
Honors Projects and Presentations: Undergraduate

5-2012

Russia and the Restricted Composer: Limitations of the Self, Culture, and Government

Ian T. Wallace

Follow this and additional works at: <https://mosaic.messiah.edu/honors>



Part of the [European History Commons](#), and the [Music Commons](#)

Permanent URL: <https://mosaic.messiah.edu/honors/145>

Recommended Citation

Wallace, Ian T., "Russia and the Restricted Composer: Limitations of the Self, Culture, and Government" (2012). *Honors Projects and Presentations: Undergraduate*. 145.

<https://mosaic.messiah.edu/honors/145>

Sharpening Intellect | Deepening Christian Faith | Inspiring Action

Messiah University is a Christian university of the liberal and applied arts and sciences. Our mission is to educate men and women toward maturity of intellect, character and Christian faith in preparation for lives of service, leadership and reconciliation in church and society.

RUSSIA AND THE RESTRICTED COMPOSER:
Limitations of the Self, Culture, and Government

BY

Ian T. Wallace

Submitted in fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of
A BACHELOR OF ARTS IN MUSIC

Dr. Timothy Dixon

Messiah College

May 2012

Abstract

This paper will consider the various creative limitations that have inhibited Russian and Soviet composers throughout history. These restrictions will be classified into three broad areas: those of the self, those of culture, and those of government. As will be seen, individual Russian composers have been constrained in at least one of these areas. Consideration of important musical and historical figures, from the beginning of the 19th century through the later decades of the Soviet Union, will assist in presenting specific forms of restraint.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....4

The Self: The Restriction to Please.....5

 The Restriction of Folk.....8

Culture and Society: Nationalism in the Air.....13

 Trade-off with Europe.....16

Government.....20

The Future of Restriction.....29

Bibliography.....31

Introduction

The study of music has dramatically changed within the past half-century. At no point in time would one argue that music developed inside a bubble, cut out from all other elements of society. To disprove such an idea, one need only consider the dominance of the patronage system during the Classical era of which many composers took part. Nonetheless, until recently, the history of music has been considered simply a discussion of style, form, and occasionally biography. In most cases, one can study music in such a basic and dry form. There is value in considering only what is written on the page. For example, few would question what can be gleaned by an analysis of Beethoven's symphonies in relation to the development of the genre as a whole. It is reasonable, due to preference sake or otherwise, to simply overlook Beethoven's cultural, governmental, and personal situations at the time of composition. However, to study the music of Russia in such a way would be a great disservice, and frankly, unproductive.

Russian music is most accessible and understood when the context in which it was composed is fully explored. The challenges Russian composers faced are unlike any of those of their Western counterparts. Of course, composers in other parts of the world faced issues that may have constrained them to various degrees. Yet in Russia, one finds a unique culture of restriction. Throughout history, the Russian composer has been limited, whether the artist himself has been aware of this limitation or not. As has been proposed, perhaps an outsider can notice more of the restrictions in place than an insider, such as the Russian artist himself. Mikhail Bakhtin points to this phenomenon stating, "In order to understand, it is immensely important for the person who understands to be located outside the object of his or her creative

understanding—in time, in space, in culture.”¹ The confines that such an outsider observes in Russian music are those of the self, culture, and government. The Russian composer, to a degree unheard of in the West, has been limited by these three forces. While some composers have only faced restrictions produced by one of these areas, others have been affected by all three. In any case, it is impossible to deny the effect of these broad areas of restraint in Russian music.

The Self

The Restriction to Please:

Throughout Russia’s history, the composer has internally limited himself in a number of ways. To a degree, these self-limitations vary from one composer to the next. At the same time, the various restrictions of different composers bare a resemblance to those of others. This commonality is found in the sense that all Russian composers are of the same culture. This creates a situation in which the line between constraints imposed by oneself and those thrust upon oneself by his or her culture is blurred. After all, is our culture not an integral part of our self? As a result, one’s culture has direct influence on his or her own internal limitations.

Much self-limitation of Russian composers can be traced back to the severely constrained grandfather of Russian music, Mikhail Glinka. Other composers existed in Russia before Glinka’s emergence onto the musical scene. However, Glinka was the first Russian composer to truly establish himself on the world stage. Oddly enough, within the origins of this achievement lays a self-limitation of Glinka that he passed on to a number of later Russian composers. This

¹ Mikhail Bakhtin, “Response to a Question from the *Noviy Mir* Editorial Staff,” in *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, ed. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, trans. Vern W. McGee (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986), 6-7, quoted in Richard Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), xxiii.

form of restraint can simply be described as a need for success and a desire to please, but this phenomenon is more complex than one would believe from that simple definition.

Glinka, as well as other Russian composers, actively sought attention and global fame. This desire can be evidenced by Glinka's own boast to his mother about seemingly being the first to accomplish this goal. In a letter from Paris, Glinka stated, "I am the first Russian composer, who has acquainted the Parisian public [and therefore, the West,] with his name and with his works, written in Russia and for Russia."² Glinka took pride in his accomplishment, and rightfully so as he achieved a level of name-recognition previously unheard of in the West for a Russian composer. Yet, in his desire to achieve success, Glinka compromised and restricted himself. As Taruskin notes, "with Glinka Russian music did not depart from Europe, but precisely the opposite—it joined Europe."³ In order for Europe to notice Glinka, he had to compose in a style that Europe would accept. For as much as Glinka is considered the grandfather of Russian music for his success, he turned his back on Russia in order to achieve it. After all, Glinka wanted to compose music that would be liked and accepted.

Interestingly, Glinka managed to pass on this form of limitation to a later figure of nineteenth century Russian music: Pyotr Illich Tchaikovsky. Throughout his life, although particularly during his younger years, Tchaikovsky actively sought approval from various sources. In contrast to the Mighty Five, Tchaikovsky sought music that would please, no matter the source material. In a letter to his brother, Tchaikovsky wrote of a particular work, "It seems

² M. I. Glinka, *Literature nasledie* Vol. 1 (Moscow-Leningrad, 1953), 272, quoted in Gerald Seaman, *History of Russian Music Vol. 1: From Its Origins to Dargomyzhsky* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., Publishers, 1967), 165.

³ Richard Taruskin, "Some Thoughts on the History and Historiography of Russian Music," *The Journal of Musicology* 3, no. 4 (Autumn, 1984): 324, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/763585> (accessed April 22, 2012).

likely to be successful. I am almost certain that [it] will please.”⁴ In this letter to his brother, Tchaikovsky clearly showed his limiting belief that a work’s success is measured by its popularity. Tchaikovsky went so far as to write to his dear friend and patron, Madame von Meck, “These moments [of success] are the best adornments of an artist’s life. For their sake, living and toiling are worth the while.”⁵ Yet in order for Tchaikovsky to please, he had to restrict himself to composing only in a style he thought would be recognized by the public at large. In this sense, Tchaikovsky shared this limitation with Glinka.

