Found in Translation

RICHARD TARUSKIN

University of California, Berkeley

Abstract: The development of academic musicology in Soviet Russia is traced with reference to debates between music historians and music theorists, and between "sociocultural" studies and internalist perspectives, with an eye toward parallels with similar debates among "Western" scholars.

Keywords: sociocultural musicology, holistic analysis, Marxist musicology, Socialist Realist historiography, Boris Asafiev, Alexey Finagin, Georgiy Khubov, Tatyana Bukina, Tamara Livanova, Lev Mazel, Valentina Konen, Yuri Kholopov.

I

So, who do you think wrote this:

> A musical work possesses true being (i.e., becomes a fact) only when it is reproduced by someone and perceived by someone. It is indisputable that "fact" implies both a certain state of mind on the part of the perceiver and a definite creative consciousness at the moment of conception, realization and configuration of the art work in question.[1]

No, not Husserl or Heidegger or Ingarden, although whoever wrote it is obviously to be classed, knowingly or not, among the phenomenologists. But there is a whiff here as well of social transaction and cognitive psychology, and an insistence on agency, which gives it a rather modern ring as a musicological pronouncement. It's the kind of thing that "new musicologists" in America were saying in the 1980s and 90s, especially when arguing with musical philologists or music analysts. It's the kind of thing that *I* might have said back then, even if I wouldn't have used words like "true being" or "creative consciousness." So it may be a bit of a surprise to learn that these words come from a book that was published in Petrograd—already you know from that name not only where it was published but also when—in 1923 (that is, slightly before the work of Heidegger or Ingarden that it might seem to recall). The book was called *De Musica*; it was edited by Igor Glebov, who in those days reserved his actual given name, Boris Asafiev, for his compositions rather than his musicological publications; and the author was a man who is

[1] A. V. Finagin, "Sistematika muzïkal'no-teoreticheskikh znaniy," in Igor Glebov, ed., *De Musica: sbornik statey* (Petrograd: Petrogradskaya gosudarstvennaya akademicheskaya filarmoniya, 1923), p. 185; quoted in Tatyana Bukina, *Muzïkal'naya nauka v Rossii 1920-2000-kh godov: Ocherki kul'turnoy istorii* (Saint Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo RKhGA, 2010), pp. 45-46.

not as well remembered today as his *chef* Asafiev, but who is well worth remembering: Alexey Vasil'yevich Finagin (1890-1942), a remarkable scholar who at the time was the *uchyonïy sekretar'* (executive secretary), under Asafiev, of the Russian Institute for the History of the Arts (*Rossiyskiy institut istorii iskusstv*, or RIII).

I had been reading about Finagin and his relationship to his *chef* in the dissertation, completed last year, of my pupil Olga Panteleeva, whom some of you know very well, she having come to us at Berkeley after graduating from the masters program at the University of Utrecht, where she had studied with Karl Kügle, and before that from the St. Petersburg Conservatory, where she was the pupil of Olga Manulkina and Lyudmila Kovnatskaya. As I put it in a memoir I was asked to contribute to Mila Kovnatskaya's festschrift, through Olga Panteleeva our musicological families had joined—and, in a larger sense, in her the traditions of Russian, western European, and Anglo-American musicology had all been cross-bred.[2] She is now a postdoctoral fellow at Princeton University.[3]

She was, and is, very conscious of her unique status—the first Russian musicologist (non-*émigré*, though I guess we'll see) to go through an American graduate program and qualify as a PhD. That consciousness, plus the fact that at Berkeley she had to go through an intensive introductory course required of all our graduate students in the history of musicology and its many issues and debates, impelled her to attempt, in her dissertation, and in her subsequent work as well, to supplement the existing literature on the history of musicology with a study focused on Russia.[4] She was particularly interested in observing the cross-over from prerevolutionary, fairly casual, music history instruction at the St. Petersburg Conservatory, where the subject was taught by the venerable Liberio (or Liveriy) Sacchetti (1852-1916), the son of an Italian flautist who was hired to play in the orchestra of the St. Petersburg Imperial Theaters, to the professionalized musicology of the early Soviet period, as preeminently exemplified by Asafiev and the Institute that he and Finagin administered.

The transition she traced looked surprisingly similar to that traced by Kevin Karnes in a recent book that described the trajectory from Eduard Hanslick to Guido Adler.[5] Russian musicology fought the same battles on its way to professionalization between idealists and positivists. The Russian world, though isolated and seemingly marginal in the eyes of Western observers who could not penetrate the barrier of language and alphabet, was aware of the international philosophical and institutional currents that attended the establishment of the discipline of musicology, first in Germany, thence throughout the western world, and responsive to them.

---

[2] R. Taruskin, "Naskol'ko ya pomnyu," in *Liber amicorum Lyudmile Kovnatskoy*, ed. Olga Manulkina, Lidia Ader and Nina Drozdetskaya (St. Petersburg: BiblioRossika, 2016), p. 538.

[3] And since the time of writing the above, she has moved on yet again, back to Utrecht, where she is now an assistant professor.

[4] *Formation of Russian Musicology from Sacchetti to Asafyev, 1885–1931* (UCB diss., 2015).

[5] Kevin Karnes, *Music, Criticism, and the Challenge of History: Shaping Modern Musical Thought in Late Nineteenth Century Vienna* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008).

The musicological culture wars were fought under various banners and rubrics. Their later Russian phases have been traced by Tatyana Bukina in a recent monograph, *Musical Scholarship in Russia, 1920-2000*,[6] a book I read with keen interest as I began preparing this talk. Bukina writes not as a dispassionate chronicler but as an advocate of the kind of musicology that was established at the *RIII*, which she calls sociocultural, the kind exemplified by the quotation from Finagin which furnished this discussion with its starting point, in which the emphasis is placed not on musical texts as such but on the *muzïkal'no-khudozhestvennïy fakt*, the "art-musical fact" as Finagin defined it, which Bukina characterizes as "the unique moment of the projection and reception of music in a concrete situation, accentuating the contextuality (both cultural and social) of any artistic event."[7]

As I say, this—minus the romantic insistence on uniqueness—is quite close to what I take to be good musicological practice in today's intellectual climate, when musicology and ethnomusicology are converging, and music is often treated as a verb rather than a noun,[8] and I am happy to acknowledge an intellectual kinship with some of the musicological ideas of the early Soviet period, described by Panteleeva and Bukina, that provided the soil in which, for example, Asafiev's *intonatsiya* theory was rooted. That is what I have been "finding in translation," to invoke, albeit in a somewhat roundabout or figurative way, the designated theme we are convened here to address. The translation that interests me is the way in which the preoccupations and inclinations that many of us share have been variously inflected by the Russian and, well, non-Russian environments in which we who have gathered here have been socialized into our habitus, as *bon père* Bourdieu might say.

Not that I was at all surprised to discover, or rediscover, that intellectual kinship. I have long been aware that many of the positions and principles to which I have tended as my work has evolved are congruent with certain varieties of Russian, and more specifically Soviet, thinking about music. Indeed, if I had not noticed them myself, I would have been informed of them by those who have commented on my work, often in a critical or even hostile vein. I have long been aware that, to put it crudely and somewhat caricaturally, the end of the cold war has had an interesting effect on musicology, whereby the Russian and the non-Russian (I hate saying "Western") habitūs underwent opposing transformations, as if they were two pendulums swinging in opposite directions. If we were to caricature the Anglo-American and Soviet brands at their extremes, they would exemplify "formalism" and "vulgar sociologism" respectively. That is to say, the Anglo-American would be wholly preoccupied with deducing methods of composition—or, more narrowly, principles of organization—from the evidence of musical texts, interested in nothing but how they

[6] T. V. Bukina, *Muzïkal'naya nauka v Rossii 1920-2000-kh godov* (see n1).

[7] "…уникальный момент звучания и восприятия музыки в конкретной ситуации, акцентирующий контекстуальность (в том числе культурную и социальную) любого художественного события"; *Ibid*., p. 45.

[8] Cf. Christopher Small, *Musicking: The Meanings of Performing and Listening* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1994).

were made, while the Soviet would be fixated on constructing a thinly yet rigidly causal nexus between the social situation of a musical practice and its products. (For a good parody of that kind of vulgar sociologism you can read the seventh chapter of Virgil Thomson's delightful old book *The State of Music*, called "Why Composers Write How: The Economic Determinism of Musical Style."[9]) From the Western perspective, the second of these stances would be described as political or ideological, the first as objective and therefore unaffected by politics. From the opposite (that is, economic-determinist) perspective the Western stance would be dismissed as empty and sterile, the Soviet as revealing the true content of the music and explaining both its *raison d'être* and its effect.

And with the passing of the cold war, as if by a wave of a magic wand, all of a sudden we Westerners were interested in social and political issues and post-Soviet Russians were interested in poetics and pure or immanent analysis. There is a grain of truth in this narrative, and even a (smaller) grain of truth in the easy explanation for it, namely that each side was now free to revel in what had been formerly stigmatized or forbidden. Chronology could seemingly be adduced in support. "New musicology" got its start in the west at just about the same time as the start of "*glasnost' and perestroika*" in the tottering Soviet Union. My very public debate with Allen Forte over his supremely formalistic analytical method, often described in retrospect as a turning point in our disciplinary history, took place during the first year of Gorbachev's tenure as the last Soviet *gensek.*

At the same time, modernism, bête noire of new musicologist and old commissar alike, began gaining ground in Russia, the late ascendency of Edison Denisov being the prime symptom. Denisov had been in 1979 the ringleader of the so-called *khrennikovskaya semyorka*, the "Khrennikov Seven," a group of renegade composers excoriated by Tikhon Khrennikov in the *otchotnïy doklad* or keynote report, which he gave ex officio as general secretary of the Union of Soviet Composers at the Union's sixth congress. In the mid-eighties, timed almost exactly with the advent of Gorbachev, Denisov was elected to the Union's board of seven secretaries working alongside Khrennikov. And in 1990 he became the titular head of the revived ASM, or *Assotsiatsiya sovremennoy muzïki* (The Association for Contemporary Music), a promotional agency for modernist music organized in the last year of Soviet rule not in opposition to the Union but as an arm of it. This was real musical *perestroika.* It was taking place right alongside the attempted political perestroika that was meant to save the Soviet regime but instead destroyed it. And it was taking place alongside the opposite swing of the pendulum in Western Europe, where the older generation of avant-gardists was mellowing alarmingly.

