

E1.3  
BK303387

T·H·E  
R·U·S·S·I·A·N  
P·I·A·N·O  
C·O·N·C·E·R·T·O

Volume I: The Nineteenth Century

JEREMY NORRIS

# THE RUSSIAN PIANO CONCERTO

VOLUME I  
The Nineteenth Century



JEREMY NORRIS



INDIANA UNIVERSITY PRESS  
Bloomington and Indianapolis

© 1994 by Jeremy Norris

All rights reserved

No part of this book may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher. The Association of American University Presses' Resolution on Permissions constitutes the only exception to this prohibition.

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.



Manufactured in the United States of America

Norris, Jeremy, date

The Russian piano concerto / Jeremy Norris.

p. cm. — (Russian music studies)

Includes discographies, bibliographical references, and indexes.

Contents: v. 1. The nineteenth century

ISBN 0-253-34112-4 (v. 1 : cl : alk. paper)

1. Concertos (Piano)—19th century—History and criticism.

2. Music—Russia—19th century—History and criticism. I. Title.

II. Series: Russian music studies (Bloomington, Ind.)

ML1263.N67 1994

784.2'62'0947—dc20

93-11565

1 2 3 4 5 99 98 97 96 95 94

## Preface

When I embarked on this project, ringing in my ears was Abraham Veinus's gentle warning: "A musicologist, one hopes, can be something other than a dreary janitor of music history tidying a magnificent cathedral where none comes to pray." Consequently, I have tried to avoid an overly academic approach, choosing instead a course based on the letters, diaries, and other writings of Russians who composed concertos, principally to discover why they composed them, under what circumstances, and in what way these motives and circumstances manifested themselves in their music. In so doing, Veinus's cathedral is no longer silent, but reverberates with the sound of personal recollections, opinions, and observations. Other voices are also heard: the voices of relatives and friends of the composers, their publishers, their critics. As the janitor/musicologist, I found myself too busy to be dreary, for this great wealth of primary material had to be put in order and analyzed—together with the music in question—with the aim of shedding new light on the composers' intentions.

The general plan of the study is chronological, though as is clear from the Contents, I have dealt with Rubinstein and Tchaikovsky separately because of their more substantial contributions to Russian concerto literature. This results in a number of minor chronological anomalies—with Rubinstein's last concerto (in E-flat, Op. 94, 1875) being discussed before Balakirev's first attempt of 1855, Scriabin's Concerto in F-sharp minor, Op. 20, (1986–97) before Tchaikovsky's celebrated Concerto No. 1 in B-flat minor, Op. 23 (1875), etc.—but they are outweighed by the obvious advantage of analyzing Rubinstein's and Tchaikovsky's concertos collectively. Moreover, despite my determination to remain impartial, I must ask the reader's forgiveness for having devoted more space and attention to what are generally considered the finer concertos composed in Russia during the nineteenth century. Whether this is a *modus operandi* to be condemned or approved I have never been able to discover, though certainly many greater writers than myself have adopted this practice as a lifelong principle.

More problematic has been the matter of transliteration, invariably a thorn in the side of writers dealing with subjects in languages based on alphabets other than the Latin. As a general principle, I have used the Library of Congress system, particularly in the Notes and Bibliography. However, for Russian names in the text I have turned to more traditional transliterations for both known and unknown persons for the sake of consistency if not for linguistic accuracy. For instance, to discuss Tchaikovsky and then to mention Tchaikovsky's friend Stoiovskii gives the

impression of writing about persons of two different nationalities! Only in cases of irresolvable confusion—the half dozen or so acknowledged transliterations of the publisher Beliaev (Belaiew, Belayev, Belaiev, even Byelyayeff!)—have I resorted to the Library of Congress system for clarity. Translations from Russian sources, incidentally, are my own unless indicated otherwise in the Notes.

Again, to avoid confusion, all dates have been given according to the Russian Julian, or Old Style, calendar, which in the nineteenth century lagged behind the European Gregorian, or New Style, calendar by twelve days.