However, Glinka never sought the notice of one particular man, unless one counts Tsar Nicholas I. On the other hand, during his youth, Tchaikovsky actively sought attention and recognition from a somewhat surprising source: Mily Balakirev. During Tchaikovsky’s twenties, he had a regular correspondence with Balakirev for approximately four years.⁶ During this time, Tchaikovsky sought Balakirev’s advice, while remaining suspicious of him. As Brown states:

underlying these letters is a quite passionate wish for acceptance and recognition by Balakirev’s St. Petersburg group. There is much evidence to suggest that Tchaikovsky felt both a great need for and, simultaneously, a resentment of guidance. It so happened that Balakirev was the almost ideal man to administer this to Tchaikovsky.⁷

Certainly, it would appear that Tchaikovsky restricted himself to a degree by what pleased Balakirev. After all, “Balakirev—and he alone—could persuade Tchaikovsky to rewrite a work several times.”⁸ As is evident, Tchaikovsky, like Glinka was limited in his desire to please and gain attention. However, Tchaikovsky, at least for a time, actively sought the approval of an individual as well as the public, while Glinka only wanted the support of the latter.

⁴ Pyotr Illich Tchaikovsky, *Polnoye sobraniye sochineniy; Literaturniye proizvedeniya I perepiska*, vol. 12 (Moscow: Muz ĭ ka, 1970), 243-44, quoted in Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically*, 259.

⁵ *Ibid.*, vol. 13 (Moscow Muz ĭ ka, 1971), 25, quoted in Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically*, 260.

⁶ David Brown, “Balakirev, Tchaikovsky, and Nationalism,” *Music & Letters* 42, no. 3 (July 1961): 227, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/731879> (accessed April 11, 2012).

⁷ *Ibid.*, 229.

⁸ *Ibid.*

It should be noted that while composers in the West certainly wanted to please, they did not face the same struggle. For Western composers, pleasing came naturally; Russian composers had to put more thought and effort into it. European composers could easily please the West because they were themselves Westerners. Therefore, composers of the West had a far easier time understanding their audience. Russian composers, not having the mind of a European, had to actively pursue a style that would please their intended audience in a way the Western composer did not.

The Restriction of Folk:

As mentioned later, throughout Russia's history, composers have been encouraged, if not outright mandated, to include nationalistic tendencies in their music. Less obvious though, is the desire composers themselves felt to include folk tunes or other nationalist music in their compositions. Much of this can be traced to the Russian culture. However, one can classify this under a form of self-limitation as well. There is evidence showing that certain composers felt a restrictive duty to their country to include nationalist tunes in their music. For some Russian composers, this sense of duty was just as powerful, if not more so, than any single mandate of their government or culture.

Again, it is useful to consider Glinka, as he clearly aspired to create "Russian music" in a way that limited him. Glinka knew all the ins and outs of the Russian music that had been written up to his point in history. Frolova-Walker, writing of Glinka's opera, *A Life for the Tsar*, stated, "pervasive Russianness [written into the opera] was consciously heard as such by the public. Its roots lay in Russian art song...this was evident to Russians—scholars, musicians and the public

alike.”⁹ In his first opera at least, Glinka actively pursued a Russian style. As is discussed later, it is true that Glinka lived at a time when such compositional choices were, to put it mildly, strongly encouraged by the tsar himself. However, Glinka himself felt a desire to pursue such a nationalist style. According to Taruskin, Glinka had an “*enthusiastic* commitment to the state ideology and his determination to embody it in symbolic sounds” [emphasis added.]¹⁰ The word “enthusiastic” indicates that Glinka was more than willing to oblige the state; Glinka *wanted* to compose in a nationalistic style.¹¹

Glinka was just the first of many Russian composers to feel an internal, limiting desire to pursue a nationalist style. The most immediate, major successor to fit into this category would be Alexander Dargomyzhsky. Despite the fact that Dargomyzhsky, particularly in his youth, showed “glimpses of a desire for originality,” this desire was sometimes outweighed by his want to follow in the nationalist footsteps of Glinka.¹² In his operas, particularly *Rusalka*, “it is clear that Dargomyzhsky was not indifferent to folk music.”¹³ Dargomyzhsky actively sought a nationalist style by including Russian folk tunes in his music. The reason for this pursuit came from Dargomyzhsky’s worship of Glinka from whom he gained much influence.¹⁴

⁹ Marina Frolova-Walker, “On ‘Ruslan’ and Russianness,” *Cambridge Opera Journal* 9, no. 1 (March 1997): 22, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/823708> (accessed February 9, 2012).

¹⁰ Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically*, 29.

¹¹ Ironically, Glinka did not completely succeed in this. While Glinka included a fair amount of Russian tunes in his music, most of these were urban songs. Rarely did Glinka rely on the folk music of peasants often associated with nationalism. As one scholar put it, “Glinka barely advanced beyond Beethoven as a scholar of Russian peasant music.” This may have to do with Glinka’s Western education. Nonetheless, Glinka clearly strove for a nationalist style to the point where it limited him as a composer; whether or not he completely captured that style is beside the point. (Marina Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism: From Glinka to Stalin* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 77).

¹² Seaman, 212.

¹³ *Ibid*, 219.

¹⁴ Interestingly, Dargomyzhsky was so influenced by Glinka that he, like his predecessor, managed to only use urban songs in his works. Like Glinka, he failed to use actual peasant folk tunes. *Ibid*.

Just as Glinka influenced Dargomyzhsky, the younger composer influenced those who followed him. The composers who most immediately followed Dargomyzhsky onto the musical scene were Balakirev and the rest of the Mighty Five. Of the group, Balakirev in particular sought a Russian nationalist style to the point that it restricted him. This desire was in no way mandated, although it is arguable that the musical environment of Russia at that time inclined Balakirev to compose in the style he did.¹⁵ Nonetheless, as can be noted in his second *Overture on Russian Themes*, Balakirev “exhibited a far greater determination...to purify the national character of his style.”¹⁶ Balakirev became somewhat obsessed with composing in a nationalist style, going far beyond what may have been demanded of him by society. Notably, Balakirev went so far as to design a type of harmonization that best lent itself to composing in the national style. Taruskin notes:

[Balakirev] sought and found a method that preserved, more faithfully than any previous one, two particular aspects of the folk original: the diatonic purity of the minor mode...and the quality of tonal “mutability” (*peremennost’*), as it is called, whereby a tune seemed to oscillate between two equally stable points of rest, as it were two ‘tonics.’¹⁷

As is seen, Balakirev’s internal need to compose in a nationalist manner limited his harmonic choices.

Balakirev shared his restricting interest in a nationalist style with the other members of the Mighty Five, including: Modest Mussorgsky, Alexander Borodin, Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov, and César Cui. To varying degrees, the five of these composers aspired to compose music that would be considered as “Russian” as possible. This noble goal was not intrinsically negative.

