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ABSTRACT

Valery Gavrilin: A Theoretical and Historical Analysis of Select Works for Voice and Piano

By: Kathleen A. Miller

The Russian composer Valery Gavrilin, 1939-1999, composed music from the heart and hoped that his compositions would move his listeners in the same way all music, whether urban, folk or classical, moved him. He believed that music should be accessible to the audience and that it should connect and resonate with the listener. It should not stand above them nor force them to struggle to find its meaning. Though he wrote music in a variety of forms and for a variety of instruments, it is in his compositions for the voice, whether choral, operatic or art song, that Valery Gavrilin best achieved his aesthetic ideals. It is through this uniquely human instrument and its ability to bring to life the written word that Gavrilin finds his own expressive voice. Though his compositions are born of a variety of social, political, cultural and musical influences, Gavrilin’s compositions remain uniquely individual, uniquely Gavrilin.

By means of an exploration of the cultural and political history of Russian music from the turn of the nineteenth century through 1999, a review of Valery Gavrilin’s musical heritage, a reflection on his life experience and an analysis of select works for voice and piano, this paper shows that Valery Gavrilin achieved a unique musical style that affords his works for voice and piano an important place not only in Russian vocal literature but also in the international standard vocal repertory.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section I: Political and Cultural Background from 1928-1999</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1 Politics: Stalin</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2 Cultural Climate: Roslavets; Mosolov; Myaskovsky; Prokofiev; Shostakovich</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3 Politics and Culture: 1953 to the fall of Communism</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section II: Valery Gavrilin</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 4 Biography</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 5 An Introduction to Gavrilin’s Compositional Style</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section III: Compositions</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 6 Miscellaneous Romances</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 7 Vremena Goda</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 8 Vecherok</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 9 Tri pesni Ophelii</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 10 Russkaya Tetrads’</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 11 Nemetskaya Tetrads’ volume one</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliography</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

The Russian composer Valery Gavrilin composed music from the heart and hoped that his compositions would move his listeners in the same way all music, whether urban, folk or classical, moved him. He believed that music should be accessible to the audience and that it should connect and resonate with the listener. It should not stand above them nor force them to struggle to find its meaning. Though he wrote music in a variety of forms and for a variety of instruments, it is in his compositions for the voice, whether choral, operatic or art song, that Valery Gavrilin best achieved his aesthetic ideals. It is through this uniquely human instrument and its ability to bring to life the written word that Gavrilin finds his own expressive voice. Though his compositions are born of a variety of social, political, cultural and musical influences, Gavrilin’s compositions remain uniquely individual, uniquely Gavrilin.

It is unfortunate that in an age where mass media and high speed internet have effectively dissolved national borders and made instantaneous communication possible that the compositions of Valery Gavrilin remain relatively inaccessible and consequently relatively unknown in Western Europe and the United States. Gavrilin’s compositions, however, live on in the hearts of the Russian people beyond his death. They are written about in journals, performed in concert halls, are the focal point of music festivals and have entered the standard vocal repertory in Russia. Despite this celebration of his music, a broad analysis of his compositional style has not yet been undertaken.

---

By means of an exploration of the cultural and political history of Russian music from the turn of the nineteenth century through 1999, a review of Valery Gavrilin’s musical heritage, a reflection on his life experience and an analysis of select works for voice and piano, this paper will show that Valery Gavrilin achieved a unique musical style that affords his works for voice and piano an important place not only in Russian vocal literature but also in the international standard vocal repertory.
Valery Gavrilin was born in 1939 at the height of the totalitarian rule of Joseph Stalin and lived his life during a time of great political and cultural upheaval. In order to understand Gavrilin’s compositional style, it is important to understand the political and cultural climate into which he was born and in which he lived. This understanding also provides evidence of the unique way in which Gavrilin utilized a tool that at this time was being wielded by many for many different purposes; that tool was nationalism.

After working his way up the political ladder within the Bolshevik Party and eliminating any political challenges from his path, Joseph Stalin was firmly entrenched as dictator of the Soviet Union by 1928. Severe economic restructuring in the form of ‘Five Year Plans’, agricultural collectivization, famine, war, territorial expansion, mass cultural, political and social oppression and eventual isolationism marked Stalin’s reign.

Though the country had experienced a brief relaxation both culturally and economically after the Bolsheviks took power in 1921 at the end of the civil war, Stalin quickly retightened the reigns. Lenin’s New Economic Policy and the pluralism experienced as a nation were effectively replaced by Stalin’s plans of Collectivization and his first economic Five-Year Plan.

By 1923 Stalin had established a political security force that, though its form and title would change several times over the years, was a constant presence within his regime and
was essential to his political success. After famine caused by the devastating effects of agricultural collectivization essentially wiped out the peasants, Stalin’s eye, and his security force, quickly moved to the ‘cleansing’ the Communist Party, the military and the educated classes. Leningrad, central to the musical and cultural experiments occurring in the early 1920’s became a threat to Stalin’s seat of power: Moscow. Anyone who undermined his rule whether by expressing disparate ideas or by simply gaining too much popularity was subject to investigation and persecution. This cleansing effected not only political institutions but also cultural ones, including the Moscow Conservatory. The years 1937-1938 saw the height of this holocaust and were named “The Great Terror.” By the end of 1938 millions had died and those that survived lived in fear.

With the onset of war both with Finland and with Germany came a period of patriotism and nationalism. Internal persecutions were relaxed and Stalin’s focus became military victory. Heroes from early in Russia’s history as well as heroes from her civil war were celebrated. To the outside world it seemed as if the Soviet Union had set aside its interest in World Revolution and instead was celebrating its own national heritage. Like the relative political thaw of 1921-1928, this thaw was short lived. Nationalism, however, remained an important component of the Soviet political machine and, as a consequence, nationalism became an important aspect of Soviet culture. It influenced the work of nearly every Russian composer of the mid-Twentieth Century, including Valery Gavrilin.
World War II left the Soviet Union devastated, but victorious. Stalin had deported over one million minorities during the final years of the war and had adopted the view of Russian racial supremacy. Any perceived foreign influence was quickly squelched. Soviet citizens, citizens of the ever-expanding occupied territories and even troops who had served valiantly at the front were subject to investigation. Those found guilty of foreign ‘infection’ were often arrested and sent to labor camps. During the post-war years the USSR engaged in forced repatriation of citizens who had emigrated and these citizens, too, were subject to investigation and exile.

This new form of nationalist oppression was overseen by Stalin’s security force, which was led by Andrei Zhdanov until 1948. Though the Great Terror of 1937-1938 led by Yezhov was more deadly, the brutality of the Zhdanov era impacted all aspects of Soviet life, especially Soviet culture. Writers, poets, artists and musicians had to conform to Party ideology or suffer the consequences. The brutality of this era came to be known as Zhdanovshchina.

In the post-war era the Soviet Union effectively isolated herself and her satellites from any outside economic or cultural influence. Her new enemy was capitalism. The ‘iron curtain’ had dropped and Stalin had new plans for another era of oppression - including the persecution of Soviet-Jews. The death of Joseph Stalin in 1953 released the Soviet people from his grip of terror.
Chapter 2
Cultural climate: Roslavets, Mosolov, Myaskovsky, Prokofiev, Shostakovich

The relative ease ushered in by Lenin’s New Economic Policy at the end of the Civil War in 1921 spilled over into other areas of Russian life, including musical culture. The years 1921-1928 were a time of individual expression, musical experimentation and internationalism. This was evidenced by the activities of the ASM – The Association of Contemporary Music, which had chapters in both Moscow and Leningrad. The ASM, founded in 1923, was associated with the ISCM, the International Society for Contemporary Music, and published the journal *Sovremennaya Muzïka (Contemporary Music)*. Though not a stylistically cohesive group, the ASM believed that Revolution was an opportunity for experimentation and they promoted musical modernism.

The ASM was quite active during the 1920’s but they were not unchallenged. The Bolsheviks tolerated the social and economic thaw that was necessary to rebuild the country after the devastating effects of civil war, but they did not release their political grip. The Bolsheviks began to centralize and consolidate their power and maintained oversight in all areas of Russian life. The RAPM – The Association of Proletarian Musicians, also founded in 1923, was built on the idea that modernism is anti-Revolution and that music should be accessible to the masses. It was the RAPM’s anti-experimental and anti-formalist platform that gained government support and took hold in conservatories and elsewhere. The ideological struggle between these two groups foreshadowed the battle that was to come in the 1930’s between Socialist Realism and Western Formalism.
In 1932 the government dissolved all Proletarian organizations in literature and the arts, including the RAPM and focused on perestroika (restructuring) of the arts.\footnote{Boris Schwartz, \textit{Music and Musical Life in Soviet Russia: 1917-1970} (London: Barrie and Jenkins Ltd, 1972), pp 55-56.} It was during this time that Socialist Realism was born. In 1934 The First All Union Congress of Soviet Writers provided a concrete definition of Socialist Realism.

(Socialist Realism) demands of the artist the truthful, historically concrete representation of reality in its revolutionary development. Moreover, the truthfulness and historical concreteness of the artistic representation of reality must be linked with the task of the ideological transformation and education of workers in the spirit of socialism.\footnote{Abram Tertz, \textit{On Socialist Realism} (New York: Pantheon Books, 1960), p. 89.}

It was not long before Socialist Realism was a guiding principal in not only the literary but also the visual and musical arts. Socialist Realism defined the reality of Soviet existence, forced the arts to portray that reality and then called it truth. Artistic truth was now forced to represent political truth. The enemy of Socialist Realism was formalism. Formalist music is music in which the form is separated from content or, as Prokofiev allegedly put it, music that people do not understand at first hearing.

As political nationalism was taking hold, folklorism emerged as a specific trend within Socialist Realism. Composers who were trying to define musical Socialist Realism considered formalism to be a folk-negating and modernist path.\footnote{Schwartz, \textit{Music and Musical Life in Soviet Russia}, 114.} In this light, Socialist Realism can be considered a folk-promoting path. Conservatories during this era began to offer musicology and composition as a unified course of study. Grove’s definition of musicology includes the view that musicology is the study of music within its social and cultural environment; that it is inextricably linked with the people for whom and by
whom it is made.\textsuperscript{5} Musicology in this context is the study of the music of the people. According to Maes, “Folkloristic studies or unimportant political posts were indeed typical outlets for modernist composers.”\textsuperscript{6} Though many musicians pursuing their musical education at a Conservatory were required to study folklore as part of their curriculum, Gavrilin chose to major in both folklore and composition while studying at the Leningrad Conservatory.

Many composers suffered at the hands of the ideological dictates of Socialist Realism and many struggled to work and live within its confines. Out of fear of being labeled a ‘formalist’ composers often sacrificed artistic integrity to gain political acceptance, or to simply survive. Many artists and musicians, such as Mosolov, Roslavets, Myaskovsky, Prokofiev and Shostakovich, were persecuted. They suffered the arrest of loved ones and were, themselves, subject to arrest, imprisonment, exile or even execution as a result of their attempts at musical self-expression.

Composers such as Nikolai Roslavets (1881-1944), who in his earlier compositions explored more modern serialist techniques, took to writing agitprop songs – stirring propaganda songs aimed at promoting party ideology. Eventually, Roslavets retreated from the musical scene altogether. Many, whether by fate or design, began to study and adopt folk idioms as a reaction to the times. The composer Alexander Mosolov (1900-1973) was one such composer. Mosolov was a singer, pianist and composer who studied

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
at the Moscow Conservatory under Glière and Myaskovsky before they were condemned and fired from their posts by the government. Mosolov’s *avante-garde* works from the 1920’s were attacked by the RAPM. In 1929 he was declared an enemy of the people and his works were banned. By 1936 he was expelled from the Composers Union, formed in 1932 to replace the RAPM and ASM. Mosolov was arrested and sentenced to hard labor in 1937, during the year of the Great Terror. Eventually, his sentence was overturned and Mosolov was sent to study folksongs in the Russian territories. Many of his later compositions are based on folk material.

Nikolai Myaskovsky (1881-1950), a co-founder of the ASM, worked primarily in Moscow and was known for his technical mastery as well as for his symphonic works. He studied at the St. Petersburg Conservatory in 1906 prior to the revolution and met Prokofiev there. He would later teach at the Moscow Conservatory where his students included Khachaturian, Shchedrin and Kabalevsky. In the early 1930’s in an effort to fit in with the party aesthetic Myaskovsky abandoned his experimental tendencies, which included heightened emotionalism and chromaticism, and began to work more with folk idioms. This is evidenced in his twenty-third symphony. Despite his attempts to integrate ‘acceptable’ musical styles into his compositions, his music was condemned by the Party and Myaskovsky was imprisoned. During his later years, Myaskovsky continued to revise his style into the clear, accessible style that the Party desired. This revised style can be seen in his last symphony, the twenty-seventh. For his efforts, Myaskovsky was allowed to return to his teaching position at the Moscow Conservatory and he was
awarded the Stalin Prize six times. Myaskovsky was considered rehabilitated by the time of his death in 1950.

Composers like Roslavets, Mosolov and Myaskovsky are not well-known in the West due to the political climate of the time in which they lived and composed. Others, however, had an undeniable and lasting impact on Russian and world music despite their political struggles. These composers include Shostakovich and Prokofiev.

