The Birth of the Soviet Romance from the Spirit of Russian Modernism

Philip Ross Bullock

To describe an artistic genre is not just to propose an account of its principal formal features, but also to situate it within a particular linguistic or national culture. Equally, it is to invite a historical analysis of its evolution over time. It is for this reason that we talk about the English and Italian sonnet, just as we talk about the romantic elegy, the realist novel, the naturalist drama or the symbolist poem. It is this intersection of spatial and temporal elements – the definition of distinct national canons, as well as major artistic movements (although there is frequently an overlap between these two categories) – that means that the genres of works of art are as susceptible to ideological interpretation as their content. This is especially the case in Russian culture, where radical historical discontinuities – say, for instance, the processes of Europeanization initiated by Peter the Great, the reign of Nicholas I, the reforms of Alexander II, the revolutions of 1905 and 1917, the Stalin era, Khrushchev's 'Thaw' or the collapse of the Soviet Union – have radically shaped the ways in which narratives of artistic evolution have been constructed. At the same time, the fact that Russian society from the eighteenth century onwards has very often imported models of culture from the West has meant that translation, imitation, adaptation and eventually rivalry have become key metaphors when it comes to the discussion of the historical development of the Russian arts.[1]

In the case of music, it is the formation of a supposedly Russian canon that has tended to predominate in criticism, whether in the nineteenth century or in the Soviet period, and which has subsequently formed the basis of recent revisionist criticism seeking to expose the ideological presuppositions of nationalism itself.[2] By contrast, studies of genre per se have figured less prominently (which is not to say that genres have not been studied in terms of

their historical situation, whether synchronically or diachronically).[3] Moreover, where they do exist, such studies often serve to reinscribe, rather than challenge conventional historical periodizations of Russian culture, as – with good reason – do important recent accounts of Russian music's intellectual and institutional contexts.[4] This issue is particularly acute when it comes to tracing the development of Russian music from the late nineteenth century through to the first decades of the twentieth, and especially across the seemingly decisive cultural break represented by the October Revolution of 1917. In the case of opera, for instance, the death of Nikolai Rimskii-Korsakov in 1908 seems to mark a terminal point in the evolution of a genre that would be reborn only in the works of Dmitrii Shostakovich some two decades later, firstly in the Nos (The Nose, 1927-8), and then, most importantly, in Ledi Makbet Mtsenskogo uezda (Lady Macbeth of the Mtsensk District, 1930-32).[5] The emigration of major early twentieth-century composer such as Sergei Rakhmaninov and Aleksandr Glazunov similarly promotes the perception of discontinuity as a key feature of the historical development of the symphony. Although the career of Nikolai Miaskovskii suggests one way in which the symphony did indeed survive in Russian culture from the early twentieth century onwards, and the premiere of his Sixth Symphony in 1924 was a major event in early Soviet musical life, it is instead the premiere of Shostakovich's first essay in the form in 1926 that seems to mark its rebirth in its new, Soviet incarnation. When it comes to chamber music, and in particular the string quartet, the relative paucity of canonical examples from the nineteenth century, and the prominent repositioning of the genre as part of Socialist Realism's emphasis on learning from the classics,[6] means that important historical continuities (as in the case of Misakovskii's quartets of the early 1930s) are effaced in favour of a narrative that foregrounds moments of rupture.[7]

In the case of art-song, it might appear at first glance that its history is also one decisively split across the revolutionary divide. As a genre associated with both the polite

space of the bourgeois salon and Russia's tradition of lyric poetry, it seems an unlikely genre to have flourished in the revolutionary, collective atmosphere of the 1920s, let alone one that might embody continuities with turn-of-the-century modernism. Such indeed is the impression given by Soviet-era criticism, and this article will begin by surveying influential historical introductions to the genre from this period in order to show how they have promoted a clear-cut distinction between song's pre- and post-revolutionary incarnations. It will then go on to argue that such an interpretation overlooks the very substantial continuities that characterized the development of art-song as a genre, whether traced through the careers of individual composers, the reception of modernist poetry in music or the history of the song recital as a form of social practice. In particular, poetry proves to be a productive way of assessing elements of continuity and change in the art-song repertoire, precisely because it establishes a palimpsestic link between the literary culture of one era and the musical culture of another.[8] The perception of significant continuities between Russian art-song of the turn of the twentieth century and developments in the early Soviet period rests, moreover, not just on historical hindsight, but also on the evidence of contemporary documents and criticism. The decisive break in the evolution of Russian art-song in the early decades of the twentieth century came, it will be argued, not in 1917, but during the final years of the 1920s, when Stalin's first Five-Year Plan was accompanied by a 'cultural' revolution that was directed against artistic modernism and such remnants of the culture of the past that had survived and even flourished in the years immediately after the October Revolution.[9]

***

Written by the leading Soviet scholar of the genre, Vera Vasina-Grossman, the two most influential monographic treatments of Russian romance in nineteenth and twentieth centuries

respectively entrench a seemingly categorical divide between the classical and Soviet repertoires and deny the profound continuities that existed between them. In Russkii klassicheskii romans XIX veka (The Nineteenth-Century Russian Classical Romance, 1956), for instance, Vasina-Grossman traces the evolution of art-song in Russia from the dilettante salon romances of the early nineteenth century to the late works of Chaikovskii and Rimskii-Korsakov, with which, she argues 'the great period of the development of the Russian classical art-song [*romans*] closes in on itself'.[10] The reason behind such a categorical claim is simple enough: Russian modernism proves to be too great a stumbling-block to an understanding of developments around the turn of the century. For Vasina-Grossman, modernism is indicative of a stylized and over-aestheticized attitude to form, an imitative attitude to Western European influences (she cites Hugo Wolf and Claude Debussy in particular), a failure to draw organically on the roots of folk culture, an unnatural treatment of human speech and a withdrawal by composers into the world of elite cliques.[11]

Nonetheless, some song composers are recognized by Vasina-Grossman, principally on account of their supposed 'realism': here, she cites Sergei Taneev, Anton Arenskii, Feliks Blumfel′d, Reingol′d Glier, and – most importantly – Sergei Rakhmaninov, whose music had been comprehensively rehabilitated in the Soviet Union by this point, despite his emigration in 1917.[12] In the case of Rakhmaninov's songs, this process was relatively straightforward, given that all of them were written before 1916 and hence could be reincorporated into an overarching narrative of Russian music that avoided the question of works composed outside the Soviet Union after the October Revolution. For Vasina-Grossman, Rakhmaninov's songs conform to the classical tradition inasmuch as they retain links to folksong, continue to prioritize accessible melody, employ some of the characteristic genres that had developed during the nineteenth century (the elegy, the oriental song and various dance forms) and enjoyed great popularity with a wide range of audiences.[13] The most significant reason for

her approval, however, is their seeming resistance to the kind of innovative trends that were otherwise typical of the early twentieth century: 'considering Rakhmaninov's vocal works as a whole, we must admit that they are essentially directed against modernism.'[14] Vasina-Grossman even downplays the experimental qualities of his final set of songs, the Shest′ stikhotvorenii (Six Poems), op. 38 (1916). Settings texts by leading symbolist poets (Aleksandr Blok, Andrei Belyi, Igor′ Severianin, Valerii Briusov, Fedor Sologub and Konstantin Bal′mont) that had been selected for the composer by Marietta Shaginian, and exploring a rather more complex and adventurous musical language than his earlier songs, the cycle is interpreted by Vasina-Grossman as 'both a fascination with modernism, and an internal attempt at overcoming this fascination.'[15]

The ideological contexts that shaped Russkii klassicheskii romans XIX veka meant that it was never likely to respond positively to musical or literary modernism; published in 1956, it betrays the evident influence of Stalinist attitudes. By the time Vasina-Grossman came to publish her study of the Soviet art-song tradition, however, attitudes to modernism had changed considerably:

> Fifteen to twenty years ago all varieties of Russian modernism struck us as almost identical, we clearly saw how alien they were, and at times even how dangerous they were in respect of the progressive ideological movements of the age. We saw their retrospectivism, their subjectivism – all the ills of the Russian intelligentsia that were characteristic of the pre-revolutionary era.
>
> But now, as well as this, something else has become clear: that within modernism a battle raged, that its best and most talented representatives clearly sensed the hopelessness [ushcherbnost′] of their social and artistic position, something

which allowed both Aleksandr Blok and Valerii Briusov to take up such prominent positions within Soviet poetry.[16]

This highly contingent view of modernism shapes Vasina-Grossman's Mastera sovetskogo romansa (Masters of the Soviet Romance, 1968, revised edition 1980) profoundly. Avoiding 1917 as a moment of decisive rupture, she argues instead that 'the history of the Soviet art-song begins more or less in the middle of the 1920s. Most of the romances which appeared in the first years after October seem to be a strange anachronism: both their choice of texts and the manner of their musical embodiment are completely the same as before the Revolution.'[17] Faced with the very substantial continuities that characterized the development of art-song in Russia around 1917, she simply ignores the early Soviet repertoire as little more than a historical and ideological anachronism, proposing instead a decisive break somewhere in the mid-1920s, after which a thorough-going Sovietization of the repertoire could take place.

