

*A: Offprints of various Novack
articles*

Folder A –

In addition to the following scanned pages, this folder also contains a copy of the article “Aspects of the Creative Process in Music” by Saul Novack from *Current Music* issue #36, pp137 – 150.

EDWARD E. LOWINSKY

12 January 1908–11 October 1985

In the Fall of 1983, the College of Fine Arts and Communications at Brigham Young University invited Professor Edward Lowinsky, Ferdinand Schevill Distinguished Service Professor Emeritus at the University of Chicago, to inaugurate the new series of Dean's Lectures. He graciously assented and favored us with a lecture of broad scope and conception, a lecture that harmonized perfectly with our College's encompassing interests in the arts.

At the conclusion of Professor Lowinsky's visit, I proposed that the College publish his lecture in an expanded form as a fine print book to be given as a gift to his colleagues in the American Musicological Society, to deans of colleges of fine arts throughout the country, and to other interested scholars. In this way, we would insure that his work would be known to a wide audience, and we would also commemorate this special occasion. Professor Lowinsky agreed to the proposal and set about the task of expanding, recasting, and further perfecting his lecture—a task that occupied him throughout 1984 and the first part of 1985.

It is lamentable that Professor Lowinsky's untimely death prevented him from seeing his monograph in its printed form, but he was able to complete the text and approve it for publication. Throughout the final stages of production, the monograph has enjoyed the scrupulous care of Professor Lowinsky's wife, Dr. Bonnie J. Blackburn, and I wish to express my deepest appreciation for her invaluable assistance and patience.

Cipriano de Rore's Venus Motet: Its Poetic and Pictorial Sources must now serve not only the cause of scholarship but also as a lasting celebration of a scholar passionately committed to this cause. As he words it in his credo:

Nothing great has ever been accomplished without passion and patience. Rooted in the same Latin word, *pati* (to suffer, to endure), passion and patience touch the two poles of the key element in a life that matters: commitment.

Please accept this little book with the compliments of the College.

Sincerely yours,

James A. Mason

James A. Mason
Dean

College of Fine Arts and Communications
Human Fine Arts Center
Brigham Young University Provo, Utah 84602

Colloquy and Review

ARNOLD SCHOENBERG IN SOVIET RUSSIA*

BORIS SCHWARZ

SOVIET HOSTILITY toward twelve-tone music borders on fanaticism. Time and again, prominent Russian composers have expressed their distaste for dodecaphony. In the opinion of Shostakovich, "the dogma of dodecaphony kills the composer's imagination and the living soul of music." Kabalevsky says, "Dodecaphony is an elaborate system of crutches for the composer." Khachaturian sees "danger when a young composer borrows the schemes of serial music." Khrennikov refers to "twelve-tone gimmicks." All this sounds ominous, as if there were an international conspiracy to contaminate the purity of Russian music. The verbal invectives against dodecaphony are matched by total silence as far as the music itself is concerned. For more than thirty years, Arnold Schoenberg's compositions have been excluded from the Soviet repertoire, and the post-Stalin "Thaw" did not bring any change in this respect. In Soviet writings on music, the name of Schoenberg is barely mentioned. A five-volume set of a Soviet bibliography, *Literature on Music*, spanning the years 1917 to 1959, contains more than 10,000 entries; yet the name of Schoenberg appears only six times, of which three are merely in passing. This conspiracy of silence prevents a whole generation of Soviet musicians and listeners from knowing the real issues as far as twelve-tone music is concerned.