Here the corresponding symptom might be György Ligeti and his Horn Trio of 1982, which looms now in retrospect as another watershed, introducing a phase not only in Ligeti's output but in many outputs, to which the weirdly anomalous label "non-atonal" has been attached.[10] Ligeti explained what he was doing by, characteristically, denying that it was a retreat, but nevertheless acknowledging, in an interview with Claude Samuel,

[9] Virgil Thomson, *The State of Music* (New York: William Morrow and Company, 1939), pp. 86-137.
[10] Cf. Mike Searby, "Ligeti's 'Third Way': 'Non-Atonal' Elements in the Horn Trio," *Tempo*, No. 216 (Apr., 2001), 17-22.

that "the avant-garde, to which I am said to belong, has become academic."[11] He said that at the beginning of the 1980s. By the end of the nineties, even Pierre Boulez, asked by an interviewer why performances of the music of the mid-century avant-garde had become infrequent, did not answer with fulminations against the stupidity of audiences, the way everyone loved to hear him do again and again, but with the admission that "perhaps we did not take sufficiently into account the way music is perceived by the listener."[12]

That interview with Boulez was published under the headline "What Happened When the Wall Came Down?" It was one of the journalistic clichés of the period to correlate the fall of the western avant-garde with the fall of Soviet totalitarianism, or, conversely, with the rise of neoliberalism. And here, too, I have firsthand experience to report, since (although I regard myself at best as an equivocal representative of "new musicology," and most of the quondam new musicologists would agree), my work has been attacked in the west as "neoliberal" even as it has been attacked in the post-Soviet east as tainted with "vulgar sociologism."[13] Being attacked from both sides is always reassuring; it gives one a sense of stability. And of course nostalgics hankering after the old order, whether Soviet or avant-garde, always attempt to deny that the end of the cold war had anything to do with the arts, or with scholarship, or *a fortiori* with arts scholarship.

But still, could all of this have been a coincidence? No, not a coincidence, though it is all too easy to oversimplify the story by exaggerating the correlation. Here is where I found Bukina's survey to be especially of use. It reminded me that formalism and vulgar sociologism—or, to put it positively, immanent analytical approaches and sociocultural ones—had been in a dialectical relationship throughout the history of Soviet and post-Soviet musicology, just as they had always been in the West, where I was up close to it and didn't need reminding. And there has always been a significant body of work that combined or synthesized the approaches, so that they don't have to be regarded as antithetical. That, then, is what I have found in translation—that is, what I have been rethinking of late: that the styles of musicology as practiced east and west are not in an

[11] Claude Samuel, "Entretien avec György Ligeti" (1981), trans. Terence Kilmartin, in *Ligeti in Conversation* (London: Eulenburg Books, 1983), p. 123.

[12] Stephen Johnson, "What Happened when the Wall Came Down?" BBC Music Magazine, September 2002 (accessed online: http://www.stephen-johnson.co.uk/publications/bbc-music-magazine.php

[13] See J. P. E. Harper-Scott, The Quilting Points of Musical Modernism (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), chapter 1 ("Modernism as we know it, ideology, and the quilting point"), pp. , in which I am accused of xenophobia; for vulgar sociologism see Levon Hakobian's tirade, referenced in n.54 below. Alexander Belonenko, ranting from a Soviet-nostalgic, chauvinistic perspective, goes startlingly far into paranoiac territory: "Such costly, unprofitable publications [as the six-volume hard-bound edition of the *Oxford History of Western Music*] cannot materialize fortuitously, in the interests of publishers or the academy alone. Such massive works appear, as a rule, by order of the government. And in the given instance we are dealing with propaganda literature. The reason for the appearance of Taruskin's work, or more precisely its commissioning, is clear enough. It lies in the new historical situation, when the USA has felt itself to be the sole master of the world, a new Rome, and when the new Carthage, the Soviet Union, has fallen" (A. S. Belonenko, "Proshloye i budushcheye klassicheskoy muzïki evropeyskoy traditsii. Zametki po povodu monografii The Oxford History of Western Music: Part 1," *Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskogo Universiteta*, seriya 15 [2015], no. 3, 160-218, at 214-15).

antagonistic or rigidly reciprocal relationship, but in a complex counterpoint in which both traditions have responded to internal and external pressures in ways that can be fruitfully compared. Here I'll sketch a few.

II

As already indicated, Bukina's book is not just a survey but in significant measure a polemic as well. She wants to reinstate sociocultural music scholarship—the kind pioneered by Asafiev and Finagin—against what she convincingly shows to be the main current in recent Russian musicology. (A comparably against-the-grain project *chez nous*, in the mirror relationship already observed, might be identified with the books by music theorists that appeared in the 1990s in reaction to the rise of "new musicology," such as Pieter van den Toorn's *Music, Politics, and the Academy* of 1996). Bukina's first task was to explain why the Asafiev-Finagin method, which had served so well to put Soviet musicology on a secure, and (in Russia) unprecedented, professional footing, lost its dominant position. Her explanation is provocative for the light it sheds on what has become one of the main debates among historians in the wake of the Soviet collapse: namely, the question whether the Soviet regime actually exercised the sort of control we in the West tend casually to assume that it did over aspects of its citizens' lives and activities—that is to say, the question of "totalitarianism."

No regime is omnipotent, although some have wished to be. The extent to which the attempt to exercise total control succeeds or fails is the issue that scholars now so zealously debate. The key figure in the case of the Soviet regime has been Sheila Fitzpatrick, who has argued vigorously that the complexity of modern society and the inertia of institutions have effectively foiled all attempts at total control, and that the ways in which individual citizens have protected their interests by gaming the system is the area that will best repay historical investigation.[14] This approach has been implemented in the musical sphere most effectively in Russia by Leonid Maksimenkov, and in this country by Kiril Tomoff in his history of the Union of Soviet Composers.[15]

Bukina makes the provocative suggestion that sociocultural musicology began losing ground long before the end of the Soviet regime; in fact, it began to lose ground exactly when it became *de rigueur* in Soviet scholarship. As early as Anatoliy Lunacharsky, the first People's Commissar of Enlightenment (whose capacious bailiwick took in education and culture), the Soviet regime adopted an instrumental view of the humanistic disciplines, whereby the sociological study of the arts could function as what Bukina calls "a lever of cultural policy and a conduit of ideological discourse into the field of music."[16] I'm quoting her for the sake of the apt metaphors, not because the idea is

[14] The programmatic statement of this position is Sheila Fitzpatrick, "New Perspectives on Stalinism," *The Russian Review*, vol. XLV (1986), 357-373. It had been preceded, of course, by similar revisionary treatments of Nazism, beginning with Hugh Trevor-Roper's in *The Last Days of Hitler* (1947).

[15] Leonid Maksimenkov, *Sumbur vmesto muzïki: Stalinskaya kul'turnaya revolyutsiya 1936-1938* (Moscow: Yuridicheskaya kniga, 1997); Kirill Tomoff, *Creative Union: The Professional Organization of Soviet Composers 1939-1953* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006).

[16] Bukina, *Muzïkal'naya nauka*, p. 61.

particularly newsworthy. We all know that publication in Soviet times had to serve what the regime regarded as a positive or beneficent social (i.e., propagandistic) purpose.

Some writers found this a burden, others (the lucky ones) a pleasure. One who surely found it a pleasure—and I say this on the basis of having read a lot of his work, both scholarly and journalistic—was Georgiy Nikitich Khubov (1902-81), a particularly *partiynïy* critic and scholar, who was an especially influential presence in Soviet musicography in the 1930s, when he was simultaneously the deputy editor (*zamestitel' glavnogo redaktora*) of *Sovetskaya muzïka*, the official organ of the just-organized Union of Soviet Composers, the editor responsible for the music articles in the *Bol'shaya sovetskaya èntsiklopediya*, and a *dotsent* (associate professor, more or less) at the Moscow Conservatory, where in 1935 he initiated courses in the history of Soviet music.

One of the first books I purchased during my year as an exchange student at the Moscow Conservatory in 1971-72 was Khubov's monograph on Borodin, published in 1933 to commemorate the composer's centenary (hence already almost forty years old when I read it), for which I plunked down thirty kopecks at the *bukinisticheskiy* counter at Dom Knigi, the big store on Prospekt Kalinina (now Novïy Arbat). I carried it around with me for a couple of weeks and have the bus tickets (used as bookmarks) to prove it. I found it fascinating reading, not for what it taught be about Borodin, but for what it taught me about Soviet musical historiography of its period. I have never cited it in my scholarly work—to do so would have been very bad form in the American academy of those days, when "metamusicology" was not a recognized subfield of the discipline—but today I want to describe it in some detail.

It was, the author asserted, only a first step toward a complete scholarly assessment of Borodin's work, a project that, he admitted, would "obviously materialize as the result of collective labor." His aim was to lay the cornerstone, which meant "showing in its general features the *klassovaya sushchnost'* [the "class essence"] of his quantitatively modest but, in terms of its artistic significance, enormous body of work."[17] That was the gist of the book's preface ("Ot avtora"). In the Introduction that follows, that class essence is identified with the "enlightened liberal" layer of the contemporary Russian bourgeoisie, and Borodin's musical work is viewed as an adjunct to his scientific profession: "Borodin," Khubov asserted, "directly and in full consciousness carried out all his musical endeavors in conjunction with his primary civic-scientific activities" (*osnovnoy obshchestvenno-nauchnoy deyatel'nosti*), so that his musical works became "in essence, a national epic of Russian liberalism in the reformist era" (*v sushchnosti—national'naya èpopeya rossiyskogo liberalizm poreformennoy epokhi*).[18]

That is the book's thesis. The rest is the demonstration and justification. The method is that of the funnel, beginning at the wide end with a first chapter called "'Prosvetiteli' i 'kuchka'" (Educators of the people, and the kuchka), referring to the two overlapping social groups to which Borodin belonged. There are two epigraphs—the first

[17] "Ot avtora," in Georgiy Khubov, *A. P. Borodin* (Moscow: Ogiz/Muzgiz, 1933), p. 2.
[18] Khubov, *A. P. Borodin*, pp. 3, 5.

from Engels, to the effect that economic conditions are always the decisive influence on history, the second from Lenin, on the difference between a *prosvetitel'* and a *narodnik* (an enlightener and a populist): "The enlightener believes in a given societal development, for he has not noticed its inherent contradictions; the populist fights a given societal development, for he has already noticed these contradictions." And, just to show you how wide that wide lip of the funnel was, here is the opening sentence from the body of the book: "If at the very the beginning of the nineteenth century obvious signs of capitalist development were already beginning to appear, setting the course for upper-class Russia, the middle of the century marked the decisive turning point for the unruly and contradictory development of economic relations in old Russia."[19] The first chapter is entirely about that economic development, illustrated with tables detailing imports and exports, and many more quotations from Engels and Lenin, from the liberal historian Konstantin Kavelin, and even from Tsar Alexander II—but then, in the first narrowing of the funnel, the *moguchaya kuchka* is introduced within the context of economic development and political reform, and we begin to hear from Vladimir Stasov alongside Engels and Lenin, and from an article from *Proletarskiy muzïkant* (the organ of the recently dissolved RAPM, the Russian Association of Proletarian Musicians) by the musicologist Anatoliy Aleksandrovich Groman-Solovtsov (1898-1965), called "The Class Roots of Kuchkism in the Light of Lenin's Views on Social Development in Russia" (*Klassovïye korni kuchkizma v svete leninskikh vzglyadov na obshchestvennoye razvitiye Rossii*).

