

THE ROLE OF VASILII VASIL'EVICH ANDREEV
IN CHANGING ATTITUDES TOWARDS RUSSIAN FOLK MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS
IN RUSSIAN CULTURE AND SOCIETY FROM 1886 TO 1918

by

RICHARD ANTHONY LATCHFORD-KNOWLES

A thesis submitted to the University of Birmingham for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Modern Languages
School of Languages, Cultures, Art, History & Music
College of Arts & Law
University of Birmingham
June 2023

**UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM**

University of Birmingham Research Archive

e-theses repository

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

ABSTRACT

This thesis discusses the role of Vasili Vasil'evich Andreev in changing attitudes towards Russian folk musical instruments over four decades from 1886. He aimed through his activities to elevate Russian folk instruments and music to a higher level of understanding and appreciation among his detractors. He also strove to encourage collective participation in playing Russian folk instruments by establishing means of disseminating them and Russian folk music widely throughout Russian society, from the peasant to educated and cultured levels of Russian society.

Chapter One outlines, with some examples, the general picture in Russian art and culture in relation to the Russian *narod* from the rise of the *raznochintsy* through to the period of K.P. Pobedonostsev's tenure as Education Minister. This is followed by an outline of the situation regarding Russian music prior to Andreev's emergence in the mid-1880s. This includes both Russian folk instruments and music, and Russian folk elements in Russian symphonic music.

Chapter Two discusses a range of Andreev's main aims in key areas of his activities, the *balalaika*, balalaika collective, the *domra*, *gusli* and other Russian folk instruments, as well as his aims for the dissemination (*rasprostranenie*) of Russian folk instruments and music.

Chapter Three focuses on Andreev's activities as an organiser. It discusses how he utilised and developed his talents in this area from his early work on improving the Russian *balalaika* through to his successful organisation of the first Russian folk instruments orchestra.

Chapter Four focuses attention on Andreev's work as a publicist in the practical sense of propagating Russian folk instruments and music via public performance in Russia.

Chapter Five discusses Andreev in his role as an educator of the people, otherwise referred to as his *prosvetitel'skaia deiatel'nost'*. It focuses on his use of the written word, in articles, interviews, essays and sketches, to elucidate examples of how this media helped to give expression of his aims and successes for the public's understanding of his work.

Chapter Six discusses the importance of the contributions to Andreev's work by his collaborators. It directs attention towards key players among his *soratniki*, explaining the ranges and nature of their collaborative roles. It also illustrates their various social, occupational, academic and professional backgrounds to demonstrate the inclusive nature of Andreev's activities.

Chapter Seven turns attention towards Andreev's connections, associations and dealings with individuals outside of his immediate orbit. This spans Andreev's work in the army, with workers' collectives, and his early and later Imperial Court connections. This shows that Andreev's work necessarily involved dealing with individuals from established social backgrounds and status in positions of institutional and administrative influence to help to maintain his work and to realise his aims.

Chapter Eight includes discussion of certain questions arising from Andreev's work – whether he belonged ideologically to any one intellectual movement within Russian culture, or whether he was a composite of varying ideological thought regarding the Russianness of Russian folk instrumental music and his work; had Andreev's orchestra inherited aspects of the *narodnost'* exemplified by R. Taruskin in relation to Russian classical composers? It also suggests potential areas of future research, e.g., more focused investigation and assessment of Andreev's relationship with the Russian Imperial Court, his ideas for a *Dom narodnoi muzyki* and the impact of his concert tours of England, including his orchestra's invitation to Windsor Castle.

This thesis is a valid contribution to the understanding of Russian folk music culture, introducing to Western scholars Vasilii Vasil'evich Andreev as a major figure in the history and development of Russian folk culture. It identifies him as the personality, hitherto largely unknown in the UK, who with indomitable energy and patriotism was

responsible for firmly establishing Russian folk instrumental music as a serious genre, the man whose legacy is still visible and active in Russia to the present day.

DEDICATION

To the memory of my mother, Mavis Latchford, who endured personal sacrifice to ensure that I had a chance in life. Thank you, Mum, ‘...plain russet-coated Captain...’.

To the memory of Sasha Polinoff, Russian émigré balalaika player, whose balalaika playing on that Dobrokhotov instrument recorded onto audio cassette changed my life when I first heard it. That electrifying encounter with you in the school music room that day in 1980 made me grab that ignored balalaika by the neck and run with it.

To Ms Tania Lipatova, a native of the Russian town of Bezhetsk, the birthplace of the central figure of this PhD thesis. Thank you, Tania, for your encouragement and for your interest in my research. You kept me going when it seemed the mountainous terrain was insurmountable.

And to Vasilii Vasil'evich Andreev. Thank you, Mr Andreev, dear fellow, for being such a major part of my life and purpose and for inspiring me by the towering example of your determination to fight for it and to see it through.

And also to Almighty God for providing the people I needed to help me along a very difficult, but rewarding journey.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I remember with gratitude the beginning of my journey. I acknowledge Mr Brian Hulme for introducing me to the Russian balalaika and the Russian language at Shawgrove School, West Didsbury, Manchester, in 1980. I also acknowledge Mr Gerald Thomas, a fine Welshman, a Greek and Latin specialist and my English Language teacher, also of Shawgrove School. Thank you for your belief in me and for stimulating my learning. And thank you to both of you, Mr Hulme and Mr Thomas, for pointing the way.

My Acknowledgements are also due to the splendid Yorkshireman Mr Gordon Lumb, my first Russian language tutor, and your dear wife, Mrs Joan Lumb, my history tutor, both of South Bolton Sixth Form College, Lancashire. Thank you, Mr Lumb, for laying foundations in Russian language study. Thank you, Mrs Lumb, for those Wednesday afternoons when you introduced me to examining classical composers and listening to their music in historical context. You planted a seed for this thesis. And thank you to you both for courageously rising above them and fighting for me when the others weren't listening.

I shall always remember with affection those who, unknowingly or otherwise, have outstandingly contributed to the fulfilment of my PhD project.

Special gratitude is due to two individuals involved with the V.V. Andreev Orchestra, formerly the *Velikorusskii orkestr* Andreev established in the late nineteenth century: Mikhail Senchurov, balalaika player with the orchestra and balalaika tutor at the St. Petersburg Conservatoire. Thank you, Misha, for the balalaika duet performance we gave in South Manchester when you were visiting that city in the summer of 1984. Thank you for choosing me, a humble young 'Любитель игры на балалайке' to perform alongside a seasoned professional 'балалаечник' as yourself. And thank you, Misha, for the honour of allowing me to play a balalaika formerly owned and played by V.V. Andreev when I was at the St. Petersburg Conservatoire during my research visit. And Dmitrii Khokhlov, the conductor of the V.V. Andreev Orchestra. Thank you, Dmitrii, for taking the time to meet with me at the end of my research visit in St. Petersburg and, especially, for your most humbling gratitude to me as an Englishman for undertaking a PhD thesis about Andreev's work for English-speaking scholars.

My sincere gratitude is also due to Ms Tania Lipatova of the University of Birmingham Department of Russian. Thank you for coinciding one of your visits to family in Russia with my research visit so that you could personally ensure I visited the museum to Vasilii Vasil'evich Andreev in Bezhetsk. Thank you, too, for helping me to access some of the archive materials I secured from that research visit.

I also sincerely acknowledge with gratitude Dr Arch L. Tait, Dr Christopher Skilbeck, Dr Ahmad Barack, Dr Sara Mechkarini, Dr Archie Dunne, Dr Matthew Edwards,

Annette Johnson, Nicole Palmer, Winsom Hazel, Cheryl Lowe, Janet Ottie, Cathy Moore, Sam and Rebecca Thompson, Mopsey Mellard (for your encouraging words to help me along the way), Dr Alison Dingle, Una O'Hara, Alwin, my siblings, Martin, Alison, Michaela, and Jason. Thank you all for your advice, encouragement, prayers and good wishes at various points on this journey.

It is an honour to pay tribute to my dedicated Study Assistants Alexandra De Prendergast, Natalia Bateeva, Katrina Galsworthy, Masha Kyuseva, Jaime Shuttleworth, Olga Bean and John Coker. Your tenacity and diligence during various stages of the frequently arduous PhD process are woven into the tapestry of this thesis.

The dedication of three supervisors has guided me through the course of this academic project. It is with enormous gratitude, therefore, that I warmly acknowledge and pay tribute to them all: Mr Michael Pushkin, Prof. John M. Klapper and Dr Isobel Palmer. Your faith and perseverance in the face of all the challenges I have had to overcome successfully to complete this PhD thesis is beyond the capacity of words to express here. Suffice it to say that I shall always be grateful to you for your expert advice, your edifying, always constructive criticism, and your encouragement during the many difficult stretches of the terrain on the road to realising the fulfilment of my humble contribution to the knowledge and understanding of Russian music culture. It has been an incredible journey.

CONTENTS

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Issues and approaches

1.2.1 Russian classical music and the folk: from Glinka to the *Moguchaia kuchka*

1.2.2 Andreev and Russian folk instruments: towards a more authentic *narodnost*?

1.3 Literature Review

2 ANDREEV'S AIMS

2.1 Introduction: General survey

2.2.1 Andreev's aims for the balalaika

2.2.2 Andreev's aims for the balalaika collective

2.2.3 Andreev's aims for the domra, gusli and other Russian folk instruments

2.3 Andreev, the narod and dissemination (*rasprostranenie*)

2.4 Conclusion

3 ANDREEV AS ORGANISER

3.1 Introduction

3.2.1 Paskin's *Bezhetskaia balalaika*

3.2.2 The St. Petersburg craftsmen and early improved balalaikas (*usovershenstvovannye balalaiki*)

3.2.3 The expansion of the *balalaika* range – organizational implications

3.3 From *kruzhok* to Russian folk orchestra

3.3.1 Preliminary considerations

3.3.2 Organization into an orchestra: inclusion of domra, gusli and wind instruments

3.4 *Kruzhok* and orchestra: organizing the amateur personnel

3.5 Conclusion

4 ANDREEV AS *PUBLITSIST*

4.1 Introduction

4.2.1 Publicising the *balalaika* – early stages

4.2.2 Publicising the Ivanov *balalaika* in mid-1880s St. Petersburg

4.2.3 Publicising the *balalaika* – Paserbskii's improved concert *balalaika*

4.3 Publicising via the first *balalaika rukovodstvo*

4.4.1 *Semizvodnaia balalaika* – publicising the first *balalaika kruzhok* at home

4.4.2 Publicising the *balalaika kruzhok* abroad – Paris 1889

4.4.3 Publicising the *balalaika* abroad – France 1892

4.5.1 Publicising the *Velikorusskii orkestr*

4.5.2 Publicising aspects of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* abroad 1909 - 1911

4.6 Conclusions

5 ANDREEV AS *PROSVETITEL'*

5.1 Introduction

5.2 Publication of *School for Balalaika Playing* and its impact

5.3 Articles, essays, sketches

5.3.1 Preliminary remarks

5.3.2 ‘*Predislovie k “Shkole dlia balalaiki”*’

5.3.3 ‘*Iubilei balalaiki*’

5.3.4 ‘*K voprosu o russkoi narodnoi muzyke*’

5.3.5 ‘*O velikorusskom orkestre*’

5.3.6 ‘*Velikorusskii orkestr pered sudom inostrantsev*’

5.3.7 ‘*Otvety na voprosy korrespondenta russkikh gazet*’

5.3.8 ‘*Pis’mo v redaktsiiu*’

5.3.9 ‘*Beseda s korrespondentom Moskovskikh vedemostei*’

5.3.10 ‘*Interv’iu gazete “Obozrenie teatrov”*’

5.3.11 ‘*Balalaika i simfoniiia*’

6 ANDREEV AND HIS SORATNIKI

6.1 Introduction

6.2 Collaborations with St. Petersburg craftsmen

6.3 Professional amateurs?

6.3.1 N.P. Fomin: pupil of N.I. Rimsky-Korsakov

6.3.2 A.K. Liadov

6.3.3 M.P. Beliaev and St. Petersburg's cultural society

6.3.4 A.K. Glazunov

6.3.5 N.I. Privalov: Russian folk instrument scholar and ethnographer

6.3.6 S.I. Nalimov: 'Stradivarius' of the Russian balalaika

6.3.7 T.I. Filippov

6.3.8 V.T. Nasonov

6.3.9 F.A. Niman

6.3.10 The members of Andreev's orchestra: professional and social characteristics

7 ANDREEV AND RUSSIAN SOCIETY

7.1 Introduction: Society and Higher Society

7.2.1 Andreev and the Army

7.2.2 Workers' ensembles and collectives

7.2.3 *Dom narodnoi muzyki*

7.3.1 Early Court associations

7.3.2 The *Velikorusskii orkestr* of the Russian Imperial Court

7.4. The battle for subsidies

8 CONCLUSION

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Issues and approaches

This thesis examines and assesses the role of Vasilii Vasil'evich Andreev (b. Bezhetsk, *Tverskaia guberniia*, 4 (16) January 1861, d. Petrograd, 26 December 1918) in changing attitudes towards the Russian *balalaika* within Russian society. It describes the practical, educational, and social means by which he took the *balalaika* and other primitive Russian folk instruments from the Russian village and established for them a valued and respected position within Russian musical culture. These achievements spanned the period from 1886 till his death in 1918, involving and impacting across Russia's social spectrum, from the peasant to the Imperial court.

The thesis necessarily covers a wide area of Andreev's activities to better acquaint Western readers with him and his work. This includes explaining the significant position of Andreev in the history of Russian musical culture, something which is little known outside Russia itself. As well as in Russia, he was also active in Western Europe, including England, and in the United States, the occasions and impact of which have faded into a largely forgotten detail of late nineteenth- to early twentieth-century English and European cultural activity. This thesis, therefore, aims to reveal to researchers in the West who are unfamiliar with Andreev's work, why his achievements and legacy, both in Russia and in Western Europe are fundamental prerequisites to understanding Russian folk musical culture. The main aim of the thesis is to reveal and to demonstrate to Western scholars the cultural figure of

Andreev, the standard-bearer for establishing Russian folk instrumental music and performance and whose legacy survives to the present day. It also aims to establish Andreev in Western scholarship as a cultural figure beyond his work in elevating Russian folk instruments and music to unprecedented heights, including through his patriotic zeal as a propagator of Russian folk musical culture both at home and abroad. Andreev, therefore, occupies a highly significant position in the history of Russian musical culture. His role in establishing Russian folk instrumental performance is widely acknowledged in Russia. This thesis broadens our understanding of the tireless work he undertook to earn that cultural position by expanding existing knowledge of Andreev's contribution to Russian musical culture, that is by bringing together relevant materials in English for this purpose. The thesis serves, additionally, to highlight the ways in which Andreev's activities impacted Western European musical culture and to provide the first substantial English-language account of his work, achievement, and legacy.

Andreev was a merchant's son and of *dvorianstvo* (noble) lineage through his mother, Sofia Mikhailovna Veselago. Born into the same landmark year of serf emancipation, he had been exposed to Russian folk song and Russian folklore throughout childhood in the family home. But he first became acquainted with *balalaika* playing much later. In the summer of 1883 aged twenty-two, he encountered and listened to a peasant worker on his family estate playing the then primitive version of the folk musical instrument. The same peasant worker, Antip Stepanovich, also demonstrated to Andreev the then fundamental techniques of balalaika-playing. This experience immediately set Andreev on the path which led him to devote the rest of his life to developing and promoting Russian folk instruments and music. He initially focused on

improving the *balalaika*, eventually establishing an amateur *kruzhok* of balalaika players by autumn 1887. This represented the culmination of his first achievement, namely demonstrating the musical, sonic and technical possibilities of a folk instrument generally dismissed as having limited musical and cultural value which essentially condemned it as a trivial, villagers' indulgence. By 1896, his *kruzhok* had expanded into an orchestra comprising ranges of other Russian folk instruments to complement the balalaika family. This achievement not only confirmed the legitimacy of Russian folk instrumental music and performance as a serious genre, despite its detractors. It also provided the template and encouragement for other enthusiasts to establish similar orchestras, a legacy which is still a respected feature of Russian music culture today. The study and performance of the balalaika and other Russian folk instruments is afforded the same merit and value as of symphonic instruments at the St. Petersburg Conservatoire and at other similarly renowned centres of music scholarship in Russia.

The focus of the chapters of this thesis is on key areas of Andreev's activities which demonstrate the musical, cultural and social significance of his aims and achievements. There is also the question of the Russian *narod* in relation to Andreev's work. Available sources published within the Soviet era consider this question in terms of peasant and worker. One aim of this thesis is to understand how Andreev's activities helped to construct the image of the *narod* during this period.

The structure of this thesis reflects these issues and approaches. Chapter Two presents an overview of Andreev's aims regarding the balalaika, the balalaika collective, the domra and other Russian folk instruments, as well as of his aims for the

dissemination of those instruments among the Russian *narod*. Therefore, Chapters Three to Seven demonstrate the range of Andreev's sphere of activities and influence as his aims took effect and evolved. Those activities and spheres of influence included his roles as organiser, *publitsist* (publicist), *prosvetitel'* (educator), his work with his key colleagues, and his dealings with prominent figures in positions of influence and authority. Chapters Five to Seven inclusive cover areas of activity and influence not discussed in depth in hitherto available sources. They identify extra colours to the spectrum of Andreev's work to help to understand him as an individual in the context of his contemporaneous circumstances, within which he was trying to fulfil his aims for the balalaika, his Russian folk instrument orchestra, and the Russian people.

In order to understand both Andreev's aims for Russian folk music and instruments, and his conception of the Russian *narod*, he needs to be placed in the context of broader social developments, and particularly debates in musical culture of the time.

1.2.1 Russian classical music and the folk: from Glinka to the *Moguchaia kuchka*

Andreev's activities in propagating Russian folk instruments and Russian folk instrumental music fit into a broader set of efforts during this period to define what constituted "Russianness" and "Russian music".¹ These ideas were frequently defined with reference to folk culture and the notion of *narodnost'*, the definition of which was itself up for debate. In the years leading up to and spanning the period during which

¹ For thorough discussion of these debates and emerging definitions, see Richard Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically. Historical and Hermeneutical Essays* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997); Marina Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism—from Glinka to Stalin* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007); Lynn M. Sergeant, *Harmony and Discord: Music and the Transformation of Russian Cultural Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

Andreev advocated for Russian folk instruments, both “Russianness” and *narodnost'* were repeatedly invoked in discussions about the most appropriate compositional techniques and instruments to be used in symphonic orchestral settings and the direction in which Russian music should develop. These debates helped to construct particular versions of “Russianness” and *narodnost'* against which the ‘authenticity’ of Andreev’s improved folk instruments were measured.

Folk motifs were a common feature of nineteenth-century classical and symphonic music in Russia. From N.A. Lvov (1751-1803) and E.I. Fomin (1761-1800) in the eighteenth century through to Mikhail Glinka, Mily Balakirev, Petr Tchaikovsky and N.A. Rimsky-Korsakov in the nineteenth century, folk song representations, quotations and adaptations featured prominently in the work of the foremost composers of the day. This tendency was driven first by Romantic nationalism, later by official nationalism, and, during the fin-de-siecle, by a revival of interest in native folk traditions.²

Lvov and Fomin, for example, collaborated on the 1787 *singspiel* (a type of German opera that was particularly popular in the eighteenth century) entitled *Iamshchiki na podstave* (The Postal Coachmen at the Relay Station). The work draws on Russian folk song traditions such as the drawn-out song (*protiazhnaia pesnia*) and features peasant characters and elements of folk culture in some scenes. In one scene, for example, a newly-wedded peasant coach driver, Timofei, dances and plays a *balalaika* for his wife, Fadeevna; however, the score stopped short of including a part

² See discussion in Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism*.

for the balalaika, which at the time remained unsuitable for use in symphonic settings, instead indicating that this part should be played by a pit mandolin.³

It was not until Glinka's *Kamarinskaia* (1848) that folk music entered Russian symphonic music in any substantial form. As Richard Taruskin describes, this was the first symphonic work in Russia based entirely on a Russian folk song, the traditional Russian folk dance of the same name. The work not only drew on motifs from folk music but took from folklore 'its structural *modus operandi*'.⁴ In this sense, it was 'a watershed in the history of musical folklorism,' with both thematic material and musical form drawn not from Western classical models but rather from indigenous sources.⁵

Glinka's innovation was taken up by Balakirev and members of his circle, the group that became known as the *Moguchaia kuchka* or 'The Mighty Five', which consolidated the brand of 'musical folklorism' that Glinka had initiated. Balakirev, for example, included motifs from folk music in pieces such as his first *Overture on Russian Themes* (1858), which featured the folk song, *Vo poli bereza stoiala*. Later, the same folk song would be used as the secondary theme of the Fourth Movement of Tchaikovsky's *Symphony No.4* (1877-78). The Russian 'folk character' of certain of Tchaikovsky's works has to do also with 'their avoidance of linearity—of "German transitions" and his 'facsimiles' of urban street music and peasant singing'.⁶ By the time of Rimsky-Korsakov's opera, *Kitezh*, this tendency had developed further, with peasant folk instruments actually incorporated into the score: he composed a part for the improved version of the *balalaika*, likely thanks to the efforts of Andreev to improve and

³ Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically*, pp. 7-8.

⁴ Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically*, p. 122.

⁵ Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically*, p. 122.

⁶ Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically*, p. 274.

popularize this instrument and to improve its standing through the activities of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* (see below).

Over the course of the nineteenth century, folk music and instruments thus came to occupy an increasingly prominent position in Russian classical and symphonic music. Opinions about the degree to which the 'Russianness' of Russian music depended on the inclusion of such folk elements into classical symphonic music remained divided, as did views on the question of whether 'Russianness' was compromised by the parallel presence of Western influences and inheritance. Glinka's *Kamarinskaia*, for example, became for many Russians, and particularly Slavophiles, 'the very paradigm of *svoeobraznost'*, a Slavophile term roughly equivalent to Herder's *Urwuchsigkeit*, which became a critical watchword among champions of the Russianness of Russian music and of the Balakirev school.⁷ Balakirev himself, however, combined Russian folk elements with Western models, chiefly the German school, but did not view this as compromising the Russianness of his music. Indeed, as leader of the *Moguchaia kuchka*, Balakirev, along with other members of the *kuchka*, including Rimsky-Korsakov, M.P. Musorgskii, C.A. Cui and A.P. Borodin, saw himself as defending Russian music. This position was informed by the *kuchka*'s support of the policy of Official Nationalism and their resistance to westernisation.⁸ They positioned themselves in opposition to institutions such as the Russian Music Society, which took no issue with Western influences in Russian music and was not particularly exercised by questions of Russianness, seeking simply to organise and promote the

⁷ Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically*, p. 123.

⁸ For more on this, see Austin Doub, "Understanding the Cultural and Nationalistic Impacts of the *moguchaya kuchka*," *Musical Offerings* 10, no. 2 (2019): 49–60.

performance of classical music.⁹ This context and debates about national identity more broadly help to explain why the question of ‘Russianness’ became particularly contested at this time.

One culmination of this debate was the polemic between A.S. Famintsyn (1841-1896) and music critic V.V. Stasov (1824-1906). This dispute, the first court hearing about music in Russian history, culminated in court proceedings in 1871. The disagreement centred around the question of *narodnost'*, or national characteristics, and the particularities of Russian musical art. Famintsyn had written an article criticizing the *Moguchaia kuchka*, especially in their use of folk song:

Many people seem to think that we already have Russian instrumental music and even call it ‘national.’ But is music national just because it uses as themes for composition trivial dance tunes that automatically remind one of disgusting scenes in front of a saloon?...This only shows that our composers have completely failed to distinguish between national music and rustic folk music... If the kernel from which an entire composition grows is not refined, then the work itself cannot be refined...In no case can it serve as a model or ideal of instrumental music in general. But then today most of our composers scarcely seek the higher ideals.¹⁰

In two articles penned for the newspaper Saint Petersburg Register (*Sankt-Petersburgskie vedomosti*), Stasov objected strongly to Famintsyn’s position, defending the use of folk motifs and contending for Glinka against Wagner. Stasov’s

⁹ See Sergeant, *Harmony and Discord*, pp. 53-82.

¹⁰ Cited in Francis Maes, *A History of Russian Music: From Kamarinskaya to Babi Yar* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2002), p. 53.

view reflected the common sentiment that the introduction of folk motifs facilitated a return to an authentically “Russian” style of music that was distinct from its Western counterpart. Famintsyn argued, on the contrary, that staging foreign operas in Russia could only facilitate the establishing of unique Russian operatic art. Russian music owed much to Germanic and operatic influences from the West. The development of Russian music was fundamentally informed by these two styles. Famintsyn’s views aligned with those of such authorities as A.G. Rubinstein of the Russian Music Society who was involved in setting up the St Petersburg Conservatoire. The 1871 court proceedings delivered no verdict on this ideological dispute. It was ruled, however, that Stasov had committed libel and he was sentenced to seven days of house arrest and fined 25 roubles.¹¹

Although the 1871 trial appears to illustrate two clearly opposed positions on the question of Russianness in music, a closer look at the biography of Famintsyn reveals that the line between these positions was rather blurred in practice. Famintsyn, who in the trial had argued for the importance of Western musical influences, had undertaken serious study of music theory, *pianoforte*, composition and instrumental technique at Leipzig Conservatoire and Lemberg (Lviv). However, when he became a professor of music at the St. Petersburg Conservatoire in 1865, he specialised in Russian song folklore and Russian and Slavonic culture. Along with *edinomyshlenniki* friends (including the Ministry of Justice civil servant, composer and writer A.N. Serov; and opera composer, pianist, conductor, folk song collector and social activist N.V.

