

Governing the Moscow Conservatory, 1889-1905

Mikhail Mazin, Department of Music Research

McGill University, Montreal

August 2020

A thesis submitted to McGill University in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree
of Master of Arts

© Mikhail Mazin, 2020

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Abstract..... | 4 |
| Résumé | 5 |
| Acknowledgements | 6 |
| Introduction | 7 |
| Literature review | 10 |
| Thesis structure | 11 |
| Chapter 1 - The origins: System and management style of Nikolai Rubinstein..... | 13 |
| Nikolai Rubinstein – the founder of the Moscow Conservatory | 13 |
| First years of operation | 14 |
| Growth problems | 20 |
| Finances, 1869-1872 | 20 |
| The new charter, 1873-1878..... | 22 |
| Chapter 2 - Sergei Taneyev, Director, 1885-1889..... | 25 |
| Taneyev’s biography and personality | 25 |
| Taneyev the director | 28 |
| Taneyev’s management style | 34 |
| Rubinstein’s successor | 36 |
| Chapter 3 - Safonov’s appointment..... | 38 |
| Safonov’s biography and the contemporaries’ opinions about him..... | 39 |
| First steps as director and three indications of Safonov’s succession to previous directors..... | 42 |
| Prerequisites for the conflicts | 48 |
| Chapter 4 - The “Conus affair” in 1899-1900 Moscow | 52 |
| Three phases of the “Conus affair” | 54 |
| Premises | 54 |
| RMO and the Conservatory phase | 56 |
| Public phase..... | 60 |
| The Legal Trial..... | 62 |
| Chapter 5 - The intensification of authoritarian practices after the “Conus affair” | 66 |
| Safonov’s legislative activities | 69 |
| Administrative activities | 70 |
| Silencing opponents | 71 |
| Psychological tactics | 72 |
| Using connections in high circles..... | 73 |
| Professors’ loyalty and opposition..... | 74 |
| Being a student in Safonov’s Conservatory..... | 79 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Similarities between Safonov and Rubinstein | 86 |
| Chapter 6 – The 1905 Revolution and Safonov’s long-term impact in Moscow, Russia and beyond | 89 |
| The 1905 Revolution within the walls of the Moscow and St. Petersburg Conservatories | 90 |
| The premises for different reactions | 96 |
| Legislative activities of Safonov and Anton Rubinstein | 96 |
| “Black knights” and “White knights” | 100 |
| Safonov’s hybrid regime and “sleeping institutions” | 104 |
| Consequences: the impact on artistic biographies of Safonov and Taneyev and the institutions | 109 |
| Safonov’s impact on music education traditions | 112 |
| Conclusion | 116 |
| Bibliography | 120 |
| Appendix 1 | 135 |
| Appendix 2 | 144 |

Abstract

Understanding the genesis of power in music institutions is pivotal for understanding their further evolution. This study of the management practices in the *fin-de-siècle* Moscow Conservatory analyzes explosive institutional politics that brought about its modernization under the directorship of Vasily Safonov (1852-1918). He tried to replace the collegial management style of his predecessors with a one-man dictatorship in the Conservatory by using and manipulating his powerful connections in the upper classes, silencing opponents within the Conservatory walls, and attempting to change its charter.

Applying political and social science methods and the tools of institutional analysis, the paper examines primary sources, charter drafts, memoirs, diaries, and correspondence and argues that the governing system Safonov established at the Moscow Conservatory was neither a collegiate, nor an authoritarian, but a hybrid regime. The support for this statement comes from a comparative analysis of managerial practices at the Moscow and St. Petersburg Conservatories as seen in their respective reactions to the 1905 Russian revolution.

This thesis contributes fresh angles to recent studies on the Moscow Conservatory's development, hierarchy in music education, and the nineteenth century European conservatories' structure.

Résumé

Comprendre la genèse du pouvoir dans les institutions musicales est essentiel pour comprendre leur évolution. Cette étude des pratiques de gestion du Conservatoire de Moscou *fin-de-siècle* analyse la politique institutionnelle explosive qui a conduit à sa modernisation sous la direction de Vasily Safonov (1852-1918). Il a essayé de remplacer le style de gestion collégiale de ses prédécesseurs par une dictature d'un seul homme au Conservatoire en utilisant et en manipulant ses puissants liaisons dans les classes supérieures, en faisant taire les opposants dans les murs du Conservatoire et en essayant de changer sa charte.

En appliquant les méthodes des sciences politiques et sociales et les outils d'analyse institutionnelle, la thèse examine les sources primaires, les projets de la charte, les mémoires, les journaux et la correspondance et soutient que le système de gestion que Safonov a établi au Conservatoire de Moscou n'était ni un régime collégial, ni un autoritaire, mais un régime hybride. Le soutien de cette affirmation provient d'une analyse comparative des pratiques managériales des conservatoires de Moscou et de Saint-Pétersbourg, comme ils se sont réfléchi dans leurs réactions respectives à la révolution russe de 1905.

Cette thèse introduit des nouvelles perspectives aux études récentes sur le développement du Conservatoire de Moscou, la hiérarchie de l'éducation musicale et la structure des conservatoires européens du XIXe siècle.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to sincerely thank my research supervisor, Professor Roemin Kok for her immense knowledge, excellent guidance, and patience. I have learned so much from Dr. Kok about how to be a musicologist and researcher in a broad sense. I am also grateful to Dr. Lynn Sargeant for agreeing to be my second reader and for her time spent on reading this thesis. I also want to thank Dr. David Brackett, Dr. Lisa Barg, Dr. Edward Klorman, Dr. Jerry M. Cain, and Dr. Elisabeth Gidengil for invaluable assistance on my journey of comprehending musical and political science.

I want to express my gratitude to the Schulich School of Music, the Music Research Department and the MA in Musicology program for their financial support and for giving me this opportunity to professionally study musicology and hone my research skills as well as to work with world class professionals who shared bits of their immense knowledge and experience with me. I would especially like to thank Administrative & Student Affairs Coordinator H el ene Drouin for her constant support and help.

I want to thank my friends who I have met in Canada: Monika, Zack, Sarah, Kristen, Emily, Linda, Debbie, Sonia, Svetla, and Emma for peer-reviewing my opuses, valuable advice, and just for spending wonderful time together. Last but not least, I want to thank my mom and dad for all their love and care and for being people I want to be like. I also want to thank my two best friends and at the same time my brothers, Serge and Konstantin. And most of all, my words of gratitude are addressed to my husband Eugene, my biggest supporter and inspirer, without whom all this adventure would not have happened.

Introduction

The Russian Empire in the 1860-1900s was home to two post-secondary music Conservatories, the St. Petersburg Conservatory having been founded in 1862, and the Moscow Conservatory in 1866. Their opening followed the general trend of forming national Conservatories with similar structures in other European countries: Paris (1795), Prague (1811), Vienna (1817), Leipzig (1843), etc.¹ The formation of the Russian Conservatories was the result of consistent efforts of musical education enthusiasts, united in an organization called the Russkoe Muzikalnoe Obshestvo (Russian Musical Society), or RMO.² Today, the St. Petersburg Conservatory and the Moscow Conservatory are internationally renowned institutions that have graduated many influential musicians.

My thesis focuses on the Moscow Conservatory at the end of the nineteenth century. Recognized as one of the premier music Conservatories worldwide, the Conservatory first experienced rapid growth and gained authority on the world stage in *fin-de-siècle* Russia. This thesis argues that the institution owed much of this development to Vasily Safonov, its director from 1889 to 1905. Safonov believed that “as it is impossible for a ‘committee’ to write a symphony, it is also true that only one person can lead a great art business.”³ He sought to establish a one-person management style in his institution to facilitate and accelerate the growth of the Conservatory’s reputation as he envisaged it. An alumnus of the St. Petersburg Conservatory, Safonov strove to change the Moscow Conservatory by applying a management style and model of power relationships used in his alma mater. He attempted to rewrite the

¹ Dawn Elizabeth Bennet, *Understanding the Classical Music Profession: The Past, the Present and Strategies for the Future* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Group, 2008), 59.

² On the pre-Conservatory activities of the Russian musical society and the attitude of Russian musicians towards them, see : Richard Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically: Historical and Hermeneutical Essays* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997); Marina Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism from Glinka to Stalin* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007); Stuart Campbell, *Russians on Russian Music, 1830-1880: An Anthology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); Vladimir Muzalevskiy, *Balakirev* (Leningrad: Leningradskaya filarmoniya, 1938).

³ Vasily Safonov and Leonid Tumarinson, *Stranstvuiushchiy Maestro: Perepiska V.I. Safonova 1905-1917 Godov (Wandering Maestro: Safonov’s Correspondence 1905-1917)* (Moscow: Belyi Bereg, 2012), 556.

Moscow Conservatory's charter and hired those professors who were graduates of the St. Petersburg Conservatory to replace their Moscow colleagues.

I believe that the way Safonov saw the future of his musical institution influenced the culture of the Conservatory, the educational experience of students and teachers, and the careers of the Conservatory's alumni. Appointed to the director's position by the artistic council on the initiative of the outgoing director Sergei Taneyev (1856-1915), Safonov became the fifth director of the Conservatory and remained in this position for sixteen years. Safonov continued the policy of his predecessors to make the Moscow Conservatory more accessible to poor students and students with disabilities. Compared to the St. Petersburg Conservatory administrators, he sought equal opportunities for female and male staff. At the same time, his vision on policies for faculty and the educational process, and his frequent noncompliance with the Conservatory charter for the good of the business caused serious conflicts, primarily with his immediate predecessor Taneyev and past and present faculty members, of whom Pyotr Tchaikovsky (1840-1896) was the most prominent. Taneyev, one of the earliest graduates of the Conservatory (in 1875), and Tchaikovsky, one of its first professors appointed in 1866, had consciously embodied its founder and first director Nikolai Rubinstein's (1835-1881) administrative ideal of a collegiate, consultative management style. Together with other like-minded professors, both represented the so-called "Rubinstein Guard."⁴ They also criticized the way Safonov managed the educational process, in particular, his attitude to music theory subjects (keyboard harmony, analysis of forms, orchestration, and counterpoint).

Based on archival documents from the Russian State Library (RGB), the Central State Historical Archive of St. Petersburg (TsGIA), the Russian State Archive of Literature and Art (RGALI), the Russian National Museum of Music (RNMM), Tchaikovsky State House-Museum in Klin (GDMMTc), the Museum at the State Philharmonic at the Caucasian Mineral Waters

⁴ Leonid Sabaneev, *Vospominaniya o Rossii (Memories about Russia)* (Moscow: Classica XXI, 2004), 107.

(MGPhKMV), and A. A. Bakhrushin State Central Theatre Museum (GTsTM) the thesis examines the genesis of administrative and management practices at the Moscow Conservatory from its opening to the time of Safonov's tenure. Relying on diaries, correspondence, and reports in the mass media about the state of affairs at the Conservatory, the present study shows multilayered power dynamics prevalent under Safonov's directorship.

The overarching framework for this study is drawn from theories in political science. I speculate that although Safonov endeavored to establish what could be termed a "mini dictatorship," he could not achieve this goal because of a number of challenges for Safonov's regime which include the opposition put up by Taneyev, Tchaikovsky and others; attempts by influential patrons (aristocracy and industrialists) to intervene in the educational policy-making process; the fallout of the "Conus affair" and the 1905 Revolution. Public attention to the Conservatory, intensified after the "Conus affair", also influenced the director's actions. Eventually these led to systemic changes in the administrative structure of the Conservatory. Also informing my framework is institutionalism theory. Institutionalism in social sciences is an approach that emphasizes the role of institutions, their formation and interrelations of included actors. The combination of musicological studies of Russian and European Conservatories, institutionalist methods, and political science concepts allows me to create a full-scale picture of the Moscow Conservatory's functioning in 1889-1905.

Finally, this research brings up broader questions: what unique institutional features had the Moscow Conservatory elaborated by the end of Safonov's directorship? How did Safonov's actions influence the future careers of the faculty and students? Which of the traditions established by Safonov were retained in the Moscow Conservatory and Russian music education?

Literature review

This thesis builds on Lynn Sargeant's research of the RMO's structure and its influence on the Russian Conservatories and musical community, analysis of the 1905 Revolution's events and their influence on further music education in Russia. Relationships of the Moscow Conservatory directors with the RMO's noble patrons are examined by Grigory Moiseev. The impact of the 1905 Revolution's events on the Russian musical community is discussed by James Loeffler. Gordon McQuere delved into the development and functioning of the Moscow Conservatory under Rubinstein and Taneyev. Leo Barenboym, Lyudmila Korabelnikova, and Leonid Tumarinson, provided thorough analyses of Rubinstein's, Taneyev's and Safonov's directorships, respectively. This study also compares the operation of the Moscow Conservatory with that of other European music institutions using works of the following scholars: Jim Samson and James A. Keene about the Leipzig Conservatory, Kailan R. Rubinoff about the Paris Conservatory, Gail Hilson Woldu about the Paris Conservatory and Schola Cantorum de Paris. As for other features of musical institutions, Anna Bull examined a student orchestra as a manifestation of the hierarchical structure and the system of subordination. Linda Cameron and Katie Carlisle study the nature of competitiveness in music institutions. Rebecca Rogers examines bourgeois music education in the nineteenth century Europe.

As for different methods in political science, the thesis relies on the research on process tracing by Andrew Bennet and Jeffrey T. Checkel, mixed methods and qualitative comparative analysis by Dirk Berg-Schlosser, and case study research by John W. Creswell, Cheryl N. Poth, and Bent Flyvbjerg. Defining Safonov's regime in the framework of political science, I rely on the studies of the regime typologies by the following authors: Steven Levitsky and Lucan A. Way, Katharina Obuch, Petra Stykow, Nataliya Velikaya, Ali Riaz, and Carlos Gervasoni. For a better understanding of the mechanisms and procedures of Safonov's oppressing dissenting professors in the Conservatory, this study considers works by Andrea Kendall-Taylor, Natasha Lindstaedt, and Erica Frantz, and Gregory L. Freeze. The dynamics and different types of regime

transformation is discussed in the works of Jakob Tolstrup, Guillermo O'Donnell and Philippe Schmitter, Andrey Zakharov, Marina Ottaway, Carl Henrik Knutsen and Håvard Møkleiv Nygård, Joseph Wright and Abel Escribà-Folch, and Adam Przeworski.

Regarding institutional analysis, the main sources are the works by James G. March and Johan P. Olsen on institutions' structure, development, and functioning, as well as research on institutional systems and memory by Mary Douglas. As for collective and institutional memory, these concepts are revealed in the works of Paul Pierson, Maurice Halbwachs, Barry Schwartz, and Yuk Hui. The influence of traditions and unspoken rules is covered by David M. Newman and Jodi O'Brien. In the framework of historical institutionalism, this thesis draws on the work of Hyman Mariampolski and Dana C. Hughes, and Dorothy Ross. Claus Offe, Philip Selznick, Max Weber, W. Richard Scott, Mattei Dogan, and John Higley in their works cover the concepts of institutionalization and institutional changes. Terry M. Moe, George Tsebelis, and Paul Pierson elaborated rational choice theory used in the present study to analyze Taneyev's actions during his directorship. The concepts of authority, legitimacy, and representation required for understanding Safonov's approval and erosion of his legitimacy among the "Rubinstein guard" representatives, are examined by David Beetham, Tony and Dagmar Waters, Philip Pettit, Tom R. Tyler and Gregory Mitchell, E. Allan Lind, and Hanna Pitkin.

Thesis structure

The first three chapters are dedicated to the activities of the three most important directors of the Moscow Conservatory in 1866-1905 and the way they influenced its functioning: Nikolai Rubinstein, Sergei Taneyev, and Vasily Safonov. Chapter 1 presents the overall structure of the Moscow Conservatory as established by Rubinstein, and the challenges he faced during the Conservatory's later development. I also compare Moscow educational practices with European Conservatories. Chapter 2 analyzes the four years of Taneyev's directorship, which of Rubinstein's traditions he strengthened and where he behaved differently. Chapter 3 discusses Safonov's activity as the Conservatory director. Taneyev's and Safonov's actions unfold in the

framework of institutionalism theory for a better understanding of the logic of the Conservatory's functioning as a social institution.

Chapter 4 discusses the so-called "*Delo Konyusa*" (the "Conus affair") in 1899-1900, an episode in which Safonov dismissed a faculty member Georges Conus (1862-1933) for perceived disloyalty to the director. The ensuing lawsuit attracted widespread public attention and media coverage. These events fully exposed Safonov's governing methods and the institutional structure of the Conservatory. Chapter 5 includes an analysis of Safonov's legislative initiatives and administrative policy. It also examines the ways professors reacted to Safonov's actions, their approval and opposition to him, and how Safonov's educational policy influenced students.

Chapter 6 deals with a series of events within the Conservatory which led to Safonov's dismissal in 1905, which coincided with the first Russian Revolution. After comparing Moscow's model with the administrations of the St. Petersburg Conservatory, this study shows how the two music institutions reacted differently to the same challenges brought about by the 1905 Revolution, and the immediate, lasting consequences their respective directors' actions had on students, faculty, and education processes. Analyzing the totality of external and internal actors who influenced the different ways the two Russian Conservatories developed, I demonstrate a comprehensive portrait of Safonov's management methods.

Chapter 1 - The origins: System and management style of Nikolai

Rubinstein

This chapter examines the first years of the Moscow Conservatory and the process of its formation as a musical institution as well as the practices and traditions from other European Conservatories that were introduced there. The process of the Moscow Conservatory's institutionalization in the framework of the Russian Musical Society has received an in-depth analysis in Lynn Sargeant's works. Leo Barenboym scrutinized Nikolai Rubinstein's activity as the founder and the first Conservatory director. Research into other Conservatories' functioning by Jim Samson (the Leipzig Conservatory), and Kailan R. Rubinoff (the Paris Conservatory) shows that the Moscow Conservatory was not an isolated case among European music institutions. Among the primary sources, this chapter relies on Nikolai Kashkin's (1829-1914) report about the first twenty-five years of the Moscow Conservatory, as well as archival sources from TsGIA. In addition, this chapter uses research by James March, Max Weber, William Richard Scott, and Philip Selznick to indicate which features of the Conservatory's organization became pivotal for its further institutional development.

Nikolai Rubinstein – the founder of the Moscow Conservatory

Nikolai Rubinstein was born in 1835 in Moscow. He was a younger brother of prominent musician, composer, and the St. Petersburg Conservatory founder Anton Rubinstein (1829-1894). Nikolai Rubinstein was also pianist and conductor. While his family was in Berlin from 1844 to 1846 he studied the piano with Theodor Kullak (1818-1882), and harmony and counterpoint with Siegfried Wilhelm Dehn (1799-1858). When they returned to Moscow in 1846 he had piano lessons of Alexander Villoing (1808-1878). Rubinstein also studied medicine at Moscow University, graduating in 1855.⁵

⁵ Edward Garden, "Rubinstein [Rubinshteyn], Nikolay," in *Grove Music Online*, 2001, <https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/omo-9781561592630-e-0000024055>.

Rubinstein founded the RMO Moscow branch in 1860.⁶ At the same year he opened the Music classes with the aim of teaching Muscovites to play musical instruments and initial music theory. Six years later early public enthusiasm and budget surpluses encouraged the RMO to develop its Music Classes into a Conservatory.⁷ Rubinstein was not only an outstanding musician and teacher, but also a versatile organizer. So, even in the days of music classes, he solved a variety of issues, from creating teaching methods to financing teachers or the material side of the life of students.⁸ Later, being the Conservatory director, he helped poor students greatly, granted them scholarships, sought subsidies for them in the city administration, and sometimes even dressed and fed them with his own money.⁹ Rubinstein fully contributed to the promotion and employment of all the Conservatory students after their graduation. The following is his letter to the graduate vocalist Ivan Bayts who was then in Italy (approximately summer 1877).

Everything that happens to you interests me very much. Your true friends are here. I have 25 rubles for you, I will send you more when you need more money and when I have more funds. Go to Mrs. Gorchakova, an ex-singer who staged *Life for the Tsar* in Milan. She is already informed about you: her advice may be useful to you. Do not apply for the [Italian] Conservatory, or we would give up knowing each other. It is utter nonsense that the Italian Conservatory is necessary for an artist's promotion! In any case, do not be discouraged and remember that no matter how far you go, you will not be alone. I will not leave you either without advice or deed, if you do not forget the dignity of being the Moscow Conservatory alumnus.¹⁰

First years of operation

On September 1, 1866 the Moscow Conservatory officially began its activities. This was the result of the transformation of music classes in Moscow into a full-fledged Conservatory or

⁶ Lynn Mary Sargeant, *Harmony and Discord. Music and the Transformation of Russian Cultural Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 60.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 63.

⁸ More details about the operation of the Music Classes see in Nikolai Kashkin, *Pervoe Dvadcatipyatiletie Moskovskoi Konservatorii (The First 25 Years of the Moscow Conservatory)* (Moscow: Imperatorskoe Russkoe Muzykalnoe obschestvo, 1891), 1–16.

⁹ Leo Barenboym, *Nikolay Grigoryevich Rubinshteyn. Istoriya Zhizni i Deyatel'nosti (Nikolai Rubinstein. History of Life and Work)*. (Moscow: Muzika, 1982), 98–102.

¹⁰ Leo Barenboym, *Nikolay Grigoryevich Rubinshteyn. Istoriya Zhizni i Deyatel'nosti (Nikolai Rubinstein. History of Life and Work)*. (Moscow: Muzika, 1982), 143.

the institutionalization of music education in the city.¹¹ Despite the fact that most of the Conservatory teachers at its first stage were the same people who had taught in music classes, such a sophisticated reorganization diversified the processes inside the music institution. It was an inestimable step in the evolution of musical education in Moscow, because institutes “give order to social relations, reduce flexibility and variability in behavior, and restrict the possibilities of a one-sided pursuit of self-interest or drives.”¹² Unlike music classes, whose goal was to provide musical education to all comers, Conservatory in Russia had a much more ambitious task – to be “a temple of art intended to initiate only the most able into the mysteries of the musical profession.”¹³

In the first years of its existence, the Moscow Conservatory had been developed as an independent institution which formed its regulative, normative, and cultural-cognitive elements that, together with associated activities and resources, would provide stability and meaning to its social life.¹⁴ This process consisted of simultaneous development of written and unwritten norms. The former included the creation of a charter, curriculum plans, syllabi, examination requirements, etc. The latter included the production and maintenance of traditions associated with a particular institution, unspoken rules and behavioral norms.¹⁵ Below I present five main directions of Rubinstein’s activity in the first years of the Moscow Conservatory: administrative structure, personnel policy, curriculum, admission policy, and teaching process.

As for managing the Conservatory, Rubinstein insisted on collegiality on its early years.¹⁶ He encouraged the professors to take an active part in the life and development of the new educational institution. On the basis of the Conservatory charter, the solution of all the most

¹¹ Sargeant, *Harmony and Discord. Music and the Transformation of Russian Cultural Life*, 88–89.

¹² Max Weber, *Economy and Society* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978), 40.

¹³ Sargeant, *Harmony and Discord. Music and the Transformation of Russian Cultural Life*, 84.

¹⁴ W. Richard Scott, *Institutions and Organizations: Ideas, Interests, and Identities*, Fourth edition (Los Angeles: SAGE Publications, Inc., 2014), 56.

¹⁵ David M. Newman and Jodi O’Brien, *Sociology: Exploring the Architecture of Everyday Life Readings*, 8th ed. (Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press, 2010), 347.

¹⁶ Gordon D. McQuere, “The Moscow Conservatory 1866-1889 Nikolai Rubinstein and Sergei Taneev,” *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* 34, no. 1 (Spring 2000): 41.

important pedagogical and artistic issues related to the Conservatory's internal structure life was entrusted to the council of professors (artistic council), whose members were all professors of the Conservatory, with the exception of wind instructors.¹⁷ The first artistic council included 10 professors. The first secretary of the council was Wieniawski, who, due to poor knowledge of the Russian language, kept minutes of the meetings in French.¹⁸ Due to the international structure of professors' staff, the official business languages of the Council were the following ones in order of prevalence: Russian, German, French.¹⁹ An important position was also created for the inspector of the Conservatory, who monitored all non-educational matters, primarily related to student life.

Concerning personnel policy, Rubinstein tried to recruit the best performers across Europe. At the same time, he preferred to hire music theory specialists trained in Russia, since he believed that such pedagogues would contribute better to the formation of the Russian national school of composition.²⁰ Thus, he laid down his principles of personnel policy, which were later revised by Vasily Safonov and were used as one of many tools for changing the institution (see more in Chapter 3 and 5).²¹

As for the curriculum, the artistic council members discussed different pedagogical approaches and systems of European Conservatories. Most professors had studied in Western European Conservatories and could introduce their own experience in Moscow. Józef Wieniawski (1837-1912) studied with Pierre Zimmermann (1785-1853) at the Paris Conservatory and with Ferenc Liszt (1811-1886) in Weimar.²² Eduard Langer (1835-1905)

¹⁷ The artistic council meetings were held in the evening after classes, and all wind instructors, in addition to the Conservatory, worked in orchestras or theaters, that is why they were busy to attend meetings.

¹⁸ Wieniawski lived most of his life in France and therefore spoke fluent French.

¹⁹ Yury Keldysh, *100 Let Moskovskoi Konservatorii (100 Years of the Moscow Conservatory)* (Moscow: Muzika, 1966), 22.

²⁰ Barenboym, *Nikolay Grigoryevich Rubinshteyn. Istoriya Zhizni i Deyatel'nosti (Nikolai Rubinstein. History of Life and Work)*, 101.

²¹ For detailed list of the faculty in 1866 see McQuere, "The Moscow Conservatory 1866-1889 Nikolai Rubinstein and Sergei Taneev," 58–61.

²² Anna G Piotrowska, "Józef Wieniawski (1837-1912) and His Works Composed in Brussels. *Revue Belge de Musicologie / Belgisch Tijdschrift Voor Muziekwetenschap* Vol. 60, Actes Du Colloque International: Les Relations Musicales Entre Bruxelles et La Pologne 1800-1950 (2006), Pp. 85-97," *Revue Belge de Musicologie /*

studied at the Leipzig Conservatory, piano with Ignaz Moscheles (1794-1870) and composition with Julius Rietz (1812-1877) and Moritz Hauptmann (1792-1868).²³ Adolf Osberg (1824-1869) studied violin at the Brussels Conservatory with Charles de Bériot (1802-1870).²⁴ Ferdinand Laub (1832-1875) studied violin in the Prague Conservatory with Moritz Mildner (1812-1865).²⁵ Anton Door (1833-1919) studied piano with Carl Czerny (1791-1857).²⁶ Alexandre Dubuque (1812-1898) studied piano with John Field (1782-1837).²⁷ Ferdinand Büchner (1823-1906) studied flute with Christian Heinemeyer (1796-1872) in Hannover.²⁸

Moscow professors were aware that the level of training of European applicants was significantly higher than that of the Russian ones at that time. Thus, they developed unique curricula for each subject and instrument for Moscow. However, they borrowed some practices from European institutions. In particular, the structure of the music history classes showed that the Moscow Conservatory teaching principles was similar to the Leipzig Conservatory's principles which were "particularly conservative."²⁹ The Leipzig curriculum in music history aimed to promote German symphonism.³⁰ Rubinstein had the same idea - to create a Russian

Belgisch Tijdschrift Voor Muziekwetenschap Vol. 60, Actes du colloque international: Les relations musicales entre Bruxelles et la Pologne 1800-1950 (2006): 85–97; Konstantin Zenkin, "The Liszt Tradition at the Moscow Conservatoire," *Studia Musicologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 42, no. 1/2 (2001): 93–108.

²³Margarita Esipova, ed., "Eduard Langer," in *Moskovskaja Konservatorija Ot Istokov Do Našich Dnej, 1866-2006: Biografičeskij Ėnciklopedičeskij Slovar (The Moscow Conservatory from Origins to the Current Days, 1866-2006: Biographical Encyclopedic Dictionary)* (Moscow: MGK, 2007), 289.

²⁴Antonina Jakovleva, "Adolf Osberg," in *Moskovskaja Konservatorija Ot Istokov Do Našich Dnej, 1866-2006: Biografičeskij Ėnciklopedičeskij Slovar (The Moscow Conservatory from Origins to the Current Days, 1866-2006: Biographical Encyclopedic Dictionary)*, ed. Margarita Esipova (Moscow: MGK, 2007), 396.

²⁵Werner Bollert, "Ferdinand Laub," in *Neue Deutsche Biographie* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1982), 687, <https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd116865407.html#ndbcontent>.

²⁶Door had been working at the Moscow Conservatory for 3 years before 1869 when he moved to Vienna and became a professor. This was one of the first cases when a professor from a Russian Conservatory got a position in a European one. Mikhail Petuhov, "Door, Anton," in *Ėnsiklopedičeskij Slovar Brokgauza i Jefrona (Brockhaus and Efron Encyclopedic Dictionary)* (St. Petersburg: Brockhaus and Efron, 1893), 43; Jan Swafford, *Johannes Brahms: A Biography* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1997), 409.

²⁷Edward Garden, "Dubuque [Dyubyuk], Aleksandr Ivanovich," in *Grove Music Online*, 2001, <https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/omo-9781561592630-e-0000008240>.

²⁸Ernst Stöckl, *Musikgeschichte Der Russlanddeutschen* (Dülmen: Laumann-Verlag, 1993), 69.

²⁹James A. Keene, *A History of Music Education in the United States*, 2nd ed. (Centennial, CO: Glenbridge Publishing Ltd., 2009), 296.

³⁰As Jim Samson writes, "he [Mendelssohn] and Schumann established a syllabus for the teaching of music history at the Conservatory, they effectively periodised this emergent German canon: Bach and Handel; Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven; Schubert; Mendelssohn and (note the significant exception) Chopin." Jim Samson, "Music and Nationalism: Five Historical Moments," in *Nationalism and Ethnosymbolism: History, Culture and Ethnicity in the Formation of Nations*, by Athena S. Leoussi and Steven Grosby (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007), 58.

national canon in composition and music history with a strong influence of German composers and a minimal presence of Italian contemporary composers.³¹ Relying on German composers had many critics among Russian musicians who claimed that for producing Russian national music it was unnecessary or rather harmful.³² It is curious that Claude Debussy (1862-1918) criticized the *fin-de-siècle* Schola Cantorum de Paris in the same manner for “the narrow traditions of German and Germanized pedagogues.”³³ Borrowing an idea from the Paris Conservatory, Rubinstein tried to adopt its hierarchical institutes and ideals of “reverence for the composer, obedience to the conductor, and compliance with the score” that existed within its walls.³⁴

Rubinstein established admission rules to accept without exams anyone over fourteen.³⁵ In addition to the necessity for tuition funds, Rubinstein was guided by the consideration that those students who would not be successful would drop out on their own; besides, he knew that selective policies would be disadvantageous for enrollment, as wealthy Muscovites were not in a hurry to send their children to an institution that had not yet gained a good reputation.³⁶ Thanks

³¹ According to tradition established by Glinka, Russian musicians of the 19th century did not like Italian music of those days, considering the Russian public enthusiasm for it as a manifestation of bad taste and lack of sophistication. They juxtaposed Italian music with German. Skepticism towards the *sugary-Italian* music was subsequently shared by Rubinstein, Taneyev, and Tchaikovsky. To a large extent, the dislike for Italian music came from concerns about its dominance in the repertoire of Russian orchestras and theaters of the 18-19 centuries to the detriment of Russian national school. As Prince Vladimir Odoevsky (1804-1869) wrote: “Italian music passes by life.” Kremlev Yuli, *Russkaya Mysl o Muzyke: Ocherki Istorii Russkoï Muzykalnoy Kritiki i Èstetiki v XIX Veke* (*Russian Thought about Music: Essays on the History of Russian Musical Criticism and Aesthetics in the 19th Century*), vol. 2 (Moscow: Muzika, 1954), 41; Barenboym, *Nikolay Grigoryevich Rubinshteyn. Istoriya Zhizni i Deyatel'nosti* (*Nikolai Rubinstein. History of Life and Work*), 98–100; Lynn Mary Sargeant, “Singing the Nation into Being: Teaching Identity and Culture at the Turn of The Twentieth Century,” *History of Education Quarterly* 49, no. 3 (August 2009): 304–5; Sargeant, *Harmony and Discord. Music and the Transformation of Russian Cultural Life*, 79.

³² Amongst those who adhered to this position were critic Vladimir Stasov (1824-1906), composer Alexander Serov (1820-1871), and composer Mily Balakirev (1836-1910). Elena Poldiaeva, “Die Ersten Konservatorien in Russland Und Das Problem Eier ‘Russischen’ Musiksprache,” in *Musical Education in Europe (1770-1914): Compositional, Institutional, and Political Challenges*, ed. Michael Fend and Michel Noiray (Berlin: Berliner Wissenschafts-Verlag, 2005), 565–84.

³³ Léon Vallas, *The Theories of Claude Debussy, Musicien Français*, trans. Marie O’Brien (New York: Dover Publications, 1967), 17.

³⁴ Kailan R. Rubinoff, “Toward a Revolutionary Model of Music Pedagogy: The Paris Conservatoire, Hugot and Wunderlich’s Méthode de Flûte, and the Disciplining of the Musician,” *Journal of Musicology* 34, no. 4 (2017): 477.

³⁵ McQuere, “The Moscow Conservatory 1866-1889 Nikolai Rubinstein and Sergei Taneev,” 48.

³⁶ Barenboym, *Nikolay Grigoryevich Rubinshteyn. Istoriya Zhizni i Deyatel'nosti* (*Nikolai Rubinstein. History of Life and Work*), 73.

to Rubinstein's approach and flexibility with this policy, Sergei Taneyev was able to enter the Conservatory at the age of nine years old (applicants were supposed to be no younger than fourteen).³⁷

Regarding the academic process the newly opened institution faced some troubles, one of them being the uneven skill levels of applicants. With the exception of those who had previously attended music classes, many of the applicants did not possess an understanding of the basic principles of music theory.³⁸ In the year 1866, 100 students were enrolled who paid for their studies on their own, 12 people were RMO scholarship holders, and 6 received scholarships from private individuals.³⁹ Scholarships were prioritized for students in the woodwind and brass department, for which there were few applicants. The Conservatory subsidized winds in order to create a student orchestra in the future. Rubinstein saw an orchestra as a pivotal institute inside institute.⁴⁰ However, the Conservatory did not have student orchestra in the early years due to a large imbalance in enrollment, in favour of the piano department. Piano was the most popular instrument because of its social status - most students were young women from wealthy families.⁴¹ As in Western European countries, according to the traditions of bourgeois society, the wife had to be musically educated and be able to play the piano, organizing leisure activities for guests at home and the basics of musical education for their children.⁴² Not surprisingly, the lion's share of income from tuition fees in the new Conservatory came from the piano department.

³⁷ Grigory Bernandt, *S.I. Taneyev* (Moscow: Muzika, 1987), 17.

³⁸ Lyudmila Korabelnikova, *S.I. Taneyev v Moskovskoj Konservatorii (Taneyev in the Moscow Conservatory)* (Moscow: Muzika, 1974), 20.

³⁹ Kashkin, *Pervoe Dvadcatipyatiletie Moskovskoi Konservatorii (The First 25 Years of the Moscow Conservatory)*, 17.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 17.

⁴¹ See detailed gender distribution of students by department in: Lynn Mary Sargeant, "Ambivalence and Desire: State, Society, and Music Education in Russia," in *Musical Education in Europe (1770-1914): Compositional, Institutional, and Political Challenges*, ed. Michael Fend and Michel Noiray (Berlin: Berliner Wissenschafts-Verlag, 2005), 245-74.

⁴² See more about girls' music education in the bourgeois society: Rebecca Rogers, *From The Salon To The Schoolroom: Educating Bourgeois Girls In Nineteenth Century France* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2005), 83-109.

Rubinstein considered the quality of teaching theoretical subjects to be an important borderline that differentiated a higher musical educational institution and ordinary music classes, aimed at educating only performing skills. Therefore, Rubinstein strongly encouraged students' interest in studying these disciplines. A huge role in the formation of teaching practices at the initial stage was played by Pyotr Tchaikovsky, who developed tutorials for teaching the main theoretical disciplines: harmony, counterpoint and instrumentation. Rubinstein insisted on the idea of a multilaterally educated musician as opposed to a virtuoso with a minimum of theoretical knowledge.⁴³ The concept of comprehensive education of musicians was also professed by Vincent d'Indy (1851-1931) while his directorship at the Schola Cantorum de Paris and Gabriel Fauré (1845-1921) as the Paris Conservatory director.⁴⁴

Growth problems

Rubinstein established gradual development of the Conservatory in its first years, however some problems emerged, later. Below I present two issues the Moscow Conservatory faced with during 1869-1878: financial crisis and the need for a new charter.

Finances, 1869-1872

In terms of finances, the budget of the Conservatory consisted of three components: tuition fees from students, income from the RMO concert activity, and donations from individuals. Despite concerts' income and Rubinstein's efforts to attract sponsorship money, the finances of the Conservatory left much to be desired. The Conservatory could not afford to increase tuition fees because of being a new and relatively undistinguished educational institution. The growing number of students required a move to more spacious building, which incurred additional maintenance costs. Rubinstein did not want to reduce professors' salaries, since this could lead to

⁴³ Barenboym, *Nikolay Grigoryevich Rubinshteyn. Istoriya Zhizni i Deyatel'nosti (Nikolai Rubinstein. History of Life and Work)*, 103–6.

⁴⁴ Gail Hilson Woldu, "Debussy, Fauré, and d'Indy and Conceptions of the Artist: The Institutions, the Dialogues, the Conflicts," in *Debussy and His World*, by Jane F. Fulcher (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001), 237–39; Gail Hilson Woldu, "Gabriel Fauré, directeur du Conservatoire: les réformes de 1905," *Revue de Musicologie* 70, no. 2 (1984): 203.

high-quality teachers' leaving the institution. Moreover Rubinstein's participation in the St. Petersburg Free School of Music charity concert in the autumn of 1869 greatly cooled the relations with the RMO noble patroness, the Grand Duchess Elena Pavlovna (1807-1873).⁴⁵ During the whole time of her patronage she donated only one thousand rubles to the Moscow Conservatory once in 1864.⁴⁶ Meanwhile, in 1869 Elena Pavlovna allocated a state subsidy for the St. Petersburg Conservatory of fifteen thousand rubles, but for Moscow did not make any efforts (I discuss in more detail her role in the RMO in Chapter 6).⁴⁷

By 1871, the situation had become so alarming that a threat of closure loomed over the Conservatory. The educational institution was never able to become a profitable enterprise, providing its existence with the forces of only the local branch of the RMO. There was an urgent need for government subsidies. It took Rubinstein enormous efforts to get the emperor Alexander II (1818-1881) to attend the concert of students at the Conservatory in order to show him the results of his labors and ask for the highest permission to provide a subsidy for the Conservatory. Using all his connections, first of all, the patronage of Grand Duke Konstantin Nikolayevich, a younger brother of Alexander II, Rubinstein achieved the presence of the emperor on June 10, 1872 at the student performance of the opera *Orpheus and Eurydice* by Gluck in the hall of the Moscow's noble assembly.⁴⁸ Here is how Kashkin described it.

The performance of *Orpheus* attracted the all-merciful attention of His Imperial Majesty and other distinguished visitors and prompted the request of His Imperial Highness Grand

⁴⁵ Princess Charlotte of Württemberg, later known as Grand Duchess Elena Pavlovna, the wife of Grand Duke Michael Pavlovich (1798-1849), the youngest son of Emperor Paul I (1754-1801). She was a co-founder and the first Head of the RMO (1860-1873). Philip S. Taylor, *Anton Rubinstein: A Life in Music* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2007), 39; Nikolai Kashkin, *M. A. Balakirev i Ego Otnoshenie k Moskve (M.A. Balakirev and His Relations with Moscow)* (Moscow: Direct-Media, 2012), 267–68; Grigory Moiseev, “Ot Konservatorii k ‘Russkim Kontsertam’: Avgusteyshiye Pokroviteli i Nikolai Rubinshteyn (From the Conservatory to ‘Russian Concerts’: August Patrons and Nikolai Rubinstein),” in *Soyuz Tvortsov i Prosvetiteley (The Union of Creators and Enlighteners)*, by Avangard Fedotov (Moscow: Kompozitor, 2012), 66.

⁴⁶ Vladimir Odoevsky, *Dnevnik. Perepiska. Materialy. K 200-Letiyu so Dnya Rozhdeniya (Diary. Correspondence. Materials. To the 200th Anniversary of the Birth)*, ed. Marina Rachmanova and Margarita Esipova (Moscow: Deca-BC, 2005), 119.

⁴⁷ Postanovlenye Glavnoy Direktzii RMO o naznachenii gosudarstvennoy subsidii Peterburgskoi konservatorii (The decree of the headquarter of the RMO on the appointment the state subsidy to the St. Petersburg Conservatory), 1 February 1869, Fond 406 op. 1 ed.hr. 124, Central State Historical Archive of St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg, Russia.

⁴⁸ See more details about this enterprise in: Moiseev, “Ot Konservatorii k ‘Russkim Kontsertam’: Avgusteyshiye Pokroviteli i Nikolai Rubinshteyn (From the Conservatory to ‘Russian Concerts’: August Patrons and Nikolai Rubinstein),” 68–80.

Duke Konstantin Nikolayevich for the appointment of a subsidy to the Moscow Conservatory. As a result of this petition, Her Imperial Highness the Grand Duchess Elena Pavlovna, the High Patroness of the Conservatory, by the Most Gracious rescript of August 1, 1872, deigned to announce to the Musical Society Directorate the subsequent High Behest and the assignment of subsidy for 5 years to 20,000 rubles annually.⁴⁹

It is curious that in this situation, Rubinstein acted, violating subordination, through the head of the Grand Duchess Elena Pavlovna, who was faced with the fact of a successfully completed campaign. However, such audacity gave a quick and successful result - unconditional funding for 5 years from the tsarist budget without any reporting obligations on the part of the Conservatory. Thus, Rubinstein created a precedent for the tradition in the Moscow Conservatory, which is very important for understanding its further state of affairs. It was the tradition to occasionally break the rules for the good of business (I explore this in detail in Chapters 3 and 5).

The new charter, 1873-1878

At the same time, the growth of the Moscow Conservatory as an educational institution necessitated changes to its charter. The first charters for the St. Petersburg and Moscow Conservatories did not cover issues and problems that could arise within the educational process and the distribution of powers inside the institutions. Sometimes it led to conflicts that could be avoided by clearer delegation of authority to each component.

Work on changing the charters began in 1873. In June 1877, the final version was sent for approval to the Ministry of the Interior, responsible for the functioning of educational institutions in the empire.⁵⁰ The first draft of the charter contained too many instructions regarding the pedagogical and performance processes, and the administrations of the Conservatories had only supervisory functions for the implementation of the curriculum. During the charter revision's

⁴⁹ Kashkin, *Pervoe Dvadcatipyatiletie Moskovskoi Konservatorii (The First 25 Years of the Moscow Conservatory)*, 45–46.

⁵⁰ Proekt ustava konservatoriy Russkogo Muzikalnogo Obshestva dlyz utverjzdenija Ministrom Vnutrennih Del (Draft charter of the Conservatories of the Russian Musical Society for approval by the Minister of Internal Affairs), 17 June 1878, Fond 408 op. 1 ed.hr. 136 list 21, Central State Historical Archive of St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg, Russia

commission work, which Rubinstein insisted on creating, most of the regulatory bureaucratic provisions were excluded from the document, while the educational institutions' autonomy from the RMO was increased and the role of the artistic councils regarding the educational and personnel policies was strengthened (see the full text of the charter in Appendix 1).

According to the 1878 charter, the administration of the Moscow Conservatory consisted of the following parts: director and his assistants, artistic council, scientific council, inspector of the Conservatory, inspector of scientific classes (§15). Below I examine powers of the two most important administrative units for the Moscow Conservatory's further institutional development: the director and the artistic council.

The director had to be a Russian citizen and a musician by profession, appointed for five years without restrictions on the number of re-elections and dismissed by the RMO's Head at the request of the local branch chairman. The director was responsible for the Conservatory personnel policy. He was a member of the RMO's main and local directorates (§18). The local directorate appointed and dismissed teachers upon the director's request, obliging him to submit the artistic council opinion on his request (§21).

The artistic council's duties were to determine the programs of music classes, the procedure for entrance and final exams, to consider the initiatives of the director for the appointment and dismissal of music teachers (§27). The director was obliged to hold the council's meetings at least once a month and notify all members of the council about the date and agenda of the next meeting (§30). When discussing the appointment and dismissal of teachers, 2/3 of the artistic council had to be present.

Thanks to Rubinstein's efforts, the charter included provisions on the annual expenditures of twenty thousand rubles of imperial subsidies on operational activities – the aftereffects of his successful operation to attract the attention of His Majesty Alexander II to the problem of insufficient funding of music education in the country (§5). It provided the Conservatory with

financial stability, which, along with the growing income from philanthropists, concerts and an increase in the number of students, provided an opportunity to develop and expand the Conservatory and acquire its status on the European stage.

Rubinstein's legislative activity from the very foundation of the RMO's Moscow branch in 1860 to adoption a new charter in 1878 was a part of the Conservatory's institutionalization process. As Philip Selznick says, "to institutionalize is to infuse with value beyond the technical requirements of the task at hand."⁵¹ Indeed, many provisions of the 1878 charter went beyond the tasks necessary at the time of its adoption. It was the establishment of the system of checks and balances between the Conservatory director, the Conservatory artistic council, and the RMO's local branch. Rubinstein elaborated traditions of relationships within the Conservatory, which were supposed to strengthen the system of this institute's functioning. It was a principle of collegiality in governing and following the interests of the Conservatory rather than one's own when making decisions. However, as James March notes, "although the rules and routines of institutional life are relatively stable, they are incomplete. It is possible to influence the resolution of ambiguity surrounding the rules."⁵² The following chapters show how such ambiguities influenced the nature of traditions within the Conservatory and subsequently its existence as an institution.

⁵¹ Philip Selznick, *Leadership in Administration* (New York: Harper & Row, 1957), 17.

⁵² James G. March, *The Ambiguities of Experience* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2010), 58.

Chapter 2 - Sergei Taneyev, Director, 1885-1889

This chapter discusses Sergei Taneyev's governing practices in the Moscow Conservatory. He was among the most prominent Conservatory alumni and later became one of the most important directors in its history. His four years of directorship from 1885 to 1889 were significantly shorter than fifteen years of his predecessor's, Nikolai Rubinstein, as well as sixteen years of his successor's, Vasily Safonov. Nevertheless, Taneyev invaluablely contributed to the advance of the Moscow Conservatory, introducing practices based on his vision of interhuman relations within the institution he managed.

Taneyev's biography has been comprehensively researched by Lyudmila Korabelnikova, Grigory Bernandt, and Svetlana Sovenko. Gordon McQuere, Lynn Sargeant, and Grigory Moiseev explored the functioning of the Conservatory during Taneyev's tenure. This chapter considers Taneyev's actions in terms of historical institutionalism which restores "the force of historical contingency, the agency of historical actors, and the contextually based continuities of social relations, ideas, and values that shaper their fields of study."⁵³ It also examines practices and traditions Taneyev implemented in the Conservatory, which ones of his predecessor he maintained and what foundations he laid for later growth of the Conservatory during Vasily Safonov's term.

Taneyev's biography and personality

Sergei Taneyev was born in Vladimir, Vladimir Governorate, Russian Empire, into an aristocratic family with little wealth.⁵⁴ His family moved to Moscow in 1865. The following year, the nine-year-old Taneyev entered the Moscow Conservatory. He joined the composition class of Pyotr Tchaikovsky and the piano class of Nikolai Rubinstein. Taneyev graduated in 1875 and was the first student in the history of the Conservatory to win the gold medal both for

⁵³ Dorothy Ross, "The Many Lives of Institutionalism in American Social Science," *Polity* 28 (1995): 117.

