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Abstract

After the End: New Music in Russia from Perestroika to the Present

by

William Norbert Quillen

Doctor of Philosophy in Music

University of California, Berkeley

Professor Richard Taruskin, Chair

This dissertation is an historical, stylistic, and sociological analysis of new Russian music from the mid 1980s until today. It examines how Russia’s social transformations of the past quarter century have affected the way composers write music and critics write about it. As a case study, it focuses on the works, activities, and critical reception of Russia’s “middle generation” of modernist composers – that is, those composers born in the 1940s and 50s who entered the professional ranks before perestroika and were middle-aged at the time of the Soviet collapse. The study is organized longitudinally, tracing these composers’ activities and critical reception from the mid 1980s onward. As a point of comparison, the dissertation looks, too, at the activities and reception of Russia’s first post-Soviet generation, educated during the 90s and who entered the professional ranks in the 2000s. The study is based upon interviews with composers, musicians, and musicologists conducted throughout 2007-08, along with analyses of recent musical works, archival research, and readings from the contemporary Russian musicological literature and musical press. It focuses almost exclusively on music and musical life in Moscow, the site of the author’s research.

This dissertation argues that social conditions during the late Soviet era bred a high degree of group cohesiveness and artistic likemindedness among modernist composers. As these social conditions changed, this cohesiveness and likemindedness largely dissipated. With the collapse of the Soviet system, modernist composers in Russia could no longer rely upon the same well-worn networks for information. At the same time, they enjoyed new opportunities to pursue careers abroad, develop new professional relationships and peer groups, and court new patrons. As a result, the homogeneous group approaches common in Soviet modern music circles of the 1980s gave way to an increasing diversity of styles during the 90s and beyond.

These stylistic developments were motivated not just by aesthetic concerns, but also by changes in the resource environment within which professional composers worked. With the end of the Soviet system, domestic institutions supporting composers largely collapsed, too. European organizations, especially government foundations and contemporary music groups, became the main source of support for Russian new music composers. Facing an institutional vacuum at home, integration with Europe—professional, personal, and stylistic—provided Russian composers the best strategy for preserving and advancing their careers. Those composers who chose to participate in European networks had strong incentive to conform to the stylistic norms expected within them. The more thoroughly one could conform to these norms
and demonstrate professional aptitude in the eyes of European colleagues, the more likely he or she was to be accepted into these networks as a peer, thus gaining greater access to funding and career opportunities. As detailed in chapters 3 and 5, these stylistic adaptations took several forms: while some composers wrote pieces in the early 90s proving conversance with recent trends in new European music, others purged from their works features perceived as too old-fashioned or Soviet.

This study looks, too, at composers’ perception of their position in post-Soviet society – and, more broadly, debates in Russia today about the status of classical music in contemporary Russian life. While many of the musicians featured in this study have emerged as “winners” in the post-Soviet transition, having gained in prestige or benefitted materially since 1991, most report feeling more like “losers,” stranded in a society that little values their talents. These feelings of social irrelevance were amplified by the rapidity of the Soviet collapse and the quickness with which domestic institutions supporting and honoring composers have deteriorated. In the past few years, various groups have proposed programs of reform to fix Russian music and return it to its position of prominence. For some, the solution lies in emulating the cultural institutions of Western Europe; for others, Russian music’s salvation lies not in emulating the West, but in rejecting it, and restoring to Russian music the qualities of tunefulness and beauty eroded from the 60s onward by the corrosive effects of the avant-garde.
To mom, in memory of dad
And, to Hedy
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Preface

The title of this dissertation may promise more than the work can deliver. Although billed as a study of new music in Russia, it focuses almost exclusively on music and musical life in Moscow. The new music scenes in St. Petersburg and other Russian cities are touched upon only briefly, if at all.

This bias came about largely through circumstance. Most of the research for this dissertation was conducted during 2007-08, which I spent as a visiting student at the Moscow Conservatory. Throughout my student year I immersed myself in Moscow’s musical organizations and concert life. When it came time to write up my research, I decided to focus on the city where I had come to know the new music organizations and their key players fairly well, and to overlook other cities, whose networks and organizations I knew much less about.

Practical considerations prompted one more decision regarding the scope of this study. Because I wanted to write about how composers and musicians have adapted to Russia’s ongoing social transformations, I decided to limit my study to those composers who still live in Moscow, and whom I was able to interview during my yearlong research period there. Individuals who emigrated from the USSR or the Russian Federation are either omitted from this dissertation or discussed up to the point of their departure.

What remains, then, is a narrowly focused study of a select group of Moscow musicians and their works and reception during the past quarter century. Despite its selectivity, I believe that the events and conditions it describes are sufficiently representative so that its conclusions will prove applicable beyond the specific group featured within, and that it will help illustrate the impact of Russia’s social changes upon music and musical life there from the mid 1980s until today.
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Chapter 1  Cage, 1988, and Alternativa

In March 1985, a young party secretary from the Stavropol region in Russia’s far south was chosen as the seventh General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. At barely fifty-four years of age, Mikhail Gorbachev was by far the youngest member of the Soviet inner circle, and fifteen to twenty years younger than his two predecessors had been at the time they took office. The Soviet Union Gorbachev inherited was stable, albeit slowly deteriorating. Although Soviet industry produced large quantities of goods, quality was poor and productivity low. A spike in oil prices, the Soviet Union’s number one export, allowed the state to keep prices of food and other necessities artificially low, though by the state’s own figures a deep recession was underway. Life expectancy was falling, infant mortality was rising, and the country was mired in a costly and unwinnable war in Afghanistan. Most troublesome, the state was crippled by a bloated and ineffective bureaucracy characterized by secrecy and infighting; the KGB reportedly used spy satellites to determine the yield of Central Asian cotton harvests, as official government reports so distorted figures as to make them useless.

These problems became painfully clear in late April 1986 when Reactor No. 4 at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant exploded, contaminating a large parcel of land in the western Soviet Union and spreading a radioactive plume throughout much of the earth’s atmosphere. The explosion at the reactor was caused by an ill-trained and poorly equipped technical staff, while the devastating after-effects—particularly the scores of unnecessary deaths caused by the authorities’ slow response in evacuating contaminated areas—were the direct result of the Soviet bureaucracy’s culture of secrecy and misinformation.

In mid-1986, Gorbachev launched a series of reforms to help rebuild the Soviet system and achieve the Leninist ideals from which the state had long since strayed. Entitled perestroika—which means “rebuilding” or “restructuring”—Gorbachev’s program had three inter-related goals: to reform the economy and close the staggering gap in living standards between the Soviet Union and the West; to establish a new partnership with the West and end the arms race (thus freeing up the nearly thirty percent of the Soviet GDP dedicated to defense); and to dial back the USSR’s imperial ambitions from Afghanistan to Eastern Europe.

1 Gorbachev’s immediate predecessor, Konstantin Chernenko (1911-85; General Secretary, 1984-85) was 73 when appointed General Secretary, while his predecessor, Yuriy Andropov (1914-84; General Secretary, 1982-84), was 68, and severely ill with kidney disease. Andropov’s predecessor, Leonid Brezhnev (1906-82, General Secretary, 1964-82), whose name is synonymous with Soviet gerontocracy, was only 56 when named General Secretary, though throughout his last decade, his health rapidly declined and he frequently slurred words in televised speeches, the result of numerous minor strokes. At the beginning of the 1980s, the average age of the Soviet politburo was 70.

Although Gorbachev was in fact the last functioning General Secretary, technically he was not the last: after Gorbachev resigned on August 24, 1991, in the aftermath of the August Coup, Vladimir Ivashko (1932-1994) served as acting General Secretary for the next five days, until he resigned on August 29.

2 For example, the AvtoVAZ automobile factory produced more cars than any other factory on earth, but each car took 30 times more manpower than factories in Japan or the U.S. See Stephen Kotkin, Armageddon Averted: The Soviet Collapse, 1970-2000 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), caption to Figure 6b.


4 Service, A History of Twentieth-Century Russia, 445-46.

these reforms was the new policy of glasnost’, or “openness,” through which Gorbachev sought to make the government’s activities transparent and responsive to citizens’ critiques. Gorbachev envisioned his reforms as a process carefully controlled from above and believed they would help rally the state’s citizens behind the Soviet project. In reality, of course, the exact opposite happened, as Gorbachev’s top-down reforms helped sprout numerous bottom-up social and political movements that soon tore the Soviet Union asunder.

In mid-1986, and largely in response to the Chernobyl accident and its disastrous cover-up, Gorbachev launched a series of directives to help end the Soviet culture of secrecy and permit a freer exchange of ideas and information. In June 1986, he instructed Glavlit [Glavnoye upravleniye po delam literaturï i iskusstv], the main state agency overseeing publishing activities, to loosen its censorship standards. Around the same time, Gorbachev appointed new editors at three main publications—the weekly newspapers Arguments and Facts [Argumenti i fakty] and Moscow News [Moskovskaïe novosti] and the weekly magazine Ogonyok [“The Little Flame,” better known in English by its Russian name]—with explicit instructions to print articles and letters on a wide variety of previously off-limit topics, from critiques of the war in Afghanistan to social ills such as drug abuse and poverty.  

For much of 1986 and 1987, the effects of glasnost’ and perestroika were largely limited to the pages of these and other press outlets, and much of Soviet life remained unchanged. Though letters critical of the government began to fill the pages of newspapers and magazines, state agencies continued to strictly patrol its citizens’ activities, including those in the area of arts and culture. In 1986, Moscow conceptual artist Dmitriy Prigov (1940-2007) was detained by the KGB and remanded to a state psychiatric hospital, a common punishment for dissidents, and the KGB continued to raid unregistered art exhibitions for the next year and a half. In 1987, well into Gorbachev’s relaxation of literary censorship, Moscow pianist and composer Anton Batagov (b. 1965) was discouraged from recording Messiaen’s Vingt regards sur l’Enfant-Jésus (1944), which he had already performed on numerous occasions, due to the work’s religious title. As Batagov explains,

[In 1987] I went to the state radio channel. They knew about me, as I’d already recorded some Ravel piano works and something else for them, and I said, “I’d like to record Messiaen.” They said, “You know, it would be great, but there is one thing: if we broadcast it, we cannot announce the complete title, because ‘Jesus’... we cannot say that.”


Prigov was released within two days thanks to the protests of his wife, Nadezhda Burova. Andrew Solomon recounts this story in his The Irony Tower: Soviet Artists in a Time of Glasnost (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1991), 124-25.

The next year, with glasnost’ well underway, the state recording firm Melodiya contacted Batagov and asked him to record the work, which it released on a three-disc set in 1990.9

By the end of 1987, the tide was beginning to turn, and decisively so. As a central feature of glasnost’, Gorbachev encouraged the Soviet government and citizens alike to discuss, explore, and critique suppressed or whitewashed chapters of the Soviet past. Journalist David Remnick effectively terms this new mood “The Return of History.”10 In November 1987, Gorbachev delivered a major speech, televised nationally, tallying many of the party’s most egregious abuses of power throughout its history.11 Around the same time, numerous grassroots movements sprung up throughout the Union to condemn long-unspoken chapters of Soviet history. This “Return of History” soon posed an existential threat to the USSR itself. Popular fronts—national self-determination movements—were organized in the Baltic republics to protest the 1939 Molotov Ribbentrop Pact which ceded these territories to the USSR, details of which were coming to light for the first time. Meanwhile, inter-ethnic violence broke out in several republics to avenge age-old grievances forcibly suppressed during Soviet rule. These developments quickly blossomed into fully-fledged secessionist movements. In 1988, the local government of Karabakh, an ethnically Armenian region Stalin annexed to the Azerbaijan SSR, declared the territory a part of Armenia, helping ignite a brutal war that raged throughout the early 1990s, and in February 1990 the parliament of Lithuania announced its intent to secede from the USSR. The Lithuanians’ announcement was followed shortly thereafter by similar declarations from Estonia and Latvia. In one of the most stunning developments of the era, in June 1990 the Russian Soviet republic (RSFSR) itself effectively seceded from the Soviet Union, declaring that the republic’s laws superseded the USSR’s.12

By early 1988, glasnost’ and perestroika were in full bloom. No aspect of Soviet life or culture went unaffected by these profound and immediate changes. In music, glasnost’ meant, perhaps most immediately, the end of all prohibitions on the basis of style or genre. Suddenly, any piece could be performed or recorded without restriction, in stark opposition to Batagov’s experience with Messiaen’s work at the state radio only a few months before. These new freedoms were seen most immediately in the glut of new festivals that mushroomed up at the end of the 1980s celebrating a wide variety of previously under-explored repertoires, genres, and styles.13 As early as 1986, composer Mark Belodubrovsky (b. 1941) had established a festival celebrating the works of early twentieth-century modernist composer Nikolay Roslavets (1881-1944) in Bryansk, Roslavets’ native city. In 1987, Moscow hosted its first annual Days of Ancient Music early music festival, followed the next year by a major summer rock festival in Tallinn. In a sign of resurgent interest in national culture, Moscow hosted, in 1988, its First International Festival of Folklore. Folk music festivals soon sprouted up in numerous regional capitals, including Tbilisi, Baku, and Alma-Ata, as separatist movements spread throughout the USSR’s republics. The new freedoms of glasnost’ allowed, too, increased opportunities for international cooperation, and in March 1988 several Soviet musicians, including Denisov,

---

10 See Remnick, Lenin’s Tomb, 36-51.
11 Ibid., 49-51.
12 For an overview of these developments, see Kotkin, Armageddon Averted, 58-112.
13 The festivals mentioned here are a small sample of the many that took place during glasnost’. Information about these festivals was compiled from materials found in the kartoteka of the Informatsionno-bibliograficheskii otdel of the Moscow Conservatory’s Taneev Music Library [Nauchno–muzikal’naya biblioteka im. S.I. Taneyeva].
Schnittke, and Gubaidulina, traveled to Boston for the “Making Music Together” festival, co-organized by Sarah Caldwell and Rodion Shchedrin.\(^\text{14}\) Amidst these festivals, one event stood out as especially representative of the changes then unfolding in Soviet society. In May 1988, the Composers’ Union of the USSR hosted the Third International Music Festival in Leningrad, a thirteen-day festival of contemporary music held at Leningrad’s most prestigious venues, including the Great and Small Halls of the Leningrad Philharmonic, the Leningrad House of Composers, and the Glinka State Academic Capella. This Third International Festival continued in the wake of the First and Second Festivals, held in Moscow in 1981 and 1984. These first two festivals were largely anodyne Soviet affairs remarkable mainly for the huge geographic diversity of composers represented—the Second Festival, for example, featured 113 composers from over 40 countries, including North Korea, Nigeria, and Afghanistan.\(^\text{15}\) Despite this geographic diversity, these festivals’ programming was extremely conservative, though the 1984 festival did feature a provocative performance by the Soloists of the Bol’shoy Theater ensemble, conducted by Aleksandr Lazarev and with soprano Nelli Li, that included Schnittke’s *Three Madrigals* [*Tri madrigala*] (1980), Berio’s *Folk Songs* (1964), and Crumb’s *Ancient Voices of Children* (1970).\(^\text{16}\)

For the Third Festival, which took place as *perestroika* and *glasnost’* were coming into full bloom, the Composers’ Union drastically reversed course. Tikhon Khrennikov (1913-2007), then beginning his forty-first year as the Secretary of the Composers’ Union, signaled a deliberate shift in the festival’s direction in prefatory remarks printed in the festival booklet. As Khrennikov explained, the festival’s new direction represented the Composers’ Union’s attempt to “capture the spirit” of *glasnost’*:

> The last two festivals, which took place in Moscow, fully accomplished everything they set out to do. They brought together several remarkable artists of today and introduced a broad audience to dozens of compositions written by twentieth-century composers from all ends of planet.

> This year’s festival continues these traditions, all the while pursuing its own specific goals. In the past, when putting together the programs, we emphasized twentieth-century classics; when incorporating contemporary compositions, we gave priority to works composed in a style familiar to us. Today, on the other hand, the festival’s organizers have attempted to overlook all stylistic boundaries and expand the festival’s thematic horizons. Because of this, listeners will enjoy a multi-faceted panorama, unprecedented in scope, of

\(^{14}\) As Michael Kurtz points out, this festival was a disappointment: it had been badly organized and poorly publicized and, as a result, audiences were small. See Kurtz, trans. Christoph K. Lohmann, *Sofia Gubaidulina: A Biography* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2007), 199-200. Laurel Fay also discusses these administrative problems in her article “The Russians Came,” *Musical America* 108, no. 5 (1988): 23-25.


\(^{16}\) Polin, “Moscow Festival Diary,” 38.
contemporary musical art. Listeners can draw comparisons, critique, and evaluate this music for themselves. I am convinced that this democratic approach perfectly captures the spirit of the times, corresponding to the creative atmosphere in our country today and the new stage in our international relations and cultural life.

[signed, T. Khrennikov]^{17}

The “unprecedented panorama” described by Khrennikov amounted to a veritable Who’s Who of European and American contemporary music. The Third International Festival featured performances of works by John Adams, Luciano Berio, Pierre Boulez, György Kurtag, Helmut Lachenmann, György Ligeti, Olivier Messiaen, Luigi Nono, Wolfgang Rihm, Tōru Takemitsu, Iannis Xenakis, and Ellen Taaffe Zwilich, along with works by Soviet modernists including Osvaldas Balakauskas, Denisov, Gubaidulina, Giya Kancheli, Schnittke, and Pēteris Vasks.^{18} Several of these composers attended the festival. The festival also included a guest appearance by the Billy Taylor jazz combo, which performed jazz classics and Bashkir folk music “arranged for jazz,” as well as a performance, on the festival’s closing day, of the Requiem (1985) by Andrew Lloyd Webber, whose music was influential upon several Leningrad musicians.^{19}

One of the festival’s featured composers, though, stood out above the rest. On the second full day of the festival, the Soloists of the Bol’shoy Theater ensemble performed music by John Cage, the first officially-sponsored performance of Cage in the Soviet Union. More significantly, Cage traveled to Leningrad for the performance, where he participated actively at the festival and met with Soviet musicians, including students at the Leningrad Conservatory. Cage’s visit was one of the watershed moments of glasnost’, indicating how radically things had changed in so little time: as Dmitriy Ukhov wryly summarized, “[In 1988], the city on the Neva River [Leningrad] hosted the epitome of decadent evil, according to communist music critique.”^{20}

^{17} Tikhon Khrennikov, Preface to the program booklet “Tretiy mezhdunarodny muzikal’nyy festival’ v SSSR. Leningrad 20 maya – 1 iyunya 1988.” Sincerest thanks to Aleksandr Radvilovich for lending me his copy of this booklet.

^{18} The festival was reviewed extensively in the Soviet press, including in the newspapers Pravda, Izvestiya, and Sovetskaya kul’tura. It was widely reviewed, too, in Soviet musicological journals. See, for example, the back-to-back articles by Leonid Hrabovsky [Grabovsky] (“Blesk i nemnogo nishchet’”) and Natal’ya Zeyfas (“Posle tovaryshchestva k nezavisimym diskutantam”) in Sovetskaya muzika 10 (1988): 2-16. The title of Zeyfas’ article, which in English might be translated as “Afterward to a dialogue that did not take place,” refers to original plans for the article, proposed either by Sovetskaya muzika editors or the authors, for Hrabovsky and Zeyfas to write a joint review of the Third International Festival. Due to a difference of opinions about the festival, she and Hrabovsky ended up writing separate reviews.

In 1991, the German firm Col Legno issued a six-disc set of recordings made at the festival, III International Music Festival Leningrad 88 (AU 31806, 1991).


This chapter examines Cage’s 1988 visit to the Soviet Union and its numerous ramifications, both artistic and institutional. It begins with a detailed examination of the theory and practice of Cage’s ideas in Soviet unofficial music of the 1970s and ‘80s. Though vilified by Soviet officialdom, Cage was extremely influential in late Soviet musical life, and the ways in which Soviet musicians understood and practiced his ideas help illuminate important developments in Russian music during perestroika and after. The chapter then turns to Cage’s trip to Leningrad and the artistic collaborations it helped seed before examining some of the more significant Cage-inspired works by Russian composers from 1988 and after.

The chapter closes with an examination of the institutional ramifications of Cage’s visit. More than anything else, Cage’s visit as an official guest of the Composers’ Union of the USSR and its conservative secretary, Khrennikov, signaled a profound shift in Soviet music policy, one with seismic consequences. In the weeks immediately after this visit, and in direct response to it, a group of Moscow musicians organized the Alternativa [Al’ternativa] Festival of contemporary music, dedicated to works by rarely played Soviet and Western modernist composers. Held annually in Moscow from 1988 to 1991, and less regularly throughout the 90s, Alternativa became one of the most important cultural events during the late Soviet period, and soon gained official support from the Ministry of Culture.

In 1991, amidst the economic and social tumult brought about by the Soviet collapse, the Alternativa festival largely fell apart, too. However, even before this collapse, and while still enjoying handsome state support, the festival began to transform in important ways. What had been founded in 1988 as a forum for presenting a wide spectrum of previously unofficial music had morphed, only a few years later, into a specialized festival catering to the specific tastes of a small group of musicians. As we shall see, this transformation resulted from profound ideological changes unleashed during glasnost’. Throughout the Soviet era, a shared opposition to the official policies of the Composers’ Union had helped bring together a wide spectrum of otherwise dissimilar artists. With the state’s voluntary abdication of authority during glasnost’, the loose gravity linking these artists together dissipated. The “left wing” [levoye krilo] of the Composers’ Union soon split into numerous factions, each of which moved throughout the 1990s to develop its own institutional bases. This factionalization was exacerbated throughout the post-Soviet era by the country’s bitter economic situation and musicians’ competition for increasingly scarce resources. Musicologist Svetlana Savenko summarized this situation when she noted, “[T]he situation in music composition in Russia today is not geared towards bringing composers together, but rather tearing them apart.”

Cage’s visit and its consequences demonstrate just how wrong Denisov was when he complained to Michael Kurtz, in March 1989, that “[So far] perestroika applies to writers, painters, film makers, and everyone else, except musicians.” Though Khrennikov had not yet been ousted, as had been the case with the conservative leadership in some of the other creative unions, by 1988 he had decisively launched the Composers’ Union on a new course, in all likelihood an attempt to retain legitimacy for himself and his institution in the face of massive social transformation. These changes would soon embroil Denisov himself: by the end of 1989,

---

22 Denisov, conversation with Michael Kurtz, March 27, 1989. Quoted in Kurtz, Sofia Gubaidulina, 211. Kurtz says that Denisov made this comment in response to the observation that, as part of perestroika, other creative unions had ousted their old leadership and elected previously “nonconformist” artists, while the Composers’ Union was still headed by Khrennikov, whom Zhdanov had appointed in 1948. Khrennikov would serve until 1992.
Khrennikov invited Denisov, whom he had brutally denounced only ten years prior, to join the Secretariat of the Composers’ Union of the USSR.23 Denisov accepted this invitation, a development scarcely believable to many of his friends and followers, some of whom felt deeply betrayed by his decision.24 (A February 1990 article in Sovetskaya kul’tura noted with disbelief “For all these years, the Composers’ Union of the USSR has stood in Denisov’s way. And today, he’s joined the ranks of its leadership...”25) More shocking still, in early 1990 members of the Composers’ Union of Moscow elected Denisov as their candidate to the Congress of People’s Deputies [S’vezd narodnikh deputatov] a lower-parliamentary house Gorbachev established in summer 1988, and Denisov gladly accepted.26 Denisov, long apolitical, was suddenly so civic-minded during glasnost’ that friends and students joked that he would accept the Minister of Agriculture position were he asked.27

Massive changes were underway in Soviet music and society, changes both symbolized and triggered by this Third International Festival of 1988 and its peculiar American guest. However, as we shall see at the chapter’s end, these changes were for many as disorienting as they were exhilarating. Already during perestroika, some were beginning to lament that the end of state control was somehow undoing music’s special value, and that as everything became possible during the emerging post-Soviet era, suddenly nothing mattered. These refrains would only grow louder amidst the social and economic chaos of the 1990s, and their multi-faceted reverberations form the subject of the next several chapters that follow.

Cage and Unofficial Soviet Music in the 1970s and ‘80s

By the time Cage had traveled to Leningrad in 1988, he had long since achieved tremendous notoriety in the Soviet Union, and numerous Soviet musicians looked to him as the inspiration

---

23 See Yuriy Kholopov and Valeriya Tsenova, Edison Denisov (Moscow: Kompozitor, 1993), 40-41. Kholopov and Tsenova say that Denisov became a Secretary in 1990, when in fact this had almost certainly happened earlier, at the end of 1989. For example, Smirnov writes in his Fragments about Denisov [Fragmenti o Denisove] that he called Denisov on December 31, 1989 to ask whether or not it was true that he had indeed become a Secretary of the Composers’ Union. Likewise, numerous informants told me that the Association for Contemporary Music-2 was formed in Moscow in January 1990 largely because, by that time, Denisov had become a Secretary. See Dmitriy Smirnov and Elena Firsova, “Chast’ vtoraya, 1987-1990,” Fragmenti o Denisove. http://homepage.ntlworld.com/dmitrismirnov/denfrag9.html (accessed September 9, 2009).

24 As Elena Firsova and Dmitriy Smirnov note in Fragmenti o Denisove, “When [Denisov] became one of the three secretaries of the Composers’ Union of the USSR, it scandalized many of his friends – Alfred Schnittke went so far as to say he would no longer shake Denisov’s hand...Sonya Gubaidulina thought [Denisov] had made a big mistake. It even bothered Gennadiy Rozhdestvensky, who began to bellow all over Europe that Denisov had become a careerist.” See Smirnov and Firsova, “Chast’ vtoraya,” Fragmenti o Denisove.


26 See Kholopov and Tsenova, Edison Denisov, 41, footnote 33 and Dolgacheva, “Novoye amplua Edisona Denisova,” 10. Denisov was one of 23 candidates from the Frunze neighborhood; in the end, he was not chosen to serve.

behind several of the most significant developments in post-war music. As composer Viktor Yekimovskiy (b.1947), active in Moscow’s unofficial music scene in the 1970s and ‘80s, describes:

For us, Cage became Western avant-gardist Number One. […] 4’33” – who [else] could have thought of that? All of his ideas – graphic music, for example, as in the Piano Concerto [Concert for Piano and Orchestra, 1957-58], simply stunned everyone, as no one assumed that music could be [written] that way […] Of course, [with Cage] there’s no music itself to listen to, to appreciate. But his ideas! Thus, for us, Cage became some sort of fetish, an idol. He thought up the first happening. For America, perhaps it simply seemed “Well, some innovator came up with this, no big deal.” But for us [in the Soviet Union], it was completely unknown! For us, it was simply… “How can this be?”

Soviet musicians associated Cage, the “fetish” and “idol,” with a staggering array of musical developments, from graphic notation and happenings, described by Yekimovskiy, through to prepared piano, electronics, music theater, and minimalism. Russian-American musicologist Elena Dubinets effectively summarized this vision of Cage as the driving force behind later-twentieth century music when she wrote, in 2006,

Without Cage’s creative output, the history of the world’s contemporary musical culture would be impossible. Alongside his friends and artistic allies—composers (Feldman, Brown, Wolff), artists (Rauschenberg, Johns), and dancers (Cunningham, Graham)—Cage brought about a genuine revolution in art, blowing apart European traditions and norms which had been formulated over the course of centuries.

During the pre-perestroika era, information about Cage came through a variety of sources. One of the main sources was officially published material. Grigoriy Shneyerson’s 1960 book On Music, Living and Dead [O muzïke, zhivoy i mertvoy] included brief though informative passages describing Cage and his works, including Cage’s use of prepared piano and his development of chance music [element sluchaynosti], among other innovations. A more

28 Viktor Yekimovskiy, interview with the author, January 14, 2008. Original in Russian. Unless otherwise noted, all interviews were conducted in Russian.
important official source was the 1976 Russian translation, published by Muzïka, of Ctirad Kohoutek’s 1965 *Compositional Trends in Contemporary Music* [Novodobé skladebné směry v hudbě, published in Russian as *Tekhnika kompozitsii v muzïke XX veka*], which included extensive passages on Cage’s work in aleatory and electronic composition.\(^\text{31}\)

Foreigners, particularly visiting foreign musicians, were another important source of information about Cage. The most significant example in this category is the ensemble Les Percussions de Strasbourg, which toured the Soviet Union around 1973 and performed Cage’s music, likely the *First Construction (in Metal)* (1939).\(^\text{32}\) During one of the ensemble’s Moscow concerts, Shneyerson was invited to deliver introductory remarks. Comedy quickly ensued, albeit unintentionally: as composer Ivan Sokolov (b. 1960), who attended the concert as a teenager, remembers, Shneyerson could not find his way to the microphone through the huge collection of instruments. “The audience,” Sokolov recalls, “began laughing, calling out directions: ‘Go this way!  Go that way!’”\(^\text{33}\)

The overwhelming majority of information about Cage, and the vast majority of performances of his music, came via a small circle of Moscow musicians headed by pianist Aleksey Lyubimov (b. 1944). Lyubimov began performing Cage’s works in the late 1960s, presenting them at semi-private, closed performances in venues such as the Physics Institute of the Academy of Sciences [Fizicheskii institut akademii nauk, or FIAN] and the Kurchatov Institute of Atomic Energy [Institut atomnoy energii im. I.V. Kurchatova].\(^\text{34}\)

Lyubimov first performed Cage’s *4’33”* (1952) in 1969 as an encore to a concert he presented at Mark Mil’man’s musical club at the House of Composers.\(^\text{35}\) One year earlier, Lyubimov and percussionist Mark Pekarsky (b. 1940) had organized the Soviet premiere of Cage’s *Amores* (1943).\(^\text{36}\) Throughout the early 1970s, Lyubimov regularly performed many of Cage’s works including *4’33”*, *Waiting* (1952), and *Water Music* (1952) in Moscow, Leningrad, and the capital cities of several Soviet republics, including Tallinn, Riga, Baku, and Yerevan.\(^\text{37}\)

---


\(^{32}\) I have written to the administration of Les Percussions de Strasbourg, but have been unable to verify the group’s repertoire during its Soviet performances. Informants in Moscow recall the group performing Cage there in 1973.\(^{33}\)

\(^{33}\) Ivan Sokolov, interview with the author, April 14, 2008.\(^{34}\)

\(^{34}\) For a description of the culture of closed concerts in Moscow in the 1970s, including these venues, see Schmelz, *Such Freedom*, 192-97.\(^{35}\)

\(^{35}\) Schmelz, *Such Freedom*, 205. As Schmelz notes, the concert took place on January 20, 1969, and included works by Morton Feldman, Pierre Schaeffer, Terry Riley, Estonian composer Kuldar Sink, and Swiss composer Pierre Mariétan. Schmelz’s sources are a 2000 interview with Lyubimov and Lyubimov’s performance notebooks. Valentina Kholopova also discusses this concert in her recent biography of Lyubimov, *Aleksey Lyubimov: Trocheskiy portret* (Moscow: Kompozitor, 2009). According to Kholopova, the concert consisted of “music for three or four pianos, from Bach to the Twentieth Century” (see p.17).\(^{36}\)

\(^{36}\) Nina Drozdetskaya, “Idei Dzhona Keydzha v sovetskom andergraunde 70-80-x godov: ot kontseptualistov i postmodernistov do rokerov i mit’kov,” in Yuriy Kholopov, Valeriya Tsenova, and Marina Pereverzeva, eds., *Dzhon Keydzh. K 90-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya*. Materiali nauchnoy konferentsii (Moscow: Moskovskaya gosudarstvennaya konservatoriya, 2004), 142. The Mit’ki was a group of conceptual artists that came together in Leningrad in the mid 1980s (see below for more information on the group, including the derivation of their name).\(^{37}\)

\(^{37}\) Ibid. Drozdetskaya’s information, like Schmelz’s, comes from Lyubimov’s own personal collection, presumably Lyubimov’s performance notebooks (“iz domashnego arkhiva,” as she cites).
In 1976-77, Lyubimov and Boris Berman organized back-to-back festivals of contemporary music in the concert hall of the Academy of Artists [Akademiya khudozhestv] in Riga, which included a performance of Cage’s *Theatre Piece* (1960), and by 1978 Lyubimov and pianist Tigran Alikhanov had performed Cage’s *A Book of Music* (1944), for two prepared pianos, in Leningrad.38

In addition to performing Cage’s music, Lyubimov wrote about it. In 1974 Lyubimov published an article about Cage in the second volume of the *Musical Encyclopedia* [Muzïkal’naya entsiklopediya], a six-volume reference work edited by Yuriy Keldïsh and published between 1973 and 1982.39 Lyubimov’s article was the first article on Cage in a Soviet reference work. This encyclopedia featured several firsts for Soviet musicology, including the first articles in a Soviet reference work on several early Soviet modernist composers, most notably Aleksandr Mosolov (1900-1973) and Nikolay Roslavets (1880/81-1944).40

Lyubimov’s article, it should be noted, is not the first mention of Cage in the encyclopedia. Volume 1, published in 1973, included an entry on aleatory music written by Shneyerson, which briefly mentioned Cage and his development of “total aleatory” [total’naya aleatorika].41 Lyubimov’s article, though, is the first even-handed entry dedicated exclusively to Cage in Soviet musicological literature. Although a greater level of detail about Cage’s music and ideas was available to Soviet musicians through unofficial channels, this inclusion of Lyubimov’s article on Cage in an official reference work marked an important milestone—Yuriy Kholopov lists this 1974 article as perhaps the most significant event in the “discovery of Cage” in the USSR.42

Lyubimov’s article is worth quoting at length because it encapsulates ideas about Cage widely held in Soviet unofficial music circles of the 1970s and ‘80s. These ideas were propagated in large part by Lyubimov himself, Cage’s greatest Soviet propagandist. In his article, Lyubimov points to a wide variety of technical, stylistic, and philosophical traits central to Cage’s work:

…[Cage] organized (together with D. Tudor, R. Rauschenberg, and M. Cunningham) a so-called happening (from the English word “happen” – to occur, to take place), which consisted of collective, syncretic “actions” [kollektivniye,}

---

38 Ibid., 142-43. Due to its generally more relaxed political climate, Riga was a hotbed of experimental music in the Soviet Union. As Drozdetskaya notes, the public responded positively to Lyubimov’s concert, though one offended listener mailed a complaint to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Latvia. In 1976, the same year as Lyubimov’s first festival performance in Riga, Soviet audiences could read a description of Cage’s *Theater Piece* in Kohoutek’s *Tehniki kompozitsii* (pp. 259-60).

The Moscow pianist Tigran Alikhanov (b. 1943) was, like Lyubimov, one of the leading proponents of new music in the Soviet Union, and is an especially well-known interpreter of Boulez (see chapter 2). From 2005-09, Alikhanov was rector of the Moscow Conservatory.


42 See Kholopov, “Vklad Keydzhva v muzïkal’noy mïshleniye XX veka,” in *Dzhon Keydzh. K 90-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya*, 80. Kholopov mistakenly states that Lyubimov’s article was published in the encyclopedia’s third volume, when it was actually published in the second.
sinkreticheskiye deystva] (including music, light, and motion), based upon events which took place completely spontaneously (the musical aspect was based upon the principle of improvisation) […] From 1939-50 he composed a series of compositions in which he attempted to incorporate rhythmic and timbral characteristics of Indian and Indonesian music, as well as music of Latin American countries, making use of various percussion instruments (including exotic ones) […] Later, Cage rejected practically all traditional forms. Cage based his principles upon the philosophy of Zen Buddhism, particularly Zen’s characteristic love for paradox, intuitivism, and spontaneity. Cage attempted to separate form—and sound itself—from any rational or emotional content that might be associated with it. In later compositions Cage turned his attention to aleatorics, in which he intensified the role of chance and undefined elements. The elements determining [Cage’s] work come from outside sources, particularly the Chinese fortunetelling book, the I-Ching.

[…] He was the first to make use of “prepared piano,” whose strings are depressed with mutes made of metal, wood, felt, or plastic. A concert Cage organized in 1951 became a model of “chance music.” At this concert, 12 radio receivers were tuned to different stations. [Cage] gave fullest expression to the doctrine of “emptiness” borrowed form Zen Buddhism—the insulation [of music] from all influences, including from the composer himself—in his so-called music of silence. In Cage’s “composition” 4′33″ the pianist sits in total silence behind the piano for the indicated time without touching the keys.

Lyubimov’s article helps provide a roadmap outlining many of the most important Soviet Cagean experiments of the 1970s and ‘80s. Around the time this article was published, several Soviet musicians began experimenting with a wide variety of ideas Lyubimov described in it, from musical “intuitivism” and new approaches to aleatory to Cage’s “doctrine of emptiness” and the divorcing of sound from rational and expressive content. Five of the main areas in which Soviet musicians experimented with Cage’s ideas in the 1970s and 80s, and which helped set the stage for what came next, are described below.

1. Kheppeningi

One of the earliest manifestations of Cage’s influence in Soviet music was the sudden proliferation of “happenings” [kheppeningi] in the 1970s and 80s. These events, modeled on the happenings staged by Cage and Fluxus during the 1950s and 60s, celebrated the “intuitive,” anti-rational style described by Lyubimov, all the while incorporating different media and different ethnic or religious traditions in a nod to Cagean “syncretism.”

Lyubimov, Mark Pekarsky, and composer Vladimir Martínov (b. 1946) staged the first Soviet happening in 1972 at a musical evening dedicated to the memory of artist and Orientalist Nikolay Roerich [Rerikh] (1874-1947) at Moscow’s “Friendship” House of Culture [Dom

43 Aleksey Lyubimov, “Keydzh (Cage) Dzhon,” 768-69. The 1951 concert to which Lyubimov refers was Cage’s performance of the Imaginary Landscape No. 4.
Several similar events soon followed. These happenings often featured music by Cage and Stockhausen alongside newly composed works by participating musicians. For example, in the summer of 1973, Martínov organized a happening within the Composers’ Union at which he performed his *Protection from the Comet “Kohoutek”* [*Okhrannaya ot kometi “Kogouteka”*] (1973). Composed for two pianos, eight hands, Martínov’s work is a shamanic musical ritual devised to save the earth from collision with the comet Kohoutek (C/1973 E1), which was predicted for winter 1974. As Martínov explains, scientists had estimated that the Earth would cross into the comet’s tail [in 1974], resulting in a change in the Earth’s atmosphere. Having read this, I decided to turn to various magical and archaic practices, especially ones from China, to frighten off the comet... 

Martínov felt the “responsibility to perform [this] work once, so as to change the comet’s trajectory”—or, as he told Margarita Katunyan, he “decided to save humanity”—and thus staged his music ritual, with performers Valery Afanasiyev, Evgeniy Korolev, and Tat’yana Grindenko, at a closed concert in the Chamber and Symphonic Music Section [*Kamernosимфонические секция*] of the Composers’ Union. Both Denisov and Schnittke attended the concert. By November 1974, scientists determined that the comet had changed its course, a felicitous development that Martínov attributes to his musical intervention several months before. A score for the work no longer survives because, as Martínov described to Katunyan, “it no longer has any use. It had fulfilled its duties”; regardless, Martínov described the piece as a “minimalist, sonoristic thing” [*minimalistskaya, sonoristicskaya vesch’*].

The provocative nature of the happenings occasionally brought reprisals from the authorities. For example, in the wake of one early happening, Lyubimov, Martínov, and Pekarsky were punished with temporary travel restrictions and refused entry into Riga. Needless to say, rebuke from authorities only increased the allure of such events.

The epicenter of these Cagean happenings was the electronic music studio at Moscow’s Scriabin Museum [*Dom-muzey Skriabina*]. The studio, headed by Yevgeniy Murzin (1915–1970), included several important pieces of electronic equipment, including the ANS Synthesizer. Many of the leading unofficial Soviet composers, including Denisov, Gubaidulina, Schnittke, and Eduard Artem’yev (b. 1937), regularly gathered at the studio to

---


45. Martínov, interview with the author, June 16, 2008.

46. Ibid.


50. Ibid.

51. Ibid., 47.

compose and perform using its electronic equipment. Cage’s music was regular fare at the studio, as were works by Stockhausen and Ligeti. The studio’s electronic resources helped attract Soviet rock musicians, too, and performances there frequently incorporated works by art-rock groups such as Tangerine Dream, King Crimson, and Pink Floyd.

As Margarita Katunyan points out, the studio’s “non-conformist spirit” attracted a broad spectrum of Moscow’s intellectual elite, including “philosophers, Orientalists and specialists in Hindu studies, rock musicians, people from various religious orders, artists, film directors, and students.” In order to help capture Cage’s “love of paradox” and “syncretism,” events at the studio often juxtaposed a wide variety of styles, including early music, electronic music, rock, and traditional Asian musics. Participants celebrated the spontaneity and intuitivism described by Lyubimov as central to Cage’s aesthetic, oftentimes devising elaborate musical rituals to help induce new states of consciousness. Saxophonist Aleksey Kozlov remembers how these various impulses came together in the numerous “crossover” jam sessions [mezhzanrovïy dzhem] hosted at the studio, during which participants attempted to “enter into a trance [and bring together] freely-improvised music, psychedelic lights, and meditative rhythmical dance improvisation.”

Rock played an especially important role in this quest for “anti-rational” music. As Artem’yev put it to Katunyan,

[Andrew Lloyd] Webber’s opera Jesus Christ Superstar shows how it’s possible to address eternal themes in an accessible, populist language [na osnove demokratichnogo yazïka] which appeals to the masses not by way of the intellect, but rather through their hearts. I saw that rock musicians are able to reckon with truly profound musical questions. They swept everything away—including the avant-garde—and returned music to music.

Martïnov, who began working at the studio around 1973, was one of the main impetuses behind this ritualistic and syncretic approach. He composed a series of works at the studio combining rock, “electronic ‘sound’ [saund], meditativeness, an orientation toward the East, [and] religiosity,” all of which were, Katunyan’s words, “not European, not worldly, non-academic,” and “completely unrelated to the avant-garde.” These works include Martïnov’s “Zen-rock” pieces Leaf from an Album [Listok iz al’boma] (1976), for violin, piano, chamber ensemble and rock group, and Autumn Song [Osennyaya pesnya] (1978), for harpsichord and tape; his electronic piece Om – Images of Radiance [Aum – obrazï siyaniya] (1976), which combines “psychedelic, meditative electronic rock with elements of minimalism”; and Hymns [Gimnï] (1978), for voice, guitar, violin, and rock group, which combines stylized Elizabethan music and seventeenth-century English texts with traditional Chinese and Indian musics.

Apparently the studio’s ritualistic atmosphere extended beyond the boundaries of the artworks staged there: Martïnov says that several participants at the studio’s events later became

54 Aleksey Kozlov, “Kozol na sakse”: i tak vzyu zhizn’ (Moscow: Vagrius, 1998), 221-222. Translated by Schmelz and quoted in his “From Scriabin to Pink Floyd,” 266.
57 Ibid., 51-52. Martïnov had participated in the studio’s rock group Boomerang [Bumerang], but in 1977 formed his own group, Forpost, which performed his Hymns as well as his 1978 rock opera The Seraphic Visions of St. Francis of Assisi [Seraficheskiye videniya Frantsiska Assizskogo].
Orthodox clergymen, and that several of the rock musicians became regular participants in the studio’s Orthodox liturgical singing groups. This ritualistic atmosphere cultivated at the happenings soon bore significant influence upon concert music, too. For example, after attending a happening staged by Lyubimov and Pekarsky in the 1970s, composer Aleksandr Vustin (b. 1943) initiated his own “ritualistic” style [deystvennaya muzïka] in a series of concert works (see chapter 4). Meanwhile, composer Nikolay Korndorf (1947-2001) undertook a Cagean-style “syncretic” approach in his theatrical work Yes! [Da!] (1982), a “musical ritual” premiered by the Soloists of the Bol’shoy Theater ensemble in Moscow’s Chaikovsky Hall and staged for a hodgepodge of performing forces including soprano, two tenors, a large percussion battery, various instrumentalists, amplified recorder consort, and organ.

Pekarsky and his six-member percussion ensemble, founded in 1976 and modeled after Les Percussions de Strasbourg, became the main champions of this new repertoire of happening-inspired concert music. In 1986, Korndorf composed his theatrical Mark Pekarsky’s Dance in Metal in Honor of John Cage [Tanets Marka Pekarskogo v metalle v chest’ Dzhona Keydzha] for the percussionist, and three years later, Yekimovsky composed his minimalist Resurrection [Uspeniye] (1989) for the group, an “endless six-voice rhythmic canon” performed behind a black scrim, hiding the performers from the audience. Martînov contributed perhaps the most significant ritualistic work to Pekarsky’s repertoire with his 1978 Order of the Day [Rasporyadok dnya], a four-movement work designed to evoke the “rituals of the East.” Martînov’s work features pentatonic outer movements, a slow “Meditation” (“a kind of improvisational raga,” in Katunyan’s words) featuring exotic instruments such as the darabuka and the Guinean gong, and a primitivist climactic movement, “Action” [Aksiya].

In part through these happenings and the “non-conformist” individuals who participated in them, Cage’s ideas found fertile soil in the Soviet unofficial art scene. Cage’s ideas were particularly influential among numerous Moscow Conceptualist artists, especially members of the Collective Actions [Kollektivnïye deystviya] performance art group. Established by Andrey Monastîrsky (b. 1949) and others in the mid-1970s, Collective Actions staged numerous Fluxus-style “actions” [aksi], usually in the woods outside of Moscow. Participants included noted artist Il’ya Kabakov (b. 1933) and author and artist Vladimir Sorokin (b. 1955), today one of Russia’s most controversial writers and librettist for Leonid Desyatnikov’s 2005 opera Rosenthal’s Children [Deti Rozentalya].

58 Ibid., 51.
59 Aleksandr Lazarev conducted the premiere. The description of the piece comes from the score published by Sikorski (Hamburg: Hans Sikorski, 2002). The piece’s title is likely a play on Aleksandr Knayfel’’s Da [Yes] (1980) for ensemble and tape. Korndorf oftentimes poked fun at other composers’ titles and works. For example, in 1999 he composed the ten-minute long piano work, “A Letter to Martînov and Pelecis” [“Pis’ma Martînovu i Peletsisu”], poking fun at Martînov’s and Pelecis’ “Correspondence” [“Perepiska”] (1985). Four years earlier, Korndorf had composed his Get out! (1995), for any four or more instruments, a play on Martînov’s neo-romantic Come in! [Voydi te!] (1985) for violin, string orchestra, and celesta.
60 Korndorf’s piece is not the only allusion to Cage’s “Construction in Metal” written for Pekarsky. In 1993, Aleksandr Raskatov (b. 1953) composed his Madrigal in Metal [Madrigal v metalle] for Pekarsky’s ensemble.
62 Drozdetskaya provides an overview of several Soviet unofficial artists’ views on Cage in her “Idee Dzhona Keydzha,” 141-52.
“Appearance” [Появление] took place on March 13, 1976. Around thirty individuals were sent invitations summoning them to a snowy field outside of Moscow. After five minutes of waiting, artists Lev Rubinstein (b. 1947) and Nikita Alekseyev (b. 1953) appeared, issuing attendees “official” documents proving that they participated in the event. Later actions played explicitly with the boundaries between sound and silence. The group’s second action, staged on April 2, 1976, brought participants to a snowy field where they heard an electronic noise emanating from the ground produced by an unseen box buried in the snow. This action was called “Lieblich,” a title apparently inspired by performance directions in a Schubert song.\(^{64}\) Another group of Moscow Conceptualists, the Totart group headed by Natal’ya Abalakova (b. 1941) and Anatoliy Zhigalov (b. 1941), were likewise influenced by Cage’s ideas. Totart was active in the area of film and video, and several of the group’s film projects are motivated by the Cagean “doctrine of emptiness” described by Lyubimov. For example, Totart’s seventeen-minute long film *Happy End* (1984), shot by Igor’ Aleynikov, consists almost entirely of blank shots, interspersed periodically with images of a doorway or a man sitting on a bench. The film’s soundtrack, compiled by composer Svetlana Golibina (b. 1941), includes excerpts from works by Reich and Nyman, various everyday noises such as stomping boots and, most prominently, silence.\(^{65}\)

Although Cage’s influence was strong among artists and conservatory-trained musicians alike, there was relatively little collaboration between these two groups before the late 1980s. When classically trained musicians and artists did collaborate, it was often in non-classical genres, especially rock, and rarely took place in classical venues. There were a few exceptions, notably experimental jazz musician Sergey Letov (b. 1956), one of the founders of Collective Actions, who first performed with Mark Pekarsky in 1982 and collaborated with Gubaidulina shortly thereafter. The coming-together of the worlds of unofficial art and music was hailed as a particularly important development during perestroika, and beginning in the late 1980s conceptual artists such as Rubinstein and Prigov regularly collaborated with musicians such as Batagov and Martînov in performances staged in venues including the conservatory and Moscow’s Chaikovsky Hall.

2. Improvisation

Another area in which Cage was influential, and one closely related to the Soviet happenings in which it originally flourished, is improvisation, named by Lyubimov as the musical principle underlying Cage’s own happenings. Beginning in the mid-1970s, numerous Soviet musicians began staging group improvisation sessions as a way of tapping into the “intuitivism” and “spontaneity” Lyubimov described as central to Cage’s aesthetic. Performances of improvised music sometimes went under the title “intuitive music” [интуитивная музыка], a term coined by Stockhausen for his *Aus den sieben Tagen* (1968), which Lyubimov performed in Moscow, Leningrad, Tallinn, and Riga in the mid-1970s.\(^{66}\) Underscoring the connection of “intuitivism” with both Cage and Stockhausen, an article published in the Alternativa 1990 program booklet names “Cage’s and Stockhausen’s intuitivism” as among the most important developments in

---

\(^{64}\) Solomon, *The Irony Tower*, 92.

\(^{65}\) The film is available on Sergey Letov’s website at http://conceptualism.letov.ru/ TOTART/Happy-End.html (accessed September 9, 2009).

post-war music. As we shall see, though, this association of Cage with free improvisation points to one of the more notable misunderstandings of Cage’s ideas among Soviet musicians of the 1970s and 80s. Cage’s own attitudes toward live performance were nowhere nearly so tolerant, as some Soviet musicians were shocked to learn upon meeting him in 1988.

Group improvisation sessions flourished in numerous venues throughout the Soviet Union during the 1970s and ‘80s. One of the most important venues for improvisation was Aleksey Batashov’s jazz club at the Moscow House of Composers, which hosted regular performances of experimental jazz and group improvisation sessions in which several conservatory-trained composers participated. The club served as an important meeting ground between jazz and classical musicians and helped facilitate later collaborations between these two groups. In April 1982, experimental jazz saxophonist Sergey Letov, one of the central figures in Collective Actions, appeared in concert with Pekarsky’s percussion ensemble at Moscow’s Central Artists’ House [Tsentrál’niy dom khudozhnika], where they performed a work by percussionist and composer Mikhail Zhukov. The next year, Letov participated in the premiere of Gubaidulina’s chance composition Heads or tails? [Oryol ili reshka?] (1983) at Moscow’s October Hall of the House of Unions [Oktyabr’skiy zal Doma soyuuzov]. Zhukov himself participated in several performances of Cagean improvised music: for example, in the mid-1980s, he conducted a performance of Svetlana Golïbina’s Invitation to Improvisation [Priglasheniye k improvizatsii] on a concert produced by Yuriy Kozïr’ev’s jazz studio at the Moscow Institute of Engineering and Physics [Moskovskiy inzhenerno-fizicheskiy institut, or MIFI]. Golïbina’s improvisatory work is framed around what she describes as a “quotation” from Cage’s 4’33”, namely a minute of silence in the middle of the performance.

Among Moscow composers of the 1970s, Gubaidulina was one of the strongest advocates of improvisation. Gubaidulina’s interest in improvisation was likely sparked by Stockhausen’s example. In the early 1970s, with assistance from Lyudmila Tovalyova, she began reading excerpts from Stockhausen’s Texte, which the Lenin Library had acquired in the original German. In 1975, Gubaidulina co-founded the Astraea improvisation troupe along with composers Viktor Suslin (b. 1942) and Vyacheslav Artyomov (b. 1940). Originally called

---

68 Kurtz, Sofia Gubaidulina, 103-104. Kurtz says that Batashov [Batashyov] founded a “Moscow Jazz Club” [Moskovskiy dzhaz-klub] in 1971, and that this club “issued invitations every year for a spring festival and played experimental jazz, improvisations, and contemporary music in its quarters on Kashirskoe Shosse [sic].” Other sources indicate that Batashov had established clubs for jazz musicians and jazz lovers significantly earlier. For example, Batashov’s biography on the website “Dzhaz.Ru” (www.jazz.ru) states that Batashov had founded a club for jazz enthusiasts (“Energetik”) at the Moscow House of Composers in 1960 (http://www.jazz.ru/pages/batashev, accessed October 9, 2010). Kurtz perhaps confused Batashov with Yuriy Kozirov (b. 1933), who in 1971 opened up a jazz studio (the Studiya Dzhaza “Moskvorech’ye”) on Kashirskoye Shosse. Kozirov’s studio is a forerunner to today’s Moscow College of Improvised Music [Moskovskiy kolledzh improvisatsionnoy muzïki] (see the “O kolledzhe” section of the college’s website, http://mcim.ru/, accessed October 17, 2010).
71 Drozdetskaya, “Idei Dzhona Keydzha,” 143-44.
“Stable-Mobile” [Stabil’-Mobil’] after Denisov’s 1971 article on aleatory music, Astraæa, which was named after an early-nineteenth century Russian Freemason lodge, performed theatrical, oftentimes costumed improvisations incorporating Central Asian folk instruments as well as found objects, especially toys, at venues throughout Moscow, including the Moscow Jazz Club, the concert hall at the House of Scientists [Dom uchyonikh], and closed meetings at the House of Composers. The group performed in the USSR from 1976 to 1981, when Suslin emigrated to Germany in the wake of his public denunciation by Khrennikov. The group’s performances were not limited to Moscow: in 1977, the Society of Students and Scholars at the Azerbaijan Conservatory invited Astraæa to Baku, where they performed at the conservatory’s Small Hall and at the Azeri Academy of Sciences, returning to Moscow with numerous new folk instruments to help encourage future experimentation.

At its performances, Astraæa cultivated the ritualistic, Orientalist atmosphere celebrated by Martïnov and others at the happenings, oftentimes staging primitivistic pseudo-rituals. Michael Kurtz describes one such musical ritual during which Astraæa was joined by female gusli players from Dmitriy Pokrovsky’s folk ensemble. Musicians entered the performance space through different doorways and convened on stage, where they began the performance with a group mantra. The performance consisted of several group improvisations with titles such as “Vision of Markandeya,” “Personal Song on the Theme of a Chukchee Bear Incantation,” and “Supernova of the Year 1054.” Artyomov hoped to involve the audience in the performance, and distributed the following text:

Play, and you’ll have new ears, new eyes, and a new life. Today, let’s take the first step toward this goal: we ask that at the end of the performance you support us with applause and then with bells (everybody who has one). The whole thing will only take an hour and a half, as we play without intermission. Relax. Let your guard down, and let the sound move freely through your body. Try to sense and soak up every moment of the sound. Whatever happens cannot be repeated. Realize that you are part of the universe of sound. Let’s get started.

Soviet authorities were extremely hostile to performances of improvised music, which were, by their nature, unpredictable events. Authorities seemed less worried by what improvising musicians might play than by what audience members might say in response. In March 1973, Frid had planned an evening of improvisation at his Moscow Youth Musical Club [Moskovskiy molodyozhnii muzikal’nii klub, or MMMK]. Upon receiving word that an evening of “subversive” music had been planned, authorities summoned Frid to discuss the matter. As Frid explained to Michael Kurtz, they seemed concerned, above all else, by the audience’s potential comments: “What do you mean by improvisation? Are you sure you know what the musicians will play and what the audience will say about it? Perhaps there will be comments

73 On Astraæa, see Kurtz, Gubaidulina, 119-123. Regarding Denisov’s article, see below.
74 Suslin was among “Khrennikov’s Seven” [Khrennikovskaya semyorka], the group of seven modernist composers Khrennikov denounced in November 1979 at the Sixth All-Union Congress of the Composers Union (see below). Astraæa was revived in 1991 after Gubaidulina moved to Germany, where Suslin also lived. By that time, Gubaidulina had, in the words of Michael Kurtz, “severed” professional connections with Artyomov (Kurtz, Sofia Gubaidulina, 219-20). Since 1991, performances of Astraæa have featured Gubaidulina, Suslin, and a variety of guest performers including Pekarsky, Valentina Ponomaryova and, most importantly, Suslin’s son, Aleksandr.
75 On Astraæa’s trip to Baku, see Michael Kurtz, Sofia Gubaidulina, 129-130.
76 Ibid., 123.
critical of the regime.” The KGB, meanwhile, kept Astraea under surveillance: as Artyomov explained to Kurtz, at one of Astraea’s private performances a mysterious individual began asking the musicians invasive questions. He introduced himself as a “colleague” of Moscow’s Serbsky Institute for Social and Forensic Psychology [Tsentr sotsial'noy i sudebnoy psikhiatrii im. V.P. Serbskogo], an infamous mental hospital where the KGB imprisoned dissidents.

3. Bol’shaya aleatorika: Chance, Indeterminacy, and Graphic Notation

Perhaps Cage’s greatest influence upon late-Soviet music was felt in the area of aleatory technique, which had become a hallmark of Soviet unofficial music of the 1960s. In the 1970s and ‘80s, though, and directly influenced by Cage, several composers of the middle generation began experimenting with new approaches to aleatory, especially chance and indeterminacy, both described by Lyubimov in his article on Cage.

In order to help put Cage’s influence on Soviet ideas of aleatory technique into perspective, let us begin with the most influential Soviet theoretical work on the subject, Edison Denisov’s 1971 article “Stable and Mobile Elements of Musical Form and their Interaction” [Stabil’niye i mobil’niye elemen’ti muzikal’noy formi i ikh vzaimodeystviye]. In this article, Denisov proposed four basic approaches to aleatorics and gave examples of their application. Denisov’s categories are defined by the relative stability of a piece’s texture and form. The first category, non-aleatory music, is characterized by both stable texture and stable form. The second and third categories consist of more conventional approaches to aleatory composition common in unofficial Soviet music of the 1960s and seen in works by Boulez, the Polish avant-garde, and Denisov himself. In Denisov’s second category, musical texture is stable while form is mobile—Denisov names Boulez’s Piano Sonata No. 3 (1955-57) as an example—while in the third category, texture is mobile and form is stable—Denisov names Lutosławski’s Venetian Games [Gry weneckie] (1961-61) as a representative example. Denisov’s fourth and final category consists of both mobile texture and mobile form. For Denisov, the main examples of this final category can be found works by Stockhausen and Cage, though Denisov warns that Cage’s extreme position “opens up a wide road to chaos and the absurd.”

For Denisov, this final category is associated in large part with graphic notation.

77 Frid, interviews with Michael Kurtz, in Kurtz, Sofia Gubaidulina, 102-103.
78 Artyomov, interview with Michael Kurtz, in Kurtz, Sofia Gubaidulina, 122. Kurtz does not indicate the Russian-language term this individual used when announcing his position to Artyomov. Given the context, it is plausible that this individual would have used the term sotrudnik, in which case “staff member” would be a more accurate translation than “colleague.”
Kohoutek’s influential *Theory of Contemporary Composition*, published in Russian in 1976, simplifies these categories. Kohoutek proposed two basic types of aleatory: “lesser” or “limited” aleatory [malaya or ogranichennaya aleatorika], which corresponds to Denisov’s second and third categories, and “greater” or “unlimited” aleatory [bol’shaya or neorganichennaya aleatorika], which corresponds to Denisov’s final category. For Kohoutek, “lesser” aleatory is associated primarily with the European avant-garde, while “greater” aleatory—which Russian commentators sometimes call “open form” [otkritaya forma], after Earle Brown—is associated primarily with Cage and the American school.

It was this area of “greater aleatory” that so enthralled many young Soviet composers in the mid-1970s and who, directly inspired by Lyubimov’s performances, devised their own Cagean experiments. These experiments in “major aleatory” took several shapes. One of the main areas of interest was chance operations. Gubaidulina noted, for example, that numerous performances at Frid’s club in the 1970s incorporated coin tossing. Musical experiments with the *I-Ching* were particularly popular, too. In 1971, Martînov attempted a musical “realization” of the *I-Ching* in his Hexagram [*Geksiagramma*] (1971) for solo piano. Twelve years later, Gubaidulina experimented with the *I-Ching* in her *Heads or tails?* [*Oryol ili reshka?*] (1983), an improvised work for folk singer and instrumentalists in which each instrument’s part derived from *I-Ching*’s fourth hexagram. Saxophonist Sergey Letov performed the premiere along with Gubaidulina on the flexatone, gypsy singer Valentina Ponomaryova, and various other improvising musicians, including Golïbina. The next year, Golïbina applied the *I-Ching* in her own Cagean-style work, *Al’tasor* (1984), which was performed at a happening Golibina helped stage at Moscow’s Gorbunov Palace of Culture [*Dvorets kul’turi im. Gorbunova*]. Golibina described her work, whose libretto is drawn from texts by the Chilean dadaist poet Vincento Huidobro (1893-1948) and Cage’s own writings, as an “a-atorio” [*a-ratoriya*], clearly alluding to Cage’s *Roaratorio* (1979), based upon texts by Joyce. In the middle of *Al’tasor*,
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84 Kurtz, *Sofia Gubaidulina*, 103.
85 Interest in the *I-Ching* was not limited to the musical experiments described in this paragraph. As Aleksandr Ivashkin notes, Schnitkke “studied” the *I-Ching* to “find some answers concerning his future.” According to Ivashkin, “the first answer [Schnittke] found was not particularly good. So he tried again, but the next answer was even worse! He continued, but received only negative answers; and then he realized it was dangerous to go any deeper.” Schnitkke, instead, immersed himself in Kabbalah. See Ivashkin, *Alfred Schnittke*, 158.
86 Katunyan, “Parallel’noye vremya,” 46.

Ponomaryova and Pekarsky soon began regular collaborations. For example, in 1987, they improvised together at a Gubaidulina portrait concert at the House of Architects [*Dom arkhitekтора*], and in 1991 they performed with Astraea. See Kurtz, *Sofia Gubaidulina*, 198-99 and 219.
Golîbina calls for a slide to project the figure “4′33”’ on the wall, inviting the audience to “make their own music” at that point.\(^{88}\)

In 1974, the year of Lyubimov’s Cage article, Suslin devised one of the more notable Soviet chance pieces. Suslin’s *Gioco appassionato* (1974), scored for four or fewer violins and/or violas, is not based upon coin tossing or the I-Ching, but rather the popular Russian card game *durak* (‘fool’). The work’s score consists of thirty-six playing cards on which Suslin had written musical fragments. The performers are dealt these cards, with which they proceed to play the card game. After playing a card, the instrumentalist performs the musical fragment written on that card. If a musician cannot play a turn with the cards at hand, there is a pause, and their neighbor continues the game.\(^{89}\) In *Gioco appassionato* Suslin was not only inspired by Cage’s open forms and chance operations, but also by Cage’s sarcasm: much as Cage suggests in the score to *Credo in Us* (1942) that the musician operating the record player or radio during the work’s performance should “use some classic: e.g., [a recording of] Dvořák, Beethoven, Sibelius, or Shostakovich,”\(^{90}\) so too does Suslin indicate, in his preface to *Gioco appassionato*, that the work is best performed “after some deadly-serious avant-garde string quartet.”\(^{91}\)

Another area in which Soviet composers experimented with *bol’shaya aleatorika* was graphic notation. In the same year Suslin composed *Gioco appassionato*, his close friend and colleague Yekimovsky composed his *Balletto* (1974) for conductor and any ensemble, one of the more prominent examples of Soviet graphic notation.

Experiments with graphic notation had become fairly common in Soviet new music circles in the later 1960s. Most Soviet examples of graphic notation use graphic notation in a limited way, combining it alongside conventional notation. However, in the mid-1960s, some composers began experimenting with works composed entirely in graphic notation. In 1965, Kiev composer Valentin Sil’vestrov (b. 1937) composed his graphic piece *Projections onto Harpsichord, Vibraphone, and Bells* [*Proyektsii na klavesin, vibrafon, i kolokola*].\(^{92}\) The work is entirely graphic, though Sil’vestrov incorporates conventional expressive and dynamic markings and clearly indicates timing (example 1.1). Four years later, Denisov, though famously disdainful of Cage, experimented with graphic notation and *bol’shaya aleatorika* in his *Singing of the Birds* [*Peniye ptits*] (1969), scored for any instrument and tape. The tape part was prepared on the ANS Synthesizer at the Scriabin Museum, a hotbed of Cagean activity. The performer’s score consists of concentric circles which feature various symbols, many of which repeat throughout (example 1.2). Although Denisov dispenses of most conventional forms of notation, the circles nevertheless indicate carefully measured temporal units. This precision timing is all the more crucial given the piece’s fixed electronics. Although scored for any instrument, Denisov’s work is most often performed on prepared piano – in fact, both the *New Grove* dictionary and Tsenova’s and Kholopov’s biography of Denisov list the work’s instrumentation as prepared piano and tape.\(^{93}\) The work’s association with prepared piano dates

\(^{88}\) Drozdetskaya, “Idei Dzhona Keydzha,” 143-4 and 148-50. Golîbina’s notes to the performance are provided on pp. 149-50.

\(^{89}\) Kholopova, “Viktor Suslin,” 239.

\(^{90}\) Cage’s instructions are cited by Alex Ross in his *The Rest is Noise: Listening to the Twentieth Century* (New York: Picador, 2005), 397.

\(^{91}\) Kholopova, “Viktor Suslin,” 239.

\(^{92}\) Thanks to Peter Schmelz for pointing me to Sil’vestrov’s work.

to its notorious premiere in April 1970 at a closed concert of the chamber music section of the Composers’ Union, which Lyubimov performed on prepared piano while dressed in full bird costume, with ribbons and bells flowing behind him.  

In Balletto, Yekimovsky dispenses of conventional expressive markings, like those Sil’vestrov had used, and specific temporal indications, like those both Denisov and Sil’vestrov had included. Conceptually, Yekimovsky’s closest precedent is the 1972 work A prima vista by Leningrad composer Aleksandr Knayfel’ (b. 1943), an improvisatory, open-form work for four percussionists. The performers stand around Knayfel’’s circular score and interpret its symbols, which consist of nothing more than interlocking patterns of black and white boxes (example 1.3). This work helped Knayfel’ earn his spot among the “Khrennikov Seven” [Khrennikovskaya semyorka]. It was one of seven works performed in Cologne in 1979 at the “Begegnung mit der Sowjetunion” festival, organized by Radio Köln. In November 1979, at the Sixth All-Union Congress of the Composers Union, Khrennikov publicly denounced the composers whose works were performed at this festival, Artyomov, Denisov, Elena Firsova (b. 1950), Gubaidulina, Knayfel’, Dmitriy Smirnov (b. 1948), and Suslin.

Yekimovsky’s Balletto follows in the wake of Knayfel’’s work by adopting a similarly open form. Yekimovsky, however, adds an important theatrical twist. Notation in Balletto does not indicate sounds, but rather physical gestures. The score of Balletto consists of seven lines, each corresponding to a different part of the conductor’s body: head (capo), shoulders (le spalle), arms (le braccia), hands (le mani, on two lines), legs (le gambe), both right (d’estra) and left (s’istra), and, most amusingly, the backside (culo) (example 1.4). As Yekimovsky described in the score’s preface,

The score presents a graphic recording of the conductor’s gestures, directions, movements, and manners of comportment. The interpretation of the system of symbols is left up to the conductor’s fantasy, artistry, and creative collaboration. The cadenza provides an opportunity for absolutely limitless interpretation. This piece can be performed with any collection of instrumentalists. Performing without parts [i.e., without music] allows the performers to concentrate solely on the conductor’s actions. […] The work can be performed in concert without any rehearsal beforehand.

Mark Pekarsky and his percussion ensemble premiered Balletto in April 1982 at Moscow’s House of Artists [Dom khudozhnikov], and the work has since become one of Yekimovsky’s most frequently performed pieces. In the year 1991 alone, for example, it was performed thirteen times in cities throughout Germany, France, Italy, and the Soviet Union. Balletto’s graphic design recalls American composer Robert Moran’s (b. 1937) Four Visions (1963), particularly in its component symbols, especially arrows and circles, as well as its overall shape, namely its outward expansion from left to right (example 1.5). Moran’s Four Visions was published in Austria by Universal Edition in 1964 and, though Yekimovsky does not

95 Yekimovsky, preface to Balletto. Reprinted in Elena Dubinets, Znaki zvukov: O sovremennoy muzikal’noy notatsii (Kiev: Gamayun, 1999), 42.
96 Yekimovsky, Avtomonografiya, 350-51. 1991 is the only year Yekimovsky provides such accounting of his performances.
cute it in his autobiography as a model for Balletto, he names Moran’s works as an important influence in his own musical “anti-illiteracy campaign” (or likbez, an early Soviet neologism meaning “liquidation of illiteracy” [likvatsiya bezgramotnosti]). Furthermore, Yekimovsky reproduces excerpts from Moran’s score alongside Balletto in his 1997 article, “Forward, to notation without music!” [Vperyod, k notatsii bez muzïki].

Balletto was not Yekimovsky’s last experiment with graphic score design. In 1986, he composed In the Hunting Dogs Constellation [V sozvezdii “Gonchikh psov”] for three flutes and tape, modeled in large part upon Cage’s Atlas Eclipticalis (1962). To compose Atlas Eclipticalis, Cage superimposed musical staves over star charts published by Czech astronomer Antonín Bečvár in his 1958 guide to the heavens by the same name. Yekimovsky followed a similar procedure when composing In the Hunting Dogs Constellation. To create his score, Yekimovsky laid a large, circular piece of paper over a map of the northern sky. He used certain stars within each constellation to determine the starting point on the page for various musical phrases. Each phrase consists of differing rhythmic patterns sounded primarily on the note E. The rhythmic patterns spell out, in Morse code, the name of the constellation whose position in the night sky corresponds to that phrase’s starting position on the page.

Having plotted out these musical phrases, Yekimovsky divided this circle into three equal segments, each of which forms a part for one of the three flutists. As in Knayfel’s circularly-notated A prima vista, the musicians gather around Yekimovsky’s circular score and read off the same score in performance. The full score of In the Hunting Dogs is shown in example 1.6. Example 1.7 shows a detail from the score, the third flute part, with its Morse code spellings of the constellations’ names.

As the flutists perform these phrases, a tape part in the background plays radio static, high-pitched drones, and intermittent white noise, through which Yekimovsky attempts to aurally symbolize “endless interstellar space.” To further emphasize the directionless-ness of space, the musicians perform the score three times: each musician first performs their part as written (that is, reading their segment left-to-right, from the center of the circle outwards), and then performs their part reading from the outside of the circle back towards the middle. For the third and final iteration, musicians are asked to perform fragments from their part at random. This work’s sparse musical material has prompted Savenko to call it a work of “minimalist

97 Yekimovsky, Avtomonografiya, 345. Yekimovsky says Moran’s works were a main route through which he learned about minimalism, alongside works by Peteris Vasks, Arvo Pärt, and the Serbian composer Milimir Drašković (b. 1952). Yekimovsky describes this Likbez achieved through Moran’s and others’ works as especially valuable in the mid-1980s, when he began teaching seminars on twentieth-century composition technique at the House of Creation [Dom tvorchestva] at Ivanovo, one of the Composers’ Union’s retreat centers. See Yekimovsky, Avtomonografiya, 141-143.


100 After its premiere in Yugoslavia in 1987, Up in the Hunting Dogs was performed several times in Moscow in 1987-88, including a performance at Moscow Autumn. Shortly thereafter, Tarnopol’ski would make use of Morse Code in his trio Echoes of the Passing Day [Otvzuki usheldshego dnya] (1989). Also, Vustin used Morse code in his 1995 works Disappearance [Ischeznoveniye]. See chapter 5.

101 Yekimovsky, Avtomonografiya, 164-67.

102 Ibid., 164.
character.” She perhaps chose these words to underscore the work’s Cagean connections since, as we shall soon see, minimalism is strongly connected with Cage in Russian musicology.

Yekimovsky’s choice of a circular score design shows the influence of Crumb, whose music was of particular interest to many young composers of the Denisov circle and with whom Denisov corresponded in the early 1980s. In 1984, two years before Yekimovsky completed *In the Hunting Dogs Constellation*, the Soloists of the Bol’shoy Theater ensemble performed *Ancient Voices of Children* in Moscow, which itself prominently features circular notation. Yekimovsky further plays up Crumb’s influence in his work by calling for a host of Crumb-style theatrical effects: he suggests the work be performed in the dark, with lights, mirrors, or perhaps a disco ball emulating the projection of stars overhead. Ideally, Yekimovsky suggests the work be performed in a planetarium.

4. Prepared piano

A fourth area in which Soviet composers experimented with Cage’s ideas was in the area of prepared piano. Lyubimov, Alikhanov, and others performed several of Cage’s prepared piano works in Soviet cities throughout the early 1970s. In the wake of these performances, several composers started writing for this instrument. In 1976, Faradzh Karayev (b.1943) included prepared piano in his *Sonata for Two Players [Sonata dlya dvukh ispolniteley]*, scored for two (unprepared) pianos, a third prepared piano, percussion instruments, and tape. Karayev wrote his work for Azeri pianists Jakhangir Karayev (his cousin) and Akif Abdullayev, who premiered it in 1977 in Baku at the Azerbaijani State Conservatory. A few years later, Azeri composer Franghiz Ali-Zadeh (b. 1947), a student of Faradzh Karayev’s father, Kara Karayev (1918-1982), included prepared piano in her *Gabil-Sajahy* (1979), for cello and prepared piano, loosely based on the Azeri mugam tradition.

In 1977, a year after Karayev’s prepared piano work, Schnittke and Estonian composer Arvo Pärt (b. 1935) also wrote for prepared piano. Schnittke included prepared piano in his *Concerto Grosso No. 1* (1977), for two violins, harpsichord, prepared piano, and strings, as did Pärt in his *Tabula Rasa* (1977) for two violins, prepared piano, and string orchestra. Schnittke recorded *Tabula rasa* in Cologne in 1977 and performed it the next year, alongside his Concerto Grosso No. 1, at Tallinn’s Festival of Old and New Music, which also featured works by Martïnov, Suslin, Cage, Stockhausen, Xenakis, Denisov, and others.

106 The concert took place in the conservatory’s Great Hall in March 1977. After the Soviet collapse the Azerbaijan State Conservatory [Azərbaycan Dövlət Konservatoriyası / Azerbaijan Dövlət Konservatoriyası] was renamed the Baku Music Academy and, in 2001, the Azerbaijan National Conservatory [Azərbaycan Milli Konservatoriyası].

Among other influences, Karayev’s *Sonata* is influenced by Crumb’s music, including in its use of circular notation in the fourth movement. Karayev and Abdullayev both were strong proponents of Crumb in the Soviet period: in 1985, Karayev completed a tribute to the composer, _...a crumb of music for George Crumb…_ (see chapter 3), and Abdullayev performed on a composer’s portrait concert of Crumb at the 1988 Alternativa festival in Moscow.

several composers of the Denisov circle began writing for prepared piano, including Yuriy Kasparov and Vladimir Tarnopolski.\textsuperscript{108}

One of the most significant Soviet works for prepared piano is Nikolay Korndorf’s \textit{Yarilo} (1981). Scored for prepared piano and tape, \textit{Yarilo} is a primitivist work named after the ancient Slavic god associated with spring, vegetation, and virility. By incorporating prepared piano into a primitivist work, Korndorf recalls Cage’s earliest works for prepared piano, namely Cage’s \textit{Africanist Bacchanale} (1940), \textit{Totem Ancestor} (1942), and \textit{Primitive} (1942).

\textit{Yarilo} is cast in a conventional arch-like form with a quiet beginning, a loud, climactic middle section, and a quiet end. Given the work’s allusions to Slavic mythology, Korndorf unsurprisingly borrows heavily from Stravinsky’s \textit{The Rite of Spring}. Stravinsky’s influence is seen most clearly in Korndorf’s use of shifting, irregular meters which are linked by a constant, sub tactile pulse (example 1.8), as well as the four-note, folk-like melody repeated in the left hand beginning at m.251 (example 1.9). Another clear influence on Korndorf is Henry Cowell, Cage’s teacher, particularly in Korndorf’s repeated use of percussive white-key clusters beginning at m.97 (example 1.10).\textsuperscript{109} \textit{Yarilo} also includes several passages featuring \textit{malaya aleatorika}, particularly in the excerpt beginning at m.160, in which musical cells are repeated \textit{ad libitum} in the left hand against notated passages in right (example 1.11).

Korndorf first uses the piano preparations only at the piece’s climax, which is the $f$f$f$f section beginning at m.161, near \textit{Yarilo}’s halfway point. A series of trilled clusters gives way, at m.171, to a percussive knocking sound produced by trills on the note F6, whose strings have been dampened by two erasers (example 1.12). As Korndorf indicates in his performance directions, these erasers should be tightly jammed onto the strings so as to result in a sound of indefinite pitch. Korndorf uses this prepared knocking sound regularly throughout the second half the piece, both during the latter part of the climactic middle section and during the work’s long coda, usually in a decrescendoing sextuplet figure. (example 1.13). The four-note Stravinskian folk-like melody beginning at m.251 is also played on prepared strings. Korndorf instructs the pianist to insert either two- or ten-kopek coins into the strings of these notes (F3, G3, B$\flat$3, and C4; refer to example 1.9). As a result, these pitches acquire a metallic ring, and this folk-like melody sounds as if it is played on gamelan.

In addition to the preparations on the strings, Korndorf asks the pianist to create new sounds from the piano through unconventional performance techniques. Beginning at m.262, several pitches in the right hand are notated with a cross (+), indicating that the pianist should pluck these pitches’ strings “with a soft plastic plectrum (but not the fingernail),” resulting in a “soft, delicate sound” (example 1.14).

These plucked notes are the last sounds the performer makes. However, they are not the final sounds of the piece: \textit{Yarilo} closes with the tape part, which dies out with a gradual \textit{morendo}. The tape part consists of a recording of the three-measure passage from mm. 301-303, which is either recorded on tape beforehand or recorded live in performance. This three-measure passage is then repeated on loop at the work’s end.

\textsuperscript{108}See, for example, Yurii Kasparov’s Concerto for Oboe and Orchestra (1988), Vladimir Tarnopolski’s \textit{Troïsti muziki} (1989) and Karayev’s revision of his 1985 Crumb tribute, \textit{…a [little] crumb of music for George Crumb} (1986).

\textsuperscript{109}In 1930, the USSR State Music Publishing House (Muzgiz) published Cowell’s \textit{Tiger} (1928), which makes use of these clusters, in the collection \textit{Two Pieces} [\textit{Dve p’yesï}]. Reproduced in Richard Taruskin, \textit{Defining Russia Musically} (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), 90.
5. Minimalism

One of the central themes in Yarilo’s Russian reception has been its identification as a landmark of Russian minimalism. For example, two recently published college music textbooks, the History of Russian Music in the Second Half of the Twentieth Century [Istoriya otechestvennoy muzïki vtoroy polovinï XX veka] (2005) and the Theory of Contemporary Composition [Teoriya sovremennoy kompozitsii] (2007), both published under the aegis of the Russian Ministry of Culture, discuss Yarilo as an important minimalist work.110 Yarilo’s minimalist reputation was strongly encouraged by Korndorf, who described his work as an example of “American minimalism on Russian soil, [written] with great love for Stravinsky, Prokofiev and Shostakovich.”111 Yarilo’s place in the Russian minimalist canon was recently underscored when Pavel Karmanov (b. 1970), widely considered one of Russia’s leading minimalist composers today, included Yarilo in his March 2008 composer’s portrait concert at Moscow’s Chaikovsky Concert Hall.112

At first glance, Yarilo’s identification as a minimalist work is puzzling, as it lacks many of the features commonly associated with minimalism. Only selected passages prominently feature repetition, and much of the work features bold melodic flourishes and lurching, irregular rhythms. Yarilo does feature a Reich-style tape loop, however Russian commentators do not cite this as evidence of the work’s minimalist quality.

As the reception history of Yarilo helps show, the concept of minimalism in Russia is generally broader and more abstract than in America. The idea of minimalism in Russia will be described in greater detail in later chapters. For the purposes at hand, though, it is important to note the degree to which Russian theorists see minimalism as directly rooted in Cage’s aesthetic. Russian thinkers, of course, are hardly alone in associating minimalism with Cage; the notion of Cage as the first minimalist is particularly strong in Anglophone musicology, too. However, as Richard Taruskin points out, Cage’s philosophical and aesthetic views were quite different from the minimalists, in whose work he found little interest.113 For example, when Laura Fletcher and Thomas Moore asked Cage his opinion about works such as Reich’s Come Out (1966), in which musical processes are easily perceptible, Cage responded,

I think it was Steve Reich who said it was clear I was involved in process, but it was a process the audience didn’t participate in because they couldn’t understand it. I’m on the side of keeping things mysterious, and have never enjoyed understanding things. If I understand something, I have no further use for it. So I

---

112 Concert of March 31, 2008. Karmanov’s concert took place on the “Authors!” [Avtora!] series, sponsored by the Moscow Contemporary Music Ensemble. Each concert features a few works by the profiled composer, plus a few works selected by the composer as especially influential on his or her style. The full program included Pärt’s Mozart-Adagio (1992) for piano trio, Sil’vestrov’s Kitsch-Music: Five Pieces for Piano (1977), Karmanov’s quaREtet (1997) for string quartet, and Karmanov’s Trout Quintet (1998) for piano quintet.
113 See Richard Taruskin, “No Ear for Music: The Scary Purity of John Cage” in Taruskin, The Danger of Music and Other Anti-Utopian Essays (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009), 267-68. This article first appeared in The New Republic on 15 March 1993. As Taruskin notes, “All that Cage had to say of the work of Riley, Reich, or Glass (ungratefully enough, for they worshiped him) was, ‘I can’t use it.’”
try to make a music which I don’t understand and which will be difficult for other people to understand, too.\textsuperscript{114}

Lyubimov, who regularly performed pieces by Riley alongside works by Cage, helped jump-start the Russian association of minimalism with Cage in his 1974 article, in which he describes Cage’s divorcing of sound from all “rational” and “emotional” associations, hallmarks of minimalism in Russian thought.\textsuperscript{115} Margarita Katunyan develops these ideas in her description of minimalism in the 2007 textbook \textit{Theory of Contemporary Composition}:

“Minimalism” is music built upon material reduced down to its most basic form. This material oftentimes consists of the most basic, abstract building blocks of music, such as a single sound, an interval, a chord, a melodic gesture, or a sonority, here divorced from any historical style...Minimalism belongs to the most radical wing of the avant-garde—“experimental music”—which was developed by John Cage and his school...The idea of the emancipation of sound unto itself and a new perception of time provide the philosophical and creative foundations of minimalism.\textsuperscript{116}

Minimalism’s origins in Cage is the central point in the most influential article on minimalism in the Russian musicological literature, Pyotr Pospelov’s 1992 article “Minimalism and Repetitive Technique” [“\textit{Minimalizm i repetitivnaya tekhnika}”].\textsuperscript{117} In this article, Pospelov attempts to distinguish minimalism—which, for him, means music rooted in Cage’s idea of emancipated sound and minimal materials—from repetitive technique. For Pospelov, repetitive technique is characterized by static forms and repeating musical elements and is common to most folk- and non-Western musics, appearing in Western art music only during “post-industrial” age.\textsuperscript{118} Minimalism, meanwhile, is rooted in Cage’s aesthetic of emptiness and aims toward the purification of musical thought, towards the making of compositions free from humanistic abstractions, in which there will remain nothing but the most basic element of music, sound.