¹¹ Yuri Olkhovsky, *Vladimir Stasov and Russian National Culture* (Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Research Press, 1983), p. 102.

Lysenko), he was one of the first researchers of Russian and Slavonic folklore, customs and the history of musical instruments. His lectures on this topic at the Conservatoire were the first of their kind in the Russian language in the field of the history of music. At the same time, he was writing operatic works, a 'symphonic painting' (*simfonicheskai kartina*), a 'Russian rhapsody' (*Russkaia rapsodiiia*), several string quartets and works for *pianoforte*. In the case of Famintsyn, therefore, as for many others during this period, Western and folk influences combined and cannot be separated.

What this context highlights more than anything is that the notions of 'Russianness' and the 'Russian music' were being actively constructed during the nineteenth century through debates such as those that were taking place around music. Composers such as Glinka made concerted efforts to introduce Russian folk elements into their music and contended that these elements made this music uniquely Russian. Others understood 'Russianness' to be not incompatible with Russian classical music's Western inheritance, and indeed argued that Western models were essential for the progress and development of Russian music. In practice, these positions were not opposed. A figure such as A.G. Rubinstein could be a member of the Russian Music Society, i.e., contented with the Western inheritance in Russian symphonic music, while simultaneously expressing support and approval for Andreev's work with Russian folk instruments, work that was also supported by members of the opposing camp, the *Moguchaia kuchka*, such as Balakirev and Rimsky-Korsakov. The question of what was authentically 'Russian', therefore, had a number of overlapping answers. It is to closer examination of Andreev's position in relation to these debates that this chapter now turns.

1.2.2 Andreev and Russian folk instruments: towards a more authentic *narodnost*?

Andreev's interest in the *balalaika* emerged from the cultural milieu described above. Despite their interest in folk motifs, classical composers made no use of Russian folk instruments, which at the time (that is, before Andreev had improved them) were still dismissed as having limited musical and cultural value.

Andreev was not alone in his interest in Russian folk instruments. His activities were in line with a general growth of interest in peasant culture ushered in by the emergence of the *raznochintsy*. The peasant cause had been voiced for over half a century, beginning in the 1820s-30s with such Russian writers as Mikhail Petrovich Pogodin, Nikolai Alekseevich Polevoi and Nikolai Filippovich Pavlov¹² and continuing with Ivan Sergeevich Turgenev from mid-century onwards. And the movement for serf emancipation was realized in 1861, coincidentally the year of Andreev's birth. By the time Andreev had emerged into wider public view in St. Petersburg in 1885-86, peasant culture had become the subject of growing interest in universities, as was just seen in the case of Famintsyn. At institutions such as the St. Petersburg Conservatoire, this led to the study and scoring of Russian folk music. Among the major Conservatoire figures recognising and exploiting the artistic merits of Russian folk instruments and music was Rimsky-Korsakov, whose influence on one of his pupils, the future St. Petersburg professor, N. P. Fomin, was to prove pivotal for the development of the

¹² One such example is Pavlov's 'The Name-Day', the hero of which is a literate and musically gifted serf who rises above his station

Russian folk instrumental genre established by Andreev. Both Fomin, and other Conservatoire graduates including A.K. Liadov and V.A. Lidin, were variously members of Andreev's evolving *kruzhok* and later orchestra, further reflecting the by then burgeoning academic interest in Russian folk music culture. M.O. Petukhov's 1884 documentation of St. Petersburg Conservatoire's Russian folk instrument museum collection, and Conservatoire academic Famintsyn's 1891 study of the origins and relatives of the Russian domra, further attest to that interest.

Whereas figures such as Petukhov focused mainly on researching various musical instruments, Andreev concerned himself primarily with the practical matter of integrating traditional folk instruments such as the *balalaika* into Russian musical culture.¹³ Andreev believed that affording folk instruments pride of place within Russian musical culture was essential, not only because these were the musical instruments of the Russian *narod* but also because these were the instruments which could, in his view, best convey authentic Russian folk music and song. For these instruments to be used to their full potential, however, they needed to be improved by craftsmen to develop their range and scope.¹⁴ Andreev insisted that, despite these changes, all of the instruments' folk characteristics were preserved; in other words, that they remained true to their folk origins and authentically Russian.

The *balalaika* was itself derived from the *domra*. The *domra*'s existence, along with other Russian folk musical instruments, can be traced back much further into antiquity. According to Famintsyn, the *domra* was derived from the *tanbura/tunbur*, which itself

¹³ Andreev himself did conduct some of his own research into folk instruments, as, for instance, when he first acquired a modestly improved *balalaika* from the Bezhetsk carpenter Antonov in 1884.

¹⁴ This is discussed at more length in Chapters 3 and 6.

originated in Egypt, this lays the basis for Andreev's argument that the domra developed in ancient Rus' from the already present tambura-like versions.¹⁵ Andreev himself discovered that many European national folk instruments were derived from the tanbura and had taken on different appearances; for example, the mandolin was the form it took in Italian folk culture; in Spain, it was a guitar; and in Russia, it was the *domra*. The crux of the matter was whether the version of the tanbura-derived instrument named the domra existed separately in Rus' and was unique to that geographical area, warranting it to be a Russian folk instrument. This was concluded to be the case and verified by Andreyev colleague N.I. Privalov.

The first recorded mentions of the domra in Russian historical literary sources appear in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Firstly, ecclesiastical records indicate that the Russians already had an instrument similar to the domra from at least the sixteenth century.¹⁶ Customs records of trade in domras and domra strings suggest the instrument's use among the *narod* from at least that period. The domra was widely used by ordinary citizens, as well as by the church class (*litsa dukhovnogo zvaniiia*), and especially by *skomorokhi* crowd entertainers.¹⁷ It was also looked upon favourably at the highest levels, as indicated by evidence of connections of Russian *domra*

¹⁵ See A.S. Famintsyn, *Domra i srodyne ei muzykal'nye instrumenty russkogo naroda* (St-Petersburg: Tipografiia E. Arngol'da, 1891), pp. 26-36; V.V. Andreev 'Kratkaya istoricheskaya spravka o proiskhozhdenii narodnykh muzykal'nykh instrumentov' in B.B. Granovskii, V.V. Andreev: *Materialy i dokumenty* (Moscow: Muzyka, 1986), pp. 105-106.

¹⁶ Famintsyn, *Domra i srodyne ei muzykal'nye instrumenty*, p. 6

¹⁷ Famintsyn, *Domra i srodyne ei muzykal'nye instrumenty*, p. 5. Famintsyn drew on a study published a decade earlier by D.A. Rovinskii, *Russkiie narodnye kartinki*, 5 vols (Saint Petersburg: Tipografiia imperatorskoi akademii nauk, 1881) 4: 296. The Russian folk instruments the *domra* and *gusli* also appear in Russian literary history. For example, they appear in a story in an eighteenth-century manuscript about two well-known foolish brothers, Erema and Foma, who also feature in songs, *byliny* and folk pictures. One is holding a *gusli*, the other a *domra*, with the words: 'Erema has a *gusli*, Foma has a *domra*' (*U Eremy gusli, a u Fomy domra*).

players from the *narod* to the seventeenth-century Royal Court. *Domra* players provided entertainment alongside *gusli* players and *bakhari* (storytellers) in the Royal Entertainment Chamber (*Poteshnaia palata*) during Mikhail Fedorovich's reign. (The *gusli* is the oldest of stringed Russian folk instruments, its origins first recorded in the eleventh century by the traveller Ibn-Dasta, who made observations of this instrument on his travels through ancient Rus'.)¹⁸ Some of the musicians were blind *domra* players who mostly performed their music in the Tsar's wife's chambers. According to Zabelin, cited by Famintsyn, there is conclusive evidence of this from records of honours given to them 'in the Tsar's wife's name and of money frequently given to them for strings from the Tsar's wife's Treasury'.¹⁹ The Tsar was entertained at his wedding in 1626 by the *domra* players Andriushka Fedorov and Vas'ka Stepanov. The blind *domra* players, Gavrila, Iakov (also referred to as Iakush, Iakunka), Luka (also referred to as Lukian, Lukash, Lukashka), Naum and Petr, are mentioned performing in the Tsar's wife's chambers in the 1630s.²⁰ The Tsar's wife's expenditure notes sometimes mention a *domra* player with *tovarishchi*, which means that the Royal Court kept more than one *domra* player at a time.²¹

That the *domra* had been widely used among the Russian *narod* is evidenced by a series of decrees directed against the *domra* and playing of it. A seventeenth-century protocol ordered monastery authorities to ensure that peasants ('*krest'iane*', i.e., 'khristianskii narod', meaning the 'Christian folk'), must not play or 'keep at home' any

¹⁸ See M.I. Imkhanitskii, 'Predposylki formirovaniia domrovo-balalaechnogo sostava v russkom kollektivnom muzitsirovaniii XVI – XIX vekov', *Trudy GMPI (RAM) im. Gnesinykh* 85 (special issue: 'Orkestr russkikh narodnykh instrumentov i problemy vospitaniia dirizhera', ed. M.I. Imkhanitskii and V.V. Chistiakov) (1986), pp. 6-8.

¹⁹ Zabelin, *Domashnii byt russkikh tsarits, Materialy* (1872) cited in Famintsyn, *Domra i srodyne ei muzykal'nye instrumenty*.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Famintsyn, *Domra i srodyne ei muzykal'nye instrumenty* pp. 439-440.

of the musical instruments listed in the order, including domras.²² The Tsar's 1648 declaration forbade inviting *skomorokhi* with domras to the home. In the event of domras and other musical instruments being found, they were ordered to be broken and burned.²³ Another of the Tsar's declarations of the same year condemns *skomorokhi* domra players as demonic.²⁴ In 1657 the Rostov Metropolitan Iona published a special order forbidding *skomorokhi* from playing gusli and domras. During the reign of Tsar Alexei Mikhailovich, the *domra* and other musical instruments also disappear from the royal entertainment chamber. Former *bakhari* and domra and gusli players were replaced by performers of Russian folk poems and songs elaborating on Christian stories and themes. As a result of these decrees, public performances were prohibited; the domra was driven 'underground', as Andreev and others describe, and ordinary citizens were forced to conceal their instruments in their homes. The prohibition also led to changes to the appearance of the domra, as people sought to circumvent the decrees against the instrument. The truncated oval-shaped body of the domra became a triangle: the *balalaika*.

In fact, Andreev's own research showed that this history was rather more complex, as Famintsyn also describes. For example, they found that instruments with a circular body (which people would assume, initially, to be a domra) were referred to in certain localities as *balalaikas*. But both Andreev and Famintsyn insisted on a crucial distinction. However people referred to them, these circular instruments were still, to

²² *Akty yuridicheskie izdannye arkheologicheskoi kommissiei*, 1838, №.334 cited in Famintsyn, *Domra i srodyne ei muzykal'nye instrumenty*, 4.

²³ Ivanov, *Opisanie gosudarstvennago arkhiva starykh del* (1850) cited in Famintsyn, *Domra i srodyne ei muzykal'nye instrumenty*, p. 4.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

all intents and purposes, domras. Having migrated as tambura-like instruments into central Russia, they had taken root within the Russian *narod* over time and evolved physical features which distinguished them as Russian, notwithstanding their being derived from the ancient tambura and its variants, a lineage also shared by a wide range of European ‘folk’ instruments. The triangular-shaped balalaika, by contrast, was, they argued, a distinctly Russian instrument: it had been developed by Russians independently of European folk culture, took on unique characteristics by account of its appearance, and demanded specific techniques for playing it. In other words, the balalaika was the first authentically Russian folk musical instrument.

This is not to say that Andreev was against making changes to the balalaika. While he did not want to interfere with the balalaika’s basic appearance – its triangular shape – early examples of the balalaika were made by carpenters and were quite primitive, hence needed to be improved in order for the instrument to reach its full potential. These changes are discussed in detail in Chapter 3. Andreev’s work also led to the standardization of the instrument, for instance, when it came to the number of strings. Prior to Andreev’s work on improving the balalaika, the number of strings to the instrument was not standardised, which accounted for the variations to the number of strings depending on the personal preferences of individual musicians from different regions of Russia. It seems, therefore, that the number of strings increased from two to three haphazardly from the eighteenth century onwards. Bergholz and Staehlin had noted that the balalaika had two strings from the early eighteenth century. An early exception to this, cited by Staehlin, was an eighteenth-century blind Ukrainian *bandura*-player who added a third string to the balalaika. And although both Georgii and Johann Joachim Bellerman (1754-1842) had also observed the balalaika to be a

commonly two-stringed instrument, three-stringed examples of the instrument were also known to Bellerman. Two-stringed balalaikas were depicted in eighteenth-century popular print images, an identical, physical prototype of this being the Dalskii museum's 'Archangel'sk balalaika'. Similar such balalaika-stringing was described by both Gurthrie and the Comte de Rechberg.²⁵ And yet in 1835, Fétis referred to the balalaika as a 'three-stringed guitar'.²⁶ In the 1850s, however, Sovinskii refers to a 'balabaika' as a two-stringed instrument. But the folk balalaika by then had the advantage of three strings made of gut, while two strings was the exception.²⁷ The authors of an article entitled 'Balalaika' in *Entsiklopedicheskii leksikon* assert that some musicians would add two extra strings to make four strings in total, but this was rare.²⁸ An example of this was the famous early to mid-nineteenth-century Moscow balalaika virtuoso Radivilov, who also used a four-string balalaika. Curiously, however, Radivilov also played a single-string balalaika.²⁹ Andreev settled with a three-stringed balalaika. The balalaika he first encountered in 1883 had three strings and his own research convinced him that the three stringed version and its tuning were more typically representative of the characteristics of that folk instrument.

To sum up, Andreev viewed the balalaika as the first authentically Russian folk musical instrument. This was an instrument deeply rooted in the *narod*, he contended, pointing to the history of its predecessor, the domra, as well as to the unique qualities and

²⁵ Famintsyn, *Domra i srodyne ei muzykal'nye instrumenty*, p. 78

²⁶ Fétis, 'Résumé philosophique de l'histoire de la musique', CXXX, in the First Edition of *Biographie universelle des musiciens* (1835) cited in Famintsyn, *Domra i srodyne ei muzykal'nye instrumenty*, p. 78.

²⁷ Rovinskii, *Russkie narodnye kartinki* cited in Famintsyn, *Domra i srodyne ei muzykal'nye instrumenty*, p. 79.

²⁸ Famintsyn, *Domra i srodyne ei muzykal'nye instrumenty*, p. 79.

²⁹ Famintsyn, *Domra i srodyne ei muzykal'nye instrumenty*, p. 79.

timbre of the triangular-shaped balalaika that eventually emerged. To his mind, authenticity had to do with the shape and sound of the instrument and its suitability for performing Russian folk music and song. For this reason, he did not consider the improvements that he made to the balalaika to change its essence or diminish its authenticity.

One criticism that was levelled at Andreev at the time was that his changes were not authentically “Russian,” in that they were influenced by Western musical cultures. For instance, Andreev created different ranges of these folk instruments for his orchestra, incorporating the playing of balalaikas, domras, guslis and other Russian folk instruments of different sizes within one single collective. His critics argued that this was derivative of Western symphonic orchestras, where, for instance, as well as the violin, one finds the viola, the cello, the bass and the double bass. Andreev himself contending that these changes were not inauthentic. He was not creating something new but recreating something that had formerly existed. He pointed to scholarly discoveries of the time, which indicated that the domra had more than one range and had appeared in different sizes at least from the seventeenth century. Famintsyn identifies evidence in at least two sources. A *domrishko*, a small-sized domra, was mentioned in a 1644 palace source: ‘Following a decree from the Tsar, and according to Ivan Fedorovich’s order, a *domrishko* was purchased for “8 *deneg*” [*den’ga* - small currency, one *den’ga* being worth half a *kopeck*]. This *domrishko* was taken by Ivan Fedorovich to the Tsarina’s quarters and a “*durka*” [Court entertainer] was asked to play it.’³⁰ Another source, the inventory of Prince V.V. Gallitsyn’s quarters, lists among

³⁰ I. Zabelin, *Domashnii byt russkikh tsarei v XVI i XVII stoletiiakh* (Saint Petersburg: Tipografiia V. Gracheva i Kompaniia, 1872), p. 118

other items received into his possession in 1690 a ‘*domra bol’shaia basistaia* valued at 1 rouble’.³¹ If there were large bass domras (*bol’shie basistye domry*), Famintsyn reasons, then undoubtedly there were also small soprano domras (*malye vysokie* or *diskantovye domry*), to which the aforementioned ‘*domrishko*’ should be related; Famintsyn concludes that it is likely that alto and tenor (*al’tovye* and *tenorovye*) domras were in use as well.³² Additionally, *skomorokhi* musicians were depicted performing on various Russian folk instruments, including *domras*, *gusli* and *svireli*, in a now lost seventeenth-century fresco (entitled ‘The Unrighteous Judge’) by the artists S. Ushakov and *podiachii* N. Klement’ev in the Kremlin’s ‘Palace of Facets’ (*Granatovaia palata*), indicating that there was a tradition of playing these instruments together collectively.³³

Interestingly, one way that Andreev himself defended changes made to the balalaika, in his eyes, Russia’s foremost national folk instrument, was to refer to changes made to other tanbura-related folk instruments in other parts of Europe. Andreev also had close links with classical musicians and composers. He consulted both Rubinstein and Famintsyn regarding his own work, engaging in correspondence with the former, and citing the latter’s work on the history of Russian folk instruments. Famintsyn became

³¹ Zabelin, *Domashnii byt russkikh tsarei*, p.186.

³² Famintsyn also adds that ‘this similarity in terms of varying sizes and tuning was found in the lute, the *tsitra* (*zither*), and the viola, instruments used in olden times in Western and Southern Europe’.

³³ See discussion in Imkhanitskii, ‘*Predposylki*’. Imkhanitskii included a reproduction of a miniature depicting a domra from a copy of the ‘Apocalypse’ (Book of Revelation) manuscript kept in the former Lenin library. This is important as the depiction of a primitive domra by the seventeenth-century German scholar, mathematician, geographer and librarian Adam Olearius used to be considered the only one preserved until the publication of Imkhanitskii’s article in 1986. The image is part of a scene depicting ‘Tsar David’s Musicians’, thus indicating early Royal Court connections with Russian folk music. See A. Olearius, *Opisanie puteshestviia v Moskoviyu i cherez Moskoviyu v Persiyu i obratno – Vvedenie, perevod, primechaniia i ukazatel’* A.M. Loviagina (St. Petersburg, 1906) and Imkhanitskii, ‘*Predposylki*’: 28-29.

well-known in St. Petersburg music circles and it is likely that Andreev knew him personally through their shared interest in Russian folk instruments from around the time Andreev became engaged in pursuing his own interest in this field from the second half of the 1880s. Andreev's orchestra frequently performed classical pieces. For example, Glinka's adaptation of the Russian folk dance *Kamarinskaia* became a popular piece performed by Andreyev's orchestra. Balakirev, who was originally reticent about Andreyev and his work, became associated with Andreyev to the point of his recommending improvements to the percussive qualities of Andreyev's orchestra. Rimsky-Korsakov's pupil Glazunov composed his *Russkaia fantaziia* for Russian folk instrument orchestra (see Chapter 6). Tchaikovsky had used Russian folk song motifs and quotations in his music, e.g., *Berezka stoiala* in Symphony No.4 and *U vorot, vorot* in his 1812 overture. Indeed, Andreev's performed the scherzo from Tchaikovsky's Symphony No. 4, which led to a much-publicized dispute. In response to arguments that folk instruments could not be used in a symphonic setting on account of their alleged limitations, he convened a commission of experts, including Rimsky-Korsakov, who listened to the performance and approved of what they heard. It was on the basis of this decision that Andreev won an appeal in court which ruled his orchestra was free to perform Tchaikovsky's scherzo with Russian folk instruments in a symphonic setting.³⁴

These examples highlight again the disputed nature of the boundaries between Russian and Western music and culture during this period. This goes some way towards explaining some of the apparent contradictions in criticisms of Andreev's work. One object of critics' derision was his passionate and single-minded propagation of

³⁴ See Chapter 2.2.1., 2.2.2. and 2.3.

Russian folk music and the musical instruments that represented it. At the same time, Andreev's opponents, both music critics and artists, portrayed his work and his collaborative associations with classically trained music artists as incongruous with his claims to be reviving an authentically Russian musical tradition.

In summary, the question of what constituted 'Russianness' and 'Russian music' was hotly debated during this period and was often connected to debates around authenticity, which was judged in relation to historical sources, on the one hand, or in opposition to perceived Western or foreign influences, on the other. As we have just seen, Andreev was not straightforwardly against Western or foreign influence, and indeed acknowledged the non-Russian roots of the domra, the predecessor of the balalaika. Nonetheless, he did insist on the authenticity of the balalaika itself, and went to some lengths to prove the legitimacy of his orchestra and the range of all Russian folk musical instruments comprising it. In this sense, Andreyev's turn to 'authentic' folk instruments, however distinct it appears from the inclusion of folk motifs in classical settings, must be viewed as part of the same process of constructing a notion of authentic Russianness that was also underway in classical music.

1.3 Literature Review

The earliest studies of Andreev's work were produced in the late nineteenth century by associates of Andreev. N. P. Shtiber, for example, offers a straightforward account

of Andreev's activities told from the point of view of a participant in this work.³⁵ Such studies, while generally brief and memoiristic, help to illuminate those aspects of Andreev's work that Andreev and his associates deemed particularly important; for instance, Shtiber emphasizes the significance that Andreev attached to his invitation to perform at Prince Ol'denbergskii's palace for members of the Imperial family in 1887.³⁶ Other studies written by associates of Andreev include A.S. Chagadaev's short 1948 volume, *V.V. Andreev*, which offers a brief chronological account of Andreev's life and activities.³⁷ Chagadaev was a later member of Andreev's orchestra and one of his activists in the armed forces involved in organising Russian folk instrument ensembles; consequently, his account of Andreev's activities places greater emphasis on this aspect of his work.

While these studies offer useful accounts of Andreev's activities, they do not tend to go into much depth; moreover, certain aspects of his life and work are mentioned only in passing or omitted entirely, whether due to personal interest (such as Chagadaev's involvement in the organisation of folk instrument ensembles in the armed forces) or the political context in which each was written. Generally speaking, the connections between Andreev and the Imperial Court tend to be downplayed in studies written during the Soviet period, mentioned only in passing, if at all. F.V. Sokolov, for example, does mention these imperial connections, but without making clear what exactly they

³⁵ N. P. Shtiber, *V.V. Andreev: Ocherk ego deiate'l'nosti* (St. Petersburg: Sirotinka, 1898). Other similar accounts include Viktor Kolomiitsev's pamphlet, *V.V. Andreev i ego Velikorusskii orkestr* (Saint Petersburg: Tipografija A.S. Suvorina, 1909). Kolomiitsev was another close friend and supporter of Andreev. He writes in sympathetic terms about Andreev's work. The volume includes a selection of press articles from the period and extracts from Kolomiitsev's written correspondence with Andreev, written while he was doing a tour of England and playing to sold out auditoriums in Manchester and London.

³⁶ Shtiber, *V.V. Andreev: Ocherk ego deiate'l'nosti*, p.3.

³⁷ A. Chagadaev, *V.V. Andreev* (Moscow: Muzgiz, 1948).

were.³⁸ This is one gap that the present study seeks to fill. A central contention in this thesis will be that it is only by understanding how Andreev sought to reach a broad swathe of Russian society—from the peasantry and working classes to the elite—that a full picture of his aims and ambitions for the balalaika comes into view. For Andreev, establishing the balalaika as an instrument worthy of inclusion in symphonic musical culture was no less important than reviving the popularity of the balalaika among the peasantry and working people; moreover, he saw these goals as closely connected parts of the same broad project.

Also missing from early studies of Andreev's activities are details about his early biography. This part of his life is discussed at more length in the studies that began to appear during *glasnost'* at the end of the Soviet period, such as Iurii Baranov's *Champion of Folk Music* (*Podvizhnik muzyki narodnoi*, 1988).³⁹ Baranov provides valuable additional insights regarding Andreev's gentry background and his education. This detail about Andreev's background is essential to contextualising his activities and the revival of folk musical culture in Russia at this time more broadly. The fact that a member of the gentry was interested in folk instruments and played such an important role in propagating them is to an extent unsurprising, and must be viewed as one example of the more general tendency whereby members of the upper classes and *intelligentsia* played an active role in constructing a useable version of Russian 'folk' culture during this period. However, as Baranov points out, and as will be explored at more length in what follows, it is also important to bear in mind that

³⁸ F.V. Sokolov, *Andreev i ego orkestr* (Moscow: Gos. muzykal'noe izdatel'stvo, 1962).

³⁹ Iu. E. Baranov, *Podvizhnik muzyki narodnoi* (Moscow: Moskovskii rabochii, 1988).

Andreev, while he was from a noble family, nonetheless had a close association with peasants and spent considerable amounts of time with peasants on his mother's estate during his early life. This fact again speaks to the significant role played in the formation and development of Andreev's ideas and aims by the variety of social spheres within which he operated. Particular consideration will be given to this question in the main body of this thesis, which aims to provide a more complex and well-rounded account of Andreev's activities, his collaborators, and his intended audiences.

