

EURASIA PAST AND PRESENT

General Editors

CATRIONA KELLY
University of Oxford

DOUGLAS ROGERS
Yale University

MARK D. STEINBERG
University of Illinois

NIETZSCHE'S ORPHANS

*Music, Metaphysics, and the
Twilight of the Russian Empire*

Rebecca Mitchell

Yale
UNIVERSITY
PRESS
New Haven & London

For Andrew

Published with assistance from the foundation established in memory
of James Wesley Cooper of the Class of 1865, Yale College.

Copyright © 2015 by Rebecca Mitchell.

All rights reserved.

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, including
illustrations, in any form (beyond that copying permitted by
Sections 107 and 108 of the U.S. Copyright Law and except by
reviewers for the public press), without written permission from the publishers.

Yale University Press books may be purchased in quantity for educational,
business, or promotional use. For information, please e-mail sales.press@yale.edu
(U.S. office) or sales@yaleup.co.uk (U.K. office).

Set in PostScript Electra with Trajan types by Tseng Information Systems, Inc.
Printed in the United States of America.

Library of Congress Control Number: 2015941641
ISBN: 978-0-300-20889-4 (cloth : alk. paper)

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

This paper meets the requirements of ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (Permanence of Paper).

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

CONTENTS

Preface	ix
Note on Transliteration and Usage	xiii
Introduction: In Search of Unity	1
ONE Musical Metaphysics in Late Imperial Russia	25
TWO Aleksandr Scriabin: Music and Salvation	61
THREE The Medtner Brothers: Orpheus in an Age of Nationalism	104
FOUR Sergei Rachmaninoff: The Unwilling Orpheus	137
FIVE Musical Metaphysics in War and Revolution	165
Epilogue: Reverberations	207
Glossary of Names	227
Notes	235
Bibliography	291
Index	313

gated the philosophical underpinnings of musical metaphysics as a dream, born in the upper echelons of society and disconnected from the *narod* it had sought to unite. For some of Nietzsche's orphans, both in the Soviet Union and in exile, music became a space of memory, an emblem of a quest for a better world that had failed to come into being. For others, the values and visions of musical metaphysics continued to develop (albeit in altered form) in both Soviet and émigré contexts.

By examining the rise and fall of musical metaphysics, the complex relationship between culture, society, and politics gains new focus. Though seldom explicitly political in their engagement with music, Nietzsche's orphans nevertheless sought to overcome the limitations and divisions that they identified in modern society. The apparent failure of their dream after 1914 resulted in no small part from their isolation from larger society and from the rise of exclusionary nationalist sentiment, which fractured rather than united their aesthetic community. That many of their musical dreams continued to reverberate long after the collapse of the Russian Empire demonstrates both their adaptability and tenacity. In this sense, the fate of musical metaphysics represents far more than the rise and fall of a particular aesthetic style—it also reveals how Soviet utopianism and even post-Soviet national visions were themselves born out of the twilight of the Russian Empire.

MUSICAL METAPHYSICS IN LATE IMPERIAL RUSSIA

One who is unmusical will understand nothing.

—Andrei Bely (1904)

In 1913 Ivan Mikhailovich Abramushkin, a voice teacher from the town of Aleksandriia, sought to convince the Russian State Duma that music alone had the ability to “combine the will of every separate person into a single collective will.” Rather than citing the authority of Orthodox theology or Russian intellectual tradition to support his argument, Abramushkin turned to the German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche. According to Nietzsche, Abramushkin claimed, “a person expresses himself as a member of the highest universality in dance and song.” For this reason, he concluded, “music is one of the mightiest means of acting on education, the development of feelings and character formation.” This unifying and moral vision of music compelled him to implore the Duma to require that all elementary school teachers receive musical training and teach choral singing in their classrooms. By bringing students together into a common chorus, Abramushkin envisioned a means to overcome social divisions in the Russian Empire.¹ Such arguments for music's importance even gained the support of State Duma representatives: a vote held in February 1914 agreed that music and singing should be required subjects for all women training as teachers.² German philosophy, Russian social engagement, and music had forged a powerful combination. For this provincial Russian teacher, like many of his urban contemporaries, music promised *sobornost'*: unity in multiplicity.

Abramushkin's letter to the Duma exemplifies how many late imperial commentators reinterpreted Nietzsche's ideas to fit their immediate social context.

Through its unifying power, music could save Russia from the accursed problems of the modern age: social disintegration, cultural decadence, and despair. The immediate experience (*perezhivanie*) of music could transform unrest and dissent among the *narod* into community, reshape individual and social identities, and provide a new basis upon which to build a unified society. Men and women such as Abramushkin sought in music both the expression of an ideal, unified world that was absent in contemporary society and a transformative power that might bring this ideal world into existence.

This chapter explores the intellectual framework of musical metaphysics in order to understand both how and why music was granted such import, and, even more significant, how this worldview informed responses to modernity and attempts to construct Russian identity in the late imperial period. As Jane Fulcher has argued, understanding the significance and range of music's symbolic meaning within a given society requires close examination of the ways in which historical actors sought to ascribe specific meaning to musical works, often through textual and philosophical interpretation. Such scripts themselves drew upon larger cultural interpretations that were current within a given society.³ While valuable scholarship has addressed the impact of Nietzschean ideas in Russia from philosophical, literary, and musicological angles, no detailed cultural-intellectual history of musical meaning in late imperial Russian thought has yet been offered.⁴ In this chapter, I illustrate how key concepts borrowed from German idealist philosophy combined with Russian intellectual tradition as philosophers, musicians, journalists, artists, theologians, and literary figures shaped a distinct worldview that influenced both interpretations of music's social import and musical creativity itself.

Late imperial Russians regularly turned to translations and summaries of philosophical texts in order to find solutions to what they considered the most pressing problems of modern life. While loosely based on philosophical ideas drawn from the writings of Nietzsche and Schopenhauer, the understanding of music they derived from these sources was based on a combination of interpretation (and misinterpretation) of the portions of texts they read, glosses on those texts written by contemporary commentators, and their own preconceptions.⁵ Russian translators and commentators on music who were able to read Nietzsche's German texts chose, by and large, to neglect the philosopher's later works in favor of his youthful texts, which celebrated the Dionysian dithyramb as the ultimate unifying force.⁶ In this sense, musical metaphysics emerged in Russia as a process of translation and adaptation rather than direct implementation of Nietzschean ideas.⁷

The translation of ideas and concepts from one context to another is shaped both by general discourse and by individual interpretation. For this reason, my analysis is built upon a synthesis of a wide range of voices expressing similar ideas (drawn from the periodical press, personal letters, diaries, and memoirs) and close analysis of the writings of several individuals who provided particularly significant expositions of musical metaphysics. By highlighting conceptual categories and discourse rather than individuals, I investigate the process of translation and reinterpretation of philosophical concepts, and demonstrate the multifaceted and ubiquitous nature of this discourse.

After an overview of how music was interpreted as a metaphysical symbol of higher reality in late imperial Russia (particularly built on the philosophical legacies of Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, and Vladimir Solov'ev), this chapter explores the fundamentals of musical metaphysics, which was built upon three interrelated concepts: unity, musical time, and the search for Orpheus. For all its internal contradictions, this mystical trinity inspired in Nietzsche's orphans an expectation of a contemporary "mystery," an artistic-liturgical act through which contemporary reality might be transformed. The exact nature of that transformation, however, was unclear.

My examination of musical metaphysics closes with the disconnect between this worldview's instigators and their intended audience, as embodied in the experience of the Moscow People's Conservatory. Despite their yearning to transform Russian society, Nietzsche's orphans ultimately practiced an insular discourse: while shaping and delineating the boundaries of their own aesthetic community, they were at best only marginally aware of the actual social and political conditions of late imperial Russia. Convinced that they were seeking unity, they were in fact often only reinforcing their own isolation and division.

THE FOUNDATIONS OF MUSICAL METAPHYSICS

THE SYMBOL OF MUSIC

In 1844 German philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer penned an influential interpretation of music as a metaphysical force equivalent to the will that lies at the basis of existence. Inspired in part by his own love of music (nurtured by regular practice on his flute), Schopenhauer raised music to the summit of artistic creation in *The World as Will and Representation (Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung)*, arguing that music and the phenomenal world were "two different expressions of the same thing."⁸ Unlike other art forms, music did not attempt to represent any individual idea or concept; rather music, like the entire

phenomenal world, provided “a copy of the will itself” that underpins existence.⁹ The absence of specific concepts or ideas in music enabled it to express that which was inexpressible by other means.¹⁰ Mere human knowledge was conceptually unable to convey the realities that were depicted through music, which was “in the highest degree a universal language.”¹¹ This glorification of music’s universal nature as portraying something specific and distinct, yet outside the realm of conceptual knowledge (thus intimately connected with irrational intuition as opposed to rational knowledge), highlighted music as the quintessential Romantic art form. Schopenhauer’s interpretation was based on a Kantian dualist description of the world as divided into *phenomenon* (sensation) and *noumenon* (the thing-in-itself). Schopenhauer defined the *noumenon* as Will—a dynamic principle, devoid of structure, of which we therefore can have no knowledge. Will ultimately underlies all our actions and is the true cause of them, despite the fact that contingent explanations may be given. “Representation” or the phenomenal world is nothing more than the “objectification of Will,” that is, Will that appears to our perception in multiple forms. While Will itself is singular, lying outside the concepts of time, space, and causality, it takes on multiple forms in its objectification in the phenomenal world. For Schopenhauer, because music was equated with this singular Will, it was, in essence, outside the phenomenal world.

Schopenhauer’s dramatic interpretation of music’s unique status, while initially garnering less interest than his older contemporary Hegel’s dialectical philosophy, eventually found an ardent supporter in the young Friedrich Nietzsche, who happened across a copy of *The World as Will and Representation* in an antiquarian shop sometime between 1865 and 1867.¹² Nietzsche’s discovery of Schopenhauer, together with his parallel discovery of the music of Richard Wagner, transformed his entire life and worldview. His first book, *The Birth of Tragedy* (*Die Geburt der Tragödie*, 1872), built upon Schopenhauer’s image of music as an irrational and emotional force that preceded the logical division of the world into disparate entities and rational concepts.¹³ Developing Schopenhauer’s dualistic interpretation of existence, Nietzsche introduced the figure of Dionysus as the metaphorical representation of the fundamental unity underlying and preceding the phenomenal world (Schopenhauer’s Will). Music, in Nietzsche’s terminology, was the most perfect expression of the Dionysian (collective) impulse and was, in its very essence, opposed to the Apollonian (individualizing) impulse.¹⁴ He equated Apollo with the physiological experience of the “dream state,” as well as with Schopenhauer’s world of representation, while Dionysus was linked to the physiological state of “drunkenness” and to Schopenhauer’s concept of Will. Attempts to use human language as a means through

which to express music’s essence were destined to fail, because “music . . . symbolizes a sphere which is beyond and before all phenomena.”¹⁵

Nietzsche’s reworking of Schopenhauer’s philosophy transformed the latter’s negative understanding of human experience and philosophy of quiet resignation to an active embrace of existence, a reinterpretation of the human condition that proved appealing to many. To Schopenhauer, the contemplation of art enabled the individual to momentarily step outside oneself, forgetting his or her own misery. Music, as the highest embodiment of Will (rather than merely a representation of the phenomenal world), bypassed the spatial representation of the physical world for the experience of Will itself, escaping the cycle of suffering that defined individual human existence. Nietzsche developed this distinctive role of music beyond the individual to apply to society as a whole, arguing that music had a crucially important task to play in reuniting an increasingly individualized and fragmented modern society. He asserted that music alone offered a symbolic depiction through which individual suffering could be accepted and embraced.¹⁶ The pure Dionysian impulse would overwhelm an individual mind if expressed in its full force, but its embodiment in a musical composition made it comprehensible to the human mind.¹⁷ As an art form, music could thus present primordial unity within a form that allowed the listener to comprehend it without his or her destruction as an individual: the Apollonian power reshaped the underlying Dionysian spirit into a formal structure that could be grasped by the limited individual mind. This individualization of music’s expression of universal or primordial Will provided the symbol through which an individual could grasp and embrace life as it truly existed. A musical composition was thus a symbol through which the human mind might comprehend and embrace the underlying unity of existence.¹⁸

Modernist movements across Europe celebrated the ability of art to open access to another realm of existence, but the special status of music found particular sympathy among Russian cultural elites, who elided the philosophies of Nietzsche and Schopenhauer with that of Vladimir Solov’ev.¹⁹ Inspired by his own mystical visions of the “Divine Sophia” and committed to fusing Christian theology with German idealist philosophy, the Russian Neoplatonic philosopher argued that music was the most “direct or magical” expression of beauty, in which “the deepest internal state connects us with the true essence of things and with the other world (or, if you like, with the ‘being in itself’ of all that exists), breaking through every conditionality and material limitation, finding its direct and full expression in beautiful sounds and words.”²⁰ Through this shared emphasis on art and music, Solov’ev provided a key impetus through which Nietzsche’s orphans elided Christian morality with Nietzsche’s Dionysian will.

These disparate intellectual influences (Solov'ev, Nietzsche, and Schopenhauer) were drawn together by Russian symbolist writers Viacheslav Ivanov, Aleksandr Blok, and Andrei Bely. In evening discussions over a glass of wine, talks delivered at the Society for Free Aesthetics, concerts hosted by the journal *The Golden Fleece*, Margarita Morozova's evening salons, and in written analysis and correspondence, all three men developed a theoretical worldview in which music held a central place. Ivanov, whose study of ancient history in general and Greek mystery cults in particular had left an indelible imprint on his personal worldview, insisted that music was "the mightiest of arts," and that the poet of the new age would "teach with music and myth."²¹ He believed that this emphasis on music had been Nietzsche's prophetic vision for humanity, echoing back to the Hellenic philosopher Socrates, who shortly before his death "dreamed that a heavenly voice commanded him to study music," though it was only in Nietzsche that this heavenly command had been fulfilled.²² For Ivanov, music was a herald of the dawning new age, the symbol of the secret essence of life that had been lost in the modern era. A new, musical prophet was required to reunite society shattered by Socratic rationality and give meaning to human existence again.²³

Rejecting the rationalist worldview of his own mathematician father (a professor at Moscow University), Andrei Bely similarly assigned unique metaphysical import to music.²⁴ Because music had no form in the physical world (being composed purely of sound in time rather than possessing a physical, spatial component), Bely elided the concepts of music and symbol, claiming that "music ideally expresses a symbol" and "a symbol is always musical."²⁵ Such vague metaphorical language presented its own issues, as fellow poet Aleksandr Blok, similarly musing over the place of music, pointed out to Bely in 1903. "Your face was hidden at that very moment when it was time to state whether music was the ultimate or not the ultimate," Blok complained, concluding that "it would be better to say that musical art will cease to exist as soon as we return to a religious understanding of reality."²⁶ Blok's critique exposed an important contradiction within the emerging discourse of musical metaphysics: music was conceived both as a compositional art (consisting of specific works) and as a symbol of religious transcendence (a path of mystical insight into a higher reality). It seemed unlikely that music per se could effectively fulfill both tasks.

Blok's critique notwithstanding, Bely's elision of music as a metaphysical symbol and music as a specific art form was common in the cultural circles of his day. For St. Petersburg composer and music critic Aleksandr Koptiaev, directly inspired by his own translations of writings by Richard Wagner and Friedrich Nietzsche, only the "mysterious, hidden art" of music could overcome the

failings of modern, rationalistic culture that had gained hold in the current age and provide the transformative impetus for re-creating life on a fundamentally new basis.²⁷ Moscow music philosopher Konstantin Eiges also argued in metaphorical language that music, unlike other arts, did not simply "re-create reality or . . . bear some relation to a structure in the phenomenal world."²⁸ Rather, it was the "highest spiritual embodiment,"²⁹ incarnating the "uplift into another, higher world."³⁰ Music "immediately touched upon heavenly beauty, which has no relation at all to the phenomenal world, the world of representation." Drawing directly on Solov'ev, Eiges concluded that music was a "magical" art, which intuitively gave access to the underlying essence of existence.³¹ For the artist Wassily Kandinsky, music "has been for some centuries the art which has devoted itself not to the reproduction of natural phenomena, but rather to the expression of the artist's soul" --and thus provided an example of a more "spiritual" path that all art should follow in the modern age.³² Such intimations provided little guidance about musical style but invested great importance in the art of music per se.

Through an active embrace and adaptation of these various intellectual trends, late imperial Russians came to interpret the impact of music as essentially spiritual: a path from ordinary reality to higher spiritual insight, from the "real" (*realia*) to the "more real" (*realiora*).³³ This framing of music's transformative power was admittedly vague, linked more to a metaphysical symbol of music than to the experience of a given musical work. But the very vagueness of its formulation enabled adherents to freely adapt musical metaphysics to those musical styles most appealing to their individual tastes. Rather than determining specific stylistic attributes, musical metaphysics thus provided a framework of shared expectation within which musical experience was interpreted by educated Russians: a future transformation focused upon concepts of unity, musical time, and the search for Orpheus, which together gave rise to the expectation of a contemporary "mystery" (*misteria*).