Sergei Prokofiev (1891-1953) spent the years after the revolution abroad, working in both Europe and the United States. After years of struggling against the reputations and successes of both Rachmaninov and Stravinsky and after unsuccessfully attempting to establish himself as a ‘modernist’, Prokofiev decided to test the musical waters at home. He returned to tour Russia in 1927 and 1929. Though he and his compositions were well received in 1927, the 1929 tour was met with opposition by the RAPM. Despite this omen of the struggle to come and with the encouragement of friends such as Myaskovky, Prokofiev decided to move back to Russia. He had been longing for home and he hoped the move back to Russia would re-invigorate his career, especially as an opera composer, while still allowing him the freedom to travel abroad. In 1932 he was granted Soviet citizenship and in 1936 he moved home permanently. Unfortunately, 1936 was the year that Socialist Realism was adopted as the Party’s cultural ideology and the year before the Great Terror. Prokofiev’s hopes of maintaining an international career were soon dashed.
Partly as a result of his unsuccessful attempts at being accepted abroad as a modernist, Prokofiev returned home with the goal of composing in a simpler, clearer and more lyric style. He also began to incorporate folk elements. This new compositional style found favor with critics and politicians alike and can be seen in compositions such as Peter and the Wolf, op 67 and the Russian Overture, op 72 both written in 1936.

Prokofiev also wrote patriotic and political music during this time. The ‘mass song’ was considered the foundation of Soviet music. The mass song was exactly as its name implies. Consistent with the ideology of socialist realism, it was a genre of song that was meant to have mass appeal and that carried a political message. Prokofiev’s Opus 66 (1936) and Opus 79 (1939) both contain mass songs. Films were also considered the perfect vehicle to disseminate Party beliefs and many composers, including Shostakovich and Gavrilin, turned to writing film scores. Prokofiev’s film scores include Alexander Nevsky, 1938, and Ivan the Terrible, 1941. Other political works from this time include the Cantata Zdravitsa, op 85, written for Stalin’s birthday in 1939.

Prokofiev’s goal of reinvigorating his opera career at home was not to be realized and his attempts garnered various results. For example, his musically successful ‘song opera’ Semyon Kotko, op 81, 1939, was unsuccessful politically despite its compliance with Socialist Realist dictates and was taken out of the repertory. A song opera is an opera built around popular or folk tunes, like the Beggar’s Opera of 1728, but which contains a political message similar to the mass song. A song opera from this time is The Quiet Don
by Ivan Dzerzhinsky. Ironically, due to its political message *Semyon Kotko* still struggles as a repertory work, despite its musical strengths.

During the relative cultural ease of the period of WWII Prokofiev found his mature compositional style and Prokofiev’s compositions gained both political and international favor. He was honored by the government and traveled within the Soviet territories. His travel during this time helped to fuel his folk-inspired compositional style as in the *Second String Quartet*, op 92, 1941, and the folksongs of op 104, 1944. His compositions from the war years are generally apolitical.

Prokofiev’s creative freedom and musical success was not to last. In 1948 Andrei Zhdanov was overseeing the “total re-indoctrination of artists and intellectuals” and attacked Myaskovsky, Shostakovich and Prokofiev as being decadent formalists. Their works were banned from the repertory. Prokofiev’s opera *War and Peace* was to undergo great scrutiny from The Party and underwent revisions for nearly ten years.

Prokofiev’s first wife was arrested and sent to a labor camp. In an attempt to realign himself with Party doctrine, Prokofiev returned to the composition of political works. He won a Stalin Prize for his *Cantata On Guard for Peace*, 1949, and a posthumous Lenin Prize for his *Seventh Symphony*. Prokofiev was not to reach the creative height he had experienced during the war years, however.

Mosolov reacted to political oppression and censorship by retreating into the study of folklore, an avenue accepted by the political powers of the time. After attacks on his
earlier compositions Myaskovsky retreated from his personal compositional style in an attempt to conform to the Party’s cultural mold. Prokofiev managed to create works of lasting importance after his return to the Soviet Union despite the restrictions placed on him. Alexander Nevsky, his later chamber works and his Fifth Symphony are but a few examples of the many works that remain in the international repertory. Unfortunately, Zhdanovshchina dealt Prokofiev a fatal creative blow. He died in 1953 on the same day as Joseph Stalin.

Dmitri Shostakovich (1906-1975) was the central musical figure during this time and, as a result, bore the brunt of Soviet censorship and oppression. He was to endure tremendous political pressures during his life and the debate continues today as to his political status as a Soviet composer. His influence on the composers of his time and on classical music cannot be measured.

Shostakovich completed his studies at the Leningrad Conservatory in 1925, just after the end of the civil war, and had completed his first symphony by 1926. His early style is marked by the influences of Stravinsky and Prokofiev. The cultural pluralism of the 1920’s exposed him to composers such as Hindemith, Berg and Milhaud and brought his works to the attention of the international community. The works of Stravinsky, Berg and Hindemith also influenced the young Gavrilin. From the start Shostakovich allied himself with the modernists of the ASM and despite enormous political pressure he would never fully retreat from this aesthetic. Works from this era include symphonies
one through four, the ballets *The Limpid Stream* and *The Golden Age* as well as the operas *The Nose* and *Lady Macbeth of the Mtsensk District*.

By the time Roslavets had withdrawn from the Russian musical scene and Mosolov’s compositions were under attack, Shostakovich had established himself as the leading musical figure of this era. With this notoriety, however, came political scrutiny. As Stalin began purging the Communist Party and the military troops of any political dissent he turned to the intellectual and cultural communities. Shostakovich was to endure multiple condemnations and ‘rehabilitations’ throughout his career.

The first of these attacks came in 1936 with Pravda’s scathing condemnation of his opera *Lady Macbeth*. This attack was aimed at Shostakovich but was meant for all modernist composers of the time and was central to The Party’s cultural war against formalism. The attacks soon spread to other works such as his ballet *The Limpid Stream*, 1935. Although his ballet *The Golden Age* found success due to its anti-capitalist themes, *The Limpid Stream* was condemned because it lacked folk elements. During this period, the Composer’s Union, which Shostakovich had supported in 1932 as a positive step for Russian music, turned on him, as did nearly everyone around him.

Shostakovich ‘rehabilitated’ himself with the composition of the *Fifth Symphony* (1936) and reestablished himself with the Communist Party. During the creative ease of the war years he also enjoyed international exposure, though under the watchful eye of the government. Works from this time include Shostakovich’s *Seventh Symphony*:
*Leningrad Symphony*. Written as a reaction to the siege of Leningrad this symphony was successful due to its uplifting, patriotic theme. The government continued to watch Shostakovich and any misstep was punished, which occurred with his *Eighth Symphony*. Inspired by the *Leningrad Symphony*, Shostakovich wrote the eighth as a more introspective and tragic symphony. In 1944 The Communist Party expressed its disapproval and the Composer’s Union criticized it. *The Ninth Symphony* did not fare any better. By 1948, two years before the arrest of Gavrilin’s mother, *Zhdanovshchina* had caught up with musicians and many major composers of the day, including Shostakovich, were accused of “formalist distortions and anti-democratic tendencies which are alien to the Soviet people and its artistic taste.”

At this time Shostakovich lost his teaching positions in both Moscow and Leningrad. He publicly confessed his political sins and set about to write politically acceptable compositions while putting aside other projects, such as the song cycle *From Jewish Folk Poetry*, 1948. The result was the composition of numerous film scores and propaganda works, such as the oratorio *The Song of the Forests*, which won the Stalin Prize. He eventually served as the cultural mouthpiece for the Communist Party abroad. With the death of Stalin in 1953 the cultural climate eased somewhat and Shostakovich was to experience a renewed creativity that he would enjoy until his death in 1975.

These final decades include the composition of Shostakovich’s later symphonies, many string quartets as well as the re-orchestration of works by Mussorgsky and the revision of *Lady Macbeth*. These post-Stalin years of renewed creativity also allowed Shostakovich

---

to pursue premieres of works that had been tabled due to Party pressure. These include performances of the *Fourth Symphony* in 1961 and of his song cycle *From Jewish Poetry*, with mezzo-soprano Zara Dolukhanova. Dolukhanova also worked closely with Valery Gavrilin and recorded some of Gavrilin’s works.

Despite the fact that after Stalin’s death the Soviet regime acknowledged that some of their previous cultural condemnations had been harsh, formalism was still the declared cultural enemy. During this transition, overt or implied dissent was sometimes tolerated as long as there was no direct condemnation of the Soviet regime. This grey area of politico-cultural policy claimed many victims, including Shostakovich’s *Thirteenth Symphony: Babi Yar*, which faded from sight soon after its premiere in 1962. The political and cultural climate may have eased, but it remained watchful and ready to react.
Chapter 3
Politics and culture: 1953 to the fall of Communism

After Stalin’s death in 1953, Nikita Khruschev rose to power and ruled until 1964. Though there was no immediate political change, there was an immediate cultural response. Just after Stalin’s death, the writer Ilya Ehrenburg and other prominent Soviet writers wrote articles that directly questioned the Communist Party’s cultural oversight and urged artists to be independent⁸, a sentiment with which Shostakovich agreed. As in the early years of Stalinism, the cultural climate of the times could be forecast within the writing community. In response to the general dissent reflected in publications at the time, in 1954 the All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers, which had twenty years prior adopted Socialist Realism, reaffirmed their stance that the party-line should take precedence over individual expression. It was during this time of questioning that Valery Gavrilin was beginning his musical studies in Leningrad.

Khruschev’s denunciation of Stalinist policy and methods in 1954 led to a sense of increased creative freedom in the cultural community but other forms of oppression, such as religious persecution, censorship and arrests of non-conformists, whether religious, political or cultural, continued. During his tenure as leader, Khruschev, despite some liberal rhetoric, extended the death penalty, encouraged vigilantism by means of ‘comrade courts’ and continued religious repression. On the other hand, Khruschev encouraged tourism (of sorts), foreign exchange and technical advancement.

During this time the political landscape was uneven and unpredictable, as was cultural policy. The roller-coaster ride of acceptance and condemnation endured by writers such as Pasternak and Solzhenitsyn continued into Kruschev’s reign and was paralleled in music and the visual arts. For example, in direct contrast to the cultural optimism of the post-Stalinist years, Shostakovich’s *Thirteenth Symphony* met with official criticism in 1962 and in 1963 Khrushchev denounced modern art. When many of Nikita Khruschev’s foreign and domestic plans proved unsuccessful he was forced into retirement in 1964 and Leonid Brezhnev took the helm.

Brezhnev’s rule began with hopes for a continued ‘thaw’ and for economic reform, just as Khruschev’s had begun. However, signs of re-Stalinization and acts of repression soon countered these hopes. Once again, cultural policy and its administration were uneven and unpredictable. Under Brezhnev, the poet Anna Akhmatova, another victim of Stalinist dogma, was honored and the poems of Boris Pasternak were published. However, the writer Siniavsky was arrested, tried and sentenced to hard labor after publishing an article which was critical of the Soviet Union, an act reminiscent of Stalinism. The experiences of the writer Alexander Solzhenitsyn exemplify the unpredictable cultural landscape that existed during the rule of both Khruschev and Brezhnev. Having been imprisoned and then exiled under Stalin, in 1956 Nikita Khruschev allowed Solzhenitsyn to return from exile and in 1962 allowed publication of a previously condemned work. Under Brezhnev, however, Solzhenitsyn was under attack once again. He was expelled from the Writer’s Union in 1969 and forced into exile in the West by 1974.
The freedoms experienced after the terror of the reign of Stalin were welcomed and are evident in the works of the composers of the time, but they did not cause a radical shift in the musical scene. Change, both political and cultural, was slow. Despite a policy of intense persecution of all dissidents, political and cultural dissent continued throughout the rule of both Khruschev and Brezhnev. This dissent took many forms, one of which was a movement to identify with and to promote Russian heritage. These Twentieth-Century Slavophiles looked to the Russian past for their identity, as opposed to other dissidents who valued Westernization. Although the movement to return to the nation’s Russian heritage echoes the nationalism of Socialist Realism, its purpose was to find an identity outside of Socialism, rather than an identity which serves it. Writers called *derevenshchiki* who wrote about Russian village life are excellent examples of this movement. Because of the subject matter with which they dealt, the *derevenshchiki* were able to maintain their artistic integrity without pushing the political and cultural boundaries of the time. Safety, in this case, did not mean artistic compromise. It is this quality that is evident in the compositional style of Valery Gavrilin and it was during these years of cautious hope and unpredictable cultural policy that Valery Gavrilin, a musical *derevenshchiki*, pursued his musical education at the Leningrad Conservatory and wrote his first compositions.

After Brezhnev’s death in 1982, political leadership changed hands twice before Mikhail Gorbachev took power in 1985. Under Gorbachev there was gradual cultural improvement as censorship was relaxed once again. Banned writers began to be published. In 1988 Solzhenitsyn’s birthday was celebrated and a decree that condemned
the work of poet Anna Akhmatova was retracted. A political and cultural revolution was occurring as a new openness (glasnost) and a continued social and political restructuring (perestroika) were taking place. In the late 1980’s the tides of change could not be held at bay. Attempts were made at establishing a market economy. Soviet Imperialism was being dismantled. There were food shortages and labor strikes. The collapse of the Soviet Empire was imminent and despite economic and social crisis, or perhaps because of it, Russian nationalism was flourishing.

