal tonalities should be sufficiently clearly revealed. Variability is manifested more strongly when in the course of a regular construction (a period) occurs a repeated change of modes, as a result of which is created a dual feeling: modes in equal measure, or almost in equal measure, pretend to hegemony.

Variability is felt also in such cases when a regular construction (a period) begins and develops in one mode, but finishes in another. There is much in common between such variability and modulatory periods (are had in view modulatory periods with a change of mode). However between both phenomena there are differences, allowing the establishment of a border.

Do not forget that we are speaking about specific Russian folk song variability. It is expressed in the process of the alternation between diatonic old modes, in particular Aeolian and Ionian.40

Moving from minor to relative major is common in Western music; there is nothing particularly Russian in that. It is the changing of modes back and forth, for example within a minor construction (minor--relative major--minor), that is the Russian characteristic of relative modes. In Glinka's music this variability takes shape most frequently
in the change of major to relative minor and back. Berkov gives an
illustration, the chorus of oarsmen from the first act of Ivan Susanin
"Led v polon reku zabral" (Example 33.1). It alternates between C
major and its relative A minor, with a concluding cadence on the
dominant of C major.

As a result of the respective positions of the relative tonality
(located "in the process of the inner development of the musical
thought") and of the dominant (at the end of the entire construction),
Berkov concludes, "the location in the form of the dominant tonality
turns out to be more significant, more weighty, than the location of
the relative tonality." However, he continues, "the parallel minor
is prepared 'to outshine' the tonality of the dominant:

First, the relative minor . . . is given also in the end of the
constructions, [which are], it is true, less final; after the
cadences follow caesurae. Second, these cadences are emphasized
by melodic curving. Third, the relative minor emphasizes the fact
that, after the cadential completion in it of the first part of
the construction, the last part of the construction is begun by
it. Picking up through a caesura the relative minor and pushing
off from it, the last part of the construction is completed on the
dominant. Fourth, one should observe the relative length of the
stay in the relative minor. . . . We note that the correlation
major—relative minor appears in the chorus twice, and the stay on
the dominant is once.42

Berkov sees in this construction, based on the accent in the concluding
modulation on the tonality of the dominant, a latent proximity to a
typical classical formula, which still remains less significant,
though, than the variability of the construction.

Other modal elements Glinka utilized include certain Eastern and
Spanish flavors (Hungarian and Gypsy modes for the former and a certain
Example 33.1. Mikhail Ivanovich Glinka, Ivan Susanin, Act I, No. 3, Scene and chorus: chorus of oarsmen, "Led v polon reku zabral."
Phrygian shape for the latter) and what Berkov calls "prerequisites of new modes," that is, signs of the modes developed by Yavorsky. Because of the hegemony of major and minor in Glinka's music, Berkov hesitates to acknowledge the full presence of any of these Yavorskian modes, but he recognizes the existence of certain of their characteristics. For example, the whole-tone scale, an indication of the augmented mode, represents the fantastic image of Chernomor in "Ruslan i Liudmila." But he cautions that in major-minor conditions, these elements (for example, the augmented triad, the whole-tone scale, tertian juxtapositions, diminished seventh chord) usually do have a different function. Also, in order definitely to judge the presence of any mode, it is necessary to have not just one element but a combination of different elements and a clear relationship between stability and instability (tonic and dominant). For the augmented mode, which is the only such mode for which Berkov finds any prerequisites, these different elements would include the whole-tone scale, major third cycles of tonalities, the augmented sixth chord and the augmented triad, in both melodic and harmonic views. In several well-known instances in "Ruslan" only one augmented element is present, for example the whole-tone scale for the image of Chernomor and the augmented triad in the March of Chernomor. Berkov cites two examples from "Ruslan" in which strong prerequisites of the augmented mode are present: portions of "Lezginka" (Example 33.2a and b), and Ruslan's aria from Act II (Example 33.2c). In the first example, the augmented triad appears in a tonic role, as a stability. In the second, Berkov sees a "grain of the augmented mode":
Example 32.2. Mikhail Ivanovich Glinka, Russlan i Liudmila [Ruslan and Liudmila]: a) Act IV, No. 20: "Lezginka," concluding part, mm. 296–307; b) "Lezginka," mm. 61–62; c) Act II, No. 8: Ruslan's Aria, coda.
The links of ascending whole-tone sequences consist of two major triads in the relation of tonic and the lowered sixth degree. In the last link there is a change: instead of the closing E major triad, C# minor is substituted (the previous chord became dominant). In the links of sequences (two-bar) the augmented triad is latent; we turn attention to the vocal part: the basses form almost a full whole-tone scale.43

Overall, in the application of new moods, Berkov views Glinka as an innovator and that "on the path of modal creation Glinka defined his time." 44

**Glinka and Function.** Berkov's discussion of harmonic function (harmonic development) in Glinka's music concentrates almost entirely on Glinka's penchant for the subdominant. He bases his study on Glinka's closed musical thoughts or periods, that is, the more stable areas. Here, he says, the basic tendencies of harmonic development are reflected more clearly, consistently, and distinctly than in more open portions located in middle segments or development sections. Glinka's "plagalness" is expressed in alternations between tonic and subdominant within phrases, and, on a broader scale, deviations and modulations into subdominant tonalities. These practices depart from classical tradition and reflect more the trends and influences, according to Berkov, of Russian folk song and Western romanticism:

For [Glinka] in the development of the harmony of a closed musical thought the more or less imposing exposition of tonic and subdominant, the postponing of dominant, the position of it in such conditions (specifically metric) in which it turns out to be significantly more weak in effect than the subdominant is regular. This principle is accomplished by Glinka with as much consistency and definiteness as any of the Western romantics. Here we find one of the important traits of the harmonic language of Glinka, reflecting in individual form Russian folklore and general romantic tendencies.45
Frequently combined with these tonic-subdominant alternations is a
tonic organ point, in which case the subdominant often takes the form
of the seventh chord on the second degree. Since Glinka generally
prefers the major mode to the minor, he very often will use the harmo-
nic form in addition to or instead of the natural form, which provides
a minor subdominant.

Berkov makes an interesting if not quite accurate comparison
between a fugue melody by Glinka and a similar one by Haydn, his
baroque-style fugue subject from the String Quartet in F minor, Op. 20,
No. 5, "Fuga a due Soggetti," both shown in Example 33.3, in order "to
show how in different styles the same intonations, depending on the
different tendencies in the sphere of functional relations, of harmonic
development, are filled by different harmonic content." The crux of
the difference depends on the continuation of the melody after the
third note, which in each melody is the sixth degree, a minor sixth in
the Haydn and a major sixth in the Glinka excerpt (a difference that
affects the analysis but which Berkov does not notice). This note may
have either subdominant implications as the third of the subdominant or
perhaps tonic of the submediant, an assumption emphasized by the leap
from tonic to the sixth degree, or dominant implications, most likely
as the seventh of the diminished or half-diminished seventh chord on
the leading tone. Berkov interprets this note in both cases to be
subdominant, but more dull in Haydn than in Glinka. In the Haydn
fragment, he points out, the Bb in the bass in measure 3 provides the
subdominant harmonization for the Db in measure 2; further, he asserts,
the dominant follows the subdominant. But the melodic outline Db-E in
measures 2 and 3 superimposes on the harmony the diminished seventh
chord on the leading tone, and the Bb in measure 3 forms part of that
diminished seventh chord. The harmony in measure 3 is potentially
vii 6/4 or vii 4/3 (the latter when viewed retrospectively with the
Db), i.e., dominant function, but certainly not subdominant. And the
harmony in measure 4 is i6. Berkov's analysis is ambiguous; he appar-
ently views the E in measure 3 as an appoggiatura to the F in measure
4, which with the previous Db and Bb fills in the subdominant harmony—
Db-Bb-F (in that order). But where is the dominant? The tonic reapp-
pears in measure 4. To the Western listener, taken as a whole, this
fragment leaves only a fleeting impression of the subdominant (on the
Db); most would view it as the seventh from the leading tone (or the
ninth of the dominant) and this is what it becomes.

Berkov fares better with his analysis of the Glinka fragment.
Here the E clearly may be interpreted as the third of the major subdom-
inant, a view reinforced by its stepwise motion down to the D, the
dominant, and the appearance in measure 6 of C, the subdominant itself.
Oddly, though, Berkov analyzes the C as the seventh of II, which is
still subdominant, of course, in functional theory. Thus there occur
two plagal "turns" in a row from measures 1 to 7: tonic-subdominant-
tonic-subdominant-tonic.

Berkov utilizes Yavorsky's definition of tonality "as the position
of a mode on a definite pitch," and in addition views tonality as "a
function of a higher order":
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A systematic functional understanding and interpretation of tonal interrelations led to the idea of a tonality as a function of a higher order. Irrespective of the dimensions of a work a developed functional consciousness is inclined to find in it a tonic tonality and to subordinate to it the subdominant and dominant tonalities.⁴⁷

Example 33.3. a) Mikhail Ivanovich Glinka, Ivan Susanin, Act I, No. 1: Introduction (Chorus): final fugato from chorus, "V buriu, vo grozu" [In the storm, in the thunderstorm], mm. 289–300; b) Franz Joseph Haydn, String Quartet in F minor, Op. 20, No. 5, Fourth movement, "Fuga a due Soggetti," mm. 1–4.

This approach recalls Taneev's theory of unified tonalities and unified tonalities of a higher order, in which tonalities were joined together and functioned in relation to the other.

Glinka and Tonal Connections. Under the general topic of tonality and tonal connections, Berkov investigates tonal coloring, innertonal deviations, modulations, and tonal plans (in both operas and other
works). Berkov's approaches to the questions of innertonal deviations and tonal plans are the most interesting. He distinguishes first of all among three categories—harmonic chromaticism, innertonal deviations, and modulations. Since only quantitative differences exist between the first two, Berkov proposes to expand the idea of innertonal deviations to include incidences of harmonic chromaticism as "elementary innertonal deviations" and to call the more usual deviations "developed innertonal deviations." A developed innertonal deviation may thus be distinguished from an elementary one by its consolidation into a secondary tonality, its agreement with some closed segment of form, or its agreement (of the secondary tonic) with the strong beats or with its length, particularly in a slow tempo. Berkov then distinguishes a developed deviation from a modulation not so much by the technique of its achievement, which can be the same for both, or cadential formulae, or by the temporary nature of the deviation—a distinction made previously by several theorists—but by its position in the form:

The position in the form is the most reliable criterion. Particularly clear and obvious is the boundary in a period. A departure into some tonality within a period, in particular with a cadential conclusion in the end of the first sentence, is still a deviation; and an analogous departure, completed in the end of the period, is already a modulation. In the first case the motion occurred within one tonality . . . . In the second case arose a second tonality, which is subordinated to the main [tonality], as a function of a higher order, but [which] is an independent tonal quantity.48

Deviations in general occur most frequently within periods, within closed musical thoughts, rather than in less structured, development-type sections, because, Berkov explains, "For the formation of inner-
tonal deviations, definitely expressed tonalities, which usually are connected with the statement of a closed musical thought, are necessary. Further, he observes, such deviations within closed periods are located in concluding sections, in codas. And such is the case in Glinka's music: "Both among his contemporaries and among a row of composers of a later time, Glinka stood out by the richness, the energy, the scope of the concluding innertonal deviations (in conclusions, codas)."

For unexplained reasons, in his discussion of elementary innertonal deviations Berkov concentrates only on the secondary dominant and two particular applications of it. First, in a progression very characteristic of Russian harmony beginning with Glinka's, the secondary dominant resolves not to its tonic (the dominant) but to the subdominant of the original tonality. The second case involves a series or short chain of three or more dominants, creating in the case of three dominants a "tertiary dominant." These particular cases are illustrated in Example 33.4. In the first illustration the effect of the progression V/V−ii is mitigated somewhat by the tonic pedal point, a frequent accompaniment to this type of progression: "In connection with the immovability of the bass (organ point of tonic) the functional conflict (secondary dominant—subdominant) turns out to be obscured. A distinctive, expanded plagal turn arises." The second illustration contains a clear "tertiary dominant." In such a case the connection to tonic, the aspiration to tonic through the series of dominants, is not always sensed, but here it is. Berkov observes, "We distinctly feel an
aspiration to tonic. ... The F♯ major triad sounds like a 'remote' dominant of the A minor tonic."


Berkov's discussion of developed innertonal deviations focuses specifically on one general method of harmonic development that Glinka used "very expressively," which Berkov calls "harmonic crescendo."

This phenomenon is a form of musical "growth," or "upsurge," in which harmony plays an essential role:

Concluding innertonal deviations sometimes are constructed in Glinka's [music] thus: initially the first clear burst of harmony appears; this is the first upsurge, the first culmination; further, a second, more strong burst, a second, higher upsurge, occurs on similar material. We see two waves of upsurge, of which the second is still higher.
Berkov gives two examples of this phenomenon, one from *Ruslan i Liudmila*, the coda to the "Introduction," which is illustrated here (Example 33.5). Berkov analyzes the first culmination:

In this coda there are two culminating points, connectioned with innertonal deviations. The second point is stronger than the first. The harmonic crescendo is both in the limits of the deviations and from the first deviation to the second.

After an exultant fourfold repetition of the basic theme of the "Introduction" (on the words "Da zdravstvuet cheta mladaia" [Long live the young couple]) the upsurge is begun, achieved by a secondary subdominant or the lowered seventh degree. The Ab major triad, as a local tonic, in the conditions of Bb major is alternated several times with its secondary dominant [Eb–G–Bb–Dbb, Example 33.5a]. This is the culmination, which is continued also in the following bars. The process of deviations is not completed. The dominant, the seventh chord of E major (Fb major), that is the dominant of the lowered sixth degree of Ab major [B–Db–Fb–A], sounds. But this chord is regarded as an augmented 5–6 chord of the dominant of Bb major and transfers into it. The cadence comes.54

Berkov's analysis is clear, with one exception. The chord B–Db–Fb–A in the ninth measure of the example is not an "augmented 5–6 chord" but resembles more a Neapolitan sixth chord, albeit in root position and with an added seventh, in which case it progresses "normally" to the dominant of the original tonic (next measure) and eventually to the tonic (last measure of the example).

Berkov analyzes the second culmination:

The second construction of the coda is similar, including the moment of the appearance of the dominant of E major (Fb major). The process of deviations is further deepened and extended [Example 33.5b]. A short dominant chain of three dominants is formed. The last dominant (conditionally of D major) with an interrupted cadence transfers into the lowered sixth degree (the triad Bb major), which is emphasized in the capacity of the basic tonic. Thus, as a whole, the second similar culmination of the coda of the "Introduction," the second deviation is stronger than the first (harmonic crescendo). We see the harmonic crescendo also within both deviations.55
Example 33.5. Mikhail Ivanovich Glinka, *Ruslan i Liudmila* [Ruslan and Liudmila], Act I, No. 1: "Introduksiia," coda: a) mm. 16-33 after Prestissimo; b) mm. 49-57 after Prestissimo.
Berkov succeeds to a certain extent with his analysis, but he fails to point out the real reason why the second culmination is stronger than the first. The two culminations are of unequal length. The first, including the choral repetitions leading up to the beginning of the upsurge, is 22 measures; the second, with the same choral statement, is 30 measures. Both upsurges begin with the major triad on Ab, as in measures 5–8 of Example 33.5a, and then move to the dominant seventh-type chord on B. In the first culmination, this chord is heard for one measure, after which it moves unresolved to the dominant of Bb, as explained above. The original tonic is reached after four measures of cadential-type progressions over a dominant pedal point. In the second culmination, this chord is heard for two measures, after which it sets in motion the chain of dominants that Berkov pointed out. Each dominant is heard for two measures, and the tonic is reached not through its dominant but through the interrupted cadence. Therefore Glinka emphasizes this tonic through an additional seven measures of subdominant and then dominant pedal points, followed by forty measures in the tonic alone that signals the end of the "Introduction." Thus, the second culmination is stronger than the first because it completes what was initiated in the first culmination, namely, the resolution of the dominant seventh-type chord on B. The inertia of this resolution carries it through yet another level, which is suddenly ended with the interrupted cadence. To compensate for this cadence, through which the tonic is restored, Glinka adds additional measures of cadential material.
Glinka's modulations are rather simple and unremarkable. Berkov divides modulation into five types, based on the methods of its implementation: 1—modulation through a common chord (tonality or sound) without enharmonism; 2—modulation through an enharmonic common chord (tonality or sound); 3—elliptical modulations; 4—sequential modulations; and 5—tonal leaps (juxtaposition). Berkov distinguishes the last two methods from the first three because in them the actual process of transfer, present in the first three methods, is omitted and substituted with a cadence. Therefore, he concludes, the last two methods belong to the category of modulation only conditionally.

Thus in Glinka's music non-enharmonic, common chord modulations based on simple diatonicism occur fairly frequently; enharmonic and elliptical modulations are far less significant than, say, in the music of Schubert and Chopin. Berkov, then, discusses two main types of modulation most common to Glinka's music—modulating periods, and enharmonic modulations. For the former in a major key, the usual keys to which Glinka modulates are the dominant, the mediant, and the relative minor. In a minor key, Glinka will modulate to the relative major of the minor dominant. Enharmonic modulations are effected either through the dominant seventh chord or the diminished seventh chord. This type of modulation usually occurs between sections or parts of a form, and may also be connected with an emotional or critical point in the musical development. Berkov calls the enharmonic modulation effected through the dominant seventh chord "an enharmonic brightening": The secondary dominant on tonic becomes a German augmented sixth chord
resolving to the tonic six-four chord of the major tonality a major third above. In the example Berkov cites, given in Example 33.6, Glinka modulates from F major to A major using this chord. "The contrast of mysterious semidarkness and light is marvelous: F major was darkened by the ominous augmented three-four chord; after the enharmonic modulations the light and easy A major is restored." Glinka also uses the dominant seventh chord to modulate to the tonality a minor second below the original.

Example 33.6. Mikhail Ivanovich Glinka, Russlan i Liudmila [Ruslan and Liudmila], Act II, No. 5: Finn's Ballade, end of "B" section before return of "A" section.
Glinka modulates enharmonically with the diminished seventh chord slightly more frequently than with the dominant seventh chord, but such cases are still rather rare. Glinka uses this chord primarily to modulate to tonalities at intervalllic distances contained within the chord, that is, minor thirds (most frequently) or tritones. Berkov also discusses Glinka's occasional use of a single note or the augmented triad to effect modulations.

Glinka's Tonal Plans. By "tonal plan," Berkov means "the organization of tonalities, having independent significance, in a greater or smaller whole." The most important aspect in a tonal plan is the functional connection of the tonalities, revealed through both the more prominent tonal correlations and the secondary deviations subordinate to them. For the analysis of the tonal development of a work, he advocates "the process of the generalization of tonalities," during which all the tonalities are "summarized" or "absorbed" by one main general tonality. He cautions, though, that this functional subordination of a row of independent tonalities to a main tonality is not to be confused with the subordination of secondary tonalities to the main tonality in connection with inner-tonal deviations, although the idea is the same.

Although Berkov includes analyses of the tonal plans of both instrumental and vocal-instrumental music, in general he concentrates on Glinka's operas, primarily Ruslan i Liudmila. His goal is to prove Glinka's strong adherence to both general and specific formal princi-
amples, that is, to show that Glinka applied definite and obvious organizational principles throughout his operas. Primarily he looks for tonal patterns that reflect traditional forms such as sonata form, rondo form, and variation form, and then looks for compliance or non-compliance of other factors that would indicate the presence of these forms. He begins with sonata form, and outlines seven schemes of sonata forms from various of Glinka's pieces—three opera overtures, two operatic segments, and two non-operatic works. Concerning Glinka's use of sonata form, Berkov reaches some general conclusions: only two of the seven tonal plans follow classical "norms" regarding tonal connections; and all but one lack a concluding section to end the exposition (the overture to Ivan Susanin is the exception). Figure 33.1 reproduces the scheme of the overture to Ruslan i Liudmila, probably the best-known of the pieces analyzed. The first portion of the scheme, labeled "A", presents the main keys from the exposition and recapitulation only. The second, longer portion, labeled "B", outlines in greater detail the order of the tonalities in all sections of the sonata form, including the coda. A second example from the same opera, Ruslan's aria from Act II, "Dai, Perun, mne mech" [Perun, give me a sword], is reproduced in Figure 33.2. In both figures, I have used Jan LaRue's letters \( P T S K \) to denote primary theme, transition, secondary theme, and closing, respectively.

Both the overture and the aria are full-blown sonata forms. Berkov compares them according to their tonal plans and thematic content. Regarding choice of tonality in the exposition and recapitula-
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Figure 33.1. Mikhail Ivanovich Glinka, Ruslan i Liudmila, Overture, D major, Berkov's scheme of tonal plan.

tion, the two pieces are reversely analogous: the exposition of the aria equals the recapitulation of the overture (tonic–dominant) and the recapitulation of the aria equals the exposition of the overture (tonic–mediant). They also share related thematic material, in addition to outright identical themes (the secondary themes of each). Concerning Glinka's application of sonata form within opera, Berkov states:

The application of so complete and complex a form as sonata form in vocal–instrumental music, in opera, is a comparatively rare phenomenon. The presence in Glinka opera music of several such models, along with other widely treated forms (rondo, variation), testifies about Glinka's aspiration to complete, regular, intensively worked out architectonic designs in opera.
Figure 33.2. Mikhail Ivanovich Glinka, *Ruslan i Liudmila*, Act II, Ruslan's aria, "Dai, Perun, mne mech" [Perun, give me a sword], Berkov's scheme of tonal plan.

The conclusion of the finale of *Ruslan i Liudmila* (D major), beginning with the text "Slava velikim bogam" [Thanks to the great gods], shown in Figure 33.3, is also in sonata form, although a truncated version without a development section. Here the main theme of the overture forms the main theme of the sonata. The exposition of the finale also reproduces the tonal plan of the exposition of the overture (tonic-mediant); but in a departure from the tonic-dominant relationship in the recapitulation of the overture, the recapitulation in the finale retains the third relationship, this time to the lower third (tonic-submediant). The finale, then, according to Berkov, due to its lack of quartal-quintal tonal connections, preserves more consistently a romantic character.
Figure 33.3. Mikhail Ivanovich Glinka, *Ruslan i Liudmila* [Ruslan and Liudmila], finale, "Slava velikam bogam" [Thanks to the great gods] to the end.

Concerning the thematic consistency among these three segments, Berkov points out that the basic themes of the overture are applied within the opera in conditions of sonata form. He concludes:

When these themes are given, as in the opera, one at a time (in the aria—the secondary part of the overture; in the finale—the main [part]), they, being joined into the whole with different themes (we showed, however, the relatedness of the main part of the aria to the main part of the overture), form namely sonata form. From here it is possible to make the conclusion that the basic themes of the opera (the theme of the general victory and happiness "Da pratsvetet v polnoi sile i krase" [Prosper in full strength and beauty] [the main theme of the overture and the finale] and Ruslan's love theme, "O Liudmila, Le'l sylil mne radost'" [O Liudmila, Lei' promised me happiness] [the secondary
theme of the overture and Ruslan's aria) were conceived as themes of the sonata type. Expanding this position, it is possible to say, that the basic content of "Ruslan" is developed in sonata-symphonic form.61

Berkov devotes a separate section to the large-scale tonal plans of the opera Ruslan i Liudmila, that is, the tonal design of the opera in general, and of each of its five acts. With such an approach he obviously is pursuing his interpretation of Glinka's operatic music as "symphonic." I present here a brief summary of his findings. Based on the key relationships in the outermost segments of the opera—the overture and introduction from the beginning, and the return of Ruslan and the awakening of Liudmila and the conclusion from the finale—Berkov views the overall structure of the opera as an arch: D major—Bb major—(Eb major)—Bb major—D major. Within each act, Berkov finds similar elements of unification. Act I is characterized by plagal tendencies in the harmony, with harmonies either minor or major thirds apart (tonic to submediant, for example). However, Berkov fails to note that this holds true primarily for tonal connections between segments; within segments, dominant tendencies are more prevalent. The "Introduction" that opens Act I constitutes, tonally and thematically, a rondo: Bb—D—Bb—F—Bb. The two following sections are also tonally unified. Act II, in contrast, is less functional, less unified in its tonal relationships. Its most obvious characteristic is what Berkov calls its "minor frame," since it begins and ends in minor keys. The tonal plan of the introduction to Act III contains a major third cycle, Ab major—E major—C major—Ab major. This in essence anticipates the tonal plan of the act as a whole: "The tonal plan of the third act
reveals and develops the plan of the introduction; after a concise carrying out of the tertian cycle, a carrying out [of it] in wide dimensions is begun. Thus, Berkov concludes,

The tonal plan of the third act, by its clarity, unity [and] consistency, seems the most perfect large tonal plan in "Ruslan," probably in Glinka's music in general. Thanks to the thorough use of the major-minor system in the third act, thanks to the presence of closed major third cycles (two times, in compressed view, in separate parts of the act and in the act as a whole), the tonal form turns out to be very romantic: the closed tertian cycles are characteristic to a later romanticism.