Several sources in particular have been essential to this end. Like Baranov's study, these were published during *glasnost'*, when there appears to have been a minor resurgence of interest in Andreev and his work. B.B. Granovskii's edited volume, *V.V. Andreev: Materials and Documents* (*V.V. Andreev: Materialy i dokumenty*, 1986), has been a particularly important one for this thesis.⁴⁰ This volume collates a selection of archival documents, including newspaper articles written about or by Andreev at the time; published interviews with Andreev; a selection of correspondence between Andreev and his close collaborators, as well as his supporters in Russian musical culture, such as Rimsky-Korsakov, and Russian culture more broadly, for example Lev Tolstoy; and a selection of memoirs written about Andreev's activities by people who knew him. Many of these documents are the same as those used in other popular historical accounts of Andreev's life and work, albeit not always referred to explicitly. The value of Granovskii's volume lies in the opportunity it provides to tease out details that are not talked about or discussed in these earlier sources, and to gain a broader

⁴⁰ B.B. Granovskii, *V.V. Andreev: Materialy i dokumenty* (Moscow: Muzyka, 1986).

understanding of what Andreev was thinking and how he was describing and positioning his work at different stages of his activities.

Granovskii's volume was the first Russian publication of its kind regarding Andreev and has not yet been superseded. His selection and publication of materials is a major breakthrough in light of the previous absence of published source documents on Andreev, as Granovskii himself is keen to point out, emphasising in his introduction the 'great, painstaking' work regarding the 'selection of the most important documents and material', including their 'textological preparation' and compiling of endnotes and a chronology of Andreev's life.⁴¹ However, the material included in this volume is by no means comprehensive. For example, the volume includes only a small representation of all the letters that are held in archives; there is no correspondence regarding subsidies for the *Velikorusskii orkestr* and its teaching role, and no Imperial Court correspondence which would reveal a further dimension to Andreev's work and the motivations behind it. None among the sources included represent Andreev's communications with Imperial Court figures, i.e., Tsars Alexander III and Nicholas II. Moreover, some portions of source text are completely omitted. Granovskii's chronology repeats what was already known of Andreev by 1986, omitting details revealing Royal Court connections and associations, such as, for example, Imperial Court patronage of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* in 1904. Also absent are any references or details about Imperial Court diary entries confirming entertainment provided at the Imperial Court, either by Andreev's orchestra, or by select musicians of it. Although his endnotes provide summaries of select documents regarding the subsidies issue,

⁴¹ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, pp. 9-10.

these are limited to the Provisional Government of 1917 and there are no reproductions of complete documents regarding this issue.

It is not clear why Granovskii was able to include only a small part of the available material relating to Andreev's connections to and correspondence with court institutions. This may have to do Soviet-era prohibitions on discussing such matters; much the same can be seen in scholarship from this period on Tchaikovsky, for example. In drawing on unpublished archival material relating to this aspect of Andreev's activities, this thesis aims to provide a more rounded view of Andreev than has been possible in earlier studies by considering the full range of his contacts and exploring in more depth the question of the social mix of his associates and the relevance of this for his views of the Russian *narod* and the particular type of 'Russianness' he sought to propagate more broadly.

Another important study for this thesis is Mikhail Imkhanitskii's *The Origins of Russian Musical Orchestral Culture* (*U istokov russkoi muzykal'noi orkestrovoi kul'tury*, 1987).⁴² Imkhanitskii wrote the introduction to Granovskii's volume, published the year before his own study, and was the author of other important publications on the history of Russian folk musical instruments.⁴³ *The Origins...* was the first major (and to date not superseded) scholarly attempt to present and to discuss Andreev's work in order to illustrate both its practical and artistic development. Like earlier studies, Imkhanitskii's volume offers a chronological account of Andreev's work, from his earliest efforts to improve the balalaika to the creation of his Society of Balalaika

⁴² M.I. Imkhanitskii, *U istokov russkoi muzykal'noi orkestrovoi kul'tury* (Moscow: Muzyka, 1987). Imkhanitskii draws on and corrects a number of earlier studies, including K. Vertkov, *Russkie narodnye muzykal'nye instrumenty* (Leningrad: Muzyka, 1975).

⁴³ See Imkhanitskii, "Predposylni".

Lovers (*Kruzhok liubitelei igry na balalaikakh*) in 1887 and thence to the eventual emergence of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* and Andreev's tours abroad. Imkhanitskii corrects a number of the errors and oversights that had appeared in earlier accounts of Andreev's life and work regarding important factual details, such as: the performance debut and appearance of the first chromatically scaled balalaika; the dispelling of confusion over the dates of archival material regarding the manufacture and patenting of a model of the improved *gusli*, and so on. He also discusses Andreev's work in the context of the longer history of Russian folk instruments and their progress before Andreev's pioneering work in that area.

Despite these additions, Imkhanitskii, like other Soviet scholars, remains more or less silent on the matter of Andreev's connections to the Imperial Court. This is despite the fact that Andreev himself placed considerable importance upon his connections with the Court. It must also be noted that Andreev was the only person other than Tchaikovsky to be given an imperial pension for life.⁴⁴ This fact is barely mentioned in existing studies but demonstrates the importance that Andreev and his work must have held in the eyes of the Court. This thesis thus seeks to illuminate the nature of these connections more fully, and to explain how this aspect of Andreev's activities is to be understood in relation to his broader aspirations for the balalaika.

While there were still severe limits placed on the quantity and subject matter of what could be accessed and photocopied among archive items held at the Russian State Archive of Literature and Art (*Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatury i iskusstva*,

⁴⁴ This information is included in Kolomiitsev, V.V. *Andreev.*

RGALI) and the Russian State Historical Archive (*Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv*, RGIA) at the time of researching this thesis, the additional material that could be identified, chiefly relating to Andreev's connections with the Imperial Court and his other associates, adds to existing studies by exploring this aspect of Andreev's activities.

Additionally, the thesis draws on archival material, both published and unpublished, in order to provide a more detailed account of the full range of Andreev's associates. Although Imkhanitskii's study includes a useful section focusing on parts of Fomin's role as one of Andreev's colleagues, it fails to devote equal space to many of Andreev's other important colleagues and supporters, the relevant roles of whom are explained in Chapter 6 of this thesis. Other scholars mention as a matter of factual detail individuals within and without Andreev's circle of collaborations, connections and influence. However, while professions and academic positions are often (though not always) mentioned, there is no meaningful discussion of those individuals' positions in the context of Russian society at that time. Why this may or may not have been important to Andreev's work in respect of his own position in Russian society is one of the questions this thesis seeks to highlight. Again, this context is essential in order to understand the full range and scope of Andreev's ideas, his ambitions, and his position in relation to Russian musical society and debates about 'Russianness' and *narodnost*.

In seeking to address these issues, this thesis builds on more recent work in the field of Russian musical history, and particularly a series of studies that have described the origins and development of nationalistic ideas about music and Russianness. This work was begun by Richard Taruskin, whose *Defining Russia Musically* provides the

groundwork for later studies such as Marina Frolova-Walker's *Russian Music and Nationalism—from Glinka to Stalin* and Lynn M. Sergeant's *Harmony and Discord: Music and the Transformation of Russian Cultural Life*.⁴⁵ These and other recent studies offer valuable insight into how ideas about what constituted authentically *Russian* music were formed through debates around folk and classical music during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This thesis contributes to this work by situating Andreev, barely mentioned in the studies just cited, in relation to these debates. In particular, by supplementing existing studies of his life and work with closer examination of unpublished sources, on the one hand, and more detailed discussion of his life and background, on the other, it seeks not only to illuminate his range as a balalaika player, the author of numerous published works (essays, articles, and at least two manuals), an organiser, and an educator, but also to demonstrate the importance of his broader role as a musico-social activist.

⁴⁵ Richard Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically. Historical and Hermeneutical Essays* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997); Marina Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism—from Glinka to Stalin* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007); Lynn M. Sergeant, *Harmony and Discord: Music and the Transformation of Russian Cultural Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

2. ANDREEV'S AIMS

2.1 Introduction: General survey

This chapter outlines and discusses Andreev's aims for Russian folk instruments and music as revealed mainly (though not exclusively) in his own writings. In brief, these aims were the wider dissemination of Russian folk instruments in their improved form in order to promote Russian folk song and music, and moreover to raise the status of these folk instruments and music by demonstrating their musical scope. It is intended that this chapter provides the basis for understanding those aims as they are presented within the contexts of the specific themes of Chapters 3 to 7.

Andreev explained what he aimed to achieve for the Russian *balalaika*, balalaika collective, *domra*, *gusli*, Russian woodwind and percussion, their dissemination and importance for the Russian *narod* in several published and unpublished sources. Examples of those aims are afforded limited reference and contextual discussion by writers of the Soviet period. It is important, therefore, to take an *ad fontes* approach for a clearer view of those aims without the constraints, for example, of the Soviet tendency to silhouette them against the penumbra of implicit Soviet cultural ideology (see example in 2.3 below).

Andreev's writings regarding his aims emerge from the mid-1890s, over half a decade from his two landmark debuts as propagator of the balalaika, namely his first officially noted (i.e., press-covered) solo balalaika performance on 26 December 1886 and the first stage appearance of his Society of Balalaika Lovers (*Kruzhok liubitelei igr na balalaikakh*) on 20 March 1888.

Andreev's aims reflect the development of his ideas for fostering interest in Russian folk instruments, including participation in playing the balalaika and (later) other Russian folk instruments, as well as encouraging their wide dissemination. These aims gathered momentum as his activities progressed from balalaika soloist through to his multi-faceted role as Russian folk orchestra director. He intended by means of the progress and fulfilment of his aims for Russian folk instruments to realize his longstanding 'idea', i.e., the advancement of Russian folk musical instruments in Russian society and the development of the genre of Russian folk instrumental performance. Therefore, this chapter reflects this order and progression of Andreev's aims. Sections 2.2.1, 2.2.2 and 2.2.3 deal with practical and musicological considerations regarding the individual and collective roles of Russian folk instruments. Andreev's aims in section 2.3 regarding the *narod* and dissemination demonstrate the social and cultural impact envisaged and anticipated and how Andreev proposed to achieve this.

2.2.1. Andreev's aims for the *balalaika*

Andreev's earliest declaration of what he was aiming to achieve for the Russian balalaika is found in his *Predislovie* to the second edition of his *School for Balalaika Playing (Shkola igry na balalaike, 1894)* (see also below section 2.2.2 & Chapter 5.3.2).¹ But a recently published archive letter from Andreev to the Russian Imperial Court in 1895 represents, in all probability, the first substantial summary of his aims

¹ B.B. Granovskii (ed.), *V.V. Andreev: Materialy i dokumenty* (Moscow: Muzyka, 1986), p.31.

for his work with the *narod* and the dissemination of the Russian balalaika, which at that stage was through the conduit of his teaching work in the armed forces (see below section 2.3 and Chapter 7.3.3).²

Andreev's aims are revealed as they evolved through the 1890s up to his final decade, that is to say as the expansion of his *Kruzhok* into a Russian folk orchestra broadened and defined those aims. It is with the benefit of experience in his roles as *Kruzhok* and, subsequently, *Velikorusskii orkestr* activist that Andreev could retrospectively outline and clarify his aims, as evident from source material cited and discussed in this chapter. For clarification regarding forthcoming chapters, the focus in Chapter 5 will be on specific examples of published articles, essays and interviews specifically to illustrate Andreev's instincts to educate the public about his work. I return to consider this at more length in Chapter 5. The source examples in that chapter, although they can be similarly used to highlight Andreev's educational instincts, represent specific examples of him outlining his aims. In this chapter, I look particularly at those writings that explicitly articulate the aims of his activities.

a) Andreev's broader, long-term objectives for the balalaika were realized out of a set of core aims which he specifies retrospectively in 'Kak mne prishla mysl' zaniat'sia usovershenstvovaniem balalaiki'.³ The fulfilment of these aims was undoubtedly crucial both to the development of the first publicly recognized Russian balalaika ensemble, and to that of collective balalaika performance. Yet their prerequisite was, in fact, improving the folk balalaika from its primitive construction and scope to an

² Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv (RGIA) f. 1405, op. 539, d. 311, l. 1-2 ("Proshenie V.V. Andreeva na vysochaishee imia Vashe Imperatorksoe Velichestvo Vsemilostiveishii Monarkh", 26 December 1895).

³ V.V. Andreev, 'Kak mne prishla mysl' zaniat'sia usovershenstvovaniem balalaiki', in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.76.

instrument of concert quality. It is a curious fact that this improvement is omitted from the aims Andreev lists in *Kak mne prishla mysl'*..., for this was the only basis from which he and his collaborators could create a 'family' (range of sizes, pitch and *timbre*) of these instruments, the *prima* among which was, indeed, the initially improved balalaika itself.

The instincts for improving the primitive folk balalaika were aroused almost immediately in Andreev. He could not conceive of how this instrument in its primitive state could produce its distinctive sound, notwithstanding the unique style in which it was played and its eurhythmic character. It is these very observations on first hearing this Russian folk instrument (see also Chapter 3.1) which testify to his grasp of its potential. However, his aims for improving the balalaika (and other Russian folk instruments) are outlined and explained retrospectively, so we do not have the benefit of any sources written by Andreev anticipating those particular aims, i.e., in advance of specific, planned improvements to those instruments.

The balalaika's various limitations, including those to its repertoire imposed by its seven-fretted diatonic scale, are reflected upon in *Kak mne prishla*.... The various stages of improvement of the instrument confirm that this was a rapid developmental process with each advance opening the way for successive improvements.

Andreev was already motivated on hearing the balalaika in 1883 to play the instrument 'to perfection'. Upon first hearing the balalaika, Andreev instantly felt that the instrument possessed unique characteristics that distinguished it from other folk instruments (see Chapter 3.1). However, a 1913 article published in *Tverskaia gazeta* marking the silver jubilee of Andreev's work asserted that his *artistic* motivation and

inspiration for the idea to improve (and, consequently, to popularize) the balalaika was the Bezhetsk gentry landowner and balalaika player Aleksandr Stepanovich Paskin (see also Chapter 3.1). Of Andreev's first acquaintance in autumn 1884 with Paskin's virtuoso demonstrations of the as-yet unimproved balalaika's potential, Andreev said that it prompted him 'to take a serious interest in the instrument'.⁴ But there is clear evidence that Andreev's broader, long-term aims for the balalaika (and other Russian folk instruments) were propelled by his existing national sentiment. This was a cause deserving of labour for the balalaika's place in Russian society and culture for the benefit of the Russian *narod* (see 2.3 below).

Andreev effectively trialled two early 'concert' balalaikas in public, firstly the Ivanov *diatonic* model from late 1886 to early 1887, followed by the *Paserbskii* chromatic balalaika through the middle portion of 1887 (see below 2.2.2 and also Chapter 3.1 & 3.2.1). This experience opened the next phase of his aims.

b) The aim to create a 'family' of balalaikas was already realized by the autumn of 1887. F.S. Paserbskii provided what remain to be the founding 'types' of balalaika, representing a diverse and expanded range of scales and *timbre*. These included (apart from the *prima*): the alto (*al'to*), bass (*bas*) and double-bass (*kontra-bas*). All of these instruments had chromatic scales, following the example set by Paserbskii's first chromatic *prima*. Their scales were tuned as follows: the bass was tuned an octave lower than the alto (e – a - E), with the double-bass tuned a further octave lower.⁵

⁴ See Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.334, which discusses the article 'K iubileiu V.V. Andreeva', originally published in *Tverskaia gazeta*, 31 March, 1913, №.501. The author of this article (credited only to the initials 'N.O.') cites the source of his assertion and of Andreev's words as an undated interview Andreev gave to the St. Petersburg newspaper *Vechernee vremia*. Andreev also refers to Paskin as an 'inspiration' in a telegram he wrote to Paskin's wife on hearing of her husband's death in 1914 (Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi archiv literatury i iskusstva (RGAL) ed. khr. 79, p.1).

⁵ M.I. Imkhanitskii, *U istokov russkoi muzykal'noi orkestrovoi kul'tury* (Moscow: Muzyka, 1987), p.58.

Other ranges created at that time were: the *diskant*, which was tuned an octave higher than the *prima* (a2 – e2 – e2), and the *pikkolo*, which was tuned to a2 – e1 – e1, an octave higher than the alto's tuning; the *tenor* balalaika was tuned an octave lower than that of the *prima* (a – e – e). Therefore, the *intervals* between the open strings of these five types of balalaika was a *fourth* and a *fifth*. The latter three balalaika variants, however, fell out of favour.⁶ One reason for this may have been the later incorporation of ranges of the Russian *domra* into the existing balalaika collective in the second half of the 1890s. These issues are discussed at more length below.

Aside from the *tessitura* variety of Paserbskii's chromatically scaled balalaikas, their scale ranges were from two to two-and-a-half octaves.⁷ This was an essential organizational feature for the collective playing now possible with the creation of such a range of balalaikas. According to Imkhanitskii, this was the *instrumental* basis of Russian folk orchestral performance.⁸ However, this was still some way short of the Russian folk orchestra into which this balalaika ensemble range evolved by the late 1890s. Yet it is a remarkable testimony to Andreev's and his appointed craftsman's rapid fulfilment of the aim to create a balalaika 'family' (Paserbskii and Andreev had only begun their collaboration in March 1887) that this very range of balalaikas is still an important, distinctive feature of today's Russian folk music orchestras. The importance of this is revealed by Andreev's aims for the balalaika collective.

⁶ ibid.

⁷ ibid.

⁸ ibid.

2.2.2 Andreev's aims for the *balalaika collective*

Having created his first range of improved balalaikas, Andreev had to create a repertoire for that range of instruments which would be played by musicians selected for his first balalaika collective.⁹ The first repertoire was created and fine-tuned at remarkable speed, judging by the timescale of about only seven months from the commencement of rehearsals in autumn 1887 to the repertoire's first official performance on 20 March 1888. What is clear is that Andreev managed to achieve this aim with limited professional assistance, if any. The only qualified musicians with whom he was collaborating from the spring of 1887 were A.F. El'man and A.N. Turner. El'man was a pianist, assisting with rehearsals of Andreev's first *balalaika kruzhok* from autumn 1887, and participating in the 1888 *kruzhok* debut. El'man also provided pianoforte accompaniment for Andreev's solo performances at variety concerts (*sbornye kontserty*) in St. Petersburg from at least spring 1887. Turner worked with Andreev from autumn 1887 in preparations for performance at the 20 March 1888 debut and was also one among the reduced-sized balalaika ensemble which toured in France on the invitation of the newspaper *Figaro* in 1892.

The creation of the balalaika collective repertoire raises several points. It is not clear whether Andreev adapted any of the pieces he performed solo from late 1886 to mid-1887 for collective performance by his *kruzhok* from March 1888. His June 1887 *Shkola dlja balalaiki* included pieces he had been performing solo in St. Petersburg's

⁹ See also L.M. Lebetskii, 'Rol' V.V. Andreeva i ego soratnikov v sozdanii repertuara dlja russkogo narodnogo orkestra' in *Tvorcheskoe nasledie V.V. Andreeva i praktika samodeiatel'nogo ispolnitel'stva: sbornik nauchnykh trudov*, edited by E.P. Karpenok (Leningrad: Leningradskii Institut kul'tury, 1988), pp. 50-51.

salons. Regarding the pieces which comprised the first balalaika collective's repertoire, one can speculate that trained pianist and Andreev accompanist El'man must have assisted with their adaptation and expansion for other balalaika ranges. Andreev's close collaboration with El'man is certain regarding one piece in particular, which was performed at the 20 March 1888 debut. Andreev's composition "March" (*Marsh*) was scored for balalaika and *pianoforte* accompaniment, and he and El'man performed it as a duet. It is not clear whether this duet had been performed in St. Petersburg salons prior to the 1888 *kruzhok* debut. It is more likely that it was specially prepared for that debut, given how unique and surprising this balalaika-*pianoforte* duet piece would have sounded to both Conservatoire musicians, and to those of a non-musical background in the audience. As for the repertoire created and adapted for the *tessitura* balalaika collective, this could only have been fine-tuned during the rehearsals commencing from September 1887, by which time Andreev had selected the best of his pupils for the *Kruzhok*. And it is important to note that this first balalaika collective repertoire for Paserbskii's range of balalaikas was created before Conservatoire trained and Rimsky-Korsakov pupil Nikolai Fomin's input from the end of 1889 to early 1890. It is all the more striking, therefore, that this debut repertoire was so successful in the view of St. Petersburg music critics at that time.

Andreev quickly fulfilled his aim to find people from whom to create and to organize a balalaika collective. He was next occupied with teaching the balalaika to willing enthusiasts steadily from late 1886 to early 1887, and especially after his profile was raised firstly by his invitation to perform for members of the Russian Imperial family in

February 1887 and secondly by the publication of his *Shkola dlja balalaiki* in June the same year.

Evidence of Andreev's serious commitment to the success of the balalaika and the balalaika collective is his clear statement that, having found suitable balalaika players to meet the standards of serious balalaika collective participation, it was equally important that such participants could 'devote' themselves to that 'special interest'.¹⁰ The latter aspect of this aim was fraught with recurring difficulties from the inception of the first balalaika *Kruzhok* and continued up to Andreev's final months as director of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* into which his original *kruzhok* evolved from the second half of the 1890s.

It is worth noting here regarding the difficulties of ensemble and orchestra members' full commitment to Andreev's work that balalaika playing was a new genre when it emerged from Andreev's example in the late 1880s (as was the case with other improved Russian folk instruments Andreev introduced into public performance from the following decade) and, as such, the genre originally had no professional platform. Andreev relied, therefore, on numerous enthusiastic amateurs and (from late 1889 to the early 1890s) a few Conservatoire students whose dedication and commitments to the genre were divided between their regular professions and studies and participation in Andreev's ensemble and (later) orchestra. This dilemma is evident, even during the final decade of his work, from subsidy requests which included seeking guarantees for payment of salaries due to orchestra members' ties to their regular occupations outside their orchestral participation and army work. There were some successes. In

¹⁰ 'Kak mne prishla mysl'...' in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.76.

1897, for example, Andreev's army teaching role was officially recognized by the State Duma approving salaries for him and members of his orchestra. However, this was subject to periodic re-applications to the State which imperilled Andreev's orchestra, its members and their work with perpetual financial insecurity, a condition which was only fully addressed and alleviated when long-term support was granted from early 1918 (see Chapter 7.4).¹¹

Having found eager amateurs to play the balalaika, Andreev's next aim was to teach them to play these folk instruments to the correct standard. He specifically emphasizes the need to teach 'individuals', indicating that this task was an essentially focused and considered undertaking. It was from these hand-picked, groomed individuals that he fulfilled the end purpose, i.e., to form an ensemble and to work with it to polish its collective folk balalaika 'music-making'.¹² In pointing out this and subsequent aims in 'Kak mne prishla....', Andreev is mindful of the extension of this aim to his work in the army regiments – see below and Chapter 7.2.1 – especially in St. Petersburg, at least during the initial army teaching phase between 1891 and 1896, i.e., before his own orchestra was augmented to include other Russian folk instruments, including domras, gusli and ancient Russian folk woodwind (see 2.2.3).

The original members of Andreev's *Kruzhok liubitelei igry na balalaikakh* had no formal musical training. In fulfilling the aim to teach them to play the balalaika, he had to rely initially on demonstrating visually, both to the group and to individual participants, the

¹¹ Andreev, 'O russkikh narodnykh instrumentakh' in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 34. See also discussion in Iu. E. Baranov, *Podvizhnik muzyki narodnoi* (Moscow: Moskovskii rabochii, 1988) and Iu. E. Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, (Tver': Russkaia provintsia, 2001).

¹² 'Kak mne prishla mysl'...' in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.76; and Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.59.

correct playing techniques and finger positioning on the fretboard for them to learn each piece. Andreev aimed to overcome the limitations of aural and visual balalaika-teaching. He achieved this by devising a ‘system and *Shkola* for teaching’ how to play the balalaika.¹³ The first *Shkola dlja balalaiki* manual of June 1887 embodied this swiftly realized aim and was the model for all similar manuals in the future.¹⁴ Applied to Andreev’s own work, the *Shkola* in practice enabled a broadening and varying of the means of teaching untrained, musically uneducated participants to play an active and fulfilling role in collective balalaika-playing.

But the early fruits of this aim were not exclusive to Andreev’s *Kruzhok liubitelei igry na balalaikakh*. Those fruits are also evident in the establishment of other collectives, both those created independently of Andreev’s collective, either using the *Shkola* manual as their principal guide, or taking advice from Andreev, and those collectives which Andreev went on to establish in regiments of the Russian army, discussed at more length in later chapters. Andreev’s *Shkola* clearly aimed to equip independently created balalaika collectives by including in its repertoire some pieces exclusively for certain combinations of balalaika ranges. This would enable players to bring those combinations of instruments together into larger collectives at their leisure. Although this is not specifically indicated the *Predislovie* to the *Shkola* manual alludes to this kind of collective balalaika-playing as one of its aims.

The ranges of balalaikas created by Paserbskii (see above 2.2.1) may, indeed, be considered to be ‘the basis of Russian folk orchestral performance’.¹⁵ But Andreev’s

¹³ ‘Kak mne prishla mysl’...’ in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.76.

¹⁴ This is based on my own comparison of Andreev’s *Shkola* with later balalaika manuals, which follow the same structure.