¹⁵ During that time in Russia’s musical history, there was a great debate about the “Germanic” style that had found a home in the Anton Rubinstein founded St. Petersburg Conservatory. As Taruskin notes, “It was in the spirit of opposition to the German dominated professionalization of St. Petersburg musical life, with its strong aristocratic and establishmentarian underpinning, that Balakirev gathered around him his famous “little band” of musical mavericks and autodidacts, and joined forces with Gavriyl Lomakin to organize the Free Music School.” (Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically*, 124).

¹⁶ Ibid, 132.

¹⁷ Ibid, 132-33.

After all, the choice of a composer to use folk tunes in his music or pursue a nationalist style was, to a degree, a valid creative decision. However, “a nationalism that insists on purity is no longer a benign or liberating nationalism. It has turned aggressive and intolerant.”¹⁸

Unfortunately, this is the limiting kind of nationalism that the Mighty Five pursued.

Of the other members of the Five beside Balakirev, Mussorgsky and Rimsky-Korsakov require special attention. Of course, that is not to say the other two were not limited by their own quests for a nationalist style. In particular, Cui’s “approach sometimes made him blind to the shortcomings of his favoured music and to the merits of music written by composers outside his coterie.”¹⁹ Yet, it was Mussorgsky who Taruskin argues, “was more thoroughly and profoundly obsessed than any other member of his musical generation by *narodnost*’ [national style or ‘folkness’] and its full panoply of attendant historical and social issues.”²⁰ Mussorgsky, like Balakirev and others, became preoccupied with his desire to achieve the maximum amount of “Russianness” in his music. Speaking of an early draft of his work, *St. John’s Night on Bald Mountain*, Mussorgsky explained he found much pride in the work because it was so “Russian and original...hot and chaotic.”²¹ It is not a coincidence that the first word Mussorgsky used to describe his work was “Russian.” After all, Mussorgsky had a burning desire to write “Russian” sounding music. Like Balakirev, what may have started as a form of protest to the influx of style from the West had become an intrinsic need embedded into Mussorgsky’s self.

After Mussorgsky’s death, Rimsky-Korsakov, speaking of the works of his late friend,

¹⁸ Ibid, 51.

¹⁹ Geoffrey Norris and Lyle Neff, “Cui, César,” in *Grove Music Online, Oxford Music Online*, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/06938> (accessed April 24, 2012).

²⁰ Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically*, 70.

²¹ Balakirev did not actually agree that Mussorgsky’s work was nationalist. This would seem to indicate that he, not Mussorgsky, was the most obsessed with nationalism and the use of folk. Either way, Mussorgsky wrote what *he* believed was “Russian” music. (Robert W. Oldani, “Musorgsky, Modest Petrovich,” in *Grove Music Online, Oxford Music Online*, <http://www.osfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/19468> (accessed April 23, 2012).

stated:

In the majority of cases, these compositions showed so much talent, so much originality, offered so much that was new and alive, that their publication was a positive obligation. But publication without a skillful hand to put them in order would have had no sense save a biographico-historical one.²²

Rimsky-Korsakov recognized the historical importance of leaving Mussorgsky's works unchanged. However, the composer had by this point in his life expressed a need to control his "musical conscience" and thus felt a need to tamper with Mussorgsky's works.²³ In his youth, Rimsky-Korsakov had followed the ways of the elder Balakirev and joined him in composing purely nationalistic works. Furthermore, Rimsky-Korsakov continued to use a large amount of folk material and "Russian" harmonies throughout his career.²⁴ Yet, the composer's comments concerning Mussorgsky's works, written in the same mindset that Rimsky-Korsakov himself once shared, confirm he had come to realize just how limiting the doctrine of the Mighty Five had been. In this sense, Rimsky-Korsakov overcame the limitation he had placed on himself to include folk content in his compositions.

However, his late blooming fascination with music that pleased the ear may have limited him just as much as his internal desire to compose in a nationalist style. Maes writes, "Rimsky-Korsakov was at once a progressive and a conservative composer. He kept his tendency to experiment under constant control. The more radical his harmonies became, the more he subjected them to strict rules. He called this need for control his "musical conscience."²⁵ In this sense, Rimsky-Korsakov may have traded the limitation of Balakirev for that of Tchaikovsky.

²² Francis Maes, *A History of Russian Music: From Kamarinskaya to Babi Yar* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996), 181.

²³ *Ibid*, 180.

²⁴ Mark Humphreys, et al., "Rimsky-Korsakov," in *Grove Music Online, Oxford Music Online*, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/52074pg1> (accessed April 25, 2012).

²⁵ Maes, 180.

Culture and Society

Nationalism in the Air:

While some forms of restriction are solely of the self, others find their origins in the culture and society of Russia. Just as the self can be caught up in his or her culture, one's culture can be connected to one's government. However, this section will deal solely with those elements of culture beyond government. As can be seen, these nongovernmental elements of culture can be just as restrictive as the governmental limitations Russian composers faced, which are discussed later.

The musical culture of Russia has always confronted limiting societal forces. One of these forces is the pressure composers felt to write in a "Russian style." This external, societal pressure should not be confused with the internal need to compose in a nationalistic style that was mentioned earlier. Nor should this force be confused with the government *mandating* that one compose in such a style, or any style for that matter. This societal pressure speaks to the general atmosphere composers had to work in and what was expected in that environment.

An emphasis placed on nationalism was not limited to one composer, one set of composers, or even one country. As scholars have noted, "nationalism was universally held to be a positive value in nineteenth-century Europe—because nationalism, to put it ironically, was international...the 'national substance' of Russian (Or Czech, or Spanish, or Norwegian) music was 'a condition of its international worth.'"²⁶ Nationalism was in vogue in both Russia and the West. Therefore, pressure to compose in such a style was just as much a reflection of the international musical environment of the 19th century as it was the Russian musical scene itself.

²⁶ Carl Dahlhaus, *Between Romanticism and Modernism*, trans. Mary Whittall (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980), quoted in Taruskin, "Some Thoughts on the History and Historiography of Russian Music," 329.

During the first half of the 19th century, this external pressure was essentially a non-issue. After all, as discussed earlier, Glinka's internal desire to compose in a national style matched the external pressure surrounding him. Furthermore, other composers recognized Glinka's relative success and emulated his nationalist style.²⁷ As a result, during the first part of the 19th century, there was hardly any distinction between the limiting factors of the self and those of culture.