⁵⁴ Ella Frolova, "Usadba Marinino - Rodovoye Gnezdo Taneyevykh (The Marinino Estate - the Taneyev Family Home)," in *Novoye o Taneyeve. k 150-Letiyu so Dnya Rozhdeniya (New about Taneyev. to the 150th Anniversary of the Birth)*, by Elena Fetisova (Moscow: Deca-BC, 2007), 31.

composition and for performing (piano). After Tchaikovsky's resignation in 1878 Taneyev was appointed to teach his classes on harmony and composition. His teacher retired to devote himself entirely to composition when he started to receive financial assistance from Nadezhda von Meck (1831-1894). Tchaikovsky himself proposed a graduate of the St. Petersburg Conservatory August Bergard (1852-1908) as his replacement.⁵⁵ However, Rubinstein preferred Balakirev, who had by that time reconciled with the need for professional music education in Russia but declined the offer due to the lack of his own systematic theoretical knowledge.⁵⁶ Then Tchaikovsky suggested his student Taneyev. Ironically, 28 years later Bergard, as the St. Petersburg Conservatory director, played a key role in the events associated with the participation of the Conservatory's students in the 1905 Revolution (I describe his role in these events in Chapter 5). Taneyev was hired as a full-time professor in 1881. In the same year, after Nikolai Rubinstein's death, the young professor took over Rubinstein's piano class.⁵⁷

Taneyev's worldview explains his overall attitude to interpersonal relationships and how they should function in the society. He attached great importance to harmony and order, wherever it could be achieved - whether through music composing or the daily routine of the whole Conservatory. Taneyev took as an epigraph of his theoretical opus magnum *Convertible Counterpoint in the Strict Style* Leonardo da Vinci's words: "No human knowledge can claim the title of true science if it has not passed through mathematical formulas of expression."⁵⁸ Because of his preference for a balanced, rational approach, musicians in Moscow believed that Taneyev would cope perfectly with the Conservatory director's duties and could be called a worthy successor to Rubinstein traditions. This opinion was shared by the RMO Moscow branch

⁵⁵ Barenboym, *Nikolay Grigoryevich Rubinshteyn. Istoriya Zhizni i Deyatel'nosti (Nikolai Rubinstein. History of Life and Work)*, 142–43.

⁵⁶ Kashkin, M. A. *Balakirev i Ego Otnoshenie k Moskve (M.A. Balakirev and His Relations with Moscow)*, 284.

⁵⁷ Elena Fetisova, *Novoe o Taneyeve (The New about Taneyev)* (Moscow: Deca-BC, 2007), 104.

⁵⁸ Sergei Taneyev, *Convertible Counterpoint in the Strict Style* (Boston: Bruce Humphries, 1962), 24.

directors and especially Tchaikovsky.⁵⁹ Moreover, Taneyev enjoyed great authority among the Conservatory's professors who proclaimed him "Moscow's musical conscience."⁶⁰

Taneyev received this sobriquet from his contemporaries, particularly Nikolai Zverev (1833-1893), for his perceived avoidance of double standards and his stated belief in the primacy of justice over short-term selfish interests.⁶¹ He was generally known as a conservative in his everyday life and musical tastes.⁶² At the same time, Taneyev was also known among Moscow musicians as being always open to criticism.⁶³ Taneyev was always straightforward in his assessment of other musicians, regardless of their former merits and authority. Tchaikovsky, who was once a teacher of Taneyev, considered him as his most severe and honest critic.⁶⁴ But it is worth noting that Taneyev's criticism was sometimes perceived as unfair and subjective, especially when he dealt with contemporary modernistic composers.⁶⁵ Sometimes Taneyev's conservatism in music tastes prevented young composers from studying at the Moscow Conservatory.⁶⁶ Some reproached Taneyev for being too cold and rational. Sofya Andreevna

⁵⁹ Pyotr Tchaikovsky, *XIII: Letters (1885-1886)*, ed. Nina Viktorova and I.S. Polyakova, vol. 13, *Polnoye Sobraniye Sochineniy. Literaturnyye Proizvedeniya i Peregipiska (Full Composition of Writings. Literary Works and Correspondence)* (Moscow: Muzika, 1971), 90–93.

⁶⁰ Svetlana Savenko, *S.I. Taneyev* (Moscow: Muzika, 1984), 169.

⁶¹ Nikolai Zverev was a pianist and a teacher. He studied piano with Alexandre Dubuque –one of the first professors at the Moscow Conservatory. Zverev taught at the Conservatory from 1870. Among his students were Alexander Siloti, Sergei Rachmaninoff, Alexander Scriabin, Matvey Pressman, Alexander Goldenweiser. Sergei Rachmaninoff, *Vospominaniya. Statyi. Intervyu. Pisma (Memories. Articles. Interview. Letters)*, vol. 1, *Literaturnoe Nasledie (Literary Heritage)* (Moscow: Sovietskii Kompozitor, 1978), 146–50; Max Harrison, *Rachmaninoff: Life, Works, Recordings* (London: Continuum, 2006), 11–15; Vyacheslav Karatygin, "To the Memory of S.I. Taneyev," *The Musical Quarterly* 13, no. 4 (October 1927): 540–54.

⁶² For example, he lived until his death in a modest house without electricity, plumbing, central heating and a telephone, which was already an obvious anachronism in Moscow at the beginning of the 20th century. Natalia Proshina, *Taneyev. Vladimirske Stranitsi (Taneyev. Vladimir's Pages)* (Vladimir: NIVA, 2002), 59; "He enjoyed and bowed only to old music. Palestrina, Bach, Mozart were his idols. He admired Beethoven, but, as it always seemed to me, less ardently and enthusiastically, and even less - romanticists, Chopin, Schumann; on the contrary, he was delighted with the semi-classic Mendelssohn and among Russian authors adored Tchaikovsky, which, perhaps, was partly a tribute to his personal sympathy for him as his teacher and musical mentor. He hated Wagner, Berlioz, List and Mussorgsky - then the most prominent innovators." Sabaneev, *Vospominaniya o Taneyeve (Memories about Taneyev)*, 131.

⁶³ Leonid Sabaneev, *Vospominaniya o Taneyeve (Memories about Taneyev)* (Moscow: Classica XXI, 2003), 77–78.

⁶⁴ Sergei Taneyev and Pyotr Tchaikovsky, *Peregipiska (Correspondence)* (Moscow: Muzika, 1951), 26–30.

⁶⁵ "Italians write badly, like Leoncavallo or other modern operatic composers". Sergei Taneyev, *1899-1902.*, vol. 2, 3 vols., *Dnevnik (Diaries)* (Moscow: Muzika, 1982), 197.

⁶⁶ In 1885 Taneyev found Vladimir Rebikov's (1866-1920) compositions too dissonant to admit him to the Moscow Conservatory. Rebikov never again sought musical training in Russia. Rebecca Mitchell, "Nietzsche's Orphans: Music and the Search for Unity in Late Imperial Russia, 1905–1921" (PhD dissertation, Urbana-Champaign, University of Illinois, 2011), 46.

Tolstaya (1844-1919) wrote: “His outward kindness is inner indifference to the whole world, excluding sounds, composing music and listening to it.”⁶⁷

The composer paid much attention to the rising generation, never turning down the requests of the parents of child prodigies to give valuable advice or simply to influence, to motivate their creative activities. The meeting with Taneyev left an indelible impression on the young Sergei Prokofiev (1891-1953), who afterwards spoke very warmly of his first teacher.⁶⁸ Sergei Rachmaninoff (1873-1943) also treated Taneyev with the same level of respect.⁶⁹ Fostered in Rubinstein’s traditions of “merciless sincerity and unpurchaseable integrity,” Taneyev hated servility, flattery and the desire to please higher-ranking officials.⁷⁰ He was “sensitive to injustice, to moral falsity, like a musician to a false note.”⁷¹

Taneyev the director

I argue that contrary to the opinion of the 19th century Moscow musicians and Soviet musicologists about Taneyev, as a natural successor of the Rubinstein tradition, Taneyev created his own style of leadership for the Conservatory. Of course, he made a lot of efforts to support and develop the initiatives of the first director, but he used other methods and organized the structure of the institution subordinate to him according to other principles. Above I presented how his contemporaries viewed his work, now I show how Taneyev himself perceived his duties based on his detailed correspondence with Tchaikovsky. A close look at all these sources (memories, correspondence and Taneyev’s diaries) gives a less subjective idea of the state of affairs at the Moscow Conservatory. Below I juxtapose features specific to the management styles of Taneyev and Rubinstein.

⁶⁷ The Countess Sofya Tolstaya was a writer and music lover. She was a big friend and supporter of Taneyev. Anne Edwards, *Sonya: The Life of Countess Tolstoy* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1981), 352–95; Sophia Tolstaya, *1862-1900*, vol. 1, *Dnevnik. 1862-1910 (Diaries. 1862-1910)* (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, 1978), 423.

⁶⁸ Sergei Prokofiev, *Avtobiografiya (Autobiography)* (Moscow: Sovietskii Kompozitor, 1982), 75–79; Sergei Prokofiev and Nikolai Myaskovsky, *Perepiska (Correspondence)* (Moscow: Sovietskii Kompozitor, 1977), 137.

⁶⁹ Rachmaninoff, *Vospominaniya. Statyi. Intervyu. Pisma (Memories. Articles. Interview. Letters)*, 1:253.

⁷⁰ Barenboym, *Nikolay Grigoryevich Rubinshteyn. Istoriya Zhizni i Deyatel'nosti (Nikolai Rubinstein. History of Life and Work)*, 140.

⁷¹ Sabaneev, *Vospominaniya o Taneyeve (Memories about Taneyev)*, 108.

Taneyev became director of the Conservatory in 1885 at the age of twenty-eight. Four years had passed after the death of the first director of the Conservatory in 1881, but its administration faced serious problems, and financial debts were getting critical.⁷² After Nikolai Rubinstein's death, many valuable contacts with financial donors and the noble patrons from RMO main directorate in St. Petersburg broke off.⁷³ Tensions between the artistic council of the Conservatory and the RMO Moscow branch were also increasing. Inside the Conservatory disagreements began to grow between professors in the absence of Rubinstein, who had played the role of an arbitrator.⁷⁴ The level of discipline and quality of education began to fall. From 1881 to 1883 the Conservatory director was Nikolai Hubert (1840-1888), from 1883 to 1885 - Carl Albrecht (1839-1893).⁷⁵ They could not remedy the situation.⁷⁶ The RMO patron Grand Duke Konstantin Nikolaevich even planned to appoint Tchaikovsky, then one of the RMO directors, as the Conservatory director in Moscow.⁷⁷ Tchaikovsky in his turn suggested Taneyev's candidacy as the best solution of the Conservatory's problems.⁷⁸

Taneyev wrote detailed letters to Tchaikovsky soon after the election and after studying all the documents about the confusion with the financing of the Conservatory and convoluted relationship between the Conservatory and the RMO. In a letter dated June 18, 1885 he wrote:

When I was elected as director, I thought that it would be wise for me to intervene with the RMO affairs as little as possible and only deal with the affairs of the Conservatory. But apparently, I will also have to interfere in the RMO affairs.

From 1872/73, the Musical Society separated the bookkeeping of the Conservatory from its own (this year the government appointed a Conservatory subsidy of 20 000 rubles) and

⁷² Lyudmila Korabelnikova, *S.I. Taneyev v Moskovskoj Konservatorii (Taneyev in the Moscow Conservatory)* (Moscow: Muzika, 1974).

⁷³ Grigory Moiseev, "P.I. Tchaikovsky I Velikiy Knyaz Konstantin Nockolaevich. K Istorii Vsaimootnoscheniy (P.I. Tchaikovsky and the Grand Duke Konstantin Nikolaevich. To History of Relations)," *Nauchnyj Vestnik Moskovskoj Konservatorii*, no. 3 (2013): 136–67.

⁷⁴ Korabelnikova, *S.I. Taneyev v Moskovskoj Konservatorii (Taneyev in the Moscow Conservatory)*, 115.

⁷⁵ Larry Sitsky, *Anton Rubinstein: An Annotated Catalog of Piano Works and Biography* (London: Greenwood Press, 1998), 185.

⁷⁶ Mily Balakirev was offered to be the Moscow Conservatory director in 1881, but he declined the offer. Stuart Campbell, "Balakirev, Mily Alekseyevich," in *Grove Music Online*, 2001, <https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/omo-9781561592630-e-0000040685>.

⁷⁷ Moiseev, "P.I. Tchaikovsky I Velikiy Knyaz Konstantin Nockolaevich. K Istorii Vsaimootnoscheniy (P.I. Tchaikovsky and the Grand Duke Konstantin Nikolaevich. To History of Relations)," 163–64.

⁷⁸ Taneyev and Tchaikovsky, *Perepiska (Correspondence)*, 123.

immediately recorded that the Conservatory **owed** the Music Society 22,785 r. for the property that the Conservatory was using.⁷⁹ This seeming debt brings a lot of confusion into the accounts.

As you probably know, government subsidies are not enough to cover the expenses of the Conservatory. Each year, the Conservatory takes an additional amount from the RMO. This amount is attributed to the Conservatory's debt to the RMO (everyone knows that the Conservatory can never pay this debt), which began with a debt of 22,785 r. (1872/73) and reached in 1883/84 the amount of 144 701 r.

All this, in essence, is not particularly important. The Conservatory and the RMO are divided on paper, but in reality, these two institutions can be considered as one. If the government gives the Conservatory annually 20,000 r. and does not consider it a **debt**, then it is all the more natural for the Russian **Music** society to give money to support the Conservatory, and this money, in essence, cannot be considered as a debt. The musical society gives concerts and the income (or part of it) is used to maintain the school. Such a state of affairs would be quite natural. But actually, it is not.⁸⁰

Further, Taneyev gives a scrupulous description of a loan of 191,029 rubles in 1878 taken from the merchant Nikolai Alekseev (1852-1893) for the purchase of a building to expand the Conservatory.⁸¹ Pointing out all the revenue in the form of donations from other donors, income from concerts and from selling some Conservatory-owned buildings (e.g. the archive building) as well as the cost of repairing and re-equipping the building, and paying interest on the debt, Taneyev indicates that the Conservatory still owes Alekseev 58 632 r. in 1883/84.

Obviously, this debt will grow more and more. We have nothing more to sell to cover it. Thus, the two institutions, the RMO and the Conservatory, exist only because a rich merchant gives them money every year. As he stops doing this or wishes to get the money he paid back, so these two institutions must cease to exist.

The main goal of those people who are interested in the Musical Society and the Conservatory should be to free these institutions from such dependence.

How can this goal be achieved? a) to decrease costs and to increase revenues from the RMO and b) to decrease costs and to increase revenues from the Conservatory.

In the impossible position in which these two institutions are located, one should literally cherish every penny. Do those who manage the monetary part of these institutions act like this? No, they do the exact opposite. They intentionally waste money and every year more and more confuse the affairs of the RMO and the Conservatory.

The expenditure on concerts a year before the death of Nikolai Rubinstein (1879/80) was: 2945 for quartet concerts, 12872 for symphonic concerts, 15155 in total. In 1883/84 (after 4 years), expenses were: 5023 for quartets and 31643 for symphonies, a total of 36,666.

⁷⁹ All the emphases in Taneyev's writings are in the originals.

⁸⁰ Sergei Taneyev and Pyotr Tchaikovsky, *Perepiska (Correspondence)* (Moscow: Muzika, 1951), 124.

⁸¹ Alekseev was the elected mayor of Moscow in 1885–1893. He was serving as one of the RMO directors in 1885–1889. William C. Brumfield, *Commerce in Russian Urban Culture, 1861–1914.*, Woodrow Wilson Center Press (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002), 216–19.

That is, an increase by almost 2 ½ times. I have no data for further years. But there can be no doubt that costs have increased significantly.

As I said, the Directorate seems to be systematically striving for one goal - to put the Musical Society and the Conservatory in a hopeless situation and in view of this task undertakes a number of activities, such as increasing Max Erdmannsdörfer's salary by almost twice; giving him the right to compile programs and invite foreign artists at will, paying them at his discretion and not taking into consideration whether their engagement is of interest to the public (example: violinist Petri, pianist Friedheim, singer Mrs. Joachim).⁸²

Drawing up contracts, such as Ms. Eichenwald's contract, under which she, having one student, receives 500 rubles.⁸³ Being obliged to perform at 10 concerts for 500 rubles and having played only in three, she, on the basis of this contract, requires an increase in payment for each concert because they are called "unscheduled", and the contract mentions only the 'current' symphonic concerts.

Drafting secret contracts, such as the contract with Kommisarzhovsky, under which for a huge amount he, by the way, must **oversee!** (strange duty still not assigned to professors) a non-existent class that is not in the curriculum and whose program the corresponding professor refused to submit before being notified that he was invited to be a professor (?!).

Meanwhile, teacher salaries increase with each passing year. The Conservatory paid a salary: 1877/78 – 47 553r., 78/79 – 49 611r., 79/80 – 54 691r., 80/81 (year of Nikolai Grigorievich's death) 68 965 r., 81/82 – 66 322 r., 82/83 – 66 393 r., 83/84 – 75 985 r.

If you and I want to bring not the imaginary, but the real benefit to the two institutions mentioned above, then **we should strive to ensure that they come to a position in which they used to be previously.** Let the RMO continue to issue hundreds of thousands of debts to the Conservatory, but, taken as a whole, these institutions **must** be content with income from concerts and a government subsidy, not being dependent on anyone.

The only means to this is constant and rigorous accounting and reporting! So, to my great regret and against my desire, I consider myself forced not to confine to a passive role in the RMO directorate, but, as far as my powers allow, to **interfere** in its affairs. Only by preventing the directorate from doing what it does, we can do something useful for the Conservatory and the Musical Society, eliminating the fate of being Alekseev's debtors always **unable** to pay the debts. I anticipate that this my intention should lead to many troubles and may result in my transformation from a director into a non-director.⁸⁴

Having thus outlined a range of problems and presented a program of action, Taneyev with Tchaikovsky's assistance established robust interconnection between the RMO and the

⁸² Max Erdmannsdörfer (1845-1905) was a German conductor, pianist and composer. He studied at the Leipzig Conservatory and was the principal conductor of the Russian Musical Society concerts in Moscow, and professor at the Moscow Conservatory in 1882-1889. Alfons Ott, "Max Carl Christian von Erdmannsdörfer," in *Neue Deutsche Biographie* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1959), <https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd116531398.html#ndbcontent>.

⁸³ During Rubinstein's directorship, a piano professors' salary was calculated on the basis of 200 rubles per student. Kashkin, *Pervoe Dvadcatipyatiletie Moskovskoi Konservatorii (The First 25 Years of the Moscow Conservatory)*, 1-16.

⁸⁴ Taneyev and Tchaikovsky, *Perepiska (Correspondence)*, 128.

Conservatory, and improved matters with concert activities in Moscow. Below I present three areas where Taneyev governed the Conservatory in a way different from Rubinstein.

The first direction, where Taneyev and Rubinstein acted differently was finances. Rubinstein managed expenses by combining positions of piano professor, director, the RMO concerts' director while paying himself as if he was only piano professor. He also covered the deficit with donor donations and government subsidies (see Chapter 1). A thorough financial audit of how each ruble from the Conservatory budget would be spent was not among his priorities, since his ability to raise additional funds allowed the institution to function safely without a decrease in its efficiency. Taneyev could not count on this as he lacked connections among the financial elite and noble patrons of the RMO.⁸⁵ Unlike Rubinstein, Taneyev abstained from holding more than one office. He intended to create a system when Conservatory would not be an extension of director's personality, as it was under Rubinstein.⁸⁶

The second direction where Taneyev had views on the order of things different from Rubinstein's was the artistic council. Rubinstein was an indisputable leader among professors and he always had the last word, although he fostered the council members' sharing their opinions which he valued very much. Taneyev, in turn, put the principle of collegiality in the development of decisions at the forefront and, accordingly, all decisions of the artistic council were based on the consensus of its members and not on the implementation of the director's will.⁸⁷ In other words, Taneyev insisted on the greater responsibility of all members of the artistic council, not giving them the opportunity to delegate it to the director, even if they completely agreed with his opinion. Based on the charter of 1878, Taneyev encouraged professors to play a more active role in the life of the Conservatory assigning himself as a moderator of discussion rather than the initiator. Being a "staunch positivist" he put written law

⁸⁵ Grigory Moiseev, "Vasily Safonov I Avgusteishie Pokroviteli Moskovskoi Konservatorii (Vasily Safonov and the August Patrons of the Moscow Conservatory)," *Nauchnyj Vestnik Moskovskoj Konservatorii*, no. 4 (2014): 62–91.

⁸⁶ McQuere, "The Moscow Conservatory 1866-1889 Nikolai Rubinstein and Sergei Taneev," 48.

⁸⁷ Nikolai Bazhanov, *Taneyev* (Moscow: Molodaya Gvardia, 1971), 144.

above all, in the case of the Conservatory, its charter of 1878.⁸⁸ He strictly followed these rules himself and made sure that others did, too.⁸⁹ The director prevented the professors from violating the charter's regulations including those concerning corruption and abuse by professors. Over the 4 years of his directorship, he developed among teachers a culture of responsible attitude to their authority.⁹⁰

The third dissimilarity was their personnel policies. Rubinstein recruited Conservatory teachers according to their loyalty to his vision of the Conservatory's future. If their view was different from the vision of the director and his dream team, then Rubinstein deliberately went into conflict with them that ended with the dismissal of the dissenting professor. In particular, soon after hiring he secured the dismissal of music history teacher Yuri Arnold (1811-1898) and replaced him with Nikolai Hubert who was loyal to the Conservatory founder's ideals and later became its next director.⁹¹ There were no disputes in Rubinstein's team of like-minded people due to the unity of opinion, therefore Sabaneev called them "Rubinstein guard."⁹² Besides, one of the items on the director's agenda was to encourage hiring graduates of the Moscow Conservatory into teaching positions. At the first stage of the Conservatory's development, Rubinstein was forced to invite musicians from abroad, but as soon as local personnel began to mature, he gradually replaced retiring foreign professors with them.⁹³

Taneyev, on the contrary, invited professors to the Conservatory not according to their views on certain aspects of its development, but on the basis of their professional and

⁸⁸ Sabaneev, *Vospominaniya o Taneyeve (Memories about Taneyev)*, 98.

⁸⁹ Numerous cases of mentioning Taneyev's scrupulous attitude to the rules can be found in his diaries. Probably, the most vivid example was note on September 1, 1905. See more in Chapter 6

⁹⁰ Korabelnikova, *S.I. Taneyev v Moskovskoj Konservatorii (Taneyev in the Moscow Conservatory)*, 115–31.

⁹¹ Jennifer Spencer, "Arnol'd, Yury," in *Grove Music Online*, 2001, <https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/omo-9781561592630-e-0000001306>; Jennifer Spencer, "Gubert [Hubert], Nikolay Al'bertovich," in *Grove Music Online*, 2001, <https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/omo-9781561592630-e-0000011912>.

⁹² Sabaneev, *Vospominaniya o Rossii (Memories about Russia)*, 107.

⁹³ Kashkin, *Pervoe Dvadcatipyatiletie Moskovskoi Konservatorii (The First 25 Years of the Moscow Conservatory)*, 17–50.

organizational skills. Besides Safonov with whom Taneyev did not agree in everything but valued him as a qualified musician, Taneyev also invited Mikhail Ippolitov-Ivanov (1859–1935) to Moscow from Tbilisi, because of his successful creation and management of a music college and the RMO local brunch.⁹⁴ Thus, Taneyev invited two future directors of the Conservatory to teach there.⁹⁵ As for human relations, Taneyev did not seek unity of worldviews, but supported plurality of views in the Artistic council and the RMO directorate as well. He believed that differences of opinions between collective members were essential and there was no necessity to overcome them.⁹⁶

Taneyev's management style

Based on Taneyev's financial, management, and personnel policies, I speculate that he saw his task as a kind of mathematical or counterpoint exercise – to harmonize the affairs of the Conservatory and its relations with the RMO Moscow branch. His way acting could be characterized within the framework of the rational choice theory.⁹⁷ This theory “views institutions as governance or rule systems, but argues that they represent deliberately constructed edifices established by individuals seeking to promote or protect their interests.”⁹⁸ The basic premise of rational choice theory is that aggregate social behavior results from the behavior of individual actors, each of whom is making their individual decisions. The behavior of the

⁹⁴ “It would be highly desirable for me that Ippolitov-Ivanov be our professor. I have a very high opinion of him as a musician, I have heard that he is a wonderful conductor and that he is a very good person. All these properties are of such a kind that I had an irresistible desire to see him as our professor.” Taneyev and Tchaikovsky, *Perepiska (Correspondence)*, 160

⁹⁵ Andrea Olmstead, *Juilliard: A History* (Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1999), 8–9.

⁹⁶ “I do not approve that our directors are going to quit because of a conflict with their colleagues. The Directorate consists of six people, everyone can have their own opinion, and there is nothing offensive that this opinion cannot be shared by others.” Taneyev and Tchaikovsky, *Perepiska (Correspondence)*, 164

⁹⁷ Rational choice theory originated during the late eighteenth century. Earlier, representatives of the rational choice theory saw the prospects of its application in the possibility of establishing universal social laws by analogy with Newtonian mechanics. In twentieth century researchers, recognizing the merits of mathematical models for theoretical constructions, also indicated the priority of causal explanations. George Tsebelis, *Nested Games: Rational Choice in Comparative Politics*, California Series on Social Choice and Political Economy (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), 19.

⁹⁸ W. Richard Scott, *Institutions and Organizations: Ideas, Interests, and Identities*, Fourth (Los Angeles: SAGE Publications, Inc., 2014), 40.

system's individual elements can be ultimately ordered and synchronized since "social choices are not chaotic. They are quite stable" because "of the distinctive role that institutions play."⁹⁹

I contend that Taneyev saw the process of the Conservatory's functioning as a system of universal rules applicable to different types of institutions. An upside of his approach was that governing on these principles rapidly improved the affairs of the Conservatory in finances, academic and creative fields, and interpersonal communications between professors. In 1885, Taneyev had accepted his post with a budget deficit of eleven thousand rubles. By 1889 when he left the Directorship, the Conservatory had a surplus, albeit a small one, of 919 rubles.¹⁰⁰ During Taneyev's directorship, the number and level of applicants increased.¹⁰¹ The entrance level and the level of the final exam performance, especially in theoretical subjects, rose as well.¹⁰²

The downside of such approach was that Taneyev's managerial style had boundaries set by itself. In an effort to reduce to zero the entropy in the Conservatory functioning his approached the limits. As a result of his four years of hard work, the institution became much more harmonious. Although such organization laid the foundations for further growth, which the current management system could not provide, because it was based on the positivistic principles of governing. Having proved their effectiveness in the financial affairs, such methods were not sufficient in case of social relations in the institution, since they were "a far, far murkier environment" than the economic realm.¹⁰³ Taneyev's good economic policy was not enough for successful operation of the Conservatory because by itself, financial profit should not and could not be the main goal of this type of institution. As for finances, further development required

⁹⁹Terry M. Moe, "Political Institutions: The Neglected Side of the Story," *Journal of Law, Economics and Organizations*, no. 6 (1990): 213–53, 216.

¹⁰⁰ Korabelnikova, *S.I. Taneyev v Moskovskoj Konservatorii (Taneyev in the Moscow Conservatory)*, 128.

¹⁰¹ McQuere, "The Moscow Conservatory 1866-1889 Nikolai Rubinstein and Sergei Taneev," 49–57.

¹⁰² Leo Ginsburg, *Moskovskaja Konservatorija 1866-1966 (The Moscow Conservatory 1866-1966)* (Moscow: Muzika, 1966), 124–26.

¹⁰³ Paul Pierson, *Politics in Time: History, Institutions, and Social Analysis* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), 38.

more than just to be content with its own income, not being dependent on anyone, as the composer wrote to Tchaikovsky.

Another obstacle to the effective functioning of the Conservatory could be Taneyev's excessive conservatism, which applied the principles of orderliness and positivism to all processes, including composition.¹⁰⁴ Such conservatism prevented some young musicians from studying in the Conservatory, whose creative style Taneyev could not understand and accept. Vasily Safonov later mentioned: "he can ruin many prodigies with his academicism."¹⁰⁵

Rubinstein's successor

Based on all the aforementioned, I ask why the "Rubinstein guard" believed Taneyev was the successor of the first director's traditions? There were two main factors of such misinterpretation of Moscow professors towards Taneyev. The first one was his "Moscowness."¹⁰⁶ He shared most of the views of the society around him, and his employment as a graduate of the Moscow Conservatory was part of Rubinstein's personnel policy to invite Russian Conservatories' graduates. In this case Taneyev's legitimacy among the Moscow Conservatory professors was based on the "inside-oriented identity."¹⁰⁷

The second factor for perceiving Taneyev as Rubinstein's heir was commemorative events and concerts dedicated to the founder of the Conservatory Nikolai Rubinstein. Concerts were held twice a year, in March and December. The tradition of these commemorations was laid by Taneyev and therefore in the memory of Conservatory professors his name became even more closely connected with the traditions of Rubinstein himself. It is interesting to observe how the commemoration procedure established connections between the apparently unconnected

¹⁰⁴ An example of such an attitude towards young talents was Taneyev's prejudice against Alexander Scriabin's music. Leonid Sabaneev, *Vospominaniya o Skriabine (Memories about Scriabin)* (Moscow: Muzika, 2000), 24.

¹⁰⁵ Leonid Tumarinson, "Trudis' I Nadejsja ...": *Vasilij Safonov: Novye Materialy I Issledovanija ("Toil and Hope...": Vasily Safonov: New Material and Research)* (Moscow: CentrGumanitarnychIniciativ, 2017), 272.

¹⁰⁶ Ru: Moskovskost.

¹⁰⁷ Gaspare Nevola, "Politics, Identity, Territory. The 'Strength' and 'Value' of Nation-State, the Weakness of Regional Challenge," *Quaderni Del Dipartimento Di Sociologia e Ricerca Sociale* 58 (October 2011): 21.

phenomena of the institution. Perhaps it is because most commemorations celebrate the origins and rise of a particular group emphasizing its uniqueness and dissimilarity with other groups.¹⁰⁸ Taneyev was not like Rubinstein in many respects, but in the eyes of Taneyev's contemporaries, due to the traditions of Rubinstein commemorations, Taneyev's continuity was legitimized even without the knowledge of Taneyev himself.¹⁰⁹ On the contrary, many considered Safonov as the person alien to Rubinstein's principles of management and traditions (more details in subsequent chapters).

Such selectivity of memory and subjectivity of perception is explained by the fact that the memory of the society in which people are located affects their attitude. This "social memory designates all products that result from the operation of trans-individual relations."¹¹⁰ In turn, social memory forms an institutional memory, which already affects the functioning of the institution itself.¹¹¹ In any case, in 1889 when Safonov rose to the directorship, he had to deal with a synthesis of traditions and practices inherited from both Rubinstein and Taneyev, as well as the "Rubinstein Guard's" point of view about these traditions.

¹⁰⁸ See more about the phenomenon of commemorations: Maurice Halbwachs, *On Collective Memory*, ed. Lewis A. Coser (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 37–192.

¹⁰⁹ See more about constructing past: Barry Schwartz, "The Social Context of Commemoration: A Study in Collective Memory," *Social Forces* 61, no. 2 (December 1982): 374–97.

¹¹⁰ Yuk Hui, "On the Synthesis of Social Memories," in *Memory in Motion: Archives, Technology, and the Social*, by Ina Blom, Tront Lundemo, and Eivind Røssaak (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2017), 309.

¹¹¹ Mary Douglas, *How Institutions Think* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1986), 70.

Chapter 3 - Safonov's appointment

The previous chapter explored Taneyev's governing the Conservatory during his relatively short but very productive directorship and showed how the "Rubinstein guard," professors united by their loyalty to ideals of the Conservatory's founder, perceived Taneyev as a successor of Rubinstein's traditions. Taneyev's successor, Vasily Safonov, was director from 1889 to 1905. This chapter examines the first years of his directorship – 1889-1898, a time during which Safonov's management style took shape, a style that later caused conflicts with Taneyev and those representatives of "Rubinstein guard" who remained in the Conservatory.

Safonov's activities as director and the functioning of the Conservatory at that time have received detailed analyses from different scholars. Lynn Sargeant studied the activities of the Russian Musical Society (RMO), particularly the Moscow Conservatory. Tatyana Zima also dedicated her research to the RMO. Grigory Moiseev focused on Safonov's relations with influential noble patrons of the Conservatory. Biographical studies of the director, professors, and musicians actively involved in the events during the first period of Safonov's directorship are also considered. Among these sources are biographies of Alexander Siloti (1863-1945), Ferruccio Ferruccio Busoni (1866-1924), Anatoly Brandukov (1859-1930), and Vasily Safonov. This chapter combines previous research with primary sources such as direct participants' memoirs, letters, and diaries: Antonin Dvořák's (1841-1904) letters, Taneyev's letters and diaries, Tchaikovsky's letters, Safonov's letters. The memoirs of former students Alexander Goldenweiser (1875-1961), Matvey Presman (1870-1941), and Sergei Vasilenko (1872-1956) are used as well.

All these sources are reviewed within the framework of institutionalism by the use of concepts of institutional memory examined by Mary Douglas, and institutional identities studied by W. Richard Scott. In addition, using political science theory helps explain the structure of Safonov's legitimacy and his approval by other musicians of the Moscow Conservatory, such as

Max Weber's concept of authority, and the legitimation of power theory by David Beetham. The concepts of legitimacy drawn from political science and institutional theories enable an understanding of the events that took place in the Moscow Conservatory during Safonov's directorship, and offer new, different angles of its basic mechanisms.

This chapter analyses the origins of Safonov's legitimacy and his approval by Tchaikovsky, Taneyev and other musicians from the "Rubinstein guard," the proponents of the view that the Conservatory should develop based on the first director's principles. It also discusses the prerequisites for the erosion of this approval that was caused by the discrepancy between the Conservatory practices existed while Rubinstein and Taneyev and new ones, introduced by Safonov. Close reading, compare-and-contrast, and critical analysis of the existing sources about Safonov construct a portrait of Safonov the manager. This helps to comprehend the logic of his decisions and actions in the further contradictions and conflicts, whose origins can be traced back to the beginning of his academic career.

Safonov's biography and the contemporaries' opinions about him.

Vasily Safonov was born in 1852 in St. Petersburg into the family of a Cossack general. According to his father's will, Safonov prepared to become a diplomat. In 1872 he graduated from the prestigious Alexander Lyceum (or Tsarskoye Selo Lyceum) and got a job at the Imperial Ministers' committees, thus making his first steps in diplomatic career. However, at the age of 27 he made a turn unexpected to his family and entered the St. Petersburg Conservatory majoring in piano in 1879. After graduating in 1880 (just in seven months, moreover *cum laude*), Vasily Safonov was hired there as a piano instructor. Notwithstanding he had a good record in giving performances and enough teaching experience, his career did not advance.¹¹² Safonov remained interested in Conservatory teaching, however.

¹¹² Leonid Tumarinson and Boris Rozenfeld, *Letopis Žizni I Tvorchestva V.I. Safonova (Life Chronicle of Vasily Safonov)* (Moscow: Belyi Bereg, 2009), 59–81.

Once, in the summer of 1885, Vasily Safonov, then a piano instructor at the St. Petersburg Conservatory, had a dream: walking along a country road, he saw a wheat field as tall as a man, whose stems were bending under the weight of wheat ears. Weighing the ears in his hand, he marveled at the rich harvest. Suddenly he heard a voice: “This is your field.” After waking up, Safonov told his wife about the dream, noting: “I would be happy to have such a field.”¹¹³ On the same day July, 10 at lunch, he received a registered letter from Tchaikovsky: “The Moscow Conservatory would be very flattered if you deigned to join its piano faculty as a professor.”¹¹⁴ At the time he accepted this offer, Vasily Safonov hardly thought that he was destined to become one of the most prominent directors of the Moscow Conservatory, one who would contribute greatly to its fame. The institution became his personal “field” (поле), from which he gathered a “rich harvest” (обильная жатва), as Safonov himself said.¹¹⁵

In the summer of 1885, after briefly hesitating and consulting his father, Safonov accepted Tchaikovsky’s invitation to start teaching at Moscow.¹¹⁶ Safonov’s Petersburg friends were sharply against his moving to Moscow, in particular, Karl Davydov (1838-1889), Safonov’s mentor and patron.¹¹⁷ The then director of the St. Petersburg Conservatory, Davydov wrote:

You have the prospects for becoming our brightest professor and most outstanding performer - it is indisputable. I can neither compare the Petersburg musical world with the Moscow one, nor the two Conservatories. We have a real musical life on the widest scale, compared to Moscow’s—only a narrow circle of Conservatory people.¹¹⁸

¹¹³Meya Kingi, “V.I. Safonov,” in *Venok Na Mogilu Vasiliya Ilicha Safonova, Ugasshego Dirizhera Zemli Russkoy: Muzykalno-Kriticheskiy Almanakh*, ed. N.F. Martsello (Odessa: Izdatelstvo Odesskoy Muzykalnoy Akademii, 1918), 12–19, 15.

¹¹⁴Tchaikovsky and Safonov did not know each other before this correspondence. At the request of the newly appointed director Taneyev, Tchaikovsky was looking for a piano teacher at the Moscow Conservatory. Safonov was recommended by Sergei Tretyakov, a prominent philanthropist and music admirer. Tchaikovsky, *XIII: Letters (1885-1886)*.

¹¹⁵Leonid Tumarinson and Boris Rozenfeld, *Letopis Žizni I Tvorchestva V.I. Safonova (Life Chronicle of Vasily Safonov)* (Moscow: Belyi Bereg, 2009), 82.

¹¹⁶His father, Ilya Safonov (1825-1896), the general of Cossack troops, was at first sharply against his son’s musical career, but later reconciled and even began to warmly support his creative endeavors. To his son’s the question whether to take the Moscow Conservatory professor position he answered briefly: “To agree without hesitation!” *Ibid.*

¹¹⁷Semyon Ginsburg, “Karl Davydov: A Feature Portrait,” *Musicus: Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskoy Gosudarstvennoy Konservatorii Im. N.A. Rimskogo-Korsakova* 29, no. 1 (2012): 4–11.

¹¹⁸Vasily Safonov, *Izbrannoe: “Davajte Perepisyvat’sja S Amerikanskoju Bystrotoju ...”: Perepiska 1880-1905 Godov (Selected: “Lets Correspond with American Speed...” Correspondence 1880-1905)* (Moscow: Petroglif, 2011), 66.

However, Safonov preferred the prospects of a Moscow career to a stable position in St. Petersburg metropolitan society, even despite the fact that the then Moscow musical world looked indeed much more modest than that of Petersburg. Moscow opened up many more opportunities for Safonov to fulfill his ambitions. Subsequently, Safonov developed vigorous activity in gaining Moscow a noticeable position on the musical map of Europe. Perhaps for this reason Taneyev saw Vasily Safonov as the best candidate for replacing him as the director.

Taneyev's opinion was shared by Tchaikovsky who described Safonov in the following way - letter to Petr Jurgenson, March 28, 1890: "A person so childishly mild and alien to ambition like Taneyev is unable to raise the prestige of the Conservatory. It needs Safonov in the absence of Rubinstein."¹¹⁹ In the letter to Nadezhda von Meck, May 19, 1889, Tchaikovsky wrote:

It can be assumed that Safonov will be the most efficient and strong director. As a person, he is infinitely less sympathetic than Taneyev, but based on his position in society and high society, as well as his practicality, he meets the requirements of the Conservatory directorship better than Taneyev.¹²⁰

Tchaikovsky and other Safonov's contemporaries agreed that Safonov, while bright and ambitious, evoked ambivalent reactions. Perhaps, the most vivid and telling description was given to Safonov by his student Sergei Vasilenko:¹²¹

One cannot imagine a person who would evoke a more different attitude to people than Safonov. However, one must admit that he evoked more hostile feelings than friendly ones. This combination of the nineteenth century marquise and the rude Cossack in one person has always surprised me.¹²²

¹¹⁹ Vladimir Zhdanov, *1886-1893. Tchaikovsky, P.I. Yurgenson. Peregiska (Correspondence)*, vol. 2 (Moscow: Muzgis, 1952), 124.

¹²⁰Pyotr Tchaikovsky, *XV: Letters (1889)*, ed. Kseniya Davydova and Galina Labutina, vol. 15, 17 vols., *Polnoye Sobraniye Sochineniy. Literaturnyye Proizvedeniya i Peregiska (Full Composition of Writings. Literary Works and Correspondence)* (Moscow: Muzika, 1976), 114.

¹²¹ Sergei Vasilenko was a composer, conductor and teacher. From 1895 to 1901 he studied at the Moscow Conservatory counterpoint under Taneyev, composition under Ippolitov-Ivanov, and conducting under Safonov. He conducted at the Mamontov Private Opera (1903–1905), He taught orchestration and composition at the Moscow Conservatory (1907–41, 1943–56) where he was appointed professor in 1907 and head of the faculty of orchestration in 1932. Inna Barsova, "Vasilenko, Sergey Nikiforovich," in *Grove Music Online*, 2001, <https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/omo-9781561592630-e-0000029067>.

¹²²Leonid Tumarinson, "*Trudis' I Nadejsja ...*": *Vasilij Safonov: Novye Materialy I Issledovanija ("Toil and Hope...": Vasily Safonov: New Material and Research)* (Moscow: Centr Gumanitarnykh Inicativ, 2017), 261.

According to Alexander Goldenweiser's memoirs, in 1889, Taneyev when director invited Safonov to his office to tell him of his candidacy.¹²³ The telephone on the desk then rang, and Safonov picked up the receiver and said, "Conservatory director speaking." Taneyev said to Goldenweiser later, "You know, it was the first time I realized that we had picked the wrong man."¹²⁴ However, Taneyev approved Safonov's actions at the initial stage, as well as other members of the "Rubinstein guard" which legitimized Safonov in their eyes.

First steps as director and three indications of Safonov's succession to previous directors.

In terms of power legitimation, the Conservatory members' approval had a dual nature. Professors approved of Safonov's continuity of Taneyev's policy and, consequently, that of Rubinstein. In the second chapter of this thesis, I had questioned the continuity of Taneyev's policy from Rubinstein's. The reality and the "Rubinstein Guard's" conceptions about it may differ. However, David Beetham depicts three criteria for power legitimation: compliance with the rules, justifying rules within common beliefs, expressed consent of collective members.¹²⁵ Safonov met all of these. Taneyev had identified Safonov as his successor and the procedure of the director's appointment was legal. Safonov maintained traditions established by Taneyev and associated with Rubinstein (e.g. biannual Rubinstein's commemorations).

The first indication of this succession was Safonov's personnel policy. Like Taneyev, he aspired to attract the best teachers and musicians from Russia and abroad (the same policy that

¹²³ Alexander Goldenweiser was a pianist, teacher, writer and composer. At the Moscow Conservatory he studied the piano with Siloti, then Pabst, graduating in 1895, and composition with Arensky, Ippolitov-Ivanov and Taneyev, graduating in 1897. Goldenweiser was professor at the Moscow Conservatory from 1906 to 1961, and the director in 1922–1924 and 1939–1942. I.M. Yampol'sky and Inna Barsova, "Goldenweiser [Gol'denveyzer], Aleksandr," in *Grove Music Online*, 2001, <https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/omo-9781561592630-e-0000011378>.

¹²⁴ Dmitry Paperno, *Notes of a Moscow Pianist* (Cleckheaton, United Kingdom: Amadeus, 2003), 65.

¹²⁵ David Beetham, *The Legitimation of Power*, Second (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 16.

had resulted in Safonov's hiring).¹²⁶ Among the important professors recruited by Safonov were Ferruccio Busoni, Leone Giraldoni (1824-1897), and Umberto Masetti (1869-1919).¹²⁷ Safonov also invited to teaching positions several Moscow Conservatory alumni, such as Vera Scriabina (1875-1920) and Georges Conus, but the fact that the institution was their alma mater was not decisive for him. On this ground Safonov sharply disagreed with Tchaikovsky when a vacancy for a cello teacher arose in 1890. Tchaikovsky demanded that they hire Moscow Conservatory graduate Anatoly Brandukov but Safonov appointed Alfred von Glehn (1858-1927), a graduate of the St. Petersburg Conservatory.¹²⁸ Tchaikovsky believed that Safonov did it primarily to spite him.¹²⁹ However, Safonov had more reasons. His choice was a tribute to the memory of Davydov, Safonov's patron – Glehn was Davydov's student, – and at the same time manifested Safonov's desire to diversify Moscow's teaching practices by introducing representatives of other schools.¹³⁰ Later Safonov tried to overcome Moscow's "narrow circle of Conservatory people" view as Davydov described it. In addition to his belonging to Davydov's school, Glehn had a talent for organizational work – he had headed the classes of cello, double bass and chamber ensemble at the Kharkov College of Music (1882-1890), and in 1888 established a student symphony orchestra at Kharkov University, becoming its conductor.¹³¹ As in the case

¹²⁶ Safonov engaged of leading world musicians to conduct symphony concerts in Moscow. For instance, Antonin Dvořák performed his own symphonies in Moscow in 1890. Kurt Honolka, *Dvořák*, trans. Anne Wyburd (London: Haus Publishing, 2004), 72.

¹²⁷ Ferruccio Busoni was an Italian composer, pianist, conductor. He studied at the Vienna Conservatory and then with Wilhelm Mayer and Carl Reinecke. He taught piano at the Moscow Conservatory in 1890-1891. Della Couling, *Ferruccio Busoni: "A Musical Ishmael"* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2005), 65–130; Leone Giraldoni was an Italian operatic baritone. He studied in Florence with Luigi Ronzi, he taught vocal at the Moscow Conservatory in 1891-1897. Elizabeth Forbes, "Giraldoni, Leone," in *The Grove Book of Opera Singers*, ed. Laura Macy (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 192; Umberto Masetti was an Italian operatic tenor. He studied in Bologna with Arturo Buzzi. He taught vocal at the Moscow Conservatory in 1899-1919. Mikhail Lvov, A.V. *Nezhdanova* (Moscow: Muzika, 1952), 28–38.

¹²⁸ Anatoly Brandukov was a Russian cellist. He studied at the Moscow Conservatory with Karl Fitzenhagen in 1868-1877 and taught cello at the Moscow Conservatory in 1921-1930. Brandukov was a director of the Moscow Drama and Music School in 1906-1917. Leo Ginsburg, *Anatoly Brandukov* (Moscow: Muzika, 1951), 10–80; Alfred von Glehn studied in 1874-1881 at the St. Petersburg Conservatory with Davydov and taught cello at the Moscow Conservatory in 1890-1921. He taught at the Konservatorium der Musik Klindworth-Scharwenka in 1925-1927. Leo Ginsburg, *Istoriya Violonchelnogo Isskustva (The History of Cello Art)* (Moscow: Muzika, 1965), 214–23.

¹²⁹ Taneyev and Tchaikovsky, *Perepiska (Correspondence)*, 165.

¹³⁰ Glehn's introduction of Davidov's school had long-term consequences. Among his graduates and graduates of his students were many prominent musicians, including Gregor Piatigorsky and Mstislav Rostropovich. Elizabeth Wilson, *Mstislav Rostropovich: Cellist, Teacher, Legend* (London: Faber and Faber, 2007), 15–16.

¹³¹ Ginsburg, *Istoriya Violonchelnogo Isskustva (The History of Cello Art)*, 214–15.

with Ippolitov-Ivanov's appointment by Taneyev, Safonov aspired to invite to the Moscow Conservatory not only musicians with a strong performance record and pedagogic experience but also those with robust organizational skills.