From here on the funnel narrows quickly and radically, into a far more familiar sort of life-and-works narrative. But that narrative now serves an illustrative function in support of the theses stated in the introduction. Compared with the sociocultural music scholarship of the 1920s, Khubov's brand shows a great narrowing of purview in conformity with a well-established historical framework, supported by an even narrower range of authorities, all of which could be viewed either as an ideological constraint on the range of investigation and interpretation, or as a trustworthy guide that insures an accurate analysis of the data, leading to reliable conclusions. Khubov obviously regarded it the more optimistic way, typical of Marxist critics, and not only in Marxist states. His descriptions of Borodin's works remind me at times of Ernest Gellner's variant of the old "black cat in a dark room" metaphor: "There is an old East European joke," Gellner once wrote,

> concerning the differences between science, philosophy, and Marxism. What is science? It is trying to catch a very small black cat in a very large, entirely dark room. What is philosophy? It is trying to catch a very small black cat in a very large, entirely dark room, when it is not there. What is Marxism? It is trying to catch a very small black cat in a very large, entirely dark room when it is not there, and pretending that one has caught it and knows all about it.[20]

[19] *Ibid*., p. 7

[20] Ernest Gellner, review of Rolf Wiggershaus, *The Frankfurt School*, and Klaus-Dieter Krohn, *Intellectuals in Exile*, *Times Literary Supplement*, 23 September 1994, 3-5, at 3.

Gellner was telling this joke at the expense of the Frankfurt School, and that's why I found it so appealing. But it applies as well, I think, to Khubov's pages on Borodin's *In Central Asia*, in which the author performs an exemplary Marxist *razoblacheniye* or "unmasking," reading with utter confidence between the lines and against the grain so that the piece can illustrate his theses. The "reformist era," Khubov's term for Borodin's era, is called that after the liberal reforms of Alexander II, particularly the abolition of serfdom. But Alexander II was not just the tsar-emancipator. He was also pre-eminently the Tsar-imperialist. It was under Alexander II that what Russians still call Central Asia was conquered and annexed to the Russian Empire. Borodin composed *In Central Asia* in 1880 to accompany one of a series of *tableaux vivants*, "living pictures from Russian history, of a patriotic character" (*zhivïye kartinï iz russkoy istorii, patrioticheskogo kharaktera*), which is why he called the piece a *simfonicheskaya kartina*, a symphonic picture. These tableaux were to be mounted as part of a celebration of the quarter-century of Alexander II's reign, in explicit celebration of his imperialist triumphs. "However," Khubov interjects:

> Analysis of this work . . . shows the profound contradictoriness of the inner fissure that was taking place in Borodin's creative development in this period of "crisis" for Russian liberalism. Undoubtedly, Borodin was bound by the terms of the commission in composing this music, but those terms admitted various treatments, various ways of presenting the required theme.[21]

The program that Borodin provided with the music describes the appearance in the distance of a native caravan crossing the endless Central Asian steppe, and its approach under Russian military guard. "Trustingly and fearlessly," Borodin writes, "it completes its long journey, protected by Russian military might. The caravan recedes further and further." Anyone reading this will probably remember that the music consists, at the beginning, of a long drawn-out note conveying the endlessness of the desert, then a motive in steady eighth-note motion conveying the motion of the caravan, and two themes, one in Russian style, played first by the clarinet and then by the horn, and one in *vostochnïy* or oriental style, played (inevitably) by the English horn, the orchestra's snake-charmer. At the climax, the two themes are montaged in counterpoint, and then everything dies away, leaving that long drawn-out note, still conveying an endless expanse and an endless duration, to resume the representation of the impassive steppe.

Lest there be any doubt as to what all of this was designed to convey, Borodin actually wrote to his friend Ivan Ivanovich Gavrushkevich about performances of his symphonic picture abroad that "despite the unpopularity of the work's program (—it's all about the success of Russian arms in Central Asia!—) this music gets encored practically everywhere, and sometimes . . . it gets repeated at the next concert *by popular demand*."[22] Khubov himself calls attention to certain repeated words in the program, particularly

[21] Khubov, *A. P. Borodin*, p. 104.
[22] Letter of 6 May 1886; S. A. Dianin, ed., *Pis'ma A. P. Borodina*, IV (Moscow-Leningrad: Muzgiz, 1950), 192.

mirnïy, "peaceful" or "peaceable." "Russian arms," he writes, "are the bringer of peace and national prosperity—that, in essence, is the gist of the program as commissioned, wherein one easily sees a distinct enunciation of the nationalist-patriotic tendency of Russian imperialist policy in the East."[23] And yet, to the extent that the music sustains a sweet, harmonious mood, abetted by the neatly harmonized contrapuntal union of the Russian and the oriental themes, Borodin reveals his "*liberal optimism*" (italics original), by which Khubov means his unwillingness to face, let alone portray, "the social contradictions of a dark reality," to which, by attempting to hide them, he only calls attention. "What is impossible in reality Borodin attempts to make possible in his art," Khubov writes,

> since from a truly realistic point of view this composition, with its juxtaposition of "Russian" and "oriental" themes, can in no way, whether by virtue of their character or by virtue of their development, correspond to "the success of Russian arms." . . . This contradiction between his assignment and its fulfillment is very typical of Borodin, who has run up against the concrete thematics of contemporary reality. He not only did not see or wish to reveal the contradictions in Russian imperialist policy, but tried *symbolically* to combine (in a "peaceful harmony of interests") what was impossible.[24]

Black cat, at last I have you, Khubov might have said. Not only has he performed a *razoblacheniye* of Borodin's hidden contradictory and critical message in what is outwardly a celebration of Russian imperialism, he has also managed to portray Borodin as having performed a *razoblacheniye* of his own, a critical exposure of Russian imperialism. For make no mistake: "Borodin," Khubov assures us, "of course, inwardly understood" everything that Khubov has pointed out, and "having understood, found himself at a crossroads when it came to realizing the assignment that stood before him." His solution was neither to go the way of what Khubov calls *ura-patriotichnost*' (gung-ho patriotism, I guess we'd say)—which is why, Khubov suggests, Borodin's symphonic picture was received better in Western Europe than at home; nor did he go the way of "revolutionary-democratic" exposure of political contradictions ("the way Musorgsky might have done," Khubov adds). Rather, "Borodin remained a liberal; and he chose *the middle way*, attempting to embody the assigned program in the style of a vaguely reconciliatory, romantically nationalist epic."[25]

My favorite part of this discussion is the gratuitous reference to Musorgsky and the revolutionary-democratic solution he might have achieved to the problem that Borodin's passive liberalism kept him from attempting. Surely Khubov knew that Musorgsky had also made a contribution to the planned twenty-fifth anniversary celebration of Alexander II's reign. That contribution, a symphonic march called "Vzyatiye Karsa," or "The Taking of Kars," commemorated the last major operation of the Crimean War, Alexander's signal

[23] Khubov, *A. P. Borodin*, p. 105.
[24] *Ibid*., p. 108.
[25] *Ibid*., p. 109.

triumph in the first year of his reign. It, too, juxtaposes Russian and "oriental" themes, but does so in a more conventional way than Borodin's contrapuntal montage. In Musorgsky's march, the oriental theme, full of banal augmented seconds, provides the Trio before the triumphant Russian da capo, and the whole piece could not be more obviously *ura-patrioticheskiy*. The view of Musorgsky as revolutionary democrat, which Khubov takes for granted, was purely a Soviet *cliché*.

And what first seduced me into sociocultural musicology, the brand with which I suppose I am now identified, was my realization that the Soviet cliché about Musorgsky completely misread, indeed turned upside down, his *klassovaya sushchnost'* (his "class essence"), which was that of a dispossessed aristocrat, impoverished by Alexander II's reforms, of all social groups in the Russia of the *poreformennaya èpokha* among the most embittered and reactionary. Substantiating this point through a tandem of historical investigation and immanent analysis was perhaps the chief task of my book on Musorgsky, and that tandem approach has been my method ever since. I emphasize this point because I have adopted what many have regarded as an approved Soviet method precisely so as to refute a Soviet orthodoxy.

III

Such a contentious path was no longer open to Soviet scholarship in the 1930s. Reliance on preconceived dogmatic truths, whether adhered to sincerely by committed Marxists like Khubov or submitted to as the price of publication, eventually discredited the sociocultural method in Soviet musicology, even as its orthodoxies were ever more stringently enforced. One of the most interesting chapters in Bukina's book describes precisely this process of enforcement and its consequences. The chapter is called "On the Path toward Socialist Realism: Investigations of Musical Culture during the Stalinist Period" (*Na puti k sotsialisticheskomy realizmu: issledovaniya muzïkal'noy kul'turï v stalinskuyu èpokhu*). What it purports to demonstrate is that, once the theory of socialist realism had been enunciated—and this took place in 1934, the next year after the publication of Khubov's book on Borodin—its principles were applied not only to artistic literature, but also to scholarship, and to historiography in particular, since historiography was most clearly identified with narrative and its attendant techniques.

Again there is an obvious east-west "translation," a piquant correspondence between Bukina's account of Soviet musicology and some well-known recent Western theorizing on scholarly method. We are all familiar by now with Hayden White's literary analyses of historical writing, in which he demonstrates the kinship between fictional and historiographical narratives and comes close—at any rate closer than I am willing to allow—to finding no essential difference between the two modes.[26] One of the reasons for my resistance to what I regard as White's complacency is probably my awareness of what Bukina has observed about Soviet historiography in the age of socialist realism, when

[26] See Hayden White, *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1990); also idem, *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1986), chapter 1.

historical narratives were required to conform to certain approved literary models (that is to say, model narratives), to the extent that as she writes (paraphrasing the émigré historian Evgeniy Dobrenko, in his book *The Political Economy of Socialist Realism*), "the discourse of history was transformed into a purely esthetic, literary project."[27]

The principles of historiography were now demarcated the same way as were those of fiction and drama, according to the classic originary definition of socialist realism, given by Andrey Zhdanov himself in a speech to the inaugural congress of the Union of Soviet Writers. Delivered on 17 August 1934, it was titled "Soviet Literature—the Richest in Ideas and the Most Advanced Literature in the World (*Sovetskaya literatura—samaya ideynaya, samaya peredovaya literatura v mire*), and the relevant passage was this:

> Comrade Stalin has called our writers engineers of human souls. What does that mean? What obligations does that title impose upon you?
>
> In the first place, it means knowing life so as to be able to depict it truthfully in works of art, depict it not in a scholastic, dead manner, not simply as "objective reality," but to depict reality in its revolutionary development. And at the same time, truthfulness and historical concreteness in artistic depictions must be combined with the task of ideologically transforming and educating the toiling people in the spirit of socialism. Such a method of artistic literature and literary criticism we call the method of socialist realism.[28]

According to this method, literary works were to be judged by their effects. Applied to history, the method demanded that historical development be portrayed as progressive, i.e., that it show movement toward socialist or more narrowly Soviet goals; but also, and increasingly, that such narratives enhance national pride (assuredly a non-Marxist criterion).