Act IV contains separate arches or frames that envelop, basically, three-part forms. Within one of these arches is a rondo form, the scene of Liudmila in Chernomor's garden. Act V is characterized mainly by continuity, a continuousness of form, and the functional connections between most of tonalities within it and the final D major tonality.

Glinka and Variation. In his final chapter Berkov investigates the variational principle in Glinka's harmony, an essential characteristic of his harmonic language, more so than any other composer, Russian or otherwise. There are several important examples in *Ruslan*—Finn's ballade (Act II), Golova's story (Act II), the "Persidskii chorus (Act III)," "Turetskii (Act IV)," and the variations of the harmonization of the whole-tone scale (associated with Chernomor). Glinka melded several influential styles into his own variational style—baroque ostinato, classical ornamentation, free romantic variation, and, not least, the variational principle of polyphonic Russian folk song. Glinka's main type of variation is harmonic variations.
under an unchanging melody. According to Berkov, "Glinka became the first to build such a type of variation systematically and to construct variational cycles on its basis." Therefore, he posits, this type of variation may well carry Glinka's name.

Berkov organizes his discussion of Glinka's variations by first investigating several manifestations of this variational principle as applied generally to harmony, beginning with short examples and then analyzing the specific variations from *Ruslan* mentioned above. The general applications include harmonic variants in connection with the repetitions of similar moments in the form, of similar cadences; harmonic variants in connection with consecutive repetitions of similar constructions (periodicity); harmonic variants in expansions (the "harmonic crescendo" discussed above); and harmonic variants in connection with the repeated appearance of some image (the whole-tone scale associated with Chernomor, for example). In general the variations from *Ruslan* that Berkov analyzes exhibit an unbroken line of harmonic growth or crescendo. Finn's ballade, though, contains a more complex rondo form superimposed over the theme and eight variations. Therefore the culmination of its harmonic growth occurs in the fifth "magical" variation, after which the harmonic tension in the remaining variations diminishes somewhat. Also singularly characteristic for this set of variations is, in addition to the usual harmonic variations, the expansion of the principle of the unchanging melody to include the development of some basic thematic elements in the melody. Berkov calls Finn's ballade "justifiably the crown of Glinkian variations."
Berkov's Conclusions. In his conclusions, Berkov makes four points, which summarize Glinka's contribution to the future of Russian music: the organic fusion of classical and romantic tendencies in Glinka's music; its clarity, organization, and systematic character; its symphonism, and Glinka's introduction of it into opera; and its true folk quality. Berkov has been illustrating these points all along, in connection with the various topics he discusses; but of these four traits, he devotes the least amount of space to Russian folk song. This occurs despite his calling folk song "the most important source of the musical language of Glinka, and after him other Russian composers." He explains Glinka's approach:

It is possible to notice that quotations from Russian folk song in Glinka's music are few, that in the music of Musorgsky and Rimsky-Korsakov such quotations are greater [in number]. But the essence is that all great Russian composers, like Glinka, absorbed popevki, turns, rhythms of folk song into the musical fabric of their speech. The entire Russian musical school is close to its folk song, close namely particularly heartfelt, sincerely.

Russian composers create in the spirit of folk song, not only in the sense of the reproduction of particularities of its musical language, but also in the sense of sincerity, truthfulness, accuracy of life.67

Thus in order to discuss Glinka's absorption of folk elements into his musical style it is not possible to cite specific melodies or obvious quotes; rather, it should be possible to discuss characteristic melodic motives, phrase structures, rhythms, or harmonic progressions that resemble or bring to mind those of Russian folk song. Outside of his discussions of the aspects of modal variability and plagal elements, though, Berkov neatly sidesteps this issue. Although he mentions this aspect many times, he does not delve into the true essence of the
"Russian" nature of Glinka's music. He far more comfortably incorporates investigations of classical and romantic elements, complete with examples, into his analyses.

Criticism. Berkov's approach, though, is not completely wrong-headed, considering Glinka's own training (Western), and the training of his predecessors and contemporaries (Western); but considering Glinka is the first truly Russian composer, such an approach does seem inadequate, even to a Westerner. This was, in fact, the opinion of Berkov's contemporaries, who, it must be noted, were under the influence of the xenophobia and political stringencies of the late 1940s. The musicologist Lev Vasil'evich Danilevich, in a 1950 review of Berkov's book, accused Berkov not only of slighting Russian influences on Glinka in favor of Western ones, but also of ignoring the analysis of Glinka's aesthetic views and ideological imagery as embodied in his music in favor of a formalistic, descriptive approach to his music. According to Danilevich, Berkov ignores "problems of an ideological, artistic, and aesthetic order," "the unbroken connection of Glinka's harmonic style with the ideological content of his creation," its "aesthetic preconditions, "the progressive significance" of his ideas, and "Glinka's advanced world view." "As a result," he concludes, "many analyses of V. Berkov do not go further than an examination of the expressive semantic characteristics of separate methods and are deprived of a firm ideological, theoretical basis." Danilevich, in accordance with the attitude of a Marxist musicologist, asserts that
Berkov's approach lacks the strong foundation and ideology supplied by Marxist-Leninist aesthetics. Such a foundation would lead Berkov, he believes, to a stronger denunciation and devaluation of atonality, which Berkov merely describes as "without form," to a discussion of the connection between Glinka's dislike of melodramatic extremes and his realistic aesthetics, to a more thorough and positive evaluation of the nationalistic traits in Glinka's music, and to the avoidance of bourgeois, scholastic theoretical methods:

Soviet musicology is obligated to expose decisively the reactionary, scholastic sense of such an analytical method [in bourgeois theory] and to give models of a truly scientific musical analysis, based on the principles of Marxist-Leninist aesthetics. . . . In order to create valuable musical theoretical works on Russian musical classicism, Soviet musicologists must more boldly, more decisively yank off the shackles of formalism.71

Danilevich reserves his strongest criticisms for Berkov's treatment of nationalistic traits in Glinka's music, and his preference for relying on the influence of classical and romantic traits, not only on Glinka, but also on the entire Russian school. To this Danilevich answers indignantly:

No one, it seems, denies the fact that Russian composers used the creative experience of the most prominent progressive artists of the West; no one denies that Russian music developed and enriched several valuable traditions of classical and romantic styles. But is this really the most important and essential? Are the great strengths of Russian musical art, its richness, its distinctiveness, really included namely in this? Did Glinka, Chaikovsky, Rimsky-Korsakov, and Musorgsky really only synthesize and generalize the achievements of the different styles of West European musical creation? Why, this is a clear humiliation of our classicists, a belittling of their progressive historical role. Conceptions of this sort unavoidably lead to a denial of the national distinctiveness of Russian musical culture.

It was time long ago to recognize that Glinka and other remarkable Russian composers of the nineteenth century not only critically mastered the experience of their foreign predecessors
and contemporaries, but also created a new epoch in the history of musical art, created a new style of Russian musical classicism. This style, based on the emphasis of the principles of realism and nationality [narodnost'], was a phenomenon more progressive in comparison with foreign classicism and romanticism and received its fullest expression in Russian opera.72

Danilevich also recoiled against another of Berkov's suggestions, made in connection with his discussion of Glinka's early works—that Glinka was influenced by distinctive national methods not directly but through Western romanticism, which exhibited similar folk elements. One can hear Danilevich fuming: "This is a clear example of the manifestation of cosmopolitan "theory" hostile to our science." 73

To Danilevich's credit, he points out the futility and virtual uselessness of what he calls Berkov's "models of an unsound formalistic, descriptive method," for example, his observations regarding the types of chords with which Glinka effects modulations and to which tonalities he modulates using those chords. After giving a long list of quotes of such descriptions from Berkov's book, he rightfully asks, "Well, what follows from this? How does this list of tonalities and degrees enrich our knowledge about the style of Glinka?" He wishes less data and more conclusions:

In musical circles the disseminated expression—"musicological kitchen"—is well known. Such a work, which is produced in this "kitchen," may be important due to its future results. But it doesn't follow from this that it is necessary to show the "kitchen" itself, particularly when it represents only elementary technology.74

Danilevich's criticisms ring true in many respects, particularly regarding Berkov's often overly-descriptive approach. Yet they underscore the dilemma of Soviet theorists at this time, that in order to be
successful one must not only follow Marxist "scientific" methods, which Berkov purported but failed to do, but one must actively and frequently—at every opportunity, it seems—"lecture" on the virtues of Soviet Marxism and the Russian traits that embody this line of thought and on the "depravities" of the Western, cosmopolitan practices and approaches. This method goes beyond pure "theory" and enters the realm of propaganda. That Berkov did utilize Western analytical methods—and some rather basic and "elementary" (as Danilevich says) ones at that—and ignore the newer Soviet traditions of intonational and imagery analysis does merit criticism from his colleagues, from the Soviet point of view. From the Western point of view, his book informs us to a point about Glinka's use of harmony, but certainly does not provide any startling new theoretical approach or discoveries. It is a survey of Glinka's harmonic methods, utilizing theoretical language that any college music major would easily understand.
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Chapter 34

Theoretical Articles: Views on Shostakovich's Music

Two of the theoretical articles from this post-war period merit serious attention. Both concern the music of Shostakovich—one article by Mazel analyzing various melodic and formal aspects (written in 1944 but unpublished until 1967) and another by A. N. Dolzhansky on mode (written in 1944 and published in 1947). In other articles published by theorists during this period, ideological, literary, and historical aspects take precedence over theoretical ones, thus continuing and extending the trend of the previous decade. Any distinction between a theoretical article, that is, one that focuses primarily on some theoretical topic, either in a general sense or in connection with a specific composer, and a musicological one, which may discuss theoretical aspects as an adjunct to the main focus, be it historical, literary, or whatever, becomes blurred to the point of nonexistence. As a result all articles—with the exception of purely historical or biographical ones—whether by a theorist or musicologist, take on an aura of same-ness, of indistinguishability.

This methodology, of course, follows the Marxist-Leninist line of thought as interpreted by the Soviets, who emphasize content over form,
ideology over technique. Dolzhansky's article in particular may therefore be seen as an exception to the rule, for in it he concentrates on theoretical topics exclusively. Mazel in his article, although continuing in a general sense the same comprehensive type of approach to analysis he advocated beginning in the 1930s, focuses on the melodic element in Shostakovich's music, with perhaps a bit more emphasis on content than previously but yet a certain boldness that distinguishes his work from others of the same period. Unfortunately, with this overwhelming tendency among the majority of articles towards the homogenization of methodology, coupled with the lack of any significant new approaches or developments during this period, save those by Ogolevets, Soviet music theory temporarily ceased to develop as an independent discipline. The political events of the late 1940s caused it even to retrogress, thereby losing any vestiges of recognition it had achieved during the Soviet era.

Mazel on Shostakovich. Mazel wrote his article, "Zametki o muzykal'nom iazyke Shostakovicha" [Notes on the musical language of Shostakovich], in 1944, as fulfillment of the plan of the scientific research office of the Moscow Conservatory. He completed and brought it up-to-date, with references to Shostakovich's most recent compositions, in 1945. It was supposed to be published in the first volume of Uchenye zapisy Moskovskoi konservatorii [Scholarly notes of the Moscow Conservatory]. At first this publication simply met with the usual publishing delays; but then, as Mazel relates, "in connection with the
well-known events at the beginning of 1948, it was no longer possible to be seen through to the end." Mazel was finally able to publish it in its original form only in 1967. He had used separate ideas from it in various later publications, and admitted from the later vantage point of 20 years he would approach certain aspects differently. However, as testimony to past events, he chose not to alter it:

Now, naturally, the author would write much of it differently. Over the last two decades the creative works of Shostakovich have continued to develop brilliantly; his previous works are studied and valued profoundly. We know better and value highly also the creations of a number of Western contemporary composers. In connection with this no longer are significant the limitations, having been active in the period when directions on the connection or analogy between contemporary Western and Soviet music were examined as compromising the latter (it will not slip from the attention of the reader the fact that in the article not one name of a foreign composer of the twentieth century is mentioned). Finally, in twenty years the scientific methodology itself of Soviet musicologists has moved forward.

Nevertheless, the author did not consider it possible to add anything to the article or to change it; to redo it would essentially mean to write a new work, and small corrections would prevent the reader from seeing clearly in the article how it appears in reality, that is, a work of twenty years ago, and furthermore what was possible to be published in 1947. The author agreed to publish these "Notes" because several positions and observations contained in them continue, in his opinion, to maintain a certain interest.

In keeping with his all-embracing, general approach to musical analysis, Mazel concentrates on a broad spectrum of melodic aspects—"the intonational and modal-harmonic side, the metro-rhythmic structure, the general methods of the construction of the melodies and themes." From this approach Mazel projects a possible path to more general questions of musical form and thought, which he treats in the last section of the article. Mazel considers the traits in
Shostakovich's music to be individual but at the same time "typical for our contemporary musical language and thought, . . . inherent in some degree to many Soviet composers." Thus he felt his study could serve as the basis for future work not only on the music of Shostakovich but other Soviet composers as well. He also considers Shostakovich's style to be new but at the same time continuing in the tradition of Russian classical music of the nineteenth century.

The obvious care and caution with which Mazel wrote this article is revealed everywhere by his choice of language, his balancing of questions of form with those of content, his strict adherence to a middle ground between contrasting sides, his attempts to place Shostakovich within the tradition of Russian music, and his evocation and development of some of Asafiev's ideas. All these elements testify to the delicate position of the Soviet theorist at this time—a theorist who is no longer just a theorist, but also a historian, philosopher, aesthetician, and critic who may express himself only within the circle of the views and methods sanctioned by the Marxist-Leninist approach. As Mazel mentions in the quote above, he makes no reference to any contemporary (or even twentieth century) Western composers; the most recent Western composer he mentions is Cesar Frank. On the other hand, Mazel dares to refer to Shostakovich's 1932 opera Ledi Makbet [Lady Macbeth], which was publicly criticized in the pages of Pravda in 1936, and to point out the jazz elements in Shostakovich's music.

In his study Mazel concentrates on a small number of recent works by Shostakovich, primarily the Symphonies 5-9 (1937-1945), and, in
addition to the opera *Ledi Makhir* already mentioned and the Piano Concetto No. 1, Op. 35 (1933) from the early 1930s, works for instrumental chamber groups or piano from the 1940s—the Piano Quintet in G minor, Op. 57 (1940), the Piano Sonata No. 2, Op. 61 (1942), the Piano Trio, Op. 67 (1944), and the Quartet No. 2 in A major, Op. 68 (1944). Since in his selection of examples Mazel devotes the most attention to the Quintet and the Fifth Symphony, I will focus on these works for the present discussion.

In his approach to history and his attempt to place Shostakovich in a historical context, Mazel adheres to the view of the unusual and the new elements becoming the norm and the norm, the usual elements, then becoming transformed into a specific particular case. The old norm may eventually die out, but in the meantime it loses its hegemony and becomes just one of the means in the new style. There exists, then, a constant process of generation, crystallization and replacement. In other words, Shostakovich's new musical style in his symphonic and chamber works, which contains many elements once interpreted as fantastic or even grotesque in theatrical or program music, is now the norm, firmly entrenched, and was prepared and anticipated in many ways in previous music, particularly Russian music from Glinka to Scriabin, which expresses "a clarity of construction, opposing the destructive tendencies of a different sort of the Western art of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries." This approach may have been drawn from Asafiev's theories of "intonational crises" and "intonational vocabulary," which govern the growth and establishment of intonations of parti-
cular oras; but whereas Asafiev emphasizes the social conditions that
give rise to new intonations, Mazel concentrates on the prescient
nature of previously unacceptable elements that ultimately gain re-
spectability, which is actually a more Western outlook.

In keeping with Marxist precepts, Mazel applies the idea of the
"dialectics" of form, i.e., the idea of contrast leading to a new
unity. Like Asafiev, Mazel interprets Beethoven's music as the first
mature application of the dialectical approach. Mazel views many
characteristics of Shostakovich's music as a dialectical opposition of
contrasting approaches leading to a new unity, a new style. Thus in
melodic intonations sudden wide leaps of intervals of sevenths and
ninth contrast with somewhat lengthier, narrower step-wise intonations
involving intervals of seconds and thirds, which recall Bach motives.
In the modal-harmonic content of melody several different aspects
converge: the use of old modes and of major and minor enriched with
elements of other modes; jazz influences (the free use of the sixth
degree in major); the "intensification of minor" by the lowering of
various degrees (the lowering of the second and the fourth degrees, or
sometimes the lowered first, fifth or doubly lowered seventh degrees),
resulting in what Mazel calls "the intensified Phrygian mode"; the
ability of melody to "absorb into itself" complex harmonic progressions
or logic; modulatory displacements in melody; and a growing indepen-
dence of the horizontal (melody) from the vertical (harmony). In the
metric and rhythmic spheres, the use of free meter is contrasted with
that of rhythmic strictness. In general constructive features, free
melodic unfolding is contrasted with concentrated, crystallized, short theme-melodies; and polyphonic and homophonic principles interpenetrate and combine with each other.

In Mazel's illustrations from the Fifth Symphony, for example, both extremes of melodic intonation are present. Wide leaps, frequently of dissonant intervals, usually from a stable tone to an unstable tone, may be found in the first and third movements (Example 34.1a and b). Mazel also describes a contrasting sort of intonation, a short culminating motive built from smaller intervals:

Shostakovich frequently uses a complex based on the alternate deviation from the fifth degree of the natural minor (or Phrygian) mode to the sixth and seventh degrees with a return after each deviation. [Example 34.1a]

The expressiveness of this complex is connected with the specific means of the minor second and minor third, with the augmentation of the interval of the deviation from the supporting sound, with the general minor coloring, with the minor instability of the sixth and seventh degrees, strengthening the tension. The abandoned (so called "airy") seventh of the natural minor mode adds a turn of Russian coloring.

Different variants of this complex are used by Russian composers. However, Shostakovich particularly steps it up and frequently uses it in more essential moments of development and form--culminating, repeating, main, [or] summarizing [moments].

Shostakovich uses this culminating motive not only in Ledi Makbet but also in the Fifth Symphony (Example 34.2b) and the Quintet (Example 34.2c).

Mazel comments on the general expressive nature of this type of intonation:

In these and other similar examples the moment of active reflection (connected with the aspiration to overcome an obstacle, to be freed, "to be smoothed out") is combined with a great emotionalness, with a particular "heaviness" of vocal-speech intonations ..., with a typical and moreover exceptionally generalized and "purified" expressiveness of intonations of a
different kind of "moans" and "cries" in music (particularly in the Largo from the Fifth Symphony [Example 34.2a]), with some kind of primieval force, conditioning the elementarity of intonations in case of a combination with a sharp rhythm [Example 34.2b].

Example 34.1. Dmitri Dmitrievich Shostakovich, Symphony No. 5, Op. 47: a) first movement, mm. 51-70 (first violins); b) third movement, mm. 33-34 (flute).

Mazel identifies the medieval church modes as the modal foundation of Shostakovich's music. Shostakovich applies them in three ways—either fragmented, with their characteristic intervals enriching the major-minor system; independently, as a whole; or independently, enriched by new intervals, predominantly lowered ones. This last method intensifies the "minor expressiveness" of the modal sphere; Mazel calls it "intensified Phrygian," due to the presence in it of the lowered second and also the lowered fourth (Example 34.3a). The lowered fourth may occur without the lowered second (Example 34.3b).
Example 34.2. Dmitri Dmitrievich Shostakovich: a) culminating motives; b) Symphony No. 5, Op. 47, first movement, "molto ritenuto, 1 m. after #38 (unison); c) Symphony No. 5, third movement, 6 mm. after #88 (second violins); d) Quintet, Op. 57, fourth movement, m. 55 (first violin).

Example 34.3. "Intensified Phrygian:" a) minor mode with lowered second and lowered fourth degrees; b) minor mode with only lowered fourth.
Other lowered intervals also occur, which Mazel explains as the result of the independence of either of the original lowered intervals, which causes it to attract its functional counterparts, such as the lowered first or doubly lowered seventh degree for the lowered fourth or the lowered fifth for the lowered second. For example, in the finale of the Second Quartet (Example 34.4), the lowered fifth "accompanies" the lowered second in the capacity of its subdominant. However this lowered fifth then becomes the focus, engendering the original lowered tonic (as its subdominant) and, in a chromatic descending line, the original lowered fourth and lowered sixth (of A minor), which rewritten enharmonically becomes the original dominant, before returning to the original tonic. In other words, it acts like a short modal deviation into the related spheres of the lowered intervals.

In the melody from the second movement of the Ninth Symphony (Example 34.5), the second, fourth, fifth, and eighth notes are lowered. According to Mazel, the F-natural, the lowered fifth, may be found in B minor—as Eb, though—in nineteenth-century Russian romance melodies. Unusual and new here, he reveals, is its direct juxtaposition with C-natural. (Although the same juxtaposition—in a different key—occurs in the previous example, the Eb-Bb, Mazel does not remark on its appearance.) However, such a slim and unverified analogy does little to explain the melodic richness of this theme; but Mazel attempts to make such correlations to Russian traditional music as frequently as possible. More interesting and to the point for this particular example would be a discussion of how the lowered intervals are
Example 34.4. Dmitri Dmitrievich Shostakovich, Quartet No. 2, A major, Op. 68, fourth movement, Theme with Variations: first statement of fugue theme, mm. 17-31 (solo viola).

woven into the fabric of B minor without losing a sense of the original key. Here, for example, both the lowered fourth and the raised third are used with completely different effects, despite their enharmony. And Shostakovich clearly juxtaposes both functional and chromatic applications of these lowered intervals; an explanation of the nature of this juxtaposition would be interesting as well. Mazel does stress that "the described enrichment of mode, giving it deeper, more flexible and more subtle expressive possibilities, does not lead to its degeneration or regeneration into other modes principally different from
The augmented and chain modes Mazel mentions are some of the types of mode discovered by Yavorsky. Regardless of its intensity, this clear support on major and major makes up "one of the classical foundations of Shostakovich's style," to which are subordinated the harmonic practices of the late Romantics and succeeding styles also used by Shostakovich.

Example 34.5. Dmitri Dmitrievich Shostakovich, Symphony No. 9, Op. 70, Eb major, second movement, mm. 1-21 (solo clarinet).

In a discussion of the harmonic element in Shostakovich's melody, Mazel describes how in contemporary music "harmony sometimes is dissolved into a line, capable without stopping the melodic development or almost without the help of the accompaniment to 'absorb' into itself corresponding harmonic progressions." Previously such colorful har-
monic progressions occurred melodically only in connection with a stop in the melodic development, either through modal or note repetition, sequence, or through melodic figuration (melody being "dissolved" into harmony). For example, the lowered second introduced into systematic usage by Liszt as a harmonic element becomes over time also a melodic element, as in the F♯ minor song of Katerina from Ledi Makbet (Example 34.6), in which the minor triad on the lowered second degree is part of the melody. Thus, Mazel concludes, "new modal formations in melody arise both directly, that is melodically, and also by way of the absorption by the melodic line of complex harmonic progressions."