Valery Gavrilin lived the final decade of his life during the collapse of the Soviet Empire and the establishment of a Russian Federation. He lived from the height of Stalinist terror through the collapse of Communist rule, yet his compositional style remained constant. It is precisely this consistency of style that proves the importance of understanding the political and cultural climate into which he was born and in which he lived. He was born into a culture of repression and censorship where the masses were more important than individual expression. One path that connected the individual to the ‘Soviet’ was folklorism – the study of the people. Gavrilin’s predecessors and contemporaries struggled to merge the concept of the individual with that of society, of their individual creative voice with that of their government. The results ranged from persecution to artistic compromise. Gavrilin embraced folk culture. Throughout his life, nationalism was wielded as a tool of both political conformity and of political revolution. Gavrilin inherited nationalism as a tool of artistic expression and it achieved a uniquely expressive musical voice in his capable hands.
Section II: Valery Gavrilin

Chapter 4
Biography

For me everything in life is – music. The movement of people’s souls, desires, memories, hands, bodies, deeds – bad or good - everything is music.

Valery Gavrilin.  

Valery Aleksandrovich Gavrilin was born on August seventeenth, 1939 in the Vologda countryside of Northern Russia. His mother, Klavdya, worked as an educator in and director of the local children’s home and his father, Aleksandr, held an official post before he served in the Russian army. His father died in 1942 on the Leningrad Front.  

When their mother was arrested in 1950, Valery and his sister, Galina, went to live at the children’s home. During this time, Valery attended a special children’s music school. In these early years Gavrilin composed waltzes, polkas and miscellaneous songs including two romances on the verses of Heinrich Heine. In his article “The Russian in Russian Songbook” Zemtsovsky speaks about Gavrilin’s childhood.

He was lucky. Around him were people of abundant and generous souls. He loved their mentality, their speech, their art. Valery often remembers…how lyrically they told wonderful tales, how they sang melodious songs. And these memories live in him…as irreplaceable emotional treasures to which he often returns.  

In 1953, the year of Stalin’s death, a professor from the Leningrad Conservatory came to the region and recommended that Valery study music in Leningrad, which he did at a special music school affiliated with the Conservatory. Gavrilin soon graduated with honors and moved on to his studies at the Conservatory in 1958. During the years 1953-1958, the early years of Khrushchev’s rule, Gavrilin composed his first string quartet, piano preludes and sonatas as well as the vocal cycle O Lyubvi on poems by Shefner. He began his compositional life on the foundation of Stalinist oppression and developed it in the relative, though unpredictable ease of Khrushchev’s era. As is evidenced by his early
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10 N.E. Gavrilin, Eto Udivitel’nyi Gavrilin, (Saint Petersburg: Zhurnal Neva, 2002), p289. This date differs from those found in other sources.  
songs on poems by Heine and Shefner, Gavrilin had a love of poetry from an early age. He wrote his own poetry and was familiar with major writers, both past and present, both Russian and non-Russian. His interest in and commitment to the expression of text would become an important aspect of his compositional style.

Gavrilin was married in June of 1959 and went on the first of many folk expeditions later that year. The study of folk music was to become Gavrilin’s major course of study along with composition. On these expeditions Gavrilin recorded the indigenous music, dances, instruments and speech of various regions in the Soviet Union. In this way Gavrilin gained specific tools to express the spirit of the Russian people who had touched him so deeply in his youth.

In 1962 Gavrilin wrote the first of three volumes of songs entitled Nemetskaya Tetrad’ on the poems of Heinrich Heine. Along with the song cycle Russkaya Tetrad’, the three volumes of Nemetskaya Tetrad’ stand out as some of Gavrilin’s greatest contributions to the repertoire for voice and piano. He graduated from the Leningrad Conservatory in 1964, receiving degrees in musicology and composition, and began his graduate study. In 1965, the year after Brezhnev took power, Valery became a member of The Composer’s Union of the Soviet Union, the same union welcomed by Shostakovich in 1932 but which shortly thereafter betrayed him. For Gavrilin, this membership meant economic and professional security. In that same year he composed Russkaya Tetrad’, for which he won the Glinka prize in 1967. In addition to Russkaya Tetrad’ and the first volume of Nemetskaya Tetrad’, notable compositions from the years 1959-1968 include his second and third string quartet, an orchestral suite and overture, works for violin and piano, miscellaneous songs and Skomorokhi, an oratorio for baritone soloist, chorus and orchestra on his own texts.

In 1968, Gavrilin met the poet Shulgina, by whom he was greatly influenced. Many of Gavrilin’s vocal works, including Vecherok, Voyenny Pisma and Zemlya, use poems by Shulgina. Also in 1968 Gavrilin received recognition for his participation in an international festival for young composers in Hungary and he participated in the first
regional folklore conference held in Vologda. Gavrilin would remain active in his home region throughout his life and his presence remains there in the form of music festivals and concerts even after his death.

In January of 1968 Gavrilin was interviewed by the journal Sovetskaya Muzyka. In this interview Gavrilin stressed how important it was to reach the audience through music and to respect that audience. He does not condemn modern music, only music whose intent is not pure, whose intent is only to be modern. For Gavrilin, everything is about the text and the expression of the piece. When speaking about the composer, Gavrilin states:

   Everything depends on the “heart’s ears” here – are they big or small, can they hear many far away people and things.\(^\text{12}\)

Gavrilin composed much incidental music for the theater and film throughout his life, as did other composers such as Shostakovich. His compositions for theater and film greatly influenced his entire body of work. His song cycles often became profound character studies, as in Russkaya Tetradi and Vecherok, and he developed a new form called an ‘action’. An ‘action’ combined characteristics of the psychological character study that he achieved in his song cycles with those of the number opera. Devoid of formal arias and a libretto, the ‘action’ relied on the emotional power of the musical numbers, executed alternately by soloists, chorus and instrumental ensemble, to create a cohesive story or message. His great achievements in this genre were Voyennye Pis’ma (1974) and Perezvony (1982). Gavrilin composed a handful of operas between the years 1968 and 1990 and, in the same 1968 interview, expresses his desire to see the dramatic theater’s value of emotional expression employed in opera productions:

The theatre with only good singers is easily achieved and belongs to the past. I’m absolutely sure that it’s true. I would like the opera composers to learn some theatrical forms from modern play-writes.\textsuperscript{13}

Finally, when asked what recent music impresses him the most, he names the composer Boris Tishchenko. Gavrilin praises his harmonic approach to composition and calls him “a master of an inspired melody, which is a rare jewel by itself”. Harmonic experimentation and melodic lyricism are two qualities valued by Gavrilin in his own compositions.

Valery worked for a time as a teacher at the Music School in Leningrad as well as an editor at the publishing house \textit{Sovetskii Kompozitor}. In 1969 he won a prize from the journal \textit{Kruzgor} for his songs ‘Lyubov’ ostanetsya’ and ‘Sshei mnei beloe’. In the same year \textit{Russkaya Tetrad’} was performed in Paris.

The 1970’s were very prolific years for Gavrilin and they were years of loss. In 1972 he lost his godmother, who had helped to raise him and his mother passed away in 1978. The instability of the politico-cultural climate of this decade, however, did not affect Gavrilin’s career and his ability to shine within the political strictures of this time earned him much professional success. He entered an All-Union Contest in 1977 and won first prize for the song ‘Dva Brata’ and he won the rank of Distinguished Artist in 1979. During the 1970’s he composed a number of songs on miscellaneous poets, including Anna Akhmatova, composed music for theater and film, participated in many national music festivals and had many of his works premiered both nationally and internationally.

\textbf{Works from this era include the following:}

\textsuperscript{13} Gavrilin, “Slovo Molodezh,” 9.
1971  *Pripevki*, for chorus on folk texts; *Two Songs of Ophelia on Shakespeare*
1972  *Nemetskaya Tetrada*, volume 2
1973  Began *Vecherok* on texts by Heine, Gavrilin and Shulgina
1974  *Voyennye Pis’ma*, vocal-symphonic poem on Shulgina
1975  *Shinel*, opera on Gogol; completion of *Vecherok, I and II*
1976  *Nemetskaya Tetrada*, volume 3
1977  *Zaklinanie*, cantata on Shulgina; *Zdravitsa*, cantata on texts by Maksimova
1978  First performance of *Nemetskaya Tetrada*, volume two

In 1977 Gavrilin wrote his first article on the music of Georgy Sviridov, a pupil and supporter, one of the few, of Shostakovich. Gavrilin was a great supporter of Sviridov and became an authority on his works. Sviridov, in turn, was an admirer of the compositions of Gavrilin.

His *Russkaya Tetrada* – a cycle of songs on folk texts – is highly original. Devoid of the slightest element of stylization, from the spirit of the musical construction to their independent and original intonations, they are folk.\(^{14}\)

By the 1980’s Gavrilin had established himself as a respected composer and musician. He was awarded the Prize of Lenin for *Voenne Pis’ma*, *Zemlya* and *Dva Brata* by the Communist Youth League in 1981 and won the golden prize at the Tenth All-Union Festival for his music for the film-ballet *Anyuta* in 1983. In 1985 he was given the rank of ‘Folkartist of the RSFSR’ and he was awarded the State Prize of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for *Perezvony*.

Gavrilin continued composing songs and music for film and theater. In addition he wrote the music for several ballets, including *Anyuta*, which was televised. By the 1980’s and 1990’s there were concerts of his music being performed throughout the Soviet Union and his music was being published. In 1993 he finished *Three Songs of Ophelia* on
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Shakespeare texts translated into Russian by Boris Pasternak. In 1995 and 1997 he won awards for his contributions to musical culture. After two heart-attacks, Gavrilin died in 1999. The Bolshoi theater held a performance of *Anyuta* which was dedicated to his memory. The festivals and memorial concerts in his honor continued into the new millennium.\(^{15}\)

Though Valery Gavrilin was successful in part due to the support of the Soviet government, as exemplified by his acceptance into the Composer’s Union and by his many accolades, Gavrilin was not political and he was well-respected by the artists of his time for his work and for his spirit.\(^{16}\) Politics did not move Valery Gavrilin to compose music. The people with whom he grew up moved him. The music to which he was exposed as he studied at the Conservatory and his national cultural heritage inspired him.

Valery Gavrilin composed music because he loved music. His compositions were strongly influenced by folk-culture and by text because he loved people and he loved words. According to Belonenko:

> Gavrilin possesses a talent for noticing poetry in everyday life and for seeing unusual traits in ordinary and unremarkable people.\(^{17}\)

The political atmosphere into which he was born and in which he lived was important not because he was active within it or because it defined him. It was important because it provided the foundation on which Gavrilin developed his own unique musical voice. There is no better evidence of this, however, than his music.

---

\(^{15}\) N.E. Gavrilin, *Etot Udivitel’nyi Gavrilin*, 296


Chapter 5
Valery Gavrilin’s Compositional Style

Gavrilin’s compositional style was driven as much by philosophy as it was by music theory. He believed that music should be inclusive and shunned theory and methodology that existed without consideration for the listener. He defined musical innovation as music’s ability to bridge that gap which often exists between ‘classical’ music and the listener and viewed music that did not attempt to bridge this gap, whether in composition or in performance, as stagnant reproductions. Gavrilin was a true Soviet in his concern for and consideration of the mass audience. He viewed his art as dynamic and, through it, wanted to repay all those people who worked so hard everyday for the benefit of all: the “actors, engineers, street sweepers and (sic) grave-diggers.”

In the same article that expressed his desire to repay the workers, Gavrilin defined his philosophy and explained how music can more effectively reach and subsequently move its audience. He believed that this was first achieved through the ‘action’ of the written word. A composition that retains at its core the ‘action’ or intent of the text can elicit subconscious, emotional associations from the amateur listener and thus include them more fully in the musical experience. The country folk-song and the urban street-song inspired Gavrilin by their social relativity and by the directness of their musical expression, qualities that Gavrilin felt serious classical musicians often lacked and qualities that he attempted to harness in his own compositions.

---

Another way Gavrilin believed the gap between so-called serious music and the listener could be bridged was through the integration of the arts. When the visual, theatrical, literary and musical arts are combined in performance the audience is stimulated on a number of levels and they become, as Gavrilin put it, “infected with the music bug and with art in general.”¹⁹ The belief that music should reflect the ‘action’ of the written word and that specific art forms should not exist in isolation but should be celebrated together led to Gavrilin’s development of the *action* as a musical genre.

Musical training, at both the public school and conservatory level, was also a major hindrance to the average listener’s appreciation of classical music, according to Gavrilin. In addition to his concern that young children, especially those from the country, did not have access to a good musical education, he also believed that conservatories helped create the gap between classical music and its audience by not being responsive to and a part of the present-day world.

People who study their fifth year rondo forms by Mozart graduate the conservatory with a poor understanding of the peculiarities of our musical life and the social connotation of their work. The only thing that they know is that music is beautiful and the public is uninspiring. ²⁰

Gavrilin felt that musical training had to coexist with experiencing life and opening yourself up to the people who surround you. It is this co-existence that is central to the development of Gavrilin’s compositional voice and his musical language. He was educated at the Leningrad Conservatory but ventured into the Russian countryside to experience the music of the people there. He valued the people and culture of his youth.

---

¹⁹ Gavrilin, “Put’ Muzyki k Slushatelyu,” 5.
²⁰ Ibid.
but recognized the importance of the present moment as expressed in the words and music of the contemporary street musician. In this way Gavrilin’s musical language attempts to serve the expression of the text and consequently to touch the heart and soul of the listener by reaching beyond the gaps that sometimes exist between serious music and its audience.