MUSIC AS UNITY

Unity (as the final goal in art and life) and music (as its ultimate expression) arose as the most influential symbols from this late imperial Russian melding of Nietzsche, Schopenhauer, and Solov'ev—even though the form and content of that unity remained undefined.³⁴ For Nietzsche, the Dionysian art of music was the artistic embodiment of "primordial unity" that underlay and preceded the phenomenal world. As the uniting spirit, Dionysus had struggled to overcome the individualizing influence of the phenomenal world.³⁵ Modern society had become too individualistic and lost touch with this underlying unity of existence, a trend that Nietzsche identified as the triumph of Socratic rationality over both

Apollonian and Dionysian artistic impulses.³⁶ Tragedy, Nietzsche argued, had been the artistic means through which the ancient Greeks had learned “the fundamental knowledge of the oneness of everything existent, the conception of individuation as the prime cause of evil” and broken “the bonds of individuation,” replacing them with “a restored oneness.”³⁷ He insisted that in ancient Greek tragedy “a public of spectators, as we know it, was unknown.”³⁸ Rather, there was a unity between creator, actor, and spectator that reflected the underlying unity of humanity. Theater offered a symbolic embodiment and reinterpretation of primordial, Dionysian unity, re-created through the purifying lens of Apollo. In this way, Nietzsche suggested, unity could be enacted or created. Immanent in Nietzsche’s thought was also the concept of *zhiznetvorchestvo* (life-creation)—art as means through which to transform or “create” life, one of the central tenets to emerge in Russian symbolist literary thought in the late imperial era—though the philosopher spoke of “overcoming” (*überwinden*) or “transfiguring” (*verklären*) existence, rather than “creating” it.³⁹

For Nietzsche, transcendent values or morality did not exist: value was assigned to existence through the creative act itself. In its Russian translation, however, the Dionysian concept of unity (*edinstvo*) merged with two additional concepts with deep religious significance: theurgy (*teurgiia*) and collectivity (*sobornost'*), a reinterpretation that drew heavily upon the writings of Nietzsche’s Russian contemporary, Vladimir Solov’ev. Like Nietzsche, Solov’ev stressed art’s transforming power. For Solov’ev, however, human artistic creativity was intimately linked with the idea of theurgy or “divine action”: artistic creations not only transformed but also spiritualized reality. Emphasizing the division between spiritual (eternally perfect) and material (existing) reality, Solov’ev saw in art an embodiment of Beauty that served as a link between these two realms. “Beauty” served to transfigure (*preobrazhit*) material reality through the “incarnation of another, higher-than-material element in it.”⁴⁰ Solov’ev imbued his aesthetic theory with a specific Christian mission: the “transformation of physical life into its spiritual counterpart.”⁴¹ Thus the transforming power of art was immediately connected with a moral goal: Beauty always worked to advance Truth (*istina*) and Goodness (*dobro*); indeed, beauty was “only the physical form of Goodness and Truth.”⁴² In Solov’ev’s vision, human history was an expression of the “eternal battle between the cosmic (harmonizing) beginning and the chaotic process of cosmogenesis.”⁴³ This gnostic vision of reality emphasized the historical process, the gradual spiritualization (harmonization) of the material world over time and the deification of humanity (*bogochelovechestvo*).⁴⁴ Art held an important place in this process, because it symbolized the bringing of form to initial chaos and advanced the transformational process itself. Solov’ev asso-

ciated moments of chaos with forms of destruction, death, and evil.⁴⁵ Thus, while Nietzsche started from an ambivalent view of the nature of reality itself, Solov’ev imbued reality and the historic process with Christian morality, criticizing the German philosopher for his abandonment of any religious, mystical basis for his philosophy. As Irina Paperno has noted, this theological slant entered into later readings of Nietzsche’s philosophy in Russia, which in turn influenced the development of musical metaphysics.⁴⁶

Nietzsche’s orphans were enthralled by Solov’ev’s claim that contemporary European art had reached its highest development as pure art and now required the appearance of a new, theurgic art that would reunify material and spiritual realms. They prophesied that the theurgic art soon to appear would not merely represent but transform (*preobrazhat*) the world.⁴⁷ For Nikolai Berdiaev, who abandoned his youthful Marxist convictions after 1905 and devoted himself instead to religious philosophy, it was clear that “in our nervous, searching, transitional, unembodied and unfinished epoch, the spirit of music rules.” Nevertheless, dissatisfied with the disunity of the current age, Berdiaev awaited the future appearance of true “theurgic art, [which is] synthetic and collective [*sobornoe*]. [Theurgic art] is something that is still unseen, an undiscovered pan-art.”⁴⁸ For Moscow-based composer Fedor Akimenko (who divided much of his time between composing salonesque pieces for piano, writing Nietzschean-style aphorisms on art, seeking ways to access the higher “astral plane,” and musing upon the potential existence of Martians and the quality of their musical life), music unquestionably possessed an uplifting influence upon the moral and spiritual abilities of its listeners, eliminating mere physical desires. Art—particularly music—was, he concluded, the “religion of the future.”⁴⁹ Troubled by Nietzsche’s rejection of religion, Bely argued that the divine spirit must be returned to the artistic creative process, claiming that “creativity, carried to its conclusion, directly turns into religious creativity: theurgy.”⁵⁰ Echoing these theurgic ideas as late as 1917, the young music critic Igor Glebov (who would later, under the name Boris Asaf’ev, enjoy acclaim as the father of Soviet musicology), argued that “art is transformation [*preobrazhenie*]”⁵¹ and that, in the end, while “the musical element is the basic element of all genuine art,” “all art is ultimately defined by its relation to religion.”⁵² For Viacheslav Ivanov, the form of this religion was also clear in its basic outlines. Arguing for the “internal oneness of Beauty and Goodness” and equating the true Nietzschean superman with Christ, he claimed that Nietzsche’s failure had been his inability to reconcile his own visions with Christianity.⁵³

Nietzsche’s image of a unifying, Dionysian spirit found fertile soil in a country with a lengthy intellectual tradition focused on the concept of *sobornost'*, a term

derived from Orthodox theology and developed in particular by Slavophile writers Aleksei Khomiakov, Ivan Kireevsky, and Konstantin Aksakov in the mid-nineteenth century.⁵⁴ *Sobornost'* suggested a communal or collective existence, "the quality of being in accordance with the unity of all, of the unity of humanity in God."⁵⁵ The noun *sobornost'* was related to the adjective "sobornyi" (the Slavic translation of the Greek term *katholikos*, meaning "universal," "whole," or "all-embracing," which was employed in the Nicene Creed to refer to the unity of Christian faithful in a single community) and to the noun *sobor* (alternately meaning "gathering," "council," or "cathedral").⁵⁶ The Slavophiles emphasized the collective (*sobornyi*) nature of Russian peasant life as a fundamental cultural characteristic distinguishing Russia from Europe. This idea of a communal, unified people became inextricably linked with the image of Russia's national character and its imagined future messianic mission. Music was considered to be particularly evocative of *sobornost'*, as demonstrated by Aksakov's 1859 metaphor that compared the ultimate embodiment of *sobornost'* — the peasant commune — to a "moral choir" in which the voice of the individual "is heard in harmony with all other voices."⁵⁷

To differentiate his aesthetic thought from the political connotations connected with the Slavophiles, Solov'ev coined the alternate term *vseedinstvo* (all-unity), defining artistic theurgy as the "active transformation of reality for the goals of achieving positive or true *vseedinstvo*."⁵⁸ In other words, theurgic art was to reunite the physical and spiritual realms, ushering in a new era of unity and harmony. The term *sobornost'* was employed in a similar way by neo-Kantian philosopher Sergei Trubetskoi, the elder brother of Evgenii Trubetskoi, head of the department of philosophy at Moscow University, and editor of Russia's first philosophical journal, *Voprosy filosofii*. His unexpected death in 1905 turned him into an inspiration for and symbol of Russia's quest for spiritual and intellectual truth. Both terms (*vseedinstvo*, *sobornost'*) subsequently entered into the general vocabulary of Nietzsche's orphans, while the messianic underpinnings of Slavophile thought continued to enjoy popularity as an interpretation of Russia's task in the modern world.⁵⁹ That the idea of *sobornost'* found such broad social resonance in late imperial Russia has been further demonstrated by Julia Mannherz. Amid her analysis of the communal emphasis granted to occult-mental prayer, she observes that "ordinary readers and occult publishers" "shared aspirations with symbolist writers and religious thinkers" in seeking ways through which to enact this desired communality.⁶⁰ Yet it was music that seemed to offer a particularly striking enactment of *sobornost'* for many members of educated society.

Aksakov's vision of *sobornost'* inspired Orthodox priest, mathematician, and theologian Pavel Florenskii to combine it with a more accurate understanding of

peasant song. Highlighting the heterophonic style of singing that existed among the Russian peasantry (in contrast to both the homophonic and polyphonic styles of the West),⁶¹ Florenskii insisted that Russian peasant choirs possessed "full freedom of all voices, uniting with each other, rather than one voice dominating another. . . . unity is achieved in the internal mutual understanding of the performers, and not through external boundaries. Each individual, more or less, improvises, but this does not destroy the whole. Quite the opposite, [the whole] is firmly connected, because every performer agrees with the general act. . . . in other words, Russian song is the realization of that 'choral beginning' upon which the Slavophiles thought to prop up Russian society."⁶² In his own philosophical work, Florenskii "wished to say the same thing that the soul of the Russian *narod* express in song" — to express this quest for *sobornost'*.⁶³

Against this eclectic philosophical backdrop of Nietzschean, Slavophile, and Solov'evian thought, the gulf separating the common people (*narod*) from the educated few became clear amid the flames of revolution in 1905, leading to reinvigorated calls for unity within Russian society.⁶⁴ Caught up in the spirit of the times, Bely determined that the very structure of Russian society would have to be transformed before true communal creation (*sobornoe tvorchestvo*) could be achieved: the current context, he argued, made communal art impossible, as there were merely "individualists who dream of *sobornost'*, and individualists who do not dream of it."⁶⁵ Both Ivanov and Blok similarly mourned the division between educated society and the people, seeing this divide as symptomatic of modern times.⁶⁶

This confrontation with popular discontent in 1905 helped to grant music's unifying role a more explicitly social slant, as musical harmony was regularly employed as a metaphor for social unity. This approach was itself based in part upon the Greek concept of *harmonia*, used variously to refer to musical consonances, the ordering of the cosmos, and the harmonious interactions of peoples.⁶⁷ In this vein, Aleksandr Maslov, editor of the music journal *Music and Life* (*Muzyka i zhizn'*) and an ethnographer with populist sympathies, argued that "music calls forth a harmony of feelings between various distinct individuals and is a means of making the heart beat in sympathy, just as the strings of a musical instrument or human voices sound in consonance. . . . music is an instrument of social unity and agreement."⁶⁸ The greatest task that music faced in the modern era, concluded numerous commentators, was to overcome the social divisions within which it had developed: the split between educated society and the *narod*. The "decline" that some people had commented upon in modern music was believed to spring from the fact that it was distant from the needs and desires of society as a whole. In the past, argued an anonymous critic, art "was not divided into 'low'

art and 'high' art, but was all-national [*vsenarodnyi*] — even more than that, it was collective [*kollektivnyi*]."⁶⁹ Classical music had evolved as entertainment for the upper class; it was now necessary for music to reach people of all social origins, in order to reforge the social fabric of the empire.⁷⁰ Inspired by such populist ideas, in September 1905 Aleksandr Koptiaev momentarily forgot his obsession with Nietzschean philosophy and expectation of a latter-day Orpheus, and warmly encouraged the formation of peasant orchestras and choirs as means through which the *narod* could engage in the process of making music and rebuilding social bonds.⁷¹ Through reuniting society and transcending class conflict, it was believed that music would fulfill its proper role as an educational, civilizing, and unifying (in short, a harmonizing) force.

The Russian *narod* that Maslov, Koptiaev, and others hoped to reach was itself a construct: an idealized image of a pure Russian folk awaiting the guiding hand of the intelligentsia to form a coherent national group. For members of educated society who worked more immediately among the people, music was not simply a means of creating a unified *narod*; it was an instrument through which to forge a particular kind of collective unity or identity. For the Orthodox clergy, music (embodied in the reintroduction of communal singing into liturgical service) was seen as a means of combating the divisive influence of sectarianism within peasant society. In a July 1905 missive to the Holy Synod, Bishop Gury of Simbirsk argued that in current Orthodox practice "the clergy offer their hymns of thanksgiving, supplication, and glorification, [while] the people are reduced to the role of passive listeners."⁷² In contrast, the emotional appeal of music in sectarian worship, in which people could freely participate, was luring away Orthodox believers. The obvious solution, Bishop Gury concluded, was the Orthodox revival of communal singing, a call seconded by other members of the clergy. Between 1905 and 1917, it was regularly argued (both in letters and in the press) that communal singing should be employed in the Orthodox liturgy to reawaken spiritual devotion among the peasantry and to protect the confused souls of Orthodox peasants from the seductiveness of both revolution and sectarian worship.⁷³ Music in this framing was connected not just to national unity but also to religious unity.

In the liberal press, music was further envisioned as a symbol for creating political unity. Philosopher Evgenii Trubetskoi found in music a metaphor for a transformed Russian Empire, in which patriotism toward one's own country would replace "narrow nationalism" and allow all peoples of the empire (including Jews, Poles, and Russians) to find common ground. In Trubetskoi's vision, the "music of the future" sounded the triumphant strains of equal citizenship rights, the end of autocratic power, and an embrace of Christian morality as

the governing basis for society.⁷⁴ Other political figures voiced similar ideas in the pages of Trubetskoi's journal *Moscow Weekly* (*Moskovskii ezhenedel'nik*). Vasilii Mikhailovich Petrovo-Solovovo (Marshal of the Nobility of the Tambov region, member of the Octobrist party, and one of the founders of the Tambov division of the Russian Musical Society) emphasized music's ability to transcend social divisions by developing "mutual solidarity between people" and furthering "the striving to combine personal and social life into a single whole."⁷⁵ Historian and liberal activist Sergei Kotliarevskii employed the figure of Frédéric Chopin as a symbol of the underlying "physical and spiritual commonality" shared by Poles and Russians, a commonality that now demanded recognition, he concluded, through political reform.⁷⁶

In 1908 the idealistic young singer Maria Olenina-d'Alheim returned to Moscow after several years in Paris with her own unifying vision: the creation of a communal performance space that would eschew capitalist relations and embody the true values of collective creation. With the support of her husband, the musicologist and philosopher Piotr d'Alheim, she founded the House of Song.⁷⁷ Expanded into a regular society in 1912, the House of Song sought to create a communal environment in which "three necessary factors: artist-creator, performer, and the public" worked together for the creation of a true artistic work, and in which the public would have "as important a place" as the artist-creator.⁷⁸ Because of this emphasis on collective experience, the society published all the texts of songs performed in Russian translation and circulated them to members prior to each concert. Texts for any potential encores were similarly included in the precirculated bulletins, as the spontaneity of performing a piece "off the cuff" did not permit the audience to reflect on the synthesis of music and textual meaning.⁷⁹ Even more unusually, the House of Song did not sell tickets for its performances, which were open only to paying members of the society. As Olenina d'Alheim explained, "for twelve years, the founder of the House of Song has striven to attract to her concerts not chance listeners, but those who consciously take part in communal creative activity [*sovmestnoi tvorcheskoi deiatel'nosti*], on the basis of a common understanding of art. These listeners are members and candidates of our Society. Opening our doors in this fashion [by selling concert tickets] not only contradicts the goals of the institution of our Society, but would even bring into question the very purpose of our Society's continued existence."⁸⁰ Ironically, the theoretical limiting of attendance for the House of Song was even greater in practice. Open in theory to anyone who wished to subscribe and attend concerts (and of course pay the membership fee — already restricting access to a small portion of Moscow's overall population), this "collective" was in fact restricted in size by the most mundane of causes: the Small Hall of the

Moscow Conservatory (where most performances were scheduled) had limited seating and could only accommodate a portion of those interested in participating.⁸¹

This emphasis on collective participation extended far beyond the question of concert attendance. The House of Song regularly sponsored contests for translations of poetic song texts into Russian, and each season Olenina d'Alheim performed a concert whose program was decided entirely by society members through a democratic vote. Similarly, musical classes connected with the House of Song sought to create conditions in which "the unifying spirit of saintly Art" would genuinely develop, creating "new artists" who, "free from the concerns of service or commercial considerations," would embrace this collective artistic path pioneered by the society.⁸² Such considerations encapsulated the emphasis on unity and life transformation through art that were at the heart of musical metaphysics, and thus appealed to many contemporaries from Moscow's cultural elite.⁸³ Captivated by the idea that music combined national expression with universal human goals, Olenina d'Alheim similarly emphasized programs that incorporated various European song traditions and (to the chagrin of less tolerant supporters such as Emilii Medtner) insisted on the central place of Jewish folk music for European culture as a whole.

Such liberal expressions of musical unity coexisted with exclusionary nationalist rhetoric. Boris Popov, a music critic tied to cultural circles in both Moscow and Perm, elected a sharply ethnic understanding of "Slavicness" that excluded those composers without sufficiently Slavic heritage from identification as "Russian" artists.⁸⁴ In contrast, Popov's sworn enemy Emilii Medtner devoted his life to the development of closer cultural ties between German and Russian culture, even while seeking to exclude what he considered to be "foreign Jewish" influence from European culture as a whole.⁸⁵ Of course, the definition of musical style according to ethnic identity was not inherently negative; as James Loeffler has demonstrated, Rimsky-Korsakov's challenge to his Jewish students to develop a Jewish national musical style found fruitful soil in the final years of the Russian Empire.⁸⁶ Moscow's House of Song similarly sought to build an understanding of music that emphasized both what the society considered as the inherent ethnic-national content of musical composition and the universal element underpinning all genuine art.⁸⁷ Nevertheless, the insistence that musical style was intimately connected with ethnic identity existed uneasily alongside the image of music as a unifying force: could music truly be universal if it contained inherent national characteristics? Moreover, with the growing nationalist movements within the Russian Empire in the aftermath of 1905, the quest for ex-

pression of a distinctly Russian ethnic identity increasingly seemed to suggest a failure to establish a coherent Russian imperial (*rossiiskii*) identity.

Although music inspired many educated Russians to envision a new world that transcended the divisions of modernity, contemporary listeners cherished their own hopes and expectations of what that unity would entail. The goal of unity was a silver thread running through all discourse on musical metaphysics, but the form that unity should take was vigorously disputed. Emphasis on ethnic nationalism interacted uneasily with the realities of musical life in the multiethnic Russian Empire, in which individuals from a wide range of ethnic backgrounds (including Russians, Jews, Germans, Ukrainians, Estonians, Poles, and many of mixed heritage) cooperated in building an imperial musical community.

MUSICAL TIME

Temporality—the human experience of the passage of time (rather than the "objective," "universal," or "natural" time connected with the external world)—is, as David Couzens Hoy has argued, "a basic feature of interpretations of the world."⁸⁸ When experiences of temporality change, overarching interpretations of the external world and human existence also change. Reinhart Koselleck has shown that post-1789 Europe experienced a shift from cyclical, repeated time (embodied in tradition) toward progressive, linear time (a product of the Enlightenment); society increasingly mused on the future rather than the past as the imagined ideal and goal.⁸⁹ Faith in linear time nonetheless began to lose ground in late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Europe: the impacts of industrialization, urbanization, and modernization potentially came to portend the decline rather than the improvement of human life. But a return to traditional patterns of religious and spiritual belief was seen as an even less viable alternative. In no small part, this quandary emerged from a growing crisis of perception, because new technological innovations and scientific discoveries were transforming the lived experience of both time and space. Distances seemed to shrink with the expansion of railroad networks, the measurement of time was standardized to simplify schedules, and in 1905 Albert Einstein's special theory of relativity critiqued the very possibility of a single, objective time.⁹⁰ Within this increased discourse on time and temporality, music emerged as a crucial method through which to engage with time itself.