Example 34.6. Dmitri Dmitrievich Shostakovich, Ledi Makbet (Katarina Izmailova), Act I, Scene 3, Song of Katerina, F♯ minor, beginning.

In another example, the first movement of the Fifth Symphony (Example 34.7), Mazel illustrates the absorption into the melodic line of the logic of a usual harmonic progression. The D♯ in measure two signals a "'dismantling from within'" of the sequential repetition of the beginning four-note motive, for it completes an interval somewhat smaller than the expected perfect fifth. Mazel defines its "sharpness"
Example 34.7. Dmitri Dmitrievich Shostakovich, Symphony No. 5, first movement: a) mm. 1-4; b) scheme of latent harmonies.

through its modal characteristics: it is perceived not only as the lowered second degree (Eb) but also, by analogy with the preceding motive, as a leading tone (D♯). He explains it as fulfilling a very
logical harmonic progression:

The special naturalness, the justification of this sharp path, applied here not in the capacity of a grotesque "displacement," but in the capacity of a turn, strengthening the expressiveness of the tragic, philosophically significant theme, is defined by its connection with a typical harmonic progression, "absorbed" by the unison motion of the first motives: the chromatically descending bass D-C♯-C (latently present in the theme) for a very long time has been harmonized by a progression of tonic, dominant and diminished harmony to the subdominant; the second motive of the theme—the notes C-F♯-Eb (D♯)—exactly outline this latter harmony [see scheme, Example 34.7b]. As a result—the expressiveness of the note D♯, connected with a typically contemporary method of "dismantling of sequence from within," turns out to be inwardly related to the sharp displacements in significant themes of Beethoven (for example, the well-known C♯ of the cellos in the beginning of the Eroica symphony).14

A third aspect of Shostakovich's music concerning the modal and harmonic content of the melody testifies to the relative independence of Shostakovich's melodies from the underlying harmonies, or, as Mazel puts it, "the significant independence of the linear energetic source of the melos and the more flexible form of the dependence of the line on vertical correlations." Mazel illustrates this linear quality with a theme from the finale of the Quintet (Example 34.8).

Mazel interprets the outline of this melody as a series of perfect fifths, creating a gap-fill design (Example 34.8b). The first four measures outline the fifth D-A, measures 5 and 6 the fifth Bb-F, (revealed first in stepwise motion and then as an open fifth), measures 6 and 7 the open fifth C-G, and then measures 7 and 8 the fifth D-A in filled-in stepwise motion. As Mazel points out, the fifth C-G connects the other two intervals not only in the melody, that is, melodically, but also in the circle of fifths, that is, harmonically (Example 34.8c). Melodically, he considers the complex C-G to be "passing," not
Example 34.8. Dmitri Dmitrievich Shostakovich, Piano Quintet, Op. 57, G minor, Finale: a) mm. 60-69; b) vertical quintal scheme; c) horizontal quintal scheme.
in the usual sense, for it is too dissonant, but in a more expanded understanding of the term. Similarly he interprets the filled-in fifth D-A at the juncture of measures 7 and 8 to be "anticipatory" in a wide sense, since the D major harmony does return in the eighth measure.

The horizontal arrangement by fifths of the three complexes explains some of the modal particularities of the theme, according to Mazel, for example, the "secret" ninth F-G in measure 6, which is analogous to the ninth G-A in measure 7, and the rigid Mixolydian nuance of the C-natural in D major. He also remarks on the symmetrical aspects of the thematic construction: in the first half (1 + 1 + 2) the symmetry of the "intonational correlation" of the beginning ascending fourth and the concluding descending fifth, and in the second half a structural symmetry of motivic arrangement, a b b a. Such symmetry in small constructions, Mazel observes, "is used comparatively rarely and usually appears as one of the means giving to music an element of sharpness and 'intricateness' in combination with special simplicity, clarity and exclusiveness." The last motive a is particularly unifying, containing as it does the complexes C-G and D-A and being accompanied by complex Bb-F. It shares a rhythm with motive a, contains the leap of a ninth from motive b, and reproduces in its outline (F-G-D) the last three notes of the first half of the melody (mm. 3-4).

Mazel ascribes to this theme characteristics far beyond the purely formal ones he analyzes:

The juxtaposition of the emphasized and open quartal-quintal complexes, being found in whole tone or quintal correlations, usually adds to a melody an element of primitiveness, rigidity, savagery and at the same time freshness, brightness. In the given case
this method of contemporary music is included as a particular moment in a general sum of means of themes unusually clever and varied in their characteristics and connections...

The striking conclusiveness, harmoniousness, economy of means, inventiveness, and "precision" of the entire construction are felt so directly that they transfer from the sphere of form into the sphere of the content of music, defining, in particular, the special contemporary cleverness of this theme, related to images of the circus and the movies. The undoubted elements of constructivism are transformed here in such a way that by no means are they perceived as something artificial, forced, formal. 17

Under meter and rhythm, Mazel observes in Shostakovich's music the combination of metric freedom, more prominent in "motor music," with rhythmic strictness, more prominent in slower melodies. These two contrasting characteristics tend to balance each other, just as in previous music there existed a balance between the contrasting elements of metric strictness and rhythmic freedom. Mazel uses the example just discussed (Example 34.8) to illustrate a type of metric freedom within a theme of a "motor dancing character." In this melody (Example 34.8), Shostakovich emphasizes and prolongs the jazz-like syncopation in measure 2 with a repetition of the note A, which adds two beats to the measure and gives a "sharp, spicy," yet "more free and flexible" flavor to the melody. As with the D# in the theme from the Fifth Symphony, Mazel finds this syncopation justified by the inner logic of the development of the theme. This "metric interruption" provides a counterbalancing "recoil" to the "sprint" of the "unusual intonational path" of the leap of the eleventh immediately preceding it, thereby restoring a sense of equilibrium to the theme. As additional evidence for this view, Mazel refers to a variant of this theme in the coda, in which both the added portion and the wide leaps are removed (Example 34.9).
Mazel assesses the nature of this metric alteration:

It is obvious from these examples that meter, which previously played in motor music the role of an inviolable foundation, frame, "iron framework," frequently more or less indifferent to the rhythmic intonational content, is transformed into a flexible
and changeable factor, closely reacting to the development of the other elements of the musical whole. At the same time the metric evenness, connected with the dance quality, here is not simply broken but is substituted with a more general and complex (but not less "exact") regularity, which then relates to the previous, as the regularity of a high-wire, acrobatic number or film trick relates to the equilibrium of the usual dance quality.

Thus, the metric characteristics of the examined themes are included in the same circle of means as its intonations (wide leaps, masterly "play" of two sounds—D and A—in different octaves) and its modal-harmonic and motivic construction [already] analyzed.19

Mazel refers in a footnote to Asafiev, who in some of his works addresses the questions of rhythmic and metric changes in recent music. According to Mazel, Asafiev notes not only a beneficial influence from the dance "in the sense of rhythmic precision, strictness and general economy of motion," but also "from acrobatics and high-wire artists." Besides influences from the dance and circus acts, Mazel also mentions certain types of Russian folk song (the "drawing" songs, for instance) and ancient polyphony as prototypes of metric freedom coupled with rhythmic strictness. Thus, he concludes, the possibility to overcome the "destructive tendency" in Western music to abuse these aspects, leading to the disintegration of the metric organization of music (as happened in the tonal harmonic system) is rooted in the basic characteristics of Russian music.

Most of the characteristics just discussed—metric freedom and rhythmic economy, the concentrated motives, linear independence, the "absorption" of harmonic progressions into the melody—are, according to Mazel, closely connected with the "huge role" in contemporary music of "a definite principle of development, namely, the principle of free melodic unfolding." This principle is also found both in Bach and
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in Russian drawling songs. As with the other characteristics, Mazel emphasizes the roots of this principle "in the entire history of Russian melos," and distinguishes it from Western applications, where in atonal or nearly atonal "linear unfolding" it has lost its "true musical richness of content." The opening melody of the intermezzo of the Quintet (Example 34.10), heard over a contrasting even ostinato in the bass, illustrates this principle. It is characterized by a lack of rhythmic or metric motivic repetition or accents and by predominantly stepwise motion. Mazel disregards the leaps in the melody because, he says, they move from long to short notes and from strong to weak beats. He traces the influence of Russian folk music on this theme in several of its distinct characteristics, and points out its strong resemblance to several lyrical themes of Chaikovsky and Glinka as a result of such similar folk influences. But Shostakovich's musical image in this intermezzo, although more intimate, subtle and flexible than the lyrical melodies of Bach,

at the same time carries a more intellectualized, refined, and aloof character than the lyric themes of the Russian classicists. The complexity of the image is defined by the combination of this aloofness and objectiveness with a latent subjectivism and lyric tension. Contemporary traits and Russian national traits are presented in the theme equally distinctly and are found in an organic unity.23

Shostakovich also utilized a contrasting type of melody— a "short, closed, closed, 'crystallized' theme-melody, frequently distinguished by a great degree of concentration of material." Two themes already illustrated, the theme from the finale of the Quintet (Example 34.8) and the first theme from the first movement of the Fifth Symphony
Example 34.10. Dmitri Dmitrievich Shostakovich, Piano Quintet, Op. 57, G minor, fourth movement (Intermezzo), mm. 1–8 (first violin).

(Example 34.7), resemble this type. In the latter theme particularly not only thematic elements but also aspects of content are concentrated. In this regard Mazel emphasizes the contrast between the first two measures of the theme, the structure of which is $1 + 1$, the joining of two similar single bars, and the last two, which form a continuous two-bar structure, resulting in $1 + 1 + 2$ overall. The first motive of the first half of the theme consists of "two large emphasized leaps to unstable sounds" activated by a sharp rhythm and "imitational strengthening," which is "a maximally sharp variant in the sense of the very progression of sounds" of a type of "philosophically significant theme" found from Bach and Handel to Franck, Taneev, and Miaskovsky. But as a variant like this one it previously was used only in culminating or concluding portions of themes. The sequential continuation of this motive exhibits the latent chromatic bass and "disintegration of the sequence from within" already discussed.
The second half of the theme begins with the double resolution, one in each voice, of the D♯, and, while preserving the sharp rhythm of the first half, it transforms the motion into stepwise progressions. The combination of the "descending Phrygian tetrachord" of the upper voice with the counter-motion of the lower voice "creates a feeling of a steady pulling down of the same image" from the first half, which continues to be developed in the second. Mazel relates the two parts of this theme on a relatively high plane:

The semantic correlation of both parts of the structure 1 + 1 + 2—the first, containing similar motives and modally clear leaps, and the second, more continuous, emphasizing a moment of stepwise motion—is analogous to the correlation of subject and predicate, noun and verb.

Essentially, Shostakovich overcame and joined here two historically complicated musical semantic complexes, having been applied earlier separately: the second half of the theme is genetically connected with the evenly descending themes of "necessity," "destiny," "fate" as an objective outer force (theme of the introduction of the B minor Sonata of Liszt . . . ); the first half—with philosophically significant themes, containing a diminished seventh and carrying a more "human" character.27

Mazel stresses that these two complexes do not contrast but rather supplement each other, "moreover the entire four-bar theme is only the first element of the basic contrast—the tragic question, directly after which follows another—'the moving answer,' the roaming 'Faustian' theme." Thus, Mazel triumphantly concludes,

it is obvious how new is the basic contrasting correlation in the symphony of Shostakovich, how active, complex and concrete is the very "posing" of the tragic problem . . . and, finally, how great is the degree of concentration of the musical expressiveness in this four-bar theme, simultaneously philosophically significant and active, majestic and nervously tense.29

Mazel also uses this theme to bring up another basic characteristic of Shostakovich's style, a new synthesis of polyphonic and homo-
polyphonic principles. The polyphonic traits—the modally clear beginning nucleus followed by more even motion and what Mazel calls the "contemporary" polyphonic principles of the second half of the theme—recall polyphonic themes of Bach and Handel, while the homophonic traits—the continuity, the unbrokenness, the "emphasized and active finer fragmentation (with succeeding unification)"—are typical for classical homophony, particularly Beethoven's mature style. Mazel concludes, "The 'Bachian' [level] is stepped up and sharpened here up to the 30 'Beethovenian' level."

Mazel illustrates this combination of principles further with examples from the fugue and finale of the Piano Quintet (Examples 34.11, 34.9 above, and 34.12). The subject of the fugue is "typically polyphonic" and "unsquare," "subordinate to the melodic energetic beginning 'overcoming' the bar lines." It is organically combined with the countersubject, with traits common to homophonic melodies—structure (1 + 1 + 2), and, in the beginning motives, "the simplest metric-rhythmic motive impulses—a quarter-note up-beat and a long note on a strong beat." This countersubject contains numerous expressive possibilities "typical for homophonic themes, dance music in particular": both the thematic nucleus of the Scherzo (bars 5-8) and the secondary part of the finale (the four-bar supplement) are derived from its rhythm. Thus for Shostakovich's music is characteristic "principles of the dialectical development of musical images"; in combining the highest achievements of both polyphonic and homophonic styles, Shostakovich 33 "possesses the great art of the synthesis of images."
Example 34.11. Dmitri Dmitrievich Shostakovich, Piano Quintet, Op. 57, G minor, second movement (Fugue), mm. 1-13 (first and second violin)

The clearest example of this synthesis, according to Mazel, is the last twelve measures of the Quintet (Example 34.9 above): "This music produces the impression of an unusually convincing conclusion, of a full "quality of resolution," of a complete confluence of images."
This is not only in the technological sense, but also in the general aesthetic sense, a "full perfect cadence." What are the elements that create this sense of conclusion? One is rhythmic and structural: each four-bar phrase, each "answering" two-bar group within the four-bar phrase, and each of the three last short motives exhibits the same rhythmic relationship: 1 + 1 + 2 (counting bars, half-bars, and eighth notes, respectively). This in Mazel's view contributes enormously to the sense of completion. The main contributing element, though, according to Mazel, is "the deep and subtle synthesis of the two basic theme-images of the finale," the themes from the beginning (Example 34.12) and the secondary part (refer back to Example 34.8). Although by virtue of their motivic content and structure Mazel calls the first two four-bar phrases of the concluding theme a variant of the beginning four-bar phrase of the secondary theme, he also sees in them several traits of the first theme—the bass accompaniment, the basic one-bar motive (although with thirds and sixths rather than fourths and eleventh), and the quiet character of the beginning imparted to the conclusion through the parallel sixths. In the last four measures of the finale, the major third G-B is replaced by the more quiet minor third B-D, an interval prominent in the beginning, which, in Mazel's view, "already prepares the direct inclusion in the last two bars of the coda of the basic motive of the main part." He concludes, "It is difficult to find in all musical literature an example of an aesthetically more perfect concluding synthesis."
Example 34.12. Dmitri Dmitrievich Shostakovich, Piano Quintet, Op. 57, G minor, fifth movement (Finale), mm. 1–4 (piano).

The combination and interpenetration of polyphonic and homophonic principles, one of the most characteristic traits of Shostakovich's style, is manifested in ways other than thematic construction—in large formal segments of movements or entire works, in methods of development, and "in contrasting correlations based on the juxtaposition of different types of thought, etc." Although the foundation for this "new synthetic system" exists universally, Mazel assigns a particularly great role to Russian music, "from drawing songs and Glinka to Taneiev. Therefore the new system should have turned out and did turn out to be particularly natural on Russian soil and gives more artistically significant fruit." Distinguishing between "Bachian" and "Beethovenian" stylistic traits, Mazel points to Beethovenian qualities in Shostakovich's music as having been absorbed into Glinka's style and thence into Russian music, then "refracted through Chaikovsky's principles of symphonism," and therefore sharply distinguished from contem-
porary Western neo-classicism and its greater emphasis on compositional principles from Bach, Handel, and Scarlatti.

On a more philosophical plane, Mazel makes several distinctions between homophonic and polyphonic music. Homophonic music aims for singular, directly emotional effects which, when contrasted, occur successively. The essence of polyphonic music, though, is contrast in simultaneity. Therefore "the processual side of reality" in homophonic music is expressed through a "Beethoven-like dialectic of development," emphasizing, however, "its pivotal points—the very fact and moment of the transfer of a phenomenon into its opposite, the manifestation of a new quality, a burst, the synthesis of images, etc." The other side of this process, "a slow organic ripening, the gradual accumulation of the smallest changes, growth, formation, in which insignificantly arise new characteristics of the phenomenon (up to a qualitative leap)," is found more readily in polyphonic music. The combination of both, then, "allows more fully, deeply and subtly to reflect both sides of reality—present existence and formation." Thus, "the methods, fully reflecting the processual side of reality, are able to reveal also the very process of thought." In connection with this, Mazel reveals one of the basic aesthetic principles of Shostakovich's style—the "combination of ardent, passionate thought with restrained, earnest, and synthesizing feeling."

In Mazel's view, the contrasts of musical images, construction methods, aesthetic principles, and types of musical thought in Shostakovich's music, while they may be perceived according to previous
values as stylistic diversity or a disruption of stylistic unity, are in fact "justified by the unity of a newer, wider stylistic system and by the unity of the ideological conception of the work, generally by reflecting and comprehending the real, unprecedentedly sharp contrasts and sharp conflicts of contemporary world reality."

Mazel also sees in many of the new traits of Shostakovich's treatment of form a combination of separate aesthetic principles and artistic methods from the classical and romantic traditions. An examination of the first-movement sonata forms in the Fifth, Seventh, and Eighth Symphonies reveals not the Romantic distinctions between the main and secondary parts but a more classical approach—"a deep relatedness, a single line of development," a more complementary than contrasting relationship. The contrast in Shostakovich's sonata form lies instead between the exposition and the development, with an increased role for the latter. This contrast in turn leads to a recapitulation that acts as a "reaction" to the basic conflict and is the logical consequence of this conflict. This view reflects the influence of Asafiev's dialectical approach to sonata form. The main part of the recapitulation is particularly strengthened and becomes the general culmination of the entire first movement. Mazel concludes:

On the whole in these symphonies the most brilliant contrasts and sharpest conflicts are subordinated to the consecutive, single and strict line of logical development. This along with many other characteristics of form and musical language of Shostakovich allow us to speak about the leading role of the classical (in a general and wide sense) basis of his style. He clarifies, though, that this joining of characteristics of different styles on a new, wider basis signifies not
a reconciliation of opposing characteristics by way of a weakening of their brilliance and a smoothing out of witticisms . . . but . . . a strengthening, intensification, development of the highest and most brilliant manifestations of these characteristics. So, the deepest subjective expressiveness of Shostakovich's music is combined with the unusually convincing transfer of phenomena and regularities of the objective world, with the summarizing reflection and revelation of the "logic of things" and facts.49

Throughout the evolution of Shostakovich's style this objective basis is obviously apparent. "The means of expressiveness, which the growth of the general significance of the musical language in connection with its continuous renewal also accompanies, become all the more clear, classically simple and economic." Ultimately, the understanding of the new and complex musical elements in Shostakovich's musical language are made more understandable by their combination with or close proximity to other more habitual, simpler elements. This approach recalls one of Asafiev's criteria for realism—new intonations expressed in a familiar way is a realistic method that can also gain the acceptance of contemporary listeners.

In conclusion, Mazel acknowledges the controversies surrounding Shostakovich's music, but argues for an immediate acceptance and appreciation of it:

The new stylistic system of Shostakovich, defined by a high ideological content of art and by fruitful aesthetic principles, already now has been crystallized with such clarity and definiteness and has been realized in works of such artistic value and force, that it is possible, not waiting for "the verdict of history," to express (and to attempt to argue one way or another) the conviction that before us is a phenomenon not only the most brilliant and most prominent (this is already generally acknowledged), but also generally significant, lying on the "main line" of the history of art, classical in the highest significance of this word.51
Mazel's analytical methods as applied to Shostakovich's music are permeated with the dialectical approach to musical form and its elements. The omnipresent idea of contrast and resulting new unity is applied to every level. Mazel also uses the ideas of music as a process, of quantity into quality, and other Marxist theories. And he accords the aspect of content a prominent place. He also utilizes ideas first expressed by Asafiev, such as those on sonata form and the presentation of the unfamiliar with the familiar. He does not go so far as to adopt Asafiev's intonational view of music history, but his approach is very similar. He focuses more on the idea of the preparedness of new elements and styles by hints in previous music, rather than on the idea of the social engendering of new intonations. He follows Asafiev in his elevation of Beethoven and his dialectical compositional principles to a prominent level, particularly for Russian music.

But, as we shall see shortly, not even Mazel's application of Marxist methods of analysis would have been sufficient to allow publication of his article. Not only did his subject matter become an anathema, but certain of his methods and approaches—his references to the relation between Shostakovich's music and jazz and circus music, his view of music history, among others—were heretic as well. His attempts elsewhere to place Shostakovich in the tradition of Russian music, while at the same time championing the composer's modernistic traits, were regarded as contradictory and were soundly denounced.

Such criticisms, it must be remembered, were pronounced for no other reason than a warped ideological viewpoint. They have no true
basis in fact. In Dolzhansky's article we shall see a complimentary view but stemming from a rather different method and approach.

Aleksandr Naumovich Dolzhansky (1908-1966). Aleksandr Naumovich Dolzhansky graduated from the Leningrad Conservatory in 1936 in theory. From 1930 to 1941 he taught at a musical technical school, and from 1937 to 1948 and again from 1954 he taught at the Leningrad Conservatory. His doctoral dissertation, completed in 1942, was "O nekotorykh kompozitsionnykh osobennostiakh instrumental'nykh fug I. S. Bakha" [On several compositional particularities of the instrumental fugues of J. S. Bach]. However, in spite of this early attention to the music of Bach, Dolzhansky devoted most of subsequent his research to the music of Shostakovich. His research on Bach did not remain unused, though; in several ways he was able to compare the characteristics of Bach's music with those of Shostakovich's music.

His article "O ladovoi osnove sochinenii Shostakovicha" [About the modal basis of the works of Shostakovich] was only Dolzhansky's second published work and the first work ever published—though not necessarily the first written, since Mazel touched on this subject in his article—on this topic. Dolzhansky wrote it in fulfillment of a plan of scientific work at the Leningrad Conservatory; in it he developed ideas first presented in a lecture in the beginning of 1945. It is based, Dolzhansky later added in a footnote, on the study of recent works by Shostakovich from the years 1937-1942 (all of which Mazel also used): the Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh Symphonies, the Quintet and the Second
Piano Sonata. However, also like Mazel, he also uses examples from the opera Ledi Makbet (Katerina Ismailova) from 1932. Dolzhansky later denied changing his opinion as expressed in this article on the basis of Shostakovich's subsequent works.

Dolzhansky treats two aspects of Shostakovich's modal language—the modes themselves, their structure, distinctive features and component elements, and their application, including their interrelationships, means of modulation and role in large forms. He divides modes into two types: "modes, formed on the basis of stepwise melodic gravitation, and modes, formed on the basis of chordal harmonic gravitation." The first type is characterized by both church and folk modes, while the second type is characterized by the major-minor modal system. This distinction has not always been spelled out so clearly by other theorists, although one assumes, for example, that Yavorsky's modes are essentially melodic in origin. For Shostakovich's works of the period examined, the modes consist overwhelmingly of the first type. Thus in Shostakovich's music examples of the medieval church modes, as well as melodic and harmonic minor modes, may be found. But alongside these modes, Dolzhansky also found "new" modes related to these "old" modes. These new modes, though, are derived specifically from the "old" modes; therefore, although Dolzhansky does not express it in these terms, one can speak about a diatonic foundation in Shostakovich's music. In general, the most characteristic features of the majority of Shostakovich's modes are their minor quality and lowered degrees. So, new modes include the Phrygian mode with a low-
erected fourth degree (what Dolzhansky calls "the lowered Phrygian mode"), the Aeolian mode with both a lowered fourth and a lowered eighth degree ("the double lowered Aeolian mode"), and the Phrygian mode with both a lowered fourth and a lowered eighth degree ("the double lowered Phrygian mode"). Thus, Dolzhansky's "lowered Phrygian" and "double lowered Phrygian" modes broadly coincide with Mazel's "intensified Phrygian mode." For example, Shostakovich used the double lowered Aeolian mode in the finale of the Second Piano Sonata (Example 34.13).