The second indication was that Safonov followed Taneyev in his efforts to discipline the Conservatory. In 1886, Taneyev had introduced a new rule to give grades to students for each lesson instead of four times a year, which had been in place since the Conservatory's establishment. Such practice had made it possible to better monitor the progress of students and the performance of teachers' duties.¹³² Safonov decided to toughen order and began with professors who were late for lessons. When several professors were late for their lessons, Safonov came to their classes and began to teach the lesson until they arrived. A couple of such interventions shamed the latecomer into coming on time.¹³³ Tchaikovsky wrote about Safonov in 1890: "He soon taught us to look at him from the bottom up, like some kind of general."¹³⁴ The new director also obliged all students to attend choir classes, a policy which had already been introduced by Taneyev, but disregarded.¹³⁵ Safonov's student Matvey Presman mentioned that Safonov established the business in such a way that discipline was expected of both faculty and students, at the same time the educational process ran smoothly and professionally, with minimal disruptions.¹³⁶ Nevertheless, Taneyev wrote in 1892 that it did not concern theoretical subjects.

There are students on the theoretical exams who have never participated classes for the whole semester (even during the entire academic year) or have been 1-3 times. That is, such a number, at which it is impossible to master the given subject. Non-attendance of classes without the director's permission is becoming increasingly large.¹³⁷

¹³²Lyudmila Korabelnikova, *S.I. Taneyev v Moskovskoj Konservatorii (Taneyev in the Moscow Conservatory)* (Moscow: Muzika, 1974), 121–22.

¹³³Vladimir Krutov and Lidiya Shvetsova-Krutova, *Mir Rakhmaninova. Odin God (The World of Rachmaninoff. A One Year)* (Tambov: Yulis, 2006), 439–40.

¹³⁴Pyotr Tchaikovsky, *XVb: Letters (1890)*, ed. Kseniya Davydova and Galina Labutina, vol. 15, *Polnoye Sobraniye Sochineniy. Literaturnyye Proizvedeniya i Peregiska (Full Composition of Writings. Literary Works and Correspondence)* (Moscow: Muzika, 1977), 61.

¹³⁵Jakov Ravicher, *V.I. Safonov* (Moscow: Muzika, 1959), 20.

¹³⁶Zarui Apetian, *Vospominaniya o Rakhmaninove (Memories of Rachmaninoff)*, vol. 1 (Moscow: Muzika, 1988), 188–93.

¹³⁷Korabelnikova, *S.I. Taneyev v Moskovskoj Konservatorii (Taneyev in the Moscow Conservatory)*, 134.

The third indication of Safonov's continuity manifested in the construction of a new Conservatory building with a concert hall in 1895-1901. In Max Weber's tripartite classification of authority (charismatic, traditional, and legal authority) director's actions fall under the charismatic type of authority. It is a type of leadership in which authority derives from the charisma of the leader. This type of approval requires extraordinary actions by the leader in order for the collective to acknowledge his legitimacy.¹³⁸ The prerequisites for Safonov's fundraising feats were created by his predecessor Taneyev who put all the Conservatory affairs in order but the spirit of these transformations was purely Rubinstein's, which I discuss below.

In 1891, Safonov decided to build a large new building with two concert halls, where students could take exams and give concerts. Enormous amounts of funding were required. Since his studies at the Alexander Lyceum, Safonov had maintained close ties with his classmates. Subsequently, many of them became influential figures in the state, and they were useful in the Moscow Conservatory's further affairs at the time of Safonov's directorship.¹³⁹ His father-in-law was the Minister of Finance Ivan Vyshnegradsky (1832-1895), which also made it easier for him to gain access to the highest circles while defending the future interests of the Conservatory.¹⁴⁰ Using all his connections at every level - officials, aristocrats, Minister of Finance Sergei Witte (1849-1915), Senator Nikolai Stoyanovsky (1821-1900), Grand Duke Konstantin Konstantinovich (1858-1915), and Grand Duke Sergei Alexandrovich (1857-1905) - Safonov

¹³⁸Tony Waters and Dagmar Waters, *Weber's Rationalism and Modern Society. New Translations on Politics, Bureaucracy, and Social Stratification* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), 137–39.

¹³⁹ For example, Vladimir Kokovtsov (1853-1943) Senator, Minister of Finance (1904-1914) and Prime Minister of Russia (1911-1914). At the same year as Safonov he graduated from the Imperial Alexander Lyceum. Vladimir Kokovtsov, *Out of My Past*, trans. Laura Matveev (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1935), 591; Ravicher, *V.I. Safonov*, 6–10.

¹⁴⁰ Ivan Vyshnegradsky was the Minister of Finance in 1887-1892. Ivan Andreevsky, "Vyshnegradsky, Ivan," in *Entsiklopedicheskiy Slovar Brokgauza i Yefrona (Brockhaus and Efron Encyclopedic Dictionary)* (St. Petersburg: Brockhaus and Efron, 1892), 472; "The Terek Cossack at heart, a minister's son-in-law in practice" (ru: "казак терский – зять министерский") - this aphorism, which circulated at one time through musical Moscow, was aimed at Safonov who deserved it due to his biography and the nature of his activity. Sabaneev, *Vospominaniya o Rossii (Memories about Russia)*, 107.

was able to reach and convince Tsar Alexander III (1845-1894) of the need to allocate money for these purposes.¹⁴¹

In addition, for the same initiative the director received 200,000 rubles to be spent “at the Conservatory director’s discretion,” a huge contribution from the merchant and major philanthropist Gavriila Solodovnikov (1826-1901), who also provided a financial basis for the construction of the new building.¹⁴² Here Safonov showed an extraordinary diplomatic talent during negotiations at the highest levels. Sometimes he had to act independently of the RMO Directorate, contacting the decision-makers directly.¹⁴³ Thanks to this, he managed to conclude this deal at an impressive speed, considering the bureaucratic hurdles he faced. In 1893, two years after Safonov began his fundraising efforts, His Majesty Alexander III with the highest decree allocated 400,000 rubles for the construction of a new Conservatory building with two concert halls.¹⁴⁴ When the actual building was completed on April 7, 1901, the RMO’s Moscow branch concerts began to be held in the Conservatory big concert hall with an organ built by Aristide Cavallé-Coll’s.¹⁴⁵ The existence of its own hall was crucial for the branch, as it made

¹⁴¹Sergei Witte was one of the most influential politicians of the Russian Empire’s late decades. He was the Minister of Finance in 1893-1903 and in the 1905 became the first Prime Minister in the Russian history, holding this position in 1905-1906. Since his student’s years Witte admired music. See Chapter 4 in, Francis W Wcislo, *Tales of Imperial Russia: The Life and Times of Sergei Witte, 1849-1915* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011); Nikolai Stoyanovsky was a lawyer, Active Privy Councillor, Secretary of State and senator. He was a lifelong distinguished member and deputy Head of the RMO in 1877-1895. Ivan Andreevsky, “Stoyanovsky, Nikolai,” in *Entsiklopedicheskiy Slovar Brokgauza i Yefrona (Brockhaus and Efron Encyclopedic Dictionary)* (St. Petersburg: Brockhaus and Efron, 1901), 716–17; Konstantin Konstantinovich was a talented pianist and a lifelong distinguished member of the RMO. He was a grandson of Emperor Nicholai I. Son of Grand Duke Konstantin Nikolaevich, the Head of RMO in 1873-1892. Grigory Moiseev, “The Grand Dukes Romanovs’ Personal Diaries as a Musical and Historical Source (the 2nd Half of the 19th Century),” *Nauchnyy Vestnik Moskovskoy Konservatorii* 34, no. 3 (2018): 10–32; Grand Duke Sergei Alexandrovich was a brother of Emperor Alexander III and uncle of Emperor Nicholai II. Between 1891 and 1905, he served as Governor-General of Moscow. He was a distinguished member of RMO and a patron of its Moscow branch. Christopher Warwick, *Ella: Princess, Saint and Martyr* (Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 2006), 167; Grigory Moiseev, “Vasily Safonov I Avgusteishie Pokroviteli Moskovskoi Konservatorii (Vasily Safonov and the August Patrons of the Moscow Conservatory),” *Nauchnyy Vestnik Moskovskoy Konservatorii*, no. 4 (2014): 72–73.

¹⁴² Protokoli zasedaniy Moskovskoy direktzii IRMO (minutes of meetings of the IRMO Moscow branch directorate), 27 August 1891, Fond 676 op. 1 ed.hr. 77 list 7-8, Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, Moscow, Russia.

¹⁴³Moiseev, “Vasily Safonov I Avgusteishie Pokroviteli Moskovskoi Konservatorii (Vasily Safonov and the August Patrons of the Moscow Conservatory),” 73.

¹⁴⁴*Otchet Po Postroyke i Torzhestvennomu Otkrytiyu Zdaniya Konservatorii (Report on the Construction and Grand Opening of the Conservatory Building)* (Moscow: Pechatnia S.P. Yakovleva, 1905), 2–3.

¹⁴⁵ 100,000 francs were allocated for the creation of the organ by the philanthropist and son of a large industrialist, Sergei von Derviz (1863-1943). The generosity and love of von Derviz for music was so great that after he had donated to the music society 200,000 rubles, his uncle began trusteeship nephew’s finances. Pyotr Tchaikovsky,

the concert practice independent of the conditions and whims of the other venues' owners. With the new facility, the popularity and the number of concerts of the RMO in Moscow began to grow in the 1900s.¹⁴⁶

Safonov did a tremendous job of attracting finances and overcoming bureaucratic barriers and his efforts were crowned with success. Even Safonov's main opponent in those years, Tchaikovsky, praised him: "You have done a really great and good deed for the Moscow Musical Society. Bravo! I expected a lot from your intelligence and administrative talent, but it exceeded my expectations."¹⁴⁷ It is noteworthy that Rubinstein had acted in similar ways when seeking a subsidy for the Conservatory from the emperor when the institution was on the verge of bankruptcy in 1872. Rubinstein circumvented the internal hierarchy of the RMO and used all his connections in the higher circles. Thus, Safonov's approval by the "Rubinstein Guard" was based on his following the practices and traditions established by Taneyev as well as his occasionally breaking the rules like Rubinstein did. It was legitimacy resting upon both succession practices, and outright rebelliousness against regulations.

Although some Safonov's steps in personnel and discipline policies were questioned by Tchaikovsky and Taneyev, they generally approved his actions. The same was with Safonov's acceptability to disregard the rules where he believed it was necessary for the good of business.¹⁴⁸ At first, this approach contributed to a marked acceleration of beneficial decisions,

XIV: *Letters (1887-1888)*, ed. Natalya Sinkovskaya and Irina Sokolinskaya, vol. 14, *Polnoye Sobraniye Sochineniy. Literaturnyye Proizvedeniya i Perepiska (Full Composition of Writings. Literary Works and Correspondence)* (Moscow: Muzika, 1974), 137–38; Boris Sabaneev, *Organ Cavaillé-Coll i Moskovskaya Konservatoria (Cavaillé-Coll Organ and the Moscow Conservatory)* (Moscow: Tipographia P.P. Ryabushinskogo, 1911), 1–10.

¹⁴⁶ See more in the third and fourth chapters: Tatyana Zima, "Russkoe Muzikalnoe Obchestvo Kak Sociokulturnoe Javlenie v Rossii Vtoroi Poloviny XIX - Nachala XX Vekov (Russian Musical Society as Sociocultural Phenomenon in Russia of Late 19 - Early 20 Centuries)" (PhD dissertation, St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg State Institute of Culture, 2015).

¹⁴⁷ Pyotr Tchaikovsky, *XVII: Letters (1893)*, ed. Kseniya Davydova and Galina Labutina, vol. 17, 17 vols., *Polnoye Sobraniye Sochineniy. Literaturnyye Proizvedeniya i Perepiska (Full Composition of Writings. Literary Works and Correspondence)* (Moscow: Muzika, 1981), 125.

¹⁴⁸ For instance, the talented blind violinist and composer Illarion Kozlov (1878– 1933) entered the Moscow Conservatory in the autumn of 1896. Safonov insisted on making an exception for him in the curriculum, adapting the subjects to his needs. Safonov, *Izbrannoe: "Davajte Perepisyvatsja S Amerikanskoju Bystrotoju ...": Perepiska 1880-1905 Godov (Selected: "Lets Correspond with American Speed..." Correspondence 1880-1905)*, 179–80.

especially on financial issues. But later, Safonov began to be perceived as regularly abusing the rules which turned Taneyev, his former mentor and supporter, into his main opponent within the walls of the Conservatory.¹⁴⁹

Prerequisites for the conflicts

In this subsection I discuss two Safonov's practices which caused the erosion of the legitimacy and approval given by the "Rubinstein guard" at the start of his directorship.

The first one was how Safonov handled financial affairs. However successful he was as a fundraiser, the income from student fees did not cover the growing expenses of the Conservatory. Under Safonov it did not become a self-sustaining enterprise and still needed external financial support. Having established relations with Moscow industrialists and merchants, Safonov's efforts with private philanthropists provided extensive aid to the institution's budget.¹⁵⁰ At the same time, he did not allow sponsors to dictate their conditions on how the curriculum should be set up, their donations notwithstanding. Safonov also clearly understood that if the Conservatory depended financially on the state, officials would begin to interfere into the Conservatory's affairs. For this reason, Safonov did not like §5 of the 1878 charter (see Appendix 1) that guaranteed the Conservatories annual aid from the state. As he said about this, "it is better to starve but develop freely."¹⁵¹

This approach to the implementation of financial donations differed him from Rubinstein who insisted on government subsidies being institutionalized in the charter. Safonov would be more satisfied with one-time financial receipts, which were always unconditional and did not entail a possible audit by officials from the education ministry or the RMO main directorate's members from St. Petersburg. Moreover, such method of fundraising also strengthened

¹⁴⁹ Korabelnikova, S.I. *Taneyev v Moskovskoj Konservatorii (Taneyev in the Moscow Conservatory)*, 133.

¹⁵⁰ Leonid Tumarinson, ed., *"Nash Starik": Alexander Goldenweiser i Moskovskaya Konservatoria ("Our Old Man": Alexander Goldenweiser and the Moscow Conservatory)* (Moscow: Centr Gumanitarnych Inicativ, 2015), 419.

¹⁵¹ Safonov, *Izbrannoe: "Davajte Perepisyvatsja S Amerikanskoju Bystrotoju ...": Perepiska 1880-1905 Godov (Selected: "Lets Correspond with American Speed..." Correspondence 1880-1905)*, 199.

Safonov's powers. Nevertheless, the growth of Conservatory expenditures exceeded these gains. For example, for the year 1898-1899 the Moscow branch under Safonov's management had a deficit of 16000 rubles (there was a surplus in the last year of Taneyev's directorship), which was eventually covered by sponsors, primarily "the inexhaustible donation of Solodovnikov."¹⁵² The reason for such state of financial affairs was Safonov's lesser scrupulosity in financial matters compared to Taneyev. Safonov did not try to go deep into every spent ruble to minimize those expenses that he considered optional, *ipso facto* inadvertently slowing the Conservatory's development into financially stable institution.

The second practice that differed Safonov from his predecessors was his attitude towards the curriculum. Rubinstein and Taneyev had regarded music theory studies as the most important component in the education of future musicians, regardless of their performance specialty. Taneyev tried not to touch the teaching process, preferring instead to lower expenditure in other types of costs. But Safonov did not shun the cutting of music classes. As a performing musician, he did not share the respect of his predecessors for theoretical subjects. A music performer without strong, fundamental knowledge of music theory could not be an outstanding artist, they believed.¹⁵³ Safonov had a different opinion. He believed that theory helped a good musician to practice, but was far from the alpha and omega of music studies. Safonov rather shared the views commonly held in the St. Petersburg Conservatory that Conservatories should be not only "temples" that give rise to great artists, but also "factories" that produce good performers, and teachers (I explain this view in greater details in Chapter 6).¹⁵⁴ One way or another, to ensure greater profits from student income, he began to reduce classroom hours for music theoretical

¹⁵² Taneyev, *1899-1902*, 80.

¹⁵³ Leo Barenboym, *Nikolay Grigoryevich Rubinshteyn. Istoriya Zhizni i Deyatel'nosti (Nikolai Rubinstein. History of Life and Work)*. (Moscow: Muzika, 1982), 101–5; Korabelnikova, *S.I. Taneyev v Moskovskoj Konservatorii (Taneyev in the Moscow Conservatory)*, 122–32.

¹⁵⁴ Korabelnikova, *S.I. Taneyev v Moskovskoj Konservatorii (Taneyev in the Moscow Conservatory)*, 132–34; Lynn Mary Sargeant, *Harmony and Discord. Music and the Transformation of Russian Cultural Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 115–20.

disciplines and even combined classes, which immediately provoked a protest from faculty members who taught theory, especially Georges Conus (more about this in Chapter 4).

Safonov's attitude to theoretical subjects, not typical to the Moscow Conservatory of previous years threatened this institution's identity. At the end of the nineteenth century, the Moscow Conservatory, as well as the St. Petersburg Conservatory, developed its own type of institutional identity. This identity was based on two subtypes, explicit and tacit. The explicit type included all documents regulating interrelations between people: the charter, examination requirements, attendance and discipline rules, textbooks. The tacit rules included the existing traditions and customs that formed the collective and institutional memory of the organization, acquired its "distinctive identity."¹⁵⁵ Timing is important for the institutional memory formation and, accordingly, institutional identity.¹⁵⁶ For example, Tchaikovsky was a graduate of the St. Petersburg Conservatory, but this did not make him a representative of the St. Petersburg tradition. Thus, the St. Petersburg Conservatory had not produced a distinctive identity when Tchaikovsky graduated because too little time had passed from its foundation. I explore the differences between the Moscow and the St. Petersburg Conservatories' identities in more detail in Chapter 6.

To sum up, during the first years of his directorship Safonov took steps which revealed him as a successful manager and continuer of the Rubinstein-Taneyev tradition. Over the first decade of Safonov's directorship, the prestige of the Conservatory continued to grow. More and more students in Russia applied for entrance.¹⁵⁷ During the directorship of Safonov, the number of students almost doubled, from 389 people in 1889 to 626 people in 1905.¹⁵⁸ Demanding entrance examination standards initiated by Taneyev in 1886 had begun to yield an increase in

¹⁵⁵ Scott, *Institutions and Organizations: Ideas, Interests, and Identities*, 25.

¹⁵⁶ Douglas, *How Institutions Think*, 55–68.

¹⁵⁷ Sargeant, "Ambivalence and Desire: State, Society, and Music Education in Russia."

¹⁵⁸ Leo Ginsburg, *Moskovskaja Konservatorija 1866-1966 (The Moscow Conservatory 1866-1966)* (Moscow: Muzika, 1966), 191.

the quality of students and, accordingly, graduates.¹⁵⁹ The Conservatory also attracted young musicians from abroad. For instance, the Dutch composer and conductor Peter van Anrooy (1879-1954) attended Taneyev's counterpoint classes.¹⁶⁰ On the other hand, Safonov's neglect of theoretical disciplines, as well as his becoming the centerpiece of all crucial decisions from finance to education consequently turned Taneyev and other professors against him. The next chapter, Chapter 4, is devoted to the first explicit collision of visions over how the Moscow Conservatory should be governed.

¹⁵⁹ Korabelnikova, *S.I. Taneyev v Moskovskoj Konservatorii (Taneyev in the Moscow Conservatory)*, 124.

¹⁶⁰ Wilma Roest, "Peter van Anrooy," in *The Essential Guide to Dutch Music: 100 Composers and Their Work* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2000), 19–21.

Chapter 4 - The “Conus affair” in 1899-1900 Moscow

This chapter presents a case study research, which is “defined as a qualitative approach in which the investigator explores a real-life, contemporary bounded system (a case) over time, through detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information, and reports a case description and case themes.”¹⁶¹ I have chosen a series of events known as the “Conus affair” because it illustrated a full range of problems and interrelations between personnel at the Conservatory within a relatively short time frame, January 1899 – April 1900, and the Moscow Conservatory and the Moscow branch of the RMO were the bounded systems. The case for a case study should be “richest in information” in the line of events. Hence, the “Conus affair” is best suited for explicit consideration because the conflict between Safonov and Conus is mentioned in multiple sources and can be reliably reconstructed.¹⁶² In particular, critic Leonid Sabaneev (1881-1968) wrote that the “Conus affair” was so significant, that it was “observed by the whole of musical Moscow.”¹⁶³ While the previous chapter is dedicated to prerequisites of Safonov legitimacy’s erosion, this one explores how Safonov’s actions turned the “Rubinstein guard” against him. Because case-study research does not require an existing theory behind, it can “avoid any propositions regarding relationships,” and is applicable for my task.¹⁶⁴

With regards to secondary sources, it is hard to find in them detailed coverage of the conflict between Safonov and Conus. As for primary sources, they are selected within the framework of historical method in social research, i.e.: “collection of probable sources of information, examination of these sources for authenticity, either in whole or in part, and analysis of the data collected through this process.”¹⁶⁵ Among them are reports, minutes of the

¹⁶¹ John W. Creswell and Cheryl N. Poth, *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches*, Fourth (Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc., 2018), 153.

¹⁶² Bent Flyvbjerg, “Five Misunderstandings about Case-Study Research, in *Qualitative Research Practice*,” *Sociologisk Tidsskrift* 12 (July 2004): 128.

¹⁶³ Sabaneev, *Vospominaniya o Taneyeve (Memories about Taneyev)*, 142.

¹⁶⁴ Hans-Gerd Ridder, “The Theory Contribution of Case Study Research Designs,” *Business Research* 10, no. 2 (2017): 291.

¹⁶⁵ Hyman Mariampolski and Dana C. Hughes, “The Use of Personal Documents in Historical Sociology,” *The American Sociologist* 13, no. 2 (May 1978): 104.

Moscow artistic council meetings, statements and dissenting opinions for the meetings of the artistic council and the directorate of the RMO's Moscow branch, telegrams, and letters from the collections of RGB, RGALI, RNMM, and GDMMTc. When working with the primary sources, the main focus is on the memories, correspondence and diaries of immediate participants and the witnesses of the "Conus affair." For example, the diaries of Taneyev (first and second volumes), the correspondence and memoirs of Stepan Smolensky (1848-1909), Safonov's correspondence, Sabaneev's memoirs, and Alexander Goldenweiser's memoirs.¹⁶⁶ As for the deputy Head of the RMO and a pivotal participant in the "Conus affair", the Grand Duke Konstantin Konstantinovich, there is no mention about this in his memoirs.¹⁶⁷

I have arranged the "Conus affair" participants into six categories according to the degree of their involvement in the events, their powers, and their professional or class affiliation. They were the Moscow Conservatory professors, the RMO's Moscow branch directors, the Moscow Conservatory students, media, Moscow lawyers, and the Grand Dukes. I have also divided this case into three temporal phases and each of them can be examined as relatively self-contained events, since they featured different sets of participants and events occurring within each were structured differently. The first episode developed from January to September, 1899 within the Conservatory and at the meetings of the RMO's Moscow Directorate. It included conflicts between teachers, decisions of the artistic council meetings, collective letters from Safonov's supporters and statements and dissenting opinions of Conus's supporters. The second took place during October, 1899. It was a newspaper war, a public exchange of opinions between the conflict parties as well as journalistic investigations into the state of affairs in the Conservatory. The last phase was the legal trial, which lasted from November, 1899 to April, 1900.

¹⁶⁶ Stepan Smolensky was a conductor, music historian and paleographer. He taught history of the Orthodox liturgical singing at the Moscow Conservatory in 1889-1901. Miloš Velimirović, "Smolensky, Stepan Vasil'yevich," Grove Music Online, 2001, <https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/omo-9781561592630-e-0000026029>.

¹⁶⁷ Moiseev, "The Grand Dukes Romanovs' Personal Diaries as a Musical and Historical Source (the 2nd Half of the 19th Century)."

The participants in the process are grouped into categories and stages of the “Conus affair” in the table below, where “P” means permanent involvement into the process development, “O” shows occasional interference, and “-” indicates no evidence of significant involvement.

| actors \ phase | Jan.-Sep. 1899 | Oct.1899 | Nov.1899 – Apr.1900 |
|-------------------|----------------|----------|---------------------|
| Moscow Professors | P | P | P |
| RMO’s directors | P | O | - |
| Students | - | O | - |
| Media | - | P | - |
| Lawyers | - | - | P |
| Grand Dukes | O | - | O |

Three phases of the “Conus affair”

Premises

Safonov’s trimming of theory classes began at the end of the academic year 1896-1897. Before this, Safonov had reduced the number of music theory teachers in the artistic council. Moreover, the remaining ones observed neutrality or were loyal to Safonov’s actions, except for Taneyev.¹⁶⁸ Safonov had a strategy: as a teacher of theory classes resigned, Safonov replaced them with *mladshiy prepodavatel* or “junior instructor,” whom he refused to promote regularly (in violation of the Conservatory’s charter). These instructors did not have the right to participate or vote at the meetings of the artistic council. Safonov’s strategy clashed with the junior instructor Georges Conus, whose independent personality annoyed Safonov (who nevertheless recognized Conus’s pedagogic talents which outshone those of his friend, Ippolitov-Ivanov).¹⁶⁹

In the spring of 1898, Conus was confronted with the fact that his classes of general and special instrumentation would be merged into one. Hence, the number of students in his class

¹⁶⁸ Taneyev, *1899-1902.*, 2:59–60.

¹⁶⁹ Georges Conus was a composer and music theorist. He studied at the Moscow Conservatory under Taneyev in 1881-1889. He taught instrumentation in 1891-1899 and the harmony of Russian folksongs in 1889-1899. He was the director of Music and Drama School in Moscow in 1904-1906, the director of the Saratov Conservatory in 1917-1919. Later he became a professor at the Conservatory, he taught there in 1920-1933. Tatyana Maslovskaya, “Georgii Eduardovich Conus,” in *Moskovskaja Konservatorija Ot Istokov Do Našich Dnej, 1866-2006: Biografičeskij Ėnciklopedičeskij Slovar (The Moscow Conservatory from Origins to the Current Days, 1866-2006: Biographical Encyclopedic Dictionary)*, ed. Margarita Esipova (Moscow: MGK, 2007), 257–58; Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism from Glinka to Stalin*, 240–41; Grigory Golovinsky, *G.E. Conūs: Statyi, Materialy, Vospominaniya (G.E. Conus: Articles, Materials, Memories)* (Moscow: Muzika, 1965), 24–27.

would be forty, which would exceed a maximum allowable capacity of twenty people. The number of class hours would be reduced from 2 to 1. Payment would be calculated as if Conus had twenty students in his class instead of forty. First and foremost, Conus was outraged by the reduction in hours with an increase in the number of students, which made it impossible, from his point of view, to teach the course as he envisioned it.¹⁷⁰ He tried to challenge Safonov's decisions but as a non-member of the artistic council, his possibilities were limited. Relations between Safonov and Conus deteriorated during 1898. In the end, Safonov decided to banish Conus from the Conservatory as he had done previously with Alexander Siloti, Ferruccio Busoni and others, once personal hostilities emerged with each. However, Conus refused to be deprived so easily of his teaching position.

A pretext for the conflict happened on January 28, 1899, when Conus refused to participate in a planned "subscription" - fundraising for the production and bestowing upon Safonov a golden badge with a diamond "S" in honor of his hundredth performance at RMO's symphonic concerts.¹⁷¹ In the Conservatory there was a practice of "giving an address" - a collective letter containing admiration for the addressee, and often financial amounts collected by the signatories. Signers brought addresses to professors on the occasion of an anniversary, a well-played concert, good marks on the exam, etc. Officially, the Conservatory charter did not allow gifts to superiors. Conus detailed the reason for his refusal on the subscription sheet: "in view of such and such laws (the prohibition to give gifts to the authorities) I cannot participate in the subscription."¹⁷² This provoked an argument with three professors who signed it: Jan Hřimalý (1844-1915), Nikita Morozov (1864-1925), Nikolai Sokolovsky (1865-1921), and Nikolai Shishkin (1857-1918).¹⁷³ Professors outside this group also accused Conus of contempt with

¹⁷⁰ Sergei Taneyev, *1894-1898.*, vol. 1, *Dnevniky (Diaries)* (Moscow: Muzika, 1981), 240–46.

¹⁷¹ Nadejda Kabanova and Marina Rachmanova, *Epistolaryarnoye Naslediye S. V. Smolenskogo. Perepiska s S. A. Rachinskim. 1883- 1902 (Epistolary Heritage of S. V. Smolensky. Correspondence with S. A. Rachinsky. 1883-1902)*, 2nd ed. (Moscow: YASK, 2019), 680–81.

¹⁷² Taneyev, *1899-1902*, 13.

¹⁷³ Jan Hřimalý studied violin at the Prague Conservatory (1855–1861) with Moritz Mildner. Invited to the Moscow Conservatory by Nikolai Rubinstein, he taught there for 46 years, from 1869 to 1915. John Tyler, "Hřimalý Family," in *Grove Music Online*, 2001, <https://www-oxfordmusiconline->

violent language. However, Alexey Sheremetyevsky, Smolensky, Taneyev, and Morozov sided with Conus, or subsequently moved to his side.¹⁷⁴

RMO and the Conservatory phase

The first phase took place from March to September, 1899. On March 22, a collective letter from fifteen teachers and professors (out of a total of sixty teachers) of the Conservatory was written that demanded that Safonov fire Conus who had, so the letter claimed, “personally insulted” each of the signatories.¹⁷⁵ Taneyev and a member of the RMO directorate Mikhail Ushakov (1828-1904) managed to find out that most of the professors who had signed the letter had never actually heard rude words from Conus.¹⁷⁶ The signers can be divided into five groups according to their reasons.

The first group did not pay attention to what they were signing. For example, Elizavetta Lavrovskaya (1845-1919) did not read what was in the letter. When it turned out that she had signed a document against Conus, she tried to somehow withdraw her signature, but she did not succeed.¹⁷⁷ The second group had signed it under threat. For instance, Karl Kipp (1865-1925) received veiled threats from Safonov’s entourage (he did not clarify who exactly) that speaking

com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/omo-9781561592630-e-0000013447; Nikita Morozov studied at the Moscow Conservatory under Anton Arensky and Taneyev. He taught music theory in 1893-1924. Leonid Tumarinson, ed., *“Nash Starik”: Alexander Goldenweiser i Moskovskaya Konservatoria (“Our Old Man”: Alexander Goldenweiser and the Moscow Conservatory)* (Moscow: Centr Gumanitarnykh Initsiativ, 2015), 668; Nikolai Sokolovsky studied at the Moscow Conservatory with Taneyev and Hřimalý in 1883-1888. He taught viola at the Conservatory from 1890. Taneyev, *1903-1909.*, 3:520; Nikolai Shishkin was a piano professor in 1891-1912. Ginsburg, *Moskovskaja Konservatorija 1866-1966 (The Moscow Conservatory 1866-1966)*.

¹⁷⁴ The years of life are unknown. Alexey Sheremetyevsky was a history teacher at the Moscow Conservatory. Taneyev, *1903-1909.*, 3:529.

¹⁷⁵ Sargeant, “Ambivalence and Desire: State, Society, and Music Education in Russia,” 270–74; Stepan Smolensky, *Vospominaniya: Kazan. Moskva. Peterburg (Memories: Moscow, Kazan, St. Petersburg)* (Moscow: LRC Publishing House, 2002), 225.

¹⁷⁶ Mikhail Ushakov was Moscow merchant and politician. In 1883-1885 he was acting Head (mayor) of Moscow. Konstantin Poleshchuk, “N.A. Alekseyev i Yego Deyatel’nost’ Na Postu Moskovskogo Gorodskogo Golovy v 1885-1893 Gg. (N.A. Alekseev and His Activities as Moscow Mayor in 1885-1893)” (PhD dissertation, Moscow, Moscow State University, 2017), 42–123; Taneyev, *1899-1902.*, 2:160.

¹⁷⁷ Yelizaveta Lavrovskaya was a Russian mezzo-soprano. She studied at the St. Petersburg Conservatory under Henriette Nissen-Saloman. She was a professor of singing at the Moscow Conservatory in 1888-1919. Garden, Edward, “Lavrovskaya [Lawrowska], Yelizaveta Andreyevna,” in *Grove Music Online*, 2001, <https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/omo-9781561592630-e-0000016145>.

against Safonov would be fraught with problems for him.¹⁷⁸ The third had signed it under pressure of obligations to Safonov. Among them were Anatoly Galli (1853-1915) who had scheduled joint concerts in symphony assemblies with Safonov.¹⁷⁹ But in words Galli fully supported Conus and all his actions against injustice in the Conservatory. The representatives of the fourth group wanted to be on the safe side and not to anger Safonov. At first Henryk Pachulsky (1857-1921) justified his signature by claiming that, like Lavrovskaya, he had not read the letter.¹⁸⁰ Later he explained his deed saying that he had misgivings that Safonov would not perform his composition (an orchestral suite). Fedor Goedicke (1840-1916) admitted that he had signed it for fear of incurring Safonov's wrath.¹⁸¹ The fifths (Shishkin, Sokolovsky, and Hřimalý) had signed the letter out of hostility to Conus, but no one could explain away the regulations of the Conservatory charter Conus had invoked or cite a statutory based on which he needed to be dismissed.

Taneyev criticized Safonov's intention to dismiss Conus, emphasizing that according to the charter, Conus had not done anything illegal. Taneyev's position was shared by professors Ivan Buldin (1853-1917), Morozov, Smolensky, and Sergei Remezov (1854-?).¹⁸² They agreed that

¹⁷⁸ Karl Kipp studied piano with Paul Pabst at the Moscow Conservatory in 1880-1888. He taught piano in 1892-1925, professor from 1909. Alexander Merkulov, "Karl Kipp," in *Moskovskaja Konservatorija Ot Istokov Do Našich Dnej, 1866-2006: Biografičeskij Ėnciklopedičeskij Slovar (The Moscow Conservatory from Origins to the Current Days, 1866-2006: Biographical Encyclopedic Dictionary)*, ed. Margarita Esipova (Moscow: MGK, 2007), 234-36.

¹⁷⁹ Anatoly Galli studied piano at the Moscow Conservatory with Klindtwordt in 1870-1877. From 1879 to 1909 he was a professor of piano at the Conservatory. Margarita Esipova, ed., "Anatoly Ivanovich Galli," in *Moskovskaja Konservatorija Ot Istokov Do Našich Dnej, 1866-2006: Biografičeskij Ėnciklopedičeskij Slovar (The Moscow Conservatory from Origins to the Current Days, 1866-2006: Biographical Encyclopedic Dictionary)* (Moscow: MGK, 2007), 150.

¹⁸⁰ Pachulsky studied piano at the Warsaw Music Institute under Stanisław Moniuszko and Władysław Żeleński, then at the Moscow Conservatory from 1880, studying with Aleksander Michałowski, Pavel Pabst, Nikolai Rubinstein, and Anton Arensky. From 1886 to 1917 he was a professor of piano at the Conservatory. Zofia Chechlińska, "Pachulski, Henryk," in *Grove Music Online*, 2001, www.oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/omo-9781561592630-e-0000020652.

¹⁸¹ Fedor Goedicke was an organist and pianist. He taught at the Moscow Conservatory in 1880-1916. He is the father of a pianist, composer, and professor Alexander Goedicke. Taneyev, *1903-1909*, 3:482.

¹⁸² Ivan Buldin studied acting at the Moscow Conservatory in 1868-1877. He was an artistic skill and declamation teacher in 1878-1903. Taneyev, 3:478; Sergei Remezov studied piano at the Moscow Conservatory with Klindtwordt in 1870-1879. He taught piano there in 1881-1903. After 1917 his fate is unknown. Kabanova and Rachmanova, *Epistoljarnoye Naslediye S. V. Smolenskogo. Peregiska s S. A. Rachinskim. 1883- 1902 (Epistolary Heritage of S. V. Smolensky. Correspondence with S. A. Rachinsky. 1883-1902)*, 383; Tchaikovsky, *XVII: Letters (1893)*, 17:282.

Safonov was a brilliant manager, whose abilities for fundraising and overcoming bureaucratic obstacles were undeniable. However, the directorship had fed his appetite for power to the point that it was threatening to damage everyday functioning of the Conservatory and its core mission of high-quality teaching. Safonov initially treated Taneyev's activities neutrally, trying to convince him that it was not his business, and that the whole matter was between Safonov and Conus. But this initial neutrality was replaced by mistrust, and then with outright hostility.

On May 20, the artistic council addressed the issue of removing Conus. Remezov, Smolensky, and Taneyev point out that Safonov's actions were illegal. After these three professors left the room because Safonov announced that the meeting was over, the remaining eleven professors wrote a collective petition to the RMO's Moscow branch directorate with a demand to dismiss Conus.¹⁸³

On May 22, the question of discharging Conus was raised at the session of the RMO's Moscow branch. The only reason given was his incorrect behavior towards the director of the Conservatory, and consequently the entire staff. To provide context for the RMO Directorate's subsequent decisions, here is information about the members and their backgrounds:

- Pavel Ivanovich Haritonenko (1852-1914) – owner of a sugar refinery, philanthropist;
- Sergey Pavlovich Jakovlev (1839-1906) - owner of typographies, senator, nobleman;
- Vladimir Alekseyevich Abrikosov (1858-1922), director of a tea partnership, owner of a confectionery plant. Left the directorate on October 8, 1899 protesting Safonov's policy;
- Vasily Ilich Safonov (1852-1918), the director of the Moscow Conservatory;
- Mikhail Abramovich Morozov (1870-1903), manufacturer, philanthropist, writer;
- Ferdinand Ludwigovich Fulda, household chemicals manufacturer;¹⁸⁴
- Nikolay Alekseyevich Kazakov, merchant, philanthropist;¹⁸⁵
- Pyotr Ivanovich Yurgenson (1836-1903), music publisher;
- Modest Ilyich Tchaikovsky (1850-1916), dramatist, opera librettist and translator;
- Mikhail Fedorovich Ushakov (1828-1904), nobleman, public figure.¹⁸⁶

¹⁸³ Protokoli zasedaniy hudozgestvennogo soveta Moskovskoy konservatorii (Minutes of the Moscow Conservatory artistic council meeting), 20 May 1899, Fond 2099 op. 1 ed.hr. 152 list 87, Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, Moscow, Russia.

¹⁸⁴ Years of life are unknown

¹⁸⁵ Years of life are unknown

¹⁸⁶ Nikolai Kashkin, *Moskovskoye Otdeleniye Imperatorskogo Russkogo Muzykalnogo Obshchestva. Ocherk Deyatelnosti Za Pyatidesyatiletie. 1860—1910 (The Moscow Branch of the Russian Imperial Musical Society. The Outline of the Activities for the Fifty Years, 1860-1910)* (Moscow: Pechatnia S.P. Yakovleva, 1910), 38–80.

Jakovev, Kazakov, and Fulda were Safonov's allies while Tchaikovsky, Abrikosov, and Ushakov were strongly pro-Conus (Yurgenson, too, though to a lesser extent). Haritonenko was mostly absent on meetings and did not take any side in the conflict.

The session on May 22, was attended by: Ushakov, Safonov, Kazakov, Yakovlev, and Fulda. Thanks to Ushakov's efforts, Conus was not fired. Conus was lucky; according to the charter, as Ushakov reminded everyone, a professor could be dismissed by the RMO directorate according to the artistic council resolution, not a professors' petition. Such resolution should indicate which regulations the teacher violated. All other methods of dismissal were illegal.¹⁸⁷

September 4: At the artistic council meeting, Safonov raised the question of dismissing Conus: "As the responsible head of the educational institution, I concluded that it is impossible to continue the service of the teacher G. Conus under my leadership. I ask the artistic council to give their opinion on the issue of dismissing Mr. Conus through closed ballot." Safonov did not explain which regulations of labor law and the Conservatory charter Conus violated. Smolensky made proposals for reconciliation of the parties: to transfer other classes to Conus, raise him to the rank of senior teacher, but not professor, etc., but Safonov did not want to compromise. By a majority vote (but not 2/3), the council recommended the RMO to dismiss Conus.¹⁸⁸

In the following weeks, Taneyev, Abrikosov, and Ushakov were persuading the RMO's Moscow branch's directors not to let Safonov dismiss Conus without a clear legal reason. Assuming that Safonov would hide some information from the directors, Abrikosov sent them Taneyev's dissenting opinion, containing a detailed analysis of the reasons for Conus dismissal, Safonov actions' legal and moral failure, and positive suggestions regarding this affair.¹⁸⁹

¹⁸⁷Taneyev, *1899-1902.*, 2:56–58.

¹⁸⁸ Taneyev, *1899-1902.*, 2:76; *Protokoli zasedaniy hudozgestvennogo soveta Moskovskoy konservatorii* (Minutes of the Moscow Conservatory artistic council meeting), 4 September 1899, Fond 2099 op. 1 ed.hr. 152 list 93, Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, Moscow, Russia.

¹⁸⁹ *Osoboe mnenie Sergeya Taneyeva k zasedaniyu hudozgestvennogo soveta* (Sergei Taneyev's dissenting opinion to the artistic council meeting) 4 September 1899, 1899, Fond 62 ed.hr. 1252, Russian National Museum of Music, Moscow, Russia.

September 28: On the directorate meeting of the RMO's Moscow branch Conus was relieved of all teaching duties. For this occasion, Safonov obtained a special rescript from the Grand Duke Konstantin Konstantinovich, instructing Moscow's RMO directorate to refer not to the Moscow Conservatory charter, but to that of St. Petersburg. The latter allowed the directorate to dismiss professors without the agreement of minimum two thirds of the artistic council. Ushakov attached a dissenting opinion, locating the legal incompetence of this decision, with reference to the relevant articles 788-9 Vol. 3 of the Code of Laws 1896.¹⁹⁰

Public phase

This subsection examines events of October 1899, when the conflict had already travelled beyond the walls of the Conservatory and reached the ears of the Moscow public, thanks to the newspaper war that began that month. The supporters and opponents of Safonov's policy openly debated the matter in the Moscow press.¹⁹¹

Taneyev, Smolensky, and Abrikosov published open letters in defense of Conus. Kashkin and Morozov published articles in defense of Safonov's position.¹⁹² A journalist, Vlas Doroshevich (1865-1922), conducted his own investigation of the situation at the Conservatory and publishes a *feuilleton* on Safonov's management methods, *Moskovskaya konservatoriya ili "chego moy noga hochet"* (The Moscow Conservatory or "what my leg wants").¹⁹³ Nikolai Findeisen (1868-1928) introduced the "Conus affair" to the St. Petersburg public.¹⁹⁴ He published a reprint of Smolensky's article.¹⁹⁵ Finally, the incident at Hřímalý's anniversary

¹⁹⁰ Osoboe mnenie chleana Moskovskoy direktzii RMO Mikhaila Ushakova k postanovleniyu ob uvolnenii konservatorskogo prepodavatelya Georgiya Konyusa (Mikhail Ushakov's dissenting opinion to the Moscow branch RMO's statement about dismissal of the Moscow Conservatory teacher Georgii Konyus), 28 September 1899, Fond 62 ed.hr. 1257, Russian National Museum of Music, Moscow, Russia.

¹⁹¹ Taneyev, *1899-1902.*, 2:383–85.

¹⁹² Mikhail Morozov, a one of the RMO's directors in Moscow, not the Conservatory professor Nikita Morozov.

¹⁹³ Vladimir Stasov, *Pisma k Rodnym (Letters to Relatives)*, vol. 3 (Moscow: Muzgis, 1962), 400.

¹⁹⁴ Nikolai Findeisen was a Russian music historian, music critic, and public figure. He wrote biographies of Glinka, Dargomyzhsky, Serov, Verstovsky, Rimsky-Korsakov and others. Marina Kosmovskaya, *Istoriya Muzykalnoy Kultury v Nasledii N. F. Findeyzena (The History of Musical Culture in the Heritage of N.F. Findeyzen)* (Kursk: Izdatelstvo Kurskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, 2006), 8–20.

¹⁹⁵ As he wrote to Smolensky, this was unprecedented, since Petersburg censorship was prohibiting writing anything about this case. Pismo N. Findeyzena S. Smolenskomu (Nikolai Findeisen's letter to Stepan Smolensky), 30 October 1899, V11 ed.hr. 1855, Tchaikovsky State House-Museum, Klin, Russia.

concert deserved special attention in the Moscow press. The concert incident took place on October 23, 1899 at the concert dedicated to the twenty-fifth anniversary of Hřimalý's activity as the concertmaster of the orchestra. Here is what Smolensky wrote about the concert:

The ovations to the venerable violinist were enormous. But the sharper was the transition to 'booing' right at the moment of Safonov's standing behind the conductor's place. This booing lasted for 5-6 minutes, interrupted by clapping of the first rows, and resumed before each of the three plays, not allowing Safonov to begin the performance.¹⁹⁶

As Goldenweiser mentioned: "I cannot remember such a major scandal."¹⁹⁷

The students of the Conservatory took an active part in this incident. Despite the fact that most of them expressed their protest to Safonov, there were those who defiantly applauded, for example, Safonov's student Alexander Scriabin (1871-1915). Student Yuri Pomerantsev (1878-1933) based on "neutrality" was catcalling Safonov and at the same time applauding him.¹⁹⁸ Further, during the years 1899-1900 no incidents like that on October 23, were found.

The Conservatory students were reticent in their memories about this incident and their participation in it. They only mentioned that Conus, among other talented professors left the Conservatory due to personal disagreements with the director.¹⁹⁹ Apparently, the students' participation in these events was not systematic but was caused by a flash of interest in the affair in the wake of the active polemic of professors in the press.

Back to 1899 Fall, Safonov drew a conclusion that in this war there was no neutrality: only associates or enemies. Though his hostile attitude began to extend not only to Taneyev, Smolensky and other direct opponents, but also to those people outside the Conservatory who, as he believed, stood in his way. For example, opera singer Maria Klimentova-Muromtzeva (1857-1946) took part in Abrikosov's efforts to persuade others RMO directors not to fire Conus,

¹⁹⁶Smolensky, *Vospominaniya: Kazan. Moskva. Peterburg (Memories: Moscow, Kazan, St. Petersburg)*, 543.

¹⁹⁷Alexander Goldenweiser, *Vvospominaniya* (Moscow: Deca-BC, 2009), 233.

¹⁹⁸ Sabaneev, *Vospominaniya o Rossii (Memories about Russia)*, 110.

¹⁹⁹ Sergei Vasilenko, *Vospominaniya (Memoirs)* (Moscow: Sovietskiiy Kompozitor, 1979), 89–90.

believing that professional relations should be superior to personal sympathy or hostility.²⁰⁰ In this respect, Safonov had an opposite opinion. From Taneyev's diary of November 7, 1899:

According to Koreshchenko, Safonov began to say to Mounet-Sully at the artistic club's dinner: "Nous avons au conservatoire une partie abominable" and, pointing to Klimentova-Muromtzeva, said: "voila mon ennemie, qui etait autrefois mon amie".²⁰¹ "Why did you switch to their side?" - he began shouting to her across the table, so that she felt embarrassed. Later he began to accuse Conus, Brandukov and Remezov in such foul words that Koreshchenko was ashamed to tell me, and I am ashamed to record it.²⁰²

Safonov's ally, the Grand Duke Konstantin Konstantinovich, in a telegram to the Moscow Conservatory artistic council on October 7, 1899 expressed "regret with the actions of some professors" who made the "Conus affair" public, hinting at Taneyev and Smolensky.²⁰³

The Legal Trial

On November 30, Conus, who had not been idle, filed a lawsuit against eleven professors and teachers who had submitted a complaint on May 20, to the RMO with charges against him. Conus claimed that "this document served as one of the main pretexts for my dismissal."²⁰⁴ The succeeding investigation was led by counsel Pyotr Korzhenevsky (1872-1968), and presided over by Judge Nikolai Davydov (1848-1920), chairman of the district court.²⁰⁵ The main source

²⁰⁰ Maria Klimentova-Muromtzeva studied vocal at the Moscow Conservatory with Giacomo Galvani. She taught at the Conservatory in 1890-1895 and later opened her own school for young singers. Margarita Esipova, ed., "Maria Klimentova-Muromtzeva," in *Moskovskaja Konservatorija Ot Istokov Do Našich Dnej, 1866-2006: Biografičeskij Ėnciklopedičeskij Slovar (The Moscow Conservatory from Origins to the Current Days, 1866-2006: Biographical Encyclopedic Dictionary)* (Moscow: MGK, 2007), 238–39.