The importance he places on his audience and their connection to the music as well as his interest in being socially relevant is reminiscent of *Gebrauchmusik* and the *Zeitoper* in Germany during the 1920’s and 1930’s and parallels socialist dogma. In Russia, music for the masses was written under the dictates of Socialist Realism. The composer/critic Boris Asafiev (1884-1949) defined musical socialist realism as being comprised of two parts: *intonazia* (musical content) and musical imagery (musical intent related to structure). In order to meet the guidelines of Socialist Realism, the musical content must relate to life and must communicate that relationship to the listener. That content is then formulated into musical images, or scenes. Malcolm Brown discusses Asafiev’s theory and defines the three types of socialist realist musical imagery in his article “The Soviet Russian concepts of ‘Intonazia’ and ‘Musical Imagery’”\(^{21}\), each of which can be found to varying degrees in Gavrilin’s compositions.

The first type of imagery is that which is immediately perceived, which can include mimicry. This device is most often used in Gavrilin’s folk-influenced pieces and manifests itself in the literature for voice and piano when the piano part mimics the

sounds of a balalaika or the ringing of a bell or when the voice wails in grief or cries out in frustration. The second type of imagery is more directly programmatic and often involves the integration of artistic genres such as theater, literature and the visual arts and is exemplified by Gavrilin’s actions. The last is musical imagery that is taken from life, or folk music, and is the musical image that most inspired Gavrilin’s vocal style.

Gavrilin studied, experienced and was inspired by genres of Russian folk music. These genres permeate his compositions, particularly Russkaya Tetrad’. Gavrilin’s integration of specific Russian folk-music genres exemplifies the first and third types of imagery defined by Brown: that which is immediately perceived and that which reflects life. These genres include the chastushka, stradaniya, plyaski, prichitaniya and prichyota.

A chastushka is a genre of folk music for voice and accordion or balalaika. The text usually consists of two to six lines with four lines being the most common. These lines are rhymed and alternate between having eight and seven syllables. The melody of a chastushka is often extremely varied and often uses expressive recitative. Ostinato accompaniments that move independently of the vocal line often appear. A variety of the chastushka is the stradaniya. A stradaniya contains a text that is expanded from the usual two to six lines of the chastushka. The syllabic pattern of these additional lines is eight and eight.

Russian dance types are used frequently by Gavrilin. These include the plyaski which are based on short, repetitive rhythmic figures containing a stress at the end of a phrase. The
plot or subject matter can vary. Meaningless, nonsense syllables are often used. In contrast to other forms that can be rhythmically complex, the dance types are metrically very steady and often contain stereotypical rhythmic patterns.

The lament is one of the most expressive genres in Russian folk music and permeates Russian folk culture. It was an important part of village life and it was expected that the village women would learn the art of the lament. The *prichitaniya*, a type of lament, is found in ritual wedding and funeral music and is sung on occasions of long separations or loss. Characteristics of the *prichitaniya* include the recurrence of descending seconds, thirds and fourths and the juxtaposition of major and minor thirds. The treatment of text in a *prichitaniya* relates to its treatment in a *chastushka*. It may contain lines of eight or nine syllables as well as extended recitative. The distinctive characteristic of the *prichitaniya* is the frequent occurrence of descending glissandi with abrupt changes in register. *Apocope*, the cutting off of a word in a phrase, occurs within the *prichitaniya* as an illustration of weeping. A wedding lament known in some regions as the *prichyota* can contain a great deal of internal rhythmic complexity. This can include frequent metric changes, specifically between 3/8 and 5/8.

In addition to being influenced philosophically and musically by the Russian folk-culture he studied throughout his life, theoretically, the roots of Gavrilin’s compositional style can be found in the composers of the German lied and in the previous generations of Russian composers.
Gavrilin was exposed to composers of the German lied during his training at the Leningrad Conservatory, founded as the St. Petersburg Conservatory in 1862 by Anton Rubinstein, a Russian composer schooled in the Germanic style. Indeed, international composers such as Berg traveled to Russia to perform their works in the early 1920’s before the iron curtain fell, thus influencing Gavrilin’s predecessors. The German Lied composers such as Brahms, Mahler, Berg and Hindemith had a profound effect on Gavrilin’s approach to music composition. The three-volume work *Nemetskaya Tetrad’ (German Notebook)* on the texts of Heinrich Heine is the most obvious result of the influence of the German Lied, not just because of its poetic inspiration but also because of its harmonic language and formal structure.

Gavrilin not only inherited the German-Romantic composer’s love for literature, specifically the poet, but his harmonic and formal approach to composition. His use of stacked harmonies and ambiguous tonal centers are reminiscent of Berg. Though Gavrilin never adopts serialism as a compositional device, he equalizes the tonal playing field by stretching the rules of harmonic progression and modulation to encompass any tone or harmony necessary for the expression of the text or the emotion of a piece. The traditional rules of harmonic progression and modulation in tonal music do not always apply to the works of Gavrilin.

Though Gavrilin embraces chromaticism and tonal ambiguity, some of his pieces still retain a more traditional formal structure, particularly the songs in *Nemetskaya Tetrad’*. In this respect one can see the influence of Brahms, or of Berg, who often maintained a
classic tonal and formal plan in their compositions. In the same way that Brahms’
approach to formal structure was not always rigid, Gavrilin’s employment of classical
formal structures is not rigid. It is sporadic and, like his harmonic language, functions
only to serve the expression of the piece. Traditional tonality most often acts as the
skeletal structure of a composition while all the inner workings, the true life-blood of the
piece, are non-traditional and often daring.

Some of this ‘daring’ can be compared to Hindemith’s new approach to the application
harmonic tension and release, which was based on acoustical tonal relationships. In
Gavrilin’s music open perfect octaves, fourths and fifths, the least tension filled intervals
according to Hindemith, are fairly common while seconds and sevenths, intervals of great
tension in Hindemith’s hierarchy, most often appear at an emotional apex.

Gavrilin also found models for his folk-compositions in the Nineteenth Century
composers of German Lied. Though Brahms composed arrangements of folk tunes that
greatly influenced his overall compositional style, the folk-inspired lied of Gustav Mahler
is closer to Gavrilin’s aesthetic. Mahler’s Des Knaben Wunderhorn lieder were
contemporary manifestations of folk culture; like Gavrilin’s folk compositions, they were
not arrangements of folk songs nor did they quote folk songs.

Russian composers of the Nineteenth Century also greatly influenced Gavrilin. From
Glinka, the first authentic native voice in Russian music, to the kuchka realism of
Mussorgsky and his contemporaries to the nationalism and primitivism of Stravinsky, Gavrilin’s music had many fathers.

Like the operas of Glinka, the so-called father of Russian music, Gavrilin’s songs utilize modal scales and chromaticism and were influenced by the Russian folk song. The speech intonation used in Dargomizhsky’s vocal works led to the importance of speech intonation in Mussorgsky’s songs which later can be seen in the vocal declamations employed by Gavrilin. One thread of Gavrilin’s interest in folk music can be traced back to the composers of the ‘moguchaya kuchka’. Borodin, Balakirev and Rimsky-Korsakov all used traditional Russian songs, but Borodin was closest to Gavrilin in that he captured the spirit of Russian folk music without copying it. Mussorgsky often employed non-functional harmonic progressions and Rimsky-Korsakov sometimes favored parallel chord progressions, both characteristic of Gavrilin’s later style. Laboring outside the umbrella of the ‘mighty handful’, though around the same time, was Skryabin, who replaced the traditional tonal hierarchy with the rule of the complex chord. Gavrilin, however, did not center his pieces around one ‘mystic chord’ but did favor complex chord structures that eschewed the traditional tonal center, as was mentioned above in reference to composers such as Berg.

The harmonic daring of Russian composers such as Skryabin and Stravinsky, who bridged the Nineteenth and Twentieth centuries, can be heard in the works of Gavrilin. It was not only Stravinsky’s early nationalist style that impacted later generations of Russian composers but also his harmonic experimentation. It was his early
experimentation that impacted Gavrilin the most, the best examples of which are the nationalism of *The Firebird* and the bitonal inferences in *Petrushka*, both of which can be found in the songs of Gavrilin. Worthy of note is the fact that from 1978-1981 Gavrilin wrote a work for soloists, chorus and orchestra called *Svadebka*, a work that was clearly influenced in content and style by Stravinsky’s *Svad’ba*, written in 1923 for soloists, chorus, four pianos and percussion ensemble.

Gavrilin’s music can be traced back to the works of the German Romantic lied composers and to his Russian musical predecessors but it is the influence of folk culture that permeates his compositional style and which most effectively merges the philosophical with the theoretical in his music.

In the decades after the Communist Revolution, vocal music was considered the most important musical form for the communication of revolutionary ideals. Opera, being a complex form, declined in importance. Traditional operas were revised to carry Soviet themes, and definitive operas such as Shostakovich’s *Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk* were banned. The revolutionary mass song rose in popularity. These were vocal pieces of little depth that were written to glorify political leaders, to motivate workers and soldiers and to celebrate political victories.

In contrast to the mass song, Gavrilin’s music is extraordinary in that it manages to expose the depth and reality of the Russian soul in an innovative way despite outward political pressures. His truth is an internal truth. He was a nationalist not for the sake of nationalism. He was a folklorist not just as a means of staying within the confines of
Socialist Realism. Belonenko calls Gavrilin’s style ‘original modern realism’ which ‘stands for life’s highest truth.’ He goes on to say:

The authenticity, the reality of the Gavrilin hero opens us up to their expressive, natural, musical language that precisely conveys the way of their soul, character and mood.²²

There is no better example of this style than the vocal cycle *Russkaya Tetrad’. In this song cycle for voice and piano Gavrilin successfully brings to the listener the loves, joys, sorrows, indeed, the soul of the hero of *Russkaya Tetrad’ – a Russian Woman. In his article “Russian features of the Russian Song Book”, Zemtsovsky defines Gavrilin’s aesthetic ideal.

A folk song excites him as one of the brightest manifestations of the national way of thinking. Therefore, he aspires to recreate a song which could shake a person, awaken what is Human in him, take him away from everyday life, educate him and, at the same time keep it’s form simple, clear and fascinating.²³

In *Russkaya Tetrad’ Gavrilin applies the knowledge gained during his musicological studies and his folk music expeditions. He does not quote Russian folk songs directly but instead uses folk genres such as the *chastushka*, *stradaniya* and *prichitaniya* as compositional tools to build and express the world of the Russian woman who is the focus of this cycle.

Gavrilin’s compositional style is a melding of traditions, whether Russian folk or Western classical, into something new and fresh that impacts the listener. In his works

---

²³ Zemtsovsky, “Russkoe v Russkoii Tetradi.”, 32.
for voice and piano this is achieved through his sensitivity to the poetic text and through his affinity for the human voice.
Vladimir Shefner lived from 1915 to 2002 and began writing poetry in 1936. He is also known for his science fiction writing. Gavrilin’s *Two Romances on verses by Shefner*, written during his student years, are excellent early examples of his compositional style. These pieces are microcosms of Gavrilin’s harmonic language. Though framed diatonically, the first piece by D major and the second by Bb minor, both pieces exist in a world of tonal ambiguity that is a hallmark of Gavrilin’s style. This is exemplified by the bi-modal implications found in measures two and six of ‘Tishina’. It is interesting to note that Gavrilin uses these ascending septuplets in both Shefner pieces.
Neither of these romances progress in a traditional manner. Instead Gavrilin relies on harmonic color and tonal ‘moments’ to create mood structure.

‘Ne Revnui’ begins in Bb minor but through a series of arpeggiated chords quickly progresses through CbM7 (BM7 or V/E), EM (III/c# or V/A), c#m, AM and c#m before arriving on FM7 which is V7 of Bb minor. The internal third and fifth chord relations are traditional but the overall tonal progression used by Gavrilin is not.
F Major in measure six gives way to G minor in measure eight which then progresses by means of a chromatic bass-line to an arrival on G Major in measure 12.

The phrases are unequal and the meter unsteady in both romances. Phrase structures, harmonic colors and musical textures that establish the mood of the piece are important expressive techniques used by Gavrilin throughout his piano-vocal works and are already
in use in these early romances. The following example includes a six measure phrase that alternates between 3/4, 4/4 and 6/4. Combined, this is equivalent to a six-measure phrase in 4/4. This internal imbalance is typical of Russian folk songs, particularly wedding songs, or svadebnye.²⁴

**Figure 6-4: Tishina, mm 12-17**

![Tishina, mm 12-17](image)

**O, Pamyat Serdtsa**

*From the play *Moi Genii* (Batyushkov)*

This song from the play *My Genius* is musically simple, which is indicative of its function as incidental music. It is strophic in form with some variation in the verses. The key is D Major. This is indicated both harmonically and by the key signature, which is not always the case in Gavrilin’s music. An incident of harmonic foreshadowing, a device used frequently by Gavrilin, occurs in measure 14. In this case an F#M7 chord foreshadows the more functional use of the chord in measure 77. In measure 14 the

---

chord could function as a V7 of vi but does not progress in this manner. It is only in
measure 77 that the chord functions in this way during a brief tonicization of the b minor
vi chord. The form of the piece is as follows.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{A} & \quad \text{refrain} & \quad \text{A'} & \quad \text{ref} & \quad \text{A''} & \quad \text{ref'} & \quad \text{B} & \quad \text{A} \\
\text{Verse1} & \quad \text{vs2} & \quad \text{vs3} & \quad \text{vs1}
\end{align*}
\]

**Figure 6-5**: Measures 76-79, F#M7 as V7/vi progressing to vi in mm77-78.

The poet Fyodor Tyutchev lived from 1803-1873 and was considered the last of the
Romantics in Russian poetry, his predecessors being Pushkin and Lermontov. His poetry
is marked by emotional contrasts, though this poem is fairly straightforward in its
sentiment.