Harmonically, these modes create new treatments of and resolutions for chords that contain these lowered degrees. For instance, Dolzhansky points out, the diminished seventh chord in the lowered Phrygian mode turns out to be not a leading seventh chord but a dominant seventh chord: in Example 34.14, the seventh chord built on the dominant is a fully diminished seventh chord as a result of the seventh degree, the A, which is not raised, and the Eb, the lowered fourth degree.

Example 34.13. Dmitri Dmitrievich Shostakovich, Sonata for piano, No. 2, Op. 64, third movement, mm. 468–473 (treble only): use of double lowered Aeolian mode.
degree. In another case, the nearness of the lowered fourth degree to the third degree in traditional minor results in a new augmented triad and resolution of it. The augmented triad on III characteristic for the harmonic minor mode with its dominant element is replaced by the augmented triad on IV in the lowered modes with its tonic element. Thus, where III+ resolves directly to tonic, IV+ resolves to tonic only after progressing first, through stepwise motion as illustrated, to the dominant (Example 34.15). In addition, this augmented triad on IV may, without the middle note, be equal enharmonically to the parallel tonic major triad. Thus, while this chord may be written as I, it functions as IV+ and requires resolution to i (Example 34.16).

Example 34.14. Lowered Phrygian mode: "Dominant" (=diminished) seventh chord on V, and its resolution to I.
Example 34.15. Lowered modes: IV+ resolving through V to I. Contrasted with minor mode: III+ resolving directly to tonic.

Example 34.16. Dmitri Dmitrievich Shostakovich, Sonata for piano, No. 2, Op. 64, first movement, mm. 283–284 (conclusion): IV+ enharmonically equal to I. Resolves to i.
Example 34.17. Dmitri Dmitrievich Shostakovich, Piano Quintet, Op. 57, G minor, second movement (Fugue), m. 102 (piano): V7 chord with omitted fifth = III.

In another instance of enharmonism, the lowered fourth (in this case in the harmonic minor mode) produces a dominant seventh chord, which, with its fifth omitted, is enharmonically equal to the minor triad on III (Example 34.17). Another chord possibility, which is met in the minor mode only through alteration, is the minor triad on the second degree in the lowered Phrygian mode. In minor this chord is achieved only through the lowering of the middle and bottom pitches of the diminished triad on II (Example 34.18). Dolzhansky points out that the two minor triads at the distance of a minor second provide the scale that agrees with the scale of the lowered Phrygian mode, and suggests this harmonic means as a way of deriving the scale. The seventh tone in this scale is lacking (which Dolzhansky provides in the example) but he does not comment on its absence (Example 34.19).
Example 34.18. Dmitri Dmitrievich Shostakovich: a) Ledi Makbet (Katerina Izmailova), Act I, Scene 3: Song of Katerina, F♯ minor, beginning; b) Piano Prelude, Op. 34, No. 22, G minor, mm. 29-31: Minor triad on II in lowered Phrygian mode.

Example 34.19. Formation of lowered Phrygian mode through juxtaposition of two minor triads a minor second apart.
Dolzhansky explains Shostakovich's preference for minor modes by comparing his music to that of Bach:

[Shostakovich's] music is polyphonic, based not on a chordal harmonic logic, but on a polymelodic one, similar to the works of Bach and Palestrina, and to folk song.

It is not accidental that the majority of works of Bach, particularly imitative [ones], are written in minor tonalities. It is possible to stress, that minor themes of Bach fugues are more brilliant than major [themes] and are recalled more easily. This occurs because minor possesses stronger expressive melodic means than major.

Also in melodic music, operating not on a tonic triad, but on one tonic sound, minor may appear as the foundation of an image not obligatorily sad but also happy. Many folk dance melodies are composed in minor modes.56

But he subsequently comments that Shostakovich's modes with separate lowered degrees, in which the basic structural principle is "the aspiration to the lowering of degrees, that is their proximity to the lower tonic and distance from the upper tonic," carry huge significance for "the possibilities of a great tragic tension." Thus Dolzhansky does not ignore the obligatory comment regarding the expressive possibilities of theoretical elements.

Dolzhansky also points out that, in a manner similar to Bach's in the melodic leap from the lowered sixth degree down to the leading tone—creating the interval of a diminished seventh, which Dolzhansky believes closes the scalar gap between the two pitches—"Shostakovich also closes the melodic motion in the diminished octave between the two tonics (I and VII degrees of the double lowered modes)." Mazel and Dolzhansky therefore agree on the relative linear independence of Shostakovich's music but only Mazel discusses this aspect in any depth.
Theoretically it is possible to construct what Dolzhansky calls "a maximally lowered mode, that is, a mode, consisting of all diminished intervals in relation to the tonic" (Example 34.20a). The resulting mode is a very compressed one in comparison to its diatonic original. As he explains it, the tonic triad of this mode is a minor-diminished triad, with a diminished third on the bottom and a major third on top (Example 34.20b). The parallel major to this tonic is the diminished triad (Example 34.20c), and the parallel major to the diminished triad is a minor triad (Example 34.20d). According to Dolzhansky, this minor triad plays the role of a "double major" and the major triad may be considered as a "triple major." For this reason, he says, the major triad in Shostakovich's works sounds particularly bright.

Shostakovich never used this maximum mode, but occasionally he comes close to it, as, for example, in the theme of the passacaglia from Ledi Makbet (Katerina Izmailova), which contains four diminished intervals from the tonic, including diminished intervals on the fourth, fifth, seventh and eighth degrees (Example 34.21).

Example 34.20. Maximally lowered mode: a) scale; b) tonic triad; c) parallel major; d) "double" parallel major.
Example 34.21. Dmitri Dmitrievich Shostakovich, Ledi Makbet (Katerina Izmailova), Act II, entre-act between scenes 4 & 5, theme from passacaglia.

In the double lowered Aeolian mode, there exists an augmented second between the lowered fourth and the fifth degrees. To avoid this augmented second, Shostakovich brings in an intermediate sound, which creates a three-time symmetrical mode—actually a half-filled-in variation of the whole-tone scale—with the pattern:

\begin{align*}
1 & 1/2 & 1/2 & 1 & 1/2 & 1/2 & 1 & 1/2 & 1/2
\end{align*}

Dolzhansky calls this mode "the Aeolian double lowered melodic mode" and explains that in Shostakovich's modal system this mode joins within itself characteristics of several modal varieties, similar to the minor and the major-minor system. He illustrates its enharmonic-parallel equivalents when constructed from the first tones of each of the three segments (which form an augmented triad) (Example 34.22).
Example 34.22. "Aeolian double lowered melodic mode": enharmonic equivalents.

In order to reveal the modulatory means and conditions of these new modes, Dolzhansky proposes "the theory of harmonic opposition." In melodically opposed modes, the same intervals occur in opposite directions; in other words, the ascending form on one mode is equal intervallically to the descending form of another mode. For example, Phrygian is opposed to Ionian, Mixolydian to Aeolian, Lydian to Locrian and Dorian to Dorian (Example 34.23a). In harmonically opposed modes, triads of opposite structure exist on opposite degrees. Thus, by degrees, II is opposed to VII, II to VI, IV to V, and I to VIII, and by type, major is opposed to minor (and vice versa), diminished to diminished, and augmented to augmented. In Shostakovich's modes other triadic combinations of intervals are opposite, for example, major-
diminished and minor-diminished (Example 34.23b). Of the church modes, the harmonically opposed pairs are Ionian-Aeolian, Mixolydian-Dorian, Lydian-Phrygian and Locrian-Loorian (Example 34.23c).

Dolzhansky uses this theory to explain the evolution of the major-minor modal system as well as Shostakovich's modes. Thus the Ionian mode was singled out because it contains the acoustically correct dominant seventh chord and tonic triad. The Aeolian entered the major-minor modal system because it is harmonically opposed to the Ionian. This foundation provided symmetrical modulatory paths for new modes:

So, in the first degree of relatedness in major--two major tonalities on IV and V degrees; in minor--two minor tonalities on the opposite V and IV degrees; in major--three minor tonalities, on II, III and VI degrees; in minor--three major tonalities on the opposite VII, VI and III degrees. The same is in tonal correlations of other degrees of relatedness.60

The harmonic minor mode arose as a result of the aspiration towards an acoustically correct dominant seventh chord and a leading tone; the harmonic major mode arose later, as a stimulus from the harmonic minor. The melodic minor arose from the need to eliminate the augmented interval between VI and VII in the harmonic minor mode; The melodic major arose as an "answer" to the melodic minor.

This same method of harmonic opposition gives rise in Shostakovich's music to additional new modes. Thus, the harmonically opposed mode to the Phrygian mode with the lowered fourth degree is the Lydian mode with the raised second degree. The double lowered Phrygian and Aeolian modes are opposed by modes with two varieties of the fifth degree, "in opposition to the two varieties of the first degree in the minor modes. And really, such modes become representatives of major
Example 34.23. a) Melodically-opposed modes; b) opposite triads; c) harmonically-opposed modes.
modes of Shostakovich." The secondary part of Shostakovich's Second Piano Sonata is written in one of these "major" modes, the raised Lydian mode: Eb major, with A natural and F# (Example 34.24).

Example 34.24. Dmitri Dmitrievich Shostakovich, Sonata for piano, No. 2, Op. 64, first movement, secondary part, mm. 66-68: raised Lydian mode.

The Aeolian double lowered melodic mode examined above is harmonically self-opposed. Three opposing triads may be constructed on its tonic—major and minor, augmented (and diminished), and diminished (and augmented).

Dolzhansky posits new interpretations of the parallel and relative relationships between major and minor modes. In Shostakovich's system, relative modes are those that are harmonically opposed to each other, such as the double lowered Phrygian mode and the double raised Lydian mode. Thus "major" and "minor" relative tonalities are distant from each other by a diminished fourth, since it is at this distance that they share the most tones. For example, B minor (double lowered Phrygian) is relative to Eb major (double raised Lydian) and not D
major, as in the major-minor modal system (Example 34.25). As support for his theory, Dolzhansky cites the Second Sonata, in which the main part is in B minor, and the secondary in Eb major, that is, in the proper relative relationship to the main tonality, according to Shostakovich's system.

Example 34.25. Relative tonalities.

The idea of parallel tonalities also takes on a new view in Shostakovich's system. Because the double lowered modes have essentially two tonics, I and bVIII, there may also be two tonalities. Parallel to B minor, for example, may be both B major and Bb major. Of these two parallel tonalities, B major is more remote from B minor than Bb major because it contains fewer common tones with B minor. "Thus, B minor and Bb major are in this modulatory system 'more parallel' tonalities than B minor and B major" (Example 34.26). The combination of
major and minor triads a half-step apart occurs frequently in Shostakovich's music.

These modes also give rise to a new, expanded circle of first degree relatedness. Related to B double lowered Phrygian mode, for example, are, in addition to D major and G major (their tonic chords found in and related to the original Phrygian mode), also C minor, Eb major and G minor, as II, IV and VI, respectively (Example 34.27).

Example 34.26. Parallel tonalities.

As an example of Shostakovich's use of these new modal connections and relationships, Dolzhansky analyzes the first movement of the Second Piano Sonata. Its tonal plan is "normal," he says. The exposition modulates from B minor to Eb major, that is, in Shostakovich's modal language, to the relative major. The recapitulation modulates from B
Example 34.27. Triads in B double lowered Phrygian mode in first degree of relatedness.

minor to Bb major, that is, to the parallel major. He describes the rest of the movement:

In the development Shostakovich follows classical principles. First he uses the method of "clouding" by way of a modulation into the parallel minor (mm. 89-98—Eb major—E minor), then a deviation into remote tonalities (mm. 119-140); further something like a false recapitulation in the parallel major (mm. 141—Bb major instead of B minor is a very bright place of the first movement, similar from the first movement of Beethoven's Ninth Symphony) and, finally, a return to the main tonality through G minor, that is through the subdominant sphere (mm. 156-168).63

Dolzhansky concludes:

Thus, the proposed theory of the opposition of modes gives the key to the discovery in the works of Shostakovich not only of separate new modal formations, serving as a means of characterology [kharakterologii], but also to the comprehension of new modulatory connections, which distinctively turn into principles of a classical modulatory system and appear as the means of formation, as a means of the construction of a musical work.64

The results of this theory of opposition, the expansion of the ideas of relative and parallel to neighboring tonalities, appears to be particularly useful, since in Dolzhansky's interpretation Shostakovich applied
these principles regularly and consistently. But to posit their origin as melodically or harmonically opposed modes is to rely on a system of deliberate pitch manipulations for which the evidence is not forthcoming. It is more likely that these modes that happen to be opposed arose as a result of the expansion of the idea of related and parallel tonalities, rather than the reverse. If major and minor modes do not oppose each other melodically—and the melodically opposed mode to Ionian is Phrygian—yet they function as relative and parallel tonalities, then why does Dolzhansky assume that altered relative and parallel tonalities function as a result of their exact opposition? Relative and parallel tonalities in the traditional sense of major and minor share certain tones. In the case of relative tonalities, they share the same tones in their natural states. In the case of parallel tonalities, they share four tones—tonic, subdominant, dominant and supertonic. Dolzhansky's altered relative and parallel tonalities share more tones than major and minor in either case. Perhaps in the same way that Shostakovich derived new modes by lowering or raising pitches, he also derived new tonal relationships.

Dolzhansky continued to promote and expand his views towards Shostakovich's modal language in subsequent works. And the topic of Shostakovich's modal language has been the subject of even more recent works. But Dolzhansky was the first to apply a strict methodology with which to analyze the modal and harmonic aspects of Shostakovich's music.

Shostakovich's use of diminished intervals, particularly the di-
minished fourth and also the diminished octave, is unquestionable. And their application to the church modes, thereby creating new modes, appears plausible. Of course, this diatonic foundation for Shostakovich’s music, one that resembles the modal foundation of folk music, constitutes a conservative approach, one undoubtedly sanctioned by the Soviet artistic hierarchy. But of all Dolzhansky's premises, the most dubious one is the theory of opposite tonalities. Although his results may be satisfactory, his method of achieving them leave doubt as to their historical validity. And, the question arises, how does Dolzhansky reconcile the derivation of modes in Shostakovich’s music through the idea of harmonic opposition—for it is only through harmonic opposition that Phrygian is opposed to Lydian—when, as he states in the beginning of the article, the modal basis for Shostakovich’s music is not harmonic but melodic? The pairs of melodically-opposed modes are not the same as the pairs of harmonically-opposed modes.

Dolzhansky raised several questions he left unanswered in his article—for example, the preconditions of the appearance of these modes, including in the music of other composers; the evolution of the modal basis in all the works of Shostakovich, and the ideological design of this evolution. To answer these questions would have meant following Marxist methodology more closely. But other questions come to mind: What are the other modes Dolzhansky mentions and how are they treated? He discusses only a few of the more prominent ones. How are these modes treated on a large scale? Outside of Dolzhansky's analysis
of one tonal plan (in the Second Piano Sonata), all his examples represent only local occurrences of these modes. What is Shostakovich's relation to folk music, to which Dolzhansky only alludes? Are there similar lowered and raised modes in any of the folk musics in the U.S.S.R.? Dolzhansky's article was just a first step towards a theoretical understanding of Shostakovich's music, which, to be comprehensive, should consider these and many other aspects.

In the sense just described, Mazel's article presents a more clear and complete analysis of Shostakovich's music than does Dolzhansky's. But, although he points out Shostakovich's use of lowered modes, Mazel makes no attempt to derive a theory explaining the nature and origin of Shostakovich's modal language, as does Dolzhansky. Mazel concentrates more on the melodic aspect, attempting to explain the origin of many of the modal melodic traits of Shostakovich's music, and to discuss the context in which they occur. In addition he aims to educate the reader and to justify the acceptance of Shostakovich's music. His own acceptance of Shostakovich's music is unqualified. He still shies away from the role of critic in its strictest sense; he does not judge Shostakovich's methods or results, merely accepts and exults over their new and innovative qualities. Dolzhansky makes little attempt to accommodate political theory, or to apply historical methods and models, except for Bach; nor does he criticize or judge except in an approving fashion like Mazel, such as his using the adjectives "completely new" and "exceptionally interesting" in reference to Shostakovich's treatment of parallel tonalities. His approach is uni-
dimensional and therefore does not fit the mold of a Soviet theoretical
article of the 1940s. Yet the conservative aspects of his approach,
relating Shostakovich's modes to the church modes and to Bach's music,
were apparently more acceptable than Mazel's analogies with jazz and
circus music. And his interpreters saw other acceptable correlations,
as this explanation from V. Bobrovsky about the semantic significance
of lowered degrees in minor testifies:

The idea about the role of lowered alterations in minor sheds
light not only on the syntactical but also on the semantic side of
musical language. Minor is distinguished from major . . . by the
lowered third, defining the essential difference of modes. The
lowering of other degrees leads to the enrichment of the coloring
of minor as a generalized psychological-semantic phenomenon, which
is connected with a dramatically intensified reaction to the
reality surrounding the artist.67

Thus the lowered degrees not only enhance the modal coloring of minor,
but also constitute an objective reaction by the artist to the reality
in his society. Both characteristics represent agreeable lines of
thought in Soviet musicology.

Yet during the 1940s Dolzhansky was criticized both directly for
his "formalist" views and indirectly, through the harsh comments
leveled at Shostakovich in the late 1940s—"guilt by association."
Thus he published nothing more about Shostakovich's music until 1956 in
an article on the Seventh Symphony. Today in the Soviet Union, though,
Dolzhansky is viewed as a founder of the field of theoretical research
on Shostakovich's music, with several important books and articles to
his credit.
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Criticism, 1946–1950

Between 1917 and 1950 Soviet musicians weathered several political crises. The first, of course, was the revolution itself, with the attendant hardships, nationalizations, reorganizations, and, despite a new and radically different political direction, relative (but short-lived) artistic freedom. The second, precipitated by the hard-line proletarian movement in the late 1920s, culminated in a second reorganization and a renewed and more stringent political direction in 1932–1933. The third, which in music began officially in February 1948 but in the arts in general started in 1946, lasted—ostensibly—until 1950, but with repercussions for years to come. Significant changes took place only after 1953, the year of Stalin's death; but even then these changes came slowly, for Soviet theorists had much time to recapture. But if the measures adopted in 1932–33 seemed restrictive, the events and proposals of the period 1948–1950 were downright Draconian.

Andrei Aleksandrovich Zhdanov (1896–1948). Andrei A. Zhdanov, a member of the Politburo and a leader and expert on cultural policy for the Communist Party, initiated this last cultural crisis, which
affected not only music but all the arts, in September 1946, with two separate speeches in Leningrad attacking the literary journals Zvezda [Star] and Leningrad, both published in Leningrad, for publishing works by Zoschenko and Anna Akhmatova. On June 24, 1947, he "publicly tore to pieces" G. F. Alexandrov's textbook on the history of Western philosophy. The next month, July 20, 1947, in an article in Pravda, he outlined his policy—one of "criticism and self-criticism," "the real strength of our development and a powerful tool in the hands of the Party. Without doubt this is a new kind of movement, a new kind of development, a new dialectical regularity." This "criticism" takes the place of class revolution as a motive power for social development, since the Soviet Union—theretically—is a classless society. Andrei Olkhovsky describes the true effect of this policy:

The meaning of "criticism" in the Soviet Union is well known: it is the authority which the Party possesses to assert that white is black and black is white. The meaning of "self-criticism" is also known: it is the repetition and confirmation of what the Party has said. It follows that the real purpose of Zhdanov's campaign was to train the Soviet people to believe once and for all that the historical development of the Soviet Union, its social, cultural and artistic life, are due entirely to the Party and the government and that the masses and man in general as a subject for history are categorically excluded from creative life. In other words there is not only no possibility of a revolution in the Soviet Union but there is no room for elementary freedom of thought and of the creative consciousness in general nor even for any partial opposition to the orders of the Party and the government. For art and for music this means complete servitude to the criticism and self-criticism of the Party, i.e., to the will, whims, aims, tastes, and arbitrary administration of a small group of Party bureaucrats.

Thus in the name of "progress" the Party was free to criticize the work and attitudes of Soviet writers, artists, and musicians and to
demand servitude from them by requiring them to repeat the same criticisms towards themselves (self-criticism) to show their obeisance. During this period Zhdanov became omnipresent; at every meeting, conference, and congress of Soviet musicians, he either appeared in person to speak or was liberally quoted. His untimely death on August 31, 1948, did little to interrupt the path of the course he had chosen; by then the famous Resolution of the Communist Party denouncing Soviet composers had made clear the intent of the Party. In the field of music the composer Tikhon Nikolaevich Khrennikov (b. 1913), the first (and so far the only) Secretary General of the Composers' Union (he became "First Secretary" in 1957), took his place, making appearances and leveling criticisms at every gathering. But even before the appearance of the 1948 Resolution, Zhdanov's words and policy were having a strong effect.

The Composers' Union Resolution, 1947. In the spring of 1947 the Musicological Commission of the Organizational Committee [Orgkomitet, formed 1939, headed by Khachaturian, 1939-1948] of the Composers' Union held a discussion of Ogolevets's two books, and issued a Resolution. Although its purpose was ostensibly to discuss Ogolevets's works, this meeting attracted enough attention to turn it into a regular theoretical conference, with a significance far beyond that originally projected. The organizers took their cue from Zhdanov and his policy of criticism: "Only on the basis of fundamental Bolshevik self-criticism will we be able to resolve the huge tasks before Soviet theoretical and
historical musicology." Earlier, the historical work by R. I. Gruber, *Istoriia muzykal'noi kul'tury* [The history of musical culture], had been singled out for "discussion"; Ogolevets's works became the target for theoretical musicology.

At this meeting the conferees criticized Ogolevets's theories to the same extent as Shchedrin, in the article discussed earlier, lauded them. According to a report of this discussion and its Resolution in *Soviet Music*, Ogolevets's theories were judged to be "deeply faulty and antiscientific"; and his method not only was considered to be formalistic and antihistorical, but also was viewed as "an attempt to subsume the theoretical basis [of music] under the phenomenon of musical modernism." The consensus held that the few positive moments in his books, such as his views on major and minor, his systematization of modes and classification of chords, unfortunately "do not offset the basic insufficiencies of his conceptions." Essentially, his works were considered too theoretical in the Western bourgeois sense ("abstract," "mathematical," and "mechanical" were some of the terms used to describe his approach), with not enough attention to the proper aesthetics, history, ideology and philosophy, i.e., Marxism. And although he attempted "to be a pioneer," as he put it, in the introduction of the method of dialectical materialism into music theory, this attempt was judged unsuccessful because of his "basic lack of understanding" of this philosophy, according to the report. As described in the report, in his works he misrepresents theses of both Engels and Lenin—Engels about history and logic and Lenin about the elements of dialectics. He
had the temerity to construct his own history of music and the musical "substrata," virtually ignoring the method of historical materialism, the application of which he called "a hopeless path, for the time being" and leading "only to untrue conceptions and infinite sociologi-
10 zation." Also, the resolution stated, he "mechanically tears away from each other the organic component elements of a single dialectical method and arbitrarily establishes 'problems of research according to their sequence,'" thereby expressing "views, basically alien to the foundations of Marxist-Leninist science about art, representing the 11 manifestation of formalism and idealism in musicology."