In 1905 German philosopher Edmund Husserl employed music as a means to examine the phenomenological experience of time. Rejecting earlier attempts to define the lived experience of temporality as a series of "now" moments that fade into the past, Husserl based his philosophical analysis in part on the ex-

ample of a musical melody to theorize how time itself was experienced. He emphasized the unity of experience that enabled a listener to link together the experience of hearing an entire melody as a single event spread out temporally, incorporating both an aspect of recent memory (retention) and the expectation of what was to come (protention). The temporal aspect of one note preceding or following another was an inherent part of the experience, both in the initial experience and in any later remembrance of the melody, demonstrating that temporality itself served as an inherent aspect of human psychological experience and was not equivalent to external measurements of time.⁹¹ French philosopher Henri Bergson similarly applied music to demonstrate what he called “duration” or “psychological time,” which, he argued, contains an indivisible unity “melted together like the notes of a melody,” contrasting with uniform time, which was a measurable quantitative entity, analogous to space. For Bergson, duration offered intuitive insight into genuine reality, in contrast to the formal, mechanistic knowledge bequeathed by Kantian philosophy.⁹² For both philosophers, music—an art form intimately connected with time rather than space—provided a key way through which to conceptualize the temporal, subjective experience of life itself.

In the Russian context, focus on the *passage* of time usually gave way to the *transcendence* of time—through music. Embracing the metaphysical image of music he had previously critiqued in Andrei Bely, poet Aleksandr Blok wrote of “calendar time” and “musical time,” in which the former referred to the measurable, linear passage of time captured in history, and the latter described the “incalculable” experience of immediate connection to the spirit of music underpinning reality.⁹³ “Musical time” facilitated a way to “emerge from calendar time, from the flight of the days and years of history which gives no knowledge [of the All],” an argument that highlighted the transformative significance granted to music in late imperial Russia more broadly.⁹⁴ This image of temporal transcendence mirrors the conceptions of time voiced by Russian religious figures such as Simon Frank and Evgenii Trubetskoi, who both, as Katerina Levidou has observed, critiqued Bergson for “ignoring the essentially timeless nature and all-encompassing unity of the absolute” in his concept of duration.⁹⁵ Thus, in contrast to Bergson and Husserl, the connection between music and temporality generally expressed in the Russian context was connected with mystical transcendence through artistic theurgy. Musician Nadezhda Briusova identified in music a “moment of insight” that was itself “outside of time” (i.e., musical time) while the path to it was “through time.” Dismissing the division between a musical composition (which exists in time) and this moment of insight that exists outside of time, she argued that through the action of creative will expressed in

a musical composition, “unruly time [i.e., historical time] must become a pure expression of light itself . . . without temporal death. Time that has been entirely transformed [*preobrazhennym*] is eternity.”⁹⁶ Broadening Blok’s terminology, I use “musical time” to reference this attempt to step outside space and time and access the absolute. Musical time was seen as a messianic or eschatological transcendence of linear time, a path to higher reality.⁹⁷ Whether attained through historical progress or recognition of ancient truths contained in an idealized past, musical time suggested a moment of transformation from the existing (often degraded) state of human experience to a higher one. For Nietzsche’s orphans, musical time offered a symbolic means through which to transcend current reality and enter into a higher level of existence.

The categories of progress and decadence underpinned contemporary debates over musical time. While “progress” in this context emphasized the development of humanity (technologically, scientifically, and intellectually) from a lower to a more advanced phase of existence, “decadence” offered an alternate, anxiety-filled interpretation of the path of history. In the mid-nineteenth century, Hegelian philosophy had postulated a completely logical account of the history of human civilization, based upon the assumption that historical time told a story of unending progress (embodied in nature, art, and human reason itself); in contrast, fin-de-siècle culture throughout Europe was criticized as representing not the advancement of human civilization but rather the decline and eventual collapse of Europe’s leading role, a reinvention of a cyclical conception of time in which civilizations rise and fall. The image of historical decline was evoked in Max Nordau’s *Degeneration* (*Entartung*, 1892), which was quickly translated into Russian. It inspired concern over the degeneration of contemporary society both in human psychological and physical health as well as in the artistic realm.⁹⁸ Fears over the direction of Russian social change vied with more optimistic assessments, and the popular press dwelt at length on the “decline” and “decadence” of contemporary Russia.

Particularly in the aftermath of 1905, emphasis on music’s transformative impulse expressed a deep-seated anxiety about modern life and a thirst to transcend the problems of the present. Music was believed to offer a means of salvation for humanity through an eschatological break with the past: in the words of Blok, a move from “calendar time” to “musical time.” Through its direct appeal to mood, emotion, and experience rather than human reason, music was seen as an escape from the present age. For those uneasy with the apparent growth of individualism, positivism, and materialism in modern life, music offered spiritual and psychological transformation, an expression of higher spiritual and emotional forms from which a more advanced humanity would emerge in the future. Per-

haps the most spectacular artistic envisioning of “musical time,” Aleksandr Scriabin’s envisioned *Mystery* (through which he expected to bring an end to time itself) was part of a larger discourse more modestly expressed in the contemporary press. Evgenii Braudo (who after 1905 divided his time between serving prison and exile terms for revolutionary activity and writing philosophically inspired music criticism) insisted that by emotionally preparing the human psyche for a new form of existence, a musical work had the potential to usher in the revolutionary break from calendar time to musical time. Music, he argued, “opens before us a realistic picture of the feelings of the new future man and accustoms us, amid the prosaic conditions of contemporary life, to the spiritual life of the future.”⁹⁹

Conceptions of musical time were not limited to metaphysical musings; rather, they found expression in specific debates over the evolution of musical style. For philosopher Boris Schloezer, already under the mystical spell cast by his idol Scriabin, the increased musical dissonance of modernist works expressed a transfigured human spirit, freed from the earlier limitations of human history. Once, Schloezer claimed in Schopenhauerian-inspired terms, music had known no other possibility than to shift from consonance to dissonance and back; similarly, human existence had known only two paths: either the endless cycle of striving to satisfy desires (ever replaced by new ones after momentary fulfillment) or else the denial of all desire and a search for calm. Contemporary music, in his view, expanded dissonance while minimizing consonance; it increased the process of change, striving, and motion while minimizing rest or resolution. While such a focus on constant striving suggests Bergson’s idea of duration, Schloezer nevertheless connected his interpretation of music with a more eschatological vision of temporality. The fact that at least some modern humans were now able to find pleasure in dissonance suggested that a “deep transformation has taken place in the human spirit” and proved that “a small group of people, more or less consciously, develop in themselves different ideals of life.” By listening to new music, these select few were undergoing individual psychological transformation, which Schloezer saw as a necessary prerequisite for the transformation of human society as a whole.¹⁰⁰

Taking time away from her self-proclaimed mission of reawakening the communal spirit of the *narod* through teaching them collective song, Nadezhda Briusova likewise argued that Scriabin’s experimentations with harmony and rhythm offered “a portent of an entirely still unseen and to us incomprehensible sensation of time,” destined to usher in a changed humanity.¹⁰¹ Such ideas echoed occultist and Scriabin disciple Piotr Demianovich Uspenskii’s call for the emergence of a “new higher race” that would solve the social and political questions

“so sharply apparent in our time” on an “entirely different level and in an entirely different form than we imagine.”¹⁰² Even St. Petersburg composer and music critic Viacheslav Karatygin, no great admirer of the metaphysical musings of his contemporaries, embraced an image of music that emphasized a progressive historical view: while dismissing Scriabin’s philosophical rantings, he embraced his progressive search for new musical forms to express contemporary experience, while critiquing both Medtner and Rachmaninoff for continuing to explore “outmoded” forms of musical creativity.¹⁰³

Although this emphasized break with past traditions suggested a modernist worldview in which new sounds and techniques would forge a new human psyche (often connected with the music of Scriabin), calls for overcoming the present through musical time were not limited to critics who espoused a modernist musical style. Rather, music of all types was commonly connected with a rupture in human history itself. The journal *Music and Life*, while devoted to the study of Russian folk song and Orthodox church music, defined its view of music in terminology reminiscent of a modernist manifesto: “the old art no longer acts on us because it has lost its living connection with life, [which is] changing its forms,” argued an anonymous contributor in the journal’s first issue.¹⁰⁴ For Aleksandr Maslov, an outspoken opponent of Scriabin’s music and worldview, musical time was intimately connected not with modernist techniques but with social revolution. The only true advancement in music, he argued in a 1906 letter, “has been closely connected with political revolution and with the renewal of the life of the *narod* . . . the successes of the agrarian workers’ revolution are also the successes of music.”¹⁰⁵ Emilii Medtner, while fundamentally opposed to any discussion of “progress” in the musical realm or modernist compositional techniques, proposed nevertheless that music could lift individual experience out of temporal reality and offer access to what he defined as “absolute reality.”¹⁰⁶ Regardless of aesthetic style, music was thus envisioned as a mystical force capable of both transcending mundane experiences of temporality and ushering in a new reality.

IN SEARCH OF ORPHEUS

The image of an artistic genius whose music was destined to mend the rifts in contemporary society was central to the worldview of musical metaphysics.¹⁰⁷ In *The Birth of Tragedy*, Nietzsche had called for the appearance of a “genius” in whom both Apollonian and Dionysian impulses would be united.¹⁰⁸ He described this unity of impulses as “*the union, indeed, the identity, of the lyrist with the musician*” that existed as the central component of ancient Greek art. He called for a similar figure to appear in the modern era, described as the “music-practicing Socrates,” who would combine the rational and irrational impulses of

humanity.¹⁰⁹ Such a creative artist would provide a symbolic depiction of Dionysian unity through the embodiment of music's essence in space and time, a process made possible through the Apollonian impulse that offered form and structure to inchoate unity.¹¹⁰

While the image of Zarathustra and the "overman" has dominated popular understanding of Nietzsche's philosophy, it was this image of "genius" in *The Birth of Tragedy* (rather than the "overman" of *Thus Spake Zarathustra*) that underpinned musical metaphysics. In his first work, Nietzsche took great pains to differentiate between the figure of genius and individual identity. The "self" of the lyric genius was "not the same as that of the waking, empirically real man" but rather the "truly existent and eternal self resting at the basis of things."¹¹¹ While both individual and universal components (genius and nongenius) coexisted, the individual subject had no impact on the creative process as such, serving only as the individualized expression of the unified creative impulse, "the medium through which the one truly existent subject celebrates his redemption through appearance."¹¹² The genius thus embodied the universal.

In Russia, Nietzsche's image of a "music-practicing Socrates" who would unite the rational and irrational aspects of humanity elided with another figure borrowed from Greek mythology: Orpheus. Because of the emphasis on music's theurgic power and the transformative moment to be reached in "musical time," the figure of Orpheus or, in Viacheslav Ivanov's words, "the miracle of Orpheus" (the ability to transform material reality through art) was evoked as a symbol of true theurgic genius.¹¹³ Alternate traditions glorified him as a Thracian singer, "the father of song," or the priest of the "mysteries of Dionysus." His parentage itself was traced to the Muse Calliope and Oeagrus, or to Apollo himself. Among the many tales surrounding Orpheus, the two most enduring were his ill-fated journey to the underworld to retrieve his wife, Eurydice, and his death at the hands of Thracian bacchantes. The constant in these myths was Orpheus's connection with *mousike*, the "art of the Muses." Orpheus's music was more than just an art form; it had an immediate impact both on his listeners and upon the natural world. This Orphic power captivated the imagination of generations of European composers; in the context of the Russian Empire, it found particularly vivid reinterpretation in the imaginations of Vladimir Rebikov and his contemporaries, who envisioned the composer as a prophetic or even a messianic figure.¹¹⁴ If music was truly the highest form of art, the underlying unity out of which the entire material world sprang, then the composer—the individual who controlled the art of giving order and harmony to sound—was, at least potentially, the ultimate prophetic visionary.

While this fascination with Orpheus predated the events of 1905, the role of

the artistic genius was given particular attention in the aftermath of revolution. For Aleksandr Koptiaev, it became clear that Nietzsche's philosophy was, in the end, of limited use for contemporary Russia, because it failed to solve the inherent conflict between individual genius and the crowd. For this reason, Nietzsche's mission had to be adapted for the contemporary Russian context. Only in Russia, Koptiaev believed, could unity be attained between the *narod* and the great composer who would arise to lead them. "Believe me," he argued dramatically in 1908, "in Russia something never before heard of is beginning."¹¹⁵ Developing the same strand of thought, music critic Evgenii Braudo hinted that it was the duty of a future Russian composer to transcend the division between music's aristocratic background and its future connection with the *narod*.¹¹⁶

Regardless of such hopes, in the aftermath of 1905, the disconnect between artists and the *narod* remained strong. Ivanov concluded that the very emergence of the concept of an individual genius was a symptom of the divide between the people and the intelligentsia. In its purest form, he argued, genius was intimately connected with the collective identity of a people rather than with any individual.¹¹⁷ While the 1905 Revolution and its aftermath had emphasized the division between the *narod* and the educated classes, Ivanov claimed that this gap could not be bridged by political leaders; it demanded a "singer," whose creation of new unifying myths would imply a reawakening of the collective spirit of Dionysus. Russia's current crisis was due to an overemphasis on individualistic dreams and isolation from the *narod*, which Ivanov considered the "basic fact of the contemporary history of the spirit." Rather than enlightening the *narod* with higher knowledge, contemporary artists were stranded at the heights of artistic inspiration, glorying in their own, secret knowledge. Thus Ivanov mourned in 1906 that "the crowd has lost its organ of speech: the singer."¹¹⁸ In contrast, he celebrated the figure of Orpheus as the "bearer of the ideas of wholeness and unification."¹¹⁹ Ivanov's outlook resonated with his contemporaries. Mesmerized by the envisioned role of a Russian Orpheus, in January 1911 Emilii Medtner asked Ivanov to submit an article on Orpheus for a book series devoted to mysticism forthcoming from his publishing house, Musaget.¹²⁰

The *Russian Musical Newspaper* gave visual expression to these utopian visions of a latter-day Orpheus who could overcome the divisions made so evident by the 1905 Revolution, when it introduced a new sketch into its pages in 1906: a Greek figure holding aloft a lyre and a small vessel with flame (fig. 1.1). The outline of a sun behind the androgynous figure's head suggested an affiliation with Apollo, but the lack of textual references left specific interpretation of the unnamed Greek deity open for the viewer to determine. In future issues the sketch tended to be placed prior to articles or stories that dealt with more

mystical aspects of musical experience, and its placement immediately before Vladimir Rebikov's story "Orpheus and the Bacchantists" in 1910 deepened the potential for direct association with Orpheus.¹²¹

Russian visions of Orpheus also mingled with Christian messianic imagery. Ivanov saw in Orpheus the synthesis of Apollo, Dionysus, and Christ. "Orpheus," he wrote, "is the creative Word that moves the world, and signifies God the Word in the Christian symbolism of the first centuries."¹²² Developing this religious aspect of Orpheus as creator, Bely argued that a theurgic approach to art required a creative personality that served as a "temple of God in which God dwells."¹²³ Philosopher Nikolai Berdiaev echoed this image of a divine spark, housed within the individual creative genius, claiming that the role of the artistic genius was "another kind of sainthood."¹²⁴ Eliding Orpheus and Christ as embodiments of spiritual (rather than physical) existence, Rebikov contended that "Orpheus is not a myth" but rather "one of the parables of the Unknowable God. A parable of the battle between Spirit and matter."¹²⁵ The prophetic task of the composer was to keep alive the message of God in times of spiritual darkness, to "catch, from time to time, particles of [Orpheus's] song," a calling that required spiritual and moral purity. "In order to create," wrote Rebikov in a letter to fellow composer Stepan Smolenskii, "you must have a soul that resembles a temple. You must have a pure soul. Then you will see God."¹²⁶ Similar Christian terminology emerged in texts by Scriabin's followers, who employed terms such as "prophet" (*prorok*), "Lamb of God" (*agnets*), and "Messiah" (*messiia*) when referring to their composer of choice.¹²⁷

But this messianic vision of Orpheus carried potential dangers, as Vladimir Solov'ev warned in his analysis of Pushkin's death. For Solov'ev, the embodiment of genius in human form brought with it both the responsibility of greater morality and the danger of failure (due to fallen human nature).¹²⁸ Even a supreme genius such as Pushkin could be mistaken or go astray, succumbing to the weak, all-too-human aspects of his personality. Lev Tolstoy further developed this question of an artist's moral culpability: if art was defined in terms of its ability to "infect" others with the same emotion the artist experienced when creating the work, the question of art's positive or negative effect could be solved only through reference to its influence on the audience.¹²⁹ A work of art was thus only as "good" or "moral" as the impact it had upon its audience. In this interpretation, the figure of genius could serve either heaven or hell, awakening both morally beneficial and destructive impulses in his audience.

Drawing on this tradition, music philosopher Konstantin Eiges developed an extensive metaphysical analysis of the moral basis upon which musical creativity took place.¹³⁰ He argued that mysticism in general (and musical mysticism in



Figure 1.1. Unnamed sketch from *Russkaia muzykal'naia gazeta* no. 1 (January 1, 1906), 8. Courtesy of the Slavonic Library, National Library of Finland.

particular) could stem both from higher and lower impulses. "Lower mysticism" was "the mysticism of *chaos*, manifested as drunkenness, raving, the experience of horror, etc." Eiges emphasized that the clearest manifestation of the "higher" mystical impulse was creativity, while the "lower" mystical impulse found its purest expression in destruction. Musical creation, he argued, was distinct from other forms of artistic creation. Only a composer could embody both the lower (Dionysian) and higher (Apollonian) mystical impulses. Whereas other artists were inspired by an object or idea in the phenomenal world, which "reflected heavenly beauty," the composer "has a different character: strong excitement, leaning toward drunkenness, seizes him, when in the moment of inspiration he not only indefinitely feels 'the touch of another world,' but also enters into this other world with his entire soul and contemplates the transcendental as a particular sound world-order in all its unearthly beauty." Eiges claimed that in entering this other world, a composer experienced the pure Dionysian state, "the destruction in consciousness of the boundaries between 'I' and 'not-I'" which would seize the composer, "freeing him from his own, concrete 'I'" such that "his will unites with 'first-unity.'"¹³¹ This direct experience of Dionysian unity distinguished musical creativity from all other artistic activities, but it also made musical inspiration particularly dangerous, as the composer entered into a realm of lower mystical experience.