The impact of modernist poetry on a number of early-Soviet song composers, as well as and the organic links between aspects of the pre- and post-1917 song repertoire, mean that Vasina-Grossman at least acknowledges the historical significance of a number of works from the early 1920s. Her acceptance proves, however, to be limited and tendentious. Writing of Anatolii Aleksandrov's settings of the poetry of Mikhail Kuzmin, for instance, Vasina-Grossman claims that the composer overlooked the most important developments in Soviet poetry (here, she names Vladimir Maiakovskii and Sergei Esenin, Nikolai Aseev and Dem′ian Bednyi, Eduard Bagritskii and Boris Pasternak, Nikolai Tikhonov and Il′ia Sel′vinskii), suggesting that 'the inertia of the pre-revolutionary era was too strong and revealed itself, of course, in the durability not just of poetic tastes, but also in musical language.'[18] In fact, it was very often a composer's choice of poet that was used to characterize his relationship to modernism. In the case of Nikolai Miaskovskii, for instance,

Vasina-Grossman expresses a strong preference for his settings of classical poetry, even whilst cataloguing his considerable investment in modernist poetry and asking, in particular, 'what, in the 1900s, was Miaskovskii searching for in the poems of Zinaida Gippius, a mannered and pretentious, albeit talented poetess, and the host of a literary salon that was at the heart of Russian decadence?'[19] As well as many songs to texts by Gippius, Vasina-Grossman notes Miaskovskii's broader interest in symbolist verse (Bal′mont and Viacheslav Ivanov especially), yet it is his settings of the early nineteenth-century poet Evgenii Baratynskii that draw both her greatest approval and most detailed commentary: 'if we turn to the songs of op. 1 (the cycle Razmyshleniia [Meditations] to texts by Evgenii Baratynskii, 1907), then we will sense in them above all a vital continuity with the best and most noble traditions of the Russian romance, traditions which are understood not in the spirit of learning, but of creativity.'[20] The key phrase here is 'vital continuity' [zhivaia preemstvennost′]. A central task of Soviet criticism, especially after the establishment of socialist realism with its emphasis on learning from the classics of nineteenth-century realism, was to distinguish between productive and acceptable forms of continuity with the past, and those aspects of Russian culture whose importance had to be downplayed or denied altogether.[21] In a literal sense, there can be no continuity between Miaskovskii's settings of Baratynskii, whose musical language is described by Vasina-Grossman as 'restrained, simple, classically poised',[22] and the heritage of the nineteenth-century Russian art-song. There can, of course, be a dialogue, but Vasina-Grossman's purpose is not to propose an intertextual reading of Russian music across the generations (unlike, say, the Russian Formalists, whose experiments in literary history explicitly foregrounded the evolution of both genre and tradition through a series of non-consecutive 'knight's moves', generational leaps and intergenerational struggles). Rather, she seeks to institute a clear and coherent narrative of the development of

the art-song as a genre that effaces the modernist tradition, or at least relegates it to a marginal place in that narrative.

Few of Vasina-Grossman's claims should surprise, given the context in which they were produced. Nonetheless, they are worth reviewing in some detail because they are indicative of broader trends in Soviet music historiography. Take, for instance, Galina Soboleva's two short, popular histories written for mass audiences in the 1980s: Russian romans (The Russian Art-Song, 1980) and Russkii sovetskii romans (The Soviet Russian Art-Song, 1985). Following Vasina-Grossman's lead, she divides song into a classical and a Soviet period and sees the turn of the twentieth century as a period of decline, followed by a renaissance from the mid-1920s onward.[23] This emphasis on two distinct traditions was characteristic of earlier scholarship too. Indeed, in the work of Boris Asaf'ev, the Russian romance tradition appeared to belong entirely to the past. In the chapter devoted to art-song in his Russkaia muzyka ot nachala XIX stoletiia (1930, translated into English in 1953 by Alfred J. Swan as Russian Music from the Beginning of the Nineteenth Century), Asaf'ev argued that the Revolution demanded a new type of lyricism ('here there is no longer any room for the romance') and suggested that composers risked isolating themselves from new audiences ('as individualistic lyricism moves away from the street and settles, behind thick walls and heavy curtains, into the quiet of lonely contemplation, the rift between artistic creation and the tastes of the majority of listeners, becomes more dangerous').[24] Similarly, the essays included in Asaf'ev's edited collection Russkii romans: opyt intonatsionnogo analiza (The Russian Art-Song: An Attempt at an Intonational Analysis, 1930) dealt entirely on the nineteenth-century repertoire (Glinka, Dargomyzhskii, Balakirev, Borodin, Musorgskii and Rimskii-Korsakov), as did his own introduction ('Vazhneishie etapy razvitiia russkogo romansa' ['The most important phases in the development of the Russian art-song']).[25] Earlier in his career, Asaf'ev had showed greater interest in the modern development of

Russian song, publishing – under the pseudonym of Igor′ Glebov – a short pamphlet on Taneev, as well as two editions of a bibliography of poems set to music by Russian composers that included many works dating from the immediate pre- and post-revolutionary periods.[26] Nonetheless, it is clear that by the 1930s, his attitude had become less inclusive and hence more indicative of mainstream Soviet attitudes when it came both to the legacy of turn-of-the-century modernism and its relationship with Soviet culture in the Stalin era.

A similar picture obtains when it comes to the main literary bibliographies of Russian song, explicitly so in the case of G. K. Ivanov's Russkaia poeziia v otechestvennoi muzyke (do 1917 goda) (Russian Poetry in Russian Music [up to 1917]), and also in the various Biblioteka poeta anthologies of Russian song texts that appeared in 1936, 1950, 1957, 1965 and 1988.[27] Despite changing attitudes to the literary canon over the Soviet period, all of these reinforce a history of Russian song that had implicitly come to its conclusion in the late nineteenth century, and certainly by the time of the October Revolution. To be sure, there have been some subsequent attempts at correcting and complementing the picture, including bibliographies of settings of the poetry of Akhmatova, Tsvetaeva, Mandel′shtam, Pasternak and even Viacheslav Ivanov, as well as revisionist studies of forgotten or neglected composers.[28] Yet the accumulated legacy of Soviet-era criticism continues to make itself felt in concert programmes, recordings and even scholarship, where the main focus remains on the nineteenth-century tradition, with a smaller body of work considering the Soviet period, yet relatively little attention is given to the extensive and organic connections that linked the two. In the West in particular, overwhelming interest in the life and works of Dmitrii Shostakovich has tended to shape assumptions about Soviet cultural politics in a way that continues to exclude alternative narratives and experiences, and although song came to constitute a very profound means of artistic expression in his later years, his career promotes a deceptive account of the genre's evolution, especially in the early Soviet period.