The "most important defect," the report states, is "the isolation of music from historical reality, from other forms of thought, combined with the ignoring of the ideological emotional content of music." This charge arises from Ogolevets's interpretation of the foundation of music (the "substratum") in quintal and major-minor relations, expressed in numerical and arithmetic means. He proposes this approach as a scientific foundation for musical aesthetics; but this "return to Pythagorism" was "long ago denounced by the doctrine of Marxism."
The Resolution mentions another mistake along the same lines:

One of the main positions of the conception of Ogolevets is based on the erroneous transferring of the simplest ideas of mechanical motion into the sphere of music: Ogolevets mechanically transfers the idea of attraction and repelling, of approach and withdrawal from the sphere of the simple, lowest forms of motion, met in nature, into the sphere of the highest form of motion, into the sphere of artistic thought, of ideology; he forgets that even very elementary forms of musical motion are not able to be understood by means of simple analogies with the phenomena of physics, of mechanics, and the more so such a high and complex form of musical organization as mode.14
Ogolevets's view of the history of musical thought as "a periodic tonal system" embracing "the gradual accumulation of new, more tense sounds, the accumulation of definite intervals—fifths, in which also is included the gradual appearance of the full tonal system"—was denounced as "apriori," a "speculative, preconceived scheme," and "isolated from concrete historical reality and the social roots of art." The report states, "The theory of A. S. Ogolevets never speaks about the system of musical images, nor about the real qualitative differences between different styles." Further, his definition of mode, which for each level depends on the previous tonal system, was labeled "absurd." The Resolution concludes that "positions of different idealistic systems are mixed eclectically in the works of Ogolevets—Pythagorian ideas are combined with a moving into the sphere of social phenomena of a different sort, 'energy' and 'tension.'"

Other problems encountered in Ogolevets's works include "the direct opposition of theory to practice," his approach to the development and contemporary state of Azerbaidzhanian folk music, his interpretation of "contemporary musical thought as some kind of unity, ignoring the question about the ideological essence of different directions," his view of a general crisis in contemporary music as a struggle between the "retrograde" (his term) 12-tone system and the "progressive" 17-tone system, his "connection of musical progress with the transfer to new, more refined sound systems," his positive evaluation of Stravinsky's music, and his distortion of Russian musicology in which he calls Stasov a dilettante and slights the contributions of
Asafiev. Finally, according to the report, Ogolevets attempts to get even with those who have criticized him and to show that before his works there did not exist a science of musicology: "A. S. Ogolevets actually crosses out all the achievements of Soviet musicology, which objectively acquires the significance of a reactionary libel towards Soviet musical science." The Resolution concludes:

Assessing the book of Ogolevets in correspondence with his declared tasks of the creation of a summarizing historical theoretical aesthetic conception in the sphere of music, it is necessary to state the deep depravity of his conception. Distorting and vulgarizing the basic positions of Marxist-Leninist methodology, revealing a wide access to idealistic views, taking the position of formalism and antihistorical apriorism, Ogolevets appears in basic opposition with practice and allows flagrant ideological political mistakes.

Ogolevets did not get all the blame; the Organizing Committee itself received its fair share:

The Resolution attempts to place blame for allowing the appearance of such faulty works. It cites insufficient attention of the Organizing Committee of the Composers' Union "to questions of theoretical musicology and to general tasks of the development of all musicology as a whole" and "also the lack of a special scientific center, where theoretical strengths would be joined together and where would be worked out 'problems of theoretical musicology, Marxist-Leninist aesthetics and other principal problems, put forward by the practice of Soviet musical construction.'"

Noting on a wider scale certain problems within Soviet theoretical thought as a whole, "the accidental nature and limitedness of worked out thematics, the isolation from the timely problem of contemporaneity, the lack of true criticism and self-criticism," the Resolution put forth several "principal requirements" for theorists:

Working out the most important theoretical problems of contemporaneity, putting forward first the problems of the style of socialist realism in music, studying and summarizing the great
experience of multi-national Soviet musical culture in its qualita-
tively new traits, defining its originality and world progres-
sive significance—Soviet musicology is recognized to play an ex-
clusively great role in the development of all Soviet music; it is
recognized ideologically to equip Soviet composers and performers,
to enrich the spiritual culture of the Soviet people.23

The Resolution also applied the requirements of Zhdanov about fighting
and winning the ideological battle against vestiges of bourgeois
ideology to Soviet musicologists.

In other words, Soviet music culture—that derived from folk
music, predominantly melodic—and political philosophy, i.e., Socialist
Realism, were to take precedence above all other topics and methods,
and were to be elevated to the highest levels of recognition and appreci-
cation. Soviet musicologists and theorists were to become educators
and critics, not only teaching the Soviet people about their native
culture, but also helping Soviet composers and performers to realize
their talents in service and homage to this great cultural tradition.
This meeting turned out to be a prominent omen of the powerful deluge
of criticism and attacks in the field of music that soon followed.

Editorial, Soviet Music, 1947. Not long after this "discussion"
of Ogolevets's (and Gruber's) works, in May of 1947 Soviet Music con-
tained an editorial entitled, "Smelee dvigat' vpered Sovetskuiu
muzykal'nuiu estetiku" [To move Soviet musical aesthetics forward more
boldly]. The editors included Asafiev, Kabalevsky, Miaskovsky, B.
Surin, Khachaturian, Y. Shaporin, and Shostakovich. Kabalevsky had been
the main editor in this group, but beginning with the issue dated
November 1946, this distinction was eliminated. From then until the
end of 1947, there was only a collective editorship. In this editorial from mid-1947, the editors call for the "active interference [vmeneshatel'stva] of aesthetic thought in the course of the formation of our musical art." As the basis for this interference, the editors place not only "the sum of the aesthetic experience already accumulated by Soviet musicians, but also the bold creative revision of the established basic ideas of musical aesthetics not always critically mastered by us in light of dialectical materialism":

The relation in music of artistic form and ideological content, of the beautiful and the expressive, the relation of musical art to reality and the artist to society should be examined not as frozen categories but in their historical motion and in connection with this from the position of the new, qualitatively higher level achieved by us in the artistic development of humanity.26 The editors address specifically the question of music theory:

One of the most important tasks of theoretical thought is the radical overcoming of exceptionally hardy, deeply rooted mechanistic ideas but in the sphere of theory and also in the history of music. In many of our theoretical works, in courses of analysis, [in] articles and dissertations continue to live negative skills and methods of thought of West European (and above all—German) formalistic musicology, with traits of [gelerteriskii] isolation of theory from living artistic perception characteristic to it, with a fundamental ostracism of ideological aesthetic evaluation as, supposedly, "unscientific," with the splitting of the artistic organism into severed, separated elements, subject to scrupulous analysis striking by its lack of fruitfulness. . . .

The overcoming of the deeply faulty influences of the philosophically idealistic West European musical theoretical thought of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is narrowly connected with the development of the vital, progressive traditions of Russian thought about music, stemming from Odeevsky, Serov, Stasov and enriched in new Soviet conditions by B. V. Asafiev.27 They call for the more immediate critical evaluation of musicological works, not waiting six years as in the case of Ogolevets, and mention specifically the works by Mazel and Ryzhkin (Ocherki po istorii
teoreticheskogo muzykoznaniia), Tiulin (Uchenie o garmonii), S. Skrebkov (Polifonicheskii analiz [Polyphonic analysis]), and the brigade harmony textbook as requiring such critical analysis. The rest of the article is directed towards historical musicology, towards its rebuilding according to Marxist premises, and towards discrediting Western musicology.

**The Central Committee Resolution, 1948.** On February 10, 1948, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union issued a resolution entitled, "Ob opere 'Velikaia Druzhba' Muradela" [On the opera "The Great Friendship" by Muradeli]. However, this resolution is not so much about Muradeli's opera as it is about the "unsatisfactory state of contemporary Soviet music." "The Great Friendship" is merely a vehicle for a more widespread critical attack on the leading Soviet composers. Thus with this resolution the Party began a campaign to purge Soviet music of all undesirable "formalist" elements, mainly modernistic and Western influences.

This Resolution did not appear out of the blue; its appearance followed several events that indicated to Zhdanov and the Party that Soviet musicians were not seriously adhering to critical warnings—such as that given in Pravda in 1936 concerning Shostakovich's opera—about the state of Soviet music. The proverbial "last straw" for the Party was Muradeli's opera, a minor work, admittedly, but one that displeased the authorities nonetheless. Its uncritical reception by many musicians gave rise to heated discussions both before and after its closed
premiere at the Bolshoi Theater in early January. The most significant
discussion took place in mid-January at a conference of composers and
musicians chaired by Zhdanov and held in the building of the Central
Committee of the Communist Party. It is this meeting that Alexander
Werth wrote about in Musical Uproar in Moscow, and which provided the
foundation for the February Resolution. Thirty composers and musicians
spoke at this conference, which, as initiated by Zhdanov, centered on
"problems" in contemporary Soviet music as represented by Muradeli's
opera. Since at this meeting the topic of music theory per se did not
come up for discussion and since Werth covers the meeting itself quite
adequately, I shall dwell here on the Resolution and subsequent meet-
ings and publications that bear more directly on music theory.

The Resolution saw nothing good in Muradeli's opera or in the
current state of Soviet music composition, criticism, education, or
science. Specifically, the Resolution criticizes Muradeli's opera for
its "feeble," "inexpressive," unmelodic, "confused," "disharmonious,"
"oppressive," "disconnected," "miserable," non-folklike, unclassical
and "formalist" music. In spite of repeated warnings from the Party
beginning in 1936 after the premiere of Shostakovich's opera Lady
Macbeth of Mtsensk, the authors assert, such traits unfortunately
continued to be characteristic for Soviet music as a whole:

The question at issue concerns composers who adhere to the formal-
istic anti-popular tendency. The very fullest expression of this
tendency is found in the works of such composers as Dmitri
Shostakovich, Sergei Prokof' yev, Aram Kachaturian, Vissarion
Shebalin, G. Popov, N. Myaskovsky, and others whose compositions
represent most strikingly the formalistic perversions and anti-
democratic tendencies in music which are alien to the Soviet
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people and their artistic tastes. The characteristic marks of this music are the negation of the basic principles of classical music: the cult of atonality, the dissonance and discord supposedly expressive of "progress" and "novelty" in the development of music form, the rejection of such a vital principle of musical composition as melody, and enthusiasm for confused, neuropathological combinations which transform music into cacophony, into a chaotic medley of sounds. This music reeks strongly of the odor of the contemporary, modernistic, bourgeois music of Europe and America which reflects the decay of bourgeois culture, the total negation, the impasse of musical art.

An essential mark of the formalistic tendency is also the rejection of polyphonic music and singing based on the simultaneous arrangement and development of a series of independent melodic lines and an enthusiasm for monotonous unisonic music and singing, often without words. This constitutes a violation of the many-voiced system of music and singing native to our people, and leads to the impoverishment and decadence of music.32

Also characteristic of this formalistic tendency is a disdain for vocal music, with the result "that composers will forget how to write for the people." Thus Soviet music must be melodic, tonal and consonant, and also—ideally—polyphonic and vocal.

The authors expand their criticisms to include also theorists and musicologists, educators—the Moscow Conservatory above all—and critics, who in their view have conspired with the composers to disregard the needs of the people and to write, promote, and study music intended only for the educated few. For this deplorable state, the Party blames "the incorrect line in the field of Soviet music which has been pursued by the Committee on Art Affairs under the council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. and the Organizational Committee of the Union of Soviet Composers," the latter headed by Khachaturian. Thus, because both "the cultural needs and the level of artistic taste of the Soviet people" and "the cultural needs and the level of artistic taste of the Soviet people have advanced greatly," and because the people "expect from
composers works of high quality and ideological content in all categories," the Central Committee resolved:

1. To condemn the formalistic tendency in Soviet music as against the people and as leading actually to the liquidation of music.

2. To propose to the Department of Propaganda and Agitation of the Central Committee and the Committee on Art Affairs that they endeavor to correct the situation in Soviet music, liquidate the shortcomings set forth in the present resolution of the Central Committee, and ensure the development of Soviet music in the direction of realism.

3. To call upon Soviet composers to become aware of the lofty demands made on musical art by the Soviet people, to clear away everything that weakens our music and hampers its development, to ensure that upsurge of creative work which will advance Soviet musical culture rapidly and lead to the creation of finished works of high quality, worthy of the Soviet people, in every branch of music.

4. To approve organizational measures of the appropriate Party and Soviet organs directed toward the improvement of musical affairs.35

Thus the remedy fell on two levels—organizational and individual. Composers, theorists, musicologists, and critics were required to produce work that reflected the concerns expressed in the Resolution; and the various Party organizations, departments, and committees were to provide the proper environment and direction to enable them to respond correctly.

The Meeting of Composers and Musicologists of Moscow, 1948. After the Resolution appeared, another meeting of composers and musicologists of Moscow was held, from February 17 to February 26, 1948. This meeting was better attended than the previous one. No fewer than fifty composers and musicologists made appearances, either in person or in writing—Prokofiev sent a letter—at this meeting. Among the Moscow
The comments by these theorists, whose political orientations ranged from moderate to extreme, were varied in tone and focus. Most tailored their remarks to the charges leveled in the Resolution, which meant concentrating on the composers or especially the education of composers. Ryzhkin and Berkov took rather moderate stances, for example, and focused on some of the more positive aspects of composition and musicology. Ryzhkin pointed out that even the most formalistic works contained some healthy realistic elements, towards which the composers of these works should be oriented, in order to help them overcome the modernistic influences and set them on the path of Socialist Realism. Berkov cautioned his colleagues not to avoid the study of "relevant" problems of Soviet music (which he did not specify) or to discontinue research on the music of those composers with formalistic tendencies. He advocated a position of strength based on knowledge: the struggle against the bourgeois West can only be won armed with information about the enemy. Berkov's approach may be interpreted as one way of circumventing the strictures against "cosmopolitanism" and allowing Soviet theorists and musicologists to continue to study Western music. The reporter for Soviet Music, where an account—not unbiased—of this Congress was published, pointed out the unfortunate lack of any self-criticism by Berkov of his work on Prokofiev.
In his appearance, Ogolevets, whose works had already been targeted for criticism, made the huge mistake of attempting "to slander" (in the words of the reporter for Soviet Music) the reputation of the great Asafiev, in order to deflect the criticisms against himself and other music critics and theorists charged with formalism. He also called for the criticism of some musicologists and critics who previously had positively evaluated works now considered formalistic. As for his own work, according to the reporter, he merely mentioned that he recognized the errors of some of his positions and renounced them, but failed to explain which were in error. He also recommended eliminating courses on analysis, since they are isolated from practical knowledge on composition.

Skrebkov, while acknowledging the formalistic tendencies in the "scientific culture" of musicologists, who "good-naturedly played in abstractions or laboriously looked for scientific foundations for the acclaim of the 'leading' composers," blamed composers equally for the situation:

The relation of many composers to the scientific study of music essentially is extremely unfavorable for its development. In compositional surroundings the damaging idea about spontaneity, about the complete unconsciousness of the creative process, reflecting particularly ruinously on young composers are widely disseminated. At the same time the composers of the older generation have their theories, generalizations, views, each has his "compositional musicology," not being subjected to discussion and criticism, but frequently being used to significantly greater influence than the articles and books of musicologists.37

The Romantic notion of a spontaneous creativity based on a mysterious unknown process and the individualistic, old style of views towards
composition were not in keeping with the idea that composers must strive consciously, using means common to all, to create music worthy of the Soviet people. Also, Skrebkov observes, the conservatories and the composers themselves have little respect or concern for what he calls "the theoretical culture," which is not music theory but the theory of Marxist–Leninist ideology. In fact, Skrebkov decries the overemphasis on craft, on technique—i.e., practical music theory—and calls for an "upsurge of the ideological theoretical culture." The lack of such a culture allowed composers to slip into formalism. Rather than eliminating the course on music analysis, as suggested by Ogolevets, he favors renovating its content, in order "to remove formalism from it and considerately cultivate those sprouts of true scientificness [Marxist–Leninist theory] that are in it and of which Soviet musicology may be proud."

Kulakovskv echoed Skrebkov's concerns regarding the "formalistic cult of technique, torn away from content," in the discipline of music theory. He called for more attention to the study of melody, for which formalistic musicology had failed to produce a significant doctrine; for the study of "musical speech as the form of ideology"; and for changes in the study and research of folk music (for which students were unprepared), particularly the study of multi-voiced song, which presents "embryos of a completely independent melodic variational style, not agreeing either with homophonic or with polyphonic styles."

Tsukkerman devoted his entire speech—which appears to have been
printed in its entirety in Soviet Music—to upbraiding the Moscow Conservatory and its director (from 1942 to 1948), the composer Vissarion Yakovlevich Shebalin, for its "unhealthy," "musty, oppressive atmosphere." Such an approach was entirely in compliance with the 1948 Resolution, which directly criticized the Conservatory for its "dominant" formalistic tendency:

Respect for the best traditions of Russian and Western classical music is not inculcated in the students, and love for popular creative art and democratic musical forms is not nurtured in them. The work of many students in the conservatories is a blind imitation of the music of Shostakovich, Prokof'yev, and others.43

In Tsukkerman's view, Shebalin ran the conservatory as he wished, with a political policy that was too middle-of-the-road, too uncommitted. His moderate direction—evident in his nominations for conservatory posts and also the curriculum—displeased Tsukkerman, who wished for a more hard-line approach. To him such a direction erred in favor of formalism:

They speak reluctantly about questions of an ideological principal character in the Moscow Conservatory. This is understandable: to expound openly formalistic directions was impossible, but to defend opposing, antiformalistic directions would signify going against their particular line.44

Tsukkerman pointed to the case of the theorist I. V. Sposobin, one of the contributors to the "brigade" harmony textbook, who ignored Russian music in his special course on harmony and was then rewarded with two prominent posts, among other positions—head of the theory department (1942–1947) and then dean of the joint theory and composition faculty at the Conservatory (1943–1948). Tsukkerman felt the "mustiness of the atmosphere" particularly in the theory and composi-
tion faculty, which "as a whole did not even exist; it artificially and deliberately was cut off from leadership in order to avoid criticism. The faculty as a whole did not meet from 1943 to 1946." In Tsukkerman's view it was Shebalin's "intolerance for criticism," which sets him apart from the majority of directors of the Conservatory (where Tsukkerman has been teaching for over twenty years), that led to this situation. People from both inside and outside the Conservatory protected Shebalin and the Conservatory from criticism, and Tsukkerman relates several instances to support this charge.

Concerning the education of composers, he pointed out the lack of instruction "in the spirit of the ideological aesthetic evaluation" of works, for which was substituted concentration on their formal aspects; this lack concerns not only composition classes but others as well, including his own course on analysis. And Shebalin, in Tsukkerman's view, was no friend of musical science. He unsuccessfully attempted in 1943 to eliminate the preparation of musicologists and theorists at the Conservatory, "reducing the character of the musicologist, as in pre-revolutionary times, to a poor copy of a composer."

Tsukkerman also repeated Skrebkov's denouncement of the emphasis on "the science of 'craft'" in music theory, the reliance on which he called "almost official and general for the Moscow Conservatory." At the same time he pointed to a decline in the level of technique of students, which he saw as nothing strange, since "professional skill is not achieved in connection with the inattention to the ideological side." However, Shebalin himself, in a paper entitled "O masterstvo"
[On skill] given in 1944, emphasized that the basic danger for Soviet composers was not formalism but dillantism.

Tsukkerman relates some other problems with Shebalin's tenure as director, for example his published program for theory courses in 1946, which was supposedly officially approved by a government agency but was not, and his close alliance with Ogolevets and his formalistic theory, which, according to Tsukkerman, explains Ogolevets's requirement for the elimination of the analysis course, since it falls outside the limits of "the craft-formalistic direction" of the conservatory. Both Shebalin and Sposobin were replaced in their posts in 1948.

Tsukkerman's comments obviously were the most pro-Party and critical of all the theorists, which is why they were printed in full. Most of the theorists attempted just to get by, playing it safe by following the Party line but not excessively. Some focused on those aspects of theory which they felt needed attention—Kulakovsky, for example, who mentioned melody and multi-voiced folk song; while others such as Ogolevets counter-attacked, in hopes that such a stance would mollify or reduce critical reaction to their own work. Since the spotlight was on the composers, few theorists themselves were criticized directly; exceptions were Ogolevets, who was the target for criticism throughout this period, Sposobin, criticized by Tsukkerman as discussed, and also V. Protopopov. Y. V. Keldysh took Protopopov to task for equating Taneev with the progressive linear tendencies of decadent and formalist music in his article, "O tematizme i melodike Taneeva" [On thematicism and melodic of Taneev]. By pointing out the continuity between
Taneev and the modern composers Shebalin, Shostakovich, and Miaskovsky, Protopopov, in the opinion of another speaker, G. B. Bernandt, attempted to justify the formalistic direction in contemporary music.

In assessing the effect of this meeting, the editor of Soviet Music (Koval) had this to say:

The walls of the Composers' Union had never before witnessed such keen and candid criticism, such an agitated discussion of the relevant problems of musical creation and musicology.

The first practical result of the Resolution of the Communist Party was felt by all: the misty atmosphere of the Composers' Union was stirred up, a fresh and unrestricted wind of criticism and self-criticism and a stepping up of social life became noticeable.

Of course, not all the appearances were at the necessary ideological height. There were superficial and erroneous appearances; some attempted to bring in personal considerations, replacing principal and great [topics] with narrow and small [ones].

The call of the Secretary of the Moscow Committee of the Communist Party comrade Danilov to the composers sounded in the meeting with great force—to raise their ideological level, to master the heights of Marxist-Leninist doctrine. Without this condition we are not able to create a truly folk music, the most advanced and perfect in the world.51

The most visible result of the 1948 Resolution and meetings connected with it was a near-total restructuring of leadership within those institutions and organizations criticized by the Party and its representatives—the Moscow Conservatory, the Composers' Union and its various sections and committees (except for Khrennikov, who only strengthened his position), and the journal Soviet Music.

The First All-Soviet Congress of Soviet Composers, 1948. From April 19 to April 25, 1948, delegates from all over the Soviet Union met in the House of Unions in Moscow. The primary emphasis of the congress was on the direction of Soviet music in fulfillment of the
goals of Marxist-Leninist thought and Socialist Realism, aimed towards the masses and understandable to them. But a few theorists, Ryzhkin, Ogolevets, Kremlev, and Kulakovsky, in addition to Asafiev (who gave an introductory address read in his absence), did speak or write to the congress. The resolution issued at the end of the Congress addressed several issues of interest for musicologists.

At the time of the January meeting Asafiev had been ill and had not attended. His address at this Congress, which summarized the thirty years of Soviet music, contained passages that supported the views expressed in the February Resolution and that directly contradicted his earlier published statements favorably evaluating the works of the great Soviet composers. The consensus of opinion today among both Western and Soviet musicologists is that Asafiev's text contained portions clearly not from his own pen.

Of the other theorists, Ryzhkin spoke hardly at all about the problems facing musicology, and Kremlev mentioned musicology only in connection with criticism. Ogolevets, following, he says, the example of Asafiev in the direction of self-criticism, attempted to "correct" his earlier defiant stance:

Admitted errors should be corrected with factual work, and in this is the great significance of criticism and self-criticism, as the bases of the regular movement forward, about which our comrade Zhdanov spoke.