According to Eiges, the composer's experience of the frantic, ecstatic, Dionysian state gave rise to the impulse to translate that experience into the most immediate form possible in the phenomenal world: that of sound (the "will to sound"). In this interpretation, the inchoate will of Nietzsche and Schopenhauer was assigned a goal: the striving for sound, most specifically musical sound. The experience of the Dionysian state then served as the inspirational basis out of

which music emerged as a higher, mystical experience. Through the composer's creative genius, the initial chaos of the Dionysian impulse would be transformed into the "crystallized musical phrases" of higher, mystical experience, referred to by Eiges as "musical mood." This mood, together with "contemplative and religious moods," was itself a "mystical state." "True" music thus transformed Dionysian chaos into a higher, mystical experience beyond the realm of rationality. If a composer failed in transforming Dionysian chaos into an ordered, mystical experience, he failed in his creative task. For this reason, the composer who entered into the lower, satanic realm for creative inspiration held a position of tremendous power and moral responsibility.¹³²

While the need for Orpheus seemed obvious to Nietzsche's orphans, the form he might take and the musical style he might espouse gave rise to sharp divisions. Writers on music often expressed strong partisanship, passionately supporting the claim of "their" composer to the lyre of Orpheus at the expense of other composers. Such debates found their origin in Nietzsche's own youthful fixation upon Richard Wagner, and the identification of Wagner's errors often served as the starting point in attempts to identify the contemporary Russian Orpheus. In his 1905 article "Wagner and the Dionysian Act" ("Vagner i dionisovo deistvo"), Ivanov employed blatantly theological overtones in emphasizing both Wagner's import and his shortcomings. Ivanov highlighted Wagner's place as both the second founder of the new, Dionysian work (after Beethoven) and the "first forerunner of universal myth creation." Ivanov posed this glorious role as analogous to the relationship between John the Baptist and Jesus Christ. With the image of the Baptizer in mind, he proclaimed that "it is not the place of the founder to be the culminator, and the forerunner must diminish."¹³³ Just as the preaching of John had given way to that of Christ, Wagner would give way to a greater artistic visionary, an Orpheus who would unite elements of Dionysus and Christ and bring theurgic art to fruition.¹³⁴

Ivanov's contemporaries also tended to view Wagner as a transitional figure, who was expected to be followed by a Russian genius.¹³⁵ Reflecting on her youthful love of Wagner in 1909 in a personal letter to Evgenii Trubetskoi, Margarita Morozova noted that her intellectual and spiritual awakening had begun through performances of Wagner's *Ring* cycle that she attended at Bayreuth. At the same time, she argued that Wagner, though he had recognized the need for spiritual transformation in *Parsifal*, had been unable to fulfill this calling, a "Christian task" that he had left to Russia.¹³⁶ Developing the comparison even further, writer Sergei Durylin (a frequent guest at Morozova's salons and secretary of the Moscow Religious-Philosophical Society after 1912) argued in 1913 that Wagner's importance for contemporary Russia stemmed from the fact that

he "was the last German in whom the spirit of music was the spirit of Christianity."¹³⁷ In the modern age, Durylin concluded, since Christianity was an inherent aspect of *Russian* rather than German identity, the new Orpheus would have to be a Russian.

Russian critics and audiences could be fickle, and their preferred composer might change with little explanation. In an October 1906 article for the journal *The Pass* (*Pereval*), Boris Popov painted a vivid image of contemporary Russia as a city in which a great beast stalked the streets at night, and in which fundamental spiritual truths were daily threatened with destruction.¹³⁸ In this nightmarish scenario, he initially held up the figure of Rebikov as one of the "chosen ones" who might save Russia from the darkness of contemporary life, an assessment echoed by other critics. By 1907, however, Popov had cooled toward his former idol. Disgusted with the perceived individualism of the composer's recent piano compositions (op. 35 and op. 36), Popov lashed out against both Rebikov and his own earlier interpretations of the composer's mission.¹³⁹ Inquiring into the broader significance of Rebikov's failure, Popov fell back on an interpretation reminiscent of Eiges's warning about music's potentially negative power, which would reecho throughout late imperial Russian discourse on music: Rebikov had succumbed to the seductiveness of "individualism," demonstrating that "he was not born to be a leader and teacher." Rebikov, Popov concluded, was "a momentary prophet, who spoke of some distant feelings, of the final freeing of music, and then fell silent, retreating into the depths of his [individual] 'I.'"¹⁴⁰ In his next article for *The Pass*, Popov had already located another potential Orpheus: Scriabin.¹⁴¹

Despite such changes in allegiance, the symbolic language with which these figures were described remained constant, demonstrating the powerful influence musical metaphysics held on the contemporary imagination. While critics such as Popov might back different composers at different moments, the concurrent embrace of several composers as the "true" Orpheus clearly demonstrates both the belief in musical metaphysics and the underlying divisions within Nietzsche's orphans. Of central importance for my analysis is not the relative persuasiveness of one or another assessment of a contemporary composer, but the exclusivist form of the discourse itself. In each of the three case studies that follow (Scriabin, Medtner, and Rachmaninoff), supporters were regularly confounded by the problem of how to prove that *their* selected composer was the genuine Orphic figure.

A MUSICAL MYSTERY

By 1912 it was common knowledge in most Moscow cultural circles that composer Aleksandr Scriabin planned to bring about the apocalyptic end of human history with his final composition—a work of collective human experience he referred to as the *Mystery (Misteriia)*.¹⁴² Less widely acknowledged was the fact that Scriabin's totalizing vision was itself partially a product of musical metaphysics, and that this search for a "mystery" was in fact a broader search within educated society. Conversations and debates over unity, musical time, and Orpheus culminated in a general expectation of a "mystery"—a quasi-liturgical or religious act through which contemporary Russian society would be transformed. While this envisioned mystery had its roots partly in Nietzsche's celebration of Greek tragedy, his Russian orphans drew inspiration from a range of sources, creating an image of a mystery intimately linked to the search for a contemporary Russian identity. Ivanov's study of the Orphic cult of Dionysus and his fascination with medieval religious mystery plays helped him to imagine the transformation of contemporary theater into a liturgical act.¹⁴³ He argued that these medieval mystery plays, together with tragedy and comedy, "must become the hearths of the nation's creative or prophetic self-determination," a means through which to define Russia's path.¹⁴⁴ Bely similarly embraced the concept; while admitting that Nietzsche had never employed the term "mystery" for referring to the "final conclusion of our culture," he rhetorically asked, "Is not the mystery [*misteriia*] the final link in the evolution we are experiencing?"¹⁴⁵ This concept of a mystery similarly conjured up the idea of musical time. As Walter Benjamin observed, in a medieval mystery play the notion of historical time itself is blurred, becoming an aspect of eternal (or musical) time.¹⁴⁶ Such was the case in late imperial Russia, where the idea of a mystery loosely corresponded to a liturgical or religious event, enacted to transform existing reality itself.

Most intriguing were the numerous attempts to enact some form of mystery. In 1908 journalist Vladimir Botsianovskii described a St. Petersburg group that sought, in all but name, to stage such a mystery. The "Order of Universal Genius Brotherhood" sought to initiate collective worship (*sobornoe sluzhenie*) through collective creative action. Music was granted center stage in this brotherhood, as shown in a photograph included by Botsianovskii. The "high priest" in charge of the group's "rite" alternated between speaking and playing his violin. His outfit was modeled after the traditional robes of an Orthodox priest, with the single exception of the violin held in his hand, which completed his attire (fig. 1.2).¹⁴⁷ In the closing creed, described by a bemused Botsianovskii, members of the order synthesized their belief in God with an emphasis on creative action, chanting



Верховный жрецъ, именуемый генераль-провока-
торомъ.
(Къ статьѣ „У геніевъ“).

Figure 1.2. Photograph accompanying article "U geniev," *Teatr i iskusstvo* no. 22 (1909): 390. The caption reads, "The high priest, who is called the General-Provocator." Courtesy of the Slavonic Library, National Library of Finland.

“may your prayerful address to God appear in creation: personal, individual, and collective creation.”¹⁴⁸ Such an emphasis on combining individual and collective creativity in liturgical expression vividly embodied the ideal of *sobornost'*. Genius and creativity were understood as inherent parts of every person, linking the individual to the collective. In seeking to stimulate the advent of collective creation through imitation of a liturgical service, the brotherhood sought, in its own way, to enact a mystery.

In 1912 the House of Song even more explicitly attempted to produce a collective “mystery,” this time based on a 1903 French translation of the seventh-century text *Uttararamacharita* by the Indian poet Bhavabhuti.¹⁴⁹ The “careful and deep study of this drama” was to serve the society’s fundamental goal of awakening a collective, spiritual creative impulse among participants and society members. By facilitating performers’ entry into the “secret of creative thought” and “spirit of creation,” the play would “pull them out of their unconsciousness” and provoke deeper spiritual insights—all goals typical of envisioned mysteries of the time.¹⁵⁰ To further participation from all members, the House of Song offered a competition for the best Russian translation of the French text, to be used in the eventual performance.¹⁵¹ All society members were encouraged to attend rehearsals in 1914, when they began to offer this symbolic experience for all.¹⁵² Perhaps most striking, however, was the Nietzschean reinterpretation of the poem’s significance for a Russian audience. As anonymous authors in the *Bulletin of the House of Song* concluded, the text provided a metaphorical depiction of the struggle between secular and spiritual power, embodied respectively by King Rama (an avatar of the god Vishnu) and his wife Sita (an avatar of the goddess Lakshmi). This struggle was, they argued in an amazing feat of cross-cultural misreading, the same metaphorical conflict between secular modernity and spiritual belief that was depicted in the works of both Nietzsche and Wagner. By sending his wife Sita into exile, King Rama symbolically separated himself from religious belief. In her exile, Sita gave birth to two children, Kusha and Lava, who, in the interpretation of the House of Song, symbolized the dual powers of music and tragedy, a clear reference to Nietzsche’s *Birth of Tragedy*. These two children then brought about the reunion of the two spouses “in another higher world,” mirroring a return to religious belief through the artistic transcendence offered by the Dionysian and Apollonian powers of music and tragedy. In this way, the Hindu tale was reinterpreted according to late imperial Russian desires and concerns.

For many, the idea of a mystery also suggested an imminent fruition of the connection between religion, Russian identity, and music, and a transcendence of the perceived threat of disintegration that Russia seemed to face. This con-

nection was inspired by reflections upon Richard Wagner’s final opera *Parsifal*: commonly referred to as a “mystery” in the Russian periodical press, its mystical, Christian character served as an inspiration to seek a uniquely Russian mystery.¹⁵³ At the age of twenty-six, poet and budding religious philosopher Sergei Durylin was equally inspired by Wagner’s *Parsifal*, Vladimir Solov’ev’s religious philosophy, and Russian messianism, envisioning a future in which Russia would take the leading role in contemporary Europe. For Durylin, both the form and the subject of the awaited Russian mystery was clear. In his 1913 book *Wagner and Russia (Vagner i Rossiia)*, which appeared under the auspices of Emili Medtner’s publishing house Musaget, Durylin argued that Wagner’s failure to bring about a genuine mystery through *Parsifal* was caused by a disconnect between the composer and the German people—a disconnect caused not by the composer’s shortcomings but by Germany’s loss of its Christian foundation. Contemporary Germany, Durylin concluded, embodied the individualism and divided nature of modern life. In contrast, the creation of a true Christian mystery was a specifically Russian task.¹⁵⁴ Building upon his interest in archaeology and ethnography, Durylin cited the myth of the vanishing city of Kitezh as an example of the Russian *narod*’s deeply Christian view of the world, suggesting that this particular myth was ripe for artistic development by a Russian composer. Such a composer would succeed where Wagner had failed, creating a true Christian and folk mystery because of Russia’s close connection to Christianity. Rimsky-Korsakov had previously sought to create an opera based on the legend; not having understood his mission, however, he had failed to become the “artist myth-creator” that Russia needed.¹⁵⁵ This Russophile interpretation of the awaited mystery gained general approbation among many of Nietzsche’s orphans, and the myth of Kitezh was a particularly fruitful topic for mystical and increasingly messianic imaginings of Russian identity at this time.¹⁵⁶

Another take on this late imperial quest for a mystery was attempted by Rebikov, who conceptualized his trilogy of “musical-psychological dramas” (entitled *Drama of the Spirit*) as a commentary on the fall of the human spirit into the material world; through experiencing the works, he hoped to carry an audience through the various spiritual and emotional states of the characters, enabling them to grasp that “human striving toward knowledge and power” would lead ultimately to the death of their souls.¹⁵⁷ To supplement this more negative commentary, his work *The Antichrist* was intended to carry its audience through the “egoism of matter” back to the “victory of Spirit.”¹⁵⁸ Like most of the envisioned mysteries, Rebikov’s *Antichrist* was never completed; nevertheless, based on sketches shown to him by the composer, Odessa Theological Seminary professor Aleksandr Gorskii concluded in 1916 that Rebikov, though unacquainted

with the philosophical writings of Solov'ev, had intuitively moved Russian religious thought forward to a new level of development—a task that no philosopher had managed.¹⁵⁹

Common to all these nebulous attempts to evoke a mystery were a focus on collective experience, the overcoming of composer/performer/audience divisions, and a shared emphasis on music's awakening of irrational emotion as the means through which to transcend historical time and, through mystical experience, access absolute or musical time.¹⁶⁰ The experience of music in a contemporary mystery thus was interpreted as a mystical "act" (*deistvo*) or "experience" (*perezhivanie*), with the potential to transform human existence and understanding. The search for this mystery emerged as a common theme, and attempts to define its content were intimately linked with attempts to define Russian identity in the modern era.

MUSICAL METAPHYSICS IN PRACTICE: SOCIAL TRANSFORMATION THROUGH MUSIC

As members of educated society, Nietzsche's orphans were self-consciously aware of the divisions between themselves and the broader *narod*. Particularly after 1905, they sought through music to overcome these social divisions and reunite with the people. However, within these discussions lurked a certain confusion regarding exactly who they sought to reach: discussions focused alternately on peasants, workers, and members of "middling classes" whose musical tastes were not considered sufficiently developed. While unclear about the population they sought to reach, however, Nietzsche's orphans were clear about their own task: to enlighten the benighted population of Russia and to direct their spiritual energies in what they themselves believed to be the correct direction. In practice, Nietzsche's orphans thus viewed themselves as a sort of cultural vanguard party (to adopt a term from Leninist politics). Their contradictory understandings of the *narod*, however, together with an inability to recognize the genuine desires of the people they sought to reach (which seems to have often been personal expression rather than *sobornost'*) undermined their practical attempts to create unity.

Nietzsche's orphans identified two potential obstacles in their attempts to overcome social division through music after 1905: music education and concerts were prohibitively expensive for the vast majority of Russian workers and peasants, and the poorer classes seemed to have lost the ability to distinguish good music from bad. According to contemporary assessments, the *narod* was ever more "polluted" by the effects of modern life, expressed in (among other

things) popular interest in urban songs. In response to these problems, members of Russian musical society genuinely sought to reach out to the "people": a growing number of concerts offered cheap or free tickets; music education institutions sought to provide stipends to the most qualified students; public lectures devoted to music history, aesthetics, and good taste aimed to educate the population; music libraries opened to provide greater access to relevant literature; and, perhaps most striking of all, "People's Conservatories" (*narodnye konservatorii*) were founded in several urban centers. The establishment and fate of the Moscow People's Conservatory demonstrates, at the individual level, both the accomplishments and the limitations of musical metaphysics.