Minimalism concentrates attention on sound in its entirety; on sound with a completely different nature than the culture of sound in the Old World. Sound in minimalist music can make use of original, beautiful timbres (like Cage’s prepared piano), but it can also be “white,” consisting of sounds or noises traditionally understood as non-musical (as in Cage’s 4’33”...) The significance of sound unto itself is made possible only when sound exists without any functional goal and is not an element in a logical structure.\textsuperscript{119}

\textsuperscript{115} Lyubimov, “Keydzh (Cage) Dzhon,” 768.
\textsuperscript{118} Ibid., 77.
\textsuperscript{119} Ibid. 74.
For Pospelov, minimalism and repetitive technique are not mutually exclusive. Characteristic for Russian musicology, Pospelov presents a classificatory system similar to the one proposed by Denisov for understanding aleatory, dividing composers into groups whose works exhibit minimalism but not repetitive technique (Cage, Feldman, Young, Knayfel); minimalism and repetitive technique (Riley, Reich, Glass, Pärt); repetitive technique but not minimalism (Rabinovich, Adams); and neither repetitive technique nor minimalism. Though several commentators hail Martïnov as a paragon of Russian minimalism, for Pospelov he fits in the category with Aleksandr Rabinovich (b. 1945) and John Adams as one who practices repetitive technique but not minimalism, due mainly to his use of stylistic pastiche and parody.

Katunyan’s and Pospelov’s descriptions of minimalism help elucidate Yarilo’s reputation as a minimalist work. Yarilo includes prepared piano and tape, thus making use of “original, beautiful timbres…completely different from the culture of sound in the Old World” described by Pospelov as central the Cagean minimalist aesthetic. For Katunyan, Yarilo is minimalist due to both its structural and temporal qualities. Writing in the Theory of Contemporary Composition, she describes Yarilo as built upon a single, basic musical element (it is “a variation on a single chord,” she writes) and inspired by a new, post-Cagean “perception of time,” particularly in its lack of a clear beginning or end:

Yarilo does not have an end. After the climax, its form becomes “non-stop” [sic] and the sound gradually dies away. At the same time, the beginning pattern—a single sound—symbolizes the absence of a real beginning.

The piece is constructed as a variation on a single chord. In order to build the entire twenty-minute long piece on this single element, the composer applied a wide array of textural, dynamic, rhythmic, and registral devices; with the aid of these devices, the piece’s process of “gradual accumulation” (as Terry Riley would call it) builds up powerful, almost primal energy.

While Katunyan is generally correct about Yarilo’s lack of a definitive end, the work’s live performance part comes to a decisive end with the pianist’s final notes at m.359, while the remaining sounds are produced by tape loop. Katunyan’s assertion that Yarilo is a “variation on a single chord,” however, is less straightforward. Katunyan does not identify the chord upon which Yarilo is supposedly built. She possibly means the sonority featured in the left hand at m.37 (example 1.15), which consists of two major seconds, separated by a perfect fifth, with another major second on top (E-F#-B-C#-D#) and which plays an important role throughout Yarilo. This chord repeats consistently throughout the rhythmic section beginning at m.6, sometimes in inversion, with the D# below the E (e.g., m.32 – see example 1.15). Both the right-hand and left-hand melodies at the end of Yarilo derive from this sonority: by transposing this sonority up a minor third (to G-A-D-E-F#) we arrive at the five pitches melody plucked repeatedly by the right hand at Yarilo’s end, while transposing the sonority by a tritone (B♭-C-F-G-A) provides the pitches of the four-note melody played in the left hand, which uses all of the

---

120 Ibid., 81. The final category—music that exhibits neither repetitive technique nor minimalism—presumably includes most pieces by most composers. For reasons not entirely clear, Pospelov selects works by Glïinka, Denisov, Aleksandr Alyab’ev (1787-1851), and Leonid Polovinkin (1894-1949) as examples of this final category. As described below, Pospelov includes Korndorf in the third category, “repetitive technique but not minimalism.”

121 Ibid., 482. The “single sound” [odnozvuk] of the piece’s beginning is not a single interval, but rather the sound of an unaccompanied major second.
notes from the transposition except A. However, this sonority itself consists of the first five
degrees of a major scale; in this way, mode is perhaps the basic linking device in \textit{Yarilo}, and not
a single chord as proposed by Katunyan.

Pospelov classifies Korndorf not as a minimalist composer but rather one who practices
repetitive technique, like Martinov. Parts of \textit{Yarilo}, Pospelov writes, are particularly similar to
“American repetitive music,” a category that, for Pospelov, includes John Adams, whose
dramatic, tonally directed idiom is similar to Korndorf’s.\footnote{122} Though he does not consider
Korndorf a minimalist, Pospelov credits him with helping to expose the repetitive technique at
the heart of Russian folk music:

Thanks to Korndorf’s works we can be sure that the principles of Russian
instrumental folk music are close to static form and repetitive technique,
especially in dance genres where the performer repeats strains \textit{[kolena]} such as
the pastoral \textit{naigrish}. Russian composers of the 19th and early 20th centuries
fought against simple repetition and, in their “arrangements,” emphasized instead
new developments in each variation – Glinka’s \textit{Kamarinskaya} was the first
Russian repetitive work. Only now, at the end of the 20th century, when folklore
is in danger of completely disappearing, is its static character recognized and
prized unto itself.\footnote{123}

Pospelov’s comments point towards one of the central themes in late- and post-Soviet
Russian discourse on minimalism, namely the notion that there is a uniquely Russian minimalist
tradition, related to American minimalism yet fundamentally rooted in distinctly Russian
traditions, particularly folk and Orthodox liturgical music. Much of this discourse is framed
around \textit{Yarilo}, hailed as among the first distinctively Russian minimalist works. Writing in the
\textit{History of Russian Music of the Second Half of the Twentieth Century}, Savenko describes
Korndorf as the founder of “a deeply national strand of minimalism,” in whose art

minimalism uniquely intersects with the Russian epic tradition. At the base of
[Korndorf’s] works...lies the idea of gradual, almost static accumulation, which
builds up to a dynamic level...The genetic link with Slavic \textit{popevochnost’} is
obvious... [especially in] \textit{Yarilo} (1981), which seizes the listener in a paganesque
daze at its climax...\footnote{124}

Questions about the stylistic relationship between minimalism and Russian musical
traditions has become a vibrant area of inquiry in recent years. This inquiry is not limited to
musicological work, as several composers have recently explored the relationship between
minimalism, Orthodox liturgical music, and Russian folk music in their works, most prominently
Martinov.

Not everyone accepted such a catholic view of minimalism. Denisov associated
minimalism mainly with its classical American examples and was altogether intolerant of it:

\footnote{122 Pospelov, “Minimalizm i repetitivnaya tekhnika,” 80.}
\footnote{123 Ibid.}
development and motivic repetition common to much Orthodox hymnody and Russian folk music.}
I do not have a good opinion of minimalism. It is predicated upon artistic conformity and expresses some sort of weariness. Minimalism arises from a desire to find the easiest possible paths through the creative process. A few American composers practice it – Steve Reich, Philip Glass. It’s very uninteresting.125

Cage and the Russian Traditions

For several commentators, the connections between Cage and indigenous Russian traditions runs far deeper than the stylistic affinities between Russian folk and liturgical music and the minimalism Cage helped inspire. Svetlana Golïbina, composer of the “a-ratoriya” Al’tasor, likens Cage’s emancipation of sound to the aesthetic views of the early twentieth-century Russian Futurist poets, many of whom split words into phonemes so as to rid them of their syntactic meaning, thus turning language into “pure sounds” à la Cage.126 Golïbina is not alone in drawing this connection, as several composers turned to Futurist poets as the source of texts for their Cagean works. For example, Martïnov’s minimalist Opus Post I (1984) and Opus Post II (1993) are based upon texts by OBERIU poet Nikolay Zabolotsky (1903-1958), while his minimalist “avant-folk” work Night in Galicia [Noch’ v Galitsii] (1996), composed for Dmitriy Pokrovsky’s folk ensemble, combines texts by Futurist poet Velimir Khlebnikov (1885-1922) with songs from the Rusalka legend presented in the 1836 collection Legends of the Russian People by ethnographer Ivan Sakharov (1807-1863).

For others, Cage’s “intuitiveism” and “anti-rationalism” are related to more deeply seated intellectual traditions. Ivan Sokolov, one of Cage’s main advocates in Russia, describes Cage’s works as expressive of the anti-rationalism and mysticism he imagines as lying at the heart of Russian culture. As Sokolov stated,

In Cage, there’s a secret, there’s mysticism, there’s something that can’t be understood, can’t be known. It’s fresh, unconventional, and new, truly new! Cage’s music stems not from rational concerns that might be understood and explained, but rather from intuition. Russia is a mystical country, and here we love [these sorts] of very strange things. [We love] the incomprehensible.127

Not so incidentally, in his 1992 tribute work On Cage [O Keydzhe], Sokolov included a text by Fyodor Tyutchev (1803-73), author of the famous poem in praise of Russian anti-rationalism, “You cannot understand Russia with the mind…” [Umom Rossiyu ne ponyat’...].

For Sokolov, Cage’s anti-rationalism is directly related to “Russian soul,” and not “German brains.” In Sokolov’s view, a small coterie of conservatory-trained Russian musicians possess musical “German brains”; the rest of the population, barred from musical education by economic or other barriers, instead experiences music in an intuitive, soulful way, naturally relating to music in a manner similar to Cage:

125 Kholopov and Tsenova, Edison Denisov, 169.
126 Drozdetskaya, “Idei Dzhona Keydzha,” 150.
127 Ivan Sokolov, interview with the author, April 14, 2008.
In Germany, the majority of the population is musically literate, has an ear for music, sings in choirs and learns to play an instrument. Here in Russia? We have either super-musicians, who everybody wants to achieve some world-wide fame. They’re on top. And below? People who maybe had money problems and couldn’t afford to buy an instrument, or maybe didn’t have a musical family or have access to music schools. But they’re interested in music. They come to a concert and see that music isn’t just music, but is thought about music. And when this thought about music is itself the subject of music, then it’s especially interesting.

A Russian musician comes [to a concert and laughs] “ha!” And then he begins to contemplate...\(^{128}\)

Sokolov’s idea of experimental music as emblematic of the anti-rational “Russian soul” (and not German musical “brains”) has become somewhat widespread in recent Russian musicography. Aleksandr Ivashkin presents a similar idea when he describes Schnittke as lying “between two traditions...German rationalism on one hand and Russian irrationalism on the other.”\(^{129}\) For Ivashkin, Schnittke’s “Russian irrationalism” is seen most clearly in passages such as the “visual cadenza” at the end of the Violin Concerto No. 4 (1984).\(^{130}\)

When Cage was in Soviet Union, he did indeed elicit the broad interest Sokolov would predict. However, not everyone was pleased with his visit, and some individuals who seemingly prided themselves on their “German brains” were not nearly so welcoming of this American guest and his assault on tradition.

**Cage in the USSR**

Cage traveled to the Third International Festival in Leningrad with an American delegation that included the musicologist Laurel Fay. Cage immediately latched onto Fay, interested by her expertise in contemporary Soviet music. As Fay describes, “[Cage] was eager to pick my brains about the most interesting composers, the latest trends in musical and cultural life, what he ought to look at and listen to [in Leningrad]. His genuine excitement was terribly touching, and I found myself doing whatever I could to try to enrich his visit.”\(^{131}\) As we will see, one of the main ways Fay enriched Cage’s visit was by helping introduce him to notable musicians at the festival in Leningrad, most prominently Gubaidulina.

Cage and Fay traveled from New York to Moscow on a flight that included Susan Feder (then a vice president of G. Schirmer, the main publishing firm representing Soviet artists in North America), Nicolas Slonimsky, and Vladimir Ussachevsky.\(^{132}\) The flight was met at the airport by Lyubimov and Aleksandr Ivashkin, a cellist and member of the Soloists of the Bol’shoy Theater ensemble. In honor of Cage’s visit, Ivashkin and his wife, Natasha, hosted a

---

\(^{128}\) Ibid.


\(^{130}\) Ibid., 157-58.

\(^{131}\) Fay’s recollection of traveling with Cage to Leningrad is published in Michael Kurtz’s *Sofia Gubaidulina*, 200-201.

\(^{132}\) Laurel Fay, e-mail communication with the author, April 14, 2010. Sincerest thanks to Dr. Fay for sharing these recollections.
dinner at their home attended by Cage, Fay, Feder, Lyubimov, Martînov, and others.\textsuperscript{133} Cage, who was then pursuing a macrobiotic diet, decided to sample the local fare. As Fay described,

> When we emerged from the metro, Cage strode off purposefully into the weeds outside Sasha’s [Ivashkin’s] apartment building and pulled up arms full of first-growth dandelion and burdock leaves, to the amusement and embarrassment of the Soviets, who snapped lots of pictures. When asked if he weren’t afraid that the greens might contain radioactive fallout from Chernobyl, his reply was that “if they do, we do.” He then proceeded to cook them up. They were delicious.\textsuperscript{134}

After the dinner, Cage and Fay took an overnight train from Moscow, arriving in Leningrad the next day. Cage’s presence at the festival, something unthinkable only a year or two before, caused quite a sensation. As Fay recalls, during his four days in Leningrad, Cage was constantly surrounded by crowds of people taking photographs and asking for autographs.\textsuperscript{135} In addition to his activities at the festival, Cage met with artists and musicians, including students, and participated in an open meeting with students at the Leningrad Conservatory translated by Fay and musicologist Lyudmila Kovnatskaya.\textsuperscript{136}

Cage’s concert took place the afternoon of May 21, 1988, the second full day of the festival.\textsuperscript{137} Held in the Small Hall of the Leningrad Philharmonic, the concert was performed by the Soloists of the Bol’shoy Theater ensemble, with soprano Nelli Li and conducted by Aleksandr Lazarev. In addition to Cage’s Music for Fourteen (1986), the concert featured marches by Mauricio Kagel, George Crumb’s Lux aeterna (1971), Sergey Slonimsky’s Novgorod Dance [Novgorodskaya plyaska] (1980), and Valentin Sil’vestrov’s Ode to a Nightingale [Oda solov’yu] (1983).

As Fay recalls, Cage was received warmly at the concert and greeted with loud applause.\textsuperscript{138} However, audience reaction to his work was mixed. While some in the audience applauded the piece, others booed it. Many of these audible protests likely originated from foreign guests since, as Fay notes, loud booing was virtually unheard of in the USSR at the time.\textsuperscript{139}

One Soviet audience member was especially demonstrative in his aversion to Cage’s piece. Midway through Music for Fourteen, composer Boris Tishchenko (b. 1939) attempted to

\textsuperscript{133} Ibid. and Laurel Fay, e-mail communication with the author, February 5, 2008.

\textsuperscript{134} Laurel Fay, e-mail communication with the author, February 5, 2008. Valentina Kholopova also mentions this incident in her recent biography of Lyubimov. See Kholopova, Aleksey Lyubimov: Tvorcheskiy portret (Moscow: Kompozitor, 2009), 31-32.

\textsuperscript{135} Laurel Fay, e-mail communication with the author, February 5, 2008. See, too, Fay’s recollections in Kurtz, Sofia Gubaidulina, 201.

\textsuperscript{136} Laurel Fay, e-mail communication with the author, February 5, 2008.

\textsuperscript{137} The festival’s first event took place the afternoon of Thursday, May 19, 1988 with a musical-ethnographic concert at the Leningrad House of Composers. The official opening [Torzhественное открытие], though, took place the next evening, on Friday, May 20, 1988, with a performance by the Leningrad Philharmonic, at the philharmonic’s Great Hall, conducted by Jansug Kakhidze and Valery Gergiyev. The program included Prokofiev’s Violin Concerto No. 2 (1935), Nono’s tribute to Tarkovsky, No hay caminos, hay que caminar … Andrej Tarkowskij (1987), Yashushi Akutagawa’s (1925-1989) Rhapsody (1971) and Kancheli’s Light Sorrow [Sevda nateli] (1985).

Akutagawa first visited the Soviet Union in 1954 and returned numerous times throughout the rest of his life, maintaining close ties with Shostakovich, Khachaturian, and others.

\textsuperscript{138} Laurel Fay, e-mail communication the author, February 5, 2008.

end the performance with deliberate, premature applause. Some informants remember Tishchenko walking out in protest. Cage was annoyed by this interruption. In an interview conducted in Leningrad for Tempo, Claire Polin asked Cage, “You are aware that someone tried to applaud before the end of the piece,” to which Cage responded, “That was something we heard, but it was not as musical as it was theatrical. His action was not beautiful; he was also very selfish for disturbing the interest of those who were going on – he imposed on everyone else.”

Tishchenko had been affiliated with many of the unofficial composers of the 1960s and ‘70s, but by the later 1980s had become one of the more important establishment figures in Soviet music, having been appointed professor of composition at the Leningrad Conservatory in 1986. Tishchenko’s odyssey from ‘60s progressive to perestroika and post-Soviet conservative establishment figure is not unique. Tishchenko’s Leningrad colleague Sergey Slonimsky (b. 1932) is now regarded as an extremely conservative figure despite his early musical experimentation, as is Moscow composer Roman Ledenyov (b. 1930), who wrote serial compositions in the 1960s but in 2007 became the secretary of a new group pledging to restore traditional, conservative values to Russian music. Even Yuriy Kholopov became arch-conservative after the Soviet collapse, a development one informant described to me as “going the way of Sviridov.”

The day after this concert, Fay arranged for Cage to meet Gubaidulina, the Soviet composer she thought would most interest him. During intermission of the evening concert of May 22 at the Leningrad Philharmonic’s Great Hall, Fay introduced the two composers, who skipped the first piece after intermission in order to prolong their conversation.

The conversation didn’t last very long, five or ten minutes at the most [...] Fresh from hearing the performance of Cage’s Music for Fourteen the previous day, Sofia [Gubaidulina] had an advantage as Cage had not heard any of her music. Mentioning her interest in musical time, she queried Cage about his own [use of timing]. Music for... is notated with flexible time brackets. In the performance we had heard the day before [...] each of the musicians had been conspicuously equipped with a watch. Sofia wanted to know why. Ideally, she thought, the performers ought to depend on their own internal clocks. Cage agreed wholeheartedly, but said that in his experience performers couldn’t always be trusted to heed their inner clocks. As I recall his explanation, he said they had an unfortunate tendency to rush. Sofia was sympathetic but remained firm in her opinion. Both considered it a critical issue.

---

141 The group calls itself MOST, which means “bridge” and is an acronym for Muzikal’noye ob’yedeniye “Sovremennaya traditsiya” [Musical union “Contemporary Tradition”]. It published its manifesto in the far-right journal Zavtra, with an introduction by Sergey Konstantinov entitled “Osvozhdeniye Evropi” proposing that Russia might liberate Europe from the tyranny of the avant-garde. See Zavtra 14 (No. 698), 4 April 2007 (available online at http://www.zavtra.ru/cgi/veil/data/zavtra/07/698/82.html, accessed November 24, 2010).
142 The program included Laotian composer Duangmisai Likaiya’s Glory to the Motherland, Mongolian composer M. Sharav’s Symphony No. 2, Austrian composer H. Ebenkhe’s Concerto for Two Groups of Percussion and Orchestra, North Vietnamese composer Kuang Hai’s Concerto for Dan Chan and Orchestra, Teizō Matsumura’s Piano Concerto No. 2 (1978), and Boris Chaikovsky’s Music for Orchestra [Muzika dlya orkestra] (1987).
143 Kurtz, Sofia Gubaidulina, 201.
The conversation had a lasting effect on Cage. Because he was only in Leningrad for four days, Cage was unable to attend the performance of Gubaidulina’s *The Hour of the Soul* ([*Chas dushi*] (1976, rev. 1988), a setting of Tsvetayeva poems for orchestra, solo percussionist, and mezzo-soprano, on the evening concert of May 26. However, Cage asked Fay to send him recordings of Gubaidulina’s music, which she did upon return to New York. Around a year later, Cage called Fay to tell her how much his conversation with Gubaidulina had meant and that he had been inspired by it to write a composition, *Two* (1989) for two pianos. The piece bears the inscription “This piece is in response to a conversation in Leningrad with Sofia Gubaidulina. ‘There is an inner clock.’”

This meeting in Leningrad was not the last one between the two composers. A year later, in April 1989, Gubaidulina traveled to New York for a composer’s portrait concert of her music presented by Joel Sachs and his Continuum ensemble. Cage attended the performance, which was held in Alice Tully Hall and featured Gubaidulina’s *Quasi hoquetus* (1984-85), *De profundis* (1978), *Quattro* (1974), and *Perception* (1981-86).

Cage’s *Two* was not the only American work inspired by Cage’s contact with Soviet artists. According to Fay, during his trip to Leningrad Cage was most excited by the prospect of meeting with unofficial Soviet artists. In fact, while in Leningrad, Cage cited his “involvement with the art world” as central to his music’s influence. Cage’s introduction to the Leningrad art scene came by way of artist Sergey Bugayev (b. 1966), better known as Afrika, who by the late 1980s had achieved a reputation in the United States and even corresponded with Andy Warhol. Led by Bugayev, Cage met with underground artists including members of the Mit’ki, a group of Leningrad artists who, in the words of Alexei Yurchak, “turned their daily existence into an aesthetic project,” dressing in uniforms of striped shirts and ragged coats and working low-pressure jobs so as to dedicate as much time as possible to drinking and painting together. While in Leningrad, Cage attended an exhibit by Mit’ki members and spent several hours talking with Vladimir Florensky, one of the group’s leaders. Cage also met with

---

144 The concert, conducted by Aleksandr Dmitriyev and Timur Minbayev, was performed by the Academic Symphony Orchestra of the Leningrad Philharmonic, and featured Ligeti’s *Lontano* (1967), Krzysztof Meyer’s (b. 1943) *Fireballs* (1976), Usko Meriläinen’s (b. 1930) “… but this is a landscape, Monsieur Dali’” [*… mutta tämähän on maisema, monsieur Dali’*] (1986), and works by North Korean composers Li Don Ki and Kim Yun Bom and South Korean Kun Kan. Pekarsky performed the solo percussion part in Gubaidulina’s piece, and Lina Mkrtchan sang the mezzo-soprano part.


146 Ibid., 204.

147 Fay, e-mail communication with the author, February 5, 2008. Fay did not accompany Cage to visit the artists.

148 Polin, “Conversations in Leningrad, 1988,” 18. Polin asks Cage, “Why do you think your music has been so influential?”, to which Cage responds, “It’s because of my involvement with the art world and my acceptance of technology.”

149 As Andrew Solomon recounts, in 1985, Afrika sent Warhol a proposal for an art project in space; Warhol, in return, sent Afrika six autographed cans of Campbell’s soup. After Afrika learned of Warhol’s death in 1987, he held a dinner party at which he opened these cans and ate the soup. See Solomon, *The Irony Tower*, 61.

150 On the Mit’ki, see Alexei Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever, Until It Was No More: The Last Soviet Generation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005), 238-243. As Yurchak notes, the group’s weird name conveys the sense of kinship and camaraderie central to the group’s ethos. The name “Mit’ki” is a plural form of Mityok, itself a diminutive form of the name Dmitriy. “Dmitriy” here refers to the Mit’ki’s leader, artist Dmitriy Shagin (b. 1957). Group members addressed one another as “my little brother” [bratishka] and “my little sister” [sestroyonka] – hence, all were little Dmitries, or “Mit’ki.” See Yurchak, 242.

151 Drozdetskaya, “Idei Dzhona Keydzha,” 147.
Leningrad artists Sergey Kuryokhin (1954-96) and Timur Novikov (1958-2002), Bugayev’s colleagues in the performance art troupe Pop Mechanics [*Pop-mekhanika*], formed by Kuryokhin around 1986.\(^{152}\)

Impressed with Afrika, Cage helped facilitate a collaboration between him and Merce Cunningham (1919-2009), who commissioned Afrika to design the sets and costumes for his 1989 ballet *August Pace*, which was premiered at the University of California, Berkeley in September 1989.\(^{153}\) In 1989, Afrika traveled to New York for an exhibition of unofficial Soviet art. Cage reciprocated Afrika’s hospitality and introduced him to several American experimentalists, including Nam June Paik (1932-2006).\(^{154}\)

**Echoes of “One Hand Clapping”**

Much as Cage was artistically inspired by his Soviet visit, so too were several young Soviet composers inspired by Cage’s trip. Cage’s ideas had found especially fertile soil among a group of Moscow musicians educated at the conservatory in the 1980s, including Batagov, Pospelov (b. 1962, author of the influential 1992 article on minimalism), Sokolov, and Sergei Zagny (b. 1960). With the exception of Pospelov, best known as a music critic, all of these figures are equally known as composers and pianists. As Batagov described, this generation looked to Martînov, Lyubimov, and Pekarsky for guidance and inspiration, and sought to take a “second step” along the path forged by this earlier generation during the 1970s.\(^{155}\)

As we shall see, though, this younger generation understood Cage in ways that differed subtly from their predecessors. While in the 1970s and early ‘80s Cage was celebrated as a liberator and unmitigated progressive—recall Yekimovsky’s description of Cage as “avant-gardist Number One”—these younger composers, and especially Batagov and Zagny, better understood Cage’s dark side, especially the authoritarian and conservative streak at the heart of his ideas. Batagov hints at this when he wrote, in 1996,

> Usually, [Cage] is considered to be something like ‘the most avant-garde composer of the 20th century.’ No, he is not. He is a Teacher, a Zen Master, and his 4’33”, as well as all his activity, is not a revolution but a ‘clap of one hand,’ the answer to the famous Zen question. Cage (his music, his philosophy, the very fact of his existence) is a silent turning point: everything after this point is ‘life


\(^{153}\) The music was composed by Michael Pugliese (1956-1997), a composer, conductor, and percussionist close to Cage and Cunningham.

\(^{154}\) The exhibition was entitled the “First North American Exhibition of the Friends of Mayakovsky Club,” curated by Paul Judelson and displayed in his home. See Solomon, *The Irony Tower*, 211-12. As Solomon recounts, Afrika thanked Paik for his 1988 *Wrap Around the World*, a video artwork broadcast worldwide in advance of the Seoul Olympics in which Merce Cunningham participated. According to Solomon, Afrika told Paik that his work allowed “millions of Soviet people” to “see scenes of cultural life from all over the world, without our television’s usual editorializing.”

\(^{155}\) Anton Batagov, interview with the author, May 28, 2008.
after Cage,’ and anyone who is able to hear, to see, to feel, must learn something from him.\footnote{Anton Batagov, “On Revolutionary Consciousness” (1996). Original in English. Published on Batagov’s website, http://www.batagov.com/slova/on_revolutionary_e.htm (accessed September 9, 2009).}

Batagov’s closing words—that “anyone who is able to hear, to see, to feel, must learn something from [Cage]”—strongly recall Cage’s authoritarianism and Hegelian view of history. As Richard Taruskin notes, Cage referred to his work as “what I was obliged to do,” further stating, “I’m practically Germanic in my insistence on doing what is necessary.”\footnote{Richard Taruskin, “No Ear for Music: The Scary Purity of John Cage,” 268. For Cage’s quote about doing “what I was obliged to do,” see Cage’s interview with Jeff Goldberg, “John Cage Interviewed,” \textit{Transatlantic Review} 55-56 (May 1976), excerpted and reprinted in Kostelanetz, \textit{Conversing with Cage}, 36. For Cage’s quote about being “Germanic” in “doing what is necessary,” see Cage’s interview with Roger Reynolds, “John Cage and Roger Reynolds: A Conversation,” \textit{The Musical Quarterly} 65 (1979): 585.}

In 1988, the year of Cage’s visit, Ivan Sokolov initiated a series of piano works explicitly inspired by the American composer. Sokolov’s works combine nonsensical texts, “pure” musical sounds, and various nonsensical actions so as to, in the words of Kholopov, “widen music’s artistic boundaries” as Cage had done.\footnote{Kholopov, “Vkład Keydzha,” 90.} Sokolov began incorporating theatrical gestures into his works shortly after participating in the first Alternativa festival, which was staged in response to Cage’s visit and during which Sokolov participated in theatrical, Cage-inspired happenings. As Sokolov describes,

\begin{quote}
Happening, performance \textit{[performans]} – these are very important words for me […] I became interested in instrumental theater in 1988, as soon as Alternativa began. For me, instrumental theater was a completely unbelievable discovery – the fact that you can express yourself with gesture, with words, with various simultaneous actions […] I sought for myself the answer to various questions – not just how to compose music, but where to go in life. Why write music? I decided to write music that was entertaining to the audience, but which also strove towards perfection.\footnote{Ivan Sokolov, interview with the author, April 14, 2008.}
\end{quote}

Sokolov’s comment points toward twin poles of Soviet Cage reception – on the one hand, the notion of music which maximally engages the audience and breaks down the boundaries separating art and life; and, on the other hand, the belief in “pure sounds” free from all connotations, as described by Pospelov and Lyubimov. Sokolov practiced these impulses in various ways, filling his works with comical and theatrical gestures rooted in Cage’s “love of paradox” all the while loading into his works hidden ciphers and abstract numerical structures beyond human cognition, hence oriented “toward perfection.”

Sokolov began his Cagean cycle with the solo piano work \textit{Volokos} (1988)—the title is Sokolov’s name spelled backwards—which is built around texts written by Sokolov himself and the OBERIU poet Zabolotsky, whom Martînov had set in his minimalist \textit{Opus Post I} (1986). The performer recites these texts and “spells” them out, note-by-note, with the aid of a musical alphabet presented at the work’s beginning. Throughout \textit{Volokos}, the performer gestures and moves about the stage – for example, at the piece’s beginning, the performer lies on the ground, under the piano, and gradually pulls themselves up by the keyboard. At the work’s end, the
performer climbs on top of the piano’s lid, jumps off of it while shouting “The End!”, then bows to the audience and exits the stage.

Sokolov continued his Cage cycle with his Thirteen Pieces [Trinadts’’ p’y es] (1988), a collection of Dadaist character pieces for solo piano. Each short movement is built around various activities or ideas, whether playing tin whistle (No. 9, “Catastrophe!” [Katastrofa!]) or blowing up a balloon until it pops (No. 11, “The Universe!” [Vseleynaya!]). Underscoring the Cage connection, one of the movements, No. 6, “Life!” [Zhizn’!] consists of ten seconds of silence, framed by the pianist shouting the movement’s title. “Life!” is followed by its antithesis, No. 7, “Death!” [Smert’!], throughout which the pianist breathes loudly while depressing the right pedal in a Sarabande rhythm (example 1.16).

Sokolov’s Cagean cycle culminated in his 1992 piano triptych On Cage [O Keydzhe]. The triptych’s first movement, also entitled “On Cage,” is built around two poems, one by Sokolov and the other a setting of Shakespeare by Fyodr Tyutchev (1803-1873), author of the famous quatrain in praise of Russian anti-rationalism. Sokolov’s poem is a stream of consciousness text extolling the “purity” of Cage’s aesthetic:

The world of Cage is pure
The idea of 4’33” is as free and simple –
as the impossibility of writing it poorly,
and - even more:
the impossibility of evil during these 273 holy seconds
(in which the figure seven helps reconcile two and three,
and three and seven help vanquish that cursed number thirteen
them – two; it – one
thirteen times seven times three equals 273)
these 273 seconds
(where 7 – like Cage –
despite the hundreds – upwards
stands between two epochs
Epochs – Three – which exhausted the body of music
and Two – Epochs – spirit, astral, ether)
these seconds
sound as Everything which is heard, Everything which takes place
they sound all around us
in them, we hear Nothing More than That which is

This first movement is cast in three parts. In the first part, the pianist reads aloud Sokolov’s and Tyutchev’s poems. The second part is what Sokolov calls a “musico-graphic variation” on the poems and is built around a musical cipher similar to the one Sokolov used in Volokos. The pianist musically spells out these poems, letter by letter, through a musical alphabet in which each note corresponds uniquely to a single letter of the Russian alphabet. While in Volokos the pianist describes and plays the musical alphabet as part of the piece, there is no such explanation for the audience in On Cage, owing perhaps to the work’s greater concern with artistic “purity.”

The musical alphabet for the first movement of On Cage is presented in example 1.17. The following example (example 1.18) applies this alphabet to the music, showing how Sokolov musically “spells out,” note-by-note, the first eleven lines of text. (The remaining notes on the
During performance, the pianist “plays” this text with their left hand. With their right hand, the pianist takes a black marker and draws shapes corresponding to the musical gestures on a piece of paper displayed in view of the audience. This movement comes to a close with a “reprise” of the spoken text, which Sokolov instructs the pianist to whisper to the audience.

Sokolov’s pursuit of Cagean “purity” intensified in the triptych’s second movement, “Airborne Letter” [Vozdushnoye pis’mo]. This movement is built around an imaginary letter by Sokolov to John Cage, the text of which reads:

Dear John Cage,
Thank you for showing us what art can be. Through your burning love for art, you have melted its body and once again returned it to the ether, the “Spirit of God,” which rushes over the water. This ether is perfectly responsive and instantly takes on the essence of its creator—he-who-creates-from-it—perfectly realizing its creator’s aspirations. Thank you for this! In every creation henceforth—whether large or small, deliberate or poetic—there will be a part of you. We will try as best as we can to find reflection in the mirror of your soul. God help us with this!

The pianist uses one hand to “write” out the text of this letter on the piano strings, all the while holding down the damper pedal to allow strings to vibrate sympathetically. After writing this letter on the strings by hand, the pianist reads it aloud. During this process of writing and reading the letter, the pianist uses his other hand to play a series of arpeggiations of an Am\textsuperscript{7} chord (example 1.19).\footnote{Sokolov provides two options for performing this movement. The first option is to perform both hands’ parts on a single piano, the right hand playing the arpeggiations and the left “writing” the text on the strings of the piano’s bass register. The second option—more difficult but Sokolov’s preferred method [no luchshe bi sdelat’ tak]—is to perform the movement on two pianos, side-by-side. In this case, the performer would play the arpeggiations with his left hand in the upper register of the left piano, while “writing” the text on the bass strings of the right-hand piano. Both pianos’ damper pedals would be depressed. The increased sympathetic vibrations brought about through this second method would produce, in Sokolov’s words, “beautiful resonance, reminiscent of the sound of the wind at the forest’s tops [v vershinakh lesa].” This phrase [v vershinakh lesa] was often used by Tyutchev, whom Sokolov set in his first Cage work, Volokos.}

Sokolov chose this sonority because its pitches—A C E G—spell “Cage,” a fact made clear in the triptych’s closing movement, “Prophecy” [Predskazaniye] when the pianist repeatedly plays this chord and states “Cage,” shortly after playing the Bach cipher (B♭ A C B) and stating “Bach!” (example 1.20). In this closing movement Sokolov makes a joke of the musical ciphers so central to his Cagean works: alongside “Cage” and “Bach,” Sokolov spells out the nonsensical ciphers “Gafisgis!” (=G A F# [Fis] G# [Gis]) and “Fisahd! (=F# [Fis] A B [H] D).

While Sokolov was writing his Cagean piano works, Pospelov organized his own Cagean musical experiments. At the end of the 1980s, Pospelov put together a multimedia performing arts group he called Eradication of Contradictions [Udaleniye protivorechiy]. As Pospelov
explained in articles about the group, its purpose was to help erase various distinctions which had developed over time, including:


Between 1989-1991, Pospelov’s Eradication of Contradictions staged a series of performances to transcend these boundaries, all the while celebrating Cagean anti-rationality and spontaneity. Many of these performances were shot as short films, like the works by Totart, and later shown at video festivals and new music concerts. For example, in 1991, Pospelov and his Eradication of Contradictions collective filmed a “lyrical home-art opera” [liricheskaya khom-art-opera] entitled “Aria with Little Bells” [Ariya s kolokol’chikami]. The piece, which was shown at the “Video-91” festival in Leningrad (1991), consisted mainly of a video recording of a woman talking on the telephone, with musical accompaniment in the background. As Pospelov explains in his commentary to the work, “Thanks to Cage’s example, we know that anything that sounds might be music. In this way, anything that sounds alongside the human voice might be opera.”

Pospelov’s Eradication of Contradictions project reached its high point, perhaps, in winter 1991, when Pospelov organized a group improvisation ensemble by the same name. Pospelov’s Eradication of Contradictions Ensemble included Batagov, Zagny, and the noted flutist and improviser Natal’ya Pshenichnikova. Ensemble members improvised on a wide variety of instruments and found objects, including piano, flute, Central Asian tambourines, empty jars, and whirligig toys. By improvising on folk instruments and everyday objects, Pospelov’s group clearly recalls Gubaidulina’s Astraea.

In December 1991, in the final days of the Soviet Union, Pospelov’s Eradication of Contradictions Ensemble participated in a Cagean happening at Moscow’s Glinka Museum [Gosudarstvennyi tsentralnyi muzey muzïkal’noy kul’turï im. M.I. Glinki] as part of that year’s Alternativa festival. The twelve-hour long event, entitled “The House that Cage Built” [Dom,

---


163 The notion of Cage “erasing contradictions” between genres and styles is widespread in Russia today. For example, in 1994 composer Aleksey Aygi (b. 1971, son of Gennadiy Aygi) founded the minimalist band 4’33”, which is dedicated, in Dmitriy Ukhov’s words, to “erasing the differences between different types of music.” See Ukhov, “Posle postmodernizma (neakademicheskiye kul’turnyye zhanri v Rossii),” in Valeriya Tsenova, Aleksandr Sokolov, and Vladimir Tarnopolski, eds, Muzïka XX veka. Moskovskiy forum. Materiali mezhdunarodnikh nauchnikh konferentsiy (Moscow: Moskovskaya gosudarstvennaya konservatoriya, 1999), 66. In the mid-1990s, Aygi’s group, which is oftentimes described as Russia’s answer to the Michael Nyman Band, became the house band at the revived Alternativa festival, managed by Ukhov.

164 Pospelov, “Avtorskiye i sovmestnye rabotï.” Available online at www.proarte.ru/ru/komposers/pospelov/cinema/tv_video.htm#%C2%E8%E4%E5%EE (accessed September 13, 2009).

kotorîy postroil Keydzh], featured performances throughout the building. As part of the happening, ensemble members played with toys and improvised on various instruments, as seen in the photographs of Batagov playing a toy flute while sitting at a prepared piano and spinning a top (example 1.21).

For Batagov, this 1991 happening signaled an artistic liberation similar to the social and political one then unfolding amidst the Soviet collapse:

We did not pretend we were doing something new. As a whole [this performance] was the same as Cage and his friends had been doing in the ‘50s. But it was very important for us to do [these] things in post-communist Russia with our own hands. It was really exciting. It was like having freedom of speech guaranteed by a constitution after many decades of communist dictatorship. We were really happy to say goodbye to communist ideology and communist musicology. But in addition to that (which was, so to speak, a step towards outer freedom) this event had a personal musical meaning for each of us. Our desire to do these happenings in the late ‘80s-early ‘90s had one more important “excuse.” It was not enough for us to read about Cage and watch available videos of his happenings. Each of us had a personal need to go through this stage of musical and creative development, otherwise it would be only theoretical knowledge. Of course we were not going to make these happenings our own style of expression for the rest of our lives but it was really important to have this practical experience. This was a step towards our inner creative freedom. We were different personalities and sometimes we didn’t share one another’s opinions, and sometimes we disliked one another’s “production” but here we got together to share some kind of sonic experience which was beyond all our distinctions.165

In the wake of this personal liberation, each member of the group would pursue this Cagean legacy in a variety of ways throughout the post-Soviet years. Pospelov, Zagny, and Batagov all became active participants at the Theremin Center [Termen tsentr], an electronic music studio formed at the Moscow Conservatory in 1992 and a hotbed of Cagean experimentalism. Pospelov’s work on Cage came to a head in a made-for-television documentary about Cage’s “Lecture on Nothing,” broadcast in Russia in January 1993 and featuring performances by Sokolov, Zagny, Lyubimov, and Pshenichnikova. Pospelov further continued his Cagean crusade of traversing conventional aesthetic boundaries by founding, in the early 1990s, the collective composition troupe TPO Kompozitor [Tvorchesco-Proizvodstvennoye Ob’yedineniye “Kompozitor” or “Composer” Creative-Production Organization], which seeks to eradicate traditional notions of authorship through producing collectively composed works. TPO Kompozitor’s name and collectivist ethos recall the early twentieth-century experimental group Prokoll, or Proizvodstvenniy kollektiv [Production Collective], a group of composers from the Moscow Conservatory that worked together to create proletarian music and published its works under the name “Collective.”166

165 Anton Batagov, e-mail communication with the author, May 28, 2009. Original in English.
For more on Prokoll, see the entry about the group on the “Tvorcheshkiye organizatsii” page in the history section of the Moscow Conservatory’s website (www.mosconsv.ru/page.phtml?11094, accessed October 20, 2010).
Cage’s influence seems particularly strong in many of Zagny’s and Batagov’s works of the 1990s and 2000s. Zagny experimented with open forms, chance, and ever-widening artistic horizons in works such as his one-minute opera *Eugène Onéguine* (2001), for any one or two voices *ad libitum* and “any actions *ad libitum*,” his Cagean silent piece *Metamusica* (2001), for which he reproduced the score of Webern’s *Variationen*, op. 27 (1936), minus its pitches, or *The Sounds of Soup* (2000), music for the multimedia art project *Recipes* by Masha Chuykova and which consists mainly of recordings of various cooking sounds. Batagov, meanwhile, shares Cage’s belief that music’s purpose is to “open the mind to new experiences” and, since the 1990s, has composed numerous pieces of Satie- and Eno-style functional music, from works incorporating Tibetan chant and designed for use in personal daily meditation through to numerous short works for Russian television stations.

Zagny, whom Kholopov identifies along with Sokolov and Martïnov as among the Russian composers most obviously influenced by Cage, is perhaps the most vociferous of all figures described thus far in distancing himself from the American composer. Zagny names Stockhausen as a stronger influence, especially because, in his opinion, Stockhausen shows greater concern in his treatment of musical material than does Cage, who is seemingly concerned more with philosophical inquiry. In Zagny’s opinion, even Cage’s philosophical inquiries are not particularly novel:

[Cage’s] rule was to ... to not break, but to examine boundaries. But all artists in the first half of the twentieth century—either Duchamp or Malevich—and also in the second [half of the century]—Rauschenberg or Jackson Pollock, and many others—had similar processes. We see it in cinema and poetry. And Cage was about this in music.

Zagny and Batagov are distinct, too, in their opinions about Cage, which often differ from those espoused by many of the older composers studied thus far. Whereas for Gubaidulina and others active in the 1970s and 80s Cage promised total liberation of the performer, Batagov and Zagny harbor no such illusions. Rather, these younger composers’ attitudes toward live performance more closely match Cage’s own, particularly in their insistence on controlling most aspects of performance. Since the 1990s, Batagov has released his works directly to album, which he himself performs and records. Although one of the leading pianists of his generation, in 1997 Batagov began a twelve-year hiatus from all live performance since, as he described in

---

167 Sincerest thanks to Zagny for lending me scores and recordings of many of his works, and for discussing them with me. For more on Zagny’s works, see his webpage at http://conceptualism.letov.ru/sergei-zagny/SERGEI-ZAGNY.htm (accessed November 27, 2010).

168 In 2007 Batagov released a CD of many of his short works for the Russian television station NTV. The disc consists of fifty-two tracks lasting between a few seconds to a few minutes each and bearing names such as “Tomorrow’s weather” or “Comedy” (Batagov, *The Musicmaker’s Contract. NTV / NTV+ Channel’s Greatest Hits*, Long Arms Records CDLA 07088, 2007). Between 2007-09 Batagov released at least four discs combining Tibetan chant with music. See, for example, his recent discs *BODHICHARYAVATĀRA*, chanted by Telo Tulku Rinpoche, the Shajin-Lama of Kalmykia (Tummo TCD 09017, 2009) or *Daily Practice*, with Lama Sonam Dorje (Tummo TCD 08016, 2008). Sincerest thanks to Batagov for giving me a copy of these CDs, as well as numerous other discs of his.


interview, “live performance is a compromise.” Zagny, meanwhile, writes mainly for solo piano or organ so that he himself can perform it, as he is often dissatisfied with how others perform his music. Many of Zagny’s works are characterized by numerous opportunities for the performer to make decisions, yet always within strictly-confined and carefully-notated limits. Zagny states that these limits demarcate his own various experiences trying out each passage. As Zagny described,

[The] difference between aleatoric [sic] music and my approach [is that] all my variants are, I believe, deeply grounded in my own feelings. I first try [them] on myself. So I’m a scientific rabbit. Experiments aren’t allowed on animals, so the first experiment is on myself. Only after that [do] I allow my music to sound for everybody else.

As Batagov’s and Zagny’s attitudes help show, Cage’s “liberation” of sound by no means implied a liberation of the performer. Rather, as Richard Taruskin notes, quite the opposite is true, as Cage’s work reinforced the traditional hierarchy between composer and performer. Ivan Sokolov made note of this in a 2006 interview with Marina Voinova, describing how Cage’s “liberation” of sound resulted in an unprecedented amplification of the composer’s authority:

[Cage’s] piece “0’00,” composed after “4’33”, consists of just one phrase on an empty piece of paper: “engage in any activity for any stretch of time.” Thus Cage suggests that the entire world performs the piece, from the dawn of creation until the end of time. Here, Cage seemingly assigns to himself the role of God-Creator [rol’ tvortsa-bozhestva]; here, the role of the composer expands to the limits, to the impossible.

This particular Cagean paradox—namely, the amplification of the composer’s authority via declarations of the end of music’s conventional boundaries—flourishes in Russia today, and is most strongly associated with the notion of the “End of the Time of Composers” widely promulgated by Martinov and others.

---

172 Zagny, interview with the author, July 3, 2008. Original in English. One exception for Zagny is Batagov’s recording of his Sonata (1990). Zagny worked with Batagov in preparing this recording, which Zagny says comes very close to capturing his intentions. Moscow’s Long Arms Records released the recording commercially in 2000 (Long Arms Records CDLA 00014).
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Cage and the “End of the Time of Composers”

The “silent turning point” in music history Batagov describes as ushered in by Cage was, for him and many others, more than stylistic. During the late Soviet era several Russian composers and musicologists began propagating the notion that the history of Western art music had somehow come to an end. These ideas continue strongly to this day. Far from being a cause for lamentation, this “End of the Time of Composers,” as Martinov calls it, means the end of the artificial tradition of “composers’ music,” driven mainly by stylistic innovation, and a return to a more authentic musical tradition concerned less with technical development than with utilitarian value. While Denisov and his circle of academic modernists looked back to the Soviet 1920s for inspiration, Martinov and several like-minded composers looked back much farther, to an imagined pre-modern time in which folk and liturgical music existed as part of peoples’ everyday lives.

In his 1996 essay entitled “On Revolutionary Consciousness,” Anton Batagov described many of these ideas. Batagov begins his essay by denouncing Romantic and Modernist aesthetics, which prize individual accomplishment and technical innovation above all else:

Let’s imagine the most typical negative reaction to a new composition by a composer X (a well-known composer): “I don't see anything new here. He utilizes his past achievements over and over again”; and a composer Y (a young composer): “I don't see anything new here, I don't feel his individual style. I hear the influence of a composer X, but Mr. X was a pioneer of this style 30 years ago, and now we’d like to hear something totally new.” Here is the result of the 150-year-long period of revolutions and Individual Styles. The main purpose of a composer is to do something that has never been done before by anyone and to be always “new.” Each composition must be based on new invention; next composition - next invention. […]177

For Batagov, this dangerous new aesthetic was ushered in by Beethoven, the “Lenin of music,” who disrupted music from its natural state:

And then he came - the first avant-garde composer, the master of conflict, the Lenin of music - his name was Beethoven. He said: This is black, and this is white. This is Evil, and this is Good. Music is struggle (and the sonata form based on “struggle philosophy” seemed to be waiting for his order to illustrate his ideology) […] Beethoven made the first decisive and “successful” step […] Romanticism was the next step. More self-expression. “Private emotions” instead of “music for millions.” The 20th Century brings new revolutions. More and more individual and collective “declarations of independence.” New techniques, new inventions. Technique quickly becomes the main goal. […]178

In Batagov’s view, Beethoven’s regime came to an abrupt end in the 1960s and ‘70s, toppled by a cabal of minimalist revolutionaries:

177 Anton Batagov, “On Revolutionary Consciousness.”
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Fortunately, there is another type of music – music for listening (here I’d certainly name the three great minimalists – Terry Riley, Steve Reich and Philip Glass; I’d name Morton Feldman; I’d not like to mention John Cage here because he is beyond everything). Thirty years ago the first minimalist compositions (like Riley’s *In C*) looked like revolutionary inventions. But it was the last revolution which canceled all the decrees of all previous revolutions and announced: Avant-garde is over!\(^{179}\)

The minimalists did not usher in a new aesthetic era per se, Batagov alleges, but instead returned music to its ancient, natural state from which Beethoven had wrested it:

This “last revolution” brought music back to its natural state. […] Minimalism (please don't pay attention to this word) is something like a huge tree the roots of which are deep in the nature of all universal processes. “Monotony is a law of nature: look at the monotonous manner in which the Sun rises” (Gandhi). Ancient rituals and folk music from any region of the world, church bells and religious chanting, music of all composers from Pérotin to Bach, - everything is minimalism in the wide sense of the word. […] The ancient “tree” which had been sleeping for 150 years is alive and well again, it is very strong and full of forces. […] [W]e have one common music which crosses all the borders between centuries and continents, genres and traditions, new and old. Within this world the music of church bells becomes the pulse of big city, rock patterns sound exactly like authentic folk songs, music written eight centuries ago turns out to be absolutely new; we can place ourselves into the past and disco that the 12th Century is a part of Today. The process of “eternal return” (Nietzsche) goes on. Nothing is new; sounds are very old, much older than any human invention. Every note connects us with our history; every note begins a new being.\(^{180}\)

Martïnov expressed many of the same views in a 2009 interview in *Gazeta*:

When discussing minimalism, you cannot describe it as a single practice. On the one hand, minimalism is a trend in contemporary music which began in the US in the ‘60s – in 1966, to be exact, when Terry Riley wrote his first minimalist piece. Soon, a whole pleiad of American minimalists appeared: Terry Riley, Steve Reich, Philip Glass. Then, minimalism migrated to Europe, and it finally appeared in Russia.

Yet besides this, there is a more primitive [*pervozdannïy*] type of minimalism. All ancient folklore, Gregorian chant, *znamennïy* chant, even music for Buddhist practice – these are all types of minimalism. Minimalism is the natural essence of music.\(^{181}\)

\(^{179}\) Ibid.
\(^{180}\) Ibid.
This view has been given its fullest elaboration in a series of influential books published in Russia in recent years, most prominently Martïnov’s *End of the Time of Composers* [Konets vremeni kompozitorov] (2002) and *Zone “Opus Posth,” or the Birth of a New Reality* [Zona Opus Posth, ili rozhdeniye novoy real’nosti] (2008) and Tat’yana Cherednichenko’s posthumously-published *Musical Reservoir. The 1970s. Problems, Portraits, Cases* [Muzïkal’niy zapas. 70-e. Problemi. Portreti. Sluchai] (2002). These works do not simply describe the end of the culture of “composers’ music” in the 1970s but, in line with Cage’s authoritarian and Hegelian streak, assert musicians’ obligation to follow suit. For example, Cherednichenko hails the advent of minimalism, including its advent in Russian music in Martïnov’s works, as “the first (and clearest) signal of the necessity [neobkhodimost’] ‘to return’” to the pre-nineteenth century state of music.

Martïnov practices these ideas in various ways, mostly through writing pseudo-liturgical or pseudo-folkloric works cast in a simplified, minimalist idiom, such as his *Litania ad Mariam Virginem* (1999), loosely based on Gregorian chant, or his 1995 minimalist diptych *The Exoteric Dances of the Kali-Yuga [Tantsi Kali-Yugi ezotericheskiye]*, for solo piano, and *The Exoteric Dances of the Kali-Yuga [Tantsi Kali-Yugi ekzotericheskiye]*, for chamber ensemble, the titles of which allude to the final *yuga*, or age of humanity, described in classical Indian scripture as beginning around 3102 BCE. Martïnov further pursues his “post-composers’” music through actively collaborating with non-classical performers: for example, he wrote his “avant-folk” *Night in Galicia* for Dmitriy Pokrovsky’s Folk Ensemble, who recorded the work in 2001 alongside Tat’yana Grindenko’s Opus-POST chamber orchestra, founded the same year and dedicated mainly to performing Martïnov’s “post-music.”

Yet Martïnov’s works rest upon an uneasy Cagean paradox. Martïnov, prophet of the End of the Time of Composers, has achieved a guru status in Russia today far eclipsing that of most other classical musicians, including the academic modernist composers whose authority he denigrates. Performances of Martïnov’s works regularly fill Moscow’s most prestigious concert halls, and in 2002 a group of Moscow musicians founded the Martïnov Festival [Festival’ rabot Vladimira Martïnova], an annual celebration of Martïnov’s works and ideas. Indeed, preaching the “end of composers’ music” has proven a boon to Martïnov’s compositional career, as he regularly receives commissions from many of the world’s leading ensembles and fills these orders with new works of “post-music.” For example, in the early 2000s, St. Petersburg’s Mariinsky Theater commissioned a new opera from Martïnov, among the theater’s first commissions in decades. Shortly thereafter the theater abandoned the commission for financial reasons. The London Philharmonic and its Moscow-born conductor Vladimir Jurowski [Yurovsky] snatched up the project and in February 2009 presented the world premiere

---


184 Sincere thanks to Vladimir Martïnov for giving me a recording of his *Litania*, along with other discs and materials.

185 Moscow’s Long Arms records released a recording of the work by these ensembles in 2001 (CDLA 01029). Dmitriy Ukhov cites Martïnov’s collaborations with groups such as Pokorovsky’s ensemble as among the more notable examples of Russian postmodernism, a term with which he is nevertheless uncomfortable. See Ukhov, “Posle postmodernizma (neakademicheskiye kul’turnyiye zhanri v Rossii),” 66.
of the complete version of Martínov’s “anti-opera” Vita Nuova (2009). As Martínov told Vadim Prokhorov, his work is not an opera per se, but rather an opera about opera, an exploration as to “whether it is still possible to write an opera in modern times.” (As Jurowski described in a pre-concert talk in March 2009 before the work’s U.S. premiere at New York’s Alice Tully Hall, the opera expresses Martínov’s nihilistic belief that “European culture is dead, Western music is dead, composition is meaningless” – or, as Gerard McBurney summarized at the talk, it is a “portrait of the artist at a place that is beyond.”) Near the project’s beginning, before the Mariinsky abandoned it, Martínov told a reporter from the Russian newspaper Novïye Izvestiya, apparently without irony, that “writing an opera is not prestigious” (“I potom, sochinyat’ operï – sovsem neprestizhnoye zanyatiye”), despite the fact that he was being interviewed by a national newspaper exclusively for having written an opera for a prestigious institution.

Much as Cage’s declaration that “anything can be music” amplified his authority as a composer, so too has Martínov’s declaration of the End of the Time of Composers proven an effective means of boosting his celebrity and advancing his status as a creator and visionary. Moreover, Martínov’s seeming anti-modernism has proven an effective way of being quite modern. In an interview with The Guardian before Vita Nuova’s world premiere, Jurowski described the modernist shock politics at the heart of Martínov’s neo-archaic style:

The best description of Martynov’s music I can think of comes from a Russian musicologist who said that to listen to his works is to experience “torture by beauty.” Some of the sounds and harmonies he employs in Vita Nuova are exactly that: torturously beautiful, maybe more than an average European listener can take.

The young composer Sergey Nevsky (b. 1972), one of the leading composers of the post-Soviet generation, noted a similar phenomenon with regard to Arvo Pärt, like Martínov a minimalist composer interested in liturgical music. As Nevsky described,

Pärt became an icon of aesthetic counter-reform. He was evidence that one can be successful [as an artist] by ignoring the complete history of twentieth-century music, and in this way be considered quite contemporary.
Alternativa

Perhaps the greatest significance of Cage’s 1988 trip to the Soviet Union, though, is not reflected in the stylistic or philosophical developments it helped inspire, but rather the institutional changes in Soviet musical life it encouraged. Cage’s visit as an official guest of the Composers’ Union of the USSR signaled a major policy shift in Soviet music. From that point forward, Soviet musicians knew that nothing was off-limits. In the wake of this visit, several musicians quickly moved to take advantage of these new opportunities.

In mid-June 1988—less than three weeks after Cage’s trip—Aleksey Lyubimov and a small circle of musicians organized a three-day festival of contemporary music at the Glinka Museum in Moscow. Entitled Alternativa [Al’ternativa], the festival was held from June 14-16, 1988, and was entirely self-produced. As Lyubimov describes, the idea to stage a festival of contemporary music in such a prominent venue was directly inspired by Cage’s trip to Leningrad “under the mark of officialdom [and] under the aegis of the Composers’ Union.” Or, as Dmitriy Ukhov, who participated in these first festivals and became Alternativa’s organizer in the mid-1990s summarizes,

The Alternativa music festival began in 1988. These were, of course, the years of perestroika. Thus, the official Third International Festival took place not in the capital, but in Leningrad, because Moscow’s main concert halls were being rebuilt [perestroivalis’, a play on the word perestroika] in the literal sense of the term. Enthusiasts of new music realized that the Soviet musical establishment was one thing, and the culture personified by John Cage, who was invited to the festival, was quite another.

It became clear, too, that we could do things on our own. We quickly put together the first, “pilot” festival, as we might say now, at the Glinka Museum. Although the festival was held at an official venue, it originally took place without approval or support from the official concert agencies. All advertising posters were made by hand and hung on the walls of the conservatory and the Glinka Museum. Each day of the festival featured three back-to-back concerts, beginning at 4:00 p.m. and ending around midnight. The first day was a Cagean-style happening—Lyubimov called it a “Day of Free Arts” [Den’ svobodnikh iskusstv]—featuring improvisation, pantomime, and jazz. The second day was dedicated exclusively to the works of Stockhausen, and the third day to the works of Cage.

The fact that Alternativa presented contemporary works in an official venue was not in itself remarkable. As early as 1982, Schnittke, Gubaidulina, and Denisov had been performed in the Great Hall of the Moscow Conservatory, perhaps the USSR’s most prestigious venue, and from the Thaw onwards, Soviet musicians had periodically performed contemporary Western music in official venues. Self-produced festivals and performances of contemporary music, on

194 Sokolov, interview with the author, April 14, 2008.
196 Sokolov, interview with the author, April 14, 2008. Sokolov remembered these three events as dedicated to Stockhausen, Cage, and “avant-garde” music.
the other hand, had largely taken place outside of official channels and in semi-closed spaces, such as private clubs or scientific institutes. Alternativa was unique in that it was a prominent, public event organized from below, by its participants, yet held in a distinguished venue and without prior approval from the Ministry of Culture. In this way, Alternativa is a musical analogue to many of the bottom-up social movements then blossoming during perestroika, including separatist movements and workers’ strikes, as Gorbachev and the state quickly lost control over their top-down reforms.

This three-day summer festival—now referred to as “Alternativa-0”\textsuperscript{197}—was extremely successful, and Lyubimov and the organizers decided to expand the event. Taking advantage of the cultural policies of glasnost’, Lyubimov and others approached the Ministry of Culture and the state concert-planning agency, Soyuzkontsert. The general director of Soyuzkontsert, Nikolay Butov, was particularly enthusiastic about the project, and helped secure state support.\textsuperscript{198}

With this sponsorship lined up, the first officially sponsored Alternativa festival was held from December 12-29, 1988. The festival was repeated annually through 1991 and soon became one of the most important Soviet cultural events of its time. Alternativa’s organizers dedicated the festival to all music except that encouraged by the Composers’ Unions during the pre-perestroika era. The festival’s programming consisted mainly of rarely performed works by Western and Soviet modernist composers, as well as premieres of new works by young Soviet composers of the “left wing” of the Composers’ Union. Due to the exhilarating sense of discovery surrounding the festival, audiences were large and musicians were eager to participate.\textsuperscript{199} Audience members were sometimes eager to participate, too: Sokolov described to Marina Voinova a performance of Cage at one of the festivals during which “a listener, in a state of euphoria, suddenly leapt onto the stage and began beating on the piano. We were absolutely horrified and had him removed from the hall.”\textsuperscript{200} Though Sokolov regularly cites Cagean ideals that “everything which happens in the world is music,” he describes this interruption as decidedly non-musical, telling Voinova that, through this interruption, “Art revealed its boundaries, its aesthetic rules.”\textsuperscript{201} (Sokolov’s comments recall Cage’s description of Tishchenko’s disruption of his 1988 concert in Leningrad: “His action was not beautiful.”\textsuperscript{202})

While Alternativa mainly featured chamber music, thanks to governmental support soloists’ ensembles from groups like the USSR Ministry of Culture State Symphony Orchestra occasionally performed works for chamber orchestra, too.\textsuperscript{203} Some participants remember that performances at Alternativa, though enthusiastic, were oftentimes of poor quality; however, as Sergei Zagny states, “Just to play [this music] was more important than to play it perfectly.”\textsuperscript{204}

\textsuperscript{197} Interviews with Sokolov (April 14, 2008) and Batagov (May 28, 2008). Sokolov refers to this June 1988 festival as the starting, “zero” festival [\textit{Al’ternativa nulevaya}] and a “test run” [\textit{probnaya}].

\textsuperscript{198} Yekimovsky, \textit{Avtomonografiya}, 269.

\textsuperscript{199} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{200} Marina Voinova, “Instrumental’nïy teatr Ivana Sokolova,” 12.

\textsuperscript{201} Ibid.


\textsuperscript{203} For example, on December 26, 1988, the Soloists of the USSR Ministry of Culture State Symphony Orchestra ensemble, under the baton of Gennadiy Rozhdestvensky, performed Volkonsky’s \textit{Immobile} (1981) for piano and chamber orchestra and Martinov’s \textit{Christmas Music [Rozhdestvenskaya muzïka]} (1976) for soloists and chamber orchestra, among other works; on December 28, the same group performed Belimov’s \textit{On Water, Living and Dead [O vode zhivoy i myortvoy]} (1987) for oboe and strings and Pelecis’ \textit{Music from Behind the Wall [Muzïka iz-za stenï]} (1984) for four players, plus other pieces.

\textsuperscript{204} Zagny, interview with the author, July 3, 2008. Original in English.
For its first three years, from 1988 through 1990, Alternativa was generously supported by the state and steadily grew in size and scope. The festival’s events were held at prestigious venues throughout Moscow, including the Chaikovsky Hall of the Moscow Philharmonic and the main halls of the House of Composers, the Gnessin Institute, and the Glinka Museum. Soyuzkontsert printed booklets with extensive program notes and lengthy essays about post-war music. The booklets featured beautifully designed, glossy covers with graphics recalling constructivist art of the 1920s (example 1.22).205

By 1991, this support largely evaporated, and the festival that year took place in drastically scaled-back form. Even before the economic and political meltdown of 1991, though, the festival had begun to change significantly. During its first two seasons, Alternativa was dedicated to a wide spectrum of new music, from Cage-inspired experimentalism and jazz through to academic modernism. By 1990, though, the festival had become dedicated almost exclusively to post-Cagean “New Age” styles, especially minimalism, a trend which would continue through 1991 and into Alternativa’s mid-1990s rebirth. This shift in the festival’s programming is demonstrated in example 1.23, which summarizes the first three festivals’ repertoire.

Alternativa’s specialization was among the earliest and clearest symptoms of the bitter factionalization that broke out among modernist composers at the end of the Soviet period. This factionalization itself resulted largely from Gorbachev’s reforms, as the sole force linking together otherwise dissimilar musicians—namely, a shared opposition to Soviet officialdom—withered away during glasnost’. As Alternativa became increasingly dedicated to post-Cagean styles, the young composers gathered about Denisov formed their own organization, the Association for Contemporary Music [Assotsiatsiya sovremennoy muzïka, better known as the ASM or ASM-2]. Like Alternativa, the ASM-2 was originally catholic in scope, but by the early 1990s it had become dedicated almost exclusively to academic modernism. A few years later, the ASM-2 itself fell victim to this factionalization, splitting up into sub-groups along institutional lines (see chapter 2).

***

During 1988-89, as part of the perestroika-era “Return of History,” Alternativa’s organizers designed the festival as a musical literacy campaign to help fill-in “blank spots” [beliye pyatna, literally “white spots”] in the concert-going Soviet public’s knowledge about twentieth-century music and featured a wide spectrum of works and styles rarely performed before glasnost’.206 Soviet “semi-underground” composers [polupodpol’niye avtorï]207 of the 1960s and ‘70s were especially well-represented: Sil’vestrov, Gubaidulina, and Pärt were all profiled in composer’s portrait concerts at the 1988 festival, while the 1989 festival featured the “public” premiere of Gubaidulina’s cantata Night in Memphis [Noch’ v Memfise] (1968) for soprano, men’s chorus

205 Sincerest thanks to Svetlana Savenko for providing me access to her full collection of programs and materials for the Alternativa 1988, 1989, and 1990 festivals.


207 The term is Pospelov’s. See his “‘Al’ternativa, ili shirokiy vibor vozmozhnostey?’”, Sovetskaya muzïka 6 (1991): 11.
(on tape), and chamber orchestra. That same year, Alternativa featured a rare performance of music by Philip Herschkowitz [Filipp Gershkovich] (1906-1989), the Webern pupil and influential theorist of serialism who emigrated in 1987 and died in Vienna in January of 1989. Herschkowitz’s works were performed on a concert of music by ‘‘60s radicals’’ including Karamanov, Hrabovsky, Mansuryan, Hodzyats’ky, and Karetnikov. The first two Alternativa festivals also featured the Soviet premieres of works by Andrey Volkonsky (1933-2008), considered the father figure of the ‘60s avant-garde (the “initiator,” as Kholopov dubbed him) and who emigrated in 1973, including his Immobile (1981), Psalm 148 (1989), and the Wandering Concerto [Stranstvuyushchii kontsert] (1966). The premiere of Volkonsky’s Wandering Concerto took place as part of a concert entitled “The Musical Diaspora” [Muzikal’naya diaspora] featuring works by composers who emigrated from the USSR, including Pârt (emigrated in 1978), Suslin (emigrated in 1981), and Aleksandr Rabinovich (b. 1945; emigrated in 1973). This issue of the Russian “musical diaspora” would become especially pressing in the post-Soviet years, as commentators began to increasingly lament, in oftentimes disturbing nationalist tones, Russia’s “lost” musical culture.

This issue of the Russian “musical diaspora” has become increasingly fraught throughout the post-Soviet period. In a 1999 article, Kholopov asks “Russia’s music: where is it?,” describing how “an entire musical culture has left Russia,” a loss equivalent to “Stockhausen, Rihm, Ligeti, Lachenmann, Kagel,” and several others suddenly leaving Germany for the United States. As Kholopov describes in this article, “Russia’s catastrophe” [Katastrofa Rossii] of 1991 was a direct result of “the so-called ‘democrats’ coming to power.”

Within the last few years, restoring a “lost national culture” has become a priority of the Russian state, which has promoted the repatriation of everything from lost art objects to lost brainpower. For example, in 2006 the Russian government negotiated the return of the Danilov

---

208 The concert, held on October 19, 1989 in the concert hall of the Gnesin Institute, also featured the Moscow premiere of Sil’vestrov’s Meditation (1972) for cello and chamber orchestra, performed by the State Cinematography Orchestra performed under the baton of Yuriy Nikolayevsky.

209 The concert, performed on October 8, 1989 at the Shuvalov Music House [Muzikal’naya gostinaya doma Shuvalovoy], was entitled “Emancipated Suitcase” [Emansipirovanniy chemodan] and dedicated to the “radicals of the ‘60s.” Repertoire included Herschkowitz’s Three Pieces for Piano (1960s) along with Karamanov’s Prologue, thought, and epilogue [Prolog, mišl’ i epilog] (1963), Hrabovsky’s Concerto misterioso (1977), Mansuryan’s Sonata for Piano (1963), Hodzyats’ky’s Ruptures of Flatness [Razrivî ploskostey] (1963), Karetnikov’s Two Pieces for Piano (1973), and Knayfel’s Monologue [aka Monodiya] (1968) and Lamento (1967).


211 In addition to Volkonsky’s works, the concert, which took place at the Glinka Museum on December 26, 1988, featured two choruses by Ives, Stravinsky’s Introitus (1965) and the world premiere of Martïnov’s Christmas Music [Rozhdestvenskaya muzika] (1988). Rozhdestvensky conducted the Ministry of Culture Symphony Orchestra, with Aleksey Lyubimov as soloist.

212 The concert, held on October 18, 1989 at the Great Hall of the Gnesin Institute, featured Pârt’s Modus (aka Sarah was 90 years old, 1976), Suslin’s Chanson contre raison (1984), and Rabinovich’s La récit du voyage [Rasskaz o stranstvi, or “Tale of Wandering”] (1976).


214 Ibid., 16.
bells from Harvard University to Moscow’s Danilov Monastery. The bells’ return was financially supported by oil and gas oligarch Viktor Vekselberg (b. 1957) and his “Link of Times” foundation, which also recently purchased nine Fabergé eggs from the Forbes family with promises to display them publicly in Russia. Meanwhile, in 2009 the Russian government announced new programs to lure educated émigrés to return to Russia.

In addition to music by unofficial Soviet composers of the 1960s and 70s, Alternativa 1988 and ‘89 featured a wide spectrum of post-war European and American modernist works. Both Stockhausen and Cage, the two composers featured at “Alternativa-0,” were well represented at these festivals. Stockhausen, who would pay a highly influential visit to Moscow in March 1990 (see chapter 2), was profiled in a composer’s portrait concert at the beginning of the 1988 festival. The concert featured several of Stockhausen’s piano works, performed by Sokolov, beginning with Klavierstück IX (1954-55) and followed by two excerpts from the operatic cycle Licht, Klavierstück XII (1979, the solo-piano version of Examen from Donnerstag aus Licht) and Luzifers Traum (1981, the opening scene from Samstag aus Licht). Marina Chapligina, the leading Soviet expert on Stockhausen, wrote extensive program notes on the composer’s life and works, especially Licht. In line with Sokolov’s taste for the theatrical, the program included an imaginary questionnaire filled out by Lucifer, first published in the Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung in 1981, featuring questions such as “Where would you like to live? (A: “In heaven”) and “What qualities do you value in a woman?” (A: “Tremolo con glissandi,” a reference to Eva’s Leitmotif in Licht) (example 1.24).

Lyubimov, Sokolov, Pekarsky, Pshenichnikova and others presented several of Cage’s works at the 1988 and ‘89 festivals, including Cage’s prepared-piano work Bacchanale, performed alongside Denisov’s Singing of the Birds. In addition to works by Cage, these 1988 and ‘89 festivals featured several Cagean-inspired events, including performances of improvised, “intuitive” music. The 1988 festival, for example, included an evening-length performance by free jazz percussionist Vladimir Tarasov (b. 1947), who throughout the later 1980s became increasingly enmeshed in the Soviet art world, collaborating with Prigov and Sergey Anufriyev (b. 1964). On December 22, 1988, in the foyer of the Glinka Museum, Tarasov performed his Atto II, “Monotypes.” Atto is an eleven-part cycle of improvisatory, theatrical works for solo percussion Tarasov began in 1985 and cast in the ritualistic, “intuitive” style cultivated by Pekarsky and others. In addition to the jazz trap set, Atto II features exotic instruments such as

---

217 Chapligina completed her undergraduate thesis on Stockhausen, under Kholopov’s supervision, at the Moscow Conservatory in 1979, and taught Stockhausen’s works at the Gnesin Institute during the 1980s. See chapter 2.
218 Both works were performed on December 28, 1988. Three of Cage’s works were performed at the concert: Bacchanale, Credo in Us (1942), and Water Music (1952). The concert also included Sokolov’s Son Ata (1988), Schnittke’s Klingende Buchstaben (1988), and the world premiere of Schnittke’s Sonata No. 1 for piano (1987), among other works.
219 Tarasov was born in Arkahgel’sk in 1947 and moved to Vilnius in 1968. In 1971 he co-founded, with Vyacheslav Ganelin and Vladimir Cherkasin, the GTC Trio (also known as the Ganelin Trio), with which he performed and recorded until 1986. He appears as a central character in Prigov’s 1985 poem “Azbuka 48.” In September 1988, Tarasov traveled to West Berlin with a group of Soviet artists, including Sergey Anufriyev (b. 1964) and the musician Vladimir Sorokin (real name Yevgeniy Orshulovich, 1936-1995), for the Isskunstvo festival. (The name combines the German and Russian [iskusstvo] words for art.) See Solomon, The Irony Tower, 165. In 1991, Tarasov became active as a visual artist, organizing installations with Kabakov and others.
tabla, as well as a wide range of electronic instruments, including a Yamaha TX-7 synthesizer, a Roland Octopad, and a Roland TR-707 Rhythm Composer.220

Alternativa also helped initiate prominent artistic collaborations between conservatory-trained musicians and Soviet underground artists. The 1989 festival featured an evening-length performance by leading Moscow Conceptualist artists Dmitriy Prigov and Lev Rubinstein alongside Pekarsky and Batagov. Pekarsky and Prigov began the concert with an improvised performance entitled “Dreadful screams, crazy screams” during which Prigov read his poetry and Pekarsky improvised on percussion. To help boost their performance’s sense of strangeness, Prigov and Pekarsky spelled their set’s title using outdated, pre-Revolutionary orthography [Kriki uzhasniya, kriki bezumniiya and not Kriki uzhasniye, kriki bezumniiye]. Prigov’s and Pekarsky’s performance was followed by Rubinstein’s and Batagov’s Domestic Music-Making [Domashneye muzitsirovanie], during which Batagov performed musical accompaniment to Rubinstein’s poetic fragments. This collaboration at Alternativa 1989 helped initiate several important later ones. For example, at Alternativa 1990 Batagov and Rubinstein performed a new collaborative work, “From the Beginning to the End” [S nachala i do kontsa], released on CD in 2004221; that same year, Pekarsky, Prigov, and Rubinstein recorded an album, released in 2005, featuring Pekarsky’s musical accompaniments to Prigov’s and Rubinstein’s poetry alongside works by Kagel and Roslavets.222

Interestingly, the best-represented composer at Alternativa 1988 and ‘89—and the only non-contemporary composer featured at the festival—was Charles Ives (1874-1954). The celebration of Ives on the Soviet stage during perestroika was not limited to Alternativa—for example, when Boulez and his Ensemble InterContemporain made their Soviet debut in March 1990, their Moscow concert series began with a performance, in the conservatory’s Great Hall, of Ives’ The Unanswered Question (see chapter 2).223

The prominence of Ives’ music at Alternativa was motivated by several factors, both personal and ideological. Ives was of great interest to Aleksandr Ivashkin, one of Alternativa’s organizers and cellist of the Soloists of the Bol’shoi Theater ensemble (sometimes described as the ensemble’s “brain center”), who during the late 1980s was at work on an extensive book-length study of Ives’ music, entitled Charles Ives and Twentieth Century Music [Charl’z Ayvz i muzïka XX veka], published by Sovetskiy kompozitor in 1991.

More importantly, several Soviet musicians looked to Ives as the progenitor of many of the most important developments in twentieth-century music. Thus, performing Ives’ works was central to Alternativa’s mission of filling-in history’s blank spots. In his 1982 book on contemporary percussion technique, Denisov writes,

220 Melodiya recorded Atto II in 1986 and issued it on LP the next year (C60 25693 003, 1987).
221 The 2004 disc (Long Arms Records/Tummo CD 04065) consists of a recording of the performance at the 1990 Alternativa festival, plus several tracks added by Batagov and Rubinstein throughout the 1990s. One of these tracks was written for Dmitriy Pokorovsky, who recorded it with his ensemble in June 1996, weeks before his death. It is his last recording.
223 Colin Roche, e-mail communication with the author, May 6, 2009. The concert began with Ives’ The Unanswered Question (1908), which was followed by Franco Donatoni’s Tema (1982), Marc-André Dalbavie’s Diadèmes (1986), and György Kurtág’s Messages de feu demoiselle R.V. Trousova (1980). Sincerest thanks to Mr. Roche, Librarian of the Ensemble InterContemporain, for his assistance.
We are already used to the fact that Ives anticipated by several decades many of the most important developments in western European music of the twentieth century (polytonality, polymeter, twelve-tone sequences [dvenadtsatitonovʻye posledovaniye], clusters, non-functional harmonies, collage, unconventional instrumentation, et cetera).\textsuperscript{224}

To this list, Denisov added Ives’ pioneering work in orchestration, noting that Ives offers the “earliest examples in the history of music of the emancipation of the percussion and its free inclusion in the ensemble [as an equal voice].”\textsuperscript{225} Many of these ideas of Ives-as-innovator to which Soviet readers, in Denisov’s words, were “already used to” were described at length in Kohoute’s book, published in Russian in 1976, which names Ives as an early pioneer of microtonal and polytonal music and, with Scriabin, of atonal composition.\textsuperscript{226}

In addition to filling-in history’s blank spots, Alternativa’s organizers used the new freedoms of glasnost’ to critique official Soviet history. In one case, such a critique ran the risk of jeopardizing the state’s support for the festival, demonstrating that the new freedoms post-1988 were not limitless. At Alternativa 1989, Viktor Yekimovsky helped organize a program entitled “A Concert of Music Living and Dead” [Kontsert muzïki zhivoy i myortvoy]. The program’s title came from Grigoriy Shneyerson’s 1960 book, On Music Living and Dead [O muzïke zhivoy i myortvoy], an extended rant against the “dead” music of Western avant-garde composers and celebration of the vital, “living” music of Soviet socialist realists. At this concert, Yekimovsky juxtaposed supposedly “dead” music by Boulez, Cage, and Messiaen against “living” music by three official Soviet composers, asking the crowd, “Decide for yourself, which music is alive, and which is dead?”\textsuperscript{227} The concert’s program was:

Tikhon Khrennikov, “Frol’s Aria” from the opera Into the Storm [V buryu] (1936-39)
Pierre Boulez, Sonatina for Flute and Piano (1946)
Dmitriy Kabalevsky, Dramatic Fragment [Dramaticheskiy fragment] for piano, No. 30 in the Thirty Children’s Pieces, op. 27 [Tridtsat’ detskikh p’yes] (1938?)
Olivier Messiaen, Quatour pour la Fin du Temps (1940-41), mvmts. VI-VIII
Nikolay Budashkin, Concerto for Domra (1940), mvmt. I
John Cage, Mysterious Adventure (1945) for prepared piano\textsuperscript{228}

\textsuperscript{224} Edison Denisov, Udarniye instrumenti v sovremennom orkestre (Moscow: Sovetskiy kompozitor, 1982), 176.
\textsuperscript{225} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{226} See Kohoutek, Tekhnika kompozitsii v muzïke XX veka, pp. 100, 104, 239, 260, and 317. Ives’ reputation as a leading innovator of the twentieth century continues strongly in Russian musicology today. Tat’yana Kyuregyan’s chapter on aleatory in the 2007 college textbook Teoriya sovremennoy kompozitsii describes Ives as one of the first practitioners of aleatory composition (p. 426), while Yevgeniy Nezaykinsky’s chapter on spatial music [prostranstvennaya muzïka] in the same book identifies Ives’ works, especially The Unanswered Question, as “the very beginning of [spatial composition]” (p. 457). Nezaykinsky’s chapter includes an extensive analysis of The Unanswered Question by theorist Aleksandr Sokolov, rector of the Moscow Conservatory from 2001-04 and Minister of Culture of the Russian Federation from 2004-08 (pp. 457-64).
\textsuperscript{227} Yekimovsky, interview with the author, January 14, 2008.
\textsuperscript{228} Yekimovsky, Avtomonografiya, 270. Tikhon Khrennikov (1913-2007), Dmitriy Kabalevsky (1904-1987), and Nikolay Budashkin (1910-1988) were all official Soviet composers. The domra is a three- or four-stringed traditional Russian lute.
According to Yekimovsky, officials at Soyuzkontsert were opposed to this program. Yekimovsky had prepared a special concert poster consisting of photographs and biographical sketches of the Soviet composers taken from the official *Musical Encyclopedia* alongside derogatory passages about the Western composers drawn from Shneyerson’s book. According to Yekimovsky, the poster hung for all of ten minutes; soon after it was posted, someone tore it down and ripped it up. Yekimovsky suspects officials from Soyuzkontsert were behind the infraction.  

***

Whereas the Alternativa festivals in 1988 and 1989 were intentionally catholic in their programming, the Alternativa 1990 festival, held in mid-December, focused almost exclusively upon post-Cagean “New Age” styles, most prominently minimalism. If composers’ portrait concerts at Alternativa 1988 and ’89 were dedicated to figures such as Gubaidulina, Sil’vestrov, and Stockhausen, those at Alternativa 1990 were dedicated to composers such as Reich and Feldman. On December 22, Lyubimov and the Lisenko Quartet performed Feldman’s eighty-minute long *Piano and String Quartet* (1985), while the next day The Hague percussion ensemble, conducted by Johan Faber, presented a concert-length performance of Reich’s *Drumming* (1970-71). Feldman, whom Pospelov hailed as “one of the most uncompromising composers of our time,” was among the most-performed composers at that year’s festival. On the festival’s fourth day, Batagov performed Feldman’s hour long-plus *Triadic Memories* (1981); his performance was followed by a primitivistic group improvisation led by Natal’ya Pshenichnikova during which “the most ancient, anti-rational, magical-erotic fundamentals of sound energy came back to life” and which culminated with “the appearance on stage of ritual children, borne of Natasha [Pshenichnikova].”

Alongside Reich and Feldman, Alternativa 1990 included minimalist works by Soviet composers such as Martïnov, Pelecis, and Aleksandr Rabinovich. Recalling the reception history of Korndorf’s *Yarilo*, the festival’s organizers explored the idea of an autochthonous Russian minimalist tradition: the 1990 festival included an evening-long performance entitled “Minimalism in Jazz” [*Minimalizm v dzhaze*] and featuring Tarasov with Mikhail Al’perin’s folkloric jazz trio (today known as the Moscow Art Trio). The performance combined elements of jazz with Russian traditional music so to demonstrate the “magical nature of [musical] repetition, stemming from ancient rituals, whirling dances, khorovods and shamanism...[and] seen particularly clearly in new jazz and rock.”