In my past work there turned out to be mistakes, it is true, frequently not those that are attributed to me, but nevertheless serious mistakes, in the context of snobism and an incorrect relation to the problems of music. These mistakes I recognize and give word to correct them in future work. However it is necessary that such a possibility be granted to each who sincerely aspires to take part in the general movement forward and to help the
reconstruction... Personally I did not understand much in the basic questions of our art, in the questions of the connection with the people. But the Resolution helped me, I believe, to find the true point of view, and I will make every effort to comprehend my task correctly to the end.54

He vacillated between wanting to be forgiven and taking a hard-line stance towards the task at hand:

It is true, in separate, rare statements one happens to hear hints that a charge in the sins of formalism represents, they say, some kind of "brand" on a man. This anachronistic view has nothing in common with the correct line in questions of the elimination of mistakes. But we should not weaken the requirement, the vigilance; we should fight all attempts of a recurrence,—this is a sacred obligation of each of us and of the entire Union as a whole, and here there may not be any leniency. But at the same time help in overcoming mistakes should be provided, in particular in such a case, when a man aspires to correct present works...55

Each Soviet musicologist, not breaking completely with the basic direction of his work, should now give his basic strengths for work in the decisive, most democratic genres of musicology, in the creation of popular literature, in the creation of books necessary to the masses. I appeal to my comrades in this and resolutely intend myself to master this most difficult genre of work.55

Ogolevets still did not reveal which positions specifically he felt were in error and even denied being guilty of all the accusations made against him, but nevertheless this appearance displayed more obesance—but by no means docility—than before.

Kulakovsky submitted a lengthy written response to the Congress, in which he spoke in detail about the requirements in music education needed to overcome formalism. Because of the "bankruptcy of all the sections of the school musical theoretical pedagogy" as revealed by the Resolution, and because current pedagogy was "dilletantish" and "superficial," thus resulting in formalism, he called for the total restructuring of "the entire cycle of music theory education." This would
include not just adding certain courses in a mechanistic fashion, but also restructuring each existing course to conform to the requirements set forth in the Resolution. He emphasized the interrelated subjects of melody, vocal music, folk music and the ideological and emotional content of music. So, existing courses of harmony should be restructured with more emphasis on the melodic, horizontal aspect; analysis courses should place greater importance on content and ideology, on an integrated approach involving all elements; folk music should become part of the structure of all courses, including elementary theory, harmony, polyphony and analysis, not just as illustrative material but as integral parts of the courses; and courses on melody, folk song, the relation between music and literature in different genres of vocal music, and opera and related disciplines such as acting and directing should be implemented.

In the course of his remarks, Kulakovsky ventured into the area of direct criticism. He did not approve of Sposobin's book, which had been recommended by the Main Agency of Educational Institutions of the Committee on Matters of Art [GUUZ] as a textbook for the course in musical analysis:

[They] have already spoken about the formalistic quality of this textbook . . . but to this day they did not note that in the given course, supposedly studying "musical form," as also in previous [courses], not a word was said about musical form itself in the exact sense of this word, and the entire content is dedicated to the study of general schemes, to this day undeservedly called "musical forms." And the single distinction of the given textbook from previous [ones] is that its author already knows well that musical form is "individual and nonrepetitive," that it is indissolubly connected with musical content. Having revealed this already on the third page, the author considered as still
possible in further statement not to make for himself any kind of practical conclusions from this thesis. And in this course, thus, everything essential in music—the musical image—remained unrecognized, unstudied. Is this not a brilliant example of the utmost superficiality of school musicology?57

He considered "formalistic musicology," both pedagogical ("traditional school view") and speculative ("music theory systems"—"militant excursions of formalism" . . . by appearance opposed to positions of traditional school musicology . . . [but] based on same idealistic methodology") to be a very real danger. As an example of such a system, he pointed to the "theory" of Ogolevets. He chided Soviet theorists for their timidity and lack of response:

Our musicology least of all succeeded in the struggle with school formalism. It is believed that now, after the 1948 Resolution, our prominent theorists will be able to renounce such timid . . . "gradualness," in which they sinned. In the conditions of the dominance of formalism, frankly having been supported also by the leadership of the Moscow Conservatory and by GUUZ, they reduced their requirements to minimal tasks: to mention in programs about the necessity to study music as the form of ideology, to introduce in a course at least some integral analyses, to connect courses at least by slender threads with the study of folk music, etc.

This method (as also any "gradualness") itself not only did not correct—it showed its fallacy. Proudly (or gloomily, depending on the mood and the moment) keeping silent from all attacks, ignoring all articles, all printed attacks both of a general and also of a particular order, completely concrete, formalists took cover and decided questions "secretly," leaning on the support of the authorities, applying administrative pressure, and other methods.59

Kulakovsky recalled his own lack of success in trying to purge formalistic elements from theory (witness his articles from the 1930s, discussed in Part VII), and called on the Composers' Union, particularly its section on criticism and musicology, to do battle with the powerful bastions of formalism in education. As we shall see, he continued to push for reforms in this area.
The Congress issued a Resolution. Here is the portion of that Resolution that applies to musicology:

It is necessary to rally the cadres of musicologists, capable to contribute creatively to the development of Soviet musical culture, to concentrate their attention on the development of the problems of Marxist-Leninist musical aesthetics, on the study of the creation of the peoples of the SSSR and of living traditions of Russian classical music, on the criticism of the bourgeois-decadent music and musicology; it is necessary to revive in Soviet musical criticism the high party principalness, the militant commemorative spirit, to re-examine carefully all the basic works, written to this day about Soviet musical creation, and to create a new, truly scientific history of Soviet music, to prepare and to publish a musical encyclopedia and musical dictionary.

Before Soviet musicology stand the tasks of the working out anew of such segments of musical science, as the science of melody, the science of folk music, the problems of the Marxist analysis of form and the content of music.

The Congress states the dissatisfaction of the work of the existing centers of scientific musicology—their alienation, break from the tasks of Soviet musical culture, the disdain for contemporaneity, the presence of serious mistakes in the working out of the problems of legacy. The Congress entrusts the government to achieve the reconstruction of work and the joining of forces in the sphere of scientific musicology.60

Note the almost complete lack of attention to specific theoretical topics, save melody and the analysis of form. However, according to Soviet interpretation, the theory of folk music and of the content of music would also fall under the heading of theoretical musicology.

Even so, it is clear from this document that music theory—in spite of the attention to compositional technique and its instruction in previous documents and meetings—remains a secondary subject within the broader field of musicology.

The Composers’ Union subsequently issued a charter. Although it deals mostly with musical culture and composition, musicology is mentioned. The following quote is from a summary of the charter:
One of the most important tasks of the Union is the all possible assistance towards the development of a Marxist-Leninist musicology. It should direct musicological thought towards the working out of the vitally important problems of the history and theory of music, towards aid in overcoming the limited and scholastic state existing still in the works of many of our musical scholars. At the same time the development of the comprehensive and principal criticism of musical works has huge significance. It is well-known that Soviet musical criticism has not been at a very high level, has not succeeded in coping with the tasks of the assertion of the realistic direction standing before them, has turned out to be in the captivity of formalistic influences. The Union is called upon to launch work on the re-education of the cadres of musical critics, on the enrichment with the latest young forces. The basic method of its work is the all possible unfolding of criticism and self-criticism. And this is connected not only with the revival of musicological thought, but also with the involvement of all members of the Union in active creative work, with the organization of creative discussions and discussions of new works.

Thus musicology is tightly connected with criticism, either within the discipline, that is, criticizing oneself or each other, or in a professional manner, that is, making public judgements of new works, assessing the political orientation of composers and exhorting them to maintain the standards set before them by their Party, educating the public on the right direction for Soviet music, and the like. There appears to be little room for either historical or theoretical musicology.

The charter also set forth the new structure of the Union. The governing body is the Secretariat, headed by the General Secretary and five Secretaries. Seven commissions and five sections were created, including a commission on musicology and music criticism, and a commission for the guidance of music education.
Response, 1948. In response to these events, most theorists continued to maintain their silence, for which they had already been criticized. It was left up to some of the more militant reformers, who were not necessarily theorists, to spell out the theoretical requirements in response to the February Resolution. An interesting example in this regard concerns the question of harmony, since its "disintegration," in the forms of atonal and dodecaphonic music, is symptomatic of modernistic, formalistic music as a whole. Several musicologists wrote articles condemning these and other dissonant practices, but their criticisms were directed not always at their contemporaries but often times at prerevolutionary composers such as A. N. Scriabin. A case in point is the article by the Moscow musicologist Boris Solomonovich Shteinpress (1908—____), "Raspad garmonii v muzyke modernizma" [The disintegration of harmony in the music of modernism]. This article answers those criticisms of "schematicism and extreme negligence" he received after the publication of another article, "Protiv zashchitnikov dekadansa v muzyke" [Against the defenders of decadence in music], in which he also singled out the music of Scriabin for discussion. In this first article he treated Scriabin too harshly and was taken to task for it; for despite his completely formalistic music—according to the definition in the Resolution—Scriabin's reputation was not to be ruined. No one recommended emulating Scriabin and his methods of composition, but no one wanted to discredit him, either.

Shteinpress attempts to explain why modernistic compositional practices are alien to Soviet music and to Marxist–Leninist theory and
to refute current theories concerning their historical development and artistic value. He attacks the "cult of dissonance" as the basis of modernistic harmony, whether it is expressed in complex modes (such as Yavorsky's "double modes") or in "continuous dissonances," arising from the six-tone "Promethian" sonority (Scriabin's later music). These practices lead directly to amodality and atonality. They are undesirable because they destroy the sense of modal function, for which is necessary not only a consonant tonic but also functional and limited dissonances such as dominant and subdominant:

Dissonance serves as [one of the] means of the creation of instability, of emotional and volitional tension. The resolution of dissonance . . . always preserved its psychological significance of the disintegration of tension, the transfer into a support (full or partial). The more wide and free application of dissonances did not lead to the exclusion of consonances, but, on the contrary, was accompanied with the bright assertion of the basic major-minor consonant chords. The modern "ultra" or complex modes possess a dissonant tonic, thereby eliminating any possibility of the sense of resolution.

In defense of the major-minor system, Shteinpress calls it "a normal [modal] system of normal human music. The music of the socialistic epoch will develop further namely this system." He points to its long rich and varied history and sees no reason why such a system cannot continue to provide the harmonic foundation for contemporary music, its riches as yet not exhausted. Under the term "major-minor system," Shteinpress includes not only the major and minor modes but also their related diatonic modes—the church modes, folk modes, etc.—that is, all modes with "a consonant chord as the basis, as the center of the harmony; this is what joins all views of modes of development
multi-voiced music into a single multi-developed and infinitely rich system." He opposes the modes of this system to those "artificial modern 'modes'" in which dissonance defines their organization. He makes an important distinction:

The expansion of the seven-degree scale through chromaticism and alterations (and also "half-chromatic" deviations in several folk songs) does not lead to the creation of new modal systems, principally distinct from the diatonic [system], but forms only a natural superstructure over diatonicism. And in this is the essential distinction of the classical 12-sound chromatic system (diatonicism with chromatic variants of its degrees) from the Schoenbergian 12-half-step system, where all degrees are "absolutely" equal and therefore "atonal." It is this chromatic superstructure over a diatonic foundation that Dolzansky attempted to illustrate in Shostakovich's music. However, he went a bit beyond Shteinpress's strictures regarding the tonic triad. But Shteinpress himself makes allowances for certain conditional appearances of dissonances as tonic: "The interval of the diminished octave, for example D–Db1, limiting the scale of several Eastern melodies, does not turn into a stable tonic chord in connection with the harmonization of these melodies." Thus, as long as a diatonic foundation with a usually consonant tonic triad can be proven to exist, a theorist is on relatively solid ground.

Shteinpress denies the theory of historical development as expressed by Mazel and others that connects the growth of modernistic elements in music with their isolated occurrences in earlier music, such as the whole-tone scale in Glinka, and various scales and attendant harmonic constructions in the music of Rimsky-Korsakov leading to impressionism, and certain expressionistic segments in the music of
Chaikovsky and Musorgsky leading to twentieth-century expressionism. According to Shteinpress, Glinka and Rimsky-Korsakov included the elements mentioned for their expressive effects, since they are used to portray predominantly the exotic, fantastic, satirical or other unusual images in the music. And just because Chaikovsky and Musorgsky may have written some music dealing with horror and hallucination, or some depicting pessimistic, dark, and gloomy emotions is not a justification for present-day composers to write all their music on such premises (Berg's *Wozzeck* for example).

From among contemporaneous composers, Shteinpress singles out only Western composers—Berg, Schoenberg, Krenek, Hindemith, Stravinsky, Messiaen, Casella, and the like. He mentions no Soviet (post-revolutionary) composers, and concentrates only on the shortcomings of Scriabin's later music as evidence of the wrong path to take in contemporary music. He quotes more than one contemporary writer concerning Scriabin's idealistic conceptions, his dissonant harmonies, his brief allusory, symbolic melodies, and the like, and refers to his music repeatedly as an example of the modernistic, disharmonious tendencies in music. Thus Scriabin's music, particularly his late music, while it may not be harshly and directly criticized, may be used as an example of what to avoid. But it certainly may not become a topic for positive analysis, either. It is understandable, then, why Tiulin's student Varvara Dernova, who in 1948 wrote a work entitled *Garmonia Skriabina*, in which she analyzes all of Scriabin's music and particularly the later music according to a system derived from Yavorsky's
concept of double modes, delayed the publication of her important work for twenty years, until 1968.

Shteinpress's article contains several cautionary observations for theorists. Following from the language of the Party's 1948 Resolution, he calls "the problem of the clarity of musical language" "one of the most relevant problems of contemporary music theory." Since the Resolution specifically addressed several important aspects of music theory, Shteinpress adds, theorists especially should take note of its contents. He cautions, though, that "the isolated study of the problem of harmony is fraught with the danger of a lapse into one-sidedness." Thus it should be studied in connection with melody and other elements contributing to the overall design.

This article essentially lays down the foundation for the future development of the study of harmony and mode in Soviet music theory. These are the key premises to which theorists should adhere: diatonicism, consonance, functionalism, modality, melody. In addition, these aspects also must be included: realism, Russianism, tradition, folk culture, content, Marxism. Any theoretical work that does not concentrate in sufficient measure on these elements will be branded "formalistic" or "cosmopolitan."

Questions related to music theory crop up in other articles from 1948 and early 1949. Articles by Kulakovsky and Tsukkerman merely expand upon their comments at the 1948 meetings in Moscow. An article by Konstantin Konstantinovich Sakva (b. 1912), a 1947 theory/history graduate of the Moscow Conservatory, addresses the problem of the
"intolerable state" of music criticism, as charged in the 1948 Resolut-
75
tion. Among those he singles out for criticism is Mazel, not only for his 1941 article on Soviet music theory but also for his 1944 unpublished article on Shostakovich. Sakva did not agree with Mazel's sharp distinctions between musicology and criticism: "Both the criti-
cal article and the fat book of a musicologist should solve one and the same problem, only with different means and in different forms." In other words, each should both judge and inform to the same degree as the other. He also criticized Mazel for his approach to the history of Russian music theory (ignoring nineteenth-century theorists and critics except for their contributions to composition, his high evaluation of German musicology) and his approach to music history in general, not as the struggle of opposing forces, democratic and realistic music versus exclusive formalistic music, but as a smooth, evolutionary process in which progress is measured by the novelty of unusual technological methods. Regarding Mazel's article on Shostakovich, Sakva was particu-
larly disturbed by Mazel's general approach to Shostakovich's style.
He quotes Mazel and then comments:

In his work . . . Mazel writes that "the new stylistic system of contemporary music . . . [sic] was born in the sharp struggle with the directly preceding (primarily Romantic) style, in the struggle in which the element of destruction, of denial, of the ridicule of legacy played a significant role," that "on the whole in the early stage of the development of contemporary music . . . [sic] the narrowing of the perceiving audience had a place."

Concretely this means that the works of Glinka, Chaikovsky, Borodin and other classicists were subjected to ridicule. But the ridicule of classical traditions does not raise the indignation of Professor Mazel, and the narrowing of the listening audience also does not trouble him.77
Sakva is apparently quoting from Mazel's 1944 manuscript, which Mazel revised in 1945. Here is what Mazel wrote in that version, published in 1967:

But the very process of the synthetization of legacy and the formation of a new system of musical language and thought was not a smooth, painless, harmonically balanced process. It is well-known that in a definite period of creation, Shostakovich, as also several other artists, gave to "left-wing" experiments, connected with the destruction, the ridicule, the parody of legacy, their due. This led to a narrowing of the ideological content of music and of the perceiving audience, by the way, also because the original (grotesque, parodying) reflection of phenomena of previous art, and not of all varieties of reality, became the content of art in too great a degree. On the whole arose a row of contradictions between the aspiration of the artist to the transfer of new content with new means and the very character of the means. Overcoming these contradictions, Shostakovich subsequently did not go, however, on the path of the complete renunciation decisively from all the sharp means worked out in that period. Many of them he transformed, rethought, included in a different "context." As a result several language methods, being perceived still relatively recently primarily from their "negative" side—as the factors of the destruction of the previous system of musical thought, revealed new characteristics and played their positive role in the creation of a new, wider stylistic system.

Although Mazel did not attempt to criticize Shostakovich for his earlier direction, neither did he present the matter in such a disrespectful manner as Sakva would have his reader believe.

From another quote about Shostakovich's synthesis of the general principles of preceding styles and thought—this time given exactly as it appears in the 1967 publication—Sakva concludes that Mazel places Shostakovich's music "above all the [music] created by the geniuses of world music—from Bach and Handel to Chaikovsky and Borodin; this monstrous hyperbolization in the evaluation of Shostakovich's music was imposed upon the students of the conservatory in lectures read by Mazel."
Open Party Meeting, 1949. The articles by Shtieinpress and Sakva and other musicologists and critics that spoke directly to problems in Soviet music were few, far fewer, in fact, than the authorities would have liked. Musicologists—now unavoidably also referred to as critics—were not fulfilling the task set before them by the February 1948 Resolution, that is, to criticize, exhort and educate along the Party lines. At their second plenary session in December, the management of the Composers' Union drew attention to the inactivity of the musicologists and critics:

Overwhelmingly the majority of musicologists, instead of striving for the ideological reconstruction of musicology and criticism on the basis of the directions of the [February Resolution], instead of supporting the valuable sprouts of realism, instead of struggling against alien influences in music, show unapproachable and harmful passivity.

Digressing from discussions on relevant creative questions, musicologists have not subjected the available mistakes of musical science to criticism. The musicological commission (heads A. Sheverdian, Y. Keld'ysh) has worked poorly, not having played an active role in the creative life of the Composers' Union . . .

The journal Soviet Music (editor M. Koval') has begun a serious reconstruction; articles, exposing the phenomenon of formalism in music and propagandizing the traditions of Russian musical classicism, have appeared. New authors are being attracted to work. But the journal still has not mastered the role of the ideological educator of Soviet musicians. The basic problems of Marxist–Leninist aesthetics and of Socialist Realism are insufficiently illuminated; the articles about the positive experience of the development of Soviet music are few.

The further lag of musical criticism and musicology is intolerable, for it hinders the successful development of our art.

In an article published in January 1949 assessing the activity of composers and musicologists after the 1948 February Resolution, Khrennikov stated essentially the same position—the poor level of criticism in the entire USSR, the unsatisfactory work of the musicological commission, the "passivity" of the majority of musicologists. He
linked musicology to criticism in this way: "It would seem that all
Soviet musicologists, irrespective of whether they appear as profes-
sional critics or not, should have each in his own way taken part in
the reconstruction of musical art that was launched in our country."

Concerning Soviet Music he stated:

The main difficulties here are included in the social passivity of
the majority of musicologists. Most difficult of all is to re-
ceive a militant article on relevant creative questions of Soviet
music. To write directly, with all keenness, why we don't yet
have an opera, for what reason some symphony is unsuccessful—our
critics decide on this reluctantly and not lightly. Only several
articles on the creation of formalist composers have appeared. We
note also the appearance of critical works on the creation of
Vasil'ev-Buglai, Zolotarev, Solov'ev-Sedyi and others. The names
of critics for this time are advanced: Apostolov, Sakva, Livanova,
and others. But all this is very little.

Speaking of the future tasks of music critics (musicologists), he
pointed to the deplorable lack of attention among musicologists to
surveys and evaluations of new works, to the struggle with formalism,
to the models of Russian classical music, to emulating the tradition of
Serov and Stasov (to which Zhdanov had referred): "Our musicologists
write little and with difficulty about Soviet music! Science lives
here not on good terms with commentary." He links the lack of
success and "huge difficulties" among critics with "the difficulties
and mistakes of science and music education . . . with the formalistic
mistakes in the method of analysis of musical works, with school analy-
sis, with conservatory courses." He called for preparatory courses
for critics, so they would know how to evaluate as well as to analyze.

The open Party meeting in the Composers' Union held on February
18, 21 and 22, 1949, which was devoted to discussions of the activities
of musicologists and critics specifically, was, therefore, obviously designed to serve the same function for musicologists and critics as had the earlier meetings for composers. This meeting was filled with both "criticism and self-criticism," according to Zhdanov's policy. According to the report in Soviet Music of the meeting, of the thirty participating musicologists and critics, only a handful of theorists appeared: Mazel, S. Skrebkov, Ryzhkin, Ogolevets, Kulakovsky. However, others also addressed topics of theoretical interest, including Y. Keldysh, P. Apostolov, Shteinpress, D. Kabelevsky, B. Kukharsky, and A. Bol'shemennikov. T. Khrennikov also appeared at the end of the three-day ordeal to comment further on the appearances of the participants and to supplement his lecture given prior to the meeting, "O neterpimom ostavani muzykal'noi kritiki i muzykovovedenii" [About the intolerable lag of musical criticism and musicology].

In his opening statement, the secretary of the Party organization of the Composers' Union, B. Terent'ev, lamented the lack of "decisive progress in our musicology" following the 1948 Resolution:

With few exceptions, many musicologists and critics still are taking a waiting position and persistently keep silent. This "taking a vow of silence" essentially means the reluctance of the more avid apologists of formalism to give up their faulty positions, to confess to their serious mistakes.

All this not only does not help the superstructure of our musical front, but, on the contrary, deprives fulfillment of such great tasks, which the Resolution of the Central Committee put forward. Being limited to the exposure only of separate mistakes and separate criticisms, the leadership and party organization of the Composers' Union was not able to inflict a decisive blow on the entire system of ideologically alien views and theories in musicology, on the antipatriotic practice of separate musicologists and critics.
If nothing else, this meeting forced some musicologists to break their silence.

Mazel appeared first. In general, he admitted to the faults of cosmopolitanism and formalism. Specifically, in reference to his 1941 article (discussed in Part VII), he admitted to the mistake of promoting the thesis of the lag of Russian musicology behind that of Western Europe, and proclaiming a formalistic break between musicology and criticism, having ignored the contributions of such theorist-critics as Serov, Stasov, Chaikovsky, and Asafiev. Concerning his work on the music of Shostakovich, he admitted to concentrating on the formal technical aspects of his music at the expense of the ideological artistic whole and the social value, and, on the basis of this distortion, for reaching the conclusion that "the creation of Shostakovich continues and develops the Russian classical tradition." Mazel also made some very general remarks about the dangers of formalistic theory for Soviet musicology. The reporter (unnamed) who summarized Mazel's remarks for publication, however, himself criticized Mazel for lacking the "courage to give a sufficiently clear political characterization of the antipatriotic direction in Soviet musicology, of which he is one of the heralds."

Mazel was also criticized by some of the other participants. I. Keldysh remarked on the "remarkable contradictions" and "irreconcilable tendencies" in Mazel's works:

Mazel attempted to work under methods of the analysis of ideological content of musical works and at the same time he contrasted our reality, our practice with musical science. How is it possible to study the content of music, its social, ideological func-
tion isolated from life, with some kind of office, laboratory method.\textsuperscript{90}

Thus, Keldysh asserted, his works are formalistic and abstract, as is his recent "theory of contemporaneity," based on some kind of general cosmopolitan criterion of contemporaneity, which in equal measure applied both to the creation of Soviet composers and to the creation of foreign bourgeois composers.