²⁰¹ Arseni Koreshchenko (1870-1921) studied composition at the Moscow Conservatory under Arensky and Taneyev. He taught harmony there in 1891-1894. Nina Pushina, "Arseni Koreshchenko," in *Moskovskaja Konservatorija Ot Istokov Do Našich Dnej, 1866-2006: Biografičeskij Ėnciklopedičeskij Slovar (The Moscow Conservatory from Origins to the Current Days, 1866-2006: Biographical Encyclopedic Dictionary)*, ed. Margarita Esipova (Moscow: MGK, 2007), 260; Jean Mounet-Sully (1841-1916) a French actor repeatedly came on tour to the *fin-de-siècle* Russia. Anne Penesco, *Mounet-Sully: L'homme Aux Cent Cœurs d'homme* (Paris: Ed. du Cerf, 2005), 315–55; Fr. "We have an abominable part at the Conservatory". Safonov, known for his love of puns, had in mind her participation in the "Conus affair" and insinuated her poor professional qualities as an opera singer; Fr. "here is my enemy, who was once my friend."

²⁰² Taneyev, *1899-1902.*, 2:103.

²⁰³ Telegrama Velikogo Knyaza Konstantina Romanova direktoru Moskovskoy konservatorii (Grand Duke Konstantin Romanov's telegram to the Moscow Conservatory director Vasily Safonov), 7 October 1899, Fond 62 ed.hr. 1259, Russian National Museum of Music, Moscow, Russia.

²⁰⁴ Zhaloba prepodavatelja konservatorii E.G. Konyusa na nezakonnoye uvolneniye (The complaint of the Conservatory teacher E.G. Conus for illegal dismissal), 30 November 1899, Fond 62 ed.hr. 1272, Russian National Museum of Music, Moscow, Russia.

²⁰⁵ Pyotr Korzhenevsky was a lawyer and advocate. He worked as an investigator in various districts of Moscow in 1895-1905. Yury Varfolomeev, "The 'Pecheneg' from Ostozhenka: The Fate and Epoch of Counsel P.I. Korzhenyovskiy," *Izvestiya Saratovskogo Universiteta. Novaya Seriya. Seriya Istoriya. Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya (Bulletin of the Saratov University. New Series. Series History. International Relationships)* 17, no. 2 (2017): 172–79; Nikolai Davydiv was a lawyer and public figure, chairman of the Moscow District Court (1896-

of information about this process is the “Decisions and Records of the Preliminary Investigation in the Case of Slander of the Free Artist G.E. Conus in a paper submitted to the Directorate of the Imperial Russian Musical Society by 11 teachers of the Moscow Conservatory. December 2, 1899 - April 29, 1900. Records of interrogations of the victim, witnesses, decisions.”²⁰⁶

Additional sources of information are the memoirs of Vjacheslav Bulychev (1872-1859), an assistant of Korzhenevsky.²⁰⁷ The Judge of the investigation issued a report on April 29, 1900. It confirmed Taneyev’s conclusions made in May 1899, that most of the signatories to the letter had no actual complaints against Conus but had signed it due to pressure of circumstances or being misled. As a result, several Conservatory professors previously loyal to Safonov switched sides and supported Conus: Kipp, Pachulsky, Goedicke, and Ludwig Betting (1856-1930).²⁰⁸ Betting quit the Conservatory in 1900 protesting against Safonov’s policy of silencing dissenting teachers and returned in 1908 when Safonov was no longer director. The further the investigation went, according to Bulychev, the more the illegality of Conus’ dismissal became apparent.

Below I present the testimonies and explanations given by professors who had signed the letter. Kipp testified to cases of pressure from Safonov’s side, who threatened him with dismissal if he would not put their signatures.²⁰⁹ Other professors claimed that they were deceived about the true reason for the letter.²¹⁰

1908), professor of law at Moscow State University. Valentina Dorozhkina, “Davydov Nikolai Vasilievich,” in *Tambovskaya Entsiklopediya (Tambov Encyclopedia)* (Tambov: Tambov, 2004), 154.

²⁰⁶ Peter Ivanovich Korzhenevsky, 1872-1968, 1836-1961, fond 436 ed.hr. 821, Manuscript Department of the Russian State Library, Moscow, Russia.

²⁰⁷ Vjacheislav Bulychev studied music theory and counterpoint at the Moscow Conservatory in 1893-1896 and simultaneously studied at the Faculty of Law of Moscow University, from which he graduated in 1897. According to Taneyev, Bulychev left the Conservatory due to a conflict with Safonov. Since 1896 he was engaged in musical and literary activities. Taneyev, *1903-1909.*, 3:478; Vjacheslav Bulychev, “Zhizn i iskusstvo: avtobiograficheskiye vospominaniya (Life and Art: autobiographical memories)”, n.d., MS Fond 277, Russian National Museum of Music, Moscow, Russia.

²⁰⁸ Ludwig Betting studied organ at the St. Petersburg Conservatory with Konstantin Gomilius. He was an organ professor at the Moscow Conservatory in 1890-1900 and 1908-1913. Irina Rozanova, “U Istokov Kafedry Organa (At the Origins of the Organ Department),” in *Maloizvestnyye Stranitsy Istorii Konservatorii (Little-Known Pages of the Conservatory History)*, by Era Barutycheva, V (St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg Conservatory, 2004), 17–20; Taneyev, *1903-1909.*, 3:475.

²⁰⁹ Taneyev, *1899-1902.*, 2:157.

²¹⁰ Goedicke said: “I did not even think of signing a paper saying that Conus insulted us, I know what I signed. The paper says only that our relations [with Conus] went bad.” *Ibid.*, 122.

Kipp also testified that according to Ippolitov-Ivanov, Safonov had asked the artistic council to help him “remove this person”.²¹¹ His words were confirmed by Morozov claiming that on May 20, 1899 after the artistic council session, when Taneyev, Smolensky, Buldin, and Remezov had left, Safonov said to the rest: “You see, gentlemen, that I cannot do anything under these conditions, will you help me?” He left after that, and remaining professors decided to drive away Conus with this “letter.”²¹²

The investigators found the following details at the level of the RMO’s main directorate in St. Petersburg. According to Oleksander Horilyj (1863-1937), the majority in the Directorate of the RMO was on Taneyev’s side, even August Gerke (1841-1902), but Safonov had many influential friends in royal circles, otherwise the RMO’s directors in St. Petersburg would be more critical of him.²¹³ Safonov was to blame for letting the matter come to light, they believed.

Disorganized documentation and other signs of the chaos in the Conservatory’s administration were uncovered as a result of the lead investigator’s interrogations of the witnesses and the defendants. According to Taneyev, Safonov attempted to fire Conus through bureaucratic procedures. For example, Safonov claimed that Conus had refused to provide his course syllabus to the director. Taneyev believed it was not true because Conus showed him this syllabus prior to its submission to Safonov. It is unsurprising that the Conservatory either did not send or delayed sending documents requested by the court. Korzhenevsky called the process unprecedented.²¹⁴ Taneyev in his private diary referred to the gossip that the Grand Duke Sergei Alexandrovich had put pressure on prosecutors and investigators to stop the process. Meanwhile, on April 17, 1900 Bulychev was removed from the case by chairman of the district court

²¹¹ Ibid., 158.

²¹² Ibid., 119.

²¹³ Oleksander Horilyj was a composer, oboist, conductor, and an RMO official. He studied at the Moscow Conservatory in 1888-1890. Later he actively contributed to the development of the RMO's local branches in Astrakhan, Saratov, Kyiv. Anton Muha, *Kompozytory Ukrainy Ta Ukrainy's'koyi Diaspory (Composers of Ukraine and the Ukrainian Diaspora)* (Kyiv: Muzychna Ukrainy, 2004), 74; August Gerke was a lawyer, public figure, and senator. He was a member of the RMO’s main directorate in 1895-1902. Nikolai Troitskiy, *Korifei Rossiyskoy Advokatury (Luminaries of the Russian Advocacy)* (Moscow: Tsentrpoligraf, 2006), 155–63.

²¹⁴ Taneyev, *1899-1902.*, 2:152.

Davydov who promoted him and posted to another district. Lawyers Alexey Lopukhin (1864-1928) and Alexander Lopatin (1859-1934) informed Taneyev that there was tremendous pressure (from the Grand Duke) on Korzhenevsky and that he would soon end the investigation.²¹⁵ And so it happened on April 29, 1900. Conus was not reinstated in his teaching position. The “Conus affair” was closed.²¹⁶

In this chapter, I have examined how Safonov turned his skills and connections against his opposition in the Conservatory. The “Conus affair” clearly showed which methods Safonov used to turn the case in his favor, where the Conservatory charter did not allow him to do that. Not having the authority to freely dismiss an obstinate teacher, Safonov persuaded the artistic council’s members to sign a letter demanding Conus’s dismissal. What made the majority of professors sign the letter lied outside Safonov’s powers as the director of the Conservatory or the RMO’s Moscow concerts. Most of the signatories were not motivated by direct threats from Safonov, but by the way they imagined their insurgence could turn him against them and damage their careers. This was the result of Safonov’s many years of acquiring the reputation as an influential figure. Taken in aggregate, all his efforts present what may be called a toolkit to become “an absolute sovereign, the source of all justice and law” within the institution.²¹⁷ The “Conus affair” also irreversibly turned Taneyev into the main critic of Safonov’s later actions and such confrontation of two directors, a current and a preceding one, colored the following five years of Safonov’s directorship. The next chapter is dedicated to how Safonov’s actions were institutionalized during his last years in the Moscow Conservatory.

²¹⁵ Alexey Lopukhin was a Moscow judicial and administrative figure, he was a prosecutor of the Moscow district court in 1899-1900, a director of the Ministry of Internal Affairs Police Department in 1902-1905, a full state councilor. Alexander Kolpakidi and Alexander Sever, *Spetssluzhby Rossiyskoy Imperii. Unikalnaya Entsiklopediya (Special Services of the Russian Empire. Unique Encyclopedia)* (Moscow: Eksmo, 2010), 188–94; Alexander Lopatin was a lawyer, a member of the Society of Russian Drama Writers and the Russian Photographic Society. A friend of Peter Korzhenevsky. Vladimir Lopatin, “Iz Vospominaniya (From Memories),” in *Issledovaniya Po Istorii Russkoy Mysli. Yezhegodnik Za 1997 (Research on the History of Russian Thought. Yearbook 1997)*, by Modest Kolerov (St. Petersburg: Aletya, 1997), 169–89.

²¹⁶ Peter Ivanovich Korzhenevsky (1872-1968), 1836-1961, fond 436 ed.hr. 821, Manuscript Department of the Russian State Library, Moscow, Russia; Taneyev, *1899-1902.*, 2:165.

²¹⁷ Peri Roberts and Peter Sutch, *An Introduction to Political Thought: A Conceptual Toolkit*, 2nd edition (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012), 107.

Chapter 5 - The intensification of authoritarian practices after the “Conus affair”

This chapter delves into Safonov’s methods of gaining power and fighting opposition within the Conservatory. It also considers how other professors perceived his actions and how students perceived the atmosphere within the Conservatory walls.

Among secondary sources, this chapter uses the works of Charles Barber about the pianist and conductor Siloti, Leonid Tumarinson about Safonov, and Leo Barenboym about Rubinstein. As for primary sources, it relies on the memoirs, diaries and correspondence of professors Smolensky, Taneyev and director Safonov. A special attention is devoted to the memoirs of the students who studied during Safonov’s directorship: Ekaterina Aglintseva (1883-1968), Elena Bekman-Shcherbina (1882-1951), Valentina Demyanova-Shatskaya (1882-1978), Anna Ostrovskaya (1868-1942), Avraamiy Shepelevsky (1874-1960), David Shor (1867-1942), and Vasilenko. Lev Tolstoy’s (1828-1910) essay, the memoirs of the pianist and later the Moscow Conservatory professor Goldenweiser and the music critic Sabaneev about the Conservatory affairs are also considered.

For this chapter, archival sources of the Russian National Museum of Music and the Russian State Archive of Literature and Art were used: documents such as the minutes of the Moscow Conservatory artistic council meetings and the drafts of the conservatoires’ charters written by Safonov.

Comparing and juxtaposing these materials presents a portrait of Safonov’s directorship in the later years 1900-1905, after his success in the “Conus affair,” a period when he gained ever greater powers. The discrepancies of Safonov’s management style were endowed with the following description by his former student Shor.²¹⁸

²¹⁸ David Shor was a pianist, teacher, and human rights activist. He studied at the St. Petersburg Conservatory from 1880 to 1884 under Safonov and moved to Moscow following his teacher, where he studied at the Conservatory

Safonov the professor did not leave anything to be desired. Safonov the performer was a wonderful and outstanding phenomenon, and Safonov the man is a kind, generous, charming, wonderful family man and a loving son. Safonov invested with the power of the director, which he understood in his own way, Safonov who wished to become a conductor whatever the cost, Safonov the new Conservatory building's founder was a completely different person. He became rude, harsh, domineering, distanced himself from everyone he previously valued, surrounded himself with flatterers and mediocrity, and absolutely did not tolerate contradiction.²¹⁹

All these data have been analyzed from a social science perspective, not only providing a “critical evaluation of historical evidence gathered from books and manuscripts” in the framework of historical institutionalism.²²⁰ This chapter also includes an analysis of the Conservatory societal structure through the concept of institutional systems proposed by Mary Douglas; the Iron law of oligarchy by Robert Michels; Thomas Green’s theory of political obligation; and Hanna Pitkin’s concept of representation.

From the institutionalist’s point of view, the topology of governed organizations could be generated along two axes of social control: one indicates the strength and number of regulations placed upon the individual’s options (also called grid); another indicates the exclusiveness and inclusiveness of the group boundary (group).²²¹ The process of the Moscow Conservatory’s “institutionalization” itself involved the creation of various regulations that allowed such a complex institution to function with predictability, efficiency, and accountability.²²² Since Rubinstein, the Moscow Conservatory had been a regulated institution, where many relationships were regulated by norms: a complex system of selection and admission to the Conservatory, teaching methodology, rules for the relationship between professors and students, rules for assessing student performance according to a variety of criteria, etc. At the same time, the very nature of the musical institution contributed to its borders' low permeability for external actors

under Safonov from 1884 to 1889. He was a piano professor at the Moscow Conservatory from 1918 to 1925. Ari Abner, “David Shor,” in *Kratkaya Yevreyskaya Entsiklopediya (Brief Jewish Encyclopedia)* (Jerusalem: Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2001), 287–88.

²¹⁹ David Shor, *Vospominaniya (Memoirs)*, ed. Inna Ablina (Jerusalem: Gesharim, 2001), 125.

²²⁰ Don C. Skemer, “Drifting Disciplines, Enduring Records: Political Science and the Use of Archives,” *American Archivist* 54 (1991): 359.

²²¹ Mary Douglas, “An Institutional Ecology of Values,” in *Understanding the Enterprise Culture*, by Shaun Hargreaves Heap and Angus Ross (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1992), 35.

²²² Scott A. Frisch et al., *Doing Archival Research in Political Science* (Amherst, NY: Cambria Press, 2012), 75.

wishing to become its full-fledged members, because they were required to fit many criteria to be considered a valuable candidate: to be a trained musician, a performer, and to have teaching experience. The Conservatory inherently was an institution with a large number of regulations and exclusiveness of group boundaries, or a high grid – high group system. As we shall see, Safonov strengthened these tendencies in both directions, grid and group.

In the final years of the nineteenth century Safonov gained near-total power when he was elected the Head of the RMO Moscow branch in 1897 by the RMO main directorate's decree.²²³ Technically speaking, only the Head of the RMO in Moscow was able to hire or fire the Conservatory director. It transpired that only Safonov could dismiss Safonov. This situation may be explained by the Iron law of oligarchy which states that all complex organizations, regardless of how democratic they are at the beginning, eventually develop into oligarchies.²²⁴ That is, powers tend to be concentrated and eventually gathered in the hands of a small group of people. This is inevitable within any organization as part of the “tactical and technical necessities” of organization.²²⁵ However, power does not necessarily corrupt the leadership of organizations, and the structure of organizations can check on leaders. Of course, the leaders can and do establish obstacles for such checking process.²²⁶ And Safonov did this as well.

In the following, I analyze the methods by which Safonov succeeded in rising through the ranks and safeguarding his own position. He achieved this by changing the institutional norms in his favor as “institutions are not static; and institutionalization is not an inevitable process; nor is

²²³ Decree of the RMO's main directorate on awarding Vasily Safonov the post of chairman of the RMO's Moscow branch, 3 June 1897, Fund 661 register 1 unit 92 list 14-15, Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, Moscow Russia

²²⁴ The Iron Rule of Oligarchy was formulated by the German sociologist Robert Michels in 1911. Robert Michels, *Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy*, trans. Eden Paul and Cedar Paul (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1999), 25.

²²⁵ James L. Hyland, *Democratic Theory: The Philosophical Foundations* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995), 247.

²²⁶ Darcy K. Leach, “The Iron Law of What Again? Conceptualizing Oligarchy Across Organizational Forms,” *Sociological Theory*, no. 23 (3) (September 2005): 312–37.

it unidirectional, monotonic, or irreversible.”²²⁷ The process of changes in institutions is quite possible, although the changes of their internal structures and rules “cannot be arbitrarily dictated.”²²⁸ As for the successful institutional design (as well as redesign), it is crucial to have a coalition of actions or actors both in time and space.²²⁹ Safonov was capable of redesigning his institution effectively because of two strategies he espoused: commitment and consistency. In other words, he constantly made purposeful efforts to bring certain norms into a shape profitable for him, which enabled his ascent. He invested his energies into two arenas of fundamental importance: legislative and administrative.

Safonov’s legislative activities

Safonov wanted to rewrite the charter of the Conservatory to accommodate his own wishes. First, he developed a draft of the charter for teaching the RMO’s music classes in 1898, which according to Taneyev served as a reason for changing the charter of the Conservatory itself.²³⁰ Indeed, Safonov published a draft of the new charter in 1901.²³¹ He sought to rewrite the Moscow Conservatory charter on the model of the St. Petersburg Conservatory charter, thereby limiting the role of the artistic council and strengthening the director’s position (I explore the St. Petersburg Conservatory charter in detail in chapter 6). Safonov would have preferred to act without looking at any opinions of other professors no matter whether they coincided with his or not. As he later wrote in the newspaper *Novosti sezona* (News of the season) on December 15, 1909:

Art is aristocratic and monarchical. As it is impossible for a ‘committee’ to write a symphony, it is also true that only one person can lead a great art business, even two will

²²⁷ James G. March and Johan P. Olsen, “Elaborating the ‘New Institutionalism,’” in *The Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions*, by Sarah A. Binder, R. A. W. Rhodes, and Bert A. Rockman (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 7.

²²⁸ James G. March and Johan P. Olsen, *Rediscovering Institutions: The Organizational Basis of Politics* (New York: The Free Press, 1989), 58.

²²⁹ Claus Offe, “Institutional Design,” in *Encyclopedia of Democratic Thought*, ed. Paul Barry Clarke and Joe Foweraker (London: Routledge, 2001), 453.

²³⁰ Taneyev, *1894-1898*, 1:210.

²³¹ Safonov, V. I. Proekt ustavov konservatoriy Imperatorskogo Russkogo Muzykalnogo Obshchestva, sostavlennii direktorom Moskovskoi konservatorii V.I. Safonovym (The draft of the Imperial Russian Musical Society Conservatoires’ charters written by the Moscow Conservatory director V.I. Safonov), 1901, Fund 1 unit 132, Russian National Museum of Music, Moscow, Russia.

interfere with each other, and, consequently, interfere with the business itself. This is clear to me. Otherwise, I cannot imagine a proper organization of artistic education.²³²

Nevertheless, Safonov was not successful in his efforts to rewrite the charter (I discuss the reasons for his failure in chapter 6).

Administrative activities

Even while he was attempting to revise the charter, Safonov tried to maneuver and manipulate the regulations of the old one within its capabilities, constantly expanding them and introducing new practices for circumventing the obstacles imposed on him by the rules. These efforts fell within the administrative realm.

Safonov created administrative obstacles for his opponents to express their position. As it was mentioned in Chapter 4, Taneyev prepared his statements and dissenting opinions concerning the “Conus affair” for the artistic council meetings; at that time Safonov was trying to avoid documented criticisms about his work within the Conservatory. The statements of Safonov’s opponents were stuck in the bureaucratic red tape initiated by the secretary of the artistic council Anna Avraamova (1848-1921) at his instigation.²³³ This was possible due to Safonov’s manipulation of the charter’s provisions.

According to the charter (see Appendix 1), before a next meeting of the artistic council took place, the director sent invitations to members-professors listing the topics that were put on the agenda. Professors could prepare and read out at a meeting statements documents that set out their position on the issue under discussion. Subsequently, this statement was attached by the secretary of the council to the meeting minutes and was provided for consideration by the RMO’s main directorate in the Moscow Conservatory director’s annual report or at the request

²³² Safonov and Tumarinson, *Stranstvuiushchiy Maestro: Perepiska V.I. Safonova 1905-1917 Godov (Wandering Maestro: Safonov’s Correspondence 1905-1917)*, 556.

²³³ Anna Avraamova studied piano with Nikolai Rubinstein, graduated in 1878. She taught piano at the Conservatory in 1872-1910. She was a secretary of the Artistic Council in 1897-1905. Tatyana Evseeva and Natalia Mironova, “Avraamova Anna Konstantinovna,” in *Moskovskaja Konservatorija Ot Istokov Do Našich Dnej, 1866-2006: Biografičeskij Ėnciklopedičeskij Slovar (The Moscow Conservatory from Origins to the Current Days, 1866-2006: Biographical Encyclopedic Dictionary)*, ed. Margarita Esipova (Moscow: MGK, 2007), 7-8; Taneyev, *1894-1898.*, 1:248–63; Taneyev, *1899-1902.*, 2:150–53.

of the RMO's directors at any time. At the meeting, a resolution of the artistic council on agenda issues should be adopted. If the meeting did not reach consensus, then its agenda was postponed until the next meeting. Besides, if any professor did not agree with the opinion of the majority of those present at the meeting, they could submit their dissenting opinion to the secretariat of the artistic council, which should be attached to the meetings' documents and also be presented in the director's report to the RMO's main directorate. According to the charter, in order not to turn meetings into an empty argument, they must consider only the issues indicated in the original agenda.

Silencing opponents

I present three methods that Safonov used to prevent professors' comments undesirable for him in the Conservatory minutes and documents.

The first one was as follows. If he could discern a slightest discrepancy in certain points of a professor's statement, he did not give them a voice and did not include it in subsequent reports. In this regard, the vague wording of the charter gives the director ample opportunities to misuse his powers, which Safonov constantly implemented to minimize Taneyev's presence in the meetings.

The second method related to the prevention of dissenting opinions in the artistic council meetings' minutes. These minutes were not available to professors at any time and should have been issued upon request. According to Taneyev, Safonov, under various pretexts, either delayed the issuance of these documents, or "accidentally" forgot about professor's requests, or issued them at the most inconvenient time for the requestor.²³⁴ Accurate compliance with the agenda of the meeting and the accuracy of the dissenting opinion were again necessary based on a clause of the charter prescribing not to include irrelevant statements or opinions in the documentation.

²³⁴ Taneyev, *1894-1898.*, 1:220–21.

Therefore, Taneyev, when writing dissenting opinions, consulted on the content with his colleagues and with his lawyer Fedor Maslov (1840-1915).²³⁵

The third method of silencing dissatisfied teachers consisted of not holding meetings of the artistic council. For instance, in the spring of 1899, the artistic council did not meet for almost 3 months, in violation of the charters, which required regular meetings every month.²³⁶ In the 1900-1901 academic year meetings were not held for 5.5 months.²³⁷ In the 1901-1902 academic year meetings were on hold for 4 months.²³⁸ These three methods show that whenever needed for his own purposes, Safonov stuck closely to the letter of the law down to the smallest detail. On the other hand, in cases when following the rules was not profitable for him, Safonov simply ignored them.

Psychological tactics

Another direction of strengthening Safonov's power was provoking teachers to resign who were objectionable to him. Based on personal hostility, Safonov forced Conus and Betting to leave their professorships (see Chapter 4). After the "Conus affair", Smolensky resigned. In 1891, Safonov forced Busoni to resign.²³⁹ I showed in Chapter 3 that Rubinstein had provided a similar policy – encouraging musicians disloyal to his vision about the Conservatory development to leave. Safonov's actions differed in that he pressured those musicians to quit who were disloyal to him personally.

²³⁵ Fedor Maslov was a chairman of the judicial service for the Moscow region. He was a close friend of Taneyev and Tchaikovsky. Fetisova, *Novoe o Taneyev* (*The New about Taneyev*), 57.

²³⁶ Minutes of the Moscow Conservatory artistic council meeting, 20 May 1899, Fund 2099 register 1 unit 152 list 87, Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, Moscow, Russia.

²³⁷ In his commentary to the artistic council meeting Taneyev wrote: "The Conservatory charter refers to the artistic council as an essential part of governing the Conservatory (section 15) and orders (section 30) to hold the artistic council meetings no less than once per month. I ask to include into the minutes that the artistic council in violation to the charter has not been invited to discharge of its duties for 5.5 months, from 16 September 1900 to 1 March 1901." Minutes of the Moscow Conservatory artistic council meeting, 1 March 1901, Fund 2099 register 1 unit 152 list 130, Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, Moscow, Russia.

²³⁸ Minutes of the Moscow Conservatory artistic council meeting, 15 February 1902, Fund 2099 register 1 unit 168 list 68, Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, Moscow, Russia.

²³⁹ Della Couling, *Ferruccio Busoni: "A Musical Ishmael"* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2005), 127-136.

Safonov knew how to be rude and tactless if it was required to get an opponent out of his way. And this style of conversations, systematically pouncing upon musicians who were not accustomed to such an attitude towards themselves, was effective. According to Tchaikovsky, while discussing the candidacy for cello professor position “Safonov resolutely refused to appoint Brandukov and announced that nothing would force him to agree to my proposal.”²⁴⁰ Such attitude angered Tchaikovsky and he left his position in the RMO directorate which was freed from one more Safonov’s opponent.

Contrariwise, Safonov knew how to be infinitely charming. His ability to win over a person was especially vivid in conversations *tête-a-tête*. Safonov promised them a lot and nothing at the same time and got their consent on his terms. Here is how Taneyev described the method employed by Safonov in his diary on April 18, 1898:

I went to Vasily Ilyich [Safonov] to read my statement. When I was reading, he was assenting, saying: “Quite right, as if that were all I dictated to you.” He agreed to offer Conus to become a professor of special instrumentation and agreed not to oppose the establishment of a normal student course capacity.²⁴¹

Subsequent developments revealed Safonov did nothing of the above.

Using connections in high circles

The most striking episode in Safonov’s persecutions of his opponents turned out to be the “Conus affair” (see Chapter 4). Such a demonstrative dismissal of a dissenting teacher and attempts to influence the outcome of the trial, which was beyond the jurisdiction of the RMO’s powers, impressed professors and teachers who could be disloyal to the director. The professor Smolensky in his memoirs expressed the opinion that twenty years before the “Conus affair,” during Alexander II’s reign, it was impossible to imagine such a thing that a representative of the nobility could stop a lawsuit, put pressure on a judge, prosecutor or their superiors.²⁴² The judicial reform of Alexander II had created equality before the law in 1864 and a truly

²⁴⁰ Tchaikovsky, *XVb: Letters (1890)*, 15:115–16.

²⁴¹ Taneyev, *1894-1898*, 209.

²⁴² Smolensky, *Vospominaniya: Kazan. Moskva. Peterburg (Memories: Moscow, Kazan, St. Petersburg)*, 224.

independent and effective court system.²⁴³ However, the first signs of this system's weakening arose in 1874, when the powers of bar associations were transferred to local courts, and the independence of the bar was reduced.²⁴⁴ Later, under the rule of Alexander III and Nicholai II, this system continued to experience erosion.²⁴⁵ These processes were reflected also in affairs close to the musical world.²⁴⁶ Ultimately, by the time of Stalin's rule this led to the "telephone law" or "telephone justice" which "actually triumphed in the Soviet administrative-command system:"²⁴⁷ the courts accepted the decisions of high-ranking officials who called directly.²⁴⁸

Professors' loyalty and opposition

An important condition for expanding Safonov's powers was the tacit non-resistance of the artistic council members and directors of the RMO's Moscow branch. First of all, the adoption of Safonov's policy by professors was based on the consent of the governed - the idea that an authority's legitimacy and moral right to use administrative power is justified when consented to by the group of people over which that administrative power is exercised, the legislative and executive power is nothing except the natural power of each person resigned into the hands of the community.²⁴⁹ The conditions for functioning of the community "have less to do with force and fear of coercion than with the members' mutual recognition of a good common to themselves and others, although it may not be consciously expressed as such."²⁵⁰ In other words,

²⁴³ Girish Narayan Bhat, "Trial by Jury in the Reign of Alexander II : A Study in the Legal Culture of Late Imperial Russia, 1864-1881" (PhD dissertation, Berkley, University of California, 1995), 137-78.

²⁴⁴ William Pomeranz, "'Profession or Estate'? The Case of the Russian Pre-Revolutionary 'Advokatura,'" *Slavonic and East European Review* 77, no. 2 (April 1999): 240-68.

²⁴⁵ Richard Wortman, "Russian Monarchy and the Rule of Law: New Considerations of the Court Reform of 1864," *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 6, no. 1 (2005): 145-70.

²⁴⁶ One of the stages of this process was the trial of the famous industrialist, merchant, entrepreneur, philanthropist and patron of music Savva Mamontov (1841-1918). The trial was held with procedural violations and pressure on witnesses for the court to decide the case against Mamontov. Delo Mamontova, Artsibusheva, Krivosheina i Drugikh: Polnyi i Podrobnyi Otchyot (The Case of Mamontov, Artsibushev, Krivoshein, and Others: Full and Complete Account), 1900, fund 155 item 72, A. A. Bakhrushin State Central Theatre Museum, Moscow, Russia.

²⁴⁷ Anatoly Bezuglov and Sergei Soldatov, *Konstitutsionnoye Pravo v Rossii (Constitutional Law in Russia)*, vol. 2 (Moscow: Profobrazovaniye, 2003), 566.

²⁴⁸ Alena Ledeneva and Natalia Shushanyan, "Telefonnoye Pravo v Rossii (Telephone Law in Russia)," *Vestnik Obshchestvennogo Mneniya. Dannyye. Analiz. Diskussii* 95, no. 3 (2008): 42-50.

²⁴⁹ George Holland Sabine, *A History of Political Theory*, Fourth edition (Hinsdale, IL: Dryden Press, 1973), 510.

²⁵⁰ Paul Harris, "Green's Theory of Political Obligation and Disobedience," in *The Philosophy of T.H. Green*, by Andrew Vincent, Avebury Series in Philosophy (Aldershot, UK: Gower, 1986), 137.

“a community works because the transactions balance out.”²⁵¹ As far as the director carried out his duties to provide funds to the Conservatory and maintain its relative independence from the RMO’s interferences, professors were loyal to his actions as part of their social contract.

Taneyev was the only one who regularly raised his voice against the lawlessness of Safonov’s policy, because the director continued to take over more power, violate the charter's paragraphs and manipulate the opinions of both the artistic council and the directorate of RMO.

In a diary entry dated April 22, 1898, Taneyev wrote the following:

I went to the Council. I suggested that my second application would be considered. But Vasily Ilyich opposed this on the grounds that it was not put on the agenda and that he is having in mind at the end of the exams to make a review of the entire curriculum and then, among other issues, consider it. Three times I began to speak in the sense that consideration of the 2nd statement would significantly help the consideration of the 1st one, that I do not think so alone, but also those members of the Council to whom I read out my statements. I suggested that those who found it desirable to consider this statement would probably say it now. But in response to my words, the members were silent.²⁵²

The meeting was attended by Smolensky, Remezov and others who considered themselves as opponents of Safonov. The same thing happened in the directorate of the RMO’s Moscow branch. On September 15, 1899, Taneyev wrote.

Abrikosov [one of the RMO’s Moscow branch directors] is ready to write to the main directorate about taking classes from Conus. He says that most directors will be on his side.” As a result, Abrikosov’s statement to the main directorate about the illegality of Safonov’s actions was signed only by one other director Ushakov, while the rest said that “it is inconvenient for them to sign it ahead of everyone else,” although actively criticized Safonov’s arbitrariness in conversations not for recording.²⁵³

The reasons for such learned helplessness were fears against Safonov’s powerful administrative resource and his strong ties, which could, if not put an end to, but slow down the career of anyone who dared to say something against his words. More importantly, Safonov was the principle director of the RMO’s concerts in Moscow: he decided who should play and who should not in Moscow, and he could also recommend to his friends in St. Petersburg who held the appropriate posts to promote or, on the contrary, impede the promotion of a particular

²⁵¹ Mary Douglas, *How Institutions Think* (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1986), 74.

²⁵² Taneyev, *1894-1898*, 210.

²⁵³ Sergei Taneyev, *1899-1902.*, vol. 2, 3 vols., *Dnevnik* (Diaries) (Moscow: Muzika, 1982), 80-81.

figure.²⁵⁴ After the conflict with the piano professor Alexander Siloti, Safonov refused to invite him to play at the RMO's Moscow concerts.²⁵⁵ Later Siloti participated only at the concerts of the Moscow Philharmonic Society when he performed for the Moscow public.²⁵⁶ According to the memoirs of the pianist and later the Conservatory professor Goldenweiser, Safonov tried to assign talented students to his friends' classes. For instance, in 1890 the pianist Antonina Heifetz (1868-?) made a very good impression on the entrance committee. After the exam, she announced her desire to enter Siloti's class. At that time, Professor Paul de Schlözer (1841-1898) whom Safonov actively promoted had just joined the Conservatory. Wanting to staff a strong class for Schlözer, he enrolled Heifetz in Schlözer's class, despite her objections.²⁵⁷ It cannot be argued that Safonov resorted to such means frequently - most often he simply "forgot" to engage the musician or invite them to his concerts.²⁵⁸ There were very few people in the Russian musical environment whom Safonov treated aggressively, with the majority he tried to maintain friendly relations in public, albeit purely declaratively.²⁵⁹ Nevertheless, the existential fear of professors against the director's possible anger was perhaps even more effective than if Safonov had surrounded his public activity with scandals and permanent crusades against his enemies.

Some of the professors benefited under Safonov's directorship. Those were his closest friends: Galli, Hřímalý, Ippolitov-Ivanov, Shishkin, Sokolovsky, and Varvara Zarudnaya (1857-

²⁵⁴ In a letter to the RMO St. Petersburg concerts' director César Cui (1835-1918) dated December 9, 1898, Safonov asked not to invite Gustav Mahler (1860-1911) to conduct the RMO concerts in St. Petersburg. Safonov's opinion was based on prejudice against Mahler with a bit of anti-Semitism. Safonov, *Izbrannoe: "Davajte Perepisyvatsja S Amerikanskoju Bystrotoju ...": Perepiska 1880-1905 Godov (Selected: "Lets Correspond with American Speed..." Correspondence 1880-1905)*, 395–96.

²⁵⁵ Charles Barber, *Lost in the Stars: The Forgotten Musical Life of Alexander Siloti* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2002), 48.

²⁵⁶ Safonov, *Izbrannoe: "Davajte Perepisyvatsja S Amerikanskoju Bystrotoju ...": Perepiska 1880-1905 Godov (Selected: "Lets Correspond with American Speed..." Correspondence 1880-1905)*, 532.

²⁵⁷ Goldenweiser, *Vospominaniya*, 192.

²⁵⁸ Vasilenko described it like that: "Safonov somehow thoughtlessly offended many. Even in the winter I sent Safonov to New York, at his persuasive request, all the orchestral material of [symphonic poem] 'The Garden of Death.' Reprinting and dispatch cost me a lot. Then I asked him about it. 'Oh, yes. The Garden of Death ... I received it back in February, but to tell the truth, I still have not unpacked it.' After that, I no longer went to dinners with Safonov." Tumarinson, *"Trudis' I Nadejsja ...": Vasilij Safonov: Novye Materialy I Issledovanija ("Toil and Hope...": Vasily Safonov: New Material and Research)*, 280.

²⁵⁹ Goldenweiser mentioned that Safonov hated him. Although their correspondence was deliberately polite. Alexander Scriabin, *Nastavnik: Alexander Goldenweiser Glazami Sovremennikov (Mentor. Alexander Goldenweiser through the Eyes of His Contemporaries)* (Moscow: Centr Gumanitarnych Inicativ, 2014), 267–72.

1939).²⁶⁰ Taneyev called them the “corporation.”²⁶¹ Nevertheless, most of the sixty teachers and professors enrolled in the late Safonov’s years put up with the director’s moves. Probably teachers justified themselves with the same logic that he himself did: Safonov had done so much for the success and prosperity of the Conservatory that he earned these “privileges.”²⁶² Nikolai Kashkin, the last representative of the “Rubinstein Guard” literally did not stand with Taneyev in his resistance to Safonov’s policy.²⁶³ After having worked for more than forty years, in the 1890s he remained the only teacher who had worked in it from the very beginning. As his daughter Sophia Nyberg-Kashkina (1871-1966) recalled: “the father always categorically refused all administrative activities and representation, although, it seems, many wanted to have him as director.”²⁶⁴

Based on non-singular mentions in Taneyev’s diaries, from time to time other professors grumbled at the director’s actions visiting Taneyev,²⁶⁵ over a cup of tea and a piece of delicious cabbage pie - the signature dish of Taneyev’s nanny Pelageya Vasilievna (1834-1910).²⁶⁶

In terms of institutionalism such loyalty to the director can be explained by the competitive nature of musicians’ interrelations within academia and the performance world. The competitive spirit is interwoven into the western music education system which tends to single out talented students and perceive them “in indisputable ‘elite’ status within any ensemble and requires a

²⁶⁰ Varvara Zarudna was an opera singer. She studied vocal at the St Petersburg Conservatory under Camille Everard in 1879-1882. She taught vocal at the Moscow Conservatory in 1893-1924. She was the wife of Mikhail Ippolitov-Ivanov. Margarita Esipova, ed., “Varvara Mikhailovna Zarudnaya,” in *Moskovskaja Konservatorija Ot Istokov Do Našich Dnej, 1866-2006: Biografičeskij Ėnciklopedičeskij Slovar (The Moscow Conservatory from Origins to the Current Days, 1866-2006: Biographical Encyclopedic Dictionary)* (Moscow: MGK, 2007), 190–91.

²⁶¹ Ru:”корпорация”. Taneyev, *1899-1902*, 59.

²⁶² Safonov, *Izbrannoe: “Davajte Perepisyvatsja S Amerikanskoju Bystrotoju ...”: Perepiska 1880-1905 Godov (Selected: “Lets Correspond with American Speed...” Correspondence 1880-1905)*, 460.

²⁶³ Kashkin was among the first professors Rubinstein hired in 1866, the first year of the Conservatory operation.

²⁶⁴ Sofia Nyuberg-Kashkina, “Vospominaniya o N.D. Kashkine (Memoirs of N.D. Kashkin)”, n.d., 19–20, The Kashkin Family personal archive, Moscow, Russia.

²⁶⁵ Taneyev mentioned professors visiting his home and discussing the Conservatory affairs multiple times in all three volumes of his diaries. Sergei Taneyev, *Dnevniki (Diaries)*, 3 vols., (Moscow: Muzika, 1981-1985)

²⁶⁶ Pelageya Vasilievna Chighova was Taneyev’s nanny from 1856 until her death in 1910. She was his housekeeper and kind of personal secretary. Taneyev took her death hard. “Pelageya Vasilievna’s death -one of the most significant events in my life”, he wrote. Proshina, *Taneyev. Vladimirskie Stranitzi (Taneyev. Vladimir’s Pages)*, 63.

competitiveness among individuals within that elite group.”²⁶⁷ As Mary Douglas says, “The interpersonal relations of scientists are governed by an institutionalized competition in which everyone loses something.”²⁶⁸ By “scientists” one can imply professors of the Moscow Conservatory, who were musicians at the same time. In the case of musicians, “competition” means also artistic opportunities. No one wanted to fall into oblivion and since Safonov gave them resources to obtain their personal fame, they were loyal to him, possibly unconsciously, by virtue of their artistic ambitions.

According to Tyler and Mitchell, “the key factor affecting the perceived legitimacy of authorities is procedural fairness. Procedural judgments have been found to be more important than either outcome favorability—whether the person won or lost—or judgments about outcome fairness.”²⁶⁹ Since Safonov systematically violated procedure for silencing dissenting professors, his authority’s legitimacy evaporated for the “Rubinstein guard” and especially Taneyev.²⁷⁰

For Safonov’s opponents his illegitimacy was based on the fact that he did not provide the possibility for people in the Conservatory, “no matter what corner they occupy, to contest the assumption that the guiding interests and ideas really are shared and to alter the pattern” of the Conservatory’s activity.²⁷¹

Another explanation of the conflict between Safonov and the “Rubinstein guard” is the difference in their perception of the director’s powers representation. The way Safonov saw his powers was different from what his predecessor Taneyev and other professors expected from him when delegating these powers to Safonov. The dilemma between the authorized and the

²⁶⁷ Linda Cameron and Katie Carlisle, “What Kind of Social Climate Do We Create in Our Music Classrooms,” in *Questioning the Music Education Paradigm*, by Lee Bartel (Toronto: Canadian Music Educators’ Association, 2014), 30.

²⁶⁸ Douglas, *How Institutions Think*, 75.

²⁶⁹ Tom R. Tyler and Gregory Mitchell, “Legitimacy and the Empowerment of Discretionary Legal Authority: The United States Supreme Court and Abortion Rights,” *Duke Law Journal* 43, no. 4 (February 1994): 746.

²⁷⁰ See more about procedural legitimation. E. Allan Lind and Tom R. Tyler, *The Social Psychology of Procedural Justice*, Critical Issues in Social Justice (New York: Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, 1988).

²⁷¹ Philip Pettit, *Republicanism: A Theory of Freedom and Government*, Oxford Political Theory (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002), 63.

authorizing is well described by Hanna Pitkin: “I do what Jones would want, or I do what seems best for him, in terms of his interests”.²⁷² However, power delegation does not mean the authorized’s unconditional adherence to all the authorizing’s conditions, because the conditions for the exercise of power are constantly changing and may differ significantly from those at the time of powers’ delegation. In other words, “should a representative do what his constituents want, and be bound by mandates or instructions from them; or should he be free to act as seems best to him in pursuit of their welfare?”²⁷³

Indeed, Safonov did not feel bounded by conditions (or at least he did not allow conditions to limit his actions) and acted independently which caused conflicts with others. He acted as “a charismatic leader who despises elites, along with the representative institutions that sustain them, and who claims a direct connection to the people”²⁷⁴ – his students and teachers, not the artistic council itself or other groups of like-minded professors, including the “Rubinstein guard.” As Smolensky wrote about Safonov’s behavior during the Conus affair: “I was most offended in this whole affair by this man’s utter faith in his strength and our silence and lack of rights.”²⁷⁵ Moreover, not only did the “Rubinstein guard” have opinions different from Safonov’s about the Conservatory’s state of affair, but some students, too.

Being a student in Safonov’s Conservatory

All the changes in the system of relations within the faculty affected the pedagogical process. Below I explain six Safonov’s practices which influenced students.

The first one was the practice of subscriptions, which gained enormous scope in Safonov’s years and produced the following situation – students understood that subscription was optional and there was no case of punishment for the person who refused to participate in this, but it was

²⁷² Hanna Pitkin, *The Concept of Representation* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967), 145.

²⁷³ Ibid.

²⁷⁴ Ghia Nodia, “Democracy’s Inevitable Elites,” *Journal of Democracy* 31, no. 1 (January 2020): 78.

²⁷⁵ Kabanova and Rachmanova, *Epistolary Heritage of S. V. Smolenskogo. Perepiska s S. A. Rachinskim. 1883-1902 (Epistolary Heritage of S. V. Smolensky. Correspondence with S. A. Rachinsky. 1883-1902)*, 680.

better to present, in order not to incur the director's possible displeasure. This is how Taneyev described it in his diary on February 1, 1899.

N.B. to ask Morozov how ladies were freed from duty to present gifts to Vasily Ilyich. (They previously felt an irresistible desire to honor Safonov. When they found out that the director would not get angry with their evasion, their feelings subsided).²⁷⁶

The second practice was favoritism among students created by Safonov's subordination system. I have analyzed the programs of the Conservatory student concerts from 1890 to 1905 prepared by Tumarinson and Rozenfeld and found out that mostly the students of Safonov and five teachers, his closest friends, aforementioned "corporation", permanently took part in that concerts.²⁷⁷ These teachers were: vocal professor Antonín Barcal (1847-1928), cello professor von Glehn, violin professor Hřímalý, piano professor Shishkin, and vocal professor Zarudnaya.²⁷⁸

Safonov contributed to active promotion of his own students in the ranks of teachers. For example, Scriabin became a professor immediately, in violation of the charter paragraphs about teachers' promotion. On September 14, 1898, the artistic council meeting considered the candidacies of James Kwast (1852-1927), professor at the Frankfurt Conservatory, and Scriabin to fill the piano professor position. Despite Kwast's academic records and the length of teaching experience the council assigned Scriabin who had none of the above.²⁷⁹ Besides, Safonov prevented promotion of students of his or his friends' rivals. Therefore, Rachmaninoff did not receive a position of teacher at the Conservatory because he was Siloti's student. Music theory teacher Conus despite the fulfillment of all criteria remained in junior teachers partly because

²⁷⁶ Taneyev, *1899-1902.*, 2:15.

²⁷⁷ Tumarinson and Rozenfeld, *Letopis Žizni I Tvorchestva V.I. Safonova (Life Chronicle of Vasily Safonov)*, 130–417.

²⁷⁸ Antonín Barcal was an opera singer. He studied vocal under Arnošt Förchtgott Tovačovský at Vienna Conservatory in 1865-1870 and was the Moscow Conservatory opera professor in 1898-1921. From 1882 to 1902 he worked as the director of the Bolshoi Theater in Moscow. Jitka Ludvová, "Barcal, Antonín," in *Hudební Divadlo v Českých Zemích. Osobnosti 19. Století* (Prague: Divadelní ústav – Academia, 2006), 37–38.

²⁷⁹ Protokoli zasedaniya hudozgestvennogo soveta Moskovskoy konservatorii po zamescheniyu doljnosti professora fortepiano (Minutes of the Moscow Conservatory artistic council meeting on filling the position of piano professor), 14 September 1898, Fond 2099 op.1 ed.hr.152 list 58, Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, Moscow, Russia.

Safonov saw him as a rival to Ippolitov-Ivanov who also taught music theory.²⁸⁰ In this, Safonov differed from Rubinstein (see Chapter 1),

The third practice that affected students' life was the Conservatory's indifference to its alumni's further career. Such attitude can be described with Bekman-Shcherbina's lines: "After receiving a Free artist degree I could 'freely live badly' because the Conservatory washed their hands of the matter and left alumni to forge their individual paths."²⁸¹

Another student Ostrovskaya recalled an occasion when, after graduation, she once decided to visit the Conservatory and met a very cold welcome in the person of Inspector Alexandra Hubert (1850-1937), whose facial expression told her: "You have already graduated from the Conservatory. What else do you need?"²⁸² Aglintseva wrote about the post-Conservatory prospects of Safonov's students:²⁸³

He usually said to the gifted ones who were very talented - just don't get married! He advised less talented students in a fatherly way to - get married, be happy. He told me neither one nor the other.²⁸⁴

²⁸⁰ Taneyev, *1894-1898.*, 1:240–46.