The romance ‘I knew these eyes’ on a poem by Tyutchev is a strophic song with a strong
tonal center: C major. The harmonic progression is traditional with the occasional use of
a secondary dominant. The *romansy* by Gavrilin are typically simpler songs, along the
lines of the simple, strophic songs with guitar accompaniment that Gavrilin might have
heard on the streets of Leningrad and that he valued as musical testaments to the people
and times in which he lived. One can imagine the plucking of the guitar in the
arpeggiated chords in the piano accompaniment. What is interesting about this piece is Gavrilin’s use of contrapuntal textures as the verses progress. It is a hint of the counterpoint that Gavrilin uses in a few of his larger scale works.

Figure 6-6: measures 13-18, simple contrapuntal interplay between voice and piano.
Vremena Goda is a set of four songs, one of which is in two parts, that reflects on the four seasons of the year. The first two songs and the first part of the third song are composed on folk texts. The second part of the third song and the fourth song are on texts of Aleksandr Tvardovsky and Sergei Esenin, respectively. Aleksandr Tvardovsky lived from 1910-1971 and found literary success even during the Stalinist era. He won two Stalin Prizes and a Lenin Prize for his poetry and was influential in getting the works of Solzhenitsyn published in the 1960’s. Sergei Esenin was born in 1895. Troubled by alcoholism and mental illness throughout his life, he died at the young age of thirty in 1925. He considered himself to be a lyric poet and won the respect of his literary contemporaries, though he did not find favor within the Soviet system.

“Zima” (Winter), “Vesna” (Spring) and “Leto” (Summer) center around the keys of E major and C major. The fact that the final song, “Osen’” (Autumn), is in d minor is unexpected and does not relate to the previous key scheme. Perhaps this is a reflection of the poem in that the text does not really describe Autumn at all. It exists separate from the other pieces and simply anticipates the arrival of winter.

### Zima
Winter (traditional)

This song begins with an unaccompanied invocation of winter in e minor. As the piece concludes E major is established. The melodic range is narrow and often outlines the
interval of a fourth, which is typical of many Russian folk songs.\textsuperscript{25} The piano ostinato, alternating first between B and C and then between A and B, is reminiscent of ‘Zima’ in \textit{Russkaya Tetrad’}, though this piece is not a bride’s lament at the loss of family and friends. It is simply snow-cast winter.

\textbf{Figure 7-1: M3-4 narrow melodic range outlining melodic fourth}

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.9\textwidth]{figure7-1.png}
\end{center}

\textbf{Vesna}

\textbf{Spring (traditional)}

As in ‘Zima’, the melodic line of this song is very narrow and frequently outlines a fourth.

\textbf{Figure 7-2: measures 3-4}

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=0.9\textwidth]{figure7-2.png}
\end{center}

Unlike “Zima” this song has more rhythmic vitality due to its shifting meters and contrasting duple and triple rhythms. It has the feel of a quick dance. One can almost hear the fiddles playing in the open fifths of the piano part as the dancer welcomes spring.

The key shifts from E major to C major by means of the common tone E. This method is unusual for Gavrilin, who usually prefers to foreshadow a tonal shift before implementing it or, as he often does in his songs that are not folk-inspired, to use chromaticism combined with extended diminished seven chords to blur tonal boundaries. In this case, the key changes simply and abruptly by means of a common tone. It is not unusual, however, for Gavrilin to use slightly more traditional and more direct harmonic language in his folk-inspired pieces.

Leto-1
Summer (traditional)

Leto-2 (Tvardovsky)

“Leto-2” acts as a serene postlude to the playful summer activity of “Leto-1”. Set to an almost ever-present pedal point of C, the vocal line chants the images of a summer evening: fields; dew; home. The only divergence from the constancy of the C is an occasional reference to a V chord and the sonorous coloring of the vocal chant by means of chord clusters. Though the song is built upon the V-I relationship with a tonic pedal point, the chord clusters act more as tone color than harmonic structure. It is a moment on a summer evening captured in a brief, almost chant-like vocal piece.
As stated above, “Autumn” is in the unexpected key of d minor. It is more about accepting that winter will return soon than it is a celebration of autumn. The melodic line spans an octave but usually remains within the interval of a third – echoing the chant-like quality of the previous piece. Gavrilin is noted for his use of interesting textures and this piece exemplifies this quality. Gavrilin utilizes the full range of the keyboard in the piano accompaniment and uses compound staves to accommodate the expansive and open texture of the piano part, which is built primarily on fifths and seconds.

Also worthy of note is the brief canonic interplay between the voice and the piano in mm10-14. It is the texture, not the tonal scheme nor the phrase structure that creates the tripartite form of this piece.

A (mm1-9)  B (mm10-14)  A’(mm15-20)
Open 5ths; accentuating 2nds  canon; increased melodic range  5ths, 2nds, Octaves, 3rds
Chapter 8

Vecherok

Evening

Vecherok is a song cycle written for soprano, mezzo-soprano and piano. It was later revised at the request of mezzo-soprano, Zara Doluxanova, who wanted to perform it as a solo. The texts are from a variety of sources and include texts by Shulgina, Heine, the composer, as well as a German folk song. Valery Gavrilin met the writer A. Shulgina in 1968 and maintained a creative relationship with her throughout his life. He set many of her works. Vecherok is an excellent example of Gavrilin’s merging of folk and classical styles. Though the spirit of the Russian folk song remains, for example in the emphasis on quartal structures and relationships, the sometimes narrow range of the vocal melody and the expressive use of the voice in a way that is reminiscent of the stradal’naya, the songs of Vecherok are more adventurous tonally and rely more heavily on classical formal schemes.

Al’bomchik

Little photo album (Shulgina)

The opening piece of this cycle is constructed in simple, four-measure phrases. The key signature implies G Major or e minor, but the piano prelude does not begin in the expected major or minor tonality. Instead, the opening has polytonal implications. The augmented fourth is emphasized both in the quartal structure in the piano left hand and in the relationship between the alternating minor sixths and major thirds in the right hand. The musical texture expands as does the tonal palate throughout the prelude. Gavrilin maintains the outer structure, the quartal structure and the alternating thirds and sixths, and adds new, internal tonal colors, which outline Bb and Ab seventh chords. Still, these are non-functional in the traditional sense. These sonorities betray the influence of
Scriabin in their emphasis on the augmented fourth and of Berg in the relative equality with which he distributes the pitches.

![Figure 8-1: measures 7-9](image)

Gavrilin expands the texture of the prelude to include the full range of the keyboard, but narrows and heightens the range and texture as the piece progresses.

Once the voice enters in measure thirteen, the tonality of e minor is clearly established. The piece is about an evening at home reminiscing over an old photo album. It is pleasant and light-hearted. Perhaps the prelude is a hint of the range of experiences and emotions to come later in the cycle.

**Odnazhdi**  
**Once upon a time (Gavrilin)**

‘Odnazhdi’ is Gavrilin’s tribute to Schubert’s ‘Gretchen am Spinnrade’ written more than a century earlier, though Gavrilin did not label it so. The textures used in this piece are typically Gavrilin. An open fifth as a pedal point for the first nineteen measures (A section) above which the voice and the piano right hand interplay, sometimes canonically, in the singing of Margaret’s song. Margaret is a young woman at a spinning wheel who is singing and thinking about love. Will she find someone? Will he come? Tонаlly, modal ambiguity and modal shifts create a progression of harmonies that leads from f# minor to Ab Major. Section A remains in f#minor but Gavrilin inserts a
diminished fifth (g#-d), which could be a iiº, or a viiº of A – but functions as neither.

Instead the g# diminished fifth serves to create a tonal color which anticipates the arrival of AM in the B section. A Major is clearly established by a pedal point on A that is present for the first ten measures of section B and by the V-I relationship of E-A outlined in the arpeggiation of the piano, left hand. A major, however, is juxtaposed with f# minor in the vocal lines and in the piano, right hand. Are we in A major or f# minor? The answer is that we are in both. Gavrilin typically combines or juxtaposes tonalities and modalities not simply for tonal color, but as a means of allowing the tonality to progress and evolve expressively. Gavrilin is more interested in giving compositional time to expression and, as a result, to tonal and textural color than to the unfolding of traditional western harmonic relationships.

Though the progression from f# to A is clearly established, however non-traditionally, the modulation to Ab is abrupt in measure 40 as section B1 and 2 are repeated. The standard modulation from minor to relative major is typical of Gavrilin in that he does utilize tonal relationships to create a formal structure. It is his internal use of harmonies that is often non-traditional in their progression and function.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>1-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>20-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>40-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1'</td>
<td>50-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2'</td>
<td>60-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lunym svetom**

**Moonlight (Heine)**

Gavrilin frequently uses rhythmic syncopations, asymmetrical meters and shifting meters in his compositions but he does not often employ polymeter. It occurs twice, however, in *Vecherok*. In the third piece of the cycle, Gavrilin uses 6/8 +2/8 to create an undulating
movement that supports the arching melodic line. The song begins and ends in Eb and though at times there is the modal ambiguity that is typical of Gavrilin, as in the introduction of Bb minor, v/I in measure 9, the tonal language is fairly straightforward. Keys related by a fifth are often found in Gavrilin’s music, though they are usually employed non-traditionally, as occurs here. The structure of the piece is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>strophe 1(A)</th>
<th>strophe 2 (A’)</th>
<th>bridge</th>
<th>coda</th>
<th>postlude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mm1-4</td>
<td>mm5-13</td>
<td>mm14-23</td>
<td>mm24-25</td>
<td>mm26-33</td>
<td>mm34-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eb – Bb</td>
<td>Eb-Bb</td>
<td>Eb-Ab</td>
<td>Ab</td>
<td>c minor</td>
<td>Eb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I – V</td>
<td>I-V</td>
<td>I-IV</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>relative minor</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The presence of Ab major, IV/Eb, is important. The fourth is a prominent interval in Russian folk music, particularly when used cadentially. Here Gavrilin employs it harmonically. The rocking, comforting feel of the piece reflects the serenity of the scene, painted so carefully by Heine: the stirring Linden trees, twilight, the song of the nightingale. A brief, three measure piano postlude returns to the key of Eb major.

**Chviki nevelichka, pela ptichka**
*The sweet little bird sang (Gavrilin)*

Like ‘Moonlight’, the fourth song is polymetric. Gavrilin sets the voice in 5/8 against the 4/4 of the piano part until measure 18 of the vocal part when both are grouped in 5/8.
meter. Another common compositional element used by Gavrilin is the pedal tone. In this piece the A section is composed on a b pedal point. The brief B section is composed over alternating A-D octaves and the coda contains a D pedal point. The structure is as follows. It is interesting to note Gavrilin’s use of secondary dominants in combination with the pedal points as well as inverse phrase structure (I – II – II – I) in section A.

A    B   A'   Coda
mm1-18 (voice)   19-26   27-42   43-57
I    II    II    I
f#    c#    D-A-e-D
b

Figure 8-3: Section A, measures 1-4, polymeter

Dolce amoro soj  = 120

Also worthy of note is Gavrilin’s use of counterpoint to vary the return of section A.

Figure 8-4: Section A’, measures 27-29, counterpoint

Ax moi milii avgustin
Oh, my dear Augustine
(Ach, du lieber Augustine) – German folk song
This Russian variation on a German folk song is set appropriately in the form of theme and variations. The theme used is the Dies Irae. Gavrilin uses this in only one other piece discussed in this document and that is in ‘Ax on umer’ from the Three Songs of
**Ophelia.** The theme itself is four measures in length and outlines the chromatic scale as it gradually descends from A to C. In doing so it emphasizes the relationship between D and A and ends on an A Major chord. It first appears a capella and then twice more, each with a more elaborate texture and increased chromatic tonal coloring.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Theme’</th>
<th>Theme’’</th>
<th>Bridge</th>
<th>Theme’’’</th>
<th>Coda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mm1-4</td>
<td>mm5-8</td>
<td>mm9-12</td>
<td>mm13-16</td>
<td>mm14-24</td>
<td>mm25-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a capella</td>
<td>with piano</td>
<td>add second voice</td>
<td>theme extended and fragmented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The harmonies created during the repetitions and the bridge (m13-16) descend chromatically, touching on A, a, Ab, G, g, f#, f, e and Eb (not necessarily in that order) before arriving in C Major, the key for the final repetition of the theme. The I-V relationship is clearly established in this section, though at times simultaneously. Measures 17-20 clearly establish C Major as tonic and this is maintained through the conclusion in measure 26.

**Figure 8-5:** measures 19-20; establishment of GM and CM as V and I; use of Sprechstimme device

The formal structure, the use of chromaticism as a tonal foundation for the majority of the piece, the presence of stacked harmonies as well as the use of rhythmic, vocal declamation reminiscent of *sprechstimme* betray Gavrilin’s German Romantic influences.
**Ni da, ni net**  
*Neither yes, nor no* (Gavrilin)

The form of this piece is A B A, which is employed often by Gavrilin, and is in the key of c# minor. As was stated earlier, *Vecherok* was composed later in Gavrilin’s life and represents a convergence of folk and classical compositional styles. The sixth song of *Vecherok* is a good example of this convergence in that, even though it does not retain the structure of a prichitanya, it does emulate the style in the wide leaps and implied glissandi found in the piano accompaniment. In this way there is a parallel between the style of ‘Ni da, ni net’ and the second song of *Russkaya Tetrad*, discussed below.