Established September 3, 1906, the Moscow People's Conservatory (or Musical Section of the Moscow Society of People's Universities, henceforth MPC) declared its founding task to be the "spreading of musical knowledge to as broad a range of the population of Moscow and Moscow province as possible, and to cooperate in this task within the boundaries of Russia."¹⁶¹ Established as an autonomous organ of the broader People's University (with a separate board and election), it proposed to arrange general and special music courses, schools, concerts, and lectures; to publish music, books, brochures, and teaching material; and to provide libraries, museums, music, and instrumental equipment. In its first year of existence, the MPC enrolled 627 students, sixty-two of whom were directly admitted to the second, more advanced course.¹⁶²

It was the MPC's explicit purpose to expand music education to the *narod* to develop greater social cohesion and an improvement in morality among the population. This educational process was meant to foster spiritual development: just as the people needed education in the external, scientific realm, they needed education in the internal, emotional realm. Through the immediate engagement of song, it was believed, the common people could be taught the value of collective creation, combining their individual voices into a more complex and unified whole. Creative, communal performance would further the internal life of the people and better prepare them for future historical and social developments.¹⁶³

In light of its founding principles, the MPC focused almost exclusively upon choral singing as the basis of musical education.¹⁶⁴ The individual ability to perform instrumental works only mattered in the educational program insofar as this was "necessary for the general musical development of students." Nadezhda Briusova, one of the conservatory founders, argued at length about the importance of developing the creative spirit of the Russian *narod* through active participation in folk choirs. In her mind, choral work would expose the *narod* to the immediate experience of collective synergy, whose highest possible achievement would be the creation of genuine "folk operas," in which each individual

composed a unique part (*napev*). In these works, each individual's free creative potential would combine with all others into a single, collective whole. Briusova held, nonetheless, that even such a high accomplishment as "folk opera" was not yet a "true musical drama," which would include "all the voices of nature."¹⁶⁵ Yet this embrace of popular music education was haunted by a lingering anxiety about the *narod*. The organization of concerts for the masses had to proceed cautiously, warned Briusova, as the people had to be educated in the proper manner of responding to music; otherwise, exposure to high art would cause more harm than good.¹⁶⁶ Perhaps not surprisingly, she reserved a leading role for the musical elite. While the *narod* would collectively create the "folk drama" through individual composition of their part, it was Briusova and her colleagues who must, as leaders, "connect together all the compositions of all the authors" into a greater whole. In her mind, those who had founded the MPC and taught music to the workers were therefore "conductors of [the *narod*'s] musical creation."¹⁶⁷

By the seventh year of operation (1912–13), choral classes were offered in the Nikitskii and Sukharevskii districts of Moscow. Students could study at the MPC for up to three years at a cost of four rubles per year for the first- and second-year courses, and a variable sum for the third year, depending on the number of hours and students enrolled. Courses were open to both men and women once their voices had changed (generally not younger than fifteen to seventeen years of age). In the first two years, the classes met two times per week from 8 to 10 p.m., demonstrating a genuine wish to appeal to workers. No prior musical knowledge was required of students when they enrolled, though they had to know how to read and had to possess some level of musical ability. By the second year, students were expected to know simple intervals, possess an elementary knowledge of music theory (scales, rhythm, measures), and be able to sing a simple melody from music at sight. Each year ended with an examination, and at the end of the third class, students received a certificate.¹⁶⁸ Space rather than interest kept the numbers at the MPC limited, as the number of interested students regularly outnumbered available spaces. Inspired by the success of the MPC, the Artistic Subsection of the All-Russian Gathering of Activists in the Society of People's Universities and Other Educational Institutions of a Private Nature (*Vserossiiskii s'ezd deiatelei obshchestv narodnykh universitetov i drugikh prosvetitel'nykh uchrezhdenii chastnoi initsiativy*) adopted a 1908 resolution that the MPC should serve as a model for the establishment of similar institutions connected with People's Conservatories throughout the country.¹⁶⁹

Despite this relatively coherent structure, division over the MPC's ultimate mission continued among its founders, highlighted by an ongoing conflict over

solo classes. When the program was established on November 8, 1906, it was decided that the MPC should strive to offer access to solo instruments and lessons to as many students as possible. On January 24, 1907, the possibility of giving wider access to solo instrument instruction was raised, and further discussed again on January 31. The decision to broaden solo classes passed with minor changes on March 29, with the explicit understanding that these classes should foster musical technique but not develop virtuosity.¹⁷⁰ The question was again debated on September 1; ultimately, while solo classes continued to be offered, the number of spaces was extremely limited.¹⁷¹ The objections raised against training soloists reiterated standard tropes from musical metaphysics: it would develop individuality and empty virtuosity (the ills of modernity) at the expense of the unified communal artistic experience offered by choral singing.

In practice, educated Russians often found that their goals of encouraging a collective identity among workers and peasants were met with indifference or incomprehension from the very *narod* whom they sought to protect. Jeffrey Brooks has noted this divide: while educated elites encouraged a rejection of individualist aspirations (all too common in the penny press), the mix of moralizing literature and belles lettres they encouraged met with limited success among the people.¹⁷² A series of questionnaires completed by students of the vocal conducting program of the MPC shows a similar divide. Out of forty-three students, nine respondents seemed dismissive of the very basis of the course in which they were enrolled (the preparation of teachers to conduct choral ensembles among the *narod*), requesting instead the possibility of studying individual musical performance.¹⁷³ One male respondent specifically asked to study piano, while a female respondent voiced the same request, stating that she "lived a different life" when she heard music.¹⁷⁴ Perhaps the most poignant request for such instruction was voiced by one Iusiia Sokolova, who scribbled out a heartfelt request to Briusova: "I can ask you only one thing: give me the ability to develop musically, at least a little bit, to allow me at least a small but active participation in singing and music. . . . This question is the most painful for me. I cannot quietly listen to your lecture because every word of yours shows me my musical illiteracy, and awoke [*sic*] in me a thirst for knowledge. . . . before me was the fateful question: why can't I play myself, when I love music, when music sounds in my ears at home?"¹⁷⁵ Such responses demonstrated a clear disconnect between the stated purpose of the courses in which the students were enrolled and their personal goals in attending the MPC. Rather than seeking collective creative experience, they yearned to develop their own personal talents and find ways to express their own emotional perspectives. This divide in turn echoed a larger gap between the expectations of

educated society, which sought to impose a particular "Russian" cultural vision, and an urban population more interested in exploring their own personal subjectivity than in forging a new form of collective identity.

Embracing the image of music as intimately connected with emotion, the students longed to focus on the individual emotional states expressed in musical works, evincing a striking disinterest in the MPC's communal focus. One respondent, tired of the instructional focus on choral singing, complained, "For me personally, the ability to feel in music that which was felt by the creator of a musical work is most important. I think that it would be good if you performed for us some musical work and explained the feelings and the forms that the performance awakens in you or that were felt by the author."¹⁷⁶ Another student wrote that she desired to "listen to the meaning that music has played, plays, and will play in the life of humanity," adding critically, "in my opinion, you have little touched on this so far."¹⁷⁷ When asked whether he or she could listen to an entire selection of music without losing focus, a third student responded that this was only possible if the music "corresponds to my experiences, to the personal music in my soul."¹⁷⁸ For these students, regardless of the lectures they attended, music was first and foremost a means of personal expression, not a tool for the moral and spiritual transformation of society. Such perspectives echo an emphasis on the inner self, the "psychological and intimate over the political and social" that Anna Fishzon, Edith Clowes, and others have identified both with cultural elites and with Russia's "middling groups" in society.¹⁷⁹ This suggests that ideals of individuality and self-expression had saturated Russian society to a degree not fully acknowledged by the cultural elite, who continued to cling to an idealized image of an inherently communal *narod*.

The actual social origins of the students at the MPC further demonstrate the lack of clarity with which the *narod* was conceived by Nietzsche's orphans. Though courses were held in the evenings to facilitate worker attendance, the requirement of basic literacy prior to commencing studies limited the number of potential students, while even the modest fee for classes was often prohibitively expensive. As a result, students tended to come from the universities and lower bureaucracy, with a decidedly low percentage of workers.¹⁸⁰ While acknowledging this shortcoming, no solution was found by the conservatory organizers for this fundamental problem. The experience of the MPC demonstrated that the much-celebrated educational and unifying power of music met with relatively little response from workers or peasants, many of whom (it was feared) preferred the degenerate influence of urban songs and *chastushki* (a folk genre of short, lively, and often satirical songs). At the same time, the students they attracted seldom desired moral and spiritual transformation through collective

creation; instead they sought the acquisition of specific musical skills, generally in solo vocal or instrumental performance, which were viewed either as a means for self-expression or as practical skills through which to improve their financial well-being. Misunderstanding and miscommunication, rather than harmonious building of a unified Russian identity through music, seems to have been the norm.

CONCLUSION

Music provided a powerful symbol of unity through which educated Russians could grapple with the increasing divisions they saw emerging in contemporary society, particularly in the aftermath of the 1905 Revolution. Music was viewed not merely as a symbol, however, but also a moral or ethical force with the power to transform existing reality, thereby transcending increasingly evident societal divisions. As Rosenthal concluded in her study of symbolist thought, music was itself the "basis of a new cosmology, a new way of viewing the world, a counter faith to the rationalism, materialism and economic individualism of the Enlightenment."¹⁸¹ Nietzschean thought provided the basis for interpreting music's meaning. His metaphysical interpretation of music as the ultimate Dionysian and unifying art appealed to intellectual traditions centered around both the Slavophile value of *sobornost'* and a belief in Russia's messianic role in human history, as well as the intelligentsia's call for revolutionary social change. This gave rise to musical metaphysics: a worldview that elevated music as a means of salvation from the problems of contemporary life. The Orphic figure of the artistic genius was central to this process, with salvation envisioned as the creation of social, spiritual, and cultural unity. This Russian concept of unity was imbued with moral, religious, and national implications that were wholly or partially absent from Nietzsche's vision of a Dionysian unity.

However, there were three fundamental contradictions inherent in the doctrine of musical metaphysics: an unbridgeable gulf between Nietzsche's orphans and the ill-defined *narod* they claimed to represent; a lack of consensus on the Orphic figure who would lead them toward it; and an emphasis on "Russian-ness" that was increasingly interpreted in a manner that served to isolate subgroups within the aesthetic community rather than to unite them. Lack of agreement over the end goal of social transformation, failure to recognize growing national conflict within the empire, and inability to bridge the divide between educated society and the vast majority of the Russian population undermined musical metaphysics from the outset. In short, musical metaphysics provided a form of belief without specific content: while the assumed need to transform

society through a musical Orpheus was shared, disagreement over the basis and desired end result of that transformation highlighted the divisions rather than the potential unity within the aesthetic community. Though minor at first, with the increasing strain of war and revolution, these tensions ultimately led to the implosion of this worldview, experienced by some former adherents as a loss in religious belief. In the end, an insurmountable gulf stretched between Nietzsche's orphans and the "children" they sought to reach. While envisioning themselves as spiritual and moral beacons for their less fortunate compatriots, in practice they could not even identify them. In the final analysis, music did not create unity.

ALEKSANDR SRIABIN: MUSIC AND SALVATION

Scriabin was a prophet.
He was Orpheus on the edge of a new epoch.

—Aleksandr Brianchaninov, 1915

On April 16, 1915, Leonid Leonidovich Sabaneev, music critic, mathematician, and composer, stood with a disconsolate stare at the grave of his friend, Aleksandr Nikolaevich Scriabin, in Moscow's Novodevichii cemetery. At a time of raging war, the most celebrated living composer in Russia had fallen victim not to an enemy bullet on the battlefield but to commonplace blood poisoning at the age of forty-three. For Sabaneev, the death of Scriabin meant the loss of his idol. Over the preceding five years, Sabaneev had spent almost every evening with the composer, listening to him perform new works, discussing Scriabin's mystical worldview, and basking in the light of his creative genius. Sabaneev had also penned critical analyses, impassioned proselytizing essays, and piano reductions of orchestral scores, always to support the same claim: in Scriabin, Russia had found its Orpheus. The sudden death of Russia's claimed musical messiah—who had been in the midst of composing his magnum opus, the *Mystery* (*Mysteria*), intended to bring about the unification of all humanity and, in a final moment of universal ecstasy, to usher in the end of the world—was incomprehensible to Sabaneev. He dreaded the task that lay before him that night. Rather than pen another passionate defense of Scriabin's new compositional style or hint about the significance of the forthcoming *Preparatory Act* (the forerunner of the *Mystery*), he had to write an account of his friend's funeral.¹

Luminaries of Moscow's intellectual, musical, and artistic life filed past Sabaneev's still silhouette to pay their final respects at the grave: Viacheslav Ivanov,

SCRIABIN, ALEKSANDR NIKOLAEVICH (1871–1915)

Moscow composer, philosopher, and mystic. Envisioned bringing about the end of the physical world through the composition of his *Mystery*. Died of blood poisoning in Moscow.

SHAGINIAN, MARIETTA SERGEEVNA (1882–1982)

Poet and passionate promoter of the music of Rachmaninoff. From 1911, an intimate friend of the Medtners, romantically involved with Emilii Medtner. After 1917, an ardent Bolshevik and supporter of Lenin and later Stalin. Died in 1982 after a successful writing career in the USSR.

SOLOV'EV, VLADIMIR SERGEEVICH (1853–1900)

Russian religious philosopher, poet, and mystic. His ideas of artistic theurgy and *vseedin-stvo* (all-unity) as well as his critique of Nietzsche's rejection of Christianity deeply influenced many of the ideas that became popular in the Russian Silver Age.

TRUBETSKOI, EVGENII NIKOLAEVICH (1863–1920)

Russian religious philosopher, publicist, and political actor of noble background. Sought to incorporate the rights of the individual into philosophical and political discussion. Greatly influenced by personal friendship with Vladimir Solov'ev. Founding member of the Constitutional Democratic Party (Kadets) but then quickly became disillusioned with political parties. Sustained an idealized love affair with Margarita Morozova, with whose financial support he founded the *Moscow Weekly* (1906–10) and the religious-philosophical publishing house 'The Way (Put)'. Died in Novorossiisk.

TRUBETSKOI, NIKOLAI SERGEEVICH (1890–1938)

Russian linguist and historian, son of Sergei Trubetskoi, and nephew of Evgenii Trubetskoi. Founding thinker of the émigré Eurasianist movement. Died in Vienna.

TRUBETSKOI, SERGEI NIKOLAEVICH (1862–1905)

Religious philosopher, friend of Scriabin and Vladimir Solov'ev, and brother of Evgenii Trubetskoi. Edited the journal *Questions of Philosophy and Psychology*. Professor of philosophy at Moscow University from 1890. Introduced Scriabin to the Moscow Psychological Society, the main philosophical circle of the day. Supporter of liberal movement in 1905 Revolution. Died in Moscow.

UL'IANOV, NIKOLAI PAVLOVICH (1877–1949)

Russian and later Soviet painter. Acquaintance of Scriabin, Baltrušaitis, and other symbolist figures. Died in Moscow.

 NOTES

Short-form names and titles are used for those works included in the bibliography.

ABBREVIATIONS

BAR	Bakhmeteff Archive
d.	<i>delo</i> (Russian for "file")
ed. khr.	<i>edinita khraneniia</i> (Russian for "storage unit")
f.	<i>fond</i> (Russian for "collection")
GARF	Gosudarstvennyi arkhiv Rossiiskoi Federatsii (State Archive of the Russian Federation)
GM	<i>Golos Moskvy</i> (<i>Voice of Moscow</i>)
GT	<i>Die Geburt der Tragödie</i> (<i>The Birth of Tragedy</i>)
GTsMMK	Gosudarstvennyi tsentral'nyi muzei muzykal'noi kul'tury (State Central Museum of Musical Culture)
IMV	<i>Iuzhnyi muzykal'nyi vestnik</i> (<i>Southern Musical Herald</i>)
IRLI	Institut russkoi literatury, Pushkinskii Dom (Institute of Russian Literature, Pushkin House)
LC	Library of Congress
l, ll.	<i>list, listy</i> (Russian for "page" and "pages")
LRA	Leeds Russian Archive
ME	<i>Moskovskii ezhenedel'nik</i> (<i>Moscow Weekly</i>)
MS	<i>Muzykal'nyi sovremennik</i> (<i>Musical Contemporary</i>)
MV	<i>Moskovskie vedomosti</i> (<i>Moscow Bulletin</i>)
MZ	<i>Muzyka i zhizn'</i> (<i>Music and Life</i>)
NZ	<i>Novoe zveno</i> (<i>New Link</i>)
op.	<i>opis</i> (Russian for "inventory")
RGALI	Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatury i iskusstva (Russian State Archive of Literature and Art)

RCB	Rossiiskaia gosudarstvennaia biblioteka: Otdel rukopisei (Russian State Library: Manuscript Division)
RCIA	Rossiiskii gosudatstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv (Russian State Historical Archive)
RMG	<i>Russkaia muzyka'naia gazeta (Russian Musical Newspaper)</i>
RMO	Russkoe muzykal'noe obshchestvo (Russian Musical Society)
RNB	Rossiiskaia natsional'naia biblioteka: Otdel rukopisei (Russian National Library: Manuscript Division)
RV	<i>Russkie vedomosti (Russian Bulletin)</i>
TD	<i>Trudy i dni (Work and Days)</i>
TSIAM	Tsentral'nyi istoricheskii arkhiv Moskvyy (Central Historical Archive of Moscow)
ZR	<i>Zolotoe runo (The Golden Fleece)</i>

INTRODUCTION

1. Vladimir Rebikov, "Orfei i vakkhanki: Rasskaz," *RMG* no. 1 (January 3, 1910): 6–15, here 13.
2. See Vladimir Rebikov to A. K. Gorskii, RGALI f. 742, op. 1, ed. khr. 1; idem, "V.L. Rebikov o sebe," *RMG* no. 43 (October 25, 1909): 945–951; idem, "Muzykal'nye zapisi chuvstva," *RMG* no. 48 (December 1, 1913): 1097–1100.
3. On the figure of Orpheus in late imperial Russian culture, see Marchenkov, "Orpheus Myth," esp. 126–203; idem, *Orpheus Myth and the Powers of Music*; Mitchell, "In Search of Orpheus."
4. Koptiaev, "Kompozitor-rabochii," *Evterpe*, 8–9. First published in *Teatr i iskusstvo* (June 25, 1906).
5. N. Suvorovskii, "Chaikovskii i muzyka budushchego," *Vesy* no. 8 (August 1904): 10–20.
6. Boris Bugaev, "Protiv muzyki," *Vesy* no. 3 (March 1907): 57–60. For an earlier, more positive assessment of music as the ultimate symbolist art, see Andrei Belyi [Boris Bugaev], "Simvolizm, kak miroponimanie," *Mir iskusstva* no. 4 (1904): 173–196.
7. Marietta Shaginian, "Vospominaniia o S. V. Rakhmaninove," in Apetian, ed., *Vospominaniia o Rakhmaninove II*, 100–174, here 100.
8. Matlaw, "Scriabin and Russian Symbolism," 1. On Scriabin's cultural significance, see also A. Losev, "Mirovozzreniie Skriabina," in *Strast' k dialektike*; I. I. Lapshin, *Zavetnye dumy Skriabina*; Florovsky, *Ways of Russian Theology*, 270–271; Berdiaev, *Smysl tvorchestva*, 220; Gasparov, *Five Operas and a Symphony*, vii–viii.
9. I use the term "classical music" to refer to music that draws upon the western European tradition.
10. Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically*, 468–544; Cauter, *Dancer Defects*, esp. 379–414.
11. Krutov, *Mir Rakhmaninova*, vol. 2, 5–20; "O ville 'Senar' v Shveitsarii," Posol'stvo Rossiiskoi Federatsii v shveitsarskoi konfederatsii, http://www.switzerland.mid.ru/ru/press_2013_15.html, accessed September 6, 2014; Sophia Kishkovsky, "Russia May Seek to Reclaim Rachmaninoff Estate," *New York Times* (November 25, 2013), [Notes to Pages 3–6](http://

</div>
<div data-bbox=)