²⁸¹ From Fr. "artiste libre". In the Russian Empire, the rank awarded to graduates of the Conservatory. This rank was introduced in the mid-1860s in order to overcome the estate system, when music lessons were not among the "high" arts and sciences and therefore were poorly compatible with the estate status. For example, a nobleman who decided to study music professionally, and not as amateur, could lose his privileged status, and a member of the lower class had to get a position according to the table of ranks for studying music. With the rank "free artist" came privileges when entering the civil service, and for the Jews - the right to live everywhere (outside the Pale of Settlement). Dmitry Gudimov, "Praktika Prepodavaniya Violoncheli v Rossii s Serediny XVIII Do 60-Kh Godov XIX Veka (The Practice of Teaching Cello in Russia from the Mid-18th Century to the 60s of the 19th Century)," in *Muzykalnoye Obrazovaniye v Kontekste Kultury: Voprosy Teorii, Istorii i Metodologii (Music Education in the Context of Culture: Questions of Theory, History and Methodology)*, by Lyudmila Djachkova (Moscow: Gnessin State Musical College, 2012), 334; Elena Bekman-Shcherbina, *Moi Vospominaniya (My Memories)* (Moscow: Muzika, 1962), 68.

²⁸² Ostrovskaya studied piano under Pabst and graduated in 1890. She was a piano professor at the Moscow Conservatory from 1908 until her death in 1942. Margarita Esipova, ed., "Anna Pavlovna Ostrovskaya (Ignateva)," in *Moskovskaja Konservatorija Ot Istokov Do Našich Dnej, 1866-2006: Biografičeskij Ėnciklopedičeskij Slovar (The Moscow Conservatory from Origins to the Current Days, 1866-2006: Biographical Encyclopedic Dictionary)* (Moscow: MGK, 2007), 396-397; Alexandra Hubert studied piano under Karl Klindtwordt at the Moscow Conservatory from 1867 to 1872. She was an inspector of the Conservatory in 1889-1914. Sergei Taneyev, *1903-1909.*, vol. 3, *Dnevnik (Diaries)* (Moscow: Muzika, 1985), 486; Stenogramma vechera vospominaniy Anny Pavlovny Ostrovskoy (Transcript of the evening of memories of Anna Pavlovna Ostrovskaya), 11 March 1939, Fond 286 ed.hr. 234 list 28, Russian National Museum of Music, Moscow, Russia.

²⁸³ Ekaterina Aglintseva studied piano at the Moscow Conservatory in 1897-1907 under Safonov and Igumnov. E.M. Karteltseva, "Aglintseva, Ekaterina Davydovna," in *Ryazanskaya Ėntsiklopediya (Ryazan Encyclopedia)* (Ryazan: Pressa: Aleksandriya, 1999), 35.

²⁸⁴ Ekaterina Aglintseva, "Dom, Muzyka, Safonov (Home, Music, Safonov)", 1966, Fund MS, The State Museum at the State Philharmonic at the Caucasian Mineral Waters, Mineralnye Vody, Russia.

Bekman-Shcherbina belonged to the category of the talented, according to the director himself, but even she sometimes did not receive help from him: “the performance promised to me in the symphony concerts did not take place.”²⁸⁵

To be fair, it should be said that Safonov began to help his students in their artistic career more after he had ceased to be the director. As an example, here is Safonov’s letter to Bekman-Shcherbina dated January 20, 1912:

My lyceum fellow is supposed to have a musical evening for the diplomatic corps. Would you be willing to come here and play 1-2 solo pieces for them? ... I think it would be nice to play for Kokovtsev family in the selected society.²⁸⁶

It is also worth to mention that for all his patriarchal views Safonov was in some ways more progressive than his fellow musicians in the matters of gender equality.²⁸⁷ In addition to the appointment of Alexandra Hubert to an important post as inspector of the Conservatory in 1889-1914, he supported his most talented female graduates.

Among these prominent musicians were Antonina Nezhdanova (1873-1950) who became a famous Russian opera singer, Demyanova-Shatskaya, professor of piano at the Moscow Conservatory and from 1937 to 1939 its acting director, the three Gnesin sisters: Elena Gnesina (1874-1967), Eugenyia Gnesina (1870-1940), and Maria Gnesina (1876-1918), founders of Gnesin’s Sisters Music School, now the Gnesin Russian State Academy of Music.²⁸⁸ In addition, in 1887, while still a professor of piano, Safonov founded a scholarship named after his teacher Nikolai Zarembo (1821-1879), the second director of the St. Petersburg Conservatory. It is

²⁸⁵ Bekman-Shcherbina, *Moi Vospominaniya (My Memories)*, 71.

²⁸⁶ Vasily Safonov to Elena Bekman-Shcherbina, 20 January 1912, Fund 492 unit 1576, Russian National Museum of Music, Moscow, Russia.

²⁸⁷ In §9 of the amendments to the St. Petersburg Conservatory charter Anton Rubinstein wrote: “Professors and their assistants in singing, in piano, in elementary theory and solfeggio can be female, in other departments, only men.” The Moscow Conservatory charter did not include such restrictions. *Kopiya ustava Peterburgskoi konservatoryi s zamechaniyami Antona Rubinsteina* (Copy of the St. Petersburg Conservatory charter edited with notes by Anton Rubinstein), 1887, Fond 361 op. 11 ed.hr 217 list 54, 57, 59, 60, 63, 67, 78, 79, Central State Historical Archive of St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg, Russia.

²⁸⁸ Rena Moisenko, *Realist Music: 25 Soviet Composers* (London: Meridian Book, Ltd, 1949), 97–98.

noteworthy that the scholarship did not indicate gender restrictions for recipients, unlike one of the conditions of the Anton Rubinstein Competition (which was restricted to males.)²⁸⁹

The fourth practice was Safonov's proselytism. He was an Edinoverie believer.²⁹⁰ This is how Safonov described the role of religion in his life.

I am a firm adherent of the Old Faith, because only it leads to purity. I probably gave people a lot of grief with my rudeness, but I am proud of my personal life purity. I have never been lecherous. Family for me is sacred.²⁹¹

He loved to baptize students especially Jewish ones in the junior courses. Ostrovskaya remembered:

There were many victims of his missionary activity. The first person he christened was his student Joseph Lhévinne, very talented, he was quite a boy and, apparently, quite naive. Safonov christened him in secret, keeping the news from the boy's father, for whom it was a great grief.²⁹²

Safonov also set a pre-requisite for all graduates seeking the position at the Conservatory – to be an Orthodox. There were no religious restrictions in the charter, however in accordance with general anti-Semitic sentiments in the ruling elite of Russian society, Safonov insisted on baptism into Orthodoxy. An applicant for the piano instructor position at the Conservatory Shor was unsuccessful because he refused to convert to Orthodoxy. Shor mentioned that Safonov had offered him a teaching position several times with the proviso that Shor change religion. The first time was in 1889, immediately after Shor graduated from the Conservatory and the last in 1898. Shor declined in all cases.²⁹³ According to Ostrovskaya's memoirs, Jewish violinist David

²⁸⁹ There were two categories: piano and composition. The competition took place from 1890 to 1910 every 5 years. The first and last competition was in St. Petersburg, others took place in Berlin, Vienna and Paris. Goldenweiser, *Vvospominaniya*, 58–63.

²⁹⁰ Edinoverie (literally “coreligionism”) is the ecumenical arrangement between certain Russian Old Believer communities and the official Russian Orthodox Church, whereby the communities are treated as part of the normative Orthodox Church system, while maintaining their own traditional rites. James A. White, “A Bridge to the Schism. Edinoverie, Russian Orthodoxy, and the Ritual Formation of Confessions, 1800-1918” (PhD dissertation, Florence, European University Institute, 2014), 109–54.

²⁹¹ Tumarinson, “*Trudis' I Nadejsja ...*”: *Vasilij Safonov: Novye Materialy I Issledovanija* (“*Toil and Hope...*”: *Vasily Safonov: New Material and Research*), 272.

²⁹² Stenogramma vechera vospominaniy Anny Pavlovny Ostrovskoy (Transcript of the evening of memories of Anna Pavlovna Ostrovskaya), 11 March 1939, Fund 286 unit 234 list 23, Russian National Museum of Music, Moscow, Russia

²⁹³ Shor, *Vospominaniya (Memoirs)*, 150–51.

Crane (1869-1926) considered the possibility of converting to Orthodoxy in exchange for a violin teacher's position at the Conservatory offered him by Safonov. After some hesitation, he was baptized and came to Safonov for the promised position, but Safonov said that Crane had taken too long to decide so the position had already been given to another person.²⁹⁴ Crane began to teach the violin at the Conservatory only in 1918, thirteen years after Safonov's resignation. Safonov was also intolerant of Taneyev's atheism calling him an "idiot, a nothingarian, and a canting hypocrite."²⁹⁵

The fifth practice was the introduction of a style of behavior and attitudes towards students which produced an unhealthy atmosphere within the Conservatory walls. Student Shepelevsky depicted it in his memoirs.²⁹⁶

When I recall the Conservatory classes now ... I vividly imagine intoxication of cries hanging in the air, insults, threats, bad language, legs stamping and fists banging. Thank God, there was a line of demarcation that blocked the way from all these frenzies to direct fisticuffs, but this demarcation line was designated so subtly, was so barely noticeable that it seemed to be just on the point of being overstepped. Moreover, I am sure that this line did not exist in our professors' souls at all but was purely of external manufacture: as far as our dear professors are concerned, probably some of them would feel even more majestic and even closer to art if they could punch a dull student's face.²⁹⁷

Lev Tolstoy portrayed Safonov's work with the students' orchestra in his essay "What is Art?"²⁹⁸ On April 19, 1897, he attended a rehearsal of Anton Rubinstein's opera *Feramors* at the Moscow Conservatory under the baton of Safonov.

The whole of such a rehearsal lasts six hours on end. Raps with the stick, repetitions, placings, corrections of the singers, - all seasoned with angry scolding. I heard the words, 'asses,' 'fools,' 'idiots,' 'swine', addressed to the musicians and singers at least forty times in the course of one hour. And the unhappy individual to whom the abuse is addressed,

²⁹⁴ Stenogramma vechera vospominaniy Anny Pavlovny Ostrovskoy (Transcript of the evening of memories of Anna Pavlovna Ostrovskaya), 11 March 1939, Fund 286 unit 234 list 26-27, Russian National Museum of Music, Moscow, Russia

²⁹⁵ Ru: "idiot, bezbojnik i hanja". Tumarinson, "Trudis' I Nadejsja ...": *Vasilij Safonov: Novye Materialy I Issledovanija* ("Toil and Hope...": *Vasily Safonov: New Material and Research*), 274.

²⁹⁶ Avraamiy Shepelevsky was a musical critic and piano professor at the Dnepropetrovsk Conservatory. He graduated from the Moscow Conservatory in 1892. Scriabin, *Nastavnik: Alexander Goldenweiser Glazami Sovremennikov* (Mentor. Alexander Goldenweiser through the Eyes of His Contemporaries), 465. Elena Kompaneyets, "Byloye i Fuga (The Past and the Fugue)," *Yevreyskaya Starina* (Jewish Antiquity) 44, no. 3 (October 16, 2013): 254.

²⁹⁷ Alexander Levitin [Shepelevsky A.M.], *V Muzikalnoi Burse* (In the Music Seminary) (Novgorod: Novgorod, 2004), 100.

²⁹⁸

flautist, horn-blower, or singer, - physically and mentally demoralized, does not reply, and does what is demanded of him... The conductor gives free vent to his churlishness, especially as he has seen the same thing done in Paris and Vienna, and knows that this is the way the best conductors behave, and it is a musical tradition of great artists to be so carried away by the great business of their art that they cannot pause to consider the feelings of other artists.²⁹⁹

According to Demyanova-Shatskaya, Safonov “regarded the Conservatory as his inheritance and behaved like a landowner.”³⁰⁰ Since students were significantly lower in the hierarchy, Safonov allowed himself a lot of rudeness.³⁰¹ However, Aglintseva, Bekman-Shcherbina, Vasilenko, and Ostrovskaya agreed that Safonov was not malicious towards his students and that his outbursts of anger quickly ended, and he often apologized for his unbalanced character. Meanwhile, he cared about poor students, allocating scholarships for their education from the Conservatory budget. He strived to secure permanent residency in Moscow for talented Jewish students who were not allowed to live outside of the Pale of settlement.³⁰² Safonov’s quarrelsome nature aside, in this regard he was very similar to Nikolai Rubinstein. Like Rubinstein, Safonov devoted himself entirely to the music institution and fully used his connections for what he thought was the good of the business.³⁰³

The sixth practice was Safonov’s extensive use or even exploitation of advanced students from his class (often in their final year of study) to teach young students. The legal status of these duties was not reflected in the charter. Students, often performing a large amount of work in the Conservatory, did not receive anything for their labor. Safonov set students to work not

²⁹⁹ Lyof Tolstoy, *What Is Art?*, trans. Aylmer Maude (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co. Publishers, 1899), 4–5.

³⁰⁰ Valentina Demyanova-Shatskaya studied piano at the Moscow Conservatory under Safonov from 1902 to 1905. She was a piano professor at the Conservatory 1932 to 1943 and its acting director from 1937 to 1939. Daniel Jaffé, “Moscow (Tchaikovsky) Conservatory (Moskovskaya Gosudarstvennaya Konservatoriya; MGK),” in *Historical Dictionary of Russian Music* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2012), 213; Valentina Demyanova-Shatskaya, “Vospominaniya Ob Uchobe v Konservatorii (Memories of Studying at the Conservatory),” 1 February 1940, Fond 286 ed.hr 218, Russian National Museum of Music, Moscow, Russia.

³⁰¹ Tumarinson, “*Trudis’ I Nadejsja ...*”: *Vasilij Safonov: Novye Materialy I Issledovanija* (“*Toil and Hope ...*”: *Vasily Safonov: New Material and Research*), 264–67.

³⁰² Elena Aglintseva, “Dom, Muzyka, Safonov (Home, Music, Safonov),” 1966, Fund MS, The State Museum at the State Philharmonic at the Caucasian Mineral Waters, Mineralnye Vody, Russia.

³⁰³ Sergei Vasilenko wrote how after the premiere of his cantata (a work written to fulfill graduation requirements), Safonov told him that they were immediately going to a dinner party at the home of Pavel Haritonenko, a wealthy merchant and member of the RMO’s Moscow Directorate. Safonov retorted to Vasilenko’s objections that his friends were waiting: “This is ruled out! Pavel Nikolaevich [Haritonenko] is one of our most important directors. You’ll have time for friends later.” Tumarinson, “*Trudis’ I Nadejsja ...*”: *Vasilij Safonov: Novye Materialy I Issledovanija* (“*Toil and Hope ...*”: *Vasily Safonov: New Material and Research*), 275.

only in piano lessons. For example, student Vasilenko was made responsible for the student orchestra and choral classes between his final years up until shortly after graduation. Like an assistant, Vasilenko rehearsed new material with the orchestra, so that the maestro could dedicate himself only to the final stages of working on the score. Vasilenko wrote.

At one time I taught choral and opera classes. For free (this is not important), but without any official position - just ‘Sergey Nikiforovich’, neither a teacher, nor an assistant. I hoped that he would officially arrange a position for me at the Conservatory, which would be very useful, since I was burning with energy. But Vasily Ilyich [Safonov] did nothing for me in this direction.³⁰⁴

Taneyev raised the issue at the artistic council meetings that the director did not fulfill his teaching duties in those classes in which he was a professor: ensemble class, orchestra class, choral class.³⁰⁵

Similarities between Safonov and Rubinstein

Safonov implemented control and subordination over students by virtue of the Conservatory symphony orchestra of which Safonov was the chief conductor. Here Safonov continued the idea of Rubinstein, who considered the orchestra to be the central place of the Conservatory, as the focus of the creative and educational process, a structure that established relationships within the student body and between students and professors as different groups, rather than as individuals. According to Anna Bull, “the orchestra figures in wider culture as a prominent socio-cultural model of, and metaphor for, control. A range of metaphors have been used to describe the orchestra since the seventeenth century—as an army, a machine, and a civil polity.”³⁰⁶ It is not surprising that Safonov saw the orchestra as a pivotal institution within the institution and his role as conductor was essentially an extension of himself as director.

³⁰⁴ Vasilenko, *Vospominaniya (Memoirs)*, 115.

³⁰⁵ Sergei Taneyev’s statement to the artistic council, 11 May 1898, Fund 62 unit 1246, Russian National Museum of Music, Moscow, Russia

³⁰⁶ Anna Bull, *Class, Control, and Classical Music* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2019), 106.

Conducting was also convenient for him in the sense that “the profession of conductor is one of the last bastions of totalitarianism in the civilized world.”³⁰⁷

Safonov used the student orchestra as a training ground for his own conducting skills. He was not an outstanding conductor by nature, but he had students in the Conservatory orchestra at his disposal for practicing and honing his skills.³⁰⁸ The Conservatory’s student orchestra sounded first-class as well and received the approval of the conductor Artúr Nikisch (1855-1922), who performed a concert with it in 1895.³⁰⁹ Albeit, such quality was the result of hours-long drill and military discipline. Not without reason, Tchaikovsky called the director “general Safonov.”³¹⁰ Although in fairness Tchaikovsky also called Rubinstein “our general [in charge of] music” for his commitment to discipline and intolerance of negligence.³¹¹

At the same time, Rubinstein, who, due to intrigues against him, was deprived of the opportunity to conduct at the Bolshoi Theater, used a student orchestra for the same purposes as Safonov - to hone his skills and reveal himself as a talented conductor.³¹² Nevertheless, for almost the same thing, many criticized Safonov for the use of the student orchestra to fulfil his

³⁰⁷ Nicholas Logie, “The Role of Leadership in Conducting Orchestras” (PhD dissertation, Milton Keynes, Open University, 2012), 39.

³⁰⁸ Tumarinson, “*Trudis’ I Nadejsja ...*”: *Vasilij Safonov: Novye Materialy I Issledovanija* (“*Toil and Hope ...*”: *Vasily Safonov: New Material and Research*), 268–70; Safonov later received much praise for his conducting skills, for example from the Norwegian conductor and composer Sverre Jordan (1889-1972) who witnessed his first performance with the Oslo Symphony Orchestra in 1913. Sverre Jordan, *Erindringer Om Kjente Musikere Og Vokalister Som Jeg Møtte* (Oslo: Norsk musikktidsskrift, 1965), 10.

³⁰⁹ Artúr Nikisch was a Hungarian conductor. He studied at the Vienna Conservatory under the composer Felix Otto Dessoff, the conductor Johann von Herbeck, and the violinist Joseph Hellmesberger, Jr. He was the music director of the Boston Symphony Orchestra in 1889—1893, the music director of The Leipzig Gewandhaus Orchestra in 1895-1922 and a guest conductor of many orchestras including Vienna Philharmonic, Concertgebouw Orchestra, London Symphony Orchestra. Marion Brück, “Nikisch, Arthur,” in *Neue Deutsche Biographie* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1999), 257; Evgenia Gurevich, ed., *V. I. Safonov. 1852–1918. K 150-Letiyu so Dnya Rozhdeniya: Materialy Nauchnoy Konferentsii* (V.I.Safonov. 1852-1918. To the 150th Anniversary of His Birth: Materials of the Scientific Conference) (Moscow: MGK, 2003), 15.

³¹⁰ Tchaikovsky, *XVa: Letters* (1889), 15:106.

³¹¹ Edward Garden and Nigel Gotteri, eds., *To My Best Friend. Correspondence between Tchaikovsky and Nadezhda von Meck (1876-1878)*, trans. Galina Meck (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 147; The Russian playwright Alexander Ostrovsky also wrote about Rubinstein’s work: “in Moscow musical society, concert performances have reached a high degree of perfection thanks to the exemplary administrator N. Rubinstein. Without such discipline, art ceases to be art and turns into childishness and frolic.” Alexander Ostrovsky, *Statyi o Teatre. Zapiski. Rechi 1859 - 1886 Gg. (Articles about the Theater. Notes. Speeches 1859-1886)*, vol. 12, *Polnoye Sobraniye Sochineniy* (Omnibus Edition) (Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, 1952), 141.

³¹² Barenboym, *Nikolay Grigoryevich Rubinshteyn. Istoriya Zhizni i Deyatel'nosti* (Nikolai Rubinstein. History of Life and Work), 145–48.

ambitions as a conductor. In chapter 3, I provide Tchaikovsky's opinion about Safonov's personality and his administrative talents. Here is what he wrote about Rubinstein: "His [Rubinstein's] administrative abilities and skill at getting on with the powers-that-be are amazing, but his downfall is his love of adulation and quite childish weakness for any expressions of submission and servility."³¹³ Jurgenson spoke about Rubinstein in the same way: "For the sake of higher goals, he could be a little Machiavellian."³¹⁴

In many respects, Safonov's actions were similar to those of Rubinstein. However, the outcomes of such similar actions can be "sometimes surprisingly sensitive to the details of the context in which they occur."³¹⁵ The dissimilarity of Safonov's and Rubinstein's management styles was influenced not so much by their different personalities as by different development stages of the institution under their jurisdiction and a number of external factors, which were changing during their respective directorships. In the next chapter, I examine external factors that played a role in the institutional change of the Moscow Conservatory during the final year of Safonov's tenure.

³¹³ Garden and Gotteri, *To My Best Friend. Correspondence between Tchaikovsky and Nadezhda von Meck (1876-1878)*, 122.

³¹⁴ Barenboym, *Nikolay Grigoryevich Rubinshteyn. Istoriya Zhizni i Deyatel'nosti (Nikolai Rubinstein. History of Life and Work)*, 140.

³¹⁵ James G. March, "Footnotes to Organizational Change," *Administrative Science Quarterly* 26, no. 4 (December 1981): 574.

Chapter 6 – The 1905 Revolution and Safonov’s long-term impact in Moscow, Russia and beyond

The main purpose of this chapter is to trace transformational processes within two institutions: the St. Petersburg and Moscow Conservatories. To develop a hypothesis about the causes of changes to the Moscow Conservatory, this chapter uses methods of political science research. In particular, it invokes “process tracing,” as defined by Andrew Bennett and Jeffrey Checkel as “the analysis of evidence on processes, sequences, and conjunctures of events within a case for the purposes of either developing or testing hypotheses about causal mechanisms.”³¹⁶

Withal, James March and Johan Olsen argue against understanding politics solely as reflections of society (contextualism) or as the macro aggregate consequences of individual actors (reductionism).³¹⁷ Hence, this chapter presents a qualitative comparative analysis, which is “context sensitive and historically bound.”³¹⁸ This method takes into account many internal and external factors, historical details of the ongoing processes, as well as specific features for the cases under consideration, such as the Conservatories’ characteristics as musical and social institutions.

Chapter 6 references primary sources such as the minutes of the artistic council meetings in both Conservatories and the correspondences and memoirs of the events’ participants from the funds of TsGIA and RGALI. Combining the primary sources already mentioned in Chapters 1-5 with secondary sources, such as Lynn Sargeant’s research on musicians’ participation in the 1905 Revolution and the development of the RMO, this chapter applies political science methods and concepts to the information from these sources. Taken together, a comparative analysis of

³¹⁶ Andrew Bennet and Jeffrey T. Checkel, *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytic Tool* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 7.

³¹⁷ James G. March and Johan P. Olsen, “The New Institutionalism: Organizational Factors in Political Life,” *American Political Science Review* 78, no. 3 (1984): 735.

³¹⁸ Dirk Berg-Schlosser, *Mixed Methods in Comparative Politics: Principles and Applications* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 85.

the two Conservatories and their actions in the framework of political science, and an in-depth research of historical sources shed light upon the Moscow Conservatory in 1905 and consequences of Safonov's tenure for this institution in particular, and for Russian music in general.

The 1905 Revolution events directly influenced the Moscow and St. Petersburg Conservatories - students of both educational institutions took part in strikes, both in solidarity with the all-Russian democratic movement and to signal their objections to policies pursued by the administrations of the Conservatories.³¹⁹ These events tested the Conservatory's system for strength and illuminated its "shadowed places in which nothing can be seen, and no questions asked."³²⁰

The 1905 Revolution within the walls of the Moscow and St. Petersburg Conservatories

The 1905 Russian Revolution began on January 9, 1905, which is known as "Bloody Sunday": a peaceful demonstration of workers in St. Petersburg that was dispersed by the tsarist troops, which provoked a wave of protests throughout the country. Most intellectuals, including musicians, condemned the brutal actions of the government against unarmed people.³²¹ On January 16, twenty-nine Moscow musicians, including Taneyev and Rachmaninoff, signed an open letter in solidarity with the democratic movement of the country and for "freedom of speech and conscience," published in the newspaper *Nashi Dni (Our Days)* on February 2.³²²

³¹⁹ Leopold H. Haimson, *Russia's Revolutionary Experience, 1905-1917: Two Essays* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), 157; Sergei Taneyev, *1903-1909.*, vol. 3, *Dnevniki (Diaries)* (Moscow: Muzika, 1985), 431-32; and Andrey Birkengoff, *Iz Istorii Leningradskoy Konservatorii. 1862-1917 (From the History of the Leningrad Conservatory. 1862-1917)* (Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe Muzikalnoe Izdatelstvo, 1964), 227-29.

³²⁰ Douglas, *How Institutions Think*, 69.

³²¹ Kathlyn Gay, *The Aftermath of the Russian Revolution* (Minneapolis, MN: Twenty-First Century Books, 2009), 11-12.

³²² James Benjamin Loeffler, *The Most Musical Nation: Jews and Culture in the Late Russian Empire* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010), 80; Taneyev, *1903-1909.*, 3:430.

The first unrest of the St. Petersburg Conservatory students took place less than a month after the Bloody Sunday, on February 5. Besides their solidarity with the workers' movement, a small group of students had put forward demands for the resignation of the director August Berngard. The director did not resign, but decided to punish the protesters and expel all who took part. On February 10, in the St. Petersburg Conservatory a large-scale gathering of students took place; they issued a collective resolution to suspend classes. By a vote of 451 to 146, the students added their names to the resolution of the Moscow musicians and called for the cessation of Conservatory classes until September 1.³²³ The St. Petersburg Conservatory's artistic council took the students' side and voted for the suspension of classes until September.³²⁴ Berngard and the RMO main directorate suspended classes only until March 15.³²⁵

In Moscow, Taneyev published a "Letter to the editor" in the newspaper *Russkie Izvestia* (*Russian News*) on March 4. Taneyev limned prevailing practices at the Conservatory:

Having become a permanent chairman of the RMO's local directorate, the director of the Moscow Conservatory once and for all lost all control over his actions. The director of the Conservatory can now be removed from his post only if he himself wishes to remove himself. At the present moment, when the students of the Conservatory enjoy complete freedom in expressing their opinions at their gatherings, it would be strange if at the same time the professors were deprived of such freedom only because the director would not allow any of their statements to be discussed in the Council.³²⁶

On the same day, Moscow students, in solidarity with their Petersburg colleagues, also began a strike. Classes were not suspended, but professors and instructors did not punish protesters for non-attendance. Safonov described his impressions of this meeting in his letter to Pavel Köppen (1846-1911) on March 4, 1905:

Today, around 300 senior students have gathered. I let them into the Small Hall, instructed them to behave themselves and sent the inspector home ... Now it is seven o'clock (the

³²³ Lynn Mary Sargeant, "Kashchei the Immortal: Liberal Politics, Cultural Memory, and the Rimsky-Korsakov Scandal of 1905," *The Russian Review* 64, no. 1 (2005): 26.

³²⁴ Birkengoff, *Iz Istorii Leningradskoy Konservatorii. 1862-1917 (From the History of the Leningrad Conservatory. 1862-1917)*, 234.

³²⁵ Sargeant, *Harmony and Discord. Music and the Transformation of Russian Cultural Life*, 234.

³²⁶ Taneyev, *1903-1909.*, 3:433.

meeting began at 3.15), and they are still sitting there and who knows what they will decide? Do not know whether to laugh or cry.³²⁷

The next day, the Moscow Conservatory students' demands were heard at the artistic council meeting. Professors postponed the adoption of a resolution until the next meeting. About half of the students stopped attending classes.³²⁸

On March 8, at a meeting of the Moscow Conservatory artistic council, Taneyev delivered a speech:

Studying must continue, the Council has no right to refuse ones who wish to study. Based on the fact that the unrest among young people is epidemiological in nature, I believe that we should treat this unrest sympathetically, not to pursue those who have stopped classes and not to impose any punishment on them: so that those who have some benefits retain these benefits until September.³²⁹

The artistic council recommended to suspend studies until further consideration.³³⁰

The next meeting of the Moscow Conservatory artistic council took place on March 12. The report of the student meeting on March 4 was considered. It set out three categories of questions: 1) political and legislative; 2) issues related to the internal life of the Conservatory; 3) personal issues. The artistic council adopted a resolution - many of the requests were not within the Council's jurisdiction, except for the question of creating a student music library, which the Council found possible to develop in more detail. The question was also raised about "measures to protect students who did not stop classes." Safonov suggested two possible solutions: either follow the St. Petersburg Conservatory experience with special passes issued to loyal students for limited visits, or conduct early exams. Taneyev insisted that the St. Petersburg experience

³²⁷ Safonov, *Izbrannoe: "Davajte Perepisyvatsja S Amerikanskoju Bystrotoju ...": Perepiska 1880-1905 Godov (Selected: "Lets Correspond with American Speed..." Correspondence 1880-1905)*, 662.

³²⁸ Protokoli zasedaniy hudozgestvennogo soveta Moskovskoy konservatorii (Minutes of the Moscow Conservatory artistic council meeting), 5 March 1905, Fond 2099 op. 1 ed.hr. 214 list 62, Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, Moscow, Russia.

³²⁹ Taneyev, *1903-1909.*, 3:433.

³³⁰ Protokoli zasedaniy hudozgestvennogo soveta Moskovskoy konservatorii (Minutes of the Moscow Conservatory artistic council meeting), 8 March 1905, Fond 2099 op. 1 ed.hr. 214 list 71, Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, Moscow, Russia.

was an inappropriate model and that there was no need to move the exams early, which would affect the curriculum.³³¹

Meanwhile, in the St. Petersburg Conservatory, despite ongoing student protests, the director ordered not to disrupt classes, contrary to the opinion of the Conservatory artistic council. The students that were striking attempted to block access to the building. The administration called the police, who forcefully broke up the demonstration. The next day, on March 17, students redoubled their efforts. While one group protested at the Conservatory's main entrance, a smaller group entered via the box office. Once inside, protesters vandalized classrooms, broke windows and doors, and set off a stink bomb that drove professors and their remaining students from the building. Police arrested more than one hundred students.³³²

On the same day, in Moscow “the artistic council found it useful to temporarily suspend classes at the Conservatory. Everyone would be allowed to take exams - annual and final.”³³³ That same day, the St. Petersburg Conservatory's professor Rimsky-Korsakov published an open letter in the Moscow newspaper *Russkiye Vedomosti* that was not approved by censors for the newspapers of St. Petersburg. Rimsky-Korsakov supported the students' actions.³³⁴

On March 19, the artistic council of the St. Petersburg Conservatory met to consider the culpability of student protesters. Also, the question of Berggard's dismissal was raised. The meeting was suspended with these issues unresolved, but the St. Petersburg RMO board, which also met that day, accepted Berggard's resignation.³³⁵ The main item on the agenda, however,

³³¹ Protokoli zasedaniy hudozgestvennogo soveta Moskovskoy konservatorii (Minutes of the Moscow Conservatory artistic council meeting), 12 March 1905, Fond 2099 op. 1 ed.hr. 214 list 81-88, Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, Moscow, Russia.

³³² Sargeant, “Kashchei the Immortal: Liberal Politics, Cultural Memory, and the Rimsky-Korsakov Scandal of 1905,” 28.

³³³ Protokoli zasedaniy hudozgestvennogo soveta Moskovskoy konservatorii (Minutes of the Moscow Conservatory artistic council meeting), 17 March 1905, Fond 2099 op. 1 ed.hr. 214 list 93-94, Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, Moscow, Russia.

³³⁴ Taneyev, *1903-1909.*, 3:228.

³³⁵ Sargeant, “Kashchei the Immortal: Liberal Politics, Cultural Memory, and the Rimsky-Korsakov Scandal of 1905,” 28.

was Rimsky-Korsakov's provocative letter, which made the Conservatory's affairs public. As a result, he was dismissed.³³⁶

March 22, the Moscow Conservatory artistic council decided to transfer students to the next course or officially graduate them, regardless of their participation in the strike:

The Artistic Council, taking into account the dismissal of 100 students at the St. Petersburg Conservatory for the disturbances that they had made within the walls of the Conservatory, expressed a unanimous desire to prevent similar events in the Moscow Conservatory and eliminate the possibility of victims, remaining on the path expressed in the decree of March 8 this year. The Council unanimously decided: not to resume classes in the current academic year. Exams start on Monday of the 5th week.³³⁷

Having begun in March, the student movement within the walls of the Moscow Conservatory came, however, to naught. The above cannot be applicable to the St. Petersburg Conservatory, where the events looked like a chain of "dramatic turning points reached and passed without an understanding of their future significance."³³⁸ Unlike the St. Petersburg Conservatory and against the backdrop of dramatic events that shocked the country from 1905-1907, the Moscow Conservatory went through a difficult Revolutionary period relatively calmly.³³⁹

However, the events of February-March 1905 fueled the longstanding feud between the director and his eternal rival, Taneyev. Their conflict culminated in a dispute after the artistic council on September 1, 1905, where Safonov announced that he would go on leave for a year and assign Ippolitov-Ivanov as the acting director in his absence.³⁴⁰ Taneyev objected, stating that Ippolitov-Ivanov's appointment would be in violation of the charter, which prescribed the

³³⁶ Ibid.

³³⁷ Protokoli zasedaniy hudozgestvennogo soveta Moskovskoy konservatorii (Minutes of the Moscow Conservatory artistic council meeting), 22 March 1905, Fond 2099 op. 1 ed.hr. 214 list 94-95, Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, Moscow, Russia.

³³⁸ Guillermo O'Donnell and Philippe Schmitter, *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Tentative Conclusions about Uncertain Transitions*. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986), 3-4.

³³⁹ Although students' unrests also took place in Moscow in November 1905, particularly among Moscow State University's students. Abraham Ascher, *The Revolution of 1905: Russia in Disarray* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994), 304.

³⁴⁰ Protokoli zasedaniy hudozgestvennogo soveta Moskovskoy konservatorii (Minutes of the Moscow Conservatory artistic council meeting), 1 September 1905, Fond 2099 op. 1 ed.hr. 214 list 103-106, Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, Moscow, Russia.

Conservatory inspector to serve as the acting director in the absence of the actual director.³⁴¹

This provoked Safonov's outburst and inappropriate behavior against Taneyev. After that, Taneyev decided to resign.³⁴² Safonov decided not to return from his sabbatical and resigned as well.³⁴³ On September 3, 1905, Safonov wrote a conciliatory letter to Taneyev in which he expressed his view on the years of his directorship and Taneyev's role:

Sergey Ivanovich, I do not want to leave with a feeling of discord and anger in my soul. Who knows how much I still have to live, and whether I am destined to return to work at the same place? Of course, you have no doubts that I am very sorry for my burst of anger, and I beg you to forgive me for it, as well as I forgive you for all the evil that you have caused me personally and our whole business so many times. It is all because of your formalistic attitude to the matter, ignorance of people, lack of understanding of the human heart. With your one-sided, closed life, it is difficult for you to comprehend a living, multisided affair that can never go without the small downsides that are inevitable in all human activity.³⁴⁴

In September 1906, Ippolitov-Ivanov was elected by the artistic council and the RMO's main directorate as the new director according to the charter's regulations. His management style was different from Safonov's, so some professors who had had a conflict with the former director returned to their posts in the Conservatory. In 1920, even Georges Conus returned to the Conservatory and thereafter fulfilled his considerable talents as a teacher. One of Conus's students was Igor Sposobin (1900-1954), who wrote music theory textbooks still widely used in Russia today.³⁴⁵ In another similar case, in 1921 Brandukov was re-appointed a professor in the Conservatory after more than a 30 years' absence brought on by his conflict with Safonov.³⁴⁶

³⁴¹ According to §25 of the Moscow Conservatory charter (see Appendix 1)

³⁴² Taneyev, *1903-1909.*, 3:258–59.

³⁴³ Safonov also had a personal reason to leave the directorship - his son's illness, which required Safonov's family to live a few months in health resorts. Safonov and Tumarinson, *Stranstvuiushchiy Maestro: Peregiska V.I. Safonova 1905-1917 Godov (Wandering Maestro: Safonov's Correspondence 1905-1917)*, 41.

³⁴⁴ Safonov and Tumarinson, 63.

³⁴⁵ Igor Sposobin studied at the Moscow Conservatory under George Conus and Reinhold Glièrece from 1922 to 1927, then became a teacher of music theory at the Conservatory (Professor since 1939) and worked there until 1954. Sposobin is the author of textbooks on harmony, analysis of forms, elementary music theory, ear training manuals. Yuriy Holopov, "Igor Vladimirovich Sposobin," in *Moskovskaja Konservatorija Ot Istokov Do Našich Dnej, 1866-2006: Biografičeskij Ėnciklopedičeskij Slovar (The Moscow Conservatory from Origins to the Current Days, 1866-2006: Biographical Encyclopedic Dictionary)*, ed. Margarita Esipova (Moscow: MGK, 2007); Ivan Starostin and Tatyana Kyuregyan, "I. V. Sposobin: Razvitiye Pedagogičeskoy Traditsii Moskovskoy Konservatorii (I.V. Sposobin: The Development of the Pedagogical Tradition of the Moscow Conservatory)," *Nauchnyj Vestnik Moskovskoj Konservatorii*, no. 1 (2016): 8–27.

³⁴⁶ Olesya Bobrik, "Sergey Vasilyevich Yevseyev. Fragmenty zapisnykh knizhek. 1922-1932 (Sergey Vasil'yevich Yevseyev. Fragments of notes. 1922-1932)," *Iskusstvo muzyki. Teoriya i istoriya*, no. 14 (2015): 199.

The premises for different reactions

The fact that the fates of protesting students in St. Petersburg and Moscow were so dissimilar reveals unique characteristics of administrative practices in the two Conservatories. In this subsection I examine what seemingly minor differences at the Conservatories' development led to such discrepancies.

On the one hand, Safonov continued community-minded management traditions of his predecessors Taneyev and Rubinstein. On the other hand, he sought to create a regime of one-man rule and, in many respects, he succeeded. The Conservatory in 1905 was much more like his personal holding than in 1889, when he began his activities to change the rules of the charter and dismantle the unspoken traditions of interaction and equality of opinions on every level that had been established by Rubinstein and Taneyev. The opposition was rendered null; some left the Conservatory, others adapted to the new rules. Only Taneyev remained. His letter on September 17, 1905 was an interesting confirmation of the success of Safonov's efforts. Taneyev responded to the Conservatory professors' collective request asking him to withdraw his letter of resignation and return to teaching. It is full of bitter irony:

Dear comrades! For your letter of September 11, let me express my deep appreciation for the invitation to return to your environment. I am very sorry that I can't fulfill this, and I am very touched by your sympathy, which I have so lacked in the last six or seven years of unlawful arbitrariness and constant violation of the charter.³⁴⁷

However, Safonov was unable to establish a regime similar to the one in the St. Petersburg Conservatory. Below I present three main differences in the conditions of the institutions' growth and functioning. The first one lay in the legislative activities of their directors.

Legislative activities of Safonov and Anton Rubinstein

After their foundation in 1862 and 1866, respectively, and until 1905, the Conservatories had changed their charters several times. The Moscow Conservatory adopted a new charter in 1878 (see Chapter 1). The St. Petersburg Conservatory had done so twice, in 1878 and 1887. The

³⁴⁷ Bernardt, *S.I. Taneyev*, 166.

development of the St. Petersburg and Moscow Conservatories originally laid down in documents influenced the subsequent legislative process. Nikolai Rubinstein, who, in his time, like Safonov, was accused of despotism, nevertheless had established principles of collegiality and deliberation. This was reflected in the Moscow Conservatory's original charter, and reinforced in the charter of 1878, where the Moscow Conservatory autonomy from the RMO main directorate's actions expanded and the role of the artistic council in internal affairs was strengthened.

As mentioned in Chapter 5, Safonov's 1898 draft amendment to the Moscow Conservatory charter reinforced the director's powers, to the detriment of artistic council. Unfortunately to Safonov, it had never been adopted by the RMO's main directorate. The formal reason was because the charter would be very different from the 1878 version. The implicit reason was, while strengthening the powers of the director, the new charter would have reinforced Safonov's sole management without increasing the RMO's control over him. St. Petersburg saw all of this as undesirable. Safonov therefore managed the Conservatory with Rubinstein's charter of 1878, and the legislative evolution of the Moscow Conservatory developed on the principle of maintaining democratic trends.

In St. Petersburg, a different situation developed, which was primarily influenced by the identity of the Conservatory's founder, Anton Rubinstein. Unlike his younger brother, he proceeded from the principles of enlightened absolutism in the management process. The director had to be an absolute leader in the team and make decisions alone, but also bear great responsibility for the decisions made. Despite the similarity of the educational process' organization structure and the legal basics of the charters (at least until 1887), the internal instructions supplementing and regulating the work of some sections in the charters differed from the Moscow ones. In general, the administrative structure of the St. Petersburg Conservatory was built upon the principles of undivided authority. This was especially accentuated in the 1887 change.

The St. Petersburg Conservatory charter's change in 1887 was associated with the reappointment of Anton Rubinstein as the director. The first tenure of Rubinstein's directorship in 1862-1867 ended with his resignation, after a conflict with officials in the RMO.³⁴⁸ As mentioned before, the St. Petersburg Conservatory was more dependent on the RMO main directorate financially. This also caused greater administrative control from the tsarist officials in charge of the RMO. Geographical proximity also gave court circles the opportunity to have more supervision over the Conservatory and influence on its professors.

Before the re-appointment of Rubinstein as director, Davydov, an outstanding musician, organizer and teacher, left this post. Davydov resigned in protest after strongly conflicting with the RMO officials, who wanted to influence the admission process. They planned to decrease the number of accepted Jewish students, on the grounds that educating them was dangerous for the State's stability.³⁴⁹ Davydov was the St. Petersburg Conservatory director in 1876-1887, when the reactionary ideology of Konstantin Pobedonostsev (1827-1907) during the reign of Alexander III began to dominate in the internal affairs of the empire and Davydov was dismissed.³⁵⁰ The Conservatory then entered a period of managerial crisis.

When the RMO officials asked Anton Rubinstein to take up the post of director again, he put forward a list of conditions for changing the charters, without which he would have refused the offer. From the materials of the Artistic Council meeting on May 23, 1887: "In his opinion, the orders existing in the Conservatory do not give him the opportunity to take all those measures with proper freedom to raise the value of the Conservatory and improve it, which he considers necessary."³⁵¹ The RMO main directorate complied with Anton Rubinstein's

³⁴⁸ Sargeant, *Harmony and Discord. Music and the Transformation of Russian Cultural Life*, 99.

³⁴⁹ Lynn Mary Sargeant, "A New Class of People: The Conservatoire and Musical Professionalization in Russia, 1861-1917," *Music and Letters* 85, no. 1 (January 2004): 56.

³⁵⁰ John D. Klier, "Pobedonostsev, Konstantin," in *Antisemitism: A Historical Encyclopedia of Prejudice and Persecution, Volume 1* (Santa-Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2005), 551.

³⁵¹ Protokoli zasedaniya hudozhestvennogo soveta Peterburgskoi konservatorii po peresmotru ustava (Minutes of the St. Petersburg artistic council meeting for revising the charter), 23 May 1887, Fond 361 op. 11 ed.hr. 155 list 85, Central State Historical Archive of St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg, Russia.

requirements and his “Regulations” were adopted as “generally not contradicting the charters of the Society and the Conservatories.”³⁵²

Here I indicate two pivotal sections of Anton Rubinstein’s amendments to the Conservatory charter in 1887, which illustrate the general direction of his legislative activity.

§7 “The appointment and dismissal of professors does not depend on the artistic council; they are appointed and dismissed by the director and local directorate of the RMO.” Rubinstein explained:

This is just an excuse for intrigue, camaraderie and all kinds of troubles - this should not be applied to the artistic council. It is normal for a university to exist with such kind of intrigues, but as for the music world this is positively unthinkable.³⁵³

§19 “Professors, their assistants, teachers, and generally everyone in the Conservatory, both in the preparatory and professional departments, have no right to write in the newspapers about the Conservatory, about the teachers and students in it neither in the sense of praise nor in the sense of criticism.” Rubinstein explained:

This is dangerous in that the preliminary revelation of the subject to be discussed could happen before it is resolved, and cause various silly interpretations, gossip, and so on; it is possible in other scientific institutions, since they relate only to specialists, the musical questions for some reason become public questions, and everyone is interested in them and everyone discusses them, and it turns out to be idle talk.³⁵⁴

Indeed, Rimsky-Korsakov was dismissed based on this section.

Rubinstein’s attitude towards the music community, which he perceived as prone to intrigue and requiring more supervision and control, was apparent. Safonov shared this point of view, bringing military discipline to the Moscow Conservatory. However, without a charter written by himself, he did not achieve Anton Rubinstein’s heights in director’s authoritarianism.

³⁵² Birkengoff, *Iz Istorii Leningradskoy Konservatorii. 1862-1917 (From the History of the Leningrad Conservatory. 1862-1917)*, 76.

³⁵³ Kopya ustava Peterburgskoi konservatoryi s zamechaniyami Antona Rubinsteina (Copy of the St. Petersburg Conservatory charter edited with notes by Anton Rubinstein), 1887, Fond 361 op. 11 ed.hr 217 list 54, 57, 59, 60, 63, 67, 78, 79, Central State Historical Archive of St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg, Russia.

³⁵⁴ Ibid.

Looking at the St. Petersburg Conservatory during the 1905 Revolution, I suggest that Rubinstein's changes were not farsighted. As March and Olsen say, such changes "reflect local adaptation to local experience and thus be both relatively myopic and meandering, rather than optimizing, as well as 'inefficient,' in the sense of not reaching a uniquely optimal arrangement."³⁵⁵ The 1905 Revolution events drastically weakened the equilibrium and effectiveness of this system within a relatively short period of time.³⁵⁶

"Black knights" and "White knights"

A second dissimilarity of the two Conservatories followed both from their charters' structures (first of all, §19 of Anton Rubinstein's amendments to the St. Petersburg Conservatory charter and the absence of the same regulations in the Moscow Conservatory charter) and from external conditions that influenced the state of affairs in the institutions. The influence on the state by outside actors to strengthen or weaken authoritarian tendencies has been called the presence of "black and white knights." A "black knight" makes an authoritarian regime more resilient towards challenges.³⁵⁷ A "white knight" strengthens democratic trends and contributes to a milder and painless democratic transition.³⁵⁸ Below I present two actors I consider as "white knights" for the Moscow Conservatory, and one "black knight" for the St. Petersburg one.

The first "white knight" for the Moscow Conservatory was the Moscow press. During the last years of his tenure Safonov had been a constant object of attention of the press and the public. In a letter to the *Russkie Vedomosti's* editor he wrote: "As for the alleged lack of control over my actions, I think few of the public figures are controlled so strictly and tirelessly by the

³⁵⁵ March and Olsen, "Elaborating the 'New Institutionalism,'" 7.

³⁵⁶ Mattei Dogan and John Higley, *Elites, Crises, and the Origins of Regimes* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield publishers, 1998), 29.

³⁵⁷ Jakob Tolstrup, "Black Knights and Elections in Authoritarian Regimes: Why and How Russia Supports Authoritarian Incumbents in Post-Soviet States," *European Journal of Political Research* 54, no. 4 (November 2015): 674.