Figure 8-6: mm 31-33; large leaps

![Figure 8-6](image)

Figure 8-7: m75 glissandi effect

![Figure 8-7](image)

Gavrilin not only defines the form of this piece tonally but also texturally. The B section is homophonic, emphasizes the duet and is more melodic. This is in contrast with the A section in which a single voice speaks rhythmically for the majority of the section and the accompaniment acts as motivic punctuation of the text.
This piece is a beautiful duet in two sections. The first half is in D Major and modulates by way of f minor to Db Major in the second half. There are canonic implications in the relationship between the voice and the piano. The undulating, canonic arpeggiated chords in both the voice and the piano as well as the shifting meters between 6/8 and 7/8 in the first half and between 6/8 and 5/8 in the second half create a seamlessness and lyricism that echo the sentiment of the third song of the set.

The low vocal-range set amidst the static, oscillating chords of the piano accompaniment create a texture where the voice and piano are one. The slow harmonic rhythm and the steady eighth-note rhythm are hypnotic in their effect. C Major is firmly entrenched with only occasional color shifts to E Major and Eb that anticipate the harmonic and dramatic shift that occur in the postlude. It is the postlude that carries the dramatic weight of this piece. Filled with stacked harmonies, chord clusters and chromatic dissonances the route from C Major to a minor would be difficult to navigate if it weren’t for Gavrilin’s use of enharmonic tones and fifth relations. For example, the d# minor chord in the right
hand in measure 47 is related to the final chord of measure 46 in the left hand, g# minor, by a fifth. The same d# minor is spelled enharmonically in the left hand of the next chord in measure 47. Additionally, there is a leading tone relationship from eb (d#) to e minor. The e minor chord is maintained for three of the four beats in measure 47 and, as a result, sets up the V-I motion to A.

Figure 8-9: mm 46-47

Right hand: G d#m e e
Left hand: g# e eb d E - A

Ax, da-da, do svidan’ya
Oh, yes, good-bye (Gavrilin)

Framed in d minor, this mournful duet bids farewell to a loved one. The ever-present octaves frame a steady bass progression that is only interrupted by the shifting meters. The harmonic language is traditional, relying heavily on secondary dominants. Gavrilin uses elements of the lament such as vocal glissandi and text declamation to heighten the feeling of grief at this parting and mournful motives are passed between the two voices and the piano, as in measures 14-16.
As the emotions intensify, the chord structures compress from octaves and triads to dissonant seconds. This farewell bids farewell not only to the loved one, but to evening itself. This song is immediately followed by the final piece of the cycle, which is a repetition of the first.
This vocalise acts almost as a film score would; Ophelia’s humming accompanies the images of her madness. The piece is static, interrupted only by tonal shifts that create musical moments within the scene. Gavrilin indicates no key signature but the piece is framed by the key of Ab Major. The structure of the piece is as follows. A ‘/’ indicates a V-I relationship.

The sudden modal shifts and brief tonicizations to seemingly distant tonal centers reflect Ophelia’s instability. Modulations, if one can call them true modulations, occur primarily by means of enharmonic tones. In measures 27-28 the enharmonic tones Ab/G# are used as Gavrilin moves into the B section by means of a c# minor chord leading to E Major. Gb and F# are used in measures 47-48 to lead away from Cb/Gb to f#/C# by means of a b minor chord. In measure 65, Bbb and Ab set up the arrival of G# (the third of EM) and A. The return of Eb as a V7 of Ab occurs abruptly, with C# and Db as the enharmonic common tones.

Gavrilin’s use of chromaticism in this piece serves several purposes. One is to bridge, by means of enharmonic tones, the shifting tonal colors outlined by the piano arpeggiation,
which is constant until the piano postlude. It also helps to create a surreal, unstable atmosphere that reflects Ophelia’s madness. Functional tonal lines are blurred just as the lines of reality and madness are blurred. Lastly, the chromaticism allows Gavrilin to create, and thus the listener to experience, dramatic musical ‘moments’. An example of this occurs in measures 41-44 when, in the midst of a wandering development section, Ab reappears, briefly tonicized (first as Ab major and then as ab minor), creating a climactic moment. It is in this way that the vocalise accompanies the drama of the stage, much in the way one of his film scores or incidental music for the theater might have done.

![Figure 9-1: mm 41-44; AbM climax](image)

**Pod utro v Valentinov den’**  
**Tomorrow is Saint Valentine’s Day**

The second song of this set is a song that is sung by the character of Ophelia as part of the stage action. With its simple chord structure and guitar-like piano accompaniment, the song emulates a popular ballad or folk tune. It begins in b minor and modulates to c minor by means of a modal shift to B Major and the resulting enharmonic common tones D#/Eb. C minor becomes C major (V of F) as the voice concludes its song; but the piano still has something to say. As the music travels to its final F Major sonority, the descending chromatic dissonance and the sforzando on the augmented fourth in measure
36, which occurs underneath a faint motivic reference to Ophelia’s song from the beginning of the piece, foreshadow the tragedy to come.

Figure 9-2: mm 34-40;

Ax, on umer
Ah,he is dead

Gavrilin sets the first section of this song of death to the *Dies Irae* theme. The first section is in two parts and utilizes antecedent-consequent phrase structures. Part two of section one is a slight variation of the first part and serves to prepare the new key at measure 37. It does so as early as measure 22 with the introduction of the quartal-quintal structure built on Fx. This Fx appears again in m25, 32 and 35. In each case it functions as an enharmonic tone in GM, thus anticipating the arrival at GM in measure 37.

The second section begins on a G Major chord but quickly shifts to g minor, v/c minor. In typical Gavrilin fashion, there is bimodality as G Major evolves to gm/cm until C Major appears in measure 47. Instead of harmonic progression, Gavrilin seems to rely on modal progression for, rather than c minor moving to its relative major, Eb, C minor moves to C major before the arrival of Eb Major in m53. This section is another vocalise, under which the *Dies Irae* continues, hidden in the oscillations of the piano left hand. In these final measures of Ophelia’s mad scene Eb Major and eb minor tease one
another, as do C Major and c minor. Again, this instability reflects Ophelia’s instability. As she sings her final ‘Ah’ on motives from the second song of the set, the key settles back to c minor. After C Major makes one last desperate attempt to win out over c minor, the five measures of postlude accompany the death of Ophelia. Three chords outline the Dies Irae one last time as Ophelia says goodnight: “Spokoinoi nochi, Gospoda…” She laughs. The final sounds of the piano illustrate Ophelia’s fall into the river.

Figure 9-3: measures 63-71
Chapter 10
Russkaya Tetrads
Russian Notebook

The song cycle Russkaya Tetrads tells the tale of a Russian peasant woman’s experiences of life and love. In addition to Nemetskaya Tetrads, Russkaya Tetrads is one of Gavrilin’s most important compositions for voice and piano. Although this cycle is inspired by folk music one cannot help but make the connection between Russkaya Tetrads and Schumann’s Frauenliebe und Leben since both are such strong musical portraits of young women. Gavrilin’s background in writing music for theater and film is evident in the strong character that he creates in this cycle. Since the character of the peasant woman is so intertwined with the music which brings her to life, any analysis of this piece must include the dramatic narrative.

Russkaya Tetrads begins with a short, lyric song, ‘Nad rekoj stait kalina’ (By the river stands a raspberry bush), in which the heroine, a Russian peasant woman, is awaiting the arrival of her first love. Perhaps he is late. Perhaps she does not remember where they were supposed to meet. The melody is simple and repetitive, accompanied at the beginning by a progression of root-position major chords. The simplicity of the music reflects the simplicity of the young woman as she begins, and we with her, her emotional journey.

Using elements of the chastushka and prichitaniya, Gavrilin establishes the world in which our heroine lives and hints at the distress to come. An accordion accompanies her as she surveys her surroundings. It is not until she cannot decide where to wait for her
lover that any minor tonalities are presented. The brief interludes based on ascending fourths break away from this simplicity by means of the expanding range. At the second verse the major triads persist, but things are no longer simple. Through his use of chromaticism, Gavrilin creates the variable thirds that are so characteristic of the prichitaniya and of Gavrilin’s folk-style. The insertion of these minor chords undermines the major tonality, the innocence of the piece, and foreshadows the experiences to come. Although the heroine has made her decision and is going to wait for her lover by the raspberry bushes, the listener knows that this is not the end of her struggle; it is just the beginning. In this way the coda of ‘Nad rekoj stait kalina’ is not a conclusion but a beginning. By moving from F# major through e minor to D major, the coda establishes D as the foundation for the open fifth that begins ‘Stradalnaya’ (Suffering).

‘Stradal’naya’ is a cry. Gavrilin uses characteristics of both the stradaniya and prichitaniya as a foundation for this song. The accompaniment, echoing the sounds of a balalaika, alternates ceaselessly between perfect fifths and augmented fourths.

Both the first and the second verse contain the traditional syllabic patterns of the chastushka: four lines alternating between eight and seven syllables, and both end in a dramatic wail. This wail is set as descending glissandi which move through a major thirteenth to an ascending fifth. Through the expressive use of extreme registers and wild
leaps Gavrilin’s text rages as the heroine shouts more than sings. The alternating meters at the end of the second wail signal the redirection of this outpouring of emotion. The Russian woman who had been raging at her onlookers now looks inside herself with sorrow.

Musical texture is an important aspect of Gavrilin’s compositional style and as the heroine sings of her deeply wounded heart an E octave pedal resounds at the bottom of the keyboard while a version of the ostinato that was used in counterpoint with the vocal line during the second verse returns nearly two octaves higher than when it first appeared.

Although Gavrilin does not use apocope as a textual device in this piece, he does use it musically as he releases each statement of the melodic ostinato in the accompaniment as if it has been cut off by tears. ‘Stradal’naya’ concludes with an expressive recitative that is a proclamation of independence and a denial of grief. The final cry again leaps down the thirteenth and ends with the longest glissando of the piece, a glissando that expresses most deeply the pain of our heroine.
The suffering continues in the third piece of the cycle, also titled, appropriately, ‘Stradal’naya.’ This piece capitalizes on the expressive recitative and ostinato qualities of the *chastushka*. A Bb major pedal chord permeates the entire piece above which our heroine speaks to her lover.

At each mention of the rising sun, Gavrilin places a chord cluster based on major seconds in the right hand of the piano. At measure 23 a melody reminiscent of a Russian folk tune unfolds independently of the vocal line.

Gavrilin uses this expressive device of the *chastushka* to create a melody that sounds as if it were coming from another time or place. Perhaps it is coming from the memory of her lover and the night they have just spent together.

A recitative begins in measure 44. At first it is unaccompanied but eventually it is punctuated by a compound FM7 pedal chord. This V7 chord is the first break away from
tonic and it marks the first internal dramatic tension for the character in this piece. Her lover is not with her. The ‘rose’ melody which she sings to calm herself will return at the end of the cycle. It is the melody of youth, of first love, of lost love.

![Figure 10-4: rose melody](image)

The postlude maintains Bb major in the bass with the piano right hand summarizing in the last five bars the tonal conflicts found throughout the piece. The variable thirds, so characteristic of the prichitaniya, and the constant hints at g minor leave the listener with a sense of instability and sadness that the Bb major chord cannot completely overcome.

And so winter arrives – ‘Zima’. Based on one of the most expressive genres in Russian folk culture, this lament is an outcry against the brutality of winter, against the bitter cold of loneliness as a new bride prepares to leave her family and friends. Above a percussive, repetitive accompaniment, our heroine cries out against winter. This is a typical type of wedding song found in Russian folk culture where the bride equates
leaving the security of family and friends with the cold, brutality of winter. This style is marked by unstable structural elements that reflect the instability of the bride’s life at this moment in time. ‘Zima’ is the centerpiece of Russkaya Tetrad’.

The metric changes characteristic of a lament as well as the unequal lengths of the vocal melody add to the frenetic quality of the outburst and to the structural instability of the piece. The piece stabilizes somewhat as the meter shifts to 6/8 and the heroine declares, as if in an attempt to defend herself, that she is a bride. Her attempt is futile. As the emotion of the text escalates and the woman attempts to rid herself of her anguish, the accompanimental figuration and register expand first upward and then outward while staying centered around the intervals of a second and a fourth. In the coda to this third section the accompaniment, now spanning more than four octaves in some places, continues the pleading melody that had been in the voice.

Alternations between 3/8 and 5/8, characteristic of the prichyota, lead from the coda into a more tranquil section that is announced by a simple D octave in the bass. Through this Gavrilin creates the expectation of D major, the expectation of arrival at a resting place. The voice enters accompanied again by the sounds of the strumming of a balalaika, but it

---

26 Brown, ed, A Collection of Russian Folk Songs by Nikolai Lvov and Ivan Prach, 57
is not in D major, it is in B major. D major does not arrive until happiness is declared in measure 115. The woman is soon alone again both emotionally and musically, watching the life around her. The vocal part is now unaccompanied, punctuated only by a piano melody based on rising and falling seconds that calls her to join in this life.

This stillness is shattered by the uncontrollable wailing of the descending glissandi which culminate in the final cry of ‘O Winter!’ The texture of the accompaniment built on quartal-quintal structures and chromatic oscillations demands an extension of the musical staff to accommodate Gavrilin’s use of the full range of the keyboard. All musical elements are now working together to create a fevered pitch of emotion.