The highlight of Alternativa 1990 was the concert of December 18 entitled “Seven Pianos” [*Sem’ royaley*]. Held at the Chaikovsky Concert Hall, the concert began with a piece for solo piano; each successive piece demanded one additional piano, concluding with a seventh and

---

229 Yekimovsky, *Avtomonografiya*, 270.
230 The performance of *Drumming* took place at the Central Artist House on December 23, while the performance of Feldman’s work took place on December 22 at the Glinka Museum.
231 Pospelov, “Al’ternativa, ili shirokiy vïbor vozmozhnostey?,” 11.
232 The concert took place on December 15, 1990 at the Glinka Museum. Regarding Pshenichnikova’s improvisation, see Pospelov, “Al’ternativa, ili shirokiy vïbor vozmozhnostey?”, 14. The full band included Natal’ya Pshenichnikova on flute, her sister, Yelena, on piano and harpsichord, and Mikhail Zhukov on percussion. Batagov recorded *Triadic Memories* in 1992. This recording was released by Long Arms Records in 2003 (Long Arms CDLA 03049).
233 Tat’yana Didenko, “Minimalizm v dzhaze,” from the Alternativa 1990 program booklet, 15.
final piece for piano septet. Given the logistical difficulties of moving seven grand pianos, the financial constraints involved, and the spectacle of seeing seven pianos on stage simultaneously, this concert was described by several informants as the highlight not just of Alternativa 1990, but of the Alternativa festival in general. The concert began with Cage’s Waiting (1952) for solo piano, followed by Korndorf’s Lullaby [Kolïbel’naya] (1984) for two pianos, Zagny’s Endless something else [Beskonechnoye chto-to yeshchyo] (1990) for three pianos, Rabinovich’s La belle musique No. 4 (1987) for four pianos, Feldman’s Five Pianos (1972), and Reich’s Six Pianos (1972). The performance concluded with the premiere of Martïnov’s King Arthur’s Twelve Victories [Dvenadtsat’ pobei Korolya Artura] (1990) for seven pianos.\(^\text{234}\)

Although the Alternativa 1990 festival emphasized so-called “post avant-garde” styles such as minimalism, modernist (or “avant-garde”) composers were nevertheless represented, too. The festival’s opening concert was dedicated to Denisov’s Association for Contemporary Music. However, the works presented by the ASM-2 were largely in line with the festival’s Cagean “New Age” orientations: the concert included Tarnopolski’s Chorale Prelude “Jesu, deine tiefen Wunden” (1987), a music theater piece reminiscent of Kagel, Yekimovsky’s Doppelkammervariationen (1989), a work juxtaposing serialism with aleatory technique, and two neo-romantic works, Korndorf’s Amoroso (1986) and Vladislav Shut’’s Warum? (1986). Karayev’s alla Nostalgia (1989), a quasi-serial work, and Kasparov’s Devil’s Trills: Variations on a Theme by Tartini [D’yavol’skiye treli: variatsii na temu Tartini] (1990) were the most non-“New Age” works of the bunch.\(^\text{235}\)

Interestingly, Martïnov participated in this concert as a member of the ASM-2, as Vladimir Pon’kin and the ASM Ensemble performed his Epistole Amorose (1970). Martïnov’s participation is especially noteworthy given his move away from the ASM throughout the 1990s. Indeed, in a recent interview, Martïnov stated that he was not a member of Denisov’s ASM-2, this despite that fact that his music was featured on the ASM-2’s earliest concerts and a biographical profile and list of his works was included by the association in an booklet it published around 1992 profiling its membership.\(^\text{236}\)

This December 1990 festival was the last Alternativa festival to enjoy handsome state support. As the Soviet Union collapsed as a political entity, so too did its economy: during 1991, the Soviet budget deficit grew exponentially, all the while industrial output, agricultural output, and

\(^{234}\text{Batagov performed all seven works. He was joined, in succession, by pianists Vladimir Skanavi, Ivan Sokolov, Sergei Zagny, Aleksey Yeremin, Aleksandr Rabinovich, Valeriy Kamishov, and Mikhail Adamovich. Lyubimov did not participate as he had fallen ill. The performances of Zagny’s and Martïnov’s works were world premieres; performances of Rabinovich’s, Feldman’s, and Reich’s works were Soviet premieres.}\)

\(^{235}\text{The concert was held on December 14, 1990 at the House of Composers. The ASM-2’s recently-founded ensemble performed, conducted by Vladimir Pon’kin. The performances of Kasparov’s and Karayev’s works were world premieres. Information from the document “Kontsertï ASM,” preserved in the ASM-2’s archives at Moscow’s House of Composers. Thanks to Viktoriya Korshunova and Viktor Yekimovsky for providing me access to this collection.}\)

\(^{236}\text{Vladimir Martïnov, interview with the author, June 16, 2008. One month before, Mark Pekarsky and his percussion ensemble performed Martïnov’s Triumf aerobiki [The Triumph of Aerobics] (1990) at a concert of music by ASM-2 composers at the 1990 Moscow Autumn festival. Pekarsky and his group repeated this work during Martïnov’s composer portrait concert at Alternativa 1990. The ASM-2 booklet is “Assotsiyatsiya sovremennoy muzïki,” compiled by Viktoriya Korshunova (Moscow: Znaniye, likely 1992). Sincerest thanks to Svetlana Savenko for lending me this booklet.}\)
energy exports dropped by double-digits. Meanwhile, food prices in state shops doubled.\textsuperscript{237} As a result of this economic collapse, state support for many cultural pursuits, including Alternativa, disappeared almost entirely. As Ivan Sokolov says, recalling these years of Alternativa’s history, “[From 1988-90] we had both financial support—good, plentiful, state support—and absolute freedom. And then the freedom remained, but the financial support vanished.”\textsuperscript{238}

A fourth Alternativa festival was held in December 1991 during the Soviet Union’s final days. The festival this year consisted entirely of Cagean experimentalism and minimalism, including performances of improvised music, a complete performance of Feldman’s four-and-a-half hour long \textit{For Philip Guston} (1984) and a twelve-hour long happening featuring Pospelov’s “Eradication of Contradictions’ Ensemble” entitled “The House that Cage Built” [\textit{Dom, kotoriy postroil Keydzhi}]. Kronos Quartet had been scheduled to perform at the festival, yet this performance fell through due to a variety of logistical and financial reasons. (The quartet would make its Moscow debut in 1997.\textsuperscript{239}) By 1992, Alternativa would consist of a single concert dedicated to Cage’s eightieth birthday.\textsuperscript{240}

Dmitriy Ukhov resuscitated the festival in the mid-1990s, though with mixed success.\textsuperscript{241} Massive financial barriers stood in the way of Ukhov and his co-organizers.\textsuperscript{242} More problematic, interest in the festival had largely evaporated. Alternativa had been founded to explore those composers and repertories officially sidelined by the Soviet establishment. With the Soviet collapse and the end of all stylistic prohibitions, the festival’s \textit{raison d’être} seemingly collapsed, too. As Yekimovsky described,

In the first few years Alternativa presented some very interesting things. Shortly thereafter the festival became less interesting. The music was no longer prohibited; it was widely played. There was no longer any opposition from an ideological point of view. It was [in the beginning] an alternative to traditional music, to the Composers’ Union, as we said. After about five years, this whole reason for being disappeared – everything became possible [in the ‘90s], ‘Go ahead, play what you’d like…’ Alternative…to what? It has to be an alternative to something…\textsuperscript{243}

---

\textsuperscript{237} Service, \textit{A History of Twentieth Century Russia}, 495-496.
\textsuperscript{238} Ivan Sokolov, interview with the author, April 14, 2008.
\textsuperscript{239} Booking Kronos Quartet was an important goal for Alternativa’s organizers for several reasons, not least of all to help the festival compete against the wildly popular December Evenings [\textit{Dekabr’skiye vechera}], an annual festival founded by Sviatoslav Richter in 1981 at Moscow’s Pushkin Museum [\textit{Muzey izobrazitel’nikh iskusstv im. A.S. Pushkina}]. During \textit{perestroika} the December Evenings hosted performances of previously unofficial composers: for example, December Evenings 1989 featured performances of Gubaidulina’s String Quartet No. 3 (1987) and Schnittke’s Monologue for Viola and Strings (1989), which were recorded live and issued by Melodiya on a disc entitled “Pasternak’s World” [\textit{Mir Pasternaka}] (SUCD 10-00492, rec. December 28, 1989)

Kronos Quartet’s 1997 Moscow debut took place at the Chaikovsky Hall, and the group has returned to Moscow numerous times since.
\textsuperscript{240} Sokolov, interview with the author, April 14, 2008.
\textsuperscript{242} As Yekimovsky describes, “In the past, we could get the hall for free, we had support from the Ministry of Culture, and so forth. Now, Alternativa is, for all intents and purposes, a private festival. They have to find sponsors, pay the musicians. And thus, I think the festival is coming to an end.” Viktor Yekimovsky, interview with the author, January 14, 2008.
\textsuperscript{243} Viktor Yekimovsky, interview with the author, January 14, 2008.
Coda: Music and Social Transformation

Yekimovsky’s comments point toward one of the more important themes in post-Soviet music to be traced throughout the remaining chapters: namely, that new music’s power, and the widespread social interest in it, were a result of Soviet-era prohibitions against it, and that with the end of these prohibitions, music seemingly mattered less.

Already during perestroika some critics were beginning to lament music’s lost power amidst the dizzying changes sweeping Soviet society. In a review of one of Pierre Boulez’s and the Ensemble InterContemporain’s March 1990 concerts in Moscow (see chapter 2), critic Vera Kolosova describes her sense of disorientation at the sudden popularity of previously banned works, as well as her own loss of interest in new music now that it is no longer forbidden:

The recent concert by the Ensemble InterContemporain, conducted by the radical avant-gardist Pierre Boulez, brought out no less radical an audience. It was simply a parade of leftists! But not only them, considering that Tikhon Khrennikov and Minister of Internal Affairs V. Bakashin were also present. Everyone clapped in ecstasy after each piece. What a progressive elite, fervent admirers of Das Glasperlenspiel!

Not too long ago, contempt for the “left” flank of the avant-garde […] aroused sympathy. Avant-garde concerts were not only rare; they practically didn’t exist, unless you count the rebellious listening sessions in tight-knit circles […] Boulez, Stockhausen, Luigi Nono: the names themselves were full of romanticism and mystery for conservatory youth, promising a certain kind of wonder and intrigue, with forbidden truths and revelations imagined inside […]

[Boulez] is certainly a wonderful musician. He’s a composer, conductor, pianist, director of IRCAM, theorist, and public figure. We could go on. His visit, organized on the Soviet side by Goskontsert, is yet another official recognition of the avantgarde – or, even more […] the next step in the rehabilitation of the Soviet avant-garde.

But I can’t rashly celebrate like the students sitting in the gallery. No, I’m not against new music. I support its being played more […] But now that Sofiya Gubaidulina has joined the committee for the Lenin and State Prizes, when Alfred Schnittke was awarded one of these prizes (and rightfully so!), when Edison Denisov (the new secretary of the governing body of the Composers’ Union of the USSR) has become Tikhon Khrennikov’s left hand (left, right, which way’s which?!), and when the left oar of our artistic life has begun paddling more actively (which way is the boat heading? Not in the same direction as when only the right oar paddled?), I could no longer sympathize with the intellectual aggression of the avant-garde’s apologists.244

Violinist Tat’yana Grindenko (b. 1946) expressed a similar idea, though from a different perspective, in a 2001 interview with Peter Schmelz. For Grindenko, the richness of musical life during the Brezhnev era was a direct result of governmental control, as compared to what she sees as a less vibrant musical life during the freer post-Soviet period:

---

244 Vera Kolovosa, “Levaya, pravaya, gde storona?”, Ekran i tsena 1 March 1990, 6-7.
When [the government] banned us [in the 1970s], the whole musical scene was much more active than it is now, when everything is possible, when everyone can do anything [...] Apparently, the forbidden fruit is sweet, or something, I don’t know.\textsuperscript{245}

However, in explaining the richness of late-Soviet musical life, and the comparative poverty of post-Soviet music, solely through matters of political authority and control, Grindenko misses a large part of the story. Although Soviet musicians of the 1970s experienced widespread ideological pressure, they were largely free from the economic pressures crippling Russian music throughout the 1990s. Though composing and performing modernist music was theoretically prohibited during the Soviet era, by the later 1970s doing so brought little risk. As composer Aleksandr Vustin recently recalled:

\begin{quote}
[The 1970s and ‘80s] were a period of remarkable internal freedom. In some sense, perhaps even more than today [...] Of course, there was no social freedom, no political freedom. But there was internal freedom. You could go to the House of Composers and write absolutely anything you want. And nobody would ask you what you’re doing. Of course, in keeping with formalities, you had to make note of what you were working on, if you were writing some little piece or writing an opera. [But experimenting with modernist styles] was not dangerous, it absolutely was not dangerous at that point. You would not get performances or publications, though, that’s true.\textsuperscript{246}
\end{quote}

In stating that “it was not dangerous,” Vustin means that, by the 1970s, composing or performing modernist music brought no risk to one’s life, liberty, or even finances. Even if a composer did not receive performances or publications, his or her livelihood was not threatened. For example, none of the seven composers whom Khrennikov denounced in 1979 (Artyomov, Denisov, Firsova, Gubaidulina, Knayfel*, Smirnov, and Suslin) suffered serious or lasting damage to their livelihood. As Yuriy Kholopov notes, in the wake of this denunciation, Smirnov was not fired from his job at the publishing house Sovetskiy kompozitor, and Smirnov and Firsova continued participating in the Composers’ Union exactly as before.\textsuperscript{247} In fact, as Kholopov notes, this denunciation perhaps worked in Smirnov’s favor, as a denunciation from Soviet officialdom stoked interest in his music from the West.\textsuperscript{248} The positive PR brought on by a denunciation from Khrennikov was not lost on composer Leonid Hrabovsky—himself not on Khrennikov’s list—who told his friend Gubaidulina, “I envy you all this publicity.”\textsuperscript{249}

Perhaps, then, the main explanation for the comparatively richer concert life of the 1970s is not the greater governmental control which attracted audiences to taste the “forbidden fruit,” but rather the vast Soviet safety net which provided rent-free rehearsal and performance space and guaranteed salaries for musicians and composers and which, by the 70s, were rarely terminated on ideological grounds. This economic stability changed drastically in the 1990s, driving many musicians into new careers or to new countries in search of a decent livelihood. In

\textsuperscript{246} Aleksandr Vustin, interview with the author, January 5, 2008.
\textsuperscript{247} Yuriy Kholopov, “Nashi v Anglii: Dmitriy Smirnov,” in \textit{Muzïka iz bïvshego SSSR} vol. 2, 262-63.
\textsuperscript{248} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{249} Michael Kurtz, \textit{Sofia Gubaidulina}, 146.
fact, as many musicians noted, these post-Soviet economic difficulties in many ways proved more threatening than late-Soviet ideological ones had. In a 1993 interview with Vladimir Tarnopolski in Muzïkal’naya akademiya, musicologist Natal’ya Zeyfas remarked, “Earlier, the Iron Curtain that cut us off [from the West] was ideological, but today it’s economic,” to which Tarnopolski responded, “I fear that the economic curtain will be even more ironclad than the political one.”250 One year later, Gubaidulina, who herself fled Moscow in 1991, echoed these remarks, telling an interviewer from Muzïkal’naya akademiya, “[economic pressure] is even more terrible than ideological [pressure].”251
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Projections
on harpsichord, vibraphone and bells

(1965)

Valentin Silvestrov (*1937)

Das Cembalo muß immer (mit einigen Ausnahmen) so laut wie möglich klingen (von f bis ff)
The harpsichord must, with few exceptions, always sound as loud as possible (from f to ff)

Die Glocken entweder mit harten, mit Wolle umhüllten Paukenenschlegeln oder mit Hämmern
(mit Haut überzogen) anschlagen. Klang nicht dämpfen! Klingeln lassen!
Strike the bells either with hard timpani sticks wrapped in wool or with hammers (covered with skin). Do not dampen the sound, but let it ring!
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By Edison Denisov
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Ex. 1.3 – Aleksandr Knayfel’, *A prima vista*

A Prima Vista (1972)
By Aleksandr Knayfel’
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International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.

62
Balletto (1974)
By Viktor Yekimovsky
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Ex. 1.6 – Viktor Yekimovsky, *In the Hunting Dogs Constellation*
Ex. 1.7 – Viktor Yekimovsky, *In the Hunting Dogs Constellation*, Flute III part

In the Hunting Dogs Constellation (1986)
By Viktor Yekimovsky
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 1.8 – Irregular meters in Nikolay Korndorf, *Yarilo*, mm. 44-61
Ex. 1.9 – Four note folk-like melody in Nikolay Korndorf, *Yarilo*, mm. 251-281
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*Yarilo* (1981)
By Nikolay Korndorf
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
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Yarilo (1981)
By Nikolay Korndorf
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Ex. 1.10 – Clusters in Nikolay Korndorf, *Yarilo*, mm.95-101

Yarilo (1981)
By Nikolay Korndorf
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 1.11 – Aleatory passages in Nikolay Korndorf, *Yarilo*, m.160
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Ex. 1.12 – First use of piano preparations (F6 in m. 171) in Nikolay Korndorf, *Yarilo*
Ex. 1.13 – Sextuplet figures on prepared F6, Nikolay Korndorf, Yarilo, mm. 241-248

Yarilo (1981)
By Nikolay Korndorf
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 1.14 – Prepared strings in LH and plucked strings in RH (+) in Nikolay Korndorf, *Yarilo*, mm. 260-281

Yarilo (1981)
By Nikolay Korndorf
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
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Yarilo (1981)
By Nikolay Korndorf
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Ex. 1.15 – Katunyan’s possible “single chord” underlying Nikolay Korndorf, *Yarilo*, mm. 31-43
Ex. 1.16 – Sokolov, Thirteen Pieces, No. 6, “Life!” and No. 7, “Death!”

© Ivan Sokolov. Used by Permission of Ivan Sokolov.
Ex. 1.18 – Sokolov’s “musico-graphic” presentation of the text in On Cage. Mvmt. I

© Ivan Sokolov. Used by Permission of Ivan Sokolov.
Ex. 1.18 cont’d.
Ex. 1.19 – Am\textsuperscript{7} chord in Ivan Sokolov, *On Cage*, Mvmt. II

© Ivan Sokolov. Used by Permission of Ivan Sokolov.
Ex. 1.20 – CAGE, BACH, and nonsensical musical ciphers in Ivan Sokolov, On Cage, Mvmt. III

3. Пределсказание

3. Prophezeihung

Senza tempo

Largo

(Голос пианиста)
(Stimme des Pianisten)

Ба-а-а-а-а-а...
Bа-a-o-h!

Tempo g

(на клавишах)
(auf den Tasten)

(Га-фи-си...
(Cage...)

Мену mosso

Cu-с а-г е...

Кейдж

Cage...

Ancora meno mosso, lento possibile

(Га-тэ-сэц...
(Ga-ge-sans? Ga-ge-sans?
Ga-ges-gist?)

Piu lento

(Га-фи-си...
(Ga-fi-sis? Ga-fi-sis? Ga-fi-sis?)

*) Вставьте правую руку, постепенно медленно опускайте ее тем, чтобы второй палец касался какую-то воображаемую очень низкую ноту на проходящей верхнюю грань C flat не обработанный клавиатуры. Медленно опускайте правую руку дальше низко до ее свободного проведения. Вставить, подходящий, уйти со сцены.

*) Den rechten Arm hochheben, ihn dann allmählich so senken, daß der zweite Finger eine imaginäre sehr hohe Note auf der sich rechts nach dem "c"-Finger fortsetzenden Klaviatur spielt. Den rechten Arm weiter sinken lassen, bis er frei durchhängt. Sich einhaken, vernehmen und die Bühne verlassen.
Ex. 1.21 – Anton Batagov performing with “Eradication of Contradictions” in 1991

Photo courtesy of Anton Batagov. Used by Permission of Batagov.
Ex. 1.21 cont’d.

Photo courtesy of Anton Batagov. Used by Permission of Batagov.
Ex. 1.22 – Covers for Alternativa festival program booklets, 1988-89

1988 program cover
Moscow: Soyuzkontsert, Ministry of Culture of the USSR, 1988
Ex. 1.22 cont’d.

1989 program cover
Moscow: Soyuzkontsert, Ministry of Culture of the USSR, 1989
Ex. 1.23 – Programming shift in Alternativa festival, 1988-1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George Crumb*</td>
<td>“Concert of Music, Living &amp; Dead”</td>
<td>Morton Feldman, <em>Piano and String Quartet</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sofiya Gubaidulina*</td>
<td>Mauricio Kagel*</td>
<td>Vladimir Martínov*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arvo Pärt*</td>
<td>Moscow Conceptualists: Prigov &amp; Pekarsky and Rubinstein &amp; Batagov</td>
<td><em>Minimalism in Jazz:</em> Mikhail Al’perin’s Jazz Trio, with Vladimir Tarasov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentin Sil’vestrov*</td>
<td>Valentin Sil’vestrov*</td>
<td>Aleksandr Rabinovich*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karlheinz Stockhausen*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Steve Reich, <em>Drumming</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vladimir Tarasov, <em>Atto II</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - *asterisk indicates composer’s portrait concert [avtorskiy kontsert]*
Ex. 1.23 cont’d.

B. Single pieces performed at Alternativa 1988-1990 on mixed concerts (i.e., not composer portrait or single-topic concerts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>1988</th>
<th>1989</th>
<th>1990</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Batagov, Anton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belimov, Sergey</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bussotti, Sylvano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cage, John</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denisov, Edison</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feldman, Morton</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freisitzer, Roland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gubaidulina, Sofiya</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gugel', Aleksandr</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herschkowitz, Philip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodzyats'ky, Vitaly</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hrabovsky, Leonid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ives, Charles</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns, Klaus (?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kagel, Mauricio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karamanov, Alemdar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karayev, Faradzh</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karetnikov, Nikolay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov, Yury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kefalidis, Igor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knayfel', Aleksandr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korndorf, Nikolay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ligeti, György</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutosławski, Witold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansurian, Tigran</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martiros, Vladimir</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McBurney, Gerard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pärt, Arvo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavlenko, Sergey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelecis, Georgs</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pshenichnikova, Natal'ya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabinovich, Aleksandr</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reich, Steve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schnittke, Alfred</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shut', Vladislav</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ex. 1.23 cont’d.

B. Single pieces performed at Alternativa 1988-1990 cont’d.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sil’vestrov, Valentin</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sokolov, Ivan</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stravinsky, Igor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suslin, Viktor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarnopolski, Vladimir</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiensuu, Jukka</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasks, Pēteris</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vieru, Anatole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volkonksy, Andrey</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xenakis, Iannis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yekimovskiy, Viktor</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zagny, Sergey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A note on methodology: These charts are based upon Alternativa programs, booklets, and festival posters I gathered in Moscow during 2007-08. The overwhelming majority of these materials were lent to me by Svetlana Savenko.

A caveat: these charts are not exhaustive, and certainly have inadvertent mistakes. In several cases, individual concert programs differ from concert information printed in the festival brochure or poster. In these instances, I have always gone with information from the concert program, on the theory that it was printed closer to the performance date than these other materials, and is hence more likely to be accurate. In the case of the 1989 festival, I have not been able to locate a single document or booklet listing all of the festival’s concerts. Thus, information about the 1989 festival comes from individual programs I collected plus information gleaned from other sources, including interviews and publications (notably Viktor Yekimovsky’s Avtonomografija).

In part B, “Single pieces performed at Alternativa 1988-1990,” each “x” indicates a single work, regardless of duration, scope, or number of movements, performed on concerts featuring works by multiple composers.

While these examples certainly contain inaccuracies and lacunae, they offer a general portrait of the festival’s activities and programming during 1988-90 and its shift toward post-Cagean “New Age” music in 1990.
Ex. 1.24 – “Questionnaire” from program of Sokolov’s performance of Stockhausen piano music at Alternativa, December 21, 1988 (Moscow: Soyuzkontsert, 1988)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frage</th>
<th>Antwort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wie ist Ihr Lieblingskomponist?</td>
<td>Igor Stravinskiy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wie ist Ihr Lieblingskomponist?</td>
<td>Alexander Dargomyzhsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was ist Ihre Lieblingssymphonie?</td>
<td>&quot;Fidelio&quot; - Beethoven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was ist Ihre Lieblingssymphonie?</td>
<td>&quot;Don Quichotte&quot; - Ravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was ist Ihre Lieblingssymphonie?</td>
<td>&quot;Kirchner&quot; - Stockhausen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: This question was filled out by the composer Alexander Khovanskij.*

Moscow: Soyuzkontsert, Ministry of Culture of the USSR, 1988
Chapter 2  
Back to the Future: The ASM-2

In January 2009, a Moscow audience gathered for a concert that, according to its organizers, promised nothing less than a trip back in time. Held at Moscow’s School of Dramatic Art [Shkola dramaticheskogo iskusstva], the performance was billed as “an experiment in reconstructing the sonic environment of the Soviet 1920s.” Concert posters were designed in the era’s constructivist style (example 2.1). The concert’s centerpiece was a revival of Persimfans [Pervïy simfonicheskiy ansambl’, or First Symphonic Ensemble], the famous conductorless orchestra founded in the Soviet Union in 1922 as an experiment in collective music making. This resurrected Persimfans performed music from the early Soviet period, including the Piano Concerto (1927) by Aleksandr Mosolov (1900-1973) and newly restored fragments from Prokofiev’s circus ballet Trapeze [Trapetsiya] (1924). Throughout the concert, historical black and white films were projected overhead. The concert closed with another experiment from the 1920s, a “noise orchestra” [shumovoy orkestr] in which sounds are produced not by traditional instruments, but everyday objects such as hammers, brooms, and saws. This group performed incidental music by early Soviet experimentalist Arseniy Avraamov (1886-1944) for Sergey Eisenstein’s 1923 production of the play “Do you hear, Moscow?” [Slïshish’, Moskva?] before closing the concert with the revolutionary hymns “Varshavyanka” and the Internationale, performed on empty bottles.

The concert was widely covered in Moscow’s newspapers, and even profiled on Russia’s Channel 1 evening news. Press coverage enthusiastically described the concert’s authenticity, referring to the event as a “restoration” or “reconstruction.” The television station Kul’tura, for example, referred to the organizer, the young composer Pyotr Aidu (b. 1976), as “the spiritual inheritor of the early twentieth-century avant-garde,” and detailed the ways in which Aidu’s Persimfans perfectly replicates the original.1 Aidu himself told the Channel 1 news crew that “We use the same name as the ensemble which existed in the 1920s” because “we don’t claim to be doing anything different,” prompting Channel 1 to declare that Aidu’s concert “isn’t an innovation, it’s a remake.”2

Alongside this claim of authenticity, a second theme stands out in the event’s press coverage, namely the concert’s supposed ideological purity. The influential critic Pyotr Pospelov—himself no stranger to collective music-making, having founded the collective composition group TPO Kompozitor [Tvorchesco-Proizvodstvennoye Ob’edineniye “Kompozitor” or the “Composer” Creative-Production Organization, established in the early 1990s]—wrote that everything on Aidu’s concert “was done without any ideological nonsense [bez ideologicheskikh kamniy]” and that the participants “simply held up, gleefully, the Utopian cause of building a new world.”3 When a Moscow Times reporter asked Aidu if his concert bore any political implications, he simply responded, “I don’t really know...My life is art, not politics.”4 Some reviewers even projected this ideological purity back onto the original

Persimfans: one online reporter, for example, wrote that Aidu’s restoration shows that “pure art has existed in all times.”

Interest in the 1920s is extremely strong in Russia today, and works from the period play a central role in contemporary Russian cultural life. At the same time that Aidu presented his Persimfans restoration, Moscow’s Studio of Theatrical Art [Studiya teatral’no go iskusstva] hosted a new stage adaptation of Andrey Platonov’s River Potudan [Reka Potudan] (1937) and the new Tretyakov gallery was presenting a special exhibit of constructivist theatrical designs from the 1920s. Music from the ‘20s is frequently performed on Russia’s main stages and forms the core repertory of the country’s new music ensembles. Moscow’s two main contemporary music groups, the Moscow Contemporary Music Ensemble [Moskovskiy ansambl’ sovremennoy muzïki, founded in 1990] and the Studio for New Music [Studiya novoy muzïki, founded in 1993], regularly perform works by early twentieth-century composers such as Mosolov, Nikolay Roslavets (1880/81-1944), and Artur Lurye (Lourié, 1891-1966), and both ensembles’ mission statements name advocacy for the music of the “first Russian avant-garde” as a central goal.

This widespread interest in the 1920s began during Gorbachev’s reforms of the mid-1980s. With the onset of glasnost’ and the end of state censorship, Soviet musicians, artists, and publishers rushed to recreate, disseminate, and perform previously-suppressed works from the early Soviet period. Long-unpublished works from the era filled Soviet bookstores and the “thick journals” popular during perestroika. In 1987, Platonov’s The Foundation Pit [Kotlovan] (1929-30) was published for the first time in the Soviet Union, followed the next year by the first Soviet publication of his dystopian novel Chevengur (1926-29). Also in 1988, Yevgeniy Zamyatin’s dystopian We [Mi] (1921) was printed for the first time in the Soviet Union, published alongside the first Soviet translation of Orwell’s 1984, inspired in part by Zamyatin’s novel. During perestroika, large exhibitions were organized of rarely seen works by early-Soviet modernist artists such as Pavel Filonov (1883-1941), Kazimir Malevich (1879-1935), and Aleksandr Rodchenko (1891-1956), and the Soviet Ministry of Culture helped facilitate major showings of these artists’ works abroad. Indeed, modernist art of the 1920s helped provide the de facto official visual language of perestroika: Gorbachev trumpeted his reforms as a return to the Leninist ideals of the 1920s, and many of the state’s propaganda posters supporting perestroika and glasnost’ were cast in a constructivist style. In music, performers and musicologists rushed to restore and perform previously unknown works by Mosolov, Roslavets, and others, while numerous composers turned to newly published literary works from the ‘20s as a source of inspiration. Example 2.2 provides a small sampling of settings by Moscow composers of literary works by early-Soviet writers.

The circumstances surrounding the rediscovery of the 1920s during glasnost’ endowed the era and its restored artworks with an almost mythic quality. Because these works were being rediscovered during a period of massive critique of the past, because many of them had in fact been suppressed by the regime then being questioned, and because these works’ styles differ so strongly from the traditionalist styles enforced by Soviet officialdom from the 1930s onwards, modernist works of the ‘20s came to be seen as monuments of a lost native tradition forcibly annihilated by the state’s intrusion into the arts. The 1920s, in other words, were quickly mythologized as the last Soviet flowering of “pure art”—that is, art without a political agenda—

until the onset of *glasnost* some sixty years later, this despite the fact that all Soviet modernist movements of the ‘20s were motivated by genuine political convictions and commitment to revolutionary ideology.

Interest in the 1920s, and its idealization as a period of “pure art,” has been especially strong in music. This chapter explores musicians’ restoration of this era’s artworks and institutions during the late-Soviet era, particularly the *perestroika*-era revival of the 1920s Association for Contemporary Music by Denisov and his followers.

***

In her *New Grove* article on the Nikolay Roslavets, Anna Ferenc discusses the suppression of Roslavets’ works in the Soviet Union, stating that even the composer’s name “disappeared from Russian reference sources until 1978.”

The work to which Ferenc obliquely refers is, presumably, the *Musical Encyclopedia* [*Muzïkal’naya entsiklopedia*], a six-volume reference work published jointly by the Sovetskaya entsiklopediya and Sovetskiy kompozitor publishing houses from 1973 through 1982 and whose fourth volume, published in 1978, includes an entry on the composer. This encyclopedia featured several notable landmarks for Soviet musicology, including the first officially published article on Cage, written by Aleksey Lyubimov and included in the encyclopedia’s second volume, published in 1974.

While correct regarding the overall suppression of Roslavets’ biography and works during the Soviet era, Ferenc’s statement is not accurate. As early as 1973, the encyclopedia’s volume 1 mentions Roslavets in an article about the Association for Contemporary Music [*Assotsiatsiya sovremennoy muzïki*, or ASM] of which Roslavets was a founding member. Written by Yuriy Keldïsh, the article begins neutrally, noting that the ASM was established in Moscow in 1924, advocated the works of its member composers abroad, and maintained close ties with foreign composers. Keldïsh even notes that such “major Soviet composers” such as Myaskovsky and Shostakovich joined its ranks. The article, though, soon devolves into a smear, with particular spite reserved for Roslavets. Keldïsh writes,

> Several of the leading figures of the ASM (Sabaneyev and Roslavets), demagogically making use of the slogans of novelty and ‘contemporaneity’, came forward preaching sermons about constructivist approaches and demanding a decisive break with classical tradition.

These extremist positions, Keldïsh states, drove out members such as Myaskovsky and Shostakovich and brought about the association’s downfall, an allegation that is untrue.

An article on Mosolov in the encyclopedia’s third volume (1976) is more restrained, albeit still selective. Written by Mikhail Yakovlev, the article downplays Mosolov’s modernist compositions, emphasizing instead Mosolov’s activities collecting folksong. The article makes no mention of Mosolov’s arrest, in 1938, on the grounds of “counter-revolutionary activities,” or

---

his year-long detention; these facts would not come to light until 1989, when Inna Barsova published a groundbreaking two-part article in *Sovetskaya muzïka* based upon archival sources opened during glasnost’.”¹¹

In light of these earlier articles, Yakovlev’s 1978 entry on Roslavets seems almost progressive.¹² The article outlines Roslavets’ biography, career, and most important works. More significantly, Yakovlev describes Roslavets’ atonal style, noting that he was “the first [composer] in Russia to write atonal compositions” and that he “formed a ‘new system for organizing sound’ very close to the principles of Arnold Schoenberg, founded upon a theory of sonorities, or ‘synthetic chords’.”¹³

In describing this trajectory of gradual liberalization over the course of the encyclopedia’s publication I do not wish to imply that there was a widespread revival, throughout the 1970s, of this modernist music of the ‘20s. This breakthrough moment would not arrive until glasnost’. Still, throughout the 1970s, musicological work was done on this repertoire, and music from this period was performed in concert, if rarely.

The leading advocate for the music of the ‘20s throughout the pre-perestroika era, and a central figure in the revival of this repertoire during the late 1980s, was Edison Denisov. In the 1970s, Denisov began programming the music of Roslavets and Mosolov on his concert series *Music of the Twentieth Century [Muzïka XX veka]*, organized within the Composers’ Union. Since scores for this repertoire were largely unavailable, Denisov assembled many of them himself, turning to friends and colleagues at Moscow’s music archives, as well as foreign contacts who had access to archival material abroad, including Detlef Gojowy. Denisov also created arrangements or new performing editions of works from the 1920s— in 1981, for example, he orchestrated Mosolov’s *Three Children’s Scenes [Tri detskikh stsenki]* and *Four Newspaper Announcements [Chetïre gazetnïkh ob’yavleniya]*, both of 1926.

More importantly, Denisov, a highly influential teacher, taught this repertoire in his instrumentation courses at the Moscow Conservatory. Denisov’s rare access to archival materials served his fortunate undergraduates well: as early as 1981, when almost nothing was written about Roslavets and scores of his music were largely unavailable, an undergraduate student named Ayna Puchina completed her senior thesis on Roslavets’ Violin Concerto [*Kontsert dlya skripki s orkestrom N. Roslavtsa i ego mesto v tvorcheskom kompozitora*], with Denisov as her adviser.¹⁴ Though Puchina’s major was musicology, she filed her thesis in the instrumentation department [*Kafedra instrumentovki*], in which Denisov had taught since 1959. (The instrumentation department is a subsection of the Composition Faculty [*Kompozitorskiy fakul’tet*].) Though Denisov was forbidden from teaching composition until glasnost’, his classes in the instrumentation department, where he worked as a dotsent, attracted students from

---


¹³ Ibid., 711.

a variety of disciplines, who flocked to his courses to study topics they could not otherwise pursue.\textsuperscript{15}

Denisov’s activities on behalf of the music of the 1920s helped inspire similar ones throughout the country. In 1984, with Denisov’s assistance, composer Mark Belodubrovsky (b. 1941) organized a performance of Roslavets’ music in his and Roslavets’ native city of Bryansk, presenting Roslavets’ music alongside works by another Bryansk native, the constructivist sculptor Naum Gabo (1890-1977). These presentations were staged by Belodubrovsky’s Apodion club, a private arts club Belodubrovsky founded in Bryansk in 1978 along the lines of Frid’s and Mil’man’s musical clubs in Moscow. Named after Apollo and Dionysius, Belodubrovsky’s club staged monthly concerts of modernist music, liturgical music, and rock in venues throughout Bryansk.\textsuperscript{16}

As Belodubrovsky told Anton Rovner, his interest in Roslavets and early Soviet modernism was guided largely by Denisov. Though he had known Roslavets’ name since childhood, he knew little about the composer other than his official Soviet reputation as a composer of “formalist, bourgeois” music.\textsuperscript{17} Upon finding out that Roslavets was from his native city of Bryansk, Belodubrovsky set about learning more about the composer and asked around for leads about Roslavets and his music.

These inquiries soon lead him to Denisov, who helped Belodubrovsky learn more about this repertoire. Through Denisov’s own collection and his contacts with Moscow librarians and archivists, Belodubrovsky was able to collect scores of Roslavets’ music. In 1984, some two years before the onset of glasnost’, Belodubrovsky staged his presentation of Roslavets’ music and Gabo’s sculpture in the concert hall of the Bryansk Musical College \textit{Bryanskoye muzïkal’noye uchilishche}. Shortly thereafter, Apodion was shut down by the authorities, who accused Belodubrovsky of “spreading bourgeois art, religion, and Zionism.”\textsuperscript{18} Two years later, as Gorbachev announced glasnost’, Belodubrovsky resumed his concert activities, and in 1986, he organized the first-annual Roslavets Festival \textit{Festival’ im. Roslavtsa}, placating authorities by performing some of Roslavets’ agitprop pieces alongside his modernist works. The festival soon grew into an annual event celebrating works by early Soviet modernists and contemporary Russian composers alike.\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{15} Denisov’s first official composition student was Yuriy Kasparov (b. 1955), who completed a graduate degree in composition, with Denisov as his official adviser, in 1991. Denisov, though, had taught curricular composition lessons before and with the conservatory administration’s blessings. In 1986, a Spanish composer named Juan Guitterez traveled to Moscow to study with him. Al’bert Leman (1915-1998), then the head of the composition department, told Guitterez that Denisov “does not have the right to teach composition lessons.” Guitterez pressed his case and the conservatory administration relented, allowing Denisov to give Guitterez composition lessons “so as to avoid an international incident.” See Tsenova and Kholopov, \textit{Edison Denisov}, 37 and Kholopov, “K istorii sovremennoy otechestvennoy muzïki: ‘Denisovskaya volna’,” in Valeriya Tsenova, ed., \textit{Svet • Dobro • Fechnost’}. \textit{Pamyati Edisona Denisova} (Moscow: Moskovskaya gosudarstvennaya konservatoriya, 1999), 19-21.\textsuperscript{16} Anton Rovner, “Interv’yu s Markom Belodubrovskim,” \textit{Musica Ukrainica} online journal, http://www.musica-ukrainica.odessa.ua/_interviews.html (accessed July 13, 2009). See, too, Mark Belodubrovsky, “The Annual Nikolai Roslavets and Naum Gabo Festival,” \textit{Leonardo} 29, no. 4 (1996): 326-327.\textsuperscript{17} Ibid.\textsuperscript{18} Rovner, “Interv’yu s Markom Belodubrovskim.”\textsuperscript{19} The festival continues to this day. It is now called the Roslavets and Gabo International Festival of Contemporary Art \textit{Mezhdunarodniy festival’ sovremennogo iskusstva im. N. Roslavtsa i N. Gabo} and is supported by the Ford Foundation, local Russian government agencies (especially the Department of Culture of Bryansk Oblast’), and the Russian State Center for Contemporary Art \textit{Gosudarstvennyi tsentr sovremennogo iskusstva}, est. 1992, among other sponsors.
Belodubrovsky not only staged performances of this repertoire, but he also wrote about it. In May 1989, Belodubrovsky and musicologist Marina Lobanova published two groundbreaking articles in Sovetskaya muzïka detailing Roslavets’ life and works and published under the rubric “Forgotten Pages” [Zabïtiye stranitsï]. These articles, described by Richard Taruskin as among “the most exhilarating musical harbingers of Gorbachev’s glasnost’,” helped kick off the massive perestroika-era musicological excavation of the 1920s. Two months after Belodubrovsky’s and Lobanova’s articles, musicologist Inna Barsova published the first in a two-part series on the life and works of Aleksandr Mosolov in Sovetskaya muzïka. Barsova’s article, “From the unpublished archive of A.M. Mosolov” [“Iz neopublikovannogo arkhiva A.M. Mosolov”], included the first-ever published accounts of Mosolov’s 1938 imprisonment, on the grounds of “counter-revolutionary activities,” as well as a reprint of Mosolov’s prison identification card.

Lobanova, Barsova, and the composer Aleksandr Raskatov (b. 1953), a pupil of Denisov, restored and published previously unknown works, which were soon performed on the Soviet Union’s most prestigious stages. In one of the clearest signals of the changing times, in 1989 the Moscow Autumn festival [Moskovskaya osen’], an official event organized by the Composers’ Union of Moscow under the auspices of the Soviet Ministry of Culture and which, until perestroika, had a reputation for conservative programming, hosted performances of Roslavets’ 1925 Violin Concerto, by Tat’yana Grindenko, and the world premiere of Mosolov’s 1928 opera Hero [Geroy], newly reconstructed by Barsova.

Back to the Future

This spirit of restoration reached a high point in January 1990 when the composers of the Denisov circle announced the formation of the newly restored Association for Contemporary Music [Assotsiatsiya sovremennoy muzïki, or ASM]. Calling themselves the “New Association for Contemporary Music,” or ASM-2, this group modeled itself after the original association by the same name, founded in Moscow in the early 1920s and disbanded some ten years later as part of Stalin’s cultural collectivization campaigns. Like many others during perestroika, including Gorbachev himself, the composers of the ASM-2 idealized the 1920s as a period of progressivism and sought through restoring the era’s lost institutions a means to cure the Soviet present. Whereas Gorbachev turned to the 1920s to help recharge the Soviet dream, however, the ASM-2 composers looked to the era as a means of overcoming the worst Soviet artistic and institutional legacies. For some of these composers, the healing power of the past extended even into their private lives: in a 2002 interview broadcast on the BBC, for example, Vladimir Tarnopolski explained that he chose to set excerpts from Platonov in his 2001 Chevengur because Platonov’s works “helped me to remove all the various layers that have built up over

---

time – the fact that I studied at the conservatory, the fact that I am a Soviet musician...I managed [through Platonov] to remove them all, one by one.”

The ASM-2 thus has its origins in the Denisov circle. Throughout the 1970s and ‘80s, composers of the Denisov circle would gather together at one another’s flats, at the Composers’ Union’s retreat in Ruza, and at Denisov’s concert series at the House of Composers to discuss music, share ideas, and critique one another’s works. Nikolay Korndorf emphasized these origins when he remarked to Anna Ferenc, “I think that the proclamation of the existence of the Association for Contemporary Music in January 1990 was but a formal passing of paperwork” as the members had all “[been] friends and colleagues for many years.” Vustin further emphasizes the group’s friendly origins, calling the ASM-2 “group of friends” [tovarishcheskaya organizatsiya]. By describing it this way, Vustin not only emphasizes the ASM-2’s origins in the close friendships of the Denisov circle, but also de-emphasizes its official nature; as Vustin notes, “[unlike the first ASM of the 1920s], we don’t have a bank account, don’t have a journal. It was more formal. We’re more an organization of friends [organizatsiya druzyay].”

On January 23, 1990, this “organization of friends” drew up a manifesto announcing the establishment of their new group. Entitled “Declaration of the Formation of the New Association for Contemporary Music, or ASM-2, Composers’ Organization” [Deklaratsiya ob uchrezhdenii kompozitorskogo ob”yedineniya Novaya “Assotsiatsiya sovremennoy muzïki” ili ASM-2], this manifesto was published several times over the next year, including in the February 1990 edition of the Russian Musical Gazette [Rossiyskaya muzïkal’naya gazeta] and the May 1990 edition of The Moscow Composer [Moskovskiy kompozitor]. Given the group’s interest in fostering international collaboration, this manifesto, like all of the ASM-2’s important early announcements, was drafted in both Russian and English. The manifesto lists Denisov as the group’s chairman [predsedatel’] and Aleksandr Vustin, Leonid Hrabovsky, Sofiya Gubaidulina, Viktor Yekimovsky, Yuriy Kasparov, Nikolay Korndorf, Vasily Lobanov, Aleksandr Raskatov, Dmitriy Smirnov, Vladimir Tarnopolski, Elena Firsova, and Vladislav Shut’ as founding members.

This manifesto announced the group’s intent to carry on the first ASM’s mission, chiefly through organizing concerts with foreign composers, promoting music by the association’s member composers in the USSR and abroad, and establishing formal ties with the International Society for Contemporary Music. The purpose of these activities was to return Russia to the international community of new music “from which it had been forcibly removed from the 1930s onward.” As the ASM-2 explained in a formal appeal sent to colleagues around the world in April 1990,
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24 Vladimir Tarnopolski, interview on the BBC, broadcast May 24, 2002. This interview took place as part of a broadcast featuring composers whose works the Studio for New Music performed at the Oxford Contemporary Music festival of that year. Sincerest thanks to Svetlana Savenko for providing me access to this recording.
26 Vustin, interview with the author, January 5, 2008.
27 Ibid.
28 See, for example, the original copy of the manifesto, “Deklaratsiya ob uchrezhdenii kompozitorskogo ob”yedineniya Novaya “Assotsiatsiya sovremennoy muzïki” ili ASM-2 / Declaration on setting up a New Association for Contemporary Music or ACM for Composers,” (hereafter “Deklaratsiya ASM-2”) conserved in the ASM-2 archives at the Moscow House of Composers. Sincerest thanks to Viktoriya Korshunova and Viktor Yekimovsky for providing me access to all of the ASM-2’s archival documents. This manifesto was republished most recently in Tribuna sovremennyh muzïki 3 (2005): 30.
[In 1931] the ASM was forcibly liquidated on ideological and political grounds and the names of many of its members officially purged from music history [...] It is time to restore justice, and we shall do everything in our power to further this goal [...] The ‘iron curtain’ policy our country has pursued for the last several decades has immensely damaged our art, isolating it from the surrounding world [...] We feel hopeful that the current changes in our society will reinstate our country’s art into its natural course. 29

In the ASM-2’s view of history there is a virtual bridge linking the 1920s to the 1990s, the intervening sixty years a period of ideologically imposed isolationism and conservatism. What links these two periods, according to the ASM-2, is that, unlike the music that came in between, the music of the 1920s and the 1990s is unencumbered by politics and free from ideological concerns. As composer Nikolay Kornordf, a founding member of ASM-2, explained to Anna Ferenc in 1994:

The Association for Contemporary music united then [in the 1920s] and continues to unite now [in the 1990s] all serious composers committed to writing real, not politically-influenced music. The most important thing is that the members of the 1920s wrote the truth; they did not conform to political pressure. 30

Needless to say, this view of history is highly selective. Many figures of the original ASM—composers whom Kornordf valorizes as writing “real, not politically-influenced music”—were enthusiastic supporters of the revolution. Mosolov’s 1928 work The Foundry [Zavod] (1926-28), now an object of modernist veneration, was written as part of a theatrical paean to Soviet industrialization. Meanwhile, Roslavets wrote enthusiastic cantatas in support of Soviet power, including his 1927 work October [Oktyabr’], premiered alongside Shostakovich’s Symphony No. 2, “To October” (1927) at a concert celebrating the tenth anniversary of the Revolution. Kornordf’s comments powerfully illustrate that the perestroika-era “Return of History,” of which the restoration of the 1920s ASM is an example, relies as much, if not more, upon selective forgetting as it does upon rediscovery and remembering.

The ASM-2’s model of history is succinctly expressed in several of its members’ attitudes toward Shostakovich, who by the late Soviet period had become the emblem of official Soviet musical culture. Several ASM-2 composers describe their affinity for Shostakovich’s early experimental works, especially his Symphony No. 4 (1935-36) and The Nose [Nos] (1927-28)—works composed while Shostakovich was a member of the original ASM—yet an aversion to his works from the Fifth Symphony (1937) onwards, which for them are ideologically tainted. 31

29 “Obrashcheniye k otechestvennym i zarubezhnym muzikantam / An appeal to musicians, here and abroad,” ASM-2 archives, Moscow House of Composers.
30 Anna Ferenc, “The Association for Contemporary Music in Moscow,” 2.
31 The Nose was revived in Moscow in 1974. Kornordf, it should be noted, salvages Shostakovich by asserting that his music, no matter how it sounds, is anti-Soviet: “You know that after the original Association for Contemporary Music was disbanded, Shostakovich continued to compose in its non-conformist tradition. His music spoke out against the totalitarian regime. And it was predominantly through Shostakovich that the non-conformist tradition was not interrupted, but passed on in the 1950s to composers such as Andrei Volkonsky, Alfred Schnittke, Edison Denisov, Nikolai Karetnikov, Arvo Pärt, and Valentin Silvestrov.” Quoted in Ferenc, “The Association for Contemporary Music in Moscow,” 2.
Viktor Yekimovsky, a founder of the ASM-2 (and, after Denisov’s death in 1996, its president) expresses these views in his comments about Shostakovich and Prokofiev:

Early Prokofiev and Shostakovich were not associated with any [state] ideologies […] They did what they wanted. In the 1920s, one could do whatever one wanted […] Their creative works [in the 1920s] were extraordinarily interesting. Yet when Prokofiev returned to Russia in ‘33…Prokofiev’s an amazing composer, in my opinion, I really love him, but his music changed.

Shostakovich, when he wrote the Fifth Symphony, his music became ideological. And all of his music became the same after that […] He stopped seeking the new. Take a look at his opera The Nose. It’s genius what he did in it. Fantastically interesting! All throughout it, he was looking [for new things]. Its entr’acte is the first use of eight percussionists. Nobody before had done this, had thought of it. After that, his music became ideologized. His symphonies are very good – No. 9 is very good, and so forth. But it’s not new.32

For Yekimovsky, even Shostakovich’s late style, often discussed as enigmatic or esoteric and thus, presumably, exemplary of the non-conformist approach encouraged by the ASM-2, is equally uninteresting. As Yekimovsky describes, Shostakovich’s late style is not only rooted in his “ideologized” post-1930s style but, by continuing this style, is emblematic of the lack of innovation characteristic of Soviet musical life:

[Shostakovich’s late works] are good, but he didn’t discover anything in them. For me, for example, it’s interesting when a composer thinks up something new. [Shostakovich] just stayed in the same style. Remember the Fifteenth Symphony with its quote from William Tell—da da DA da da DA. Well, that little formula— da da DA da da DA da da DA—is EVERYWHERE in all his symphonies. He didn’t think of anything new, that is, he just fed upon himself [rastyot na samom sebye]. But you have to be innovative […] That’s why the Soviet period was bad, at least in this sense.33

This aversion to Shostakovich as the symbol of the worst of the Soviet legacy reached a high point in 2005 when St. Petersburg composer Boris Filanovsky (b. 1968) published his scathing “Without Shostakovich” [Bez Shostakovicha] in the St. Petersburg newspaper Khronika. Timed in accordance with the Shostakovich centenary of 2006, Filanovsky offers a pointed critique of what he calls the “monotheistic cult” of Shostakovich still ruling the composition faculties of Russia’s conservatories and which is responsible for the traditionalism dominant Russian music today.34 Filanovsky’s article, which closes with the incendiary line “Kill DSCH in yourself,” elicited the response it was calculated to provoke; several members of the Composers’ Union of St. Petersburg attempted to eject Filanovsky from the organization.
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33 Ibid.
For Yekimovsky, Shostakovich’s music is not alone in bearing the Soviet taint. For him, even the music of Schnittke, an honorary member of the ASM-2 and a leading figure in unofficial Soviet music, is too closely associated with the Soviet period:

From the get-go, [Schnittke] was Composer #1 for me. He thought up the most unbelievable things in his style. His music was very interesting, especially the Concerto Grosso No. 1 – a brilliant composition, simply magnificent. Or the First Symphony, which astounded everyone.

But time went by, and now his music seems closely tied to the era, to its time. During its time, his music made a phenomenal impression. But now, it doesn’t work. Schnittke was connected with his time. He wasn’t Soviet – maybe he was anti-Soviet…[but] It’s not abstract music, it’s connected to its time.

Therefore, today only a handful of Schnittke’s works come across as interesting, sound good, like they did before – for example, the Concerto Grosso [No.1] And the others? They’ve stopped working.35

What was needed, according to the ASM-2, was a return to the 1920s, to the era before art became “politicized” and subjected to Soviet bureaucracy. Despite this call for a reset to the pre-Soviet past, the ASM-2 composers found themselves in the position of having to work within the same Soviet bureaucratic networks against which they had pledged themselves.

The notion that the ASM-2 is fundamentally opposed to the Composers’ Unions is central to the group’s mythology. For example, the descriptions of the ASM-2 included in accompanying booklets for the association’s recordings issued by Le Chant du Monde state, “…[T]he Association became in many ways an alterative to official and traditional music, and even to the Composers’ Union itself.”36 In a 2005 article in honor of the ASM-2’s fifteenth anniversary, Yekimovsky states the point more forcefully, declaring “The members of ASM [ASM-2] made up the left wing of the Composers’ Union and stood in opposition to the Union itself and its official doctrine.”37 Or, as Tarnopolski tells it, “In 1990, during the USSR’s twilight, a group of composers from the ‘middle generation’ announced the simultaneous formation of the […] ASM-2 and its ensemble, in opposition to the traditional line of the Composers’ Union.”38

Despite their opposition to the Composers’ Union, the composers of the ASM-2 nevertheless sought from the beginning to organize their new group within the Union and as an official part of it. This was motivated in large part by practical concerns, for whatever the ASM-2’s ideological opposition to the Composers’ Union and its aesthetic platforms, the Union represented the only viable infrastructure for music and musical life in late-Soviet Russia. Already with their January 1990 manifesto the ASM-2 composers announced their intention to organize within, and not outside of, the Composers Union:

35 Yekimovsky, interview with the author, January 14, 2008.
Pursuant to statutes of the Union of Moscow Composers (II, §3), which guarantee members the right to “organize and participate in creative organizations and associations according to their interests,” a group of Moscow composers, having similar interests and a shared aesthetic platform, hereby announce the formation of a new creative organization, the new “Association for Contemporary Music” or ASM-2.  

The manifesto closed with an appeal to the Composers Unions for direct financial and material support:

Without positioning itself in opposition to the Composers Union, but rather considering itself one of the Union’s structural links, the association requires assistance from the Union’s leadership and from Muzfond to help it function normally (especially through providing space for meetings, seminars, and conferences, concert halls for performances, the means to pay performers, etc.)

Until this time, most official sub-groups within the Union had been organized along genre lines and not aesthetic orientation, including subsections for composers of choral music, of film music, of symphonic music, et cetera. There existed, too, some semi-official subsections, like Frid’s Moscow Youth Musical Club, which consisted of like-minded members who helped finance the club’s activities through subscriptions and donations.

The ASM-2 sought to combine these models and exist, like Frid’s club, as a group of philosophically like-minded individuals, all the while receiving formal recognition and direct financial support from the Union, like the genre-based subsections. As stated in their January 1990 manifesto, the ASM-2 invited composers working in any genre to join the new organization, provided they share the group’s commitment to eclecticism and innovation:

The organization’s aesthetic platform rests upon the full recognition of the musical culture of the twentieth century without the artificial and biased exclusion of such important developments such as the New Viennese School, the European avant-garde, new innovations in Soviet music, et cetera. This organization is against musical conservatism and stilted academicism and for unorthodox approaches and creative undertakings to the limit of experimentation [tvorcheskiy poisk vplot’ do eksperimenta].

The Association is open for any composer sharing our creative principles and aesthetic platform. The Association’s active members will together decide admission for prospective members.

Any members of the Composers’ Union, and anyone taking interest in the Association, may attend its meetings.

The Unions, themselves undergoing massive shifts in ideology, structure, and personnel, eagerly embraced this new association. Denisov, who by the end of 1989 had joined the Secretariat of the Composers’ Union of the USSR, helped broker discussions between his new group and the Union’s various administrative structures. By May 1990, the Composers’ Union of Moscow had invited the ASM-2 to host a multi-concert series at that year’s Moscow Autumn
festival, and in June the ASM-2 met with Vladislav Kazenin (b. 1937), chairman of the Composers’ Union of the RSFSR, who pledged support for a festival in 1991.

In order to restore the Soviet Union to the “worldwide community of new music from which it had been forcibly removed,” the ASM-2 proposed in its January 1990 manifesto a seven-step plan of action:

1. The promotion of creative and personal collaborations among the association’s members
2. Propagandizing the best creative achievements of the association’s composers throughout the USSR and abroad
3. Facilitating the open exchange of information regarding the most significant developments in both Soviet and non-Soviet music
4. The organization of meetings, seminars, and conferences with composers from other cities (besides Moscow) and countries
5. Compiling a list of works by the association’s members performed at philharmonic concerts and various festivals and expositions, including Moscow Autumn
6. Publicizing the association’s activities in print, on the radio, and on television, and establish a dedicated newsletter for the association
7. Establish contacts with the International Society for Contemporary Music

With the exception of the seventh and final point, most of these goals announced in January 1990 were relatively unspecific. In the months after the group’s formation, ASM-2 members worked to develop concrete plans of action to fulfill these goals. These endeavors were guided in large part by two prestigious visitors who came to Moscow in early 1990, described below.

The ASM-2 quickly attracted to its ranks a broad coalition of composers, performers, and musicologists. A list of ASM-2 members and affiliates likely compiled in April 1990 gives a portrait of this membership (example 2.3). This list shows the same core membership announced in January 1990, with the addition of Faradzh Karayev, and lists Schnittke as an honorary member. The membership includes composers alongside performers (such as cellist Aleksandr Ivashkin) and musicologists and music theorists (including Svetlana Savenko, Yuriy Kholopov, and Aleksandr Sokolov, Russian Minister of Culture from 2004-08 and Rector of the Moscow Conservatory from 2001-04 and reappointed in 2009). Member composers represent a wide variety of aesthetic orientations, from Denisov-style academic modernists to minimalists and post-Cagean composers such as Svetlana Golôbina, Vladimir Martînov, and Ivan Sokolov. The ASM-2 also included composers from other Soviet republics, including Leonid Hrabovsky and Karayev, as well as foreign-born composers working in the USSR, including Tso Chen Guan. Around 1992, the ASM-2 published a booklet profiling twenty-seven of its members, including biographies and work lists. Example 2.4 lists these twenty-seven composers, who represent a notable degree of stylistic and geographic diversity.

During its first few years, the ASM-2’s activities matched the stylistic diversity of its membership. Sponsored concerts ranged from performances of works by Darmstadt-style modernists through to American experimentalist composers. For example, in late January 1991, the ASM-2 hosted a two-concert series of post-Cagean “New Age Music” at the House of
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42 Ibid.
43 “Novaya assotsiatsiya sovremennoy muzikê ili ASM-2,” ASM-2 archive, Moscow House of Composers. This document is undated. However, the ASM-2’s “Kratkaya letopis’,” a chronology of the group’s activities from January 1990 through May 1991, shows that the group drew up a membership list on April 14, 1990.
Composers and featuring works by Cage, Glass, Korndorf, Pelecis, Aleksandr Rabinovich, Reich, and Zagny, performed by Anton Batagov and Aleksey Lyubimov and with introductory remarks by Pospelov. Less than two weeks later, in mid-February 1991, the association presented a concert hosted by Raskatov and featuring works by Milton Babbitt, Carl Ruggles, and Sandor Kalloš, among others. However, this stylistic diversity was short lived. Amidst the Soviet collapse, the ASM-2 was affected by many of the same forces shaping Alternativa. The association’s stylistic diversity largely disappeared and the group became increasingly dominated by Denisov’s modernist followers — that is, by those composers who chose not to emigrate in the early 1990s.

Two Visits: Boulez & Stockhausen

Shortly after the ASM-2 was founded, two prestigious musical guests visited the Soviet Union. In late February 1990, Pierre Boulez and his Ensemble InterContemporain visited Moscow, followed less than a month later by Karlheinz Stockhausen and his ensemble. Boulez’s and Stockhausen’s trips, funded by their home governments in collaboration with the Soviet Ministry of Culture, helped symbolize Russia’s re-joining of the worldwide community of new music so desired by the ASM-2 composers and others. Pianist Mikhail Dubov (b. 1966), today one of Moscow’s leading new music performers, attended Boulez’s and Stockhausen’s concerts as a young conservatory student (he enrolled in 1989) and recalls them as “colossally joyous events, a sign that we were once again part of worldwide culture.”

These visits provided more than moral support. Members of the ASM-2 were inspired by Boulez’s and Stockhausen’s visits and turned to them for advice regarding how best to develop institutions for new music. What had begun in January 1990 as a loose program of reforms morphed, in the wake of these visits, into a fully-fledged campaign to establish self-sustaining, professional institutions in Moscow on par with those in France and Germany. Unfortunately, these ambitions soon collided with the brutal economic and social realities brought about by the Soviet collapse.

Visit I: Boulez

Boulez’s visit to Moscow in February-March 1990 was not his first trip to the Soviet Union. Nor did it mark the first performance of his music in the Moscow Conservatory’s Great Hall, the Soviet Union’s most prestigious venue. In 1967, Boulez visited Moscow and Leningrad as co-conductor, with Sir John Barbirolli, of the BBC Symphony Orchestra. During this 1967 visit, Boulez conducted a performance, in the Conservatory’s Great Hall, of his Eclat (1965) along with Schoenberg’s Fünf Orchesterstücke, op. 16 (1909), Webern’s Sechs Stücke, op. 6 (1909) and excerpts from Berg’s Wozzeck (1917-22).

Over the next two decades, Daniel Barenboim

44 “Kontserti ASM,” from the ASM-2 archive, Moscow House of Composers.
45 Mikhail Dubov, interview with the author, January 16, 2008.
46 The BBC Orchestra performed in Moscow between January 7-10, 1967, under both John Barbirolli and Pierre Boulez. Repertoire ranged from Boulez’s work to Haydn’s Symphony No. 83 in g minor, “La poule” (1785) and Sibelius’s Symphony No. 2 (1901-2). See D. Rabinovich, “Orkestr Bi-bi-si v Moskve,” Muzikal’naya zhizn’ 6-7 (1967): 16. This concert is also discussed by David Wright in his “Peinture: Some Thoughts on Denisov,” The Musical Times 132 (May 1991): 242-43. Kholopov says that, in addition to Webern’s op. 6, Boulez also conducted

Though performances of Boulez’s works were rare in the Soviet Union, by the time Boulez visited Moscow in 1990, several of his works were well known among circles of Soviet musicians. As early as 1956, Vissarion Shebalin had played a recording of *Le marteau sans maître* for his class at the conservatory, and Frid had played recordings of Boulez’s works at meetings of his musical club, which began in the mid-1960s. 49 By the 1970s, recordings of some of Boulez’s works were available in the recording libraries of the Moscow Conservatory and Gnesin Institute – Ivan Sokolov, for example, remembers listening to *Le marteau* at the Gnesin Institute’s *fonoteka* as a teenage student in either 1976 or ’77. 50 Some of Boulez’s works had been performed in music concerts at FISI and the Kurchatov Institute, especially by Tigran Alikhanov, who performed the Piano Sonata No. 3 several times throughout the 1970s. 51

The main Soviet advocate of Boulez’s music was Denisov, who began corresponding with Boulez in the early 1960s as Boulez prepared the Paris premiere of his *Sun of the Incas* [*Sol’tse Inkov*] (1964). The two met in person for the first time during Boulez’s 1967 trip to Moscow. 52 Denisov taught Boulez’s music in his instrumentation class at the conservatory and maintained a large personal library of Boulez’s scores and recordings, many of which Boulez provided himself and which served as the main collection of Boulez’s works during the pre-perestroika era.

Boulez and his Ensemble InterContemporain arrived in Moscow in late February 1990. Their visit was co-sponsored by the French government and the Soviet Ministry of Culture. The ensemble performed a series of four concerts in Moscow between February 20-22 and two in St. Petersburg on February 24-25. The ensemble’s four Moscow concerts were held at the
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47 See Ivashkin, “Orkestr de Pari,” *Muzïkal’naya zhizn*’ (1978): 17-18. Barenboim led the orchestra in three concerts during the 1977 tour. The first featured Berlioz’s *Symphonie fantastique* and Boulez’s *Rituel;* the second, Beethoven’s Third Symphony and First Piano Concerto, with Barenboim as soloist; and the third, Debussy’s *La Mer* and *Prelude a l’apres midi d’un faune* and Ravel’s *Daphnis et Chloe,* Suite No.2 and *Tomeau de Couperin.* Although this was the Orchestre de Paris’ first Soviet tour, it was Barenboim’s second: he toured the Soviet Union as a solo pianist in 1965.

48 Barenboim led the Orchestre de Paris in three concerts in 1986. The first featured Ravel’s *Pavane pour une infante défunte* (1910), Suite from *Ma mère l’oye* (1911), and *Rapsodie espagnole* (1907-08), as well as Stravinsky’s *The Rite of Spring* [*Vesna syashchennaya*] (1911-13). The second concert featured Mozart’s Piano Concerto No. 21 in C Major, K.467 (1785), with Barenboim as soloist, and Bruckner’s Symphony No. 7 (1881-85). The third program included Berlioz’s *Roméo et Juliette* (1839), Ravel’s *Daphnis et Chloé* Suite No. 2 (1913), and Boulez’s *Répons.* See V. Yuzefovich, “Vtorïye gastroli orkestra,” *Sovetskaya muzïka* 5 (1986): 59-66. This issue also includes Yu. Viktorov’s interview with Barenboim, “Daniel’ Barenboïm: ‘Kul’turnïy obmen budet sposobstvovat’ vzaimoponimanîyu mezdu nashimi narodami,” *Sovetskaya muzïka* 5 (1986): 57-59.

49 Regarding Shebalin playing Boulez for his class and Frid playing Boulez at meetings of his club, see Schmelz, *Such Freedom,* 33 and 202-203. Shebalin’s class marked Denisov’s first acquaintance with Boulez’s music. See Kholopov and Tsenova, *Edison Denisov,* 13.

50 Ivan Sokolov, interview with the author, April 14, 2008. Sokolov cites this event as one of the landmark events in his personal acquaintance with contemporary music, which began in 1974 when he listened to Messiaen’s *Vingt regards sur l’Enfant-Jésus* (1944) and *Quatuor pour la fin du temps* (1940-41).


52 See Boulez, “Hommage à Denisov,” in *Svet • dobro • vechnost*, 174-75.

In addition to his performances with the Ensemble InterContemporain, Boulez lectured and met with students and faculty at the Moscow Conservatory and the Gnesin Institute. Near the end of his visit, Boulez worked with one of the Moscow Conservatory’s student orchestras, leading it in a concert on March 5 of Stravinsky’s *Petrushka* (1910-11), Webern’s *Sechs Stücke*, op.6 (1909), and Debussy’s *La Mer* (1903-05). The concert was described enthusiastically in a front-page article entitled “Pierre Boulez at the Moscow Conservatory” [“P’yer Bulez v Moskovskoy konservatorii”] in the April 25, 1990 edition of *Sovetskiy muzïkant*, the Moscow Conservatory’s newspaper.

While in Moscow, Boulez appeared in press conferences with Denisov and his followers, bringing the ASM-2 a great deal of prestige. On February 19, the day before the Ensemble InterContemporain’s first Soviet concert, Boulez appeared with Denisov and others in the ASM-2’s first-ever press conference, held in the Small Hall of the House of Composers. Boulez and members of the ASM-2 appeared in a second press conference a week and a half later in the conservatory’s Rachmaninoff Hall. At these press conferences, Boulez was apparently asked not only about his own works, but his attitudes regarding a wide spectrum of twentieth-century genres. Boulez’s comments revealed the close affinities between his opinions and Denisov’s own. For example, at the February 19 press conference Boulez described his aversion to minimalism as a “primitive” style not worth serious attention, an attitude shared by Denisov who derided minimalism as “very uninteresting” [ochen’ neinteresno].

Boulez’s visit helped spark the ASM-2’s concert-presenting activities. On March 2, 1990, the ASM-2 hosted its first concert, timed in accordance with Boulez’s visit. Held in the House of Composers’ Great Hall, this concert was dedicated exclusively to Boulez’s music. The concert opened with a performance of Boulez’s Piano Sonata No. 2 (1947-48) performed by Ivan Sokolov, followed by *Domaines* (1961-8) for solo clarinet, performed by Vasiliy Zhelvakov. Boulez then conducted an ad hoc Moscow ensemble in his *Dérive I* (1984), followed by a

53 Colin Roche, e-mail message to the author, May 6, 2009. Sincerest thanks to Mr. Roche, Librarian of the Ensemble InterContemporain, for sending me detailed information about the group’s 1990 performances in Moscow and Leningrad.


performance of the Piano Sonata No. 3 by Tigran Alikhanov. The concert closed with Boulez conducting Moscow musicians in excerpts from the Improvisations sur Mallarmé (1957-59).58

As Ivan Sokolov describes, Denisov had planned this concert for several months. Since a soloist from the Ensemble InterContemporain would perform Boulez’s Sonata No. 1, Denisov likely asked Sokolov and Alikhanov to perform the Second and Third Sonatas so that the full cycle of sonatas might be heard during Boulez’s Soviet visit. As Sokolov describes, at the beginning of November 1989,

Denisov called me. He _himself_ called me. I remember it. It was rare in those days for a professor to call. I was working alongside Denisov at the conservatory, as a pedagogue in the department of instrumentation and score reading. “Vanya, play [Boulez’s] Second Sonata. Boulez is coming. We want to do a concert of his music, so that he can hear how we play his music. The First [Sonata] is easy. Tigran Alikhanov will play the Third. The Second is the most difficult. Try to learn it.” He gave me the music.59

Sokolov took the score and practiced it four or five hours per day for the next several months, learning it by memory in time for the March 2 concert. At the time of the concert, nerves interfered, and Sokolov decided to perform from the score. After the concert, Sokolov asked Boulez what he thought of his performance. Boulez took Sokolov’s score, wrote “très _dramatique_,” then autographed it.60

After this March 2 concert, Denisov and several young members of the ASM-2 retired with Boulez to the café of the House of Composers to pick Boulez’s brain about the best way to develop the necessary institutions for new music. Boulez counseled the group to retain their independence from the Composers’ Union, telling them “[In France] we don’t have a Union of Composers. [IRCAM] is independent. It’s necessary to remain independent.”61 This was a particularly hot-button issue, as Denisov’s decision to join the Secretariat of the Composers’ Union of the USSR several months before had proven controversial within the ranks of ASM-2. Smirnov particularly took Boulez’s advice to heart, and shortly thereafter published an article entitled “It’s important to be independent” [Vazhno bït’ nezavisimïm] in the newspaper _Moskovskiy komsomolets_ describing the ASM-2 composers’ meetings with Boulez.62

These discussions about institutionalization continued the next day as Boulez met with the ASM-2 composers at Smirnov’s and Firsova’s flat.63 That evening, the ASM-2 members began discussing in detail the matter of founding their own ensemble, modeled after Boulez’s Ensemble InterContemporain. Though not listed in the to-do list of the January 1990 manifesto, establishing an ensemble soon became the group’s number-one priority, and helped provide the ASM-2 the means for realizing many of its other objectives.

The ASM-2 composers were not the only ones who hoped Boulez and the Ensemble InterContemporain’s visit would lead to much-needed institutional reforms. Yurii Kholopov hoped that Boulez’s trip would help spark a _perestroïka_ in Soviet musicology and music
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58 “Kontserti ASM.”
59 Ivan Sokolov, interview with the author, April 14, 2008.
60 Ibid.
education. Writing in the pages of Sovetskiy muzïkant, the Moscow Conservatory’s newspaper, Kholopov lamented the lack of knowledge about Boulez in Soviet scholarship:

A metamorphosis is taking place before our very eyes. After decades of endless opprobrium directed towards the avant-garde and a sinister “battle against Western influences” (which means a battle against the Soviet Union’s best musicians), our audiences can finally see just how successful this battle truly was. The success of this battle (which was waged without an enemy) is clear: [in the Soviet Union], only one article has been published about Pierre Boulez, one of the most important composers of today, and zero books or dissertations have been written about him. Only one undergraduate thesis [diplomnaya rabota] has been written about him at the Moscow Conservatory (and this thesis was not filed in either the music theory or music history departments). The same situation holds for performances of his music. Thus, it reasons to follow: if we are fighting against those in the avant-garde, then where does that leave us? In the arrière garde. Or, if you do not wish to see it in a foreign language: at the tail end [v khvoste].

Kholopov’s assessment of the lack of Soviet musicological work on Boulez is technically correct, though slightly misleading. The single diplomnaya rabota completed at the conservatory on Boulez was Tat’yana Nikiforova’s 1980 thesis, “’Pli selon pli’ and Some Distinctive Features of Boulez’s Orchestral Style” [“Pli selon pli’ i nekotorïye osobennosti orkestrovogo stilya P. Buleza”]. Like Puchina, the musicology student who completed the 1981 thesis on Roslavets, Nikiforova was also a musicology student who filed her thesis in the instrumentation department, with Denisov as her advisor.

The “single article” on Boulez named by Kholopov is likely Yuzef Kon’s 1983 work, “Pierre Boulez as a Theorist” [P’yer Bulez kak teoretik], published in volume 4 of the series The Crisis of Bourgeois Culture and Music [Krizis burzhuazoyn kul’turï i Muzïka]. While Kholopov was correct in stating that, by 1990, only one article on Boulez had been written in the

---

66 Yuzef Kon, “P’yer Bulez kak teoretik (vzglyadï kompozitora v 1950-60-ye godï),” in Krizis burzhuaznoy kul’turï i muzïka, vol. 4, ed. L.N. Raaben (Moscow: Muzïka, 1983), 162-96. Kon was the source of several “first-and-only”s in Soviet musicology: in addition to this Boulez article, in 1973 Kon had published, in vol. 3 of the same series, the first major Soviet musicological work on Xenakis. See his “O teoreticheskoy kontseptsiï Yanissa Ksenakisa,” in Krizis burzhuaznoy kul’turï i muzïka, vol. 3, ed. L.N. Raaben (Moscow: Muzïka, 1973), 106-34. Though the first diplomnaya rabota on Boulez at the Moscow Conservatory was completed in the 1980s, the first one on Xenakis would not come for much later. In 1996, Mikhail Dubov completed his diplomnaya rabota, “Yannis Ksenakis: granii tvorchestva” in the Kafedra mezhdistsiplininarnykh spetsializatsii muzïkovedov, with Yuriy Rags as his advisor. In 2008, Dubov filed his kandidatskaya dissertatsiya, “Yannis Ksenakis – arkhitektor noveyshey muzïki,” the first dissertation on Xenakis at the Moscow Conservatory. Completed in the music theory department, Dubov’s dissertation was co-directed by Kholopov, who died in 2003, and Tsenova, who died in 2007. Moscow Conservatory Library 785.1 D-796 ch.z.
Soviet Union, Boulez’s music had been discussed in detail in a few other articles and books, including Tat’yana Tsaregradskaya’s 1988 article on Boulez, Stockhausen, and Babbitt entitled “The Utopia of Musical Structuralism in the 1950s” [Utopii muzikal’nogo strukturalizma 50-ïkh godov], published in the collection Western Artistic Criticism of Twentieth-Century Art [Iskusstvovoznaniye zapada ob iskusstve XX veka].

In fact, Tsaregradskaya’s article was a slightly extended version of the published prospectus [avtoreferat] for her dissertation, A Critical Analysis of the Compositional Methods of Pierre Boulez, Karlheinz Stockhausen, and Milton Babbitt. A Comparative Study of the Musical Avant-garde of the 1950s [Kriticheskiy analiz kompozitsionnikh metodov P. Buleza, K. Shtokkhauzena, M. Bebbita: K probleme sravnitel’ nogo izucheniya muzikal’nogo avangarda 50-x g.], which she began at the Lithuanian State Conservatory in Vilnius, then still a part of the USSR, in 1988.

Thus, although Kholopov’s claim that no dissertation on Boulez had been written in the Soviet Union by 1990 was correct, one was well underway. After the Soviet collapse, Tsaregradskaya began teaching at the Gnesin Institute, where she later supervised the first dissertation on Boulez in Moscow, written by Irina Ivanova.

In order to stimulate Soviet musicology and help the Soviet Union close the knowledge gap with the West, Kholopov organized a small scholarly conference at the Moscow Conservatory dedicated to Boulez’s music. Convened on February 16, the eve of Boulez’s arrival in Moscow, Kholopov’s conference featured three papers on various aspects of Boulez’s music. Mikhail Proshnyakov opened the conference with a paper, “Principles of Boulez’s Pointillist Composition” [Printsi pi puantalisticheskoy kompozitsii Buleza], consisting mainly of an analysis of Boulez’s Structures (Book I, 1951-52; Book II, 1956-61). Pyotr Menshchaninov then gave a talk positioning Boulez within the context of post-war European music. Sergey Prozogin, whom Kholopov calls the USSR’s leading specialist on Boulez despite the fact that he is not a musician by training, delivered a paper on Boulez’s use of electronics, including an analysis of Boulez’s Répons (1980-84).

Ivan Sokolov closed the conference with an analytical lecture-demonstration of the first movement of Boulez’s Piano Sonata No. 2, which he was busy preparing for the ASM-2’s March 2 debut concert.

---


69 In 1992 the Lithuanian State Conservatory was renamed the Lithuanian Academy of Music and, in 2004, the Lithuanian Academy of Music and Theater [Lietuvos muzikos ir teatro akademija].

70 I am not sure when or if Ivanova filed her dissertation. However, the Moscow Conservatory library has a copy of her dissertation’s avtoreferat. See Irina Ivanova, “Seriy naya ideya i yeyo realizatsiya v kompozitsii P’yera Buleza” (avtoreferat for the kandidatskaya dissertatsiya, Rossiyskaya muzikal’naya akademiya im. Gnesenikh, 2000). Moscow Conservatory Library 785.1 Ts-20 ch.z. (In 1993, the Gnesin Institute of Music [Gosudarstvenniy muzikal’n no-pedagogicheskii institut im. Gnesenikh] changed its name to the Gnesin Academy of Music [Rossiyskaya muzikal’naya akademiya im. Genensikh]).

In 2009, musicologist Ol’ga Puzko completed a dissertation at the Moscow Conservatory examining the Darmstadt International Summer Course for New Music, with great attention paid to Boulez. See Puzko, “Darmstadtskiye mezhdunarodnye letniye kursi novoy muziki i zapadnoevropeyskiy poslevoyennyi muzikal’nii avangard” (kandidatskaya dissertatsiya, Moskovskaya gosudarstvennaya konservatoriya, 2009).

71 Kholopov describes the conference in “P’yer Bulez. Nashi problemi,” 2.

72 Ibid. Menshchaninov’s paper was entitled “Sobstvennoye i nesobstvennoye,” and Prozogin’s was called “Informatika i muzika.”
Kholopov hoped that Boulez’s visit would not only stimulate new directions in Soviet musicology, but would help prompt a whole-scale reassessment of the Soviet music education system:

Boulez’s aesthetic world differs from ours, which is colored by Zhdanov’s legacy and the Stagnation, in the same way that Parisian stores differ from their Moscow counterparts. [Mir estetiki Buleza otlichaetsya ot nashikh zhdanovsko-zastoynikh ustanovok tem zhe, chem parizhskie magaziny ot magazinov moskovskikh.]

Boulez’s example, once again, demonstrates the compelling necessity to solve our methodological problems. What should we teach at institutions of higher learning now, at the end of the second millennium? Of course our students have to know functional harmony and must be able to analyze Bach fugue and classical forms, with their melodies and progressions. But the total education of a professional musician today—in any discipline!—demands good knowledge of contemporary music. At the conservatory’s graduation exams in harmony, polyphony, musical form, and solfeggio a student should be able to demonstrate the ability to engage, in a professional manner, with pressing issues in contemporary music, whether in Webern’s Cantatas or Variations, Stockhausen’s piano pieces, Boulez’s Le marteau sans maître, or the works of our best contemporary Soviet composers. Or are we content to sit arrière garde? 

Visit II: Stockhausen

Less than three weeks after Boulez and the Ensemble InterContemporain departed Moscow, a second, no less prestigious guest arrived. In late March 1990, Karlheinz Stockhausen made his long-awaited Soviet premiere, performing with his ensemble in a five-day festival of his works at Moscow State University. Held from March 23-27, 1990, the Stockhausen festival was a joint venture between the West German and Soviet governments, co-sponsored by the German Music Council (Bonn), West German Radio and Television (Cologne), the city of Duisburg, the Foreign Ministry of the Federal Republic of Germany, the USSR Ministry of Culture, Goskontsert, and the Composers’ Union of the USSR.

Although this was Stockhausen’s first visit to the USSR, by 1990 his music and ideas were arguably better known among Soviet composers and musicologists than Boulez’s. Scores and recordings of Stockhausen’s works were more available in Moscow than Boulez’s. One of the main sources of information about Stockhausen was the pianist Mariya Yudina (1899-1970) and her secretary, Anatoliy Kuznetsov. Beginning in the 1960s, Yudina and Kuznetsov maintained a regular correspondence with Stockhausen, who sent them scores and recordings of his latest works. Stockhausen continued sending these materials to Kuznetsov after Yudina’s death, and Kuznetsov often shared these materials with interested musicians. Both Lyubimov
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74 Ivan Sokolov, interview with the author, April 14, 2008.
and Kholopov also had large libraries of Stockhausen recordings and would often host listening parties for their friends; Svetlana Savenko, for example, remembers listening to the full two-hour recording of *Hymnen* (1966-67) at Lyubimov’s.  

Also, Lyubimov, Pekarsky, and others regularly performed Stockhausen’s works in Moscow and other Soviet cities throughout the 1970s, including *Kreuzspiel* (1951), *Zyklos* (1959), and *Aus den sieben Tagen* (1968). In addition to his music, Stockhausen’s ideas were highly influential upon several Soviet composers and musicologists. Already by the early 1970s, the Lenin Library had German-language editions of many of Stockhausen’s writings, while the Moscow Conservatory library had acquired several of Stockhausen’s *Texte zur Musik* likely in the early 1980s. Gubaidulina began reading Stockhausen’s writings in German in the 1970s, assisted by Lyudmila Tovalyova, who taught German at the conservatory. Savenko herself closely studied Stockhausen’s writings at the Lenin Library, and used them as the basis for her article “Karlheinz Stockhausen’s Musical Ideas and Musical World” [*Muzikal’niye idei i muzikal’naya deystvitel’nost’ Karlkhaintsa Stokkhauzena*], published in the 1987 collection *The Theory and Practice of Bourgeois Culture: Problems of Criticism* [*Teoriya i praktika burzhuaznoy kul’turi: problemykritiki*] though completed well beforehand.

Kholopov’s complaint that, by 1990, no thesis on Boulez had been completed in the music theory or music history departments at the Moscow Conservatory did not hold true for Stockhausen. In 1979, Moscow Conservatory undergraduate Marina Chaplïgina wrote her thesis in the music theory department on Stockhausen, “Towards a Critique of Stockhausen’s musical-theoretical ideas. The problem of composition” [*K kritike muzikal’no-teoreticheskikh vzglyadov Karlheinza Shtokkhauzena. Problema proizvedeniya*], supervised by Kholopov himself. Upon graduation from the Moscow Conservatory, Chaplïgina began teaching Stockhausen’s music in the advanced theory course at the Gnesin Institute, which in 1990 published her lectures and course materials on Stockhausen.

Stockhausen arrived in Moscow in mid-March. A small band of Moscow musicians, led by Ivan Sokolov, met him and his ensemble at Moscow’s Sheremetyevo Airport. The musicians were dressed to represent figures from Stockhausen’s operatic cycle *Licht* (1977-2003) excerpts


77 Svetlana Savenko, interview with the author, May 23, 2008.

78 These books’ card in the kartoteka of the abonementskiy otdel of the Moscow Conservatory library shows the date 1983 on the back, likely indicating date of acquisition and/or date the card was created. Since these books were available at the Lenin Library in the 1970s, it seems likely that the conservatory library would have had them at least by the early 80s.