As a crisp example of how these standards were transmitted and maintained, Bukina focuses on one of the most prominent historians of Russian music of the period, Tamara Nikolayevna Livanova (1909-86), whose particularly successful socialization into the profession as then practiced had made her a notorious figure in the history of Soviet scholarship. Livanova's source-critical study of 1938, *Essays and Materials on the History of Russian Musical Culture* (Ocherki i materialï po istorii russkoy muzïkal'noy kul'turï), a pioneering study of Russian music in the eighteenth century,

---

[27] Bukina, *Muzïkal'naya nauka*, p. 67.

[28] «Товарищ Сталин назвал наших писателей инженерами человеческих душ. Что это значит? Какие обязанности накладывает на вас это звание? Это значит, во-первых, знать жизнь, чтобы уметь ее правдиво изобразить в художественных произведениях, изобразить не схоластически, не мертво, не просто как «объективную реальность», а изобразить действительность в ее революционном развитии. При этом правдивость и историческая конкретность художественного изображения должны сочетаться с задачей идейной переделки и воспитания трудящихся людей в духе социализма. Такой метод художественной литературы и литературной критики есть то, что мы называем методом социалистического реализма». Translation adapted from the one given online at https://www.marxists.org/subject/art/lit_crit/sovietwritercongress/zdhanov.htm .

> provoked at the end of the 1930s a stormy polemic in the art-scholarly press. What called forth particular critical complaint was the author's "excessive exaggeration" [the pleonasm is original: *chrezmernoye preuvelicheniye*] of the role played by the church and by western European influences in the formative period of our country's musical tradition and the corresponding "underestimation" of its popular [*narodnïye*] sources. With abundant citations from Engels and Chernïshevsky, the musicologist Ivan Ivanovich Martïnov [1908-74, father of the composer Vladimir Martïnov], utterly in the spirit of Stalinist "historical" logic, demonstrated that "Livanova's scholarly outlook is anti-historical and anti-people in its very essence." A little over a decade after this episode, in 1950, by then made wise [*umudrennaya*] by experience, T. N. Livanova pressed similar charges (albeit in terms not quite as categorical) against B. V. Asafiev's monograph, *Glinka*, in which the author, in her opinion, "does not always remind the reader with sufficient clarity that at no time and nowhere did Glinka ever waver in his originality."[29]

"So Livanova was a *bitaya*!" exclaimed a friend to whom I had sent a draft of this essay for comment. *Bitaya*, the feminine past participle of the verb "to beat," used here as a substantive, means "one beaten down." According to the Leninist principle of *kto kogo* ("who [will do it] to whom," originally intended to encapsulate the inescapable class struggle, but colloquially something closer to "dog eat dog"), those beaten today will become tomorrow's beaters; and that certainly applied to the dreaded Livanova.

Bukina credits this process of socialization with the gradual "abolition" of sociocultural musicology, even as it was being ostensibly promoted and refined, because it became increasingly obvious that historians were under pressure to fictionalize (read: to lie)—or, to use the euphemism she borrows from Dobrenko, to turn historical reportage and interpretation into an elaborate process of "representation and de-realization" (*reprezentatsiya/derealizatsiya*).[30]

I found it interesting to compare her characterization with the more detailed, and perhaps more sympathetic, account of Stalin-era music historiography in the work of a non-Russian scholar, Jiří Smrž, a Czech-born Canadian historian, whose recent monograph, *Symphonic Stalinism: Claiming Russian musical classics for the new Soviet listener, 1932-1953*, its subtitle notwithstanding, concerns the work of professional musicologists writing monographs and, in particular, textbooks for use in musical schools and conservatories—instruments, in other words, for exactly the process of transmission and socialization that Bukina decries.[31]

---

[29] Bukina, *Muzïkal'naya nauka*, p. 70. The citations are from I. I. Martïnov, "Iskazhennaya istoriya. O knige T. Livanovoy" (Distorted History: On a book by T. Livanova), *Sovetskaya muzïka*, 1939, no. 5, 83, and T. N. Livanova, "B. V. Asaf'yev I russkaya glinkiana," in Livanova, ed., M. I. *Glinka: Sbornik materialov i statey* (Moscow-Leningrad: Muzgiz, 1950), p. 370.

[30] For abolition (*uprazdneniye*), see Bukina, *Muzïkal'naya nauka*, p. 71; for *reprezentatsiya/derealizatsiya*, see *ibid.*, p. 9.

[31] Jiří Smrž, *Symphonic Stalinism: Claiming Russian musical classics for the new soviet listener, 1932-1953*, with a foreword by Thomas Lahusen and Peter H. Solomon, Jr. (Berlin: LIT Verlag, 2011); reviewed by R. T. in *The Russian Review*, LXXI, no. 3 (July), 510-11.

Smrž wrote consciously as what I call a Fitzpatrician, with the avowed intention of countering the old totalitarian model of Sovietology. What his book reveals is the ingenuity with which those professional musicologists responded to the demand that they find a way of narrating the history of Russian music and critiquing its artifacts in accordance with the newly imposed but vaguely delineated doctrine of *sotsrealizm*. He recognizes that the vagueness of the doctrine, hence of the demand, was deliberate and necessary. It enabled the Party to avail itself of the professionals' expertise by leaving the details of the proverbially difficult application of realist ideas to music in professional hands. Following the Fitzpatrician line, the author touts this as evidence of the musicians' autonomous agency. But at the same time he acknowledges that the cultural bureaucrats acting in the name of the Party retained the prerogative of redefining goals at will, with the consequence that "Soviet composers could be found perennially lacking in accomplishment, and Soviet critics perennially lacking vigilance."[32]

In Smrž's analysis, Soviet musicologists faced three tasks, involving, respectively, technical analysis, composers' biographies, and the general narrative of Russian musical history, with particular attention to the nexus between realism and national identity. In technical analysis, the task was to find musical analogues of the socialist realist desiderata that had been formulated for literature (e.g., *konkretnost'*, *obraznost'* or "imagery," *dialektichnost'*, and, hardest of all, *tvorcheskoye soznaniye*, "creative consciousness"). Biographies were constructed in conformity with the outlines of the Soviet *Bildungsroman* as described by Katerina Clark and others, with father figures (chiefly Glinka and—inevitably—Belinsky) showing younger composers the path from spontaneity to full consciousness.[33]

To illustrate the impact of *sotsrealizm* on the general narrative, Smrž compares the two standard textbooks on the history of Russian music that were in use in conservatories and music schools during the period that he surveys, the first edited by Mikhaíl Samoilovich Pekelis (1899-1979) and published in 1940, the other singlehandedly authored by Yuriy Vsevolodovich Keldïsh (1907-95) and published in 1947. The nativism and xenophobia of Keldïsh's version, the one scholars of my generation are likely to have read, corresponds neatly and chillingly with the official mood of the early cold war and the nearing anti-cosmopolitan campaign.

It is quite true that the methods and arguments that Smrž recounts were developed within the field of musicology rather than imposed upon it, and I agree that it took considerable inventiveness to come up with them. But to recognize these virtues does not in itself constitute an answer to Bukina's misgivings (or mine, come to that). Does it look better or worse for the scholars to give them full credit for the lies they told? In the case of Keldïsh, particularly, one has to wonder about his own *tvorcheskoye soznaniye* and its impact on his morale when savoring the nationalistic excesses of his historical account, considering that he was an old RAPMist, i.e., a former member of the left-wing Russian

[32] Smrž, *Symphonic Stalinism*, p. 21.
[33] See Katerina Clark, *The Soviet Novel: History as Ritual* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000).

Association of Proletarian Musicians in the first postrevolutionary decade-and-a-half, whose Marxist orthodoxy was perforce inimical to *velikoderzhavnïy shovinizm* ("great-power chauvinism"), as Stalin had called it, let alone the *ura-patriotichnost'* of the incipient cold war years. How could such a man's consciousness not have been painfully divided?

But that is not the only way in which I have to wonder whether Smrž's account supports the "post-totalitarian" paradigm as persuasively as he seems to think it does. He convincingly portrays socialist-realist doctrine as fluid, mutable, susceptible to revision, whereas the "totalitarian" viewpoint (or rather, I should say, the caricature of the totalitarian viewpoint that is adduced by post-totalitarians so as to knock it down) asserts Soviet doctrine as utterly rigid and monolithic. But one can reject the caricature without resorting to a normalizing countercaricature. Mutability is precisely what one would expect of an epiphenomenon reflecting changes in policy to which the arts then had to conform.

In any case, not one of the examples of revision in Smrž's book had its origin in a musicological initiative. The musicologists are portrayed throughout in a reactive posture, forced by changes in the official line to modify their approach—always resourcefully, always inventively, deftly—and come up with new "original" solutions. The dynamic remains at all times predictably top-down.

So if we rely only on Smrž's account, I don't think we have real evidence of professional autonomy or evidence of real agency in the evolution of Russian musicology during this most stringent period in Soviet history. In this, Smrž's account seems to me even more pessimistic than Bukina's. Like hers, it shows sociocultural music historiography in a state of decline, even degeneration. Professional autonomy means little if it only means the freedom to find new ways of conforming to prescriptions.

IV

Yet unlike Smrž's, Bukina's account does illustrate a way out for musicologists who wanted to protect the autonomy of their professional practice. One could avoid the risks of sociocultural studies, which intersected dangerously with official ideology, by moving musicology, or at least its cutting edge (if that is a correct translation of *vedushchiy diskurs*) out of institutes like *RIII* and into conservatories, where it could become a more purely (or "essentially") professional and technical branch of instruction and learning, focused on trans-historical issues and values, most of them concerned with what literary people (but also, famously, Stravinsky) call poetics.

Citing (who else but) Bourdieu, Bukina postulates this move as a necessary one for the maintenance of any artistic field: "securing its existence, investing it with intrinsic value and lending it a sacralized [that is, inviolate] status."[34] Of course she is talking about what we would call "music theory" as opposed to "musicology." And again I am struck by the similarity between the disciplinary debates that took place in Russia and the ones here, although they were not precisely synchronized, in part because the sources of the

[34] Bukina, *Muzïkal'naya nauka*, pp. 123-24 (citing Bourdieu, [Istoricheskiy genesis chistoy èstetiki]).

pressures on the discipline differed, as did the historical conditions that brought the pressures to bear, hence the differing motivations for the similar movement toward autonomous music theory in two distinct geographical domains.