The voice can go no further. Gavrilin resorts to a high pitched cry as the woman declares: You cannot touch me, I am a married woman!

‘Seyu-Veyu’ (Sow-Winnow) is one of the few carefree songs of the cycle. Gavrilin’s use of plyaska elements adds to its optimistic atmosphere. The arching quality of the
accompaniment, the modulations which create a melodic sequence, the repetitive melodic figures and the ‘ti-ri-ri’ (fa-la-la) lend a lightheartedness to ‘Seyu-Veyu.’

*Figure 10-6: measures 5-6*

But is it truly carefree? Is this only a fantasy? Syncopations and the use of measures in 3/8 create a metric momentum that drives the 2/4 meter and expresses the heroine’s determination to maintain the happy illusion. Her struggle is futile, however, and concludes with a recitative in which she questions life. As in the postlude of the second ‘Stradal’naya’, the last four measures of ‘Seyu-Veyu’ comment on the illusion of happiness by means of tonal and modal ambiguity. Quartal chords that juxtapose perfect and augmented fourths hover over a G pedal while the right hand of the piano echoes the carefree melody that appears in the voice at the beginning of this piece. This melody omits the ‘ti ri ri’, however, and instead ends on the note B, clearly indicating that if this happiness ever truly existed, it surely would not last.

*Figure 10-7: echo of opening melody in final measures*
Syncopations; intervals of seconds, fourths and fifths; the repetition of rhythms, syllables and motives; bits of melody set in counterpoint; the sounds of fiddles; the sounds of heels stomping; the sounds of weeping – this is Delo Bylo’ (It Happened). It is a plyaska. At this point in Russkaya Tetrad’, our heroine relates how she met a man at a party and fell in love. She asks her anguish: Why did this have to happen to me? She dances to rid herself of this grief.

The repetition of syllables represents the sound of weeping. The repetitive, percussive and sometimes syncopated accompaniment is the sound of the dance. The first dance ends in a cry. The variable thirds, which Gavrilin uses throughout Russkaya Tetrad’, undermine an attempt by C major to win out over the chromaticism of the previous section. Glissandi in contrary motion lead into the invitation to her friends to come and view her grief. The tonalities of d minor and e minor, which had been in conflict at the beginning of the invitation, become D major and E major as the woman’s plea becomes more emphatic. The woman, exhausted from the dance, finally screams the invitation at her onlookers as an accusation. Eventually, her cries die out. The accompaniment, which again had encompassed the entire range of the keyboard, contracts to an Ab7 chord that becomes the V7 of Db major.
The pleas stop. Out of the silence the dance begins again. This time it runs out of control and the final cry of the heroine ends the dance. The accompaniment runs forward through a rapidly rising whole tone scale built on Db. An accented quartal chord in the bass brings everything to a stop.

In the next piece, ‘Stradaniya’, Gavrilin returns to the chastushka and prichitaniya for inspiration. The frantic attempts at illusion and denial that made up ‘Seyu-Veyu’ and ‘Delo-Bylo’ amount to nothing. Out of this nothingness an unaccompanied, dramatic recitative begins. ‘Stradaniya’ is the song of a deceived woman. The repeated text, the syncopation and the metric shifts create the weeping of the heroine.

Though the piece begins steadily, interrupted only by her suppressed cries, the tempo quickens and the voice begins to chant on a reciting tone as her declaration of fidelity moves to accusations of infidelity. In the previous pieces, Gavrilin manipulated specific musical elements to create the emotional world, the illusions, the fantasies of this Russian woman. At this point in ‘Stradaniya’ all of these elements are stripped away. She must
face her truth. She speaks, unaccompanied, and asks her lover if the rumors are true.

This dramatic, non-musical effect is evidence of Gavrilin’s consistent work in film and theater.

She cannot face the truth. The opening melodic figures return as she declares that she does not believe the rumors. An optimistic melody, a melody of denial, begins twice but fails each time as it falls down a ninth and lands in a chord cluster composed of two fourths spaced a second apart. Although she tries, the truth cannot be denied.

‘Stradaniya’ ends as it began, in a passionate unaccompanied recitative.

The woman ends her ordeal as she began, alone with her grief. Her final cry is the cry for everything that she has endured until this point. The descending fifth and the glissandi, although heard before, now bring out the true depth of her suffering. Here is the climax of *Russkaya Tetrad’. From here there is nothing left, nowhere to go.
In ‘V Prikrasneshem mesyatse maye’ (In the lovely month of May), the final piece of *Russkaya Tetrad’, Gavrilin references ‘Im wunderschönen Monat Mai’ from Schumann’s  *Dichterliebe*, opus 48, 1840. In Schumann’s setting of text by Heinrich Heine, a poet also admired by Gavrilin, the piece is left unresolved until the beginning of the second piece of the cycle, ‘Aus meinen Tränen spriessen’. It is in this second song of  *Dichterliebe* that the nightingale’s song is heard. Schumann’s tonal ambiguity and lack of resolution depict all the possibilities of love. The Nightingale’s cry transforms love’s sorrows into love’s joys. Gavrilin’s depiction is of a memory of what was. The nightingale’s call remembers what used to be, or what could have been.

This final piece begins with a long piano introduction. The voice enters unaccompanied and without vibrato. She is stripped of emotion. Everything is now a memory, or perhaps just a dream.

The introductory melody returns. The song of the nightingale, so symbolic in Russian culture, can be heard in the rapidly descending five note scales.

*Figure 10-10: nightingale’s call*
Slowly the strumming of the accompaniment begins to signify a recovery, a new beginning. High above the bass the melody is heard, strong and free from the cares of this Russian woman. The voice and piano come together in unison at the words “They remember us” and continue in canon over a C pedal. The thoughts of the past are now connected to the possibilities of the future. The ostinato begins again. Above it major and minor tonalities are in conflict creating a distant, melancholic but somehow serene atmosphere. Separate from all that is going on around it, the vocal part moves between duple and triple rhythmic groupings.

C major ultimately wins out as the accompanimental ostinato continues to the end of the cycle. Despite this the sense of completion is elusive as the voice concludes on a D and the ostinato ends on a minor third. Our heroine has survived. She is strong. Where will she go from here?

Gavrilin’s heroine lives. She lives in the folk idioms that he uses to compose her world. She lives in all women who have shared her experiences. But who is she? She is
nameless. She is a Russian woman. She is all women. Through his use of folk materials, Gavrilin creates a universal character. His reality is not a reality of appearances. He does not simply quote folk tunes and genres. He makes them his own through his use of contemporary idioms such as speech-song, voice without vibrato, unconventional tonal progressions and wild leaps. It is in this way that Gavrilin takes the universality of the folk idioms and gives them individual impact. It is in this way that this Russian woman can stand tall next to the heroine of Schumann’s *Frauenliebe und Leben* and that *Russkaya Tetrad’* can take its rightful place in song literature.
Gavrilin’s vocal compositions are works in which the text and the music serve one another; they are partners in the story-telling, whether the words be those of a Russian peasant, of Shakespeare or of Heinrich Heine. Though he was a composer who wanted to give voice to the common man (or woman) he also was inspired by the high art of the poet. In this way he was akin to composers of German Lied who were also inspired by the poet, in particular the words of Heinrich Heine.

Gavrilin’s cycle *Nemetskaya Tetrady* was written in three volumes between the years 1961 and 1976 and is set entirely to the poetry of Heinrich Heine (1797-1856), a poet whose works inspired many of the great German composers of Lied. In this cycle one can see the influences of these composers but the musical voice remains that of the Russian: Gavrilin.

While *Nemetskaya Tetrady*, volume one, contains many of the compositional elements found in *Russkaya Tetrady*, its structural elements are derived from the classical music tradition as opposed to the Russian folk tradition. *Nemetskaya Tetrady* is also more adventurous tonally, although both ‘notebooks’ utilize the same harmonic gestures that are indicative of Gavrilin’s style.

*Nemetskaya Tetrady* exemplifies Gavrilin’s ability to merge the new with the traditional. He uses triadic structures as a formal base but the harmonic content is often non-diatonic.
and non-traditional. There are unexpected twists and turns both melodically and harmonically that evolve out of the composer’s penchant for poly-modality, chromaticism and cross-relations. Quartal-quintal structures are prevalent as are melodic relationships of fourths and fifths. Phrase structures can be semi-regular but Gavrilin freely uses asymmetrical meters, shifting meters and sometimes polymeters in order to underscore text or to give time for harmonic variation.

Although, unlike Russkaya Tetrad’, there is no main character and no single story to be told, Gavrilin’s compositions transcend their techniques and his colorful tonalities, sparkling pianistic textures and expressive use of the voice effectively convey the mood and emotion of each of the poems of Nemetskaya Tetrad’.

Osen’
Autumn

In ‘Osen’’ Heine’s text expresses the weighty pall of autumn. In the same way that the green of summer is cloaked in grey, the tonal anchor, d#, is cloaked by the chromaticism that permeates this first piece of Nemetskaya Tetrad’. Gavrilin’s music is illustrative of the text both texturally and tonally. The piano introduction acts as a model for the piece itself. Though there is a clear relationship established between d# and g# in the first measure, the tonalities evolve through a series of seventh chords before settling on d#m7 in measure 9.
In the same way, the voice invokes ‘autumn’ on a d# in measure 10 - but the piano does not answer in kind. Instead it leads us away by means of cross-relations between G and G# and the augmented 4th relationship between G and C# in mm 11 to 12. On the word *ischez* (‘disappears’) the D# ‘disappears’ and turns into D natural – leading us further astray. The tremolo on f# in dissonance with the octave e# in the bass introduces the *veter* (wind) which in measures 16-23 comes and blows not only the *listya* (leaves) but also the notes which move chromatically all around the desired d#.

The ostinato right-hand texture and the brief melismatic setting of the text in measures 18-22 clearly illustrate the movement of the wind. Quartal-quintal relationships permeate this section, as well, leaving open the possibilities of both harmonic and ‘seasonal’
movement. In fact, the g♯-d♯ relationship is replaced in this brief section by movement from E to A, which finally cadences in measure 23. The wind dies down in measures 24-25 and eventually our g# and d# settle in. Gavrilin echoes the melody of measures 4-9 in measures 28-33 and the piece ends on the d#m7 chord which ended the piano introduction.

**Gonets**

**Messenger**

A

*Messenger, ride out at top speed through the woods, meadows and fields until you enter into the courtyard of Duncan, king. Ask the people in the stable, which of the king’s two daughters is wearing the wedding crown.*

B-C

*If they say that dark locks are under the bridal veil then fly to me straight as an arrow, but if they say that there are golden locks, do not rush back to me. Buy some rope for me in the rope-shop and travel back on a slow horse.*

A’

In the second piece of the first volume, ‘Gonets’, several compositional techniques come to the fore. One such element that is also important to the remainder of the set is the introduction of the CM chord, which is used as a means of emphatic punctuation. This occurs in several other pieces in *Nemetskaya Tetrad* and can clearly be seen in measures 7, 14, 46 and 58 of “Gonets”.

![Figure 11-3: Measures 44-46; CM in measure 46](image)

Measures 7 and 14 mark the ends of the first two sentences of text, which comprise the two parts of section A. In the A section the ostinato bass line and the arpeggiated right
hand, textures found frequently in Gavrilin’s works, outline DbM for five measures until an abrupt turn to dm/am in measures 7 and 14. On the last beat of these measures a C major chord appears on a syncopated rhythm marked ‘sforzando’, clearly indicating the end of the grammatical and musical phrase. Despite this quick yet emphatic interruption, the Ab returns in the bass followed by Db major, though briefly heard as db minor.

Gavrilin relies on the traditional V-I harmonic structure (A-D and Ab-Db) but uses non-diatonic structures, such as the CM, for emphasis. In addition, these harmonic gestures are related, though, again, non-diatonically. For instance, Gavrilin frequently relates harmonies through cross-relations, as in a-d and Ab-Db, or through modal shifts, as in the db minor followed by the Db major.

Also notable in this piece are Gavrilin’s use of dotted rhythms as well as sixteenth and thirty-second rhythms. The opening line ‘Messenger, ride out at top speed through the woods…’ is illustrated by the use of double-dotted rhythms in the vocal line and swift rhythmic arpeggiations in the piano. In these we can clearly hear the galloping of the horse and feel the urgency of the errand. Though the vocal rhythms slow down in section B, beginning in measure 15 (‘If there are dark locks…’), the sense of urgency never leaves as the piano continues its swift arpeggiations.

The texture changes briefly in measures 26-46 as the composition transitions from the desire for answers into the request for rope (presumably to hang himself). The arpeggiations cease and are replaced by more homophonic textures interrupted by brief motivic punctuations. Augmented fourths, minor sixths and quartal-quintal structures
permeate this section and the tonal center shifts to A with A-E-A (I-V-I) outlining measures 29-46.

In ‘Gonets’, Gavrilin’s use of chromaticism is not only harmonic but also melodic. A chromatic melody emerges from the arpeggiated chords of the piano right hand (G-Ab-A-Bb-Cb-Bb-A-Ab-G) that moves in counterpoint to the syncopated rhythmic melody in the vocal line. This melody can be heard in measures 4, 6, 10 and 11-12 of section A and in measures 48 and 49-50 in A’. Perhaps this melody foreshadows, and subsequently reflects, the dire request to come in measures 33-46: ‘Buy me a rope…’ This suicidal appeal ends in AM but is quickly interrupted by a C Major chord and then followed by the chords Ab-db-Db which return us to the A section.