¹⁵ Imkhanitski, *U istokov...*, p.58.

solo performances on the same billing as mandolin and guitar ensembles during the spring of 1887 may have reinforced any existing ideas Andreev might have had about achieving the same kind of collective playing for the balalaika by establishing his own balalaika ensemble. It seems to be a tenuous suggestion, however, that the same exposure to mandolin and guitar ensembles in St. Petersburg salons gave Andreev the ‘idea of creating a Russian *national* [my emphasis] orchestra’ comprising Russian folk instruments.¹⁶ Available source evidence contains no definitive statement by Andreev to support this suggestion. The research, discovery and improvement of other Russian folk instruments, including stringed, woodwind and percussion instruments of Russia’s central belt, is more likely to have given rise to the idea of a national Russian folk orchestra. Their subsequent, phased introduction into the existing collective gave rise to a *national* Russian folk orchestra, comprising as it did improve ancient instruments of the central belt of Russia.

Andreev then states his aim ‘to fight against the deep-rooted prejudice in society towards the balalaika’ regarding its perceived ‘unsuitability as a musical instrument’.¹⁷ The die was cast regarding this aim from the point he embarked on improving the primitive balalaika, as testified by his account of finding a St. Petersburg craftsman to undertake this work.¹⁸ This was the first of many instances of Andreev’s determination to defy the prejudicial views of influential music critics and other sceptics. His struggle to gain acceptance for the balalaika would continue for the remainder of his life, despite support and encouragement from artistic (literary and musical) society to the

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Andreev, ‘Kak mne prishla mysl’...’ in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.76.

¹⁸ Andreev, ‘Iz vospominanii’ in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 121.

highest (Imperial court) level. It was a battle which exhausted both his father's inheritance and his own health, such was his determination to overcome that prejudice.¹⁹ He dealt with this in two ways: firstly, he demonstrated the validity of Russian folk instruments by the example of balalaika and, later, Russian folk instrument collective performance; secondly, he communicated these instruments' artistic validity to the public via the printed word, both in articles, and in letters published in the St. Petersburg and wider Russian print media.²⁰

Andreev acknowledges the uniqueness of his work, alluding even to its curiosity as a genre. He implies that his work was judged relatively to other genres in the sphere of musical arts with the analogy of the isolating experience of primitive man alone in the forest.²¹ This view of how Andreev perceived his chosen path puts into context the difficulties with which he contended in order to elevate Russian folk instruments, with the balalaika at the helm, to the status of recognized national folk instruments. It is, perhaps, the case that, without any prejudice to overcome, Andreev's achievement in this regard might not have had the same significance, as subsequent chapters in this thesis attempt to illustrate.

2.2.3 Andreev's aims for the domra, gusli and other Russian folk instruments

Andreev's rapid achievement in improving the Russian folk balalaika and expanding its range proved to be the basis for further expansion of his existing collective. Out of the success of Andreev's initial aim for the balalaika collective arose the need for

¹⁹ Andreev, 'Kak mne prishla mysl'... in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.76.

²⁰ See materials collected in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*.

²¹ Andreev, 'Kak mne prishla mysl'... in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.76.

additional range and timbre to convey an improving, ever more finely tuned repertoire. This was achieved with the incorporation of extra ancient Russian folk instruments into the collective. These additional instruments included the stringed *domra* and *gusli*, the woodwind *brelka* (*zhaleika*) and *svirel'*, as well as the percussion instruments *buben*, *nakry* and *lozhki*. The process of introducing these instruments into Andreev's balalaika collective spanned three decades from the early 1890s to beyond 1910. As with the balalaika, prototypes of these additional instruments²² had to be found, studied, appraised and improved to take their place alongside existing improved balalaikas. One exception in this process was the stringed instrument the *gudok* (see 'e' below in this section).

The revival of these Russian folk instruments embodied and demonstrated his aim of collective performance of the various instrument types in a single orchestral setting. This in turn revived, on a grander scale, the collective playing of Russian folk instruments documented from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The folk characteristics of these improved instruments were expressed both visually in their physical appearance, and through the blend of timbres to create a richer sonic texture. The improved instruments were incorporated into the orchestral setting additionally to exhibit what Andreev and his colleagues had identified as authentic Russian folk instruments specific to the central belt of 'Great Russia'. These aims were encapsulated in the eventual naming of the orchestra as the *Velikorusskii orkestr*.

²² Including those catalogued and described, for example, by Petukhov and Famintsyn in their 1884 and 1891 publications on Russian folk instruments, i.e., M. Petukhov, *Narodnye muzykal'nye instrumenty muzeia S-Peterburgskoi konservatorii* (St. Petersburg: Tip. Imp. Akad. nauk, 1884) and A.S. Famintsyn, *Domra i srodyne ei muzykal'nye instrument russkogo naroda: istoricheskii ocherk* (St. Petersburg: Tipografiia E. Arngol'da, 1891).

It is useful at this stage to summarize the eight key phases of Andreev's work on improving Russian folk instruments for incorporation into collective playing, from ensemble to orchestra. His first major improvement was Ivanov's first 'experimental' balalaika, constructed according to Andreev's detailed sketches; this diatonic model was soon replaced by the chromatic balalaika, this time crafted by Paserbskii, expanding the balalaika's range to twelve frets; the timbre of an individual, solo balalaika was inadequate, so Andreev created a *Kruzhok* of seven balalaika players (eight including himself) using instruments of various ranges and sizes, again crafted by Paserbskii; Andreev next increased the number of performers from seven (eight) to sixteen, altering the range and ensemble structure; Andreev then introduced new instruments into the collective, uniting balalaikas with domras; Andreev followed this with the introduction of the plucked *gusli*, and then the clavical (keyboard) *gusli*; he next introduced the *buben* (similar to a tambourine), *lozhki* (spoons) and *nakry* (a Russian folk percussive instrument similar to a timpani); in 1913 Andreev introduced the *gusli zvonchatye* (2 months prior to the 1913 25th anniversary of the first balalaika *kruzhok* debut).²³

a) Andreev explains the importance and reasons for finding a domra prototype from which to create an improved version of it, as well as of other Russian folk instruments, in various of his published and unpublished written works.²⁴ Writing in 1916, he

²³ V.D. Bibergan, 'Nasledie V.V. Andreeva i problem razvitiia orchestra russkikh narodnykh instrumentov' in Karpeok, *Tvorcheskoe nasledie*, p.125.

²⁴ See V.V. Andreev, 'Nakry i svireli' in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, pp.43-44. Regarding the range & variety of Russian folk instruments, including the domra, see V.V. Andreev, 'Konspekty dokladov Velikorusskogo orkestra' in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.87; regarding the domra's origin, the basis of improving & incorporating it into the Russian folk orchestra, see V.V. Andreev, 'Kratkaia istoricheskaia spravka o proiskhoshdenii narodnykh muzykal'nykh instrumentov, voshedshikh v sostav Velikorusskogo orkestra' in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, from p.105, esp. 'Domra' from p.106. Regarding the domra and other Russian folk instruments, See additionally V.V. Andreev, 'O russkikh narodnykh instrumentakh' in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, pp.32-40. Granovskii's

pointed out that there were no definitive illustrations depicting the outward appearance of an original domra prototype.²⁵ Therefore, as with the balalaika, a definitive domra prototype had to be found to provide the basis for improving it. Determining such a prototype's authenticity in the absence of a precise illustration of its appearance depended on logical conclusions drawn from comparing written descriptions of ancient musical instruments with which the domra had a shared lineage. Andreev confidently proposed that the Russian domra's circular-bodied appearance was derived from the ancient circular and pear-shaped bodied tambura-like instruments ('*tamburovidnye instrumenty*') to which the domra owed its origins.²⁶

Andreev casts doubt on eighteenth century cultural historian and antiquary J.J. Bellerman's depiction of a two-stringed and circular-bodied 'balalaika'.²⁷ This '*balalaikaobraznyi*' instrument was, in fact, a domra, from which the three-stringed balalaika was derived, a retained feature of Andreev's improved balalaika. The balalaika's 'undoubted ancestor', the domra, also had three strings, a feature also retained by Andreev in his improved domra.

Andreev was fortuitously assisted in his work on improvements to the 'authentic' three-stringed domra by A.A. Martynova (the wife of his colleague A.S. Martynov, *kontrabas* balalaika-player in the *Velikorusskii orkestr*). She provided two 'balalaika' prototypes

endnote states that this article was 'published in *Sankt-Peterburgskie vedomosti* No.354 on 24 Dec. 1896' (*Materialy i dokumenty*, p.305). A second publication date is also indicated, i.e. '11 January 1897, issue No.10'. This was the date that Andreev's *Velikorusskii orkestr* officially debuted in St. Petersburg. It seems that this article was published firstly as a precursor to, and, subsequently, to coincide with the first official performance of Andreev's re-named *Velikorusskii orkestr*, now incorporating additional types of Russian folk instruments.

²⁵ V.V. Andreev, 'Kratkaia istoricheskaia spravka' in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.106.

²⁶ See also Chapter 1.2.2

²⁷ J.J. Bellerman, 'Bemerkungen über Rußland' (1788), cited in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.311

she acquired in *Kotel'nichestkii uezd* of *Vyatskaia guberniia*: one prototype was circular-bodied with its bottom end slightly truncated, while the other had a triangular body. Both prototypes had been made by peasant artisans. That the first 'tambura-like' type of domra had survived and been preserved among the *narod* by a peasant of *Vyatskaia guberniia* was, in Andreev's view, hardly in doubt. And there were still occurrences of this prototype in separate regions (guberniia) and in outlying areas. Like the domra prototype given to Andreev, local peasant craftsmen used to make circular balalaikas for sale alongside authentic triangular ones, both having three strings. Both types were called 'balalaikas' from the eighteenth century, as the name 'domra' had all but disappeared from folk memory by then, the name 'domra' subsequently being replaced by 'balalaika'.²⁸ In any event, Andreev asserts, peasants' crafting of circular-bodied balalaikas in the late nineteenth century was 'indisputable evidence' of the existence among the *narod* of the domra, with all the indicia of its outward appearance. It became 'obvious to anyone surveying the primitive workmanship of this instrument', Andreev concluded, that 'the body needed to be perfectly circular' and that the bottom of the body was truncated merely for ease and speed of crafting the instrument.²⁹

Therefore, Andreev was resolved not to proceed with improving any Russian folk musical instrument without having acquired its authentic prototype preserved among the *narod*. Only when he was satisfied that he had an authentic domra prototype did he present the '*viatskaia domra*' to his Bezhetsk workshop Russian folk instrument

²⁸ Andreev explains this in more detail in the 'Balalaika' section of his above cited article 'O russkikh narodnykh instrumentakh' in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, pp.32-39.

²⁹ Andreev, 'Kak mne prishla...' in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 75. Andreev points out that this primitive version of the domra was still being sold by peasant artisans in 1896 for 15-25 kopecks.

master craftsman S.I. Nalimov to survey for improvement. Andreev personally supervised Nalimov in producing in 1896 a perfectly improved domra type, 'preserving all the original features given to it by the *narod*'. The result of this work, Andreev summarised, was that the domra 'occupied a unique position among the tambura-type instruments to which it was related'.³⁰ On account of its undoubted Russian features, the domra 'could not be confused, for example, with the mandolin or any other tambura-like instrument, despite their common derivation'.³¹ This was chiefly because the domra possessed 'its own inherent sound quality'.³² To claim that the Russian domra and mandolin were the same instruments would be the same as asserting, Andreev reasoned, that the Russian, Czech or Serb were one and the same because all these nationalities were Slavkindreds.³³

All of the above principles for verifying the authenticity and improving the Russian domra fulfilled the aim of reviving and re-asserting it as a Russian folk instrument and incorporating it into the authentic Russian folk instrumental collective. These principles were meticulously applied by Andreev and his colleagues regarding the other Russian folk instruments which were subsequently phased into the Russian folk collective named the *Velikorusskii orkestr*.

b) Versions of the *gusli* were introduced into Andreev's orchestra after the ranges of domras. Two types were introduced, the plucked and keyboard-operated. These were crafted by master Gerl' using orchestra member and Andreev colleague N.P. Fomin's

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Andreev, 'Pochemu ia posviatil svoiu zhizn' usovershenstvovaniu drevnikh muzykal'nykh instrumentov russkogo naroda' in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 79.

³² Ibid.

³³ Andreev, 'O ruskkikh narodnykh instrumentakh' in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.37.

sketches; a further *gusli*, the ‘*gusli zvonchaty*’ (or ‘*zvonchatye gusli*’) was also later introduced (after the *svirel*’, *brelka*, *buben*, *nakry* & *gudok*, to which I will turn shortly).

There were four types, all constructed by orchestra member and Andreev colleague N.I. Privalov and Smolenskii: their types were ‘*pikkolo*’, ‘*prima*’, ‘*al’t*’ and ‘*bas*’.³⁴

c) After the *gusli*, Andreev introduced the paired woodwind instruments, the *svirel*’ and the *brelka*. Both were also crafted by master Gerl’.³⁵ Andreev next constructed ‘*pastusheskie rozhki*’ using sketches by N.I. Privalov. Four types were introduced.³⁶ There was a *rozhechniki* ensemble, or choir in existence before Andreev became active. It seems these ‘*rozhki*’ were introduced after the introduction and trials of the *gudok*. However, Andreev was concerned about their *timbre* clashing with the *timbre* of the stringed *gudok*.³⁷

d) Percussion – Andreev next introduced *buben* and *nakry* into his orchestra on the advice of Russian composer Balakirev.³⁸

³⁴ Bibergan, V.D., ‘Nasledie V.V. Andreeva i problemy razvitiia orkestra russkikh narodnykh instrumentov’ in *Tvorcheskoe nasledie V.V. Andreeva i praktika...*, Leningrad, 1988, p.125 & Andreev, V.V., ‘Gusli zvonchaty, vvedennye v Velikorusskii orkestr v 1913 godu’ in Granovskii, B., op.cit., p.125.

³⁵ V.D. Bibergan, ‘Nasledie V.V. Andreeva i problemy razvitiia orkestra russkikh narodnykh instrumentov’ in Karpenok, *Tvorcheskoe nasledie V.V. Andreeva*, p.125. The *svirel*’ is mentioned in an interview with Andreev, ‘*Nakry i svireli*’, in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.43. See also Andreev, ‘O brelke i igroke na nei krest’ianine Afanasiia Iakovleva’, in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, from p.40.

³⁶ Bibergan, ‘Nasledie V.V. Andreeva’, p.125. Andreev’s assessment of the value and credibility of ‘*pastusheskie rozhki*’ is found in ‘O muzyke rozhechnikov’ (i.e., choir of *rozhechniki* from the Vladimir region, conducted by N.V. Kondrat’ev), a 1902 letter to the editor of *Novoe vremia*, reprinted in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, pp.51-52. See esp. the final paragraph.

³⁷ See Andreev’s ‘Kratkaia istoricheskaia spravka’, in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, pp.116-117. On the *zhaleika* and *brelka*, the following quote is of note: “The whole issue is that improvements were going in the wrong direction: they were trying to refine these instruments, to adjust them to the aesthetics of the music making of their time. The whole beauty of the timbre of the *zhaleika* or the *brelka* lies in the fact that they are precisely not finely hewn but coarse; in the fact that they are always unexpected and joyful, just like the manifestation of national character itself” (‘*Vse delo v tom, chto usovershenstvovanie shlo v nepravil’nom napravlenii: eti instrumenty pytalis’ oblagorazhivat’, podgoniat’ pod estetiku muzitsirovaniia svoego vremeni. Vsia prelest’ tembra zhaleiki ili brelki v tom i sostoit, chto oni neobtesany, sherokhovaty, chto oni vsegda neozhidannyi, radostnyi, kak samo proiavlenie natsional’nogo kharaktera.’) Cited in Bibergan, ‘Nasledie V.V. Andreeva’, pp.126-127.*

³⁸ See Bibergan, ‘Nasledie V.V. Andreeva’, p.125. Also note Andreev’s explanation of ‘*nakry*’, in ‘*Nakry i svireli*’, in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.44; and of ‘*lozhki*’ in Andreev, ‘Kratkaia istoricheskaia

e) The *gudok* was introduced into Andreev's orchestra on the advice of N.P. Fomin.

Four types were introduced on a trial basis: '*gudochek*', '*gudok*', '*gudilo*' and '*gudishche*'.³⁹ These names refer to four separate ranges, from *prima* to bass. Andreev acknowledged that the *gudok* was 'very widespread in ancient times among the *narod*'; in other words, he was fully convinced of its status as a Russian folk instrument.⁴⁰ However, the introduction of the *gudok* into his orchestra ultimately proved problematic due to its similarity to the violin.⁴¹ Andreev was conscious that the *gudok* was a 'prototype' of the violin, and was anxious that any improvements to the *gudok* would simply result in copying or reinventing the violin:

'After much research, I came to the undeniable conclusion that the *gudok* is a prototype of the violin and improving it would inevitably produce a violin, because everything would have to be borrowed from this most perfect of bowed instruments, which such geniuses as Stradivarius, Amati and others worked on.'

'...после долгих изысканий, пришел к неоспоримому выводу, что гудок есть прототип скрипки и при усовершенствовании его неминуемо получится та же скрипка, ибо все придется заимствовать от этого

spravka o proiskhozhdenii narodnykh muzykal'nykh instrumentov voshedshikh v sostav Velikorusskogo orkestra', in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.118.

³⁹ See Bibergan, 'Nasledie V.V. Andreeva', p.125

⁴⁰ See Andreev, 'O russkikh narodykh instrumentakh', in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, pp.37-38: "The *gudok* was a bow instrument mentioned in a *letopis*' as early as the eleventh century. It was one of the most ancient Russian musical instruments and today has completely disappeared among the *narod*." ('ГУДОК был смычковым инструментом, о нем упоминается еще в летописи XI столетия. Это был один из древнейших русских музыкальных инструментов и ныне совершенно вымер в народе.')

⁴¹ See Andreev, 'Kratkaia istoricheskaia spravka...', in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, pp.116-117. Andreev did initially intend to include the *gudok* in his orchestra, as he made clear in a letter to N.I. Privalov: «Я думаю восстановить все инструменты, на которых играл народ государства Московского, т. е. средней полосы России, к моим балалайкам присоединю домры, затем восстановлю гусли, жалейку, а также рожки, вероятно, гудки, если удастся найти их в народном обращении, наконец, накры и другие ударные». Cited in Bibergan, 'Nasledie V.V. Andreeva', p.125.

совершеннейшего из смычковых инструментов, над которым работали такие гении, как Страдивариус, Амати и другие.⁴²

As he did not wish to bring a symphonic element into the folk collective, he therefore deemed it impossible to include the *gudok*. He was in any case unhappy with the sound and the *timbre* of the *gudok* against the sound of other Russian folk instruments, which further explains this decision.

On 13 March 1888, a week prior to the concert debut of Andreev's balalaika *Kruzhok*, an interesting point of view was expressed in *Peterburgskii listok* regarding the composition of the range of instruments comprising the collective. With a certain foresight, it was suggested that the collective had become 'the nucleus of a future, variedly timbred Russian orchestra'.⁴³ Whether this envisaged simply a larger collective of balalaika ranges is not explicit in the text. It is important, therefore, that Andreev named the future orchestra the *Velikorusskii orkestr* in 1897-1898, only when it had become comprised of a varied blend of musical instrument voices additional to the ranges of balalaikas as they stood in early 1888. But the future 'orchestra', characterized in part by its varied *tessitura*, was comprised of folk instruments *alongside* ranges of balalaikas.

2.3 Andreev, the *narod* and dissemination (*rasprostranenie*)

There are recurrent references to the *narod* and dissemination (*rasprostranenie*) in Andreev's writings, where one frequently finds reference to his aims in this regard. As

⁴² Andreev, 'Kratkaia istoricheskia spravka...', in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.116.

⁴³ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.59.

he writes in one essay, 'the main goal of [his] aspirations in the field of revival and improvement of folk instruments (balalaika, domra, gusli and horn), which perfectly convey folk song, is to return to the *narod* through these musical instruments the beautiful monuments of its songwriting, which are the key to the further independent development of its musical tastes in the highest meaning of this words. Everyone knows what a beneficial effect good music has on the moral human body. It ennobles the soul [and] nurtures an attraction to everything beautiful and sublime.'⁴⁴ Such passages demonstrate the importance that Andreev placed on his work in relation to the *narod*, who he saw as an important audience for – and beneficiary of – this work.

However, our understanding of the emphasis he places on these words and what they represent for his work with Russian folk instruments can sometimes be obfuscated by Soviet writers' narrowly focused assimilation of these words into Soviet interpretations of them. The effect of this, intentionally or otherwise, is to place emphasis on Andreev's work with workers and soldiers as though this was the only significant dimension to his activities. However important that aspect of Andreev's work may have been, the actual indications are that Andreev's activities had a broader perspective. He had a shared conviction with the Imperial Court regarding the dissemination of Russian folk instruments and music from the beginnings of his activities with the balalaika. There is compelling evidence to suggest that Andreev was motivated from at least February 1887 by Imperial Court approval of what could be achieved for the

⁴⁴ See Andreev, 'O russkikh narodykh instrumentakh', in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, pp.38-39.

Russian *narod* regarding the dissemination of, at least, the balalaika as an improved and artistically valid musical instrument.

As well as Andreev's own words revealing the unity between himself and the Imperial Court regarding the value and benefits to the *narod* of the burgeoning balalaika activist's work, archival documents from the Imperial Court concerning Andreev's activities confirm the extent of Imperial Court associations with that work. One such example is seen in archived Imperial Court reminiscences from the 1890s which are now in the public domain. The document states:

In order to achieve the goal of disseminating these Russian instruments among the people as quickly as possible, he [Andreev] chose the lower ranks as the most faithful and closest guides to the instruments and forgotten folk song for the people [*narod*]. He conducted his first experiment in the Consolidated Guards Battalion, where in 1891 he began to teach soldiers to play the balalaika and formed a circle of balalaika players

Для более скорого осуществления цели распространения этих русских инструментов в народе он [Andreev] избрал нижних чинов, как вернейших и ближайших проводников инструментов и забываемой песни в народ. Первый опыт произвел в Сводно-Гвардейском батальоне, где в 1891 году стал учить солдат игре на балалайке и сформировал кружок балалаечников.⁴⁵

⁴⁵ RGIA, f. 1405 op. 539 d. 311 l. 1-2 ob. ('Pamiatnaia zapiska o deiatel'nosti Vasiliia Vasilievicha Andreeva').

As is clear from this select reminiscence, the term “dissemination” (*rasprostranenie*) had two meanings in relation to Andreev’s work, referring to the dissemination of Russian folk instruments, on the one hand, and the dissemination of the Russian folk song via those instruments, on the other. Working in the Russian armed forces regiments and battalions from 1891 emerged as one of the cornerstones of dissemination. It signalled Andreev’s intention to fulfil the idea he shared with the Russian Imperial Court - that of returning to the *narod* improved Russian folk instruments and their music (see Chapter 7.2.1 and 7.3.1). This aim evolved and broadened over ensuing years to include additional aspirations.

It is clear from available source material how Andreev was to fulfil this overall aim. One example of this was by means of the social aspect of fulfilling his aims regarding the *narod* and dissemination. This included ideas for establishing organizations and institutions as means to benefit the *narod* and to facilitate dissemination such as the Society for the Promotion of Playing Folk Instruments and Collective Singing (*Obshchestvo rasprostranenia igry na narodnykh instrumentakh i khorovogo peniya*), first created in 1915. Writing in that year in support of this idea, Andreev points out: a) the uniqueness of improved Russian folk instruments in terms of the speed with which they could be mastered, of their accessibility to the *narod* through their affordability, and of their versatility for accommodating a wide repertoire; b) the wide dissemination of orchestral playing of these instruments to the healthy benefit of the *narod* was aimed, at least initially, at the villages deprived of entertainment;⁴⁶ c) the tasks of the

⁴⁶ Andreev’s aim for the «*Obshchestvo...*» in this regard is stated in his ‘*Dannyye i soobrazheniya*’ in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 82.

aforementioned ‘*Obshchestvo...*’ were not limited to this group, that is to say villagers. The aim was to give the opportunity ‘to all wishing to learn to play Russian folk instruments’ and to set up and to organize *velikorusskie orkestry*. This would be fulfilled in part by teaching in towns. The ultimate aim, therefore, was to allow ‘every person’ to learn to play whatever folk instrument they preferred, that is any of those introduced into ‘the *velikorusskii orkestr*’, i.e., any such orchestra modelled on Andreev’s orchestra.⁴⁷

However, the means for fulfilling this ultimate aim were not limited to the work he began in the armed forces in November 1891. It was through his three years’ activities with his first balalaika ensemble that Andreev began the process of dissemination. This was manifestly through public performance of his first *Kruzhok* and the educated people whom he aimed to attract to his work. This first enabled Andreev to expand his work beyond his own collective’s role by disseminating interest in Russian folk instrument music-making through others outside his own *Kruzhok*. His work in the armed forces was the logical next step in fulfilling this broad aim. As Andreev himself clearly stated:

‘In order to return to the people, or at the very least sustain among them, the beautiful monuments of its art of song, I undertook to disseminate the improved balalaika as widely as possible, first among the intelligentsia, and then among the people through the medium of soldiers’

‘Для возвращения народа или хотя бы удержания в нем прекрасных памятников его песенного творчества я и предпринял возможно большее

⁴⁷ ‘Dannye i soobrazheniia’ in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 82.

распространение усовершенствованной балалайки сначала среди интеллигенции, а затем в народе через посредство солдат'.⁴⁸

2.4 Conclusion

The artistic and social implications of dissemination are Andreev's appeal to high and low class of his musical pieces, i.e., the high society appeal of waltzes and polonaises & their high-class flavour. But their simplicity of arrangement and of performance also appealed to and, therefore, included the lower, musically untrained class. His aims regarding the *narod* and dissemination were not limited to the villages, however important this aspect of Andreev's aims. The *narodnost'* of Russian folk instruments, that is their accessibility for the lower, poorer *narod*, did not preclude accessibility for those of higher social standing but who were also musically untrained. The progress of Andreev's work illustrates this in foregoing chapters regarding those who participated in his work from 1887-1918.