***

A preliminary step in reconstituting the modernist history of art-song both before and after 1917 must be to reconsider and even reorder the perceived hierarchy of composers' reputations, where both the biographies and lyric output of Rakhmaninov, Prokof′ev and Stravinskii have tended to give a misleading impression of the development of song. Rakhmaninov wrote his last songs in 1916; emigration, with its attendant loss of attachment to both nation and language, constituted a terminal point in his interest in lyric forms. Prokof′ev's early output included three groups of songs (opp. 9, 23, and 27) and his miniature scena, Gadkii utenok (The Ugly Duckling), op. 18, all written between 1910 and 1916, as well as two sets of songs (opp. 35 and 36) that date from 1920 and 1921 (the first a set of five wordless vocalises that were later transcribed for violin and piano, the second a series of five settings of Bal′mont, written during a summer that the composer and poet spent together in Brittany). Thereafter, Prokofiev would not revisit song until after his return to the Soviet Union, when he produced works far closer in aesthetic to Soviet norms (mass songs, folksongs and settings of Pushkin written just before the centenary of the poet's death in 1937).[29] In the case of Stravinskii, song occupied a relatively marginal place in his Russian period, and even before his emigration, his 'rejoicing discovery' of the irregularities of Russian folk prosody meant that he had abandoned the principles of text-setting that had been central to the Russian art-song tradition throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.[30] If this list is widened to include Nikolai Metner (who was certainly highly regarded by Rakhmaninov at least), then the picture may need to be modified slightly. Before 1917, Metner had set a substantial number of poems by Pushkin, Tiutchev and Fet, as well as a very large corpus of texts by Goethe, Heine and Nietzsche. This pattern continued after he

moved to Western Europe in 1921, and suggests that despite Metner's geographical displacement from his homeland, Russian songs could represent a kind of nostalgic affinity with the culture of the past. What links all of these composers is, of course, their status as émigrés. Yet their prominence in the critical literature suggests that when it comes to song at least, the distinction between Soviet and émigré maps onto a broader set of discontinuities, whether between pre- and post-revolutionary periods, the between the aesthetics of modernism and (eventually) Socialist Realism, and even between word and music itself (at least in the case of Stravinskii). In each case, 1917 functions as a metonymic representation of a creative hiatus within the evolution of song as an artistic genre.

Yet such an account pays excessive attention to composers whose works give a potentially misleading impression of the development of song as a genre. In particular, it effaces substantial continuities in both the composition and performance of song across the revolutionary divide, and which can be traced by examining other composers' contribution to the Russian song tradition and how this was represented in the critical literature of the time. Here, three composers – Mikhail Gnesin (1883-1957), Nikolai Miaskovskii (1881-1950) and Anatolii Aleksandrov (1888-1982) – stand out as being in need of substantial reconsideration, both when it comes to the evolution of early Soviet culture out of elements of turn-of-the-century modernism, and for their particular exploration of the possibilities of art-song. Between them, they represent both the Moscow and the St Petersburg schools of compositions (Aleksandrov trained at the Moscow Conservatoire, Miaskovskii and Gnesin at the St Petersburg, although Miaskovskii also had private lessons with Glier in Moscow). Most crucially, they all illustrate the close relationship between musical and literary modernism in the first decades of the twentieth century.

One the leading composers of song in the early twentieth century and a key figure in the musical reception of modernist verse was Mikhail Gnesin, whose four book of songs

entitled ‘Iz sovremmennoi poezii’ (‘From contemporary poetry’), op. 2 (1907), op. 5 (1908-9) op. 16 (1915) and op. 22 (1915-16) set verses by Vol′kenstein, Bal′mont, Sologub, Blok, Ivanov and Akhmatova. Other major vocal works from this period include Posviashcheniia (Dedications), op. 10 (1912-14), to texts by Ivanov, Bal′mont and Sologub, Rosarium, op. 15 (1914), to texts by Ivanov, and Iz Shelli (From Shelley), op. 18 (1915), based on translations by Bal′mont. Gnesin’s engagement with Russian modernism expressed itself not just in his musical responses to symbolist poetry; he also collaborated closely with Vsevolod Meierkhol′d, using musical notation as a means of transcribing the rise, fall and rhythm of theatrical declamation.[31] After 1917, however, Gnesin’s interest in modernist verse waned, and he turned instead to a series of settings of Jewish poetry – his Stranitsy iz ‘Pesni pesnei’ (Pages from the ‘Song of Songs’), op. 33 (1926), and the Evreiskie pesni (Jewish Songs), op. 37 (1927).[32] Gnesin’s later works have tended to efface the importance of his contribution to modernist art-song. Nonetheless, a number of these works were republished in the early Soviet period, as attested both by the holdings of the libraries in Moscow and St Petersburg, and by lists of scores issued by the music branch of the Soviet state publishing house and advertised on the back pages of editions of his Jewish songs, opp. 33 and 37. Indeed, Gnesin’s turn to Jewish music did not put a stop to his interest in literary modernism entirely; in 1927, his setting of Sofiia Parnok’s Saficheskie strophy (Sapphics), op. 26, was published in Moscow, part of the rather surprising endurance of Sappho’s poetry in early Soviet song.

Gnesin’s songs to symbolist texts all date from before 1917, they were an important factor in creating the preconditions for other composers’ engagement with modernist poetry well into the 1920s. Similarly, Miaskovskii devoted himself extensively to symbolist poetry before 1917; unlike Gnesin, however, he continued to set modernist text well into the 1920s. Moreover, many of these works continued to be republished well into the Soviet period and constitute one of the seeming continuities between the pre- and post-1917 contexts, and even

into the Stalin period. Tracing the history and evolution of Miaskovskii's song is not always easy, however, given his habit of revising his earlier works and often republishing them with different titles and different opus numbers. There are settings of Bal′mont – most notably the cycle Madrigal (written 1908-9, first published in Vienna in 1925 and in Moscow in 1945), but also the twelve songs of Iz iunesheskikh let (From the Days of Youth) that were written between 1903 and 1906, collated in 1945 and partially published only in 1956.[33] Miaskovskii's Tri nabroski (Three sketches, eventually numbered as op. 8) are settings of Ivanov that date from 1908 which were first published in Berlin in 1913 and reissued in Moscow in 1945. There are also settings of Baratynskii (Razmyshleniia [Meditations], op. 1 [written 1907, published 1922, 1926 and 1944]), Blok (Shest′ stikhotvorenii [Six poems], op. 20 [written 1921, published 1922]), Tiutchev (Na sklone dnia [At the Close of Day], op. 21 [written 1922, published 1923 and 1944]) and Del′vig (Venok poblekshii [A Faded Garland], op. 22 [written 1925, published 1926]).[34]

It is, though, Miaskovskii's twenty three settings of the poetry of Zinaida Gippius that constitute his most sustained and extensive engagement with modernist poetry and which illustrate the prominent role played by symbolist verse in both pre- and post-revolutionary musical culture (even when Gippius herself had gone into emigration and positioned herself as one of the most virulent critics of Soviet rule). These songs were published in various groups from 1906 onwards:

- 6 stikhotvorenii Z. Gippius (6 Poems of Zinaida Gippius) (St Petersburg, 1906)
- Iz Z. Gippius: Tri p′esy dlia odnogo golosa i f-p. (From G. Zippius: Three pieces for solo voice and piano) (Berlin, Moscow and St Petersburg, 1913)
- Iz Z. Gippius: Dve p′esy dlia peniia i fortepiano (From G. Zippius: Two pieces for voice and piano) (Moscow and Leipzig, [n.y.])

- Iz Z. Gippius: Vosem′ nabroskov dlia peniia i fortepiano (From G. Zippius: Eight sketches voice and piano) (Moscow, 1917)
- Iz Z. Gippius: Vosem′ nabroskov dlia peniia i fortepiano (From G. Zippius: Eight sketches voice and piano) (Moscow, 1921)
- Na grani: Deviat′ p′es ‘Iz Z. N. Gippius’ dlia golosa i fortepiano (po starym eskizam) (On the Border: Nine Pieces ‘From Z. N. Gippius’ for voice and piano (based on old sketches) (Moscow and Petrograd, 1922)
- Predchuvstvie: Shest′ nabroskov dlia peniia i f-p (Premonition: Six sketches for voice and piano) (Vienna and Leipzig, 1927)
- Iz Z. Gippius: Tri p′esy dlia odnogo golosa s f-p (From Z. Gippius: Threepieces for solo voice and piano) (Moscow, 1946)

Yet these sets of songs are not discrete cycles; rather, their contents often overlap, as Miaskovskii recast (and sometimes revised) them for various publications (figure 1).