We are used to saying that the pressure in Soviet Russia was political, whereas in the so-called West it was "purely" professional (or, more indirectly, economic), but that is obviously a reductive oversimplification. Any disciplinary pressure has an economic component, because it affects employment and career prospects. And if you read the writings of American music theorists, especially the composer-theorists among them, you cannot miss the political subtexts (as many writers have been lately pointing out, including me). So as I turn now to figures like Lev Mazel' and Yury Kholopov, Americans might think of Milton Babbitt or Kofi Agawu, and our British delegates might think of Arnold Whittall or Jonathan Dunsby. Bukina's observation, that "the solidity [*neziblemost'*] of the artistic field [that is, its firm definition or delimitation] becomes a guarantor of the music scholar's own identity, enhancing his authority, lending weight to his analyses and 'sanctifying' the results of his research," penetrates to the heart of the debate, both as it was conducted in Russia and as we have known it.[35]

It was precisely when it became clear that practitioners of sociocultural musicology did not have a free hand in defining their goals and methods (which means, defining their identity) that theoretical musicology was able to challenge the dominant position of sociocultural studies in Russia. Theirs, unlike the maneuvers described by Jiří Smrž, was a true musicological initiative in that it was uncalled for by political authority. Pride of place in this phase of the story goes to Lev Abramovich Mazel' (1907-2000), who taught music theory at the Moscow Conservatory from 1931 to 1967, and whose name is the first in every list of Soviet *muzteoretiki*, whether Bukina's or Zhdanov's. He is the obvious counterpart on the Soviet scene to Milton Babbitt, not because he composed serial music or approved of it, but because his name is proverbially synonymous with the "scientific"—or, as we now often say with a touch of irony, the "scientistic"—approach to art. Like Babbitt, Mazel' was a trained mathematician in addition to being a music scholar. That is perhaps a coincidence, but it is not at all a coincidence that both in Mazel's case and in Babbitt's, science was seen as a refuge, a safe haven from politics.

He was at first regarded by the Soviet musical establishment with admiration. *Sovetskaya muzïka*, the official organ of the Union of Soviet Composers, had a regular feature called "Druzheskiye sharzhi" (Friendly caricatures), in one of which we see Mazel' in his Conservatory classroom, taking his pupils through a score. To complete the effect, the cartoonist should have had him wearing a lab coat, but the idea that his classroom was a lab emerges clearly enough from the equipment the students are using. The caption reads, Yuntsy prilezhnym skopom, /Pril'nuli k mikroskopam, /Ne vidya v pole zreniya/ Ni muzïki, ni peniya. Na to i dan analiz,/ Chtoby yuntsy staralis'!
["The kids, diligently working as a group, cling to their microscopes, blinkered from music and from song. Analysis is there to make the kids work hard!"]

[35] *Ibid*., p. 124.

And if I were doing the caricature, I would have put a passage from Chopin's Fantasia in F minor, op. 49, on the blackboard, because Mazel's most celebrated publication was his first book, a volume of 183 pages devoted exclusively to an exhaustive analysis of that one work of Chopin. It was written in 1934, the very year that socialist realism was first promulgated as an official method, and published in 1937.[36]

I called the book exhaustive, but *le mot juste*—Mazel's own word—would be *tselostnïy*, which in connection with his analytical method has been variously rendered in English as "holistic" or "integrated" or "integral," occasionally as "complex" or "many-sided."[37] Though less literal as a translation, I would suggest that what Mazel' (and Victor Tsukkerman, the other luminary among *tselostnïye* analysts) meant by the word was "eclectic," if we can divest that word of the negative vibes with which modernist dogmas have saddled it. The idea was that the *proizvedeniye,* the work itself (and it was always specific works that analysts addressed, not their composers) should prompt the choice (or invention) of an approach, so that analysis would not be merely the application of a preconceived method or theory, such as the theory of "modal rhythm" (which despite its name is a theory of symmetrical pitch organization) advanced by Boleslav Yavorsky (Tsukkerman's teacher), which was a very ingenious way of understanding post-Wagnerian harmony, but which had been aggressively advanced as a new "revolutionary" universal, saddling practitioners with unnecessary difficulties when it came to analyzing ordinary major-minor tonality. In the words of Yuriy Kholopov, "having witnessed the end of functional tonality, Yavorsky was wrong to turn around and say his new system accounted for this defunct tonality."[38] *Tselostnïy analiz* promised a more flexible, less dogmatic *ad hoc* approach that could encompass both older and newer principles of tonal organization, each on (what the analyst determined to be) its own terms. That was the sense in which it aspired to be truly holistic.

But the term sanctioned a different, more expansive claim as well, namely that *tselostnïy analiz* integrated all aspects of a given composition—structure, content and historical context—into one comprehensive view. This it never did. It is quite obvious that the primary interest of holistic analysts, like that of pretty much all music analysts who identify themselves as such, was structure. That, more or less, was tantamount to what Mazel' and Tsukkerman meant by a *proizvedeniye*. It meant the score, the actual object produced by the composer, certainly not something "reproduced by someone and perceived by someone" at a given moment, to recall the definition of a work by Finagin, the exemplary sociocultural musicologist, with which this discussion began. Mazel's testamentary work, published as he approached his eightieth birthday, was a textbook

[36] Lev Abramovich Mazel', *Fantaziya f-moll Shopena: opït analiza* (Moscow: Muzgiz, 1937).

[37] See Daniil Zavlunov, "The 'tselostnyĭ analiz' (holistic analysis) of Zuckerman and Mazel," *Music Theory Online*, 20/1 (September 2014) http://www.mtosmt.org/issues/mto.14.20.3/mto.14.20.3.zavlunov.html

[38] Yu. Kholopov, Yuri, L. Kirillina, T. Kiuregian, G. Lyzhov, R. Pospelova, and V. Tsenova, *Muzykal'no-teoreticheskie sistemy*. Moscow: Kompozitor, 2006), p. 381; paraphrased in Philip A. Ewell, "Rethinking Octatonicism: Views from Stravinsky's Homeland," *Music Theory Online*, 18/4 (December 2012), par. 2.16 (http://www.mtosmt.org/issues/mto.12.18.4/mto.12.18.4.ewell.html#kholopov_et_al_2006).

expressly intended to supersede the classic conservatory textbook he had co-authored with Tsukkerman. The earlier book was called *Analiz muzïkal'nïkh proizvedeniy* (The Analysis of Musical Works). Its replacement was called *Stroyeniye muzïkal'nïkh proizvedeniy* (The Structure of Musical Works).[39]

The changed title did not represent a change of heart, although it may have reflected a difference in temperament between the co-authors. In a conversation with a former pupil, Liana Genina, Mazel' said that he and Tsukkerman "study the same subject, music, but we relate to it the way a poet and a scientist might respectively relate to the moon: Victor Abramovich extols its beauty, its brilliance, the inspiration it gives to lovers; whereas I try to find out how and from what it is made."[40] Poetics, as opposed to poetry.

Yet if Mazel' was eclectic in method, he nevertheless had his biases, and they were the familiar biases of romantic esthetics, which holds sacred the organic metaphor and its insistence that there is always a higher unity behind the diversity of the surface, and that the analyst's *a priori* goal is to uncover it. (In his later writings, Mazel' even coined the term *muzïkal'noye otkrïtiye*—musical discovery or disclosure—to identify the result of a good analysis, which is to say, making available to experience or cognition that which was previously hidden).

His method of establishing that unity differed considerably from the one now usually instilled in Anglophone music analysts. Unlike Schenker, Mazel' did not see elaboration in terms of diminution, nor did he practice reduction. The end product of his analyses did not consist of a detemporalized visual display like a Schenker graph. He was always interested in temporality, in narration, in describing the moment-to-moment unfolding of music, and in this he was closer to Kurth or Schoenberg than to Schenker. That narrative *razbor*, or analytical commentary, was always the heart of a *tselostnïy analiz*, whether by Mazel' or by Tsukkerman. (Out of the 183 pages in Mazel's monograph on the Chopin Fantasie, for example, the *razbor* occupies more than 100.) And the rest, the part given over to content and context, never contains the discovery, only background information of a conventional kind—the "encyclopedia facts."

This was even true of the legendary *chef d'oeuvre* of *tselostnïy analiz*, Tsukkerman's 500-page tome that explicates Glinka's seven-minute-long orchestral showpiece, *Kamarinskaya*. The book was touted as the exemplary instance of integration, in which analytical, historical and cultural investigations would all intersect in a single blinding flash of *illuminatio*. I approached this book with the keenest interest and the highest expectations when I was making my own study of *Kamarinskaya*. I had a similar aim—namely, to integrate an analysis within a historical discussion[41]—and I was very disappointed, because the historical and cultural component of Tsukkerman's book was

[39] Lev Abramovich Mazel' and Victor Abramovich Tsukkerman, *Analiz muzïkal'nïkh proizvedeniy* (Moscow: Muzïka, 1967); Lev Abramovich Mazel', *Stroyeniye muzïkal'nïkh proizvedeniy* (Moscow: Muzïka, 1986).

[40] L. G., "Poslesloviye," following L. A. Mazel', "Tselostnïy analiz—zhanr preimushchestvenno ustnïy i uchebnïy," *Muzïkal'naya akaemiya*, no. 4 (2000), 135.

[41] Richard Taruskin, "How the Acorn Took Root: A Tale of Russia," *19th-Century Music*, 6 (1982-83), 189-212; rpt. in Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), pp. 113-51.

subject to all the constraints that had hobbled sociocultural history since the promulgation of socialist realism, including the xenophobic requirement that Russian music be represented as entirely autochthonous. Accordingly, Tsukkerman had to maintain a direct influence from Russian folklore on the composition of this orchestral fantasia on the themes of two Russian folk songs, and entirely ignore (so as not to have to deny) the obvious influence on the work of German instrumental music, especially Beethoven's, about which Tsukkerman was a world-class expert. Here, more than anywhere else, it was obvious that music analysis, to the extent that it could retreat from sociocultural concerns, was able to find a safe space where investigations could be undertaken with far less risk of bureaucratic interference or ideological reprisal. To reincorporate the sociocultural was to reintroduce political constraints.

V

Did the practitioners of *tselostnïy analiz* see what they were doing the way I saw it? I was always convinced that they had to know exactly what they were doing, because I knew them for the brilliant and erudite musicians that their pupils (who never spoke of them except in reverent whispers) always described. And now there is documentary corroboration in Mazel's tiny, last, posthumously published article, called "*Tselostnïy analiz*—a predominantly oral and pedagogical genre," written when the author was past ninety, more than sixty years after the publication of his Chopin monograph. Half resigned rumination, half exposé, it is one of the most deeply moving documents I have ever found in the pages of a musicological journal.