However, the musical climate of Russia shifted as the 19th century progressed. As Tchaikovsky became a more prominent figure on the Russian musical scene, composers began to question whether or not they had to compose in a nationalist style in order to achieve success. After all, Tchaikovsky had managed to become rather popular during the second half of the 19th century despite his Western-style training. It was natural then for composers to look at Tchaikovsky's success and question the significance of nationalism.²⁸

Despite Tchaikovsky's achievements, the cloud of nationalism still hung over the Russian and European musical scenes throughout the 19th century. In Russia, arguably in response to Tchaikovsky's success, a societal organization was created in order to ward off any perceived threats to nationalism. This societal organization came to be known as the Belyayev Circle. Mitrofan Belyayev, a wealthy timber merchant, was a supporter of the arts as well as an amateur musician. During the last quarter of the 19th century, Belyayev "endowed a magnificent publishing enterprise, two concert series, and several annual prizes for the purpose of supporting

²⁷ As has been mentioned, Glinka's status as a nationalist is questionable. However, Glinka was considered a nationalist composer in his day and has gone down in history as such.

²⁸ Despite the fact that Tchaikovsky has gone down in history as an anomaly among other composers of his time for his open-mindedness to the West, it is important to note that Tchaikovsky was not anti-nationalist. Tchaikovsky was just not as extreme of a nationalist as some of his peers. In truth, Tchaikovsky "was at the heart no less a nationalist than Balakirev. When travelling in the West he often experienced a very strong wish to be back in Russia once more, nor did he neglect the natural folksongs in his own compositions as well as making arrangements of them for publication." (Brown, 39-40).

Russian art music.”²⁹ Furthermore, “The patron’s [Belyayev’s] will made provision for the continuation of these undertakings in perpetuity.”³⁰ Such enticements were undeniably attractive to young composers.

However, the benefits of joining the Belyayev circle came at a cost. As Maes notes:

Under the control of Rimsky-Korsakov, Glazunov, and Lyadov, the Belyayev circle was reserved for those who worked in a style of which the circle approved. Rimsky-Korsakov’s style thus became the preferred academic style, the model that young composers had to follow if they were to have a career.³¹

This in itself does not seem outright startling. In fact, Rimsky-Korsakov’s newfound emphasis on Western style training somewhat balanced out Belyayev’s insistence that composers write in a nationalistic style.³² Nevertheless, it is in the constricting form of style that is nationalism where composers of the Belyayev circle faced the most limitation and censorship. For many young composers, the decision came down to composing in a nationalist style or not having the funds to sustain them. Taruskin notes that “so powerful were the blandishments it could offer, even without any raw state power to back [it] up, that the Conservatory/Belyayev nexus made for an absolutely invincible establishment.”³³ Thus, the Belyayev circle can be described accurately as the strongest manifestation of external pressure to compose in a nationalist style of the later 19th century. In this way, an entire generation of composers was limited in its creativity.

²⁹ Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically*, 82.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Maes, 172.

³² As noted earlier, Rimsky-Korsakov’s respect for his “musical conscience” could be construed as just as much of a limitation as pure nationalism.

³³ Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically*, 83.

Trade-off with Europe:

Cultural limitation was not confined to external pressure to compose in one way or another. Certain restrictions composers confronted emerged from the interactions Russia had with Europe. During the 18th and 19th centuries, much of the constraints in place were the result of an influx of Western music, particularly opera, into Russia. From the very beginning of Russia's musical history, Russian composers were limited by the West with an invasion of Italian opera singers in 1735.³⁴ Previous to this event, Russia had not really developed a secular art music of its own. With the influx of Europeans, Russia lost any chance to create a form of art music from a blank slate. Once the Italian opera arrived, its presence was felt throughout the remainder of the 18th century.

As the 19th century unfolded, Italian opera became only more popular. Previous to Glinka, no Russian composer had been able to pose a serious threat to the dominance of Italian opera in Russia. Glinka was able to gain some notoriety for sure. Nonetheless, Glinka had to work in a compromising environment where the work of foreigners was valued more by the Russian people than that of native composers. Furthermore, those in the government preferred the Italian opera.³⁵ Such an environment drove Russia composers to write in a certain way:

Were there no state-supported Italian opera to contend with, torturing them at once with professional frustration and creative isolation, it is unlikely, moreover, that composers of Russian opera would have proven so prone to assume those radically pure aesthetic and stylistic stances for which they live in history, if not on stage.³⁶

³⁴ Ibid, xi.

³⁵ Tsar Nicholas 1st supported Italian opera because having an Italian opera in a country's capital was a sign of prestige. As a result of his preference, Nicholas 1st did not allow any Russian opera to be performed at the Italian opera, which housed the best singers. Thus, Russian composers did not have access to the best talent. (Ibid, 200).

³⁶ Ibid, 214.

Russian composers, particularly those of opera, were *driven* to compose in the way they did in order to stand out from the Italian opera that permeated their culture.

At the same time, Russian composers of the first half of the 19th century lived in a culture in which their work was unrecognized, despite their best efforts. As much as Russian composers sought to compose in a unique style, and succeeded somewhat in doing so, they also had to be sensitive to the cultural reality of their times. After all, “no one expected anything of Russian opera.”³⁷ Russian opera was thought of by the aristocratic classes as too untamed to be successful on the world stage. As mentioned, Glinka himself recognized this problem and was limited by it. In fact, despite Glinka’s reputation as the grandfather of Russian music, “there is no later Russian composer of opera whose Italianate borrowings are as plain as Glinka’s.”³⁸ Glinka was compelled, if not outright forced, by his culture to use Italian style traits in his music. So as much as Glinka wanted to distance himself from the West, he also recognized the musical culture of his time demanded he join it. As noted earlier, Glinka was limited by the fact that he was willing to compromise for success. Yet even if Glinka had not been so willing, or if he had not sought success, the musical and cultural climate would have necessitated he compose in a Western style.

As the 19th century went on, Italian opera grew less popular with the Russian people. However, that did not mean that Russia’s interactions with the West were over. As time went on, not only did the West invade Russia more, but Russia invaded the West. As Taruskin notes, by the 20th century:

The repertory of timbres and special instrumental effects was expanded, and the arsenal of exotic harmonic *Künstucke* grew, as the result of both a normal emulatory impulse and the special needs of Sergey Diaghilev’s ‘export campaign’ by which the Russian school had to

³⁷ Ibid, 197.

³⁸ Ibid, 228.

become more demonstratively Russian than ever to satisfy the expectations of a Parisian audience.³⁹

The West had begun to expect a certain sound from Russian composers, which limited them creatively. Much of this was due to the Sergey Diaghilev, the famed impresario. During the first decade of the 20th century, Diaghilev began showcasing Russian music in Paris. Diaghilev's company of Russian ballets, the Ballets Russes as it was called, actually survived until his death in 1929.⁴⁰ While Diaghilev's efforts created a demand for Russian music in the West, they also dictated the way in which Russian composers had to write.

As Diaghilev's Ballet Russes grew in popularity, more sponsors became involved. Unfortunately for the composers, these sponsors "were less interested in artistic merit than in commercial publicity."⁴¹ The Parisian audience demanded an exotic sound, even more exotic sounding than the music Russian composers naturally wrote. Russian composers had to put extra effort into ensuring that their music would sound striking, if not downright bizarre, to Western audiences.