Razgovor v paderbornskoi stepi
Conversation in Paderbor

A1
Do you hear it? The sounds of basses, flutes and violins rush to me. They dance in the meadows and under the linden trees.

B1
Basses, flutes and violins?! Have you gone crazy with this commotion? This is the grunting of pigs, the echoing squeals of suckling pigs.

A2
Do you hear it? How the hunter blows his copper horn in the dark forest. Listen, how the shepherd calls on his simple bagpipes?

B2
I do not hear the bagpipes nor any hunting horn; I see only a swine-herd that goes on its way.

A/B
Yes, you viciously ridiculed the questions of a dreamer…but you will not destroy that which is concealed in his soul.
As in the second piece, C Major is an important element in the third piece. However, C Major is not simply used emphatically, as in ‘Gonets’, but also structurally. It is the harmonic basis of all variations of sections A (the words of the dreamer) and B (the words of the critic) as well as the piano interludes (which combine elements of A and B and illustrate the sounds described). Although CM is clear in every section, Gavrilin introduces harmonic color that at times could be labeled polytonal. For example, section B1 juxtaposes C Major against a Db-Ab relationship, a relationship that defines the borders of this section but does not sway the internal tonal center (C-G-D7-G-C). In addition, in section A1 G Major functions not only as V of C but also is tonicized by means of cross-relations (F and F#) which imply G Major. This tonal relationship is not presented horizontally, simply as a DM, V/V relationship, but vertically, which creates the polytonal inferences.

C Major outlines the beginning of the vocal melodies of ‘the dreamer’ and clearly represents the ‘dream’. The tonal center of ‘the critic’ is ambiguous, as is exemplified in section B2 measure 53, where the vocal line implies CM as does the right hand of the piano, while the left hand of the piano outlines a varied version of the opening C major pentatonic melody. As a result, C Major is obscured by dissonant minor seconds and augmented fourths – forcing the music to ridicule the dreamer as well as the words.

Sections A and B merge both harmonically and melodically as the piano illustrates not only the clashing of sounds but also the clashing of interpretations; whose perspective is correct – the idealist or the pragmatist?
As stated earlier, texture is important to Gavrilin’s style and this piece is no exception. From the ringing of the flutes’ folk-like melody and the dancing of the modal melody four octaves above the ostinato bass, as in measures 3 and 9, to the parallel octave and quartal-quintal structures of the interludes, as in measures 30-33, texture is the primary expressive element of this piece.

Figure 11-4: measures 3-4

Figure 11-5: measures 30-33

Gavrilin creates harmonic color and interest by means of chromaticism, polymodality and polytonality but heightens emotion and expression by means of texture. In contrast to the use of octaves in the upper range of the piano at the beginning of the piece, measures 68-74 use the very bottom of the piano’s range. In this way Gavrilin takes a melody that has recurred throughout the piece (Section A1, m3; B1, m16; interlude, m 30; B2, m51) and varies it by utilizing the full extent of the keyboard with wide-open textures that eventually deconstruct into the return of C Major.
Mily drug moi
My dear friend

My dear friend you are in love and endure new torments.
In the darkness of your mind
and in the brightness of your heart.
  Ah!

My dear friend, you are in love and hide these feelings
  but you cannot hide your heart
  Ah!

But you cannot hide your heart
  in a vest pocket.
  Ah!

Though ‘Milji drug moi’ contains many of the compositional elements found in the first three pieces of Nemetskaya Tetrads, including recurring ostinati, cross-relations, modal shifts and interesting pianistic textures, several additional elements stand out. These include the use of a chromatic-pentatonic folk-like melody, metric shifts, and the use of counterpoint.

Though the songs of Nemetskaya Tetrads were inspired by German poetry as well as by German lied composers, folk elements still appear. For example, the G(M) ostinati are interrupted in measure 16 by a descending chromatic-pentatonic scale, just like the strumming of a guitar interrupted by the wail of a violin. Perhaps this wail is the emotion concealed by the friend?
Metric shifts occur throughout the piece as a means of expanding or enhancing an expressive moment. For example, in measure 6 the meter shifts from 4/4 to 3/2 in order to allow the piano the time to echo the voice’s expression of ‘novye muchenya’ (‘new torment’). In measures 21-23 the same shift occurs, again in order to allow the piano to echo the sentiment of the voice.

Contrapuntal gestures appear throughout Gavrilin’s works for voice and piano. One striking example occurs in measures 30-33 of ‘Mily drug moi’. Here Gavrilin merges several key compositional elements for the primary purpose of expressing emotion. Beginning on AbM the voice wails on ‘Ah’, followed by the piano in counterpoint. Using quartal-quintal structures, cross relations and third-relations the tonality progresses from Ab to BM by way of am, f# and d#. The textures span the range of the keyboard and the voice and piano are one in their emotion.
As in the lieder of Brahms, formal structure is a key element in many of the pieces of *Nemetskaya Tetrad*. For Gavrilin, structure is directly related to the text. For example, the third piece ‘Razgovor’ is a conversation between two people and its formal structure delineates both speakers. The form of ‘Razgovor’ can be laid out as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A1</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>A+B</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>A+B</th>
<th>A+B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker1</td>
<td>Speaker2</td>
<td>piano interlude</td>
<td>Spkr1</td>
<td>Spkr2</td>
<td>piano interlude</td>
<td>Conclusion(Spkr1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mm1-15</td>
<td>mm16-29</td>
<td>mm30-34</td>
<td>mm35-50</td>
<td>mm51-67</td>
<td>mm68-74</td>
<td>mm75-90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Structure is also directly related to the text in the fifth piece, ‘Dobryak’. Here the form is that of a sonata.

**EXPOSITION**

*They gave counsel and admonition and expressed their delight,*

*They promised to give me every influence if only I could wait.*

*Ta…ta…ta…ta…*

*And everyone expressed delight to me, looked tenderly with deep concern.*

*They promised to love me, to make me happy and to provide their patronage.*

*They asked little, just that I would wait again. Well, after all, this is everything to me – it is happiness.*

*Ah…ta…ta…ta*

**DEVELOPMENT**

*But…I would have died from hunger like a dog before getting their help,*

*If it weren’t for one good person saving me,*

*He took hold of me.*

*Ah…ta…ta…ta*

**RECAPITULATION**

*Oh, what a good person! He kept a watchful eye on me, I will not forget him until the grave.*

*What a glorious chap, he always helped me, he walked with me through fire and water.*

*Only it is very distressing to me that I could not embrace him.*

*Because this good person …ta…ta…ta…is me.*
As in the Lieder of Berg, however, Gavrilin stretches the rules of form and harmony to achieve his musical goals. Gavrilin plays with the harmonic progression in the ways previously discussed but notable in this piece are his use of fifth relations without standard progression. This occurs in the second part of the exposition in mm44-98:

\[ C - a - e - \underline{a} - D^7 - g - D - edim - F \] ---- C

As in earlier pieces in *Nemetskaya Tetrad’*, the relationships between e/a, a/d and d/g are not presented as V/V structures that briefly tonicize V. Instead, Gavrilin foreshadows the new tonality and than transitions by means of the very bass line which had established the relationship. For example, in measures 45-59 octaves in the bass line alternate repeatedly between a and e and then between g and d. In order to make this transition Gavrilin foreshadows g minor through the introduction of a BbM9 structure in measure 47 and measure 51. In both measures the interval of an augmented fourth is created by the oscillating octaves in the bass, thus destabilizing the tonality. In measure 52, a minor is restated but is immediately followed by a movement from d7 on beat three to g minor in measure 53.
The sonata structure itself is also non-traditional in several aspects. One is the way in which the bridges (‘ta…ta…ta’) act as a refrain between increasingly longer verses. Another is that, though the structure progresses from C – G – C, there is not a traditional tonal relationship between the sections of the sonata structure. For example, after the bridge into the development, Eb (V/Ab) is established in measure 107 without any real tonal preparation. Gavrilin destabilizes the tonality through the use of octaves in the bass line that alternate between c-f#, an augmented fourth, and through the descending chromatic scale in measures 103-105, a favorite compositional device of his, but he does not prepare the Eb-Ab tonally. In addition, though there are two sections in the exposition, section two is basically an extended and more harmonically varied version of section one. It is section two that appears in the recapitulation.
In the final piece of Nemetskaya Tetrad’, volume one, Gavrilin’s colorful use of the piano and of harmony create Hans and Greta’s lively dance as well as Peter’s bitterness. It is important to note that in his Lieder year, 1840, Schumann wrote a set of songs entitled Der arme Peter (opus 53, no. 3). The first of these songs was the inspiration for Gavrilin’s ‘Gants i Greta’. Schumann’s interplay of voice and piano in the composition of his lieder was not lost on Gavrilin. One can see the influence of Schumann not only in the choice of text but also in the treatment of the piano as an equal partner to the voice.

The piece begins a capella, but the dance almost immediately ensues. The description of Peter standing alone and pale is also unaccompanied, but again the dance goes on. When the text is accompanied by the piano the texture is primarily homophonic. This juxtaposition of textures creates an initial narrative where the vocal line is intoned and all of the melodic and harmonic interest is in the piano: the dance. The description of Greta in her bridal attire is in C Major while Peter bites his nails in a minor. Open quarten-
quintal structures in measure 25 illustrate how *nishi* (destitute) Peter feels, but the dance goes on despite Peter’s bitterness. Gavrilin represents this dichotomy through polymodality: The dance is in D Major while Peter’s bitterness is d minor. Measures 34-45 provide a postlude to the piece as well as to this set of songs. It is the wild dance of the bride and groom that, despite its tonal adventures, ends in measure 45 revealing the narrator once again in measure 46 in Bb Major – or is it Bb minor? Gavrilin ends with a quartal-quintal structure on Bb that reminds the listener of ‘Poor Peter’, probably still standing alone and biting his nails.

*Figure 11-9: conclusion*
Conclusion

Valery Gavrilin’s compositional style can be defined as easily by what it was not as by what it was. With his music Gavrilin did not challenge the political forces at work during his lifetime nor did he make a specific effort to support or advance them. He was born into a time of great upheaval and, whether through nature or nurture, his personality and musical style fit comfortably into the political and cultural restraints of his time. He did not suffer as Prokofiev or Shostakovich did while trying to balance musical and political acceptance nor did he advance himself by diluting or altering his own personal aesthetic. Gavrilin’s own compositional aesthetic was in harmony with the cultural climate of the time and he excelled at the nationalist style of composition that was embraced by those in power during his lifetime. Gavrilin’s compositions reflect a desire to achieve clear and emotionally honest musical communication that could reach and move listeners on a basic human level.

Though Gavrilin’s musical voice was unique, musical innovation was not Gavrilin’s goal and his vocal works exhibit no real evolution of style as he matured. He was influenced by his Russian predecessors and by the German Romantics but he did not innovate. At heart, he was a folklorist. In contrast, many of his Russian musical contemporaries took advantage of the gradual political thaw that occurred in the latter decades of the Twentieth Century and used that atmosphere as an opportunity to explore and to experiment musically.
Sergei Slonimsky, a contemporary of Gavrilin born in 1932, integrated many different national and historically-retro styles into his own personal compositional style. Like Gavrilin, and many other composers of the time, Slonimsky studied Russian folk culture and this exposure impacted his compositions. Unlike Gavrilin, however, this study did not define his style. Slonimsky’s compositional style was born of a universal palette and was often rhythmically innovative. The synthesis of styles found throughout his ouvre is exemplified by his *Concerto-Bouffe*. Slonimsky’s research on the music of Prokofiev, during a time when Prokofiev’s works were still banned, and on Mahler’s *Das Lied von der Erde* were important contributions to the field of musicology. Sergei Slonimsky wrote in all genres, including opera, voice with orchestra, vocal-chamber and piano-vocal. His works are better-known and more accessible in the West than are Gavrilin’s, perhaps because of the fame of his relative, Nikolai Slonimsky.

Another contemporary of Gavrilin’s who, along with Gavrilin and Slonimsky, was part of the musical scene in St. Petersburg, was Boris Tishchenko. Like Gavrilin, he was born in 1939 and was trained in Russian folklore. Tishchenko, like Slonimsky, expanded upon these folk roots and experimented with avant-garde techniques, including pointillism, serialism, asymmetrical rhythms and meters and microtones. His output was primarily orchestral and chamber but he also wrote piano-vocal and vocal-chamber pieces. His orchestral works betray a philosophical inspiration, one that explored both the growth of the natural world as well as the search for truth in that world. While Gavrilin was a

---

28 Loushin et al. interview by author.
humanist, interested in the expression of the individual and striving to reach his listener on a visceral level, Tishchenko strove to compose cathartic music, music that would inspire change in the world. Gavrilin did not want to change the world through his music. He wanted his music to reflect upon the human condition, to amplify it and ultimately to use it to connect and impact his listeners. The piano-vocal works which best exemplify Gavrilin’s achievement of this goal are Vecherok, Nemetskaya Tetrad’ and, in particular, Russkaya Tetrad’.

Through his expanded tonal palate, his versatile textures and his sensitivity not only to the text but to the human condition, Gavrilin achieved a compositional style that was uniquely his own and that could be appreciated by audiences for both its musical and expressive beauty. His works continue to impact audiences today. He did not influence generations to come, but he did mark his time in the musical world by creating an oeuvre that is worthy not only of recognition in Russia but of international recognition.
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