However, this was not always the case. In fact, prior to the First World War, Schoenberg enjoyed a certain vogue in Russian intellectual circles. In December 1912, he was invited to St. Petersburg to conduct his own orchestral Suite *Pelléas and Mélisande*. Previously, his piano pieces Op. 11 and the Second String Quartet Op. 10 had been heard there. (Sergei Prokofiev remarks in his *Autobiography* that he had been the first in Russia to perform Schoenberg's piano music.) Schoenberg's personal appearance in Petersburg aroused considerable interest. The critic Venturus went so far as to compare the importance of Schoenberg's Russian visit to that of Richard Wagner in 1863. Articles on Schoenberg and his music, written by experts like Anton Webern and Richard Specht, were translated and published in Russian journals, as were some of Schoenberg's own essays. His *Harmonielehre*, just off the press in Vienna, was reviewed by Russian critics. Most revealing, perhaps, is an essay by Vyacheslav Karatygin written for the influential newspaper *Ryech*. Karatygin was a critic of modern orientation,

* This article is a somewhat expanded version of a talk given for B.B.C. (London) on Aug. 28, 1965. Reprinted by permission of the British Broadcasting Corporation.

COLLOQUY AND REVIEW

an early champion of Scriabin, Stravinsky, and Prokofiev, and the guiding spirit of the group sponsoring the "Evenings of Contemporary Music." Karatygin noted that Schoenberg's music reached the Petersburg audiences in reverse chronological order: first the complex piano pieces Op. 11 which were greeted "with homeric laughter"; then his "marvelous" String Quartet Op. 10 which met with "less obstruction"; and finally the early *Pelléas and Mélisande* Op. 5, received with applause. Clearly, Karatygin was most deeply impressed by the Second String Quartet which he found "laconic, thoroughly original, wildly bold yet rigidly logical." He continued, "Knowing the Quartet, I could detect weaknesses in *Pelléas*—excessive length, lack of form (despite thematic unification), and occasional shortcomings in harmonic and modulatory logic. Even more objectionable is the orchestration: despite some original timbres the immense orchestra often sounds too thick and viscous, obscuring many interesting contrapuntal lines." Nevertheless, Karatygin was convinced of Schoenberg's "enormous talent" and praised him as "the most daring, most paradoxical, and perhaps the most significant of the German modernists." This evaluation, one must remember, was written in 1912.¹

Shortly afterwards, Karatygin received a letter from Igor Stravinsky. Though living at Clarens, Switzerland (where he was at work on the *Sacre*), Stravinsky obviously kept in close touch with events at home. The letter, dated 26/13 December, 1912 (note the double dating of new and old style), reads as follows:

Dear Vyacheslav Gavrilovich!

I just finished reading your review about the Siloti concert at which Schoenberg conducted his *Pelléas*. I gathered from your lines that you really love and understand the essence of Schoenberg—that truly remarkable artist of our time. Therefore I believe that it might interest you to become acquainted with his latest work which reveals most intensively the unusual character of his creative genius. I am speaking about . . . *Pierrot Lunaire* Op. 21 which I recently heard in Berlin. There is a work which you "contemporaries" ought to perform! Perhaps you met him already and he told you (as he told me) about the work?

In sincere devotion

Yours,

Igor Stravinsky.²

This letter is noteworthy because it reveals Stravinsky's early sympathetic attitude toward Schoenberg which cooled in succeeding years. Two decades later, in his *Autobiography*, Stravinsky virtually retracted his earlier favorable opinion of *Pierrot Lunaire*.³

After the 1917 Revolution, there was increased Russian interest in Schoenberg and his ideas. Among his new disciples was the Russian composer Nikolai Roslavets who was quite successful during the 1920's, only to disappear in the 1930's. In 1923, Roslavets wrote a perceptive essay on *Pierrot Lunaire*⁴ which included a

¹ V. G. Karatygin, *Zhizn', deyatelnost', statii i materialy* (Leningrad, 1927), pp. 222–24.

² *Ibid.*, p. 232 (in Russian). The allusion to "contemporaries" refers to the "Evenings of Contemporary Music" in Petersburg.

³ *Chroniques de ma vie* (Paris, 1935; reprint, New York, W. W. Norton, 1962), pp. 43–44.