For assistance in the preparation of this volume, my thanks go to Edward Garden, who cast a stern eye over the early drafts, and to Jarmila Hickman, Laurence Marshall, and Terence Warburton for their useful and sometimes invaluable help. I would also like to express my gratitude to the following persons:

A. F. Leighton Thomas, the editor of *Music Review*, and Gordon Watson for granting permission to use a revised version of my article on Rubinstein's piano concertos (published in *Music Review* in 1985), as the second chapter of the present volume.

Basil Ramsey, the editor of the *Musical Times*, for allowing me to incorporate my discoveries concerning Balakirev's Piano Concerto, first published in the *Musical Times* in July 1990.

The publisher Victor Gollancz Ltd. for permission to use the musical example cited on page 129, taken from David Brown, *Tchaikovsky*, Vol. II.

Acknowledgments are also due to the music publishers who have kindly granted permission to reproduce extracts from copyrighted scores:

Excerpts from Rachmaninov, Concerto No. 1 and *Etude-Tableau*, Op. 33, No. 5, are reproduced with permission from Boosey & Hawkes Music Publishers Ltd.

Excerpts from Tchaikovsky, Piano Concertos Nos. 1 and 2, and Scriabin, Piano Concerto, Op. 20, are quoted courtesy of Edition Eulenburg/Schott. Excerpts from Mussorgsky, *Pictures at an Exhibition*; Chopin, Scherzo in C minor, Op. 39; and Borodin, Scherzo in A; and from the Piano Concertos of Grieg, Rimsky-Korsakov, and Tchaikovsky are reproduced by kind permission of Peters Edition Ltd., London.

Excerpts from Chopin, Etudes, Op. 10 and Op. 25 are quoted with permission of Stainer & Bell.

# *Contents*

Preface

ix

Introduction

I

I

The European Heritage

5

2

The Piano Concertos of Anton Rubinstein

21

3

The Piano Concertos of the Nationalists  
and the Eclectics

54

4

The Piano Concertos of Peter Tchaikovsky

114

Conclusion

186

Notes

189

vii

Chronological List of Works Analyzed  
205

Selected Bibliography  
208

Discography, compiled by David Griffioen  
211

Index  
224

## Introduction

The literature of the piano concerto is a vast, heterogeneous affair containing examples in every conceivable mood and style, from the aristocratic concertos of Koželuch, Vanhal, and Mozart to the jazz-inspired compositions of Copland, Gershwin, and Jarrett; from the transcendently virtuosic concertos of Kalkbrenner, Henselt, and Prokofiev to the "infantile" concertos of Margola and Raphling; from the exotic creations of Schulhoff, d'Indy, and de Falla to the neoclassical austerity of Stravinsky. Almost every composer of instrumental music attempted a piano concerto, though few made concerto composition central to their creativity, and fewer still invested in it their finest music. The reasons for this lie in the intrinsic nature of the concerto itself, above all in the expressive limitations imposed by the ubiquitous element of display and in the compositional difficulties inherent in the joining together of two disparate forces. After Mozart—the first and probably the greatest composer to consider the piano concerto on a par with other forms—the concerto languished in the shadow of the symphony, which offered greater technical and expressive freedom. Subsequently, self-expression never convincingly found a foothold in the Romantic concerto as it did in the symphony. A few composers, such as Brahms, Dvořák, and Rachmaninov, came close to conveying in their concertos sentiments of a symphonic nature, but even in these masterworks such sentiments are expressed in perceptibly broader strokes than in a symphony—with one eye cocked on public reaction as it were—and these ideas are often reiterated and underlined so as to leave no room for misunderstanding. Furthermore, the expression of subjective emotions was often compromised by the "theatrical" aspect of the Romantic concerto, for the drama unfolding between the two protagonists on the concert platform and the virtuosic means with which this contest is fought often distract the listener from the sentiments expressed by the music and obscure the channel of communication between composer and audience. Not all nineteenth-century composers, however, nurtured ambivalent feelings toward the concerto. For many, in particular the composer-virtuosi of the so-called Biedermeier period (c. 1810–35), including Herz, Moscheles, Hunten, and Kalkbrenner, the concerto represented an ideal vehicle for displaying their technical prowess, if not compositional ability; and soon genuine self-expression as a creative impulse became virtually extinguished by the weight and proliferation of superfluous virtuosity and spectacular effects. The "Biedermeier" composers' domination of the European concert halls—so vociferously condemned by Schumann in *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik*—was short-lived, for, rescued by Mendelssohn and consolidated by Schumann, the piano concerto regained its respectability