It begins with a reminder: "In scholarship, particular interest in *tselostnïy analiz* was aroused here in the 1930s, when it was insistently demanded of music theory that it address not only the form but also the content and the expressively meaningful side of music."[42] And that triple approach was precisely the claim that the method advanced on its own behalf. But now, in his valedictory essay, Mazel' seemed to retract the famous claim:

> A scientific [or scholarly (*nauchnïy*)] analysis does not necessarily presuppose either full comprehensiveness or exhaustive detail. It must merely be sufficiently comprehensive and detailed to achieve the aim of the analysis, the task the author has proposed. [Such analyses] are bent on revealing something new, something hitherto unknown about a work, its properties, its internal and external connections, sometimes even seeing the work as a whole from an unaccustomed point of view. From such an analysis one expects not that it be all-embracing but that it be novel and purposeful (the latter demand sometimes entering into contradiction with an oversimplified notion of *tselostnost'*). (p. 133)

[42] Mazel', "Tselostnïy analiz—zhanr preimushchestvenno ustnïy i uchebnïy," *Muzïkal'naya akaemiya*, no. 4 (2000), 133 (further references in main text).

So *tselostnïy analiz* was not necessarily *tselostnïy* after all. What Mazel' was really after was not *tselostnïy* but *tselenapravlennïy* [i.e., purposeful] *analiz*. Amen to that! After six decades, Mazel' was ready not only to admit that, but also to specify what he was prepared, and actually inclined, to jettison from the definition and the practice. The content and expressivity of the music, he now strongly implied, were included in the original definition mostly as camouflage.

"Every scholarly or pedagogical discipline must rest upon clearly delineated ideas and terms," he stipulated. Accordingly, "*Tselostnïy analiz* was understood from its beginnings to disclose the content of a work together with its form. But what is the content of a musical work?"

Now he asks! The answer was explosive. Stand back.

> For a long time we mouthed official clichés like "the reflection of social reality." (I also used them frequently.) These clichés have long since fallen away [except among Adorno's western epigones—R. T.], but a serious definition or even a clarification of the idea of "content" (which is, after all, an actual historical term in general use) in relation to instrumental, nonprogrammatic works of European music of the seventeenth to the twentieth centuries has been lacking. (Allow me to observe in this connection that when scholarship questions itself, so to speak, it usually advances.)
>
> The idea of "musical imagery" [Asafiev's term, one of the foundations of socialist realism as applied to music] will hardly help us out here, for it is vague and poorly understood. It might be better, in my view, to use the German word *Gestalt*, one of whose meanings envisages something approximating inner structure and which has already entered into our scholarly practice (for example, the German term Gestaltpsychologie is usually translated as "Gestal'tpsikhologiya" [and in English we say "Gestalt psychology"]).
>
> Our everyday understanding of musical content as the emotional shape or character of a work is naïve and inadequate. Other construals are possible (I have sometimes used the definition "the artistic problems solved in the work," which touches somehow on the work's "function" [*naznacheniye*; and here it sounds like Mazel' has been reading Carl Dahlhaus]), but they, too, it seems, are unsatisfactory. Yury Kholopov was probably right when he asserted that "the mysterious [*zavetnaya*] final task of music theory turns out to lie in the realm of philosophy"). (p. 134)

Which to me sounds like a dismissal (Get thee to philosophy!). And even more like a dismissal is a passing remark a little earlier in the essay, when Mazel' writes, "In a *tselostnïy analiz* one can dispense (or nearly dispense) with interpretation."[43] This effectively cuts out half of what one normally means by a scholarly investigation, which is the joint product of observation and inference (*nablyudeniye* and *vïvod*). Can one draw an inference without construal (*istolkovaniye*)? Obviously not—not even if one is merely describing or deducing form, and Mazel' was obviously aware of that. So I will hazard my own *istolkovaniye* here, and suggest that Mazel' was speaking in code, a process in which

[43] В целостном анализе можно обходиться без (или почти без) толкований (p. 134).

Soviet writers—and readers—were schooled to the point of expertise. What Mazel' actually meant to convey with his seemingly absurd aphorism was that *tselostnïy analiz* created a space where the kind of *tolkovaniye* that got you into trouble, or that compromised scholarly standards, could be avoided. So much for content.

Mazel' was aware that he was making a momentous concession. The first sentences of this poignant last testament (or what the Russians would call a *zavet*) from which I am quoting make ironic reference to Aristotle. "Enthusiasts of *tselostnïy analiz* will perhaps greet this thesis with objections," Mazel' allows; "and yet, 'while Plato is my friend, dearer yet is truth.'"[44] What he was now admitting, of course, was what had to be denied at all costs during more stringent times, when the kind of delimitation of the field that Mazel' now openly proposed would have been denounced with what was surely among Soviet epithets the most dreaded one of all, *formalizm.*

Sure enough, together with practically the whole musicological fraternity, Mazel' was among those tarred with that brush in 1948. After the *soveshchaniya*, the hearings at the headquarters of the Central Committee of the Communist Party where Zhdanov read his bill of indictment and the accused mounted the rostrum to offer their thanks, *Sovetskaya muzïka* published another cartoon showing Mazel's face, but this one was in a group titled *Nedruzheskiye sharzhi*—"Unfriendly caricatures"—and it shows Mazel', along with Tsukkerman, and Igor Fyodorovich Boelza, and Daniyel' Vladimirovich Zhitomirsky, and Semyon Isaakovich Shlifshteyn, and Izraíl' Vladimirovich Nest'yev, and Alexander Naumovich Dolzhansky, among others, worshiping an idol who looks more than a little like Igor Fyodorovich Stravinsky. "Slaves to a robot," the legend reads, and the rhyming part of the caption goes like this:

> Pogibla lira / V tiskakh kumira. / I vsyo zhe on / Prevoznesyon.
> Zabïv o chesti, V pripadke lesti / Razbili lbï / Yego rabï.
>
> The lyre is out of action / in the clutches of an idol / And still he is / extolled.
> Forgetting honor, in a fit of flattery, / its slaves / kowtow.

I included the patronymics in the list of names so as to make obvious what was already obvious to Soviet readers in 1948, namely that with the exception of Igor Boelza, who descended from the Polish nobility (which was not much better), everyone named in the caption was Jewish. When applied to musicologists, the antiformalist campaign intersected with the anti-cosmopolitan campaign, for Jews were disproportionately represented in the ranks of science and scholarship in Soviet Russia, as they were everywhere in Europe and America.

It was not easy to live down the taint of formalism if one's profession was studying and describing form; so that had to be minimized if not altogether concealed. The discourse of *tselostnïy analiz* was one way of doing that, and the effort went much further into the language and practice of the discipline. We have seen the word *analiz* used as a euphemism

[44] *Platon mne drug, no istina dorozhe*. Mazel', "Tselostnïy analiz," p. 132, quoting a famous Latin paraphrase (attributed by some to Roger Bacon) of a line from Aristotle's Nichomachean Ethics: *Nam Plato dicit: "Amicus est Socrates, magister meus, sed magis est amica veritas."*

for *stroyeniye* in the titles of textbooks, to avoid the association of "structure" with "form." As Yury Kholopov has attested, the time-honored conservatory course "Analysis of musical forms" (*analiz muzïkal'nïkh form*) had to be changed post-*zhdanovshchina* to "Analysis of musical works" (*analiz muzïkal'nïkh proizvedeniy*).[45]

VI

By the 1960s the ideological atmosphere had relaxed sufficiently so that music theorists did not have to pretend to encompass sociocultural issues in their analyses; but as the pretense lost its necessity as a ploy and the delimitation of music theory to formal and structural matters became overt, it also became an issue for discussion. A debate arose between historians and theorists that began to resemble the turf wars of the West.

One of its early rounds was an essay, "In Defense of Historical Scholarship," that appeared in *Sovetskaya muzïka* in June 1967, and reappeared the next year as the preface to a book with a title that has a weird ring for any but Soviet musicologists: *Studies in Foreign Music* (*Etyudï o zarubezhnoy muzïke*)—a title that reflects the romantic nationalistic history of Russian music and music scholarship, which has led to the bifurcated organization of Soviet (and now post-Soviet) musicology departments, segregated into *kafedrï* of *russkaya muzïka* and *zarubezhnaya muzïka*, a situation designed to perpetuate the mythology of autochthony that had led to so much historiographical distortion, which led in turn to the discrediting of historical musicology and the rise of analysis (*tselostnïy* or not) as a separate discipline in Russia.[46]

The author was Valentina Dzhozefovna Konen (1909-91), one of the most famous Soviet musicologists—indeed I think it is fair to say the foremost Soviet musicologist specializing in "foreign music"—but one whose career took shape, to an unusual degree, outside the institutional structure of Soviet musicology. This was not by her choice. She was born in Baku into the family of a Russian revolutionary who had to leave Russia for political reasons. (Her surname is a variant of Kunin, one of her father's pseudonyms; by birth it was Roberson or Roberman, depending on which source one consults.) From the age of one year she was brought up outside of Russia, at first in Bessarabia (then part of Romania), then in Western Europe, and finally in America.

Here I have to get personal. Valentina Konen lived in Brooklyn, New York from 1921 to 1931, that is, from the age of twelve to the age of 22. And during that time, one of her closest friends was my (future) mother, who was three years younger than Val (the name I always knew her by from my mother's stories). They met in the studio of their

[45] Yu. Kholopov, "Teoriya muzïki," In E. Dolinskaya, L. Nikitina, et al., *Istoriya sovremennoy otechestvennoy muzïki*, 3 (Moscow: Muzïka, 2001), 576; quoted in Bukina, *Muzïkal'naya nauka*, p. 172n284.
[46] Valentina Dzhozefovna Konen, "B zashchitu istoricheskoy nauki," *Sovetskaya muzïka* (1967), no. 6, 18-23; *idem*., "Ot avtora," in V. Konen, *Etyudï o zarubezhnoy muzïki* (Moscow: Muzïka, 1968), pp. 3-13. German translation: V. Konen: 'Zur Verteidigung der historischen Musikwissenschaft', *Kunst und Literatur*, xvi (1968), 199–207.

common piano teacher in Brooklyn, whose name was Lillian Wolf, and later they both studied piano at the Institute of Musical Art (now the Juilliard School of Music).

In 1931 her father decided to take the family back to Soviet Russia, at first back to Baku, to help build communism, as the slogan went. After a time studying at the local petroleum institute, Val Konen decided on musicology and enrolled at the Moscow Conservatory. She also worked as a music critic and as the Moscow correspondent of *The Musical Courier*, an American magazine. But here the story takes an untoward turn, when, like so many other returning émigrés, her father was arrested and executed.

My mother never saw Val Konen again after 1931, but I looked her up during my first visit to the USSR in 1966, and got to know her and her husband, Yevgeniy Lvovich Feinberg, an eminent nuclear physicist and an Akademik (i.e., a member of the Soviet Academy of Sciences along with Asafiev) during my year as an exchange student in 1971-72. I won't say any more about my personal relationship with her, except to note that my having found her was a tremendous thing for my mother. Val sent some pictures through me, one of which my mother kept framed on her wall until her death, and it is now on my piano.