80 Savenko’s article was published in L. D’yachkova, ed., *Teoriya i praktika burzhuaznoy kul’turi: problemykritiki* (Moscow: Gosudarstvennyi muzikal’no-pedagogicheskiy institut im. Gnesenïkh, 1987), 82-119.


of which would be performed in Moscow, and greeted him by playing excerpts from Licht.\footnote{Svetlana Savenko, interview with the author, May 23, 2008. See, too, Michael Kurtz, trans. Richard Toop, \textit{Stockhausen: A Biography} (London: Faber and Faber, 1992), 233.} As Sokolov told Michael Kurtz:

As soon as we saw Stockhausen come through the glass doors, poised like an alert eagle, we cut loose. I played the opening of the Michael formula. For a few moments Stockhausen was taken aback; but then he gazed at us, abandoned his luggage trolley and started to conduct us.\footnote{Ivan Sokolov, conversation with Michael Kurtz. Reprinted in Kurtz, \textit{Stockhausen}, 233.}

On March 20, Stockhausen held a press conference at the House of Composers, like Boulez had done a few weeks before. The next day, an article hailing Stockhausen’s visit appeared on the front page of \textit{Evening Moscow [Vecheryayaya Moskva]}, followed on March 22 with an overview of the Stockhausen festival published in \textit{Moskovskiy komsomolets} alongside Smirnov’s article on Boulez.\footnote{See “Vpervïye v SSSR,” \textit{Vechernyaya Moskva} 21 March 1990, 1 and T. Vesina, “Pyat’ vecherov muzïka Shtokkhauzena v Moske” \textit{Moskovskiy komsomolets} 22 March 1990, 4.} In addition to these performances, Stockhausen’s ensemble held open rehearsals at Moscow State University, attended by several musicians.\footnote{Mikhail Dubov, interview with the author, January 16, 2008 and Sergei Zagny, interview with the author, July 3, 2008. Both Dubov and Zagny described their amazement at Stockhausen’s musicianship, particularly the way in which he precisely sang complex excerpts to his musicians while conveying great subtleties.}

The five-day festival opened on March 23 with a performance of \textit{Telemusik} (1966). Over the next five days, several of Stockhausen’s most popular works were performed, including the Klavierstück IX (1956), \textit{Gesang der Jünglinge} (1955-56), and excerpts from \textit{Tierkreis} (1975). The festival was mainly dedicated to excerpts from \textit{Licht}, including \textit{Michaels Reise um die Erde} (1978, from \textit{Donnerstag}), \textit{Luzifers Traum} (1981, from \textit{Samstag}), \textit{Kathinkas Gesang als Luzifers Requiem} (1982–3, from \textit{Samstag}), \textit{Mondeva} (1978–9, from \textit{Michaels Jugend}), \textit{Examen} (1979, from \textit{Michaels Jugend}), \textit{Argument} and \textit{Vision} (1980, from \textit{Michaels Heimkehr}), and \textit{Donnerstags-Abschied (Michaels-Abschied)} (1980, from \textit{Donnerstag}).\footnote{The order in which the excerpts from \textit{Licht} are listed here reflects the order in which they were performed at the festival (according to the festival booklet) between March 23-27, 1990.} All concerts were performed by Stockhausen’s ensemble, featuring Suzanna Stevens (bassethorn), Markus Stockhausen (trumpet), Maiella Stockhausen (piano), and Simon Stockhausen (synthesizer), and accompanied with extensive commentary by Stockhausen, in both German and Russian, in the program booklet.

Though this visit is remembered as a colossal event, many were disappointed by Stockhausen’s long-awaited Soviet premiere. In an interview in \textit{Muzïkal’naya akademiya} published some three years after Stockhausen’s visit, Vladimir Tarnopolski expressed his distaste for the cultishness surrounding the composer:

With regard to [Stockhausen’s] music, I’m more interested in Stockhausen’s works through the mid-‘70s […] Honestly, I left his concerts at [Moscow State] University rather upset: I couldn’t help but feel like Cagliostro and his retinue had come to Moscow – an amateur staging (done by Stockhausen himself), the naivety of his quasi-mythic/philosophical libretto and, most importantly, a certain recycled quality in the musical ideas [nekotoraya vtorichnost’ muzïkal’nikh idey].
Peeking out through all of this is Stockhausen’s naïve desire to see himself as the “Wagner of the Twentieth Century.”

Much as musicians eagerly sought Boulez’s advice on reforming Soviet musical life, so too did they turn to Stockhausen for guidance. This “Wagner of the Twentieth Century” was eager to chime in. In an interview with Stockhausen entitled “To Breathe the Air of Different Planets” [Dïshat’ vozdukhom inïkh planet] published in Sovetskaya muzïka shortly after his visit, Svetlana Savenko asked Stockhausen why he thinks his music was “practically banned” in the USSR. Stockhausen launches an extended monologue on the nature of state interference in the arts, including in his native country:

I think that there are deeply rooted reasons for conservatism in your country, especially given the century at hand. One time I was talking with my teacher, Stravinsky, and he said that sometimes there is bad weather and you simply have to wait, but as soon as the sun comes out society will have more things to worry about than art. Of course, waiting is not easy. I remember how Alfred Schnittke came over to my house one time. We sat there, talking about various things, before he suddenly asked, “Should I emigrate?” I responded, “What would you do here? You were born there [in the USSR], you grew up there; try to find a new meaning in your life there.” I myself am from a poor family. I was a child during the Third Reich. I looked around and was riddled with several questions. The authorities had banned some music and said that it’s bad, that it’s good for nothing, and that no one should listen to it. Nevertheless, I purposefully sought out this artistic music and went out of my way to find it.

I won’t conceal the fact that there are numerous difficulties surrounding my trip to the USSR. But I’ve arrived, the sun has come out, and it’s very important that we’re here together.

Savenko then asks Stockhausen how Soviet musicians might “overcome our nearly fifty-year lag in new music,” to which Stockhausen advises:

Right now your main problem regards technical progress: in acoustics, in the practice of composition for new electroacoustic instruments, in the working-out of spatial questions [v reshenii prostranstvennikh zadach][…] You must build more musical forms, and absolutely new ones, and not copy the traditional ones. It’s important to liberate music from any functional use: earlier, composers wrote for church, for festive occasions, for concerts, et cetera, and only in the twentieth century, in Europe, did there emerge the notion of music for its own sake [yedinaya muzïka,muzïka voobshche]. Only then can a composer create for the sake of art and make art in a completely free manner. An artist will then be as free in his research [v poiske] as an astronomer, a biologist, or a mathematician. The art of performing or composing music follows its own internal evolutionary process, and in order to advance it requires a lot of time. I say: everyone must go to the studio and make sound. For each composition, find sonorities which have

not yet existed. The main theme of art in our century is invention and discovery.\textsuperscript{90}

\textbf{The Seven Steps}

In the wake of Boulez’s and Stockhausen’s visits, numerous Soviet composers set about restructuring Soviet musical life along the lines their distinguished guests had advised.

Several musicians shared Stockhausen’s concern about Soviet music’s technological gap and sought to establish the institutions necessary for the type of acoustic research he proposed. In 1992, Andrey Smirnov (b. 1956) founded the Theremin Center [\textit{Teremt-sentr}] at the Moscow Conservatory, a center for the research and composition of electronic and electroacoustic music. Named after Lev Theremin [\textit{Termen}] (1896-1993), inventor of the eponymous electronic instrument, the center was motivated by the same spirit of restoration underlying the ASM-2. The Center looked to revive the fabled State Institute of Musical Science [\textit{ Gosudarstvennyi institut muzikal’noy nauki}] (1921-33) with which Theremin, Avraamov, and others had been affiliated, and today regularly hosts concerts, lectures, and performance-demonstrations to disseminate information about the “forgotten history” of early Soviet experimental music.\textsuperscript{91}

Though located at the conservatory, the Theremin Center was not incorporated as an official part of the conservatory in 1992; rather, it was affiliated with the conservatory’s Recording Laboratory [\textit{Laboratoriya zvukozapisi}], where Theremin had worked in the mid-1960s before resigning in the wake of a scandal brought about by an article in the \textit{New York Times} detailing his experimental work.\textsuperscript{92} During the 1990s, the Theremin Center became a hotbed of Cagean experimentalism, regularly hosting events such as “brain jazz” jam sessions inspired by Alvin Lucier’s electroencephalographic devices.\textsuperscript{93} As part of the ongoing push to professionalize electronic music in Russia, in 2006 the Theremin Center became an official part of the newly-

\textsuperscript{90} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{91} For example, Andrey Smirnov and Lyubov’ Pchelkina have directed an ongoing project at the Theremin Center, “Generation Z: The Forgotten History of Soviet Experimental Music of the Beginning of the Twentieth Century (and not only…)” [\textit{Pokoleniye Z. Zabïtaya istoriya eksperimental’noy muzïki nachala XX veka (i ne tol’ko…)}], which stages exhibitions and performances of electronic instruments and works from this period.

After 1933, the State Institute of Musical Science became the Scientific Musical Research Institute [\textit{Nauchnïy issledovatel’ skiy muzikal’nïy institut}] located at the conservatory. It, too, was eventually shut down. \textsuperscript{92} The \textit{Laboratoriya zvukozapisi} was itself a reorganized version of the Acoustics Laboratory [\textit{Laboratoriya akustiki}], founded at the conservatory in 1947.

In 1967, the \textit{Times} published a profile of Theremin by Harold Schonberg, “Music: Leon Theremin. Inventor of Instrument Bearing His Name is Interviewed in Soviet Union” (\textit{The New York Times} 26 April 1967, 40). Schonberg himself did not travel to Moscow; instead, his article discusses a conversation between Theremin and an unnamed “visitor,” described in other sources as one Christopher Walker.

As Andrey Smirnov recounts, in the wake of this article, the conservatory’s rector, Aleksandr Sveshnikov (1890-1980), had Theremin fired. After leaving the conservatory, Theremin worked in the Department of Acoustics at Moscow State University’s Faculty of Physics. See Smirnov’s biography of Theremin (at http://theremin.ru, accessed November 21, 2010). See, too, Stephen Montague, “Rediscovering Leon Theremin,” \textit{Tempo} 177 (1991): 18-23. Montague simply states that, after working at the Moscow Conservatory from 1964-66, Theremin “moved quietly to the Acoustics Department in the Faculty of Physics at Moscow State University” (p.22).

\textsuperscript{93} Smirnov first devised his electroencephalographic Brain Jazz experiment in 1985 while working at the Institute for Psychology of the Academy of Sciences. The project is similar to Alvin Lucier’s \textit{Music for Solo Performer} (1965). Since 2001 Smirnov has continued his Brain Jazz project using the Max/MSP computer program.
established Center for Electroacoustic Music [Tsentr elektroakusticheskoy muziki] at the conservatory, headed by composer Igor’ Kefalidis [Kefalidi] (b. 1941).

The biggest response to these visits, though, was seen in the ASM-2 composers’ new interest in founding their own ensemble modeled after Boulez’s group. Yurii Kasparov (b. 1955), one of the ASM-2’s younger members and then a graduate student of Denisov’s, took the lead. Kasparov’s biography closely resembles Denisov’s own. Like Denisov, Kasparov came to music late and from a technical background. Born in 1955, Kasparov graduated from the prestigious Moscow Energy Institute [Moskovskiy energeticheskii institut] in 1978 and soon thereafter took a job as an engineer at the Central Scientific-Research Institute of Robotics and Hydraulics [Tsentral’nyi nauchno-issledovatel’skiy institut avtomatiki i gidravliki], a closed research institute. In 1980, Kasparov enrolled at the Moscow Conservatory, graduating from the composition class of Mikhail Chulaki (1908-1989) in 1984. After a four-year stint as music editor at the Central Studio of Documentary Films [Tsentral’naya studia dokumental’nikh fil’mov], Kasparov returned to the conservatory for graduate study. In 1989, during perestroika, he became Denisov’s first official composition student and completed a graduate degree in composition, with Denisov as his adviser, in 1991.

Kasparov and the other members of the ASM-2 recruited musicians into their nascent group. As violinist Mariya Khodina recalls, finding players was not difficult, as numerous musicians were eager to perform new music. Questions of musical competency, though, were another matter. Many musicians, though proficient in the classical repertoire, were unfamiliar with new music, having neither studied nor listened to it at conservatory. An audience member at one of the ensemble’s November 1990 concerts remarked upon some of the ensemble members’ seeming lack of familiarity with the repertoire and its demands, noting that, under Pon’kin, the ensemble performed unevenly and rather stiffly [ochen’ formal’ no]. Organizers variously referred to the new group as either the ASM Ensemble [ASM Ansambl’] or the Moscow Contemporary Music Ensemble [Moskovskiy ansambl’ sovremennoy muziki, or MASM]. Today the ensemble is known exclusively by this latter name, the acronym of which nevertheless includes “ASM.”


---

94 Denisov, who was named [Edison] after the American inventor, graduated from the Faculty of Physics and Mathematics [Fiziko-matematicheskiy fakul’tet] at Tomsk State University in 1951. After completing his degree in Tomsk he enrolled at the Moscow Conservatory, completing his undergraduate degree in music in 1956 (at the age of 27) and his graduate degree [aspirantura] in 1959.
95 Mariya Khodina, interview with the author, January 10, 2008.
96 In order to help address these deficiencies, Tarnopolski founded the Center for Contemporary Music [Tsentr sovremennoy muziki, originally the Society for New Music, Obshchestvo novoy muziki] at the conservatory in 1993. Ten years later, the Center became host to a formal Department of Contemporary Music [Kafedra sovremennoy muziki], offering courses in late-twentieth century instrumental technique.
97 These comments were made by an unidentified student and included in “The audience speaks” [Govoryat slushateli], a common feature in the pages of Sovetskaya muzika during perestroika. See “‘Moskovskaya osen’-90’: govoryat slushateli,” Sovetskaya muzika 2 (1991): 51.
98 “Kratkaya letopis’ novoy ‘Assotsiatsiya sovremennoy muziki’.”
The ensemble’s founding allowed the ASM-2 to pursue the goals announced in its January 1990 manifesto, particularly performing members’ works in the USSR and abroad and disseminating their music through recordings and broadcasting. In the wake of this April 27 concert, the ASM-2 and its ensemble launched an ambitious performance series in Moscow. Over the next eighteen months (the only period for which I have detailed records), the ASM-2 presented over 32 concerts in Moscow at venues including the conservatory’s Great and Small Halls, the Chaikovsky Concert Hall, and the House of Composers. In addition to performances of its members’ music, the ASM-2’s concerts included portrait concerts of composers such as Edgard Varèse (1883-1965) and György Kurtág (b. 1926), as well as appearances at the Moscow Autumn and Alternativa festivals. The ASM-2 and its ensemble also participated at the “New Reality” [Novaya real’nost’] exposition at Moscow’s Manezh center in December 1990 - January 1991. The exhibition took its title from the infamous 1962 exhibit, at which Nikita Khrushchev vociferously denounced modernist art. The ASM-2 presented seven concerts, hosted by Yekimovskiy, at this new “New Reality” festival.

These live performances in Moscow were not the only way the ASM-2 reached out to Soviet listeners. Motivated by perestroika-era ideals of social engagement, the ASM-2 took to the airways to help fill-in history’s “blank spots” and introduce Soviet listeners to composers and works rarely performed before glasinost’. Viktor Yekimovskiy, the only trained musicologist among the ASM-2’s core membership, took the lead. In March 1990, Yekimovskiy led a delegation of ASM-2 composers on the Soviet television program Viewpoint [Vzglyad], a particularly important show during perestroika. The program was broadcast on March 8. Over the next several months, Yekimovskiy appeared on numerous Soviet radio and television stations to propagandize for the ASM-2, including a November 1990 interview on the Moscow station “Youth” [Yunost’], a March 1990 appearance on Irkutsk television, and an April 1991 spot on Dmitriy Ukhov’s radio program, “Contrasts” [Kontrasti].

With the founding of the ensemble, the group was able to demonstrate its members’ music on air, and not simply talk about it. In 1991, the ASM-2 teamed with the classical radio station Orpheus [Orfey] to establish the “Evening of Contemporary Music” series [Vecher sovremennoy muzïki], broadcast live from the House of Recording and Radio Broadcast [Dom zvukozapisi i radioveshchaniya] and with Yekimovskiy as program host. Radio Orpheus, Russia’s state classical music station, was established in 1991 by the successor agency to Gosteleradio USSR. The ASM-2’s series began on October 31, 1991 with a live broadcast, performed by the group’s ensemble and hosted by Yekimovskiy, of Denisov’s Chamber

---

99 The document “Kontsertï ASM,” a detailed list of the ASM-2’s concert and repertoire, provides listings only from March 2, 1990 to October 31, 1991. All concert information in this paragraph comes from this document.

100 The five composers profiled by the ASM-2 and its ensemble during this period were Denisov (concert of May 23, 1990), Varèse (November 2, 1990), Swiss composer Francesco Hoch (b. 1943) (April 3, 1991), Nikolay Karetnikov (April 5, 1991) and György Kurtág (April 22, 1991). Other special concerts included a performance of music by young composers from South Korea (October 22, 1990) and participation in Pekarsky’s April 1991 concert Signor Luigi’s Magic Gift [Volshebnïy dar sin’ora Luidzhi], a collective composition by members of the ASM-2 in memoriam Luigi Nono.

101 This was not the first perestroika-era performance of modernist music at the Manezh. In 1989, Aleksey Lyubimov, Mark Pekarsky, Natal’ya Pshenichnikova, Ivan Sokolov, and others performed works by Berio, Cage, Pelecis, and Sil’vestrov at the Manezh center. See Pospelov, “Avangard v Manezhe,” Muzïkal’naya zhizn’ 2 (1989): 7-8.

102 Yekimovskiy, Avtomonografiya, 402. The “Kratkaya letopis’” shows that this program was recorded on March 4, the same day the ASM-2 hosted its final meeting [vstrecha-beseda] with Boulez.

103 Yekimovskiy, Avtomonografiya, 403.
Symphony (1982), Tarnopolski’s Jesu, deine tiefen Wunden, Gubaidulina’s Concordanza (1971), and Kasparov’s Devil’s Trills [D’yavol’skiye treli] (1990). These broadcasts continued on Orpheus for the next several years, albeit with decreasing regularity, due in large part to the changes in Russian radio broadcasting throughout the post-Soviet period. As Russian radio stations began competing more aggressively for market share and advertising dollars, Orpheus’ managers sought to make the station as broadly accessible as possible. In 2005, administrators proposed new slogans for the station including “Orpheus – Radio for Gourmands” and “Recharge your Mind,” all the while directing that no loud or challenging repertoire should be broadcast. Despite these attempts at appealing to a broad listening public, Orpheus remains marginalized: though it broadcasts in seven Russian metropolitan regions, Orpheus is heard on the FM band only in Moscow; in the six other regions, Orpheus is broadcast only on the UKV band.

In addition to these domestic programs, the ASM-2 and its ensemble focused a great deal of energy on international projects, especially participation in international festivals, as a way of disseminating members’ music abroad and reintegrating Russia into the European new music scene. Already in February 1990, only weeks after the group’s formal organization, the ASM-2 began planning concert series in Germany and France the next year. In September 1991, the ASM-2 and its ensemble participated at the Frankfurt Feste 1991, hosted by the Ensemble Moderne. Over the next few years, the ASM-2 and its ensemble participated in numerous festivals in countries including Denmark, France, Germany, Switzerland, and Turkey. Several of these foreign tours led to recording contracts. The ASM-2 began recording members’ works in the early 1990s on the British label Olympia, which had a partnership with the USSR’s Mezhdunarodnaya kniga importing firm. In 1993, the Moscow Contemporary Music Ensemble’s performance at Radio Frances’ Festival Presénces led to a series of recordings on Le Chant du Monde, while the ensemble’s performance at the Tokyo Summer Fest in 1994 resulted in a recording contract with the Japanese label Meldac.

104 “Kontserti ASM.” This October 31, 1991 concert is the last entry on this list.
105 Yekimovsky, Avtomonografiya, 396.
106 I tried to access records of Radio Orpheus’ broadcast programs from the early 1990s, but was unsuccessful. Several people told me that these records no longer exist, which is plausible though unlikely; rather, these records likely exist in partial and disheveled form, as is the case with many documents from the time immediately after the collapse.
107 For a description of these new policies, and a scathing rebuke of them, see “Orfey bez slushateley?,” Filarmonik 2 (2006): 19. Another proposed slogan for Radio Orpheus was, “We present to you a musical lunch, prepared by Bach and Beethoven” [A seychas nam predstoit muzïkal’nïy obed, nad kotorïm potrudilis’ Bakh i Betkhoven]
108 The festival’s theme that year was “Schönheit-eine Utopie?”, and the ASM-2 composers presented works examining this and other weighty philosophical questions. The festival featured the world premieres of Yekimovsky’s Tripelkamerversationen (1991), Karayev’s Der Stand der Dinge (1991), and Tarnopolski’s Kassandra (1991). In total, the ASM-2 presented three concerts, and seventeen works by member composers, at the Frankfurt Feste 1991. One concert was performed by the Ensemble Moderne, conducted by Ingo Metzmacher, and the other two by the Moscow Contemporary Music Ensemble, conducted by Aleksey Vinogradov, who was named the group’s conductor earlier that year.
109 Olympia released a total of six discs during the early 1990s of works by ASM-2 composers, including Kasparov, Vustin, Shut’, Firsova, Raskatov, Pavlenko, Vasks, and others. See Olympia OCD 281, 282, 283, 295, 296, and 297 (early 1990s).
110 On these tours, see Pyotr Pospelov, “Yuriy Kasparov: Tonika muzïkal’noy zhizni,” in Valeriya Tsenova, ed., Muzïka iz bïvshego SSSR vol. 2 (Moscow: Kompozitor, 1996), 174. The three discs released by Le Chant du Monde in 1993 profiling ASM-2 composers and performed by MASM are Yuri Kasparov (LDC 288 060, 1993),
These recordings and festival engagements abroad were important not only because of the international exposure they provided, but also because they helped provide salaries for the ensemble’s musicians. Beginning in June 1990, the ensemble’s rehearsal and production costs were partially supported by Miloserdiye [Compassion], a private charitable foundation active in the Soviet Union during glasnost.¹¹¹ This support, however, likely covered only a fraction of the ensemble’s costs. Through stringing together numerous performances abroad, the ensemble’s manager, musicologist Viktoriya Korshunova, was able to piece together decent pay (at least by standards of the Soviet collapse) for ensemble musicians, though this pay was always contingent upon finding new projects. As Pyotr Pospelov notes, “although it was not easy for the musicians to work without a guaranteed salary,” thanks to Korshunova’s tireless efforts they were able to earn an income comparable to that of a mid-level [srednestatisticheskiy] Russian orchestra.¹¹²

The ASM-2 used these foreign recording contracts as an opportunity to begin experimenting with private corporate sponsorship, still a largely unfamiliar concept in Russia today. The group’s 1993 recordings on Le Chant du Monde were partially underwritten by Inkombank, a private bank founded in Moscow in 1988. Inkombank’s sponsorship is recognized at the back of each disc’s booklet with a two-page advertisement describing the bank and its activities in three languages (French, English, and German). This early corporate partnership remains a rare exception, and since the early 1990s most new music organizations in Russia have been funded almost exclusively by Russian and foreign government agencies and foreign private foundations.¹¹³

Participating in foreign festivals was one way the ASM-2 sought to reestablish international connections severed during the Soviet era. Another way was through rejoining the International Society for Contemporary Music (ISCM), with which the original ASM had been affiliated. The ASM-2 met to discuss this matter throughout spring 1990, and on May 31 of that year Tarnopolski sent a letter to the ISCM requesting membership for the association. Four months later, in September 1990, Tarnopolski traveled to Oslo to deliver application documents and begin formal discussions with the ISCM regarding the ASM-2’s candidacy. On March 4, 1991, the ASM-2 received a letter from the ISCM recommending it for membership.

Viktor Yekimovsky (LDC 288 062, 1993), Alexander Raskatov (LDC 288 059, 1993). In the years since, MASM has released several more discs on this label.


¹¹² Pospelov, “Yuriy Kasparov,” 173. Pospelov’s article was published in English as “Yury Kasparov: the tonic of musical life,” in “Ex oriente...”: Ten Composers from the Former USSR, ed. Valeria [Valeriya] Tsenova and trans. Carolyn Dunlop (Berlin: Ernst Kuhn, 2002), 131-153. This English translation excludes most of the passages detailing the financial difficulties facing Russian music during the early ‘90s.

¹¹³ Some private sponsorship for new music has recently resumed in Russia. For example, in 1998, the heirs of nineteenth-century music publisher Pyotr Jurgenson [Yurgenson] (1806-1934) established a private foundation [Fond Yurgensona] which sponsors concert performances and well as an annual international competition for young composers, administered by the conservatory’s Center for Contemporary Music. In 2004, oligarch Mikhail Prokhorov, currently Russia’s wealthiest individual, established a foundation [Fond Mikhaila Prokhorova] which funds cultural projects, including new music events. Meanwhile, Moscow’s Deal Bank [Dil-Bank], founded in the early 2000s, has recently emerged as a sponsor for the Moscow Autumn festival.
Raspad

By the end of 1991, then, the ASM-2 had or surpassed all of the goals laid out in its January 1990 manifesto and was well on its way to developing a well-functioning infrastructure to support the composition, performance, and study of new music. However, the association’s mission, and indeed the ASM-2 itself, was soon threatened by a variety of social, economic, and political forces unleashed amidst the Soviet collapse.

The most immediate force threatening the ASM-2 apart was emigration. In the early 1990s, well over half of the group’s founding members emigrated: Gubaidulina, Schnittke, Lobanov, and Raskatov moved to Germany; Korndorf emigrated to Canada, Hrabovsky emigrated to the United States; and Shut’, Smirnov, and Firsova moved to England. Yuriy Kholopov characterizes this mass emigration as the loss of “an entire musical culture.” In a 1999 passage entitled “Russia’s music: where is it?” [Muzïka Rossii: gde ona?], Kholopov lists several of the composers, conductors, and performers who left Russia in the early 1990s, especially the composers of the ASM-2, before summarizing:

The usual question to a contemporary musician in Russia is, Why haven’t you left, too?

Yes, an entire musical culture has left Russia. To draw a comparison using the case of German composers, imagine if the following had left Germany for America: Karlheinz Stockhausen, Wolfgang Rihm, György Ligeti, Dieter Schnebel, Helmut Lachenmann, Friedrich Goldman, Mauricio Kagel, Wilhelm Killmayer, Peter Ruzicka, Friedrich Schenker, Heiner Goebbels, Georg Katzer, Paul-Heinz Dittrich. What would German music look like then?114

The greatest blow to the ASM-2 came in September 1990, when Denisov himself left Moscow. Denisov had long counseled his disciples not to emigrate but rather to “live and work in Russia” and “serve our motherland.”115 Denisov, it should be noted, did not actually emigrate, but accepted a half-year residency at IRCAM, organized by Boulez, to compose his electroacoustic work Sur la nappe d’un étang glace (1991). After his residency was complete,

---


According to Smirnov, when he asked Denisov in December 1989 whether or not he had joined the Secretariat of the Composers’ Union, Denisov replied, “You have to save your Motherland, which is coming apart right now [Nado spasat’ svoyu Rodinu, kotoraya teper’ razvalivayetsya] and remain here, don’t go abroad.” Kasparov remembers, “Denisov told us, ‘You mustn’t leave Russia. It would be a huge mistake to leave Russia. We must live and work here.’”
though, Denisov remained in Paris for much of the next several years, returning to Moscow only periodically. In 1994, Denisov was involved in a serious automobile accident in Paris and remained hospitalized there until his death in 1996. Denisov’s de facto emigration struck several members of the ASM-2 especially hard. Firsova traces the ASM-2’s disintegration, and the collapse of post-Soviet Russia’s musical life in general, to Denisov’s move abroad:

Suddenly, in September [1990], returning from Sortavala, we found out that Denisov would move to France for a half year, as he had been invited to work at IRCAM and write a new electroacoustic work there. We immediately sensed catastrophe. Though Denisov reassured everyone at the last ASM meeting before his departure that he would return in April, no one believed him. Korndorf even cried out in despair, “Comrades, do you know what is happening? Our ASM has had its head cut off! [Nash ASM okazalsya obezglavlennîm!]

Gradually everything fell apart [vraskosets]: the ensemble stopped performing; the ASM’s meetings became more boring, with fewer and fewer people in attendance […] Disagreements broke out within the ASM, sponsors and conductors disappeared. Given the generally worsening situation [in Russia], the mass exodus to the West and the widespread feeling of hopelessness, ASM seemed liked a mirror splintering up into countless fragments.

Sometimes it still seems that had Denisov not left everything would have turned out differently: we [Firsova and Smirnov] definitely would not have emigrated, nor would have Shut’ or Raskatov, and Moscow’s musical life could be totally different today. No doubt, this is just an illusion.116

Those members of the ASM-2 who remained in Russia faced a staggering array of logistical and financial difficulties as they attempted to continue developing the organs for new music amidst the Soviet collapse. As Tarnopolski remarked in the particularly dark year of 1993, “[In Russia] not just individual elements for the normal functioning of new music have failed; the entire system has failed.”117

The most obvious problems, of course, were economic. The Soviet political collapse brought about an economic collapse, too, and state funding nearly disappeared. In the early 1990s some private firms were established to help fill this gap: for example, in 1990 film director Vadim Dubrovitsky (b. 1960) established a private production firm [Prodyuserskaya firma Vadima Dubrovitskogo] which, in the early 1990s, began producing contemporary music concerts in cities throughout Russia with the support of Western publishing houses, private Russian interests, and Russian regional and city governments.118 These private ventures, though, remain the exception rather than the rule, and throughout the 1990s Russia’s new music institutions subsided largely through foreign support. This foreign support was not always

---

116 Elena Firsova, “1990 (Bulez),” Fragmentï o Denisove.
118 In 1996, Vladimir Tarnopolski and the conservatory’s Society for New Music [Obshchestvo novoy muzïki, after 1998 the Center for Contemporary Music] teamed with Dubrovitsky to produce the third Moscow Forum [Moskovskîy forum] festival, one part in his Dubrovitsky’s ongoing “Festival of Festivals” [Festival’ festivaley], a year-long festival of contemporary music staged in cities throughout Russia. This information comes from the “Festival’ festivaley” booklet (1996), held in the archives of the Center for Contemporary Music at the Moscow Conservatory. See, too, Pyotr Pospelov, “GK v DK i v BDK,” Kommersant’’ 9 April 1996.
reliable: as Tarnopolski recounts, in the early 1990s Boulez invited him, Yekimovsky, and Raskatov to Paris for a month-long residency, yet the French Ministry of Culture was unable to provide funding. Soon thereafter, IRCAM again invited Tarnopolski for a residency there. Though IRCAM covered program fees, it would not pay living expenses, forcing Tarnopolski to decline since, as he explained to Natal’ya Zeyfas, “A whole month’s pay for a professor at the Moscow Conservatory isn’t enough for a single lunch in Paris, to say nothing about rent.”

In addition to these economic problems, the Soviet collapse unleashed a variety of ideological forces shaping music and musical life in perhaps unexpected ways. Some of these are particularly ugly. In his 1994 interview with Anna Ferenc, Korndorf describes how emergent post-Soviet nationalism had affected the ASM-2:

> I think that the Association is now limited to Russian members with the exception of the Armenians [Ashot] Zograbian and [Tigran] Mansurian. Today, a difficult situation has arisen between old friends. Unfortunately, state borders are being strongly enforced. They have not only inhibited artistic interaction, but have also broken personal contacts. For some people, it is difficult to separate personal from political relationships.

It must be emphasized that the ASM-2 did not enact citizenship standards for its members. Furthermore, Korndorf is incorrect in his tally of non-Russian membership: Azeri composer Faradzh Karayev, one of the ASM-2’s founding members, remains one of its most active members, and from 1994-96 served as its vice president. However, as Korndorf implies, emergent nationalist sensibilities drove wedges between old colleagues. This matter became especially clear in 1996 as Tsenova and Kholopov prepared the second volume of their *Music from the Former USSR* [Muzïka iz bïvshego SSSR] series, collections of short articles profiling previously unofficial or underground Soviet modernists, including numerous ASM-2 members. Tsenova and Kholopov had hoped to include a chapter on Lithuanian composer Osvaldas Balakauskas (b. 1937). However, Balakauskas wrote to Kholopov forbidding them from doing so. In Balakauskas’ words, including him in a book on music from the former Soviet Union would be the equivalent of someone “writing to Schoenberg in Los Angeles and proposing to include an article about him in a collection entitled Music from the former Third Reich.”

Balakauskas’ comments prompted a sharp response from musicologist Levon Hakobian (b. 1953), born in Yerevan and, like Balakauskas, a non-Russian former Soviet. As Hakobian wrote in response to Balakauskas’ letter,

> Frankly speaking, there is something inconsistent in this reasoning. Schönberg had never participated in the structures of the Third Empire’s cultural life. His scores had never been performed in the Empire’s concert halls; nobody had published papers on him in the Empire’s musical press. As to Balakauskas and

---

119 Tarnopolski, “Most mezhdu razletayushchimisy Galaktikami,” 5.
120 Anna Ferenc, “The Association for Contemporary Music in Moscow,” 2-3. Ashot Zohrabian (b. 1945) and the Beirut-born Tigran Mansurian (b. 1939) are Armenian composers.
121 Perhaps Korndorf did not include Karayev because Karayev, unlike Zograbian and Mansurian, resides partially in Moscow. Since 1991 Karayev has split his time between Baku, where he is a professor at the Azerbaijan Conservatory, and Moscow, where he has served as professor of music theory at the conservatory since 1999.
his confrères, they were competent members of the Union of the Composers of the USSR, and their professional life developed according to the commonly accepted, not too onerous rules. Au fond, such personalities as Ustvolskaya, Butzko [Yuriy Butsko], Suslin (to mention here but the heroes of several articles inserted in the book in question) are spiritually by no means more Soviet than Balakauskas or, say, [Veljo] Tormis, in whose portfolio there are such works as a vocal-symphonic poem dedicated to the 22th Congress of the Communist Party (1960-61) [or] the cantatas Words of Lenin (1972) […]

Be that as it may, though Balakauskas spoke in his own name, it seems certain that a good deal of Baltic composers would have willingly subscribed to his reply to Kholopov. Hence, to avoid “diplomatic” complications, let us refrain from touching upon Baltic music on these pages. Let us simply point out that the panorama of the all-Union avant-garde of the 1960s can hardly be imagined without the early Pärt. 123

Tsenova and Kholopov navigated the nationality question by dividing their 1996 volume into two sections, “Patria” and “Terrae externae.” The “Patria” section included profiles of composers, both ethnic Russians and not, who remained in the Russian Federation after the collapse, including Eduard Artem’yev (b. 1937), Yuriy Butsko (b. 1938), Boris Chaikovsky (1925-1996), Andrey Eshpay (b. 1925), Kasparov, Martînov, and Nikolay Sidel’nikov (1930-1992). Meanwhile the second section, “Terrae externae,” profiles former Soviets, Russian and non-Russian alike, who emigrated to the West or reside in newly-independent former Soviet republics, including Firsova, Pärt, Smirnov, Suslin, Avet Terteryan (1929-1994), and Pèteris Vasks (b. 1946). (Per his request, Balakauskas was, indeed, excluded.)

In the end, though, perhaps the greatest threat facing the ASM-2 during the early 1990s came not from members’ emigration or Russia’s economic difficulties, but rather the seeming loss of mandate brought about by the Soviet collapse. The ASM-2 had been founded as a broad coalition of artists united solely by a shared opposition to the conservative styles of Soviet officialdom. With the collapse of the Soviet system, so, too, collapsed the loose gravity uniting these artists. In this way, the fate of the ASM-2 is similar to that of the Alternativa festival, described in chapter 1. Like Alternativa, the ASM-2 also abandoned its original inclusiveness and became increasingly specialized throughout the post-Soviet period. In Pyotr Pospelov’s summary:

The euphoria surrounding the consolidation of the “left wing” composers into the ASM soon dissipated. Several members of the Association emigrated, choosing instead a quiet life abroad. Those who remained no longer zealously pursued a common vision. 124

Moscow’s non-academic and post-Cagean composers such as Martînov, Batagov, and Zagny largely ceased collaborations with the ASM-2 during the 1990s and instead developed their own institutional bases at Alternativa and, later Moscow’s Dom cultural center [Kul’turnïy

---


124 Pyotr Pospelov, “Yuriy Kasparov.” 173. Pospelov states that, “In fact, only one element from the ASM remains: the Moscow Contemporary Music Ensemble, led by Yuriy Kasparov.”
tsentr Dom]. The ASM-2’s remaining membership, meanwhile, consisted almost exclusively of Denisov-style academic modernists. Soon, divisions broke out within this core group, too. In 1993, Tarnopolski told Skvortsova,

Now the ASM must decide if we should remain an informal, friendly society of like-minded composers, as we were at the beginning, or if we should develop an extensive, formal organizational structure, with all the pluses and minuses this might bring about.\textsuperscript{123}

As Tarnopolski spoke these words he was well underway developing just the type of structures he proposed. In 1993, Tarnopolski, who the year before had been appointed professor of composition at the conservatory, founded a rival organization to the ASM-2 at the conservatory, the Society for New Music \textit{(Obshchestvo novoy muziki}, later the Center for Contemporary Music \textit{(Tsentr sovremennoy muziki)}\textsuperscript{124}. Tarnopolski founded, too, a new ensemble, the Studio for New Music \textit{(Studia novoy muziki)} as well as a festival, Moscow Forum \textit{(Moskovskiy forum)}\textsuperscript{125}. Like the ASM-2, Tarnopolski’s group sought recognition from the ISCM, and in 2001 his Center for Contemporary Music became an associate member of the ISCM. By establishing his Center Tarnopolski sought to develop a “new infrastructure, supporting all aspects of the daily functioning of contemporary music, from study to festival concerts,” so as to help “integrate Russian music into a broader European musical context”\textsuperscript{126} – in other words, to continue the dream of the ASM-2 launched in January 1990. For Tarnopolski, this dream went awry as the ASM-2 became more deeply entrenched within the Composers’ Union, the very organization against which it had originally pledged itself:

The ASM[-2] did not last long in its original form. The collapse of the USSR and the mass emigration of its members automatically transformed \textit{[the ASM-2]} into a subsection of the Composers’ Union of Moscow.\textsuperscript{127}

\textsuperscript{123} Tarnopolski, “Most mezhdu razletayushchimisya Galaktikami,” 14.
\textsuperscript{124} Tarnopolski and Irina Snitkova, “Peyzazh posle bitv,” 14.
\textsuperscript{125} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{126} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{127} Ibid.
Ex. 2.1 – Concert posters for Persimfans-2009

Poster for *Persimfans*-2009 concerts (dir. by Pyotr Aidu) at Moscow’s School of Dramatic Art, 27 January and 26 February 2009. Poster designed by Jaroslaw Schwarzstein [Yaroslav Shvartsshteyn].

Used by Permission of Schwarzstein. Thanks to Schwarzstein for permission to use this image, and to Pyotr Aidu and Konstantin Dudakov-Shakuro for helping arrange this permission.
Ex. 2.1 cont’d.

Poster for *Persimfans-2009* concert (dir. by Pyotr Aidu) at Moscow’s School of Dramatic Art, 27 January 2009. Poster designed by Jaroslaw Schwarzstein [Yaroslav Shvartsshteyn].

Used by Permission of Schwarzstein. Thanks to Schwarzstein for permission to use this image, and to Pyotr Aidu and Konstantin Dudakov-Shakuro for helping arrange this permission.
Ex. 2.2 – Some recent musical settings of literary works by early-twentieth century Russian writers

[writers in **bold**]

**Daniil Kharms (1905-1942)**


**Velimir Khlebnikov (1885-1922)**

Vladimir Martïnov, *Four Poems of Velimir Khlebnikov [Chetïre stikhovoreniya Velimira Khlebnikova]* (1963)
Vladimir Martïnov, *The Hierarchy of Rational Values [Iyerarkhiya razumnïkh tsennostey]* (1977)
Vladimir Tarasov (b. 1947), *Thinking about Khlebnikov [Dumaya o Khlebnikove]* (2009) – improvisatory jazz performance based on Khlebnikov’s poems

**Andrey Platonov (1899-1951)**

Aleksandr Vustin (b. 1943), *Three Songs from Platonov’s Novel Chevengur [Tri pesni iz romana Andreya Platonova Chevengur]* (1992)
Vladimir Tarnopolski (b. 1955), *Chevengur* (2001)

**Nikolay Zabolotsky (1903-1958)**

Ivan Sokolov, *Volokos* (1988)
Ex. 2.3 – ASM-2 Membership ca. April 1990

Denisov, Edison – chairman
Schnittke, Alfred – honorary member

Core membership [aktiv obyedineniya]:

Vustin, Aleksandr
Hrabovsky, Leonid
Gubaidulina, Sofiya
Yekimovsky, Viktor
Kasparov, Yuriy
Korndorf, Nikolay
Lobanov, Vasiliy
Raskatov, Aleksandr
Smirnov, Dmitriy
Firsova, Elena
Tarnopolski, Vladimir
Shut’, Vladislav
Karayev, Faradzh (handwritten)

Other members [a takzhe]:

Artyomov, Vyacheslav
Bakshi, Aleksandr
Voronov, Grigoriy
Gabeli, Irakliy
Gagnidze, Merab
Geviksman, Vitaliy
Golïbina, Svetlana
Dmitriyev, Georgiy
Ivashkin, Aleksandr
Kallo, Sandor
Karetnikov, Nikolay
Kefalidi, Igor’
Magidenko, Ol’ga
Martinov, Vladimir
Minbayev, Timur
Pavlenco, Sergey
Pal’chun, Vladimir

Uspensky, Vladislav
Savenko, Svetlana
Sokolov, Ivan
Sokolov, Aleksandr
Tso Chen Guan
Sumarokov, Viktor
Chemberdzhi, Yekaterina
Libman, Mikhail
Kholopov, Yuriy
Kharyutchenko, Aleksandr

Note: the list includes around fifteen handwritten names in the “Other members” section, including Leonid Bobîlev, Grigoriy Frid, Margarita Katunya, Valentina Kholopova, Viktoriya Korshunova, and Yefrem Podgays.

Source: “Novaya assotsiatsiya sovremennoy muzïki ili ASM-2.” Undated archival document, likely April 1990. ASM-2 Archive, Moscow House of Composers. Thanks to Viktoriya Korshunova and Viktor Yekimovsky for providing me access to this document, and to Korshunova for helping me decipher it.
Ex. 2.4 – Composers profiled in the ASM-2 booklet (ca. 1992)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artyomov, Vyacheslav</td>
<td>1940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bakshi, Aleksandr</td>
<td>1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denisov, Edison</td>
<td>1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firsova, Elena</td>
<td>1950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gagnidze, Merab</td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gubaidulina, Sofiya</td>
<td>1931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hrabovsky, Leonid</td>
<td>1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalloš, Sandor</td>
<td>1935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karayev, Faradzh</td>
<td>1943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kasparov, Yuriy</td>
<td>1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kefalidi, Igor’</td>
<td>1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kharyutchenko, Aleksandr</td>
<td>1951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knayfel’, Aleksandr</td>
<td>1943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korndorf, Nikolay</td>
<td>1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinov, Vladimir</td>
<td>1946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavlenko, Sergey</td>
<td>1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raskatov, Aleksandr</td>
<td>1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schnittke, Alfred</td>
<td>1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shut’, Vladislav</td>
<td>1941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smirnov, Dmitriy</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sokolov, Ivan</td>
<td>1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumarokov, Viktor</td>
<td>1954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarnopolski, Vladimir</td>
<td>1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tso Chen Guan</td>
<td>1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voronov, Grigoriy</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vustin, Aleksandr</td>
<td>1943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yekimovsky, Viktor</td>
<td>1947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Viktortiya Korshunova, “Assotsiyatsiya sovremennoy muzïki” (Moscow: Znaniye, likely 1992). Thanks to Svetlana Savenko for lending me this booklet.
Chapter 3  
Music of the Denisov Circle, ca. 1985-1990

Age, Period, Cohort, Group

In the previous chapter we examined the concert and institutional activities of the Association for Contemporary Music-2 (ASM-2), founded in 1990, and its origins in the informal meetings of the Denisov circle during the 1970s and 80s. The present chapter offers a cross-sectional analysis of compositional practices within the Denisov circle in the years immediately preceding the ASM-2’s establishment. Through this analysis we can begin to understand how several late-Soviet composers conceptualized and practiced a variety of modernist techniques, and also develop a baseline against which we might gauge changes in compositional practices during the years following the Soviet collapse.

A note on terminology: throughout this dissertation I use the term “Denisov circle” to refer to those middle generation composers who gathered around Denisov in the 1970s and 80s, identified him as their mentor, and established the ASM-2 in 1990 (e.g., Tarnopolski, Raskatov, Smirnov, Firsova, Karayev, Vustin, Kasparov, Yekimovsky, et al.). These are the composers Russian commentators generally have in mind when they refer to “Denisov’s followers” [posledovateli Denisova] or the “Denisov school” [Denisovskaya shkola]. Occasionally, the term “Denisov school” is used to refer to a broader group of composers, of which the Denisov circle is but a part. In his article “Features of the Denisov School of Composition,” Anton Safronov (b. 1972), himself a Denisov pupil, describes how “three generations of composers were shaped by Denisov’s influence.” For Safronov, composers from all three generations together comprise the “Denisov school,” which includes individuals born in the 40s and 50s along with two younger generations of composers, who were born in the 60s and 70s and studied with Denisov in the 80s and early 90s. Safronov notes, though, that of these three groups, the oldest generation (i.e., the Denisov circle) was the most socially cohesive.

Throughout this dissertation I use the term circle [krug] instead of school [shkola] because it better characterizes the personal dynamics and professional relationships that existed between Denisov and his followers.

Almost all the members of the Denisov circle were born between the mid-1940s and the mid 50s. They belong to a generation referred to in Russia today as the srednaye pokoleniye, or “middle generation” of professional composers (as distinct from the older generation, born in the 1930s, or the younger generation, born in the 1960s and 70s). Shared generational identity means that composers belonging to the Denisov circle experienced the same social pressures and transformative events at roughly the same point in their professional lives – for example, they attended conservatory during the Brezhnev Stagnation; entered the professional ranks before perestroika; were middle-aged at the time of the Soviet collapse, et cetera. It meant, too, that throughout their educational years, composers of the Denisov circle could look for inspiration and guidance to an earlier generation of homegrown Soviet modernists, including Denisov, Gubaidulina, and Schnittke.

3 Ibid., 124.
These categories of personal development, historical circumstances, and generational membership roughly correspond to the effects of age, period, and cohort described by longitudinal researchers when analyzing changes in social phenomena over time. As we shall see in the following chapters, each of these inter-related effects helped shape changes in musical behavior, including compositional practices, in the years immediately following the Soviet collapse.

One additional effect that shaped compositional practices within the Denisov circle—and a particularly important one for our study—was social influence, including peer-group influences between member composers and the strong leadership influence exerted by Denisov. These social influences were expressed in a variety of ways. Composers of the Denisov circle would gather together to share ideas, critique one another’s work, and solicit Denisov’s opinion. Denisov, meanwhile, would comment upon his followers’ work, suggest instructive musical models (drawn mainly from his personal library), and nurture their careers by arranging performances of their work and introducing them to influential musicians in the USSR and abroad.

These social influences were amplified by the historical and social circumstances (= period effects) in which the circle functioned. Composers of the Denisov circle sought to practice modernist styles that differed from the more conservative ones endorsed by Soviet officialdom, and about which relatively little information circulated publicly. Scores and recordings of modernist music were generally difficult to obtain through public channels in the Soviet Union, while the styles and techniques of greatest interest to Denisov circle composers were largely excluded from the conservatory curriculum.

Thus the closed personal networks of the Denisov circle became the main routes through which member composers learned about modernist music and formed ideas and opinions about it. As a result, there developed within the Denisov circle a high degree of what social psychologists call entitativity, a quality characterized by strong group cohesiveness, close and regular interactions among members, and commonly shared ideas and goals. This “groupiness” influenced composition in a variety of ways. Throughout the 1980s, composers of the Denisov circle tended to work with the same handful of styles and techniques, most of which were of personal interest to Denisov. Also, the ways in which circle composers practiced these techniques throughout the 80s resembled one another, and closely matched Denisov’s own approaches.

As we shall see in chapter 5, when the social conditions that bred this “groupiness” decayed, so too did its artistic cohesiveness. With the collapse of the Soviet system, modernist composers in Russia no longer relied upon the same well-worn networks for information. At the same time, they enjoyed new opportunities to pursue careers abroad, develop new professional relationships and peer groups, and court new patrons. As a result of these changes, the relatively homogeneous, “groupy” approaches of the 1980s gave way to an increasing diversity of styles during the 1990s and beyond.

These stylistic developments of the 90s closely parallel the post-Soviet institutional entropy described in chapters 1 and 2. Indeed, as this entropy set in, some of the individuals who

---

4 For an introduction to longitudinal research, including the effects of age, period, and cohort, see Scott Menard, *Longitudinal Research* (Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications, 2002). Thanks to Jeffrey Leiter for pointing me to this and other methodological literature about longitudinal research.

had been central figures in the Denisov circle only a few years before began to criticize the group’s earlier cohesiveness. Take, for example, Vladimir Tarnopolski, an enthusiastic practitioner of many of the circle’s “groupy” styles in the 80s, and the one most often considered Denisov’s successor today. Several factors contribute to this perception. First, Tarnopolski is the only member of the Denisov circle who is a professor of composition at the Moscow Conservatory, a position Denisov held from around 1991 until his death in 1996. (Indeed, after Denisov was hospitalized following his automobile accident, many of his composition pupils became Tarnopolski’s students.) Because of his institutional position, Tarnopolski is able to attract young composers to study with him and to shape their careers. As a result, Tarnopolski, like Denisov, is the only member of his generation around whom there has developed a circle of followers - i.e., a collection of young composers who perceive themselves as a group, look to Tarnopolski as their mentor, and whose careers he nurtures.6 (Tarnopolski’s followers are primarily the young composers of Plastika zvuka, or “Sound Plasticity” as they call themselves in English, a group of seven young composers born in the 70s and early 80s, most of whom studied with Tarnopolski at the conservatory and whose music he champions in Russia and abroad.7)

One additional element underlining the Denisov-Tarnopolski parallel is biographical, and related to how both composers began their careers: when Tarnopolski (b. 1955) was a student at the local music college in his native city of Dnepropetrovsk (in the Ukrainian SSR) he sent a letter to Denisov, who invited Tarnopolski to Moscow to show him his works. Tarnopolski traveled to Moscow to meet with Denisov, who took the young composer under his wing and became a lifelong mentor. As Valeriya Tsenova points out, this event strongly recalls a moment from Denisov’s youth. Around 1950 Denisov sent a letter to Shostakovich, who invited Denisov to send him his music. Denisov replied, and Shostakovich became an important mentor for the aspiring composer. This story not only emphasizes the connection between Tarnopolski and Denisov; it also boosts Denisov’s authority, implying parallels between him and Shostakovich (Shostakovich:Denisov::Denisov:Tarnopolski).8

And yet, in an interview with Valeria Tsenova published in 1994, Tarnopolski related how, throughout his conservatory years, he gravitated toward Sidel’nikov, his formal composition teacher, in order to stave off Denisov’s overwhelming influence.9 Tarnopolski stated this point more forcefully in a 1999 interview with Tsenova, in which he described the “epigonism” among Denisov’s followers:

I came under the spell of [Denisov’s] music, personality, and style even before I enrolled at the conservatory. Already during my first year [at the conservatory],

6 On Denisov as the only composer of his generation to “found of a school” of composition, see Kasparov, “Denisov-lider,” 19-20; on Denisov’s students transferring to Tarnopolski, see Tarnopolski, “Shkola bez didaktiki,” in Tsenova, ed., Svet • Dobro • Vechnost’, 217.
and having become dangerously close to his style, I sensed that Denisov’s style wasn’t so much an influence, but a path to epigonism. And I tried to distance myself from it as much as possible […] During that time [the 1970s] several young composers had gathered around Denisov. Denisov’s style had become especially fashionable.10

At the time of these interviews, Tarnopolski had several reasons for distancing himself from the “groupy” styles of the Denisov circle in which he earlier partook. In the early 90s, and in direct response to professional opportunities abroad in the wake of the Soviet collapse, Tarnopolski sought to cultivate a more cosmopolitan, contemporary style. As part of this shift Tarnopolski moved away from many of the late-Soviet artistic traditions seen in his works of the 80s, which are heavily indebted to Schnittke and Denisov, in favor of what in the post-Soviet context appeared a fresher approach, inspired by figures such as Murail and Lachenmann. Amid these changes, the “groupy” ethos permeating the Denisov circle came to be seen not just as a relic of a bygone era, but as a byproduct of the imposed cultural isolation of the Soviet era, and hence something to be forgotten or condemned.

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a broad, cross-sectional overview—a “glimpse from 10,000 feet”—of those “groupy” styles of greatest interest to Tarnopolski and his Denisov circle comrades during the later 1980s. This cross-sectional analysis will help provide a starting point for the closer longitudinal study presented in chapter 5, which traces how individual composers’ styles changed during the early post-Soviet period. A survey of the three main areas of widespread interest within the Denisov circle during the 1980s—serial composition, sonoristic music, and instrumental theater—will equip us to perform a detailed examination of Tarnopolski’s Schnittke-inspired “culturological” cycle.

What is a circle?

Before turning to compositional practices, we should begin by looking more closely at a term that, up to now, has figured in discussion without qualification. As Barbara Walker has described it, the idea of the circle, or kruzhok, has been a central feature of Russian intellectual life since the early nineteenth century.11 Walker has identified several distinguishing traits of what she calls “kruzhok culture” in Russian history. Although her observations stem from her study of circles during the late imperial and early Soviet periods, many of the features Walker describes are applicable to the late-Soviet Denisov circle.

First, Walker points out that circles featured a high degree of clientelism and patronage. A well-networked circle leader would use his connections to further his followers’ careers by introducing them to influential people, helping procure professional opportunities for them, or arranging for the dissemination of their work through publication or performance. As Walker summarizes, “Kruzhok leaders were not patrons in the classic economic sense of providing mere

---

financial support to intellectual endeavor. Rather, they were skillful organizers of intelligentsia social, professional and emotional life – charismatic fathers, disciplinarians and mentors.”¹²

Walker’s concept of patronage helps characterize Denisov’s leadership role. Throughout the 1970s and 80s, Denisov would arrange performances of his followers’ works, either on his closed concert series in the Composers’ Union or, after perestroika, in more public venues. Sometimes Denisov would use the lure of performance to help steer his followers’ creative development: at the end of the 80s, for example, Denisov asked Vustin to compose a work for string orchestra as an exercise to improve his writing for strings, promising Vustin that conductor Aleksandr Vedernikov and the Amadeus Chamber Orchestra would premiere the new work.¹³

Like the patrons Walker describes, Denisov would exploit his personal connections to help advance his followers’ education and professional development. Perhaps the main way Denisov did this was by introducing members of his circle to influential Western composers and performers with whom he had corresponded or collaborated before. Since it was difficult for most Soviet citizens to travel abroad, these meetings generally took place in Moscow during foreign artists’ officially sponsored visits. Several of these meetings bore immediate artistic fruit. For example, around 1975 the prominent Swiss flutist Aurèle Nicolet (b. 1926) visited Moscow and met with Denisov’s pupils; in the wake of this meeting, the Bulgarian composer Bojidar Spassov (b. 1949), a Denisov pupil, composed a Concerto for Flute, Thirteen Strings, and Celeste (1975-76), directly inspired by Nicolet.¹⁴ This meeting with Nicolet has continued to bear artistic fruit for composers of the Denisov circle: in the early 90s Nicolet commissioned new works from husband-and-wife Dmitri Smirnov and Elena Firsova, who by that point had settled in the United Kingdom. Smirnov wrote a short, unaccompanied piece for Nicolet, Orcades (1992), while Firsova composed a chamber trio for him, Meditation in the Japanese Garden (1992) for flute, viola, and piano. Around the time of Nicolet’s trip to the USSR, Denisov completed a four-movement concerto for him (the Concerto for Flute and Orchestra, 1975), which Nicolet premiered in Dresden in 1976. A few years later, Denisov composed his Concerto for Flute, Oboe and Orchestra (1978) for Nicolet and Swiss oboist Heinz Holliger (b. 1939). Similarly, Denisov arranged numerous meetings between his followers and French composer Henri Dutilleux in Moscow during the 70s. In the wake of these meetings, some members of the Denisov circle looked to Dutilleux’s scores as models for their own work. For example, Vustin seems to have modeled the opening of his 1975 chamber work The Word [Slovo] on the first several measures of Dutilleux’s orchestral score Métaboles (1959-64) (see chapter 4).

The professional connection Denisov exploited to the greatest benefit of his followers was his relationship with Boulez. As we saw in chapter 2, during Ensemble InterContemporain’s 1990 visit to Moscow, Denisov arranged for Boulez to meet with members of his circle and even to appear in a press conference to endorse the newly established ASM-2. Soon after Boulez’s trip, IRCAM offered fellowships to three members of the Denisov circle (Raskatov, Tarnopolski, Tsenova, ed., Prostranstvo Edisona Denisova, 115. Spassov also mentions this meeting with Nicolet in his contribution to the section of recollections entitled “Denisov as Teacher” [Denisov-uchitel’] in Kholopov’s and Tsenova’s 1993 biography, Edison Denisov (see p. 40).

¹⁴ See Bojidar Spassov [Bozhidar Spasov], “O vliyanii tvorchestva Denisova. Nekotorïye nablyudeniya,” in Tsenova, ed., Prostranstvo Edisona Denisova, 115. Spassov also mentions this meeting with Nicolet in his contribution to the section of recollections entitled “Denisov as Teacher” [Denisov-uchitel’] in Kholopov’s and Tsenova’s 1993 biography, Edison Denisov (see p. 40).
and Yekimovsky). These invitations were likely arranged by Denisov, himself a fellow of IRCAM at the time.  

Alongside patronage, a second element Walker identifies as characteristic of circles is the cult of personality surrounding the circle leader. These personality cults are created and maintained primarily along what Walker calls “client chains” – that is, the networks of individuals who benefit from the circle leader’s patronage. For Walker, one of the main traces of these personality cults is a genre of literature she calls the “contemporaries’ memoir,” or vospominaniya sovremennikov, an intimate account of the circle leader’s life and works by those who knew him best. Although these memoirs are rarely reliable sources of factual information, they perform several important functions. First, they help preserve, strengthen, or even create a circle’s group identity. This function is especially important since they are usually published after the circle leader has died. Contemporaries’ memoirs not only keep alive the circle leader’s memory, but in a sense help keep the circle alive, too: as long as the circle is written about it continues to exist, and to matter. (This performative dimension helps explain the near-constant stream of books about Denisov, the majority of which include strikingly similar content.) Also, contemporaries’ memoirs provide a forum for the memoir writer to assert his or her own legitimacy and authority: by relating intimate details of the circle leader’s life, the writer demonstrates his privileged access to the leader, thus implying that the leader held him in special regard. 

The notion of personality cult seems apt for describing Denisov’s status in Russian music today. In the fourteen years since his death, Denisov’s followers—his “client chain”—have memorialized him as the towering figure in later twentieth-century Russian music, the true inheritor of Shostakovich, or the demiurge who singlehandedly “created the universe of new music in the USSR.” The numerous books about Denisov teem with personal recollections and contemporaries’ memoirs written by circle members. (Some of these books are listed in example 3.1.) Denisov has been memorialized in several compositions, while the anniversaries of his

---

15 See Vladimir Tarnopolski, “Most mezhdu razletayushchimisya Galaktikami,” Muzïkal’naya akademiya 2 (1993): 4. As Tarnopolski describes, the French Ministry of Culture was unable to offer any funding, thus they had to turn down this invitation.


19 Most of these commemorative works were composed soon after Denisov’s death in 1996, including Dmitri Smirnov’s Elegy (1997) for cello and three crystal glasses (op. 97A) or chamber ensemble (op. 97B), Elena Firsova’s The River of Time (1997) for chorus and chamber orchestra, Sergey Pavlenko’s L’Imparfait (hommage en mémoire d’Edison Denisov) (1997) for chamber quintet, or Anton Safronov’s sentimento...CODA (in memoriam Edison Denisov) (1997, rev. 2001) for solo piano. In 2009, Karayev composed his orchestral work vingt ans après – nostalgie... (2009), dedicated to Denisov and Schnittek. It was premiered at the 2009 Moscow Autumn festival on a concert dedicated to the seventy-fifth anniversary of Schnittek’s birth, and the eightieth anniversary of Denisov’s. Some pieces in Denisov’s honor were composed before his death, including Sergey Pavlenko’s In Denisov’s
birth and death are commemorated with concerts, films, festivals, and book publications. Because many of Denisov’s followers’ have assumed influential roles in post-Soviet Russia’s cultural institutions, these commemorative events generally enjoy high visibility. Denisov tribute concerts have been staged in prestigious venues like the conservatory’s Great Hall, while documentary films about Denisov’s life and works have been broadcast on the television station Kul’tura.20

There are numerous other manifestations of the Denisov cult in Russia today. Over the last decade several musicologists and writers have published critical editions of Denisov’s diaries, notebooks, and some of his works and correspondence.21 Also, in 2008 the music college in Denisov’s native city of Tomsk was renamed in his honor [Tomskiy muzïkal’niy kolledzh im. E. V. Denisova]. The college includes a “Denisov Center” [Denisov-tsentr], which is charged with the “preservation, study, and propagandizing of Denisov’s works and those of his contemporaries.”22 This center hosts various conferences and events, including a Denisov Piano Festival and a Denisov Young Composers’ Competition, with members of the Denisov circle on the jury.23 Although this personality cult and the patronage network within the Denisov circle are emblematic of several of the features of the kruzhok culture Walker describes, there is at least one significant difference between the Denisov circle and the intellectual circles of the late imperial and early Soviet periods. In Walker’s analysis, circles emerged during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries mainly to compensate for the lack of corresponding state

---

20 The seventh anniversary of Denisov’s death in 2006 was commemorated with at least two large concert events in Moscow. The first, entitled “Denisov’s Universe” [Prostranstvo Edisona Denisova], was a four-part cycle of concerts staged in several of Moscow’s most important halls, including the conservatory’s Great Hall, and featuring several high-profile performers and groups, including the National Philharmonic Orchestra of Russia. (This cycle concluded with run-out performances in the cities of Ufa and Samara – a nod, perhaps, to Denisov’s Siberian roots.) The second event, an exceptionally long concert in the conservatory’s Small Hall, took place on November 24, the day of Denisov’s death, and featured many of Denisov’s most important works including Singing of the Birds [Peniye ptits] (1969), Sun of the Incas [Solntse inkov] (1964), and Laments [Plachi] (1966).


23 The first Denisov Young Composers’ Competition [Mezhdunarodnyi konkurs molodoikh kompozitorov imeni Edisona Denisova] was held in 2007, and the jury included Yekimovsky, Kasparov, and Karayev. The next competition will take place in October 2010. Information posted on the website of the Tomsk Musical College, (http://tmk.tomsk.ru, accessed July 6, 2010).
institutions, including the absence of an extensive post-secondary education system or of well-developed professional organizations for scholars and artists (such as the professional Unions established in the 1930s).

The Denisov circle, by contrast, did not function in the absence of state institutions, but as a supplement to them. In fact, throughout the 1970s and 80s the Denisov circle functioned in many ways as a de facto subsection of the Composers’ Union. Most of the activities of the Denisov circle were accessible only to Union members: many of the circle’s informal meetings took place at the Composers’ Union retreat in Ruza, while the two different concert series that Denisov curated as an outlet for his followers were hosted within the Composers’ Union and could be attended only by Union members. The Composers’ Union provided not only the venue for these performances, but the infrastructure for recruiting and engaging musicians as well. In fact, when the Denisov circle sought official recognition during perestroika in the form of the ASM-2, it organized itself as an official subsection of the Composers’ Union of Moscow, and claimed legitimacy on the basis of the Composers’ Union’s statutes (see chapter 2).

For these reasons, we should treat with skepticism later claims by members of the Denisov circle that the circle and its participants were inherently opposed to the Composers’ Union. While it is true that the artistic interests of most Denisov circle composers differed from the more conservative styles encouraged by Soviet officialdom, the circle was able to function only because of, and largely in harmony with, the Composers’ Union’s infrastructure. Nor were the artistic differences between Denisov circle composers and their more traditionally minded colleagues as pronounced as circle members might claim. As we shall see in chapter 4, though most Denisov circle composers disagreed with conservative colleagues as to the means, most shared official Soviet views as to art’s ends, and believed that the composer had a duty to engage and move his listener, to convey clear expressive content to him, and to address profound philosophical topics in their music. (This commitment to expressivity and engagement helped motivate, in particular, the widespread interest within the circle in instrumental theater, one of the three main “groupy” styles described below.)

---

24 These two series were entitled “New Works by Moscow Composers” [Novïye proizvedeniya kompozitorov Moskvi] and “Evenings of Contemporary Music” [Vechera sovremennoy muzïki]. According to Alikhanov, Denisov programmed the first series “objectively,” ensuring that it represented works by a stylistically diverse array of Moscow composers, while the second series, “Evenings of Contemporary Music,” more closely reflected his tastes.

25 In his book Music of the Soviet Age, 1917-1987, Levon Hakobian (b. 1953) rebuts Russian artists and intellectuals who, in the post-Soviet period, portray the relationship between Soviet officialdom and “non-conformist” artists as one of antagonism or hostility:

First of all, virtually all the so-called “non-conformist” composers were competent [sic] members of the Composers’ Union; hence, no one among them—in contrast to the equally “non-conformist” painters, let alone poets and prose writers—was deprived of the right to publish his or her works at the expense of the State [sic] and to present them to the audience […] [Today] many intellectuals share the opinion that “by the end of the 1960s, the authentic Russian culture had diverged from the State so radically that it continued to exist only in its underground aspect”; patently exaggerated in application to every branch of culture, this postulate seems absolutely inappropriate as regards music.

The remainder of this chapter will examine different compositional practices of common interest to Denisov circle composers during the later 1980s. Not every Denisov circle composer engaged with all three of the “groupy” styles described below; moreover, many circle composers developed unique approaches to different styles and techniques. These variations aside, the body of creative work produced within the Denisov circle during the later 1980s exhibits a high degree of homogeneity, especially in light of the stylistic diversification of the early 90s, and speaks to a persistent like-mindedness among circle composers in matters both philosophical and technical. The following pages present a series of core samplings extracted from Denisov circle repertoire and selected to illustrate this like-mindedness as it flourished on the eve of the Soviet collapse.

“Groupiness” I: Serialism-Plus

One of the clearest indicators of Denisov’s influence upon his followers is seen in their widespread interest in serial composition. From the mid-1960s until his death in 1996, Denisov primarily composed serial music, and he encouraged his followers to study the works and ideas of Boulez, Nono, and other leading practitioners of serial technique. Accordingly, throughout much of the 1980s, most composers of the Denisov circle wrote serial music. In fact, serial composition was so common within the circle that in many ways we might regard it as the group’s *lingua franca*.

The theory and practice of serialism by members of the Denisov circle, especially Vustin, will be analyzed in detail in chapter 4. For now, it is important to note that, by the later 1980s, serial composition had become so widespread that many members of the Denisov circle seem to have regarded it not as a goal unto itself, but rather as a means toward other stylistic ends. Throughout the later 1980s and early 90s, several Denisov circle composers combined serial procedures with other techniques or approaches, from those with a long tradition in late-Soviet modernist music (serialism-plus-aleatory; serialism-plus-sonorika) to more recent influences (serialism-plus-spectralism; serialism-plus-minimalism).

Many of these serialism-plus works are not serial per se, at least not in the sense of the term as it is generally applied in Anglophone musicology. As Peter Schmelz has noted, Soviet composers and theorists conceptualized serialism not as a fixed set of procedures, but rather as a constellation of techniques ranging from freely atonal (or “twelve-tonish”) composition, in which multiple sets or rows are used within the confines of a single work, through to a strict “dodecaphonic” approach, in which a single row or set governs all of a work’s pitch content.26 Schmelz orders these techniques graphically into a figure he terms the “Soviet serial bull’s eye,” a set of concentric circles collapsing inward from “twelve-tonish” composition—the target’s outer ring and the most inclusive type of Soviet serialism—to “dodecaphonic” music, the most restrictive form and the center of the bull’s eye.27

---

27 Ibid. The four ranks of Schmelz’s “Soviet serial bull’s eye,” ordered from least to most restrictive, are: (1) atonal/“twelve-tonish” music; (2) twelve-tone music; (3) serial music; (4) dodecaphonic music. The second rank, “twelve-tone music,” is also called “non-serial dodecaphony,” and denotes a style of composition that employs multiple twelve-tone rows which do not govern every pitch.
Some of the serialism-plus works by Denisov circle composers can be categorized at the center of Schmelz’s bull’s eye. For example, in the 1989 chamber work *Doppelkammervariationen*, Yekimovsky combines a strictly “dodecaphonic” technique with aleatory. The aleatory elements apply to duration, are seen in the graphic notation Yekimovsky uses throughout the work’s second half. Yekimovsky is not the first Soviet composer to unite serial technique and aleatory in the same work. Both Sil’vestrov and Schnittke combined these techniques in a handful of large-scale works of the 1960s, often toward dramatic or symbolic ends. For example, Schnittke juxtaposed serialism with aleatory in his Violin Concerto No. 2 (1966) so as to dramatize the difference between the perfection of God and the chaos of the world, while Sil’vestrov employed these techniques in his Symphony No. 3, “Eschataphoniya” [*Eschatofoniya*] (1966) to variously represent the realm of man (the “cultural” realm) and the realm of the spirit (the “magical”).

Yekimovsky’s goals in *Doppelkammervariationen* are not so high-minded, and the work bears no obvious narrative or dramatic content. Rather, the piece sounds more like a technical or intellectual exercise, an impression not lost on one of the reviewers of a 1989 performance in Glasgow, who condemned *Doppelkammervariationen* as a “sterile exercise.” (This appraisal was echoed by a listener at the 1990 Moscow Autumn festival who complained that *Doppelkammervariationen* sounds “too academic,” a quality “generally uncharacteristic of Yekimovsky’s works.”)

In *Doppelkammervariationen* Yekimovsky combines serialism with aleatory in a novel, if decidedly simple way. The work’s title refers to its binary form. Yekimovsky organized *Doppelkammervariationen* into two closely related parts. Each part consists of three smaller

---

28 Appropriately, Yekimovsky’s “dodecaphonic” work is scored for twelve players (flute, oboe, clarinet, bassoon, trumpet, horn, trombone, violins I & II, viola, cello, and bass). It was commissioned by the Soloists of the Bol’shoy Theater ensemble.


31 Review from the *The Scotsman* 8 November 1989, reprinted in Yekimovsky, *Avtomonografiya*, 226. This performance, by the Soloists of the Bol’shoy Theater ensemble, was part of the New Beginnings festival, a celebration of Soviet visual art, literature, and music in Glasgow.

32 See “‘Moskovskaya osen’-’90’: govoryat slushateli,” *Sovetskaya muzïka* 2 (1991): 51. This concert at Moscow Autumn was performed by the ASM Ensemble and conducted by Pon’kin. According to the “Kontserti ASM” document, this concert featured Yekimovsky’s *Doppelkammervariationen*, Korndorf’s *Amoroso* (1986), Viktor Sumarokov’s *Verse for the Earth* [*Poeziya zemli*], and Tarnopolski’s *Jesu, deine tiefen Wunden* (1987). The concert listing in the festival’s program booklet replaces Tarnopolski’s piece with Gubaidulina’s *Hommage à T.S. Eliot* [*Posvyashcheniye Eliotu*] (1987) (see “XII festival’ sovetskoy muzïki ‘Moskovskaya osen’ ‘14-22 noyabrya 1990 goda,” 32). As the “Kontserti ASM” document was produced after the festival, whereas the booklet was produced before the festival, I believe repertoire listed on the “Kontserti ASM” document is more accurate.
sections (marked a, b, and c in Part I and A, B, and C in Part II). The work’s entire pitch content is based on a single row (G - E - Bb - Gb - F - A - B - Db - Eb - C - D - A♭) presented at its outset. As seen in example 3.2, the texture at the beginning of Doppelkammervariationen is sparse and pointillistic, and each instrument plays only one pitch at a time. Over the course of Part I, pitch durations grow progressively longer. By section c, each pitch is sustained measures at a time, and multiple pitches sound simultaneously (ex. 3.3).

Part II of Doppelkammervariationen is essentially a repeat of Part I. During this repeat, though, Yekimovsky omits a lot of the most important rhythmic information, including all rests (and, hence, the precise indication of each pitch’s duration). Single pitches are represented as black dots (cf. the reprised A section in ex. 3.4), while sustained pitches are indicated with a black bar (cf. the reprised C section in ex. 3.5). Yekimovsky’s bar notation at the end of Doppelkammervariationen recalls the score of Schnittke’s Pianissimo... (1968) (see ex. 3.6), excerpts of which were reproduced in Kholopov’s 1981 article on sonorika in the Muzikal’naya entsiklopedia. Although the rhythmic durations in Part II of Doppelkammervariationen are noted graphically, this part’s pitch content is an exact reproduction of the strict “dodecaphonic” procedures extending throughout Part I.

Along with Schnittke’s Pianissimo..., another possible model for Doppelkammervariationen was Babbitt’s Composition for 12 Instruments (1948, rev. 1954), like Doppelkammervariationen a pointillistic, serial work for twelve players. Yekimovsky does not discuss Babbitt in his Autobiography. However, Babbitt visited Moscow in June 1987 and, while there, participated in daily meetings and colloquia at the Composers’ Union. According to Alan Feinberg, who accompanied Babbitt, American and Soviet composers played recordings of their work for one another at these meetings. Feinberg also says he brought scores by Babbitt to the Soviet Union. The trip included a televised concert from the Composers’ Union that featured multiple works by Babbitt, including All Set (1957).

A similar “dodecaphonic” approach can be found in serialism-plus works by other Denisov circle composers, including Vustin and Kasparov, who combined strict serial techniques with extensive sonoristic elements. The majority of serialism-plus works, though, are not strictly “dodecaphonic,” but instead feature looser applications of serial principles. Some of these works are simply “twelve-tonish” or even non-serially atonal, and use the twelve pitches of the chromatic scale in various ways to help determine the piece’s form or harmonic content.

For example, Faradzh Karayev organizes the first part of his 1989 chamber work Klänge einer traurigen Nacht according to the principle of aggregate completion. Each of this piece’s four movements explores a different idiom or genre: the second movement (Calmamente)

---

33 Yekimovsky uses these letter markings (a, b, c and A, B, C) throughout the score. The indications Part I and Part II are my own.
34 See Kholopov, “Sonorizm (sonorika, sonoristika, sonornaya tekhnika),” Muzikal’naya entsiklopedia vol. 5 (Moscow: Sovetskaya entsiklopediya, 1981), 207-12. Excerpts from Schnittke’s work are reproduced on pp. 210-11. As reported in chapter 2, Yekimovsky named Schnitte as one of his favorite composers (“Composer No. 1”) during the pre-perestroika era. Yekimovsky, interview with the author, January 14, 2008.
35 Another difference between Parts I and II is their dynamic markings. As Dmitry Shul’gin points out, the dynamics in Part II do not replicate those of Part I, but reverse them instead. Thus, the dynamic markings of Doppelkammervariationen’s six sections form a palindrome: the three sections of Part I are marked p – mf – f, while the corresponding sections in Part II are marked f – mf – p. See Shul’gin, Sovremenniyie chertii kompozitsii Viktora Yekimovskogo, 366.
37 Ibid.
38 Ibid.
evokes Webern’s pointillistic style, the third movement (Fluttuante) is sonoristic, and the fourth movement (Meditabondo) recalls Sil’vestrov’s collage technique. Different parts of Klänge einer traurigen Nacht feature varying degrees of serial principles, from strict “dodecaphony” through to a “twelve-tonish” style and free atonality.

The work’s first movement (Tranquillamente) is representative of Karayev’s meditative style. With its snaky, chromatic voice leading, the movement evokes the opening movement of Bartók’s Music for Strings, Percussion, and Celesta (1936). Bartók’s work was a favorite of Denisov, who likely prized it for its symmetrical designs. Indeed, throughout his Tranquillamente movement, Karayev imitates many of Bartók’s symmetries. For example, Bartók closes the first movement of his work by repeating a fragment from the opening melody along with its inverted counterpoint (= reflection across an imaginary x-axis); Karayev, meanwhile, ends his Tranquillamente movement by restating the beginning portion of the opening melody loosely in retrograde (= reflection across an imaginary y-axis) (see exs. 3.7A and 3.7B). Also, the pitch design of Karayev’s Tranquillamente movement recalls the expansion and contraction of Bartók’s work. Bartók’s movement gradually expands outward from a home key (A) to increasingly more remote ones—up to the most remote key, E♭, at the work’s climax—before returning home. Although Karayev’s movement has no obvious key, it features a gradual migration of tonal center from C, the home pitch, to a “far-out point” of A at the movement’s climax, then gradually collapses back down to the starting pitch.

Throughout this expansion and contraction, Karayev uses only those ten pitches located between the tonal poles of C and A. The final two pitches of the twelve-tone collection, B♭ and B, are not included anywhere in this first movement. Instead, they are played in the first measure of the second movement, Calmamente, by the chimes and the violin, and are the first notes in the piece for these instruments. In fact, these two pitches, which complete the aggregate, are the first instances of any bright, clear sounds in the work, as the Tranquillamente first movement is uniformly dark, low, and muddy.

Other works by Denisov circle composers use the chromatic aggregate as a harmonic determinant. For example, in his music for Aleksandr Fedulov’s 1989 animated film The Kiss [Potselay], Yekimovsky attempted to combine twelve-tone principles with spectral music. As Yekimovsky described his method in his Autobiography, he based the film’s score on a single chord “modeled on the overtone scale – in response to the French spectral school [po tipu obertonogo zvukoryada – otgoloski frantsuzskoy spektral’noy shkoli].” The chord Yekimovsky devised is shown in example 3.8:

---

39 Throughout the fourth movement Karayev juxtaposes sharply dissonant passages with melancholic, tonal ones. This technique recalls similar passages in various works by Sil’vestrov, including the Serenade [Serenada] (1978) for string instruments, which was given its Moscow premiere at the 1988 Alternativa festival, or the Symphony No. 5 (1982-83), performed at Alternativa in 1989.
40 See Kholopov and Tsenova, Edison Denisov, 157.
41 Yekimovsky, Avtomonografiiya, 222.
Yekimovsky’s chord

Grisey’s chord

Ex. 3.8 – Chords for Yekimovsky, *The Kiss* and Grisey, *Partiels* (opening harmony)\(^{42}\)

Yekimovsky states that, upon hearing *The Kiss*, he was shocked at the similarities between it and Grisey’s *Partiels* – similarities he claims he did not intend:

All my life I feared emulation [вторичность] in all its forms as if it were fire, and recoiled from it as if it were the devil. And suddenly there appeared [in *The Kiss*] a whole bouquet of borrowings [заимствования]: the very beginning—it starts with an E in the bass, over which a quasi-overtone scale builds up—recalls the opening of Grisey’s *Partiels*, which also begins with a low E and is followed by a similar harmonic build-up [с аналогичным вибрационным вертикали].\(^{43}\)

Example 3.8 compares the opening sonorities of *The Kiss* and *Partiels*. In addition to the shared low E, there are a few points of similarity: both chords feature a prominent major tenth (E – G#) and include a D major triad and a D# – G major third in their upper ranges. However, whereas Grisey selected the pitch content of his chord to replicate certain acoustic phenomena—in this case, the relative strength and weakness of different partials produced by a trombone playing a low E as determined through spectrographic analysis—Yekimovsky designed his chord along twelve-tone lines. Yekimovsky’s “spectral” chord for *The Kiss* contains all twelve pitches of the chromatic scale. (As he rhetorically asks in his *Autobiography*, “…how could it be any other way?”\(^{44}\)). If one omits the chord’s bottom dyad (the tritone E – B♭), the remaining pitches form a symmetrical design. Spelling upward from G#, the chord’s intervals form a palindrome (P4 – M3 – TT – m3 – M3 – m3 – TT – M3 – P4). As we shall see in the next chapter, symmetries such as this were of great interest to composers of the Denisov circle, particularly in the field of serial music.

\(^{42}\) Yekimovsky describes this chord in his *Avtomonografiya*, 222. My reproduction of Grisey’s chord is based on the figure on page 9 of François Rose, “Introduction to the Pitch Organization of French Spectral Music,” *Perspectives of New Music* 34 (1996).

\(^{43}\) Yekimovsky, *Avtomonografiya*, 222.

\(^{44}\) Ibid.
A more direct model for *The Kiss* have been Scriabin’s twelve-tone chords. Yekimovsky himself notes that several passages in *The Kiss* sound Scriabinicque, particularly the various trumpet calls heard throughout the score. Soon after *The Kiss*, other Denisov circle composers would write their own Scriabin-inspired pieces: Vustin quoted Scriabin’s *Prométhée* (1908-10) in two separate works from 1991, *Music for Ten* [*Muzïka dlya desyatï*] and *Heroic Lullaby* [*Georicheskaya kolïbel’naya*], while that same year Karayev orchestrated Scriabin’s Sonata No. 10 (1912-13).

Finally, some of the serialism-plus works by Denisov circle composers are not even loosely “twelve-tonish,” but instead feature a more idiosyncratic application of serial principles. One of the more interesting examples in this category is Yekimovsky’s 1990 harpsichord solo *Deus ex machina* [*Bog iz mashini*], which combines what Vladimir Barsky calls “quasi-serial logics” with a minimalist style.

As Yekimovsky told Dmitriy Shul’gin, he based *Deus ex machina* on a six-note set:

![Ex. 3.9 Basic hexachord for Yekimovsky, *Deus ex machina*](image)

Yekimovsky borrowed this set from Czech composer Luboš Fišer (1935-99), who had used it as the basis for three orchestral works of the 1960s, *Fifteen Prints after Dürer’s Apocalypse* [*Patnáct listů podle Dürerovy Apokalypsy*] (1965), *Capriccio* [*Caprichos*] (1967), and the *Requiem* (1968). As Yekimovsky told Shul’gin, he was fascinated by the way Fišer created seemingly complex works out of limited materials:

This idea of a composition in which, over the course of ten minutes, only six notes are sounded, but throughout which they are used vertically, horizontally, diagonally, or however else one desires – this was earth shattering for me, the way

---

45 Ibid., 223.
46 Vustin’s *Music for Ten* and Karayev’s orchestration of Scriabin’s sonata were commissioned by Amsterdam’s Schoenberg Ensemble for a 1992 Scriabin-themed concert at the Concertgebouw (see chapter 5). The title of Vustin’s *Music for Ten* alludes to the title of an earlier work by another Denisov circle composer, Elena Firsova’s *Music for Twelve* [*Muzïka dlya dvenadtsati*] (1986). Similarly, Vustin’s title *Heroic Lullaby* alludes to the title of a piece by Debussy, the *Berceuse héroïque* (for solo piano, 1914; orchestrated version, 1915).
48 Deus ex machina was commissioned by the Bulgarian-born Swiss harpsichordist Petja Kaufman, who commissioned several harpsichord works from Denisov circle composers, including Raskatov’s *Punctuation Marks* [*Znaki prepinaniya*] (1989) and Sergey Pavlenko’s *Quasi toccata* (1989). See Shul’gin, *Tvorchestvo-zhizn’ Viktora Yekimovskogo*, 115.
that the most unbelievable structural designs could be made from a minimum of means.\footnote{Shul’gin, \textit{Tvorchestvo-zhizn’ Viktora Yekimovskogo}, 114.}

As we shall see in the next chapter, Yekimovsky was not alone among Denisov circle composers in his attraction to the economy of means and abstract designs he found in Fišer’s works; Vustin, for example, describes his interest in Webern in strikingly similar terms.

In \textit{Deus ex machina} Yekimovsky hoped to apply Fišer’s economical approach. Yekimovsky states that, having thought about it for a long time, he found it “difficult to come up with a more crystalline row” \cite{Ibid.} \footnote{Ibid.} than the one Fišer had used, thus he decided to base \textit{Deus ex machina} on Fišer’s six-note set.\footnote{Ibid.} Throughout \textit{Deus ex machina} Yekimovsky uses Fišer’s original set, which begins on B, plus five chromatic transpositions of it (ex. 3.10).