Stravinsky in particular was influenced by Diaghilev and the musical atmosphere of Paris. "Neonationalism [had come] to predominate in Diaghilev aesthetic" and he called upon Stravinsky to usher in this style.⁴² Such neonationalism was therefore integrated into Stravinsky's ballets for Diaghilev, particularly *The Rite of Spring*, which "satisfies the neonationalist paradigm fully."⁴³ Stravinsky undoubtedly felt pressure to compose in a

³⁹ Ibid, 85.

⁴⁰ Paul Griffiths, "Diaghilev, Sergey Pavlovich," in *Grove Music Online, Oxford Music Online*, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/08450> (accessed April 28, 2012).

⁴¹ Maes, 175.

⁴² Ibid, 218.

⁴³ Ibid, 226.

neonationalist style. In this sense, it would be fair to say that Stravinsky was limited by Diaghilev and his audience.⁴⁴

Stravinsky was not the only Russian composer of the 20th century effected by Diaghilev's influence. Sergei Prokofiev also felt limited by Diaghilev at points in his career. In 1915, Diaghilev commissioned Prokofiev to write *Chout*, a work centered on a collection of Russian folk stories assembled by Alexander Afanasyev.⁴⁵ Diaghilev was very clear about the fact that he wanted the piece to include more neonationalist material than Prokofiev typically included in his works. Essentially, Prokofiev was to avoid other styles beyond neonationalism in this piece if he were to satisfy the impresario. After all, the neonationalist style is what sold tickets in Paris and that was Diaghilev's primary concern.

Furthermore, in a collection of his memoirs, Prokofiev claimed Diaghilev told him, "In art you have to be able to hate—otherwise your own music will lose its personality."⁴⁶ Clearly, Diaghilev was interested in restricting Prokofiev's eclectic tendencies. Prokofiev did his best to resist Diaghilev's influence on his music, but he did not always succeed. For example, in the case of *Chout*, "In response to the impresario's command, over 40 percent of the [original composition] was deleted or rewritten."⁴⁷ Evidently then, Diaghilev had a limiting effect on Prokofiev.

⁴⁴ While Stravinsky may have been limited to a neonationalist style, his relationship with Diaghilev was by no means fully diminishing. Stravinsky put forth some of his greatest works for the Ballet Russes. As Maes notes, Stravinsky, "[Adopted] Diaghilev's theory that opera was antiquated and ballet its modern substitute, [and] he removed all references to opera from the ballets he wrote immediately after *The Firebird*." Whether or not Stravinsky would have pursued the ballet without Diaghilev's influence is possible. However, the effect on Stravinsky of Diaghilev's insistence on neonationalism is less of an open question. (Ibid, 219).

⁴⁵ Ibid, 231.

⁴⁶ Sergei Prokofiev, *Materials, Documents, Memoirs*, ed. S.I. Shilifshstein (Moscow: 1961), quoted in Harlow Robinson, *Sergei Prokofiev* (New York: Viking, 1987), 111.

⁴⁷ Stephen D. Press, *Prokofiev's Ballets for Diaghilev* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2006), 180.

Government

The Russian government has, nearly consistently, placed restrictions on Russian composers throughout its history. Such governmental limitations can be traced back even prior to the full emergence of secular Russian art music in the 19th century. In fact, Russia's first experience with governmental limitation may have been one of the most extreme. During the reign of Paul I in the late 18th century, "The number of private orchestras was reduced, all dramatic and operatic productions were subjected to censorship both before and during production, and restrictions were imposed on travel, publication, and import of materials from abroad."⁴⁸ Despite the fact that these particular restrictions and censors came to an end with Paul I's assassination in 1801, they set the stage for the limitations Russian composers would face during the 19th and 20th centuries.

After the death of Paul I, his son Alexander I became the ruler of Russia. As the new tsar, Alexander I relaxed the limitations Russian musicians faced. However, Alexander I's efforts did not matter much considering the fact that the predominate form of music during his reign was foreign opera.⁴⁹ In 1825, just as Glinka and Russian music itself were coming of age, Nicholas I ascended the throne after Alexander's death. The reign of Nicholas I severely repressed Russian composers, notably Glinka. The new tsar espoused the limiting idea of Official Nationalism. According to the textbooks of the time, Official Nationalism could be described using this definition of the ideal Russian citizen's character:

profound and quiet piety, boundless devotion to the throne, obedience to the authorities, remarkable patience, a lucid and solid intelligence, a kind and hospitable soul, a gay temper, courage amidst the greatest dangers, finally, national pride which had produced the conviction

⁴⁸ Seaman, 114.

⁴⁹ Ibid, 118.

that there was no country in the world better than Russia, no ruler mightier than the Orthodox Tsar.⁵⁰

This demand for an extreme form of nationalism came from Nicholas I himself. Russian composers were limited by the fact that “one of the cornerstones of Official Nationalism was the creation of a romantic national mythology.”⁵¹ As a result, Russian composers, particularly those of opera, had to ensure their work encouraged the “[creation of] a national consciousness out of national myths.”⁵² Thus, composers were limited in terms of what libretti they could use for their works.

Unfortunately, the doctrine of Official Nationalism was not the only means of restriction Nicholas I put in place. First off, “No theatrical work could see production without the Tsar’s personal approval and implicit (often active) cooperation.”⁵³ This was just a general form of limitation. Nicholas I put more specific forms of censorship in place as well:

Among them was an immediate edict (promulgated 14 December 1825) that banned all “rescue operas” of the kind popularized in revolutionary France, and all operas with overtly antityrannical plots...In addition, all operas with biblical plots were prohibited in keeping with the Orthodox Church’s strictures against the secular depiction of religious themes...[Furthermore], after 1848 restrictions became tighter yet: even when sung by Russian singers, some operas could be performed only in the original language.⁵⁴

Other forms of creative constraint were put in place as well, all of which hindered the 19th century Russian composer. Not only did these specific censors put in place hurt composers, but they also produced an atmosphere in which “self-censorship and patronage flourished.”⁵⁵

⁵⁰ N. Ustryalov, *Russkaya istoria* (St. Petersburg: 1855), 2:15, quoted in Nicholas Riasanovsky, *Nicholas I and Official Nationality in Russia, 1825-1855* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1961), 125.

⁵¹ Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically*, 27.

⁵² Hubert F. Bainski, *The Mazeppa Legend in European Romanticism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1974), 89, quoted in *Ibid*, 27.

⁵³ *Ibid*, 193.

⁵⁴ *Ibid*.

⁵⁵ Robert Goldstein, *The War for the Public Mind: Political Censorship in Nineteenth-Century Europe* (Westport CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, 2000), 260.

Unfortunately, this meant that the various censorships espoused by the government caused an even greater amount of creative limitation than what was intended by their creation.