toward the 1850s, though it was rarely taken up by composers with more serious musical intentions until several decades later. Nineteenth-century piano concertos were frequently composed with a specific performer in mind—again, hardly an apposite stimulus for self-expression—and the end product was almost invariably tailor-made to gratify the virtuosic rather than the expressive abilities of the performer. Among Russian composers, Tchaikovsky, for example, wrote his Second Piano Concerto in G major, Op. 44, for Nikolai Rubinstein and his Third Piano Concerto in E-flat, Op. 75, for the French pianist Louis Diémer.

The musical outcome of such lukewarm and disinterested inspiration, as with the earlier "war horses" of the "Biedermeier period," is generally disappointing. Neither can one expect profundity of creative thought from the piano concertos based on material originally intended for other works but rejected on the grounds of unsuitability or inferiority (Tchaikovsky's Third Concerto, in E-flat, and his *Concert Fantasia*, Op. 56, for example). Then there are piano concertos composed merely for the sake of writing something, usually to fill gaps resulting from creative lassitude. Again, among Russian composers, Tchaikovsky figures prominently with his Second Concerto.

Just as the piano concerto proved not entirely suitable for the expression of profound emotions, so it struggled to convey, for more or less the same reasons, sentiments of a nationalist character. Few composers, Russian or otherwise, succeeded in writing genuinely fine nationalist concertos. In addition to the conceptual and compositional difficulties involved in composing piano concertos—in particular, the tonal balance and distribution of thematic material between soloist and orchestra—they were confronted with the task of employing often modally conceived folk material in large-scale structures based on Western European tonal schemes. Though Glinka's *changing background* technique proved effective in varying repeated statements of a folk melody on a small scale (as displayed in his orchestral fantasia *Kamarinskaya*), in a concerto situation, aspiring nationalist composers were faced, sooner or later, with elaborating and developing what are often stubborn and intransigent thematic chunks. Not surprisingly, most so-called nationalist concertos employ folk material only in the finale "after the serious business of the concerto is done," to quote Veinus<sup>1</sup> (usually a congenial rondo requiring little if any thematic development), and these folk melodies are usually incorporated merely to provide a dash of national color or a taste of the exotic and unfamiliar. Genuine national concertos on the other hand, that is to say, concertos that contain folk characteristics as an intrinsic part of their musical vocabulary, are less common because of the enormous musical and technical problems already hinted at. However, the finer examples in the literature, including the piano concertos of Dvořák, Grieg, and Rimsky-Korsakov, are so immersed in their native folk idiom that these difficulties resolve themselves as a matter of course in fresh and often breathtakingly beautiful ways. Occasionally, the concertos'

basic material is so rich in national elements that the direct quotation of folk material is not even deemed necessary. Indeed, the employment of folk material does not necessarily signify greater national color, as a comparison of two celebrated piano concertos—Tchaikovsky's Concerto in B-flat minor and Grieg's Concerto in A minor—reveals. But as already noted, such concertos are rare. Nationalism, in fact, found a more sympathetic reception in symphonic works in which virtuosity is of secondary importance to programmatic content, for example, in the symphonic poem; and it blossomed into full flower in musical-literary genres such as opera and song. Unfortunately, these genres—the most profound expression of nationalist ideals and arguably the finest musical creations of nationalist composers in general—are still little known to Western European audiences because singers and public alike are reluctant to confront unfamiliar languages, particularly of Slavic origin. As far as Russian is concerned, this has led to the curious situation in which composers are generally better known by their less-representative works. Opera, for example, was central to the creativity of both Tchaikovsky and Rimsky-Korsakov, yet both are still considered in the West as master orchestral composers who occasionally, and apparently without significant success, dabbled in operatic fields.