⁴ In *K Novym Beregam* No. 3 (June/August, 1923), pp. 28–33.

knowledgeable discussion of Schoenberg's approach to melody, harmony, and rhythm. He sensed a dichotomy between the impressionist text of Giraud and the expressionist musical setting of Schoenberg. The Pierrot of Schoenberg is actually not the "spectral 'lunaire' but a 'ferroconcrete' Pierrot, an offspring of the contemporary industrialized mammoth-city . . . in whose sighs we hear the clang of metal, the drone of propellers, the howl of automobile sirens. . . . It is indeed a strange amalgam of irreconcilable world outlooks. . . ." Roslavets predicted confidently that "Schoenberg's principles and methods of creativity will gradually conquer the thoughts of contemporary artistic youth; already now we can speak of a 'Schoenbergian School' as of a fact, which is of decisive importance for the immediate future of music."

In 1925, Russian interest in modern Western music was stimulated by the founding of the Leningrad Association for Contemporary Music. Its guiding spirit was the remarkable Boris Asafiev, also known under the pen name Igor Glebov, who was active as a composer, music historian, pedagogue, and author. Asafiev and his associates—mostly his young students—published a series of booklets dealing with modern music. One of them was devoted to Alban Berg's *Wozzeck*, to coincide with its first staging in Leningrad in 1927. The same year, Nikolai Malko conducted the first performance, in Russia, of Schoenberg's *Gurre-Lieder*—a work conceived in 1901 and orchestrated ten years later. (The reduced orchestration was used for the Leningrad performance.) In reviewing the event, the critic Valerian Bogdanov-Berezovsky (himself a composer and today one of Leningrad's leading musicians) recognized the work as a key to Schoenberg's evolution and an "integral page of history"; yet, he said, "much of the music has lost its burning actuality and resembles a museum piece."⁵

Schoenberg continued to arouse much discussion among Soviet musicians, though more often in print than through actual performances. A perceptive analysis of his piano works (up to, and including, the Suite Op. 25) was published by Mikhail Druskin in a modest-size book, *New Piano Music*,⁶ which was given added importance by a preface written by Asafiev-Glebov. The twenty-three-year old Druskin was a student of Asafiev but had also worked with Artur Schnabel in Berlin where he acquired an insight rare among Soviet musicians of the day. The traditional minds of the Leningrad Conservatory must have been startled by some of Druskin's evaluations: he described Schoenberg's Opus 25 as a "sample of highest mastery, placing this Suite on a level with the best polyphonic achievements of J. S. Bach." At present, Dr. Druskin is professor of musicology at the Leningrad Conservatory and remembers his youthful book with a faint smile.

But there were also dissenting voices in Russia, and they grew stronger. In 1927, the composer Alexander Veprik visited Schoenberg in Vienna and returned with negative impressions, "Today, Europe realizes that atonality is a blind alley which leads nowhere. And what is more: Schoenberg himself is constitutionally alien to it." Veprik's essay is illustrated by two musical examples, one from *Pierrot Lunaire*, the other from Beethoven's Piano Sonata Op. 7; and he comments with sarcasm,

⁵ In *Muzika i Revolutzia*, No. 12 (December, 1927), p. 34.

⁶ M. Druskin, *Novaya fortepiannaya muzika* (Leningrad, 1928), pp. 88-90.

Schoenberg, in contrast to the prototype of the post-war composer, honors Beethoven. And the true Schoenbergian, Erwin Stein, is determined to prove that both masters share certain principles of thematic development. This may be so, but Schoenberg's music does not gain hereby. He may develop with great mastery, but it does not reach the listener. Both examples have musical logic, with only one difference: in Beethoven it sounds, in Schoenberg it does not. One cannot deny external mechanistic logic in Schoenberg. But who can hear his thematic development? Who can hear his contrapuntal contrivances. . . ? All this, at best, pleases the eye and appeals to the intellect. But this music is not designed for actual listening. It is dead. It lives only a *graphic* life.⁷

When Veprik told Schoenberg that the atonal method made all composers sound alike, he received a predictably irritated reply, "What do you mean—alike? Look at Alban Berg—that's one way; then listen to Hanns Eisler—that's something quite different." (Incidentally, the alleged "sameness" of twelve-tone music is a recurrent Soviet criticism.) The objections raised by Veprik were not only musical but also ideological, "Schoenberg's theory of atonality, born in the laboratory, broke the link between him and the mass audience. His creative work lost all social significance. He leans on emptiness. . . ." And again, "One cannot break with the masses unpunished. . . . When this happens, as in Schoenberg, the means of musical creativity degenerate."