	1906	1913	n.y.	1917	1921	1922	1927	1946
‘P′iavki’ (‘Leeches’)	x					x		
‘Nichego’ (‘There is nothing’)	x					x		
‘V gostinoi’ (‘In the drawing room’)	x			x	x			
‘Serenada’ (‘Serenade’)	x							
‘Pauki’ (‘Spiders’)	x					x		
‘Nadpis′ na knige’ (‘An inscription in a book’)	x					x		

‘Protivorechiia’ (‘Contradictions’)	x					x
‘Odnoobrazie’ (‘Monotony’)	x					x
‘Krugi’ (‘Circles’	x					x
‘Luna i tuman’ (‘Moon and fog’)		x				
‘Krov′’ (‘Blood’)		x				
‘Neskornomu uchiteliu’ (‘To a carefree teacher’)			x	x		
‘Dar’ (‘The gift’)			x	x		x
‘Bol′’ (‘Pain’)			x	x		x
‘Tak-li’ (‘Like so?’)			x	x		x
‘Zaklinanie’ (‘Incantation’)			x	x		x
‘Vnezapno…’ (‘Suddenly…’)			x	x		x
‘Petukhi’ (‘Cocks’)			x	x		x
‘Strany unyn′ia’ (‘Lands of melancholy’)					x	
‘Nadpis′ na konverte’ (‘Inscription on an envelope’)					x	
‘Tsvety nochi’ (‘Night flowers’)					x	
‘Mgnovenie’ (‘A moment’)					x	
‘Pyl′’ (‘Dust’)					x	

FIGURE 1: Miaskovskii’s settings of the poetry of Zinaida Gippius

In terms of their publication history, Miaskovskii's settings of Gippius extend across more than two decades, between 1906 and 1927, and some of them even made a brief reappearance in the mid-1940s.[35] They form one of the most visible instances of how songs written and in some instances published before 1917 continued to circulate into the 1920s, illustrating the evolution of art-song as a genre across the revolutionary divide. However, the legacy of Miaskovskii's early songs was partially eclipsed, whether by his later settings of Lermontov (1935-6, published 1937), Shchipachev (1940, published 1941) and Burns (1946, published 1947), or his reputation as a leading Soviet symphonist. Nonetheless, it is clear that they retained a sufficiently prominent place in cultural memory to have been adduced as supposed proof of the composer's lifelong decadence by Tikhon Khrennikov at the First Congress of Soviet Composers in 1948.[36]

Noted in particular for his music for solo piano (including fourteen sonatas and a substantial body of smaller works), as well as for various chamber ensembles (most notably four string quartets), Aleksandrov was equally renowned as a as a composer of songs. The substantial (although still incomplete) four-volume edition of his songs that was published in the early 1970s contains a total of 119 works written between 1912 and 1968.[37] As far as his choice of poetry is concerned, then from the 1930s onwards Aleksandrov set a large number of texts by contemporary Soviet poets (Stepan Shchipachev, Samuil Marshak, Sergei Severtsev and Margarita Aliger), as well as exploring aspects of the nineteenth-century classical tradition (Baratynskii, Pushkin, Fet and Tiutchev). His songs also illustrate a sustained interest in foreign poetry in Russian translation. If his three settings of the Georgian romantic poet Nikoloz Baratashvili in versions by Pasternak look like an attempt to appeal to Stalin (whilst also reflecting the fact that many leading poets had taken refuge in translation at this time), then other works are more evidently indicative of his cosmopolitan literary

tastes, as well as of the prominence of translation in the Russian literary tradition. There are, for instance, songs to texts by modern French poets such as Remy de Gourmont, Emile Verhaeren and Paul Verlaine, settings of the renaissance poet, Pierre de Ronsard, and an early group of three songs to verses by the Persian poet Hafiz in translations by Fet.

Aleksandrov's Hafiz songs reveal a significant feature about the survival and subsequent development of Russian song across the revolutionary divide. Originally written in 1912, they were first published by Gutheil in 1917, before eventually being reissued in 1926. Similarly, his settings of Gourmont were written in 1915, but still available in a publication dating from 1926 – striking evidence of how the pre-revolutionary repertoire continued to exert an influence on the development of the genre after 1917.[38] It is, though, Aleksandrov's settings of Russian modernist verse that most clearly reveal the vitality of song as an early Soviet genre with organic roots in artistic culture of the late Imperial era. Dating from 1915, his Chetyre stikhotvorenii K. Bal′monta i I. Severianina (Four Poems of Konstantin Bal′mont and Igor′ Severianin), op. 5, were republished in Soviet Russia in 1926, despite setting texts by two émigré poets. Only one of them was included in the 1970s edition of his songs, potentially suggesting a certain degree of discomfort on the part of his later editors with the legacy of literary modernism, even in the years of the Brezhnev stagnation. But Aleksandrov's seventeen settings of Mikhail Kuzmin's Aleksandriiskie pesni (Alexandrian Songs) were too significant a historical and musical document to be similarly overlooked. Divided into four books and published between 1917 and 1926, they take poems by a leading member of the pre-revolutionary Acmeist school, some of which had already been set to music by the poet himself (a talented amateur when it came to music).[39] The first book of Aleksandrov's settings was published by Gutheil in 1917 as his op. 8. By the time it was reissued in 1926, it had been joined by two further books – Aleksandrov's op. 20 (published in 1923) and his op. 25 (published in 1926). A fourth book appears to have been

composed in the late 1920s, although its publication may have been disrupted by the change in the political climate at the time.[40]

Aleksandrov's persistent interest in Kuzmin is significant because although he remained in the Soviet Union after 1917, it is hard to make a case for him as being in any way a revolutionary writer. As Vasina-Grossman admits, 'there can be no comparison between Mikhail Kuzmin and either Aleksandr Blok or Valerii Briusov.' For Vasina-Grossman, his poetry can be tolerated, because 'he shared with them the sense of the hopelessness [ushcherbnost'] of modernism, as did, as it happens, many other representatives of his generation.'[41] Moreover, Vasina-Grossman cites Kuzmin's Acmeist manifesto, 'O prekrasnoi iasnosti' ('On beautiful clarity', 1910) as a positive reaction against the abstraction and inwardness of symbolism, and hence – potentially at least – as a kind of realism. Yet this is very much a late-Soviet rationalization of the persistence of pre-revolutionary aesthetics after 1917. As we shall see, contemporary reviews of Aleksandrov's songs frequently singled them out as offering a new form of lyricism that was well attuned to the needs of the age.

***

The careers of Gnesin, Misakovskii and Aleksandrov all illustrate how settings of a wide range of poetry – Soviet, modernist, classical and foreign works in translation – survived and even flourished well into the Soviet period. Yet the mere fact of publication gives little indication of significance, which should be traced instead through contemporary reviews of both publications and performance. These give a good indication of the importance of song not just as a hybrid musical and literary genre, but also as a form of social practice embedded in early Soviet culture. Writing in 1926 about the first years of Soviet musical life, Leonid

Sabaneev emphasized the continuity of the romance tradition with both composers and performers, as well as highlighting the particular set of social and institutional factors that had facilitated that continuity:

> But the fact that the work of Russian composers has continued to enrich the treasure-trove of the song genre with new achievements, as well as the fact that in general, the art of vocal performance, because it is the most intimate form of musical performance, has been simultaneously the easiest one to organize, and the one most able to cope with the wide range of issues raised by the import of foreign musical novelties – all of this has gone to supporting the vitality of the art of vocal performance at a significant level and has nurtured in the public a taste for chamber song that was only partially expressed beforehand.[42]

In particular, Sabaneev noted that although many of the leading vocalists of the pre-revolutionary period had gone into emigration, a new generation of singers (such as Nazar′ Raiskii, Zoia Lodii, Vera Dukhovskaia and F. Petrova) had done so much to promote this seemingly unpropitious repertoire: 'Thanks to these performers, contemporary foreign and Russian musical works continue to be heard from concert platforms, and chamber concerts are even becoming more a popular form of performance than other serious concerts, even if they are still only designed for a relatively limited circle of musical consumers'.[43]

In terms of the composers who had devoted themselves to song, then Aleksandrov was undoubtedly the most visible figure at the time. Viktor Beliaev, writing in 1927, praised his settings of Kuzmin's Aleksandriiskie pesni, both for their successful fusion of the best traditions of the past, and for their development of a new kind of vocal lyricism that would be more appropriate for the present day:

> In his Aleksandriiskie pesni […] Aleksandrov has presented a range of models of a completely individual vocal style, which is as distinct from the declamatory style of Dargomyzhskii, Musorgskii and their followers, as it is from the melodious style of Chaikovskii and his imitators. […] In his songs, Aleksandrov almost completely avoids the salon style which was so characteristic of Chaikovskii and other Russian Song composers and strives to create a style of art-song that is the expression of an 'objective' lyricism and the direct opposite of the subjective lyricism of the salon romance.[44]