The development of the nineteenth-century piano concerto—in addition to practical and compositional considerations—was also influenced by the role and status of the instrument itself and the general attitude of contemporary composers toward piano composition. In Germany and Austria, the piano enjoyed considerable popularity from the earliest days of its evolution, and both the solo and the concerto repertoires of these countries are rich and varied. In Russia, on the other hand, because of the slow and limited diffusion of the instrument, the lack of a tradition of piano composition, and the strong bias toward opera inherited from the French and Italian theatre companies, few piano works of significance were composed during the nineteenth century. Furthermore, the piano was considered primarily a component of the aristocratic salon. Almost all Russian composers wrote salon music, from the dilettante efforts of Engalichev, Las-kovsky, and Glinka to the "pot-boilers" of Tchaikovsky, Lyadov, and Blumenfeld. Even Rachmaninov found himself writing facile, innocuous pieces for the *fin-de-siècle* Russian salon "just to balance his account."<sup>2</sup>

Serious piano composition, that is, works composed specifically for concert performance, began with Anton Rubinstein during the 1850s, but his contribution, though substantial, is of little musical significance. However, with the publication of Balakirev's magnificent essay in transcendental virtuosity, the Oriental fantasy *Islamey*, in 1869, and five years later, Musorgsky's splendidly eccentric *Pictures from an Exhibition*, Russian piano music began to establish itself on the European musical scene. But these were isolated occurrences; Balakirev dissipated his energies guiding the *Moguchaia Kuchka* (The Mighty Handful), and Musorgsky only turned to

the piano to compose song accompaniments and miniatures during pauses between his more ambitious operatic projects. It was only during the closing decade of the nineteenth century, with the appearance of Scriabin's Piano Sonata in F minor, Op. 6, in 1892 and Rachmaninov's *Fantasy* (First Suite) for two pianos, Op. 5, in 1893 that Russian composers resumed the exploration of the piano's technical and expressive capabilities initiated by Balakirev and Musorgsky. Scriabin and Rachmaninov were soon joined by a host of minor composers, including Lyapunov, Glazunov, and Arensky, and the tradition of Russian piano composition was consolidated once and for all by Prokofiev.

The composition of piano concertos in Russia roughly coincided with these sporadic bursts of interest in the piano as a solo instrument, though rarely do these concertos match their solo counterparts in quality. The two finest Russian piano concertos composed during the nineteenth century—Tchaikovsky's deservedly popular Concerto in B-flat minor and Rimsky-Korsakov's unjustly neglected Concerto in C-sharp minor—were penned by composers who were not expert performers and who had only a minor interest in the piano as an expressive instrument.

# I

## The European Heritage



The Russian piano concerto could not have had more inauspicious beginnings. Unlike the symphonic poem and indirectly, the symphony—genres for which Glinka, the so-called Father of Russian Music provided an invaluable model: “Well? It’s all in *Kamarinskaya*, just as the whole oak is in the acorn,” wrote Tchaikovsky<sup>1</sup>—the Russian piano concerto had no such indigenous prototype. All that existed to guide and inspire early nineteenth-century Russian composers was a small handful of dilettante concerto-style works and fantasies for “fortepiano or harpsichord,” composed for the entertainment of the Russian aristocracy. Their influence on the evolution of the Russian piano concerto was negligible, for none were published and few have survived. Certainly Anton Rubinstein’s concertos—the first Russian piano concertos to see their way into print—offered something more substantial, as Tchaikovsky acknowledged in his celebrated Piano Concerto in B-flat minor, Op. 23, but by this time the century was approaching its final quarter.