I had to tell all of this not only in the name of hackneyed "full disclosure," but also as a way of explaining the fact about Val Konen with which I introduced her name—that is, her extra-institutional career. The fact—or rather the three facts: that she had lived in America, that she was Jewish, and that her father had been an "enemy of the people"—made serious problems for her throughout her career. When her father was executed in 1940, she was expelled from the graduate program in musicology at the Moscow Conservatory without a degree. She was readmitted in 1944, and on the basis of her knowledge of America (by then an ally of the USSR in World War II) wrote a dissertation, defended in 1947, on American music (published in 1961 as the first book on American music by a Soviet author). But in 1948, because her book was a serious scholarly study rather than an attack on American music, she was accused of *preklonenie* (or worse, *nizkopoklonstvo) pered zapadom* ("kowtowing to the West") and fired from her job as a docent at the Gnesin Institute in Moscow. One of her chief persecutors, in a manner that links up neatly, and chillingly, with earlier phases of the present discussion, was Tatyana Livanova, Konen's exact but better-connected contemporary, who had served as her supervisor for the aborted *kandidat* degree (with a dissertation, *Predposïlki klassicheskoy simfonii*, on the stylistic harbingers of the classical symphony).

From 1951 to 1953 Konen taught at the only institution that would hire her, the Ural Conservatory in Sverdlovsk (the former and future Yekaterinburg), about 700 miles east of Moscow. It was a *de facto* exile. She came back to Moscow after Stalin's death, and was eventually, in the late 1960s, invited to give lectures to graduate students at the Moscow Conservatory, but she was never a regular faculty member there. Instead, she worked at the later incarnations of *Institut istorii iskusstv*, the old *RIII*. On the basis of her published work, and her network of personal relationships, she managed to become a very prominent figure, widely regarded as the true heir to the mantle of Roman Il'yich Gruber, the long-time head of foreign music at the Moscow Conservatory, and the worthiest

Moscow counterpart to Mikhaíl Semyonovich Druskin, the legendary Leningrad Conservatory professor who kept a corner of St. Petersburg alive for the benefit, and to the lasting gratitude, of his pupils. He and Konen divided the subject of *zarubezhnaya muzïka* between them when it came to writing the conservatory textbook on the subject, Konen covering the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries and Druskin the rest of the nineteenth. Konen's half went through seven editions. You could call it the Russian "Grout."

At the time of her intervention in *Sovetskaya muzïka*, Konen was *starshiy nauchnïy sotrudnik*, or senior research fellow, at the *III*. As such, she was writing from outside the pedagogical establishment and offering a critique of its curricula and the consequent state of Soviet musical scholarship. She recalled the glory days of early Soviet musicology, starting with the figures cited at the beginning of this essay. She lamented the loss of historical perspective in Soviet musicology since that time. "Even in music history textbooks," she complained, "books designed to set a standard for historical thinking, one finds pages where rather than a broad general evaluation of a composer's work one finds only a technical dissection of separate elements of his musical style."[47] While "a fluent mastery of analysis according to the latest methods is just as necessary as general artistic erudition as a prerequisite for functioning professionally," only "a synthesis of both aspects of scholarly preparation will allow one to avoid dilettantism" (p. 19).

Musicologists, she acknowledged, needed more technical training in the craft of composition and analysis than their counterparts in other art-historical disciplines; and therefore, she conceded, the fact that Soviet musicologists were trained in conservatories rather than universities gave them an advantage over their counterparts elsewhere. But she warned that "there is negative complement to this positive phenomenon, namely the lack of a true university-level humanistic culture" (p. 19). She listed eight specific tasks for which she thought Soviet musicologists were inadequately trained. They seem to be in ascending order of importance, so I will cite the last two as representing Konen's essential claim. What musicologists cannot do but must be able to do, she asserted, culminated in these skills:

> —To determine the dependency of creative activity in music on the broad social and cultural features of a period
>
> —To support one's conclusions on the basis not only of technical musical analysis, but also on the observed developmental patterns [she writes *zakonï razvitiya*, which translates literally as "laws of development"] of a particular artistic tradition, a given style, genre, formal or expressive device (p. 19).

One can easily imagine how Lev Mazel' might have responded to this, and of course so could Konen. So she added a somewhat defensive or pre-emptive footnote:

> I deliberately refrain from analyzing now the reasons for such a situation as I am describing. This is a hard question [*slozhnïy vopros*] and would demand an

[47] V. Konen, "V zashchitu istoricheskoy nauki," *Sovetskaya muzïka* no. 6 (1967), 18. Further citations in the main text.

> investigation of its own. My proposals in this area might call forth a polemic, which would distract us from the main problem at hand. It seems to me more important to limit discussion at this point to the stating of the relevant issue (p. 20n).

Indeed, all of Konen's real fighting words are relegated to footnotes. Having written that there has been an especial dearth of serious books on *zarubezhnaya muzïka*, she seeks the sanctuary of a footnote to add this:

> I underscore the importance of such works not only because it happens to be my specialty. To work out the problems of Russian music's past also demands deep knowledgeability about the processes that were taking place in western Europe in the preclassical and classical periods (p. 22n).

There was a time when this sentence could have drawn a sentence, for *nizkopoklonstvo.* By the 1960s, penalties were professional rather than political, and there were many who never forgave Konen for saying this, and much else in this coolly incendiary piece. Starting in the 1960s, when they were no longer so severely policed by political authorities, scholarly disciplines began to show what you might call autonomous divisions and rivalries, and music theorists were moved to defend what they regarded by then as hard-won turf—just as they did here. What had once been a political refuge had become a protected specialist preserve.

But then historical musicology had also undergone a depoliticizing transformation, as would have been apparent if I had quoted the less polemical parts of Konen's essay. Her brand of musicology was not nearly as sociocultural as was the musicology practiced by the patriarchs of the *RIII*, or her own student work up to her doctoral dissertation, that pioneering study of American music, which contained only one chapter on "professional composerly music" [*professional'noye kompozitorskoye tvorchestvo*], devoted to Edward MacDowell and his frustrated career, the rest being devoted to popular genres and their social settings and tasks.[48]

By the time she wrote her defense of historical scholarship, and more than any other Soviet musicologist, Konen resembled the Western, that is German or Anglo-American, musicologist of the 1960s and 70s, interested above all in source studies and style criticism. Her crowning book, in my opinion, was *Teatr i simfoniya*, published in 1968, which means she was working on it when she made her polemical intervention. It anticipates some of the groundbreaking work of Daniel Heartz, Elaine Sisman, and other prominent scholars of eighteenth-century music in exploring the interrelationship of dramatic and instrumental genres. If her work had been translated in time, and if Soviet scholarship had not been so isolated from western scholarship, and in consequence so subject in the west to not-wholly-unjustified suspicion, hers would have been a big name here as well as there. That a woman

[48] A chapter breakdown (taken from the revised edition (Moscow: Muzïka, 1965): (1) New England choral hymnody. (2) The sources of Negro music, (3) Spirituals, (4) Minstrels, (5) The birth of theatrical jazz; George Gershwin, (6) The role of Latin American culture in the development of jazz, (7) The paths of development of jazz in the USA, (8) Protest songs, (9) the MacDowell chapter, (10) The problem of a national school.

could be such a weighty presence in Soviet musicology, the more so as she had had such a checkered and politically troubled career, speaks eloquently on behalf of her qualities as a scholar. Perhaps her fortunate marriage has to be factored into the equation.

But that sort of status and authority breeds resentment on its own account, and so it will not surprise anyone familiar with the disciplinary debates in our own neck of the musicological woods that it festered and grew until, more than twenty years later, it exploded into the open—by coincidence or not, precisely at the time when *glasnost'* became the order of the day in the run-up to the Soviet collapse. It was a spectacular example of what happens when the lid comes off a pressure cooker.

VII

The protagonist of this phase was Yury Nikolayevich Kholopov (1932-2003), a younger scholar, which added a dollop of generational warfare to the polemical stew. Kholopov, the mainstay of the music theory faculty at the Moscow Conservatory, was an outstanding scholar and a prolific author. His field was twentieth-century harmony, which he studied analytically and inferentially rather than historically, armed (as I can personally attest) with an amazing knowledge of repertoire from all periods and places, and an astounding memory. An outspoken and unabashed formalist (not that he would have applied such a tainted word to himself), Kholopov saw no need to camouflage his position for the sake of protecting it. By the time of his death he (along with his sister, Valentina Nikolayevna, who—as if by agreement to divide the world of music between them—studied rhythm) had achieved virtual pre-eminence among Russian music scholars, especially in terms of international recognition; and yet, at the time of his debate with Konen et al., he was still fighting under something of a handicap in that, until the era of *glasnost',* his generation and his musicological faction lacked equal access to the press, which, like all public media in the Soviet Union, remained subject to centralized control. Surely it was the frustration he had been suffering that accounts for the evident lowering of the tone of debate once he had joined in. Where Konen had been lofty and maintained a façade of magnanimity, Kholopov was all sarcasm and indignation.

He had a right to it. *Sovetskaya muzïka* had followed up on Konen's "Defense of Historical Scholarship" with a "round table" of musicological heavy-hitters—Boris Mikhailovich Yarustovsky, Mazel', Druskin, Keldïsh, Elena Semyonovna Berland-Chernaya, Nest'yev, Konen herself, and Elena Andreyevna Grosheva, the journal's editor—at which, to quote the beginning Keldïsh's contribution, "everyone here shares [Konen's] attitude and warmly welcomes it," so that the twenty-two double-column pages the journal devoted to the discussion make pretty dull reading.[49]

One might have expected Lev Mazel' to offer some defense of his beat, but he was still obliged to camouflage his position. He offered a veiled reminder, cast in what Russians call Aesopian language, of some of the factors Konen had elaborately avoided

[49] Boris Yarustovsky et al., "Istoriya i sovremennost'," *Sovetskaya muzïka* no. 3 (1968), 2-23 (quoted words of Keldïsh on p. 9).

addressing—that is to say, the politically fraught reasons why music analysis had arisen as a separate subject in the first place. The "natural aspiration to base music-historical inferences on data drawn from the analysis of the music itself," he said, was "at root a healthy one, but has sometimes been taken to absurd lengths." And yet, he reminded his colleagues, "we have to recall that in the late twenties and early thirties"—that is, the period immediately preceding the organization of creative unions and the imposition of socialist realist standards—

> lecture courses in music history were mainly devoted to general observations and no time was set aside for studying the literature itself. That is when mistaken notions of "music history babble" arose and it became fashionable to contrast theorists as "doers" with historians as "talkers." In the thirties the analysis of individual works worked its way into a leading position in our scholarship and our pedagogy.