³⁵⁸ David Adesnik and Michael McFaul, "Engaging Autocratic Allies to Promote Democracy," *The Washington Quarterly* 29, no. 2 (Spring 2006): 7–10.

press and public opinion as I am.”³⁵⁹ In addition, the Moscow press was much more liberal than in Petersburg and, since the time of the “Conus affair,” had provided a platform for all sides of the conflict (see Chapter 4). The ability of the Moscow Conservatory professors to voice, publicly, their position in the press without the threat of dismissal could be called a “democratic enclave” - a stable democratic practice within the framework of an authoritarian institution.³⁶⁰ The presence of such a practice was one of the pivotal differences between the two Conservatories.

A second “white knight” for the Moscow Conservatory was a competing structure represented by the Moscow Philharmonic Society and its Music and Drama School. The Moscow Philharmonic Society appeared in 1883 due to the efforts of the Conservatory’s former professor Pyotr Shostakovsky (1851-1917).³⁶¹ Shostakovsky had been a piano teacher who, due to his conflict with Nikolai Rubinstein, had left the Conservatory.³⁶² Shostakovsky turned out to be a talented administrator and quickly found august patrons in the person of first Grand Duke Nikolai Nikolaevich (1831-1891), then Grand Duchess Elizabeth Fedorovna (1864-1918).³⁶³ The Music and Drama School, established at the Philharmonic Society in 1885, received an official

³⁵⁹ Safonov, *Izbrannoe: “Davajte Perepisyvatsja S Amerikanskoju Bystrotoju ...”*: *Perepiska 1880-1905 Godov (Selected: “Lets Correspond with American Speed...” Correspondence 1880-1905)*, 660.

³⁶⁰ Bruce Gilley, “Democratic Enclaves in Authoritarian Regimes,” *Democratization* 17, no. 3 (June 2010): 391.

³⁶¹ Pyotr Shostakovsky studied piano under Alexander Dreyschock (1818-1869) at the St. Petersburg Conservatory and later under Theodor Kullak at the Neue Akademie der Tonkunst. In 1876, he was invited by Nikolai Rubinstein to teach piano at the Moscow Conservatory but a year later left the Conservatory and founded the Moscow Music and Drama school. He was its director from 1878 until 1898. Daniel Jaffé, “Moscow Philharmonic Society Music and Drama School,” in *Historical Dictionary of Russian Music* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2012), 215–16.

³⁶² There are different opinions about his pianist's skills. Rimsky-Korsakov wrote “wonderful pianist Shostakovsky”, Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov, *Letopis Moyey Muzykalnoy Zhizni (Chronicle of My Musical Life)* (Moscow: Direct-Media, 2015), 310; However later he changed his opinion, “it was not an artist, but a man chasing fame.” *Ibid.*, 322; A music critic Osip Levenson (1839-1892) wrote about Shostakovsky: “we have never heard such a cacophony.” Osip Levenson, *V Kontsertnoy Zale (Muzykalnyye Felyetony). 1878-1880 g. (In the Concert Hall (Musical Feuilletons). 1878-1880)* (Moscow: Tipolitogafiya. N.S. Skvortsova, 1880), 110; “Our [the RMO] semi-literate competitor,” Alexander Kireev (1833-1910), an aide-de-camp of the Grand Duke Konstantin Nikolaevich (then the Head of the RMO) wrote to Safonov. Grigory Moiseev, “Vasily Safonov I Avgusteishie Pokroviteli Moskovskoi Konservatorii (Vasily Safonov and the August Patrons of the Moscow Conservatory),” *Nauchnyj Vestnik Moskovskoj Konservatorii*, no. 4 (2014): 70; Tchaikovsky wrote: “Shostakovskiy is a complete zero and nothingness.” Pyotr Tchaikovsky, *IX: Letters (1880)*, ed. Nina Viktorova, Nikolai Gorlov, and E.A. Pustovit, vol. 9, *Polnoye Sobraniye Sochineniy. Literaturnyye Proizvedeniya i Perepiska (Full Composition of Writings. Literary Works and Correspondence)* (Moscow: Muzika, 1965), 120.

³⁶³ Elizabeth Fedorovna was the Grand Duke Sergei Alexandrovich’s wife. Thus, the husband was the Moscow patron of the RMO, and the wife was the patroness of the Moscow Philharmonic Society.

status equal to a Conservatory. The Philharmonic Society as well as the RMO did not survive the 1917 Revolution.³⁶⁴ But the Music and Drama School was renamed the Russian Institute of Theater Arts (GITIS) in 1922, and now it is one of the most prestigious Russian educational institutions in its field.³⁶⁵

The RMO's patron, Grand Duke Konstantin Nikolaevich, called the School nothing more than a "filthy quasi-Conservatory."³⁶⁶ Nevertheless, some former professors of the Moscow Conservatory taught there: Antonín Barcal, Vasily Bezekirsky (1835-1919), Arseni Koreshchenko – and even more graduates of the Moscow Conservatory found employment there. Among the School's graduates were conductor Sergei Kusevitsky (1874-1951), director Vsevolod Meyerhold (1874-1940), tenor Leonid Sobinov (1872-1934), and many other prominent Russian musicians and directors. Rachmaninoff performed with its student orchestra. In 1906-1917, the director of the School was Anatoly Branduckov, who had not been allowed to teach at the Conservatory by Safonov in 1889. After his dismissal from the Conservatory, Conus was appointed a professor here, and in 1904-1906 the director. In general, the presence of a strong competing organization in the same city overshadowed Safonov's path to absolutism.

I speculate that the St. Petersburg Conservatory, on the contrary, experienced the presence of a "black knight" in the form of the RMO main directorate. The person who influenced the genesis of the RMO's management system and played an incommensurable role in its fate was the Grand Duchess Elena Pavlovna.³⁶⁷ She was the patroness and official chairman of the society until her death in 1873. The Grand Duchess was highly educated, a big admirer of music and possessed outstanding organizational skills. In the first years of the Saint Petersburg

³⁶⁴ Daniel Jaffé, "Moscow Philharmonic Society (Moskovskoe Filarmonicheskoe Obshestvo)," in *Historical Dictionary of Russian Music* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2012).

³⁶⁵ Alaina Lemon, *Technologies for Intuition: Cold War Circles and Telepathic Rays* (Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2018), 19.

³⁶⁶ Moiseev, "Vasily Safonov I Avgusteishie Pokroviteli Moskovskoi Konservatorii (Vasily Safonov and the August Patrons of the Moscow Conservatory)," 68.

³⁶⁷ Princess Charlotte of Württemberg, later known as Grand Duchess Elena Pavlovna, the wife of Grand Duke Michael Pavlovich, the youngest son of Emperor Paul I. She was a co-founder and the first Head of the RMO (1860-1873). Taylor, *Anton Rubinstein: A Life in Music*, 39.

Conservatory's existence she shouldered almost all of its expenses personally: she provided part of her residence, the Mikhailovsky Palace, for use as classrooms, gave scholarships to financially disadvantaged students, and covered a considerable share of salaries for professors and staff - as a whole from eight to ten thousand rubles per year (the annual state subsidy that the St. Petersburg Conservatory received under the charter of 1878 was ten thousand rubles).³⁶⁸

The Grand Duchess had a conflict with Anton Rubinstein in 1866-1867 regarding the level of final exams and Rubinstein's demands to secure employment for Russian musicians in orchestras and theatres across the country.³⁶⁹ Rubinstein was nicknamed the musical *istopnik* of her highness concerning his subordinate role in relation to the patroness.³⁷⁰ He himself thought otherwise and his independence and willfulness annoyed the Grand Duchess. As even her closest associate, Prince Aleksey Obolensky (1855-1933), acknowledged, Elena Pavlovna had great difficulty accepting limitations to her authority.³⁷¹

The Grand Duchess also had an adversary among the advocates of musical enlightenment, the Free School of Music in St. Petersburg, founded in 1862 by Mily Balakirev. This school provided music training for everyone who could not afford a paid education, regardless of age and estate.³⁷² The existence of such an organization could be useful for the RMO's educational mission. Although, Balakirev was skeptical about the Conservatory's institutional model, which he associated with "German pedantry and scholasticism", and tried to present an alternative with

³⁶⁸ Andrey Boretsky, "Idealnaya Pokrovitel'nitsa Muzykal'nogo Iskusstva: Velikaya Knyaginya Yelena Pavlovna Kak Drug i Metsenat (An Ideal Patroness of Musical Art: Grand Duchess Elena Pavlovna as a Friend and Philanthropist)," in *Soyuz Tvortsov i Prosvetiteley (The Union of Creators and Enlighteners)*, by Avangard Fedotov (Moscow: Kompozitor, 2012), 106-7.

³⁶⁹ Leo Barenboym, *1829-1867*, vol. 1, Anton Grigorievich Rubinstein (Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe Muzikalnoe Izdatelstvo, 1957), 343.

³⁷⁰ *Istopnik* or *istopnichiy* (fireman). In the fifteenth-nineteenth century Russia, it was a position in the palace. The duties included ensuring the cleanliness of rooms, bedchambers, fireplaces, and supervising the servants. Gerhard Friedrich Müller, *Izvestiya o Dvoryanakh Rossiyskikh (News about Russian Nobles)* (Moscow: ÈÈ Media, 2013), 267-69; Barenboym, *1829-1867*, 1:100.

³⁷¹ Sargeant, *Harmony and Discord. Music and the Transformation of Russian Cultural Life*, 58.

³⁷² Daniel Jaffé, "Free School of Music, St. Petersburg (Besplatnaya Muzikal'naya Shkola)," in *Historical Dictionary of Russian Music* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2012), 136.

his school.³⁷³ Elena Pavlovna used her influence to complicate the Free School's operation and punished Nikolai Rubinstein financially for his contacts with Balakirev (see Chapter 1).³⁷⁴ The way she managed the RMO affairs influenced its later attitude to the Conservatories.

The RMO's more custody over the St. Petersburg Conservatory than the Moscow one was based on three factors. Firstly, the St. Petersburg Conservatory was more dependent on the finances of the RMO than Moscow. Secondly, Anton Rubinstein drew more attention from the RMO to the St. Petersburg Conservatory because of complicated relations with Elena Pavlovna in 1862-1867, rewriting charter in 1887, and the beginning of the construction of the new Conservatory building in 1891. Thirdly, the RMO main directorate was generally more interested in the St. Petersburg Conservatory affairs than in any other local branches. The tradition of such attitude was also laid by the Grand Duchess.³⁷⁵ Thus, the St. Petersburg Conservatory directors were under more control of the RMO than their Moscow colleges.

Aforementioned "white and black knights" in addition to legislative differences between the two Conservatories give me a reason to argue that the Moscow Conservatory under Safonov's directorship was not authoritarian but a hybrid regime.

Safonov's hybrid regime and "sleeping institutions"

In political science, among hybrid regimes are considered "all kinds of defective democracies and liberalized authoritarian states, countries in transition and with diverse historical backgrounds that cannot be assigned to neither the liberal-democratic nor the

³⁷³ Sargeant, "A New Class of People: The Conservatoire and Musical Professionalization in Russia, 1861–1917," 41.

³⁷⁴ Pyotr Tchaikovsky, *VIII: Letters (1879)*, ed. Kseniya Davydova, Galina Labutina, and Natalya Sinkovskaya, vol. 8, *Polnoye Sobraniye Sochineniy. Literaturnyye Proizvedeniya i Perepiska* (Full Composition of Writings. Literary Works and Correspondence) (Moscow: Muzika, 1963), 77–79.

³⁷⁵ Konstantin Mann (1830-1883) wrote in his memoirs that Elena Pavlovna "considered one Conservatory in St. Petersburg sufficient for Russia." There were also geographical factors. Balakirev writing to Nikolai Rubinstein about affairs in the Capital noted: "how happy must be Moscow to be far away from St. Petersburg." Moiseev, "Ot Konservatorii k 'Russkim Kontsertam': Avgusteyshiy Pokroviteli i Nikolai Rubinshteyn (From the Conservatory to 'Russian Concerts': August Patrons and Nikolai Rubinstein)," 70; Miliy Balakirev, *Perepiska s N.G. Rubinsteinom i M.P. Belyaevy* (*Correspondence with N.G. Rubinstein and M.P. Belyaev*) (Moscow: Muzika, 1956), 28.

authoritarian end.”³⁷⁶ They have an “ambiguous political nature combining formal democratic features with autocratic practices”.³⁷⁷ They are characterized by a “mixture of institutional features of democracy with institutions of an autocracy.”³⁷⁸ In other words, such regimes practice authoritarian methods of governance, but with the presence of democratic institutions (regular elections, the presence of a parliament, removability of power, separation of powers, etc.) However, the work of these democratic institutions is not equivalent to their counterparts in democratic systems.³⁷⁹ For example, elections are held with numerous violations and frauds before, during or after the vote;³⁸⁰ the opposition in the parliament fully supports the decisions of the current government;³⁸¹ the removability is more like castling and contractual matches;³⁸² and the separation of powers, the key element of democracy, exists only on paper when in fact, the judicial and legislative branches are subordinate to the executive one.³⁸³

Considering the Moscow Conservatory management model from the political science point of view testifies that Safonov’s governing fits the definition of a hybrid regime very well. His administrative model contained the features of authoritarian power against the background of democratic institutions created by his predecessors. His methods of suppressing resistance have characteristics of most hybrid regimes and competitive autocracies.

The first feature is the character of repressions. They were non-violent low intensity targeted repressions, whose main goal was to weaken the opposition before it would become too

³⁷⁶ Katharina Obuch, *Civil Society Organizations in the Hybrid Regime of Nicaragua: Challenging or Maintaining the Status Quo?* (Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft MbH & Co, 2017), 56.

³⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 57.

³⁷⁸ Ali Riaz, *Voting in a Hybrid Regime: Explaining the 2018 Bangladeshi Election* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), 15.

³⁷⁹ Larry Jay Diamond, “Thinking About Hybrid Regimes,” *Journal of Democracy* 13, no. 2 (2002): 23–25.

³⁸⁰ Steven Levitsky and Lucan A. Way, *Competitive Authoritarianism: Hybrid Regimes after the Cold War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 7–12.

³⁸¹ Nataliya Velikaya, “Opposition as a Mirage of Political Field in Russia,” in *New Authoritarianism: Challenges to Democracy in the 21st Century*, by Jerzy J. Wiatr (Opladen: Verlag Barbara Budrich, 2019), 93–98.

³⁸² Petra Stykow, “Elections in Authoritarian Regimes: The Post-Soviet Cases,” in *Comparing Autocracies in the Early Twenty-First Century: Volume 1: Unpacking Autocracies - Explaining Similarity and Difference*, by Aurel Croissant et al., 1st ed., Democratization Special Issues (New York: Routledge, 2014), 162.

³⁸³ Carlos Gervasoni, *Hybrid Regimes within Democracies: Fiscal Federalism and Subnational Rentier States* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 61.

strong to challenge the authority.³⁸⁴ Safonov ousted his opponents one by one, without applying any punitive measures to professors who did not express opposition to his actions. That is, it did not matter whether they criticized him or not, it was important that they did not vote against him on fundamental issues. At the same time, repressions should have been demonstrative to intimidate possible opponents and more importantly loyal people.³⁸⁵ The “Conus Affair” revealed Safonov’s power and his administrative resource: Grand Duke Konstantin Konstantinovich, an important patron of the RMO, and Grand Duke Sergey Alexandrovich, the Governor of Moscow.

The second feature of hybrid regime’s practices typical to Safonov was encouragement of emigration - “A decent person should leave the institution if he does not like its order, but if you stay, do not criticize it” - apparently that was Safonov’s motto.³⁸⁶ He did not lock the doors, but rather left them wide open and invited every displeased member of his community to leave. Safonov’s actions encouraged the exodus of the dissatisfied from the Conservatory, besides for them there were prospects of employment in other places. Siloti gained fame as a conductor in Europe.³⁸⁷ Conus became a professor, and soon the director of the Moscow Drama and Music School.³⁸⁸ Rachmaninoff taught at the Elizabethan Women’s Institute and the Moscow School of St. Catherine Order, and later became a conductor in the private opera of Savva Mamontov in Moscow.³⁸⁹ Smolensky became the director of the Synodal Choir.³⁹⁰

³⁸⁴ Andrea Kendall-Taylor, Natasha Lindstaedt, and Erica Frantz, *Democracies and Authoritarian Regimes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 108.

³⁸⁵ Gregory L. Freeze, “From Stalinism to Stagnation, 1953-1985,” in *Russia: A History, New Edition*, by Gregory L. Freeze (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 371.

³⁸⁶ Safonov said to Taneyev these words during their quarrel at the September 1 artistic council meeting. Taneyev, *1903-1909.*, 3:258.

³⁸⁷ Barber, *Lost in the Stars: The Forgotten Musical Life of Alexander Siloti*.

³⁸⁸ Golovinsky, *G.E. Conus: Statyi, Materialy, Vospominaniya* (*G.E. Conus: Articles, Materials, Memories*).

³⁸⁹ In 1885 an industrialist and philanthropist Savva Mamontov established Private Opera which discovered Chaliapin, and supported the Russian opera composers. Olga Haldey, *Mamontov’s Private Opera. The Search for Modernism in Russian Theater* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2010), 39.

³⁹⁰ Kabanova and Rachmanova, *Epistolaryaroye Naslediye S. V. Smolenskogo. Peregipiska s S. A. Rachinskim. 1883-1902* (*Epistolary Heritage of S. V. Smolensky. Correspondence with S. A. Rachinsky. 1883-1902*), 234–36.

A third feature that characterized the Moscow Conservatory as a hybrid regime was the presence of a “sleeping institution” in the form of the artistic council. A “sleeping institution” is a hybrid regime institution, which exists in the structure of the regime, but is mostly never used. More often, it is an institution all of whose functions and powers correspond to a similar institution in a democratic society.³⁹¹ In the case where such institutions are partly active and they sustain the incumbent’s power, they are called “weak institutions” or “formal democratic institutions” because of only partial adoption of powers, typical to similar ones in a democratic society.³⁹² This correlates to the way the artistic council, a legislative body, functioned under Safonov’s administration. Possessing strong powers and formal independence, but devoid of feasible opposition inside, it implemented all the director’s legislations without any argument.

Concerning sleeping institutions, it is important to remember that they can wake up, that is, gain agency and begin to behave as full-fledged democratic institutions. This happens when the regime passes through a series of external or internal trials, when authoritarian power loses ground, and a seemingly unshakable system becomes unbalanced. Awaken during such events, sleeping institutes and especially legislatures could highly “affect the likelihood of democracy” after authoritarian rule and secure a safer process of institutional changes.³⁹³ This is exactly how the artistic council behaved in March 1905: it was holding regular meetings throughout the month, and thanks to these meetings Safonov, who had originally planned to follow the St. Petersburg Conservatory experience, took the side of most professors and suspended classes until September, which saved students from the fate of their hundred colleagues at St. Petersburg.

³⁹¹ Andrey Zakharov, *Spyashchiy Institut: Federalizm v Sovremennoy Rossii i v Mire (The Sleeping Institute: Federalism in Contemporary Russia and in the World)* (Moscow: Novoye literaturnoye obozreniye, 2014), 180.

³⁹² Marina Ottaway, *Democracy Challenged: The Rise of Semi-Authoritarianism* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2013), 3; Carl Henrik Knutsen and Håvard Møkleiv Nygård, “Institutional Characteristics and Regime Survival: Why Are Semi-Democracies Less Durable Than Autocracies and Democracies?,” *American Journal of Political Science* 59, no. 3 (July 2015): 660.

³⁹³ Joseph Wright and Abel Escribà-Folch, “Authoritarian Institutions and Regime Survival: Transitions to Democracy and Subsequent Autocracy,” *British Journal of Political Science* 42, no. 2 (February 2012): 284.

It is important to mention that the majority of the artistic council members were the same people whom Taneyev had characterized as Safonov's "corporation". The composition of the artistic council in 1905 was as follows: the artistic council secretary and pianist Anna Avraamova, vocalist Antonín Barcal, pianist Anatoly Galli, cellist Alfred von Glehn, organist Fedor Goedicke, violinist Jan Hřimalý, the Conservatory inspector Alexandra Hubert, pianist Konstantin Igumnov (1873-1948), composer Mikhail Ippolitov-Ivanov, music historian Nikolai Kashkin, pianist Karl Kipp, music theorist Nikolai Laduchin (1860-1918), vocalist Elizavetta Lavrovskaya, vocalist Umberto Masetti, music theorist Nikita Morozov, pianist Henryk Pachulsiky, the director Vasily Safonov, violist Nikolai Sokolovsky, pianist Nikolai Shishkin, music theorist and composer Sergei Taneyev, and vocalist Varvara Zarudnaya.³⁹⁴ Safonov and his allies totaled eleven, while only Taneyev regularly raised his voice against Safonov's arbitrariness. The rest remained indifferent to Safonov's actions. However, such an alignment of forces did not prevent the artistic council from showing its independence at a crucial moment for the Conservatory.

In St. Petersburg, Anton Rubinstein incorporated the authority of the director, as an enlightened ruler, into the philosophy of developing the Conservatory and further contributed to the growth of absolutist tendencies. The director's opinion was, therefore, undeniable, although, in February, 1905 August Bergard had many critics in the artistic council represented by Rimsky-Korsakov, Anatoly Lyadov (1855-1914), and Alexander Glazunov (1865-1936), their hands were tied by the rules of the charter (adopted when Rimsky-Korsakov and Lyadov already worked at the Conservatory).³⁹⁵ Thus, it can be concluded that it is not the personal composition of the governing body that matters, but its powers and institutional capacities.

³⁹⁴ Bernandt, *S.I. Taneyev*, 165.

³⁹⁵ Anatoly Lyadov studied violin, piano and harmony at the St. Petersburg Conservatory from 1870 to 1878. In September 1878 Lyadov became a teacher of elementary theory at the Conservatory, taking over the instruction of advanced counterpoint in 1901, and, in 1906, composition. In 1905 he resigned in protest to Rimsky-Korsakov's dismissal, but returned when Rimsky-Korsakov was reinstated. Jennifer Spencer and Edward Garden, "Lyadov [Liadov], Anatoly [Anatol] Konstantinovich," in *Grove Music Online*, 2001, <https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/omo-9781561592630-e->

Consequences: the impact on artistic biographies of Safonov and Taneyev and the institutions

Ironically, leaving the Conservatory had a beneficial effect on the careers of both Taneyev and Safonov. Taneyev finally gained long-awaited creative freedom, and he could devote much more time to composition and theoretical work. During that period and until his death in 1915 Taneyev was highly productive as a composer and a theorist, having written in particular his monumental cantata *Po prochtenii psalma* (*At the reading of a Psalm*) and published his work *Convertible Counterpoint in the Strict Style*. During the “Conus affair” and the 1905 Revolution Taneyev postponed his work on his second opera *Hero and Leander*. Unfortunately, it was never written.³⁹⁶ Perhaps this opera could be regarded as the main creative victim of his conflicts with Safonov.

Safonov’s concert activities after leaving Moscow experienced a rise. He went to the United States, where in 1906-1909 he was a music director of New York Philharmonic.³⁹⁷ Safonov also became the director of the National Conservatory of Music of America.³⁹⁸ Here is how he described his state in letters after he left Moscow : “I am now experiencing the long-desired days of freedom and full artistic satisfaction.”³⁹⁹ From 1909 to 1916 he was actively touring America and Europe introducing the public to the newest musical compositions, especially those written by Russian composers, especially Scriabin.⁴⁰⁰

0000017240; Alexander Glazunov was a composer and conductor. He had never studied at the Conservatory. In 1879 he began to take Rimsky-Korsakov's private composition lessons. He was a St. Petersburg Conservatory professor of composition from 1889 to 1928. He was its director from 1905 to 1928. Boris Schwarz, “Glazunov, Aleksandr Konstantinovich,” in *Grove Music Online*, 2001, <https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/omo-9781561592630-e-0000011266>.

³⁹⁶ Lyudmila Korabelnikova, *Tvorchestvo S.I. Taneyeva (The Creative Works of S.I. Taneyev)* (Moscow: Muzika, 1986).

³⁹⁷ Howard Shanet, *Philharmonic: A History Of New York's Orchestra* (New York: Doubleday and Company Inc, 1975), 193.

³⁹⁸ Paperno, *Notes of a Moscow Pianist*, 66.

³⁹⁹ Vasily Safonov and Leonid Tumarinson, *Stranstvuiushchiĭ Maestro: Perepiska V.I. Safonova 1905-1917 Godov (Wandering Maestro: Safonov's Correspondence 1905-1917)* (Moscow: Belyĭ Bereg, 2012), 105.

⁴⁰⁰ On December 11, 1906, talking with representatives of the New York Philharmonic society, Safonov noted about Scriabin: “I want every American student to know his music.” Safonov and Tumarinson, 142.

As for the Conservatories' affairs, after Berggard's dismissal, Glazunov became the director and remained in this position to 1928.⁴⁰¹ Ippolitov-Ivanov was elected as director in Moscow in 1905 and governed the Conservatory for seventeen years until 1922.⁴⁰² Beginning in September 1905, Conservatories' managerial systems entered the process of democratization or, as Adam Przeworski says, "an act of institutionalizing uncertainty."⁴⁰³ The RMO created a special commission to reorganize the Conservatories and gain them greater autonomy. The process of negotiations and rewriting drafts of new charters began in September, 1905, and included the participation of both Conservatories' artistic councils, the RMO main directorate as well as prominent Russian musicians.⁴⁰⁴ Taneyev also took part as a consultant and sent his suggestions regarding the future charters to the Head of the RMO's main directorate.⁴⁰⁵ However, new charters were not adopted until the end of the Russian Empire in 1917. The reason for this failure lay in the continuing alienation of musicians and the RMO's governing class, the nobility's inability to compromise and give independence to the Conservatories. As Lynn Sargeant has noted, "the conflict over the governance of the Society was a microcosm of a much larger conflict over political power and social hierarchies."⁴⁰⁶

Besides his correspondence with the RMO, Taneyev also took an active part in the creation and activities of the People's Conservatory, an educational institution aimed at disseminating musical knowledge among a wide range of people through systematic music education, organizing public concerts and lectures.⁴⁰⁷ Unlike the "regular" Conservatory, the People's

⁴⁰¹ Galina Kopytova, *Jascha Heifetz: Early Years in Russia*, trans. Dario Sarlo and Alexandra Sarlo (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2013), 47.

⁴⁰² Sergei Bugoslavsky, *M. M. Ippolitov-Ivanov: Zhizn i Tvorchestvo (M.M. Ippolitov-Ivanov: Life and Work)* (Moscow: Muzgis, 1936), 12–13.

⁴⁰³ Adam Przeworski, *Democracy and the Market: Political and Economic Reforms in Eastern Europe and Latin America* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 14.

⁴⁰⁴ Protokoli zasedaniy hudozhestvennogo soveta Moskovskoy konservatorii (Minutes of the Moscow Conservatory artistic council meeting), 22 September 1905, Fond 2099 op. 1 ed.hr. 214 list 108, Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, Moscow, Russia.

⁴⁰⁵ Pismo S.I. Taneyeva predsedatelyu glavnoy direktzii RMO o proekte reorganizatsii konservatoriy (Sergei Taneyev's letter to the Head of the RMO's main directorate about reorganization of the Conservatories), 27 April 1910, Fond 408 op. 1 ed.hr. 611 list 31-32, Central State Historical Archive of St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg, Russia.

⁴⁰⁶ Sargeant, *Harmony and Discord. Music and the Transformation of Russian Cultural Life*, 252.

⁴⁰⁷ Mitchell, "Nietzsche's Orphans: Music and the Search for Unity in Late Imperial Russia, 1905–1921."

Conservatory did not prepare professional musicians, although some of its graduates reached significant heights in musical art.⁴⁰⁸ The People's Conservatory did not outlive its founder and a year after Taneyev died in 1915 it was closed down.⁴⁰⁹

As for Safonov's governance heritage, the Gnessin sisters, Safonov's students, founded the Gnessin Private Music College in 1895, which later grew up and in 1925 was renamed the Gnessin Institute. Today it is known as the Russian State Academy of Music.⁴¹⁰ Using Safonov's pedagogical principles, the Gnessin sisters made a great contribution to the development of the Russian piano school.⁴¹¹

Conus became the director of the Music and Drama School in 1904, although he occupied the position for only two years. Conus's debut in an administrative position was summarized by Taneyev in a diary entry on September 28, 1904:

Press came.⁴¹² He said that at the meeting of the council of the Philharmonic School Conus said that "their charter was bad", and when Press wanted to speak at the council, he [Conus] referred to the charter, first slamming his hand on the table and saying that he had responded to Press' demands in a private conversation in his office. Thus, Conus began with what he had previously reproached Safonov for.⁴¹³

In 1917 Conus became a professor and the director (1917-1919) of the Saratov Conservatory.⁴¹⁴ In 1920 he returned to teach at the Moscow Conservatory, where at that time there was virtually none of the professors left from Safonov's era. During those years Conus was

⁴⁰⁸ Galina Sycheva, "Mikhail Gnessin - 'Stroitel Muzikalnoy Zhizni' Provintsialnogo Goroda Rostova-Na-Donu (Mikhail Gnessin the 'Founder of Musical Life' in the Provincial City of Rostov-on-Don)," *Russian Journal of Academic Studies "Music Scholarship,"* no. 12 (2013): 92–98.

⁴⁰⁹ Lynn Mary Sargeant, "High Anxiety: New Venues, New Audiences, and the Fear of the Popular in Late Imperial Russian Musical Life," *19th-Century Music* 35, no. 2 (Fall 2011): 104.

⁴¹⁰ Daniel Jaffé, "Gnessin (Musical-Pedagogic) Institute, Moscow (Russian Academy of Music)," in *Historical Dictionary of Russian Music* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2012), 146–47.

⁴¹¹ Marissa Silverman, *Gregory Haimovsky: A Pianist's Odyssey to Freedom* (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2018), 23–24.

⁴¹² Mikhail Press (1871-1938), a Russian and American violinist, studied violin at the Moscow Conservatory with Hřimalý and in Brussels with Eugène Ysaÿe. Press was a teacher at the Music and Drama School in 1901-1904. Alexandra Vodarsky-Shiraeff, *Russian Composers and Musicians. A Bibliographical Dictionary* (New York: H. W. Wilson, 1940), 104.

⁴¹³ Sergei Taneyev, *1903-1909.*, vol. 3, 3 vols., *Dnevnik (Diaries)* (Moscow: Muzika, 1985), 175.

⁴¹⁴ The Conservatory in Saratov was founded in 1912, and was the first provincial Conservatory to be founded in Russia, after the St. Petersburg Conservatory and the Moscow Conservatory. Saratov was, at the time, Russia's third city. When Saratov Conservatory opened in September 1912, it immediately had 1,000 students ready to begin their studies. Paul du Quenoy, *Stage Fright: Politics and the Performing Arts in Late Imperial Russia* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009), 99.

actively engaged in developing his theory of metrotectonism, a method of analyzing musical form.⁴¹⁵ Conus began work on the ideas of this analysis as far back as the years of his early teaching at the Moscow Conservatory but the conflict with Safonov also prevented its implementation.⁴¹⁶

Safonov's impact on music education traditions

Below, I present three main areas Safonov had an impact on the Moscow Conservatory and Russian music education.

The first one was Safonov's replacing the Moscow performance practices with those of St. Petersburg since 1889 (see Chapters 3 and 5). He adopted his own piano school, Davydov's cello school, etc.⁴¹⁷ At the same time, I believe that his treatment of foreign professors (in particular Busoni, see Chapter 4) might have alarmed potential European applicants for a teaching position at the Moscow Conservatory and therefore hampered the introduction of other teaching practices.

The second result of Safonov's influence on higher musical education in Russia was a decreased emphasis on theoretical subjects. Safonov questioned the supremacy of music theory subjects established by Rubinstein by cutting hours of instrumentation and persecuting his opponents among the theorists, Conus and Taneyev. After the "Conus affair", a hierarchy of subjects where theory was subordinate to performance was established. This was the principal reason why the development of music research took place outside the walls of the Conservatories

⁴¹⁵Kenneth Smith, "The Psychoanalytic Drive in the Harmonic Language of Alexander Skryabin. Russian Journal of Academic Studies 'Music Scholarship' No 7," *Russian Journal of Academic Studies "Music Scholarship"* 7 (2010): 11–17.

⁴¹⁶ From the Greek: μέτρο "measure" and τεκτων "builder", the "measured construction." The theory which subject is the musical form, treats music as sound construction. Anton Rovner, "The Microtonal Application of Boleslav Yavorsky's Theory of Modal Rhythm in Sergei Protopopoff's Book 'Elements of Construction of Musical Language,'" *Russian Journal of Academic Studies "Music Scholarship"* 11, no. 2 (2012): 282–90; Nikolai Plotnikov, Natalia Podzemskaya, and Yury Yakimenko, *Iskusstvo Kak Yazyk — Yazyki Iskusstva. Gosudarstvennaya Akademiya Khudozhestvennykh Nauk i Esteticheskaya Teoriya 1920-Kh Godov (Art as a Language - the Languages of Art. State Academy of Arts and Aesthetic Theory of the 1920s)* (Moscow: Novoye literaturnoye obozreniye, 2017), 1004–6; More details about Georges Conus's theory in his article *Метропектоническое разрешение проблемы музыкальной формы (Metrotectonic resolution of musical form problem)*. Golovinsky, G.E. *Conus: Statyi, Materialy, Vospominaniya (G.E. Conus: Articles, Materials, Memories)*, 87–96.

⁴¹⁷ Terry King, *Gregor Piatigorsky: The Life and Career of the Virtuoso Cellist* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2010), 333.

in the first third of the 20th century in Russia. Thus, the first musicology department was opened by Boris Asafiev (1884-1949) in 1919 in the State Institute of the History of Arts in Petrograd (the then name of St. Petersburg).⁴¹⁸ The Paris Conservatory under Théodore Dubois (1837-1924) exhibited an attitude to theoretical subjects similar to Safonov's.⁴¹⁹

Safonov's attitude to theoretical subjects echoed that of the Grand Duchess Elena Pavlovna. In 1869, she started a reform to transform the Conservatory into an orchestra school with the assistance of the Czech musician Eduard Nápravník (1839-1916), who was just appointed to the post of the RMO concert director.⁴²⁰ He convinced the patroness that the goal of Conservatories in Russia was not training composers, but, to a greater extent, orchestral musicians. In other words, the Conservatory would be a "factory producing the multitude of modest practitioners needed to disseminate culture widely through the empire."⁴²¹ This point of view was opposite to Rubinstein's, who saw the Conservatory as a "temple of art" producing great artists creating a musical culture of the motherland.⁴²² As a result, in 1871-1872, at the Conservatory, no student was admitted to the theory and composition departments.⁴²³ The steady decline of the theory department was halted only after the death of the Grand Duchess, with Nikolai Konstantinovich's assignment as a new patron of the RMO in 1873.⁴²⁴ Nevertheless, one can see from which Safonov's skepticism towards theoretical subjects came. He had studied at the St. Petersburg Conservatory shortly after these events had taken place and such sentiment within the Conservatory's walls could influence him.

⁴¹⁸ Olga Panteleeva, "St. Petersburg Conservatory and the Beginnings of Russian Musicology," in *Rimsky-Korsakov and His World*, by Marina Frolova-Walker (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2018), 233–47.

⁴¹⁹ Hilson Woldu, "Debussy, Fauré, and d'Indy and Conceptions of the Artist: The Institutions, the Dialogues, the Conflicts," 240.

⁴²⁰ Lyudmila Miheeva, *Eduard Frantsevich Napravnik* (Moscow: Muzika, 1985), 8–30.

⁴²¹ Sargeant, *Harmony and Discord. Music and the Transformation of Russian Cultural Life*, 84.

⁴²² *Ibid.*

⁴²³ Boretsky, "Idealnaya Pokrovitel'nitsa Muzykal'nogo Iskusstva: Velikaya Knyaginya Yelena Pavlovna Kak Drug i Metsenat (An Ideal Patroness of Musical Art: Grand Duchess Elena Pavlovna as a Friend and Philanthropist)," 110.

⁴²⁴ Tatyana Zima, "Activity of Grand Duke Konstantin Romanov (k. r.) as Vice-Chairman of the Imperial Russian Musical Society," *Vestnik MGUKI* 57, no. 1 (February 2014): 100.

The third result was the growth of Russian musicians' performance skills owing to Safonov's overemphasis on performance practice. At that time, European and American musicians began to talk about the "Russian school" as a sign of quality. Here is the Peabody Institute director Asger Hamerik's (1843-1923) letter to Julius Johannsen (1826-1904), then the St. Petersburg Conservatory director, on October 13, 1895.⁴²⁵

I think I can safely say that Rubinstein would be proud of the pleiad of excellent pianists who performed at the competition.⁴²⁶ All of them are true artists, confident in themselves and in their victory, and surpass all representatives of other nations.

I was glad that Lhévinne received the prize, and I am happy for him and for his homeland.⁴²⁷ You represent a nation that currently stands incredibly high musically and which will take first place in the not too distant future.

The other day I met with an American who is going to go to Germany to improve his pianism. "Go to Russia," I advised him, "there you can learn something more than is generally known." If you meet with Mr. Safonov or write to him, say hello from me and tell him what impression I have left from the Berlin competition.⁴²⁸

Safonov's teaching practice has left a noticeable mark on the development of pianism worldwide. Many of his graduates later became outstanding pianists and teachers. Among them were composers and pianists Marthe Servine (1862-1960) and Nicolas Medtner (1879-1951).⁴²⁹ The aforementioned Josef Lhévinne and his wife Rosina Bessie (1880-1976) influenced

⁴²⁵ Asger Hamerik was a Danish composer. He studied in Berlin, with Hans von Bülow and in Paris with Hector Berlioz. He was the director of Peabody Institute in Baltimore from 1871 to 1898. John Bergsagel, Ruth B. Hilton, and E. Douglas Bomberger, "Hamerik [Hammerich], Asger," in *Grove Music Online*, 2015, <https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/omo-9781561592630-e-1002283068>; Julius Ernst Christian Johannsen was a Danish music theorist. He studied piano under Ignaz Moscheles and composition under Felix Mendelssohn in Leipzig Conservatorium der Musik. He was a composition professor at the St. Petersburg Conservatory from 1867 to 1898, and its director from 1891 to 1897. Among his students were Rimsky-Korsakov and Lyadov. Rimsky-Korsakov, *Letopis Moyey Muzykalnoy Zhizni (Chronicle of My Musical Life)*, 398.

⁴²⁶ The Second Anton Rubinstein Competition in Berlin, 1895.

⁴²⁷ Josef Lhévinne (1874-1944) was mentioned by Ostrovskaya (see Chapter 5) as a boy baptized by Safonov. He studied piano under Safonov from 1888 to 1892 at the Moscow Conservatory. He was a piano professor there from 1903 to 1906. In 1919 he moved to New York and became a piano professor at Julliard school. Jerrold Northrop Moore, "Lhévinne, Josef," in *Grove Music Online*, 2001, <https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/omo-9781561592630-e-0000016552>.

⁴²⁸ Pismo Asgera Hamerika Juliu Johannsenu (Asger Hamerik's letter to Julius Johannsen), 13 October 1895, Fond 361 op. 11 ed.hr. 315 list 201-202, Central State Historical Archive of St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg, Russia.

⁴²⁹ Noel Straus, "Concert Is given by Roth Quartet: Marthe Servine, Composer, Is Heard at Piano with String Group at Town Hall," *New York Times*, February 10, 1941, sec. Amusements; Barrie Martyn, "Medtner, Nicolas," in *Grove Music Online*, 2001, <https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/omo-9781561592630-e-0000018517>.

American pedagogical practice.⁴³⁰ As a Julliard school piano professor for forty-six years, she trained many musicians, including pianist Van Cliburn, pianist and conductor James Levine, pianist and composer John Williams, pianist John Browning (1933-2003), and many others.⁴³¹

In this chapter, I have examined three main prerequisites for different behaviors of the St. Petersburg and Moscow Conservatories in the 1905 Revolution. The first was Safonov's failure in rewriting the Moscow Conservatory charter of 1878 and Anton Rubinstein's success in rewriting the St. Petersburg Conservatory charter in 1887. The second one was constant attention of the Moscow press to the Moscow Conservatory after the "Conus affair" and a lack thereof in St. Petersburg. Finally, Grand Duchess Elena Pavlovna's activity as the Head of the RMO and her special relations with the St. Petersburg Conservatory led to its directors' heavier dependence on the RMO than their Moscow colleagues'. Taken together, these three factors shaped the Moscow Conservatory as a hybrid regime, and the St. Petersburg conservatory as an authoritarian one. Apparently, not only Safonov's actions themselves, but also a series of events that had taken place years before Safonov's directorship or miles away from Moscow – Nikolai and Anton Rubinsteins' legislative activities, Sergei Taneyev's directorship, and Grand Duchess Elena Pavlovna's impact on musical education in Russia - affected the governing style of the Moscow Conservatory.

⁴³⁰ Rosina Bessie studied piano at the Moscow Conservatory under Safonov in 1893-1898. In 1919 with her husband Josef Lhévinne she moved to New York where she began to teach piano at Julliard School. Ellen Highstein, "Lhévinne [Née Bessie], Rosina," in *Grove Music Online*, 2001, <https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/omo-9781561592630-e-0000043665>.

⁴³¹ Philip Kennicott, *Counterpoint: A Memoir of Bach and Mourning* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2020), 101.

Conclusion

From 1866, when Rubinstein flung the Moscow Conservatory's doors open, to 1905, when Safonov last went through them as director, passed just thirty-nine years but how dramatic the changes that the institution experienced were! As well as the Conservatory's growth, the way it was governed altered. During that time, the Conservatory passed through three significant periods each of which was both unique and similar to others in governing practices.

Like his elder brother, Nikolai Rubinstein envisaged the Conservatory as a "temple of art." The goal of creating one set certain tasks for the personnel policy, curriculum, and the institution's self-advertisement in Russia's social life. Rubinstein's Conservatory changed from a relatively small enterprise into a more complex pedagogical institution. At that time, Rubinstein and the artistic council developed their own curriculum, based on the experience of their European and St. Petersburg colleagues. Faced with material difficulties and successfully resolving them with the help of his connections, Rubinstein created a precedent for the Moscow Conservatory director: communicating with highest circles of society and bypassing the existing hierarchy in the RMO. Having rewritten the Moscow Conservatory charter in 1878, Rubinstein balanced the artistic council's and director's powers within the Conservatory and simultaneously strengthened the Moscow Conservatory director's independence from the RMO's Headquarters. Meanwhile, the St. Petersburg Conservatory director remained unrestricted in his powers inside (especially after the adoption of the new charter in 1887) and dependent on the Headquarters's will outside.

Four years of Taneyev's directorship revealed that the management model created by Rubinstein was able to function successfully even in the absence of its creator. Taneyev actively developed his predecessor's traditions of collegial management, thus forming a circle of like-minded people, the "Rubinstein Guard", who believed that the director should be the first among equals, not a dictator. Even though Rubinstein sometimes behaved both as an autocrat and as a

rule breaker, the “Rubinstein guard” associated Taneyev’s adherence to rules and relying on colleagues’ opinion with his name as well.

Safonov in many ways became the successor of both Taneyev and Rubinstein, sharing management methods with them, but at the same time making significant changes in the tradition of relations within the Conservatory. Indeed, many of his activities were rooted in the traditions established by his prominent predecessors. Safonov followed the personnel policy initiated by Taneyev as well as his efforts to strengthen discipline in the institution. Safonov acted like Rubinstein who could break rules for the good of business. Safonov’s fundraising for the new Conservatory building’s construction in 1893 through his powerful connections in the upper classes was similar to Rubinstein’s successful efforts to allocate a government subsidy for the Conservatory in 1871. However, Safonov’s systematic violations of the Conservatory charter and his neglecting music theory subjects in favor of music performance distinguished him from his predecessors, which consequently set Taneyev and the “Rubinstein guard” against him.

Safonov attempted to develop a one-man dictatorship in the Conservatory. The 1905 Revolution revealed, however, that he was not successful in his endeavors. The Moscow Conservatory artistic council’s activity in decision making had shown that this institution had a structure more similar to that of a political hybrid regime, than an authoritarian one. During most of Safonov’s directorship the artistic council existed as a “sleeping” institution and “awakened”, that is to say, gained agency, during challenging times for the Conservatory. This happened mostly because of Safonov’s ambiguous relationship with the RMO that prevented the 1878 charter from being rewritten into a less democratic one, as well as because of the Moscow press’ permanent attention to the Conservatory after the “Conus affair”, and Taneyev’s consistent opposition to the director’s arbitrariness. The St. Petersburg Conservatory was not under the influence of similar conditions, which explains the differences in the way both reacted to the 1905 Revolution events.

All of the above leads to the conclusion that written laws are stronger and more stable than unspoken traditions. Safonov was able to deconstruct almost completely the principle of collegial decision-making, nurtured by Rubinstein and Taneyev, but he failed to take away the power from the artistic council without changing the charter. Unable to change the Conservatory's institutional structure, Safonov, however, changed its pedagogical principles, the most significant of which was the re-subordination of music theory to music performance. He succeeded thanks to his personnel policy, curriculum, and management practices with greater focus on music performance, than music theory. Although this did not shape the institutional structure of the Moscow Conservatory, it did shape the outcomes of its pedagogical practices and teaching traditions. For a disquisition on conservatories, the latter is just as important as changes in their institutional structure.

The same approach can be applied to the studies of other musical educational institutions. Further research into their development may consider three directions for comparative analyses. The first one is studying the underlying legal documents of a musical educational institution, which could reveal directions for its further evolution: which provisions influence and regulate its maintenance and all involved actors and how they do it. A second problem is nurtured administrative practices, which are based both on the written and unwritten rules in the institution, and traditions imprinted in institutional memory. Tracing their origins, development, and replacement with new ones can help to better understand internal environment of the institution. A third line of inquiry is a broad study of external factors and conditions, such as societal structure around the institution, events associated with particular political processes, the presence of mechanisms of social control over the institution, etc. These factors can substantially influence further evolution of the institution, albeit indirectly.

Applying these three criteria, while juxtaposing the Moscow and St. Petersburg Conservatories' coping with the 1905 Revolution, has shown tangible differences in their institutional development. At first glance, the two Russian Conservatories should have developed

in a similar way because of common prerequisites and of being opened around the same time.

The above-outlined approach has explained why they did not.

There is no reason to limit the diversity of directions for comparative analysis to only these three factors. Given that such an analysis deals with music education processes, many nuances and variables should be taken into account for more accurate conclusions. However, applying the three aforementioned major criteria can help distinguish which aspects of musical educational institutions' functioning are easier to explain and why they are different or, on the contrary, similar. For example, Schola Cantorum and the Paris Conservatory in *fin-de-siècle* France were under the influence of common external circumstances, but had different management and teaching practices, the Moscow and Leipzig Conservatories at some point had a few similar pedagogical approaches, but functioned in different political and social environment, etc. These data would supplement and explicate the model of institutional analysis, making it generalizable and scalable. Subsequently, this totality of approaches could be applied to analyze a wide range of musical educational institutions, their genesis and further evolution.