As mentioned, Glinka was particularly constrained by the censors put in place by Nicholas I. In fact, “Glinka was the first Russian composer to experience directly the unfortunate effects of Tsar Nikolai’s arts policies”⁵⁶ *A Life for the Tsar* was a great achievement considering the environment in which Glinka produced it. Yet, it seems unquestionable that Glinka’s first opera would have been different had the repressive policies of Nicholas I not been in place. In 1950, less than a decade before his death, Glinka wrote in a letter to his friend, Nestor Kukolnik, “I’m finished with Russian music, as I am with Russian winters.”⁵⁷ Undoubtedly, such exasperation with Russian music was due to the repressive era in which Glinka lived.

Alexander II, who reigned from 1855 to 1881, continued the policy censorship put in place by his predecessor. Compositions by Russian composers during this era were “subjected...to the same scrutiny that typified newspaper and book censorship. This was especially so as members of the Imperial family took a personal interest in opera and ballet.”⁵⁸ Such restriction effected composers of the second half on the 19th century greatly. For example, Modest Mussorgsky had to revise his opera, *Boris Godunov*, in order for its production to be permitted.⁵⁹

It was not until the reign of Alexander III, beginning in 1881, that the restrictions put in place by previous tsars were eased or eliminated. Most notably, the new tsar “[Brought] to an end what historians of late tsarist Russia have designated the Imperial Theatre ‘monopoly’ of

⁵⁶ Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically*, 218.

⁵⁷ Mikhail Glinka, *Pis’ma i dokumenty (Literature naslediy, vol. 2)* (Leningrad: Muzgiz, 1953), 90, quoted in *Ibid*, 114.

⁵⁸ Goldstein, 263.

⁵⁹ *Ibid*, 264.

drama, opera and ballet in the two capitals.”⁶⁰ This allowed more Russian work to be produced and performed. Furthermore, “[Alexander III] supported the Russian Music Society, granting it the building of the St. Petersburg Bol’shoi theatre and funds for the construction of the Conservatory.”⁶¹ Overall, Alexander III was less repressive than some of his predecessors. In this sense, composers who lived during Alexander’s III’s reign were less restricted. However, during this time the Belyayev circle was in full force. As mentioned earlier, this nongovernmental organization was just as restrictive as one Alexander III could have put in place himself.

Despite the hope Alexander III gave Russian composers, his reign did not result in an end to governmental restriction in Russia once and for all. In fact, after the abdication of the throne by Alexander III’s successor, Nicholas II, a new era of censorship began to unfold. During the 20th century, the rise of the Soviet Union brought with it a whole new order of restraint.

During the 1920’s, despite the fact that the Soviet government was at that time primarily concerned with strictly economic issues, it was clear that the new political order had already had an effect on the Russian musical scene. Independent arts organizations such as the Association of Contemporary Music (ASC) and the Russian Association of Proletarian Musicians (RAPM) dominated Russian musical life. Even though these groups were not technically affiliated with the government, the Soviet regime still interacted with them frequently. In the case of the ASM,

⁶⁰ Murray Frame, “Freedom of the Theatres: The abolition of the Russian Imperial Theatre Monopoly,” *The Slavonic and East European Review* 83, no. 2 (April 2005): 254, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4214088> (accessed April 11, 2012).

⁶¹ *Ibid*, 288.

“many of its members suffered cruelly under Stalin.”⁶² This was due to the fact that one of the ASM’s core beliefs was the pursuit of modernist music.⁶³

The RAPM was the more prevalent of the two organizations. This resulted from the fact that the RAPM encouraged the creation of the type of music the government itself wanted. The RAPM, like the Soviet regime, pressured Russian composers, “to spurn all styles and genres that had flourished under the Tsars and cultivate instead the only authentically proletarian genre, the marchlike *massovay pesnya*, the ‘mass song,’ through which proletarian ideology could be aggressively disseminated.”⁶⁴ The goals of the RAPM matched those of the Soviet government nearly succinctly. An environment where such “independent” organizations were controlled to such a degree by the government limited Russian composers greatly. As Schwarz emphasizes, “much Soviet music composed during the 1920’s is strangely barren and synthetic—music manufactured by composers who aimed at a certain effect, at a certain type of audience, and who tried to satisfy the demands of the day.”⁶⁵ Thus, the restriction composers felt during this period in Soviet history can be heard in their music.

After the 1920’s, the Soviet government sought to involve itself in the arts to a greater degree than it had previously. On April 23, 1932 the Soviet government established the Union of Soviet Composers (USC) and dissolved other independent arts organizations.⁶⁶ This was a more official form of censorship than that practiced by the RAPM. The USC strongly encouraged Socialist Realism: “The struggle against folk-negating modernistic directions that are typical of

⁶² It should be noted that not all of these composers were punished during the 1920s. In fact, many were disciplined later. (Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically*, 91).

⁶³ *Ibid*, 89.

⁶⁴ *Ibid*, 512.

⁶⁵ Boris Schwarz, *Music and Musical Life in Soviet Russia 1917-1970* (New York: Norton Library, 1973), 61.

⁶⁶ Nicolas Slonimsky, “Soviet Music and Musicians,” *Slavonic and East European Review. American Series* 3, no. 4 (December 1944): 6, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3020186> (accessed April 15, 2012).

the decay of contemporary bourgeois art.”⁶⁷ Of course, the implied rule here is that contemporary bourgeois art must be indistinguishable from contemporary *proletarian* art. Despite this restriction, composers were attracted to the supposed benefits of the USC, only later coming to terms with how repressive the governmental organization was. Furthermore, those benefits were hardly substantial. The USC “Never provided enough money to be a viable exclusive funding source.”⁶⁸ Therefore, Russian composers were both creatively and financially limited because of the USC.

Notably, Stalin himself encouraged this type of constraint and stated, “The development of cultures [must be] national in form and socialist in content.”⁶⁹ With this statement then, one finds evidence that composers were expected to not only appeal to the masses, but also compose in a nationalist style as well. Granted, music that was nationalist would naturally appeal to the proletariat, but composers were undoubtedly limited by this extra burden nonetheless.

Such restriction was easily apparent in the lives and work of the two largest musical figures the Soviet Union: Prokofiev and Dmitry Shostakovich.⁷⁰ The legacies of both of these men are inherently bound to the Soviet Union and the restrictive age in which they lived. In the case of Prokofiev, “He remains the straightforward, unreconstructed reflector of his catastrophic environments and all its hypocrisies.”⁷¹ This description of Prokofiev’s legacy is furthermore

⁶⁷ Quoted in B.S. Shteynpress and I.M. Yampolsky, *Entsiklopedicheskiy muzikal’niy slovar*, 2nd ed. (Moscow: Sovetskayay entsiklopediya, 1966), 486, quoted in Schwarz, 114.

⁶⁸ Kiril Tomoff, *Creative Union: The Professional Organization of Soviet Composers, 1939-1953* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006), 45.

⁶⁹ Quoted in Marina Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, 311.