Within a few years, in the early 1930's, the Association for Contemporary Music faded out of the Soviet musical scene while a new cultural force, the "Proletarian Cult," gained strength: it stressed a down-to-earth popular appeal. In 1933, the confused musical situation was clarified by the dissolution of *all* musical organizations, to be replaced by a single Composers Union. This was considered progress by some, including Prokofiev, who had returned to Russia that year; but the actual result was centralized political control of creative work.

The year 1933 also brought Hitler's rise to power. Schoenberg, branded by the Nazis as a "Kultur-Bolschewist," had to flee. As a victim of fascist persecution, he was assured a measure of sympathy in the Soviet Union. Thus we read, "Schoenberg, in his fight against fascism, is aligned against Richard Strauss and the Catholic semi-fascist Igor Stravinsky." This sentence is contained in a Russian monograph on Schoenberg, published in 1934 under the imprint of the Leningrad Philharmonic. The author was Ivan Sollertinsky, a brilliant young music historian and close friend of Shostakovich.⁸ Sollertinsky's 55-page booklet is essentially non-controversial. He discusses twelve-tone technique in factual, general terms and gives a sympathetic survey of Schoenberg's works up to Opus 35, the Six Songs for male chorus. Sollertinsky's attitude toward Schoenberg is not one of unqualified admiration. He calls him a musical innovator of genius "who created completely new means of musical expression and discovered hitherto unknown musical resources." But he also brands Schoenberg as "the most striking representative of that ideological crisis afflicting the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia of Europe." In

⁷ In *Muzika i Revolutzia*, No. 4 (April, 1928), pp. 18-21.

⁸ Shostakovich dedicated his Trio Op. 67 to the memory of Sollertinsky who died in 1944 at the age of forty-one.

fact, the Soviet author speaks rather contemptuously of what he calls "German post-Versailles Expressionism." Aside from occasional socio-political stabs, Sollertinsky expresses many perceptive views on Schoenberg, his theories and his music. Also praised are some of Schoenberg's disciples; in fact, Sollertinsky calls *Wozzeck*, despite its "atonal language," a music drama of genius, worthy to stand next to *Tristan*, *Carmen*, and—*Pique-Dame*. (To a Russian, the comparison with Tchaikovsky's opera is indeed high praise.)

Sollertinsky expressed the hope that Schoenberg, shaken by the political events of 1933, might find his way into the "camp of proletarian world revolution." At the time, Schoenberg seemed indeed interested in coming to the Soviet Union. As evidence of this interest, Sollertinsky mentioned a letter written by Schoenberg to Fritz Stiedry, the German-born conductor of the Leningrad Philharmonic. Since Schoenberg's published correspondence does not list such a letter, I asked Dr. Stiedry, now living in Switzerland, to verify this matter. In his recent reply to me, Dr. Stiedry confirmed that Schoenberg wrote to him from New York in 1934. Here are a few pertinent sentences from Schoenberg's letter to Stiedry in translation,

... Hans Eisler asked me through my son whether I might come to Russia, and I sent him an outline for the establishment of a musical institute, to be submitted to the proper Soviet authorities. May I ask you to further this project, should the opportunity arise. ...

In his comment to me, Dr. Stiedry describes the whole project as a "crazy idea" of Eisler and adds, "At that time, Russia was under the totally reactionary whip of Stalin; under those conditions, friend Schoenberg would have been the least suitable musician imaginable. ... I strongly advised him against it, and I never heard anything further." The day after writing to Stiedry, Schoenberg departed for California where he was to establish his new home. This must have disappointed his Russian well-wishers.