Most of \textit{Deus ex machina}—including its beginning and end—is based on the untransposed version of the set, which Yekimovsky seems to regard as the equivalent of a home “key” (or “modus”). For Yekimovsky, movement away from and back to this “key” is not only a way to give his work form, but also to elicit an emotional response in the listener:

> If a person becomes acclimated to the aura of this \textit{modus} [i.e., the original set] at the work’s beginning, and then all of a sudden there appears an extra, seemingly foreign sound, then he would necessarily experience this as a sonic intrusion, as some sort of “rupture of the tone row” \cite{Ibid.}.\footnote{Ibid.}

Yekimovsky “acclimates” his listener to the original set mainly through blunt repetition. \textit{Deus ex machina} consists of an unwavering pulse of dissonant chords. Each chord is repeated anywhere from one to six times (see ex. 3.11). As Yekimovsky told Shul’gin, there is no overarching pattern to the work’s rhythmic design; on the contrary, he tried to make the number of beats per measure as seemingly unpredictable as possible by ensuring that he did not repeat any patterns.\footnote{Ibid., 115.}

The first forty-one measures of \textit{Deus ex machina} consist entirely of the home “key.” The first “sonic intrusion” comes at measure 42 with the addition of the pitch E (indicated by a star in ex. 3.11). This pitch signals an upward shift of the set from B to E (E-F-F#-A#-B-C).

Throughout the remainder of the work Yekimovsky shifts back and forth between different transpositions of the set before settling back to the home “key” at work’s end.

With its blunt repetition of dissonant chords and its shifting rhythmic units, \textit{Deus ex machina} recalls the minimalist style of Andriessen, especially passages from \textit{De Staat} (1972-76). We know from Yekimovsky’s \textit{Autobiography} that Andriessen was on his and other Denisov circle composers’ minds around the time he wrote \textit{Deus ex machina}. According to Yekimovsky, after Korndorf moved to Canada in 1991 (one year after the completion of \textit{Deus ex machina}), Korndorf would regularly send him long letters

that were not so much letters as much as complete artistic essays about, for example, the role of philosophy in Schnittke’s recent works or critical studies of
the music of Smirnov, Firsova, Tarnopolski, Martinov – or, from a different angle, Scelsi, Andriessen, Crumb, and Fernyhough – whom Korndorf, having both time and opportunity, had thoroughly studied.\footnote{Yekimovsky, \textit{Avtomonografiya}, 185.}

A few years after \textit{Deus ex machina}, Yekimovsky wrote a larger work inspired by Andriessen. Yekimovsky modeled the third movement of his \textit{Symphonic Dances} \cite{Simfonicheskiye tantsyi} (1993) for piano and orchestra on Andriessen’s \textit{De Staat}. As Yekimovsky described in his \textit{Autobiography}:

The third Dance [of the \textit{Symphonic Dances}] is essentially built according to a minimalist design, but as opposed to Terry Riley, Steve Reich, or Philip Glass, my “pattern” is not one, two, or a few notes, but rather a whole construct, and a rather complex one at that: the chord has a [fixed] intervallic structure and set outer pitches (a low F in the bass and E four octaves higher) and it “centripetally” shapes the passages that follow. This fixed [chordal] entity (which nevertheless features some internal variation) is repeated 50 (!) times […] [My approach,] of course, continues along the lines of the European model [of minimalism], which had become a “new classic” in the “macrominimalist” works of Louis Andriessen (particularly his famous piece \textit{De Staat} 1976) […]\footnote{Ibid., 261.}

Yekimovsky’s comments point toward the general bias within the Denisov circle toward structural complexity. This bias was instilled by Denisov, who himself detested music that was seemingly simple or in which formal processes were readily perceptible. Denisov’s disdain for simplicity and perceptibility shines through in his denigration of American minimalism:

[Minimalism] has, at its core, a quality of artistic conformity; it reflects a certain kind of fatigue \cite{vïrazhayet kakuyu-to ustalost’}. Minimalism results from a desire to find the easiest possible path through the creative process. It’s practiced by a few Americans – Steve Reich, Philip Glass. It’s very uninteresting.\footnote{Quoted in Kholopov and Tsenova, \textit{Edison Denisov}, 169.}

\footnote{The term “macrominimalism” \cite{makrominimalizm} here used by Yekimovsky was coined by a fellow member of the ASM-2, Igor’ Kefalidis [Kefalidi], who devised it to help describe his 1993 work \textit{Repetitoriks for Icebreaker}. For more on Kefalidis’ use of this term, see Valeriya Tsenvova, “Vnutri prostranstva Igorya Kefalidi,” in \textit{Muzïka i vremya} 2 (2006): 35 (available online at www.tsenova.ru/books/ kefalidi_prostranstvo.pdf, accessed May 26, 2010).}

Kefalidis’ term has since entered the Russian musicological lexicon. Margarita Katunyan’s chapter on minimalism in the 2007 textbook \textit{The Theory of Contemporary Composition} contains a special section on “macrominimalism.” For Katunyan, like Kefalidis, macrominimalism means minimalist music in which the repeating patterns unfold over long periods of time (hence “macro”). Above all, for Katunyan it is a European phenomenon:

As opposed to the short patterns in the classic examples of American minimalism, in the European branch of minimalism, patterns are built from structures that unfold over greater expanses of time and space. Some of the numerous examples we might cite include Andriessen’s \textit{De Staat} (1976) and Martinov’s \textit{Passionslieder} (1977) and \textit{Come In! [Voydite!]} (1985).

As we will see in the next chapter, Denisov’s celebration of complexity helped motivate many of his followers to fill their serial compositions with increasingly esoteric, hidden structures.

“Groupiness” II – Sonorika

A second area that interested numerous composers of the Denisov circle during the later 1980s was so-called “sonoristic” or “timbral” music – that is, music built from sounds of indefinite or imperceptible pitch. In Russian, music of this type is generally called sonorika – or, more rarely, sonornaya muzïka, muzïka tembrow [timbral music] or muzïka zvuchnostey [sonoristic music].

The term sonorika is roughly equivalent to the English terms “sonoristics” or “sonoristic music” (but not “sonorism” or “sonorist music”); indeed, throughout this dissertation I use the noun sonorika and the adjective “sonoristic” to refer to the same compositional approach.

Importantly, Russian sonorika encompasses a wide range of later-twentieth century compositional practices, from the sound-mass compositions of Ligeti and the sonorist approach of Penderecki through to Lachenmann’s musique concrète instrumentale style. Although most examples of sonorika feature homophonic or polyphonic textures, it does not require multiple voices: according to Russian theorists, a composer can write sonoristic music for a solo instrument, too, mainly by creating innovative sounds through extended techniques so as to focus the listener’s ear on timbre, not pitch.

For Kholopov, sonorika was the result of an evolutionary process that began with late-Romantic chromaticism and continued through mid-century serialism. This musical evolution was driven by composers’ constant desires to create innovative new worlds of sound:

Generally speaking, the First Avant-garde of the 1910s-20s, having boiled down [sgustiv] the most novel aspects of late-Romantic harmony, moved toward something new and previously unheard-of: twelve-tone music […] The second avant-garde of the late 1940s-'60s began from the accomplishments of the first, from dodecaphony and serialism, and moved toward sonoristic thought [k sonornomu mishleniyu].

57 For an overview of these and other terms, see Aleksandr Maklígin’s and Valeriya Tsenova’s chapter, “Sonorika,” in Tsenova, ed., Teoriya sovremennoy kompozitsii, 382-411. Rarer still, some Russian theorists occasionally use the term sonorizm. For example, Kholopov’s 1981 article on sonoristic music in vol. 5 of the Muzïkal’naya entsiklopediya (ed. Keldïsh) is indexed under the main heading “Sonorizm” (see vol. 5, 207-12). In his own writings, though, Kholopov overwhelmingly uses the terms sonorika and muzïka zvuchnostey.


In English, the terms “sonorism” and “sonorist music” generally refer to the specialized type of sonoristic music composed in Poland in the 1960s by Penderecki, Schaeffer, Kilar, and others. In Russian, this Polish approach is usually called sonoristika and is considered a subcategory of the broader phenomenon of sonorika.

To summarize: [Russian] sonorika = [English] sonoristics, while [Russian] sonoristika = [English] sonorism (i.e., the Polish school of sonoristika).


In Kholopov’s opinion, Denisov’s works represent the apogee of this evolutionary process:

Denisov stands out in the consistency, the regularity, and the stability of his sonoristic approach [sonorika]. For Denisov, this technique was neither a passing fad nor just one technique among others in his toolbox. Sonorika was the discovery of a new musical world, a way of accessing a type of beauty that a person would hope never to leave. As was the case with timbre, Denisov was never satisfied with the color palette of the orchestra; he always hoped for newer and newer [novyi i novyi] colors and timbres, new instruments.

In this way, Denisov’s artistic world demonstrates just how broad and rich music can be when it is built from the “third dimension,” color (that is, if we consider melody [gorizontal’] the first dimension and harmony [vertikal’] the second dimension). 61

Owing to Denisov’s influence, several composers of the Denisov circle became interested in this “third dimension,” color, and incorporated sonoristic techniques into their music of the later 1980s in a variety of ways. Examples of sonorika in works from this period by Denisov circle composers are diverse and widespread, ranging from the occasional use of extended techniques in pieces for solo instruments through to large orchestral scores composed of Xenakis- and Penderecki-inspired sounds.

In order to better understand the theory and practice of sonoristic music in the Denisov circle, we can turn to Aleksandr Maklïgin’s and Valeriya Tsenova’s chapter on sonorika from Tsenova’s 2005 textbook The Theory of Contemporary Composition. 62 Both Maklïgin, who wrote the bulk of this chapter, and Tsenova, who wrote its final part and edited the book in which it appears, were pupils of Kholopov. 63 (Maklïgin’s faculty biography on the Kazan Conservatory website describes him as a member of “one of the most authoritative schools in Russian music studies – the Kholopov school”). 64 Given Maklïgin’s and Tsenova’s closeness with Kholopov, and considering Kholopov’s influence on composers of the Denisov circle, it seems plausible that Maklïgin’s and Tsenova’s ideas about sonorika are similar to those held by many of the composers at the heart of our study.

Maklïgin presents a detailed taxonomy of six different “textural forms” [fakturniye formi] common in sonoristic music. He gives each of these forms a metaphoric title such as “dot” [tochka] or “stream” [potok]. Maklïgin divides his six textural forms into three pairs, based on whether they are short or prolonged and, if prolonged, their relative degree of dynamism or stasis. Maklïgin further subdivides these pairs into single-voiced textural forms [prostiy] and multi-voiced ones [sostavniye]. Example 3.12 summarizes Maklïgin’s taxonomy:

---

61 Ibid., 8-9.
63 According to the book’s introduction, Maklïgin wrote parts 1-8 of the chapter (pp. 382-401) and Tsenova wrote part 9 (“Noveyshie tendentsii,” 401-409).

Maklïgin completed his kandidatskaya dissertatsiya at the Moscow Conservatory in 1986 and his doktorskaya dissertatsiya in 2001. From 2002 to the present he has served as chair of the composition department at the Kazan Conservatory. In 2007, he was appointed prorector of research [prorektor po nauchnoy rabote].
The labels Maklïgin selected for the three single-voiced textural forms—rossïp', liniya, and tochka—recall the title of Gubaidulina’s 1976 sonoristic work *Dots, Lines, and Zigzags* [*Tochki, linii, zigzagi*], a duo for bass clarinet and piano. As we shall see, this work, plus a handful of others Gubaidulina completed around the same time, provided likely models for later sonoristic works by Denisov circle composers. For this reason, it is plausible that Gubaidulina’s title helped inspire Maklïgin’s labels.

Maklïgin’s taxonomy provides an effective tool for navigating our way through the large body of sonoristic works by Denisov circle composers. In the discussion that follows, we will examine each of Maklïgin’s six categories, citing passages from Denisov circle works of the later 80s to help illustrate them.

Maklïgin describes the single-voiced, dynamic textural form rossïp’ [scattering] as a “‘lightly rhythmic’ grouping of points [ “melkoritmicheskaya” gruppa tochek] whose rhythmic concentration helps create the impression of a single, pulsating color.”

This textural form, Maklïgin notes, is roughly equivalent to Boulez’s “arabesque” figures.) As an example of rossïp’, Maklïgin cites the accompanimental harpsichord flourishes in the fourth movement of Volkonsky’s cantata *The Lamentations of Shchaza* [*Zhalobï Shchazï*] (1961).

As seen in ex. 3.13, this section of Karayev’s score consists almost entirely of coloristic flashes of sound. Apropos the discussion in this chapter’s previous section, Karayev builds these rossïp’ figures from twelve-tone rows (see the top system of the second

---


66 As Michael Kurtz notes, Gubaidulina originally called her work *Lines, Curves, and Dots* [*Linii, izgibï i tochki*]. This original title appeared in the program for the work’s 1977 premiere in East Germany by bass clarinetist Josef Horák and pianist Emma Kovárnová (who performed as the “Duo Boemi di Praga”). See Kurtz, *Sofia Gubaidulina*, 120-21, 128, and 279.


68 As Michael Kurtz notes, Gubaidulina originally called her work *Lines, Curves, and Dots* [*Linii, izgibï i tochki*]. This original title appeared in the program for the work’s 1977 premiere in East Germany by bass clarinetist Josef Horák and pianist Emma Kovárnová (who performed as the “Duo Boemi di Praga”). See Kurtz, *Sofia Gubaidulina*, 120-21, 128, and 279.

69 Example 3.13 comes from Karayev’s second version of the work, *Postludio II* (1990), for piano, double bass, and string quartet.
page of ex. 3.13).\textsuperscript{70} As seen in ex. 3.13, the first statement of the row includes only five pitches. By the third statement the row has grows to seven pitches and, by the seventh statement, to the full twelve. In several versions of the \textit{Postludio}, Karayev utilizes different performance techniques to intensify the sense of a “single, pulsating color” central to this textural form. For example, in \textit{Postludio III} (1991) for two pianos (eight hands), Karayev instructs the performers to silently depress different clusters of keys so that the pianos’ strings might vibrate sympathetically along with these twelve-tone \textit{rossîp’} figures; as a result, Karayev creates shimmering waves of sound throughout the work’s sonoristic middle section (example 3.14).

The multi-voiced analog of \textit{rossîp’} is \textit{potok}, which means “current” or “stream” and which Maklïgin describes as a “pulsating sonority made up from the polyphonic interweaving of various moving lines.”\textsuperscript{71} Maklïgin cites the layered scalar figures at R.302 in Lutosławski’s \textit{Livre pour orchestre} (1968) as an example of this textural form. Examples of \textit{potok} abound in sonoristic works by Denisov circle composers. As an example, we might look to the climactic middle section of Yuryi Kasparov’s 1990 \textit{Devil’s Trills: Variations on a Theme by Tartini} (\text{D yavol’skiye treli: variatsii na temu Tartini}), in which Kasparov stacks ascending melodic and scalar figures one on top of the other in stretto (ex. 3.15).

It is plausible that Kasparov looked to Lutosławski, including the \textit{Livre pour orchestre}, as a model for this section of \textit{Devil’s Trills}. As critic Pyotr Pospelov points out, Lutosławski’s music provided the likely model for a large work Kasparov completed two years before \textit{Devil’s Trills}, the 1988 Oboe Concerto.\textsuperscript{72} Kasparov, though, could find a more immediate model for this section of \textit{Devil’s Trills} in different sonoristic works by his teacher, Denisov.\textsuperscript{73} For example, Denisov’s Requiem, a sonoristic work completed in 1980, is filled with \textit{potok} textures similar to the ones Kasparov created in \textit{Devil’s Trills}. Some of Denisov’s \textit{potok} textures in the Requiem consist of staggered melodies descending from high to low (ex. 3.16); others are stacked upward from low to high, like many of Kasparov’s \textit{potok} textures (ex. 3.17). Denisov’s Requiem seems to have been particularly influential upon several members of the Denisov circle. Tarnopolski named the Requiem as one of his favorite pieces by Denisov.\textsuperscript{74} The same year Denisov completed this piece, Yekimovsky incorporated \textit{potok} passages similar to those found throughout the Requiem into \textit{Cantus figuralis} (1980), a work for twelve saxophones composed at Denisov’s behest.\textsuperscript{75}

\textsuperscript{70} This row is constructed almost entirely of fourths and fifths: \text{E – A – D – B – G – C – F – Bb – Eb – Ab – Db}. These intervals recall the descending fourths and fifths (A–E–A) sounding throughout the first section of the \textit{Postludio}, itself a reference to the opening of Beethoven’s Symphony No. 9 (see chapter 5).

\textsuperscript{71} Maklïgin, “Sonorika,” 395.


\textsuperscript{73} As mentioned in chapter 2, Denisov was Kasparov’s formal composition teacher. In this regard, Kasparov was unique among Denisov circle composers, most of whom had graduated from conservatory before Denisov was permitted to teach composition. Kasparov (b. 1955) was a relative latecomer to formal music studies, completing his undergraduate degree in composition at the conservatory in 1984 and graduate studies (under Denisov) in 1991.

\textsuperscript{74} Tarnopolski, “Shkola bez didaktiki,” 216.

\textsuperscript{75} See, for example, the beginning of \textit{Cantus figuralis’} fifth movement, “Recitative” [\textit{Rechitativ}], reproduced in Shul’gin, \textit{Sovremennïye chertï Viktora Yekimovskogo}, 307. As Yekimovsky stated in his \textit{Autobiography}, in summer 1980 Denisov approached him and Pavlenko and asked them to write works for Bordeaux-based saxophonist Jean-Marie Londeix (b. 1932), whom Denisov had met earlier. Londeix had originally asked Denisov to compose a piece for him and his ensemble of twelve saxophones. Denisov told Yekimovsky that he did not have time to meet Londeix’s request, and instead asked him and Pavlenko to fulfill it, “so that Londeix isn’t left without anything to play.” Yekimovsky suspects that Denisov had other reasons for farming out Londeix’s request: as he states in his \textit{Autobiography}, “in my opinion [...] the leader of our country’s avant-garde responded much more warmly to commissions (with money involved) than requests for pieces (without any).” Yekimovsky and Pavlenko fulfilled
Maklïgin’s prolonged static forms are the multi-voiced polosa [band] and its single-voiced analog, liniya [line]. Maklïgin describes polosa—defined as “the unification of two or more related lines into a single element” so as to create the sense of a “prolonged sonority or cluster”—as the most prevalent textural form in sonoristic music, and he identifies it as the basic texture in famous sonoristic works including Penderecki’s Threnody for the Victims of Hiroshima [Ofiarom Hiroszimy - Tren] (1960), Boulez’s “Don” (No. 1 from Pli selon pli, 1960-62), Schmitke’s Pianissimo... (1968), and Ligeti’s String Quartet No. 2 (1968). Not surprisingly, polosa is the textural form most often encountered in sonoristic works by Denisov circle composers; examples of it might be found in abundance in works by Raskatov (e.g., Circle of Singing [Krug peniye, 1984]), Karayev (e.g., ...a crumb of music for George Crumb [1985]), Tarnopolski (e.g., Concerto for Cello and Orchestra [1980]), Yekimovsky (e.g., Mändälä [1983]), and Kasparov (e.g., Devil’s Trills [1990]), among others.

Most polosa textures in late Soviet music feature static bands of sound built from one or more sustained pitches, a tremolo between two pitches, or chordal arpeggiation. Occasionally, Denisov circle composers would create polosa textures through other means. For example, in the sonoristic third movement (Fluttuante) of Klänge einer traurigen Nacht, Karayev builds a polosa texture by stacking repeating twelve-tone rows on top of one another (see the double bass and clarinet parts in ex. 3.18). Vustin, Tarnopolski, and Raskatov, meanwhile, sometimes built polosa textures from bands of repeating glissandi. While Vustin ostensibly derived this technique from his study of Xenakis, Raskatov and Tarnopolski likely borrowed it from Sidel’nikov, their formal composition teacher at the conservatory, who used it in works like the 1968 cycle Russian Fairytales [Russkiye skazki]. (Compare the violin and viola glissandi from the fifth movement of Sidel’nikov’s Russian Fairytales in ex. 3.19 with the violin and viola glissandi from the end of Tarnopolski’s 1980 Cello Concerto in ex. 3.20). Sidel’nikov’s Russian Fairytales contains several elements that his pupils would later exploit: for example, near the end of the work’s fourth movement, Sidel’nikov instructs the pianist to play directly on the piano’s strings (ex. 3.21), a technique later used by his pupils Raskatov (in works such as Xenia [1991] – see the piano glissando in ex. 3.22) and Ivan Sokolov (in On Cage [1992] - see chapter 1).

Maklïgin defines polosa’s analog, liniya [line], as a “single-voiced, continuous sonority” [nepreïivnaya odnogolosnaya zvuchnost’]. He differentiates between two types of line. The first, “active line” [podvïzhnaya liniya], is simply a continuous, single-voiced glissando. As an example of this textural form, Maklïgin cites the cello glissando from the end of Gubaidulina’s In croce (1979) (ex. 3.23). For a more prominent example of “active line” in Gubaidulina’s music, we might look to her appropriately-named Dots, Lines, and Zigzags (1976) (ex. 3.24).

Londeix’s “almost-commission” [pochti-zakaz] with Cantus figuralis (1980) and the Concerto breve (1980) respectively, both for twelve saxophones. See Yekimovsky, Avtomonografìya, 92.

77 The double bass plays a twelve-tone row that begins on F# (F# – B – C – F – E – B♭ – A♭ – D – C♯ – G – E♭ – A); the clarinet plays a retrograde of this row, starting on C (C – G♭ – D – A♭ – G – D♭ – B – F – E – A – B♭ – E♭) (n.b. – the clarinet is notated in A).

The bass and clarinet repeat their rows in full ad libitum before playing increasingly shorter fragments of them. Each new fragment starts from a different position of the row – for example, the bass’ second statement starts from position 2 of the row (B), the third statement starts from position 3 (C), et cetera. This rotation technique recalls Vustin’s serial practice (see chapter 4).

79 Ibid.
“Active lines” can be found in several works of the later 80s by Denisov circle composers; in nearly every instance they feature the same kind of graphic notation used by Gubaidulina. (The “whistle tone” flute glissando at the end of Kasperov’s Devil’s Trills, shown in ex. 3.25, provides a representative example.)

Maklïgin’s “immobile” line [nepodvizhnaya liniya], by contrast, consists of a repeated or sustained pitch, the tone color of which changes over time as a result of alterations in articulation or dynamics. As an example, Maklïgin cites the sustained high E, which “glitters with different colors,” from the beginning of Ligeti’s Concerto for Cello and Orchestra (1966). For a Soviet example of “immobile line,” we might look to Denisov’s Romantic Music [Romanticheskaya muzïka] (1968), a quintet for oboe, harp, and string trio composed for Heinz and Ursula Holliger, who premiered it in Zagreb in 1969. The oboe’s opening statement features a prominent “immobile line” in the bisbigliando, or timbral trill, on C5 in the second system (ex. 3.26).

Throughout the 80s, many Denisov circle composers became interested in “immobile lines,” often creating them through bisbigliandi similar to the ones Denisov used in Romantic Music. Bisbigliandi became an especially beloved technique of Denisov’s pupil, Kasperov, who included them in numerous works from the late 80s onward (see, for example, the opening page of Kasperov’s 1989 solo bassoon work Sonata-Infernale, shown in ex. 3.27).

Maklïgin’s final pair of textural forms are the so-called short [kratkiye] forms, including the single-voiced tochka [dot] and multi-voiced pyatno [blot]. For Maklïgin, these short forms consist of any self-contained sound of relatively short duration and used to coloristic effect. To illustrate these forms, Maklïgin cites the single-pitched “specks” of sound [tochki-bliki] peppered throughout Gubaidulina’s Poem-Fairytale [Poema-skazka] (1971)—an example of tochka—or Cowell’s piano clusters in Tiger (1930)—an example of pyatno.

One of the main ways late Soviet composers created these short sonoristic forms was through extended techniques, particularly for woodwind instruments. The main impetus behind Soviet composers’ adoption of extended techniques came from a handful of virtuoso performers, both foreign and domestic. Swiss oboist Heinz Holliger (b. 1939), with whom Denisov first worked in the late 60s, was an especially important influence. In his first work for Holliger, Romantic Music (1968), Denisov used extended techniques sparingly. By contrast, in his second work for Holliger, the unaccompanied Solo for Oboe [Solo dlya goboya] (1971), Denisov incorporated extended techniques quite freely. The piece is filled with multiphonics, bisbigliandi, half-tone trills, and other special effects closely associated with Holliger’s innovative performing style (ex. 3.28). Through Denisov, Holliger exerted an indirect influence on Denisov circle composers. In the wake of Denisov’s 1971 solo oboe piece, a handful of Denisov’s followers composed unaccompanied oboe works, including Raskatov (Little Triptych [Mal enkiy triptikh, 1975]) and Vustin (Fairytale [Skazka, 1979]). Both Raskatov’s and Vustin’s works liberally incorporate many of the techniques associated with Holliger and used by Denisov, especially bisbigliandi (ex. 3.29) and multiphonics (ex. 3.30).

An even more important influence encouraging Soviet composers’ interest in extended techniques came from virtuoso Moscow bassoonist Valeriy Popov (b. 1937). Popov, who graduated from Vladimir Gorbachyov’s bassoon class at the Moscow Music College
Popov began teaching at the Moscow Conservatory in 1971. Around that time he formed a duo with pianist Pyotr Meshchaninov, Gubaidulina’s husband and an active figure in Moscow’s new music scene. Meshchaninov, who was particularly close with Kholopov, had developed an elaborate theory of timbre and sonorika, which Kholopov summarized in detail in his 2002 textbook Approaches to Music Theory: A Course [Muzikal’no-teoreticheskiye sistemï. Programma kursa]. Meshchaninov’s interest in timbre perhaps influenced Popov, who developed a vast palette of colorful extended techniques. Attracted by Popov’s virtuosity, several Soviet modernists, including Schnittke, began writing for him in the mid 70s. Most famously, Gubaidulina composed her Concerto for Bassoon and Low Strings [Kontsert dlya fagota i nizkikh strunnikh] (1975) for Popov, who premiered it in 1976 with the Moscow State Symphony Orchestra under the baton of Meshchaninov. The solo bassoon passages at the beginning of the concerto’s fourth movement contain several multiphonics, perhaps the first use of bassoon multiphonics by a Soviet composer (ex. 3.31).

Several members of the Denisov circle flocked to Popov in the late 70s, eager to write works capitalizing on his repertoire of unconventional techniques. Popov not only inspired these young composers, but helped educate them, too. As Dmitri Smirnov told Jeffrey Lyman, Popov showed him and his wife, Elena Firsova, important reference works on new bassoon technique by Bruno Bartolozzi and Sergio Penazzi:

Bassoon was not our favorite musical instrument before we heard Valery Popov’s performances of contemporary music. They were so impressive that we reconsidered our views on that [instrument]. In the process of work we used for the multiphonics the very popular (at that time) tables by Bruno Bartolozzi and another Italian bassoonist (Penazzi, I think).

We were not attracted by any comic or funny sounds which can be produced by the bassoon, but were engaged by the richness of its technique...

Inspired by Popov, and armed with Bartolozzi’s tables of multiphonics, Smirnov incorporated multiphonics into his 1977 Sonata for Bassoon and Piano, which Popov and Meshchaninov premiered at the Composers’ Union in 1978. Importantly, Smirnov shared Bartolozzi’s and

---

85 Lyman, “After Shostakovich, What Next?,” 60. Several Denisov circle composers completed works for Popov around this time, including Pavlenko (Four Pieces for Bassoon and Piano [1977] and Hommage [1979] for bassoon and string quartet) and Shut’ (Solo for Bassoon [1978], the Trio [1978] for bassoon, cello, and piano, and Romantic Messages [1979] for bassoon, strings, flute, and prepared piano). Denisov, too, began writing for Popov during this
Penazzi’s reference works with some of his comrades in the Denisov circle, who proceeded to use them as the basis for their own experiments with extended techniques. For example, Vustin says that he derived the multiphonics for his 1979 unaccompanied oboe piece *Fairytale* from Bartolozzi’s reference book, which Smirnov had shown him.86 (Vustin wrote this piece at the invitation of Denisov circle composer Vladislav Shut’, Vustin’s and Smirnov’s colleague at the Sovietskiy kompozitor publishing house, who requested a short piece to round out a volume of oboe works he was editing.87)

Thanks to Popov, woodwind multiphonics became the most prevalent “short” form used by Denisov circle composers in sonoristic works of the 80s. Multiphonics can be found in a wide variety of pieces, from those with practically no other extended techniques (e.g., Korndorf’s neo-romantic *Amoroso* [1986] – see ex. 3.32) to works built almost entirely from unconventional techniques or performing styles (e.g., Kasparov’s *Landscape fading into infinity* [Peyzazh, ukhodyashchiy v beskonechnost’, 1991] – see ex. 3.33). Also, in keeping with the spirit of modernism and innovation permeating the Denisov circle, some circle composers sought to “extend” extended techniques. As Pyotr Pospelov notes, throughout the Oboe Concerto (1988) Kasparov develops increasingly complex multiphonic chords, including (at fig. 49) a “two-part chord with a trill on the bottom note,” an invention “you cannot find even in the works of Heinz Holliger.”88 In the 1989 *Sonata-Infernale*, dedicated to Popov, Kasparov pushed the envelope still further, incorporating five- and six-note multiphonic chords (ex. 3.34).

“Groupiness” III: Instrumental Theater

In addition to serialism and sonorika, a third and final area of common interest to Denisov circle composers throughout the 1980s was instrumental theater. In Russian and Soviet music, the term instrumental theater [*instrumental’niy teatr*] primarily denotes works in which the musicians act as characters in some sort of narrative or stage action. Most Soviet examples of instrumental theater are longer works, twenty minutes or more, composed for large ensembles, such as chamber orchestra. Many of these pieces feature clear character associations or plots (e.g., Karayev’s *Waiting for...* [V ozhidanii..., 1983], in which the solo instrumentals represent characters from Beckett’s *Waiting for Godot*, or Tarnopolski’s “culturological” *Jesu, deine tiefen Wunden* from 1987, in which three “actor-percussionists” symbolically crucify the conductor at work’s end). Others lack a readily identifiable story, and instead combine music, movement, and lighting into a large theatrical spectacle (e.g., Korndorf’s 1982 music “ritual” *Yes!* [Da!]).

Judging from Kholopov’s and Tsenova’s works list in their biography *Edison Denisov*, Denisov began writing instrumental theater works only in the mid 80s. By that point, both Korndorf and Karayev had already completed large theatrical works. Denisov’s two instrumental theater pieces are *The Blue Notebook* [*Golubaya tetrad’*] (1986), a ten-movement work for soprano, narrator, and chamber ensemble based on texts by early twentieth-century experimentalist writers Aleksandr Vvedensky and Daniil Kharms, and *The Steamboat Passes the
Harbor [Parokhod plïvet mimo pristani] (1986), a work for “sound orchestra” [shumnovoy orkestr] composed for Mark Pekarsky and his ensemble. In fact, the 1980s saw the first theatrical works of any kind by Denisov: he completed his first opera, L’écume des jours [Penadney] in 1981 and his final one, Les quatre filles [Chetïre devushki], in 1986, while in 1984 he composed his only ballet, Confession [Ispoved'].

Several factors explain this widespread interest in instrumental theater during the 80s. Most members of the Denisov circle believed that art should address profound, philosophical topics, identifying this as a distinctly Russian artistic tradition preserved throughout the Soviet era in the works of official and unofficial composers alike. Nikolay Korndorf, one of the Denisov circle’s strongest proponents of instrumental summarized this viewpoint:

I certainly feel myself to be a Russian composer. I spent forty-five years in Russia. I was raised on Russian literature, and my whole system of thinking is purely Russian. My views on art, on the purpose of art, on the destiny of an artist, are entirely adopted from the Russian classics. […] Shostakovich, Shnitke, and Pärt undoubtedly belonged to Soviet music, and I include myself in it.

Elsewhere Korndorf stated:

I belong to the direction in Russian music which, independent of the composer’s style, typically addresses very serious topics: philosophical, religious, moral, the problems of a person’s spiritual life, his relationship with the surrounding world, the problem of beauty and its relationship with reality, as well as the problem of loftiness and meaning in human beings and in art, relationship of the spiritual and the anti-spiritual. All this means that most of my works were written not for fun and in no way can be classified as entertainment. As much as possible I strive to ensure that every one of my works contains a message to each listener and that my music leaves no one indifferent, but aroused with an emotional response. I even accept that at times my music arouses negative emotions - as long as it is not indifference.

For Korndorf and others, instrumental theater provided one of the quickest routes for achieving these ends. The inclusion of theatrical elements helped ensure that listeners did not remain “indifferent,” and that works provoked a strong emotional response. At the same time,

---


works of instrumental theater contained easily read symbols, including gestures and words, thus helping guarantee that a composer could easily communicate his “message to each listener.”

As in the case of extended techniques, performers played an important role in the development of instrumental theater. The most important group encouraging new theatrical works was the Soloists of the Bol’shoy Theater ensemble [Ansambl’ solistov Bol’shogo teatra], conducted by Aleksandr Lazarev. As we saw in chapter 1, this group performed works by Crumb and Berio in Moscow in the early 1980s. Throughout the 80s, several members of the Denisov circle wrote pieces for this ensemble, including Tarnopolski, Korndorf, Yekimovsky, and Karayev. Given its prestige and visibility, the ensemble had access to high-profile venues and extensive resources, and was thus well positioned to perform logistically demanding works that otherwise would have remained unplayed. For example, in 1984 the ensemble premiered Korndorf’s forty-minute long “ritual” Yes! at the Chaikovsky Concert Hall [Kontsertnïy zal im. P.I. Chaikovskogo], one of Moscow’s largest and most prestigious music venues. Scored for three singers, ensemble, and tape, Korndorf’s piece requires a huge collection of equipment and instruments including seven microphones, three separate tape parts (the second part alone blends recordings of music by Bach, Beethoven, and Brahms), several speakers positioned throughout the hall, an extensive percussion instrumentarium, organ, and various lighting effects. Given these demands, only a well-funded, well-connected group like the Bol’shoy ensemble could have marshaled the resources to present this work.

The Bol’shoy ensemble’s visibility and prestige, though, did not guarantee the group a carte blanche to perform anything it wanted. In 1983, the Soviet Ministry of Culture intervened to stop the ensemble’s premiere of Karayev’s Beckett-inspired Waiting for... at the Zagreb Biennale. Karayev’s forty-minute long work is scored for around twenty musicians, including four on-stage soloists who correspond to the main characters from Beckett’s play (solo bass = Estragon; solo cello = Vladimir; solo trombone = Pozzo; solo bassoon = Lucky).92 This premiere was to be staged by distinguished actor and director Igor’ Yasulovich (b. 1941) and presented alongside a semi-staged version of Schnittke’s Three Scenes [Tri stsenï] (1980), featuring soprano Nelli Li and directed by Yuriy Lyubimov (b. 1917), the famous director of the Taganka Theater [Teatr na Taganke]. Four years after this cancellation, portions of Karayev’s work were premiered in Moscow’s Chaikovsky Hall by the Georgian Chamber Orchestra, under the baton of Liana Isakadze.

In addition to writing large instrumental theater pieces, composers of the Denisov circle filled their smaller-scale chamber works of the 1980s with various theatrical elements, including singing, speaking, and acting. Composers’ incorporation of theatrical elements into chamber works was motivated not just by ideological concerns—that is, their desire to create emotionally engaging works filled with easily read symbols—but practical ones, too: in the Soviet Union as

---

92 For an overview of Karayev’s work, including the parallels between it and Beckett’s, see Marianna Visotskaya, “Poeitika absurda v instrumental’nom teatre Faradzha Karayeva (Chast’ 1),” Kultura.az: portal kul’turi i iskusstva 20 April 2010 (http://kultura.az/articles.php?item_id=20100420021704313&sec_id=3#_ftn1, accessed June 18, 2010).

In notes for the aborted premiere, Karayev cautions that his piece “was written ‘as a homage to Beckett’ and not as a musical illustration of Beckett’s work” and that listeners ought not “seek any analogies with the actual scenes from Beckett’s work.” Visotskaya, though, has pointed out how closely Karayev’s work adheres to the plot and script of Waiting for Godot. In particular, the arrangement of solos and duets in Waiting for... parallels the organization of monologues and dialogues in Beckett’s work. For Karayev’s notes, see the program booklet “12. Muzički Biennale. Međunarodni festival suvremene glazbe 22-28. travnja 1983,“ reproduced on Karayev’s website (http://karaev.net/ w_1986_waiting_for_e.html#, accessed June 19, 2010).
elsewhere, it was substantially easier to secure performances for smaller, shorter works than for
dhuge, spectacular ones.

Speaking or singing roles for the instrumentalists were the theatrical elements Denisov
circle composers most often incorporated into chamber works of the 80s. In some cases, these
speaking or singing parts were limited to a few words or phrases peppered throughout the
composition; in others, they covered larger portions of a work. Many were settings of literary,
religious, or journalistic texts; others required the instrumentalists to speak or sing only vowels
or syllables.

While most of these speaking and singing parts call for relatively normal modes of vocal
declamation (e.g., whispering, shouting, or conventional speech or song) others require more
specialized techniques. For example, in ...a crumb of music for George Crumb (1985; rev. 1986,
1998, 2004)—originally for sixteen-person chamber orchestra yet subsequently revised for
smaller ensembles—Karayev includes a handful of unconventional vocal techniques for the
instrumentalists. Karayev built his piece around Emily Dickinson’s poem “If I shouldn’t be
alive,” excerpts of which the instrumentalists recite throughout the fifteen-minute long work.
Karayev likely selected this poem because it includes the words “thank you” and “crumb,” thus
providing an easy opportunity to pay homage to George Crumb, the work’s dedicatee.
Throughout the piece Karayev highlights these dedictory words: although he sets most of
Dickinson’s text as a whisper, Karayev instructs the instrumentalists to shout or even shriek the
words “crumb” and “thank you.” Karayev notates these shouts with an upward-pointing triangle,
a symbol often used in sonoristic works to instruct performers to play the highest possible pitch
(see ex. 3.35). Karayev’s score features other unconventional vocal effects, including loud,
rhythmic breathing.

Although most theatrical chamber works by Denisov circle composers feature vocal parts
for instrumentalists, some include instrumental parts for vocalists. For example, Raskatov’s
Gra-ka-kha-ta (1988) for voice and four percussionists, a setting of texts by early twentieth-
century poet Velimir Khlebnikov, includes an extensive violin part for the solo tenor. This violin
part is sufficiently complex that only a singer who is also a trained string player could perform it
well. (For a sampling of this part and its complexities, see ex. 3.36). Raskatov wrote Gra-ka-
ka-ta to exploit the talents of tenor Aleksey Martïnov (b. 1947) who, prior to completing a
degree in voice at the Moscow Conservatory, completed an undergraduate degree in violin at the
Gnesin Institute.

In addition to speech and song, other theatrical elements Denisov circle composers
incorporated into chamber works of the 80s include movement and gesture, lighting, and
theatrical props. Sometimes these elements were used selectively so as to highlight especially
dramatic parts of a composition. For example, at the conclusion of Music for Ten [Muzïka dlya
desyati] (1991), for nine instrumentalists and conductor, Vustin instructs the performers to
remain frozen in place for an indefinite period. In other instances, composers incorporated
theatrical effects more thoroughly into their works. As described in chapter 1, for example,
Yekimovsky requests that his minimalist work In the Hunting Dogs Constellation (1986) be

---

93 Karayev’s original sixteen-player version from 1985 is scored for flute, oboe, clarinet, bassoon, horn, trumpet,
trombone, two percussionists, harp, piano, two violins, viola, cello, and bass and was composed for the Soloists of
the Bol’shoy Theater ensemble, who premiered it in Lugano, Switzerland in 1987. Karayev later produced three
different six-player versions of the piece: for flute, oboe, piano, violin, viola, cello (1986); flute, clarinet, piano,
violin, viola, cello (1998); and flute, clarinet, trombone, piano, violin, cello (2004).
performed in the dark, with lights, mirrors, or a disco ball emulating the projection of stars overhead; ideally, Yekimovsky suggests his work be performed in a planetarium.\textsuperscript{94}

Again, performers played an important role in developing or adding these theatrical effects. One of the performers best known for his dramatic performing style was percussionist Mark Pekarsky, for whom several composers of the Denisov circle wrote theatrical works. Though Pekarsky’s theatrical style earned him a loyal following among listeners and composers, it could sometimes alienate audiences. In the later 1980s, Pekarsky asked Yekimovsky to compose a new work to complement \textit{Balletto}, the humorous, graphically notated piece for “conductor and any ensemble” Yekimovsky wrote for him in 1974 (see chapter 1). As Yekimovsky told Shul’gin, Pekarsky was looking for a work to pair with \textit{Balletto} so that both pieces together might constitute half of a concert.\textsuperscript{95}

Yekimovsky met Pekarsky’s request with \textit{The Assumption} \textit{[Uspeniye]}, an eight-minute long work for percussion sextet. In many ways \textit{The Assumption} is \textit{Balletto}’s opposite: whereas \textit{Balletto} is raucous and unpredictable, the minimalist \textit{Assumption} is quiet, restrained, and repetitive. The piece consists of a thirty-second long rhythmic formula repeated continuously (ex. 3.37). The performers play the formula on different instruments in two-minute segments. The entire work is \textit{pianissimo}, and all of the instruments are muted. Near the beginning of the piece, the percussionists play high, bright instruments (e.g., triangle, crotales), while at the piece’s end they play low, dark ones (e.g., timpani, bass drum). Yekimovsky describes this timbral and registral shift as symbolic of the idea of death evoked by the work’s title.\textsuperscript{96}

For the work’s 1989 premiere at the Moscow Autumn festival, Pekarsky decided to highlight these funereal associations. As Yekimovsky recalls:

\begin{quote}
[After the work’s title was announced] Pekarsky and his ensemble walked out on stage and, in a theatrical manner, draped black fabric over their instruments, thus creating a strong impression of a funeral…\textsuperscript{97}
\end{quote}

Though Yekimovsky was pleased with Pekarsky’s presentation, listeners seemed less so: as Shul’gin and Yekimovsky note, the performance was panned by critics and booed by the audience.\textsuperscript{98} Despite this bad reception, Pekarsky and his ensemble performed the work several more times in Russia and abroad, and the piece has become a staple in Pekarsky’s repertoire. Pekarsky has continued seeking new ways to heighten the work’s dramatic effect. In 1997 he presented \textit{The Assumption} in Moscow on Good Friday, performing the work, in Yekimovsky’s words, as if “carrying out some holy sacrament.”\textsuperscript{99} At the work’s conclusion, the audience

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[94] Shul’gin, \textit{Tvorchestvo-zhizn’ Viktora Yekimovskogo}, 105.
\item[95] Ibid., 111.
\item[96] Although Yekimovsky calls his work \textit{The Assumption} in English, the Russian title could also be translated as “Dormition.” The Russian word \textit{Uspeniye} refers to the earthly death of the Virgin Mary. While Catholicism holds that Mary was immediately assumed into heaven, Russian Orthodoxy teaches that she died a physical death and, before being resurrected, spent three days in “dormition” (hence the association with death described by Yekimovsky).
\item[97] Shul’gin, \textit{Tvorchestvo-zhizn’ Viktora Yekimovskogo}, 112. The liberties Pekarsky took in adding theatrical elements to Yekimovsky’s piece recall Lyubimov’s decision to perform the official premiere of Denisov’s \textit{Singing of the Birds} \textit{[Peniye ptits]} (1969) in full bird costume, an idea neither suggested nor approved by Denisov (see chapter 1).
\item[98] Shul’gin, \textit{Tvorchestvo-zhizn’ Viktora Yekimovskogo}, 112.
\item[99] Ibid., 113.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
remained silent. Not surprisingly, Korndorf, the Denisov circle’s leading advocate of instrumental theater, hailed this performance as “wonderful.”

Culturology

Several of the compositional approaches outlined thus far came together in Tarnopolski’s so-called “culturological” cycle, a series of pieces he wrote between 1984-89. These works help summarize the “groupy” practices that flourished in the Denisov circle at the end of the 80s and provide an effective way to close this chapter’s cross-sectional analysis.

The term culturology, which Tarnopolski himself applies to his works of the late 80s, refers to a branch of speculative philosophy developed during the later Soviet period and formally instituted as an academic discipline soon after the Soviet collapse. A mix of various disciplines including philosophy, cultural studies, and anthropology, culturology [kul’turologiya] is, in the words of Marina Bykova, the “philosophical inquiry into the phenomenon of culture in all its varied aspects […] a metadiscipline that investigates the interaction among various cultural phenomena in the spheres of history, social and political life, learning, art, literature, and religion.”

Tarnopolski pursued this “metadiscipline” in the 80s by dedicating each of his culturological works to a different cultural practice or group. The centerpiece of his culturological cycle is a triptych of religiously themed works composed during the latter half of the decade, Psalmus poenitentialis (1986), Jesu, deine tiefen Wunden (1987), and Troïsti muziki (1989). Each of these works represents a different European Christian tradition and is based upon an historical genre Tarnopolski selected as emblematic of that religion’s “artistic tradition.” Moreover, each work is cast in a different modernist style meant to evoke certain qualities inherent to that religion: thus, the “Catholic” Psalmus poenitentialis (1986) is based loosely on responsorial psalmody and composed in a sonoristic style, its ringing harmonies symbolizing the notion of “elevated repentance”; the “Protestant” Jesu, deine tiefen Wunden (1987) is based on the chorale prelude tradition and is a work of instrumental theater, its direct, engaging style representing the Protestant belief in the unmediated relationship between man and God; and the “Orthodox” Troïsti muziki (1989), based on traditional hymnody, combines folkloric elements and minimalism so as to depict musically the virtues of poverty and humility. (These works, along with their religious associations and generic models, are summarized in example 3.38)

100 Ibid.
101 Ibid.
103 Tarnopolski, “Most mezhdu razletayushchimisya Galaktikami,” 11.
104 Tsenova, “The ‘culturology’ of Vladimir Tarnopolsky,” 258.
In developing this culturological triptych throughout the late 80s, Tarnopolski followed closely on the heels of another Moscow modernist, Al’fred Schnittke, who himself completed a large-scale ecumenical work only a few years before.106 Schnittke’s Symphony No. 4 (1984)—which Gennadiy Rozhdestvensky, one of Tarnopolski’s earlier champions, recorded in Moscow in 1986—combines Catholic, Lutheran, Orthodox, and Jewish elements into a nearly forty-five minute long, single-movement work. Schnittke’s symphony is based upon a short, repeating figure derived from Orthodox chant. Above this *cantus firmus* (or “Orthodox line,” as Alexander Ivashkin calls it)108 Schnittke spins melodies meant to symbolize the different religions featured in the work. Each of these melodies is cast in a different mode, or “intonational system,” representing a corresponding religious creed. For example, the Catholic melodies all use a major tetrachord and the Orthodox melodies a minor one. The Jewish melodies, meanwhile, use a scale built from a repeating m2 – m2 – aug2 pattern (i.e., A#-B-C-D#-E-F-G#-A-Bb-Cb-D- Eb), while the Lutheran melodies use a six-note scale consisting of M2 – m2 – aug2 – m2 – M2 – m2 (e.g., B-C#-D-E#-F#-G#; A-B-C-D#-E-F#).109 Schnittke filled his symphony with other symbols, too: for example, he organized the piece into fifteen different “episodes” which, as Valentina Kholopova points out, likely represent of the fifteen traditional Mysteries of the Rosary.110

---


108 Rozhdestvensky almost certainly conducted the work’s 1984 premiere in Moscow, too, though I have been unable to confirm this. Rozhdestvensky’s 1986 recording of Schnittke’s Syphony No. 4 with the USSR Ministry of Culture Symphony Orchestra was released by Melodiya on LP in 1987 (A10 00271 005, 1987) and on CD four years later (SUCD 10-00065, 1990). The LP’s cover notes, by Manashir Yakubov, reproduce Schnittke’s description of the symphony published in the Oct.-Dec. 1984 issue of *Muzïka v SSSR*.


Following the Cello Concerto, Rozhdestvensky conducted the premieres of several more works by Tarnopolski, including *Music in Memory of Dmitri Shostakovich* [*Muzïka pamyati Dmitriya Shostakovicha*] (1983; premiered 1985), a “collage” for narrator and chamber orchestra; *Wahnfried* (1984; premiered 1991) for violin, piano six Wagner tubas, five flutes, and offstage chorus or tape; the “opera-parody” *Three Graces* [*Tri Gratsii*] (1987; premiered 1988), based on texts from Carl Maria von Weber’s unfinished novel *Tonkünstlers Leben*; and *On Reading Musorgsky’s Draft Notebooks* [*Po prochtenii muzikal’nikh naboroskov Musorgskogo*] (1989; premiered 1989) for narrator, chorus, and chamber orchestra.


110 Kholopova, *Kompozitor Al’fred Shnitke* (Moscow: Arkaim, 2003), 168-69. Ronald Weitzman also describes the symphony’s fifteen parts as emblematic of the Mysteries of the Rosary in his liner notes to Valery Polyansky and the Russian State Symphony Orchestra’s recording of the work on the Chandos label. See the liner notes to Chandos CD 9463 (1996), 4-8.

Schnittke alluded to the work’s hidden symbols when he said to Ivashkin, “[I]n the symphony there are many ideas apart from the intonational structure, ideas connected with the form or the style, to say nothing of the
Schnittke’s symphony helped provide Tarnopolski a recipe for his own ecumenical works. Like Schnittke, Tarnopolski drew heavily upon different types of symbols. As he described to Irina Skvortsova, Tarnopolski symbolized the Trinity in Psalmus poenitentialis by casting the work in the key of E♭ (= three flats) and in Jesu, deine tiefen Wunden through the prominent use of a string trio.111 Similarly, Tarnopolski says that he used F♯ as a central pitch in Jesu, deine tiefen Wunden to represent the cross, and that he selected G as the tonal center for Troïsti muziki since the pitch’s solfège syllable is the Russian word for salt [sol’], thus alluding to the Biblical saying about “salt of the earth” [sol’ zeml’] and Russian adages about the “salt of life” [sol’ zhizni].112

Like Schnittke, Tarnopolski also used various “intonational systems” throughout his cycle to represent different religions. For example, he based Troïsti muziki on different “quasi-folkloric modal systems,” all centered on the pitch G.113 Most of these “quasi-folkloric” modes in Troïsti muziki involve g minor scales with the sixth and seventh degrees variously flat or natural (i.e., E♭ or E; F♯ or F) (see the scalar passages after R.4 in example 3.39). Because of these shifting degrees, the scales variously sound like g minor or B♭ major, thus evoking the tonal mutability [peremennost’] characteristic of Russian folk music.

Tarnopolski composed his first culturological work, the thirty-minute long Psalmus poenitentialis (1986), for Oxford University’s Schola Cantorum, which premiered it in 1990. As its title suggests, the piece is a setting of the Latin text of one of the seven penitential Psalms – in this case, Psalm 32 (31), “Blessed are those whose sins are forgiven” [“Beati quorum remissae sunt iniquitates”].114 Tarnopolski scores his work for chorus, organ, violin, and percussion, though the score indicates that the percussion part may be played by the conductor or one of the choristers.

Tarnopolski told Irina Skvortsova that Psalmus poenitentialis was inspired by St. Peter and St. Paul’s Church in Vilnius, especially its acoustics, and that he attempted to create in the work an acoustically-based “new euphony” [“novaya efoniya’ (blagozvuchiye)’].115 He divides Psalmus poenitentialis into four sections (Antifono – Psalmodia – Baptismo - Arioso), which flow continuously and imperceptibly one into the next. The piece develops through a process of gradual accumulation. Psalmus poenitentialis is based on an E♭ pedal, sustained throughout most of the work by the organ. In each new section, more and more sonorities are stacked on top of this pedal. By the work’s end, chorus and organ sustain a shimmering E♭ chord, built up from various harmonies gathered throughout the work. Tarnopolski decorates this final chord with ringing bells and repeating violin harmonics, coloristic devices suggesting some sort of spiritual transformation or transcendence (ex. 3.40).

inner program or the fact that it is based on fifteen episodes – five, five, and five.” See Schnittke, “From Schnittke’s Conservations with Alexander Ivashkin (1985-1994),” 15.
111 Tarnopolski, “Most mezhdu razletayushchimisya Galaktikami,” 11.
113 Tarnopolski, “Most mezhdu razletayushchimisya Galaktikami,” 12.
114 A few years after Psalmus poenitentialis, Tarnopolski included a psalm in another work, the 1989 “theater music” On Reading Musorgsky’s Draft Notebooks [Po prochtenii muzïkal’nïkh nabroskov Musorgskogo] for narrator, chorus, and chamber orchestra. In this work, the chorus sings Psalm 39:4 (“Lord, make me to know my end,” famously set by Brahms in Ein deutsches Requiem). See Tsenova, “The ‘culturology’ of Vladimir Tarnopolsky,” 256.
115 Tarnopolski, “Most mezhdu razletayushchimisya Galaktikami,” 11.
Tat’yana Cherednichenko summarizes *Psalmus poenitentialis* as combining a “neoprimitivistc accumulation of static, sonoristic material (similar to Ravel’s 1928 *Bolero* or Pärt’s 1977 *Tabula Rasa*)” with “polyphonic symbols from the Middle Ages.” The “polyphonic symbols” Cherednichenko describes are likely the numerous points of imitation weaving throughout the work. For Tarnopolski, these points of imitation constitute *Psalmus poenitentialis*’ “responsorial” qualities. Some points of imitation in the work are local, consisting of call-and-response passages between different instruments or voices. For example, at m.10 Bass I sings one of the piece’s two main melodies (labeled “Ant,.” for antiphon); five measures later, the tenor imitates this melody at the minor sixth (ex. 3.41). Other points of imitation unfold over longer durations. For example, at m.1 the violin plays *Psalmus poenitentialis*’ other main melody, here labeled “Ps.” (for psalm – see ex. 3.42). This “psalm” melody returns at various points throughout the piece, usually at especially climactic moments. (Ex. 3.43 shows the return of the “psalm” melody in the violin at letter T, a setting of the text’s penultimate verse and one of the loudest points in the work.)

Having represented “elevated repentance” in *Psalmus poenitentialis*, Tarnopolski shifted gears in his next culturological work, the “Protestant” *Jesu, deine tiefen Wunden* (1987), composed for the Soloists of the Bol’shoy Theater ensemble. Scored for string trio, two percussionists, eleven-member ensemble, and conductor, it is the most popular of Tarnopolski’s three culturological works. Between March 1990 and October 1991 the ASM Ensemble alone performed the piece four times—more than any other work—including live radio broadcasts in Moscow and on tour in Frankfurt.

Much of *Jesu, deine tiefen Wunden*’s popularity is due to its theatrical style. Almost all of the work’s theatrical elements are given to the two solo percussionists—or “actor-percussionists” [*aktyorï-udarniki* or *attori-batterii*], as Tarnopolski calls them—who move about the stage throughout the piece. The musical parts for these “actor-percussionists” are easy, consisting entirely of a sarabande rhythm (\(\text{\texttt{\textbf{\textbackslash q q Q}} \text{\texttt{\textbf{\textbackslash q q Q}}}\)) tapped out on various instruments or surfaces. Because these parts are so musically simple, they need not be performed by trained musicians, and can be performed by stage actors instead. In fact, this seems to be Tarnopolski’s preferred option: in addition to “actor-percussionists” [*aktyorï-udarniki*], the score refers to these performers as *artisti* [“actors”].

In *Jesu, deine tiefen Wunden*, these “actor-percussionists” act as Christ’s tormentors. At the beginning of the piece they stand upstage, next to the other ensemble members. Over the course of the work they gradually move downstage, toward the conductor, playing the sarabande rhythm on different instruments positioned along their path. At the work’s end these “actor-percussionists” arrive at the conductor’s podium, where they pound out the sarabande rhythm with hammers—an obvious reference to the crucifixion—before posing the conductor, arms-out, in the posture of the crucified Christ.

---

117 The ensemble premiered *Jesu, deine tiefen Wunden* at the Bol’shoy Theater in 1987 under the baton of Lazarev.
118 See the “Kontsertï ASM” document in the ASM-2 archives at the Moscow House of Composers.
119 See the performance instructions on page i of the score.
120 The score does not indicate that the conductor should strike this gesture at the end. Instead, it is likely a performance tradition added by Soloists of the Bol’shoy Theater ensemble or other Russian ensembles. Tsenova, who almost certainly attended several performances of *Jesu, deine tiefen Wunden* in Moscow, describes the piece’s end: “The conductor himself eventually becomes an ‘object’ of castigation (he is to be ‘hammered in’), stopping dead in the posture of the crucified Jesus Christ. The theatrical element is explained here by the need to carry...
As always, these theatrical elements could alienate some listeners, too. The same audience member at Moscow Autumn 1990 who described Yekimovský’s Doppelkammervariationen as “too academic” complained that Jesu, deine tiefen Wunden is “illustrative to the point of being sacrilegious” and that “as a religious person, I am offended by [Tarnopolski’s] frivolous treatment of religious themes.”121 (If nothing else, the fact that Tarnopolski’s work was performed at the official Moscow Autumn festival and that Sovetskaya muzïka published complaints from a “believer” whose religious sensibilities had been offended indicates how profoundly Soviet culture had changed in only a few years.)

As Jesu, deine tiefen Wunden’s theatrical plot unfolds, the wind and brass players take turns playing homophonic, four-part settings from the seventeenth-century chorale of the work’s title.122 The first chorale statement comes at R.5 with the four-bar statement in the brass quartet (ex. 3.44). Over the course of the piece, the winds and brass play a total of eight chorale phrases.

After each phrase, and in keeping with Tarnopolski’s idea of the chorale prelude tradition, the string trio plays a musical response. (Tarnopolski describes these responses as providing “pictorial and rhetorical commentary” on the chorale and emblematic of the Baroque genre of chorale prelude.123) The strings’ first response (at R.2b) is relatively simple, consisting of a sustained F# in the viola with half-step neighboring tones (G and F) sustained by the violin and cello. Over the course of the piece, though, these responses grow in complexity, duration, and volume.

By work’s end—and around the time the “actor-percussionists” arrive at the podium to perpetrate the symbolic crucifixion—the string trio performs raucous, fortissimo glissandi, which, as Tarnopolski indicates, should be amplified and with heavy reverberation. As these glissandi begin, the wind and brass players put down their instruments and start to pound heavy, syncopated rhythms on various percussion equipment (ex. 3.45). These thumping beats, coupled with the strings’ amplified glissandi, evoke the sounds of rock and roll, recalling the carnivalesque climaxes heard in many of Schitttke’s polystylistic works, especially the Symphony No. 1 (1974).

In his final culturological work, Troïsti muziki (1989), Tarnopolski draws upon minimalism and folk music, two elements Tsenova describes as “quite alien” to Tarnopolski’s modernist style.124 Tsenova’s assessment reflects the degree to which Denisov circle composers had become associated with elite modernism. However, minimalism is not nearly as “foreign” to Tarnopolski’s style as Tsenova suggests: for example, Tarnopolski gives the fourth movement, “Ins Theater,” of his 1995 chamber work Szenen aus dem wirklichen Leben the expressive marking “a la minimal rock,” while the climax of his opera Wenn die Zeit über die Ufer tritt (1999) combines, in Tarnopolski’s words, “elements of rap and minimalism.”125 Indeed, as

122 The text of “Jesu, deine tiefen Wunden” was likely written by Johann Heermann (1585-1647) around 1644 and set to the melody of Psalm 42 in the Genevan Psalter (1551). Like many other tunes in the psalter, this melody was likely arranged or composed by Loys [Louis] Bourgeois (ca. 1510 – ca. 1559), and probably based upon a popular song of the era. Numerous seventeenth- and eighteenth-century composers set this tune, including Bach, who used it as the basis for several chorales (sometimes under the title “Freu dich sehr, o meine Seele”).
123 Tarnopolski, “Most mezhdu razletayushchimisya Galaktikami,” 11.
125 See Tarnopolski’s commentary to the opera published on his website, www.tarnopolski.ru (accessed July 1, 2010).
indicated in the program notes for *Troïsti muziki*’s world premiere at the 1989 Alternativa festival, Tarnopolski dedicated his work to Arvo Pärt, hailed as one of the “founding fathers [rodonachal’nik] of Soviet minimalist music.”126 (This dedication is not indicated in the published score.)

Tarnopolski’s title refers to the three-member instrumental groups common in Ukrainian folk music. Called *troïsti muziki*, these groups feature variable instrumentation and perform in an improvisatory style. Most include a melodic treble instrument (like violin or *sopilka*, a kind of flute), a harmonizing instrument (like cimbalom or accordion), and percussion (usually *buben*, a type of tambourine).127

In *Troïsti muziki*, Tarnopolski imitates both the improvisatory style and instrumentation of these traditional groups. He omits a percussionist from his ensemble, and instead writes for a treble, bass, and keyboard instrument (violin, cello, and prepared piano). The piano preparations—pencils laid across several of its strings—give the piano a metallic ring and make it sound like a cimbalom or a *bandura*, a lute-shaped zither popular in Ukraine.128

To evoke the spontaneous, improvisatory style of Ukrainian folk bands, Tarnopolski begins *Troïsti muziki* with passages meant to sound like a band warming up. At the work’s beginning, marked “S*enza tempo* (in a free folk-improvisational style),” the violin and cello tune their strings in open fifths, while the prepared piano rehearses various scales (ex. 3.46). In a preface to the score, Tarnopolski instructs that, throughout this opening section, the string players should play *sul ponticello* and with decreased bow pressure, an effect calculated to produce maximum harmonics. He repeats this effect at several points throughout the piece.

This quasi-improvisatory opening is perhaps part of the work’s minimalist design. In interview with Skvortsova Tarnopolski described *Troïsti muziki*’s seemingly spontaneous opening as an example of “intuitive music,” a term Russian critics often use to refer to Cage and those styles perceived as directly inspired by him, including minimalism (see chapter 1).129 The work’s sparse opening perhaps reflects, too, Tarnopolski’s general idea of minimalism as a “poverty of musical style.”130

More conventional minimalist elements might be found in *Troïsti muziki*’s repetitive middle section. At R.8 the instrumentalists begin to play a repeating rhythmic figure, marked “quasi tremolo.” This figure consists of forty-eight sixteenth notes (= twelve beats), barred together into irregular groups of twos and threes (2+3+2, 3+2+2, 3+2, 2+3, 3+2+3, 2+2+2, 3+2, 2+3). These irregular groupings recall the additive rhythms of Philip Glass, an association strengthened as this twelve-beat figure repeats time and again (ex. 3.47). After several minutes, Tarnopolski layers different repeating figures on top of this twelve-beat pattern; by R.9, all three

---

126 See the program notes (author unnamed) to the concert of October 11, 1989 at that year’s Alternativa festival. The concert, which was held Shuvalov Music House [Muzïkal’naya gostinaya doma Shuvalovoy], included the world premiere of *Troïsti muziki*, performed by Aleksandr Avramenko (violin), Sergey Sudzilovsky (cello), and Andrey Diyev (piano), alongside Sergey Pavlenko’s Quartet for Four Clarinets (1980), Kefalidis’ Sonata for Cello and Piano (1989), and Vasks’ *Episodi e Canto perpetuo* (1985).


128 As Tarnopolski described to Skvortsova, the piano in *Troïsti muziki* is “пепарированный, то ли ‘под цимбальы,’ то ли ‘под бандуру’…” See “Most mezhdu razletayuschchimsya Galaktikami,” 11.

129 Tarnopolski, “Most mezhdu razletayuschchimsya Galaktikami,” 11.

130 Ibid., 11-12.
instruments simultaneously play repetitive figures, resulting in a sonoristic *polosa* texture common in Denisov circle works from the period (ex. 3.48).

The minimalist “poverty of style” extending throughout *Troïsti muziki*’s opening and middle sections lays the groundwork for the final and most important part, a vocal setting for the instrumentalists of Hryhorii [Grigoriy] Skovoroda’s “Hymn to the Nativity of Christ; on His poverty” [*Pesn’ rozhdestvu Khristovu, o nishchete yego*] (ca. 1787).[131] As we saw in the previous section, several Denisov circle composers included vocal roles for instrumentalists in chamber works of the 80s. The singing parts in *Troïsti muziki* stand out in degree and kind. While other composers instruct instrumentalists to sing as an occasional effect, in *Troïsti muziki* the vocal setting of Skovoroda’s text spans nearly one-third of the work’s duration (around 8 minutes out of 22). Also, while most works including vocal effects require instrumentalists to sing in lieu of playing, in *Troïsti muziki* the musicians sing while playing their instruments. (In this way, *Troïsti muziki* recalls *Gra-ka-kha-ta* with its solo part for tenor/violinist by Aleksandr Raskatov, Tarnopolski’s fellow Sidel’nikov pupil.) For most of the setting of Skovoroda’s text the musicians accompany themselves, doubling their vocal parts on their instruments. This theatrical effect of singing-while-playing recalls the folk traditions alluded to in the work’s title. It has an important expressive function, too: because the musicians sing and play simultaneously, they are unable to focus on either activity. As a result, both the singing and playing in this part of *Troïsti muziki* sound unpolished and amateurish, an effect very much in keeping with the work’s aura of piety and humility.

Throughout this setting, Tarnopolski is careful to convey musically the structure of Skovoroda’s text. Skovoroda’s “Hymn to the Nativity of Christ” is divided into two main parts. The first part consists of an imaginary dialogue, marked “В.” ([вопрос] [question]) and “От.” ([ответ] [answer]), between a narrator and a group of shepherds who witnessed the birth of Christ; the second part, beginning with the words “The congregation sings together” [*Liki poyut sovokupno*], comprises a seven-stanza poem in praise of poverty and humility.

As demonstrated in ex. 3.49, Tarnopolski set nearly half of Skovoroda’s original text. Tarnopolski arranges the dialogue portion of the text as a musical dialogue between the string players and the pianist, with the violinist and cellist singing and playing all of the narrator’s questions and the pianist singing and playing the shepherds’ answer. Each party repeats the same melody throughout this dialogue, the string players asking their questions to a lilting,

--

[131] Hryhorii [Grigoriy] Skovoroda (1722-94) was a poet, composer, and mystic recognized today as one of Ukraine’s most important literary figures. After early study in Kiev, Skovoroda moved to St. Petersburg in 1742, where he sang in the imperial chapel choir. After several years of travel abroad, Skovoroda returned to the Ukraine, where he taught poetics at a local seminary and, later, served as a tutor for the children of wealthy landowners. Around 1770 Skovoroda quit teaching; he spent most of his last few decades traveling throughout the Ukraine on foot while writing religious treatises advocating, among other values, communion with God through a revocation of material goods.

The “Hymn to the Nativity of Christ; on His poverty,” upon which *Troïsti muziki* is based, hails from this final, itinerant period of Skovoroda’s life. The text was included in Skovoroda’s collection *The Indigent Lark* [*Убогій Жайворонок*], likely compiled around 1787.

For an overview of Skovoroda’s life and works, see Dmytro Čyžev’s’kyj, “An Introduction to the Life and Thought of H.S. Skovoroda,” in Richard H. Marshall, Jr. and Thomas E. Bird, eds., *Hryhorij Savyč Skovoroda: An Anthology of Critical Articles* (Alberta: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1994), 1-60. The full text of *Убогій Жайворонок*, including this hymn, is available through the *Online Concordance to the Complete Works by Skovoroda*, created by Natalia Pylypiuk, Oleh S. Ilnytzkyj and Serhiy Kozakov and maintained by the University of Alberta’s Ukrainian Culture, Language, and Literature Program (http://www.arts.ualberta.ca/~ukr/skovoroda/, accessed May 29, 2010).
dancelike tune in triple meter and the pianist singing his replies in a more florid, incantatory style (ex. 3.50). (n.b. – Throughout this section the violinist plays viola, hence the score’s reference, at R.14, to viola [al’ti] and violist [al’tist].)

By contrast, Tarnopolski sets the final “congregational” portion of Skovoroda’s text in an unaccompanied, three-voice homophonic texture. This part of the setting features closely-spaced triadic harmonies that slip between B♭ Major and g minor and shifting, irregular meters designed to fit the scansion of Skovoroda’s poem (ex. 3.51).

In combining a centuries-old hymn with minimalist elements, Troïsti muziki recalls a work composed only one year before it, the String Quartet No. 1, “Already it is Dusk” [Już się zmierzcha] (1988) by Polish composer Henryk Mikolaj Górecki (1933-2010). Commissioned by Kronos Quartet, Górecki’s work is based on the sixteenth-century song “A prayer at the time children are going to bed (Already it is dusk)” [Modlitwa, gdy dzieci spać idą (Już się zmierza)] (ca. 1550) by Waclaw z Szamotuł (1524-60). Like Troïsti muziki, most of the middle section of Górecki’s quartet is dissonant and repetitive. Although the final version of the quartet ends with a simple canon on Szamotuł’s melody, Górecki’s original version apparently closed with a triadic, hymn-like passage similar to the homophonic ending of Troïsti muziki.132

While it is possible that Tarnopolski knew Górecki’s work,133 a more likely model for Troïsti muziki can be found in a Skovoroda-inspired work that Gubaidulina wrote nearly a decade earlier. According to Michael Kurtz, Gubaidulina was intensely interested in Skovoroda’s philosophy and spent the summer of 1980 in the Ukraine with her sister, Vera, studying his works.134 The next year, Gubaidulina used Skovoroda’s ideas as the basis for her composition Rejoice! [Raduysya!] (1981, rev. 1988), a five-movement work for violin and cello composed for husband-and-wife duo Oleg Kagan and Natalia Gutman, who premiered the piece in Finland in 1988.

Gubaidulina gives each movement of her work a descriptive title borrowed from Skovoroda’s writings (e.g., movement 1, “Your joy no man taketh from you”). As Kurtz points out, Gubaidulina employs string harmonics throughout Rejoice!, often toward symbolic ends:

To express this realm of joy [described by Skovoroda], Gubaidulina used a musical-instrumental symbol that, when she first discovered it, had filled her with enthusiasm. By slightly altering the pressure of one’s finger on the string, one can transform the expressive-sensual tone of the instrument into the ethereal sound

---


133 Kronos Quartet premiered Górecki’s work in Minneapolis in January 1989. It is possible that Tarnopolski could have learned about Górecki’s piece in 1988 or ‘89 through various channels, including the connections between some of his Soviet colleagues (especially Schnittke) and Kronos Quartet. In 1988 the quartet released a recording of Schnittke’s String Quartet No. 3 (1983) on the disc Winter Was Hard (Elektra Nonesuch 9-79181). This disc also included a recording of Fratres (1977; rev. 1992 and 93) by Arvo Pärt, the dedicatee of Troïsti muziki. Several Moscow composers were interested in Kronos Quartet during the late 1980s and early 90s. As stated in chapter 1, the group had even been scheduled to perform at the 1991 Alternativa festival (the same festival where Troïsti muziki was premiered in 1989), though this engagement was canceled.

In recent years, Tarnopolski has curated presentations of Górecki’s music in Moscow in his capacity as artistic director of the Studio for New Music ensemble and Moscow Forum festival.

134 Kurtz, Sofia Gubaidulina, 153.
of natural harmonics, suggesting a transition from this world to the world above; the performance then becomes a metaphor for Skovoroda’s aphorisms.\textsuperscript{135}

It is doubtful that harmonics were the technical revelation for Gubaidulina that Kurtz describes. Nevertheless, it is significant that Gubaidulina prominently used harmonics as a symbolic device in a work inspired by Skovoroda, since Tarnopolski employed a similar technique throughout his own Skovoroda-inspired piece less than a decade later.

***

_Troïsti muziki_ marks the end not just of Tarnopolski’s culturological cycle, but also of a significant period in his artistic career. Upon completing _Troïsti muziki_ Tarnopolski consciously sought to change stylistic directions. As he explained in a 1993 interview:

> Having completed the Trio [ _Troïsti muziki_, 1989] I started to feel that the [culturological] approach was too restrictive. As Pasternak would say, I’m glad that these compositions “happened,” but now I’m interested in different ideas. The “culturological” method (as I had defined it for myself) limited various parameters of composition too strictly, it had set boundaries (including boundaries of genre) that predetermined the work's range of stylistic reference [ _intonatsionnaya sfera_].\textsuperscript{136}

As part of his creative shift, Tarnopolski attempted to cultivate a more abstract style “free from any foreign ‘cultural’ associations.”\textsuperscript{137} If throughout the 80s he looked to Denisov, Gubaidulina, and Schnittke for inspiration, in his new “abstract” style Tarnopolski seems to have taken his cues from more contemporary European influences, especially Lachenmann.

Tarnopolski’s shift overlaps not only with massive political change in the USSR, but also with a significant transformation in the institutional, economic, and social networks supporting composers there. If nearly every one of Tarnopolski’s works up to _Troïsti muziki_ was composed for a Soviet ensemble, his “abstract” pieces of the late 80s and early 90s were written exclusively for foreign groups and premiered abroad. Many of these premieres took place at high-profile contemporary music festivals or events (e.g., the 1991 Frankfurt Festival, at which Germany’s Ensemble Modern premiered Tarnopolski’s 1991 chamber orchestra work _Cassandra_ [ _Kassandra_]).

These professional opportunities abroad in the early 90s gave Tarnopolski an incentive to abandon styles or ideas that seemed too old-fashioned or Soviet and cultivate instead a more up-to-date, cosmopolitan musical language. Among other outcomes, Tarnopolski’s adoption of more fashionable, contemporary styles provided him a means to demonstrate professional competency vis-à-vis the European colleagues that became his new peer group—and, at times, patrons—following the Soviet collapse.

Some of these social forces and the impact they had upon new music composition in Russia during the early 90s are detailed in chapter 5.

\textsuperscript{135} Ibid., 154.
\textsuperscript{136} Tarnopolski, “Most mezhdu razletayushchimiy Galaktikami,” 12.
\textsuperscript{137} Ibid., 13.
Ex. 3.1 – Selected book-length works about Denisov


Ex. 3.2 – Yekimovsky, *Doppelkammervariationen*, Part I, mm. 1-6

Doppelkammervariationen (1989)
By Viktor Yekimovsky
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 3.4 – Yekimovsky, Doppelkammervariationen, Part II, mm. 1-9

Doppelkammervariationen (1989)
By Viktor Yekimovsky
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 3.4 cont’d.
Ex. 3.5 – Yekimovsky, *Doppelkammervariationen*, Part II, mm. 40-51

Doppelkammervariationen (1989)
By Viktor Yekimovsky
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 3.5 cont’d.
Ex. 3.6 – Schnittke, *Pianissimo…*, mm. 1-5

Pianissimo… (1967/68)
By Alfred Schnittke
Copyright © Universal Edition
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 3.7 – Karayev, *Klänge einer traurigen Nacht*, I. Tranquillamente

A. mm. 1-9
Ex. 3.7A cont’d.

Klänge einer traurigen Nacht (1989)
By Faradzh Karayev
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 3.7 cont’d.

B. Karayev, *Klänge einer traurigen Nacht*, I. Tranquillamente, mm. 43-49
Ex. 3.7B cont’d.

Klänge einer traurigen Nacht (1989)
By Faradzh Karayev
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 3.10 – Original set and five transpositions for Yekimovsky, Deus ex machina

ORIGINAL:

TRANSPOSITIONS:

Source: Dmitriy Shul’gin, Tvorchestvo-zhizn’ Viktora Yekimovskogo, 114.
Deus ex machina (1990)
By Viktor Yekimovsky
Copyright © MUSIKVERLAG HANS SIKORSKI GmbH & Co. KG, Hamburg
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 3.13 – Karayev, *Postludio II*, mm.39-43 (second section)
Ex. 3.13 cont’d.

Postludio II (1990)
By Faradžh Karayev
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 3.14 – Karayev, *Postludio III*, m. 31 (second section)
Postludio III (1991)
By Faradzh Karayev
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Devil’s Trills: Variations on a theme by Tartini (1990)
By Yuriy Kasparov
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Devil’s Trills: Variations on a theme by Tartini (1990)
By Yuriy Kasparov
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 3.16 cont’d.

Requiem (1980)
By Edison Denissov
Copyright © MUSIKVERLAG HANS SIKORSKI GMBH & CO. KG
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 3.17 – Denisov, Requiem, Mvmt. V, “La Croix,” mm. 29-32

Requiem (1980)
By Edison Denisov
Copyright © MUSIKVERLAG HANS SIKORSKI GMBH & CO. KG
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.

Klänge einer traurigen Nacht (1989)
By Faradzh Karayev
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Klänge einer traurigen Nacht (1989)
By Faradzh Karayev
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 3.20 – Tarnopolski, Cello Concerto mm. 595-605 (R.51A-R.51B)

Cello Concerto (1980)
By Vladimir Tarnopolski
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Cello Concerto (1980)
By Vladimir Tarnopolski
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 3.21 – Sidel’nikov, *Russian Fairytales*, No. 4, “Topi, da tumanî,” R.4-end (mm. 18-30)

Russian Fairytales (1968)
By Nikolay Sidel’nikov
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All RightsReserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 3.21 cont’d.

Russian Fairytales (1968)
By Nikolay Sidel’nikov
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 3.22 – Piano glissandi in Raskatov, Xenia, mm. 18-26
Ex. 3.23 – Gubaidulina, *In croce*, mm. 90-115 (R.48 – end)

In Croce
By Sofia Gubaidulina
Copyright © 1979 by MUSIKVERLAG HANS SIKORSKI GmbH & Co. KG, Hamburg
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
DOTS LINES AND ZIGZAGS (1976)
By Sofia Gubaidulina
Copyright © by MUSIKVERLAG HANS SIKORSKI GmbH & Co. KG, Hamburg
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Devil’s Trills: Variations on a theme by Tartini (1990)
By Yuriy Kasparov
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Devil’s Trills: Variations on a theme by Tartini (1990)
By Yuriy Kasparov
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
romantische musik
per oboe, violino, viola, violoncello ed arpa(1968)
edison denisow

Lento rubato

---

ROMANTISCHE MUSIK
By Edison Denissov
Copyright © Universal Edition
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 3.27 – Kasparov, Sonata-Infernale, p. 1

Dedicated to Maestro Valeri Popov

Sonata-Infernale

for bassoon solo

Yuri Kasparov

Sonata-Infernale (1989)

By Yuriy Kasparov

Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.

International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.

Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
СОЛО ДЛЯ ГОБОЯ
(1971)

Транквилио poco rubato

Оклюсо solo

Легеро

Rit.

A tempo

а tempo

* — accerelando; ** — ritenuto.
* * Нотация четвертного: ⫸ — повышение на 1/4 тона, ⫹ — на 3/4 тона, ⫸ — понижение на 1/4 тона, ⫹ — на 3/4 тона.
* *** В квадратных скобках адалигaturas X. Ходжера.
* **** Двойные флажолеты. До второй октавы + 2-ой октанный клапан.

Solo for Oboe (1971)
By Edison Denissov
Copyright © MUSIKVERLAG HANS SIKORSKI GMBH & CO. KG
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 3.30 – Vustin, *Fairytale*, p.3

Fairytale (1979)
By Aleksandr Vustin
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured.  All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Concerto for Bassoon and Low Strings (1975)
By Sofia Gubaidulina
Copyright © by MUSIKVERLAG HANS SIKORSKI GmbH & Co. KG, Hamburg
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Amoroso (1986)
By Nikolay Korndorf
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 3.33 – Kasparov, *Landscape fading into infinity*, mm. 30-35

Landscape fading into infinity (1991)
By Yuriy Kasparov
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
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Ex. 3.34 – Kasparov, *Sonata-Infernale*, p.2

Sonata-Infernale (1989)
By Yuriy Kasparov
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
...a crumb of music for George Crumb (1986 version)

By Faradzh Karayev
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
...a crumb of music for George Crumb (1986 version)
By Faradzh Karayev
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 3.36 – Raskatov, *Gra-ka-kha-ta*, Mvmt. I, mm. 40-52

Gra-ka-kha-ta (1988)
By Aleksandr Raskatov
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 3.36 cont'd.

Gra-ka-kha-ta (1988)
By Aleksandr Raskatov
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 3.37 – Yekimovsky, The Assumption

The Assumption (1989)
By Viktor Yekimovsky
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 3.38 – Tarnopolski’s “culturological” trilogy, 1986-89

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Religious association</th>
<th>Historical genre</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Symbols</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Psalmus poenitentialis</em> (1986)</td>
<td>Catholicism</td>
<td>Responsorial psalm</td>
<td>Sonorika</td>
<td>Tonal center of E♭ (= Trinity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Jesu, deine tiefen Wunden</em> (1987)</td>
<td>Protestantism</td>
<td>Chorale prelude</td>
<td>Instrumental theater</td>
<td>String trio (= Trinity) Tonal center of F# (= cross)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Troïsti muziki</em> (1989)</td>
<td>Orthodoxy</td>
<td>Hymn</td>
<td>Minimalism; folkloric &amp; theatrical elements</td>
<td>Tonal center of g (=сол/соль)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ex. 3.39 – Tarnopolski, *Troïsti muziki*, mm. 25-43

Troïsti muziki (1989)
By Vladimir Tarnopolski
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 3.39 cont’d.
Psalmus poenitentialis (1986)
By Vladimir Tarnopolski
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Psalmus poenitentialis (1986)
By Vladimir Tarnopolski
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Psalmus poenitentialis (1986)
By Vladimir Tarnopolski
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Psalmus poenitentialis (1986)
By Vladimir Tarnopolski
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Psalmus poenitentialis (1986)
By Vladimir Tarnopolski
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Psalmus poenitentialis (1986)
By Vladimir Tarnopolski
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 3.44 – Tarnopolski, *Jesu, deine tiefen Wunden*, mm. 65-70 (first six bars of R.5)

Chorale Prelude Jesu, deine tiefen Wunden (1987)
By Vladimir Tarnopolski
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Chorale Prelude Jesu, deine tiefen Wunden (1987)
By Vladimir Tarnopolski
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 3.45 cont’d.

Chorale Prelude Jesu, deine tiefen Wunden (1987)
By Vladimir Tarnopolski
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
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Ex. 3.46 – Tarnopolski, *Troïsti muziki*, m.1

Troïsti muziki (1989)
By Vladimir Tarnopolski
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 3.47 – Tarnopolski, TROIŠTI MUZIKI, mm. 98-105 (first six systems of R.8)

Troïsti muziki (1989)
By Vladimir Tarnopolski
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 3.47 cont’d.

Troïsti muziki (1989)
By Vladimir Tarnopolski
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 3.48 – Tarnopolski, Troïsti muziki, R.9

Troïsti muziki (1989)
By Vladimir Tarnopolski
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 3.49 – Text and translation for Tarnopolski, *Troïsti muziki*

Hryhorii Skovoroda, “ПѢснь рождеству Христову, о нищетѣ его” [Hymn to the Nativity of Christ; on His Poverty], from *Убогій Жайворонок* [*The Indigent Lark*] (ca. 1787).