⁷⁰ One could argue that Stravinsky was just as large a figure as Prokofiev and Shostakovich. However, Stravinsky spent a considerable amount of time outside of the Soviet Union, going so far as to obtain citizenship in both France and the United States. As a result, Stravinsky felt less restricted than the two other great Soviet composers of his day.

⁷¹ Richard Taruskin, “Art and Politics in Prokofiev,” *Culture and Society* 29, no. 1 (Nov.-Dec. 1991): 61, <http://www.springerlink.com/content/1u8271052653u826/fulltext.pdf> (accessed May 7, 2012).

highlighted by the unfortunate event of his death occurring on the same day as Stalin.⁷² This, of course, has made it difficult for Prokofiev to avoid associations with the evil Soviet tyrant himself.

Despite his fair or unfair associations with the Soviet regime, Prokofiev did his best to not be limited by the government as an artist. The need to compose under the guise of Socialist Realism, while remaining true to himself, was a challenge for Prokofiev. However, Prokofiev managed, for at least part of his career, to balance the fine line between pleasing himself creatively and pleasing Stalin. As Maes notes:

In about 1930 he began to simplify his style. He advocated a new look at the traditional elements of music, such as tonality, melody, and classical forms, and spoke of the need to create “a new simplicity.” This move brought him closer to the criteria of Soviet music than those of the Western avant-garde.⁷³

Such new simplicity was seen in works such as the *Lieutenant Kije* score and *Egyptian Nights*. These pieces display simplicity, and therefore comprehensibility, but also contain Prokofiev’s unique artistic flare.⁷⁴

However, despite the fact that Prokofiev made the best of the environment in which he lived, he was restricted nonetheless. One can only wonder what Prokofiev would have created in a less constricting environment. Prokofiev himself finally came to terms with just how limited he was towards the end of his life. Writing about his seventh opera, *The Story of a Real Man*, which had been rejected by both critics and audiences, Prokofiev stated his frustration:

In my opera I endeavoured to be as melodic as possible and write melodies that would be very easily understood. In the depiction of my hero I was particularly concerned to indicate the internal world of a Soviet man, love of the homeland and Soviet patriotism. It gave me pain to

⁷² Dorothy Redepenning, “Prokofiev, Sergey,” in *Grove Music Online, Oxford Music Online*, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/22402> (accessed May 3, 2012).

⁷³ Maes, 321.

⁷⁴ Schwarz, 117.

hear the comrades' critical opinions. However, I would rather write operas on Soviet subjects, and even hear criticism if they do not succeed, than not to write and to hear no criticism.⁷⁵

Thus, Prokofiev was very much exasperated. The composer had spent precious time composing a work according to specific guidelines in the hope that it would be accepted, only to have it rejected for honoring those guidelines too much. Prokofiev was able to work around the limitations of his day for a good portion of his career. However, by the end of his life, it was painstakingly clear to himself just how restricted he had been.

Dmitry Shostakovich was the other great composer of the Soviet era. However, unlike Prokofiev, Shostakovich lived beyond Stalin. Thus, Shostakovich, while restricted, does not have a legacy quite as engulfed in the Stalinist era as Prokofiev's. Throughout his career, Shostakovich had a unique relationship with the Soviet government. Like Prokofiev, he was very much limited by that relationship. In fact, as Brooke notes, in order to avoid compositional "error," the head of the Moscow Union, Platon Kerzhentsev:

suggested that it would be wise for Shostakovich to send any future opera or ballet libretti to the committee in advance of starting work on the music, and to experiment by having individual movements of his works performed to audiences of workers and *kolkhozniki* (collective farm workers) during the process of composition.⁷⁶

Despite this advice being given to him months before its premiere, performances of Shostakovich's Fourth Symphony were withdrawn. At the time, this event was presented as a result of the will of the composer. However, "it is clear Shostakovich withdrew the work only under pressure from local party officials."⁷⁷ Such censorship by the government was a blatant restriction.

⁷⁵ Quoted in Redepenning.

⁷⁶ Caroline Brooke, "Soviet Musicians and the Great Terror," *Europe-Asia Studies* 54, no. 3 (2002): 406, <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=ed5ac9b8-668a-49cc-9a44-4a3b1b1457a1%40sessionmgr111&vid=10&hid=113> (accessed May 7, 2012).

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 407.

With his triumphant Fifth Symphony, Shostakovich managed to walk the same fine line Prokofiev had of pleasing himself and pleasing the political order. As Maes asserts:

Remarkably, the symphony appealed equally to two different parties: the official critics no less than the public reacted ecstatically. The authorities found everything they had looked for restored in the symphony. The public, for its part, heard it as an expression of the suffering to which it had been subjected by the Stalinist terror. One and the same work was therefore received in two distinct ways.⁷⁸

Shostakovich managed to compose in a style that would please Stalin. At the same time, Shostakovich ensured his music would emotionally connect with the audience.

The symphony's informal title, "My Creative Response," was the same name of an article written by Shostakovich himself found in a Moscow periodical.⁷⁹ The article was an explanation of his symphony, which in turn was a sardonic reaction to the criticism Shostakovich's opera, *Lady Macbeth*, had received. Shostakovich wrote, "if the demanding listener will detect in my music a turn toward greater clarity and simplicity, I will be satisfied."⁸⁰ In the same article though, Shostakovich stated, "At the center of the work's conception I envisioned... *a man* in all his suffering."⁸¹ Of course, the audience was able to relate to such a man. Clearly, Shostakovich was able to compose in the style demanded of him while also expressing himself as an artist. However, despite the fact that he managed to hold on to some creativity, the fact that Shostakovich had to even consider a set of certain qualifications during his compositional process showed how constrained he was.

Later in life, Shostakovich's regret and guilt over his affiliations with the Communist Party limited him just as much as the Soviet government itself. Technically, this could be

⁷⁸ Maes, 353.

⁷⁹ As should be noted, there is debate about whether or not Shostakovich himself was truly the author of this article. In any case, it appears an accurate description and explanation of his work.

⁸⁰ Dmitry Shostakovich, "Moy tvorcheskiy otvet," *Vechernyaya Moskva*, 25 January 1938, 30, quoted in Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically*, 523.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*

classified as a form of self-limitation. However, this unique form of self-limitation was a direct consequence of governmental restriction. Shostakovich's Eighth String Quartet was a prime example of this facet of constraint. As Taruskin positions, "It was in agony of humiliation and self-reproach, as much as an agony at fascist atrocities, that he conceived this work."⁸² In this fourth movement, Shostakovich's signature D-S-C-H motif interplays with:

the famous song of revolutionary martyrdom that begins with the words *Zamuchen tyazholoy nevoley*, which mean, literally, "Tortured by grievous unfreedom."...By appropriating it, Shostakovich was as it were, giving his quartet not only a subtext but literally a text, proclaiming his unfreedom and disclaiming responsibility for what he judged in himself to be an act of cowardice, or rather, a craven failure to act.⁸³

In this sense, Shostakovich then was not just limited by the government, but also by his own feelings about how he responded to it.