Bibliography

Archival sources

- Aglintseva, Elena, "Dom, Muzyka, Safonov (Home, Music, Safonov)", 1966, Fond MS, The Museum at the State Philharmonic at the Caucasian Mineral Waters, Mineralnye Vody, Russia.
- Bulychev, Vjacheslav. "Zhizn i iskusstvo: avtobiograficheskiye vospominaniya (Life and Art: autobiographical memories)," MS Fond 277, Russian National Museum of Music, Moscow, Russia.
- Delo Mamontova, Artsibusheva, Krivosheina i Drugikh: Polnyi i Podrobnyi Otchyot (The Case of Mamontov, Artsibushev, Krivoshein, and Others: Full and Complete Account), 1900, Fond 155 item 72, A. A. Bakhrushin State Central Theatre Museum, Moscow, Russia.
- Demyanova-Shatskaya, Valentina, "Vospominaniya Ob Uchobe v Konservatorii (Memories of Studying at the Conservatory)", 1 February 1940, Fond 286 Ed.hr. 218, Russian National Museum of Music, Moscow, Russia.
- Kopiya ustava Peterburgskoi konservatoryi s zamechaniyami Antona Rubinsteina (Copy of the St. Petersburg Conservatory charter edited with notes by Anton Rubinstein), 1887, Fond 361 op.11 ed.hr.217 list 54-79, Central State Historical Archive of St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg, Russia.
- Korzhenevsky, Peter Ivanovich (1872-1968), 1836-1961, fond 436 ed.hr. 821, Manuscript Department of the Russian State Library, Moscow, Russia.
- Nyuberg-Kashkina, Sofia. "Vospominaniya o N.D. Kashkine (Memoirs of N.D. Kashkin)," The Kashkin Family personal archive, Moscow, Russia.
- Osoboe mnenie chleana Moskovskoy direktzii IRMO Mikhaila Ushakova k postanovleniyu direktzii (Mikhail Ushakov's dissenting opinion to the IRMO Moscow branch directorate's statement), 28 September 1899, Fond 62 ed.hr. 1257, Russian National Museum of Music, Moscow, Russia.
- Osoboe mnenie Sergeya Taneyeva k zasedaniyu hudozhestvennogo soveta (Sergei Taneyev's dissenting opinion to the artistic council meeting) 4 September 1899, 1899, Fond 62 ed.hr. 1252, Russian National Museum of Music, Moscow, Russia.
- Ostrovskaya, Anna Pavlovna, Stenogramma vechera vospominaniy (Transcript of the evening of memories of Anna Pavlovna Ostrovskaya), 11 March 1939, Fond 286 ed.hr. 234 list 14-15, 23-29, Russian National Museum of Music, Moscow, Russia.
- Pismo Asgera Hamerika Juliu Johannsenu (Asger Hamerik's letter to Julius Johannsen), 13 October 1895, Fond 361 op. 11 ed.hr. 315 list 201-202, Central State Historical Archive of St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg, Russia.
- Pismo N. Findeizena S. Smolenskomu (Nikolai Findeisen's letter to Stepan Smolensky), 30 October 1899, V11 ed.hr. 1855, Tchaikovsky State House-Museum, Klin, Russia
- Pismo S.I. Taneyeva predsedatelyu glavnoy direktzii IRMO o proekte reorganizatsii konservatoriy (Sergei Taneyev's letter to the Head of the IRMO's main directorate about reorganization of the Conservatories), 27 April 1910, Fond 408 op. 1 ed.hr. 611 list 31-32, Central State Historical Archive of St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg, Russia.
- Pismo Vasilya Safonova Elene Bekman-Shcherbinoy (Vasily Safonov's letter to Elena Bekman-Shcherbina), 20 January 1912, Fond 492 ed.hr. 1576, Russian National Museum of Music, Moscow, Russia.
- Postanovlenie glavnoy direktzii IRMO o prisvoenii Vasiliyu Safonovu zvaniya predsedatelya direktzii Moskovskogo otdeleniya IRMO (Decree of the IRMO main directorate on awarding Vasily Safonov the post of chairman of the IRMO's Moscow branch), 3 June 1897, Fond 661 op. 1 ed.hr. 92 list 14-15, Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, Moscow Russia.
- Postanovlenye Glavnoy Direktzii IRMO o naznachenii gosudarstvennoy subsidei Peterburgskoi konservatorii (The decree of the IRMO main directorate on the appointment the state

- subsidy to the St. Petersburg Conservatory), 1 February 1869, Fond 406 op. 1 ed.hr. 124, Central State Historical Archive of St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg, Russia.
- Proekt ustava konservatoriy Russkogo Muzikalnogo Obshestva dlya utverjzdenija Ministrom Vnutrennih Del (Draft charter of the Conservatories of the Russian Musical Society for approval by the Minister of Internal Affairs), 17 June 1878, Fond 408 op. 1 ed.hr. 136 list 21, Central State Historical Archive of St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg, Russia.
- Protokoli zasedaniy hudozgestvennogo soveta Moskovskoy konservatorii (Minutes of the Moscow Conservatory artistic council meeting), 20 May 1899, Fond 2099 op. 1 ed.hr. 152 list 87, Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, Moscow, Russia.
- Protokoli zasedaniy hudozgestvennogo soveta Moskovskoy konservatorii (Minutes of the Moscow Conservatory artistic council meeting), 4 September 1899, Fond 2099 op. 1 ed.hr. 152 list 93, Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, Moscow, Russia.
- Protokoli zasedaniy hudozgestvennogo soveta Moskovskoy konservatorii (Minutes of the Moscow Conservatory artistic council meeting), 1 March 1901, Fond 2099 op. 1 ed.hr. 152 list 130, Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, Moscow, Russia.
- Protokoli zasedaniy hudozgestvennogo soveta Moskovskoy konservatorii (Minutes of the Moscow Conservatory artistic council meeting), 15 February 1902, Fond 2099 op. 1 ed.hr. 168 list 68, Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, Moscow, Russia.
- Protokoli zasedaniy hudozgestvennogo soveta Moskovskoy konservatorii (Minutes of the Moscow Conservatory artistic council meeting), 5 March 1905, Fond 2099 op. 1 ed.hr. 214 list 62, Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, Moscow, Russia.
- Protokoli zasedaniy hudozgestvennogo soveta Moskovskoy konservatorii (Minutes of the Moscow Conservatory artistic council meeting), 8 March 1905, Fond 2099 op. 1 ed.hr. 214 list 71, Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, Moscow, Russia.
- Protokoli zasedaniy hudozgestvennogo soveta Moskovskoy konservatorii (Minutes of the Moscow Conservatory artistic council meeting), 12 March 1905, Fond 2099 op. 1 ed.hr. 214 list 81, Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, Moscow, Russia.
- Protokoli zasedaniy hudozgestvennogo soveta Moskovskoy konservatorii (Minutes of the Moscow Conservatory artistic council meeting), 17 March 1905, Fond 2099 op. 1 ed.hr. 214 list 93-94, Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, Moscow, Russia.
- Protokoli zasedaniy hudozgestvennogo soveta Moskovskoy konservatorii (Minutes of the Moscow Conservatory artistic council meeting), 22 March 1905, Fond 2099 op. 1 ed.hr. 214 list 94-95, Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, Moscow, Russia.
- Protokoli zasedaniy hudozgestvennogo soveta Moskovskoy konservatorii (Minutes of the Moscow Conservatory artistic council meeting), 1 September 1905, Fond 2099 op. 1 ed.hr. 214 list 103-106, Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, Moscow, Russia.
- Protokoli zasedaniy hudozgestvennogo soveta Moskovskoy konservatorii (Minutes of the Moscow Conservatory artistic council meeting), 22 September 1905, Fond 2099 op. 1 ed.hr. 214 list 108, Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, Moscow, Russia.
- Protokoli zasedaniy Moskovskoy direktzii IRMO (minutes of meetings of the IRMO Moscow branch directorate), 27 August 1891, Fond 676 op. 1 ed.hr. 77 list 7-8, Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, Moscow, Russia.
- Protokoli zasedaniya hudozgestvennogo soveta Moskovskoy konservatorii po zamescheniyu doljnosti professora fortepiano (Minutes of the Moscow Conservatory artistic council meeting on filling the position of piano professor), 14 September 1898, Fond 2099 op. 1 ed.hr. 152 list 58, Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, Moscow, Russia.
- Protokoli zasedaniya hudozgestvennogo soveta Peterburgskoi konservatorii po peresmotru ustava (Minutes of the St. Petersburg artistic council meeting for revising the charter), 23 May 1887, Fond 361 op. 11 ed.hr. 155 list 85, Central State Historical Archive of St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg, Russia.
- Safonov, V. I. Proekt ustavov konservatoriy Imperatorskogo Russkogo Muzykalnogo Obschestva, sostavlennii direktorom Moskovskoi konservatorii V.I. Safonovym (The

draft of the Imperial Russian Musical Society Conservatoires' charters written by the Moscow Conservatory director V.I. Safonov), 1901, Fond 1 ed.hr. 132, Russian National Museum of Music, Moscow, Russia.

Telegrama Velikogo Knyaza Konstantina Romanova direktoru Moskovskoy konservatorii (Grand Duke Konstantin Romanov's telegram to the Moscow Conservatory director Vasily Safonov), 7 October 1899, Fond 62 ed.hr. 1259, Russian National Museum of Music, Moscow, Russia.

Zayzvlennie Sergeya Taneyeva v hudoghestvenniy sovet (Sergei Taneyev's statement to the artistic council), 11 May 1898, Fond 62 ed.hr. 1246, Russian National Museum of Music, Moscow, Russia.

Zhaloba prepodavatelya konservatorii E.G. Konyusa na nezakonnoye uvolneniye (The complaint of the Conservatory teacher E.G. Conus for illegal dismissal), 30 November 1899, Fond 62 ed.hr. 1272, Russian National Museum of Music, Moscow, Russia.

Primary sources

Balakirev, Miliy. *Perepiska s N.G. Rubinsteinom i M.P. Belyaevyv* (*Correspondence with N.G. Rubinstein and M.P. Belyaev*). Moscow: Muzika, 1956.

Bekman-Shcherbina, Elena. *Moi Vospominaniya* (*My Memories*). Moscow: Muzika, 1962.

Garden, Edward, and Nigel Gotteri, eds. *To My Best Friend. Correspondence between Tchaikovsky and Nadezhda von Meck (1876-1878)*. Translated by Galina Meck. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

Jordan, Sverre. *Erindringer Om Kjente Musikere Og Vokalister Som Jeg Møtte*. Oslo: Norsk musikktidsskrift, 1965.

Kabanova, Nadejda, and Marina Rachmanova. *Epistolyarnoye Naslediye S. V. Smolenskogo. Perepiska s S. A. Rachinskim. 1883- 1902* (*Epistolary Heritage of S. V. Smolensky. Correspondence with S. A. Rachinsky. 1883-1902*). 2nd ed. Moscow: YASK, 2019.

Kashkin, Nikolai. *Moskovskoye Otdeleniye Imperatorskogo Russkogo Muzykalnogo Obshchestva. Ocherk Deyatelnosti Za Pyatidesyatiletie. 1860—1910* (*The Moscow Branch of the Russian Imperial Musical Society. The Outline of the Activities for the Fifty Years, 1860-1910*). Moscow: Pechatnia S.P. Yakovleva, 1910.

———. *Pervoe Dvadcatipyatiletie Moskovskoi Konservatorii* (*The First 25 Years of the Moscow Conservatory*). Moscow: Imperatorskoe Russkoe Muzykalnoe obshchestvo, 1891.

Kokovtsov, Vladimir. *Out of My Past*. Translated by Laura Matveev. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1935.

Levenson, Osip. *V Kontsertnoy Zale* (*Muzykalnyye Felyetony*). 1878-1880 g. (*In the Concert Hall* (*Musical Feuilletons*). 1878-1880). Moscow: Tipolitogafiya. N.S. Skvortsova, 1880.

Levitin [Shepelevsky A.M.], Alexander. *V Muzikalnoi Burse* (*In the Music Seminary*). Novgorod: Novgorod, 2004.

Lopatin, Vladimir. "Iz Vospominaniya (From Memories)." In *Issledovaniya Po Istorii Russkoy Mysli. Yezhegodnik Za 1997* (*Research on the History of Russian Thought. Yearbook 1997*), by Modest Kolerov, 169–89. St. Petersburg: Aleteya, 1997.

Odoevsky, Vladimir. *Dnevnik. Perepiska. Materialy. K 200-Letiyu so Dnya Rozhdeniya* (*Diary. Correspondence. Materials. To the 200th Anniversary of the Birth*). Edited by Marina Rachmanova and Margarita Esipova. Moscow: Deca-BC, 2005.

Ostrovsky, Alexander. *Statyi o Teatre. Zapiski. Rechi 1859 - 1886 Gg.* (*Articles about the Theater. Notes. Speeches 1859-1886*). Vol. 12. 16 vols. Polnoye Sobraniye Sochineniy (Omnibus Edition). Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, 1952.

Otchet Po Postroyke i Torzhestvennomu Otkrytiyu Zdaniya Konservatorii (*Report on the Construction and Grand Opening of the Conservatory Building*). Moscow: Pechatnia S.P. Yakovleva, 1905.

Prokofiev, Sergei. *Avtobiografia* (*Autobiography*). Moscow: Sovietskii Kompozitor, 1982.

Prokofiev, Sergei, and Nikolai Myaskovsky. *Perepiska* (*Correspondence*). Moscow: Sovietskii Kompozitor, 1977.

- Rachmaninoff, Sergei. *Vospominaniya. Statyi. Intervyu. Pisma (Memories. Articles. Interview. Letters)*. Vol. 1. 3 vols. Literaturnoe Nasledie (Literary Heritage). Moscow: Sovetskii Kompozitor, 1978.
- Rimsky-Korsakov, Nikolai. *Letopis Moyey Muzykalnoy Zhizni (Chronicle of My Musical Life)*. Moscow: Direct-Media, 2015.
- Sabaneev, Boris. *Organ Cavaillé-Coll i Moskovskaya Konservatoria (Cavaillé-Coll Organ and the Moscow Conservatory)*. Moscow: Tipographia P.P. Ryabushinskogo, 1911.
- Sabaneev, Leonid. *Vospominaniya o Rossii (Memories about Russia)*. Moscow: Classica XXI, 2004.
- . *Vospominaniya o Skriabine (Memories about Scriabin)*. Moscow: Muzika, 2000.
- . *Vospominaniya o Taneyeve (Memories about Taneyev)*. Moscow: Classica XXI, 2003.
- Safonov, Vasily. *Izbrannoe: "Davajte Perepisyvatsja S Amerikanskoju Bystrotoju ...": Perepiska 1880-1905 Godov (Selected: "Lets Correspond with American Speed...": Correspondence 1880-1905)*. Moscow: Petroglif, 2011.
- Safonov, Vasily, and Leonid Tumarinson. *Stranstvuiushchiy Maestro: Perepiska V.I. Safonova 1905-1917 Godov (Wandering Maestro: Safonov's Correspondence 1905-1917)*. Moscow: Belyi Bereg, 2012.
- Shor, David. *Vospominaniya (Memoirs)*. Edited by Inna Ablina. Jerusalem: Gesharim, 2001.
- Smolensky, Stepan. *Vospominaniya: Kazan. Moskva. Peterburg (Memories: Moscow, Kazan, St. Petersburg)*. Moscow: LRC Publishing House, 2002.
- Stasov, Vladimir. *Pisma k Rodnym (Letters to Relatives)*. Vol. 3. Moscow: Muzgis, 1962.
- Straus, Noel. "Concert Is given by Roth Quartet: Marthe Servine, Composer, Is Heard at Piano with String Group at Town Hall." *New York Times*. February 10, 1941, sec. Amusements.
- Taneyev, Sergei. *1894-1898*. Vol. 1. 3 vols. Dnevnik (Diaries). Moscow: Muzika, 1981.
- . *1899-1902*. Vol. 2. 3 vols. Dnevnik (Diaries). Moscow: Muzika, 1982.
- . *1903-1909*. Vol. 3. 3 vols. Dnevnik (Diaries). Moscow: Muzika, 1985.
- . *Convertible Counterpoint in the Strict Style*. Boston: Bruce Humphries, 1962.
- Taneyev, Sergei, and Pyotr Tchaikovsky. *Perepiska (Correspondence)*. Moscow: Muzika, 1951.
- Tchaikovsky, Pyotr. *IX: Letters (1880)*. Edited by Nina Viktorova, Nikolai Gorlov, and E.A. Pustovit. Vol. 9. 17 vols. Polnoye Sobraniye Sochineniy. Literaturnyye Proizvedeniya i Perepiska (Full Composition of Writings. Literary Works and Correspondence). Moscow: Muzika, 1965.
- . *VIII: Letters (1879)*. Edited by Kseniya Davydova, Galina Labutina, and Natalya Sinkovskaya. Vol. 8. 17 vols. Polnoye Sobraniye Sochineniy. Literaturnyye Proizvedeniya i Perepiska (Full Composition of Writings. Literary Works and Correspondence). Moscow: Muzika, 1963.
- . *XIII: Letters (1885-1886)*. Edited by Nina Viktorova and I.S. Polyakova. Vol. 13. 17 vols. Polnoye Sobraniye Sochineniy. Literaturnyye Proizvedeniya i Perepiska (Full Composition of Writings. Literary Works and Correspondence). Moscow: Muzika, 1971.
- . *XIV: Letters (1887-1888)*. Edited by Natalya Sinkovskaya and Irina Sokolinskaya. Vol. 14. 17 vols. Polnoye Sobraniye Sochineniy. Literaturnyye Proizvedeniya i Perepiska (Full Composition of Writings. Literary Works and Correspondence). Moscow: Muzika, 1974.
- . *XVa: Letters (1889)*. Edited by Kseniya Davydova and Galina Labutina. Vol. 15. 17 vols. Polnoye Sobraniye Sochineniy. Literaturnyye Proizvedeniya i Perepiska (Full Composition of Writings. Literary Works and Correspondence). Moscow: Muzika, 1976.
- . *XVb: Letters (1890)*. Edited by Kseniya Davydova and Galina Labutina. Vol. 15. 17 vols. Polnoye Sobraniye Sochineniy. Literaturnyye Proizvedeniya i Perepiska (Full Composition of Writings. Literary Works and Correspondence). Moscow: Muzika, 1977.
- . *XVII: Letters (1893)*. Edited by Kseniya Davydova and Galina Labutina. Vol. 17. 17 vols. Polnoye Sobraniye Sochineniy. Literaturnyye Proizvedeniya i Perepiska (Full Composition of Writings. Literary Works and Correspondence). Moscow: Muzika, 1981.

- Tolstaya, Sophia. *1862-1900*. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Dnevnik. 1862-1910 (Diaries. 1862-1910). Moscow: Khudozhestvennaya Literatura, 1978.
- Tolstoy, Lyof. *What Is Art?* Translated by Aylmer Maude. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell & Co. Publishers, 1899.
- Vasilenko, Sergei. *Vospominaniya (Memoirs)*. Moscow: Sovietskii Kompozitor, 1979.
- Secondary sources**
- Abner, Ari. "David Shor." In *Kratkaya Yevreyskaya Entsiklopediya (Brief Jewish Encyclopedia)*, 10:287–88. Jerusalem: Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2001.
- Adesnik, David, and Michael McFaul. "Engaging Autocratic Allies to Promote Democracy." *The Washington Quarterly* 29, no. 2 (Spring 2006): 7–26.
- Andreevsky, Ivan. "Stoyanovsky, Nikolai." In *Entsiklopedicheskiy Slovar Brokgauza i Yefrona (Brockhaus and Efron Encyclopedic Dictionary)*, 31A (62):716–17. St. Petersburg: Brockhaus and Efron, 1901.
- . "Vyshnegradsky, Ivan." In *Entsiklopedicheskiy Slovar Brokgauza i Yefrona (Brockhaus and Efron Encyclopedic Dictionary)*. Vol. 7A (14). St. Petersburg: Brockhaus and Efron, 1892.
- Apetian, Zarui. *Vospominaniya o Rakhmaninove (Memories of Rachmaninoff)*. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Moscow: Muzika, 1988.
- Ascher, Abraham. *The Revolution of 1905: Russia in Disarray*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994.
- Barber, Charles. *Lost in the Stars: The Forgotten Musical Life of Alexander Siloti*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2002.
- Barenboym, Leo. *1829-1867*. Vol. 1. 2 vols. Anton Grigorievich Rubinstein. Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe Muzikalnoe Izdatelstvo, 1957.
- . *Nikolay Grigoryevich Rubinshteyn. Istoriya Zhizni i Deyatel'nosti (Nikolai Rubinstein. History of Life and Work)*. Moscow: Muzika, 1982.
- Barkanov, Boris. "Institutionalism." In *Encyclopedia of Governance*, by Mark Bevir, 450–53. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc., 2007.
- Barsova, Inna. "Vasilenko, Sergey Nikiforovich." In *Grove Music Online*, 2001. <https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/0-mo-9781561592630-e-0000029067>.
- Bazhanov, Nikolai. *Taneyev*. Moscow: Molodaya Gvardia, 1971.
- Beetham, David. *The Legitimation of Power*. Second. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
- Bennet, Andrew, and Jeffrey T. Checkel. *Process Tracing: From Metaphor to Analytic Tool*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Bennet, Dawn Elizabeth. *Understanding the Classical Music Profession: The Past, the Present and Strategies for the Future*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Group, 2008.
- Bergsagel, John, Ruth B. Hilton, and E. Douglas Bomberger. "Hamerik [Hammerich], Asger." In *Grove Music Online*, 2015. <https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/0-mo-9781561592630-e-1002283068>.
- Berg-Schlosser, Dirk. *Mixed Methods in Comparative Politics: Principles and Applications*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- Bernandt, Grigory. *S.I. Taneyev*. Moscow: Muzika, 1987.
- Bezuglov, Anatoly, and Sergei Soldatov. *Konstitutsionnoye Pravo v Rossii (Constitutional Law in Russia)*. Vol. 2. 2 vols. Moscow: Profobrazovaniye, 2003.
- Bhat, Girish Narayan. "Trial by Jury in the Reign of Alexander II: A Study in the Legal Culture of Late Imperial Russia, 1864-1881." PhD dissertation, University of California, 1995.
- Birkengoff, Andrey. *Iz Istorii Leningradskoy Konservatorii. 1862-1917 (From the History of the Leningrad Conservatory. 1862-1917)*. Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe Muzikalnoe Izdatelstvo, 1964.

- Bobrik, Olesya. "Sergey Vasilyevich Yevseyev. Fragmenty zapisnykh knizhek. 1922-1932 (Sergey Vasil'yevich Yevseyev. Fragments of notes. 1922-1932)." *Iskusstvo muzyki. Teoriya i istoriya*, no. 14 (2015): 161–217.
- Bollert, Werner. "Ferdinand Laub." In *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, 13:687. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1982. <https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd116865407.html#ndbcontent>.
- Boretzky, Andrey. "Idealnaya Pokrovitel'nitsa Muzykalnogo Iskusstva: Velikaya Knyaginya Yelena Pavlovna Kak Drug i Metsenat (An Ideal Patroness of Musical Art: Grand Duchess Elena Pavlovna as a Friend and Philanthropist)." In *Soyuz Tvortsov i Prosvetiteley (The Union of Creators and Enlighteners)*, by Avangard Fedotov, 93–112. Moscow: Kompozitor, 2012.
- Brück, Marion. "Nikisch, Arthur." In *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, 19:257. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1999.
- Brumfield, William C. *Commerce in Russian Urban Culture, 1861–1914*. Woodrow Wilson Center Press. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002.
- Bugoslavsky, Sergei. *M. M. Ippolitov-Ivanov: Zhizn i Tvorchestvo (M.M. Ippolitov-Ivanov: Life and Work)*. Moscow: Muzgis, 1936.
- Bull, Anna. *Class, Control, and Classical Music*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2019.
- Cameron, Linda, and Katie Carlisle. "What Kind of Social Climate Do We Create in Our Music Classrooms." In *Questioning the Music Education Paradigm*, by Lee Bartel, 21–38. Toronto: Canadian Music Educators' Association, 2014.
- Campbell, Stuart. "Balakirev, Mily Alekseyevich." In *Grove Music Online*, 2001. <https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/0mo-9781561592630-e-0000040685>.
- . *Russians on Russian Music, 1830-1880: An Anthology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Cechlińska, Zofia. "Pachulski, Henryk." In *Grove Music Online*, 2001. www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/0mo-9781561592630-e-0000020652.
- Couling, Della. *Ferruccio Busoni: "A Musical Ishmael"*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2005.
- Creswell, John W., and Cheryl N. Poth. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among Five Approaches*. Fourth. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc., 2018.
- Diamond, Larry Jay. "Thinking About Hybrid Regimes." *Journal of Democracy* 13, no. 2 (2002): 21–35.
- Dogan, Mattei, and John Higley. *Elites, Crises, and the Origins of Regimes*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield publishers, 1998.
- Dorozhkina, Valentina. "Davydov Nikolai Vasilievich." In *Tambovskaya Entsiklopediya (Tambov Encyclopedia)*, 154. Tambov: Tambov, 2004.
- Douglas, Mary. "An Institutional Ecology of Values." In *Understanding the Enterprise Culture*, by Shaun Hargreaves Heap and Angus Ross, 32–40. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1992.
- . *How Institutions Think*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1986.
- Edwards, Anne. *Sonya: The Life of Countess Tolstoy*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1981.
- Esipova, Margarita, ed. "Anatoly Ivanovich Galli." In *Moskovskaja Konservatorija Ot Istokov Do Našich Dnej, 1866-2006: Biografičeskij Ėnciklopedičeskij Slovar (The Moscow Conservatory from Origins to the Current Days, 1866-2006: Biographical Encyclopedic Dictionary)*, 150. Moscow: MGK, 2007.
- , ed. "Anna Pavlovna Ostrovskaya (Ignateva)." In *Moskovskaja Konservatorija Ot Istokov Do Našich Dnej, 1866-2006: Biografičeskij Ėnciklopedičeskij Slovar (The Moscow Conservatory from Origins to the Current Days, 1866-2006: Biographical Encyclopedic Dictionary)*, 396–97. Moscow: MGK, 2007.

- , ed. “Eduard Langer.” In *Moskovskaja Konservatorija Ot Istokov Do Našich Dnej, 1866-2006: Biografičeskij Ėnciklopedičeskij Slovar (The Moscow Conservatory from Origins to the Current Days, 1866-2006: Biographical Encyclopedic Dictionary)*, 289. Moscow: MGK, 2007.
- , ed. “Maria Klimentova-Muromtzeva.” In *Moskovskaja Konservatorija Ot Istokov Do Našich Dnej, 1866-2006: Biografičeskij Ėnciklopedičeskij Slovar (The Moscow Conservatory from Origins to the Current Days, 1866-2006: Biographical Encyclopedic Dictionary)*, 238–39. Moscow: MGK, 2007.
- , ed. “Varvara Mikhailovna Zarudnaya.” In *Moskovskaja Konservatorija Ot Istokov Do Našich Dnej, 1866-2006: Biografičeskij Ėnciklopedičeskij Slovar (The Moscow Conservatory from Origins to the Current Days, 1866-2006: Biographical Encyclopedic Dictionary)*, 190–91. Moscow: MGK, 2007.
- Evseeva, Tatyana, and Natalia Mironova. “Anna Konstantinovna Avraamova.” In *Moskovskaja Konservatorija Ot Istokov Do Našich Dnej, 1866-2006: Biografičeskij Ėnciklopedičeskij Slovar (The Moscow Conservatory from Origins to the Current Days, 1866-2006: Biographical Encyclopedic Dictionary)*, edited by Margarita Esipova, 7–8. Moscow: MGK, 2007.
- Fetisova, Elena. *Novoe o Taneyeve (The New about Taneyev)*. Moscow: Deca-BC, 2007.
- Flyvbjerg, Bent. “Five Misunderstandings about Case-Study Research, in Qualitative Research Practice.” *Sociologisk Tidsskrift* 12 (July 2004): 117–42.
- Forbes, Elizabeth. “Giraldoni, Leone.” In *The Grove Book of Opera Singers*, edited by Laura Macy, 192. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Freeze, Gregory L. “From Stalinism to Stagnation, 1953-1985.” In *Russia: A History, New Edition*, by Gregory L. Freeze, 347–83. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Frisch, Scott A., Douglas B. Harris, Sean Q. Kelly, and David C.W. Parker. *Doing Archival Research in Political Science*. Amherst, NY: Cambria Press, 2012.
- Frolova, Ella. “Usadba Marinino - Rodovoye Gnezdo Taneyevykh (The Marinino Estate - the Taneyev Family Home).” In *Novoye o Taneyeve. k 150-Letiyu so Dnya Rozhdeniya (New about Taneyev. to the 150th Anniversary of the Birth)*, by Elena Fetisova, 31–46. Moscow: Deca-BC, 2007.
- Frolova-Walker, Marina. *Russian Music and Nationalism from Glinka to Stalin*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.
- Garden, Edward. “Dubuque [Dyubyuk], Aleksandr Ivanovich.” In *Grove Music Online*, 2001. <https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/0-mo-9781561592630-e-0000008240>.
- . “Lavrovskaya [Lawrowska], Yelizaveta Andreyevna.” In *Grove Music Online*, 2001. <https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/0-mo-9781561592630-e-0000016145>.
- . “Rubinstein [Rubinshteyn], Nikolay.” In *Grove Music Online*, 2001. <https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/0-mo-9781561592630-e-0000024055>.
- Gay, Kathlyn. *The Aftermath of the Russian Revolution*. Minneapolis, MN: Twenty-First Century Books, 2009.
- Gervasoni, Carlos. *Hybrid Regimes within Democracies: Fiscal Federalism and Subnational Rentier States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- Gilley, Bruce. “Democratic Enclaves in Authoritarian Regimes.” *Democratization* 17, no. 3 (June 2010): 389–415.
- Ginsburg, Leo. *Anatoly Brandukov*. Moscow: Muzika, 1951.

- . *Istoriya Violonchel'nogo Isskustva (The History of Cello Art)*. Moscow: Muzika, 1965.
- . *Moskovskaja Konservatorija 1866-1966 (The Moscow Conservatory 1866-1966)*. Moscow: Muzika, 1966.
- Ginsburg, Semyon. “Karl Davydov: A Feature Portrait.” *Musicus: Vestnik Sankt-Peterburgskoy Gosudarstvennoy Konservatorii Im. N.A. Rimskogo-Korsakova* 29, no. 1 (2012): 4–11.
- Golovinsky, Grigory. *G.E. Conus: Statyi, Materialy, Vospominaniya (G.E. Conus: Articles, Materials, Memories)*. Moscow: Muzika, 1965.
- Gudimov, Dmitry. “Praktika Prepodavaniya Violoncheli v Rossii s Serediny XVIII Do 60-Kh Godov XIX Veka (The Practice of Teaching Cello in Russia from the Mid-18th Century to the 60s of the 19th Century).” In *Muzykalnoye Obrazovaniye v Kontekste Kultury: Voprosy Teorii, Istorii i Metodologii (Music Education in the Context of Culture: Questions of Theory, History and Methodology)*, by Lyudmila Djachkova, 332–48. Moscow: Gnessin State Musical College, 2012.
- Gurevich, Evgenia, ed. *V. I. Safonov. 1852–1918. K 150-Letiyu so Dnya Rozhdeniya: Materialy Nauchnoy Konferentsii (V.I.Safonov. 1852-1918. To the 150th Anniversary of His Birth: Materials of the Scientific Conference)*. Moscow: MGK, 2003.
- Haimson, Leopold H. *Russia's Revolutionary Experience, 1905-1917: Two Essays*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.
- Halbwachs, Maurice. *On Collective Memory*. Edited by Lewis A. Coser. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
- Haldey, Olga. *Mamontov's Private Opera. The Search for Modernism in Russian Theater*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2010.
- Harris, Paul. “Green's Theory of Political Obligation and Disobedience.” In *The Philosophy of T.H. Green*, by Andrew Vincent, 127–42. Avebury Series in Philosophy. Aldershot, UK: Gower, 1986.
- Harrison, Max. *Rachmaninoff: Life, Works, Recordings*. London: Continuum, 2006.
- Highstein, Ellen. “Lhévinne [Née Bessie], Rosina.” In *Grove Music Online*, 2001. <https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/0-mo-9781561592630-e-0000043665>.
- Hilson Woldu, Gail. “Debussy, Fauré, and d'Indy and Conceptions of the Artist: The Institutions, the Dialogues, the Conflicts.” In *Debussy and His World*, by Jane F. Fulcher, 235–53. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.
- . “Gabriel Fauré, directeur du Conservatoire: les réformes de 1905.” *Revue de Musicologie* 70, no. 2 (1984): 199–228.
- Holopov, Yuriy. “Igor Vladimirovich Sposobin.” In *Moskovskaja Konservatorija Ot Istokov Do Našich Dnej, 1866-2006: Biografičeskij Ėnciklopedičeskij Slovar (The Moscow Conservatory from Origins to the Current Days, 1866-2006: Biographical Encyclopedic Dictionary)*, edited by Margarita Esipova, 520–21. Moscow: MGK, 2007.
- Honolka, Kurt. *Dvořák*. Translated by Anne Wyburd. London: Haus Publishing, 2004.
- Hui, Yuk. “On the Synthesis of Social Memories.” In *Memory in Motion: Archives, Technology, and the Social*, by Ina Blom, Tront Lundemo, and Eivind Røssaak, 307–26. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2017.
- Hyland, James L. *Democratic Theory: The Philosophical Foundations*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1995.
- Jaffé, Daniel. “Free School of Music, St. Petersburg (Besplatnaya Muzikal'naya Shkola).” In *Historical Dictionary of Russian Music*, 136. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2012.
- . “Gnessin (Musical-Pedagogic) Institute, Moscow (Russian Academy of Music).” In *Historical Dictionary of Russian Music*, 146–47. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2012.
- . “Moscow Philharmonic Society Music and Drama School.” In *Historical Dictionary of Russian Music*, 215–16. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2012.

- . “Moscow Philharmonic Society (Moskovskoe Filarmonicheskoe Obshestvo).” In *Historical Dictionary of Russian Music*, 2015. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2012.
- . “Moscow (Tchaikovsky) Conservatory (Moskovskaya Gosudarstvennaya Konservatoriya; MGK).” In *Historical Dictionary of Russian Music*, 210–14. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2012.
- Jakovleva, Antonina. “Adolf Osberg.” In *Moskovskaja Konservatorija Ot Istokov Do Našich Dnej, 1866-2006: Biografičeskij Ėnciklopedičeskij Slovar (The Moscow Conservatory from Origins to the Current Days, 1866-2006: Biographical Encyclopedic Dictionary)*, edited by Margarita Esipova, 396. Moscow: MGK, 2007.
- Karatygin, Vyacheslav. “To the Memory of S.I. Taneev.” *The Musical Quarterly* 13, no. 4 (October 1927): 540–54.
- Karteltseva, E.M. “Aglintseva, Ekaterina Davydovna.” In *Ryazanskaya Ėntsiklopediya (Ryazan Encyclopedia)*, 1:35. Ryazan: Pressa: Aleksandriya, 1999.
- Kashkin, Nikolai. *M. A. Balakirev i Ego Otnoshenie k Moskve (M.A. Balakirev and His Relations with Moscow)*. Moscow: Direct-Media, 2012.
- Keene, James A. *A History of Music Education in the United States*. 2nd ed. Centennial, CO: Glenbridge Publishing Ltd., 2009.
- Keldysh, Yury. *100 Let Moskovskoi Konservatorii (100 Years of the Moscow Conservatory)*. Moscow: Muzika, 1966.
- Kendall-Taylor, Andrea, Natasha Lindstaedt, and Erica Frantz. *Democracies and Authoritarian Regimes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.
- Kennicott, Philip. *Counterpoint: A Memoir of Bach and Mourning*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2020.
- King, Terry. *Gregor Piatigorsky: The Life and Career of the Virtuoso Cellist*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2010.
- Kingi, Meya. “V.I. Safonov.” In *Venok Na Mogilu Vasiliya Ilicha Safonova, Ugasshego Dirizhera Zemli Russkoy: Muzykalno-Kriticheskiy Almanakh*, edited by N.F. Martsello, 12–19. Odessa: Izdatelstvo Odesskoy Muzykalnoy Akademii, 1918.
- Klier, John D. “Pobedonostsev, Konstantin.” In *Antisemitism: A Historical Encyclopedia of Prejudice and Persecution, Volume 1*, 551. Santa-Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2005.
- Knutsen, Carl Henrik, and Håvard Mokleiv Nygård. “Institutional Characteristics and Regime Survival: Why Are Semi-Democracies Less Durable Than Autocracies and Democracies?” *American Journal of Political Science* 59, no. 3 (July 2015): 656–70.
- Kolpakidi, Alexander, and Alexander Sever. *Spetssluzhby Rossiyskoy Imperii. Unikalnaya Ėntsiklopediya (Special Services of the Russian Empire. Unique Encyclopedia)*. Moscow: Eksmo, 2010.
- Kompaneyets, Elena. “Byloye i Fuga (The Past and the Fugue).” *Yevreyskaya Starina (Jewish Antiquity)* 44, no. 3 (October 16, 2013): 238–98.
- Kopytova, Galina. *Jascha Heifetz: Early Years in Russia*. Translated by Dario Sarlo and Alexandra Sarlo. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2013.
- Korabelnikova, Lyudmila. *S.I. Taneyev v Moskovskoj Konservatorii (Taneyev in the Moscow Conservatory)*. Moscow: Muzika, 1974.
- . *Tvorchestvo S.I. Taneyeva (The Creative Works of S.I. Taneyev)*. Moscow: Muzika, 1986.
- Kosmovskaya, Marina. *Istoriya Muzykalnoy Kultury v Nasledii N. F. Findeyzena (The History of Musical Culture in the Heritage of N.F. Findeyzen)*. Kursk: Izdatelstvo Kurskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, 2006.
- Krutov, Vladimir, and Lidiya Shvetsova-Krutova. *Mir Rakhmaninova. Odin God (The World of Rachmaninoff. A One Year)*. Tambov: Yulis, 2006.
- Leach, Darcy K. “The Iron Law of What Again? Conceptualizing Oligarchy Across Organizational Forms.” *Sociological Theory*, no. 23 (3) (September 2005): 312–37.

- Ledeneva, Alena, and Natalia Shushanyan. "Telefonnoye Pravo v Rossii (Telephone Law in Russia)." *Vestnik Obshchestvennogo Mneniya. Dannyye. Analiz. Diskussii* 95, no. 3 (2008): 42–50.
- Lemon, Alaina. *Technologies for Intuition: Cold War Circles and Telepathic Rays*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2018.
- Levitsky, Steven, and Lucan A. Way. *Competitive Authoritarianism: Hybrid Regimes after the Cold War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Lind, E. Allan, and Tom R. Tyler. *The Social Psychology of Procedural Justice*. Critical Issues in Social Justice. New York: Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, 1988.
- Loeffler, James Benjamin. *The Most Musical Nation: Jews and Culture in the Late Russian Empire*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010.
- Logie, Nicholas. "The Role of Leadership in Conducting Orchestras." PhD dissertation, Open University, 2012.
- Ludvová, Jitka. "Barcal, Antonín." In *Hudební Divadlo v Českých Zemích. Osobnosti 19. Století*, 37–38. Prague: Divadelní ústav – Academia, 2006.
- Lvov, Mikhail. A. V. *Nezhdanowa*. Moscow: Muzika, 1952.
- March, James G. "Footnotes to Organizational Change." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 26, no. 4 (December 1981): 563–77.
- . *The Ambiguities of Experience*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2010.
- March, James G., and Johan P. Olsen. "Elaborating the 'New Institutionalism.'" In *The Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions*, by Sarah A. Binder, R. A. W. Rhodes, and Bert A. Rockman, 3–22. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- . *Rediscovering Institutions: The Organizational Basis of Politics*. New York: The Free Press, 1989.
- . "The New Institutionalism: Organizational Factors in Political Life." *American Political Science Review* 78, no. 3 (1984): 734–49.
- Mariampolski, Hyman, and Dana C. Hughes. "The Use of Personal Documents in Historical Sociology." *The American Sociologist* 13, no. 2 (May 1978): 104–13.
- Martyn, Barrie. "Medtner, Nicolas." In *Grove Music Online*, 2001. <https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/0-mo-9781561592630-e-0000018517>.
- Maslovskaya, Tatyana. "Georgii Eduardovich Conus." In *Moskovskaja Konservatorija Ot Istokov Do Našich Dnej, 1866-2006: Biografičeskij Ėnciklopedičeskij Slovar (The Moscow Conservatory from Origins to the Current Days, 1866-2006: Biographical Encyclopedic Dictionary)*, edited by Margarita Esipova, 257–58. Moscow: MGK, 2007.
- McQuere, Gordon D. "The Moscow Conservatory 1866-1889 Nikolai Rubinstein and Sergei Tanev." *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* 34, no. 1 (Spring 2000): 33–61.
- Merkulov, Alexander. "Karl Kipp." In *Moskovskaja Konservatorija Ot Istokov Do Našich Dnej, 1866-2006: Biografičeskij Ėnciklopedičeskij Slovar (The Moscow Conservatory from Origins to the Current Days, 1866-2006: Biographical Encyclopedic Dictionary)*, edited by Margarita Esipova, 234–36. Moscow: MGK, 2007.
- Michels, Robert. *Political Parties: A Sociological Study of the Oligarchical Tendencies of Modern Democracy*. Translated by Eden Paul and Cedar Paul. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1999.
- Miheeva, Lyudmila. *Eduard Frantsevich Napravnik*. Moscow: Muzika, 1985.
- Mitchell, Rebecca. "Nietzsche's Orphans: Music and the Search for Unity in Late Imperial Russia, 1905–1921." PhD dissertation, University of Illinois, 2011.
- Moe, Terry M. "Political Institutions: The Neglected Side of the Story." *Journal of Law, Economics and Organizations*, no. 6 (1990): 213–53.
- Moiseev, Grigory. "Ot Konservatorii k 'Russkim Kontsertam': Avgusteyskiye Pokroviteli i Nikolai Rubinshteyn (From the Conservatory to 'Russian Concerts': August Patrons and

- Nikolai Rubinstein)." In *Soyuz Tvortsov i Prosvetiteley (The Union of Creators and Enlighteners)*, by Avangard Fedotov, 55–92. Moscow: Kompozitor, 2012.
- . "P.I. Tchaikovsky I Velikiy Knyaz Konstantin Nockolaevich. K Istorii Vsaimootnoscheniy (P.I. Tchaikovsky and the Grand Duke Konstantin Nikolaevich. To History of Relations)." *Nauchnyj Vestnik Moskovskoj Konservatorii*, no. 3 (2013): 136–67.
- . "The Grand Dukes Romanovs' Personal Diaries as a Musical and Historical Source (the 2nd Half of the 19th Century)." *Nauchnyj Vestnik Moskovskoj Konservatorii* 34, no. 3 (2018): 8–77.
- . "Vasily Safonov I Avgusteishie Pokroviteli Moskovskoi Konservatorii (Vasily Safonov and the August Patrons of the Moscow Conservatory)." *Nauchnyj Vestnik Moskovskoj Konservatorii*, no. 4 (2014): 62–91.
- Moisenko, Rena. *Realist Music: 25 Soviet Composers*. London: Meridian Book, Ltd, 1949.
- Moore, Jerrold Northrop. "Lhévinne, Josef." In *Grove Music Online*, 2001. <https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/0-mo-9781561592630-e-0000016552>.
- Muha, Anton. *Kompozytory Ukrayiny Ta Ukrayins'koyi Diaspory (Composers of Ukraine and the Ukrainian Diaspora)*. Kyiv: Muzychna Ukrayina, 2004.
- Muzalevskiy, Vladimir. Balakirev. Leningrad: Leningradskaya filarmoniya, 1938.
- Müller, Gerhard Friedrich. *Izvestiya o Dvoryanakh Rossiyskikh (News about Russian Nobles)*. Moscow: Èë Media, 2013.
- Nevola, Gaspare. "Politics, Identity, Territory. The 'Strength' and 'Value' of Nation-State, the Weakness of Regional Challenge." *Quaderni Del Dipartimento Di Sociologia e Ricerca Sociale* 58 (October 2011): 3–79.
- Newman, David M., and Jodi O'Brien. *Sociology: Exploring the Architecture of Everyday Life Readings*. 8th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press, 2010.
- Nodia, Ghia. "Democracy's Inevitable Elites." *Journal of Democracy* 31, no. 1 (January 2020): 75–87.
- Obuch, Katharina. *Civil Society Organizations in the Hybrid Regime of Nicaragua: Challenging or Maintaining the Status Quo?* Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft Mbh & Co, 2017.
- O'Donnell, Guillermo, and Philippe Schmitter. *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Tentative Conclusions about Uncertain Transitions*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986.
- Offe, Claus. "Institutional Design." In *Encyclopedia of Democratic Thought*, edited by Paul Barry Clarke and Joe Foweraker, 447–54. London: Routledge, 2001.
- Olmstead, Andrea. *Juilliard: A History*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1999.
- Ott, Alfons. "Max Carl Christian von Erdmannsdörfer." In *Neue Deutsche Biographie*, 4:573. Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 1959. <https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/pnd116531398.html#ndbcontent>.
- Ottaway, Marina. *Democracy Challenged: The Rise of Semi-Authoritarianism*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2013.
- Panteleeva, Olga. "St. Petersburg Conservatory and the Beginnings of Russian Musicology." In *Rimsky-Korsakov and His World*, by Marina Frolova-Walker, 233–47. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2018.
- Paperno, Dmitry. *Notes of a Moscow Pianist*. Cleckheaton, United Kingdom: Amadeus, 2003.
- Penesco, Anne. *Mounet-Sully: L'homme Aux Cent Cœurs d'homme*. Paris: Ed. du Cerf, 2005.
- Pettit, Philip. *Republicanism: A Theory of Freedom and Government*. Oxford Political Theory. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002.
- Petuhov, Mikhail. "Door, Anton." In *Entsiklopedicheskiy Slovar Brokgauza i Yefrona (Brockhaus and Efron Encyclopedic Dictionary)*, 11 (14):43. St. Petersburg: Brockhaus and Efron, 1893.