It is completely clear that such a theory was able to arise only on the soil of a full ignorance of ideological and class direction of music and factually led to the imposition of tendencies basically alien to our Soviet music.\textsuperscript{91}

Pavel Ivanovich Apostolov (1905-1969), a theorist and specialist on military music, criticized Mazel for apparent lies about his attempts to correct his mistakes even in the pre-war years. As proof Apostolov described a faculty discussion some months before concerning Mazel's \textit{Vvedenie v kurs analiza} [Introduction to a course of analysis]:

I appeared then at a meeting of the department and convincingly showed that this work turned out to be deeply apolitical, deeply antipopular, formalistic, constructed on the principle of the purest bourgeois cosmopolitanism. I turned attention then to the fact that Mazel speaks about some kind of abstract art in general, about classless, ahistorical positions of "world" art, calling it progress. A conclusion about the necessity to recognize as a progressive art also the decomposing alive contemporary bourgeois art of the epoch of imperialism comes to mind.\textsuperscript{92}

Apostolov also discussed Mazel's apolitical approach, his ignoring the doctrines of Marxist-Leninist classics in his works, and his distortion of Lenin's theory of reflection.

In his lecture Khrennikov also comments negatively on Mazel's separation of science and pedagogy from commentary and his underestimation of the significance of the Russian tradition of musicologist/composer/critic in his 1940 article. He also criticizes Mazel for interpreting the music of Shostakovich as representing the universal norms
of contemporary music, and for making analogies between it and Chaplin, Hemingway and the movie "Bambi." He comments derisively, "Here is what turns out to be the basic positive criterion, according to Mazel, for Soviet art!"

The statements of the other theorists, with the exception of Ogolevets, were rather similar and general. S. Skrebkov called for the "exposure" of the mistakes not only of separate musicologists but also of "the whole system of faulty views, hindering the development of Soviet music." He also mentioned the need for greater attention to questions of pedagogy and to the correction of philosophical diletantism among musicologists and composers. In conclusion he admitted his own lack of consideration of Party and ideological concerns and content in his works. Ryzhkin and Kulakovsky both observed the German influence in Soviet music theory and called for reform and reconstruction of this field. Kulakovsky called for a complete overhaul of theoretical works. Ryzhkin included in his remarks "a toothless critique"—according to the reporter—of his chapters from Essays on the history of theoretical musicology:

Instead of a sharp and merciless judgment of his harmful statements, having humiliated the authority of Russian musical science, he expressed several general views, penetrated, as his entire appearance, with indifferent and false objectiveness. The withered and fruitless appearance of I. Ryzhkin showed that the "taking of the vow of silence" did not go for him without consequences, but led to a break from life and hindered the correct understanding of occurrences.

Before discussing Ogolevets’s appearance, it is necessary to summarize the statements of the other participants concerning him. His
two works (1941 and 1946), as well as with the recently published works by Berkov and Butskoi, were almost universally vilified by the participants. Unfortunately for Ogolevets, he had to endure the harshest and lengthiest criticisms, and then defend himself publicly at the meeting. Berkov and Butskoi also underwent considerable criticism, but they did not appear at the meeting. Berkov was criticized (by Apostolov and others) for emphasizing Western influences on Glinka's music at the expense of Russian ones. In the same vein Butskoi was criticized for ignoring the Russian musicological and critical tradition in favor of foreign theorists, and for using examples from German modernism (Strauss's Salome!) rather than from contemporary Soviet music (he included one example—from his own music). He also was taken to task for concentrating on formal aspects rather than ones of content. His quotes from Marx and Engels, according to Kukharsky, "are cited unsuccessfully, in order to conceal the poverty and paucity of this formalistic work. This is what the neglect of the tasks of the struggle with alien, hostile tendencies leads to!" The publisher of both works, A. Bol'shemennikov, from the state music publishing house "Muzgiz," apologized for the mistake of publishing them.

Those who judged Ogolevets most severely and at some length were Apostolov, Kabalevsky and Kukharsky. Apostolov criticized him for coming out in his books against the near-exclusive emphasis on diatonicism in theory and composition pedagogy, and for therefore "attacking" diatonicism and "normal music" and fawning over the "obscurantist, emigrant, renegade Stravinsky." He also accuses him of favoring
complex, Western terminology over more easily understood expressions:

Comrade Apostolov points to the inaccessible clogging up of many musicological works with expressions and terms, borrowed from the lexicon of reactionary, bourgeois philosophical systems and "doctrines."

The Party requires the joining of science with commentary. Our works must be written with easily understood, intelligible language, so that harmful thoughts are not concealed under the hulls of scholarly terms.98

In his remarks Kabalevsky illustrates his point concerning "the low ideological philosophical level of the representatives" of Soviet musicology with an example from Ogolevets. According to Kabalevsky, the views expressed by many musicologists in their works have nothing at all to do with the numerous citations from Marx and Engels included in these works. In his 1941 book Ogolevets quotes Engles to the effect that historical development is not only evolutionary but also revolu-
tionary. To Ogolevets, each successive stage in history is the same as the preceding stage, but enriched with specific traits. Thus the regu-
larities of each stage may apply to any other stage. Qualitative differences do not exist either between historical phenomena or between national cultures, which are a part of one universal system. From this position Kabalevsky makes two conclusions:

First is a full obliteration of national borders in art, that is theoretically based cosmopolitanism. Second is that the historical process is nothing different than the gradual quantitative accumulation of sounds of the mode, developing from the simplest forms to the complex 22-degree mode. Thus, modernism and formal-
ism are born as unavoidable consequences of the historical pro-
cess. Even if Stravinsky, as Ogolevets stresses, reveals the 22-
degree mode in our temperament and if the entire development of the musical culture aspires to the 22-degree mode, then, according to Ogolevets, classical music unavoidably leads to Stravinsky, to formalism!99

This is the same sort of historical inevitability that Shteinpress came
out against in his article, and Kabalevsky criticizes its application in a wide sphere of works.

Kukharsky scorns both Ogolevets and his followers, who are "helping him to spend hundreds of thousands of state money," for supporting formalism, and for not making "an attempt to rise to the correct real-istic path."

What did they do this year [1948–1949]? They did not find in themselves the strength to confess to their mistakes, to help to the extent of their strength the growth of the new. These people, including Ogolevets, took a waiting position. They still harbor hopes to some kind of revenge; they think that the campaign against formalism may pass and that a time will return when Ogolevets again will be the hero of the day and guide of the minds of young musicians. Our meeting with its entire attitude towards similar people should show that such a time will be repeated no more!403

He also chides Ogolevets for cautioning an Azerbaidzhanian musician against becoming "Russified" when in fact the Russian culture is supreme in all of the Republics (which contradicts somewhat Kabalevsky's concern about the lack of distinction of national cultures).

How did Ogolevets react to all this? Here is the reporter's version of his appearance, which I quote in full:

In his appearance the stateless cosmopolitan, pseudo-musicologist A. Ogolevets attempted in every way to mollify the gravity of the crimes carried out by him. It was felt that this time he tried not to abuse the insolence usual for him. However, this effort did not happen to him by force. The meeting met with laughter his statement about the fact that he "is experiencing the drama of confession," because "not all done" by him "turned out to be necessary to our people."

Having announced the aspiration "to realize his past mistakes and to eliminate the survivals of capitalism in his consciousness," Ogolevets declared as his basic defect "the incorrect relation to Stravinsky," and in connection with this still considered it possible to stress that "objectively he slipped to a formalistic position"! No one, it seems, was able to believe
Ogolevets, that his faulty, harmful activity grew only from a lack of understanding of the music of Stravinsky and that subjectively he was far from formalism. Ogolevets's attempts to slur over the political sharpness of the charges presented to him in the faulty expressions about "the danger of Russification," that was threatening Azerbaijanzhanian music aroused the auditorium still more. He considered himself guilty only in that he appeared with "categorical opinions about the Azerbaijanzhanian culture, not having studied it in a thousand real works"! And here he showed the aspiration to slur over the essence of the question and to elude the political qualifications of his work.

Ogolevets concealed from the meeting the openly hostile essence of all his activity, bringing no small detriment to our musical culture. He preferred to be quiet about his consummately formalistic system of views, actively propagated by him wherever possible and primarily in the pages of his still-born books. He did not speak about the fact that the printing of these books cost the state many hundreds of thousands of rubles. This man, long ago having opposed himself to collectivism, attempted to consign to oblivion his entire system of demagogic intrigues, attacks, slanders. A great deal was recounted to this arch cosmopolitan, alien to the Soviet people, about this.

The appearance of Ogolevets aroused the indignation of all present.102

Kukharsky had this to say concerning Ogolevets's appearance before the participants:

This man completely does not want to recognize the essence of his antipopular views. All remember his appearance at the meeting. This was the speech of a man, in whatever became a striver to disparage everything new, occurring in our collective, everything valuable, appearing in Soviet music. This is a man, who with a petty lie, with direct denunciation, attempted to discredit everything necessary to our people.103

In his concluding remarks, T. Khrennikov also referred to Ogolevets:

I understand very well the incredulity with which all listened to the appearance of Ogolevets. What do the crocodile tears of this inveterate double-dealer really suggest? Too frequently he went to bat from this speaker's rostrum and still more frequently tried to prove in practice the amorality of his behavior.104

Khrennikov in his lecture discussed Ogolevets's "formalistic theory, alien to Marxist-Leninist science about art" and filled with the "pro-
paganda of cosmopolitan ideas," in greater detail. He aimed his main criticisms at Ogolevets's "formalist" reduction of music to mathematics and to quantitative enrichment; at his refusal to consider musical content and his contention that the method of historical materialism cannot be applied to music; at his unflattering evaluations of Stasov and Asafiev; at his experiments with classical music and pentatonicism (which Khrennikov calls an "outrage" and antihistorical); at his equating Soviet and bourgeois music; at his progressive view towards the music of Stravinsky; at his vision of the inevitability of a 22-degree mode in a new world culture; and at his warning to Azerbaidzhanian musicians not to become Russified.

Summing up the official opinions towards these theorists and their works, any theoretical work that was based on Western theoretical ideas (or even appeared to be so) was branded as "formalist," and any work in which Russian folk music, Soviet music, or Russian theorists appeared to be neglected was labeled as "antipatriotic" or "cosmopolitan." By the end of this meeting in Moscow and a similar one held in Leningrad (March 5 and 6, 1949), over thirty-five musicologists and critics, including those mentioned here, had been censured or reprimanded.

What was the official outcome of this meeting? A resolution recognizing the "lag" of science and criticism behind political theory, as expressed by Khrennikov in his lecture, was issued. In addition to "condemning" the activities of Mazel and Ogolevets, among others, "as antipatriotic, harmful, directed towards the undermining of the ideolo-
gical bases of Soviet music," the resolution chastised Ryzhkin, Tsukerman, Protopopov and Berkov for standing "on the side of contemporary creative motion, not taking part in the work of the sections and commissions of the Composers' Union, not appearing in print and thus not turning out to be of any help to composers in their creative rebuilding." In general, it was agreed to continue to expose and persecute those who expressed views harmful to Soviet culture, either through loss of membership in the Composers' Union or the withdrawal of their works and the like, and to persevere with the ideological education of young composers, musicologists and critics.

Many theorists escaped criticism; among these were Sergei S. Skrebkov (who appeared at the meeting), Igor V. Sposobin (who had already been criticized), Garbuzov, Bogatyrev, and Mutli in Moscow, and Khristofor S. Kushnarev and Tiulin in Leningrad, most of whom also published works during this period. For example, Skrebkov and Sposobin, theory professors at the Moscow Conservatory, both published textbooks. Garbuzov, in his work Zonnaia priroda zvukovysotnogo slukha [The zonal nature of pitch audibility], turned his attention to the explanation of his recently-developed theory of "zone." Bogatyrev's and Mutli's works were obviously "safe" from criticism because of their conservatism and traditionalism.

The General Meeting in the Leningrad Composers' Union, 1949. A similar meeting in Leningrad, dedicated to the questions of musicology and criticism, was held on March 5-6, 1949. It was organized mainly in
connection with articles about certain unpatriotic critics (that is, musicologists and theorists) recently published in Pravda and Kul'tura i zhizn' [Culture and life]. The Leningrad critics specifically mentioned at this meeting included Iulian Yakovlevich Vainkop, Semyon L'vovich Ginzburg, Mikhail Semyonovich Druskin, Valerian Mikhailovich Bogdanov-Berezovsky, L. Entelis, Butskoi, Dolzhansky, and Kremlev.

The Deputy Chairman of the Leningrad Composers' Union, Mikhail Aleksandrovich Glukh, in his opening lecture, in addition to the general charges of formalism and bourgeois cosmopolitanism, directed specific charges at each one of these critics. He singled out Butskoi for his book, "a model of bourgeois cosmopolitanism." Besides charges that Butskoi ignored Russian music and musical thought and substituted formalistic analysis for "the uncovering of the ideological sense of a work," Glukh accused him of "vulgar materialism":

The use of Marxist terminology carries a speculative character. Butskoi stood on the position of vulgar materialism and at the same time of idealism and naturalism: music, in his opinion, may reflect both subjects and physical phenomena, everything besides man with his asorbed intelligent powers. Antihistoricism leads Butskoi to abstractness and to extreme schematicism; the starting positions of the author are formalistic, confuse the reader, and distort the picture of the process of the development of musical art.

Glukh took Dolzhansky to task for his article on mode in Shostakovich's music, which he called formalistic "to the core," and for not yet--after a year--denouncing his past mistakes. He attacked Kremlev for his book Russkaia mysli o muzyke pervoi poloviny XIX veka [Russian thought about music of the first half of the nineteenth century], which at that time had not yet even been published, and in
fact was not published until 1954. He accused Kremlev of examining the sources of Russian criticism isolated from the development of Russian music, of overemphasizing the fundamental significance of Western influences, and of criticizing too harshly some of the great Russian composers, a fault he shared with Shteinpress. Fortunately, whatever changes Kremlev eventually did make in his book—if indeed he made any—did not affect the scholarly value of his work; it (and the two volumes succeeding it) remains an informative and valuable tool for research. In his closing remarks, Glukh widened his charges to include all but two or three of the "criticism section" of the Leningrad Composers' Union, almost all of whom he accused of keeping quiet and not helping the creative movement in Soviet music.

Twenty-two people, among them Kremlev and Dolzhansky, spoke at this meeting. Kremlev admitted to serious mistakes in his book, in particular its overestimation of the influence of foreign philosophy at the expense of the originality of the Russian musical culture, and its "stamp of false 'objectivism,'" the inability with necessary sharpness to uncover the contrasts of the historical development of the Russian thought about music." On the other hand, he pointed out his numerous appearances against formalism and "excessive enthusiasm" for Western music, and devoted the last third of his speech to the struggle against cosmopolitanism.

In the review of his appearance in Soviet Music, Kremlev was quoted liberally with a minimum of editorial comment from the reviewer. Obviously he acquitted himself well. Unfortunately Dolzhansky did not:
A. Dolzhansky reduced his insincere and evasive appearance to a justification and coverup of his coarsest formalistic mistakes, presenting a definite and not unimportant link to the faulty antipatriotic activity of Leningrad critics-cosmopolitanists. This was essentially a lawyer's speech, vainly attempting to cite mitigating circumstances, to establish "objective reasons" and to shift blame onto someone else's shoulders.114

Like Ogolevets to a degree, Dolzhansky sought to deflect criticism by drawing attention elsewhere—in this case to his "imaginary virtues," as the reviewer described them, such as his struggle against the RAPM "deviationists," and his love for classical music. Further, he stressed that his formalistic "eccentricities" concerned only the music of Shostakovich, whose creative path was complex and whose talent charmed him.

As a result of this meeting the Union issued a resolution, which called for the struggle against "bourgeois cosmopolitanism and formalism, having sprouted deep roots among Leningrad musicologists and critics." These attitudes had taken root in the 1920s when Leningrad was "a most prominent center of the cult of contemporaneity [sovremennichestvo]," which involved "servility before the achievements of the West European musical culture of the epoch of imperialism," surviving to this day in the works of Butskoi, for example.

Rimsky-Korsakov's Harmony Textbook, Seventeenth Edition. In 1949 the seventeenth edition of Rimsky-Korsakov's Praktitcheskii uchebnik garmonii, corrected and enlarged under the editorship of M. O. Shteinberg (recently under fire as Shostakovich's composition teacher), was published, in celebration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the
textbook (from the lithograph edition of 1884). In the face of the complete lack of any similar work being published at this time, Rimsky-Korsakov's textbook was hailed, by no less a personage than Ryzhkin, as answering "the vital requirements of music theory preparation of students in our institutions of higher learning and schools." He continues his hyperbole:

In pedagogical achievements—clarity and systematic statement—not one textbook of harmony in the entire world may compare with the textbook of Rimsky-Korsakov. In connection with this the significance of this prominent work is defined not only by its pedagogical, but also by its scientific achievements. The Practical Textbook of Harmony by Rimsky-Korsakov belongs to the number of such theoretical works, the high scientific qualities of which defined the truly classical level of Russian musicology and its being first in the solution of a row of the most important theoretical questions.

Using the appearance of this textbook as a pretext, Ryzhkin attempts to set the record straight on the subject of his interpretation of the history of nineteenth-century music theory. He reverses his earlier position, as expressed in volume I of Ocherki po istorii teoreticheskogo muzykозnania, that Riemann was "the founder of the theory of functions"; rather he names Rimsky-Korsakov as "the founder of the theory of harmonic functions", which was "basically distinct from the functional theory of H. Riemann and developed completely independent of him in the same years, the 1880s, when Riemann appeared with his works on harmony." "The principal distinction" between the two theories, according to Ryzhkin, is that Rimsky-Korsakov's theory of function "was free from scholastic means, characteristic for the conception of Riemann," such as the undertone row. Further, "the deep
understanding of musical creative practice gave Rimsky-Korsakov the possibility to define on the basis of the theory of functions the basic principles of gradual modulation and to establish firmly the priority of Russian musicology in the solution of this important question. In Ryzhkin's view, Rimsky-Korsakov's attention to functional relations—and the very textbook itself—was "predetermined" not only by his style but by that of all the Russian classicists, who were "very sensitive to modal harmonic logic and intolerable to its violation."

He reaffirms the diatonic basis of Rimsky-Korsakov's textbook and harmonic thought, which, along with the other Russian classicists, "enriched," rather than violated as in Wagner's music, the diatonic modal basis. Also, with his Textbook, Rimsky-Korsakov opposed not only "the extremes of Wagnerian chromaticism," "the scholastic constructions of Ettingen and Riemann," and "the craft-oriented empiricism of the Leipzig theorists," but also the "reactionary (cosmopolitan and formalistic) direction in the Petersburg Conservatory," that is, the Zaremba and Berngard (Director) group. Finally, Ryzhkin discussed Rimsky-Korsakov's views towards the expressive possibilities of harmony, and called for a new edition—this one simply republished the previous one—that would include a complete picture of Rimsky-Korsakov's theoretical views as expressed in the full range of his writings—articles, reviews, and the textbook. Such an approach would establish "the true character of Rimsky-Korsakov as a prominent and progressive representative of the science about harmony."
The All-Soviet Scientific Session on Musicology, 1950. In 1950 another musicological conference was held. The All-Soviet Scientific Session on Musicology, sponsored by the department of Science Research Institutions of the Art Committee attached to the Council of Ministers of the SSSR, was attended by 262 delegates from all over the Soviet Union representing musical institutions of research and higher learning as well as the Composers' Union. The purpose of this conference was to discuss plans for future scientific works on the history of Soviet music, and for new textbooks and course plans in the areas of music history, folk music, and theory. For theory only three areas were mentioned specifically—harmony, polyphony, and Russian polyphony. In essence, this conference laid the foundation for the rewriting of music history according to various directives that had been established over the past several years. These directives called for the narrow, insular and chauvinistic approach to music history recently championed with the focus on the tradition of Russian classical music and the continuation of that tradition in contemporary Soviet music, the folk music of Russia and the other republics, Russian and contemporary Soviet music and musicians as leaders in world culture, and the disassociation with everything Western, bourgeois, imperialistic, antipatriotic, formalistic, and cosmopolitan.

In contrast to the meetings of 1949, this conference appears to have been a model of constructive collectivism. Instead of the accusatory atmosphere of the 1949 meetings, the atmosphere for this conference was positive, productive, even conciliatory. The reporter for
Soviet Music, M. Blok, characterised the proceedings in this way:

The Session showed a significant leap in our musicology, in its ideological theoretical growth, the growth of our musicological and pedagogical personnel not only of Moscow and Leningrad, and also of the periphery.

The work of the Session took place on a high ideological, fundamental level, in an atmosphere of healthy businesslike criticism and self-criticism. The entire course of the debates, the character of the appearances testify about the intense interest of the entire collective of Soviet musicologists not only in the successful completion of the outlined works, but also in the destinies of the development of our entire musical culture as a whole.126

Although the primary emphasis was on music history, topics of theoretical importance were addressed. For example, the senior musicologist, Aleksandr Viacheslavovich Ossovsky (1871–1957), a professor at the Leningrad Conservatory and also director of the Leningrad Science Research Institute of Theater and Music, at that time nearly eighty years old, gave a lecture entitled, "Osnovnye voprosy russkoi muzykal'noi kul'tury XVII i XVIII vekov" [Basic questions of Russian musical culture of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries]. One of the most important tasks of Soviet musicology, arising from the Party Resolution of 1948, was the study of melody:

Melody, song is the battle cry of our day. The working out of melodics, the study of melody, is the primary task of Soviet musicology. Melodics is the least worked out music theory discipline. Here in the full sense of the word is an abandoned lot. This barrenness is possible to explain by the formalistic approach to the solution of the question. But Soviet musicology persistently struggles for the full elimination of formalism. Music theorists should satisfy the burning need in the mastery of the problem of melodics. Folk creation with its inexhaustible melodic richness gives the most worthwhile material for melodic analysis and fruitful conclusions. The works of Russian classicists, so abundant in song, are no less instructive for the construction of a system of melodics.127

He points to other topics that need attention:
Still long before the Great Patriotic War Asafiev dreamed about the working out of the study of a national Russian harmony on the basis of the analysis of the modal, rhythmic and polyphonic construction of Russian folk song and of the creation of the Russian music classicists. But he did not succeed in fulfilling his intention and gave Soviet musicologists this attractive scientific task. Its solution will help Soviet composers develop the norms of harmonic thought inherited from the classicists and will enrich Russian Soviet harmonic language. The indicators of the possibility of such a renovation namely on the folk song basis already is present in a row of works, created by Soviet composers in the most recent years.128

He mentions also multi-voiced polyphony and the aesthetics of folk music, as well as the analysis of the content, musical language and forms of the songs themselves, as topics worthy of attention. And, indeed, a plan for a course on Russian folk music was proposed and discussed at the conference:

The course of folk creation is thought by the authors as the study of folk musical speech—melodics, rhythmics, polyphony, modal characteristics, etc.—and its genres, which are examined as real, historically developed categories, defined not by formal signs but by living, real content.129

In the meetings of the theoretical commission, plans for courses and textbooks in the fields of harmony and polyphony were presented. The outline for a textbook for a special course of harmony, written by Tiulin and Nikolai G. Privano (also from the Leningrad Conservatory), was approved; and two theory textbooks by Tiulin and Privano were eventually published, the first in 1956. However, plans for a general course on polyphony by Skrebkov and Bogatyrev and for a textbook on Russian polyphony, Polifonija v Russkoj klassicheskoi i Sovetskoi muzyke, by Anatolii N. Dmitriev, head of the theory department at the Leningrad Conservatory, were not so readily accepted. The
commission requested that Skrebkov and Bogatyrev, although their program was basically satisfactory, include more information on polyphony in nonpolyphonic works, especially opera and symphonic works "in which polyphony has dramatic significance," on nonimitative polyphony, "particularly polyphonic variations, having taken such a significant place in the creation of the Russian classicists and having important significance for the creation of Soviet composers," and on polyphony in Russian multi-voiced music. Skrebkov published a textbook on polyphony in 1951. And they asked Dmitriev to make substantial changes in the content, structure and scope of his planned work, and to apply the historical method of research more consistently. Dmitriev eventually published a work entitled *Polifoniia kak faktur* formoobrazovaniie [Polyphony as a factor of form structure] in 1962.