Beliaev had long been a supporter of Aleksandrov, praising his settings of Kuzmin in print throughout the 1920s. In the first edition of Sovremennaia muzyka (Contemporary Music), for instance, he discussed the relationship between the first and second set of songs:

> Aleksandrov's Aleksandriiskie pesni, now complemented by four new romances, is capable of producing a deep and powerful impression. Whoever has heard them performed by the composer in an intimate setting will know how many subtle shades they contain and how profoundly they can stir the listener. This new set is more mature than the first, but is replete with that same smell of freshness and directness of creativity. In it, the composer, whilst remaining true to the style of the earlier set, deepens and underscores the stylistic link by means of allusions to the music of the first set, thereby fusing the two groups of romances, separated from each other by a large gap in time, into a single whole.[45]

Here, Beliaev posits an organic connection between the pre- and post-revolutionary songs, seeing the creative promise of the former fully realized in the latter. He returned to the question of Aleksandrov's place in early Soviet musical aesthetics a few years later:

> Aleksandrov is not a 'modernist', if one can use at all a word which often signifies a total spiritual poverty and contemporary artistic vacuity, masked by a 'contemporary' and 'fashionable' exterior. He is by his very nature a traditionalist, combining in his artistic make-up his talents as a musical performer with an independence of musical thought. As a traditionalist, Aleksandrov is more inclined to develop, deepen and refine the existing achievements of Russian music, than to make new discoveries.[46]

For Beliaev, Aleksandrov's principal accomplishment is to bridge the artistic culture of the past with the demands of a new age. His works embody a spirit of creative continuity, and such continuity is perceived as a necessary feature of early Soviet musical culture.

Such views were common enough in Sovremennaia muzyka, the journal of the Assotsiatsiia sovremmennoi muzyki (often shortened to ASM, Association for Contemporary Music). Despite its name, the association did not espouse a radically avant-garde attitude to the culture of the past. Rather, it aligned itself with what it saw as the best of the heritage of the pre-revolutionary period, as well as with developments in modern Western Europe music. As well as reviewing works by its members, it also included reviews of its own concerts. On 12 November 1924, for instance, Aleksandrov and his wife gave a recital of songs by Karol Szymanowski (including extracts from his settings of Rabindranath Tagore, Hafiz and the Songs of an Infatuated Muezzin, to words by Jarosław Iwaszkiewicz).[47] Then, on 29 April 1928, two of Aleksandrov's own Aleksandriiskie pesni were heard with orchestral accompaniment at a concert held in the Great Hall of the Moscow Conservatoire.[48] An earlier

modernist periodical, K novym beregam (Towards New Shores), very much a precursor to Sovremennaia muzyka, also featured regular reviews of concerts featuring the work of contemporary Russian song composers. On 28 February 1923, Nazarii Raiskii and Aleksandr Gol′denweizer performed a selection of Metner's romances at a concert in Moscow.[49] (Gol′denweizer's involvement is striking, given his close association with pre-revolutionary song culture; in early 1907, for instance, he had played the piano in the premiere of Rakhmaninov's 15 romansov [15 Songs], op. 26, in Moscow.) That spring, the soprano Siranush Kubatskaia gave a concert of Aleksandrov's songs at the Beethoven Hall of Moscow's Bol′shoi Theatre, including the first two volumes of the Aleksandriiskie pesni, which were praised by the reviewer as 'not only the most significant of Aleksandrov's own compositions in particular, but also in the modern Russian art-song literature.'[50] Publications of new vocal works by Georgii Katuar, Aleksandr Krein and Samuil Feinberg were warmly welcomed, as were Prokof′ev's settings of Anna Akhmatova ('so limpidly luminous and exhaustive in their fullness of their expressivity that they leave behind an indelible impression').[51]

Yet what of the proletarian musical associations, which are often seen as the antipode of the early Soviet modernists? To be sure, the works of song composers association with the ASM were briefly the target of hostile criticism in the early 1930s, when the cultural revolution was at its height and the proletarians felt emboldened to unleash a virulent attacked on modernists, formalists and those artists whom Leon Trotskii had earlier called 'fellow travellers'. Writing in Proletarskii muzykant (Proletarian Musician) in early 1931, for instance, Boris Shteinpress criticized the decadence and aestheticism of a number of leading song composers, especially Aleksandrov.[52] Gnesin too found himself condemned both for his early association with so-called Russian decadence, and then for his 'reactionary Jewish nationalism'.[53] Although he refused to renounce his earlier works, claiming that 'one simply

cannot remove the history of the twentieth century from Russian history, that's completely impossible',[54] his emphasis on the continuity of the Russian song tradition found itself in direct opposition to the proletarians' call for a new form of revolutionary culture that rejected the legacy of modernism and looked back to the examples of Beethoven and Musorgskii instead. In fact, the proletarians seem largely to have dismissed, rather than attacked, art-song as a bourgeois genre, focussing primarily on jazz, gypsy music and popular culture as the most dangerous impediments to the development of proletarian culture. Art-song was simply too rarefied, and hence too limited in its potential impact on society, to be the object of sustained ideological criticism.[55]

Paradoxically, however, proletarian organizations could also prove to be surprisingly welcoming of aspects of the art-song tradition, at least in the second half of the 1920s, when the ideological atmosphere was less extreme and when the distinction between the modernists and the proletarians was less clear cut.[56] As well as calling for the development of a new genre, the Soviet 'mass song',[57] critics also emphasized the importance of the legacy of the past, whether in the form of the Russian nineteenth-century tradition (Glinka, Dargomyzhskii and Musorgskii in particular), or the Lieder of Beethoven and Schubert (the centenary of whose death was widely marked in the Soviet Union in 1928).[58] In the second half of the 1920s, even the contemporary Soviet repertoire found itself discussed more generously, and reviews of performances published in Muzyka i revoliutsiia (Music and Revolution), the organ of the Obedinenie revoliutsionnykh kompozitorov i muzykal′nykh deiatelei (Association of Revolutionary Composers and Music Workers), reveal some striking continuities with the pre-Soviet period. In the spring of 1926, Mariia Olenina-Dal′geim, who had not only contributed to the rediscovery of Musorgskii in the early twentieth century, but also done much to promote the song recital as an institution, returned to Moscow for the first time in more than ten years to give three recitals.[59] Like many recitals at the time, these were

broad and anthological in scope: the second (on 21 April) consisted of a selection of folksongs that was followed by romances by Musorgskii, whilst the third (on 8 May) juxtaposed French songs from the medieval period to Gabriel Fauré with Russian songs and Schumann's Frauenliebe und –Leben.[60] Later that month, Vera Dukhovskaia sang works by Chaikovskii, Dargomyzhskii and Glinka, as well as more recent songs by Stravinskii and Gnesin, bringing the contemporary scene into dialogue with the nineteenth century.[61] November 1926 saw recitals by Natal′ia Vesnina (16 October) and Ol′ga Bogoslavskaia (26 October) which included Metner's recent settings of Fet, Tiutchev and Pushkin, and a survey of songs by women composers from the early nineteenth century up to the present day (Iuliia L′vova, Liubov′ Shekhter, Valentina Ramm and Iuliia Veisberg).[62] That December, Kubatskaia offered a historical overview of Russian song that included not only the dilettante romances of the early nineteenth century and works by Chaikovskii and the moguchaia kuchka ('Mighty Handful'), but also romances by Rakhmaninov, Stravinskii, Prokof′ev, Miaskovskii, Krein and Aleksandrov.[63] Song recitals were a prominent feature of Soviet musical life throughout the rest of the 1920s, often combining Russian and foreign repertoires, and making little distinction between pre- and post-revolutionary composers.[64]

If proletarian journals could respond warmly to Soviet Russia's lively culture, then they also carried thoughtful reviews of the contemporary art-song repertoire. In 1926, Anatolii Drozdov reviewed the third volume of Aleksandrov's Aleksandriiskie pesni in terms that were as appreciative of their poetry as they were of their music:

> M. Kuzmin's Aleksandriiskie pesni are one of the rare highpoints in the art of poetry. The poet has taken not the grandly heroic era of classicism, but the late era of its decadence (its waning) and has revealed its very essence, translating every nuance of this interesting way of life. And if the Aleksandriiskie pesni are fascinating in and of