Sollertinsky's monograph of 1934 contained the last sympathetic words written in Russian about Schoenberg and his school. Actually, it took considerable courage on the part of the author to speak with such warmth of a musician whose work was considered anti-social by a growing number of Soviet critics. In fact, the 1930's in Soviet Russia were a period of increasing hostility against *all* modernism, Western and Russian alike. After the Second World War, the campaign against so-called "Formalism" culminated in the notorious decree of 1948 which Alexander Werth once described as "Musical Uproar in Moscow."⁹ It was far more than an uproar—it was the public castigation and humiliation of virtually all leading Soviet and Western composers of modern orientation. Singled out among foreign musicians were Stravinsky and Schoenberg.

Respected and well-informed music critics joined in this concerted campaign of vilification. Typical is an article in the monthly journal *Sovietskaya Muzyka*, official organ of the Composers Union, which appeared in August 1949. Entitled *Arnold Schoenberg, liquidator of music*, it had the illuminating subtitle "Against decadent atonal direction and its defensive disguise." The author was Joseph Ryzhkin, then—as now—a member of the Moscow Institute of Musicology. Mixing musical and

⁹ Alexander Werth, *Musical Uproar in Moscow* (London, 1949).

ideological criticism, Ryzhkin asserted that, for forty years, atonality had exerted its disastrous influence on contemporary bourgeois music. Schoenberg's system, he said, actually leads to a "liquidation of music as an art, to be exchanged for senseless cacophony." Atonality has become "an organization, a sect" everywhere in Europe and America, except the Soviet Union. The center of the "sect" is in America, with Schoenberg—settled in California—acting as a "pedagogue-consultant" of many American composers. Ryzhkin appears fully conversant with the literature on dodecaphony and extends his acid criticism to the writings of Joseph Matthias Hauer, Herbert Eimert, Ernst Krenek, René Leibowitz, and Hanns Eisler. On this subject, he says, "Lately, articles and books have appeared in the West (written by Krenek, Leibowitz, and others) attempting to rekindle the fading interest in atonality. Leibowitz praises Schoenberg and his adherents with such abandon that he includes, among his geniuses, a mediocrity like Anton von Webern." Ryzhkin's evaluations reflect the party line when he declares that "atonality is actually a highly reactionary system though it tries to hide behind the false legend of its alleged progressiveness." This was the time when *Pravda* referred to the "reactionary composers Hindemith and Schoenberg," when Stravinsky was called "the apostle of reactionary forces in bourgeois music," when *Izvestia* described the American musical scene as *Dollar Cacophony*.¹⁰ Observing that the so-called "creative" method of Schoenberg had influenced composers outside his immediate school—like Hindemith and Messiaen—the Soviet author declared, "Hence, we do not have an isolated case demanding clinical diagnosis, but a definite social occurrence, a kind of social impoverishment in need of an ideo-political, class-conscious analysis." Indeed, what could be more nefarious from the Soviet point of view than "the deep-seated disregard for the people, their lives, cultures, and aspirations which brought the atonalists to the negation of folk melodies and the idiom of folk music."

Aside from his ideological tirades, Ryzhkin gives a well-organized, fairly detailed account of Schoenberg's evolution as a composer and theorist. His central musical argument against the twelve-tone system is the assertion that the abnegation of mode and tonality must lead to the destruction of the basic concepts of music. The acidity of Ryzhkin's critique reflects the ideological climate of the "purge" year 1948; yet, in essence, the views expressed by him still circulate widely in Soviet musical circles.