*Dark boxes indicate the text Tarnopolski sets*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hryhorii Skovoroda,</th>
<th>Hryhorii Skovoroda,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ПѢснь Рождеству Христову, о нищетѣ его</strong></td>
<td><strong>HYMN TO THE NATIVITY OF CHRIST; ON HIS POVERTY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Из онаго Соломонова зерна:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>БЛѢГѢ ЯРОСТЬ ПАЧѢ СМѢХА, ЯКО В ЗЛОѢБѢ ЛИЦА УБЛѢЖИТѢСЯ СЕРѢДѢЦѢ [Екклесіасти].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Из Христова: ГОРЕ ВѢМ, СМѢЮЩИМѢСЯ НѢ ЪѢ, то есть снаружи.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Из Іереміина: В ТѢѢ НѢ ВѢСПѢЛѢЧѢТѢСЯ ДУѢѢА ВѢѢѢѢА.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>В[ОПРОС].</th>
<th>[Question] (<em>violinist</em> &amp; <em>cellist</em>)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Пастыри милиц! Гдѣ вы днесь были? Гдѣ вы бывали? Что вы видали?</td>
<td>Dear shepherds, where have you been today? Where were you? What did you see?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ОТ[ВѢТ].</th>
<th>[Answer] (<em>pianist</em>)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Грядем днесь из Виѳлеема. Из Града уничтоженна. Но днесь блаженна.</td>
<td>We come from Bethlehem. From the ravaged city. But today is blessed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>В[ОПРОС].</th>
<th>[Question] (<em>violinist &amp; cellist</em>)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Кое ж оттуду несетѣ Чудо? И нам прорците. БлаговѢстите.</td>
<td>Did a miracle occur there? Tell us about it. Sound the bells.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ex. 3.49 cont’d.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OT[ВЪТ].</th>
<th>Видъли мы вновь рожденно, Отроча Свято, Блаженно. Владыку всѣм нам.</th>
<th>[Answer] (pianist)</th>
<th>We saw He who is born, the Holy Child, the Blessed One. The King of us all.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>В[ОПРОС].</td>
<td>Кія Палаты имѣет Тое, Ах! Всеблаженно Чадо Царское?</td>
<td>[Question] (violinst &amp; cellist)</td>
<td>In what kind of dwellings resides this most-blessed Child King?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT[ВЪТ].</td>
<td>Вертеп выбит под Скалою. И то Простою Рукою. Се Чертог Его!</td>
<td>[Answer] (pianist)</td>
<td>All iniquity will be crushed under his firmament, by his righteous hand! Behold his kingdom!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

В[ОПРОС].
Мягка Постель ли? В красном ли Ложи, Сей почивает Чудный Сын Божій?

OT[ВЪТ].
В Яслях Мати кладет Траву. Ту ж Перину и под Главу. Се Царска Кравать!

В[ОПРОС].
Кія там Слути от Домочадцов, Имѣет тое Милое Чадцо?

OT[ВЪТ].
Овцы и Мулы с Ослами. Волы и кони с Козлами. Се Домочадцы!

В[ОПРОС].
Воинов кій Род? Коего Чина? Чем окружают Царского Сyna?

OT[ВЪТ].
Грабли, Вила, Серпы, Косы. Хлѣборобы, Съюкосцы. Се Дориносцы!

В[ОПРОС].
Кую же той Дом вкушает Пищу? Развѣ имѣет Трапезу нишу?
Ex. 3.49 cont’d.

| **ОТ[ВЪТ]** | Пища в Зелѣ, в Млекѣ, в Зернѣ. Се Стол Раннїй и Вечернїй! В том чудном Домѣ. |
| **В[ОПРОС]** | Музыка там ли Модна и Лестна, Увеселяет Царя Небесна? |
| **[Question]** (violinist & cellist) | Is the music there flattering, fashionable; does it please the Heavenly King? |
| **ОТ[ВЪТ]** | Пастьрскїй Сонм на Свирѣлках, Хвалит Его на Сопѣлках, Препростым Хором. |
| **[Answer]** (pianist) | The shepherds praise Him in simple choirs, with reeds and fifes. |
| **В[ОПРОС]** | Кия же Ризы? Мню, Златотканны, У сего Сына Марїи Панны. |
| **ОТ[ВЪТ]** | Баволна, и Лен, и Волна. Сим Нищета предовольна, В Наготѣ своей. |

**[ЛИКИ ПОЮТ СОВОКУПНО:]**

| (violinist, cellist, pianist; unaccompanied) | О нището! Блаженна, Святая! Дверь нам отверзи, твоего Рая.** Кий Бѣс Сердце украл наше? Кій нас Мрак ослѣпил? Даже чуждатись Тебѣ? О Нището! О даре Небесный! Любить тебе всяя Муж Свят и Честный. Кто с тобою раздружился, Тот в ночи токмо родился. Нѣсть Сугубый Муж. Мир сей являет Вид Благолѣпный. Но в нем таится Червь неусыпный. Се Пещера Убога! Таит Блаженнаго Бога В Блаженном Сердѣ. |

O poverty! Blessed, holy! Open for us the doors to Your kingdom. What devil has stolen our heart? What darkness has blinded us? And led us even to shun You? O poverty! O heavenly gift! Every holy, honest person loves you. Anyone who has renounced you was born only yesterday; he is not a wise man. The world is but a reflection of Your gracious countenance. But it contains an unremitting hell. A wretched cave! Keep Holy God close to your heart!
Ex. 3.49 cont’d.

| Ах! Блага Ярость есть паче Смъха. Яко в Лицѣ злом тайна утѣха. Се бо Нищета святая! Извѣ яра, внутр Златая, Во Мирной Душѣ. Горе ти, Мире! Смѣх вѣ я влашеш. Внутр же Душею тайно рыдаеш. Украсился ты Углами. Но облицись ты Слезами, Внутрѣ День и Нощь. Зависть, Печаль, Страх, неыта Жажда, Ревность, Мятеж, Скорбь, Тяжба и Вражда, День и Нощь ты Опалают. Как Сіонскій Град плѣняют, Душевный твой Дом. Возвеселися! а не смутимся! Днесь непрестанно, всѣ Христіане. Там, Гдѣ Бог наш нам родися, И Пеленами повисъ. Хвала День и Нощь. |

**Notes:**

* - The violinist plays viola throughout this section
** - Here Tarnopolski reverses the word order: “отверзи нам двер твоего рая”

**Source:** Hryhorii Skovoroda, “Убогій Жайворонок” (1787), full text available online at Natalia Pylypiuk and Oleh Ilnytzkyj, eds., *Online Concordance to the Complete Works of Hryhorii Skovoroda* (http://www.arts.ualberta.ca/~ukr/skovoroda/, accessed June 16, 2010)
Ex. 3.50 – Tarnopolski, *Troïsti muziki*, mm. 201-37 (i.e., first thirty-seven bars of R.14)
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Chapter 4  The Apex: Aleksandr Vustin's Zaitsev's Letter

In November 1990, as the Soviet Union continued to unravel, Denisov’s recently-established Association for Contemporary Music [Assotsiatsiya sovremennoy muziki, better known as ASM or ASM-2] hosted a four-concert series at that year’s Moscow Autumn, an annual festival of contemporary music established in 1978 by the Moscow division of the Composers’ Union [Soyuz kompozitorov Moskvi]. Moscow Autumn’s reputation for conservative programming changed drastically during perestroika as the festival played host to the premieres of several important works by Denisov and his followers as well as newly-restored works by Soviet modernist composers of the 1910s-20s. The liberalization of Moscow Autumn was closely tied to the ascendency of the Composers’ Union of Moscow as the most important successor to the Composers’ Unions during the post-Soviet period.

The ASM-2’s series at Moscow Autumn 1990 featured several works now celebrated as “classics of the time” [klassiki togo vremeni], including Nikolay Korndorf’s Amoroso (1986), Viktor Yekimovskiy’s Doppelkammervariationen (1989), and Vladimir Tarnopolski’s “culturological” Troïsti muziki (1989) (see chapter 3).1 One work in this series, though, was especially noteworthy. On November 22, during the ASM-2’s final concert at the festival, the Amadeus Chamber Orchestra presented the world premiere of Aleksandr Vustin’s Zaitsev’s Letter [Pis’mo Zaytseva] (1990) in the Moscow Conservatory’s Small Hall.2 Vustin’s work is a setting for string orchestra, bass drum, amplified narrator, and tape of a 1987 letter to the editor of the weekly magazine Ogonyok by a young man named Sergey Zaitsev detailing the horrors he experienced in a Soviet juvenile labor camp.3 Vustin represents these horrors through a variety of modernist idioms, including sonorist techniques, Sprechstimme, and his own idiosyncratic approach to serialism.

With its bold style and subject matter directly critical of the Soviet regime, Zaitsev’s Letter powerfully symbolized for its first listeners the spirit of glasnost’. In a review of the 1990 Moscow Autumn festival published in April 1991 in the journal Musical Life [Muzikal’naya zhizn’], musicologist Maya Pritsker describes Vustin’s work as among the festival’s highlights, praising Vustin for the way he “draws from real life” and boldly “reflects our contemporary problems in art.”4 Pritsker’s enthusiasm for Vustin’s new work is one of the few positive points in her otherwise bleak article, entitled “Will we survive?” [Vïzhivyom?], which describes many

---

1 The phrase is Mariya Khodina’s. Khodina, interview with the author, January 10, 2008. Concert information comes from the program booklet “XII festival’ sovetskoy muziki ‘Moskovskaya osen.’ 14-22 noyabrya 1990 goda,” published by the Soyuz kompozitorov Moskvï. Sincerest thanks to Svetlana Sigida for giving me a copy of this booklet. A list of concerts held in the ASM-2’s archive at the House of Composers indicates that Tarnopolski’s Troïsti muziki was not performed at the festival, but rather another of his “culturological” works, the chorale prelude Jesu, deine tiefen Wunden (1987). See the document “Kontserti ASM.” Thanks to Viktoriya Korshunova and Viktor Yekimovskiy for providing me access to this document.

2 Valentin Zverev conducted the premiere, which featured Yuriy Khomenko as narrator. The concert also included Aleksandr Raskatov’s Concerto for Oboe and Fifteen Strings (1987), Georgiy Dmitriyev’s Scene [Stsena] (1980), Mikhail Meyerovich’s Double Concerto for Flute, Harp, and Chamber Orchestra (1990), and Denisov’s Concerto for Bassoon, Cello, and Chamber Orchestra (1982).

3 Throughout this chapter, I transliterate the surname Зайцев as Zaitsev, and not Zaytsev, to help facilitate more accurate pronunciation in English.

of the problems facing musicians amid the Soviet collapse, from disintegrating economic support to the mass emigration of many of Russia’s leading musicians.

Pritsker’s admiration for Vustin’s work was widely shared. Although this November 1990 premiere remains Zaitsev’s Letter’s only performance, the work has achieved a prominence within the post-Soviet musicological literature beyond what its limited performance history might suggest. For example, the 2005 History of Russian Music of the Second Half of the Twentieth Century [Istoriya otechestvennoy muzïki vtoroy polovinï XX veka], published under the auspices of the Russian Ministry of Culture, dedicates one of the longer discussions of a single work in its post-Soviet section to Zaitsev’s Letter, drawing explicit parallels between Vustin’s work and Schoenberg’s Survivor from Warsaw.5 Zaitsev’s Letter enjoys a particularly strong reputation, too, among contemporary Russian musicians and musicologists, several of whom recalled this work in interview as among the most poignant musical impressions of glasnost’, particularly due to the work’s ethical implications.6

Zaitsev’s Letter’s special poignancy in 1990, and its enduring legacy in Russian music today, stem from many factors. Perhaps more than any other musical work, Zaitsev’s Letter symbolizes the most pressing philosophical and artistic concerns of the perestroika years, a period now widely idealized as the most active and interesting years for music due to a variety of social, economic, and political factors. Furthermore, Zaitsev’s Letter and its shifting critical reception from 1990 to the present provide a useful perspective for gauging the ways in which these concerns have changed over the course of the post-Soviet years.

On the most basic level, Zaitsev’s Letter provides a digest of several of the modernist techniques of greatest interest in the Denisov circle during the 1980s, particularly serialism and sonorism. Like all Soviet musicians of his generation, Vustin did not formally learn about these techniques at the conservatory, but rather pieced together information about them by dint of self-study and informal networks of friends and musicians. The ways in which Vustin learned about these techniques and applied them in works such as Zaitsev’s Letter helps elucidate the distinctive ways in which Soviet musicians understood them and their significance.

More to the point, Vustin’s application of these techniques points to the perseverance of certain Russian and Soviet intellectual traditions among late-Soviet modernist composers, particularly ideas regarding the relationship between artist and society. Throughout Zaitsev’s Letter, Vustin applies modernist techniques as analogues to the horrors described in the text. The idea that modernist techniques had such an expressive potential far predates Vustin’s perestroika-era work: in the early 1960s Denisov was already arguing that serialism might bear great expressive potential, pointing to Schoenberg’s A Survivor from Warsaw as evidence, while in the later 1950s Schnittke had applied sonorist techniques in his graduation work, Nagasaki (1957-58) to convey the horror of the atomic bombing.7 As Peter Schmelz points out, Denisov’s

---

5 See Tamara Levaya, ed., Istoriya otechestvennoy muzïki vtoroy polovinï XX veka (St. Petersburg: Kompozitor, 2005), 442. Vustin quotes Schoenberg’s A Survivor from Warsaw, along with Beethoven’s Symphony No. 5, Mahler’s Symphony No. 5, Musorgsky’s Boris Godunov, and his own music to the film Anna Karamazov, in his 1991 sextet Heroicheskaya kolïbel’naya (see chapter 5).
6 Vladimir Tarnopolski, for example, named Vustin’s work, which he termed “our Survivor from Warsaw,” as especially emblematic of the spirit of glasnost’. Vladimir Tarnopolski, interview with the author, February 15, 2008.
argument was, perhaps, largely opportunistic, as he had hoped in the 1960s to gain institutional support (or, at least, tolerance) for serial music, and Schoenberg’s work, dedicated to the victims of Fascism, provided a useful example of serialism applied toward politically correct expressive ends. Yet this commitment to expression was not simply pragmatic. Differ though they did with Soviet officialdom as to means, many late Soviet modernists shared the deeply ingrained Soviet ideals that art must have socially useful expressive content and that the composer’s primary task is to convey this content to the listener. Richard Taruskin has noted how Schnittke, “beneath the surface avant-gardism,” has “always conformed, for better and for worse, to the customary outlook and manner of a Soviet composer,” producing massive, all-encompassing symphonies which “aspire…to the condition of philosophy” yet nevertheless brim with easily-read symbols designed to “guarantee comprehension,” a style Taruskin memorably calls “socialist realism minus socialism.” Denisov himself deeply believed in the artist’s responsibility to communicate with their audience, writing “A true artist must bring Light [sic] to people. People are in great need of this, though they do not know it.” These values were deeply shared by composers of the post-Denisov “middle generation,” too. Composer Vladislav Shut’ (b. 1941), for example, described to Valentina Kholopova his belief in Russian music’s philosophical bases and Russian composers’ “responsibility” to convey their works’ philosophical and aesthetic messages as clearly as possible to the audience.

For some, this commitment to expression did not indicate conformity with official Soviet ideology, but a reaction against it. In a 2003 article, composer Vladimir Tarnopolski and musicologist Irina Snitkova describe late-Soviet modernist composers’ commitment to expression as an act of opposition. If official Soviet culture was materialist and radically anti-spiritual, Tarnopolski and Snitkova imply, then unofficial Soviet culture—including unofficial music—sought to become radically spiritual. And while the Western avant-garde was consumed with technical innovation as an end unto itself, the late Soviet avant-garde was interested mainly in applying these technical innovations towards soulful, maximally expressive ends immediately relevant to their listeners:

---

Schmelz notes that in this same article Denisov describes Nono’s *Il canto sospeso*, but does not describe its political content, focusing instead on its serial design. Yuriy Keldish, on the other hand, praised Nono’s political convictions in *Il canto sospeso* while denigrating the work’s serial style (Keldish, “Pesnya, kotoraya ne prozvuchala.” *Sovetskaya muzïka* 11 (1958): 126-29). See Peter Schmelz, *Such Freedom, if Only Musical: Unofficial Soviet Music During the Thaw* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 60-62.


8 Schmelz, “Listening, Memory, and the Thaw,” 256.


As opposed to their Western colleagues, for whom the essence of the avant-garde consisted in a radical departure from conventional musical language and, consequently, overcoming a negative “dependence” upon the public and an uncompromising repudiation of anything which appears to be normal (recall here Helmut Lachenmann’s well-known definition: “Beauty is the denial of habit”), Russian composers were collectively engaged in reviving a lost spiritual communication.

The post-war avant-garde in Russia was not only and not so much a symbol of a coming new epoch as much as a social mark of intellectual and creative freedom and a means of consolidating society’s spiritual opposition. Out of this stems the practice, peculiar to Soviet music yet uncharacteristic for the Western avant-garde, of making use of the newest musical innovations in otherwise conventional genres and forms, accessible to the audience and based upon easily-understood linguistic symbols and other types of signs. Out of this, too, stems the particularly clear and unambiguous “historicism” and retrospectivism of Russian postmodernism, which is consumed with aesthetic and religious questions, finding the alternative to today’s imperfections and tragedies not in some inevitable and just future, but rather in the everlasting values of “the eternal.”

The traditions of the late-Soviet avant-garde described by Tarnopolski and Snitkova—combining modernist innovations with easily-apprehended words and symbols—reached a high-point during perestroika. Zaitsev’s Letter, with its modernist shrieks vividly expressing a text critical of the regime, stands as perhaps the clearest musical example of this phenomenon. This same impulse underlies numerous other works of the period, too, most notably Tarnopolski’s own “culturological” cycle, itself heavily influenced by Schnittke’s ecumenical Fourth Symphony (1983), which trades, like Schnittke’s works, in readily-discriminable symbols. With the new political freedoms of perestroika, this commitment to social engagement moved beyond artworks and into institutional and political activities, as best exemplified by Denisov’s own political activism during this period and his ASM-2’s intensive public-outreach programs during perestroika, which sought to bring long-prohibited modernist music to the Soviet masses.

Amid the chaos of the 1990s, though, this commitment to social engagement quickly waned, so much so that Viktor Yekimovsky, who had headed many of the ASM-2’s outreach programs in the early ‘90s, would claim in 2007, “We honestly say that the music we write is elite. It’s not our goal to bring music to any and everyone [I ne nasha zadacha – dovodit’ muzïku do vsekh i kazhdogo].” This shift in attitude away from the responsibility for social engagement is seen in many post-perestroika artworks, too, from Vustin’s cultivation during the early 1990s of a more ethereal style through to numerous Russian composers’ obsession in the mid-1990s with Latin-texted liturgical works.

12 Vladimir Tarnopolski and Irina Snitkova, “Peyzazh posle bitvï:  muzïkal’nïy avangard Rossii i Germanii vo vtoroy polovine XX veka,” preface to the booklet “Rossiya-Germaniya: Stranitsï muzïkal’noy istorii XX veka. Tsikl kontsertov kamerno-orkestrovoy muzïki” (Moscow: Center for Contemporary Music at the Moscow State Conservatory, 2003), 11.

13 Yekimovsky, interview with Pavel Raygorodsky, “Viktor Yekimovsky: ‘Glavnoye ideya i kontrapunkt mûsleyn’,” Muzïkal’noye obozreniye 286, no. 10 (2007), 5. Sincerest thanks to Yekimovsky for providing me a copy of this article. Yekimovsky implies that it is no longer a composer’s job to appeal to broad masses in part because today everyone has instantaneous access, via the Internet, to whatever specifically interests them.
As will be detailed over the next several chapters, this shift away from social engagement and aesthetic immediacy towards abstraction and artistic remove unfolded in conformity with the most significant development in post-Soviet music. In the wake of the Soviet collapse, composers, musicians, and musicologists have grappled with a wide range of Soviet philosophical legacies, most prominently ideas regarding music’s relationship to the world around it. The idea of a clear and homologous relationship between music and its social conditions was a hallmark of Soviet cultural ideology, one thrown into deep flux with the collapse of the Soviet system and the emergence of profoundly different social, economic, and cultural realities. In response to these social upheavals, two dominant philosophical trends have emerged in post-Soviet music. The first is what I call the trans-social, namely the vigorous insistence that music exists on its own terms and outside of social concerns. The second is the opposite, namely the assertion that all aspects of music, like every human act, are inextricable from their social, political, and cultural conditions.

Of these two modes of discourse, the trans-social is the dominant one in Russia today. It is both a reaction against the crude Marxist sociology of Soviet music and, more to the point, against the harsh political, social, and economic difficulties faced by Russian musicians amidst the Soviet collapse. By claiming that “social concerns are foreign to [music’s] essence,” Russian musicians and musicologists help insulate music from the vagaries of everyday life and protect it from the messy realities of post-Soviet society.

As we shall see at the end of this chapter, the flourishing of this trans-social mode throughout the late-Soviet era is particularly clear in the changing critical reception of Zaitsev’s Letter. Whereas Pritsker heard Zaitsev’s Letter in 1990 as “[reflective of] our contemporary problems in art,” by the mid-1990s critics largely deemphasized the work’s social bearings, describing it instead as a piece of pure music “confined to an abstract musical form.” This vigorous denial of the relationship between art and society is a result of Russia’s massive social transformations, as theorists Valeriya Tsenova and Yuriy Kholopov noted during the particularly bleak year of 1993, during which Yeltsin laid siege to the White House:

In a period of terrible crisis, it is by no means necessary that art reflect social disintegration. An artist might stake out a position in opposition to the negative influences of the surrounding world.

Sergey Nevsky (b. 1972), among the leading composers of Russia’s post-Soviet generation, recently stated this point more forcefully:

For citizens of the former USSR who have, with the Soviet collapse, miserably experienced firsthand Adorno’s thesis “Das Ganze ist das Unwahre” (that is, “The Whole is the untrue”), the craving for a lost wholeness, already unattainable in real life, was, quite naturally, transferred to the realm of art.

16 Yuriy Kholopov and Valeriya Tsenova, Edison Denisov (Moscow: Kompozitor, 1993), 171.
This relatively quick shift on the part of several composers and musicologists from perestroika-era social engagement to post-Soviet social detachment provide the overarching theme for this and the following chapters.

Zaitsev’s Letter

With Denisov ensconced in the Secretariat of the Composers’ Union of the USSR, the ASM-2 was well positioned to commission new works from member composers and guaranteeing their performance. Denisov’s new position of influence, along with the broader changes in Soviet institutions and society, helped ensure that members of his circle could receive direct payment from the government for their completed works. Before glasnost’, the Soviet Ministry of Culture rarely paid non-conformist composers for their compositions. Gubaidulina recounts bringing a score and recording of her Night in Memphis [Noch’ v Memfise] (1968) to Anatoliy Ushkaryov, chairman of the committee in the Ministry of Culture responsible for paying composers for their works, who told her that no one would be interested in the piece, advising her instead to “Find texts that celebrate Soviet life!”18 Vustin, too, encountered similar experiences presenting works to the Ministry of Culture for consideration of payment:

I submitted scores of pieces that, in my opinion, had already been received well at Moscow Autumn. I submitted Returning Home [Vozvrashchen’ye domoy, 1981], and it was turned down. I submitted the Nocturnes [Noktyurni, 1972/82] – again, rejected. But who was at the Ministry then? Some sort of conservative populist [narodnik]. He took a peek at some of my scores and said angrily “This is some sort of pointillistic nonsense!” [Eto zhe puantilizm kakoy-to!]19

As Vustin tells Shul’gin, it was only after Denisov became a secretary of the Composers’ Union that he began to receive payments for his work from the Ministry of Culture.20 Zaitsev’s Letter was one of the first works commissioned by Denisov and the ASM-2, and Vustin acknowledged this favor by dedicating the piece to Denisov. Despite the seriousness of its subject matter and the historical circumstances of its premiere, Vustin describes the composition of Zaitsev’s Letter in notably less weighty terms. As Vustin explained to Shul’gin, it originated as a pedagogical challenge posed to him by Denisov. In 1988, Vustin presented two of his works, Dedicated to Beethoven [Posvyashchennye Betkhovenu] (1984), a concerto grosso for percussion and chamber orchestra, and Blessed are the Poor in Spirit [Blazhenni nishchiye dukhom] (1988), a setting of Matthew 5:3 for voice and chamber ensemble, in a meeting at the Composers’ Union. Denisov criticized Vustin’s writing for strings in these pieces as featureless and uninteresting. To help overcome these deficiencies,

---

18 Kurtz, Sofia Gubaidulina, 124. The recording was made in Prague. As Kurtz recounts, Gubaidulina insisted that the whole committee listen to the recording. Ushkaryov protested, “Even if [the whole committee] votes for it, I’m the chairman, and I’ve got the final say!” The whole committee eventually heard the piece and, in the end, awarded Gubaidulina a small sum for it.
19 Shul’gin, Muzikal’niye istini Aleksandra Vustina, 35.
20 Ibid.
Denisov suggested to Vustin that he write a new work for string orchestra, promising that Aleksandr Vedernikov and the Amadeus Chamber Orchestra would perform it.²¹

Vustin gladly accepted Denisov’s challenge: not only did he want to address the shortcoming Denisov had pointed out to him, but he was eager to experiment with the extended string techniques he had learned through studying Penderecki and Xenakis, especially Penderecki’s Threnody for the Victims of Hiroshima [Ofiarom Hiroszimy - Tren] (1960) and Xenakis’ Pithoprakta (1955-57). Vustin had long studied both scores and recordings of Penderecki’s works, which were readily available in the Soviet Union, though his familiarity with Xenakis’ works came entirely through recordings, particularly the recordings available in the fonoteka [recording library] of the USSR State Radio, where Vustin worked from 1969 to 1974. Throughout Zaitsev’s Letter, Vustin replicates many of the effects he heard in Pithoprakta, particularly sounds produced by players tapping and striking their instruments.

Denisov, it should be noted, himself looked to Xenakis as the originator of Penderecki’s sonorist style.²²

Having accepted Denisov’s challenge, Vustin set about finding a subject serious enough to justify the modernist effects he was planning to use.²³ Vustin found such a subject one day while reading the magazine Ogonyok [“The Little Flame,” better known in English-language literature by its Russian name]. Founded in 1899, Ogonyok is one of the oldest and most popular Russian weekly magazines. For much of the Soviet period, Ogonyok was a reliably conservative publication. During both the Thaw and perestroika, the magazine changed drastically, and became an important forum for the publication of previously suppressed works and discussions of taboo subjects. In 1986, Gorbachev selected Ogonyok, along with the weekly newspapers Arguments and Facts [Argumenti i fakti] and Moscow News [Moskovskije novosti], as the primary press outlets through which the government would advocate its program of reforms.²⁴ As Stephen Lovell points out, Gorbachev likely selected Ogonyok for its capacity to reach the broad middle of the Soviet citizenry, particularly given the journal’s nationwide distribution, large circulation, and attractive, illustrated format.²⁵ In mid-1986, Gorbachev appointed Vitaliy Korotich editor of Ogonyok with explicit instructions to report on a wide variety of previously off-limit topics, from exposés on the war in Afghanistan to social ills including poverty and drug abuse. The magazine began printing letters critical of the regime, and its pages were soon flooded with letters from Soviet citizens describing the horrors, injustices, or downright tedium of the Soviet experience.²⁶

²¹ Ibid., 174. Denisov might have been particularly critical about Vustin’s setting from the Gospel of Matthew as that year he himself had completed his own religious work, a setting of O Gladsome Light [Svete tikhii] (1988) for unaccompanied chorus. This was beginning of Denisov’s new religious phase, which Tsenova describes in her article “Novaya religioznost’ russkoy muzïki i dukhovnïye sochineniya Edisona Denisova” in Tsenova, Sokolov, and Tarnopolski, eds., Muzïka XX veka. Moskovskiy forum, 128-141.


²³ Shul’gin, Muzïkal’nye istinï Aleksandra Vustina, 168.

²⁴ There are numerous English-language compilations of the most provocative perestroika-era letters to the editor of Ogonyok, many edited by Vitaliy Korotich, Ogonyok’s editor during perestroika. See, for example, Vitaly [Vitaly]
In December 1987, an issue of *Ogonyok* hosted a forum on Soviet jurisprudence featuring several letters describing injustices in the country’s legal and penal systems. The forum’s longest letter was from a nineteen year-old man from Arkhangelsk named Sergey Zaitsev, who had spent two and a half years in a juvenile labor colony. Zaitsev described in wrenching detail the horrific circumstances of his imprisonment, from sexual assaults of fellow prisoners to the prison staff’s constant humiliation of the inmates. The text of Zaitsev’s letter as it appeared in *Ogonyok* is provided in example 4.1, and its English translation in example 4.2.

Vustin’s decision to set a prisoner’s text was perhaps motivated by Luigi Nono’s *Il canto sospeso* (1955-56), a setting of texts by condemned prisoners of the anti-Nazi resistance which enjoyed popularity among several Soviet musicians. Nono had visited the Soviet Union numerous times since the early 1960s, most recently in 1988, and maintained a close relationship with Denisov and several of his followers. Denisov had completed a detailed analysis of *Il canto sospeso* which was to be included in a collection of his theoretical works planned for publication in the early 1990s by Sovetskiy kompozitor, where Vustin worked at the time. Denisov’s analysis of *Il canto sospeso* emphasized the abstract symmetries underlying the work’s serial design, qualities at the heart of Vustin’s *Zaitsev’s Letter*. Vustin himself was a great devotee of Nono: in 1990, the year of Zaitsev’s *Letter*’s premiere, Vustin completed the percussion ensemble piece *Action from Luigi [Deystvo ot Luidzhi]* (1990), his contribution to the collective composition *Signor Luigi’s Magic Gift* [*Volshebnïy dar sin’ora Luidzhi*] (1990-91), composed in commemoration of Nono’s death by members of the Denisov circle.

---


29 Denisov originally wrote this analysis for inclusion in his *Sovremennaya muzïka i problemëv evolyutsii kompozitorskoy tekhniki* (Moscow: Sovetskiy kompozitor, 1986). However, this analysis, along with chapters exploring works by Webern and Dallapiccola, were excluded both from the 1986 first edition of Denisov’s work and a planned second edition in the early 1990s “for ideological reasons.” They were published in 1999 in *Svet • Dobro • Vechnost*, 79-127. For Denisov’s analysis of *Il canto sospeso*, see Denisov, “Dva fragmenta iz ‘Il canto sospeso’ L. Nono,” in ibid., 117-127.

30 *Signor Luigi’s Magic Gift* was premiered by Mark Pekarsky and his percussion ensemble at Moscow’s Chaikovsky Hall in April 1991. The piece consists of eight separate movements, many of which feature one or more of the unique instruments Nono had given to Pekarsky. All of the movements make use of improvisation or theatrical elements (including acting, dance, and “silent” playing). As Michael Kurtz recounts, Pekarsky had traveled to Berlin in 1986 to perform Gubaidulina’s *Jubilatio* [*Jubilatsiy*] (1979). His trip overlapped with the much-anticipated premiere of Gubaidulina’s symphony *Stimmen...verstummen...*(1986). A few days after the symphony’s premiere, Pekarsky, Gubaidulina, Denisov, Viktor Suslin, Avet Terteryan, and Nono gathered at Arvo Pärt’s home. Nono and Pekarsky talked at length about new music in Russia; the next day, Nono gave Pekarsky various percussion instruments he had collected during his worldwide travels. See Michael Kurtz, *Sofia Gubaidulina*, 189.

The eight movements of *Signor Luigi’s Magic Gift* are:

---
Vustin states that as soon as he read Zaitsev’s letter, he immediately knew he wanted to set it “a la Penderecki.”\textsuperscript{31} Vustin’s decision to apply Penderecki’s techniques to this letter critical of the Soviet regime shows the degree to which Penderecki’s musical language, used most famously in the \textit{Threnody for the Victims of Hiroshima}, had become equated with ethical protest. Emulations of Penderecki’s style were relatively common in Soviet music by the later 1960s. Composer Alemdar Karamanov (1934-2007) noted that imitations of Penderecki had become so common at the Moscow Conservatory in the mid-1960s that students there coined a new verb, \textit{penderchit’}—“to Penderecki”—to describe this style of mimicry.\textsuperscript{32} Several composers of the 1960s and 70s made prominent use of Penderecki’s sonorist style, most notably Arvo Pärt in his Symphonies No. 1 (1963) and No. 2 (1966) and Schnittke in works such as \textit{Pianissimo...} (1968) or \textit{Dialogue} (1965).\textsuperscript{33}

As noted in chapter 3, beginning in the late 1980s, composers of the Denisov circle began experimenting with new approaches to sonoristic composition, particularly “short” forms achieved through extended instrumental techniques. Zaitsev’s \textit{Letter} reflects this new sensibility. Like Xenakis in \textit{Pithoprakta}, Vustin divides the string orchestra into small units, oftentimes one-on-a-part \textit{divisi}.\textsuperscript{34} In his instructions to the score, Vustin prescribes a wide variety of extended techniques for the strings, all precisely notated (example 4.3).\textsuperscript{35} He divides these extended techniques into two basic categories (A and B), the first for techniques that produce either unspecified pitches or non-pitched sounds and the second for techniques that embellish pitched material. As shown in example 4.3, the first three symbols within this first category instruct the string players to tap on their instruments with the fingertips, to knock on their instruments, or to hit their strings with the palms of their hands, respectively. These techniques were likely influenced by Xenakis’ \textit{Pithoprakta}, though Valentin Sil’vestrov (b. 1937) also used some of them, particularly knocking on the instruments’ bodies, in his Symphony No. 2 (1965), which

---

Sofia Gubaidulina, \textit{Can You Hear Us, Luigi? Here’s a Dance, Which an Ordinary Wooden Rattle Will Dance for You} [\textit{Slishish’ li ti nas, Luidzhi, vot tanets, kotorïyi stantsuyet dlya tebya obïknovennaya treshchotka}]

Nikolay Korndorf, \textit{Kalimba, Crotales, and Tam-Tams} [\textit{Kalimba, krotali, i tam-tam}]

Vladimir Martinov, \textit{Lamento}

Aleksandr Raskatov, \textit{Illusion} [\textit{Illyuzion}]

Vladislav Shut’, \textit{...it is a long sleep} [“...eto dolgiy son”]

Vladimir Tarnopolski, \textit{Quartetto per archi}

Aleksandr Vustin, \textit{Action from Luigi} [\textit{Deystvo ot Luidzhi}]

Viktor Yekimovsky, \textit{Disappearing...} [\textit{Ischezaya...}]

These titles come from the “Kontserti ASM” document preserved in the ASM-2 archives at the Moscow House of Composers. Thanks to Viktoriya Korshunova and Viktor Yekimovsky for providing me access to this document. Viktoriya Korshunova reviewed this April 1991 concert in \textit{Muzïkal’naya zhizn’} 15/16 (1992).

\textsuperscript{31} Vustin, interview with the author, January 5, 2008.


\textsuperscript{33} Kholopov includes an example from Schnittke’s \textit{Pianissimo...}, alongside examples from Penderecki’s \textit{Threnody} and Sidel’nikov’s \textit{Russian Fairy Tales} [\textit{Russkiye skazki}] (1968), in his article on sonorism in the \textit{Muzïkal’naya entsiklopediya}. See Kholopov, “Sonorizm (sonorika, sonoristika, sonornaya tekhnika),” \textit{Muzïkal’naya entsiklopediya} vol. 5 (1981), 207-212. Thanks to Peter Schmelz for pointing me towards Schnittke’s \textit{Dialogue}.

\textsuperscript{34} Aleksandr Raskatov uses similar one-on-a-part \textit{divisi} in his chamber orchestra work \textit{Xenia} (1991). See Chapter 3.

\textsuperscript{35} I am extremely grateful to Svetlana Savenko for lending me her copy of this score and to Aleksandr Vustin for permission to reproduce excerpts from it and his other works.
was given its Moscow premiere at the Alternativa Festival in December 1988, around the time Vustin began work on Zaitsev’s Letter.36

Although not listed on this performance instructions page, Vustin occasionally includes extended techniques for the narrator, including several techniques similar to ones Gubaidulina had used in her cantata Rubaiyat (1969). Almost all of Zaitsev’s Letter calls for Schoenberg-style Sprechstimme, further underscoring the work’s indebtedness to A Survivor from Warsaw. Vustin’s Sprechstimme features precisely notated rhythms, while vocal contours are depicted by the varying heights within the staff of the crossed noteheads (x), the same notation Schoenberg uses in A Survivor from Warsaw. At moments of heightened emotional intensity, particularly sections describing the inmates’ sexual humiliation, Vustin changes the narrator’s style. For these passages, Vustin instructs the narrator to whisper the text very close to the microphone. These directions, which are indicated with empty, diamond-shaped noteheads (◊) and marked “senza suoni,” intensify the sense of emotional immediacy. Vustin applies this style periodically throughout Zaitsev’s Letter, most notably during the passage describing how the young male prisoners were forced to stand naked in front of a young female prison guard, which Vustin indicates should be read “between whisper and speech, like a man who has lost his voice” (example 4.4).

Example 4.5 shows a representative example of Vustin’s techniques “a la Penderecki” in context. Here, the narrator performs in the work’s default Sprechstimme style. Instruments performing specifically pitched material (violins 1-3, violas 1-2, and cello 1) variously perform sharp staccati or various types of tremolos. The accompanying instruments, meanwhile, sound their highest possible pitches on a single string, performing these pitches in either strictly notated rhythms (violas 3-4, cello 2) or pulsating glissandi (violins 4-6). By m.34, the accompanying instruments all perform molto vibrato at unspecified pitch levels, and three measures later begin long, undulating glissandi.

However, example 4.5 points to an important distinction between Penderecki’s practice and Vustin’s emulation of it. Whereas Penderecki’s sonorist scores generally feature static blocks of sound, Zaitsev’s Letter consists of several independent, dynamic lines winding about one another. This dynamic, polyphonic texture is possibly the reason Denisov judged Vustin’s attempt at mimicking Penderecki unsuccessful.37 Besides, Vustin’s techniques “a la Penderecki” are mainly surface-level embellishments, and not the main musical material unto itself as is the case with Penderecki’s sonorist works. Instead, the main musical material of Zaitsev’s Letter is based upon Vustin’s serial technique, an idiosyncratic system he began developing in the mid-1970s shortly after joining the Denisov circle. The ways in which Vustin learned about serialism, and the values he enshrined in his serial practice, can tell us a great deal about late-Soviet musical aesthetics and help point the way toward enduring intellectual traditions in Russian music today.

36 Sil’vestrov’s Symphony No. 2 was performed on December 21, 1988 at Moscow’s Glinka Museum during a composer’s portrait concert [avtorsky kontsert] of Sil’vestrov at that year’s Alternativa Festival. Sincerest thanks to Svetlana Savenko for lending me her collection of Alternativa programs.
37 Vustin, interview with the author, January 5, 2008.
Vustin began developing the serial system that underlies Zaitsev’s Letter as a young conservatory graduate in the early 1970s. Vustin graduated from Vladimir Feré’s (1902-1971) composition class at the Moscow Conservatory in 1969, where his works consisted mainly of conservative imitations of Shostakovich. Upon graduation, Vustin was not immediately invited to submit an application to join the Composers’ Union. Without membership in the Union, Vustin’s employment opportunities were limited, and he accepted a position as an editor at the USSR State Radio’s Litdrama section, helping to select and prepare music for stage productions in Moscow. Vustin worked at the radio for five years, a period he described as “tragic...during which I almost forgot I was a composer.”

These “tragic” circumstances, though, proved in many ways to be a blessing. Thanks to Vadim Dobrïnin, an editor at the radio’s foreign music section, the radio maintained a large and up-to-date collection of recordings that were almost impossible to obtain elsewhere in the Soviet Union, including recordings of Xenakis’ works, music from Darmstadt, and extensive recordings of the Second Viennese School. As a program editor, Vustin had full access to these recordings, and he readily immersed himself in them. It was here, at the radio’s fonoteka, that Vustin says his “real musical education” began.

One of Vustin’s most important listening experiences at the radio was Berg’s Lulu (1929-35). In the 1970s, Galina Zarembo, an editor at the radio, had established a program entitled “Panorama of Twentieth-Century Opera” [Panorama operï XX veka], which broadcast recordings of significant twentieth-century operatic works along with commentary by musicologist Mikhail Tarakanov. Early in his tenure at the radio, Vustin came across a recording of the program on Lulu, including Tarakanov’s commentary, and was immediately captivated by the Second Viennese School.

Using the radio’s extensive fonoteka, Vustin set about listening to all the works of Schoenberg, Berg, and Webern. Having been reared on a diet of expansive Soviet symphonic repertory, Vustin was immediately interested in the economy of means in much of the music of the Second Viennese School, particularly “the intense concentration of ideas, the great density of musical events within time, and the important role assumed by all musical events – a pause, a single note, a figure – especially in Webern’s music.”

This listening-based study of the Second Viennese School was not entirely self-guided. Although Vustin had not formally analyzed these works, he had a general sense of how twelve-tone music operated thanks to Yurï Kholopov, who had introduced him to a few pieces by Schoenberg and Webern at the conservatory. Significantly, Kholopov had demonstrated for Vustin the internal symmetries in some of Webern’s works, especially the palindromic row of...
Webern’s Symphony, op. 21 (1927-28). Kholopov’s emphasis on symmetry would prove especially influential later on as Vustin developed his own serial practice.

Having listened extensively to the Second Viennese School, and armed with a few theoretical insights from Kholopov, Vustin tried his hand at twelve-tone composition. His first attempt was the Nocturnes [Noktyurnï] (1972/82) for chamber ensemble. Vustin completed two movements in 1972, and added a third movement ten years later after Denisov arranged to have the work premiered on his concert series at the House of Composers by Aleksandr Lazarev’s Soloists of the Bol’shoy Theater ensemble. The two movements completed in 1972 became the Nocturnes’ first and third movements, “Melody” [Napev] and “Landscape” [Peyzazh], while the part composed in 1982 became the work’s second movement, “Improvisation” [Improvizatsiya]. Each movement of the Nocturnes features a different idiom. The first movement is cast in a quasi-folkloric style featuring drawn-out melodies [protyzhniye pesni], a style Vustin first used in his Three Toropets Songs [Tri toropetskiye pesni] (1972), which are based upon melodies Vustin found in one of Izally Zemtsovsky’s works on folk music. The Nocturnes’ second movement, “Improvisation,” is modeled after the opening of The Rite of Spring, featuring quasi-modal material, often of a limited range and treated in a rhythmically free way.

It was in the Nocturnes’ third movement, “Landscape,” where Vustin made his first attempts at twelve-tone composition. The movement is not so much dodecaphonic as it is atonal, as the movement features numerous rows and sets, with no single row predominating. Vustin moves through these numerous rows one-by-one, taking care to complete each aggregate before repeating a note within any given row. As we saw in chapter 3, Peter Schmelz has identified a hierarchy within the Soviet theoretical understanding of twelve-tone music, ranging from atonal, or “twelve-tonish” [dvenadtsatitonovïye] styles through to “twelve-tone,” “serial” and, finally, “dodecaphonic” composition. Within this hierarchy, the third movement of Vustin’s Nocturnes qualifies as “twelve-tone,” or “non-serial dodecaphony,” as it uses multiple twelve-tone rows that do not determine every note.

Having dipped his toe into atonal composition, Vustin attempted to compose his next work, the two-movement Sonata for Six [Sonata dlya shesti] (1973), in an “orthodox” dodecaphonic style. In order to achieve this orthodoxy, Vustin looked to Webern’s Symphony, op. 21, one of the works Kholopov had shown him at the conservatory, and hoped to attain in his Sonata for Six the same degree of internal cohesion that Webern had accomplished in his work.

As a beginning step towards this cohesion, Vustin based the Sonata for Six on a single row, unlike the multiple row forms used in the final movement of the Nocturnes. Motivated by Webern’s ideas of internally referential structures, Vustin decided that all row transpositions

---

47 Ibid.
48 For background on this work, see Shul’gin, Muzïkal’niye istinï Aleksandra Vustina, 71-77. Sovetskiy kompozitor published the revised three-movement version in 1985.
49 Shul’gin, Muzïkal’niye istinï Aleksandra Vustina, 84. The Three Toropets Songs (1972) were published by Sovetskiy kompozitor in 1977. In 1975, Vustin set the songs for ensemble as Toropets Songs [Toropetskiye pesni] for flute, bass clarinet, piano, violin, viola, and cello. The collection where Vustin found these melodies is perhaps Zemtsovsky’s study of the protyzhnya tradition, Russkaya protyzhnaya pes’nya (Leningrad: Muzïka, 1967).
50 Vustin, interview with the author, January 5, 2008 and Shul’gin, Muzïkal’niye istinï Aleksandra Vustina, 75.
51 See Schmelz, Such Freedom, 135.
53 Vustin, interview with the author, January 5, 2008, and Shul’gin, Muzïkal’niye istinï Aleksandra Vustina, 82.
should emanate from the row itself, and decided to begin the second statement of the row with the pitch from the second position of the P0 row, the third statement with the pitch from the third position of P0, and so forth. This method is similar to various principles of rotation described by Ctirad Kohoutek in his 1965 *Compositional Trends in Contemporary Music*, which was published in Russian in 1976 with Kholopov’s commentary. 54 Although Vustin would develop his serial practice in important ways over the next several decades, he abided by this basic practice for determining row transposition.

Shortly after completing the *Sonata for Six*, Vustin was accepted into the Composers’ Union, helping set into motion an important chain of events shaping his creative development. Vustin’s acceptance into the Union came largely through the advocacy of Gubaidulina, who would soon become a close friend, and Grigoriy Frid, in whose musical club Vustin had long participated. 55 Membership in the Union made Vustin eligible for a wider variety of jobs, and Frid arranged for him to leave the radio and begin work at the publishing house Sovetskiy kompozitor. It was through friendships he developed at the publishing house that Vustin gained access into the Denisov circle and became deeply enmeshed in Moscow’s new music scene.

Sovetskiy kompozitor was a hotbed of modernist music. Throughout the 1970s Anatoliy Kuznetsov, Mariya Yudina’s secretary, hosted soirees there during which he would play recordings and show scores to young composers he collected through correspondence with several leading Western composers, most notably Stockhausen. 56 The publishing house’s staff included Dmitriy Smirnov (b. 1948) and Vladislav Shut’ (b. 1941), both active participants in Moscow’s new music scene and close to Denisov.

Vustin befriended Smirnov and Shut’ and soon began attending new music events with them. Encouraged by his friends, and enabled by his membership in the Union, Vustin began attending Denisov’s closed concert series at the House of Composers. Vustin quickly developed a close relationship with Denisov himself: in 1975, only one year after Vustin began work at the publishing house, Denisov programmed Vustin’s *Sonata for Six* on one of his concert series at the House of Composers. 57

Vustin’s entrance into the Denisov circle opened up wide new artistic horizons for him and immediately transformed his compositional practice. In 1975, shortly after joining the Denisov circle, Vustin launched an ambitious new project, an opera entitled *The Devil in Love* [Vzlyublyonnïy d’yavol] (1975-89) based upon the 1772 romance *Le Diable amoureux* by French writer Jacques Cazotte (1719-1792) and with a libretto by Vladimir Khachaturov. 58 In order to


55 Vustin began the process for entry into the Composers’ Union in 1972, and was accepted in 1974. See Shul’gin, *Muzïkal’nïye istinï Aleksandra Vustina*, 34 and 38.

56 Ivan Sokolov, interview with the author, April 14, 2008.


58 Vustin’s was not the first stage adaptation of Cazotte’s work in Russia. In 1848, Petipa presented his ballet *Satanella* at St. Petersburg’s Bol’shoy kamenný teatr, a revival of Joseph Mazilier’s ballet *Le Diable amoureux*, based on Cazotte’s romance and staged in Paris in 1840.

Nor does the opera mark Cazotte’s final appearance in Vustin’s works: Vustin based his 1991 *Music for Ten* [Muzïka dlya desyati] upon French playwright Jean-François de La Harpe’s (1739-1803) posthumously published “Prophétrie de Cazotte,” a description of a pre-Revolutionary aristocratic gathering at which Cazotte
sustain Webernian-style internal cohesion over huge formal stretches, Vustin sought to develop methods for generating large quantities of interrelated musical material from limited sources. He found the solution in the brand of serialism practiced widely in the Denisov circle and influenced mainly by the ideas of theorists Yuriy Kholopov (1932-2003) and Philip Herschkowitz [Filipp Gershkovich] (1906-1989). This approach to serialism heavily emphasized internal symmetries and various other types of hidden, esoteric structures. For Vustin, this approach provided a means of injecting numerically-based truth into his works, helping bring about that exalted, spiritual connection between music and listener described by Tarnopolski as the hallmark of late Soviet modernism.

**Sound Crystals**

Vladimir Tarnopolski’s assessment, cited at the beginning of this chapter, that the Soviet avant-garde applied modernist devices primarily to revive a “lost spiritual communication”

59 is especially true with regard to serialism. All of the early masterpieces of Soviet serialism feature composers using the technique to help conjure up the beyond and depict extraordinary or fantastical places or moods, from Volkonsky’s *Suite of Mirrors* [*Syuita zerkal*] (1960) and *Laments of Shchaza* [*Zhalobi Shchazi*] (1962)—settings of exotic poems by Federico Garcia Lorca and folkloric texts from Dagestan, respectively—to Denisov’s *Sun of the Incas* [*Solntse inkov*] (1964), a setting of surrealist texts by Chilean poet Gabriela Mistral. Perhaps the clearest example of this phenomenon is Gubaidulina’s cantata *Night in Memphis* [*Noch’ v Memfise*] (1968), in which Gubaidulina uses serial techniques to set mystical ancient Egyptian texts concerned with, in Michael Kurtz’s words, “some of the ultimate questions of existence,” including “death as ‘the center of human life’ and man’s acceptance of its inevitability.”

60 If more traditional Soviet musical idioms might be associated with everyday life [bït], then serialism might help conjure up a higher, more exalted plane of existence [bïtiye].

61 During the 1970s, several composers of the middle generation sought to explore serialism’s magical properties, turning to Kholopov and Herschkowitz for guidance regarding the technical means to achieve these ends.

Kholopov, who completed his graduate studies in music theory in 1960, taught theory at the Moscow Conservatory from 1960, first as a *prepodavatel’*, then as *dotsent* (1972) and, from 1983, professor. His influence upon composers of the Denisov circle is difficult to overstate. Beginning in the late 1960s, Kholopov taught music theory, formally or otherwise, to most of the composers of the Denisov circle, many of whom list Kholopov, along with Denisov, as their primary teachers, though few had either figure as a formal adviser.

62 Although Kholopov taught

---


60 Kurtz, *Sofia Gubaidulina*, 79-80. The work’s Egyptian texts were translated into Russian by Anna Akhmatova (1889-1966) and Vera Potapova (1910-92).


62 Consider, for example, Dmitriy Smirnov’s and Vladimir Tarnopolski’s artistic biographies, available in numerous concert program notes and published on their websites (tarnopolski.ru and homepage.ntlworld.com/ dmitrismirnov/bio-en.html). Both figures list their main teachers at the conservatory as Nikolay Sidel’nikov, Edison Denisov, and Yuriy Kholopov. Sidel’nikov was both composers’ formal composition teacher. Denisov was
and wrote about numerous topics from the Renaissance to the present, he was particularly interested in music of the Second Viennese School, especially Webern. In the mid-1960s, Kholopov and his sister, Valentina Kholopova, began work on a book-length study of Webern’s music, which they completed in the early 1970s, and in 1973 he published the first of his numerous articles on Webern, “Die Spiegelsymmetrie in Anton Webersn Variationen für Klavier op. 27,” in a West German publication. This 1973 article was timed in accordance with the ninetieth anniversary of Webern’s birth, which was commemorated in the Soviet Union with a series of concerts at the Composers’ Union of Moscow in December 1973 at which Valentin Kozhin and Yuriy Nikolayevsky conducted the Soviet premieres of Webern’s Concerto, op. 24 (1931-34) and the Fünf Stücke, op. 10 (1911-13). The Kholopovs delivered introductory remarks.

As the title of his 1973 “Spiegelsymmetrie” article suggests, Kholopov was particularly interested in symmetrical forms in Webern’s music. The issue of symmetry occupies a central role in the Kholopovs’ book on Webern: one of the largest sections in the book’s analytical section is entitled “Serialism. Symmetry” [Seriynost’. Simmetriya], and includes extensive figures demonstrating symmetrical structures in several of Webern’s works, including the Op. 24 with its SATOR square. The importance of symmetry and Webernian magic squares in Kholopov’s teaching is evidenced by the title of the Festschrift his students compiled in honor of Kholopov’s seventieth birthday, SATOR TENET OPERA ROTAS: Yuriy Nikolayevich Kholopov and His School [SATOR TENET OPERA ROTAS: Yuriy Nikolayevich Kholopov i yego nauchnaya shkola (k 70-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya)], the front cover of which reproduces the SATOR magic square, replacing the name “Arepo” with an oversized “Holopov” [sic].

Kholopov, it should be noted, was interested in questions of musical symmetry in general, and not only in Webern’s music. In 1965, shortly before commencing work on his Webern book, Kholopov completed an article on modes of limited transposition and non-retrogradable scales in the theoretical works of Messiaen and Boleslav Yavorsky (1877-1942). This article, “Symmetrical modes in Yavorsky’s and Messiaen’s Theoretical Systems” [Simmetrichnyye Iadi v teoreticheskikh sistemakh Yavorskogo i Messiana] (pub. 1971), drew upon an earlier work Kholopov had completed on Messiaen’s modal practice and published in Sovetskaya muzïka in 1965. Shortly after Kholopov’s articles on Messiaen appeared, Yekimovsky completed his undergraduate thesis on Messiaen at the Gnesin Institute. This thesis initiated the first of Yekimovsky’s many scholarly works on Messiaen, the most prominent of which is his book Olivier Messiaen: Life and Works [Oliv’ye Messian. Zhizn’ i tvorchestvo]

63 Though completed in the ‘70s, the book on Webern was published only in 1984. See Kholopov and Valentina Kholopova, Anton Vebern. Zhizn’ i tvorchestvo (Moscow: Sovetskiy kompozitor, 1984). Kholopov’s “Spiegelsymmetrie” article was included in a collection published by the Wiesbaden Archiv für Musikwissenschaft in 1973. The article was reprinted in the Bulgarian journal Muzikalni khorizonti in the 1980s (Nos. 1-2 [1981] and Nos. 19-20 [1985]).

Kholopov’s ideas about Webern, particularly his emphasis on internal cohesion, were strongly influenced by the ideas of Herschkowitz, a Romanian-born composer and theorist who had studied with Webern in Vienna from 1934 to 1939. The onset of war drove Herschkowitz from Vienna in 1939, and the next year he emigrated to the USSR, settling in Moscow in 1946 where he worked briefly as an editor for Muzfond and Sovetskiy kompozitor. In 1949, Herschkowitz was expelled from the Composers’ Union, and he lived much of the next several decades in penury. He was accepted into Muzfond in 1953, which helped provide some financial support, though in 1979 he was expelled from this organization, too, after applying for permission to leave the USSR.

To help eek out an existence, Herschkowitz began teaching private lessons in theory and composition in the early 1960s. Though famously ornery, Herschkowitz achieved almost oracular status in late-Soviet unofficial musical life. Composer Viktor Suslin called Herschkowitz “an apostle sent by Webern to teach the barbarians,” describing that

[Herschkowitz’s] influence on new Russian music was immense…[I]t was thanks to him that a number of Moscow composes received, as it were, a thread which led back directly to Webern, to Schoenberg and Berg…

It is thanks to their acquaintance with [Herschkowitz] that many composers (especially in Moscow, of course) came to understand what musical form is, and began to concern themselves with it on quite a different level. This was not some kind of quantitative addition to their knowledge, but a great leap forward, into a new order […] He was the seed.

As Schnittke described to Aleksandr Ivashkin following Herschkowitz’s death in 1989,

It’s not easy to find someone who bore such a strong influence upon composers of different generations. More than a few people (who later became famous) passed through his hands, but not in the usual sense of study – mainly, he told his students what Webern had said to him about Beethoven, though out of his mouth this was enough to expound upon the full history, the prehistory, and future history of the most important features of musical form. […] Many composers traveled to Moscow especially to show him their compositions and listen to his oftentimes paradoxical yet always accurate appraisals. His influence upon the development of Soviet music remains largely unappreciated. Philipp Moiseyevich Herschkowitz was a brilliant and wholly original figure, and his place in music is unique.

---


69 For Herschkowitz’s biography, see Dmitri [Dmitriy] Smirnov, A Geometer of Sound Crystals: A Book on Herschkowitz (Berlin: Ernst Kuhn, 2003), 1-14.


Dmitriy Smirnov, perhaps Herschkowitz’s greatest devotee, describes how a “whole Pleiad [sic] of composers, performers, and musicologists had their eyes opened thanks to him, and were indebted to him for their accomplishments and developments”; Smirnov lists some forty members of this “Pleiad,” including Volkonsky, Denisov, Schnittke, Gubaidulina, Silvestrov, Vustin, Shut’, Suslin, Firsova, Kholopov, Ivashkin, Lyubimov, Pekarsky, and Alikhanov. 72

Kholopov was among Herschkowitz’s greatest advocates. He began visiting Herschkowitz’s flat in the early 1960s while starting work on his book on Webern, and soon began steering several of his brightest pupils from the conservatory to Herschkowitz for lessons.73 In the late 1960s, Kholopov introduced Smirnov to Herschkowitz, who studied with him from 1970-71 and again from 1980 through to Herschkowitz’s emigration in 1987. Through Smirnov, Vustin became personally acquainted with Herschkowitz and, throughout the early 1980s, regularly accompanied Smirnov, Yelena Firsova (Smirnov’s wife), and Vladislav Shut’ to Herschkowitz’s flat for lessons.74 After Herschkowitz’s death in 1989, Vustin co-edited, along with Herschkowitz’s widow Yelena Abalduyeva and composer Leonid Gofman, another Herschkowitz pupil, a multi-volume collection of Herschkowitz’s writings, published by Kompozitor in 1991.75

Herschkowitz’s private lessons focused not on twentieth-century works but rather on the music of Beethoven, whom Herschkowitz considered the paragon of music. The Beethoven Herschkowitz taught, though, was decidedly Webernian. As Gubaidulina recalls, “I would have liked to hear him say something about Webern and Schönberg, but when we saw each other he talked only about classical harmony and analyzed Mozart and Beethoven from Webern’s perspective.”76

Smirnov provides a glimpse into this Webernian “perspective” on Beethoven in his A Geometer of Sound Crystals: A Book on Herschkowitz. This book consists mainly of Smirnov’s recollections of his private lessons with Herschkowitz, documenting the great lengths to which Herschkowitz would go to demonstrate hidden unities underlying Beethoven’s works. As Smirnov and others note, one of Herschkowitz’s favorite sayings was “Form is harmony in the condition of a crystal,”77 and he would take pains to demonstrate for his students the ways in which the formal plan of Beethoven’s works (their horizontal structure) correlated with their harmonic design (their vertical structure). Herschkowitz summarized his belief in this Beethovenian time-space continuum in a 1982 letter to Smirnov, writing that “Geometry [in Beethoven’s music]...turns the substance of time into the substance of space.”78 Another one of

72 Smirnov, A Geometry of Sound Crystals, 4.
74 Smirnov recounts many of his and Vustin’s several trips to Herschkowitz’s flat throughout A Geometry of Sound Crystals. Smirnov tried to convince several other friends to study with Herschkowitz, sometimes unsuccessfully. In 1984, Smirnov tried to steer Tarnopolski to Herschkowitz, yet Tarnopolski was not interested. See Smirnov, A Geometry of Sound Crystals, 143. While I do not know the exact reasons for Tarnopolski’s refusal, he is not alone in wishing to avoid close contact with Herschkowitz: Gubaidulina reports feeling “concerned about being drawn into [Herschkowitz’s] sphere of influence.” See Kurtz, Sofia Gubaidulina, 66.
76 Gubaidulina to Michael Kurtz, in Kurtz, Sofia Gubaidulina, 66.
77 Smirnov, A Geometry of Sound Crystals, 61.
78 Ibid., 77.
Herschkowitz’s favorite sayings was “Symmetry […] is the essential core of all things” and, as Smirnov’s notes show, he went to great lengths in his private lessons to prove to his pupils that musical events in Beethoven’s works unfold in symmetrical, numerically-predetermined patterns.

Though he mainly taught the music of Beethoven “from Webern’s perspective,” Herschkowitz occasionally lectured and wrote on music of the Second Viennese School. In 1966, he lectured on Webern at the Composers’ Union of Leningrad, repeating this lecture in Kiev (in 1967) and in Yerevan (in 1968). In 1973, Herschkowitz completed his influential article “The Tonal Sources of Schoenberg’s Dodecaphony” [Tonal’niye istoki shyonbergovoy dodekafonii], published in Tartu University’s series Studies in Semiotics [Trudi po znakovïm sistemam].

Inspired by Kholopov’s and Herschkowitz’s ideas about symmetry and numerically-based unity, composers of the Denisov circle set about practicing these principles in a variety of ways. One of the main areas of interest was palindromic rows similar to the one in Webern’s op. 21 (1927-28). For example, Smirnov devised the following palindromic row for the second movement of his 1977 Piano Trio:

![Ex. 4.6 – Palindromic row for Smirnov, Piano Trio (1977), II. Allegro](image)

The same year, Viktor Suslin, also a Herschkowitz pupil and a close friend of Gubaidulina, devised a similar palindromic row for his Midnight Music [Polunoshchnaya muzïka] (1977) for violin, harpsichord, and contrabass:

![Ex. 4.7 – Palindromic row for Suslin, Midnight Music (1977)](image)

To create his palindromic row, Suslin divided a chromatic scale in half. (The row’s first hexachord spans D # – A b, and the second hexachord A – D.) As Valentina Kholopova points out, Suslin ordered the pitches within his row so that it might readily generate triadic harmonies. Any two pitches six positions apart are related by fourth or fifth (e.g., G and D [positions 1 and

---

80 Smirnov, A Geometer of Sound Crystals, 4 and 250. As Smirnov notes, the 1991 publication O muzïke states that Herschkowitz lectured in Kiev and Yerevan in 1968 and 1969 (not 1967 and ’68, as Smirnov maintains).
7]; F # and B [positions 2 and 8]; et cetera). Thus, by stacking this row’s two hexachords directly on top of one another—aligning position 1 with 7, 2 with 8, 3 with 10, and so forth—Suslin is able to create series of perfect fourths and fifths (G - D, F # - B, D # - B, etc.). By keeping these hexachords stacked yet shifting their alignment two positions—that is, aligning position 1 with 9, 2 with 10, 3 with 11, 4 with 12, 5 with 7, and 6 with 8—Suslin is able to create a series of minors thirds (G - B, F # - A, D # - C, etc.).

Near the end of Midnight Music, Suslin exploits this feature of his row, aligning its hexachords in various ways so as to create triads. For example, at R.28, both the violin and bass perform in double stop. The violin’s top voice sounds through positions 1-6 of the row, while its bottom voice plays this staggered rotation, sounding through positions 9-10-11-12-6-7. Meanwhile, the double bass’ top voice plays through the row’s positions 1-6 and its bottom voice through positions 7-12. The end result is a series of major and minor triads and minor seventh chords, all derived from the P0 row (example 4.8).84

Whereas triadic harmonies in Midnight Music result from rotating the row, in earlier works Suslin built triads into the row itself. For example, the row for his 1973 work 24 Triads [24 trezvuchiya] for harpsichord (or organ) is built exclusively from minor and major triads:

Ex. 4.9 – Triadic row for Suslin, 24 Triads (1973)

This row is similar to the one for his 1971 Trio-Sonata for flute, guitar, and cello:

Ex. 4.10 – Triadic row for Suslin, Trio-sonata (1971)85

If not directly inspired by Herschkowitz, these triadic rows were emblematic of the view of music history he vociferously espoused. As Suslin explained to Valentina Kholopova, in designing the triadic row for his 24 Triads he drew inspiration from Bach, who was “the first person to discover the triadic basis for the twelve-tone row.”86 This view of Bach as a proto-serialist was strictly in line with the ideas of Herschkowitz, who taught serialism as a direct outgrowth of the German tradition emanating from Bach.

Finally, inspired by Kholopov and Herschkowitz, several composers of the Denisov circle experimented with various types of magic squares. In 1971, one year after his first lesson with Herschkowitz, Dmitriy Smirnov composed a short two-movement work for solo piano entitled Two Magic Squares [Dva magicheskikh kvadrata]. Each movement is based upon a different numerical magic square. The first movement, “The Magician” [Volshebnik], is based...

84 Ibid.
86 Ibid.
upon two elements: first, a palindromic twelve-tone row\textsuperscript{87} and, secondly, a three-by-three magic square which determines how the row and its various transpositions are deployed. This magic square, reproduced here from Kholopov’s analysis of the work, is:

\begin{align*}
6 & 1 & 8 \\
7 & 5 & 3 \\
2 & 9 & 4
\end{align*}

Ex. 4.11 – Rhythmic magic square for Smirnov, Two Magic Squares (1971), Mvmt. 1\textsuperscript{88}

In this short movement, each measure corresponds to one of the magic square’s cells and contains the number of pitches indicated in that cell. There are sixteen unique ways of ordering the square’s vertices: three horizontal rows, each of which can go forward or backward (3 x 2 = 6), three vertical columns, forward or backward (3 x 2 = 6), and two diagonals, forward or backward (2 x 2 = 4). As Kholopov points out, the numbers for every vertex of this square—vertical, horizontal, and diagonal—add up to fifteen. Thus, the work consists of sixteen three-measure units, and every three measures contain fifteen pitches. The work’s second movement, “Bells” [Kolokola], is built upon a four-by-four magic square in which each vertex equals 34 and which generates pitch content.\textsuperscript{89}

\textit{Dvenadtsatikratnost’}

These theories of serialism preached by Kholopov and Herschkowitz and practiced by the young composers of the Denisov circle came together in the serial system Vustin began developing in 1975, shortly after joining the Denisov circle. Vustin calls his serial system \textit{dvenadtsatikratnost’}, which roughly means “twelve-sidedness.” As the name implies, Vustin’s system is built upon repeating patterns of twelve, a number he believes holds universal significance. Vustin originally devised his system as the unifying principle for his \textit{magnum opus}, the still-unperformed opera \textit{The Devil in Love} (1975-89) the composition of which overlaps with Vustin’s most direct involvement with Herschkowitz (who left Moscow in 1987 and died, in Vienna, in 1989). Although he originally devised this system for his opera, Vustin took to heart Herschkowitz’s advice, “If you want to master something, restrict yourself to it,” and used this \textit{dvenadtsatikratnost’} system as the basis for most of his compositions from 1975 onwards.

Vustin describes his voluntary adoption of his strict serial system as artistically liberating as, having found a set of algorithms which generated pitch and rhythmic content, he felt freer to

\textsuperscript{87} The row is C – F – B - F# - C# - G – D – G# - D# - A# - E – A. From Smirnov’s annotations to the work, linked to from his website. See http://www.sibeliusmusic.com/indexexamplephp?sm=home.score&?scoreid=44843 (accessed July 27, 2009).

\textsuperscript{88} Reproduced from Kholopov, “Nashi v Anglii: Dmitriy Smirnov,” 272.

\textsuperscript{89} Ibid.
focus on matters of expression and artfulness, an attitude expressed by Denisov, too. Vustin’s
description of artistic liberation through voluntary restriction of materials recalls Gubaidulina’s
defense of dodecaphonic composition to her former piano teacher, Yakov Zak (1913-1976).
When Zak asked Gubaidulina why she chooses to write dodecaphonic music, she responded,

There are always rules one needs to overcome. Twelve-tone music is like a heavy
chain that composers lay upon themselves in the manner of Russian Orthodox
ascetics, to surmount pain and suffering. [Zak asked.] “And if the composer
actually masters the technique?” – [Gubaidulina answered:] Then he will take
upon himself a new burden.

Having mastered his technique in Zaitsev’s Letter, and amidst the social chaos of the early
1990s, Vustin did indeed adopt “new burdens” as predicted by Gubaidulina, interfacing his
dvenadtsatikratnost’ system with new sets of restricting algorithms, most prominently the
Russian Orthodox obikhodniy zvukoryad (see chapter 5).

Vustin’s serial practice is built upon two elements: first, a single twelve-tone row and,
secondly, a series of numerical sequences which determine row forms. In order to determine
row transposition, Vustin used the rotation system he first practiced in the Sonata for Six. The
row Vustin devised around 1975, and which lies at the heart of his dvenadtsatikratnost’ system,
is:

```
\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{vustin_row.png}
\caption{Vustin’s row in P0 form}
\end{figure}
```

In interview with Shul’gin, Vustin mythologized the row’s origins, describing it as borne of
revelation and not formulation. This mythologization is perhaps unsurprising given the row’s
towering importance in most of his creative work. As Vustin described,

[The row] appeared to me rather spontaneously....It began to take shape almost
subconsciously. As soon as I sensed the row, all I had to do is add a few sounds
to it. That is, my row was born the way all music must be born, which is not
through the working out of some sort of complex design. [It was born] from an
image, from a situation.

---

90 Vustin, interview with the author, January 5, 2008. As Denisov said to Shul’gin: “[The] serial method of
composition gives [the composer freedom]: the composer creates a beginning that is full of various restrictions, but
afterwards, however, there is only free writing, only self expression, when it is unnecessary to think about whether a
particular note or timbre is moving in the proper direction, and so on.” See Shul’gin, Priznaniye Edisona Denisova.
Po materialam besed (Moscow: Kompozitor, 1998), 66. Translated and quoted by Peter Schmelz in “Listening,
92 Shul’gin, Muzikal’niye istinati Aleksandra Vustina, 328.
Despite this insistence on spontaneity, Vustin confessed to Shul’gin that the row’s design was guided by “the little German part in him” [“nemetskaya ‘chetvertinka’ ”] which urged “if you must arrange the twelve tones, you have to make sure there’s some sort of progression to the design.”

This progression largely takes the form of tonal implications built into the row. As Valeriya Tsenova pointed out, Vustin’s row implies tonal motion from $B\flat$ to $D\flat$. The row begins with a major third, $B\flat-D$, connoting $B\flat$ major, and closes with the pitches $F-G-A\flat-D\flat$, connoting cadential motion of $3-\#4-5-1$ in $D\flat$ major. Vustin would explore these tonal implications in several works of the early 1990s.

Although his row is not palindromic like many of Suslin’s or Smirnov’s, it nevertheless shows varying degrees of Kholopov-inspired internal cohesion. Each of the row’s four trichords outlines the interval of a tritone (example 4.13). More significantly, the row bears its own abstract symmetrical designs, albeit in rather esoteric ways. In a standard matrix of this row, the matrix’s top- and right-hand edges (row forms P0 and R13) share the same hexachords (see example 4.14). This matrix, in other words, reflects upon itself across an imaginary diagonal, as the row forms emanating from the upper left-hand and lower right-hand corners both feature related pitch content. However arcane, Vustin plays with features such as this in later works, most notably Zaitsev’s Letter, whose pitch organization follows a similarly abstract mirror design.

Having devised a row, Vustin next sought to create a method for determining row forms. He devised a series of four twelve-digit numerical patterns, shown in example 4.15. As the example’s key shows, each of these four digits represents a standard row form. These numerical patterns are themselves laden with Kholopov- and Herschkowitz-inspired internal symmetries, as demonstrated in example 4.16, which shows numerical palindromes within these sequences.

Interleaving these numerical patterns with his row, Vustin constructs elaborate tables generating pitch content for his compositions. One such table, formed by applying numerical pattern 1 to the P0 form of the row, is shown in example 4.17. It was generated by, first, filling in the grid with the numerical patterns. The digits from the first pattern were added to column 1 then extended across the top of the chart, where they are boxed. These boxed numbers determine which of the four pattern will complete the corresponding column. For example, columns 6 and 11 are also headed by a boxed 1, so they use the first pattern. Pitches are then added. Vustin’s row in P0 form is added to the first column, then extended across the top row. Pitches for the remaining columns are generated by applying the row transposition indicated by the boxed number to the pitch in the first row. For example, the starting pitch in Column 2 is a D and the column is headed by a boxed 2, indicating retrograde inversion; thus, this column’s pitches spell out a retrograde inversion on D.

These procedures result in a strictly-ordered table of 144 twelve-tone rows which proceed column-by-column, from left to right. By combining rows other than P0 with any of the four numerical patterns, Vustin could produce numerous similar 12 x 12 tables. In practice, though, Vustin draws most pitch material for his compositions from this basic table shown in example 4.17, built from the application of pattern 1 to the P0 form of his row.

---

93 Ibid.
To see what all of this actually means in practice, let us turn to an especially clear application of this system, Vustin’s 1992 *Three Songs from Andrey Platonov’s Novel Chevengur* [*Tri pes’ni iz romana Andreya Platonova “Chevengur”*] for mezzo-soprano and chamber ensemble. This piece is a setting of three song texts from early twentieth-century writer Andrey Platonov’s dystopian novel *Chevengur* (1926-29), published in the USSR for the first time in 1988. The texts for these three short songs are provided in example 4.18.

This work is especially useful for demonstrating Vustin’s pitch system because, unlike most of his other works, it features relatively few row forms. Throughout this work, Vustin lingers on individual rows and specific pitches within each row. This lingering is itself an expressive device, symbolizing the frozen time characteristic of much of Platonov’s novel, which tells the story of an experimental utopian city founded in the vast nothingness of Russia’s steppe.

The pitch material for these *Three Songs from Chevengur* comes from Column 2 of the table of 144 row forms described above. The piece makes use of the first four row forms from this column, highlighted in example 4.19. All of the first song, and half of the second, is based upon an I4 row. Midway through the second song, at the pickup to m.11, Vustin moves to row form RI0. An R7 row begins at m.5 in the third song, which concludes with a coda based upon P0 (beginning at m.29).

Throughout this work, Vustin exploits the tonal implications in his row to generate a tonally-driven form. The piece is cast in a tonally-closed, rounded binary form in the key of B♭ major. To establish a closed tonal form within his strict twelve-tone system, Vustin selected a series of row forms in which the opening and closing rows share the same contiguous major third (B♭-D). Vustin cycles throughout these rows slowly, lingering for prolonged periods on individual dyads and trichords that might bear tonal implication.

For example, Song No.1 opens with row form I4. Vustin reverses the positions of the row’s first two pitches, starting not with D-B♭ but rather B♭-D. Nearly the entire first half of this song consists exclusively of B♭-D, weakly establishing the tonality of B♭ major. B♭ and D are also the opening pitches of the piece’s final row, P0. The third song ends with an extended coda on B♭ and D, the only pitches Vustin uses from this P0 row. This return at the piece’s end to B♭ and D—to the home key of B♭ major—coincides with a return of the opening music, closing off the cycle in a rounded form.

Between these B♭ major poles, and still strictly abiding to his serial system, Vustin moves to increasingly far-out tonal areas. In the first song, Vustin moves from B♭ to the bvi key of g♭ minor, expressed by A♭, A, G♭—or A♭, B♭♭, G♭ in g♭ minor—from positions 3-5 of the opening row (example 4.20). In the second and third songs, Vustin moves even further afield: for example, in Song No. 3, Vustin moves to the key of e minor, a tritone away from the home key of B♭. Vustin establishes this tonality by lingering on the E-G minor third from positions 6 and 7 of R7, the piece’s penultimate row. These tonal excursions only increase the sense of resolution at the return home to B♭ major at the piece’s end (example 4.21).

With its quietude and calm, this 1992 Chevengur setting is emblematic of Vustin’s post-1990 stylistic shift, which will be described in chapter 5. Until this shift, the majority of Vustin’s works are not only relentlessly atonal, but also sear with ritualistic intensity. Like his *dvenadtsatikratnost’* system, Vustin forged his ritualistic style in the mid-1970s after joining the Denisov circle and was directly influenced by the new vistas opened through Vustin’s contact with Smirnov and Shut’. Through his ritualistic style Vustin attempted to capture the drastic, theatrical aesthetic very much in vogue in Moscow new music circles of the 1970s, all the while...
extending his serial practice into the area of rhythm. These various aesthetic and technical aspirations would find their fullest expression in Zaitsev’s Letter.

**Deystvennaya muzïka**

Serialism was only one musical current to which Vustin gained fuller exposure through his involvement in the Denisov circle. Another current, and one perhaps more immediately transformative for Vustin, was the Cage- and Stockhausen inspired “intuitive” style which flourished at the happenings and was propagated mainly by Lyubimov, Pekarsky, and Vustin’s friend, Gubaidulina.96 If serialism provided Vustin with a means of saturating his scores with numerically derived “truth,” then this intuitive style provided a means of delivering this truth directly to the audience.

Vustin dates his interest in improvised, intuitive music to one particularly influential concert he attended at Moscow’s Central House of Workers of the Arts [Tsentral’nyi dom rabotnikov iskusstv] around 1975.97 The concert’s organizers and performers were Lyubimov, Pekarsky, and conductor Konstantin Krimets, and the program featured a performance of Stockhausen’s Kreuzspiel (1951) along with several improvisations. At one point, the concert turned into an improvised group dance. Encouraged by Lyubimov, who directed the spectacle from the bass drum, musicians danced their way out of the hall, inviting listeners to follow behind.98 Although Vustin did not join in, the overall effect of the concert was shattering: as he told Shul’gin, throughout the evening he felt, for the first time in his life, like he was “inside the music.”99 Or, as he described to Pol’dyayeva,

Music leaving behind the confines of passive listening or contemplation, music as ritual (is this too grandiose a term?). Or, to summarize: music AS EVENT [sobïtïye]. All of this shook me to the core that evening. And, I would say, that the strongest impressions of all the best concerts throughout the 1970s were connected with similar sensations: it was like this for [the premiere of] Gubaidulina’s Rubaiyat (all of her music is extraordinarily effective in this way: it simply seizes you and forcefully leads you somewhere) or Schnittke’s First Symphony.100

In the wake of this concert, Vustin set about attempting to capture this sense of ritualistic intensity and “event-ness” [sobïtynost’]. He initiated a style he calls deystvennaya muzïka—“ritualistic” or “action” music—beginning with his 1975 work The Word [Slovo] for chamber ensemble and percussion and continuing through Memoria-2 [Memoriya-2] (1978) for strings,

---

96 Vustin tells Shul’gin that it was through his new friendships with Smirnov and Shut’ formed at the Sovetskiy kompozitior publishing house that “I began going to concerts, to meetings within the Composer’s Union [na sektï]—in general [through these friendships] a whole new life began...” See Shul’gin, Muzïkal’niye istinï Aleksandra Vustina, 34-35.


All of Vustin’s ritualistic pieces are characterized, first and foremost, by the great prominence given to percussion, described by Vustin as “innately ritualistic” instruments [*ritual’niy po svoey prirode*] most capable of conveying immediate expression. More specifically, these ritualistic works are characterized by independent, solo writing for percussion: both *The Word* and *Memoria-2*, for example, feature prolonged, quasi-improvisational solo passages for percussion, while *Zaitsev’s Letter* includes a “solo bass drum” [*soloiruyushchiy baraban*] which performs independently of the musical and rhythmic structures governing the other instrumental voices. Although these solo percussion parts in Vustin’s ritualistic works sound improvised, they are the end result of complex numerical designs. In this way, Vustin is like his mentor, Denisov, who was loath to abandon composerly control over his material. More importantly, for Vustin this seeming spontaneity became something like a Trojan Horse through which he might capture his listeners’ attention and smuggle numerical Truth into their hearts and minds.

Vustin’s interest in percussion, and particularly his interest in the use of percussion as an independent solo voice, had taken root before he joined the Denisov circle. While at the radio Vustin had listened extensively to Xenakis’ percussion sextet *Persephassa* (1969) and attended Les Percussions de Strasbourg’s performance of it in Moscow in 1973, a concert he hails as among the most significant events of the 1970s. Another important influence on Vustin was French composer André Jolivet (1905-1974). Scores and recordings of many of Jolivet’s works were available at the radio’s *fonoteka* and Vustin studied them intensively, particularly Jolivet’s *Concerto No. 2 for Trumpet and Orchestra* (1954), which features extensive use of percussion.

In the early 1970s, Vustin became acquainted with Pekarsky, who immediately encouraged him to write for percussion. As part of this encouragement, in 1972 Pekarsky gave Vustin a copy of Polish composer Włodzimierz Kotoński’s (b. 1925) book *Percussion Instruments in the Contemporary Orchestra* [*Instrumenty perkusyjne we współczesnej orkiestrze*] (1963, rev. 1968). Thanks to Pekarsky, interest in percussion was widespread in Moscow new music circles of the time. In 1966, Gubaidulina began the first of many collaborations with Pekarsky with her Five Etudes for Harp, Double Bass, and Percussion. Denisov, meanwhile, wrote numerous theoretical works on percussion during these years, perhaps motivated by

---

102 Vustin, interview with the author, January 5, 2008.
103 Ibid.
Kotoński’s book. In 1973, Denisov wrote an article about Stravinsky’s use of percussion, followed four years later with an article on percussion in Bartók’s works. Edison Denisov’s theoretical work on percussion peaked in 1982 with the publication of his treatise Percussion Instruments in the Contemporary Orchestra [Udarnïye instrumentï v sovremennom orkestre]. Denisov’s interest in percussion during these years was not only theoretical: in 1977, the same year he wrote about Bartók’s use of percussion, Denisov composed his Concerto piccolo for four saxophones (one performer) and six percussionists, written for Les Percussions de Strasbourg and saxophonist Jean-Marie Londi.

Lyubimov’s improvisatory performance at the Central House of Workers of the Arts not only provided general inspiration for Vustin’s ritualistic style, but helped jump-start it in a more direct way. Vustin was impressed by Krimets’ conducting at the concert and wanted Krimets to perform one of his works. In the wake of the concert, Vustin approached Krimets and showed him his Sonata for Six and the Nocturnes, hoping that Krimets would program them. Krimets proposed instead that Vustin write a new work, provided that it “is interesting not only to professional musicians, but to the general public, too.”

Vustin responded with his first ritualistic work, The Word [Slovo] (1975), an eight-minute long work for oboe, clarinet, baritone saxophone, contrabassoon, horn, trumpet, trombone, and percussion (one player). The Word is cast in a rounded three-part form [A B C A’]. Each of the work’s three sections features a different rhythmic texture. The opening incantatory passage, which is repeated in modified form at the piece’s end (m.153), is homorhythmic and characterized by constantly-shifting meters. The Word’s penultimate section (m.111-152) is largely heterorhythmic, characterized mainly by unexpected stops and starts.

The work’s longest section is its extensive second part, which Tsenova dubs a rhythmic theme with variations. Built upon straightforward processes of repetition and accumulation, this section is probably Vustin’s most direct answer to Krimets’ request for a work pleasing to non-specialists and musicians alike. This section is based upon an eight-measure rhythmic pattern, first sounded piano by the brass trio at m.22 (example 4.22). This eight-bar figure is repeated, back-to-back, ten more times (for a total of eleven iterations). With each iteration, more instruments join this rhythmic figure, which grows louder and louder. By m.106, all wind instruments have joined in, playing this figure forte.

While the wind and brass instruments perform this gradually accumulating repeating pattern, the percussionist begins a quasi-improvisational solo. At first, the percussionist’s gestures are sparse and quiet, and its first several passages on the tom-tom, marked piano, are supported by the contrabassoon. As the repeating rhythmic pattern in the winds grows in volume, the percussionist’s solo becomes louder and more complex. By m.102, the eleventh and final iteration of the repeating rhythmic structure, the percussionist drums frantically (example 4.23).