> themselves, then they are doubly interesting as themes for musical composition; the musical element is embedded in the verse form itself of the Aleksandriiskie pesni, and their content calls for musical setting, with its many references to dancing, flutes, tambourines, the sound of the sea, etc. But the challenges of embodying them in music are equally great, and are to be found in the complexity of their rhythmical construction, and – most of all – in the subtlety of the stylistic problem that the stylised theme of the work forces upon the composer. It seems that the main task of the composer in setting the Aleksandriiskie pesni to music should be the preservation of the harmony between musically retrospective means (the evocation of antiquity) and the means available to a contemporary composer. It is precisely this sense of harmony that we can discern in the volume of songs by An. Aleksandrov under review here.[65]

A review of a concert performance of all three groups that took place on 26 February 1927 made similar claims and referred to Aleksandrov's 'radiant, objective and somewhat abstract lyricism' as being 'absolutely alien to modish mannerism, affectedness or shrill innovation'. Yet the critic sounded a note of caution too. Observing that Aleksandrov's musical language had its roots in 'Metner […], Debussy and middle-period Skriabin', he suggested that they were 'very far removed from our contemporary life' and that 'one wishes for something greater, something more modern from such a master of vocal style as Aleksandrov'.[66] If this review suggests that after a decade of continuity and evolution, critics were beginning to seek new things from the art-song repertoire, then there seemed little risk, for the time being at least, that composers would be criticized, whether for their choice of poets, or their musical language. Writing in late 1928, the same critic who had called for Aleksandrov to explore new themes, praised Miaskovskii's recent settings of Del′vig: 'Venok poblekshii [A Faded Garland] should be considered one of the most successful vocal cycles of Miaskovskii and

one of the most interesting works of our art-song literature.' Indeed, Miaskovskii's songs, for all their complexity, were 'probably no less rich and significant than his work in the field of the large musical forms – the symphony and the sonata.'[67]

***

As this article has sought to demonstrate, the Russian art-song tradition did not come to an end at some point before the October Revolution, only to be reborn in its new Soviet guise, whether in the mid-1920s or as part of the implementation of Socialist Realism from the mid-1930s. There were, in fact, organic connections between the various phases of Russian song that came before 1917 – whether the early nineteenth-century dilettante tradition, the 'golden age' of the second half of the nineteenth century or, most importantly, the vital interaction between music and poetry that characterized the turn of the twentieth century – and its development in the early Soviet period. If these continuities have been largely effaced in the most prominent and influential instances of the secondary literature, then they are clearly there to be seen in the periodical literature of the time. Soviet criticism was not alone in overlooking this body of material; Western scholars keen to establish of the early Soviet period in terms of its avant-gardism have equally sought to case 1917 as a moment of decisive rupture, even if for very different reasons.[68] Reconstituting the organic links between Russian modernism of the late Imperial era and the musical culture of the early Soviet period helps to illuminate not only broad continuities between the two, but more crucially, establishes the preconditions for a re-evaluation of the art-song tradition in particular. Viewed in this new light, works such as Dmitrii Shostakovich's Shest′ romansov na slova iaponskikh poetov (Six Romances to text by Japanese Poets), op. 21, may take on new relevance. Composed between 1928 and 1932, they are often read in the context of his work on his opera, Ledi Makbet mtsenskogo uezda, as well as against the background of his relationship

with his first wife, Nina Vazar′. A reading of their literary sources might suggest parallels with Stravinskii's Tri iaponskikh stikhotrovenii (Three Japanese Lyrics, 1912-13), as both sets of songs were based on a volume of Japanese poetry in Russian translation that was published in St Petersburg in 1912.[69] Yet a reading of Shostakovich's songs in terms of their place in the early Soviet song tradition potentially exposes links not to other works by the composer, still less to other settings of related texts, but to the kind of compositions by figures such as Aleksandrov, Gnesin and Miaskovskii that have been considered here, as well as other song composers whose work has get to be considered in any detail. The legacy of turn-of-the-century modernism for early Soviet culture has been extensively explored in the case of literature, yet a similar process has yet to be undertaken when it comes to art-song, and remains an urgent priority for contemporary scholarship, as well as an alluring field for adventurous performers.

---

[1] See, for instance, David Gasperetti, The Rise of the Russian Novel: Carnivalization, Stylization, and Mockery of the West, DeKalb, IL, 1998.

[2] See, most influentially, Richard Taruskin, Defining Russia Musically: Historical and Hermeneutic Essays, Princeton and Oxford, 1997. See too Marina Frolova-Walker, Russian Music and Nationalism: From Glinka to Stalin, New Haven, CT, and London, 2007, and Rutger Helmers, Not Russian Enough?: Nationalism and Cosmopolitanism in Nineteenth-Century Russian Opera, Rochester, NY, 2014.

[3] See, for instance, Richard Taruskin, Opera and Drama in Russia as Preached and Practiced in the 1860s, Ann Arbor, MI, 1981.

[4] Examples here include Rebecca Mitchell, Nietzsche's Orphans: Music, Metaphysics, and the Twilight of the Russian Empire, New Haven, CT, and London, 2015, and Amy Nelson, Music for the Revolution: Musicians and Power in Early Soviet Russia, University Park, PA, 2004.

[5] For treatments of opera which do reach across the revolutionary divide, see Simon Morrison, Russian Opera and the Symbolist Movement, Berkeley, CA, and London, 2002, and Tatyana Sirotina, Russian Opera (1901-1936): Musical Experiments and Paths of Development , unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Manchester, 2007.

[6] Katerina Clark, 'Shostakovich's Turn to the String Quartet and the Debate about Socialist Realism in Music', Slavic Review, 72, 2013, 3, pp. 573-89.

[7] Of the many pressing issues in the historiography of twentieth-century Russian music, a reassessment of the importance of Miaskovskii, both as a creative artist and as a key figure within Soviet music, is one of the most urgent. See, in this respect, Patrick Zuk, 'Nikolay Myaskovsky and the Events of 1948', Music and Letters, 93, 2012, 1, pp. 61-85, and 'Myaskovsky and the "Regimentation" of Soviet Composition', Journal of Musicology, 31 (2014), 3, pp. 354-93.

[8] Although beyond the scope of the present article, Russian art-song in the wake of Rakhmaninov is of considerable interest from the point of view of its musical means and offers case studies as varied and inventive as their composers' taste in poetry, as witnessed by, say, the terse, almost expressionistic musical language of Miaskovskii's songs, particularly his settings of Gippius, and the lush expressivity of Aleksandrov's Kuzmin songs.

[9] On the late 1920s and early 1930s, see Sheila Fitzpatrick (ed.), Cultural Revolution in Russia, 1928-31, Bloomington, IN, 1978, and Fitzpatrick, The Cultural Front: Power and Culture in Revolutionary Russia, Ithaca, NY, and London, 1992. For a study of Russian and early Soviet piano music that traces a similar trajectory, not least because of the prevailing influence of the music of Skriabin on several generations of composers, see Peter Deane Roberts, Modernism in Russian Piano Music: Skriabin, Prokofiev, and their Russian Contemporaries, 2 vols, Bloomington, IN, 1993.

[10] V. A. Vasina-Grossman, Russkii klassicheskii romans XIX veka, Moscow, 1956, p. 299.

[11] Ibid., p. 300.

[12] Ibid., p. 304.

[13] Ibid., pp. 305-6.

[14] Ibid., p. 318.

[15] Ibid., p. 336. For an account of the genesis of the cycle, see Richard D. Sylvester, Rachmaninoff's Complete Songs: A Companion with Texts and Translations, Bloomington and Indianapolis, IN, 2014, pp. 234-56. See too Marietta Shaginian, 'Vospominaniia o Sergee Vasil′eviche Rakhmaninove', in Sobranie sochinenii, 9 vols, Moscow, 1971-75, 9, pp. 363-436.

[16] V. A. Vasina-Grossman, Mastera sovetskogo romansa, Moscow: Muzyka, 1968; 2nd edn 1980, p. 102 (here and subsequently, all references will be to the revised, second edition).

[17] Ibid., p. 11.

[18] Ibid., p. 107.

[19] Ibid., p. 43.

[20] Ibid., p. 35.