The most recent Soviet appraisal of Schoenberg and his school is contained in a book by Grigory Shneyerson, *Of Music, dead and alive*.¹¹ The first edition of 1960 devoted 35 pages to Schoenberg; the second edition of 1964 expanded that chapter to 50 pages. But the expansion consists merely of a more fully documented rejection of Schoenberg and his theories. Among Soviet critics, Shneyerson is one of the best informed and most internationally minded. His treatment of Schoenberg is one of hostile objectivity. He quotes extensively, not only from Schoenberg's own writings, but also from such well-disposed authors as Hans Redlich, Hanns Eisler, Roman Vlad, and Hans Stuckenschmidt. Yet, the quotations are selected

¹⁰ Cf. Boris Schwarz, "Stravinsky in Soviet Russian Criticism" in *Musical Quarterly* (July, 1962), p. 349.

¹¹ G. Shneyerson, *O muzyke, zhivoi i mertvoi* (Moscow, 1960 and 1964).

in such a way as to stress those points which make the dodecaphonic system appear absurd in the eyes of the Soviet reader.

To illustrate the twelve-tone technique, Shneyerson uses Schoenberg's Wind Quintet Op. 26: he prints the tone row and four brief excerpts, demonstrating the use of the row. Other examples include fragments from the Piano Suite Op. 25, from Berg's *Lulu* and Webern's Opp. 17 and 26. To the Soviet reader, who has no opportunity whatsoever to hear or study the complete works, these excerpts must appear as cerebral aberrations—which is exactly the effect Shneyerson undoubtedly planned to produce. To be fair, Shneyerson quotes Schoenberg's repeated plea to judge his works on the basis of musical quality, not mathematical equation. Yet, in Soviet Russia this opportunity is not available since there are no performances. Shneyerson tends to belittle Schoenberg's opinion that the strict application of twelve-tone technique is extremely difficult. In refutation, he quotes Hanns Eisler, one of Schoenberg's early disciples, who said, "The style whose creation is the historic achievement of Schoenberg, the style which once was bold and new, can today be aped by any undersized graduate of a secondary music school." In summing up, Shneyerson says,

Schoenberg's role in the history of music was extremely negative. He succeeded in confusing and destroying much in musical art, but he did not succeed in creating anything. . . . Dodecaphony as a system was already fully compromised in the early 1930's. The aura of "great innovator" surrounding Schoenberg's name has long since paled and withered. Obviously, life did not confirm the truth of his teaching. . . . Schoenberg contributed much to the decadent schools of composition disguised as "Avant-Garde." Such manifestations as dodecaphony, abstract painting, existentialist philosophy are natural and unavoidable results of bourgeois decadence and its reactionary ideology.¹²

Shneyerson reflects the opinions held by the leading Soviet composers of today. As proof that these negative views are not isolated, prominent Western composers—opponents of dodecaphony—are used as witnesses; among them are Honegger, Hindemith, and Bartok. Despite this reinforcement, one can sense that much of Soviet rejection is based on prejudged information disseminated mainly by musical journalists. Among young Soviet musicians, the thirst for information is great, yet they seem ill prepared to absorb it. Stravinsky, lecturing before a group of young Leningrad composers on the "seriation principle" in the fall of 1962, was confronted with questions like "Doesn't it constrain inspiration? Isn't it a new dogmatism?" The Russians fear the "leveling" effect of serialism, the loss of individuality, and—more importantly—the loss of a national musical idiom. There is a certain provincialism in that fear, and Prokofiev remarked as early as 1934, "The danger of becoming provincial is unfortunately a very real one for modern Soviet composers." This problem is multiplied today: having missed Western musical developments from the 1930's to 1960, Soviet composers are bewildered by the latest trends. Robert Craft, who traveled with Stravinsky to Russia in 1962, has this to say, "My own feeling is that to the custodians of this outward-growing society, Webern's music can only seem like the nervous tic of a moribund culture."¹³

¹² *Ibid.*, pp. 276–78.

¹³ R. Craft, "Stravinsky's Return, a Russian Diary" in *Encounter* (London, June 1963), p. 46.