The reasons for the Russian piano concerto’s delayed incipience are both many and complex, but almost all are derived from two crucial factors: Russia’s cultural and geographical isolation, and the country’s lack of an indigenous tradition of symphonic music. Whereas other Slavic peoples, in particular, the Poles and the Czechs, have always maintained close links with Western Europe, Russian contacts, until the eighteenth century, had been more or less limited to isolated incidents, such as the employment of an Italian organist, Giovanni Salvatore, by Ivan III toward the end of the fifteenth century and the gift of a clavichord by Elizabeth I to the court of Fyodor Ivanovich in 1586. During the eighteenth century, however, the Russian Imperial Court, eager to recreate the splendor and opulence of its Western European counterparts, particularly Versailles, engaged foreign instrumentalists to perform and train Russian musicians. On 5 August 1702 the Court received its first official visit by foreign musicians—a German wind band invited by Peter I—organized through the agency of Popp Bros., Hamburg. Soon afterward, foreign ambassadors brought both musicians and instruments, and during the reigns of Anna, Duchess of Courland (1730–40), and Catherine II (1762–96), French and Italian music and

musicians began to dominate the concert halls and salons of the Imperial Court and the palaces of the aristocracy. Italian opera *buffa* and *seria* and French *opéra comique* were the most popular forms of musical entertainment, but chamber music was also performed by members of the theatre orchestras.

Russian composers active during this period were encouraged to study abroad and assimilate contemporary Western European composition. Dmitri Stepanovich Bortnyansky (1752–1825) lived in Italy for ten years (1769–79) and studied with Baldassare Galuppi;<sup>2</sup> Daniel Nikitich Kashin (1769–1841) worked in Bessarabia with Giuseppe Sarti; and Evstignei Ipatovich Fomin (1761–1800) studied at Bologna with various teachers between 1776 and 1785, including Buini, Padre Martini, Sartori, and Mattei. Those who remained in Russia endeavored to master the art of composition by studying the imported French and Italian music. Inevitably, most Russian compositions dating from this period are little more than pale imitations of their European counterparts. Nevertheless, a few demonstrate a spark of individuality, if not originality; and one or two even hint at the emergence of a national character, though the employment of folk material is generally primitive and superficial. Russian symphonic composition of this period is probably best represented by the overture, in particular the overtures to the earliest nationalist operas; *The Miller—Magician, Cheat and Matchmaker* (with songs compiled and arranged by the violinist Sokolovsky, revised by Fomin in 1791), Mikhail Matinsky's *The St. Petersburg Bazaar*, and V. A. Pashkevich's *The Misfortune of Having a Carriage* (all of which were composed in 1779). Significant also are the program overtures to melodrama and tragedy, such as Fomin's *Orfeo and Euridice*, produced in St. Petersburg in 1791–92.

Russian composition on a smaller scale toward the end of the eighteenth century was dominated by variations, and many were based on folk melodies. Probably the earliest examples are the two sets for "clavicembalo o pianoforte" by Vasili Fedorovich Trutovsky (c. 1740–1810), published in 1780. Some of the finer keyboard variations of this period were composed by Lev Stepanovich Guril'ev (1770–1840) and Kashin. Though the overall style of these variations is clearly derived from early Classical fortepiano music, folk elements are evident in their dancelike characteristics, modal harmony, and occasional passages influenced by the *gusly*—a stringed folk instrument similar to a psaltery. Variations for other instruments were less common. The court violinist Khandoshkin composed "Six Old Russian Songs with additional variations for violin and viola" (1783), and many variations appeared for harpsichord or fortepiano "con violino obbligato."

It was also during this period that the earliest Russian piano concertos were written, though none have survived to the present day. Composed specifically for performance at the Imperial Court and the palaces of the aristocracy, they were probably of chamber dimensions, despite their generic title; and to judge from contemporary Russian instrumental works, they were most likely heavily influenced by Western European music.

Whether Bortnyansky's piano concerto was typical is impossible to determine, as the manuscript has never come to light. Gerald Seaman suggests that "in all probability it resembled the 'Concert Symphony' [*Sinfonia Concertante*] written by Bortnyansky in 1790 and took the form of a Sextet in which the leading part was played by a 'fortepiano organisé' i.e. a piano equipped with organ registers."<sup>3</sup> A general idea of the lost concerto can be gleaned therefore from a study of the *Sinfonia Concertante* (in B-flat major). Like the Quintet in C (for piano, harp, violin, viola da gamba, and cello, composed in 1787), it dates from the period of Bortnyansky's employment as Kapellmeister at the court of the Grand Duke and heir-apparent Paul Petrovich, in St. Petersburg, between 1780 and 1796. It was composed, as were many of Bortnyansky's chamber works, for performance at the palaces of Gatchina and Pavlorsk and was dedicated to "son Altesse impériale Madame La Grande Duchesse de Russie par D. Bortniansky 1790"<sup>4</sup> and scored for "Le Fortepiano Organisée, L'Arpe, deux violons, viola de gamba, Basson et Violoncelle." The *Sinfonia Concertante* is eclectic in style and combines melodic elements derived from Italian opera *buffa* with obvious rhythmic and structural characteristics of German *Galanter Stil*. Both influences are evident in the delicately scored *Allegro maestoso* opening movement, the thematic material of which is based predominantly on the repetition of brief melodic fragments alternating with variants (see Ex. 1-1).