[21] See, for instance, Marina Raku, Muzykal′naia klassika v mifotvorchestve sovetskoi epokhi, Moscow, 2014, and Pauline Fairclough, Classics for the Masses: Shaping Soviet Musical Identity Under Lenin and Stalin, New Haven and London, 2016. A return to the classics was not limited to official culture at this time, even if it was partly dictated by political factors. For a study that explores how a series of writers – Iurii Tynianov, Vladislav Khodasevich and Mikhail Bulgakov – appropriated the legacy of Pushkin in their own writing, see Angela Brintlinger, Writing a Usable Past: Russian Literary Culture 1917-1937, Evanston, IL, 2000.

[22] Vasina-Grossman, Mastera sovetskogo romansa, p. 37.

[23] G. Soboleva, Russkii romans, Moscow, 1980, and Russkii sovetskii romans, Moscow, 1985. See too V. Muzakelevskii, Sovremennaia tema v russkom sovetskom romanse, Leningrad, 1964, for an attempt to connect the social engagement of the contemporary Soviet romance with the nineteenth-century tradition, bypassing turn-of-the-century modernism almost entirely.

[24] Boris Asaf′ev, Russian Music from the Beginning of the Nineteenth Century, trans. Alfred J. Swan, Ann Arbor, MI, 1953, pp. 89-90.

[25] B. V. Asaf′ev (ed.), Russkii romans: opyt intonatsionnogo analiza, Moscow and Leningrad, 1930.

[26] Igor′ Glebov, Romansy S. I. Taneeva, Petrograd, 1916, and Russkaia poeziia v russkoi muzyki, Petersburg, 1921; Petrograd, 1922.

[27] G. K. Ivanov (ed.), Russkaia poeziia v otechestvennoi muzyke (do 1917 goda), 2 vols, Moscow, 1966-9. The major anthologies of Russian songs texts included in the Biblioteka poeta series are I. N. Rozanov (ed.), Pesni russkikh poetov (XVIII-pervaia polovina XIX veka), Leningrad, 1936, and Pesni russkikh poetov, 2nd edn, Leningrad, 1950, and Pesni russkikh poetov, 3rd edn, Leningrad, 1957; and V. E. Gusev (ed.), Pesni i romansy russkikh poetov, 2nd edn, Moscow and Leningrad, 1965, and Pesni russkikh poetov, 3rd edn, 2 vols (Leningrad, 1988).

[28] Bibliographies of modernist poetry set to music include Boris Rosenfel′d (ed.), Anna Akhmatova, Marina Tsvetaeva, Osip Mandel'shtam i Boris Pasternak v muzyke: notografiia, Stanford, CA, 2003, Pavel Nerler and Aleksandr Dunaevskii, 'Notografiia: muzykal'nye sochineniia na stikhi Osipa Mandel′shtama', Sem′ iskusstv, 1 (2016), and P. V. Dmitriev (ed.), Poeziia Viacheslava Ivanova v russkoi muzyke: notograficheskii spravochnik prizhiznennykh publikatsii, 1913-48, St Petersburg, 2013. Surveys of song in this period include T. Levaia,

'Poeziia simvolizma v romansovoi lirike', in Russkaia muzyka nachala XX veka v khudozhestvennom kontekste epokhi, Moscow, 1991, pp. 41-56 and Konstantin Pluzhnikov, Zabytye stranitsy russkogo romansa, St Petersburg, 2004.

[29] For a survey of these works, see N. Rogozhina, Romansy i pesni S. S. Prokof'eva, Moscow, 1971, and Philip Ross Bullock, 'The Songs of Sergei Prokofiev: Texts and Contexts, Imitations and Interrogations', Three Oranges, 11, 2006, pp. 17-22. On the Soviet period in particular, see Eugenia E. Joukova, The Songs and Song Cycles of Sergei Prokofiev (1930-1950), unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2007.

[30] Richard Taruskin, 'Stravinsky's "Rejoicing Discovery": In Defense of His Notorious Text-Setting', in Ethan Haimo and Paul Johnson (eds), Stravinsky Retrospectives, Lincoln, 1987, pp. 162-99. For a pithy overview of Stravinsky's songs see Richard Taruskin, 'In Stravinsky's Songs, the True Man, No Ghostwriters', in Russian Music at Home and Abroad, Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, 2016, pp. 503-7.

[31] M. F. G., 'Obraztsy pitmicheskoi interpretatsii stikha u russkikh kompozitorov', Liubov′ k trem apel′sinam, 1914, 1, pp. 48-51. Brief accounts of Gnesin's lectures on 'musical reading in drama' were published in Liubov′ k trem apel′sinam, 1914, 1, p. 60, and 2, 1914, pp. 60-61. See too S. Bondi, 'O "muzykal′nom chtenii" M. F. Gnesina', in M. F. Gnesin, Stat′i, vospominaniia, materialy, ed. R. V. Glezer, Moscow, 1961, pp. 80-101.

[32] Gnesin was not alone in moving away from literary and musical modernism towards an interest in Jewish national music. See, for instance, Leonid Sabaneev, Aleksandr Abramovich Krein (Moscow, 1928), which traces Krein's early interest in leading modernist poets such as Blok, as well as his subsequent interest in Jewish texts. See too Sabaneev, Evreiskaia national′naia shkola v muzyke, Moscow, 1924. An interest in modernist poetry was not necessarily incompatible with a commitment to Jewish cultural politics, and one cannot assume that a turn to Jewish nationalism was a direct corollary of Soviet nationalism. For an overview of Gnesin's career which highlights his pre-revolutionary interest in Zionism – 'another messianic dream' to match his interest in the Revolution, see James Loeffler, The Most Musical Nation: Jews and Culture in the Late Russian Empire, New Haven and London, 2010, pp. 202-9. Gnesin also makes a number of appearances in Klára Móricz's study of the activities of the Obshchestvo evreiskoi narodnoi muzyki (Society for Jewish Folk Music), founded in St Petersburg in 1908 and reorganized after 1917 as the Obshchestvo evreiskoi muzyki (Society for Jewish Music). Significantly, part of the work of the society involved creating a 'classical' art-song repertoire out of a song culture that had largely been a folkloric one up to that point, even if doing so was achieved by taking the stock formulae of Russian musical orientalism and applying them to Jewish works. See Klára Móricz,

'Jewish Nationalism à la Russe: The Society for Jewish Folk Music', in Jewish Identities: Nationalism, Racism, and Utopianism in Twentieth-Century Music, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London, 2008, pp. 11-91.

[33] The publication of Madrigal in Vienna forms of the collaboration between leading Soviet composers of the 1920s and early 1930s and the Viennese published, Universal Edition, which has been studied in detail in Olesia Bobrik, Venskoe izdatel′stvo 'Universal Edition' i muzykanty iz sovetskoi Rossii: istoriia sotrudnichestva v 1920-30-e gody, St Petersburg, 2011.

[34] Publication details compiled on the basis of Russian library holdings and on N. Miaskovskii, Izbrannye proizvedeniia, ed. R. Glier et al., 12 vols, Moscow, 1953-6, 11: Vokal′nye proizvedeniia.

[35] These, along with other works by Miaskovskii, were published by Muzfond, and may possibly reflect a decision by the Composers' Union to use its financial resources to support the composer. The relative autonomy of Muzfond at this time has been adduced as one of the major reasons behind the attacks on Shostakovich, Miaskovskii, Prokof′ev and other leadings composers in 1948, when the Union was broad more decisively under centralized control. See Kirill Tomoff, Creative Union: The Professional Organization of Soviet Composers, 1939-1953, Ithaca, NY, and London, 2006.

[36] 'Doklad general′nogo sekretaria soiuza sovetskikh kompozitorov T. Khrennikova', in M. Koval′ et al. (eds), Pervyi vsesoiuznyi s′′ezd sovetskikh kompozitorov: stenograficheskii otchet, Moscow, 1948, pp. 26-7, cited in Patrik [i.e. Patrick] Zuk, 'Romansy N. Miaskovskogo na slova Z. Gippius', in N. Deriareva and N. Braginskaia (eds), Sankt-Peterburgskaia konservatoriia v mirovom muzykal'nom prostranstve: kompozitorskie, ispolnitel′skie, nauchnie shkoly 1862-2012, St Petersburg, 2013, pp. 218-23 (p. 223). Writing of Miaskovskii's Lermontov settings in 1938, Vasina-Grossman welcomed them as a departure from the heightened declamatory style of the early Gippius songs and a turn towards a more relaxed form of vocal style. See V. Grossman, 'Lermontovskie romansy N. Ia. Miaskovskogo', Sovetskoe iskusstvo, 2 October 1938, reprinted in N. Ia. Miaskovskii, Sobranie materialov, 2nd edn, 2 vols (Moscow, 1964), 1, pp. 140-43.