- artsbeat.blogs.nytimes.com/2013/11/25/russia-may-seek-to-reclaim-rachmaninoff-estate/?ref=music&_r=0#h[PVVVVV], accessed September 6, 2014.
12. Recent scholarship has demonstrated the richness of musical life prior to the career of Mikhail Glinka, often celebrated as the "father of Russian music." See, for instance, Jensen, *Musical Cultures in Seventeenth-Century Russia*; Ritzarev, *Eighteenth-Century Russian Music*. Music did not emerge, however, as an acceptable profession for members of educated Russian society prior to the groundbreaking career of Anton Rubinstein in the mid-nineteenth century. See Loeffler, *Most Musical Nation*, esp. 15–55.
 13. The term was suggested by an article in the periodical *Muzyka*. See Ziegfried Ashkenazi, "Muzyka i Metafizika," *Muzyka* no. 75 (May 5, 1912): 396–402; *Muzyka* no. 76 (May 12, 1912): 412–416; *Muzyka* no. 78 (May 23, 1912): 462–465. In his analysis of the connection between Russian opera and the symbolist literary movement, Simon Morrison employs a similar term. See Morrison, *Russian Opera*, 48.
 14. Musical metaphysics is discussed in greater detail in chapter 1.
 15. Applegate and Potter, *Music and German National Identity*. On the connection between national identity and music, see also Fulcher, *Composer as Intellectual*; Loeffler, *Most Musical Nation*.
 16. *A Life for the Tsar* (1836) and *Ruslan and Liudmila* (1842) were operas by Mikhail Glinka, often pointed to as marking the beginning of Russian national musical style. See, for instance, Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically*, 25–47; Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*, esp. 74–139. On Evgenii Trubetskoi as a liberal philosopher, see Poole, "Religion, War, and Revolution."
 17. Evgenii Trubetskoi, "Staryi i novyi natsional'nyi messianizm," *Russkaia mysl'* no. 3 (March 1912): 82–102, here 82.
 18. Friedrich Nietzsche, *Twilight of the Idols, or How One Philosophizes with a Hammer* (1888).
 19. Nadezhda Briusova, "Lektsii po muzykal'nomu obrazovaniiu," RGALI f. 2009, op. 1, ed. khr. 82, l. 342.
 20. Rosenthal, ed., *Nietzsche in Russia*; idem, *Nietzsche and Soviet Culture*; idem, *New Myth, New World*; Clowes, *Revolution of Moral Culture*; Grillaert, *What the God-seekers Found in Nietzsche*.
 21. A. P. Koptiaev, "Muzykal'noe mirosozertsanie Nitsche," *RMG* no. 18 (1900): 504–507; *RMG* no. 19–20 (1900): 538–539. This publication was based on a lecture given by Aleksandr Koptiaev to the Society of Musical Teachers in St. Petersburg, and had previously appeared in the journal *Ezhemesiachnye sochineniia* no. 2–3 (April 1900): 165–193. *RMG* editor Nikolai Findeizen hired Koptiaev to prepare translations of Wagner essays in 1898, which inspired Koptiaev's philosophical interests in this direction. See N. F. Findeizen to A. P. Koptiaev (June 3, 1898), IRLI f. 566, no. 10; A. P. Koptiaev to N. F. Findeizen, "Muzykal'noe mirosozertsanie Nitsche," RNB op. 4, ed. khr. 3188.
 22. Tolstoi, *What Is Art*; N. Gusev and A. Gol'denveizer, *Lev Tolstoi i muzyka* (Moscow: Muzgiz, 1953), 5, 16; Sabaneev, *Vospominaniia o Rossii*, 122.

23. Belyi to Blok (January 6, 1903) in Orlova, ed., *Aleksandr Blok i Andrei Belyi: Perepiska*, 9.
24. Konstantin Eiges, "Muzyka, kak odna iz vyslkh misticheskikh perezhivanii," ZR no. 6 (1907): 54–57; Eiges, "Osnovnye voprosy muzykal'noi estetiki," in *Stat'i po filosofii muzyki*, 65–94, esp. 90–94; Rebecca Mitchell, "In Search of Orpheus."
25. Emilii Medtner, "Dnevnik, 1901–1905," RGB f. 167.23.10, l. 3.
26. Rebikov, "Orfei i vakkhanki"; A. K. Gorskii, "Poiasnienie k pis'mam kompozitora Rebikova," RGALI f. 742, op. 1, ed. khr. 2; Rebikov to Gorskii (December 14, 1915), RGALI f. 742, op. 1, ed. khr. 1, ll. 1–20b.
27. Nietzsche, *GT*, 105.
28. For a study of the German roots of the Russian musical conservatories and the contemporary debate surrounding their creation, see Ridenour, *Nationalism, Modernism, and Personal Rivalry*; Olkhovsky, *Vladimir Stasov and Russian National Culture*. On the cult of Wagner in Russia, see Bartlett, *Wagner in Russia*; Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal, "Wagner and Wagnerian Ideas in Russia," in Large and Weber, eds., *Wagnerism in European Culture and Politics*; Cozenpud, *Rikhard Vagner i russkaia kultura*; Mitchell, "How Russian Was Wagner?"
29. On nineteenth-century critiques of Russian "imitation" of European cultural production, see Rabow-Edling, *Slavophile Thought and the Politics of Cultural Nationalism*.
30. Margarita Morozova to Evgenii Trubetskoi (1909), RGB f. 171.3.2, ll. 19–280b, esp. 25–250b; 42–420b; 59–600b.
31. Sargeant, "High Anxiety"; Brooks, *When Russia Learned to Read*, 295–299.
32. E. Trubetskoi, "Gde zhe, nakonets, Rossiia?" *ME* no. 24 (September 2, 1906): 1–9.
33. E. Trubetskoi, "Staryi i novyi natsional'nyi messianizm," *Russkaia mysl'* no. 3 (March 1912): 82–102, here 82–83; idem, "Minornye i mazhomye noty," *ME* no. 4 (January 23, 1910): 10–15, here 14.
34. Evtukhov, *Cross and the Sickle*, 8–9.
35. Kaufman Shelemay, "Musical Communities."
36. Applegate and Potter, eds., *Music and German National Identity*.
37. Fishzon, "Confessions of a *Psikhopatka*"; idem, "Operatics of Everyday Life"; idem, *Fandom, Authenticity, and Opera*.
38. Lotman and Uspenskii, *Semiotics of Russian Culture*.
39. Richard Taruskin, "Turania Revisited, with Lourie My Guide," in M6ricz and Morrison, eds., *Funeral Games*, 63–120, here 83.
40. Margarita Morozova, "Vospominaniia Morozovoi: Chast' III," RGALI f. 1956, op. 2, ed. khr. 36. According to widely circulating rumors at the time, Morozova's marriage was far from happy; nevertheless, the death of her husband was a shock that ultimately transformed her life. See Dumova, *Moskovskie metsenaty*, esp. 97–107.
41. On Morozova's dwellings, see Natal'ia Semenova, "Chetyre 'epokhi' odnoi zhizni," *Nashe nasledie* no. 6 (1991): 110–111. Morozova's house on the corner of Smolenskii Boulevard and Glazovskii Alley was sold in 1910 to Konstantin Ushkov, who in turn sold it to Natalia and Serge Koussevitzky. It continued to be used to host musical and cultural events until it was nationalized after the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917. Yuzefovich, *Sergei Kusevitskii*, 123–124.

42. Morozova, "Vospominaniia Morozovoi: Chast' III," RGALI f. 1956, op. 2, ed. khr. 36.
43. "Godovye otchety spisok chlenov 'Obshchestva svobodnoi estetiki,'" RGALI f. 464, op. 2, ed. khr. 9; Viacheslav Karatygin, "Muzyka v Peterburge," *Apollon* no. 6 (March 1910): 14–20, here 20; Evtuhov, *Cross and the Sickle*, 3; Tumanov, *Ona i muzyka, i slovo*; Florovsky, *Ways of Russian Theology*, 276; Belyi, *Mezhdru dvukh revoliutsii*, 218–245; Iliukhina and Shumanova, "Kollektsionery obshchestva 'svobodnaia estetika'"; Burchardi, *Moskauer "Religi6s-Philosophische Vladimir-Solov'ev-Gesellschaft."*
44. Leonid Sabaneev, "V nedrakh muzykal'nogo mira," *GM* no. 4 (January 6, 1911): 4.
45. Shore, *Caviar and Ashes*, 4.
46. Halley, *Mamontov's Private Opera*; West and Petrov, eds., *Merchant Moscow*; Owen, *Capitalism and Politics in Russia*; Rieber, *Merchants and Entrepreneurs in Imperial Russia*.
47. Margarita Morozova, "Vospominaniia o Skriabine," RGALI f. 1956, op. 2, ed. khr. 12; idem, "Vospominaniia o Metnere," RGALI f. 1956, op. 2, ed. khr. 11; Keidan, ed., *Vzyskuiushchie grada*, 19; Halley, *Mamontov's Private Opera*; Dumova, *Moskovskie metsenaty*; Yuzefovich, *Sergei Kusevitskii*, 123–124; Levidou, "Eurasianism in Perspective"; Sabaneev, *Vospominaniia o Rossii*, esp. 101–104, 132–171, 175–181.
48. See, for instance, Bowlt, *Moscow and St. Petersburg, 1900–1920*; idem, "The Moscow Art Market," in Clowes, Kassow, and West, eds., *Between Tsar and People*, 108–130.
49. Anna Medtner to Eric Pren (May 25, 1958), LRA ms. 1377/73.
50. Bowlt, "Moscow Art Market," esp. 116–120.
51. On the "new religious consciousness," see, for instance, Florovskii, *Ways of Russian Theology*; Zernov, *Russian Religious Renaissance*; Rosenthal and Bohachevsky-Chomiak, *Revolution of the Spirit*; Rosenthal, *Dmitrii Merezhkovsky and the Silver Age*; on symbolism, see Pyman, *History of Russian Symbolism*; on the relationship between symbolism and music, see Morrison, *Russian Opera*; on the new philosophical idealism, see Poole, "Neo-Idealist Reception of Kant," 319–343.
52. On the disconnect between Belyi and Scriabin, see Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically*, 317–318.
53. Emilii to Anna Medtner (January 30–31, 1909), RGB f. 167.24.38.
54. On the range of social backgrounds among the late imperial Russian cultural elite, see, for instance, Evtuhov, *Cross and the Sickle*, 12–14; Yuzefovich and Kostalevsky, "Chronicle of a Non-Friendship: Letters of Stravinsky and Koussevitsky," 750–752.
55. Iulii Engel', "Muzyka," *RV* no. 1 (January 1, 1909): 7.
56. On the gendered aspect of musical life in the Russian empire, see Sargeant, *Harmony and Discord*, esp. 141–154.
57. Shaginian, "Vospominaniia o Rakhmatinove," 112–114.
58. Margarita Morozova to Evgenii Trubetskoi (undated letter, 1909), RGB f. 171.3.2, l. 490b.
59. Tumanov, *Ona i muzyka, i slovo*.
60. Emilii to Anna Medtner (January 15, 1909), RGB f. 167.24.38, l. 40b.
61. V. F. Ern to E. D. Ern (March 15, 1915), in Keidan, ed., *Vzyskuiushchie grada*, 625–626.
62. Shaginian, "Vospominaniia o Rakhmaninove," 115–117.

63. Jakim, Kornblatt, and Magnus, eds., *Divine Sophia*; Carlson, "Gnostic Elements in the Cosmogony of Vladimir Solov'ev," in Kornblatt and Gustafson, eds., *Russian Religious Thought*, 49–67.
64. West, *Russian Symbolism*, 64–65.
65. Sabaneev, *Vospominaniia o Skriabine*, 198–199.
66. Loeffler, *Most Musical Nation*; Sargeant, *Harmony and Discord*; Lomtev, *Nemetskie muzykanty v Rossii*.
67. Sargeant, *Harmony and Discord*.
68. Sargeant, "New Class of People"; idem, *Harmony and Discord*, esp. 85–91, 175–217.
69. On Koussevitzky's early career, see Yuzefovich, *Sergei Kusevitskii*, esp. 7–120.
70. Loeffler, *Most Musical Nation*; Sargeant, *Harmony and Discord*.
71. Sargeant, *Harmony and Discord*, 22–52.
72. "Programmy konsertov," RGALI f. 727, op. 1, ed. khr. 38.
73. See for instance V[iacheslav] Karatygin, "Muzykal'naiia khronika Peterburga," *ZR* no. 5 (May 1906): 65–68; Vol'fing [Emilii Medtner], "Muzykal'naiia vesna," *ZR* no. 5 (May 1906): 69–72; Evgenii Braudo, "Muzyka posle Vagnera," *Apollon* no. 1 (October 1909): 54–69; Vl. Derzhanovskii, "Muzyka v Moskve," *Apollon* no. 6 (March 1910): 9–12; B. Ianovskii, "Muzyka v Kieve," *Apollon* no. 6 (March 1910): 12–13; V. Karatygin, "Muzyka v Peterburge," *Apollon* no. 6 (March 1910): 14–20; N[adezhda] Briusova, "Nauka o muzyke, ee istoricheskie puti i sovremennoe sostoiianie," *Vesy* no. 10–11 (1909): 185–211; Vol'fing [Emilii Medtner], "Invektivy na muzykal'nuiu sovremenost'," *TD* no. 2 (March–April 1912): 29–45.
74. RMC, published in St. Petersburg, appeared from 1894 to 1918. The new journals included *Muzyka*, *Muzykal'nyi truzhenik*, *Orkestr*, *Muzyka i zhizn'*, *Muzykal'nyi sovremennik*, *luzhnyi muzykal'nyi vestnik*, *Tserkovnoe penie*, and *Baian*. *Muzykal'nyi truzhenik* (Moscow, 1906–10) and its later incarnation *Orkestr* (1910–12) sought to represent the interests of the average orchestral musician; *Muzyka* (Moscow, 1910–16) and *Muzykal'nyi sovremennik* (Petrograd, 1915–17) emerged as champions of new music; *Muzyka i zhizn'* (Moscow, 1908–12) approached music from a populist viewpoint; *Tserkovnoe penie* (Kiev, 1909; renamed *Staroobriadcheskaia mysl'*, 1910–16) sought to reinvigorate Orthodox *znamennyi* chant tradition.
75. Matvei Presman to Nikolai Findeizen (1899–1914), RNB f. 816, op. 2, ed. khr. 1740; Boris Popov to Nikolai Findeizen (1897–1917), RNB f. 816, op. 2, ed. khr. 1722; Vladimir Derzhanovskii to Nikolai Findeizen (1901–10), RNB f. 816, op. 2, ed. khr. 1344.
76. "Otvety na opublikovannye v RMC voprosy obrashchennye 'K uchiteliam peniia i muzyki,'" RNB f. 816, op. 1, ed. khr. 155–168. The journal most often cited in these responses was *Muzyka i penie*, a journal with a strong pedagogical rather than philosophical orientation.
77. "Ankety slushchatelei kursov s otvetami ob ikh znaniakh v oblasti muzyki," RGALI f. 2009, op. 1, ed. khr. 83, ll. 18–32.
78. Music critic Leonid Sabaneev estimated that the entire "musical world" of late imperial Russia, including both active and "passive" musicians (i.e., audience members) consisted of "less than 10,000." While this number can hardly be accepted uncriti-

- cally, it demonstrates an awareness of the intimate nature of musical life at this time. See Sabaneev, *Vospominaniia o Rossii*, 103.
79. Rieber, "Sedimentary Society," 353–376; Ascher, *Revolution of 1905: Russia in Disarray*; idem, *Revolution of 1905: Authority Restored*; Frank and Steinberg, eds., *Cultures in Flux*.
80. Kornblatt and Gustafson, eds., *Russian Religious Thought*; Walicki, *History of Russian Thought*, 371–405; Gaidenko, *Vladimir Solov'ev i filosofiiia Serebrianaogo veka*; Evtuhov, *Cross and the Sickle*.
81. In Kant's mature critical philosophy, experience was in fact the product of synthesis. In late imperial Russia, however, Kantian philosophy was often blamed for introducing this division. See Meerson, "Put' against Logos."
82. Aleksandr Blok, "The Decline of Humanism," in *Spirit of Music*, 56–70, here 62–63.
83. For discussion of the term "middling groups," see Clowes, Kassow, and James West, eds., *Between Tsar and People*, 3–14.
84. For scholarship on the close connection between artistic phenomena, philosophical ideas, politics, and social life, see McGrath, *Dionysian Art and Populist Politics in Austria*; Schorske, *Fin-de-Siècle Vienna*; Shattuck, *Banquet Years*; Eksteins, *Rites of Spring*; Kern, *Culture of Time and Space*.
85. Evtuhov, *Cross and the Sickle*, esp. 1–20.
86. Stites, *Revolutionary Dreams*.
87. Steinberg, *Petersburg Fin de Siècle*, 268.
88. *Ibid.*, 3; Matei Calinescu, *Five Faces of Modernity: Modernism, Avant-Garde, Decadence, Kitsch, Postmodernism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1987); Marshall Berman, *All That Is Solid Melts into Air: The Experience of Modernity* (Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin Books, 1982).
89. On the binary aspect of late imperial Russian thought and culture, see Steinberg, *Petersburg Fin de Siècle*.
90. Adamenko, *Neo-Mythologism in Music*.
91. This connection between musical harmony and social harmony can be traced back to ancient Greece. See Bundrick, *Music and Image in Classical Athens*, 11–12, 140–196.
92. Fink, *Bergson and Russian Modernism*.
93. This emphasis on experience rather than logical argumentation has a lengthy history in Eastern Orthodox thought, which stressed the "experience of Christocentric communion with God." See Sergey Horujy, "Slavophiles, Westernizers, and the Birth of Russian Philosophical Humanism," in Hamburg and Poole, eds., *History of Russian Philosophy*, 27–51, here 28–30. Though Husserl's writings found less resonance in Russia than Nietzsche's, he was nevertheless reinterpreted through a similarly religious philosophical lens. See Steve Cassedy, "Gustav Shpet and Phenomenology in an Orthodox Key," *Studies in East European Thought*, 49, no. 2 (June 1997): 81–108.
94. Leonid Sabaneev, "Muzykal'nye besedy: Opiat ob evoliutsii," *Muzyka* no. 98 (October 6, 1912): 846–850, here 850.
95. Leonid Sabaneev, "Muzykal'nye besedy: Opiat ob evoliutsii, emotsii i prochem," *Muzyka* no. 101 (October 27, 1912): 898–901, here 899.
96. Steinberg, "Melancholy and Modernity," 815–816.