Though they are hardly developed in a conventional sense, these fragments are employed with a degree of technical proficiency rivaling that of Bortnyansky's teacher Galuppi. They surpass all future Russian instrumental composition until the chamber works of Alexander Alexandrovich Alyabev (1787-1851) and Glinka some thirty years later. Bortnyansky's slim, elegant *Sinfonia* displays little if any Russian character, though, curiously, a variant of the French folk song "Dodo l'enfant do, l'enfant dormira bientôt" is introduced into the thematic material of the first movement.<sup>5</sup> It is initially announced by the piano in the closing section of the exposition and rises to prominence in the development and coda, where it is subjected to some degree of elaboration (see Ex. 1-1b). Coincidentally, Debussy, more than a century later, constructed the opening



Ex. 1-1. Bortnyansky, *Sinfonia Concertante*, first movement: a. first subject, mm. 1-4; b. second subject, mm. 41-44.

and closing sections of his sparkling piano solo *Jardin sous la pluie* (from *Estampes*) on this folk song, and like Bortnyansky, he exploits the melody in both major and minor keys.

The second movement of the *Sinfonia Concertante*, *Larghetto*, is less inspired. Its somewhat insipid elegiacal theme tends to pall after a while, and although the more complex central episode, heralded by an attractive bassoon solo, attempts to recreate the first movement's vivacious interplay between concertante instruments, the movement as a whole lacks sufficient contrast to be entirely satisfactory (see Ex. 1-2).

The *Allegretto* finale is in the form of a rondo and is characteristically conceived in a lighter vein. The Russian musicologist Yuri Keldysh considers its themes reminiscent of Ukrainian folk dance (Bortnyansky was, in fact, Ukrainian) and draws attention to the similarity between the principal theme, Ex. 1-3a, and the refrain from the first aria from Bortnyansky's nationalist opera *Syn-sopernik* (The rival son),<sup>6</sup> shown in Ex. 1-3b. However, the movement suggests more the influence of Western European rococo or galant composition, particularly the early chamber music of Haydn and Mozart.

During the early years of the nineteenth century, the process of musical cross-fertilization between Russia and Western Europe ceased to be the



Ex. 1-2. Bortnyansky, *Sinfonia Concertante*, second movement, mm. 1-4.



Ex. 1-3. Bortnyansky: a. *Sinfonia Concertante*, third movement, mm. 1-4; b. *Syn-sopernik*, refrain from first aria, mm. 1-4.

prerogative of the culturally hermetic palaces of the aristocracy. The so-called Napoleonic period (1807–12) of the reign of Alexander I encouraged many Russian noblemen to travel abroad, and in the European capitals they came into contact with people of social and cultural backgrounds other than their own. The consequences of these encounters were far-reaching, for they stimulated dormant sentiments of nationalism and at the same time drew attention to the appalling backwardness of the Russian people as a whole. Taking advantage of the temporary lifting of repressive measures implemented during the reign of Paul I (who was assassinated in 1801) and the apparent, though short-lived moderacy of the new tsar, Alexander I, Russian intellectuals formed secret societies and circles to discuss proposals for reform. Images of the dark and dangerous times that followed culminating in the Decembrist Revolt of 1825, are found in contemporary Russian literature, most notably in the writings of Gogol and Pushkin. One searches in vain, however, for parallel sentiments in Russian symphonic music, then very much in its infancy.<sup>7</sup>

Also significant for the development of early Russian composition was the exploitation of the newly opened channels of communication between East and West by European piano manufacturers,<sup>8</sup> singers, composers, conductors, and—most important for the Russian concerto—composer-virtuosi such as Field, Steibelt, Hummel, Henselt, and Liszt. Apart from introducing to Russians musical forms and styles then prevalent in Western Europe, they demonstrated recent developments in instrumental technique and established new levels of professionalism.