Nevertheless, young Soviet musicians strain to make up for lost time. They start anew where a previous generation left off—with Alban Berg's *Wozzeck* which is studied avidly at the Leningrad Conservatory and elsewhere. The work is also the subject of a detailed analysis by one of Russia's foremost musicologists, Yuri Keldysh in the March 1965, issue of *Sovietskaya Muzyka* ("Wozzeck and Musical Expressionism"); and though Keldysh's final evaluation is essentially negative, it may well precipitate a new discussion of the entire topic. When I visited Leningrad late in 1962, I received an urgent request from the Conservatory to obtain George Perle's book *Serial Composition and Atonality* which had just been published. The books by Hans Jelinek and René Leibowitz circulate among young composers in Russia. A few of these twelve-tone "rebels" have achieved some fame (or better, notoriety), and they have been scolded publicly. Among them is Andrei Volkonsky, born in 1933 as a Russian émigré, who returned to Moscow as a student, only to be expelled from the Conservatory; and Arvo Pyart (born 1935), a gifted young Estonian, castigated for his allegedly atonal *Necrologue* (1960). There is a group of young Ukrainian composers who are experimenting in the twelve-tone idiom.¹⁴ But in the face of official disapproval, all these musical experiments bear the aspect of an "underground" operation in stark contrast to the innovative zeal of the early revolutionary years. Thus in 1918, Lunacharsky—serving as Lenin's cultural commissar—said to young Prokofiev, "You are a revolutionary in music, we are revolutionaries in life: we ought to work together." The spirit of exploration was driven out of Soviet art in the Stalinist purge of the 1930's, but it is not necessarily lost forever. Polish composers have proven successfully that Communism and Serialism are not incompatible. Well-remembered is Hanns Eisler, the German composer, who was an adherent of both Marx and Schoenberg, much to the discomfort of some Soviet critics. Actually, it was a Russian composer, Alexander Scriabin, who contributed significantly to the dissolution of tonality in music. Were it not for Scriabin's premature death in 1915, Moscow might have joined Vienna as the citadel of non-tonal music. In fact, the affinity between Scriabin and Schoenberg was pointed out by Russian and Polish musicologist some decades ago.

The next few years will show whether young Soviet composers will be permitted freely to join their Western confreres in musical experimentation. A more flexible official attitude toward modernism in the arts has been evident in the past months. Leningrad has heard a new work by Volkonsky which in itself is significant, since this gifted young composer has been virtually excluded from the Soviet repertory because of his modernist leanings. The new composition, *The Laments of Shchaza*, scored for soprano, violin, viola, English horn, xylophone, vibraphone, and harpsichord, was written in 1962 and is said to have assimilated the influence of Webern as well as post-Webern trends. Another talented young composer, Boris Tishchenko (a post-graduate student of Shostakovich at the Leningrad Conservatory) had the temerity of closing his new ballet, *The Twelve* (based on Alexander Blok's revolutionary poem) with a twelve-tone chorale, but the ending was eliminated prior to the *première*. Even such musical conservatives as Kara Karayev and Rodion Shchedrin, known primarily for their assimilation of folk materials, are re-

¹⁴ Cf. Boris Schwarz, "Soviet Music since the Second World War" in *Musical Quarterly* (January, 1965), pp. 280–81, including an example of a twelve-tone piece by Valentin Silvestrov, a young Ukrainian composer.

PERSPECTIVES OF NEW MUSIC

ported to have used some twelve-tone devices in their latest symphonies, first performed in the spring of 1965. Shchedrin, now thirty-three, declared only two years ago that "there is no cleavage between the generations [of Soviet musicians] . . . we have our Soviet socialist musical culture, powerful in the unity of ideas and strong ethical aims. . . ."

Yet, some cleavage seems to be developing lately, for the interest of the younger generation of Soviet composers in dodecaphony and "avant-gardism" is strongly opposed by the older leaders who are still in firm control. Once their excessive tutelage of the new generation is weakened, once the outdated concept of *Socialist Realism* is revised to fit the increasingly sophisticated needs of Soviet society, Soviet music will undoubtedly regain its contact with the mainstream of Western musical thought.