---

107 Edison Denisov, Udarnïye instrumentï v sovremennom orkestre (Moscow: Sovetskiy kompozitor, 1982).
108 Kholopov and Tsenova, Edison Denisov, 104. This was not Denisov’s final work for Les Percussions de Strasbourg: in 1995, he composed the sextet Naissance du rythme for the group.
109 Shul’gin, Muzïkal’niye istinyi Aleksandra Vustina, 86.
110 Pol’dyayeva, “Muzïka – eto muzïka,” 21 and Shul’gin, Muzïkal’niye istinyi Aleksandra Vustina, 88. As Vustin tells Pol’dyayeva, “[Krimets] forgot about our little ‘agreement’ [dogovor],” and has yet to conduct the work.
While writing *The Word*, Vustin looked for inspiration to a recent work by Gubaidulina, whom he describes as a master of the direct, intense style he was then developing. In November 1974, Vustin attended the world premiere of Gubaidulina’s *Quattro* (1974), for two trumpets and two trombones, in a concert at the Composers’ Union. *Quattro* provided Vustin an example of a work pleasing to specialists and non-specialists alike, thus showing him how he might go about fulfilling Krimets’ directive. As Michael Kurtz describes,

The rhythmic character and entertaining performative [sic] style of *Quattro*—trumpets and trombones play together in the same direction and in opposition, the trumpets turn to the right and to the left or up or down—all has enormous appeal, and the performance was a huge success...Shostakovich was in the audience and rose for a standing ovation, so that the musicians felt obliged to present a part of the work as an encore.\(^{112}\)

The concert left a particularly strong impression on Vustin, and he modeled much of *The Word* upon Gubaidulina’s piece; as Vustin told Pol’dyayev, “without *Quattro*, I would not have written *The Word*.\(^{113}\)

The influence of Gubaidulina’s work on *The Word* is clear in several ways. *Quattro* prominently features repetition as a central organizing principle. For example, the trombones’ opening passage in *Quattro* is repeated in the trumpets at R.12 (though in inversion, as the trumpets perform descending minor sevenths, as opposed to the trombones’ ascending intervals) (example 4.24). Also, throughout *Quattro*, Gubaidulina juxtaposes strict and free forms. For much of the concluding part of *Quattro*, from R.25 to R.27, the trumpets perform a constant sixteenth-note pulse, against which the trombonists improvise (example 4.25). This section likely inspired the second section of *The Word*, during which the percussionist performs a quasi-improvisatory solo against the winds’ strictly repeating rhythmic figure. However, while Gubaidulina provides the trombonists general guidelines within which they are to improvise ad libitum, Vustin carefully writes out the percussionist’s part, which is precisely notated so as to sound improvised.

Gubaidulina’s *Quattro* is not the only work influencing *The Word*. Musicologist Svetlana Savenko has drawn comparisons between *The Word* and Stravinsky’s *Symphonies of Wind Instruments* (1920). Savenko’s comparison is not based solely on the fact that *The Word* is written exclusively for wind instruments. Rather, she senses a deeper aesthetic link between the two works. As Savenko writes,
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\(^{112}\) Kurtz, *Gubaidulina*, 113. Kurtz states that this concert marked Vustin’s “first encounter with Gubaidulina’s music.” This statement is plausible, if doubtful. By 1975, Gubaidulina and Vustin had a personal relationship, as in 1972 Gubaidulina strongly promoted Vustin’s entry into the Composers’ Union (see Shul’gin, *Muzïkal’nïye istinï Aleksandra Vustina*, 38). Kurtz’s work list in his book on Gubaidulina does not show any premieres of her works between 1972-75. Thus, it is possible that this concert marked Vustin’s first time hearing Gubaidulina’s music live, though it is doubtful he did not know her music before then.

\(^{113}\) Vustin, “Muzïka – eto muzïka,” 20. *Quattro* itself was inspired in large part by Smirnov, Vustin’s new friend at the publishing house. As Michael Kurtz recounts, Smirnov, who was the editor of works for winds at Sovetskiy kompozitor, asked Gubaidulina to contribute a brief work to help round out a volume then being prepared for publication. Around the same time, trumpeter Leonid Chumov asked Gubaidulina to write a work for him. Gubaidulina responded to these requests with *Quattro*, and Smirnov’s relationship with the work likely influenced Vustin’s interest in it. See Kurtz, *Sofia Gubaidulina*, 112-13
Vustin searches for ritual power [ritual’naya deystvennost’] in art...[and] the magical can indeed be sensed in his music. It first appeared...in his work The Word (1975) for winds and percussion, which is reminiscent of Stravinsky’s Symphonies of Wind Instruments with its pagan incantations [yazïcheskaya zaklinatel’nost’].

However, Vustin’s “pagan incantations,” which Savenko sees as derived from Stravinsky, are perhaps inspired by a less obvious source, French composer Henri Dutilleux (b. 1916) and his orchestral work Métaboles (1959-64).

Dutilleux enjoyed special popularity in Moscow’s new music circles thanks to his close relationships with Rostropovich and Denisov. Rostropovich long championed Dutilleux and commissioned several works from him, beginning with Tout un monde lointain... (1967-70) for cello and orchestra. Denisov began corresponding with Dutilleux in the early 1970s and taught Dutilleux’ music in his orchestration classes at the Moscow Conservatory. Denisov also arranged for Dutilleux to meet with his students during the French composer’s numerous trips to the Soviet Union beginning in the 1970s.

Denisov was particularly fond of Dutilleux’s Métaboles, which he described as exemplary of the ways in which contemporary composers “entrust to percussion instruments the most important dramatic and structural functions [in a composition],” ideals Vustin was developing as a central feature of his ritualistic style. Denisov analyzed and reproduced excerpts from Métaboles in his 1982 percussion book and, according to Tarnopolski, regularly showed this work to the young composers of his circle. Underscoring Denisov’s affinity for this piece, Métaboles was one of four works performed by the National Philharmonic of Russia in an October 2006 concert at the Moscow Conservatory’s Great Hall in honor of the tenth anniversary of Denisov’s death.
Given Denisov’s close relationship with Dutilleux during the 1970s, his affinity for *Métaboles* and opinion of it as exemplary of independent, fresh use of percussion, and the fact that he regularly showed *Métaboles* to his followers, it seems plausible that Vustin would have consulted *Métaboles* while designing his own percussion-oriented style. Indeed, several elements of *The Word* seem directly modeled on Dutilleux’s score. For example, the opening, incantatory passage of *The Word* bears striking resemblance to the opening bars of *Métaboles*’ first movement, “Incantatoire” (compare the opening of *The Word* in example 4.26 with the opening of Dutilleux’s *Métaboles* in example 4.27). The opening melodic gestures of Vustin’s work recall the opening contours of *Métaboles*, especially through the prominent use of the interval of a fourth, though in Dutilleux’s work the fourth is augmented while in Vustin’s it is perfect. Also, the opening of *The Word*, like *Métaboles*, prominently features syncopation and accented appoggiaturas. In *Métaboles*, the accented appoggiatura is achieved through use of a grace note on the downbeat of m.5, whereas in *The Word* the appoggiaturas are created through sixteenth-note figures on the downbeats of mm. 3, 5, 7, et cetera.

Dutilleux’s score perhaps further inspired the repetitive second section of *The Word*. The final movement of *Métaboles*, “Flamboyant,” features a four-bar structure that repeats ten times. With each iteration more instruments join in, and this four-bar unit grows from a handful of instruments playing *pianissimo* (at R.59) through to a full orchestral *forte* (at R.62). This technique is similar to the processes of repetition and growth in the second section of *The Word*.

“Dodecaphony in Time”

With *The Word*, Vustin laid the foundation of his ritualistic style and began his experiments with rhythm, the aspect of music he felt was most neglected in his formal studies at the conservatory. Vustin pursued this rhythmic experimentation in his next ritualistic work, *Memoria-2* (1978), a fifteen minute-long *concerto grosso* for percussion sextet and chamber orchestra written for Pekarsky and his ensemble, who premiered it at the House of Composers in December 1978.

*Memoria-2* develops the basic hallmarks of Vustin’s ritualistic style first presented in *The Word*. Like the second section of *The Word*, *Memoria-2* develops through a gradual process of accumulation, building slowly from a *pianissimo* beginning to a *fortissimo* end. Only the work’s first and last minute include the accompanying instruments; the overwhelming majority of *Memoria-2* is written exclusively for the percussionist soloists, who perform in a quasi-improvisatory style throughout. The percussionists’ seeming spontaneity, though, is the result of a complex numerical structure, as *Memoria-2* features Vustin’s first extension of his *dvenadtsatikratnost’* system to the field of rhythm.

Innovative approaches to rhythm, especially numerically based ones, increasingly interested several Moscow composers during this period. For example, in the early 1980s, as Vustin developed his ritualistic style, his friend Gubaidulina began her own experiments with interlinked [*kreplko pererepletis’*] with the French avant-garde.” See Biryukova, “Desyat’ let bez Denisova,” *Izvestiya* 2 November 2006. Available online at http://www.izvestia.ru/culture/article3098099 (accessed September 13, 2009).
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122 For six solo percussionists accompanied by string orchestra, piano, celesta, and tubular bells. Pekarsky and his ensemble premiered the work on December 25, 1978, conducted by Vladimir Kozhukhar’. Sincerest thanks to Eliza Montgomery for helping me obtain a copy of the published score of *Memoria-2*.
rhythm, devising elaborate numerical calculations to determine a work’s individual rhythmic figures and the proportions between formal sections. Gubaidulina, who developed these theories in collaboration with her partner Pyotr Meshchaninov, called her new approach the “rhythm of form” [ritm formi] and first practiced it in the twelfth movement, “Monty’s Death,” of her chamber work Percepción (1981-83), which is based largely upon the Fibonacci sequence. As Gubaidulina explained to musicologist Olga Bugrova, throughout this period she came to view rhythm as the most important aspect of music and the single element upon which all others are based:

Mulling over which of the three fundamental elements [of music] might be seen as the “roots” of the tree, I realized that it was rhythm. All of the harmonic, the mass of the resonance, forms the “trunk” while the contrapuntal lines exemplify the “leaves.” […] Melody can no longer be conceived, as in the past, as the means for developing, elaborating the material. Instead, it must manifest itself as a transformation of the material itself, and the consequence of growth from the “roots” through the “trunk.”

As Michael Kurtz points out, Gubaidulina’s “rhythm of form,” though based upon complex numerical calculations, is motivated largely by metaphysical aspirations, as Gubaidulina attempts to conjure up through these calculations a sense of “essential, sacred time… ‘time outside of time’…the realm of the soul.”

Beginning with Memoria-2, Vustin pursued a similarly rigorous approach to rhythm, and with similar metaphysical aspirations. Memoria-2 is Vustin’s first large-scale attempt at serializing rhythm, and the work’s rhythmic structure is organized according to his dvonadtsatikratnost’ system in a technique Vustin calls dodekafonija vo vremeni, or “dodecaphony in time.” For Vustin, the work’s complex rhythmic structure is central to its ritualistic power. As Vustin explained to Shul’gin, Memoria-2’s esoteric design imparts unto it a higher, numerically based truth, transmitted to performers and listeners alike through the work’s immediate, accessible style:

[At the premiere of Memoria-2] I was simply in ecstasy. I don’t think I’ve ever been happier. At that moment I saw things in a new light and came to a new understanding of the Beautiful, as I found for myself a new definition of beauty, one connected with numbers…And I understood that this symmetry, these numbers, this strictness and limitation, when practiced, can bring about a higher level of beauty. Even more, it can help impart a feeling of transformative action, especially when the composition becomes ritualistic. I mean ritualistic in the broadest possible sense, not in reference to church or some specific denomination.

123 For a detailed analysis of Gubaidulina’s rhythmic practice, especially its numerological bases, see Valeriya Tsenova, Chisliviye tayni muzyki Sofii Gubaydulinoj (Moscow: Moskovskaya gosudarstvennaya konservatoriya, 2000).
124 For a brief discussion of Meshchaninov’s ideas and Gubaidulina’s “rhythm of form,” see Michael Kurtz, Sofia Gubaidulina, 174-177.
126 Kurtz, Sofia Gubaidulina 175.
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but rather ritual as an act - perhaps even an offering to the Deity of Art
[prinosheniye bozhestvu iskusstva], in which everyone might be united together –
not only the performers, but everyone on stage, even everyone in the hall. Earlier
I had felt this only vaguely, and only then at a few concerts of avant-garde music.
I wanted more than anything to achieve this feeling.128

How Vustin serialized rhythm in Memoria-2 is detailed in the Appendix. In the wake of
this piece, Vustin applied his “dodecaphony in time” technique to several large-scale works of
the 1980s and early 90s, including Zaitsev’s Letter.

Zaitsev’s Magic Square

The technical, stylistic, and philosophical concerns occupying Vustin throughout the 1970s and
80s came to a head in Zaitsev’s Letter, in which Vustin extended his ritualistic style all the while
intensifying his quest for the numerically Beautiful. Zaitsev’s Letter marks Vustin’s first attempt
at serializing pitch and rhythm in a single work. Before Zaitsev’s Letter, Vustin had applied his
dvenadtsatikratnost’ system to organize either a work’s pitch or rhythmic content, but not both.
In Zaitsev’s Letter, this system governs both elements simultaneously. At the same time, Vustin
applies his dvenadtsatikratnost’ system to develop increasingly esoteric formal designs,
particularly in Zaitsev’s Letter’s pitch organization. As we shall see in the next chapter, in
the wake of this piece and the closely-related Music for Ten [Muzïka dlya desyatï] (1991), and amid
the chaos of the Soviet collapse, Vustin would largely abandon his ritualistic style, all the while
focusing intently on the numerically Beautiful.

Like Memoria-2, Zaitsev’s Letter is organized as a two-part fugue. Fugue I spans
roughly the first half of the work (mm. 4-75), while Fugue II covers the second half (mm. 76-
147). Examples 4.28 and 4.29 present each fugue’s twelve-bar subject. The Fugue I subject is
first stated by Violins 1-3 (m.4), and repeated by Violas 1-2 (m. 16) and Cello 1 (m. 28). The
Fugue II subject is first stated by Violins 1-3 (m. 76), and repeated by Violas 1-2 (m. 88) and
Cello 1-2 (m. 100).

Each fugal subject consists of four twelve-tone rows. In both Fugues I and II, the
intervallic content of each answer differs from the intervallic content of the original subject.
Compare, for example, the initial statement of the Fugue I subject and its first answer (example
4.30). The first statement of the subject begins with an ascending major third, ascending major
second, and descending minor second (i.e., a P0 row), while the answer begins with an ascending
fourth, followed by descending minor and major seconds (i.e., an R5 row). As we will see
below, these row forms are determined by Vustin’s dvenadtsatikratnost’ system.

Although the fugal subjects and their answers have different intervallic content, Vustin is
able to create the impression of fugal imitation by replicating melodic gesture. As demonstrated
in examples 4.28 and 4.29, both subjects feature an unusually wide melodic ambitus. These
wide ambituses permit Vustin to mimic melodic gesture in each fugal answer without recreating
the subject’s intervallic content. In this way, Vustin’s fugal answers throughout Zaitsev’s Letter
are not “real,” but are instead “tonal,” replicating the subjects’ melodic contours within the
 confines of the work’s governing pitch scheme.

128 Shul’gin, Muzïkal’niye istini Aleksandra Vustina, 110-111.
In Zaitsev’s Letter Vustin serializes rhythm according to his “dodecaphony in time”
technique. The work’s rhythmic organization is almost identical to that of Memoria-2 (see
Appendix). There are a total of forty-eight rhythmic units repeating throughout Zaitsev’s Letter.
Half of these units are derived from Fugue I, and half from Fugue II.
Examples 4.31 and 4.32 show these units and the pitch names I have assigned to them.
Example 4.33 applies these pitch names to map out the rhythmic organization of Zaitsev’s Letter.
As is the case in Memoria-2, these rhythmic units form twelve-tone rows which recur in patterns
determined by Vustin’s {\textit{dvenadtsatikratnost’}} system. Example 4.34 shows the derivation of
these rhythmic rows from the standard table of 144 row forms produced by Vustin’s
{\textit{dvenadtsatikratnost’}} system. These rows almost exactly match those Vustin used in Memoria-2
(see example 4.34). As in Memoria-2, these rows are themselves abstracted “retrogrades” of one
another: the starting pitches of Fugue I’s rhythmic rows spell out the first hexachord of a P0
row, while the starting pitches of Fugue II’s rows, arranged from the end to the beginning, spell
out the first hexachord of R11.

As to pitch content, Vustin cycles through the tone rows of his {\textit{dvenadtsatikratnost’}}
approach in a systematic fashion. Throughout Zaitsev’s Letter a new row begins every three
measures, and every row is stated in full. For most of Zaitsev’s Letter only one row form sounds
at any given time. There is, however, a twenty-four measure span in the work’s middle (mm.
76-99) during which multiple row forms sound simultaneously.
Example 4.35 shows the row forms Vustin uses throughout Zaitsev’s Letter. As
demonstrated in this chart, Vustin creates two interlocking patterns in the work. Both patterns
are derived from his {\textit{dvenadtsatikratnost’}} system, though not in immediately obvious ways. The
first pattern comes directly from the standard table of 144 rows first presented in example 4.17.
(Compare the unshaded boxes in example 4.35 with the first three columns of example 4.17.)
The second pattern, shown in the shaded boxes, adheres to Vustin’s standard numerical
sequences for determining row forms (namely, pattern \( \begin{bmatrix} \text{1 \ 2 \ 3 \ 4} \end{bmatrix} ^{1} \ 3 \ 1 \ 4 \ 2 \ / \ 2 \ 4 \ 1 \ 3 \ \text{and pattern} \ \begin{bmatrix} \text{4 \ 2 \ 3 \ 1} \end{bmatrix} ^{2} \ 1 \ 3 \ 2 \ 4 \ / \ 3 \ 4 \ 1 \ 2 \)). However, the starting pitches of this second pattern do not form
twelve-tone rows, as is standard in Vustin’s practice (see the shaded boxes in columns 3 and 4 of
example 4.35).
The key to this second pattern lies at the end of each row. Example 4.36 shows the final
pitches of each row in this second pattern. As demonstrated in this example, these final pitches
form rows derived from Vustin’s {\textit{dvenadtsatikratnost’}} system: reading upwards from the bottom
right-hand corner, the right-hand column forms an I0 row (or 4 on B♭), while the next column
begins with the pitch from position 2 of this row, G♭, and forms an R5 row (or 3 on G♭).
Thus, Vustin organizes the pitch material of Zaitsev’s Letter in an elaborate mirror form.
Two symmetrical patterns unfold throughout the work: the first pattern begins at the work’s
outset and is determined by each rows’ starting pitch, while the second begins at the work’s end
and is determined by each row’s final pitch. This elaborate mirror design mimics the work’s
rhythmic organization, which itself is cast in a loose retrograde form. Example 4.37 summarizes
these twin mirror designs. Through these elaborate formulations, Vustin helps perfect, in
Zaitsev’s Letter, the ideals of symmetry and hidden structures preached by Kholopov and
Herschkowitz.
Ghosts of 1948

For Vustin, these esoteric designs are not only tied to his interest in cultivating the numerically Beautiful, but are also central to his goal of expressing the text. In conversations with Dmitriy Shul’gin, Vustin described these melodic and rhythmic fugues, produced through his strict serial practice, as emblematic of the imprisonment Zaitsev describes in his letter:

[In Zaitsev’s Letter] everything is pieced together in blocks [in the rhythmic fugue] because I wanted to express the “mechanicity” [mekhanisticnost’] characteristic of the awful life in prison, of the way everything is pre-planned in that hell.129

In applying fugue towards symbolic ends, Vustin could look for models to several pieces by his mentor Denisov, who included what Tat’yana Dubravskaya calls “symbol-canons” [kanoni-simvoli] in several works, notably the Canon in Memory of Igor Stravinsky [Kanon pamyati Igorya Stravinskogo] (1971), the Blue Notebook [Golubaya tetrad’] (1985) and, later, the “Golgotha” movement of The Story of the Life and Death of Our Lord Jesus Christ [Istoriya zhizni i smerti Gospoda nashego Isusa Khrista] (1992).130

Vustin’s “symbolic” pitch and rhythmic fugues, it should be noted, are not the only musical elements helping to express the text in Zaitsev’s Letter. Throughout the piece, as some instruments play Vustin’s sonorist sounds “a la Penderecki” and others cycle throughout the rhythmic and pitch series, differing groups of instruments occasionally play long, sustained chords. These sustained chords begin at m.19 and continue intermittently throughout the piece, appearing at particularly fraught moments in the text to help provide an aureole of sound setting off these emotionally-charged moments. For example, the first appearance of these sustained chords (mm. 19-30) corresponds with the passage in which the narrator describes hearing the repeated sexual assaults of prisoners next door.

Like all pitch material in Zaitsev’s Letter, these sustained chords are also drawn from Vustin’s dvenadtsatikratnost’ system. Example 4.38 shows the pitch content of the first set of sustained chords, from mm. 19-30:

---

129 Ibid., 182.
130 See T. Dubravskaya’s section on “Kanon” in Chapter 7, “Polifoniya. Muzikal’noye pis’mo.” of Teoriya sovremennoy kompozitsii, ed. Valeriya Tsenova (Moscow: Muzika, 2007), 215-227. Symbolic canons are but one of the several types of canons Dubravskaya identifies in Denisov’s work, whom she calls a “master of the canon.” She also identifies Denisov’s use of “spatial canons” [prostranstvenny kanon], “surrealist canons/ ‘visions’” [zyurrealisticheskiye kanoni-’videniya’] and “timbral ‘detached’ canons” [“tembrovo-otryoshenny kanon], like the whispered canon in the sixth movement of Sun of the Incas.
Ex. 4.38 – Derivation of the sustained voices’ pitch content in Aleksandr Vustin, Zaitsev’s Letter, mm. 19-30

As this example shows, these chords form the tetrachords of row forms P2, I11, and RI4. The order of these rows follows Vustin’s dvenadtsatikratnost’ system. When these sustained pitches begin at m.19, the fugal voices are performing a P2 row, thus the sustained voices begin with a P2 row, too. After the sustained voices complete the P2 row, they move to the next rows in Vustin’s system, I11 and RI4.

Near the end of Zaitsev’s Letter, these sustained chords move from instruments to voice. Beginning at m.109, and lasting through to m.147, the instrumentalists begin to sing a slow, sustained chorale. The text for this chorale comes from the Gospel of Matthew 27:46, “My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?” [Bozhe Moy, dlya chevo Ti Menya ostavil?]. This chorale is the only instance of singing in the work. Like all pitched material preceding it, its pitches, too, derive from the work’s serial system. In closing his work with a twelve-tone chorale setting of a liturgical text, Vustin underscores the connection between Zaitsev’s Letter and Schoenberg’s A Survivor from Warsaw, which closes with a twelve-tone setting of the Shema Yisroel.131

Zaitsev’s Letter, then, is a hodgepodge of symbols and sounds designed to maximally express the text, from its sonorist shrieks “a la Penderecki” to its fugal design symbolic of prison life through to the dodecaphonic chorale at the work’s end. In this way, Zaitsev’s Letter is emblematic of what Tarnopolski and Snitkova describe as the distinguishing feature of late-Soviet modernism, namely the conjoining of easily-read symbols with modernist musical devices so as to communicate with the audience as clearly as possible.

However, not everyone seemed convinced by Vustin’s and his cohort’s belief in modern music’s expressive potential. In a 1993 interview in Muzïkal’naya akademiya, Yelena Pol’dyayeva tells Vustin that, in her opinion “contemporary music written in the West and in Russia today is oriented more towards abstract constructions and schema.”132 Pol’dyayeva’s question touched a nerve in Vustin, who attributed such thinking to leftover prejudices from the Zhdanovshchina:

Don’t believe it! It’s a legend! Not too long ago I heard Ligeti’s Lux aeterna at a fantastic concert, and I could think only about heavenly beauty. Abstract constructions, what do you mean? This is just the ghost of 1948! And Moses und

---

Aron or A Survivor from Warsaw – abstract constructions? No! In our culture, we simply have some complex that if a person spends a long time working out the technical details of his material, then he’s not a composer, but a computer. This isn’t true.133

Despite her general skepticism towards contemporary music, Zaitsev’s Letter’s expressive powers clearly worked on Pol’dyayeva, who confessed to Vustin, “I could listen to Zaitsev’s Letter only once. The relentless cries and confession of this tormented soul were simply too much to bear.”134

The Two Paths

As we have seen, Zaitsev’s Letter embodies two separate yet interrelated tendencies – Vustin’s interest in aesthetic immediacy and expression on the one hand and, on the other, his fascination with esoteric structures and abstract musical designs. During perestroika and the early 1990s, critics focused mainly upon the work’s immediacy and direct relevance for contemporary society. Pol’dyayeva’s comments about the work to Vustin echo many of the sentiments first expressed by Maya Pritsker in 1991, whose review of the work’s premiere was quoted in this chapter’s introduction. As Pritsker wrote in Muzïkal’naya zhizn’,

In [Zaitsev’s Letter] there is the pain of a young man, of the loss of dignity, the horrors of violence. These are expressed through means which, although well-known, are unexpected and used in a fresh, new way: Vustin makes use of Schoenberg’s Sprechstimme, here used so obviously for practically the first time in Russian music, along with a “torn,” [rvanaya] convulsing instrumental fabric. We seek a reflection of our contemporary problems in art, yet are scared off by anything too immediately relevant, by anything associated with today’s “hot topics” [‘na zlobu dnya’]. Yet here comes a sincere and talented person who takes his material directly from real life, who writes music about these eternal matters, compelling us to shudder at the unexpected...135

From the mid-1990s onward, though, fewer and fewer critics would describe the work as expressive of real-life matters, as Pritsker and Pol’dyayeva had done. Rather, critics increasingly focused on the work’s abstract designs and deemphasized its social relevance. In 1994, Valeriya Tsenova—who one year earlier had noted the direct relationship between the trans-social mode and Russia’s social chaos136—described Zaitsev’s Letter as a pure work of art motivated exclusively by formal matters and little concerned with social questions:

133 Ibid.
134 Ibid., 25.
135 Maya Pritsker, “Vïzhivyom?,” 111-112.
136 As quoted at the chapter’s beginning, Tsenova wrote that art needn’t reflect social collapse during times of crisis, and that artists “might stake out a position in opposition to the negative influences of the surrounding world.” Kholopov and Tsenova, Edison Denisov, 171.
Zaitsev’s Letter is not a musico-journalistic work; first and foremost, it is a musical composition confined to an abstract musical form, which corroborates Alexander Vustin’s tenet that all is music and any phenomenon in life, even the most horrible one, is musical.\footnote{Tsenva, “Alexander Vustin: The Battlefield is the Soul,” in Underground Music from the Former USSR, 212. Tsenova originally wrote these lines in her 1994 article “Aleksandr Vustin: Pole bitvi – dusha,” in Muzika iz bivshego SSSR (Moscow: Kompozitor, 1994). I quote here from the 1997 English-language version, translated by Rom{v}a Kovanovskaya, because this is the only version of the text I have seen.}

Musicologist Svetlana Savenko shares many of the same ideas. Writing in the 2005 History of Russian Music of the Second Half of the Twentieth Century, Savenko downplays the work’s expressive qualities. For her, even the work’s prose text, which is clearly read by the narrator, is simply another element in Vustin’s abstract designs:

In numerous instances [Vustin] unmistakably makes use of the New Viennese technique of Sprechstimme (speech-song) – his Zaitsev’s Letter (1990) for voice, strings, and large bass drum (Vustin’s favorite instrument) bears more than an incidental resemblance to Schoenberg’s A Survivor from Warsaw. At the same time, it is not an imitation. Unlike Schoenberg, Vustin seemingly sacrifices the words’ semantic meaning, instead highlighting their phonetic aspects and sonoristic qualities, all the while filling his score with various timbral effects, thus uniting the vocal and instrumental sounds.\footnote{Svetlana Savenko, “Postsovetskoye muzikal’noye prostranstvo,” in Istorinya otechestvennoy muziki vtoroy polovini XX veka, 442.}

Savenko’s assertion that Vustin sacrifices the text’s meaning and instead parses words into component sounds is puzzling, as throughout Zaitsev’s Letter the narrator reads the text in a clear, comprehensible, and straightforward fashion. The recording of the work’s November 1990 premiere confirms this. Throughout the performance vocalist Yuriy Khomenko enunciated words crisply and clearly, and the text is readily understandable.\footnote{Thanks to the staff of the Center for Contemporary Music at the Moscow Conservatory for providing me access to this recording.}

Tsenova’s and Savenko’s comments about Zaitsev’s Letter were perhaps motivated in part by Vustin’s own remarks about his work during the early post-Soviet years. Though he had taken great pains to fill Zaitsev’s Letter with symbols expressing the text and its images, by 1993 Vustin claimed that Zaitsev’s Letter is actually not expressive of its text after all, but is instead representative of a wider, more open-ended music which transcends all boundaries and promises us liberation:

Having read Zaitsev’s letter I understood that everything might be music, even the most awful. It’s a story about how they tried to kill a man’s soul […] Even in Schoenberg’s A Survivor from Warsaw, those people’s souls are not crushed [dushi ne slomleni], as testified to by the hymn at the work’s end. And thus, despite whatever horrors might exist, it seems to me that music exists in everything [muzika razlita vo vsyem]; I sense this even in the most terrible things.  

[…] I wouldn’t want to consider Zaitsev’s Letter a morose composition […] Listening to music such as this brings me joy, if you’d pardon my saying so. Because, in it, there is nevertheless some sort of liberation [osvobozhdeniye].

Vustin elaborated upon these ideas in a recent interview:

Society is music, our lives are music. This conversation with you is music […] Everything is music […] [I read Zaitsev’s] prose text. He doesn’t pretend to any sort of artfulness. And I heard music in this text. I heard tremendous music! […] Any text, even the most awful, can be illuminated through music. It’s difficult for me to explain this. Music has its own language, its own territory, its own world.

Tsenova’s, Savenko’s, and Vustin’s comments about Zaitsev’s Letter are emblematic of the broad shift toward the trans-social unfolding in Russian music throughout the 1990s. This shift is not only evident in musicological discourse, but in new composition, too. As Vustin described these ideas to Pol’dyayeva in 1993, he was busy exploring music’s “own territory, its own world,” filling his works with ever-more esoteric symbols while abandoning the engaging language of his ritualistic style.

Vustin was not alone. Though most Russian musicological works today insist that the Soviet collapse had no effect upon new composition, in fact several composers changed or developed their styles during the early post-Soviet years. These stylistic shifts form the subject of the next chapter.

---

142 Aleksandr Vustin, interview with the author, January 5, 2008.
Мне было семьдесят лет, когда ворота специприятия захлопнулись за моей спиной. Прошло два с половиной года, тех самых, что определил суд. Теперь мне девятнадцать, я только-только вышел на свободу и, как говорится, по свежим еще следам хочу поделиться своими наблюдениями.

В трудовой колонии для несовершеннолетних практически всё построено на культуре силы и унижении достоинства более слабого. Нормальных взаимоотношений нет как среди воспитанников, так и между ними и администрацией. У меня в памяти с первых месяцев заключения (это еще следственный изолятор) стоит страшные сцены расправ и насилия над одним пареньком. Буквально за несколько дней из человека сделали животное, методично убивая в нем собственное достоинство, заставляя делать то, о чем невозможно написать, исходя из элементарной порядочности. А было человеку всего-то четырнадцать лет… Подобное происходило и в соседней камере. И приходилось идти на компромисс со своей совестью, отворачиваться от стены, лёжа на нарах, старатся не слышать стона и слёзы мольбы парня, обращенные к мучителям. Иначе подобная участь может постигнуть и тебя. Закончилось всё тем, что он несколько раз покушался на самоубийство, а в конце концов совершил побег из-под стражи.

Называются колонии воспитательно-трудовыми. Но на практике первоочередная задача администрации – выполнение производственного плана. Может, дело в том, что в ВТК обычно работают люди, не имеющие специального педагогического образования?

До сих пор администрация назначает на должность бригадира тех, кто пошёл в плечах, да и кулак у кого впечатляющих размеров. Они и бесчестивают, с попустительства некоторых, язык не поворачивается сказать, воспитателей, держа в страхе весь коллектив. Это так называемые “оборзевшие”. Как же всё просто: сказал им, что необходимо организовать построение, уборку помещений и т.п. – всё будет сделано. И не нужно угрожать себя, искать подход, заниматься педагогикой, ведь есть надёжные помощники. Главное – с виду полный порядок, воспитанники как ёлковые, идет отряд по палату – любо смотреть: шаг чеканят, песню поют – аж воздух содрогается… Шло свидание с родственниками. Мать, узнав о том, что у сына пропали рукавицы (морозы в ту зиму стояли лютые, даже в комнате свиданий коченели руки и ноги) сняла свои и упросила дежурного разрешить передать их сыну. Я видел, как у мальчишки в глазах стояли слёзы. Но закончилось свидание, ушли родители, к парню подошёл один из “сильных мира сего” и не церемонясь, вырвал варежки из его рук…

Постоянно внушенное различными методами сознание собственной неполноценности, вытравливание из личности собственного «я», постоянное напоминание о том, что ты преступник, и ты недостоин, чтобы к тебе нормально относились, – вот самое первое, с чем мы столкнулись по прибытии в ВТК и будучи еще в карантине. Утром во время завтрака в комнату вошёл дежурный помощник и вывел всех в коридор. Он приказал встать лицом к стене, сложив руки над головой. Так он продержал нас в течение получаса, понося различными оскорблениями. У одного ему почему-то не понравились
уши, за что их незадачливый хозяин получил несколько ударов и с удивлением узкал, что “такие уши могут быть только у дебила.” Довольно?

Вечером того же дня нас повели в баню. Когда мы были уже раздеты, вошла сотрудница колонии – молодая женщина лет двадцати восьми – с какими-то бумагами. Нас построили перед ней, и она принялась заполнять карточки на каждого, задавая вопросы. Видимо, ей и в голову не пришло, что у людей, попавших сюда, может быть чувство стыда, элементарного человеческого достоинства.

Ясно, если постоянно сталкиваешься с подобным, развивается закомплексованность, теряешь веру в себя. Всё это опасно: ведь человек, махнувший рукой на себя, на собственную судьбу, становится безразличным и к окружающим, не говоря о том, что до повторного преступления один шаг.

Сергей ЗАЙЦЕВ
Архангельск
Ex. 4.2 – Translation of Zaitsev’s letter

from Ogonyok 49 (1987): 27

I was seventeen years old when the gates to the “special institution” slammed shut behind me. I spent two and a half years there, as sentenced by the court. I’m nineteen now. I was recently released and I’d like to share a few observations while the experience is fresh in my mind.

In the juvenile labor colony, just about everything is organized around the cult of strength and the humiliation of the weak. There are no such things as normal relations amongst the inmates or between the inmates and the staff. I remember terrible acts of retribution and violence against one particular fellow from my first months of imprisonment (I was still in quarantine). Literally within days they made an animal out of him, steadily killing within him any sense of personal dignity, forcing him to do things I can’t even write about out of a sense of basic decency, and this guy was all of fourteen years old. The same thing happened in the room next door, and I had to make a compromise with my conscience to turn my face to the wall, lay down on the bunk and try not to hear this person’s moans, his tearful begging, his pleading with his torturers, or else a similar fate might come my way. Once everything had come to an end, he made several attempts at suicide, and he was eventually able to escape the guards.

They call this place an educational-labor colony, but in reality the administration cares only about fulfilling various production plans. Maybe it’s because the people who work at the camps aren’t trained as educators?

The administration appoints only those who are impressively broad-shouldered and big-fisted to the post of brigadier. They rampage about and terrorize the whole place in cahoots with a few other “educators” (it’s hard to even write that). These are the so-called “big dogs” [oborzevshiye]. It’s all quite simple: they tell them to organize some building project or cleaning-up of the quarters or so forth and everything’s taken care of. They don’t need to worry, don’t need to find a way, and certainly don’t need to teach us anything; after all, they have “reliable helpers.” The most important thing is that everything appear to be in perfect order – the inmates look meek, the regiment marches about in the yard. Just take a look – they mark time, sing a song. The air itself shudders… People met with relatives. One mother who found out that her son’s mittens had disappeared (it was bitterly cold then, and even in the visiting room your hands and legs would go numb) took off her own pair and asked the deputy to allow her to give them to her son. I saw tears well up in the boy’s eyes. But after the meeting, after the parents left, one of the camp’s bullies snatched the mittens from his hands as if it was nothing.

You are constantly reminded in all sorts of ways of your personal inferiority, any sense of self is beat out of you, any sense of self is beat out of you, and there are constant reminders that you are a criminal, that you’re unworthy – this is the norm in the camp. This is the first thing you struggle with upon arrival and while in quarantine. In the morning during breakfast the assistant on duty led everyone into the hallway. He ordered us to stand with our faces to the wall, our hands behind our heads. He kept us like that for an hour, hurling various
Ex. 4.2 cont’d.

insults our way. For some reason he didn’t like one guy’s ears, and these ears’ unlucky owner received several punches, finding out with surprise that only a moron can have such ears. Had enough?

That same day, in the evening, they led us into the showers. After we had undressed a female employee of the camp, a young woman around twenty-eight years old, came in holding various documents. They lined us up in front of her, and she set about filling out paperwork for each person, asking us questions. It was clear that it hadn’t even occurred to her that inmates in the camp might have a sense of shame, let alone of basic human dignity.

It’s obvious that when you constantly encounter such things you develop an inferiority complex and lose faith in yourself. It’s all quite dangerous: after all a person who's given up on himself and his own future will become indifferent to his surroundings, and from there it’s but one small step to becoming a repeat offender.

Sergey ZAITSEV
Arkangel’sk
Ex. 4.3 – Aleksandr Vustin, *Zaitsev’s Letter* (1990), performance instructions

Zaitsev’s Letter (1990)
By Aleksandr Vustin
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
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Ex. 4.4 – Aleksandr Vustin, *Zaitsev’s Letter, senza suoni* whispering, “like a man who has lost his voice,” mm. 97-100

Zaitsev’s Letter (1990)
By Aleksandr Vustin
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 4.4 cont’d.

Zaitsev’s Letter (1990)
By Aleksandr Vustin
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 4.5 – Aleksandr Vustin, Zaitsev’s Letter, compilation of sonorist techniques “a la Penderecki,” mm. 31-38
Ex. 4.5 cont’d.

Zaitsev’s Letter (1990)
By Aleksandr Vustin
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Midnight Music (1977)
By Viktor Suslin
Copyright © MUSIKVERLAG HANS SIKORSKI GmbH & Co. KG, Hamburg
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 4.13 – Tritone sets with Vustin’s row

Vustin’s row in P0 form:

\[
\begin{align*}
[B_b & \ D & E] \quad [C & \ E_b & G_b] \quad [F & \ A & B] \quad [G & \ A_b & D_b] \\
\end{align*}
\]

Ex. 4.14 – Combinatorial hexachords in Vustin’s row

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
\text{P0} & B_b & D & E & E_b & G_b & C & A & B & F & G & A_b & D_b \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
A & G & A_b & F & B & D & C & G_b & E & E_b & B_b & \text{RI3}
\end{array}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hexachord I</th>
<th>Hexachord II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P0</td>
<td>B_b D E E_b G_b C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI3</td>
<td>B_b E_b E G_b C D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example 4.15 – Vustin’s four numerical sequences

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: 1 = prime form; 2 = retrograde inversion form; 3 = retrograde form; 4 = inversion form

Example 4.16 – Palindromes in Vustin’s four numerical sequences
Ex. 4.17 – Table of 144 row forms generated by applying pattern 1 to the P0 form of Vustin’s row

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 30 | 31 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 43 | 44 | 45 | 46 | 47 | 48 | 49 | 50 | 51 | 52 | 53 | 54 | 55 | 56 | 57 | 58 | 59 | 60 | 61 | 62 | 63 | 64 | 65 | 66 | 67 | 68 | 69 | 70 | 71 | 72 | 73 | 74 | 75 | 76 | 77 | 78 | 79 | 80 | 81 | 82 | 83 | 84 | 85 | 86 | 87 | 88 | 89 | 90 | 91 | 92 | 93 | 94 | 95 | 96 | 97 | 98 | 99 | 100 | 101 | 102 | 103 | 104 | 105 | 106 | 107 | 108 | 109 | 110 | 111 | 112 | 113 | 114 | 115 | 116 | 117 | 118 | 119 | 120 | 121 | 122 | 123 | 124 | 125 | 126 | 127 | 128 | 129 | 130 | 131 | 132 | 133 | 134 | 135 | 136 | 137 | 138 | 139 | 140 | 141 | 142 | 143 | 144 |

| 1 on B<br/P0 | 4 on D | 1 on E | 4 on E<br/P6 | 1 on G<br/P8 | 1 on C | 4 on A | 4 on B<br/I11 | 4 on F | 4 on G | 1 on A<br/P19 | 1 on D<br/P3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 on D<br/R0 | 2 on G | 3 on B<br/R10 | 3 on B | 3 on D<br/R10 | 2 on E<br/R0 | 3 on F<br/R19 | 2 on E<br/R19 | 2 on B<br/R13 | 3 on E<br/R2 | 3 on B<br/R15 | 3 on D<br/R7 |
| 3 on E<br/R3 | 3 on A<br/R7 | 2 on B<br/R13 | 2 on A | 2 on C<br/R12 | 3 on G<br/R5 | 2 on E<br/R18 | 3 on F<br/R4 | 3 on B<br/R10 | 2 on D<br/R16 | 3 on D<br/R10 | 2 on G |
| 4 on E<br/I5 | 1 on B<br/P0 | 4 on A<br/I10 | 1 on B<br/P0 | 4 on B<br/I10 | 4 on F<br/I17 | 1 on E<br/P6 | 1 on G<br/P9 | 1 on D<br/P3 | 1 on D<br/P4 | 4 on D<br/I3 | 4 on F |
| 3 on G<br/R5 | 1 on E<br/P6 | 4 on D<br/I14 | 2 on G<br/R10 | 4 on E<br/I16 | 3 on A<br/R7 | 2 on D<br/R16 | 1 on D<br/P3 | 1 on G<br/P9 | 2 on B<br/R14 | 3 on E<br/R3 | 4 on B |
| 1 on C<br/R2 | 3 on G<br/R5 | 2 on C<br/R13 | 4 on D<br/I13 | 2 on D<br/I17 | 1 on D<br/I19 | 4 on G<br/I19 | 3 on D<br/R10 | 3 on A<br/R16 | 4 on F<br/I17 | 1 on B<br/P0 | 2 on A |
| 4 on A<br/I11 | 2 on E<br/R18 | 3 on E<br/R2 | 1 on E<br/R4 | 3 on F<br/I11 | 4 on B<br/I11 | 1 on B<br/I11 | 2 on C<br/I11 | 2 on G<br/I11 | 1 on A<br/I11 | 4 on G<br/I11 | 3 on C |
| 2 on B<br/I4 | 4 on A<br/I11 | 1 on A<br/I11 | 3 on D<br/I11 | 1 on B<br/I11 | 2 on D<br/I11 | 3 on A<br/I11 | 4 on G<br/I11 | 4 on C<br/I11 | 3 on G<br/I11 | 2 on A<br/I11 | 1 on G<br/I11 |
| 2 on F<br/R10 | 3 on C<br/R11 | 2 on G<br/I11 | 3 on A<br/I11 | 2 on A<br/I11 | 2 on G<br/I11 | 3 on D<br/I11 | 3 on A<br/I11 | 3 on E<br/I11 | 3 on C<br/I11 | 2 on E<br/I11 | 2 on E<br/I11 |
| 4 on G<br/I9 | 4 on B<br/I10 | 1 on G<br/I10 | 1 on A<br/I10 | 4 on A<br/I10 | 1 on C<br/I10 | 4 on A<br/I10 | 4 on D<br/I10 | 1 on B<br/I10 | 4 on F<br/I10 | 1 on E<br/I10 | 1 on E<br/I10 |
| 1 on A<br/I10 | 1 on D<br/I10 | 4 on F<br/I10 | 4 on G<br/I10 | 1 on B<br/I10 | 4 on B<br/I10 | 1 on B<br/I10 | 1 on E<br/I10 | 4 on A<br/I10 | 1 on G<br/I10 | 4 on D<br/I10 | 4 on D<br/I10 |
| 3 on D<br/I0 | 2 on F<br/I10 | 3 on D<br/I0 | 3 on E<br/I10 | 3 on E<br/I10 | 2 on G<br/I10 | 2 on D<br/I10 | 2 on A<br/I10 | 2 on E<br/I10 | 3 on B<br/I10 | 3 on B<br/I10 |

Key: 1 = prime; 2 = retrograde inversion; 3 = retrograde; 4 = inversion
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex. 4.18 - Text of Aleksandr Vustin, <em>Three Songs from Andrey Platonov’s Novel Chevengur</em> (1992)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Шумит волна на озере,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Лежит рыбак на дне,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>И ходит слабым шагом</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Сирота во сне...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Chevengur, p.269)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Кто отопрет мне двери,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Чужие птицы, звери?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>И где ты, мой родитель,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Увы, не знаю я!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Chevengur, p. 278)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ах, мой товарищ, боевой,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Езжай вперёд и песнь пой,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Давно пора нам смерть встречать –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ведь стыдно жить и грустно умирать.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(Chevengur, p.382)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source:</strong> Andrey Platonov, <em>Chevengur</em>. Moscow: AST, 2004.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ex. 4.19: Derivation of rows for Aleksandr Vustin, Three Songs from Andrey Platonov's Novel Chevengur (1992)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 on B♭</th>
<th>4 on D♭</th>
<th>1 on E</th>
<th>4 on E♭</th>
<th>1 on G♭</th>
<th>1 on C</th>
<th>4 on A</th>
<th>4 on B</th>
<th>4 on F</th>
<th>4 on G</th>
<th>1 on A♭</th>
<th>1 on D♭</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(P0)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(P6)</td>
<td>(15)</td>
<td>(P8)</td>
<td>(P2)</td>
<td>(I11)</td>
<td>(I1)</td>
<td>(I17)</td>
<td>(I9)</td>
<td>(P10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R10)</td>
<td>(R10)</td>
<td>(R0)</td>
<td>(R0)</td>
<td>(R19)</td>
<td>(R4)</td>
<td>(R4)</td>
<td>(R19)</td>
<td>(I3)</td>
<td>(R2)</td>
<td>(R13)</td>
<td>(R7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R7)</td>
<td>(R13)</td>
<td>(R12)</td>
<td>(R15)</td>
<td>(R5)</td>
<td>(R18)</td>
<td>(R4)</td>
<td>(R10)</td>
<td>(R16)</td>
<td>(R1)</td>
<td>(R10)</td>
<td>(R7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P0)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(P6)</td>
<td>(P9)</td>
<td>(P3)</td>
<td>(P4)</td>
<td>(I3)</td>
<td>(I7)</td>
<td>(I1)</td>
<td>(I11)</td>
<td>(I15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R5)</td>
<td>(R6)</td>
<td>(I4)</td>
<td>(R10)</td>
<td>(I6)</td>
<td>(R7)</td>
<td>(R6)</td>
<td>(P3)</td>
<td>(P9)</td>
<td>(R14)</td>
<td>(R3)</td>
<td>(I1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R5)</td>
<td>(R5)</td>
<td>(R15)</td>
<td>(I3)</td>
<td>(I7)</td>
<td>(P4)</td>
<td>(I9)</td>
<td>(R0)</td>
<td>(R8)</td>
<td>(I7)</td>
<td>(P0)</td>
<td>(R12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I11)</td>
<td>(R18)</td>
<td>(R2)</td>
<td>(P6)</td>
<td>(R4)</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>(P0)</td>
<td>(R15)</td>
<td>(R11)</td>
<td>(P10)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
<td>(R11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R14)</td>
<td>(P11)</td>
<td>(R1)</td>
<td>(R1)</td>
<td>(R16)</td>
<td>(R7)</td>
<td>(I8)</td>
<td>(I2)</td>
<td>(R5)</td>
<td>(R12)</td>
<td>(P8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R10)</td>
<td>(R11)</td>
<td>(R7)</td>
<td>(R11)</td>
<td>(R0)</td>
<td>(R1)</td>
<td>(R8)</td>
<td>(R2)</td>
<td>(R11)</td>
<td>(R18)</td>
<td>(R18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I9)</td>
<td>(I1)</td>
<td>(P9)</td>
<td>(P8)</td>
<td>(P11)</td>
<td>(P2)</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(P0)</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>(P6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P10)</td>
<td>(P3)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td>(I7)</td>
<td>(I9)</td>
<td>(P0)</td>
<td>(P6)</td>
<td>(I11)</td>
<td>(P8)</td>
<td>(I4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R0)</td>
<td>(R10)</td>
<td>(R0)</td>
<td>(R15)</td>
<td>(R2)</td>
<td>(R11)</td>
<td>(R17)</td>
<td>(R11)</td>
<td>(R19)</td>
<td>(R10)</td>
<td>(R9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Key:
- 1 = prime
- 2 = retrograde inversion
- 3 = retrograde
- 4 = inversion

*Row forms for Vustin, Three Songs from Andrey Platonov’s Novel Chevengur (1992)*

Three Songs from Chevengur (1992)
By Aleksandr Vustin
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 4.20 cont’d.

Three Songs from Chevengur (1992)
By Aleksandr Vustin
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 4.21 – Aleksandr Vustin, *Three Songs from Andrey Platonov’s Novel Chevengur* (1992), Mvmt. III, mm. 23-32. Implied movement from e (♯iv) back to B♭ (I).
Ex. 4.21 cont’d.

Three Songs from Chevengur (1992)
By Aleksandr Vustin
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 4.22 – First statement of repeating eight-bar figure in Aleksandr Vustin, *The Word*, mm. 22-29

The Word (1975)  
By Aleksandr Vustin  
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.  
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.  
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 4.23 – Final iteration of eight-bar repeating phrase (mm. 102-109) in Aleksandr Vustin, *The Word*
Ex. 4.23 cont’d.

*В партии Hi-hat штрихи, направленные вниз, указывают на игру педаля; штрихи, направленные вверх, — игру палочками.*

The Word (1975)
By Aleksandr Vustin
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
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The Word (1975)
By Aleksandr Vustin
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 4.24 – repetition in Sofiya Gubaidulina, *Quattro*

A. *Quattro*, opening (mm. 1-20)

Quattro (1974)
By Sofia Gubaidulina
Copyright © 1979 by MUSIKVERLAG HANS SIKORSKI GmbH & Co. KG, Hamburg
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 4.24 cont’d.

B. *Quattro*, mm. 106-120

Quattro (1974)
By Sofia Gubaidulina
Copyright © 1979 by MUSIKVERLAG HANS SIKORSKI GmbH & Co. KG, Hamburg
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 4.25 – Free and fixed forms at the end of Sofiya Gubaidulina, *Quattro*, mm. 222-37

Quattro (1974)  
By Sofia Gubaidulina  
Copyright © 1979 by MUSIKVERLAG HANS SIKORSKI GmbH & Co. KG, Hamburg  
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.  
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 4.25 cont’d.
Ex. 4.26 – Opening of Aleksandr Vustin, *The Word* (mm. 1-25)
Ex. 4.26 cont’d.
Ex. 4.27 – Opening of Henri Dutilleux, *Métaboles* (mm. 1-9)

© Heugel & Company, represented by Alphonse Leduc. Used by Permission of Alphonse Leduc.
Ex. 4.27 cont’d.
Ex. 4.28 – Fugue I subject, Aleksandr Vustin, Zaitsev’s Letter

Violins 1-3, mm. 4-15:
Ex. 4.29 – Fugue II subject, Aleksandr Vustin, Zaitsev’s Letter

Violins 1-3, mm. 76-87:
Ex. 4.30 – Subject and “tonal” answer in Fugue I, Aleksandr Vustin, *Zaitsev’s Letter*

Fugue I, subject, Violins 1-3, mm. 4-15

Fugue I, first answer, Violas 1-2, mm. 16-27
Ex. 4.31 – Rhythmic series in Fugue I of Aleksandr Vustin, *Zaitsev’s Letter*

**Fugue I**
(mm. 1 – 75)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prime forms</th>
<th>Retrograde forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| B♭ | e ♬ ♪ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♬ ♥
Ex. 4.32 – Rhythmic series in Fugue II of Aleksandr Vustin, *Zaitsev’s Letter*

Fugue II
(mm. 75 – end)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prime forms</th>
<th>Retrograde forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>B♭&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>D&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>E&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>E♭&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G♭</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>G♭&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>C&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>A&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>B&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>F&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>G&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A♭</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>A♭&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D♭</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>D♭&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ex. 4.33 – Rhythmic organization of Aleksandr Vustin, Zaitsev’s Letter

**Fugue I (mm. 4-75)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violins 1-3</th>
<th>Violas 1-2</th>
<th>Cello 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>G♭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>A♭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>D♭</td>
<td>G♭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>E♭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>A♭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>D♭</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 on B♭ (P0)

2 on D (R17)

B♭ | D | E |
1 on B♭ (P0)

**Violins 1-3**

| 9 | E♭ | B♭ | B♭ |
| 10 | A♭ | D♭ | E♭ |
| 11 | E♭ | A♭ | G♭ |
| 12 | G♭ | F♭ | D♭ |
| 13 | E♭ | B | A |
| 14 | B♭ | G | D♭ |
| 15 | E | D | A♭ |
| 16 | G♭ | F | C |

3 on E (R3)

4 on E♭ (R5)

**Violas 1-2**

| 17 | G♭ | D♭ | C♭ |
| 18 | B♭ | E♭ | D♭ |
| 19 | E♭ | B♭ | A♭ |
| 20 | A♭ | G♭ | E♭ |
| 21 | C | E | G♭ |
| 22 | F | A♭ | D |
| 23 | B | D♭ | G |
| 24 | A | B♭ | E♭ |

3 on G♭ (R5)

1 on C (P2)

**Cello 1**

| 28 | 29 | 30 |
| 31 | 32 | 33 |
| 34 | 35 | 36 |
| 37 | 38 | 39 |
| 40 | 41 | 42 |
| 43 | 44 | 45 |
| 46 | 47 | 48 |
| 49 | 50 | 51 |
| 52 | 53 | 54 |
| 55 | 56 | 57 |
| 58 | 59 | 60 |
| 61 | 62 | 63 |
| 64 | 65 | 66 |
| 67 | 68 | 69 |
| 70 | 71 | 72 |
| 73 | 74 | 75 |
### Fugue II (mm. 76-147)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violins 1-3</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 B♭</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1 on B♭ (P0)</td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>G♭</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violas 1-2</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>37</th>
<th>38</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 D♭</td>
<td>A♭</td>
<td>A♭</td>
<td>D♭</td>
<td>G♭</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>D♭</td>
<td>G♭</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cello 1</th>
<th>41</th>
<th>42</th>
<th>43</th>
<th>44</th>
<th>45</th>
<th>46</th>
<th>47</th>
<th>48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 B♭</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1 on B♭ (P0)</td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>G♭</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violins 1-4</th>
<th>49</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>51</th>
<th>52</th>
<th>53</th>
<th>54</th>
<th>55</th>
<th>56</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 B♭</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4 on B♭ (I1)</td>
<td>G♭</td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B♭</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violas 1-3</th>
<th>57</th>
<th>58</th>
<th>59</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>61</th>
<th>62</th>
<th>63</th>
<th>64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 G♭</td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2 on G♭ (R11)</td>
<td>G♭</td>
<td>B♭</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cello 1 &amp; 2</th>
<th>65</th>
<th>66</th>
<th>67</th>
<th>68</th>
<th>69</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>71</th>
<th>72</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 G♭</td>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2 on G♭ (R11)</td>
<td>G♭</td>
<td>B♭</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - at m.109 (R.36), Violin 4 begins playing with Violins 1-3, Viola 3 joins Violas 1-2, and Cello 2 joins Cello 1
### Ex. 4.34 – Row forms for rhythmic series in Aleksandr Vustin, Zaitsev’s Letter

#### Fugue I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 on B♭</td>
<td>4 on D</td>
<td>1 on E</td>
<td>4 on E♭</td>
<td>1 on G♭</td>
<td>1 on C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P0)</td>
<td>(I4)</td>
<td>(P6)</td>
<td>(I5)</td>
<td>(P8)</td>
<td>(P2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 on D</td>
<td>2 on G</td>
<td>3 on B</td>
<td>3 on B</td>
<td>3 on D♭</td>
<td>2 on E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R17)</td>
<td>(R10)</td>
<td>(R10)</td>
<td>(R10)</td>
<td>(R0)</td>
<td>(R19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 on E♭</td>
<td>3 on A♭</td>
<td>2 on B♭</td>
<td>2 on A</td>
<td>2 on C</td>
<td>3 on G♭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R3)</td>
<td>(R7)</td>
<td>(R13)</td>
<td>(R12)</td>
<td>(R15)</td>
<td>(R5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 on E♭</td>
<td>1 on B♭</td>
<td>4 on A♭</td>
<td>1 on B♭</td>
<td>4 on B♭</td>
<td>4 on F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I5)</td>
<td>(P0)</td>
<td>(I10)</td>
<td>(P0)</td>
<td>(I0)</td>
<td>(I7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 on G♭</td>
<td>1 on E</td>
<td>4 on D</td>
<td>2 on G</td>
<td>4 on E</td>
<td>3 on A♭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R5)</td>
<td>(P6)</td>
<td>(I4)</td>
<td>(R10)</td>
<td>(I6)</td>
<td>(R7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 on C</td>
<td>3 on G♭</td>
<td>2 on C</td>
<td>4 on D♭</td>
<td>2 on D</td>
<td>1 on D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P2)</td>
<td>(R5)</td>
<td>(R15)</td>
<td>(I3)</td>
<td>(R17)</td>
<td>(P4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Fugue II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 on B♭</td>
<td>4 on B</td>
<td>4 on F</td>
<td>4 on G</td>
<td>1 on A♭</td>
<td>1 on D♭</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P0)</td>
<td>(I1)</td>
<td>(I7)</td>
<td>(I9)</td>
<td>(P10)</td>
<td>(P3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 on E</td>
<td>2 on B♭</td>
<td>3 on E♭</td>
<td>2 on C</td>
<td>3 on A♭</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R19)</td>
<td>(R13)</td>
<td>(R2)</td>
<td>(R15)</td>
<td>(R7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 on F</td>
<td>3 on B</td>
<td>2 on D♭</td>
<td>3 on D</td>
<td>2 on G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R4)</td>
<td>(R10)</td>
<td>(R16)</td>
<td>(R1)</td>
<td>(R10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 on G</td>
<td>1 on D♭</td>
<td>1 on D</td>
<td>4 on E♭</td>
<td>4 on F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P9)</td>
<td>(P3)</td>
<td>(P4)</td>
<td>(P13)</td>
<td>(I7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 on D♭</td>
<td>1 on G</td>
<td>2 on B</td>
<td>3 on E</td>
<td>4 on B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(P3)</td>
<td>(P9)</td>
<td>(P4)</td>
<td>(P13)</td>
<td>(I7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 on D♭</td>
<td>3 on A</td>
<td>4 on F</td>
<td>1 on B♭</td>
<td>2 on A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R0)</td>
<td>(R8)</td>
<td>(I7)</td>
<td>(P0)</td>
<td>(R12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Note: The table represents row forms for rhythmic series in Aleksandr Vustin, Zaitsev’s Letter.*
### Ex. 4.35 – Pitch organization of Aleksandr Vustin, *Zaitsev’s Letter*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>m. 4</th>
<th>1 on B♭ (P0)</th>
<th>m. 40</th>
<th>4 on D (I4)</th>
<th>m. 76</th>
<th>1 on E (P6)</th>
<th>m. 112</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2 on D (R17)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2 on G (R10)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3 on B (R10)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>4 on B♭ (P2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 on E (R19)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 on A (R12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3 on E (R3)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3 on A♭ (R7)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2 on B♭ (R13)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>3 on E (R3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 on C (R11)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 on E (R3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>4 on E♭ (I5)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1 on B♭ (P0)</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>4 on A♭ (I10)</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>1 on C (P2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 on B (I1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 on C (P2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3 on G♭ (R5)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1 on E (P6)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4 on D (I4)</td>
<td>124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 on D (R1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 on G♭ (P8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1 on C (P2)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3 on G♭ (R5)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>2 on C (R15)</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 on D (P4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 on D (R1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4 on A (I11)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2 on E♭ (R18)</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>3 on E♭ (R2)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 on F (I7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 on F (R110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2 on B (R14)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4 on A (I11)</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1 on A (P11)</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 on D♭ (R16)</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 on F (I7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2 on F (R110)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3 on C (R11)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2 on G (R10)</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 on A♭ (R7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>4 on G (I9)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4 on B (I1)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>4 on E♭ (I5)</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 on G (I9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1 on A♭ (P10)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1 on D♭ (P3)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>1 on B♭ (P0)</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 on E♭ (P5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>3 on D♭ (R0)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2 on F (R110)</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>3 on A (R8)</td>
<td>145</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 on G (R10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- = pattern follows both row order and pitch order

- = pattern follows row order, but not standard pitch order
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Ex. 4.36 – Final pitches in the second pattern of rows in Aleksandr Vustin, *Zaitsev's Letter*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>m.76</th>
<th>m.112</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>... G</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>Db</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Ab</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Eb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Ab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Db</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Gb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Gb</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>Bb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 on Gb</td>
<td>4 on Bb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(R5)</td>
<td>(I0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ex. 4.37 – Magic Squares in Aleksandr Vustin’s Zaitsev’s Letter

PITCH:

1 on B♭ (P0) (from first note)

4 on B♭ (I0) (from last note)

RHYTHM:

1 on B♭ (P0) (from beginning)

2 on G♭ (RI11) (from end)
Chapter 5  The Shift

“Music and society – these two concepts do not intersect. The possibility of a
different kind of existence [inobîtiye] is what gives me joy in creative work. Even
when I address real-life social themes, it nevertheless remains ‘pure’ music.”
-- Aleksandr Vustin (1996)¹

“For me there is no such thing as ‘pure’ music. Even in its most abstract forms,
music always resolves, at its most basic levels, the eternal dualism between nature
and society.”
-- Vladimir Tarnopolski (1996)²

“This longing for God! This aching for God! That is what people are in search of
nowadays. Never has the apocalypse been so near, the end of the world such a
real possibility, and the possibility that the just shall be saved so unlikely.”
-- Sofiya Gubaidulina, interview with Lutz Lesle (1992)³

Ivory Towers

The previous chapters examined compositional styles and techniques of greatest interest to
Soviet modernist composers at the end of the 1980s, along with the social and institutional forces
shaping these interests. This final chapter analyzes changes in compositional practices during
the early post-Soviet period, examining how composers responded to some of the new social
forces emergent with the Soviet collapse.

In arguing that several composers changed their styles during the early post-Soviet
period—and that these stylistic changes occurred as a result of social ones—this chapter is at
odds with the assessment, frequently encountered in recent Russian musicology, that Russia’s
social upheavals of the past quarter-century have not affected music, which many commentators
describe as impervious to social or political forces. In a 2002 article about the music of Boris
Chaikovsky, Vladimir Barsky emphasized music’s disconnectedness from the often-tumultuous
world around it:

In 16th-century Italy there lived Lodovico Gonzaga, a 16-year-old seminarist [sic]
who was very fond of playing ball. Once a certain priest passing by wondered if
for a future priest the youth was too keen on his pursuit and asked him:
  “What would you do if you learned that in half an hour the end of the
world was coming?”  To which Lodovico replied:  “I’d play on.”  According to
the Russian thinker Georgy Fedotov [Georgiy Petrovich Fedotov, 1886-1951], the

¹ From the booklet “Sovremennaya muzïka: svoboda ili angazhirovannost’? Rossiya – Niderlandï. Chetvyortïy
mezhdunarodnïy festival’ sovremennoy muzïki Moskovskiy forum. 8-13 oktyabrya 1996” (Moscow: Moskovskaya
² Ibid.
importance of culture lies in precisely that: we go on playing ball on the verge of Doomsday...

For this reason I venture to suggest that the stormy developments which have accompanied the formation of our century’s artistic culture – in aesthetics, psychology, compositional technique, etc. – have had virtually no impact on the essence of music as it were. [This is] Primarily due to the special status of musical language, which is too sensitive to any falsity, transcending anything aesthetically alien that is forcibly imposed on it. What was always the primary essence of music has remained as such. And vice versa: laying bare the separate strata of 20th-century music history interspersed with chains of artifacts and lines of artistic destinies, a modern researcher, even if he has been personally involved in this history, discovers a continuous current of spiritual movement. The river runs slowly and majestically beyond the horizon, towards a destination unknown to any living person, forking into tributaries, plunging underground and seemingly disappearing altogether to emerge each time anew irrespective of the relief of the surrounding locality and the firmness of the bedrock...

In a 2005 chapter on post-Soviet music published in the college textbook History of Russian Music in the Second Half of the Twentieth Century, Svetlana Savenko presents a more nuanced view of the relationship between music and social change. Savenko analyzes some of the developments in musical life caused by the Soviet collapse, especially institutional changes. She also provides an historical perspective on the idea of aesthetic autonomy in late Soviet music, describing it as a learned response by artists who grew up in the Soviet system and came to resist the system’s insistence that art explicitly engage with social themes.

These evaluations aside, Savenko nevertheless asserts that social concerns are largely “foreign” to the music of “true artists,” and that the new social and political realities emergent with the Soviet collapse have had little effect upon composition:

The tumultuous developments in musical-social life from the end of the 1980s to the beginning of the 1990s did not bring about as radical a change in musical composition, with the exception of ephemeral works written for the occasion [skorospelïye kon’yunkturïye opusï “na sluchay”] – for example, works dedicated to the victory of the democratic forces over the putschists in 1991. Foreign colleagues who visited the USSR and, later, Russia during this period were often surprised that this new social situation was not reflected in music, which could finally be written without any [ideological] pressure. One could hardly expect anything else: among true artists reared in the Soviet system there

---


The “Ex oriente...” collection from which the above quote is excerpted consists mainly of translated chapters from the second volume of Tsenova’s Muzika iz bïvshego SSSR series. That volume includes a chapter on Boris Chaikovsky, but it is not by Barsky (see Tat’yana Fedchenko, “Svet dukhovnosti: muzika Borisa Chaikovskogo” in Tsenova, ed., Muzika iz bïvshego SSSR, vol. 2, 93-111).
had developed a hardy immunity against any kind of social infection—or, more
generally, against the imposition onto art of social concerns that are foreign to its
nature. Of course, neither Schnittke, Gubaidulina, nor their colleagues were “pure
artists,” composing in an ivory tower. But the spiritual content of art and the
social concerns characteristic of the Russian tradition appeared in their music in
hidden, indirect ways.5

Not everyone who has written about this topic agrees that music composition remained
unchanged by the Soviet collapse. In the 1992 article “The Paradox of Russian Non-Liberty,”
the distinguished cellist Alexander Ivashkin, who had emigrated from Russia one year before,
points out a distinct stylistic shift in works of the early 90s by Tarnopolski, Yekimovsky,
Karayev, Raskatov, and Gubaidulina.6 As Ivashkin describes, in their first post-Soviet works
each of these composers cultivates an abstract, “pure musical” style devoid of clear symbolic
referents, an approach Ivashkin characterizes as more “Western” than “Russian.”7

As we will see, there are numerous practical explanations as to why Russian composers
would have adopted more “Western” attitudes in the early 90s. Ivashkin, though, invokes
metaphysical forces to explain this shift. For him, composers’ adoption of “Western” styles
represents the next stage in Russia’s messianic quest to fuse East and West into a distinctive
Russian civilization.8 As Ivashkin describes, Soviet autocracy bred a flourishing of mysticism
and profundity (as expressed in the Aesopian language and hidden symbolism of Soviet music)
while the freedoms post-1991 resulted in a surge in Western “rationalism” (as expressed in the
abstract styles of the early 90s). In Ivashkin’s calculus, this shift toward abstraction in the early
90s represents a swing of the pendulum too far to the Western side; for this reason, he augurs
that the new attitudes “will not last long,” and that Russian music will soon return to
authentically Russian values of confession and deeply-hidden meaning so as to continue its
historically pre-determined mission to “join East and West.”9

It should be noted that, in the post-Soviet era, the assertion that Russia is neither Western
(European) nor Eastern (Asian), but rather a separate cultural entity (Eurasian) with its own
history and traditions has become associated almost exclusively with far-right, anti-Western
politics. In particular, these ideas are associated with writer and political figure Aleksandr
Dugin, founder of the ultra-nationalist Eurasia Party and author of the 1997 bestseller The
Foundations of Geopolitics [Osnovi geopolitiki], which reportedly enjoyed popularity in Kremlin
policy circles and among Russia’s military elite.10 Eurasianism has had an impact on the
historiography of recent Russian music, partly through the influence of Kholopov, who himself
turned markedly to the right in the 90s (see, for example, the passage “The Eurasian Cultural

настоящих художников, сформировавшихся в советских условиях, выработался стойкий иммунитет против
любого социального пафоса и, вообще, навязывания искусству чуждых его природе общественных задач.”
7 Ibid., 544.
8 Ibid., 550.
9 Ibid., 544, 550.
10 Aleksandr Dugin, Osnovi geopolitiki: Geopoliticheskoye budushcheye Rossii (Moscow: Arktogeya, 1997). On
Dugin’s influence on the Russian political and military elite, see John B. Dunlop, “Aleksandr Dugin’s ‘Neo-
Although Ivashkin and Savenko reach different conclusions about music of the early post-Soviet period—Ivashkin sees a clear stylistic shift in Russian music of the early 90s while Savenko sees no such change—both start from a similar premise, namely that music exists in a special realm beyond the everyday, impervious to social concerns (as Savenko describes) and shaped by arcane, supernatural forces (as Ivashkin argues). Returning to the interrelated effects of age, period, and cohort first presented in chapter 3, the belief among Russian musicians and music scholars that art is socially autonomous is most closely associated with cohort effects. This belief is widely held by members of older Soviet birth cohorts—born in the 50s or earlier and who had entered the professional ranks by the time of the Stagnation—and consistently expressed by them despite variation in social and historical circumstances. Thus, Ivashkin (b. 1948) endorses the idea of aesthetic autonomy in 1992 as a newly arrived émigré in the West, as do Barsky (b. 1954) and Savenko (b. 1946) writing in twenty-first century Russia some ten to fifteen years after the Soviet collapse.

By contrast, members of younger Soviet birth cohorts—born in the 60s or later and who entered the professional ranks during perestroika or after—seem generally less beholden to the idea of aesthetic autonomy. Consider, for example, a recent article about Faradzh Karayev’s works of the 1990s and 2000s by Marianna Vïsotskaya (b. 1967). Karayev temporarily stopped composing in the mid 90s, and between 1994-96 the only new works he produced were reorchestrations of the brief Postludio (see chapter 3). Karayev’s silence overlaps with some of the darkest days of the early post-Soviet period, including the First Chechen War (1994-96) and the economic chaos of Yeltsin’s first term. For Vïsotskaya, Karayev’s creative hiatus represents his artistic response to this social tumult:

[![Karayev’s] four years of practical silence can be understood today as a somewhat complicated attempt to define or identify one’s self in a crumbling world, some kind of personal creative statement [nekoye dogovarivaniye sobstvennogo tvorchestva] when up against an intellectual vacuum, which both coincided with—and was caused by—the crisis then facing the country.]  

While these historical factors perhaps played a role in Karayev’s silence, a more plausible explanation might lie in professional or practical concerns. Like other modernist composers, Karayev was able to accept more prestigious teaching and professional appointments after the Soviet collapse. In 1994—the start of his brief creative hiatus—Karayev was appointed professor of composition at the Baku Academy of Music [Baki Musiqi Akademiyasi, formerly the Azerbaijan State Conservatory]. The next year, he founded a contemporary music society in Baku, Yeni Musiqi [New Music]. (Since 1991, he has split time between Baku and Moscow, where he maintains an active professional and teaching career.) In other words, Karayev stopped

---


13 Ibid., 138.
composing around the same time his professional and pedagogical activities increased. In this way, Karayev’s artistic silence was indeed a response to the Soviet collapse and the social changes it unleashed, though perhaps not in the way Visotskaya postulates.

I agree with Ivashkin’s observation that several Russian composers changed their styles in the early 90s, and that these stylistic changes helped bring their compositional approaches more in line with contemporary European norms. These changes, though, were motivated less by the abstract forces Ivashkin describes than by more mundane ones. With the opening of Russia’s borders in the late 80s and early 90s, Russian musicians could exchange information and collaborate more frequently with foreign colleagues, resulting in a host of new stylistic influxes. More significantly, the collapse of the Soviet system brought Russian composers new opportunities to pursue their careers abroad, whether by participating in festivals and masterclasses at Darmstadt, IRCAM, or other new music centers or by working closely with foreign ensembles, publishing houses, or recording firms. (Significantly, all of the works of the early 90s Ivashkin named as demonstrative of more “Western” attitudes were premiered in Germany, and most were commissioned by European organizations.14)

For those Russian composers who chose to participate in European new music circles, there were strong incentives to abandon seemingly insular Soviet traditions and cultivate a more up-to-date style. As discussed at the end of chapter 3, the development of a more contemporary, cosmopolitan style provided Russian composers a means to demonstrate professional competence in the eyes of their new European colleagues. The more thoroughly one could demonstrate competence—whether by composing works proving conversance with recent international trends or, at the least, by purging from one’s works old-fashioned Soviet traditions—the more likely he or she was to be accepted as a peer in European professional networks.

In the early 90s, there were clear benefits for Russian composers to join European professional networks, while remaining aloof from them brought even higher costs. With the collapse of the Soviet system, most domestic institutions supporting composers in Russia collapsed, while domestic funding for music virtually ceased. European organizations—including ensembles, foundations, governments, publishing houses, and recording firms—became a primary source of support for Russian musicians. The more deeply one had become enmeshed in European professional networks—and the more thoroughly one had adapted his or her style to conform to the artistic norms expected within these networks—the more likely he or she was to gain access to funding.

These career pressures were felt especially strongly by composers of the “middle generation” (b. 1940s-50s), middle-aged at the time of the Soviet collapse and in their professional prime. Facing a sudden institutional vacuum at home, and no longer restricted from traveling or earning income abroad, integration with Europe—personal, professional, stylistic—provided perhaps the only strategy for preserving and advancing one’s career. (Indeed, all but one of the composers Ivashkin cited as having adapted “Western” styles are middle-generation composers. The single exception—the older Gubaidulina—had emigrated to Germany by the

14 With regard to the works Ivashkin cited, Tarnopolski’s Cassandra (1991) and Yekimovsky’s Tripelkammervariationen (1991) were commissioned by Ensemble Modern, which premiered them in Frankfurt, while Gubaidulina’s Alleluia [Alliluiya] (1990) was composed for the Berlin Philharmonic, which premiered it at the Berliner Festwochen 1990. The final piece Ivashkin named, Raskatov’s Dolce far niente (1990/91, dedicated to Tarnopolski), was premiered in Kiel, though by Russian performers (cellist Elena Yerofeyeva and pianist Ivan Sokolov).
time Ivashkin wrote his article, thus maximizing her own opportunities to integrate into European new music circles.)

This chapter examines composers’ stylistic changes of the 90s. It departs from the cross-sectional analyses developed in earlier chapters and proceeds longitudinally. We will focus on the works and careers of two composers, Tarnopolski and Vustin, as case studies. Both composers abruptly changed their styles around 1990, with Tarnopolski moving away from his Schnittke-inspired “culturological” method and Vustin rejecting his engaging, “ritualistic” style in favor of a cooler, seemingly more distant approach. These stylistic shifts were motivated by a host of interrelated factors including institutional pressures, social influence, and professional concerns.

In sum, Tarnopolski’s and Vustin’s works of the early 90s help illustrate some of the new forces shaping music composition post-1991. With the Soviet collapse, the professional realities of working as a composer in Russia changed virtually overnight, as did the strategies for success. As we will see at chapter’s end, the composers who have found greatest success in the post-Soviet era are those who have adapted most quickly to these new social realities.

The End of Culturology

Tarnopolski initiated his stylistic shift in 1989, soon after he completed his culturological cycle. As we saw at the end of chapter 3, Tarnopolski told an interviewer in the early 90s that, upon finishing Troïstî muziki (1989), he felt that his culturological method had become “too restrictive,” especially with regard to form and genre, and that he sought to cultivate a new style free from some of these limitations. Tarnopolski launched his new style with Echoes of the Passing Day [Otzvuki ushedshego dnya] (1989), a trio for clarinet, cello, and piano dedicated to cellist Elizabeth Wilson and premiered by her chamber group, the Chameleon Ensemble, at the 1990 Huddersfield Festival.

Tarnopolski’s turn away from Schnittke-inspired culturology overlaps with important milestones in his international career. Echoes of the Passing Day was one of Tarnopolski’s first pieces composed for a foreign group, and among his first works premiered at a major international contemporary music festival. By contrast, nearly every one of Tarnopolski’s pieces to that point had been composed for a Soviet ensemble and premiered in Moscow.

---

15 Tarnopolski, “Most mezhdu razletayushchimisya Galaktikami,” 12.
16 Prior to Echoes of the Passing Day’s 1990 premiere in Huddersfield, only one of Tarnopolski’s works had been premiered at a foreign new music festival: in November 1989, Tatjana Porwoll premiered Tarnopolski’s solo piano work Eindruck-Ausdruck (1989) at the Aktive Musik Festival in Dortmund in Nov. 1989. The musical language of Eindruck-Ausdruck is similar to that of Echoes of the Passing Day, and both works seem to share a common source of inspiration in the music of Lachenmann. Tarnopolski later reorchestrated Eindruck-Ausdruck for piano and large ensemble (1993, premiered in Paris) and piano, flute, clarinet, and string trio (1996, premiered in Munich). See the works list on Tarnopolski’s website, www.tarnopolski.ru (accessed November 10, 2010).
17 Before 1989, Tarnopolski had composed only two pieces for foreign ensembles. The first, Psalmus poenitentialis (1986), was composed for Oxford University’s Schola Cantorum, which did not premiere it until May 1990. The second was the orchestral version of Brooklyn Bridge, or My Discovery of America [Bruklinskiy most, ili Moyo otkritïye Ameriki] (1988), a setting of texts by Mayakovsky for soprano, tenor, and ensemble and, like Psalmus poenitentialis, one of Tarnopolski’s “culturological” pieces. Tarnopolski originally composed Brooklyn Bridge for the Soloists of the Bol’shoy Theater ensemble, which premiered it in London at the Almeida Festival in June 1989. He prepared the orchestral version for the San Diego Symphony, which premiered it under the baton of Vladimir Sinaisky in November 1989.
So as to free himself from some of the perceived restrictions of culturology, Tarnopolski
designed *Echoes of the Passing Day* as a “Proustian-Joycean stream-of-consciousness” in which
a “free stream of sound associations […] bring[s] out not the directly linear logical connections
between elements but rather their remote subconsciously associative connections.”

Or, as Tarnopolski explained to Skvortsova,

In *[Echoes of the Passing Day]* I tried for the first time to give equal treatment to
both existing “cultural signs” and totally spontaneous impulses of pure, “pre-
symbolic” expression, ones that seemingly emanate from the subconscious.

To achieve these compositional ends, Tarnopolski seems to have turned for inspiration to
the music of Helmut Lachenmann. Lachenmann’s music would have likely attracted
Tarnopolski for a few reasons. First, Lachenmann’s *musique concrète instrumentale* style,
which bursts with grunts, groans, and howls, provided a colorful palette to represent the “pre-
symbolic,” “subconscious” sounds Tarnopolski describes as one-half of *Echoes of the Passing
Day*’s musical formula. (For evidence that Tarnopolski associated Lachenmann’s approach with
“subconscious” or “spontaneous” music, we might look to one of Tarnopolski’s later works, the
1995 chamber work *Szene aus dem wirklichen Leben*, in which the first movement, “my own
song,” is filled with Lachenmann-esque techniques and bears the subtitle “ein Psychogramm.”)

Secondly, and perhaps more importantly: in light of the prestige Lachenmann enjoyed in
European and American new music circles at the end of the 80s, the adoption of his works as a
source of inspiration, or even as a model, would have been a strategic career move for a younger
composer (Tarnopolski was around 35 at the time) near the beginning of his international career.

In his 1993 interview with Zeyfas, Tarnopolski addressed Lachenmann’s style and its
significance:

In my opinion, there are three different trends or “schools” of greatest interest [in
Western music today]. The first is what we might call the “school” of German
composer Helmut Lachenmann. He has made truly amazing discoveries in the
field of musical sounds and noises. Of course, we [in the Soviet Union]
completely bypassed the experience of Luigi Nono; without him, it is impossible
to truly understand and appreciate Lachenmann, if only because Lachenmann was
Nono’s pupil […]

Actually, [Lachenmann] didn’t so much start from noise as much as from
the “building blocks” [of noise], which he achieves not through “external”
measures, but with the help of actual musical instruments. He has gone on from
there to achieve an extraordinary sense of the harmony of sound [*k neobïknovenno
garmonichnomu zvukovomu oshchushcheniyu*], especially in his most recent

These foreign performances of *Brooklyn Bridge* (in London and the US) and *Psalmus poenitentialis* (in
Oxford), along with Porwoll’s 1989 performance of *Eindruck-Ausdruck* in Dortmund, mark Tarnopolski’s only
foreign premieres before *Echoes of the Passing Day*. All of Tarnopolski’s other works of the 70s-80s were
premiered in Moscow, many under the baton of Gennadiy Rozhdestvensky (see chapter 3). By contrast, following
*Echoes of the Passing Day*, the overwhelming majority of Tarnopolski’s premieres, have taken place in Western
Europe. See the works list on Tarnopolski’s website, www.tarnopolski.ru (accessed August 28, 2010).

See Tarnopolski’s commentary to *Echoes of the Passing Day*, published on his website (www.tarnopolski.ru,
accessed August 29, 2010).

Tarnopolski, “Most mezhdu razletayushchimisya Galaktikami,” 12.

328
compositions, like *Allegro sostenuto*. I don’t simply mean harmony as a science of sonorities, but rather the “harmony” between sound, rustling, the limits of sound [zvuk, shorokh, prizvuk], which he accomplishes in a way that sounds simply extraordinary. Unfortunately, not every composer who uses Lachenmann’s techniques does it so well. But he himself is a remarkable musician.20

(The two other trends Tarnopolski names as of interest to him are spectralism—which he discusses at length—and the “quiet, beautiful, calm” style in which “absolutely nothing happens – complete Nirvana!” practiced by Uros Rojko [b. 1954], Roland Freisitzer [b. 1973] and others.21)

Tarnopolski’s comments about Lachenmann and Nono are striking. While it is true that Nono’s quiet style differed from the bold rhetorical gestures characteristic of most Soviet music, his approach was not “completely bypassed,” as Tarnopolski states. As we saw in earlier chapters, Nono maintained a close relationship with Denisov and was widely adulated by Denisov’s followers (recall the Denisov circle composers’ collective Nono tribute, *Signor Luigi’s Magic Gift* [Volshebñiy dar sin’ora Luidzhi, 1990-91], discussed in chapter 4).

Following Nono’s first visit to the USSR in 1962, Denisov composed a work in honor of his Italian friend, the *Italian Songs* [*Ital’yanskiye pesni*] of 1964. Scored for soprano, flute, violin, horn, and harpsichord, it is a setting of four poems from Aleksandr Blok’s 1909 cycle *Italian Verses* [*Ital’yanskiye stikhi*].22 The work’s final movement, “The Assumption” [*Uspeniye*], evokes Nono’s muted approach. The movement is quiet, and most dynamic markings range between *pp* and *pppp*. The movement’s final measures make prominent use of extended techniques seemingly calculated to explore the “limits of musical sound and noise,” a feature Tarnopolski associated so prominently with Lachenmann (ex. 5.1). In *Echoes of the Passing Day* Tarnopolski applied some of the same techniques Denisov uses here, including audible key-clicking in the wind instruments (see the *Klappengeräusch* figures in the flute and horn) and indications to the string player to play on the body of his instrument (in Denisov’s case, by tapping on it with fingertips or the bow). A few years after Denisov’s *Italian Songs*—and two decades before Tarnopolski’s *Echoes of the Passing Day*—Shostakovich used some of these techniques in his String Quartet No. 13 in B♭ minor (1970), during which the performers are instructed to tap their instrument with the tip of their bow (see the viola part at R.22 or the violin 2 part three measures before R.27).