⁴⁸ Andreev, 'O russkikh narodnykh instrumentakh' in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 34.

3. ANDREEV AS ORGANIZER

3.1 Introduction

This chapter explains Andreev's role as an organizer specifically in relation to the balalaika's transition from its primitive folk prototype to its improved concert standard model. It is shown that the transition was inevitable and necessary in order that the balalaika could be organized for ensemble performance of the level Andreev anticipated for it. It also demonstrates how Andreev's organizational instincts evolved synchronously with each stage of the balalaika's practical, aesthetic and artistic improvements.

3.2.1 Paskin's Bezhetskai balalaika

The foundations of the organizational aspect of Andreev's work were laid in the autumn of 1884 when he met the Bezhetsk *pomeshchik* Alexandre Stepanovich Paskin.¹ Paskin's input was crucial in helping Andreev to see the full potential of the balalaika and to begin developing ideas about its improvement.

Andreev had first heard the balalaika for the first time in the summer of 1883 on his family estate at Mar'ino near Bezhetsk in the province of Tver'.² Andreev was 'struck' by the rhythm and unique way of playing the instrument, as then demonstrated by the labourer Antip. He was also impressed by how this 'wretched looking, imperfect

¹ Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p.27.

² Shtiber dates this encounter to 'the late [18] seventies' (N. P. Shtiber, V.V. Andreev: *Ocherk ego deiatel'nosti* (St. Petersburg: Sirotinka, 1898), p.1), though 1883 is more likely based on Andreev's relation of the sequence of events from that period.

instrument could produce so many sounds' with only three strings.³ Andreev indicates he was aware in 1883 of the impediments to the balalaika's scope and repertoire due to its primitive design. For example, its tied frets were intrusive and the instrument was also hamstrung by its limited *diatonic* range (absence of *semitones*). And yet, to Andreev, such restrictions were eclipsed by the instrument's musical effects (tonal and rhythmical). In his view, this 'Russian folk instrument acutely differed from all other folk instruments' he had heard.⁴

Andreev's assessment of the balalaika's practical and musical scope had some merit. He was a self-taught musician, playing 12 musical instruments by the age of fourteen,⁷⁹ including guitar, flute, mandolin and *garmonika*.⁵ He was also taught professionally to play the violin during his youth by N.V. Galkin.⁶ But although the violin gave him most enjoyment in his earlier years, he was subsequently 'drawn to the balalaika' and, by his own admission, he had become a balalaika player instead of a violinist.⁷ The indications, therefore, are that his musical pursuits (both amateur self-taught and professional violin instruction) were a solid musical basis for him to make a reasoned assessment of the balalaika's capabilities and potential.

³ Andreev, 'Kak mne prishla...' in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 75.

⁴ *ibid.*

⁵ Iu. E. Baranov, *Podvizhnik muzyki narodnoi*, p. 9.

⁶ *Ibid.* Note that Granovskii says with regard to Galkin: 'Педагогом Андреева по скрипке был Н.В. Галкин (1850-1906), ученик Л.С. Ауэра, по классу которого он окончил в 1872 году Петербургскую консерваторию. Солист оркестра Мариинского театра, профессор Петербургской консерватории.' *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 309fn3.

⁷ Andreev, 'Kak mne prishla...' in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 76.

Andreev met Paskin during a visit to the home of P.A. Bayer (a Bezhetsk pharmacist).⁸

Paskin was himself a balalaika player, locally reputed to be the *Tverskaia guberniia* virtuoso of that then unmodified folk instrument.⁹ Andreev had been playing the balalaika since the summer of the previous year, and asked Paskin to play for him when he saw a balalaika lying on top of Bayer's piano. Paskin notes that his playing impressed Andreev.¹⁰ Subsequently, Paskin explained to Andreev several possible ways of improving the balalaika's construction: for example, the sound the instrument produced could be amplified by enlarging its body (*kuzov*); the use of thicker guitar strings would also make for a richer sound and would completely eliminate the 'irritating snapping noise'¹¹ which would have been quite audible when playing the primitive balalaika due to its thinner, under-taut copper strings; the *semi-tone* could be acquired from the instrument by installing permanent frets along its neck.¹² The reason for its limited tonal range was that the instrument had only five movable frets (*peredvizhnye lady*), meaning they were not permanently affixed to the neck. Moreover, before improvement, the instrument *characteristically* could only be played in a range of *sharps* (*dieznyi ton*) and a limited number of *flats* (*bemol'nyi ton*).¹³

Within a year of his autumn 1884 meeting with Paskin, Andreev was refining his ideas for improving the balalaika. This was through experience he gained performing solo

⁸ Baranov, *Vasili Andreev*, p.27.

⁹ Ibid. Paskin (22 Dec. 1846 (3 Jan. 1847)–25 Dec. 1914 N.S.) was a Deputy of the State Duma, a hereditary nobleman of *Tver' guberniia*, a landowner in the Bezhetsk district, residing in the village of Shishkovo-Dubovo. He also played other Russian folk instruments. He confirms the primitive scope of the unmodified balalaika thus: 'Будучи страстным любителем музыки, я слыхал балалайку еще в руках крепостных людей моего деда, генерала Нилова. Но должен сказать, что игра приказчика и кучера не производила на меня впечатления, так как инструменты у них были весьма плохого качества, да и репертуар слишком ограничен.' – A.S. Paskin, 'Balalaika i Andreev' in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.223.

¹⁰ Paskin, 'Balalaika i Andreev', p. 223.

¹¹ Baranov, *Vasili Andreev*, p. 27.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Paskin, 'Balalaika i Andreev', p. 223.

on the balalaika in St. Petersburg at amateur concerts. But the gestation of the idea to improve the balalaika had arguably begun in the summer of 1883 during the time he spent with Antip, over a year before he was introduced to Paskin. Evidence for this is Andreev's above observations of Antip's balalaika-playing, and his observations on the primitive model of the instrument at that time.

Andreev does not state specifically in his own writings when the idea to improve the balalaika occurred to him. But it seems it was on Paskin's advice that Andreev ordered his first 'improved' balalaika from a carpenter local to Bezhetsk,¹⁴ who himself was said to be a modest player of the instrument.¹⁵ This 'Antonov' balalaika – the carpenter in question is only referred to by that surname in all available sources – marked the first attempted improvement of the instrument. Whose specific recommendations for those improvements Antonov undertook is not quite clear. Paskin surmises in 1913 that the improvements were undertaken in light of his suggestions to Andreev for improving the balalaika at their meeting in autumn 1884.¹⁶

Antonov's improved balalaika differed from Paskin's, both in the higher quality of materials Antonov used for its construction, and in the limited modifications he made to increase the size of the instrument's body.¹⁷ But its overriding improvement at that stage was its shortened neck. This would allow for more ease of playing: primitive balalaikas such as that played by Paskin had a longer neck, meaning the fret-board

¹⁴ Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p. 27.

¹⁵ Paskin, 'Balalaika i Andreev', p. 223.

¹⁶ Paskin, 'Balalaika i Andreev', p. 223. See also article in *Tverskaia gazeta*, no. 510 (25 April 1913), reprinted in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 334.

¹⁷ It also differed from Andreev's own Antip-esque balalaika which he had been playing up to that time ('for a whole year', according to Shtiber. V.V. Andreev: *Ocherk ego deiatel'nosti*, p. 1).

hand would have to jump around awkwardly when playing especially rapid passages. Andreev's improved 'Antonov' model reduced this inconvenience. It allowed for more agile and flexible playing of rapid, intricate passages, and was arguably the first (albeit tentative) development towards more sophisticated and skilful balalaika playing in subsequent years.¹⁸

3.2.2 The St. Petersburg craftsmen and the early “improved balalaikas” (*usovershenstvovannye balalaiki*)

The experience Andreev gained from performing on the Antonov balalaika in St. Petersburg served as the catalyst for more significant improvements to the instrument. Any notions and intentions of presenting the balalaika as a *concert* musical instrument were still very much at odds with the balalaika in its current 'Antonov' form. The improvements employed by shortening the neck and enlarging the body of the instrument were still overshadowed by its primitive appearance and restrictive melodic and tonal scope. Its movable frets, limited *diatonic* scale, inexpressive dynamics and generally anaemic (however unique) *timbre* would have rendered it still a folk prototype.

It was approximately in late 1884 that Andreev's ideas for improving the balalaika beyond Antonov's prototype were fuelled by his studying of the history of musical instruments. He discovered that the development of all European musical instruments

¹⁸ Commenting on V.V. Ivanov's first improved balalaika of spring 1885, Baranov notes: 'На нем [то есть на грифе] врезаны пять постоянных, металлических ладов, впоследствии замененных слоновой костью'. Also 'Струны натянуты жильные, чтобы смягчить звучание.' i.e., not only *taut* strings that 'softened the tone', eliminating 'snapping noise'. *Podvizhnik muzyki narodnoi*, p. 16.

had advanced in only relatively recent times: although they had undergone changes and improvements over the course of the centuries, it was particularly the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries that witnessed those changes.¹⁹

As far as improving the balalaika was concerned, it was clear to him that the time was ripe to begin that work. This would not, however, be at the expense of the balalaika's original qualities, but would rather be for preserving its characteristic form, with its three strings, and with it the unique ways of playing the instrument. All these standard principles were duly upheld with each subsequent improvement to the balalaika.

The first very significant advances away from the post and existing Antonov balalaika prototypes which Andreev envisaged were undertaken in two major stages.

a) The first stage in this development began with the renowned St. Petersburg craftsman Vladimir Vasil'evich Ivanov. The main focus at that stage was now to improve the balalaika by enhancing the resonance of the instrument. That requirement would be met by further enlarging its body, i.e., a further improvement on the same modification undertaken by Antonov.²⁰ However, replacing the movable frets (*peredvizhnye pereviazi*) with permanently affixed ones (*lady*) would also complement the enhanced resonance produced via the instrument's enlarged body. Increased resonance alone would merely amplify the 'snapping' sound simultaneously accompanying each note played on the primitive fret board, whereas permanent, metal frets would cause each amplified note played on the fret board to 'ring', thus enhancing the listening experience. Andreev also understood that playing the

¹⁹ Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p. 27.

²⁰ *ibid.*

balalaika itself could be improved by shortening the neck of the instrument a stage further than that original improvement also undertaken by Antonov.

Andreev took his sketches of the Antonov prototype to V.V. Ivanov in late 1884.²¹ It is significant that Andreev's sketches and reasoning were insufficient initially to convince Ivanov to craft an improved balalaika. It was only when Andreev returned to Ivanov and played several folk tunes to him on Antonov's balalaika that Ivanov was persuaded to carry out the request for an improved instrument. As a violin craftsman, Ivanov could only be persuaded on *hearing* the balalaika's *acoustic* potential. And there was great scope for improving the balalaika's unique *timbre* because no-one else had yet crafted a folk balalaika with the *timbre* required for concert performance.

When it was completed by the spring of 1885, Ivanov's improved balalaika constituted a striking departure from Antonov's prototype.²² The body of Ivanov's balalaika was crafted from resonant mountain maple and had a shortened ebony neck inlaid with five permanent, metal frets. The instrument was also strung to a higher tension with its two lower-pitched strings (tuned to the classical guitar's top e) being replaced with gut strings, which helped to soften the balalaika's tone. The overall result was an elegant, refined and melodious instrument compared with the Antonov model and its

²¹ As Baranov notes, 'Andreev did not wander from workshop to workshop with his plans trying to persuade craftsmen to accept the order, as is written in some books about Andreev, but *immediately went* (my emphasis) to the famous violin master V.V. Ivanov....' *Vasilii Andreev*, p. 27. The timing of Andreev's approach to Ivanov is an approximation, taking into account the time from which he acquired Antonov's balalaika in late 1884 up to the completion of Ivanov's balalaika.

²² Baranov contradicts Imkhanitskii with regard to this approximation of the date (*Vasilii Andreev*, p.28). Imkhanitskii states: 'It used to be generally accepted that V.V. Ivanov created this type of balalaika in 1885. K.A. Vertkov, naming 1887, further confuses the question, since in another chapter of his book he writes that F.S. Paserbskii made the first chromatic balalaika "about two or three years later", that is, in 1889-1890!...Meanwhile, V.V. Andreev's personal secretary, G.D. Pakhorukov, who wrote his "Brief biographical note" about the musician in close communication with him, names 1886 as the date that Ivanov made the first improved balalaika.' *U istokov...* p. 52fn2.

predecessors.²³ With its improved acoustic effects, this balalaika's *diapasonal* dynamics ranged from the most delicate *pianissimo* to the strong *forte*.²⁴ This significant development was foundational with regard to Andreev's future organizational work in establishing and refining his balalaika collective.

There is some evidence that Andreev was performing on the Ivanov balalaika for approximately an eighteen-month period from the spring of 1885. His performances were at privately organized concerts, (possibly) in the St. Petersburg area.²⁵ It is almost certain that such opportunities to perform and to develop his own artistry on the balalaika enabled him to develop his ideas for even further improvements to the instrument. The ultimate test of the balalaika's improved resonance was for it to be heard acoustically in a larger performance venue. He had the opportunity of that experience when he officially debuted publicly in the *Kontsernyi zal Pavlovoi* on the 21 November 1886 (performing there again on 9 December 1886). And on 23 December 1886 (the date incorrectly considered in some publications to be his official public balalaika appearance), Andreev performed at St. Petersburg's acoustically superior *Zal dvoryanskogo sobraniiia*.²⁶

Numerous of the following day's newspaper reviews of this performance made observations which significantly highlighted the direction in which Andreev's

²³ Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p. 28.

²⁴ F.V. Sokolov, *Andreev i ego orkestr* (Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe muzykal'noe izdatel'stvo, 1962), quoted in Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p. 52.

²⁵ Baranov, *Podvizhnik muzyki narodnoi*, p. 16.

²⁶ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p. 52. Note: The *Zal dvorianskogo sobraniiia* was later to become the *Petersburgaia Filarmoniia*. V.V. Andreev, therefore, wrote himself early on into St. Petersburg's musical history.

increasing virtuosity was taking the balalaika. They observed such characteristics as the ‘fiery temperament’ of Andreev’s playing, the precision of his playing rhythm, and his ‘remarkable artistry and technical mastery’.²⁷ But the review in *Peterburgskaia gazeta* made a crucial observation. Andreev had played in the *chromatic* scale, although he was performing on the less sophisticated five-fretted, *diatonic* balalaika. He achieved this by playing higher up the balalaika’s *diatonic* register, on the fretless part of the neck beyond the boundary of the fifth (and final) fret. A chromatically scaled balalaika would have included all semi-tones in the scale of A of the top open string, ranging from the open A of the top string (tuned to the same pitch as the open A of the violin) to the A of the following chromatic scale (the twelfth fret of a chromatically scaled balalaika) and beyond. A diatonically scaled balalaika at that time only had the scope for playing in the scale of A of its top string, but without the semi-tones between the tones. The expanded chromatic scale allowed for playing more sophisticated melodic passages as balalaika playing subsequently developed.

Imkhanitskii correctly explains that Andreev’s lengthy professional violin tuition had ‘stood him in good stead’.²⁸ Such a performance innovation would therefore have come naturally to him, given the scope for playing the fretless violin on which he had received professional tuition. But such an innovation of playing on the so recently improved, yet still five-fretted balalaika also anticipated an instrument with a full *chromatic* scale. The expansion of the balalaika’s range enabled by the *chromatic* scale would in turn anticipate a balalaika crafted for truly *concert* performance. For, however improved the instrument crafted by Ivanov, it was still a five-fretted instrument.

²⁷ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 334.

²⁸ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p. 52.

Despite Baranov's doubtful claim to the contrary,²⁹ Ivanov's balalaika could not quite have aspired to *concert* performance level, as it was superseded by a truly *concert*, *chromatic* balalaika within six months of Andreev's successful performance of 23 December 1886.

b) For the next stage in the balalaika's development, Andreev collaborated with the highly respected St. Petersburg craftsman Frants Stanislavovich Paserbskii. But it seems that this was not initiated by Andreev. In a letter dated 1 March 1887, Paserbskii had the 'honour to inform' Andreev that he had opened a workshop in St. Petersburg two months earlier dealing in (and repairing) 'stringed instruments...of all kinds'.³⁰ Paserbskii continues that he heard by chance that Andreev was a proficient multi-instrumentalist. Venturing 'most humbly' to request that Andreev gave him the pleasure of visiting his establishment, Paserbskii suggests Andreev may find something to his taste among the musical instruments in his possession. Concluding with assurances to Andreev of his honourable intentions, Paserbskii reveals the purpose of his letter: 'The craftsman A. Povitsii, who is well known to you and *who worked in Ivanov's workshop* [my emphasis], is working at the present time in my workshop and bears the deepest respect for you, Vasilii Vasil'evich' [Khorosho izvestnyi Vam master A. Povitskii, rabotaiushchii u Ivanova, v nastoiashchee vremia rabotaet v moei masterskoi i svidetel'stvuet Vam, Vasilii Vasil'evich, svoe glubokoe pochtenie].'³¹

²⁹ Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p. 27.

³⁰ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 162.

³¹ *ibid.*

On 27 February 1887, a few days prior to Paserbskii's letter, Andreev had performed at the palace of Prince Ol'denburgskii.³² Imkhanitskii suggests the Ol'denburgskii concert invitation was beneficial for Andreev, that it helped to allay the disregard in which the balalaika was held by personalities in the higher echelons of Russian society. Therefore, it helped Andreev establish new contacts with highly respected musical instrument craftsmen such as Paserbskii. And the implication from Imkhanitskii is that Paserbskii's letter may have been prompted by Andreev's recent performance success in the presence of relatives of the Russian royal family, including Prince Ol'denburgskii, on 27 February 1887.³³ But Paserbskii's letter could also suggest that he was driven by the prospect of a commercial opportunity (see next section 3.2.3 and Chapter 6.5).

Andreev's response to Paserbskii's invitation resulted in the balalaika undergoing two rapid developments which superseded Ivanov's improved instrument crafted approximately two years earlier. Between approximately March and June 1887, Paserbskii's further improved, five-fretted instrument was soon followed (with Andreev's directions) by his, and the first *chromatic*, twelve-fretted (двенадцатиладовая) balalaika.³⁴ The appearance of these two improved balalaikas coincided with the June 1887 publication of P.K. Seliverstov's *Shkola dlja balalaiki*, which included a picture illustration of Paserbskii's five-fretted instrument on its front cover.³⁵

³² Shtiber, V.V. *Andreev: Ocherk ego deiatel'nosti*, p. 3.

³³ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p. 53.

³⁴ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p. 54.

³⁵ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p. 53.

The timing of the appearance of both the Paserbskii five-fretted balalaika and of Seliverstov's *Shkola* was not only significant for the future popularization of the balalaika (as Imkhanitskii asserts).³⁶ It also arguably facilitated Andreev's initiative to organize his first balalaika ensemble. Seliverstov's newly-published *Shkola* was a professionally compiled manual that introduced and explained the nuances of playing styles, techniques (such as the *drob'*), and playing temperament (i.e., *piano*, *mezzopiano*). And its publication saw an increase in firm requests for the five-fretted instrument.³⁷ But both the manual and the appeal of the new balalaika as depicted in Seliverstov's *Shkola* very likely prompted requests for balalaika tuition, which Andreev provided free of charge.³⁸ And the indications are that Andreev organized his first balalaika ensemble at least partly from the best of those of his balalaika pupils whose interest in the balalaika was spurred by the appearance of both Seliverstov's manual and Paserbskii's improved five-fretted *diatonic* balalaika.

However, in parallel with the enthusiasm for Seliverstov's *Shkola*, and the five-fretted balalaika for which it was compiled, Andreev was now giving St. Petersburg salon performances on his new twelve-fretted balalaika in the presence of aristocrats and other of his adherents.³⁹ Any interest that may have been generated by those salon performances was likely to have facilitated further Andreev's next organizational move: the expansion of the balalaika range by means of creating a *semeistvo balalaek* for a *kruzhok balalaechnikov*.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Baranov, *Podvizhnik muzyki narodnoi*, p. 19.

³⁹ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p. 54.

3.2.3 The expansion of the *balalaika* range – organizational implications

Judging from available sources on Andreev, the transition from the Ivanov five-fretted (*piatiladovaia*) balalaika to the Paserbskii twelve-fretted (*dvenadtsatuladovaia*) balalaika happened within an eighteen-month period. This remarkably rapid development was bridged just a few months prior to the appearance of the twelve-fretted model, by a seven-fretted model (*semiladovaia balalaika*). The public was made aware of this model through the St. Petersburg press:⁴⁰ it was depicted on the front cover of Andreev's balalaika composition (aptly entitled 'Balalaika'), published in 1888.⁴¹

Although Andreev's transition from seven-fretted to twelve-fretted instruments was rapid, it appears that the seven-fretted balalaika *necessarily* bridged the gap between those two models. The reason for this in musicological terms is simple. The sevenfretted model – it was then synonymously referred to as the 'семивзводная балалайка' – incorporated the full range of naturals in one scale and logically bridged the transition to a full chromatic scale. This premise is supported as follows. An expanding and increasingly sophisticated balalaika repertoire, for example, necessitated the expansion of the balalaika's scale range. Whereas the full diatonic range achieved with seven frets incorporated the equivalent of all white piano keys in that scale, the chromatic scale achieved with twelve frets included all tones and semitones, as with all black and white keys on a full, twelve-interval (note) piano scale.

⁴⁰ Baranov, *Podvizhnik muzyki narodnoi*, p.19. This seven-fretted balalaika is mentioned in an article in the 6 March 1887 issue of *Novoe vremia*.

⁴¹ Baranov, *Podvizhnik muzyki narodnoi*, p.20.

This transition to the chromatic scale is significant when viewing Andreev's work in its organizational context. An expanded twelve-fretted scale expanded performance levels which was an organizational necessity for a balalaika 'family', i.e., an increased, varied range of instruments with complementing full-scale harmonic accompaniment to the *prima* balalaika.

Although the number of amateur players was increasing through 1887, there were still no balalaika ensembles. St. Petersburg was awash with ensembles featuring other musical instruments, i.e., guitarists, mandolin players, even concertina ensembles. Baranov claims Andreev decided to create a balalaika ensemble as a rival to those representing other musical instruments.⁴² However, Andreev's express aims for the balalaika and Russian folk music do not mention rivalling other similarly organized ensembles, but only acknowledge those similarities (e.g., see Chapter 5.2.1.) And even so, Andreev could not have organized such a 'rival' ensemble without the transitional modifications and expansions to the balalaika range.

Andreev initially explored the possibility of a balalaika ensemble by playing in unison with others of his balalaika pupils. One reason why this proved unsuccessful was that the balalaika's tonal range was not enhanced by the separate voices in group playing, as they were all of the same tonal range. And this was despite the significant improvements already made to the balalaika up to that point (approx. mid 1887). The solution was to create a balalaika of a fuller (lower) diapason in order that the *prima* balalaikas could be organized around it and, thereby, could be complemented both in

⁴² Baranov, *Podvizhnik muzyki narodnoi*, p.22.

tone and in melody. The result was the first balalaika *alto* (small octave). The effect of its open diapason accompaniment was apparently striking: the compass of two combining, complementing voices spread the melody across two separate performing ‘parts’ which would have created a much fuller, harmonious sound. The effect would be similar, for example, to complementing a violin with the accompaniment of a cello.

According to Baranov, Paserbskii then proposed to create a ‘*semeistvo balalaek*’ (family of balalaikas), and available sources do not contradict this.⁴³ The idea for creating the balalaika ‘family’ was modelled on the typical (in contemporary St. Petersburg) mandolin ensemble, as Andreev himself openly confirms. This was the first time that balalaikas of varying sizes, according to their diapason, were crafted for organized group performance. Following the addition of the new balalaika *alto*, Andreev collaborated with Paserbskii in developing the first models of a balalaika *bass*. This was an octave lower than the *alto* and was referred to at the time as the ‘*violonchel*’ (cello), since it was analogous with instruments of the violin family.⁴⁴ By the autumn of 1887, the range of crafted instruments had broadened to include the *balalaika-pikkolo* (of the second octave), as well as a *balalaika bas*.⁴⁵

Andreev assigned two principal musicians from the best of his pupils to each of the instruments of the new balalaika family. Rehearsals began in the autumn of 1887 in St. Petersburg’s Pedagogical Museum of Military Educational Institutions (*Pedagogicheskii muzei voenno-uchebnykh zavedenii*), where an auditorium had been made available for the *kruzhkovtsy*. And in December 1887, Andreev opened free’

⁴³ Baranov, *Podvizhnik muzyki narodnoi*, p.22.

⁴⁴ Baranov, *Podvizhnik muzyki narodnoi*, p.22.

⁴⁵ *ibid.*

balalaika classes, held at St. Petersburg's *Solianoi gorodok*, attended by 14 pupils.⁴⁶ The indications from available source material are that there was an organizational drive to Andreev's pedagogical work with the prospective ensemble musicians. Clearly viewing this work as a serious undertaking, Andreev is said to have been a 'demanding teacher', demonstrating how to play pieces which he instilled into his pupils with his 'infectious passion' for the balalaika and for playing folk music. His specific approach when teaching his pupils was to demonstrate to them individually the correct ways to play a particular piece. All of this was done by memory, as the pupils could not read music.⁴⁷

The 14 pupils participating in the free lessons were additional to those with whom he had been rehearsing since earlier in the autumn of 1887. It was during this period that Andreev divided his time between teaching the balalaika during the day and performing (albeit with a modest repertoire) at private houses in the evenings with his *kruzkhkovtsy*. Baranov's description of this arrangement suggests that those performing at private evening concerts were the pupils he had specifically selected to play the instruments of the new *semeistvo balalaek*, though this is not entirely certain.