97. See, for instance, Richardson, *Zolotoe Runo and Russian Modernism*; Sargeant, *Harmony and Discord*; Rosenthal, ed., *Nietzsche in Russia*; Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically*; Morrison, *Russian Opera*; Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*; Bird, *Russian Prospero*; West, *Russian Symbolism*; Wachtel, *Russian Symbolism and Literary Tradition*.
98. Celia Applegate, "Introduction: Music among the Historians," 332. Applegate borrows the term from Dror Wahrman, *The Making of the Modern Self: Identity and Culture in Eighteenth-Century England* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006), but the application to music's role in history is her own.
99. Iu. V. Keldysh, "Muzykal'naiia polemika," in Alekseev, Barabash, Ginzburg, Kalashnikov, Sidorov, Sternin, and Shvidkovskii, eds., *Russkaia khudozhestvennaia kul'tura*, 288–309. The only time period rivaling this (in Keldysh's view) was the 1860s and the discourse surrounding the founding of the conservatories. Until recently, this latter time period has received greater attention in scholarly literature.
100. A complete listing of sources used appears in the bibliography.
101. Fulcher, *Composer as Intellectual*; Fishzon, *Fandom, Authenticity, and Opera*; Loeffler, *Most Musical Nation*; Applegate and Potter, *Music and German National Identity*; Sargeant, *Harmony and Discord*.
102. In 1908 *Russkaia muzykal'naiia gazeta* charged twenty kopecks per weekly issue; *Muzyka* charged fifteen kopecks in 1911. While such prices would theoretically have placed these publications within the reach of workers, there is little evidence that this happened in practice. Symbolist journals, in which many of the music articles mentioned here appeared, also demonstrated a low readership, and a much higher cost per issue. In 1906 *Zolotoe runo* had 934 subscribers and charged fifteen rubles for an annual subscription, while *Vesy* recorded 845 subscribers. See Read, *Religion and Revolution in Russia*, 7.
103. A 1913 survey of readers of the Moscow-based "professors' newspaper" *Russkie vedomosti* suggested that, while 53 percent of respondents claimed to read the paper from start to finish, for those who admitted to omitting certain sections of the paper, entries on music and theater were among the most commonly ignored. See Balmuth, *Russian Bulletin, 1863–1917*, 324. Such data suggest that the larger reading population interacted with the musical press in only a limited manner; only those actively involved in musical or artistic life tended to read newspaper coverage.
104. V. G. Karatygin, "Skriabin i molodye moskovskie kompozitory," *Apollon* no. 5 (May 1912): 25–38; Iulii Engel', "Avtorskii kontsert N. Metnera," *RV* no. 274 (November 9, 1906); idem, "Rakhmaninov i Skriabin," *RV* no. 90 (April 21, 1909); idem, "Taneev, Rakhmaninov, Skriabin," *RV* no. 276 (November 30, 1910); idem, "Muzyka N. Metnera," *RV* no. 57 (March 11, 1911); idem, "Kontsert A. N. Skriabina," *RV* no. 41 (February 19, 1913); Andrei Belyi, "Nikolai Metner," in *Arabeski*, 372–375. For an earlier scholarly comparison of Medtner and Scriabin within the context of late imperial Russia, see Levaia, "Paradoksy okhranitel'stva v russkom simvolizme," in *Skriabin i khudozhestvennye iskaniia XX veka*, 63–77.

CHAPTER 1. MUSICAL METAPHYSICS IN LATE IMPERIAL RUSSIA

1. Ivan Abramushkin to Nikolai Findeizen (January 11, 1913), RNB f. 816, op. 1, ed. khr. 155, l. 8. Abramushkin's quote is taken directly from Nietzsche's *Birth of Tragedy*. See Nietzsche, *GT*, 22.
2. "Okolo dumy: Premia o muzyke," *RV* no. 43 (February 21, 1914): 3.
3. Fulcher, "Introduction: Defining the New Cultural History of Music, Its Origins, Methodologies, and Lines of Inquiry," in Fulcher, ed., *Oxford Handbook of the New Cultural History of Music*, 3–16.
4. Rosenthal, ed., *Nietzsche in Russia*; idem, *Nietzsche and Soviet Culture*; idem, *New Myth, New World*; Clowes, *Revolution of Moral Culture*; Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically*; Morrison, *Russian Opera*; Haldey, *Mamontov's Private Opera*, 107.
5. On the different ways in which ideas were read and interpreted in imperial Russia, see Brooks, *When Russia Learned to Read*.
6. Rosenthal, "Introduction," in *Nietzsche in Russia*, 3–48, here 9–10, 38.
7. My understanding of the term "translation" is based on recent scholarship on cultural translation, which examines the adaptation of a foreign text to new contexts. See Lawrence Venuti, ed., *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology* (London: Routledge, 1992); Peter Burke and R. Po-chia Hsia, eds., *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007); Anuradha Dingwaney and Carol Maier, eds., *Between Languages and Cultures: Translation and Cross-Cultural Texts* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1995).
8. Schopenhauer, *World as Will and Representation*, 1:262.
9. *Ibid.*, 1:257.
10. For earlier interpretations of music that Schopenhauer was responding to, see Kant, *Critique of Judgement*, 189–195; Hegel, *Fine Art*, 394.
11. Schopenhauer, *World as Will and Representation*, 1:262.
12. Dolson, "Influence of Schopenhauer upon Friedrich Nietzsche." For a discussion of the triumph of music as the "ultimate" art form in German thought, see Bowie, *Aesthetics and Subjectivity*; Dahlhaus, *Between Romanticism and Modernism*, 19–39, here 33–37.
13. This metaphysical view of music based on German Romanticism was later rejected by Nietzsche and served as a central theme in his writings from *Human, All Too Human* through *The Gay Science*. See Liébert, *Nietzsche and Music*, 156–163.
14. Nietzsche, *GT*, 19–25.
15. Nietzsche, *GT*, 37; Benson, *Pious Nietzsche*, 170; Higgins, "Nietzsche on Music," 663–672; Sarah Kofman, "Metaphor, Symbol, Metamorphoses," in Allison, ed., *New Nietzsche*, 201–206.
16. Nietzsche, *GT*, 76–77.
17. *Ibid.*, 78.
18. *Ibid.*, 79; 95–98.
19. On Schopenhauer's reception in particular, see, for instance, Saminsky, *Physics and Metaphysics of Music*, 1; Prokof'ev, *Dnevnik, 1907–1918*, 639; Gol'denveizer, *Dnevnik: Pervaiia tetrad*, 55.

20. V. Solov'ev, "Obshchii smysl iskusstva," in *Filosofia iskusstva i literaturnaia kritika*, 73–89, here 84.
21. Viacheslav Ivanov, "Simvolika esteticheskikh nachal," in *Po zvezdam*, 21–32, here 31; idem, "Poet i chern," in *Po zvezdam*, 33–42, here 34. For Nietzsche's influence on Ivanov, see Bartlett, *Wagner in Russia*, 118, 121; Morrison, *Russian Opera*, 5. For broader examinations of their aesthetic views, see West, *Russian Symbolism*; Wachtel, *Russian Symbolism and Literary Tradition*.
22. Ivanov, "Nitsse i dionis," in *Po zvezdam*, 1–20, here 5. On this reference to Socrates being called to be a musician, see also Blok, *Spirit of Music*. The reference is to Plato's *Apology*, in which Socrates describes a dream bidding him to study music shortly before his death.
23. Ivanov, "Simvoliki esteticheskikh nachal," 31; idem, "Nitsse i dionis," 5.
24. Belyi, "Simvolizm, kak miroponimanie"; Levaia, "Skriabin i simvolizm: vzgliad na iskusstvo," in *Skriabin i khudozhestvennye iskaniiia XX veka*, 9.
25. Belyi, "Simvolizm kak miroponimaniia," 176.
26. Blok composed the letter after reading Bely's 1903 article "Formy iskusstva," in which music is described in almost religious terminology. See Orlova, ed., *Aleksandr Blok i Andrei Belyi: Perepiska*, 3–4.
27. Koptiaev, "Muzykal'noe mirosozertsanie Nitsse," 103, 106; idem, "Skriabin (iz svobodnykh muzykal'nykh besed)," *Eyterpe*, 100–109, here 103; idem, "Kniga ob 'intimnoi muzyki,'" *Eyterpe*, 1–8, here 1.
28. Eiges, "Muzyka i estetika," ZR no. 5 (May 1906): 60–62; idem, "Osnovnye voprosy muzykal'noi estetiki," 68–69.
29. Eiges, "Osnovnye antonomiia muzykal'noi estetiki," ZR no. 11–12 (November–December 1906): 122–125, here 125.
30. Eiges, "Muzyka i estetika," 60–62.
31. Eiges, "Krasota v iskusstve," in *Stat'i po filosofii muzyki*, 45–64, here 59.
32. Kandinsky, *Concerning the Spiritual in Art and Painting in Particular*, 40.
33. Belyi, "Realiora," *Vesy* no. 5 (May 1908): 59–62. For a comparison between this concept and Scriabin's *Preparatory Act*, see Morrison, *Russian Opera*, 197.
34. On the Russian emphasis on Nietzsche's unifying message in *The Birth of Tragedy*, see Rosenthal, "Losev's Development of Themes from Nietzsche's *The Birth of Tragedy*," 187–191.
35. Nietzsche, *CT*, 19–22.
36. *Ibid.*, 63–69.
37. *Ibid.*, 52.
38. *Ibid.*, 43.
39. *Ibid.*, 107.
40. Solov'ev, "Krasota v prirode," 38; Irina Paperno, "The Meaning of Art: Symbolist Theories," in Paperno, ed., *Creating Life*, 13–23, here 13.
41. Paperno, "Meaning of Art," 14. The citation is from Solov'ev, "Obshchii smysl iskusstva."
42. Solov'ev, "Sud'ba Pushkina," in *Filosofia iskusstva i literaturnaia kritika*, 271–300, here 282.

43. Gaidenko, *Vladimir Solov'ev i filosofia serebriannogo veka*, 80.
44. On Solov'ev's concept of *bogochelovechestvo*, see Richard Gustafson, "Soloviev's Doctrine of Salvation," in Kornbatt and Gustafson, eds., *Russian Religious Thought*.
45. See, for instance, Solov'ev, "Obshchii smysl iskusstva," 79.
46. Paperno, "Meaning of Art," 17.
47. Solov'ev, "Obshchii smysl iskusstva," 89; Morrison, *Russian Opera*, 2; Ivanov, "Kop'e afiny," in *Po zvezdam*, 43–53.
48. Berdiaev, *Smysl tvorchestva*, 219.
49. Fedor Akimenko, "Aforizmy khudozhnika," RMC no. 47 (November 27, 1909): 1091–1094, here 1093; idem, "Zhizn' v iskusstve," RMC no. 44 (October 31, 1910): 961–964, here 961.
50. Paperno, "Meaning of Art," 17. Citation from Belyi, "Bal'mont," in *Lug zelenyi* (Moscow: Al'tsiona, 1910), 230.
51. B. B. Asaf'ev, "Dnevnik, 1915–1922," RGALI f. 2658, op. 1, ed. khr. 439, l. 22.
52. B. B. Asaf'ev, V. V. Gippus, and P. P. Suvchinskii, "Prospekt izdaniia zhurnala 'Muzykal'naia mysl'" (April 28, 1917), RGALI f. 2658, op. 1, ed. khr. 220.
53. Ivanov, "Simvolika esteticheskikh nachal," 27; Paperno, "Meaning of Art," 17–18.
54. Robert Bird, "Introduction," in Jakim and Bird, eds., *On Spiritual Unity: A Slavophile Reader*, 7–25, here 15; Sergey Horujy, "Slavophiles, Westernizers, and the Birth of Russian Philosophical Humanism," in Hamburg and Poole, eds., *History of Russian Philosophy*, 27–51, here 47–48.
55. Bird, "Introduction," 7–8, 15.
56. Horujy, "Birth of Russian Philosophical Humanism," 46–48; Bird, "Introduction," 15; Zernov, *Moscow, the Third Rome*.
57. Quoted in Peter K. Christoff, *K. S. Aksakov: A Study in Ideas* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1982), 368.
58. Gaidenko, *Vladimir Solov'ev i filosofia serebriannogo veka*, 82.
59. A. A. Gritsanov, ed., *Noveishii filosofskii slovar* (Minsk: Knizhnyi Dom, 2001); Margarita Morozova, "Vypiski iz raznykh knig i zapisi," RGB f. 171.3.15, l. 12.
60. Mannherz, *Modern Occultism*, 98–102, esp. 101.
61. "Homophonic" refers to a single melodic line, "polyphonic" to multiple melodic lines. "Heterophonic," in contrast, describes a style in which multiple voices sing a single basic melodic line but introduce variations into their own part. Heterophonic singing is a typical attribute of many kinds of folk singing.
62. Pavel Florenskii, "U vodorazdelov mysli," in *Imena*, 7–313, here 18–19.
63. *Ibid.*, 19.
64. Rosenthal, "Transmutation of the Symbolist Ethos: Mystical Anarchism and the Revolution of 1905," 608–627.
65. Belyi, "Pis'mo v redaktsiiu," *Pereval* no. 10 (August 1907): 58–60, here 59.
66. Ivanov, *Po zvezdam*; Blok, *Spirit of Music*.
67. Bundrick, *Music and Image in Classical Athens*; Baker, *Imposing Harmony*.
68. A. Maslov, "Narodnaia konservatoriia: Muzykal'no-teoreticheskii obshcheobrazovatel'nyi kurs. Stat'i i lektsiia," attachment to MZ no. 1 (January 9, 1909): 3.
69. "Zhizn' i muzykal'noe iskusstvo," MZ no. 1 (February 10, 1908): 1–2, here 1.

70. Ibid.; A. Maslov, "Zadachi narodnykh konservatorii," *Muzykal'nyi truzhenik* no. 17 (May 1, 1907): 3–5; Pr. Neelov, "Rasprostranenie muzyki," *Muzykal'nyi truzhenik* no. 19 (1908): 4–5; Fr. V. Lebedev, [untitled], *Baian* no. 1 (January 28, 1907): 2–4; Neelov, "Penie svetskogo kharaktera, kak odna iz funktsii deiatel'nosti narodnykh khorov," *Baian* no. 4–5 (1907): 7–10; N. Ianchuk, "Muzyka i zhizn," *MZ* no. 1 (February 10, 1908), 2–5; Koptiaev, "Muzykal'nyi biurokratizm i kompozitory," in *Evterpe*, 13–17.
71. Koptiaev, "Kompozitor-rabochii," 8–12; idem, "Russkii krest'ianskii orkestr," *Evterpe*, 45–48, first published in *Sankt Peterburgskie vedomosti* (September 2, 1905); idem, "Sud'ba khora," *K muzykal'nomu idealu*, 210–211, first published in *Khorovoe i regentskoe delo* (October 1909).
72. *Otzyvy eparkhial'nykh arkhiereev po voprosam o tserkovnoi reforme*, vol. 2 (St. Petersburg, 1906), 20.
73. "Izvestiia i zametki: Iz eparkhial'noi pečhati," *Tserkovnye vedomosti* no. 5 (1905): 201–202; Freeze, "Pious Folk," 337. On the exclusion of Russian Orthodox congregations from singing, see Norden, "Brief Study of the Russian Liturgy and Its Music," 426–450.
74. E. Trubetskoi, "Minornye i mazhorne noty," *ME* no. 4 (January 23, 1910): 10–15, here 14. For Trubetskoi's discussion of patriotism and "narrow nationalism" in contemporary Russian political life, see, for instance, "Gde zhe, nakonets, Rossiia?," *ME* no. 24 (September 2, 1906): 1–9; idem, "K voprosu o ravnopravii," *ME* no. 35 (November 18, 1906): 5–8; idem, "Patriotizm i soiuz 17 oktiabra," *ME* no. 38 (December 9, 1906): 7–13; idem, "Ideiniia osnovy partii 'mirnogo obnoveniia,'" *ME* no. 41 (December 30, 1906): 5–9.
75. V. Petrovo-Solovovo, "Muzyka v ee obshchestvennom znachenii (Iubileinaia rech na prazdnovanii 25-letii Tambovskogo otdeleniia IRMO)," *ME* no. 11 (March 17, 1907): 23–36, here 27–28.
76. S. Kolliarevskii, "Shopin," *ME* no. 9 (February 27, 1910): 5–8, here 7–8.
77. Tumanov, *Ona i muzyka, i slovo*.
78. "Dom pesni," *Biulleten 'Doma Pesni'* no. 1 (1912–13): 3–5, here 5.
79. *Biulleten 'Doma Pesni'* no. 1 (1912–13), 7.
80. "K nashem slushateliam," *Biulleten 'Doma Pesni'* no. 2 (1912–13): 3–5.
81. Ibid. Approximately 250 people who wished to attend the 1912 season were without tickets.
82. "Dom pesni," *Biulleten 'Doma Pesni'* no. 1, 5.
83. See the membership lists included in *Biulleten 'Doma Pesni'* no. 1 (1912–13): 39; no. 7 (1912–13): 26–28.
84. Boris Popov, "Pis'ma o muzyke: Noiabr'skiiia rozy," *Pereval* no. 2 (December 1906): 58–61.
85. Vol'fing [Emilii Medtner], *Modernizm i muzyka*, esp. 87–122.
86. Loeffler, *Most Musical Nation*, esp. 104–110.
87. "Po povodu kontserta 18-go dekabria: Narodnosti," *Biulleten 'Doma pesni'* no. 14 (1914): 7–9.
88. Hoy, *Time of Our Lives*, 93.