While Denisov and his followers likely learned about Lachenmann via Nono, they met Lachenmann in person in 1982 when he traveled to the USSR to participate at that year’s Moscow Autumn festival. Lachenmann was part of a contingent of West German composers including Hans-Jürgen von Bose, Peter Michael Hamel, Wilhelm Killmayer, and Alfred

---

21 Ibid., 7.
22 As Schmelz notes, there is disagreement over the date of Nono’s first Soviet visit. While some sources indicate that Nono first visited the USSR in 1963, others—including the Archivio Luigi Nono in Venice—date this trip to 1962. See Schmelz, *Such Freedom, if Only Musical*, 62. Schmelz points out that Denisov’s *Italian Songs* was not the only Soviet work from around this time dedicated to Nono: in 1963 Pärt dedicated the *Perpetuum Mobile* (1963) to him.
Koerppen. In Moscow, the West Germans spent an evening at Denisov’s apartment, participating in what Hamel described as a “conspiratorial” meeting with their Soviet colleagues, including Vustin, Firsova, Smirnov, Schnittke, Gubaidulina, Hrabovský, and Artyomov. The assembled composers presented their music to one another, and Lachenmann performed his solo piano piece *Wiegenmusik* (1963) for the group.

Composers of the Denisov circle could meet Lachenmann once again in 1988 when Lachenmann traveled to Leningrad to participate in the Third International Festival, also attended by Cage (see chapter 1). According to the festival’s program booklet, Lachenmann’s *temA* (1968) for flute, mezzo-soprano, and cello was scheduled for performance in Leningrad on May 27, 1988 by members of the Soloists of the Kirov Theater ensemble. One informant told me that Lachenmann canceled the performance on account of the musicians’ lack of preparedness, though I have not yet corroborated this story.

Several features of *Echoes of the Passing Day* are similar to *Allegro sostenuto* (1986/88), the work Tarnopolski named to Zeyfas in 1993 as emblematic of Lachenmann’s “extraordinary sense of the harmony of sound.” Both works are scored for clarinet, cello, and piano. (In Lachenmann’s *Allegro sostenuto* the clarinetist also plays bass clarinet.) Like *Allegro sostenuto*, *Echoes of the Passing Day* makes prominent use of extended techniques. Many of the techniques Tarnopolski used closely match ones used by Lachenmann in *Allegro sostenuto*, including pressed bowing in the cello, “fingernail” glissandi in the piano and, most prominently, different types of “toneless” playing for all three instruments. (To play “tonelessly,” the instrumentalist does everything associated with playing the specified note, except create a discernable pitch. To play clarinet “tonelessly,” for example, the musician fingers the indicated note and blows into the instrument, but without sufficient air pressure to sound the note. Instead, the audience would hear a rustle of air and, possibly, squeaks or incidental noises.)

Tarnopolski’s score is similar to Lachenmann’s not just in these techniques, but in their notation, too. Ex. 5.2 compares some of the extended techniques and notation in *Echoes of the Passing Day* with analogous ones in *Allegro sostenuto*. Part one of the example shows matches between the works in both technique and notation, while part two shows near-matches in either category.

As this example indicates, Tarnopolski’s and Lachenmann’s works use many of the same expressive markings. Both works prominently feature dynamic markings (generally *mf* or louder) in quotation marks. These symbols, which usually accompany toneless playing, do not indicate actual dynamic levels. Rather, they indicate the performer’s perceived level of exertion. As Lachenmann explains in the preface to *Allegro sostenuto*:

---

24 For Hamel’s recollections of this “conspiratorial” meeting, see Kurtz, *Sofia Gubaidulina*, 169-70.
26 Some of these techniques and symbols can be found in other scores by Lachenmann, including the score of *temA*, scheduled for performance in Leningrad. In my opinion, though, *Echoes of the Passing Day* shows more in common with *Allegro sostenuto* than with *temA*. Regarding similarities between extended techniques for the clarinet in Tarnopolski’s *Echoes of the Passing Day* and Lachenmann’s *Accanto: Musik für einen Klarinettisten mit Orchester* (1975-76), see Dubinets, *Znaki zvukov*, 56.
Forte markings in quotation marks (e.g. “fff” or “mf”) do not indicate the objective resulting volume, but the (“subjective”) intensity of effort during the execution (which must still be recognized as such).  

Finally, both works feature expressive markings that allude to specific genres, including dance forms. For example, *Allegro sostenuto* includes markings such as “quasi Walzer” (m.119), “quasi Gigue” (m.328), and “alla Marcia” (m.141), while *Echoes of the Passing Day* includes the markings “Quasi Valso” (R.10), “a la Jazz” (at R.8) and “Marciale” (one measure after R.15). In both works, the passages bearing these markings sound little like the genre or style indicated by them. One noteworthy example is the “Marciale” section in *Echoes of the Passing Day*, which features strict duple rhythms and verbal marching commands, spoken in German (see below).

For a sampling of how Tarnopolski applies these Lachenmann-esque elements, we might look to the opening measures of *Echoes of the Passing Day*, shown in example 5.3. It begins from near-silence, with varying degrees of toneless or near-toneless playing in all three instruments. The passage features extensive “subjective” dynamics, as indicated by the numerous “f” and “ff” markings. The first discernable pitch is played by the cellist at R.1 (see the low C left-hand pizzicato). More pitches gradually coalesce, leading to the loud outburst three measures after R.2, which quickly evaporates into silence.

If Lachenmann helped provide the tools to create “pre-symbolic,” seemingly “spontaneous” sounds, then for the other half of *Echoes of the Passing Day*’s musical formula—the “cultural symbols”—Tarnopolski turned to a hodgepodge of musical and literary sources. *Echoes of the Passing Day* is framed around a quotation of the first measure of Beethoven’s bagatelle “Für Elise,” WoO 59 (1808-10), which Tarnopolski selected in honor of his work’s dedicatee, Elizabeth Wilson. This quotation is first played by the clarinet two measures before R.24 (ex. 5.4), around the work’s halfway point, and repeated by the piano shortly thereafter (three measures before R.27). Although these quotations are brief, they are preceded and followed by several measures of undulating half steps, themselves an allusion to the opening of “Für Elise,” as becomes clear in light of the clarinet’s quotation.

There are other musical references in *Echoes of the Passing Day*. Tarnopolski included a quotation from an American popular song, “Elizabeth,” also selected in Wilson’s honor. Other parts of the work reference specific sounds: for example, several passages in Tarnopolski’s score are marked “a la Morsealphabet” and are designed to sound like a Morse code transmission (ex. 5.5) a technique similar to the one Yekimovsky used in his 1986 *In the Hunting Dogs Constellation* (see chapter 1). (A few years later, Vustin emulated the sounds of Morse code in his 1995 *Disappearance* [Ischeznoveniye].)

Alongside these musical quotations, *Echoes of the Passing Day* includes extensive speaking parts for the performers. At the “Marciale” section (R.16) the musicians chant marching orders in German [Rechts, links, rechts, links] (ex. 5.6), while a few minutes later they shout out Chernishevsky’s famous question, “Chto delat’?” [What is to be done?] (ex. 5.7) (This moment recalls Berio’s *Sequenza V*, in which the solo trombonist stops playing and asks aloud, “Why?”) In keeping with Tarnopolski’s vision of *Echoes of the Passing Day* as a “Proustian-

---

Joycean stream of consciousness,” the work concludes with a recitation of the final passage of Joyce’s *Ulysses* (1918-20), which the musicians whisper in hocket (ex. 5.8). While whispering Joyce’s text, the musicians mime playing their instruments (for example, the cellist turns her instrument around and pretends to play on its reverse, while the pianist closes the keyboard cover and “plays” on its top). These actions recall some of the theatrical gestures in Sil’vestrov’s piano trio *Drama* (1971), performed in Moscow at the Al’ternativa festival in December 1988. However, *Echoes of the Passing Day*’s speaking parts, and the theatrical gestures accompanying them, point to a strong line of continuity between it and Tarnopolski’s earlier works. As we saw in chapter 3, the inclusion of acting and speaking roles for the instrumentalists was a prominent feature of Tarnopolski’s culturological method, the stylistic practice he had hoped to end with *Echoes of the Passing Day*. (More broadly, these theatrical elements were among the main “groupy” features common to Denisov circle works of the later 80s.) In interview with Skvrotsova, Tarnopolski explained *Echoes of the Passing Day*’s texts “culturologically”: they symbolize “different national/cultural archetypes,” Tarnopolski stated, the German marching orders representing the ideals of “order [and] discipline, with perhaps an undertone of militarism,” and the “Russian ‘What is to be done?’ [representing] our eternal question, from Chernïshevsky to today.” Tarnopolski indirectly referenced culturology, too, to explain *Echoes of the Passing Day*’s musical quotations: in comments to the work published on his website, he described the work’s musical language as “the product of an ‘after-culture’, when such radically different phenomena as quotations from Beethoven and instrumental theatre are naturally able to exist side by side in a single context.” This statement recalls Schnittke’s appraisal of his Symphony No. 4—one of Tarnopolski’s models for culturology—as “bring[ing] together different layers of culture” so as to demonstrate the “idea of the universality of culture and its unity.”

As we will see, in Tarnopolski’s first major work of the 90s he erased these points of continuity, stripping from his instrumental music both spoken texts and theatrical gestures.

**Vustin’s Shift**

Around the same time that Tarnopolski attempted to end culturology, his Moscow colleague Aleksandr Vustin began changing his style, too.

*After Zaitsev’s Letter* (1990), Vustin composed one more work of searing ritualistic intensity. In 1991, Vustin completed *Music for Ten [Muzïka dlya desyati]* (1991), commissioned by Dutch musician Elmer Schönberger for the Schönberg Ensemble, which premiered the work

---

30 *Drama* was performed on a Sil’vestrov portrait concert at the Glinka Museum on December 21, 1988. Alongside *Drama*, the concert’s program included Sil’vestrov’s Trio for Flute, Trumpet, and Celesta (1962) and the Moscow premieres of his Symphony No. 2 (1965) and Serenade (1978) for string orchestra.

Savenko describes some of the *Drama*’s theatrical effects: “The participants in the trio move around the stage, handling their instruments in the most unusual manner, sometimes treating them like the live creatures [sic].” See Savenko, trans. Kohanovskaya, “Valentin Silvestrov’s lyrical universe,” in Tsenova, ed., *Underground Music from the Former USSR*, 69.


on a Scriabin-themed concert at Amsterdam’s Concertgebouw in 1992.\textsuperscript{34} \textit{Music for Ten} was one of several commissions Vustin received in the early 90s. As Vustin explained to Shul’gin, having received practically no commissions throughout the 70s and 80s, he was inundated with them around 1991.\textsuperscript{35} While most of these commissions came from abroad, one or two came from Soviet sources, including the Ministry of Culture, which began paying for works by Soviet modernists during \textit{perestroika}. (In some cases these domestic commissions for Vustin and other ASM-2 composers were arranged by Denisov who, as part of the reforms of \textit{perestroika}, joined the governing board of the Composers’ Union of the USSR, and was in an advantageous position to steer funds toward his followers.\textsuperscript{36}) After 1991, domestic commissions essentially ceased, and foreign entities became a primary source of funding and commissions for Vustin and his ASM-2 colleagues.

\textit{Music for Ten} is a theatrical work for nine instrumentalists and conductor (i.e., ten performers total).\textsuperscript{37} Throughout the piece the performers variously whisper, speak, or shout the work’s text, which Vustin adapted from a Russian translation of the short story “Cazotte’s Prophecy” [\textit{Prophétie de Cazotte}] by Jean-François de la Harpe (1739-1803).

This story, which Le Harpe wrote sometime between 1794 and his death nine years later, depicts a gathering of nobleman and intellectuals on the eve of the French Revolution. The characters are all historical figures whom La Harpe knew through the Académie française and who died during the Terror, either through execution or suicide. At the beginning of the story, the assembled noblemen toast the revolution and the impending age of reason it will usher in. The story’s title character, Jacques Cazotte (1719-92), soon paints a darker picture, “prophesying” in detail the violent ends awaiting each of the guests. (Cazotte—whose 1772 short story \textit{Le Diable amoureux} provided the libretto for Vustin’s eponymous opera, completed in 1989—was himself guillotined during the Terror. Le Harpe, author of the “prophecy,” survived: imprisoned during the Terror, he converted to Catholicism and, upon release, published pro-Catholic broadsheets critical of the revolution.\textsuperscript{38})

Vustin’s text of \textit{Music for Ten} and its English translation are shown in exs. 5.9A and B. With the exception of the final two lines, Vustin drew the entire text from A.L. Andres’ 1967 Russian translation of La Harpe’s story.\textsuperscript{39} While abridging Andres’ and Le Harpe’s text Vustin

---

\textsuperscript{34} Alongside \textit{Music for Ten}, the concert included Karayev’s orchestration of Scriabin’s Sonata No. 10, op. 70 (1912-13), Scriabin’s \textit{Vers la flamme} [\textit{K plameni}] (1914) with an instrumental postscript, \textit{Eclips} (1992), by Klaas de Vries (b. 1944), and Ustvol’skaya’s Composition No. 2, “Dies Irae” (1972-73) for eight double basses, piano, and wooden cube (Elmer Schönberger, email correspondence with the author, April 9, 2010).

\textsuperscript{35} As Vustin explained to Shul’gin, Schönberger had originally invited him to compose an instrumental gloss [\textit{obrabotka}] on one of Scriabin’s piano sonatas. Vustin answered that he does not like to work with pre-existing compositions, but that he would try to find a way to “realize Scriabin” in his new work (Shul’gin, \textit{Muzïkal’nïye istinï Aleksandra Vustina}, 339-40). Vustin answered that he does not like to work with pre-existing compositions, but that he would try to find a way to “realize Scriabin” in his new work (Shul’gin, \textit{Muzïkal’nïye istinï Aleksandra Vustina}, 207).

\textsuperscript{36} See Shul’gin, \textit{Muzïkal’nïye istinï Aleksandra Vustina}, 207.


\textsuperscript{39} A.L. Andres, trans., “Prorochestvo Kazota,” from V. M. Zhirmunsky and N.A. Sigal, eds., \textit{Goratsiy Uolpol, Zhak Kazot, Uil’yan Bekford. Fantasticheskiye povesti} (Leningrad: Nauka, 1967), 244-48. This volume also includes a
rearranged some of it lines: for example, in the original text, the line “It seems that he won’t even leave a confessor for her!” [Того гляди, он не оставит ей и духовника] follows the line “Just what is this you’re preaching about, the end of the world or something?” [Ах, что это такое Вы проповедуете, конец света что ли?], while Vustin reverses their order in his adaption.

Given the dates of its composition and premiere (1991 and 92), it is nearly impossible for listeners not to hear Music for Ten and its “prophetic” text as a commentary upon the Soviet collapse. These historical associations likely motivated Tarnopolski and his Center for Contemporary Music to program Music for Ten alongside works by socially-committed artists like Hans Werner Henze on a 2003 concert entitled “Music as Social Engagement” [Музïка kak sotsial’niïy angazhement], part of a yearlong cycle of new Russian and German music in Moscow co-sponsored by the Ernst von Siemens Music Foundation.\(^{40}\)

Vustin filled Music for Ten with musical devices designed to make it as engaging as possible. Like Zaitsev’s Letter—another work with clear social implications—Music for Ten is characterized by forceful, driving rhythms and loud instrumental outbursts. (Ex. 5.10 shows one of these outbursts, excerpted from the work’s fortissimo climax.) At the conclusion of the piece, Vustin instructs the instrumentalists to remain frozen for several moments, a theatrical effect designed to heighten the work’s dramatic impact.

In this way, Music for Ten, along with Zaitsev’s Letter, represents the culmination of Vustin’s so-called “ritualistic” style, which he began developing in the mid 70s shortly after joining the Denisov circle (see chapter 4). However, Music for Ten was to become Vustin’s last major work of the 90s cast in this idiom. Around the time he completed Music for Ten, Vustin was busy cultivating a radically new style, in many ways the opposite of his engaging ritualistic approach.

Vustin launched his new style with White Music [Belaya muzïka] (1990), a sparse, ten-minute long work for solo organ commissioned by German organist Gerd Zacher. As Vustin summarized to Shul’gin:

> I basically consider White Music the starting point for my compositions of the last five years […] Perhaps I was no longer satisfied with the unconcealed dynamism [otkriïty dinamizm] of the works that came before and therefore dreamed up something totally different...\(^{41}\)

In White Music, Vustin purged the “unconcealed dynamism” from his style in a variety of ways. Whereas most of his works through Music for Ten feature a strong sub-tactile pulse, White Music does not have an easily perceptible beat, and its meters regularly shift (ex. 5.11). The absence of an easily perceptible beat is perhaps appropriate in a work for organ, which plays without accent. The texture of White Music is often sparse and pointillistic, a far cry from the crowded, complex textures of his earlier works. Also, White Music is uniformly quiet: its dynamic markings rarely

---

\(^{40}\) Alongside Music for Ten, this concert, which was held on June 4, 2003, featured Henze’s El Cimarón (1969/70), Ustvol’skaya’s Symphony No. 4, “Prayer” [Molitva] (1985/87), Huber’s Plâinte – die umgepflügte Zeit (1990), Stäbler’s Affiliert (1989/90), Schnittke’s Violin Concerto No. 3 (1978), and excerpts from Dessau’s incidental music (ca. 1953) for Brecht’s Mutter Courage und ihre Kinder.

\(^{41}\) Shul’gin, Muzïkal’niye istinï Aleksandra Vustina, 190.
rise above piano, and are often ppp or pppp, a sharp contrast to Vustin’s loud, percussion-heavy works of the decades before. As in the case of Tarnopolski, Vustin’s abrupt stylistic shift overlaps with important milestones in his international career. *White Music* was among Vustin’s first international commissions, and his trip to its 1991 premiere in Duisburg was his first visit to Europe (and his second trip abroad). Soon after the premiere, the German publishing firm Sikorski bought the rights to *White Music* and paid Vustin an honorarium of 400 Deutsche Marks, which he described as the largest honorarium he had received to that point.

One of the most noteworthy characteristics of *White Music*—and the feature that makes it a starting point for the works that follow—is its pitch design. Like most of Vustin’s works that came before, *White Music* is serial, its pitch content generated through the patterns of his *dvenadtsatikratnost’* system (see chapter 4). In *White Music*, though, Vustin filters his serial technique through an even more restrictive algorithm. This work marks Vustin’s first adoption of the *obikhodnîy zvukoryad* (the “liturgical scale,” also known as the “liturgical mode” [*obikhodnîy lad*]), a scale generated through a repeating whole step-whole step-half step pattern ostensibly derived from Orthodox practice:

Every pitch in *White Music* conforms to the *obikhodnîy zvukoryad*. As ex. 5.12 demonstrates, the *obikhodnîy zvukoryad* accrues flats as it ascends and sharps as it descends. This characteristic accounts for the weird enharmonic spellings encountered throughout *White Music*: between measures 66-69, for example, the organ pedal plays an E# and the middle manual F, while the middle manual plays B and D and the upper manual C♭ and E♭♭ (ex. 5.13).

Although the *obikhodnîy zvukoryad* is derived from liturgical practices, Vustin borrowed it from Moscow composer Yuriy Butsko (b. 1938), who famously used it throughout his *Polyphonic Concerto* [*Polifonicheskiy kontsert*] (1969), a cycle of nineteen short pieces [*kontrapunktî*] scored for various combinations of celesta, harpsichord, piano, organ, chorus, and

---

42 One exception is the two-measure *fortissimo* outburst in mm. 87-88 of *White Music*, which is preceded and followed by quiet passages (marked pp and ppp, respectively).
percussion. Many of the movements in Butsko’s work are based on melodies from Orthodox chant, and all of them adhere to the obikhodniy zvukoryad.

Vustin likely learned about the Polyphonic Concerto and its pitch design sometime during the 70s through his involvement in Moscow’s new music circles. Vustin told Shul’gin that he did not learn about Butsko’s system from Butsko himself, but from someone named Krasil’nikov (probably Moscow composer Igor’ Krasil’nikov). 45 Vustin’s new interest in the obikhodniy zvukoryad (or the “Butsko scale” [gamma Butsko] as he calls it 46) at the beginning of the 90s was perhaps spurred by activities the Sovietskiy kompozitor publishing house, where Vustin worked at the time. In 1992 the firm published Butsko’s Polyphonic Concerto. The edition includes a preface by Butsko dated June 1989—shortly before Vustin began work on White Music—in which Butsko details the Polyphonic Concerto’s basis in the obikhodniy zvukoryad (or the “scale of the znamenni mode” [zvukoryad znamennogo lada], as he calls it). 47 Vustin, it should be noted, was not the only Moscow composer interested in Butsko’s scale around this time: in 1984, Schnittke used elements of the obikhodniy zvukoryad to represent Orthodoxy in his Symphony No. 4. 48

Vustin employed the obikhodniy zvukoryad in several works of the 90s, including the quotation-heavy Heroic Lullaby (1991), the string quartet Birth of a Piece [Rozhdeniye p’yesi] (1994), and his 1995 Disappearance [Ischeznoeniy] for bayan, cello, and fifteen strings, composed as an analog to Gubaidulina’s Seven Words [Sem’ slov] (1982). 49 Like White Music, these works are largely quiet and disengaged, the opposite of Vustin’s ritualistic style of the 70s and 80s.

For another illustration of Vustin’s quiet style of the 90s, we might look to his Song from Platonov’s Novel [Pesnya iz romana Platonova] for male chorus and orchestra, composed in 1995 and premiered at the 1998 Moscow Autumn festival. Vustin dedicated the Song to his close friend Raskatov, who had emigrated to Germany shortly before its composition. The work is a setting of a brief text from Platonov’s novel Chevengur, a copy of which Raskatov had given to Vustin a few years earlier. This text, shown in ex. 5.14, is sung by an unidentified character in the novel and evokes feelings of longing and loss. In selecting this text, Vustin seems to pay tribute not only to Raskatov, but to other departed friends, too: discussing this work with Shul’gin, Vustin notes that, during the early 90s, he lost several colleagues and friends to emigration and death. 50

Vustin’s musical setting accentuates the feelings of loss and distance evoked by the text. The Song is uniformly quiet, rarely rising above piano. (The work’s loudest dynamic marking is mf.) Unlike the pointillistic textures of White Music, the texture in this work is primarily

46 Shul’gin, Muzikal’nye istiny Aleksandra Vustina, 190.
48 See Schnittke’s remarks to Ivashkin about the pitch design of his Symphony No. 4 in Ivashkin, ed., A Schnittke Reader, 14-15.
49 The premiere of Disappearance took place in Moscow in 1995 on a concert that included a performance of Seven Words. The concert featured cellist Vladimir Tonkha and bayanist Fridrikh Lips, the dedicatees of Gubaidulina’s work. In Disappearance Vustin replicated the instrumentation of Seven Words, subdividing the fifteen string parts into the same subgroups Gubaidulina had used (5 first violins, 4 second violins, 3 violas, 2 celli, and 1 bass). See Shul’gin, Muzikal’nye istiny Aleksandra Vustina, 287.
50 Shul’gin, Muzikal’nye istiny Aleksandra Vustina, 284.
homophonic. The piece is constructed from large, static blocks of sound generated through Vustin’s serial system and filtered through the obikhodniy zvukoryad. So as to emphasize the idea of distance or loss, Vustin fills the Song with otherworldly effects such as string harmonics, piano glissandi, and the ethereal sounds of the celesta. The text is heard only at the very end, sung by a lontano male chorus. (Ex. 5.15 shows Vustin’s setting of the first line of Platonov’s text.)

The obikhodniy zvukoryad is not the only restriction Vustin applied during to his already strict serial practice during the early 90s. As we saw in chapter 4, in the Three Songs from Andrey Platonov’s Novel Chevengur [Tri pes’ni iz romana Andreya Platonova “Chevengur”] (1992) for soprano and chamber ensemble Vustin interfaced his serial system with common practice harmony, organizing this short work in a rounded binary form in the key of B♭ major. (This piece, dedicated to Gerard McBurney, was commissioned by London’s Composers Ensemble, which premiered it in the UK in 1992.)

Also, as Vustin adopted ever-greater stylistic restrictions, he became newly interested in Latin, especially Latin liturgical texts. Vustin first set Latin in his 1993 Agnus Dei for chorus, percussion, and organ (also an obikhodniy zvukoryad work) and continued with his four-movement Kleines Requiem (1994) for soprano and string quartet and Spem in alium (2002) for chorus and ensemble. For Vustin, Latin seemed perfectly suited to the cooler, restrained style he was then cultivating. As Vustin explained to Shul’gin, upon completing Agnus Dei,

[… I immediately understood the power of ancient language. I understood, that this language [Latin] has been purified, purified by the passage of time [otshlifovannyi vekami]! I saw that there is absolutely nothing extraneous in it, that every word, every syllable is as hard as granite.51

Vustin’s turn to Latin, it should be noted, was prompted by influences from abroad: he composed his first Latin-texted work, the 1993 Agnus Dei, for a sacred music competition in Switzerland,52 while the Kleines Requiem (1994) was commissioned by the publishing firm M.P. Belaieff (then based in Frankfurt) and premiered in 1998 at Gidon Kremer’s chamber music festival in Lockenhaus.53 Belaieff issued its commission through Volkonsky, who had joined the firm’s advisory council and to whom Vustin had sent examples of his work during a trip to London shortly before.54 Vustin says that Volkonsky asked him to write a piece (not necessarily a Requiem) “in a foreign language”; when Vustin asked, “Which language?”, Volkonsky replied, “It would be wonderful to write in Latin, of course.”55

Vustin’s adoption of ever-greater stylistic restrictions during this period played an important practical function. As he explained to Shul’gin, during the 1980s, when he received practically no commissions, he could spend as long as he wanted working on a single piece. In the 1990s, though, he had to change his working methods in response to the torrent of commissions that came his way:

51 Ibid., 336.
52 Ibid., 252-53.
53 The publishing firm M.P. Belaieff is named after its founder, the Russian publisher and impresario Mitrofan Petrovich Belyayev (1836-1904). Belyayev established the firm in Leipzig in 1885, licensing it under the Germanized spelling of his surname (Belaieff).
54 Shul’gin, Muzïkal’niye istinï Aleksandra Vustina, 270.
55 Ibid.
[In the 80s] I would sometimes spend up to a year working on a single piece. But then, in the next decade [the 90s], that was a luxury I felt I simply could not afford myself […] From the beginning of the 90s the problem of commissioned works became increasingly common. By this time I was already somewhat older, well over forty. In a way, though, I felt like a little kid again: everything has to be completed on a deadline, done quickly according to various strictly-defined parameters, no other way. Of course, I love to write music, but earlier every one of my works was composed outside of [these restrictions]; they were motivated by other, more fundamental motives.⁵６

We already saw in chapter 4 that part of serialism’s appeal for Vustin was that it limited his compositional choices, helping him feel freer. By applying new filters like the obikhodniy zvukoryad, Vustin could reduce his decision-making still further, an obvious benefit when faced for the first time with a glut of deadlines.

While these practical considerations help explain certain attributes of Vustin’s stylistic shift, particularly his adoption of stricter algorithms, they do not explain his new interest in quietude. (After all, it would have been just as easy for Vustin to have written ff at the beginning of White Music instead of pp.) Why, in 1990, did Vustin suddenly become so averse to the “unconcealed dynamism” of his earlier works? I believe the answer lies in a confluence of social and historical factors. As the Soviet Union crumbled, and as the USSR’s satellites and constituent republics asserted their independence, Soviet composers (especially non-conformist ones) likely found it distasteful to speak in bold, declamatory tones, associated as they were with the official aesthetics of a defeated and discredited superpower. Given these circumstances, Vustin, making his international debut in the newly-reunified Germany, would have probably felt especially strong pressure to avoid the bombast of his earlier, ritualistic style.⁵⁷

After years of a comparatively ascetic approach, Vustin has recently returned to his loud, engaging style. In 2006 he completed Theater [Teatr], a setting of poems by Dmitriy Shchedrovitsky for voice and large ensemble and dedicated to Savenko, conductor Igor’ Dronov, and Tarnopolski’s Studio for New Music ensemble, which premiered it at the 2007 Moscow Forum festival. An obikhodniy zvukoryad work, Theater is marked by driving, forceful rhythms, raucous percussion, and loud instrumental outbursts (see ex. 5.16) – in other words, the “unconcealed dynamism” from which he fled in the early 90s.

**Cassandra**

Having failed to sever ties with culturology in Echoes of the Passing Day (1989), Tarnopolski laid the foundations for his new, post-Soviet style in his first major work of the 90s, the twenty-five minute long chamber orchestra piece Cassandra [Kassandra] (1991). Cassandra was commissioned by Germany’s Ensemble Modern, which premiered it at the 1991 Frankfurt

---

⁵⁶ Ibid., 286.
Festival on a concert of music by ASM-2 composers including Yekimovsky, Karayev, and Schnittke.\footnote{Along with the premiere of Cassandra, this concert, held on September 8, 1991, featured the premieres of Yekimovsky’s Tripelkammervariationen (1991) and Karayev’s Der Stand der Dinge (1991), plus a performance of Schnittke’s Four Hymns (1974-79). The concert program is reproduced on Karayev’s website at http://karaev.net/w_1991_der_stand_e.html# (accessed August 14, 2010).}

In Cassandra Tarnopolski applies many of the Lachenmann-esque effects he had utilized throughout Echoes of the Passing Day, including “subjective” dynamics, unconventional bowing techniques (such as bowing on the wood of the bridge), and different kinds of “toneless” playing. In Cassandra, though, Tarnopolski uses these effects more sparingly than in Echoes of the Passing Day. The primary influence in Cassandra seems to derive not from Lachenmann, but from spectralism, one of the other Western “schools” Tarnopolski described as of greatest interest to him in the early 90s.

In his 1993 interview with Zeyfas, Tarnopolski elaborated upon spectral music and its significance:

[T]he so-called spectral school, though closely connected with IRCAM, has spread out far and wide behind beyond the borders of France. […] The most important representatives of the spectral trend are, of course, Gérard Grisey and Tristan Murail.

If Lachenmann’s fundamental ideas are connected with silence, with the sonic space between sound and whisper, then in spectral music it’s the opposite: it is based on a lush, beautiful, absolutely French approach to harmony, based on the plentiful riches of the overtone series.

[…] I can put it this way: if Lachenmann is situated in that area between sound and silence, then [spectral composers] are situated between sound and harmony, the overtone series, the study and development of timbre.\footnote{Tarnopolski, “Most mezhdu razletayushchimisya Galaktikami,” 7.}

Later in the interview Tarnopolski underscored his interest in spectral music: when Zeyfas asked him which Western composers of his generation he finds most interesting, he answered “Grisey and Murail,” though he pointed out that both are slightly older than he.\footnote{Ibid., 8.} (In response to this question Tarnopolski also named Wolfgang Rihm, whom he calls “very famous and popular, especially in Germany” but “not of even quality as a composer.”\footnote{Ibid.})

Several factors likely propelled Tarnopolski’s interest in spectral music. As we saw in previous chapters, many composers of the Denisov circle maintained a longstanding interest in contemporary French music, influenced by Denisov’s personal tastes. Also, throughout the 1970s and 80s Denisov and several of his followers experimented with timbral or coloristic composition (recall Tarnopolski’s 1986 work Psalmus poenitentialis, discussed in chapter 3).

These general interests aside, a specific chain of events that unfolded in 1990 drew Tarnopolski’s interest to IRCAM, spectral music’s institutional base. In March 1990—exactly a year and a half before Cassandra’s German premiere—Pierre Boulez and Ensemble InterContemporain visited Moscow, where they performed works by the younger generation of spectral composers (or “post-spectralists”), including Manoury, Dalbavie, and Stroppa (see chapter 2). During this visit Tarnopolski asked Boulez about spectral music:
In response to my question about spectral music, Boulez said that he sees a lot of interesting things in it but, to his taste, block harmony \textit{vertikal’} plays too prominent a role in it. Be that as it may, he conducts these pieces, although he himself writes in quite a different style. \textsuperscript{62}

Six months later, in September 1990, Denisov left Moscow to begin a fellowship at IRCAM, which soon invited Tarnopolski for a residency. (In 1993 Tarnopolski stated that he had twice been invited to IRCAM for residencies, yet had to decline both invitations due to lack of adequate financial support. \textsuperscript{63})

\textit{Cassandra} shares many similarities with works by Grisey and Murail, those Western contemporaries Tarnopolski named in 1993 as two of the composers of greatest interest to him. \textit{Cassandra}’s form recalls that of several spectral pieces, most prominently Grisey’s \textit{Partiels}. Like \textit{Partiels}, \textit{Cassandra} is built around a basic harmonic structure that changes gradually over time. In both \textit{Cassandra} and \textit{Partiels}, this harmonic structure accumulates pitches throughout the first part of the form, becoming more dissonant or complex, and sheds them throughout the latter part. (Apropos \textit{Partiels}, François Rose has described this formal procedure as movement between “harmonicity” and “inharmonicity,” the terms denoting degrees of fidelity to the overtone series that provides the foundation of \textit{Partiels}’ pitch design. \textsuperscript{64}) In both pieces, this arch-like form spans a little over twenty minutes (\textit{Partiels} is around twenty-two minutes in duration, \textit{Cassandra} around twenty-four).

In interview with Skvortsova Tarnopolski described \textit{Cassandra}’s form as organized around

a single expressive chordal complex, which forms the basis for a series of episodes and variations that flow imperceptibly one into the next. Throughout this process different types of chords are formed—from hazy and vague “whispered” chords and from quasi-electronic, seemingly blurry multiphonics chords through to strident polychordal complexes—all of them unfolding as a study in a single, uninterrupted process. \textsuperscript{65}

Although the “expressive chordal complex”) constantly changes, most versions of it feature a few common characteristics, including at least one pitch within the range of A♭4 - B4 (i.e., A♭4, A4, B♭ 4, or B4) and a prominent minor ninth between E and F. In most versions of the chord, this minor ninth is scored in the upper register, at E5 and F6, and F is the chord’s highest pitch. (In \textit{Cassandra}’s middle sections this minor ninth moves to the bottom register, to E2-F3 and even E1-F2, before returning to the top.)

Ex. 5.17 shows three different versions of this evolving chord, excerpted from \textit{Cassandra}’s opening (ex. 5.17A), its second formal section (ex. 5.17B), and its climax (ex. 5.17C). The common features named above are indicated with hollow noteheads:

\textsuperscript{62} Ibid. 7.
\textsuperscript{63} Ibid., 4-5.
\textsuperscript{64} Rose, “Introduction to the Pitch Organization of French Spectral Music,” 8-11.
\textsuperscript{65} Tarnopolski, “Most mezhdu razletayushchimisy Galaktikami,” 12.
As the harmonies in *Cassandra* become more complex or dissonant, Tarnopolski increases their timbral density or noisiness. Ex. 5.18 shows the orchestration of the three chords presented above. The chord from *Cassandra’s* opening (5.18A) is airy and ethereal, with five of its nine pitches played by string harmonics and a sixth pitch bowed on a marimba. The next chord (5.18B), from *Cassandra’s* second section, is more substantial, the highest pitches sustained *fortissimo* by woodwinds and strings and some of the chord’s middle pitches played *forte* by the brass. The final chord (5.18C), from *Cassandra’s* climax, is raucous and noisy: every pitch is trilled, and Tarnopolski instructs the instrumentalists to rapidly alter the chord’s dynamic, playing each pitch *fortepiano* and with heavy accent. (Ex. 5.19 shows Tarnopolski’s setting of this chord in the full score.)

Here, too, *Cassandra* is like *Partiels*. François Rose notes that, as *Partiels* becomes more inharmonic, Grisey adds noise elements and pitch distortions. These noise elements include trills and shakes (cf. the clarinet trills and *molti vibrato* string parts at R.11 in Grisey’s score) and rapid alterations of dynamics (cf. the winds and brass parts at R.13) – the same techniques Tarnopolski later applied to the climactic chord in *Cassandra*.

Within this general *Partiels*-like scheme, several passages in *Cassandra* recall excerpts from works by Grisey and Murail. For example, the second main section of *Cassandra* (beginning at fig. G) recalls the opening of Murail’s 1980 orchestral work *Gondwana*. Like the opening of *Gondwana*, this section of *Cassandra* is built from a repeating two-part phrase consisting of a low, growling gesture in bass instruments followed by a series of high, bright chords. In both *Cassandra* and *Gondwana*, this phrase repeats a total of eight times in full and several times in part. In both works, the phrase repeats in fairly regular fifteen-second intervals.

Similarities between these passages go deeper still. Ex. 5.20 shows reductions of one statement of the phrase from *Gondwana* (ex. 5.20A) and from *Cassandra* (ex. 5.20B). For the sake of comparison, both reductions are drawn from the third statement of the phrase (out of eight statements total) in each work.

As these examples illustrate, in both pieces the low, growling gesture consists of a measured accelerando in the low strings. (Tarnopolski adds other bass instruments, including contrabassoon, tuba, and piano LH.) This gesture crescendoes into a high, bright chord,

---

sustained in the winds and brass and heavily accented by piano and bell-like percussion instruments. (Murail scores this chord for vibraphone, crotales, and chimes; Tarnopolski uses those three instruments, plus glockenspiel.) In both pieces the piano and percussion instruments’ accents prominently feature appogiaturas (accented and unaccented), while the woodwind and brass instruments stagger their releases.

In both works, this bright, heavily-accented chord is followed by a series of four secondary chords or pitches (see the top lines of exs. 5.20A and 5.20B). Murail scores this part for woodwinds, and Tarnopolski scores it for violins and violas. In both works, each of these four chords or pitches features hairpin dynamics and, as a set, gradually diminishes in volume. Also, in both works they follow a loose low-high-low-high pattern (see, especially, the top voice in the Murail example).

Other passages in Cassandra also recall excerpts from works by Grisey or Murail, if not to the specificity described above. For example, the repeating thirty-second notes in the brass in the passages leading up to Cassandra’s climax (ex. 5.21) recall the penultimate section of Grisey’s Transitoires (see R.60 in Grisey’s score), while the lumbering chords at the beginning of Cassandra’s third section (fig. M) loosely evoke the opening of Grisey’s Modulations.

As a final point of comparison, Cassandra’s instrumentation and orchestration, including its extended techniques, show similarities with some of the landmark works of spectral music. As demonstrated in ex. 5.22, Cassandra’s instrumentation is similar to that of Partiels and, especially, Murail’s Désintégrations (1982), the first piece Murail composed after attending the computer music course at IRCAM. Tarnopolski indicates that the synthesizer part in Cassandra should be performed on a Yamaha DX-7, a favorite instrument of many spectral composers, including Murail. Manufactured between 1983 and 1986, the DX-7 was the first electronic instrument based on John Chowning’s research into frequency modulation (FM) synthesis, the same technique Murail applied in some of his acoustic works, most prominently Gondwana (1980). Later, Murail used the DX-7 in a series of works of the mid 80s including Time and Again (1985), Atlantys (1986), and Vision de la cité interdite (1986).

Many of Cassandra’s extended techniques are common in scores by Grisey and Murail, including quarter-tone alterations of pitch and unconventional bowing techniques such as alto sul tastto, an instruction to play high on the fingerboard. Ex. 5.23 compares some of the techniques and notation in Cassandra with analogous ones in scores by Grisey and Murail. (As a point of comparison, this example also shows some of the symbols from Echoes of the Passing Day alongside ones from Lachenmann’s Allegro sostenuto.)

Tarnopolski acknowledges his general interest in spectral music around the time he wrote Cassandra, and in Lachenmann’s works around the time he wrote Echoes of the Passing Day. He states that he first heard Murail’s Gondwana and Lachenmann’s Allegro sostenuto in the early 1990s, after he had completed the works under discussion. Tarnopolski notes, too, that many of the features of Cassandra detailed above are common not just to his and Murail’s pieces, but to works by many spectral and spectral-influenced composers, and that a passage in his 1978 orchestral work Symphonic Prologue [Simfonicheskiy prolog] resembles passages in later works by Grisey.

Recalling “the End of Culturology,” perhaps the most noteworthy features of Cassandra are not the stylistic features Tarnopolski loaded into it, but the ones he left out. In contrast to many of his works before it, Cassandra includes neither acting nor speaking roles for the instrumentalists. It was probably this absence of texts and other easily-paraphrasable symbols that motivated Tarnopolski to remark to Ivashkin in 1992, apropos Cassandra, “Maybe I’ve lost
programmatic, extramusical ideas, but I’ve got a new quality, and new understanding of a pure sound instead [sic].”

Tarnopolski’s assessment is striking, as Cassandra is hardly devoid of “programmatic, extramusical” associations as he describes. The work’s provocative title—it is named after the Greek prophetess of doom—immediately triggers extramusical associations, especially in light of its fateful date of completion and premiere (1991, the year of the Soviet collapse). Moreover, Tarnopolski filled Cassandra with musical symbols designed to reinforce these associations. Some of these symbols are introversion: in his 1993 interview with Skvortsova, Tarnopolski described Cassandra’s constantly-returning “chordal complex” as symbolic of the “idea of dire prophecy” evoked by the title. Other symbols are intertextual: near the work’s climax, Tarnopolski instructs the horn player to sound a series of fff alarm calls with bell in the air (ex. 5.24). These calls are reminiscent of numerous passages throughout Grisey’s Epilogue (1985) for four horns and orchestra, the concluding piece of Les espaces acoustiques. Tarnopolski, though, could have found a model for them closer to home in a work by his teacher, Sidel’nikov. The fifth movement of Sidel’nikov’s Russian Fairytales (1968) includes a series of glissandi solo horn calls similar to those in Cassandra (ex. 5.25). (Compare, in particular, the opening figure for the horn in the Sidel’nikov excerpt with the series of four glissandi—up, up, up, down—at mm. 441-43 in Cassandra.) These horn calls are similar, too, to the horn glissandi near the end of Stravinsky’s revised Suite from The Firebird of 1945 (see the six glissandi for Horns I and III between R.167 and R.172 in the suite’s “Final Hymn”).

***

It is difficult to gauge why Tarnopolski, in conversations only months apart, discussed Cassandra in such different ways, describing it as free from “extramusical” content in his 1992 conversation with Ivashkin but as a loosely programmatic work in interview with Skvortsova one year later. Perhaps Tarnopolski tailored his comments for the publications in which they appeared: his interview with Skvortsova was published in the Russian-language Muzikal’naya akademiya, while his remarks to Ivashkin were printed in the English-language The Musical Quarterly, and were thus more broadly accessible to an international audience (including potential patrons).

Tarnopolski’s 1992 description of his style as “pure” and free from “extramusical associations” differs from some of his more recent descriptions of his work. As seen in this chapter’s epigraph, in 1996 he declared that, for him, there is “no such thing as ‘pure’ music.” Or, as he stated in remarks at the University of Iowa in April 2004:

In short I want to accentuate that, the most important thing in music is for me not art for art (l’art pour l’art) [sic] not beautiful sounds playing themselves, but the embodiment of a certain meta-idea, which determines the individual character of the sound material and the development of the musical ‘subject’. In this context, I attempt in each composition to find an individual idea, inhering only in the given composition. Technique in, and of itself, never provides individuality to a work.

---

68 Tarnopolski, “Most mezhdu razletayuschchimsya Galaktikami,” 12.
69 Tarnopolski, notes for his lecture-presentation “Analysis of Chevengur” at the University of Iowa, 2 April 2004. Original in English. Thanks to Tarnopolski for sending me these remarks.
Whatever Tarnopolski’s motivations might have been for his 1992 statement to Ivashkin, both Cassandra and the stylistic period it initiated proved enormously successful, helping him win commissions and premieres from many of Europe’s leading new music groups. Germany’s Ensemble Modern, which gave the first performance of Cassandra in 1991, premiered two more works of his in the mid 90s, Landschaft nach der Schlacht (1995), a setting of texts by Rilke for baritone, bass choir, and ensemble, and Szenen aus dem wirklichen Leben (1995), a setting of poems by Ernst Jandl for soprano and chamber ensemble. Other commissions and premieres came from Amsterdam’s Orkest de Eretripj (for the 1993 Welt voll Irrsinn, a setting of texts by Kurt Schwitters for ensemble and tape, and the 1998 Ins Theater, a setting of Jandl for choir, ensemble, and tape), the Symphonieorchester des Bayerischen Rundfunk (for the 1994 orchestral work The Breath of Exhausted Time), Ensemble InterContemporain (for the chamber orchestra work Feux follets, 2003), and the Schönberg Ensemble (for the chamber orchestra work Foucault’s Pendulum, 2004).

In the late 1990s and 2000s Tarnopolski received two commissions for large-scale theater pieces. In 1999, the Münchener Biennale presented the world premiere of his Wenn die Zeit über die Ufer tritt, a ninety-minute, three-act opera inspired by Chekhov’s Three Sisters, and in 2006 the Beethovenfest Bonn premiered his hour-long Jenseits der Schatten, a “multimedia opera” based loosely on texts by Plato and Pliny the Elder and with a score that substantially quotes Cassandra. These operas represent a significant investment of money and staff time on the part of the presenting and commissioning organizations. This is particularly true with regard to Jenseits der Schatten, which includes an elaborate—and likely very expensive—computer-controlled set designed in part by Tarnopolski. That Tarnopolski’s foreign patrons have invested so substantially in his work speaks to his international status and the success with which he has navigated the post-Soviet transition.

Epilogue: Winners or Losers?

The social changes enabling Tarnopolski’s success—namely, the collapse of the Soviet system and its various prohibitions, especially those against foreign travel—have, in the eyes of many, come at a high cost for music. As we saw in chapter 1, during perestroika some had already begun to worry that, as everything became possible, suddenly nothing would matter, and that composers and artists (especially non-conforming ones) would no longer be of value. Anxieties about the decline of high culture, and about composers’ deteriorating social relevance in particular, have intensified in recent years, particularly amid the surge in consumerism under Putin.

In a 1996 essay Victoria Bonnell addressed some of the changes in Russia’s social structures and status hierarchies caused by the Soviet collapse. As Bonnell notes:

For most Russians, the world has been turned upside down over the past decade, with particularly drastic changes occurring since the collapse of communism.

---

People who once had status, security, and a relatively decent standard of living have sometimes suffered great hardships during the transition while others, including some who never gained a respectable position under the Communist regime and were sometimes outcasts, have become millionaires.71

To illustrate these changes, Bonnell focuses on two groups: “winners”—individuals who have “benefited materially and/or gained in terms of prestige since 1991”—and losers, individuals who have suffered materially or lost prestige.72 The “winners” are mainly Russia’s “new entrepreneurs,” a socially diverse group made up of individuals with backgrounds in the Soviet cultural elite, individuals who had worked in the Soviet underground economy, and former communist officials who converted their political power into financial power (the “nomenklatura millionaires”).73 The “losers,” by contrast, include most other social or occupational groups, including blue-collar workers, agricultural workers, and educated professionals, all of whom have generally suffered lower wages and decreased standards of living post-1991.74

As Bonnell notes, within these broad categories there is significant and often surprising variation. A small but important segment of agricultural workers have prospered as private farmers, while some skilled workers, opting for “money over security,” have found success as employees of private firms with strong market position.75 Some intellectual and cultural elites have prospered, too. As Bonnell observes, the main strategies of success for them include earning income abroad or, more cynically, exploiting their access to economically valuable resources under their stewardship. For example, archivists might personally profit by selling access to rare materials, while cultural officials in charge of physical spaces can strike lucrative leasing agreements with private firms.76 (Along these lines, a scandal erupted in the Composers’ Union of Moscow in the early 90s when Georgiy Dmitriyev, chairman between 1988-92, attempted to sell or lease the House of Composers to a foreign company; the Union membership convened an emergency meeting, where they voted down the plan and ousted Dmitriyev.77)

With these categories in mind, how might we classify the modernist composers at the heart of our study? In some ways, many of them are clear “winners.” Most of the composers described herein have gained in prestige post-1991, at least in the form of institutional authority. With the collapse of communism, they are able to accept more prestigious appointments in the conservatories and institutes (as professors of composition, not just score reading or instrumentation) and accept more influential positions within the Composers’ Unions’ hierarchy. Some have benefitted materially, too, earning commissions, royalty payments, and artists’ fees abroad. In contrast to the communist era, these payments are no longer siphoned off by state bureaucracies.

The composers who have found greatest success are the ones who have adapted most quickly to the new institutional realities post-1991, particularly the realities of funding. Two composers, Martinov and Tarnopolski, have proven particularly adept at financing their projects

---

71 Ibid., 14.
72 Ibid. 13.
75 Ibid., 18.
76 Ibid., 17.
77 Yekimovsky briefly mentions this episode in the most recent version of his Avtomonografiya. See Yekimovsky, Avtomonografiya (Moscow: Muzizdat, 2008), 231-32.
at home and abroad through private or foreign support. Because of their adeptness in this area, they have emerged as two of the Soviet transition’s biggest musical “winners.”

Martínov co-founded a new music center, Devotio Moderna, dedicated to the dissemination of his music and ideas and substantially funded by the Ford Foundation. (For three of the past four years the foundation has awarded Devotio Moderna grants between $175,000-$250,000.⁷⁸) Some of the projects funded through the Ford Foundation’s support include an annual Martínov Festival [Festival ‘Vladimira Martínova], established by Devotio Moderna in 2002. Tarnopolski, meanwhile, funds the numerous new music activities he directs at the Moscow Conservatory chiefly through grants from foreign embassies and their cultural outreach offices, including the Moscow offices of the Goethe-Institut, the Istituto Italiano di Cultura, the Austrian Cultural Forum, the Polish Cultural Center, the Prohelvetia Foundation of the Swiss Arts Council, and others.

Tarnopolski has mastered another institutional reality, to the benefit of himself and his followers. Many new music circles in Europe and America operate as a tacit gift economy, whereby performance opportunities or professional invitations from one composer to another are reciprocated at a later date. Having established a new music ensemble and festival in Moscow in the mid 90s, Tarnopolski created the infrastructure to participate in these exchanges, and today he trades performances and festival engagements with many of Europe’s leading composers.

To illustrate: in April 2009, Tarnopolski’s Center for Contemporary Music staged a two-day event celebrating the works of François Paris (b. 1961), a pupil of Grisey and one of France’s leading composers today. With funding from the Moscow office of the Centre culturel française, the event featured a concert portrait of Paris, plus a lecture and a masterclass with him. Seven months later, Tarnopolski’s orchestral work The Breath of Exhausted Time was one of the featured pieces in Nice at the 2009 MANCA Festival, which Paris directs. (Paris is director of Nice’s Centre International de Recherche Musicale [CIRM], the parent organization of the MANCA Festival.) In May 2010, Paris returned to Russia for a series of performances of his music in Moscow and Novosibirsk by Tarnopolski’s Studio for New Music ensemble. Next November, the Studio for New Music will be a featured group at the 2010 MANCA Festival, where they will perform Cassandra and a new work by Tarnopolski’s pupil, Ol’ga Bochikhina (b. 1980).⁷⁹ Another Tarnopolski pupil, Nikolay Khrust [b. 1982], is currently in residence at CIRM.⁸⁰

These successes aside, many of the composers at the heart of this study report feeling more like Bonnell’s “losers,” lost in a society that no longer values their talents. There is little correlation between composers’ professional accomplishments and their perception of social relevance; in fact, some of Russia’s most successful composers offer the bleakest assessments of contemporary musical life. As Tarnopolski told a Russian reporter from Germany after the premiere of his second opera, Jenseits der Schatten:

---

⁷⁸ Information from the Ford Foundation’s online grants database (http://www.fordfoundation.org/grants/search, accessed August 29, 2010). The foundation’s grants to Devotio Moderna likely predate 2006, the last searchable year in the database. (N.B. – Grants to Devotio Moderna were established prior to foundation’s adoption of initiative-based grant making, and can be viewed through its online database only if this option is checked in the search screen.)

⁷⁹ See the MANCA 2010 concert listing on CIRM’s webpage, available at http://www.cirm-manca.org/archives-diffusion.htm (accessed August 19, 2010). These 2010 events are part of the France-Russia Year 2010, a yearlong series of cultural activities throughout Russia and France funded by both countries’ governments.

In my opinion, in our country today the attitude toward culture and cultural figures is worse than it was during Soviet times. Back then the country counted as culture-conscious: not to know about academic music or to demonstrate any kind of disregard for high culture was considered improper. And now, I am sure that this sphere of life is simply dying. Here in Germany I hang around bookstands and feel thoughts just buzzing about, how an intensive intellectual process is underway here. But in Russia, it seems, people who have any kind of interest in art are simply “superfluous people.” In Moscow I’m much in demand as a musical figure, a teacher, an ensemble leader… But as a composer, I’m not needed by anyone in Russia. I don’t exist – it’s like I’m an invisible person.  

Composers’ feelings of social irrelevance are amplified by the rapidity of the Soviet collapse and the quickness with which state institutions supporting and honoring them have deteriorated. In a colorful passage in his 2010 book Kazus Vita Nova, Martînov addresses some of these institutional changes, which he interprets as proof of the “End of the Time of Composers”:

The issue of the End of the Time of Composers might be observed in everyday life. To illustrate this, we might consider where, and in what conditions composers drink their vodka. In connection with this question, it serves us well to remember that there used to be a pretty good restaurant at the House of Composers with the folksy name “Balalaika.” There wasn’t any music in this restaurant; there was, instead, a special dining hall just for composers where no outsiders were permitted and, as long as the hall wasn’t full, a composer could always get a glass of vodka and a Suvorov-style steak. But then perestroïka came thundering in, and after it the Soviet collapse and, as a result, composers lost their special restaurant. A new, elite nightclub took the space where the restaurant used to be, blaring music so loud that you could sometimes hear it in the concert hall of the House of Composers. I still have a concert recording of my Folk Dance [Narodnïy tanets, 1997], performed by Lyubimov, and in the quiet sections you can hear bass guitar riffs coming up from the nightclub, which used to be the composers’ restaurant.

[...] In the spot in the House of Composers where there used to be a snack bar, and which was nice to drop by even just for a concert intermission, there is now a café with the musical-gastronomic name “Fa-sol’.” [The name is a play the word fasol’—Russian for “bean”—and the solfège syllables fa and sol’.] In this newish-looking café there was a little table, right in front of the bar, that had a small sign proudly declaring “Table for Composers.” [...] Say what you will, but composers’ tender hearts couldn’t help but be warmed by the thought that, somewhere in the world, there stood a table with a sign proclaiming, “Table for Composers.” But time continued its inexorable march, and the sign “Table for Composers” was replaced by another sign, “Table for Composers and Management.” [...] One time, during one of my customary stops at the café for a

couple of mugs of beer, I didn’t see the usual sign on the usual table, but instead saw a laminated sign tacked to the wall above the table announcing “Table for Management.” At that moment, I experienced something like satori in the form of the piercing question, “Why did I write so many books about the End of the Time of Composers—quoting from Heidegger, Adorno, Foucault, and Habermas—when everything is so simple and so obvious? […] When a sign proclaiming “Table for Management” appears over a table that used to bear the sign “Table for Composers” — well, this is the End of the Time of Composers, and you don’t need Heidegger, Foucault, Habermas, or even me to see it. 82

Martinov’s pronouncements of the End of the Time of Composers are especially striking in light of his guru-like status in Russian music today, with the annual festival dedicated to his works. For Martinov, announcing the End of the Time of Composers has proven an effective tool for boosting his authority as visionary genius, hence boosting his status as a composer. It has been an extraordinarily effective PR tool, too, as Martinov is regularly quoted and discussed in the Russian blogosphere and press.

In recent years, various individuals have proposed programs of reform to fix Russian music and arrest its rapid decline in social relevance. These programs fall into two broad categories, each with a long pedigree in Russian intellectual history. For some, Russian music’s solutions lie in emulating the institutions of Western Europe. For an example of this position, we might look to the “Open Letter of the Composers” published in February 2010 on the Russian news and culture site OpenSpace.ru 83. The letter was authored by three of the leading composers of Russia’s post-Soviet generation, Sergey Nevsky (b. 1972), Dmitri Kourliandski (b. 1976), and Boris Filanovsky (b. 1968, whom we met in chapter 2 as author of the provocative 2005 article “Without Shostakovich”). The authors compare state support for new music in Russia with the situation in Western Europe:

A whole country stands behind every contemporary European composer: he receives grants, scholarships, commissions. Our composers also travel abroad to performances of their works, paid for by the host organizations. Russia is a participant on the international scene only in a formal sense – it’s just a word in parenthesis next to a composer’s name. Entire concerts of new Russian music take place at leading international festivals, but always with the support of European foundations, not Russian ones […] If our national institutions stood behind us, then the contemporary musical scene would recognize Russia as one of the most active participants in a worldwide process, and not just a place where talented loners reside. 84

According to the letter’s authors, the problems facing composers in Russia are not just a matter of funding, but of policy: the Russian music education system, the authors argue, favors traditional music, thus few musicians are willing or able to play new music. To rectify this

82 Vladimir Martinov, Kazus Vita Nova (Moscow: Klassika XXI, 2010), 100-101.
84 Ibid.
situation, the authors present a six-point plan of action calling upon the state to create a regional network of new-music centers. These centers would disburse grants to performers, encouraging them to play new works. The plan also includes calls for the establishment of a contemporary music recording label, a system of disbursing grants to composers, and a publishing house dedicated to new Russian music—in other words, the establishment of a national music center similar to those in Western European countries. The letter invites all those in agreement to add their name to it; as of August 5, 2010, some 146 individuals had signed the letter electronically, and several more had expressed their support in the comments section.

For others, Russian music’s salvation lies not in emulating the West, but in rejecting it. In April 2007, a group calling itself the Musizkal’noye ob’yedineniye “Sovremennaya Traditsiya” [Musical Organization “Contemporary Tradition”—the name forms the acronym MOST, which means “bridge” in Russian—published its manifesto in the far-right wing newspaper Zavtra.

For some of the composers of MOST, Russian music’s woes began in the 1960s with the rise of the late-Soviet avant garde. As MOST composer Ivan Vishnevsky (b. 1960) stated in the pages of Zavtra in December 2007:

Readers might not know that our entire compositional world survived a palpable crisis which did not begin in 1992, when the stench of crisis became apparent in every corner of our life. The crisis first became apparent at the end of the 60s and became stronger in the 70s; by the 80s there had developed in our musical world a totalitarian dictatorship by worshippers of dodecaphony, atonality, and an absence of ethnic roots [bezumichnost’] and, correspondingly, haters of tradition, in so far as tradition always rests on melodies, harmonies, and modes defined along national lines. […] For me, of course, it’s more interesting to directly associate with composers who purposefully continue tradition—with shining, prominent masters like Sviridov, Boris Chaikovsky, Slonimsky, Sidel’nikov. Of course, in the Composers’ Union there were talented people who love art and who are today members of MOST—Ledenyov, Rubin [Vladimir Rubin, b. 1924], Muravlyov [Aleksey Muravlyov, b. 1924], Volkov [Kirill Volkov, b. 1943], Kikta [Valeriy Kikta, b. 1941]… In terms of quality they were always better [than the avant-gardists], but in terms of quantity there were always more of those individuals who detest our country’s traditions. Now that today’s middle-aged composers have grown up and matured the balance of power has evened out. These composers include Dovgan’ [Vladimir Dovgan’, b. 1953], Larin [Aleksy Larin, b. 1954], Mikita [Andrey Mikita, 1959], Ul’yanich [Viktor Ul’yanich, b. 1956],

Although MOST’s nationalist, traditionalist platform matches well the political culture of Putinism, it remains a fringe group. Outside the pages of Zavtra, MOST composers receive little press coverage and, with the exception of the nearly eighty-year old Ledenyov, none enjoy particularly high-profile careers. (Compare this with the relatively frequent coverage in major national papers afforded even young European-oriented composers like Filanovsky and Kourliandski.)

The social, institutional, and stylistic transformations in Russian music post-1991 have been profound and far-reaching. These transformations are likely to intensify in the near future as Russia’s first post-Soviet birth cohort enters adulthood. Who will be Russian composers’ audiences of tomorrow, and who will be their patrons? How the next generation of Russia’s professional composers—born in the early 80s and entering the professional ranks today—answers these questions will become clearer with time. It will be the subject for another study.

---

Ex. 5.1 – Denisov, *Italian Songs*, IV. The Assumption, mm. 65-80

© Editio Musica Budapest
Used by Permission of Universal Music Publishing Editio Musica Budapest, Ltd.
Ex. 5.1 cont’d.

*) Cluster ganz breit (mit den Handflächen) im tiefsten Register

**) das Horn mit einem Metallstab schlagen (an der Stelle, wo das Instrument das lausteste Geräusch von sich gibt.)

****) Klappergeräusch

*****) mit beiden Händen sehr schnell, bei ausgeschalteten Registern des Kieflügels (ohne Ton) zu spielen

******) ohne Bogen (auf der Violine) nur mit den Fingern spielen

© Editio Musica Budapest
Used by Permission of Universal Music Publishing Editio Musica Budapest, Ltd.
Ex. 5.2 – Comparison of selected extended techniques and notation in Tarnopolski, *Echoes of the Passing Day* and Lachenmann, *Allegro sostenuto*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>I. Same technique, same notation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Clarinet</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Clarinet notation" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Clarinet notation" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Toneless playing; the sound of air blowing through the instrument is audible</td>
<td>1. Toneless playing; the sound of air blowing through the instrument is audible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Cello</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Cello notation" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Cello notation" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Toneless bowing (sul ponticello)</td>
<td>1. Toneless bowing (sul ponticello)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pressed bowing</td>
<td>2. Pressed bowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Expressive marks</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Expressive marks" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Expressive marks" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. “Subjective” dynamics (perceived intensity of playing, not actual loudness)</td>
<td>1. “Subjective” dynamics (perceived intensity of playing, not actual loudness)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ex. 5.2 cont’d.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Similar technique and/or similar notation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Clarinet</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="clarinet notation" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="quasi tonlos notation" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Quasi tonlos; pitch is barely audible</td>
<td>1. Quasi tonlos; pitch is barely audible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="clarinet notation" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="clarinet notation" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Blow through the instrument so as to create the “sound of a gust of wind”</td>
<td>2. Blow “onto the mouthpiece” as if “playing a recorder” (a “kind of ‘flautato’ playing”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Cello</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="cello notation" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="quasi tonlos notation" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Toneless bowing (sul ponticello, on the right-hand side of the bridge)</td>
<td>1. Toneless bowing (sul ponticello, on the right-hand side of the bridge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="pizz notation" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="pizz notation" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Left-hand pizzicato</td>
<td>2. Left-hand pizzicato</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ex. 5.2 cont’d.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Music notation 1" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Music notation 2" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Flautato</td>
<td>3. Flautato</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Piano

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><img src="image3" alt="Music notation 3" /></th>
<th><img src="image4" alt="Music notation 4" /></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Rub strings with fingernails</td>
<td>1. Rub strings with fingernails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Music notation 5" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Music notation 6" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Knock on the wood at the ends of the keyboard</td>
<td>2. “Frame attack”: knock on frame of piano with a beater</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Expressive marks

- Quasi Valsø
- Marciale
- a la Jazz
- quasi Walzer
- alla Marcia
- quasi Gigue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><img src="image7" alt="Music notation 7" /></th>
<th><img src="image8" alt="Music notation 8" /></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Allusions to other styles or genres</td>
<td>1. Allusions to other styles or genres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ex. 5.3 – Tarnopolski, *Echoes of the Passing Day*, mm. 1-6

Echoes of the Passing Day (1989-90)
By Vladimir Tarnopolski
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 5.3 cont’d.

Echoes of the Passing Day (1989-90)
By Vladimir Tarnopolski
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 5.3 cont’d.

Echoes of the Passing Day (1989-90)
By Vladimir Tarnopolski
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 5.4 – Tarnopolski, *Echoes of the Passing Day*, “Für Elise” quotation (clarinet), mm. 182-96

Echoes of the Passing Day (1989-90)
By Vladimir Tarnopolski
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 5.5 – Tarnopolski, *Echoes of the Passing Day*, “Morse code” transmission, mm. 86-87

Echoes of the Passing Day (1989-90)
By Vladimir Tarnopolski
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 5.6 – Tarnopolski, *Echoes of the Passing Day*, “Rechts-links” mm.89-93

Echoes of the Passing Day (1989-90)
By Vladimir Tarnopolski
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.

361
Ex. 5.7 – Tarnopolski, *Echoes of the Passing Day*, “*Chto delat’*?”, mm. 202-208 (four before R.28 through three after R.28)
Ex. 5.8 – Reading from Joyce’s *Ulysses* at end of Tarnopolski, *Echoes of the Passing Day*, mm. 250-66 (R.38)

- **Text:**

  and first I put my arms around him yes and drew him down to me he could feel my breasts all perfume yes and his heart was going like mad and yes I said yes I will yes.


- **Tarnopolski’s setting (beginning):**

  ![Image of musical notation](image-url)
Ex. 5.9 – Text of Aleksandr Vustin, *Music for Ten*

A. Russian-language text (translated by A.L. Andres, adapted by Vustin)

Мне кажется, что это было вчера, а между тем это случилось ещё в начале 1788 года… У нашего товарища по Академии собралось в тот день многочисленное общество. Все господа пообедали, и мальвазия и капские вина постепенно развяли языки.
– Да, господа, я так же твердо убежден в том, что Бога нет, как и в том, что Гомер был глупцом.
– Знаете ли, что заявил мой парикмахер: “Я, сударь, всего лишь жалкий недоучка, однако верю в бога не более других.”
– Суеверию и фанатизму скоро придет конец. Место их заступит философия.
– Революция не за горами.
– Да, господа, можете радоваться, Вы увидите её.
– Чтоб это знать, чтоб это знать, пророком быть не надо.
– Пусть так, но знаете ли вы, что будет ее итогом, логическим следствием, естественным выводом? Вы, господин Кондорсе, умрете от яда, дабы избежать руки палача. Вы, господин Шамфор, бритвой перережете себе жилы. Вы, господин Вик д’Азир, попросите это сделать других. Вы, господин Николаи, кончите на эшафоте. Вы, господин де Байи – на эшафоте. Вы, господин Мальзерб – на эшафоте. Я вам говорю: то будет владычество разума.
– Ну а мне, господин Казот, Вы ничего не предскажете?
– Вы—чудо!—станете верующим христианином.
– Вы же видите: он сумасшедший.
– Да нет же, он просто шутит.
– А вот мы, женщины, счастливее Вас, к революции не причастны.
– Вас постигнет та же участь.
– Того гляди, он не оставит и духовника.
– Ах, что это такое Вы проповедуете, конец света что ли?
– Последний, кому в виде величайшей милости ведет даровано право исповеди...это будет...король Франции.
– Но что ты будешь делать сам?*
– Kyrie eleison… Kyrie eleison…*

* - *Vustin’s additions*

Ex. 5.9 cont’d.

B. English translation of Vustin, Music for Ten

It seems to me like it was just yesterday, but it actually happened back in the beginning of 1788… On that day, a big group gathered at the home of our friend from the Academy. The gentlemen in attendance had dinner, and Madeira and Cape wine gradually began to loosen their tongues.

– “Yes, gentlemen, I’m quite certain that there is no God, and that Homer was a fool!”
– “Do you know what my barber said to me? ‘Even though I, sir, am terribly uneducated, I still don’t believe in God any more than the next person.’”
– “Superstition and fanaticism will soon come to an end. Philosophy will take their place.”
– “Revolution is not far off!”
– “Yes, gentlemen, go ahead and rejoice. You will witness it.”
– “You don’t have to be a prophet to see that!”
– “So be it, but do you know what will result from all of this – what will be its logical end, its natural outcome? You, Monsieur Condorcet, will die of poison in order to escape the executioner’s hands. (a) You, Chamfort, will slice your own veins with a razor. (b) You, Monsieur Vicq d’Azyr, will ask someone else to do it for you. (c) And you, Monsieur de Nicolaï, will die on the scaffold. (d) Monsieur Bailly – on the scaffold. (e) And Monsieur Malesherbes – on the scaffold, too. (f) I say to you: this will be the ‘rule of reason.’”
– “And do you not foresee anything for me, Monsieur Cazotte?”
– “You, believe it or not, will become a devout Christian.”
– “You see it yourself – he’s gone mad!”
– “No, he’s simply joking.”
– “We women are more fortunate than you and won’t participate in this revolution.”
– “The same fate awaits you nevertheless…”
– “It seems that he won’t even leave a confessor for her!”
– “Just what is this you’re preaching about, the end of the world or something?”
– “The last individual to whom the right to confess will be extended as a great mercy will be … the King of France.”
– “And what will you yourself do?”*
– “Kyrie eleison… Kyrie eleison…”*

* - Vustin’s additions

 Individuals named in the text: (a) Marie Jean Antoine Nicolas de Caritat, the Marquis de Condorcet (1743-94); (b) Nicolas Chamfort (1741-94); (c) Félix Vicq d’Azyr (1746-94); (d) Aimar-Charles-Marie de Nicolaï (1747-94); (e) Jean-Sylvain Bailly (1736-93); (f) Guillaume-Chrétien de Lamoignon de Malesherbes (1721-94)
Ex. 5.11 – Vustin, *White Music*, mm. 1-12

weiße musik · white music

*Sostenuto molto*

*poco più mosso*

\*1\) Die Länge der Linie entspricht der Tondauer. Alle Phrasen ohne besondere Kennzeichnung werden legato gespielt. Versetzungszeichen gelten grundsätzlich nur für die nachfolgende Note, außer bei Tonrepetitionen.

The length of the line defines the duration. Unless otherwise indicated, all phrases are to be played legato. Accidentals only apply to the notes they immediately precede, except in the case of repeated notes.

White Music (1990)
By Aleksandr Vustin
Copyright © MUSIKVERLAG HANS SIKORSKI GmbH & Co. KG, Hamburg
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
White Music (1990)
By Aleksandr Vustin
Copyright © Musikverlag Hans Sikorski GmbH & Co. KG, Hamburg
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 5.14 – Text of Vustin, *Song from Platonov's Novel*

Есть в далёкой стране,          There exists in a far-off country,
На другом берегу,               On the opposite shore,
Что нам снится во сне,           That which we dream about,
Но досталось врагу.             But which was given to the enemy.

Ex. 5.15 – Vustin, *Song from Platonov’s Novel*, mm. 57-74

Song from Platonov’s Novel Chevengur (1995)
By Aleksandr Vustin
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.

*) Die Basspartie muss wie ein leiser Schatten klingen // the bass part should sound like a soft shadow.
Ex. 5.15 cont’d.

Song from Platonov’s Novel Chevengur (1995)
By Aleksandr Vustin
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 5.16 – Vustin, *Theater*, mm. 73-75

Theater (2006)
By Aleksandr Vustin
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 5.16 cont’d.

Theater (2006)
By Aleksandr Vustin
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 5.16 cont’d.

Theater (2006)
By Aleksandr Vustin
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 5.18 – Orchestration of three chords from *Cassandra*

A. – m. 10       B. – m. 140       C. – m. 435
Cassandra (1991)
By Vladimir Tarnopolski
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 5.20 – Comparison of opening of Murail, *Gondwana* and Tarnopolski, *Cassandra*

A. Murail, *Gondwana*, mm. 10-15
Ex. 5.20A cont’d.
Ex. 5.20 cont’d.

B. Tarnopolski, *Cassandra*, mm. 148-55
n.b. – throughout the score of Cassandra Tarnopolski indicates duration with bars, especially in the synthesizer part. However, in the woodwind and brass parts in mm. 152-55, he writes out each pitch’s full duration. In this reduction I have opted to use bars for the woodwind and brass parts for the sake of legibility. Also, by using bars, I wish to highlight the parallels between these sustained chords and those in Gondwana.
Ex. 5.21 – Tarnopolski, Cassandra, mm. 377-85
**Ex. 5.22 – Comparison of instrumentation of works by Tarnopolski, Murail, and Grisey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 players</td>
<td>18 players</td>
<td>19 players</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flute I/piccolo</td>
<td>Flute I</td>
<td>Flute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flute II</td>
<td>Flute II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oboe/English Horn</td>
<td>Oboe</td>
<td>Oboe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarinet I</td>
<td>Clarinet I</td>
<td>Clarinet I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarinet II/Bass Clarinet</td>
<td>Clarinet II</td>
<td>Clarinet II/Bass Clarinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass Clarinet</td>
<td>Bass Clarinet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassoon/Contrabassoon</td>
<td>Bassoon/Contrabassoon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horn</td>
<td>Horn I</td>
<td>Horn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horn II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumpet</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trumpet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trombone</td>
<td>Trombone</td>
<td>Trombone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percussion I</td>
<td>Percussion I</td>
<td>Percussion I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percussion II</td>
<td>Percussion II</td>
<td>Percussion II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano</td>
<td></td>
<td>Piano/Celesta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Synthesizer (Yamaha DX-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violin I</td>
<td>Violin I</td>
<td>Violin I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violin II</td>
<td>Violin II</td>
<td>Violin II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viola</td>
<td>Viola I</td>
<td>Viola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viola II</td>
<td>Viola II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cello</td>
<td>Cello</td>
<td>Cello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass</td>
<td>Bass</td>
<td>Bass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - *Désintégrations* also includes a tape part.
Ex. 5.23 – Comparison of extended techniques and notation in works by Tarnopolski, Murail, Grisey, and Lachenmann

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toneless playing in winds (breath sound only)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⅔ tone higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>⅔ tone lower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alto sul ponticello</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.s.p.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.st.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poco s.p.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- marked “‘Left’” (e.g., horn m.55).
- marked “‘senza tono’” (e.g., clarinet l. m.17)
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Ex. 5.23 cont’d.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lachenmann, Allegro sostenuto (1986-88)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tarnopolski, Echoes of the Passing Day (1989)</td>
<td>s.p.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarnopolski, Cassandra (1991)</td>
<td>p.s.t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murali, Gondwana (1980)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>poco sul tasto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ex. 5.24 – Tarnopolski, *Cassandra*, mm. 437-445

Cassandra (1991)
By Vladimir Tarnopolski
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 5.24 cont’d.

Cassandra (1991)
By Vladimir Tarnopolski
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.

Russian Fairytales (1968)
By Nikolay Sidel’nikov
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Russian Fairytales (1968)
By Nikolay Sidel’nikov
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
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Appendix  “Dodecaphony in Time” in Vustin’s Memoria-2

Vustin first serialized rhythm in Memoria-2 (1978), a concerto grosso for percussion sextet and chamber orchestra composed for Mark Pekarsky and his ensemble. To organize Memoria-2’s rhythm, Vustin turned to the patterns of his dvenadtsatikratnost’ system, which he had devised in 1975 as a means of generating twelve-tone rows for his opera, The Devil in Love [Vzlyublyonnîy d’yavol] (1975-89). Given its derivation from his twelve-tone practice, Vustin named his method of rhythmic serialism “dodecaphony in time” [dodekafoniya vo vremeni]. In the wake of Memoria-2, Vustin applied the basic features of “dodecaphony in time” to other works, most prominently Zaitsev’s Letter.

Vustin organized Memoria-2 as a two-part rhythmic fugue for the percussionist sextet. The first fugue, played by Percussion I, III, and V, features a seventeen-bar subject presented by Percussion I at m. 8 (see example 6.1) and repeated by Percussion III at m.24 and Percussion V at m.56. The second fugue is played by Percussion II, IV, and VI and is built upon a twenty-four bar subject presented by Percussion II at m.145 (see example 6.2) and repeated by Percussion IV at m.169 and Percussion VI at m.217.

Vustin told Dmitriy Shul’gin that the second fugue is a retrograde of the first.1 His statement is confusing, as the subject of the second fugue is seven measures longer than that of the first, and the subjects’ rhythmic profiles are quite different. While there are a few isolated points of symmetry, the second fugue is in no obvious way a retrograde of the first. The explanation behind Vustin’s puzzling comment lies in the patterns of his dvenadtsatikratnost’ system.

There are forty-eight distinct two-measure rhythmic units that repeat regularly throughout Memoria-2. These units repeat in twenty-four measure blocks (= twelve two-measure blocks). The same twelve units are always grouped together (= four distinct sets of twelve), and each unit is played only once in any given twenty-four measure span. If one assigns pitch names to these forty-eight rhythmic units, one notices that they repeat throughout Memoria-2 in patterns derived from Vustin’s dvenadtsatikratnost’ system.2 For example, let each of the fugal subjects represent Vustin’s row in P0 form. Example 6.3 reproduces the first statements of each fugal subject, and shows how these subjects can be divided into two-measure units, each unit corresponding to a pitch from Vustin’s row. In the case of the first subject, which is seventeen measures long, the subject corresponds to the last nine pitches of the row; in the case of the second subject, which is twenty-four measures long, every two measures correspond to a pitch from Vustin’s row.

Examples 6.4 and 6.5 show the forty-eight distinct rhythmic units repeating throughout Memoria-2 and the pitch names I have assigned to each. The rhythmic units presented in the fugal subjects correlate to pitches in non-retrograde row forms (P or I), while the others correlate to retrograde forms (i.e., R and RI).3 Using these charts as a key, one can map out the rhythmic organization of Memoria-2. This rhythmic organization is presented in example 6.6. As

---

1 Shul’gin, Muzikal’niye istini’ Aleksandra Vustina, 329.
2 My analysis of Memoria-2, particularly the notion to assign pitch names to the repeating rhythmic units, was instigated by Vustin’s brief description of his dodekafoniya vo vremeni technique to me in interview (January 5, 2008) as well as his remarks about the work’s rhythmic design to Shul’gin (Muzikal’niye istini’ Aleksandra Vustina, 113 and 179) and Tsenova (“Alexander Vustin: The Battlefield is the Soul,” 206 and 208).
3 In the case of Fugue I, I have deduced the prime forms of the rhythms corresponding to the row’s first three pitches (B♭ D E), as well as the full prime form corresponding to the fourth pitch (E♭), from later phrases within the fugue, and not from the initial statement of the subject, which begins with seven measures of rest.
demonstrated in this chart, the patterns of Percussion I and II’s parts form various transpositions of the P0 form of Vustin’s row. The remaining voices, Percussion III-VI, each perform one of the two fugal statements, in P0 form. After playing these statements, these voices begin free counterpoint, sometimes playing from the forty-eight main rhythmic units of the work, other times playing new, unrelated rhythms.

The order of Percussion I and II’s rows is drawn directly from Vustin’s *dvenadtsatikratnost’* system. Example 6.7 shows Percussion I and II’s rows on the standard table of 144 row forms generated by this system. This chart holds the key to Vustin’s puzzling comment to Shul’gin that the second fugue of *Memoria-2* is a retrograde of the first “from the end to the beginning.” As shown in example 6.8 below, the starting pitches of the row forms sounded by Percussion I produce a P0 row (B♭ D E♭ G♭ C A B F G A♭ D♭), while the starting pitches of Percussion II’s rows produce the second half of an I11 row (B♭ A♭ D C B G♭). When this fragment is reversed— that is, arranged “from the end to the beginning,” as Vustin described to Shul’gin—it forms a retrograde form (RI11) derived from Percussion I’s P0 row:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Percussion I:} & \quad \text{B}♭ \quad \text{D} \quad \text{E}♭ \quad \text{G}♭ \quad \text{C} \quad \text{A} \quad \text{B} \quad \text{F} \quad \text{G} \quad \text{A}♭ \quad \text{D}♭ \\
\text{Percussion II:} & \quad \text{B}♭ \quad \text{A}♭ \quad \text{D} \quad \text{C} \quad \text{B} \quad \text{G}♭
\end{align*}
\]

Ex. 6.8 – Starting pitches for the rhythmic fugue entrances in Aleksandr Vustin, *Memoria-2*

In this respect, Fugue II forms a highly abstracted retrograde of Fugue I, refracted through the patterns of Vustin’s *dvenadtsatikratnost’* system.
Ex. 6.1 – Fugue I subject in Aleksandr Vustin, *Memoria-2*

**Fugue I subject:** see Percussion I part, mm. 8-24

Memoria-2 (1978)
By Aleksandr Vustin
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 6.1 cont’d.

Memoria-2 (1978)
By Aleksandr Vustin
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 6.1 cont’d.
Ex. 6.2 – Fugue II subject in Aleksandr Vustin, *Memoria-2*

Fugue II subject: see Percussion II part, mm. 145-168.
Ex. 6.2 cont’d.
Ex. 6.2 cont’d.
Ex. 6.2 cont’d.

Memoria-2 (1978)
By Aleksandr Vustin
Copyright © G. Schirmer, Inc.
International Copyright Secured. All Rights Reserved.
Used by Permission of G. Schirmer, Inc.
Ex. 6.3 – Pitch correlations for the two fugal subjects from Aleksandr Vustin’s Memoria-2
Ex. 6.3 cont’d.
Rhythmic Series, Fugue I  
(Percussion I, III, V)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prime forms</th>
<th>Retrograde forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>B♭(^R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>D(^R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>E(^R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E(^b)</td>
<td>E(^b)(^R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G(^b)</td>
<td>G(^b)(^R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C(^R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>A(^R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>B(^R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>F(^R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>G(^R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A(^b)</td>
<td>A(^b)(^R)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D(^b)</td>
<td>D(^b)(^R)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** - When included as part of the Fugue I subject, only the second measure of this E\(^b\) figure is performed (i.e., Percussion I at m.8, Percussion III at m.24, and Percussion V at m.56). In all other instances, the full two-measure figure is performed (i.e., Percussion I at mm. 73-74, 143-44, 149-50, 219-220, and 257-58).
Rhythmic Series, Fugue II  
(Percussion II, IV, VI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prime forms</th>
<th>Retrograde forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B♭</td>
<td>B♭&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>D&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>E&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E♭</td>
<td>E♭&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G♭</td>
<td>G♭&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>C&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>A&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>B&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>F&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>G&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A♭</td>
<td>A♭&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D♭</td>
<td>D♭&lt;sup&gt;R&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Ex. 6.6 – Rhythmic organization of Aleksandr Vustin, Memoria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>E♭*</th>
<th>G♭</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>A♭</th>
<th>D♭</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>from 1 on B♭ (Fugue I subject)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II</th>
<th>D♭</th>
<th>G♭</th>
<th>A♭</th>
<th>B♭</th>
<th>E♭</th>
<th>G♭</th>
<th>E♭</th>
<th>A♭</th>
<th>C♭</th>
<th>B♭</th>
<th>D♭</th>
<th>F♭</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 on D (R17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III</th>
<th>E♭*</th>
<th>G♭</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>A♭</th>
<th>D♭</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>from 1 on B♭ (Fugue I subject)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - when included in the Fugue I subject, only the first measure of this E♭ figure is sounded
Ex. 6.7 – Row forms for rhythmic series in Aleksandr Vustin’s Memoria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fugue I (Percussion I)</th>
<th>Fugue II (Percussion II)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 on B♭ (P0)</td>
<td>4 on B (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 on D (R17)</td>
<td>4 on F (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 on E (R3)</td>
<td>4 on G (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 on E♭ (P0)</td>
<td>1 on A♭ (P10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 on E</td>
<td>2 on B♭ (R19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 on G (R10)</td>
<td>3 on E♭ (R15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 on C</td>
<td>2 on E♭ (R19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 on E♭</td>
<td>1 on C♭ (R15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 on B♭ (P0)</td>
<td>4 on A♭ (P10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 on D (R17)</td>
<td>4 on F (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 on E (R3)</td>
<td>4 on G (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 on E♭ (P0)</td>
<td>1 on A♭ (P10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 on E</td>
<td>2 on B♭ (R19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 on G (R10)</td>
<td>3 on E♭ (R15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 on C</td>
<td>2 on E♭ (R19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 on E♭</td>
<td>1 on C♭ (R15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 on B♭ (P0)</td>
<td>4 on A♭ (P10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 on D (R17)</td>
<td>4 on F (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 on E (R3)</td>
<td>4 on G (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 on E♭ (P0)</td>
<td>1 on A♭ (P10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

422