The Future of Russian Restriction

As mentioned earlier, it is far easier for a Westerner to characterize the Russian composer as restricted than it is for the composer to do so himself. What an outsider may define as a limitation, the Russian composer may simply categorize as an unchangeable fact of life. At the same time, it seems reasonable that certain composers, especially those of the Soviet era, recognized their constraints. Whether or not composers throughout Russian musical history saw themselves as limited does not change the fact that Russian composers have produced some of the finest works found in the literature of art music. Considering what Russian and Soviet composers have accomplished in a creative prison, one can only wonder what would have been possible had there been less restrictions in place throughout history.

⁸² Ibid, 494-5.

⁸³ Ibid, 495.

It may be too soon to tell whether or not composers of the post-Soviet era remain as constrained as their predecessors. The political climate of Russia is certainly as volatile as ever and this may very well impact the creativity of the modern composer. Furthermore, the culture of a nation is heavily impacted by its history. As a result of that fact, the culture of Russia may well remain a limiting one. In the future, in order for Russian composers to break free of restraint, recognizing the constraints in place will not be enough. If true freedom for the Russian composer is to ever come, Russia will need to embrace freedom itself.

Bibliography

- Bainski, Hubert F. *The Mazeppa Legend in European Romanticism*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1974. Quoted in Richard Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Response to a Question from the *Noviy Mir* Editorial Staff." In *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, ed. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Trans. Vern W. McGee, 6-7. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986. Quoted in Richard Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.
- Brooke, Caroline. "Soviet Musicians and the Great Terror." *Europe-Asia Studies* 54, no. 3 (2002): 397-413. <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=ed5ac9b8-668a-49cc-9a44-4a3b1b1457a1%40sessionmgr111&vid=10&hid=113> (accessed May 7, 2012).
- Brown, David. "Balakirev, Tchaikovsky, and Nationalism." *Music & Letters* 42, no. 3 (July 1961): 227-41. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/731879> (accessed April 11, 2012).
- Dahlaus, Carl. *Between Romanticism and Modernism*. Trans. Mary Whittall. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980. Quoted in Richard Taruskin, "Some Thoughts on the History and Historiography of Russian Music." *The Journal of Musicology* 3, no. 4 (Autumn, 1984): 321-9. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/763585> (accessed April 22, 2012).
- Frame, Murray. "Freedom of the Theatres: The abolition of the Russian Imperial Theatre Monopoly." *The Slavonic and East European Review* 83, no. 2 (April 2005): 254-89. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4214088> (accessed April 11, 2012).
- Frolova-Walker, Marina. "On 'Ruslan' and Russianness." *Cambridge Opera Journal* 9, no. 1 (March 1997): 21-45. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/823708> (accessed February 9, 2012).
- Frolova-Walker, Marina. *Russian Music and Nationalism: From Glinka to Stalin*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.
- Glinka, Mikhail. *Literature nasledie* Vol. 1. Moscow-Leningrad: 1953. Quoted in Gerald Seaman, *History of Russian Music Vol. 1: From Its Origins to Dargomyzhsky*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., Publishers, 1967.
- Glinka, Mikhail. *Pis' ma i dokumenti (Literature nasledie, vol. 2)*. Leningrad: Muzgiz, 1953. Quoted in Richard Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.
- Goldstein, Robert. *The War for the Public Mind: Political Censorship in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Westport CT: Greenwood Publishing Group, 2000.
- Griffiths, Paul. "Diaghilev, Sergey Pavlovich." In *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*.

- <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/08450> (accessed April 28, 2012).
- Humphreys, Mark, et al. "Rimsky-Korsakov." In *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/52074pg1> (accessed April 25, 2012).
- Maes, Francis. *A History of Russian Music: From Kamarinskaya to Babi Yar*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.
- Norris, Geoffrey, and Lyle Neff. "Cui, César." In *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/06938> (accessed April 24, 2012).
- Oldani, Robert W. "Musorgsky, Modest Petrovich." In *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/19468> (accessed April 23, 2012).
- Press, Stephen D. *Prokofiev's Ballets for Diaghilev*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2006.
- Prokofiev, Sergei. *Materials, Documents, Memoirs*, ed. S.I. Shilifshstein. Moscow: 1961. Quoted in Harlow Robinson, *Sergei Prokofiev*. New York: Viking, 1987.
- Redepenning, Dorothy. "Prokofiev, Sergey." In *Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online*. <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/22402> (accessed May 3, 2012).
- Schwarz, Boris. *Music and Musical Life in Soviet Russia 1917-1970*. New York: Norton Library, 1973.
- Seaman, Gerald. *History of Russian Music Vol. 1: From Its Origins to Dargomyzhsky*. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1967.
- Shostakovich, Dmitry. "Moy tvorcheskii otvet." *Vechernyaya Moskva*, 25 January 1938, 30. Quoted in Richard Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.
- Shteynpress, B.S., and I.M. Yampolsky. *Entsiklopedicheskiy muzikal'nyi slovar*, 2nd ed. Moscow: Sovetskayay entsiklopediya, 1966. Quoted in Boris Schwarz, *Music and Musical Life in Soviet Russia 1917-1970*. New York: Norton Library, 1973.
- Slonimsky, Nicolas. "Soviet Music and Musicians." *Slavonic and East European Review. American Series* 3, no. 4 (December 1944): 1-18. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3020186> (accessed April 15, 2012).

- Taruskin, Richard. "Art and Politics in Prokofiev." *Culture and Society* 29, no. 1 (Nov.-Dec. 1991): 60-3. <http://www.springerlink.com/content/1u8271052653u826/fulltext.pdf> (accessed May 7, 2012).
- Taruskin, Richard. *Defining Russia Musically*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.
- Taruskin, Richard. "Some Thoughts on the History and Historiography of Russian Music." *The Journal of Musicology* 3, no. 4 (Autumn, 1984): 321-9. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/763585> (accessed April 22, 2012).
- Tchaikovsky, Pyotr Ilich. *Polnoye sobraniye sochineniy; Literaturniye proizvedeniya I perepiska*, vol. 12, 243-44. Moscow: Muz ĭ ka, 1970. Quoted in Richard Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.
- Tchaikovsky, Pyotr Ilich. *Polnoye sobraniye sochineniy; Literaturniye proizvedeniya I perepiska*, vol. 13, 243-44. Moscow: Muz ĭ ka, 1971. Quoted in Richard Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.
- Tomoff, Kiril. *Creative Union: The Professional Organization of Soviet Composers, 1939-1953*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006.
- Ustryalov, N. *Russkaya istoria*, II. St. Petersburg: 1855. Quoted in Nicholas Riasanovsky, *Nicholas I and Official Nationality in Russia, 1825-1855*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1961.