Mazel' was plainly assuming that his listeners and eventual readers would remember why. Thanks to the introduction of analysis into the curriculum, Mazel' concluded, "the deficiencies typical of the twenties were to a large extent overcome; but at the same time some corresponding minuses evolved."[50]

Kholopov was in no mood to maintain this conciliatory tone. He was furious. In the meantime *Sovetskaya muzïka* had convened yet another round table, in 1977 (as if marking the tenth anniversary of Konen's original intervention), to which he was invited, as Mazel's de facto successor, to submit a response, which he did. It was rejected at the time, and when it finally appeared in 1988, Year One of *glasnost'*, it bore a note from the author declaring that he had been the victim of censorship. ("This article, written in 1977-78, was intended as the author's contribution to the journal *Sovetskaya muzïka*'s 'round table' 'Musicology as a social, humanistic science', . . . but its printing was not permitted.")[51]

It is prefaced with an epigraph drawn from Konen's contribution to that 1977 symposium, which restated the position she had advanced in 1967: "History cannot rest on technical analysis alone. It must have the benefit of a wide-ranging intellectual synthesis, it must possess a broad humanistic horizon, [and] an associative turn of thought." Kholopov left no doubt, however, that it was the original 1967 piece to which he was irately responding. His wrath was not entirely unjustified: surely he was not alone in finding the title of Konen's very aggressive intervention somewhat paradoxical.

> "In defense of historical scholarship?" Pardon me, but "defense" against what? Against whom? Might it be against the successes of "young" theorists in the absence of any such successes by "young" historians?

---

[50] *Ibid.*, p. 5.

[51] Yury Kholopov, "Teoreticheskoye muzïkoznaniye kak gumanitarnaya nauka, problema analyza muzïki," *Sovetskaya muzïka* no. 9 (1988), 73-79, no, 10 (1988), 87-93. The note is printed as a footnote in no. 9, p. 73. (The remaining quotes from this piece are from no. 9, p. 74.) At the end of the second installment, the editors objected to Kholopov's characterization, saying that the refusal to print the piece in 1977 had been the normal result of in-house negative referee reports rather than censorship. They did not mention it, but Kholopov's response exceeded the length of the original round table in its entirety.

He objects heatedly to the binary oppositions on which Konen and the other panelists had relied: "technicians" vs. "humanists," "historians" vs. "theorists." He makes very heavy weather of the word "alone" in the epigraph from Konen—"History cannot rest on technical analysis alone"—and performs a neat little *razoblacheniye*: "With regard to musical analysis theorists are, so to speak, 'sub-historians' [*nedoistoriki;* cf. *nedorosl'* (a minor child), *nedouchka* (an educational dropout), etc.]; historians do everything that theorists do, but in addition they add a certain humanistic layer, they bring in the intellectual culture that technician-theorists cannot possibly have." His mockery hits bottom with a sly allusion to an old and unprintable joke about Lenin that our Russian guests will probably recognize: "Get it?" he taunts: "The historian does the same thing as the theorist, but does it on a high intellectual level: does it broadly, eruditely, humanistically." Finally he lets V. D. Konen have it with both barrels, in a passage suppurating with italics, boldface and caps:

> I will formulate now in one word what is never stated outright in [Konen's] article, but what the author's every point portends. What is humanistic musicology according to V. D. Konen? *Leaving out the music*, that's what. **Humanistic means extramusical.** What is lacking for me in every remark the author makes about what is humanistic? **THERE'S NO MUSIC.**[52]

Caps plus boldface is something I have never seen, before or since, in a Russian scholarly journal (or a non-Russian one, come to that).

It is familiar, though. Depressingly familiar. When I first read it, I was just a two years past my "notorious exchange" with Allen Forte in the pages of the British journal *Music Analysis*.[53] That exchange marked a point of polarization between musicology, informally so-called, and music theory, one that I never intended (since I was fully trained in music analysis and have always been a practitioner and a contributor to that discipline, if not an uncritical one).

I have told you of my personal relationship with Valentina Konen. Well, I had one with Yury Kholopov, too. I met him at a national meeting of the American Musicological Society in New Orleans in 1987, and got to know him several years later (it must have been around 1994 or 1995) when he extended another American visit in order to come out to California for the express purpose of reading my Stravinsky monograph, which was then in press, and available for perusal only *chez moi*, or at the offices of the University of California Press. (See what email has done for us since?) I felt honored by the intensity of his interest in my work. We had long, fervid discussions of my analyses in that book, which Yury Nikolayevich basically approved, and at times actually liked, because I had all unawares been working, as he put it, "in the tradition of Yavorsky," whose work I had not yet read (but only read about).

---

[52] "Чего мне не хватает во всех рассуждениях автора о гуманитарном? **МУЗЫКИ НЕТ**."

[53] "Letter to the Editor from Richard Taruskin," and "Letter to the Editor in Reply to Richard Taruskin rom Allen Forte," *Music Analysis,* 5 (1986), 313-37; the characterization is from Arnold Whittall, "Allen Forte in *Music Analysis*," *Music Analysis,* 26 (3007), 3-13, at 6.

I found Yury Nikolayevich an utterly delightful companion, and as things warmed up between us I told him about my mother's friendship with Valentina Konen, my own acquaintance with her, and asked him why he had responded to her so bitterly. He didn't really answer me, just assured me that he had great respect for her withal. But I understood. We were all in the grip of what I have subsequently called the "Great Either/Or," something to which Yury Nikolayevich himself had drawn exasperated attention in his reply to Konen.[54]

VIII

I have been trying ever since to surmount the Great Either/Or, both in my own work and in the influence I have sought to exert, first on my own pupils, and, through my writings, on the discipline at large. What I have been trying to restore to musicology, without letting go of the other, is precisely the sociocultural dimension that political conditions on *both* sides of the cold war had militated against—although in the one case (the "western") the minimizing of the sociocultural dimension was an orthodoxy and in the other (the Soviet) it was a resistance to orthodoxy which affected not only the work of music theorists but also that of their antagonists like Konen, who had had to soft-pedal the sociocultural dimension after suffering what amounted to Stalinist persecution.

Because I was putting it back, my work has occasionally been described—not only by phobic post-Soviet formalists like Levon Hakobian, who dismisses my work the old-fashioned way as "vulgar sociologism,"[55] or by rabid political opponents like Shostakovich "revisionists," but also by some of its most knowledgeable readers—as having submitted to Soviet orthodoxy.

In his final, perorative paragraph, for example, Jiří Smrž, the best informed of the lot, wrote that "Much like the integral analysis of the Stalin era [his translation of *tselostnïy analiz*], many Western scholars [I only wish there were many!] (including one of the leading authorities in North America on Russian music, Richard Taruskin) no longer view musical compositions as closed autonomous entities and approach them instead as a complex interplay of cultural historical factors."[56] And Anne Shreffler, in a very shrewd comparison between Carl Dahlhaus and his East German counterpart Georg Knepler, actually came close to putting me down as a disciple of the latter, whom I did actually meet once (in Moscow, at a meeting of the UNESCO-sponsored International Music Council in the fall of 1971) and whose writing I had, long ago, actually praised in print (being one of

[54] On the Great Either/Or, see the introduction to R. Taruskin, *The Oxford History of Western Music* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), I:xix.

[55] L. B. Bayakhunova, "Levon Akopyan: 'Mï mnogim obyazanï zapadnïm ispolnitelyam, muzïkovedam, kritikam," "Мы многим обязаны западным исполнителям, музыковедам, критикам» http://www.os.x-pdf.ru/20iskusstvovedenie/276985-1-il-akopyan-levon-oganesovich-r-1953-intervyu-veduschego-nauchnogo.php

[56] Jiří Smrž, *Symphonic Stalinism*, p. 165.

the very few Western music historians who even knew his name in those days).[57] Summarizing Knepler's significance, she wrote: "The scholarly project that Knepler and his colleagues opened up (and ultimately did not finish) resonates strongly with many current concerns, even though there was, as far as I can tell, little or no direct influence of East German and Soviet Marxist musicology on the North American scene (with the possible exception of Richard Taruskin's work)."[58]

I took strong umbrage at this at the time, and even dashed off an angry email to Anne, which I later had to patch up. Having lived something like a Soviet student's life for ten months, and having seen up close the conditions that my own relatives and their friends were facing, including a number of what in those days were known as *otkazniki* ("refuseniks" in "English"), I came back from my year on the academic exchange with a view of the Soviet Union that, as I liked to put it then, was somewhat to the right of Ronald Reagan's. And yet that same student year contained experiences that I have described in my own writing that did have a strong impact on my musicological thinking, including a performance of Shostakovich's "Leningrad" Symphony that educated me in the social value that music can have, precisely because of the constraints imposed by the totalitarian institutions whose authority, as I had been taught up to then, had vitiated the music's aesthetic value.[59]

One of the things that educated me was first-hand knowledge that those who subscribed to Soviet ideas on music, including the most orthodox ones, were at least my intellectual and musicianly equals. So I am willing to describe myself at this point as a walking translation of Eastern ideas into a Western musicological context, and—now that my work has at least a few Russian readers—of Western ideas into an Eastern context. It is one more Either/Or to surmount, and I am always in favor of that.

But there is still work to do. Sociocultural musicology has yet to make a decisive post-Soviet comeback. It is what Tatyana Bukina is still agitating for, as she looks longingly on "new musicology"—the term we used in the 1990s to describe some big changes in purview that were then taking place, particularly in American musical scholarship.[60] The term is old now, partly because the new musicology quickly took a wrong turn, away from the sociocultural into naïve hermeneutics, which caused it to age

[57] "To the Editor," *Current Musicology* 19 (1975), 33-40, at 33. This was a rebuttal to a paper by Hans Helms, called "Charles Edward Ives: Ideal American or Social Critic," *Current Musicology* 17 (1973), 37-44.

[58] Anne C. Shreffler, "Berlin Walls: Dahlhaus, Knepler, and Ideologies of Music History," *Journal of Musicology*, 20 (2003), 498-525, at 523.

[59] R. Taruskin, "Double Trouble," *The New Republic*, 24 December 2001, 26-34; rpt. with an update as "When Serious Music Mattered," in Malcolm H. Brown, ed., *A Shostakovich Casebook* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005), pp. 360-84, and in R. Taruskin, *On Russian Music* (University of California Press, 2009), pp. 299-321.

[60] Bukina, *Muzïkal'naya nauka*, p. 120.

with stunning rapidity. We are still feeling our way back to what both Soviet musicology and German musicology were doing in the 1920s, before both were tainted with totalitarianism: not as the next exclusive purview, which would only spawn at best a new Either/Or, at worst a new totalitarianism, but as one more string in our bow. There cannot be too many.

About the Author

Richard Taruskin (University of California, Berkeley) is an American musicologist, the author of *The Oxford History of Western Music* in 6 volumes (2005, 2009), *Stravinsky and the Russian Traditions* (1996), Defining Russia Musically (1997) and other books on Russian music, as well as on early music and performance, contemporary music culture, nationalism, modernism, and analyses. He is a recipient of Kyoto Prize in Arts and Philosophy (Music, 2017) and several American prizes and awards for contribution to musicology.