Despite the stimulating presence of foreign musicians, music making in Russia continued to be an almost exclusively aristocratic pastime and remained centered around the palaces of St. Petersburg and Moscow. However, serf orchestras began to be established on private estates, and music salons became increasingly fashionable in the larger towns and cities. Concert societies such as the Musical Academy (Moscow, 1800) and the St. Petersburg Philharmonic Society (1802) were founded, and musical activities were further stimulated by a growth in publications such as the journals *Severnaia arpa* (Northern harp) and *Zhurnal otechestvennoi muzyky* (Journal of national music), the latter published by Kashin between 1806 and 1809. However, during the reign of Alexander I, music criticism was discouraged, and unfavorable reportage of the Imperial theatres was actually forbidden. It was only with the appearance of Feofil Tolstoy in 1852, writing under the pseudonym Rostislav in the journal *Severnaia pchela* (Northern bee) that serious music criticism began to assert itself. Nevertheless, the standard was generally low, as journalists were “encouraged” by their editors to overlook negative aspects of a work or a performance and to write with enthusiasm whenever possible.

The years immediately following the Napoleonic invasion in 1812 were crucial in Russia's cultural development, for never before had her relationships with Western Europe been so intense. Many Russian noblemen



spent years in France and Germany as part of the armies of occupation, and their experiences abroad made them more conscious than ever before of the comparative backwardness of their homeland and its agonizingly slow progress toward cultural emancipation. On their return to Russia they saw the organization of music making entirely controlled by, and almost exclusively intended for, aristocratic amateurs, with little if any provision for ordinary Russians. To their credit, however, these amateurs were considerably more earnest in their musical activities than their "powdered wig" counterparts in the eighteenth century. Among the more notable were the scholars Ulybyshev and Prince Odoevsky; the composers Alyabev, Verstovsky, Glinka, and Dargomizhsky; and performers such as the Wielhorski brothers and L'vov.

These early pioneers of Russian musical culture, some of whom were wealthy enough to maintain their own choirs, orchestras, and even opera companies, organized charity concerts and founded societies and circles for music appreciation, including the Society of Music Lovers, established during the 1840s. As these activities were primarily undertaken for the pleasure of the aristocracy, whose preferences lay with foreign music, performances of contemporary Russian music were rare. Furthermore, the performers themselves were predominantly foreign and were usually recruited from the choirs and orchestras of the Imperial chapel and theatres. For the ordinary Russian, therefore, there were few opportunities to attend concerts of "serious" music and even fewer for Russian composers to have their works performed in public. Growing indignation at the blatant discrimination against Russian music and musicians encouraged the organizing of "alternative" concert societies. One such society, curiously named the Musical Exercises of the Students of the Imperial University, was founded during the 1840s by a university inspector, A. I. Fitzum von Ecstedt. It featured an orchestra of mainly nonmusic students and amateurs, conducted by Carl Schuberth. Its repertoire included contemporary Russian music, most probably operatic overtures by Alyabev, Verstovsky, and Glinka. There were no rehearsals, despite the Society's proviso "in the best possible performance"; and the concerts must have been excruciating, saved only from total disaster by the small handful of professional players seconded from theatre orchestras. Despite taking place on Sunday mornings during the winter months, the concerts were well attended. Nevertheless, the Society's existence was precarious, being entirely financed from tickets sold at the door.

Considering the primitiveness of Russian musical life during the early years of the nineteenth century, it is perhaps surprising that Steibelt and Field, two of the most influential foreign musicians to have ventured to Russia during this period, decided to settle there permanently—Steibelt in St. Petersburg from 1809 until his death in 1823, and Field in St. Petersburg from 1803 to 1822, and then in Moscow, where he died in 1837. Actually, it