In the report of the conference given in *Soviet Music*, the reporter M. Blok pointed to several deficiencies of Soviet musicology with relevance for music theory, including the "weakness" of current analytical methods, the lack of serious study devoted to the "role of Russian folk music as the basic foundation of professional creation, history and theory," and the lack of attention to folk music in theoretical studies: "Among folklore, theory, and history there is not the necessary organic connection." Secondly important for music theory are the still under-developed problems of style and of the uncovering of the method of Socialist Realism in music. Overall, though, the role of theory in the general field of musicology is greatly diminished at this time, particularly when compared to earlier
decades. There just was not room for any speculative music theory within the strictures of Marxism and realism. Only theory based on acceptable musical practice, following the guidelines of diatonicism, folk music, and other simpler means, was even considered. Theorists such as Mazel and Ogolevets, who were accustomed to greater activity in this sphere, were concerned. At the fourth plenary meeting of the board of the Composers' Union in 1950, Ogolevets stated that "questions of theory" were all but "forgotten, both in the Union, in Muzgiz, and in scientific work of the conservatories and institutes. New textbooks without a working out of separate theoretical problems may be only models of conservatism." Mazel called theoretical musicology "one of the most lagging fields," and considered work on questions of theory to be "weak": "The formalistic mistakes admitted in the sphere of the theory of music led many musicologists to the untrue conclusion that in general one should not study questions of the theory of music." The great task of music theory should be to help creative practice, aided by "a narrow connection with Marxist-Leninist aesthetics," and "a true historicism," without which "the study of the norms of the musical art will grow into a narrow technologicism, into an empirical, recipe approach." He called for a doctrine of melody based "simultaneously both on folk and on composers' melodics." Mazel must have had in mind his own work on this subject, which was soon published, in 1952.

Blok summarized the future goals of Soviet musicology as determined at the conference:
the aspiration to rebuild our musicological science on the basis of Marxist-Leninist methodology; the aspiration to interpret to the end the exhaustive directives given in the [Party] Resolution . . . on ideological questions and in the appearances of comrade Zhdanov at the meeting of the figures of Soviet music; to eliminate formalistic and cosmopolitan tendencies, as also other survivals of the influences of bourgeois ideology; to overcome the theory of the single stream and to examine the music history process in the light of the Leninist doctrine of two cultures. To show the development of musical culture in the process of the struggle of two directions—realistic and antipopular, antirealistic. To uncover the depths of the interconnections of the Russian musical culture with the musical cultures of the fraternal peoples of the SSSR, to emphasize the world significance of Russian and Soviet musical culture. 140

As restrictive as these guidelines were, focusing exclusively on Russian and Soviet culture as seen through Marxist-Leninist ideology, they nevertheless enabled musicologists and theorists to resume work, since there could be no doubt now as to the "correct" path. In fact, the deficient areas mentioned by Blok have received much attention over the last thirty years from Soviet theorists, and now constitute major research spheres within Soviet music theory. Folk music theory has indeed become a major source for Soviet theory in general and today remains a very fruitful area of research. To illustrate the growing confidence of Soviet theorists following this conference, in 1951 and 1952 a number of theory works were published. These included several textbooks, additional works by Garbuzov on his theory of zone, and Mazel's work on melody. Thus the stage was set for a return to normalcy of sorts, although a resurgence of such a variety and boldness of works as appeared in the 1920s has yet to occur in the Soviet Union. For most of the 1950s, Soviet theorists kept their work within the prescribed limits. Far fewer and less innovative theoretical works
than in the previous decades were published, and most of these were practical textbooks. In the 1960s, though, as a result of a more tolerant official policy, the situation began to change. New trends in theoretical thought began to appear, and have continued to appear until the present time.

But as of 1950, the prescribed trend in music theory was away from speculative theory towards more practical applications. Theory once again became just a teaching tool for composition and an adjunct to music history. It was subservient to the basic aims and goals of Soviet musicology as a whole: to serve a political ideology above all, to demonstrate the hegemony of native music—folk, classical Russian, and contemporary Soviet—over the music of foreign peoples, and to justify the current ideology and its musical embodiment through revealing the "ties" between contemporary, Socialist realist music, with its basis in folk music, to music in the past, to Russian classical music, some of which had its own "realist" and folk bases, i.e., to pursue actively the ideas of tradition and legacy in their contemporary realizations, to prove the legitimacy of the Soviet approach through its obvious continuation of Russian tradition. Thus the only theory that could be developed had to come from folk music and its theoretical traits—melody, diatonic modal harmony, rhythm and meter, polyphony, and the like—and from Russian classical music, with similar traits. Soviet music theorists lost the independence for which they had once striven, and any progress they had made was buried under political rhetoric and the search for Socialist Realism and "content" in music.
Summary to Part VIII. Within the span of a few years, then, Soviet music theory was completely overrun by ideology. Those most promising and prominent theorists who attempted to inject some interest into their moribund discipline during the 1940s were severely reprimanded. The cost to human dignity is incalculable. The situation improved after Stalin's death in 1953, but it was still some time before Soviet theorists were able to regain the momentum begun early in this century.

Of the theoretical ideas advanced during this period, only those connected with the music of a specific composer, such as Shostakovich, Prokofiev, and Glinka, had any lasting influence in Soviet theory. Of course, the mandated approach was away from abstract, speculative theory, so this legacy is not surprising.
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CONCLUSION

The development of Russian and Soviet music theory would appear by 1950 to have come almost full circle—back, that is, to its nineteenth-century beginnings, particularly in harmony and analysis. In the theory and pedagogy of harmony, for example, Ryzhkin, in a striking repetition of the simplistic view promoted by the proletarians in the late 1920s, advocated a return to the same pedagogical principles espoused some seventy years earlier by Rimsky-Korsakov. In the realm of analysis, the merging of criticism, content analysis, and history and theory into a single concept of "integrated analysis" signaled a return to the analysis of the role of content in music by the great nineteenth-century critics Stasov, Serov, and Larosh. In addition, Odoevsky's call for the serious study of folk music was echoed many times by musicologists at the various meetings of the late 1940s. Soviet music theory by 1950 eschewed some of the more progressive views advanced by such significant twentieth-century theorists as Yavorsky and Asafiev. Indeed, its critics found fault with nearly every approach attempted by theorists in its more recent past; in the face of such a reception, it is little wonder that theorists retreated.
Yet in spite of these regressive intrusions, the Soviet view of music theory by 1950 had in fact been irrefragably altered. The conservative faction may have wished to return to nineteenth-century practice and tradition but, given their twentieth-century Marxist-Leninist ideology and the lasting and pervasive influence of the leading twentieth-century theorists, this was not possible. The hard-line traditionalists—and the modernists—had to settle for a commingling of both nineteenth- and twentieth-century traditions. Who could actually deny, for example, the impact of those most original musical thinkers Taneev, Yavorsky, and Asafiev? Certainly Catoire and even Conus and Garbuzov left their marks on the development of Soviet music theory. To their credit, Soviet theorists resisted eliminating their most recent history from conscious memory; while advocating a return to the more conservative views of their nineteenth-century predecessors, they did not lose sight of important twentieth-century advances. These advances had become such an integral part of Soviet music theory that it would have been almost impossible to eliminate them. Yavorsky's dynamic and functional interpretation of mode, for instance, forever altered the Soviet interpretation of mode. A similar undeniability may be attached to Asafiev's view of form as process, to Catoire's functional interpretation of harmony, and so on. The point is that no matter how much Zhdanov and the others decried contemporary music and its theory, certain aspects could not be uprooted, regardless of the call for an elimination of modernist elements and a return to a simpler era. The later theorists from the 1930s and 1940s such as Mazel,
Tiulin, Berkov, Tsukkerman, and Dolzhansky were strongly influenced by the views of these earlier theorists and tended to build on them rather than develop vastly different approaches. This practice helped to entrench firmly these earlier advances within the general attitude toward music theory. But these younger theorists were guided not only by the works of their predecessors but also by the powerful yet inhibiting force of Marxism-Leninism. Only those theories in conformance with that philosophy could be accepted. This naturally limited the overall influence of theorists such as Yavorsky, for example. Since, as we saw, Soviet theorists found it difficult to reconcile modal rhythm with Marxism-Leninism, they rejected it as a complete system, but maintained selected practical elements.

Before the stricter enforcement of Marxist-Leninist philosophy in music theory—that is, in the sixty years from 1870 to 1930—the discipline of music theory in Russia blossomed. Its rapid growth was due in large measure to devoted attention to the question of music education for Russians, to the conscious efforts to create an atmosphere conducive to scholarly endeavors, and to the extraordinary personalities and talents of those musicians who championed these tasks, such as Rubinstein, Odoevsky, Chaikovsky, Rimsky-Korsakov, Taneev, Yavorsky, and Asafiev. Scholarship from the West became an additional incentive to their research, but more as a model than as a call to competition. In the years prior to 1870, Western-style composition and pedagogy in Russia fostered a favorable climate for this subsequent growth. Another important component was a strong native tradition of oral folk
music and written chant. This musical wellspring provided the initial foundation for the development of musical appreciation and performance. Thus, when both native and imported musical entertainments began to appear in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, they found receptive—if limited—participants and audiences alike. From the late eighteenth century, though, this musical tradition provided much material for both native composers and scholars. At first both the study and utilization of this heritage were accomplished by amateurs; but once the means for professional music education were established, the status of amateurs became "legitimized" and was raised to a professional rank.

Of the eight time periods investigated in this study, covering approximately 300 years from 1650 to 1950, only the last five periods, encompassing the ninety years from 1860 to 1950, reveal the actual development of a truly native Russian/Soviet music theory. And of these five time periods, the fifth, 1900–1917, and above all the sixth, 1917–1932, witnessed the most rapid and intense development of this discipline. One might generalize that the slow initial development of a Russian music theory illustrated in the first three periods, from 1680 to 1860, was due to a lack of official concern towards music and music education, while the retrenchment witnessed in the last two periods, from 1932 to 1950, was due conversely to an excess of official concern. The development of music theory can be reduced then to five basic stages: 1) introduction (1650–1770), 2) foreign dominance (1770–1860), 3) Russian pedagogical theory (1860–1900), 4) Russian/Soviet
speculative theory (1900–1932), and 5) Soviet retrenchment (1932–1950). The fourth stage turned out to be the most innovative and influential stage. Most all of the subsequent approaches in Soviet theory stemmed from the work of theorists active during that period—Taneev, Yavorsky, Catoire, Conus, Garbuzov, and Asafiev. Other theorists such as Mazel, Tiulin, and Tsukkerman received their training during this period, although their major contributions came after 1932. This fourth stage also witnessed the development and intense growth of professional societies or institutes devoted to the promotion of research. But within this stage a distinction between the pre-revolutionary unofficial societies and the post-revolutionary official institutes should be made. One can also distinguish between the less fruitful pace of theory research in the pre-revolutionary period, and the almost frenetic, rushed pace of the research output of the post-revolutionary period.

Throughout the development of the discipline of music theory in Russia, one can observe the influence of the indigenous chant and folk traditions upon the melodic, modal, or linear emphasis of Russian and Soviet theorists. The melodic line, either alone, with accompaniment, joined in counterpoint, or controlled by folk or unusual modes, dominates their harmonic thinking. Russia's theoretical tradition, then, sought to exploit—in the best sense of this word—this melodic heritage.

This preference for melody-related theories may be divided roughly into four categories: 1) modal properties (including scale and func-
tion), 2) thematic manipulation (counterpoint), 3) linear process, and
4) analysis. Under the first category, Russians such as L'vov began to
collect the melodies of folk music and analyze its modal properties as
early as the late eighteenth century. In the nineteenth century,
Serov, Odoevsky and Mel'gunov devoted separate articles to the question
of mode in folk music. Although Rimsky-Korsakov utilized a diatonic
chord classification resembling functionalism, he also was the first to
approach harmony utilizing an expanded scalar basis, and to stress
melodic harmonization using actual chorales. Yavorsky's theory focused
primarily on mode and melodic function. Mazel, too, had a particular
fondness for melodic theory, one perhaps influenced by Asafiev. In his
study of Shostakovich, for example, the subjects of theme and mode are
prominent. Dolzhansky also analyzed modality in Shostakovich's music,
positing a diatonic foundation for his "lowered" modes. Tiulin, taking
his cue from Yavorsky, derived a theory of modal function based on the
resolving tendencies of tones in the mode. Garbuzov and Ogolevets also
stressed the modal aspects of their respective theories. Under this
category also falls the use of folk tunes or folk-derived tunes with
modal properties in composition. While composers such as Rimsky-
Korsakov and Chaikovsky in their own compositions used luscious or
exotic harmonies that are traceable to a modal influence, they still
preserved a strong melodic bias in them, in many cases employing actual
folk or folk-like melodies. Berkov, in his article on functional
theory in Russia, assessed its application predominantly in the melodic
sphere by Serov, Stasov, Taneev, and Larosh.
The second category of melody-related theory encompasses thematic development, contrapuntal manipulation, and the like. Chaikovsky, for example, emphasized voice-leading and contrapuntal aspects of part-writing in his harmony textbook. Larosh and Taneev actively encouraged the study of counterpoint, the latter not only developing a theory for the application of difficult contrapuntal techniques but also urging its use in contemporary composition. Taneev advocated the rejection of the early twentieth-century trend towards harmonic exorcism and atonality and the preservation of a tonal foundation by which melodic and modal properties may be maintained.

The third category of melody-related theory includes primarily Asafiev's theory of form as process. Although his theory of intonatsiya may refer to any of the elements of music, he had a particular penchant for melos, the melodic aspect. Asafiev's view of musical form as a process combines all musical elements into a continuous temporal--linear--framework. This enables one to analyze form as a dynamic process (emphasizing the horizontal and temporal) rather than a static state (emphasizing the vertical or "frozen" formal, as in Conus's sense). Yavorsky could also be placed in this category, based upon his attempts to understand the linear logic of modal resolution.

Under the final--and broadest--category of analysis, I place Shishov (who attempted to expand Conus's symmetrical interpretation of musical form to melody) and Kulakovsky (who also addressed the aspect of melodic analysis, albeit with less success). Mazel also belongs in this category with his motivic and thematic analysis of Chopin's
Fantasia, although he certainly broke no new ground with it. Tsukkerman and Ryzhkin could also be placed in this category on the strength of their integrated analyses that incorporate melodic or thematic aspects.

It is arguable that a fifth category should be added to the four already discussed—that of aesthetics. Asafiev's theory of intonation could belong to this category, as it reflects largely melodic aesthetic content. Under this category, then, would fall any attempt to derive aesthetic content from an analysis of a melody, an approach shared by many of the attempts at integrated analysis.

Russian and Soviet theorists have not ignored harmony, as is evident by their great interest in functionality. The Soviets even claim the idea of functionality for their own and maintain that Rimsky-Korsakov predated Riemann in its "discovery," although Riemann himself doesn't claim to have discovered it. Yet Catoire, the main practitioner of this approach, derived his approach from Riemann's followers, not Rimsky-Korsakov. Catoire's students and others broadened its application. Tiulin, for instance, building on Yavorsky's initiative, combined the idea of function with mode in a practical way. Yavorsky was also more influenced by Riemann than by Rimsky-Korsakov. Yet so many of his ideas have not yet received their fair attention. His approach to melody, for example, has never been fully explored in the Soviet Union. Only recently have theorists in the West begun to apply principles similar to those he developed in connection with his theory of modal rhythm.
Attention to the question of musical form has also occupied Russian and Soviet theorists since Arensky in the late nineteenth century. The Soviets themselves divide this category into two camps: a static approach, which views form as a fixed entity, "frozen" in time, and a dynamic approach, which views form as a temporal process. Conus, Arensky, and Catoire, of course, belong to the first group, whereas Asafiev belongs to the second. This second, dynamic group overlaps with the third category of melody-related theories discussed above. One may also place Taneev in the second group, as he analyzed harmonic motion both hierarchically, for instance in its contribution to the overall tonal plan of the sonata development section, and dynamically, in the necessary preparation for the return of tonic through the juxtaposition of the subdominant and the dominant. Butskoi (through his attempt to provide an aesthetic foundation for the analysis of formal elements), Mazel (through his content analyses), and Tsukkerman (through his approach to the dynamic properties in musical form) should also be placed in this group devoted to the "dynamic" concept of form. Berkov belongs more squarely in the first group, with his examinations of Glinka operas in a more static formal sense, relating their formal structures to standard forms.

Philosophically we see an initial move from empiricism (Chaikovsky) to rationalism (embryonic in Rimsky-Korsakov and full-blown in Taneev). The rationalist trend then broke off into two directions, one line being the Catoire/Riemann functional approach and the other line the acoustical studies of Garbuzov and Ogolevets. But
although Taneev claims his method is deductive and teaches students to think deductively, his own method in developing his theory is inductive and hence empirical, based upon his direct study of sixteenth-century polyphonic music and the mathematical formulations he derived from it. In contrast to Taneev's inductive method, Yavorsky may be said to have adopted an deductive method--building an entire system on the tritone and subsequently applying it to the music. Yavorsky claimed to have formulated his theory of modal rhythm only after a thorough investigation of the music; yet one senses a bit of the a priori in his monistic approach, since it cannot always be derived from the music as directly as Taneev's results. Yet the results of both are rational and scientific. Conus, claiming a deductive, rational, "scientific" approach akin to Taneev's--as did the ultrachromaticists--nonetheless skewed his results to fit his theory. His Gestalt-like approach, which views the whole as more than the sum of its parts, irrationally attempts to derive in a priori fashion similar non-musical characteristics, i.e., symmetry, from musical form.

Unfortunately, after 1932, these various approaches were subsumed by Soviet ideologues under one large heading of "idealist" philosophy and effectively eliminated as actual or potential research avenues. They substituted the twin forces of Marxism-Leninism (i.e., historical and dialectical materialism) and Socialist Realism for these earlier "idealist" approaches. These Communist ideologies are maintained exclusively to this day. This means that music must contain a materialist foundation; only musical acoustics as utilized by Rameau provides
this necessary foundation. Yet this foundation is maintained only so far as it provides the raison d'être for musical tones and chords. Any unnatural extension of acoustics will usually meet with scepticism, if not outright scorn, since it steps outside the bounds of a realistic interpretation of music and becomes formalist and unnatural. Music must therefore express realism and exist for the betterment of mankind. Criticism thus enters into every aspect of music, including music theory; anything that subverts the materialist, realist, and socialist foundations and goals of music is suspect. For a time this un-philosophical imposition crippled Soviet music theory. Music theory is a discipline that ideally can be considered from several different philosophical perspectives. The late 1940s was the absolute nadir of this development. Fortunately this xenophobic attitude did not last. The last forty years have seen an impressive raising of the level of sophistication in Soviet music theory; greater tolerance is in evidence everywhere.

So just what is the theoretical legacy in the Soviet Union today? I have maintained throughout that an understanding of contemporary Soviet music theory is not possible without a knowledge of its history. In spite of the Soviets' philosophical rejection or reinterpretation of many elements in this history, many more have been retained and form the foundation for contemporary Soviet music theory. Few of the "systems" investigated in the course of this study—Yavorsky's modal rhythm, Conus's metrotechtonicism, Garbuzov's multiple modal-chordal foundations, and Ogolevets's acoustical expansion theory, to name the
most prominent—have survived totally intact in Soviet music theory today. Yet Soviet music theory has retained individual elements of these theories, either singly or as the basis for subsequent theoretical systems or approaches. Those theories that have survived partially or somewhat intact are generally those most recently developed: Tsukkerman's and Mazel's theory of integrated analysis, Asafiev's theories of intonation and of form as a dynamic process, Tiulin's theory of modal and harmonic function, and Dolzhansky's diatonic modal interpretation of Shostakovich's music. Surviving elements from earlier periods include Yavorsky's dynamic interpretation of mode and many of his modal designations, Catoire's hierarchic approach to tonal structure and his functional approach to harmony, and Taneev's approach to moveable counterpoint and canon (which more than any of the earlier systems has been utilized essentially as Taneev conceived it). Yet each of the more recent theories mentioned essentially transforms an element introduced earlier. Yavorsky's theory of intonation is an obvious example. His analyses concentrated upon relatively low structural levels, while Asafiev transformed them to reveal structures on a somewhat higher level, both theoretically and philosophically. Tsukkerman and Mazel developed the theory of integrated analysis as a reaction to the individualistic, isolated approaches of the earlier period; they fashioned it not from one theoretical idea but from a combination of all elements into what was viewed as a cohesive whole. It partakes not only of theoretical elements derived from Yavorsky, Catoire, Tiulin, and Asafiev, etc., but also aesthetic elements of content as analyzed by
the nineteenth-century critics. Asafiev's theory of form as a dynamic process has its philosophical derivations—primarily Hegel—and its musical one in Yavorsky. Tiulin's theory of modal and harmonic functionality is inconceivable without its predecessors in the theories of Yavorsky and Catoire. The notion of variable function, for instance, was most probably derived from Yavorsky's variable mode and from the major-minor variability in Russian folk song. Certainly Tiulin's idea of melodic modal function was derived from Yavorsky.

These are the most salient features of the legacy of Soviet music theory. They penetrate to some extent every theoretical work published in the Soviet Union today. To trace their contemporary influence would require a separate study. Indeed, two of the contemporary studies mentioned in previous chapters do find direct precursors in Russian/Soviet music theory. In both cases, theorists revived aspects of previous theories that had been ignored and applied them in fresh ways. Varvara Dernova was inspired by Yavorsky's theory of modal rhythm—and specifically his theory of duplex modes—to produce a harmonic theory of Scriabin's music in 1968. Eleonora Fedosova cites a lengthy legacy reaching as far back as Sokal'sky in the nineteenth century, and most recently Dolzhansky, as corroborative evidence for her theory of diatonic modes in Shostakovich's music.

Thus a groundwork was laid, primarily during the first thirty years of this century, that endured in spite of the tremendous philosophical shifts of the 1930s and 1940s. Of course the severity of their philosophical shifts has waxed and waned since the 1930s; Dernova wrote
her study of Scriabin's harmony in the 1940s, but dared publish it only twenty years later. At the time of this study (1988) we are witnessing a general loosening of philosophical strings. In literature authors once banned are being published, controversial movies shelved for years are finally being released, and musicians and other artists are generally being allowed greater freedom to travel and to do their work.

Even in the pre-glasnost era, Yury Kholopov, the leading Soviet theorist, and his sister Valentina Kholopova were able to publish a thorough study of the life and music of Anton Webern. This study would have been unthinkable for many years, not only because of its subject matter but also because of a lack of emphasis in theory education in the area of dodecaphonic music. Yury Kholopov also has written works on the theories of Messiaen, Hindemith, and Schenker, for example. In another recent collection of articles entitled Sovremennaia muzyka i problemy evoliutsii kompositorskoi tehnikii [Contemporary music and the problems of the evolution of compositional technique], the Soviet composer Edison Vasil'evich Denisov explores methods of composition used by composers ranging from Debussy to Boulez and Cage, including himself. He also includes articles on electronic music and jazz. Of course, for every "avant-garde" approach such as these by Kholopov and Denisov, there are dozens of more "traditional" works devoted to topics such as mode or form. Yet even within these more traditional works, theorists are branching out and achieving more diverse and interesting results than ever before. And because of these significant additions to the discipline of Soviet music theory, it is beginning to take on a
richer, more multi-faceted appearance, rather than the one-sided mono-
tone of the previous forty years. Such developments hold great promise
for the future of Soviet music theory. I certainly do not advocate
substituting Western approaches for their native ones; rather, I see
the future direction of Soviet music theory within its own research and
approaches. The branching out of Soviet theorists into areas more
familiar to Western theorists is merely symptomatic of a broader, more
healthy attitude towards theory scholarship on the whole. I hope that
Soviet theorists are able to take maximum advantage of the opportuni-
ties at hand to further their discipline, one less encumbered by pure
philosophy and more cognizant of purely musical matters.
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