[37] An. Aleksandrov, Vokal′nye sochinenii, 4 vols, Moscow, 1970-73.

[38] The major disruption caused by the interruption of the First World War, the Russian Revolutions of 1917 and then the Civil War is a further factor in the delayed publication of many songs written around this time. Many of the songs of Artur Lur′e, for instance, were published only after the October Revolution, despite belonging more properly to the twilight of Imperial Petersburg.

[39] For a study of Kuzmin's settings of his own poetry, see Philip Ross Bullock, '"An Era of Eros": Hellenic Lyricism in the Early Twentieth-Century Russian Art-Song', in Katerina Levidou, Katy Romanou and George

Vlastov (eds), Musical Receptions of Greek Antiquity: From the Romantic Era to Modernism, Newcastle-Upon-Tyne, 2016, pp. 260-95.

[40] Only the first three books of Aleksandrov's settings are included in the 1970s edition of his vocal works, although Vasina-Grossman gives details of the fourth book in Mastera sovetskogo romansa, p. 107.

[41] Ibid., p. 102.

[42] L. L. Sabaneev, Muzyka posle Oktiabria, Moscow, 1926, p. 93.

[43] Ibid., p. 94.

[44] V. Beliaev, Anatolii Nikolaevich Aleksandrov, Moscow, 1927, pp. 13-14.

[45] V. Beliaev, review of Anatolii Aleksandrov, Aleksandriiskie pesni. Tetrad′ 2aia, Petrograd, 1923, Sovremennaia muzyka, 1924, 1, pp. 26-7.

[46] Viktor Beliaev, 'Anatolii Aleksandrov', Sovremennaia muzyka, 1926, 12, pp. 47-51 (p. 48).

[47] Sovremennaia muzyka, 1924, 4, p. 126.

[48] Sovremennaia muzyka, 1928, 28, p. 105.

[49] 'Khronika, kontserty', K novym beregam, 1923, 1, pp. 46-50. See too Beliaev's laudatory review of new editions of Metner's op. 36 settings of Pushkin (1915) and op. 37 settings of Tiutchev and Fet (1918-20), as well as Sabaneeev's short article on the composer in the following edition. K novym beregam, 1923, 1, p. 60, and L. Sabaneev, 'Metner', K novym beregam, 1923, 2, pp. 21-5. See too V. V. Iakovlev, Nikolai Karlovich Metner, Moscow, 1927.

[50] A. V., 'Khronika, kontserty', K novym beregam, 1923, 2, pp. 56-62. In Music of the Soviet Era: 1917-1991, 2nd edn (Abingdon and New York, 2016), Levon Hakobian gives the date of this recital as 24 March 1923. Elsewhere, he notes other performance of the various volumes of Iz 'Aleksandriiskikh pesen' on 28 April 1925 and 5 October 1929.

[51] A. Versilov, review of Sergei Prokof′ev, op 9, op. 18, op. 27, K novym beregam, 1923, 3, p. 52.

[52] B. Shteinpress, 'Protiv burzhuaznykh tendentsii v muzyke', Proletarskii muzykant, 1931, 2 (20), pp. 28-9.

[53] D. Zhitomirskii, '"Povest′ o ryzhem Motele" Mikh. Gnesina', Proletarskii muzykant, 1931, 10 (28), pp. 27-31 (p. 31).

[54] B. D., '"Ia slozhnyi chelovek". M. F. Gnesin o sebe i okruzhaiushchei deistvitel′nosti', Proletarskii muzykant, 1931, 8 (26), pp. 22-30 (p. 22).

[55] For studies of changing Soviet attitudes to popular culture, see in particular Richard Stites, Russian Popular Culture: Entertainment and Society since 1900, Cambridge, 1992, and David MacFadyen, Songs for Fat People:

Affect, Emotion, and Celebrity in the Russian Popular Song, 1900-1950, Montreal and Ithaca, 2002. Fairclough likewise notes the widespread hostility among the proletarian musical groups towards popular culture, rather than classical art music (Classics for the Masses, pp. 50-57).

[56] For a documentary study of early Soviet musical politics that gives a good impression of such blurred boundaries and shifting allegiances, see Marina Frolova-Walker and Jonathan Walker, Music and Soviet Power, 1917-1932, Woodbridge, 2012.

[57] L. Shul′yn, 'Massovaia pesnia', Muzyka i revoliutsiia, 1926, 2, pp. 18-20, and D. Rovinskii, 'O massovykh pesniakh', Muzyka i revoliutsiia, 1926, 2, p. 33.

[58] See, for instance, M. Ivanov-Boretskii's review of Beethoven's settings of Scottish folksongs in Proletarskii muzykant, 1931, 5 (23), pp. 47-8, or the list of cheap and accessible editions of songs that was published in Za proletarskaia muzyka, 1930, 1, p. 30. See too M. Bruk, 'Shubert i ego pesni', Za proletarskuiu muzyku, 1931, 16 (26), pp. 6-12.

[59] Alexander Tumanov, The Life and Artistry of Maria Olenina d'Alheim, trans. Christopher Barnes, Edmonton, 2000.

[60] Vs. Liutsh, 'Kamernye kontserty vokalistov', Muzyka i revoliutsiia, 1926, 5, p. 31.

[61] Ibid.

[62] Vs. Liutsh, 'Kamernye vechera vokalistov', Muzyka i revoliutsiia, 1926, 11, pp. 31-2.

[63] Vs. Liutsh, 'Kamernye vechera vokalistov', Muzyka i revoliutsiia, 1926, 12, p. 31.

[64] See, for instance, Georgeii Poliakovskii, 'Avtorskii kontsert S. N. Vasilenko, Muzyka i revoliutsiia, 1927, 2, p. 31, and regular reviews by Vs. Liutsh: 'Kontsery vokalistov', Muzyka i revoliutsiia, 1927, 2, p. 33; 'Kontserty vokalistov', 1927, 3, p. 35; 'Kontserty vokalistov', 1927, 4, p. 32; 'Kontserty vokalistov', 1927, 5-6, p. 45; 'Kontserty vokalistov', 1927, 10, pp. 27-8; 'Kontserty vokalistov', 1927, 12, pp. 30-31; 'Kontserty vokalistov', 1928, 2, p. 33; 'Kontserty vokalistov', 1928, 3, pp. 38-9; 'Kontserty vokalistov' and 'Vecher frantsuskoi pesni', 1928, 5-6, pp. 48-9; 'Itogi vokal'nykh kontsertov', 1928, 2, pp. 34-5; and 'Obzor vokal'nykh kontsertov', 1929, 3, pp. 37-8.

[65] A. Drozdov, review of An. Aleksandrov, Iz 'Aleksandriiskikh pesen' M. Kuzmina. Tetr. III, 1926, Muzyka i revoliutsiia, 1926, 6, pp. 39-40 (p. 39).

[66] Vs. Liutsh, 'Avtorskii vecher An. Aleksandrova', Muzyka i revoliutsiia, 1927, 3, p. 34.

[67] Vs. Liutsh, Review of N. Miaskovskii, op. 22, Venok poblekshii, Muzyka i revoliutsiia, 1928, 10, pp. 45-6 (p.45).

[68] See, for instance, Larry Sitsky, Music of the Repressed Russian Avant-Garde, 1900-1929, Westport and London, 1994. Similarly, Detlew Gojowy's emphasis on avant-gardism leads him to misread the profound influence of the Russian Silver Age on the work of Artur Lur′e. See Arthur Lourié und der russische Futurismus, Laaber, 1993, as well as his Neue sowjetische Musik der 20er Jahre, Laaber, 1980. For an influential attempt at distinguishing between modernism and a more politically engaged avant-garde, see Peter Bürger, Theory of the Avant-Garde, trans. Michael Shaw, Minneapolis, 1984.

[69] G. Kopytova, 'Poeticheskie istochniki vokal′nogo tsikla D. D. Shostakovicha (Shest′ romansov na slova iaponskikh poetov', in O. Digonskaia and L. Kovnatskaia (eds), Dmitrii Shostakovich: Issledovaniia i materialy. Vypusk 3. Moscow, 2011, pp. 176-205.