- Pierson, Paul. *Politics in Time: History, Institutions, and Social Analysis*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.
- Piotrowska, Anna G. "Józef Wieniawski (1837-1912) and His Works Composed in Brussels. Revue Belge de Musicologie / Belgisch Tijdschrift Voor Muziekwetenschap Vol. 60, Actes Du Colloque International: Les Relations Musicales Entre Bruxelles et La Pologne 1800-1950 (2006), Pp. 85-97." *Revue Belge de Musicologie / Belgisch Tijdschrift Voor Muziekwetenschap* Vol. 60, Actes du colloque international: Les relations musicales entre Bruxelles et la Pologne 1800-1950 (2006): 85–97.
- Pitkin, Hanna. *The Concept of Representation*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1967.
- Plotnikov, Nikolai, Natalia Podzemskaya, and Yury Yakimenko. *Iskusstvo Kak Yazyk — Yazyki Iskusstva. Gosudarstvennaya Akademiya Khudozhestvennykh Nauk i Esteticheskaya Teoriya 1920-Kh Godov (Art as a Language - the Languages of Art. State Academy of Arts and Aesthetic Theory of the 1920s)*. Moscow: Novoye literaturnoye obozreniye, 2017.
- Poldiaeva, Elena. "Die Ersten Konservatorien in Russland Und Das Problem Eier 'Russichen' Musiksprache." In *Musical Education in Europe (1770-1914): Compositional, Institutional, and Political Challenges*, edited by Michael Fend and Michel Noiray, 565–84. Berlin: Berliner Wissenschafts-Verlag, 2005.
- Poleshchuk, Konstantin. "N.A. Alekseyev i Yego Deyatel'nost' Na Postu Moskovskogo Gorodskogo Golovy v 1885-1893 Gg. (N.A. Alekseev and His Activities as Moscow Mayor in 1885-1893)." PhD dissertation, Moscow State University, 2017.
- Pomeranz, William. "'Profession or Estate'? The Case of the Russian Pre-Revolutionary 'Advokatura.'" *Slavonic and East European Review* 77, no. 2 (April 1999): 240–68.
- Proshina, Natalia. *Taneyev. Vladimirske Stranitzki (Taneyev. Vladimir's Pages)*. Vladimir: NIVA, 2002.
- Przeworski, Adam. *Democracy and the Market: Political and Economic Reforms in Eastern Europe and Latin America*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Pushina, Nina. "Arseni Koreshchenko." In *Moskovskaja Konservatorija Ot Istokov Do Našich Dnej, 1866-2006: Biografičeskij Ėnciklopedičeskij Slovar (The Moscow Conservatory from Origins to the Current Days, 1866-2006: Biographical Encyclopedic Dictionary)*, edited by Margarita Esipova, 260. Moscow: MGK, 2007.
- Quenoy, Paul du. *Stage Fright: Politics and the Performing Arts in Late Imperial Russia*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009.
- Ravicher, Jakov. *V.I. Safonov*. Moscow: Muzika, 1959.
- Riaz, Ali. *Voting in a Hybrid Regime: Explaining the 2018 Bangladeshi Election*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019.
- Ridder, Hans-Gerd. "The Theory Contribution of Case Study Research Designs." *Business Research* 10, no. 2 (2017): 281–305.
- Roberts, Peri, and Peter Sutch. *An Introduction to Political Thought: A Conceptual Toolkit*. 2nd edition. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012.
- Roest, Wilma. "Peter van Anrooy." In *The Essential Guide to Dutch Music: 100 Composers and Their Work*, 19–21. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2000.
- Rogers, Rebecca. *From The Salon To The Schoolroom: Educating Bourgeois Girls In Nineteenth Century France*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2005.
- Ross, Dorothy. "The Many Lives of Institutionalism in American Social Science." *Polity* 28 (1995): 117–23.
- Rovner, Anton. "The Microtonal Application of Boleslav Yavorsky's Theory of Modal Rhythm in Sergei Protopopoff's Book 'Elements of Construction of Musical Language.'" *Russian Journal of Academic Studies "Music Scholarship"* 11, no. 2 (2012): 282–90.
- Rožanova, Irina. "U Istokov Kafedry Organa (At the Origins of the Organ Department)." In *Maloizvestnyye Stranitsy Istorii Konservatorii (Little-Known Pages of the Conservatory*

- History*), by Era Barutycheva, 17–20. V. St. Petersburg: St. Petersburg Conservatory, 2004.
- Rubinoff, Kailan R. “Toward a Revolutionary Model of Music Pedagogy: The Paris Conservatoire, Hugot and Wunderlich’s Méthode de Flûte, and the Disciplining of the Musician.” *Journal of Musicology* 34, no. 4 (2017): 473–514.
- Sabine, George Holland. *A History of Political Theory*. Fourth. Hinsdale, IL: Dryden Press, 1973.
- Samson, Jim. “Music and Nationalism: Five Historical Moments.” In *Nationalism and Ethnosymbolism: History, Culture and Ethnicity in the Formation of Nations*, by Athena S. Leoussi and Steven Grosby, 55–67. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007.
- Sargeant, Lynn Mary. “A New Class of People: The Conservatoire and Musical Professionalization in Russia, 1861–1917.” *Music and Letters* 85, no. 1 (January 2004): 41–61.
- . “Ambivalence and Desire: State, Society, and Music Education in Russia.” In *Musical Education in Europe (1770-1914): Compositional, Institutional, and Political Challenges*, edited by Michael Fend and Michel Noiray, 245–74. Berlin: Berliner Wissenschafts-Verlag, 2005.
- . *Harmony and Discord. Music and the Transformation of Russian Cultural Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- . “High Anxiety: New Venues, New Audiences, and the Fear of the Popular in Late Imperial Russian Musical Life.” *19th-Century Music* 35, no. 2 (Fall 2011): 93–114.
- . “Kashchei the Immortal: Liberal Politics, Cultural Memory, and the Rimsky-Korsakov Scandal of 1905.” *The Russian Review* 64, no. 1 (2005): 22–43.
- . “Singing the Nation into Being: Teaching Identity and Culture at the Turn of The Twentieth Century.” *History of Education Quarterly* 49, no. 3 (August 2009): 291–322.
- Savenko, Svetlana. *S.I. Taneyev*. Moscow: Muzika, 1984.
- Schwartz, Barry. “The Social Context of Commemoration: A Study in Collective Memory.” *Social Forces* 61, no. 2 (December 1982): 374–97.
- Schwarz, Boris. “Glazunov, Aleksandr Konstantinovich.” In *Grove Music Online*, 2001. <https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/0-mo-9781561592630-e-0000011266>.
- Scott, W. Richard. *Institutions and Organizations: Ideas, Interests, and Identities*. Fourth. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications, Inc., 2014.
- Scriabin, Alexander. *Nastavnik: Alexander Goldenweiser Glazami Sovremennikov (Mentor. Alexander Goldenweiser through the Eyes of His Contemporaries)*. Moscow: Centr Gumanitarnykh Initsiativ, 2014.
- Selznick, Philip. *Leadership in Administration*. New York: Harper & Row, 1957.
- Shanet, Howard. *Philharmonic: A History Of New York’s Orchestra*. New York: Doubleday and Company Inc, 1975.
- Silverman, Marissa. *Gregory Haimovsky: A Pianist’s Odyssey to Freedom*. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2018.
- Sitsky, Larry. *Anton Rubinstein: An Annotated Catalog of Piano Works and Biography*. London: Greenwood Press, 1998.
- Skemer, Don C. “Drifting Disciplines, Enduring Records: Political Science and the Use of Archives.” *American Archivist* 54 (1991): 356–68.
- Smith, Kenneth. “The Psychoanalytic Drive in the Harmonic Language of Alexander Skryabin. Russian Journal of Academic Studies ‘Music Scholarship’ No 7.” *Russian Journal of Academic Studies “Music Scholarship”* 7 (2010): 11–17.
- Spencer, Jennifer. “Arnol’d, Yury.” In *Grove Music Online*, 2001. <https://www-oxfordmusiconline->

- com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/om-9781561592630-e-0000001306.
- . “Gubert [Hubert], Nikolay Al’bertovich.” In *Grove Music Online*, 2001. <https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/om-9781561592630-e-0000011912>.
- Spencer, Jennifer, and Edward Garden. “Lyadov [Liadov], Anatoly [Anatol] Konstantinovich.” In *Grove Music Online*, 2001. <https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/om-9781561592630-e-0000017240>.
- Starostin, Ivan, and Tatyana Kyuregyan. “I. V. Sposobin: Razvitiye Pedagogicheskoy Traditsii Moskovskoy Konservatorii (I.V. Sposobin: The Development of the Pedagogical Tradition of the Moscow Conservatory).” *Nauchnyj Vestnik Moskovskoj Konservatorii*, no. 1 (2016): 8–27.
- Stöckl, Ernst. *Musikgeschichte Der Russlanddeutschen*. Dülmen: Laumann-Verlag, 1993.
- Styckow, Petra. “Elections in Authoritarian Regimes: The Post-Soviet Cases.” In *Comparing Autocracies in the Early Twenty-First Century: Volume 1: Unpacking Autocracies - Explaining Similarity and Difference*, by Aurel Croissant, Steffen Kailitz, Patrick Koellner, and Stefan Wurster, 154–84, 1st ed. Democratization Special Issues. New York: Routledge, 2014.
- Swafford, Jan. *Johannes Brahms: A Biography*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1997.
- Sycheva, Galina. “Mikhail Gnessin - ‘Stroitel Muzikalnoy Zhizni’ Provintsialnogo Goroda Rostova-Na-Donu (Mikhail Gnessin the ‘Founder of Musical Life’ in the Provincial City of Rostov-on-Don).” *Russian Journal of Academic Studies “Music Scholarship,”* no. 12 (2013): 92–98.
- Taruskin, Richard. *Defining Russia Musically: Historical and Hermeneutical Essays*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.
- Taylor, Philip S. *Anton Rubinstein: A Life in Music*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2007.
- Tolstrup, Jakob. “Black Knights and Elections in Authoritarian Regimes: Why and How Russia Supports Authoritarian Incumbents in Post-Soviet States.” *European Journal of Political Research* 54, no. 4 (November 2015): 673–90.
- Troitskiy, Nikolai. *Korifei Rossiyskoy Advokatury (Luminaries of the Russian Advocacy)*. Moscow: Tsentrpoligraf, 2006.
- Tsebelis, George. *Nested Games: Rational Choice in Comparative Politics*. California Series on Social Choice and Political Economy. Berkley: University of California Press, 1990.
- Tumarinson, Leonid, ed. “Nash Starik”: *Alexander Goldenweiser i Moskovskaya Konservatoria (“Our Old Man”: Alexander Goldenweiser and the Moscow Conservatory)*. Moscow: Centr Gumanitarnykh Inicativ, 2015.
- . “Trudis’ I Nadejsja ...”: *Vasilij Safonov: Novye Materialy I Issledovanija (“Toil and Hope...”: Vasily Safonov: New Material and Research)*. Moscow: Centr Gumanitarnykh Inicativ, 2017.
- Tumarinson, Leonid, and Boris Rozenfeld. *Letopis Žizni I Tvorchestva V.I. Safonova (Life Chronicle of Vasily Safonov)*. Moscow: Belyi Bereg, 2009.
- Tyler, John. “Hřimalý Family.” In *Grove Music Online*, 2001. <https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/om-9781561592630-e-0000013447>.
- Tyler, Tom R., and Gregory Mitchell. “Legitimacy and the Empowerment of Discretionary Legal Authority: The United States Supreme Court and Abortion Rights.” *Duke Law Journal* 43, no. 4 (February 1994): 703–815.
- Vallas, Léon. *The Theories of Claude Debussy, Musicien Français*. Translated by Marie O’Brien. New York: Dover Publications, 1967.

- Varfolomeev, Yury. "The 'Pecheneg' from Ostozhenka: The Fate and Epoch of Counsel P.I. Korzhenyovsky." *Izvestiya Saratovskogo Universiteta. Novaya Seriya. Seriya Istoriya. Mezhdunarodnyye Otnosheniya (Bulletin of the Saratov University. New Series. Series History. International Relationships)* 17, no. 2 (2017): 172–79.
- Velikaya, Nataliya. "Opposition as a Mirage of Political Field in Russia." In *New Authoritarianism: Challenges to Democracy in the 21st Century*, by Jerzy J. Wiatr, 77–99. Opladen: Verlag Barbara Budrich, 2019.
- Velimirović, Miloš. "Smolensky, Stepan Vasil'yevich." Grove Music Online, 2001. <https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/0-mo-9781561592630-e-0000026029>.
- Vodarsky-Shiraeff, Alexandra. *Russian Composers and Musicians. A Bibliographical Dictionary*. New York: H. W. Wilson, 1940.
- Warwick, Christopher. *Ella: Princess, Saint and Martyr*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 2006.
- Waters, Tony, and Dagmar Waters. *Weber's Rationalism and Modern Society. New Translations on Politics, Bureaucracy, and Social Stratification*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
- Wcislo, Francis W. *Tales of Imperial Russia: The Life and Times of Sergei Witte, 1849-1915*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Weber, Max. *Economy and Society*. Berkley: University of California Press, 1978.
- White, James A. "A Bridge to the Schism. Edinoverie, Russian Orthodoxy, and the Ritual Formation of Confessions, 1800-1918." PhD dissertation, European University Institute, 2014.
- Wilson, Elizabeth. *Mstislav Rostropovich: Cellist, Teacher, Legend*. London: Faber and Faber, 2007.
- Wortman, Richard. "Russian Monarchy and the Rule of Law: New Considerations of the Court Reform of 1864." *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History* 6, no. 1 (2005): 145–70.
- Wright, Joseph, and Abel Escribà-Folch. "Authoritarian Institutions and Regime Survival: Transitions to Democracy and Subsequent Autocracy." *British Journal of Political Science* 42, no. 2 (February 2012): 283–309.
- Yampol'sky, I.M., and Inna Barsova. "Goldenweiser [Gol'denveyzer], Aleksandr." In *Grove Music Online*, 2001. <https://www-oxfordmusiconline-com.proxy3.library.mcgill.ca/grovemusic/view/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/0-mo-9781561592630-e-0000011378>.
- Yuli, Kremlev. *Russkaya Mysl o Muzyke: Ocherki Istorii Russkoï Muzykalnoy Kritiki i Èstetiki v XIX Veke (Russian Thought about Music: Essays on the History of Russian Musical Criticism and Aesthetics in the 19th Century)*. Vol. 2. Moscow: Muzika, 1954.
- Zakharov, Andrey. *Spyashchiy Institut: Federalizm v Sovremennoy Rossii i v Mire (The Sleeping Institute: Federalism in Contemporary Russia and in the World)*. Moscow: Novoye literaturnoye obozreniye, 2014.
- Zenkin, Konstantin. "The Liszt Tradition at the Moscow Conservatoire." *Studia Musicologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 42, no. 1/2 (2001): 93–108.
- Zhdanov, Vladimir. *1886-1893. Tchaikovsky, P.I. Yurgenson. Perepiska (Correspondence)*. Vol. 2. Moscow: Muzgis, 1952.
- Zima, Tatyana. "Activity of Grand Duke Konstantin Romanov (k. r.) as Vice-Chairman of the Imperial Russian Musical Society." *Vestnik MGUKI* 57, no. 1 (February 2014): 99–105.
- . "Russkoe Muzikalnoe Obchestvo Kak Sociokulturnoe Javlenie v Rossii Vtoroi Poloviny XIX - Nachala XX Vekov (Russian Musical Society as Sociocultural Phenomenon in Russia of Late 19 - Early 20 Centuries)." PhD dissertation, St. Petersburg State Institute of Culture, 2015.

Appendix 1

The charter of the Conservatories of the RMO, 25 November, 1877⁴³²

Chapter I. General Provisions

§1 Conservatories are higher professional musical educational institutions whose aim is to educate orchestral performers, virtuosos, concert singers, drama and opera artists, conductors, composers, and music teachers.

§2 The subjects that are part of the teaching in the Conservatories are divided into artistic and scientific subjects.

A. artistic subjects: orchestral instruments, namely: strings, winds, and percussion, piano, organ, singing, music theory, history of music, history of arts, aesthetics, stage play, recitation and facial expressions, dances, etc.

B. Scientific subjects: divinity, arithmetic, geography, world and Russian history, physics, Russian language and literature with a detailed emphasis on the most important works of foreign writers, German, French and Italian languages, and calligraphy.

Note 1. Of the foreign languages, only two are required.

Note 2. General education subjects must be taught according to textbooks approved by the Ministry of Public Education and the church, according to their affiliation.

§3 Artistic subjects are taught in Conservatories according to the programs and curriculum drawn up by the artistic council and approved by the Head of the Imperial Russian Musical Society.

Scientific subjects are taught in Conservatories according to the programs and curriculum established by the scientific council, with the approval of the Ministry of Public Education.

§4 There are museums affiliated with Conservatories, which contain libraries consisting of musical compositions and books related to musical art, as well as textbooks in all branches of science that are part of teaching at Conservatories, collections of autographs, musical instruments, physical instruments, and others necessary for scientific teaching of pedagogues. The order of museum administration and the rules of the use of their funds are determined by special instructions.

§5 Conservatories are supported by the amounts contributed by the students themselves or by private individuals and organizations that support the scholarship holders. The St. Petersburg Conservatory, in addition, is provided with the annual funding from the government in the amount of 15,000 rubles, and the Moscow Conservatory - the same funding in the amount of 20,000 rubles.

§6 Conservatories, being under the jurisdiction of the local branch of the Imperial Russian Musical Society, are under the patronage of the Head of this Society.

Chapter II. Head of the Imperial Musical Society. Main Directorate. Local Directorate.

§7 The Head of the Imperial Russian Musical Society, as the patron of the Conservatories, approves, at the local directorate's proposal, instructions, programs and curriculum developed by

⁴³² Translated by myself of Birkengoff, *Iz Istorii Leningradskoy Konservatorii. 1862-1917 (From the History of the Leningrad Conservatory. 1862-1917)*, 45–62.

the artistic council, as well as the protocols of the artistic council on the award of diplomas, certificates and medals.

§8 The Head approves the local directorate's proposal on the appointment and dismissal of the director, professors and senior teachers, the Conservatory inspector and the inspector of scientific subjects, on the promotion of those teaching artistic subjects to higher ranks, as well as on the conferment the Conservatory honorary membership to the outside artists.

§9 The Head of the Imperial Russian Musical Society asks for all-merciful awards by orders and ranks to persons serving in the Conservatories, he also makes proposals for all-merciful awarding the Honored Professor rank to ordinary professors of the 1st degree in reward for their exceptional merits.

§10 The Head is given recurrent information about the course of teaching in Conservatories and, in general, about the state of these institutions; special incidents are reported immediately.

§11 The direct management of each Conservatory belongs to the local directorate of the Imperial Russian Musical Society. The general supervision and care of all Conservatories rests with the main directorate of the Society.

§12 The main directorate may send authorized persons to the Conservatory for the closest acquaintance with the course of studies and affairs in the Conservatories.

§13 The local directorates of the Imperial Russian Musical Society, which have the Conservatory under their supervision, take care of its welfare and mainly of the augmentation of its money. Local directors can visit the Conservatory at any time.

§14 The local directorate is responsible for:

1. Considering the budgets and reports on the Conservatory provided by the Conservatory director.
2. Electing a member from among its members to attend the Conservatory final exams, as well as to manage the Conservatory during vacations in the absence of the director.
3. Giving its opinion on the issues submitted by the Conservatory's director to the directorate if he disagrees with the artistic council's majority votes.
4. Determining and dismissing the treasurer and superintendent of the Conservatory, appointing and dismissing, on the Conservatory director's proposal, teachers of artistic subjects, teachers of scientific subjects, the office secretary, the museum manager and his assistants, and the Conservatory inspector's assistants.
5. Making proposals to the Head of the Imperial Russian Musical Society on the appointment and dismissal of the director, professors, senior teachers, inspector of the Conservatory, and inspector of scientific classes; and on all matters requiring the Head's approval.
6. Approving, on the director's proposal, the artistic council's decisions on the expulsion of students from the Conservatory.

Chapter III. Administration

§15 The constituent parts of each Conservatory's management: the director, the artistic council, the scientific council, the Conservatory inspector, scientific classes' inspector. The administration may include: a manager of affairs, a museum manager, a treasurer, a caretaker, and a clerk.

A. Director

§16 The director must certainly be a person specially engaged in music, and at the same time a Russian citizen.

§17 The director is appointed and dismissed by the Head of the Imperial Russian Musical Society on the local branch directorate's recommendation.

§18 The director is a member of both the local and the main directorate of the Russian Musical Society.

§19 The director exercises direct management of the Conservatory.

§20 The director is obliged to monitor the progress of teaching, both artistic and scientific, the development and success of students, their behavior at the Conservatory and, in general, the exact execution of all regulations relating to teaching at the Conservatory.

§21 The director makes proposals to the local directorate about the appointment and dismissal of those teaching artistic subjects at the Conservatory, at the same time representing each time the artistic council's opinion. The director makes proposals to the local directorate about the appointment and dismissal of the Conservatory inspector and his assistants, the inspector of scientific classes, teachers of scientific subjects, the manager of affairs, the museum manager, the treasurer, the caretaker, and the clerk.

§22 The director annually draws up an estimate of all income and expenses for the Conservatory and reports it two months before academic year starts for the local directorate's consideration, which submits this estimate for the Head's approval. In the orders for the expenditure of the amounts allocated annually by the estimate, the director acts independently, but he has no right to spend amounts in excess of the estimate without the permission of the local directorate. If it is necessary to exceed the estimate, he informs the local directorate about that.

Note: within the limits of the approved estimate the director can redirect funds from one item of expenditure to other items.

§23 The director annually submits a report to the local directorate on all parts of the Conservatory management and in general on everything related to the subordinate institution.

§24 The director, with the permission of the local branch directorate, sends the Conservatory employees on vacation during the time of classes, but not otherwise than for exceptional reasons, and for a period not exceeding one month. An employee's vacation during the time of classes for a period of more than a month may be authorized by the director only with the approval of the Head of the Imperial Russian Musical Society.

Note. During summer breaks, the Conservatory teachers are allowed to go on vacation without the director's special permission; nevertheless, other employees should ask for the permission of the local directorate.

§25 The director of the Conservatory is sent on vacation by the Head of the Imperial Russian Musical Society, at the local directorate's suggestion. In the director's absence during the academic year, the management of the Conservatory is entrusted to the inspector. In the director's absence during the summer break the management is entrusted to one of the local branch directors of the directorate's choice.

B. Artistic Council

§26 The artistic council consists of professors, senior instructors, the Conservatory inspector, and is chaired by the director. The inspector of scientific subjects may also be invited to the artistic council's meetings, and in this case has the right to vote on an equal basis with other council members.

§27 The artistic council is responsible for:

1. Giving its opinion on the Conservatory director's proposals on the appointment and dismissal of instructors, senior instructors, and professors of artistic subjects.
2. Resolving the issues of promoting Conservatory teachers to the highest ranks as well as promoting outside artists to the rank of Conservatory honorary members.
3. Selecting and appointing examination board members.
4. Assigning to graduation students who have completed their Conservatory studies.
5. Considering the examination board's grade lists after the end of examination. Based on these grades, drawing up resolutions on the granting of certificates, diplomas, and medals to persons who have completed the course and passed the exams.
6. Resolving issues about the transfer of students from year to year, about the transfer of supernumerary students to complete students for success in learning, as well as the transfer from complete to supernumerary for negligence and the expulsion from the Conservatory altogether.
7. Drawing up instructions for the Conservatory in development of the rules contained in the charter.
8. Developing programs and methods of teaching artistic subjects, drawing up a curriculum for these subjects and resolving all issues relevant to the studies of these subjects.
- 9 Establishing rules for class attendance and examinations.
10. Authorizing the publication of lectures given at the Conservatory, and musical opuses, as well as literary works in the field of musical art approved by the artistic council.
11. Assigning (at the invitation of the local directorate) themes for musical and musical-literary competitions, established by the Musical Society.
12. Considering and giving feedback on the merits of musical pieces submitted to the competitions of the Imperial Russian Musical Society local branch, and
13. Giving feedback and opinions on all subjects related to musical art, submitted for discussion by the main or local directorate, as well as other organizations.

Note 1. All issues set out in section 2 are resolved by balloting, and decisions on them are submitted for approval to the Head of the Society.

Note 2. All lectures permitted for publication, musical pieces, and literary works should have the inscription in the title: "Adopted by the council of such and such Conservatory of the Imperial Russian Musical Society"

C. Scientific Council

§28 The Scientific Council is chaired by the Conservatory director. It consists of the scientific subjects' inspector and teachers of scientific subjects. In the absence of the director, the council headship is given to the scientific subjects' inspector.

§29 The scientific council is responsible for:

1. Resolving all questions related the Conservatory's scientific subject studies.
2. Drafting curricula, programs, and methods of teaching scientific subjects at the Conservatory.
3. Drawing up rules for attending scientific subjects and examinations.
4. Transferring students from year to year and recognizing students as having completed the course of science and
5. Expulsing students from scientific classes for negligence and failure.

§30 Meetings of both the artistic and scientific councils take place during the academic year at the director's command at least once a month. Before each council's meeting, the members thereof receive on the director's behalf the list of its agenda subjects.

§31 The artistic council is allowed to appoint temporary special commissions for preliminary discussions of special issues. The commission opinion is submitted for the artistic council's approval.

§32 Both the artistic and scientific councils begin to discuss and decide matters if the meeting is attended by at least five members, besides the chairman.

Note. When the artistic council consider appointment, dismissal, and promotion to higher ranks of those teaching artistic subjects, at least two-thirds of the councils' members must attend.

§33 The decisions of both the artistic and scientific councils are passed by a majority vote. In case of vote equality, the opinion which the Conservatory director agreed with is considered accepted; in case of disagreement with the council, the director is allowed to postpone the matter at the Society's local directorate discretion, the decision of which, approved by the Society's Head, both the artistic council and the Conservatory director must obey.

§34 Both the artistic and scientific councils have their own secretaries, who manage the council's affairs, reports them to the council and draws up the minutes of its decisions. The secretary is responsible for the accuracy of the decisions and certificates displayed in the minutes. The artistic council's secretary is elected by this council from among its members or from outsiders; the scientific council's secretary is elected from among the teachers of scientific subjects.

D. Inspectors

§35 The Conservatory inspector must necessarily be a person who is specially involved in music; he oversees both the order in terms of the academic and the students' behavior in the Conservatory and carries out the director's arrangements. One or more assistants are assigned to the Conservatory inspector as needed.

Note. The Conservatory inspector is responsible for the distribution of teaching hours and for the exact implementation of the curriculum, he also maintains both the students' attendance book and the exam lists. The Conservatory inspector is elected by the director and approved in this rank by the Head of the Society.

§36 In order to fulfill the responsibilities for scientific classes specified in section 35, the director shall select the scientific subjects inspector from among the scientific subjects' teachers.

Note: The scientific subjects inspector is approved in this rank by the Head of the Society.

E. Teachers.

§37 Artistic subjects instructors are selected not only from the number of persons who graduated from the course at the Conservatories of the Imperial Russian Musical Society, but also from outside artists - both Russians and foreigners. The following are eligible in artistic subjects:

ordinarius instructors and supernumerary instructors, senior instructors, and professors of the second and first degrees, and, in addition, honored professors.

§38 Ordinarius instructors are those artists who have been awarded a certificate or diploma from the Imperial Russian Musical Society's Conservatory, who, upon the recommendation of the director, will be recognized by the artistic council's opinion as worthy to teach any artistic subject at the Conservatory.

§39 An ordinarius instructor, after serving in this rank for at least three years, may, at the director's discretion, be promoted by the artistic council to the rank of an ordinarius senior instructor, and this title is approved by the Head of the Society.

§40 An ordinarius senior instructor with a Conservatory diploma, after serving in this rank for at least three years, may, at the director's suggestion, be promoted by the artistic council to the rank of ordinarius professor of the second degree, and this title is approved by the Head of the Society.

§41 An ordinarius professor of the second degree, after serving in this rank for at least ten years, may, at the director's suggestion, be promoted by the artistic council to the rank of ordinarius professor of the first degree, and this rank is approved by the Head of the Society.

§42 An ordinarius professor of the first degree, after serving in this rank for at least ten years, can receive the rank of the honored professor by the Head of the Society.

§43 Conservatories are allowed to invite, as supernumerary instructors, senior instructors, and professors of the second and first degrees, persons who do not have a certificate or diploma from the Conservatory, if these persons, upon the director's suggestion, are recognized by the artistic council's opinion as worthy to teach any artistic subject at the Conservatory. The approval of artists in the rank of supernumerary and senior instructors, and professors of the second and first degrees, as well as their promotion to higher ranks, is carried out in the same manner as the approval and promotion to the highest ranks of ordinarius and senior instructors, and professors.

§44 Supernumerary and senior instructors, and supernumerary professors who have passed the test for the Conservatory diploma are renamed as ordinary and senior instructors, and professors respectively.

§45 Persons approved in the rank of an ordinary or supernumerary senior teacher and an ordinary or supernumerary professor of the 2nd or 1st degree, as well as an honored professor, receive certificates for this signed by the Head of the Society.

§46 Scientific subjects instructors are selected from persons entitled to do so under the existing regulations, and are dismissed, at the director's suggestion, by the Society's local branch directorate.

F. Officials

§47 The manager of affairs is in charge of the chancellery and all documentation of the Conservatory. The clerk is attached to the manager of affairs.

§48 The museum manager oversees the order in the museum, its proper organization, in accordance with the given instructions, and compiles detailed catalogs of musical compositions, textbooks, instruments, teaching aids, etc., available in the museum.

Note. One or more assistants are assigned to the museum manager as needed.

§49 The manager of affairs, the museum manager and his assistants, the Conservatory inspector's assistants and the clerk are assigned and dismissed, upon the director's suggestion, by the local directorate of the Society.

§50 The treasurer is in charge of the Conservatory's and the Society local branch's finances.

§51 A superintendent is appointed to manage all the property and the Conservatory's service part.

§52 The treasurer and superintendent are appointed and dismissed by the local directorate of the Society. The posts of treasurer and superintendent may be entrusted to one person.

§53 Persons serving in the Conservatories are considered in the civil service and are in the classes defined by the schedule of posts, without, however, enjoying the rights to receive pensions and other cash benefits and awards from the funds of the state treasury.

Chapter IV

A. Admissions

§54 The Conservatory accepts persons of both sexes and all classes.

§55 Persons wishing to enter the Conservatory submit an application to the Conservatory director, indicating which discipline they choose for special study, and attach a certificate of identity.

§56 Applicants are assigned to classes according to the level of knowledge revealed on the entrance examinations. The knowledge required for admission to the Conservatory is determined by the courses of male and female gymnasiums and educational institutions equal to them; for those who have an ability for artistic talents' development, for example, an excellent voice, the level of this knowledge can be somewhat lowered, however, in any case, not lower than the admission requirements in secondary schools. Those wishing to study singing or playing one of the wind instruments have to pass medical examination and if it turns out that taking these subjects could have harmful consequences for their health, they cannot be admitted to these classes.

§57 Anyone who enters the Conservatory can receive a residence permit from the Conservatory in exchange for the identity certificate provided to them.

B. Students and auditors

§58 Applicants are admitted to the Conservatory as students and auditors.

Students are individuals who attend classes in all subjects defined by the curriculum - artistic and scientific.

Auditors are people who are allowed to attend either only one class of their chosen special subject or, in addition, also classes of compulsory subjects, all or some, of their own choice.

§59 An annual fee is set for both students and auditors, the amount of which is determined, upon the proposal of the Conservatory director, by the local branch directorate of the Society.

§60 For a limited number of students, tuition fees at the Conservatory are set at a reduced rate in comparison with the fees charged to other students and auditors. The number of such students is determined by the local branch directorate in proportion to the funds at its disposal. These students are called complete, and others are called supernumerary.

§61 The admission of complete students and the transfer of supernumerary students to the complete ones, or vice versa, is carried out according to the artistic council's decision.

§62 Students and auditors are admitted to the Conservatory before the academic year begins after the summer break. Persons wishing to enter the Conservatory during the academic year are allowed to audit courses, but special courses are not opened to them. Tuition fees are paid by

students twice a year, at the beginning and in the middle of the academic year, for every term in advance.

Note. The money paid for a student or an auditor are not refundable.

§63 The Conservatory administration oversees the behavior and actions of students only within the Conservatory walls; students' supervision is not implemented outside.

§64 At the discretion of the Conservatory's director, students and auditors are required to participate both in music concerts and in dramatic and musical-dramatic performances of the Conservatory and the local branch of the Society.

§65 Excluding vacations, the studies in the Conservatories take place nine months, namely from September 1 to June 1.

C. Examinations

§66 For admissions, studying, and graduation, the Conservatory students take exams that can be entrance, evaluative, transfer, and graduation exams.

§67 Entrance, evaluative, and transfer exams are nonpublic, while graduation ones are public.

§68 The artistic council assigns an examination board from persons teaching at the Conservatory. The board is chaired by the director on the basis of rules drawn up by the artistic council and approved by the Head of the Society.

Note. The council is allowed to hire outside artists as members of the examination board.

§69 Graduation exams in artistic objects are carried out in the presence of a government deputy appointed by the Ministry of Internal Affairs, a deputy appointed by the Head of the Society, and one of the local branch directors of the Society of the directorate's choice.

§70 During the examination the examination board's members put their grades in examinee lists, and at the end of the exam, all members sign the lists. The government deputy, the deputy assigned by the Society Head, and the local branch director sign a protocol certifying the exam's correctness.

§71 At the end of all exams, the artistic council considers the lists and, on the basis of the grades given by the examination board's members, awards certificates, diplomas, and medals. A resolution issued and signed by the artistic council's present members is submitted for approval to the Head of the Society.

§72 Scientific subjects' exams are carried out on the basis of the rules established by the scientific council, in the presence of a deputy from the Ministry of Public Education.

D. Certificate, diploma, medals

§73 Persons who studied at the Conservatory, upon leaving the Conservatory and upon passing a certain test, can receive certificates or diplomas. The persons awarded the diploma acquire the title of a free artist. Individuals who are distinguished by special abilities and, moreover, who have shown particular success, in addition, are awarded medals: silver - small or large, or gold - small or large.

Note. The Conservatory attaches the nomination of each student from petty bourgeois and peasants, who received a free artist diploma, for the poll taxpayers' exclusion by the Governing Senate.

§74 Auditors, not using the rights granted to students during their stay at the Conservatory, can, however, receive certificates and diplomas on an equal basis with the Conservatory students if they pass the final exams in all the artistic and scientific subjects required by the program.

§75 On the same ground, persons who have not studied at the Conservatory can be admitted to take final exams and receive certificates and diplomas on an equal basis with the Conservatory students if they pass them in all the artistic and scientific subjects required by the program.

§76 At the end of the final examinations, a public act is appointed, which announces the decision of the artistic council, approved by the Society Head, about the awards, diplomas, certificates, and medals, on the basis of paragraph 71 of this Charter. Also the Conservatory activities' annual short report is read out.

E. Deferrals and benefits for conscription

§77 On conscription, the Conservatory students enjoy the rights specified in the Conscription Charter for students of the St. Petersburg and Moscow Conservatories (Article 53 of the Charter on Military Service).

Auditors who received a certificate or diploma upon graduation enjoy the same rights to shorten the term of active service, which are granted to students who have received a certificate or diploma, but auditors do not enjoy the right to receive deferrals while studying.

§78 The Conservatory students are drafted for military service upon reaching certain draft age. In order to complete their education, they can postpone it until they reach 22 years of age; students in the singing class admitted before 22 years are postponed to the military service until 25 years. The students who have been awarded a certificate before reaching 22 years and continue their artistic education at the Conservatory, enlistment in the troops is postponed until 27 years.

Chapter V. Honorary Members of the Conservatory

§79 Conservatories are given the right to confer the Conservatory honorary member degree on outside artists in view of any remarkable musical compositions of theirs or for their literary works, related to musical art. Persons approved in the honorary member degree receive certificates signed by the Society Head.

Chapter VI. Instructions. Stamps

§80 Conservatories are guided by special rules and instructions for the educational and administrative processes. These rules must be drawn up by the artistic council in addition to this Charter's provisions. These rules are approved by the Head of the Society. These rules and regulations should define:

1. The Conservatory director's duties and his relationship to all employees and students.
2. Duties of other employees of the Conservatory and their mutual relations.
3. The students' responsibilities, as well as their relationship with the director and other employees of the Conservatory.
4. The procedure for enforcing the curriculum, audition rules, rules for using the museum, etc.
5. Rules on behavior and observance of order in classes and on measures of punishment for violation of the established rules.

§81 Conservatories are assigned a special seal and the name of such and such Conservatory of the highly approved Imperial Russian Musical Society.

Appendix 2

Index of people with years of life, page of the first mention, and a short description

Abrikosov, Vladimir (1858-1922) 58 director of a tea partnership, owner of a confectionery plant
Aglintseva, Ekaterina (1883-1968) 66 Moscow Conservatory student
Albrecht, Carl (1839-1893) 29 Moscow Conservatory director in 1883-1885
Alekseev, Nikolai (1852-1893) 30 merchant and philanthropist
Alexander II (1818-1881) 21 Russian Emperor in 1855-1881
Alexander III (1845-1894) 46 Russian Emperor in 1881-1894
Anrooy, Peter van (1879-1954) 51 Dutch composer and conductor
Arnold, Yuri (1811-1898) 33 Moscow Conservatory music history instructor
Asafiev, Boris (1884-1949) 113 Russian-Soviet musicologist
Avraamova, Anna (1848-1921) 70 Moscow Conservatory artistic council secretary
Balakirev, Mily (1836-1910) 7 Free School of Music's founder
Barcal, Antonín (1847-1928) 80 Moscow Conservatory vocal professor
Bekman-Shcherbina, Elena (1882-1951) 66 Moscow Conservatory student
Bériot, Charles de (1802-1870) 17 Brussels Conservatory violin professor
Berngard, August (1852-1908) 26 St. Petersburg Conservatory director in 1897-1905
Bessie-Lhévinne, Rosina (1880-1976) 115 Russian-American pianist, Julliard School professor
Betting, Ludwig (1856-1930) 63 Moscow Conservatory organ professor
Bezekirsky, Vasily (1835-1919) 102 Music and Drama School cello professor
Brandukov, Anatoly (1859-1930) 38 Music and Drama School cello professor
Büchner, Ferdinand (1823-1906) 17 Moscow Conservatory flute professor
Buldin, Ivan (1853-1917) 57 Moscow Conservatory artistic skill teacher
Bulychev, Vjacheslav (1872-1859) 63 lawyer and conductor
Busoni, Ferruccio (1866-1924) 38 Moscow Conservatory piano professor
Chighova, Pelageya (1834-1910) 77 Taneyev's nanny
Conus, Georges (1862-1933) 12 Moscow Conservatory music theory professor
Crane, David (1869-1926) 84 Moscow Conservatory student
Cui, César (1835-1918) 76 the RMO St. Petersburg concerts' director
Czerny, Carl (1791-1857) 17 Austrian composer, pianist, and teacher
d'Indy, Vincent (1851-1931) 20 director of Schola Cantorum de Paris
Davydov, Karl (1838-1889) 40 St. Petersburg Conservatory director in 1876-1887
Davydov, Nikolai (1848-1920) 62 chairman of the Moscow district court
Debussy, Claude (1862-1918) 18 French composer
Dehn, Wilhelm (1799-1858) 13 Nikolai Rubinstein's piano teacher in Berlin
Demyanova-Shatskaya, Valentina (1882-1978) 66 Moscow Conservatory student
Derviz, Sergei von (1863-1943) 46 industrialist and philanthropist
Door, Anton (1833-1919) 17 Moscow Conservatory violin professor
Doroshevich, Vlas (1865-1922) 60 Russian journalist
Dreyschock, Alexander (1818-1869) 101 St. Petersburg Conservatory piano professor
Dubois, Théodore (1837-1924) 113 Paris Conservatory director
Dubuque, Alexandre (1812-1898) 17 Moscow Conservatory piano professor
Dvořák, Antonin (1841-1904) 38 Czech composer
Elena Pavlovna (1807-1873) 21 Grand Duchess, the RMO Head
Elizabeth, Fedorovna (1864-1918) 101 Grand Duchess, the RMO Head
Erdmannsdörfer, Max (1845-1905) 31 the RMO Moscow concerts' director
Fauré, Gabriel (1845-1921) 20 Paris conservatory director
Field, John (1782-1837) 17 Russian composer, pianist, and teacher
Findeisen, Nikolai (1868-1928) 60 Russian critic
Fulda, Ferdinand (?-?) 59 household chemicals manufacturer

Galli, Anatoly (1853-1915) 57 Moscow Conservatory piano professor
 Gerke, August (1841-1902) 64 senator, lawyer, the RMO main directorate's member
 Giraldoni, Leone (1824-1897) 43 Moscow Conservatory vocal professor
 Glazunov, Alexander (1865-1936) 108 St. Petersburg Conservatory director in 1905-1928
 Glehn, Alfred von (1858-1927) 43 Moscow Conservatory cello professor
 Gnesina, Elena (1874-1967) 82 founder of Gnesin's Sisters Music School
 Gnesina, Eugenia (1870-1940) 82 founder of Gnesin's Sisters Music School
 Gnesina, Maria (1876-1918) 82 founder of Gnesin's Sisters Music School
 Goedicke, Fedor (1840-1916) 57 Moscow Conservatory organ professor
 Goldenweiser, Alexander (1875-1961) 38 Moscow Conservatory student
 Hamerik, Asger (1843-1923) 114 Peabody Institute director
 Haritonenko, Pavel (1852-1914) 58 owner of a sugar refinery, philanthropist
 Hauptmann, Moritz (1792-1868) 17 Leipzig Conservatory piano professor
 Heifetz, Antonina (1868-?) 76 Moscow Conservatory student
 Heinemeyer, Christian (1796-1872) 17 flute teacher in Hannover
 Horilyj, Oleksander (1863-1937) 64 Ukrainian composer
 Hřimalý, Jan (1844-1915) 55 Moscow Conservatory violin professor
 Hubert, Alexandra (1850-1937) 81 Moscow Conservatory inspector
 Hubert, Nikolai (1840-1888) 29 Moscow Conservatory director 1881-1883
 Igumnov, Konstantin (1873-1948) 108 Moscow Conservatory piano professor
 Ippolitov-Ivanov, Mikhail (1859-1935) 34 Moscow Conservatory director in 1905-1922
 Jakovlev, Sergey (1839-1906) 58 owner of typographies, senator, nobleman
 Johannsen, Julius (1826-1904) 114 St. Petersburg Conservatory director in 1891-1897
 Jordan, Sverre (1889-1972) 87 Norwegian composer and conductor
 Kashkin, Nikolai (1829-1914) 13 Moscow Conservatory music history professor
 Kazakov, Nikolay (?-?) 59 merchant, philanthropist
 Kipp, Karl (1865-1925) 56 Moscow Conservatory piano professor
 Kireev, Alexander (1833-1910) 101 aide-de-camp of the Grand Duke Konstantin Nikolaevich
 Klimentova-Muromtzeva, Maria (1857-1946) 61 Russian opera singer
 Konstantin Konstantinovich (1858-1915) 45 Grand Duke, the RMO's patron
 Köppen, Pavel (1846-1911) 91 aide-de-camp of the Grand Duke Konstantin Nikolaevich
 Koreshchenko, Arseni (1870-1921) 62 Moscow Conservatory counterpoint professor
 Korzhenevsky, Pyotr (1872-1968) 62 council, lawyer
 Kullak, Theodor (1818-1882) 13 piano professor at the Neue Akademie der Tonkunst
 Kusevitsky, Sergei (1874-1951) 102 conductor, Music and Drama School graduate
 Kwast, James (1852-1927) 80 Frankfurt Conservatory's piano professor
 Laduchin, Nikolai (1860-1918) 108 Moscow Conservatory music theory professor
 Langer, Eduard (1835-1905) 16 Moscow Conservatory piano professor
 Laub, Ferdinand (1832-1875) 17 Moscow Conservatory violin professor
 Lavrovskaya, Elizavetta (1845-1919) 56 Moscow Conservatory vocal professor
 Lhévinne, Josef (1874-1944) 114 Russian-American pianist, Julliard School professor
 Liszt, Ferenc (1811-1886) 16 Hungarian composer and pianist
 Lopatin, Alexander (1859-1934) 65 lawyer
 Lopukhin, Alexey (1864-1928) 65 lawyer
 Lyadov, Anatoly (1855-1914) 108 St. Petersburg Conservatory music theory professor
 Mahler, Gustav (1860-1911) 76 Austrian composer and conductor
 Mamontov, Savva (1841-1918) 74 industrialist, philanthropist, and patron of music
 Mann, Konstantin (1830-1883) 104 Maritime Ministry's secretary
 Masetti, Umberto (1869-1919) 43 Moscow Conservatory vocal professor
 Maslov, Fedor (1840-1915) 72 lawyer
 Meck, Nadezhda von (1831-1894) 26 industrialist and philanthropist
 Medtner, Nicolas (1879-1951) 115 Russian composer

Meyerhold, Vsevolod (1874-1940) 102 director, Music and Drama School graduate
 Mikhail Pavlovich (1798-1849) 21 the youngest son of Emperor Paul I
 Mildner, Moritz (1812-1865) 17 Prague Conservatory piano professor
 Morozov, Mikhail (1870-1903) 58 manufacturer, philanthropist, writer
 Morozov, Nikita (1864-1925) 55 Moscow Conservatory music theory professor
 Moscheles, Ignaz (1794-1870) 17 Leipzig conservatory piano professor
 Mounet-Sully, Jean (1841-1916) 62 French actor
 Nápravník, Eduard (1839-1916) 113 the RMO St. Petersburg concerts' director
 Nezhdanova, Antonina, (1873-1950) 82 Moscow Conservatory student
 Nikisch, Artúr (1855-1922) 87 Hungarian conductor
 Nikolai, Nikolaevich (1831-1891) 101 Grand Duke, the RMO Head
 Nyberg-Kashkina, Sophia (1871-1966) 78 Nikolai Kashkin's daughter
 Obolensky, Aleksey (1855-1933) 103 Prince
 Osberg, Adolf (1824-1869) 17 Moscow Conservatory violin professor
 Ostrovskaya, Anna (1868-1942) 66 Moscow Conservatory student
 Pachulsky, Henryk (1857-1921) 57 Moscow Conservatory piano professor
 Paul I (1754-1801) 21 Russian Emperor in 1796-1801
 Pobedonostsev, Konstantin (1827-1907) 98 adviser of Alexander III, reactionist
 Pomerantsev, Yuri (1878-1933) 61 Moscow Conservatory student
 Presman, Matvey (1870-1941) 38 Moscow Conservatory student
 Press, Mikhail (1871-1938) 111 Music and Drama School's violin professor
 Prokofiev, Sergei (1891-1953) 28 Russian composer
 Rachmaninoff, Sergei (1873-1943) 28 Russian composer, Moscow Conservatory student
 Remezov, Sergei (1854-?) 57 Moscow Conservatory piano professor
 Rietz, Julius (1812-1877) 17 Leipzig conservatory composition professor
 Rubinstein, Anton (1829-1894) 13 St. Petersburg Conservatory's founder and first director
 Rubinstein, Nikolai (1835-1881) 8 Moscow Conservatory director 1866-1881
 Sabaneev, Leonid (1881-1968) 52 Russian critic
 Safonov, Vasily (1852-1918) 4 Moscow Conservatory director 1889-1905
 Schlözer, Paul de (1841-1898) 76 Moscow Conservatory piano professor
 Scriabin, Alexander (1871-1915) 61 Moscow Conservatory piano professor
 Scriabina, Vera (1875-1920) 43 Moscow Conservatory piano professor
 Sergei Alexandrovich (1857-1905) 45 Grand Duke, Moscow general governor
 Serov, Alexander (1820-1871) 18 Russian composer
 Servine, Marthe (1862-1960) 115 French-American composer and pianist
 Shepelevsky, Avraamiy (1874-1960) 66 Moscow Conservatory student
 Shishkin, Nikolai (1857-1918) 55 Moscow Conservatory piano professor
 Shor, David (1867-1942) 66 Moscow Conservatory student
 Shostakovsky, Pyotr (1851-1917) 101 Music and Drama School's founder and director
 Siloti, Alexander (1863-1945) 38 Russian pianist, conductor
 Smolensky, Stepan (1848-1909) 53 Moscow Conservatory music history professor
 Sobinov, Leonid (1872-1934) 102 opera singer, Music and Drama School graduate
 Sokolovsky, Nikolai (1865-1921) 55 Moscow Conservatory viola professor
 Solodovnikov, Gavriila (1826-1901) 46 merchant and philanthropist
 Sposobin, Igor (1900-1954) 95 Soviet music theorist
 Stasov, Vladimir (1824-1906) 18 Russian critic
 Stoyanovsky, Nikolai (1821-1900) 45 Senator
 Taneyev, Sergei (1856-1915) 8 Moscow Conservatory director in 1885-1889
 Tchaikovsky, Modest (1850-1916) 58 dramatist, opera librettist and translator
 Tchaikovsky, Pyotr (1840-1896) 8 Moscow Conservatory music theory professor
 Tolstaya, Sofya (1844-1919) 28 Countess, writer
 Tolstoy, Lev (1828-1910) 66 Count, writer

Ushakov, Mikhail (1828-1904) 56 the RMO's Moscow branch director
Vasilenko, Sergei (1872-1956) 38 Moscow Conservatory student
Villoing, Alexander (1808-1878) 13 Nikolai Rubinstein's piano teacher in Moscow
Vyshnegradsky, Ivan (1832-1895) 45 Minister of Finance
Wieniawski, Józef (1837-1912) 16 Moscow Conservatory piano professor
Witte, Sergei (1849-1915) 45 Minister of Finance
Yurgenson, Pyotr (1836-1903) 58 music publisher
Zarembo, Nikolai (1821-1879) 82 St. Petersburg Conservatory director in 1867-1871
Zarudnaya, Varvara (1857-1939) 77 Moscow Conservatory vocal professor
Zimmermann, Pierre (1785-1853) 16 Paris Conservatory piano professor
Zverev, Nikolai (1833-1893) 27 Moscow Conservatory piano professor