With the latter group of select musicians, Andreev's work was rigorous, changing arrangements, and looking for the most appropriate volume levels at which to perform individual pieces. The aim was to achieve a freedom and fervour of expression in performance as a prerequisite to appearing in public on stage.⁴⁸ This was only

⁴⁶ The *Pedagogicheskii muzei* is one of a number of institutions located in the *Solianoi* district in St. Petersburg. It is, therefore, likely that these balalaika classes took place in the *Pedagogicheskii muzei*.

⁴⁷ Baranov, *Podvizhnik muzyki narodnoi*, p.23.

⁴⁸ *ibid.*

possible with the range of modified balalaikas and the additional, accompanying models he had organized into an ensemble.

By March 1888, members of his *kruzhok* were ready and were undertaking trial sessions at various informally organized private gatherings. This was apparently in preparation for what is historically termed the 'debut' concert at which his ensemble had already been invited to perform in the Main Hall of the Saint Petersburg Mutual Credit Society (*Zal Sankt-Peterburgskogo obshchestva vzaimnogo kredita*).⁴⁹ It was a charity concert to aid a nursing home for chronically ill children from poor families.⁵⁰

The 'private' trial sessions attracted the attention of the St. Petersburg press. *Novosti*⁵¹ reported one such gathering at a business club. Alluding to contemporary preconceptions of the balalaika in certain society circles, the reporter suggested the trial session made an impression that 'probably' exceeded the expectations of those gathered informally to hear the *kruzhok* of balalaika players.⁵¹ Moreover, a report in *Novoe vremia* was more specific about the details of the same trial session, helpfully conveying the sense of the organizational level Andreev had reached with his pupils by that time. They played balalaikas of 'four different types', differing from each other only proportionally, i.e., the sizes of the instruments' respective bodies and their strings' material. Otherwise, the instruments were 'unchanged' (that is materially and visually). It makes particular reference to the instruments' frets being permanent (as 'with the guitar') instead of 'movable'. But more importantly, the reporter is clear about the 'remarkable effects' that Andreev and his 'group of seven comrades' achieved with

⁴⁹ Located at *Kanal Griboedova* 9, opposite the end of *Ital'ianskaia ul.*, about 200 yards from the *Filarmoniia*

⁵⁰ Baranov, *Podvizhnik muzyki narodnoi*, p.23.

⁵¹ *Novosti*, cited in Baranov, *Podvizhnik muzyki narodnoi*, p.24.

the balalaika with its ‘original resonance’. There was ‘no doubting Andreev’s success’.⁵²

In organizational terms, Andreev had a balalaika *kruzhok* whose range of instruments provided an expansive sound. Andreev exploited that range as evidenced by the pieces included in the concert programme he organized for the 20 March 1888 debut of the ‘Society of Balalaika Lovers’ (*Kruzhok liubitelei igry na balalaikakh*), to which I now turn.

3.3 From *kruzhok* to orchestra – organizational implications

It is clear that the quality of the range of instruments comprising the Society of Balalaika Lovers (henceforth *kruzhok*) had an important bearing on Andreev’s ability to organize a balalaika ensemble for concert performance. *Peterburgskii listok* specifically mentioned the quality of both the materials used to craft the balalaika range used by the *kruzhok* and their acoustic results. These factors, it suggests, were realized by Andreev’s fortune in having a craftsman of Paserbskii’s standing, and who had now created balalaikas from the *pikkolo* to the bass (*violonchel’*) balalaika.⁵³

Viewed in the context of the *kruzhok*’s upcoming ‘public’ debut, these and other certain press observations following in this section highlight the inextricable link between

⁵² *ibid.*

⁵³ ‘Vozrozhdenie balalaiki’, *Peterburgskii listok*, no. 72 (14 (26) March 1888), cited in A.B. Tikhonov, *Sozdatei’ Velikorusskogo orkestra V.V. Andreeva v zerkale russkoi pressy*, 2nd edn., (Saint Petersburg: Predpriiatie Sankt-Peterburgskogo soyuza khudozhnikov, 1998), p.8.

qualitative improvements to the balalaika and organizing a range of those instruments into an ensemble.

That the transition from the first improved (Ivanov) balalaika to the Paserbskii chromatic balalaika had taken barely two and a half years was a considerable achievement. And yet it had taken a mere three months for Andreev to organize Russia's first ever balalaika ensemble for its 20 March 1888 debut performance.⁵⁴ The test, however, of how significant an organizational transition had been achieved was partly revealed by the performance of the pieces included in the debut concert programme.

The packed audience in Main Hall of the Saint Petersburg Mutual Credit Society that evening heard original folk pieces which Andreev exploited to demonstrate the range of the new balalaika ensemble. Press reports of the event impart the extent to which Andreev achieved this with ostensibly simple Russian folk songs and melodies. For example, the performance of the traditional Russian folk song *Vo sadu li, v ogorode* began with ultra-delicate pianissimo, with the music then becoming increasingly audible and then suddenly exploding into an apparent frenzy of speed and rhythm. The Russian folk piece *la vechor v lugakh guliala* began in a very high register played on the balalaika *pikkolo*. The piece then progressed through the various ranges of the balalaikas on show, with the same *pikkolo* motif being repeated in turn by the *prima* balalaikas, followed by the *alto*, and finally by the balalaika bass. The piece then continued with all instruments combining together in their respective ranges for the remainder of the piece. *Vo piru byla* was particularly appreciated by the audience: they

⁵⁴ 'Vozrozhdenie balalaiki', in Tikhonov, *Sozdate! Velikorusskogo orkestra...*, p.10.

were impressed by the rich variations to the piece and by the rhythm so energetically conveyed by the respective instruments in the ensemble.⁵⁵

These observations and impressions affirm the quality and standard to which the new members of the kruzhok had been organized for ensemble performance. Andreev clearly sought to demonstrate aspects of the instruments' acoustic range, their timbre and the levels of energy possible in group balalaika-playing. All these nuances of music performance require a high level of organization in order to broaden the spectrum of the musical arrangements and the instruments' capabilities for performing them.

It is clear from descriptions of the shortcomings of the unmodified balalaika that it would have been impossible to organize an ensemble of instruments of that degree of underdevelopment. Their limited, impeded acoustics and resonance would have proved difficult to exploit in the same way as soon became possible with the improved prima balalaika and her accompanying alto and bass voices. The rhythms characteristic of balalaika playing could arguably have been appreciated in an ensemble of unmodified instruments, but even their *collective* resonance could not have been conveyed to an audience in a concert setting, as proved by the reported effects produced following subsequent modifications to the instrument. Referring to the audio experience gained at a *Kruzhok* practice session before a gathering which took place at a 'zal kommercheskogo sobraniia'⁵⁶ in St. Petersburg eight days prior to

⁵⁵ Baranov, *Vasili Andreev*, p.25.

⁵⁶ It is not clear whether this venue was the same as the business club (*kommercheskii klub*) mentioned above.

its official 20 March 1888 debut, *Peterburgskii listok* noted what it termed the 'double quartet' ensemble:

'...for the first time we had the opportunity to get acquainted with the playing of this original circle of balalaika lovers. We admit that we did not expect when we entered the hall to hear sounds as *harmonious and beautiful as those that the gentlemen amateurs extracted from their balalaikas*. It was difficult to admit that seven balalaikas (one balalaika, the cello, was absent due to the non-arrival of one amateur), the sound of which turned out to be *much softer and more pleasant* than a mandolin, sometimes even approaching *the human voice*, could achieve such *strength* and such *nuances*, and at the same time produce such *harmonic chords* as those obtained from *the joint performance of seven balalaikas*' (my emphasis).

('...нам впервые пришлось познакомиться с игрой этого оригинального кружка любителей – балалаечников. Мы признаемся, не ожидали, входя в зал, услышать такие *стройные, красивые звуки, которые извлекали из своих балалаек господа любители*. Трудно было допустить, чтобы семь балалаек (одна балалайка – виолончель отсутствовала за неприбытием любителя), звук которых оказался *гораздо более мягким, приятным*, порою приближающимся к *голосу человека*, чем мандолин, могли достигать такой *силы* и таких *нюансов*, и *вместе с тем* производить такие *гармонические аккорды*, которые получались от *совместного исполнения семи балалаечников*.'⁵⁷)

⁵⁷ 'Vozrozhdenie balalaiki' in Tikhonov, *Sozdatei' Velikorusskogo orkestra...*, p.10.

The inclusion in the 20 March 1888 *kruzhok* debut programme of the Russian folk song *Kamarinskaia* is a suitable exemplar of the kind of effects produced by the ensemble. Its association with the classical composer Glinka would have set it apart from other Russian folk songs performed in the concert that evening. For example, the Russian folk songs: *Nauchit' li tia*, *Vanyusha?*; *Barynia*; *Vyidu l' ia na rechen'ku* and *Po ulytse mostovoi* were adapted for balalaika ensemble performance from the original songs themselves. However, *Kamarinskaia* was first adapted and scored by Glinka for classical, symphonic orchestral performance.

Andreev adapted Glinka's own version, combining both folk and symphonic elements expressed by playing technique and dynamics of *piano* and *forte*. However, Andreev also demonstrated the individual scope of the balalaika prima with a solo performance of his own composition *Svodnogvardeiskii marsh*. He also played several portions from the opera *Ivan Susanin* on the *garmoshka* (a small Russian button accordion).⁵⁸

Other newspapers' observations of the *kruzhok* helpfully describe details of the high standard of performance achieved by the *kruzhok* and its musicians. Reviews pointed out such technical nuances as the tender, light pizzicato executed by the musicians. An example is the review in the 2 May 1888 issue of *Russkie vedomosti* of the 29 April 1888 Moscow appearance of the *kruzhok*. That concert was a repeat of the same programme performed at the St. Petersburg debut the previous month. The reporter described the 'characteristic effects' created by the musicians in their 'polished and harmonious performance': the 'sharp transitions from piano to forte, the gradual

⁵⁸ Baranov, *Podvizhnik muzyki narodnoi*, p.25.

increase and fading in volume; how a given theme in various registers sounded against the background of a barely audible, beautiful murmur',⁵⁹ i.e., the effect created by rapid, though very delicate strumming accompaniment.

Commenting on the repertoire of the *kruzhok*, the same reporter noted it consisted of varying fantasias to themes of Russian folk songs, 'as befitted the balalaika'.⁶⁰ The report continued that 'whether by virtue of artistic flair or of studying the Russian song in all its facets', the author (i.e., Andreev) of the folk song arrangements had demonstrated skilful handling of the Russian song 'in a Russian way'. And the 'exhilarating variations' to the theme of the Russian folk dance *Barynia* was, in the reporter's view, 'an accurate depiction of [Russian] folk song-making'.⁶¹

Peterburgskii listok spoke about the debut performance of the *kruzhok* as emphatically resolving questions about the 'validity' and 'scope' of the 'improved balalaika': it had emerged 'from the wilderness' and 'oppression' and had embarked on 'its musical mission'. The journal *Ob'iavlenie* expressed the view that the balalaika had turned out to be the 'complete musical instrument'.⁶²

The foregoing press observations underline why improving the Russian folk balalaika for concert performance was essential to organizing a *kruzhok* for that purpose. The sequence of events in the three years from late 1884 to late 1887 shows that it was only due to the successive improvements undertaken by Antonov, Ivanov and Paserbskii that Andreev had the basis to organize group playing, out of which emerged

⁵⁹ Baranov, *Podvizhnik muzyki narodnoi*, p.26.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Ibid.

a *kruzhok* comprising the best of his balalaika pupils. It required great skill to play the unimproved balalaika well, due to its primitive and cumbersome construction and restricted acoustics. Once these restrictions had been overcome, the balalaika quickly became more accessible to play, as Andreev had demonstrated on the Ivanov and Paserbskii models in public and private performances from spring 1885 to late 1887. And yet, the modifications undertaken by mid-1887 were instrumental in raising the benchmark to greater balalaika virtuosity, and they arguably anticipated the expansion of the Society of Balalaika Lovers into a Russian folk instrument orchestra.

3.3.1 From *kruzhok* to Russian folk orchestra - preliminary considerations

It might be assumed that Andreev's exposure to and observations of other national musical instrument orchestras had sown the seed of the idea for creating a Russian orchestra along similar lines. Imkhanitskii, for example, reminds us that Andreev had become acquainted with mandolin and mandola orchestras, as well as varying Spanish guitar orchestras during his lengthy visits to Italy and other parts of Europe in 1882. But ideas about creating and organizing a Russian music ensemble could not have entered Andreev's mind at that stage, as he had not yet heard a balalaika and, therefore, could not compare its sound with that of mandolins and guitars.⁶³ He first heard the Russian balalaika in the summer of 1883. This may have caused him to reflect on other national musical instrument collectives he had already observed abroad, but it is doubtful whether exposure to such collectives prior to 1883 served as

⁶³ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.58.

¹³¹ *ibid.*

the catalyst for creating a future Russian instrument orchestra, since Andreev only became active towards creating a Russian music ensemble in late 1887. And the only possible inspiration to do so prior to this may have been, as Imkhanitskii also suggests, performing as a balalaika soloist on the same bill as other popular St. Petersburg music ensembles at private and 'select' concerts during the spring of 1887. It was at such performances that Andreev would have had the opportunity to scrutinize such ensembles as Ginislao Paris's mandolin and guitar ensemble.¹³¹ And yet only after he had used the balalaika over the first three stages of its improvement did Andreev reveal any inclination towards group playing, as emerged from his balalaika classes from late 1887. It was then that he organized his first Russian balalaika ensemble, which was subsequently expanded into a Russian folk instrument orchestra. There were three transitional phases to this:

a) The process of creating the 'double quartet' of four balalaika ranges confirms Andreev's organizational instincts. One of its original members, N.P. Shtiber, states that it was the 'group-playing' with his balalaika pupils that gave Andreev the idea to include a balalaika of a lower register as accompaniment to the 'first' (prima) balalaikas.⁶⁴ Paserbskii's alto and piccolo balalaikas were crafted and then simultaneously introduced into the ensemble. They were soon followed by Paserbskii's balalaika bass (one octave lower than the alto) and some time later by his balalaika double-bass (one octave lower than the bass). Except for the double bass, the original *kruzhok* comprised this range of instruments, all of which had 'twelve frets or more' of the chromatic scale,⁶⁵ i.e., between two and two-and-a-half octaves.⁶⁶

⁶⁴ Shtiber, V.V. Andreev: *ocherk ego deiatel'nosti*, p.3.

⁶⁵ *ibid.*

⁶⁶ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p. 58.

This meant that the chromatic piccolo, alto and bass balalaikas complemented the existing Paserbskii chromatic prima balalaikas. As Paserbskii's primas had been originally crafted and provided for Andreev's balalaika classes from approximately mid-1887,⁶⁷ the additional, chromatically scaled balalaika ranges would have been easier to mould into an ensemble including musicians already playing chromatic primas.

The results of this initial expansion of octave and scale ranges within the ensemble were: a more expansive acoustic range; improvements to the then limited repertoire, such as introducing into folk pieces more expansive, complex passages of variations; an emerging classical element to performances. These qualities anticipated the next developmental phase.

b) It is helpful for the purpose of defining the point of its transition to an orchestra that critics often gave the title 'orchestra' to the *kruzhok* during the initial years of its activity.⁶⁸ Imkhanitskii explains this by the fact that Andreev's ensemble, even from the outset, 'adhered to the fundamental principles' which contrasted an orchestra with an ensemble.⁶⁹ In organizational terms, this meant that the ensemble was originally divided into two distinct sections of musicians according to their respective roles, encompassing melody, chordal accompaniment and bass. Five prima balalaika players (Andreev, A.A. Volkov, A.F. Solov'ev, D.D. Fyodorov and N.P. Shtiber) comprised the lead (melody) section; the group of three musicians comprising the

⁶⁷ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p. 57.

⁶⁸ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p. 59.

⁶⁹ *ibid.*

accompaniment section (F.E. Rennicke, V.A. Panchenko and A.V. Parigorin) played the piccolo, alto and bass balalaikas respectively.⁷⁰ However, the above examples from press reports reveal that this had soon changed even by the time of the trial concerts for the pending March 1888 debut. The ensemble was now comprised of two musicians for each type of balalaika (piccolo, prima, alto and bass), i.e., the 'double quartet' ('...po dva [ispolnitelia] na kazhduiu balalaiku') as referred to by the *Peterburgskii listok* review of 14 (26) March 1888.⁷¹

The double quartet differed organizationally from the *kruzhok* as it was first established in the late autumn of 1887. As the name implies, each two-musician section of the double quartet played in unison with one or another section.⁷² But Imkhanitskii also points out that the very orchestral characteristic represented by sections playing in unison was compromised as the orchestra doubled in size to 16 musicians by the mid-1890s.⁷³ The increase in the ensemble's size meant more of the same types of balalaikas in each section playing in their respective unisons. This likely resulted in an amplification of the existing timbre but with no other distinct variation to the ensemble's sound. A balance would be achieved by introducing into the ensemble other Russian folk musical instruments of contrasting timbre.

It would appear contradictory, therefore, for Imkhanitskii to assert that 'the 'Andreevskii collective' (*kruzhok*) was 'in essence... a small balalaika orchestra ...from its very origin'.⁷⁴ The organizational developments characterized by the division of four types of balalaika range into four sections are more indicative of a transitional phase from

⁷⁰ RGALI, f. 695, op. 1, ed. khr. 1116 ('Spiski sotrudnikov orchestra Andreeva V.V.', 1888-1917), p.1.

⁷¹ 'Vozrozhdenie balalaiki' in Tikhonov, *Sozdate!* *Velikorusskogo orkestra...*, p.10

⁷² Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.59.

⁷³ Ibid.

⁷⁴ ibid.

kruzhok to orchestra than of a development of an existing orchestra. Moreover, the expansion of the timbre and scale ranges of folk instruments in the *kruzhok* prior to 1896 was specific to the Russian balalaika alone. An orchestra necessarily comprises a wider variety of musical instruments, rather than a collective range of one specific type. It was only by 1896 that an orchestra of varying Russian folk instrument types was eventually achieved with the introduction of the Russian *domra* and *gusli* into the by then expanded balalaika collective.

3.3.2 Organization into an orchestra: the inclusion of *domra*, *gusli* and wind instruments

The respective roles of Andreev's collaborators in the shaping and development of the *Kruzhok* into an orchestra are presented and discussed in context in Chapter 6. It suffices for explaining the *organizational* aspect of expanding the *Kruzhok* into a folk instrument orchestra to summarize select examples of the work of two of the most important of Andreev's colleagues, N.I. Privalov and N.P. Fomin. Their specific contributions involved the expansion of repertoire (Fomin) and the inclusion into the existing balalaika collective of ancient Russian woodwind, the *domra* and the *gusli* (Privalov).

During the period between the debut of the *Kruzhok* on 20 March 1888 and the first public debut performance of the renewed and, subsequently, re-named *Velikorusskii orkestr* on 9 November 1897⁷⁵, there were at least two factors which were relevant to

⁷⁵ *Peterburgskii listok*, no. 310 (11 November 1897) in Tikhonov, *Sozdatei' Velikorusskogo orkestra...*, p.59.

Andreev organizing his ensemble into an expanded instrumental collective.⁷⁶ On the one hand, the financial constraints of running a collective of amateur balalaika players necessitated the expansion of the *Andreevskii kruzhok* to maintain public interest in it. The financial pressures on maintaining the balalaika collective could only be partly offset so long as it was performing regularly before paying audiences.

On the other hand, Andreev's *Kruzhok* had become one among several balalaika ensembles by the turn of the 1890s, the emergence of such *Kruzhok* imitators likely fuelled in part by the increasing trade in balalaikas. Consequently, the listening public now had a widening choice of balalaika ensembles to entertain them aside from Andreev's. For example, there were several St. Petersburg-based balalaika ensembles by the mid-1890s, such as those directed by I.I. Volgin, V.V. Abaza and A.R. Fremke.⁷⁷ However, a Moscow based balalaika ensemble comprising 17 musicians had already emerged later in the same year (1888) that Andreev's *Kruzhok* had made its debut in St. Petersburg.⁷⁸ Similarly as with Andreev's *Kruzhok*, the larger Moscow ensemble led by V.M. Kazhinskii comprised a balalaika range including piccolo, primas (nine in total), alto, tenor and bass.⁷⁹

Although Andreev's original Society of Balalaika Lovers did not comprise the instrumental range of the Russian folk orchestra into which it expanded, it had begun moving inexorably in that direction even before its 20 March 1888 official debut.

⁷⁶ The first trial concerts of the newly re-named *Velikorusskii orkestr* included public appearances at St. Petersburg's *Zal kreditnogo obshchestva* on 23 November 1896 (*Novoe vremia*, no. 7435 (7 November 1896) in Tikhonov, *Sozdatei' Velikorusskogo orkestra...*, p.53) and 11 January 1897 at St. Petersburg's *Zal dvorianskogo sobraniiia* (*Peterburgskii listok*, no. 11 (12 January 1897) in Tikhonov, *Sozdatei' Velikorusskogo orkestra...*, p.56)

⁷⁷ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.72.

⁷⁸ Ibid.

⁷⁹ Ibid.

Andreev's organizational work to that effect was initially facilitated artistically by the pianist 'concert-meister' A.F. El'man. El'man had performed at Andreev's solo concerts through 1887 and subsequently gave 'qualified advice' to Andreev at the balalaika collective's first rehearsals.⁸⁰ But greater organizational impetus was provided by Nikolai Petrovich Fomin, a St. Petersburg Conservatoire pupil of Rimsky-Korsakov. Fomin had attended the 20 March 1888 debut concert of the *Kruzhok* on the advice of two of his course peers at the Conservatoire, the cellists V.A. Lidin and M.M. Val'iano (see Chapter 6.2).⁸¹ From his student days, Fomin had a keen interest in Russian folk song, producing his own variations of Russian folk pieces, as well as working on the harmonization and transposition of folk extracts at the St. Petersburg conservatoire. Fomin became more directly involved in preparing works in the expanding repertoire of the *Kruzhok*, especially classical pieces, and he would also advise Andreev on improving Russian folk instruments.⁸² But for his Conservatoire commitments, Fomin would have accompanied Andreev's ensemble in an artistic advisory role on its performance trip to Paris in 1889. Nevertheless, Andreev asked him to become music director of the *Kruzhok* shortly after returning from Paris in October that year.⁸³

Fomin's versatile education in music theory, composition, conducting and music score transposition would all prove to be invaluable qualities which Andreev would harness most effectively as his balalaika ensemble expanded into an orchestra. That process

⁸⁰ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.59.

⁸¹ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p. 67.

⁸² *ibid.*

⁸³ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, pp. 66-67. See also Fomin's reminiscences in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, pp.224-227.

began with the introduction of wind instruments into the balalaika collective, followed by the improved Russian *domra*. The incorporation of these extra musical instruments would expand and vary the overall *timbre* of the collective in a way which would be more recognizably that of a full orchestral sound. However, the precursor to the transition to orchestra in musical terms was the expanding repertoire of an expanding balalaika *kruzhok*.

One reason for adjusting and expanding the repertoire was that the experience of repeated *Kruzhok* performances increased Andreev's understanding of the potential for improving the combined *timbre* of the collective's balalaika range. And as the repertoire became more sophisticated, a more varied *timbre* became increasingly necessary to express that repertoire. In that sense, the ensemble's expansion into an orchestra was the inevitable complement to its improving repertoire.

Fomin's credentials as a music director were ideally suited to the direction in which Andreev's collective was moving. Aside from receiving from Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov music composition instruction and advice on writing variations of Russian folk song themes, Fomin was an accomplished pianist and conductor who had been taught by St. Petersburg Conservatoire Professor F.F. Stein and A.G. Rubinstein respectively. He received instruction and guidance on music theory and harmonization from A.K. Liadov, as well as advice from M.A. Balakirev.⁸⁴ Both Fomin's convincing musical pedigree and adventurous approach to music were essential contributions to Andreev's work for the organization of the expanding *Kruzhok* into a Russian folk instrument orchestra (see Chapter 6.3.1).

⁸⁴ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, pp.66-67.

The early progress of Andreev's organizational work neatly coincided with the appearance of two publications which proved pivotal in advancing his balalaika *Kruzhok* towards an expanded collective of Russian folk instruments. A.S. Famintsyn's *Skomorokhi v Rusi* (1889) and *Domra i srodyne ei instrumenty russkogo naroda* (1891) stated that the favoured musical instrument of the *skomorokhi* was the *domra*⁸⁵ and that the balalaika was derived from it.⁸⁶ And moreover following the debut of Andreev's balalaika *Kruzhok* in 1888, the St. Petersburg press, such as the piece by O.M. Petukhov in *Zvezda* entitled 'Usovershenstvovanie balalaiki', was claiming that the balalaika was a *domra* derivative.⁸⁷ The authenticity of images of the *domra*, however, was difficult to verify, as that used by Famintsyn was the only image available for scrutiny at that time. Imkhanitskii intriguingly states that the images of the *domra* depicted in Famintsyn's publications were taken from the work by Adam Olearius.⁸⁸

This semi-circular, or oval shaped instrument was not only played with the fingers, but also by plucking with a small feather (peryshko). But crucially, it was an instrument for ensemble performance, as indicated in Famintsyn's work by its various types, the *domrishko* and the *domra bol'shaia basistaia*.⁸⁹ Famintsyn, however, also suggests that there were possible tenor and alto variants of the instrument in ancient *Rus'*.⁹⁰ Reconstructed and improved versions of those variants were being introduced into Andreev's expanding folk instrument collective by September 1896. It is unclear from

⁸⁵ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p. 81.