89. Koselleck, *Futures Past*, esp. 93–114. See also Steinberg, *Petersburg Fin de Siècle*, esp. 5–6.
90. Kern, *Culture of Time and Space*, esp. 10–35; Williams, "Russian Revolution and the End of Time."
91. Husserl, *On the Phenomenology of the Consciousness of Internal Time*, 21–27.
92. Fink, *Bergson and Russian Modernism*, 3–8; Levidou, "Artist-Genius in Petr Suvchinskii's Eurasianist Philosophy of History," 615; Bergson, *Time and Free Will*, 100; idem, *Creative Evolution*, 67; Curtis, "Bergson and Russian Formalism," 109–121.
93. See S. Volkov and R. Redko, "A. Blok i nekotorye muzykal'no-esteticheskie problemy ego vremeni," in Elik, ed., *Blok i muzyka*, 85–114; Rosenthal, "The Spirit of Music in Russian Symbolism"; Blok, "Decline of Humanism," in *Spirit of Music*, 56–70; Medvedova, ed., *Zapisnye knizhki Aleksandra Bloka*, 162.
94. Blok, "Decline of Humanism," 61.
95. Levidou, "Artist-Genius," 616; Trubetskoi, *Smysl zhizni*, 13–15; Fink, *Bergson and Russian Modernism*, esp. 27–41.
96. Nadezhda Briusova, "Dva puti muzykal'noi mysli: Shopen i Skriabin," in Igor Glebov and P. P. Suvchinskii, eds., *Melos: Kniga pervaiia* (St. Petersburg, 1917), 73–77.
97. This bears certain similarities to the "messianic time" discussed by Walter Benjamin. In his "Theses on the Philosophy of History," Benjamin contrasted "historicism" (based upon the Enlightenment idea of progress and undifferentiated, homogenous time) and "messianic time" (the "here and now," an objective break with the linear, progressive image of time in favor of the experience of historical significance in the moment). See Benjamin, *Illuminations*, 253–264; Löwy, *Fire Alarm*. On conflicting visions of "messianic time" in the Russian context, see Williams, "Russian Revolution and the End of Time."
98. Matich, *Erotic Utopia*; Sargeant, *Harmony and Discord*; Beer, *Renovating Russia*; Pick, *Faces of Degeneration*; Halley, *Mamontov's Private Opera*. For a primary source concerned with this potential "decline," see Tolstoy, *Chto takoe iskusstvo*.
99. Evgenii Braudo, "Muzyka posle Vagnera," *Apollon* no. 1 (October 1909): 54–69, here 54. See also Koptiaev, "Kompozitor-rabochii," 8. Similar interpretations were offered of the impact of the actress Vera Kommissarzhevskaiia, who expressed the "new moods" of "modern life." See Steinberg, "Melancholy and Modernity," 818.
100. Boris Shletser, "Konsonans i dissonans," *Apollon* no. 1 (January 1911): 54–61, here 57–60. See also Leonid Sabaneev, "Novye puti muzykal'nogo tvorchestva," *Muzyka* no. 54 (December 12, 1911): 1210–1214; idem, "Muzykal'nye besedy: Modernizm," *Muzyka* no. 72 (April 14, 1912): 334–337; idem, "Muzykal'nye besedy: Opiat ob evoliutsii, emotsii i prochem," *Muzyka* no. 101 (October 27, 1912): 898–901; idem, "Evoliutsiia garmonicheskogo sozertsaniia," *MS* no. 2 (1915): 18–30.
101. Briusova, "Shopen i Skriabin," 76.
102. M. N. Lobanova, "'Ekstaz i bezumie': Osobennosti dionisiiskogo mirovospriiatiiia A. N. Skriabina," in Isupov, ed., *Filosofia, Literatura, Muzyka*, 398–417, here 410–411; Uspenskii, *Vnutrennii krug*. For Uspenskii's thoughts on Scriabin, see "Mistiko-filosofskii otdel: Po povodu smerti A. N. Skriabina," *Novoe zveno* no. 18 (May 9, 1915): 10–12.

103. See, for instance, Viacheslav Karatygin, "Molodye russkie kompozitory," *Apollon* no. 12 (December 1910): 37-48; idem, "Skriabin i molodye moskovskie kompozitory," *Apollon* no. 5 (May 1912): 25-38.
104. "Zhizn' i muzykal'noe iskusstvo," *MZ* no. 1 (February 10, 1908): 1-2, here 1.
105. Aleksandr Maslov to Nikolai Findeizen (January 9, 1906), RNB f. 816, op. 2, ed. khr. 1589, l. 34.
106. On Emilii Medtner's philosophical interpretation of music, see chapter 3.
107. The term "genius" has been problematized by music scholars in recent years. See De-Nora, *Beethoven and the Construction of Genius*; Kivy, *Possessor and the Possessed*.
108. Nietzsche, *GT*, 34.
109. *Ibid.*, 72.
110. *Ibid.*, 37.
111. *Ibid.*, 33-34. It was on this point that he challenged Schopenhauer, who argued that the lyricist or singer inevitably combined will-less knowing and subjective desire in their song, *Ibid.*, 31-33.
112. *Ibid.*, 34.
113. The quote is from Ivanov's diary. See Wachtel, *Russian Symbolism*, 149; Belyi, "Pesn' zhizni," in *Arabeski*, 58.
114. For an overview of the reception of the figure of Orpheus in Russia, see Gerver, *Muzyka i muzykal'naiia mifologiya*, 30-52; Marchenko, "Orpheus Myth," esp. 126-203. While the authors discuss the image of Orpheus primarily in relation to Scriabin and Rimsky-Korsakov, this figure was much more widely used. On the Greek concept of *mousike*, see Bundrick, *Music and Image in Classical Athens*, 10, 13-102.
115. Koptiaev, "Muzykal'noe mirosozertsanie Nitsshe," 104; Koptiaev, "'Skriabin' (iz svobodnykh muzykal'nykh besed)," 108.
116. Braudo, "Muzyka posle Vagnera."
117. Ivanov, "Sporady," in *Po zvezdam*, 338.
118. Ivanov, "Poet i chem," 37. See also Bartlett, *Wagner in Russia*, 125.
119. Ivanov, "O Dionise orficheskim," *Russkaia mys'l* no. 11 (November 1913): 70-98.
120. Emilii Medtner to Viacheslav Ivanov (January 11, 1911), RGB f. 109.29.97, l. 2.
121. [Unnamed sketch], *RMG* no. 1 (January 1, 1906): 8; Rebikov, "Orfei i vakhanki," 6. For a sampling of other appearances of the image in 1906, see also *RMG* no. 13 (March 26, 1906): 333; no. 16 (April 16, 1906): 393; no. 38 (September 17, 1906): 801; no. 40 (October 1, 1906): 1; no. 43 (October 23, 1906): 974; no. 49 (December 3, 1906): 1153.
122. Quoted in Marchenkov, "Orpheus Myth," 163.
123. Belyi, "Simvolizm, kak miroponimanie," 236.
124. Quoted in Rosenthal, *New Myth, New World*, 60-63. Berdiaev's central work dealing with creativity and genius was *The Meaning of the Creative Act (Smysl tvorchestva: Opyt opravdaniia cheloveka)*, written 1911-14.
125. Rebikov, "Zametki na religioznye temy, vypiski," *GT:MMK* f. 68, no. 101; S. A. Naidenov, "Vospominaniia o kompozitore V. I. Rebikove," *RGALI* f. 1117, op. 1, ed. khr. 17, ll. 1-2; Vladimir Rebikov to Aleksandr Gorskii (undated, fall 1916), *RGALI* f. 742, op. 1, ed. khr. 1, l. 23.

126. Vladimir Rebikov to Stepan Smolenskii (undated, 1898-1902), *RGIA* f. 1119, op. 1, no. 158, l. 22.
127. See, for instance, *Muzyka* no. 220 (April 26, 1915).
128. Solov'ev, "Sud'ba Pushkina," 275-276.
129. Tolstoy, *Chto takoe iskusstvo*; N. Gusev and A. Gol'denveizer, *Lev Tolstoi i muzyka*, 19.
130. On the influence of Solov'ev, see Eiges, "Krasota v iskusstve," 61-63; idem, "Muzyka, kak odno iz vyshikh misticheskikh perezhivanii," 54; idem, "Muzyka i estetika," 60.
131. Eiges, "Muzyka, kak odna iz vyshikh misticheskikh perezhivanii," 54; idem, "Osnovnye voprosy muzykal'noi estetiki," 91-94; idem, "Muzyka i estetika," 60-62.
132. Eiges, "Osnovnye voprosy muzykal'noi estetiki," 91-92; idem, "Muzyka i estetika," 60-62; idem, "Krasota v iskusstve," 59; idem, "Muzyka, kak odna iz vyshikh misticheskikh perezhivanii," 57.
133. Ivanov, "Vagner i dionisovo deistvo," in *Po zvezdam*, 65-69, here 65.
134. Ivanov, "Nitshe i Dionis," 6-7; Rosenthal, "Losev's Development of Themes from Nietzsche's *The Birth of Tragedy*," 190.
135. See, for instance, Mizgir [Boris Popov], "Pis'ma o muzyke: 'O komicheskoi opery,'" *Pereval* no. 1 (1906): 42-46; Popov, "Vechernye ogni: Pis'mo o muzyke," *Pereval* no. 10 (August 1907): 48-50; Vol'fing, "Muzykal'naiia vesna," 69; Braudo, "Muzyka posle Vagnera," 54-69.
136. Margarita Morozova to Evgenii Trubetskoi (August 20, 1909), *RGB* f. 171.3.2, ll. 19-28, 42.
137. For an analysis of Wagner's symbolic role in the final years of the Russian Empire, see Mitchell, "How Russian Was Wagner?"
138. Mizgir, "Pis'ma o muzyke."
139. Boris Popov, "V. Rebikov: Noveye sochineniia dlia fortepiano v 2 ruki, op. 35 'Sredi nikh,' op. 36 'Skazka o printsesse i korole liagushek,'" *Pereval* no. 8-9 (June-July 1907): 106-107.
140. *Ibid.*
141. Boris Popov, "Vechernye ogni: Pis'ma o muzyke," *Pereval* no. 10 (August 1907): 48-50. Several years later, Aleksandr Gorskii once again overturned Popov's analysis, arguing that it was Scriabin, rather than Rebikov, who had proven to be trapped in his own individualistic dreams. A. Gorskii, "Okonchatel'noe deistvie," *IMV* no. 7-8 (April 1916): 35-38; idem, "Rebikov," *IMV* no. 15-16 (November 1916): 100-104.
142. Though English-language scholarship has traditionally rendered Scriabin's *Misteriia* as *Mysterium*, I prefer to use *Mystery*, which demonstrates its links to broader social trends of the time. Scriabin's relationship to musical metaphysics is explored in depth in chapter 2.
143. Ivanov, *Dionis i pradionisistvo*.
144. Bird, *Prospero*, esp. 91-92; Morrison, *Russian Opera*, 193.
145. Belyi, "Misteriia," in *Arabeski*, 141-142.
146. Benjamin, *Illuminations*, 77-78. See also Bird, *Prospero*, 92; Von Geldern, *Bolshevik Festivals*, esp. 47-48.
147. This was a departure from traditional Orthodox ritual, which banned instruments

- from worship, but it was a natural extension of the cult surrounding the art of music that emerged in Russia at this time.
148. Vladimir Botsianovskii, "Ugeniev," *Teatr i iskusstvo* no. 22 (1909): 389–392.
149. "Zamiatia v 'Dome Pesni,'" *Biulleten 'Doma Pesni'* no. 1 (1912–13): 37–41; "Rama," *Biulleten 'Doma Pesni'* no. 2 (1912–13): 23–24. The French text employed had been published in a small run in 1903 in Paris.
150. "Rama," 23–24.
151. *Biulleten 'Doma pesni'* no. 3 (1912–13): 45.
152. "Prepodavanie v 'Dome Pesni,'" *Biulleten 'Doma Pesni'* no. 15 (1914–15): 16.
153. Belyi, "Misteriia," 142; Mitchell, "How Russian Was Wagner?"
154. Durylin, *Vagner i Rossiia*, 16.
155. *Ibid.*, 25.
156. See, for instance, Sergei Bulgakov to Sergei Durylin (May 23, 1913), RGALI f. 2980, op. 1, ed. khr. 452, ll. 9–100b; B. P. [Boris Popov], review of Durylin's *Vagner i Rossiia*, *Muzyka* no. 187 (June 21, 1914): 417–418; Morrison, *Russian Opera*, 115–183; Margarita Morozova to Evgenii Trubetskoi (undated, 1916–1917), RGB 171.3.8, ll. 41–42.
157. Vladimir Rebikov to Aleksandr Gorskii (December 14, 1915), RGALI f. 742, op. 1, ed. khr. 1, ll. 10b–2. See also "Pis'mo kompozitora V. Rebikova o 'drame dukha,'" *IMV* no. 1–2 (1916): 10.
158. Rebikov to Gorskii (December 14, 1915), l. 2.
159. A. Gorskii, "Rebikov," *IMV* no. 15–16 (November 1916): 100–104; *idem*, "Rebikov," *IMV* no. 17–18 (December 1916): 115–120.
160. Rebikov's insistence on music's Orphic ability to directly awaken specific emotions in an audience was thus connected with mystical insight—by awakening new emotions, an audience would be transfigured by previously unimagined experiences and ultimately lifted to a new level of spiritual understanding. See, for instance, Rebikov, "V. I. Rebikov o sebe," *RMG* no. 43 (October 25, 1909): 945–951; Gr[igori]i Prokof'ev, "Muzyka chistoi emotsii (Po povodu 'vechera nastroenii' iz proizvedenii V. Rebikova)," *RMG* no. 5 (January 31, 1910): 136–141.
161. RGALI f. 2099, op. 1, ed. khr. 323, l. 1; RGALI f. 2099, op. 1, ed. khr. 150, l. 3.
162. RGALI f. 2099, op. 1, ed. khr. 150, l. 5, 7; RGALI f. 2099, op. 1, ed. khr. 323, l. 1; RGALI f. 2099, op. 1, ed. khr. 323; TSIAM f. 179, op. 21, ed. khr. 3397, ll. 59, 118–120; TSIAM f. 179, op. 21, ed. khr. 2708; Iulii Engel', "Narodnaia konservatoriia," *RV* no. 122 (May 7, 1906), in Kunina, ed., *Iu. D. Engel': Glazami sovremennika*, 166–168; Ivenina, *Kul'turno-prosvetitel'nye organizatsii*, 168–170. Central figures in the People's Conservatory movement included A. A. Krein, Aleksandr Medtner, A. Gol'denveizer, A. Maslov, N. Briusova, B. Iavorskii, F. Akimenko, Iu. Engel', N. Ianchuk, E. Lineva, S. Smolenskii, and P. Karasev.
163. N. Ia. Briusova, "Muzyka dlia naroda," "Nasha narodnaia konservatoriia," RGALI f. 2009, op. 1, ed. khr. 86, ll. 20–83. See also Koptiaev, "Kniga ob 'intimnoi muzyki,'" *Evterpe*, 1–8, here 8.
164. RGALI f. 2009, op. 1, ed. khr. 150, l. 93.
165. Briusova, "Muzyka dlia naroda," l. 38.
166. Briusova, "Nasha narodnaia konservatoriia," l. 57.

167. Briusova, "Muzyka dlia naroda," l. 38.
168. RGALI f. 2009, op. 1, ed. khr. 150, l. 50. All three years of courses were offered in the Nikitskii region, only the first two in the Sukharevskii district.
169. Ivenina, *Kul'turno-prosvetitel'nye organizatsii*, 171.
170. RGALI f. 2009, op. 1, ed. khr. 150, ll. 41–42; RGALI f. 2009, op. 1, ed. khr. 150, l. 96; Ivan Lipaev to Iulii Engel' (undated), RGALI f. 795 op. 1, ed. khr. 40.
171. RGALI f. 2009, op. 1, ed. khr. 150, ll. 41–42. In contrast to 627 students in regular courses in 1906, only 56 students were registered in special courses. TSIAM f. 179, op. 21, ed. khr. 3397, l. 600b.
172. Brooks, *When Russia Learned to Read*, 295–352.
173. RGALI f. 2009, op. 1, ed. khr. 17, l. 180b, l. 430b, l. 50, 510b, 56, l. 290b, l. 260b, l. 440b, l. 180b.
174. *Ibid.*, l. 180b; l. 430b.
175. *Ibid.*, l. 440b.
176. *Ibid.*, l. 340b.
177. *Ibid.*, l. 400b.
178. *Ibid.*, l. 44.
179. Fishzon, *Fandom, Authenticity, and Opera*, 15–16, 39–40; Clowes, "Social Discourse in the Moscow Art Theater," in *Between Tsar and People*, 271–287, here 287.
180. TSIAM f. 179, op. 21, ed. khr. 3397, l. 60 (1906 report).
181. Rosenthal, "Spirit of Music in Russian Symbolism," 76.

CHAPTER 2. ALEKSANDR SRIABIN

1. Sabaneev, *Vospominaniia o Skriabine*, 307–312.
2. Sabaneev, *Vospominaniia o Rossii*, 154–157, here 156–157; *idem*, *Vospominaniia o Skriabine*, 312; *idem*, "Pavel Florensky: Priest, Scientist and Mystic." On Florenskii's place within late imperial Russian culture and thought, see Kornblatt and Gustafson, eds., *Russian Religious Thought*; Pyman, *Pavel Florensky*.
3. Peyton Engel, "Florensky: Background," in *Russian Religious Thought*, 91–93; Pyman, *Pavel Florensky*, 181–182.
4. Kunina, ed., *Iu. D. Engel': Glazami sovremennika*, 253–254; Del'son, *Skriabin*. For examples of scrapbooks partially or entirely devoted to Scriabin clippings, see RGALI f. 1720, op. 1, ed. khr. 563; RGALI f. 2954, op. 1, ed. khr. 1014.
5. Entry ticket sent to M. O. Gershenzon, RGB f. 746.38.39, l. 1.
6. Leonid Sabaneev, "Pamiati A. N. Skriabina," *GM* no. 86 (April 15, 1915): 5; "Pokhorony A. N. Skriabina," *GM* no. 88 (April 17, 1915): 5; Viacheslav Karatygin, "Pamiati A. N. Skriabina," *Rech* no. 102 (April 15, 1915): 3; *idem* [Chernogorskii, pseud.], "A. N. Skriabin," *Teatr i iskusstvo* no. 16 (April 19, 1915): 271; "Stat'i o smerti A. N. Skriabina, vyrezki iz gazet," RGALI f. 2954, op. 1, ed. khr. 1014, l. 15; "Stat'i o smerti A. N. Skriabina," RGALI f. 2319, op. 2, ed. khr. 103.
7. *Muzyka* no. 220 (April 26, 1915); Viacheslav Ivanov, "Skriabin: Sbornik statei," RGALI f. 225, op. 1, ed. khr. 38; Sabaneev, *Skriabin*. The abbreviated form "agnts" suggests the form that would appear on Russian Orthodox icons.