⁸⁶ Famintsyn, *Domra i srodyne ei instrumenty russkogo naroda*, p.2.

⁸⁷ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, pp.81 & 277.

⁸⁸ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p. 81.

⁸⁹ *ibid.*

⁹⁰ Famintsyn, *Domra i srodyne ei instrumenty russkogo naroda*, p.8.

available sources exactly when Andreev discovered the first *domra* prototype (see Chapter 1). In any case, the general consensus indicates that the prototype found in Viatka province (*Viatskaia guberniia*) was the basis for the *domra*'s reconstruction and improvement.⁹¹ However, S.A. Martynov, who was to be one of the first two *domra* players in Andreev's *Velikorusskii orkestr*, brought to Andreev's attention a prototype discovered in Viatka by his (Martynov's) sister in the spring of 1896. This prototype apparently could not be considered to be a genuine, ancient prototype, given that it was acquired from a local peasant carpenter and made in the nineteenth century.⁹² Andreev and his collaborators accepted that instruments with oval and circular shaped bodies were balalaikas of sorts, but were convinced that they preceded the instruments with triangular bodies.⁹³ This logically suggests oval and circular-shaped instruments developed somewhat independently from triangular shaped instruments, thereby emphasizing that the triangular-shaped balalaika was a unique Russian folk type.

The first two *domras* to be incorporated into the existing balalaika *Kruzhok* in September 1896 were crafted by the peasant carpenter S.I. Nalimov (see Chapter 6.7) in the summer of that year. The first of these improved instruments to be introduced was the *domra malaia*, then soon followed by a *domra al't* (alto).⁹⁴ The sketches for these and future ranges of *domra* owed much to the specialist knowledge and input of Nikolai Fomin, who would also play a leading role in the development and

⁹¹ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, pp.83 & 88.

⁹² Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.84 and 'Pis'mo S.A. Martynova' in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.201.

⁹³ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.84.

⁹⁴ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.88.

improvement of the expanding orchestra's repertoire in line with the scope of the additional Russian folk instruments (see Chapter 6.3.1).

It is appropriate to note here that the introduction of the two ranges of *domra* into the ensemble induced the re-organization of the balalaika sections, precipitating the replacement of the balalaika *piccolo* with the *balalaika sekunda*. The *sekunda* played alongside the alto section, thus improving the range of sound. Additionally, the *kvartokvintovyi* bass balalaika was replaced by *kvintovyi* bass balalaikas, thus providing a richer contrast to the pitch produced by the *domras*.⁹⁵

In organizational terms, the addition of a *domra* section into the expanding folk instrument collective was vital for augmenting the volume and range of collective performance on account of the *domras*' 'transmission of clear melodic passages and their polyphonic textures' as well as their bright tremolos.⁹⁶ But no less significant was the unique character and resonance of *timbre* projected by the orchestral fusion of the contrasting sounds of balalaika and *domra* ranges.

The introduction of the *gusli* into the *Velikorusskii orkestr* was undertaken in phases from 1896. There would eventually be four types of *gusli* incorporated into the orchestra. The first of these, the *shlemovidnye* [helmet-shaped] *gusli*, was also included into the collective in 1896, shortly after the introduction of the *domras*. This *gusli* was reconstructed and improved by N.I. Privalov using sketches of the instrument depicted in A.S. Famintsyn's work *Gusli: russkii narodnyi muzykal'nyi*

⁹⁵ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.89.

⁹⁶ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.82.

instrument.⁹⁷ This was followed by two floor-mounted types, namely *pryamougol'nye gusli*. These were tuned chromatically. One version required the traditional method of employing the fingers of one hand to mute strings which were not to be plucked or strummed: its successor, the *gusli klavishnye*, utilized a key mechanism in whose construction and improvement Fomin played a significant role (see Chapter Six).⁹⁸

The fourth *gusli* type to be afforded a place in the orchestra was the *gusli zvonchatye*. This was eventually realized in 1913, 17 years after the orchestra's inception. It was the culmination of an idea which Andreev had been apparently considering for at least 13 years. He was first introduced to this ancient Russian folk instrument by a virtuoso *gusli*-player, 'the peasant Osip Ustinovich Smolenskii', and had subsequently first heard Smolenskii's 'collective *gusli* playing' in 1900.⁹⁹ Although the organization of this *gusli* collective was Smolenskii's initiative, it was facilitated by the input of Privalov, whom Andreev had enlisted into his re-named, expanded orchestra as 'gusliar', i.e., playing the *shlemovidnye gusli*.¹⁰⁰ Privalov had recommended the incorporation into Smolenskii's collective of a fourth *gusli* to complement the existing three (i.e., 'малые, средние и большие') in the ensemble, thereby ameliorating the *gusli* collective.¹⁰¹ Andreev used this input from his principal *gusliar* to improve the quality and *tessitura* of the *gusli* in his own Russian folk instrument orchestra. This was especially the case with the *gusli zvonchatye*. The instrument's 'primitiveness' delayed its inclusion into the *Velikorusskii orkestr* from 1899 when Andreev was first introduced to it by

⁹⁷ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p. 89.

⁹⁸ Ibid., including fn. 1. See also V.V. Andreev, "Gusli zvonchatye", vvedyonnye v Velikorusskii orkestr v 1913 godu' in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.70.

⁹⁹ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.68.

¹⁰⁰ ibid.

¹⁰¹ ibid.

Smolenskii. Andreev worked with Privalov not only to improve the quality of the instrument's sound, but also to modify its design for ease of playing. This was achieved by expanding the righthand side of the instrument (i.e., its playing position as it rested on the lap and breast of the player (*gusliar*)). This convenient addition was enhanced with decorative Russian folk motifs on the resting board (*otkrylok*). This ancient Russian folk instrument (dating from the eleventh century) was successfully incorporated into the *Velikorusskii orkestr* following its protracted modifications and improvements. Its *diatonic* tuning complemented the existing ranges of *gusli*, including the chromatic floor-mounted type, Privalov's improved *shlemovidnye gusli* and the *udarnye gusli*.¹⁰¹

The original members of the newly-named *Velikorusskii orkestr* of 1896 were: nine balalaika players, including the three balalaika *prima* players V.V. Andreev, V.A. Lidin and V.B. Lengren; one balalaika *discant*, V.V. Chorokov; two balalaika *sekunda* players, N.P. Fomin and N.M. Varfolomeyev; one balalaika *al't* player, A.V. Parigorin; two balalaika bass players, A.S. Shevelyev and V.A. Veselago; two *domra* players including S.A. Martynov on *domra malaia* (or *discant* as it was then), and P.P. Karkin on *domra al't*; or *sredniaia* as it was then; and the *shlemovidnye gusli* ('psaltyrevidnye', i.e., psaltery-like) player N.P. Privalov.¹⁰²

The wind section of the orchestra was realized initially by Privalov, who had recommended the incorporation of the Russian reed instrument the *zhaleika* into Andreev's orchestra. The post-1896 roles and contributions to this area of V.T.

¹⁰¹ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, pp.68-73.

¹⁰² Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.89.

Nasonov and German-born flautist F.A. Niman are discussed in context in Chapter Six.

3.4 *Kruzhok* and *orkestr* – organizing the amateur personnel

Sections 3.1 to 3.3 illustrate key examples of the practical means by which Andreev organized the Society of Balalaika Lovers (*Kruzhok liubitelei igry na balalaikakh*) and the *Velikorusskii orkestr* into which it evolved by: a) improving and expanding the ranges of balalaikas to form his *Kruzhok*; and b) improving and incorporating into his folk instrument orchestra ranges of domras and other Russian folk instruments (i.e., gusli, woodwind and percussion). That aspect of his organizational work was quite successful when considering: (i) the rate of progress from improvements on the primitive balalaika through to expanding the orchestral collective with much improved Russian folk instruments, achieved in the face of varying opposition to his organizational plans; and (ii) the frequent improving of the ranges and quality of the musicians' folk instruments for the *Velikorusskii orkestr* (see 3.3.2).

But no less arduous was the task of organizing the personnel of both *Kruzhok* and orchestra. This had financial ramifications for organizing both home and foreign concert tours. Organizing the personnel of both collectives was subject to challenging financial circumstances. Owing to limitations of space and of content in available source materials, the section focuses on selected examples of those organizational challenges for both *Kruzhok* and *Velikorusskii orkestr*.

The members of the original *Kruzhok* (octet) formed in late 1887 comprised the lead section of five prima balalaika players (Andreev, A.A. Volkov, A.F. Solov'ev, D.D.

Fyodorov and N.P Shtiber) and the accompaniment section of three musicians (F.E. Rennicke, V.A. Panchenko and A.V. Parigorin) who played the piccolo, alto and bass balalaikas respectively.¹⁰³ This first *Kruzhok* comprised a heterogeneous collective of people of different occupations, its individual amateur musician members being drawn from diverse professional, public service backgrounds, including a physician, an engineer, a lawyer and an army officer.¹⁰⁴ There was no one in the *Kruzhok*, however, of any vocation associated with the lower classes. We can be sure, therefore, that Andreev was making no heterogeneous *social*, as distinct from occupational, statement with his balalaika collective. Rather, his initial aim with the *Kruzhok* he formed from the best of his balalaika pupils was collective music-making ('*sovmestnoe muzitsirovanie na balalaikakh*').¹⁰⁵ Therefore, it seems it was *organized* purely on the basis of its musicians' individual and mutual (i.e., with Andreev) enthusiasm for music and their openness to new perspectives in artistic expression which the newly formed *Kruzhok* of improved balalaikas already represented.¹⁰⁶ And it is clear that organizing a balalaika collective (comprising a heterogeneity of professions other than the lower classes) characterised by occupational, rather than social class heterogeneity, benefited the propagating of the balalaika in higher social circles. Andreev's desire was to attract 'everyone' (i.e., not only the lower class within the *narod*) to the improved instrument. And this organizational principle applied to his expanded Russian folk instrumental orchestra.

¹⁰³ RGALI, f. 695, op. 1, ed. khr. 1116 ('Spiski сотрудников оркестра Андреева В.В.', 1888-1917), p.1.

¹⁰⁴ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.58

¹⁰⁵ 'Kak mne prishla mysl'... in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.76.

¹⁰⁶ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.58

In the context of Andreev's organizational activities, however, the *professional* heterogeneity of both the *Kruzhok* and *Velikorusskii orkestr* posed a significant practical challenge to his organizational strengths. The musicians of both *Kruzhok* and *Orkestr* were 'lovers of playing the balalaika' (*liubiteli igry na balalaike*), i.e., unpaid enthusiasts. Their availability to participate initially in performances was therefore bridled by their financial dependence on their respective regular employments. A major contributing factor to consider here, for example, is the organization of the *Kruzhok* into a collective of varied balalaika ranges and timbres, which inevitably engendered the expansion both of repertoire and of personnel. This tested Andreev's organizational resourcefulness to the utmost. Organizing the increasing number of amateur participants necessary to expand the collective into a recognizable Russian folk instrument orchestra incurred additional financial pressures.

Andreev's success in organizing his *Kruzhok* on the basis of improving the balalaika prima and then expanding the balalaika range has been outlined in sections 3.1 to 3.3. The practical challenges to his organizational skills and instincts mounted significantly from the official 20 March 1888 St. Petersburg *Kruzhok* debut through to the establishment of his *Velikorusskii orkestr* in 1896 and beyond. The remainder of this chapter focuses, however, on select examples of the financial aspect of organizing both the *Kruzhok* and orchestra in connection with the professionally heterogeneous membership of amateur musicians for performance and touring outside Russia.

The first foreign tour for which Andreev organized his *Kruzhok* of amateur musicians was undertaken throughout September 1889 in Paris. Andreev had already made acquaintance with the music enthusiast M.P. Beliaev following the successful *Kruzhok* debut in 1888 (see Chapter 6.4). Baranov states that it was as a result of Beliaev's

intentions to organize for the 1889 World Exhibition in Paris several symphony concerts featuring Russian music that Andreev immediately began to prepare his balalaika ensemble for the event.¹⁰⁷ Andreev's organization of repertoire and the preparation of the *Kruzhok* for its Paris debut were effected efficiently, evidenced by positive reviews of his ensemble's preparatory tours of Riga, Vilnius and Warsaw. However, his request for financial subsidies for the Paris trip was 'refused outright', forcing Andreev to fund the trip from his personal finances.¹⁰⁸ But the success of Andreev's *Kruzhok* at the 1889 World Exhibition created further, immediate financial difficulties despite which he had to organize his concerts in Paris. The French media's praise of Andreev's balalaika ensemble also added to those pressures with increasing demands for public appearances. And although substantial expenses were incurred by the *Kruzhok* members' month long stay in Paris, they received no pay for their virtually daily concert appearances. Baranov notes that this was despite the fact that the organizers of the Russian pavilion at the Exhibition 'had significant sums [of money] at their disposal'.¹⁰⁹

Baranov provides no specific source for this claim, which therefore ought to be handled cautiously. However, there is a plausibility to Baranov's subsequent point that Andreev relied on friends to send contributions to help him subsidize the fulfilment of the Paris tours. In his *Vospominaniia*, with reference to his ensemble's later Paris tour of 1892, Andreev illustrates the financial constraints of organizing performance tours with unpaid amateur musicians. He introduces his conclusions regarding that concert

¹⁰⁷ Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p. 31.

¹⁰⁸ *ibid.*

¹⁰⁹ Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p. 32.

schedule by stating that he had ‘selected five musicians’ for that tour who were not tied to ‘public service’ employment, but for whom he had secured payment of all expenses for the performance tour.¹¹⁰ But Andreev was contending with those restrictions three years previously on returning to St. Petersburg from the Paris World Exhibition and related concert tours. His ensemble’s musicians were being paid infrequently for their continuing concert preparations and appearances due to lack of financial support and their ties to paid public service duties.¹¹¹ This subsidies issue, which was so immediately apparent in organizing a musicians’ collective that was undertaking a new genre of music performance, would prove to be the beginning of a saga spanning over two decades.

One example of the expenses involved in keeping his *Velikorusskii orkestr* together is an undated draft of an application Andreev submitted to the State Duma requesting subsidies to be assigned to three of his orchestra’s ‘collaborators’ (*sotrudniki*). For the virtuoso, and orchestra’s then lead balalaika player, Boris Sergeyevich Troianovskii, Andreev requests 150,000 rubles annually. For Nikolai Privalov, the orchestra’s researcher of Russian folk instruments, the request is for 250,000 rubles annually. In stating the cases for Troianovskii and Privalov to receive their annual subsidies, Andreev summarizes their respective importance to Russian culture and the nation. Troianovskii is said to be the first balalaika player to introduce and to employ the ‘guitar style’ of playing in the overall playing style of the ‘improved balalaika’. This, Andreev asserts, is of ‘huge cultural-educational significance’ (*kul’turnoposvetitel’noe znachenie*). And in support of Privalov, Andreev lists the numerous practical,

¹¹⁰ Andreev, ‘Iz vospominanii’, in Granovskii, p.124.

¹¹¹ Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p. 32.

academic and literary talents and roles Privalov was undertaking as ‘a founder of the *Velikorusskii orkestr*’ (see Chapter 6.6). Andreev advocated Privalov’s roles as ‘services to the [Russian] nation’. Possibly alluding to the benefits to the nation of the foreign tours of the *Velikorusskii orkestr*, the drafter of the application, I.V. Godnev, concludes by acknowledging the ‘considerable amount’ of subsidies requested in parallel with his sympathetic acknowledgement that Troianovskii’s and Privalov’s roles had exerted great influence on forging closer ties between Russia and Finland. Godnev recognized the ‘undoubted services’ of those ‘popular activists’ in benefitting the *narod*.¹¹²

For Andreev, the importance of financial security to organizing the *Velikorusskii orkestr* was self-evident. This is further illustrated in available source materials, such as in the collection of Andreev’s written communications with the Minister of Finance, Count Vladimir Nikolaevich Kokovtsev. In his 20 May 1908 letter, Andreev postulates that the fruits of his organizational work were specifically dependent on substantial financial support from the state. He summarizes the continuing urgency of the subsidies matter with great conviction. The ‘organization of the [*Velikorusskii*] orchestra’, he asserts, should be on the basis of a ‘secure [annual] income’ for the orchestra’s members. The crux of this argument from Andreev’s point of view was that a) his orchestra was, at least ‘for the time being a unique, one-of-a-kind specimen of artistic performance’; and

¹¹² RGALI, f. 695, op. 1,2, d. 8 (‘Zamechaniia po povodu proshchenii sotrudnikov orkestra Andreeva, V.V. v gosudarstvennuiu dumu o subsidiakh (chernovoi avtograf)’), no date.

that b) [Russian folk] musical instruments would be unthinkable without his orchestra being a means of disseminating them.¹¹³

The great difficulty, however, was that the details of the case Andreev was presenting to secure an annual budget for fulfilling this aspect of his organizational work may have been viewed by the State as insufficient incentive for it financially to facilitate that work. He conjectured that an annual turnover of 1.5 million rubles would 'either decrease' or (more likely) would 'increase tenfold or more' should the orchestra focus on its 'funding'. This would therefore be an expeditious means for the orchestra to disseminate Russian folk instruments and would also enable it to accomplish annual tours both around Russia and abroad.¹⁸²

It is to Andreev's credit that he had the courage to advocate at least part of the case for financial support towards organizing his orchestra on such a speculative basis as unsubstantiated and uncertain turnover forecasts. However doubtful the incentive for state support he surmises above, Andreev was chiefly driven by his passion for Russian folk instrumental music, as pervasively expressed in much of his writings (see chapters 2 and 5). But since his ever-expanding organizational work was at the mercy of government funding, it would surely have been a redundant exercise for him to focus exclusively on his own belief in his work, given that the latter was unpalatable to many in positions of influence in the state Duma. This would be eloquently confirmed by the number of rejections of funding he would receive over a thirty-year period.

¹¹³ '...без такого распространения [i.e., of the orchestra's unique instruments and sound] и жизни [русские народные] музык[альные] инструменты немыслимы...' RGALI, f. 695, op. 1,2, d. 51 ('Pis'ma k grafu Kokovtsevu, Vladimиру Nikolaevichu, (Ministru finansov), 20 March, 14 June 1908).

¹⁸² *ibid.*

The national interest in his organizational work was another argument he presented as a government incentive to support his applications for state subsidies, citing his successes in establishing balalaika classes in the armed forces. The careful balancing act Andreev had to perform between his communications with the Imperial Court and State Duma in order to secure the funding relevant to his work in the armed forces is discussed in context in Chapter 7.2.1. Regarding the organizational role of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* in the army, it suffices in the present context to refer once more to Andreev's 20 May 1908 letter to Count Kokovtsev. Andreev asserts that funding released by 'His Excellency's Exchequer' i.e., to support the organizational roles in the army connected with his *Velikorusskii orkestr*, would contribute to rewarding the teaching staff in the army and its educational establishments.¹¹⁴ Significantly, members of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* were among the same 'staff' undertaking teaching roles in balalaika classes in the army at that time. This clearly demonstrates how state funding was critical, in Andreev's view, in maintaining his orchestra's existence. Its functions as a 'disseminator' of Russian folk instrumental music were multi-faceted. But this was dependent on the necessary funding without which it would be impossible to organize and maintain those functions indefinitely.

3.5 Conclusion

The selected examples of Andreev's work as an organizer in sections 3.1 to 3.4 demonstrate the parameters within which he functioned in that role. His organizational

¹¹⁴ *ibid.*

work necessarily expanded beyond the improvements made to the balalaika and the establishment of the first Russian balalaika ensemble, to include improving other Russian folk instruments (*domra* and *gusli*) for their phased incorporation into the expanding *Kruzhok* and subsequent *Velikorusskii orkestr*. The expansion of the ranges of both the balalaika and *domra*, as well as the incorporation of ancient Russian woodwind and *gusli* not only complemented the existing repertoire as it expanded, but also induced further improvements and expansion to the orchestra's repertoire. The roles of certain of Andreev's collaborators in that regard are explained and discussed in Chapter 6.

The need for Andreev's organizational role is highlighted by the financial pressures of the orchestra's dual function as a 'disseminator' (*rasprostranitel'*) of Russian folk music by means of: a) domestic and foreign touring; and b) the pedagogical roles of certain of its musicians in the armed forces. Andreev's petitions presented to the State Duma, as well as his pleadings on behalf of Privalov and Troianovskii, show him to be an organizer with a humanitarian disposition concerning the artistic welfare and status of his key musicians and collaborators. This sentiment was extended to the *narod* in respect of how he viewed the importance to the *narod* of organizing his *Velikorusskii orkestr*.

His commitment as an organizer is clear. For him, the task of organizing his orchestra was as much to do with overcoming attitudes as it was to do with practical challenges. He well understood in light of those attitudes the disadvantages to organizing his orchestra in comparison with 'regular' (i.e., classical) orchestras and choirs. The latter 'regular' musicians' collectives already had a 'longstanding history' and were thereby subject to 'fewer organizational obstacles' than the *Velikorusskii orkestr*. One reason

for this, he believed, was that ‘regular’ orchestras’ longstanding history enabled them to attract the ‘specialists’ necessary for their organization, for they were always required in church (in the case of choirs), in theatres and for concert performance. The *Velikorusskii orkestr*, on the other hand, had the disadvantage of having no such longstanding history. Andreev explained the organizational predicament of his orchestra in light of that reality, claiming that the orchestra’s work was ‘only just emerging and beginning to make its way’ (*tol’ko chto narozhdaetsia, tol’ko nachinaet prokladyvat’ sebe dorogu*). Therefore, ‘the demand for specialists in this sphere of music [i.e., Russian folk music], which is still not seen as credible and sometimes even causes ridicule that is offensive to national feeling, does not yet exist.’¹¹⁵

Andreev viewed as ‘pioneers’ those who had ‘fearlessly dedicated themselves ‘to this new business of folk music’ (*etomu novomu narodnomu muzykal’nomu delu*) and who had ‘provided their improved devices [i.e., Russian folk instruments] for broad social use’ (*predostavali svoi usovershenstvovannye izobreteniia v shirokoe obshchestvennoe pol’zovanie*). For this reason, he asserted, they had ‘the right to support’ via government subsidies.¹¹⁶ It is perhaps an indication of the measure of Andreev’s organizational stamina that he worked so assiduously in defiance of protracted opposition to realize his vision for his orchestra. However, he was still dependent on the roles played by his various collaborators in organizing his *Kruzhok* and subsequent *Velikorusskii orkestr* into highly reputable music collectives.

¹¹⁵ RGALI, f. 695, op. 1,2, d. 1021 (‘Ob’iasnenie na zamechanie biudzhetnoi komissii Gosudarstvennoi dumy ob assignovanii neobzhodimykh sredstv dlia orkestrea Andreeva, V.V.’, 22 January 1909).

¹¹⁶ *ibid.*

4. ANDREEV AS PUBLICIST

4.1 Introduction

In order to achieve his aims of disseminating Russian folk instruments more widely and raising their cultural status, Andreev had to act as publicist (*publitsist*) for his work. Andreev did not initially embark on this work systematically. His approach was shaped and expanded by the need to confront new challenges which arose as his work progressed, as this chapter will describe. Broadly speaking, his activities as publicist included raising awareness of Russian folk instruments, his *Kruzhok*, and the *Velikorusski orkestr* orchestra and popularizing them, both at home and abroad. His publicistic endeavours aimed at creating an audience for the balalaika and Russian folk music that spanned every level of society. This work was undertaken on several levels and via two main channels: 1) public presentation and performance initially on solo balalaika, followed by balalaika ensemble performance and subsequently orchestral performance on various Russian folk musical instruments; 2) the written word and publications. The latter mode became increasingly important after the formation of his *Velikorusskii orkestr* of Russian folk instruments in 1895, and will be dealt with at more length in Chapter Five, which turns to Andreev's work as an educator.

4.2.1 Publicising the balalaika – early stages

As described in Chapter Two, Andreev's first encounter with the balalaika in the summer of 1883 made him determined to play this instrument well.¹ This determination led him to Aleksandr Stepanovich Paskin in late 1883.² Like Andreev, Paskin was a landowner. He lived in *Vyshnii volochok*, near Andreev's estate outside Bezhetsk. Paskin was also a virtuoso amateur balalaika player.³ Andreev's meeting with Paskin was enlightening for two reasons: firstly, Paskin demonstrated a variety of playing techniques which added colour to virtuoso performance;¹⁸⁹ secondly, Paskin played a balalaika of better quality than the more primitive-looking instrument owned by Andreev at that time. Paskin's balalaika was made by a local carpenter and he advised Andreev to order an improved one of his own.⁴ As was discussed in the previous chapter, Andreev took this advice, along with Paskin's recommendations for improving the instrument, to the Bezhetsk carpenter Antonov, who made a balalaika of improved appearance and resonance.⁵ This suggests that, even at this very early stage in his activities, it was probably clear to Andreev that any kind of reasonable public performance on the folk instrument necessitated improvement both of playing technique and of the musical instrument itself.

The earliest record of Andreev performing on what was almost certainly Antonov's improved balalaika dates from 26th July 1884.⁶ The concert programme for this event

¹ B. B. Granovskii, *Orkestr imeni V. V. Andreeva* (Leningrad: Muzyka, 1987), p.6. Andreev discovered a peasant-worker playing a balalaika on the family estate, just outside Bezhetsk (Tverskaia guberniia) in the summer of 1883.

² Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p.27.

³ *ibid.*

¹⁸⁹ *ibid.*

⁴ F. V. Sokolov, *V. V. Andreev i ego orkestr* (Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe muzykal'noe izdatel'stvo, 1962), p.17.

⁵ Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p.27.

⁶ B. Granovskii, 'V. Andreev i ego orkestr', *Sovetskaia muzyka* 7 (1959): 126.

states that it was to take place at the *dacha* of E. N. Annaeva: Andreev performed solo on the balalaika as a musical *divertissement* from a performance of amateur dramatics ('*любители драматического искусства*').⁷ There is uncertainty about whether Andreev's performance actually took place at Annaeva's *dacha* or, indeed, about whether it was Andreev's first informal public performance.⁸ However, these doubts do not obscure the overall importance of this event. It can be argued that Andreev performing on the same programme as amateur arts performers indicates that he was introducing the balalaika to a circle of cultured, artistic people from the outset. Moreover, this would suggest that he was taking seriously the manner in which the balalaika ought to be presented, however formal or informal a gathering it may have been. In view of this, the question arises of when Andreev actually began his activities as a *publitsist*. Concerning the July 1884 performance, and Andreev's subsequent, but early public performances, Sokolov states:

'This is where the young musician's experience of performing on stage was forged and honed...this is also the origin of the first shoots of his future...publicistic activity'

'Здесь выковывался и оттачивался эстрадно-артистический опыт молодого музыканта, ...отсюда же ведут свое начало и первые ростки его будущей ...публицистической деятельности'.⁹

⁷ *ibid.*

⁸ Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.22.

⁹ Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.23.

In fact, it is not unreasonable to suggest that Andreev's publicizing activities actually began in July 1884. Yet there is little doubt that the overall success of his subsequent performances in the same year, in the small towns near to his family estate, helped to develop Andreev's publicizing activities.

Initial success brought with it a dilemma for Andreev. He could continue as a virtuoso balalaika soloist for his own personal enjoyment, or he could expand his performance activity. Sokolov suggests that Andreev's successful (albeit limited) exposure of the balalaika outside St. Petersburg in 1884 persuaded him to 'test his strengths' in that city.¹⁰

4.2.2 Publicising the *Ivanov* balalaika in mid-1880s St. Petersburg

St. Petersburg in the mid-1880s was rich in both Russian and foreign virtuoso talent, with guitarists, mandolin-players and *garmonisty* being popular attractions in the city's salons.¹¹ How would Andreev, with his primitive-looking balalaika, fit into this cultural milieu? One might assume that, if foreign musicians playing foreign folk instruments could attract a St. Petersburg audience, then Andreev could do likewise with a *Russian* balalaika. Theoretically, he was at a severe disadvantage to other St. Petersburg musical virtuosi because of prejudice 'against the very name of the instrument "balalaika"' ('...*protiv samogo nazvaniia instrumenta "balalaika"*').¹²

¹⁰ *ibid.*

¹¹ *ibid.* The *garmonika* roughly resembles a miniature accordion, with fewer keys.

¹² V. V. Andreev, 'Velikorusskii orkestr i ego znachenie dlia naroda' in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.143.

Around the time when Andreev began to publicize the balalaika in St. Petersburg,¹³ some expressed the opinion that folk instruments, by their primitiveness, spoiled musical taste.¹⁴ However, it is difficult to determine the basis of this opinion. It is more likely that this was merely an attitude, rather than an opinion based on informed judgement, especially as there is no record of any public balalaika playing in St. Petersburg prior to Andreev's entry into that city's amateur artistic arena from 1884-85.¹⁵ However, it seems that Andreev largely overcame any prejudice towards Russian folk instruments during the initial stages of his appearances as a virtuoso balalaika soloist in St. Petersburg. Evidence for this rests on two facts. Firstly, from the second half of 1884, he was performing at various St. Petersburg salons and at amateur entertainment evenings, some organized by aristocrats.¹⁶ Secondly, by late 1884 he had managed to persuade the highly reputed St. Petersburg violin craftsman V. V. Ivanov to make the first ever concert standard balalaika,¹⁷ but on Ivanov's stated condition that he 'never tell anyone about it, since such work is humiliating and might seriously damage his reputation' ('...nikomu i nikogda o tom ne rasskazyvat', *tak kak takaia rabota unizitel'na i mozhet ser'ezno povredit' ego reputatsii*).¹⁸

News of Andreev's musicianship began to spread around the salons of St. Petersburg. A typical Andreev performance at that time included his playing the piano and the

¹³ This was probably late 1884 to early 1885, though no actual date has been cited in available material.

¹⁴ V. I. Akulovich and Yu. B. Bogdanov, 'Prosvetitel'skaia deiatel'nost' V. V. Andreeva' in Karpenok, *Tvorcheskoe nasledie V. V. Andreeva*, p.37.

¹⁵ It is difficult to clarify details of public balalaika performance in St. Petersburg prior to Andreev's public appearances in 1884-85 because of the lack of evidence relating to that period.

¹⁶ Sokolov, *V. V. Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.24.

¹⁷ Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p.29.

¹⁸ V. V. Andreev, 'Iz vospominanii' in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.121.

zhaleika (the ancient Russian woodwind instrument discussed in the previous chapter), impersonations of Petersburg society figures, as well as playing the balalaika made by Ivanov.¹⁹

There were three factors which helped to shape Andreev's early publicizing of the balalaika in St. Petersburg and which probably fuelled initial performance success. The first factor was Andreev's virtuosity as a solo balalaika player. It is very likely that this had a key role in quickly dispelling negative ideas about the balalaika's primitiveness. His playing would have demonstrated the full potential of balalaika art which was possible at that time. This in itself would surely have aroused great interest in any given audience. The second factor was his trip to Western Europe in 1882. In the taverns and salons of Italy and France, Andreev observed folk instrumentalists such as mandolin players, guitarists and bagpipe players.²⁰ He adored folk music and his observations of various folk instrumentalists in Europe made a great impression on him.²¹ Observing the response to folk musicians in French salons, he wondered why *Russian* folk music did not enjoy anything like the same level of acceptance in Russia.²² This question is very likely to have returned to him and given him great incentive to aim for that acceptance, once he had discovered the balalaika in 1883.

Thirdly, consideration ought to be given to Andreev's theatre activity in early 1880s St. Petersburg. Not much is known of that activity. However, at that time, Andreev often visited St. Petersburg's theatres, such as the Aleksandrinskii. As a result of these visits, he became acquainted with famous personalities in the performing arts, such as Maria

¹⁹ Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.24.

²⁰ Baranov, *Podvizhnik muzyki narodnoi*, p.9. Details of Andreev's 1882 trip to Europe are unclear due to lack of information about that period.

²¹ Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.12

²² *Ibid.*

Gavrilovna Savina and the comedian/humorist Konstantin Varlamov, the son of the composer.²³ Moreover, Andreev also played violin, piano and *garmonika* at amateur arts evenings during the early 1880s²⁴ – this was before he became known as a balalaika soloist – and the overall regularity of his artistic activities indicates that he was already establishing himself as a performer of some reputation. This reputation, along with his burgeoning public persona, no doubt facilitated his later performances on Ivanov's improved balalaika from early 1885.

Indeed, Andreev continued to enhance his profile in St. Petersburg through 1885. He found that he was more and more often invited to perform on the balalaika at various artistic social gatherings,²⁵ although it should be noted that these were probably among higher social circles. Such was the interest amongst those who heard Andreev play that he was often asked where and how one could obtain a balalaika and how one could learn to play it.²⁶ Arguably, the publicity Andreev had hitherto given to the balalaika was now beginning to yield positive returns: here were the first signs that others, too, desired to play this curious Russian folk instrument.

4.2.3 Publicising the balalaika – Paserbskii's improved concert balalaika

In 1885, Andreev began to draw up sketches for a further improved balalaika²⁷ which would supersede that made by Ivanov. Two likely reasons for this are the increasing

²³ Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p.24.

²⁴ Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p.25.

²⁵ Sokolov, *V. V. Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.24.

²⁶ *ibid.*

²⁷ Sokolov, *V. V. Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.25.

interest in the balalaika projected by those who had already heard Andreev play and the recognition that increasing popularity demanded further improvements to the instrument, both in appearance and in timbre. To this effect, Andreev approached and received approval for his ideas from another highly reputed St. Petersburg violin craftsman Frants Stanislavovich Paserbskii, who undertook work on an improved, but still five-fretted balalaika through late 1885 to early 1886.²⁸

However, as 1886 progressed, Andreev found that interest in his balalaika playing appeared to be declining. The reduced number of invitations to perform,²⁹ despite Paserbskii's improved instrument, highlighted a significant limitation in balalaika performance in general. A five-fretted balalaika, for all its potential in the hands of a virtuoso, was nonetheless clearly lacking in scope due to its small diatonic range. This in turn prevented the playing of more elaborate pieces; the balalaika was originally only designed for playing simply-structured folk song patterns and phrases. These limitations would reveal themselves to the listening public in a rather unvaried repertoire, with many of the musical pieces sounding too similar. Therefore, logic dictated that the overall scope of the balalaika would need to be enlarged and improved in order to renew interest in it. This created another dilemma for Andreev. Again, he would have to decide whether to continue playing the balalaika for personal satisfaction,³⁰ accepting the limitations of a five-fretted model, or to engage in improving the instrument even further and thereby continuing to 'disseminate' it. Eventually, Andreev chose the latter course and remained in St. Petersburg.³¹

²⁸ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.52.

²⁹ Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.26.

³⁰ *ibid.*

³¹ Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, pp.26-7.

Andreev's publicistic activity now faced greater challenges in order to maintain public interest in the balalaika. It not only became necessary to expand the range of the instrument and, thereby, the scope of balalaika performance. It was also necessary to create a much more varied playing technique than even Andreev himself could have anticipated. It is to his credit that, in order to maintain interest in it, he had taken the balalaika to such an advanced state of musical and technical potential in just three years. It can be stated with confidence that by the summer of 1886, Andreev's efforts had already begun to establish a place for the balalaika in Russian musical culture where previously there had been no such recognition. The clearest indication of this progress was that by the middle of 1886, Paserbskii had crafted a twelve-fretted, chromatic balalaika,³² based on Andreev's suggestions for improvement, which made the balalaika worthy of presentation in a more formal concert setting.

After several months' absence, Andreev made a striking return to the public arena. On 23rd December 1886, he participated in a concert held at the *Zal Blagorodnogo sobraniiia* in St. Petersburg³³ in aid of 'nedostatochnykh uchenits Kolomenskoi gimnazii'.³⁴ Two key features of Andreev's performance at this event underline its importance for his publicizing activity. Firstly, he introduced the balalaika into a more formal concert environment. Secondly, he performed on Paserbskii's new twelve-

³² Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, pp.27-8. Sokolov's source for Andreev's mid-1886 acquisition of the 12-fretted (chromatic) balalaika is A. Lachinov and N. Beknazarov, *V. V. Andreev: Vstupitel'naia stat'iia k Sborniku val'sov Andreeva* (Moskva: Muzgiz, 1955). Imkhanitskii (*U istokov...*, p.52) states that Paserbskii presented the 12-fretted (chromatic) balalaika to Andreev in early 1887. The comments in the *Peterburgskaia gazeta* about the scale range of the balalaika used by Andreev on 23 December 1886 suggest he was already using the 12-fretted chromatic-scale balalaika.

³³ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.8.

³⁴ Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.28. Performances at concerts in aid of charitable causes would become a regular performance feature of Andreev's *Kruzhok liubitelei igry na balalaikakh* and his subsequent *Velikorusskii orkestr*. The first ever performance by the *Kruzhok* on 20 March 1888 was in support of charity for 'poor and sick children'.

fretted balalaika which would have enabled him to demonstrate an expanded virtuoso technique in addition to the superior sound quality and more attractive appearance of the instrument itself. Above all, these features signalled that the balalaika ought to be taken more seriously as a musical instrument. On 24th December 1886, the *Peterburgskaia gazeta* stated in its report on this event:

'Beneath the fingers of this artist, this simple instrument forces one to completely forget its low origins'

'Под пальцами этого артиста, простой инструмент совершенно заставляет забыть свое низменное происхождение.'³⁵

The reporter then outlined his observations about how the improved chromatic balalaika allowed for more dynamic performance.³⁶ Such a public acknowledgement in the press of Andreev's contribution to the concert was an early indication that the aim of generating positive responses to publicizing the balalaika via performance was reaping some reward. This is particularly significant when one considers that Andreev had taken the balalaika from the village, via the salons, to the formal concert hall in barely three years. The concert was not only a publicity event: it was an education in the potential of the rapidly-evolving art of balalaika-playing under Andreev'. It indicated a new direction for Andreev to follow in his future publicistic activities.

An important witness to Andreev's activities from 1886 was N. P. Shtiber, who became one of the original members of Andreev's *Kruzhok liubitelei igry na balalaikakh* in 1887.

³⁵ Baranov, *Vasili Andreev*, p.31.

³⁶ *ibid.*

Shtiber pointed out that, following Andreev's solo concert appearance of December 1886,

'After this successful debut as a balalaika player, word of Mr. Andreev's virtuosity has begun to spread around Petersburg.'

'После этого удачного дебюта в качестве балалаечника молва о виртуозности г. Андреева стала быстро распространяться по Петербургу'.³⁷

News of Andreev's balalaika-playing even reached the Imperial Court of Alexander III. On 29th February 1887,³⁸ Andreev was invited to perform at the palace of Prince Ol'denburgskii in the company of members of the Imperial family.³⁹ This event was summarized by Andreev as 'the dearest and most unforgettable day of [his] life'.⁴⁰ That first royal invitation marked the beginning of an association with the Imperial Court lasting over a quarter of a century and which would lend greater public appeal to Andreev's activities.

It is interesting to note that, soon after Prince Ol'denburgskii's invitation, Andreev began to receive requests for balalaika lessons from 'certain individuals'.⁴¹ This may indicate that royal approval of Andreev's activities with the balalaika (Alexander III apparently expressed sentiments to this effect)⁴² was the incentive for others to

³⁷ Shtiber, V.V. *Andreev: Ocherk ego deiatel'nosti*, p.3.

³⁸ Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p.31.

³⁹ Shtiber, V.V. *Andreev: Ocherk ego deiatel'nosti*, p.3.

⁴⁰ *ibid.*

⁴¹ *ibid.*

⁴² Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p.31. Baranov does not cite the source of these sentiments, even though they appear in quotes.

express an interest in playing the balalaika, too. Moreover, the Imperial Court's interest is also a good indicator of how far Andreev's public profile was reaching at that early stage of his activities.

4.3 Publicising via the first balalaika rukovodstvo

In response to the requests for balalaika lessons,⁴³ Andreev decided to begin work on a balalaika *rukovodstvo*, a self-tuition or 'teach yourself' manual.⁴⁴ He collaborated in this undertaking with Pyotr Klement'evich Seliverstov, an established St. Petersburg music shop owner.⁴⁵ There are two points to note about this project. Firstly, Seliverstov was also a highly respected magazine editor and publisher.⁴⁶ Andreev's decision to compile and seek publication of a balalaika *rukovodstvo* is likely to have come to fruition as a result of Seliverstov's reputation in certain St. Petersburg social circles. Secondly, the *rukovodstvo*, entitled *Shkola dlia balalaiki*, contained musical pieces which Andreev had performed at St. Petersburg concerts.⁴⁷ This can be viewed as the first written or published example of Andreev's publicistic instincts. The title reference to *Shkola* was surely intended to attract others into playing the balalaika via musical pieces that many in St. Petersburg would recognize from Andreev's various balalaika performances. Therefore, *Shkola* represents an early example of the published and performance aspects of Andreev's publicistic activities, as well as of his educational activities (the latter will be discussed in Chapter Five). Indeed, the combination of

⁴³ Shtiber, V.V. *Andreev: Ocherk ego deiatel'nosti*, p.3.

⁴⁴ Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.29. Nowadays, similar manuals are also referred to as *samouchiteli* (lit. 'self-instructors').

⁴⁵ *ibid.*

⁴⁶ *ibid.*

⁴⁷ Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p.31.

these two aspects of Andreev's promotion of the balalaika was recognized early in the Russian press. On 7th February 1888, just eight months after *Shkola*'s publication, *Pravda* pointed out that:

'*Shkola dlja balalaiki...* is forcing many people to change their opinion of our folk instrument.... This small book, alongside Mr. V.V. Andreev's excellent playing, has resurrected the balalaika, which had been beginning to die out'.

'Школа для балалайки... заставляет многих изменить мнение о нашем народном инструменте... эта небольшая книжечка вместе с превосходной игрой г. В.В. Андреева воскресила балалайку, начинавшую вымирать'.⁴⁸

Andreev continued his solo balalaika performances through 1887. These performances, in combination with the availability of *Shkola*, brought further requests for balalaika lessons.⁴⁹ Paserbskii made extra balalaikas to meet these requests.⁵⁰

4.4.1 *Semizvodnaia balalaika* – publicising the first balalaika *kruzhok* at home

On 9th March 1887, the 'Theatre and Music' section of *Novoe vremia* contained details of a forthcoming 'Amateur Concert Season' with a 'national theme'.⁵¹ Each concert would include a 'special Russian virtuoso' and the 'great attraction' was V. V. Andreev, the 'father of the balalaika'.⁵² However, *Novoe vremia* also revealed a fact indicating the continued, rapid evolution of Andreev's publicistic activity. A reference was made

⁴⁸ Baranov, *Podvizhnik muzyki narodnoi*, p.21.

⁴⁹ Sokolov, *V. V. Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.30.

⁵⁰ *ibid.*

⁵¹ Sokolov, *V. V. Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.33.

⁵² *ibid.*

to Andreev's 'new creation' of a *semivzvodnaia balalaika* group ('platoon of seven balalaika players') which was currently undertaking rehearsals between concert seasons.⁵³ This new creation was a group of Andreev's best balalaika pupils. They were to be officially organized into the *Kruzhok liubitelei igry na balalaikakh*⁵⁴ later in 1887. Shtiber, one of the seven *balalaechniki* in this group, recalled that the official formation of the ensemble was in early October 1887 and from that point, until early the following year, the musicians undertook gruelling rehearsals.⁵⁵ There was a very good reason for this.

Andreev was preparing for arguably his best, and most serious publicity event for the balalaika to date. He had already expanded the range of balalaika performance by means of Paserbskii's chromatic twelve-fretted balalaika. Now he could expand the *repertoire* of balalaika performance by expanding the number of musicians. To this effect, Paserbskii crafted al'to, tenor, bass and double-bass balalaikas at Andreev's request and these were incorporated into the *Kruzhok*.⁵⁶ The emphasis here was on maximum audience impact, both musically and visually, for the appearance of a range of balalaikas on stage at that time was completely unprecedented.

Andreev had already reaped considerable rewards for his earlier publicistic activities in the form of the references to his activities in the press, as exemplified above. This in turn had surely created much anticipation of his next move as a *publitsist* for the balalaika.

⁵³ *ibid.*

⁵⁴ Shtiber, V.V. Andreev: *Ocherk ego deiatel'nosti*, p.4.

⁵⁵ *ibid.*

⁵⁶ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.59.

By the spring of 1888, Andreev's ensemble of balalaika players was well prepared for concert performance. The musical programme of the historic first concert of the *Kruzhok* in the Main Hall of the St Petersburg Mutual Credit Society on 20th March 1888 was discussed in the previous chapter.⁵⁷ It was also significant from the point of view of Andreev's efforts to establish the reputation of the balalaika. The event emphasized in several ways the seriousness Andreev attached to the performance and the impact he was seeking. All musicians appeared in formal evening dress,⁵⁸ a presentational feature befitting any reputable classical string ensemble in 1880s St. Petersburg. The concert programme performed that evening also reveals that Andreev was aiming for the widest appeal possible. The traditional Russian folk songs which were performed reminded the audience of the balalaika's peasant roots, whereas extracts from more demanding classical works demonstrated to the audience the range, versatility and playing technique used on the improved and newly-created balalaikas.⁵⁹

It is very likely that such a programme was especially designed for an audience of varied social backgrounds. Nikolai Petrovich Fomin, a St. Petersburg Conservatoire pupil of Rimsky-Korsakov and future colleague of Andreev, attended the 20th March 1888 concert.⁶⁰ He remarked on the fact that the audience that evening ranged from aristocrats to soldiers, artists to civil servants (*chinovniki*).⁶¹ On this evidence, it seems Andreev was publicizing the balalaika on this occasion in a way that took account of

⁵⁷ Shtiber, V.V. *Andreev: Ocherk ego deiatel'nosti*, p.4.

⁵⁸ Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p.36.

⁵⁹ For detailed discussion of this programme, see Chapter 3 (section 3.3).

⁶⁰ N. P. Fomin, 'Otryvki iz vospominanii', in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.225.

⁶¹ *ibid.*

most musical tastes. This is especially significant in view of the social heterogeneity of future balalaika ensembles which Andreev either organized directly, or which were organized in response to the growing popularity of Russian folk musical ensemble performance.

The success of this concert was confirmed by demands for a second concert. This was duly undertaken on 10th April 1888 and the same programme was performed at the same venue with equal success.⁶² It is worth noting here that an immediate impact of the first (20 March 1888) concert was the setting up of a balalaika ensemble in the *Andreevskii kruzhok* mould. It was set up by El'i Gavrilovich Perebiinosov, the director of the *Institut Slepykh Chelovekoliubivogo Obshchestva*, and it comprised members of his own family.⁶³ Soon after this, Perebiinosov set up a balalaika ensemble of blind players.⁶⁴

Andreev now felt compelled to publicize the balalaika via *kruzhok* performance outside St. Petersburg. A part of Andreev's memoirs, published in 1917, reflected on the early years of his work. Included in these extracts are his recollections of his experiences and thoughts arising from the first St. Petersburg performance in March 1888 and the first Moscow concert on 29 April 1888 at the *Zal blagorodnogo sobraniia*.⁶⁵ The Moscow concert, via a performance at Tula, was a direct response to the St. Petersburg successes, and Andreev envisaged equal success in Moscow:

⁶² Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.62.

⁶³ Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p.41.

⁶⁴ *ibid.*

⁶⁵ Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p.39.

'Now that, I thought, is where the balalaika should particularly appeal – there in the very heart of Russia!'

'Вот где, думал я, балалайка в особенности должна понравиться – именно в сердце России!'⁶⁶

However, the concert was poorly attended, despite an extensive poster advertising campaign and good press coverage leading up to the event.⁶⁷ This will be discussed in the relevant context in Chapter 5. The disappointment of a low attendance at the Moscow concert helped to convince Andreev to rethink his methods for publicizing the balalaika, despite words of encouragement from some students who attended and were impressed by the Moscow performance. They tried to persuade Andreev to repeat the concert, but he declined to do so.⁶⁸ Instead, Andreev continued with his immediate plans, and he and his *Kruzhok* continued their short concert tour which would take in Orel, Kursk and Tver'.⁶⁹

It is interesting to note how the low attendance at the 29 April 1888 Moscow concert appeared to overshadow Andreev's recollection of the event in his 1917 memoirs. Press reports relating to this event demonstrate quite clearly that the *performance* of the musicians was received and reported with enthusiastic approval.⁷⁰ Indeed, the participation in the concert of well-known contemporary artists of Russian opera (the result of great prior efforts of persuasion on Andreev's part) was surely an invitation

⁶⁶ Andreev, 'Iz vospominanii', in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.122.

⁶⁷ Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p.39.

⁶⁸ Andreev, 'Iz vospominanii', in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.124. See also Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, pp. 38-9.

⁶⁹ Andreev, 'Iz vospominanii', in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.124.

⁷⁰ Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p.39 quotes part of a report in *Moskovskii listok* about this event.

for press interest in and coverage of the upcoming event. It is a typical example of the kind of publicity image Andreev was careful to project, namely that, at this still early stage of publicizing his *Kruzhok* there was an emphasis on the inclusion of a serious, classical music element into the overall aural and visual presentation of Russian folk instrumental performance. Later, on 31 July 1888, the ensemble would also perform with the classical bass vocalist F.I. Shaliapin at the All-Russian Exhibition at Nizhnii Novgorod.⁷¹ In the context of Andreev's publicizing activity, his incorporation of this classical performance aspect into the presentational side of his activity would be important for generating acceptance of balalaika music as culturally viable.

However, in contrast to the solid press coverage of the first Moscow concert, the concerts immediately following it received virtually no press attention, apart from a mention in issue No.19 of *Baian*⁷² which briefly stated that, on 2 May [1888], a concert by the well-known balalaika virtuoso V. Andreev had taken place in Tver' with 'enormous success'.⁷³

It is important to note that, in contrast with the disappointment expressed by Andreev at the low attendance at the aforementioned Moscow concert, he does not mention the Tver' venue being full, as stated in the local press at the time.⁷⁴ Baranov wonders whether this was because Andreev was a 'local' (*zemliak*).⁷⁵ Logically, therefore, this would imply that Andreev was not surprised by the attendance and might not have felt

⁷¹ See Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.63 and A.I. Peresada, *Shaliapin, Andreev and [the] Russian Balalaika* (Krasnodar: Krasnodarskoe izdatel'sko-poligraficheskoe proizvodstvennoe predpriiatie, 1990), regarding detail and context. See also Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, pp.62-3 for detail of post 20 March 1888 performances.

⁷² No date of publication cited and does not appear in Tikhonov's *Andreev v zerkale russkoi pressy* editions of 1998 and 2001.

⁷³ Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p.40.

⁷⁴ ibid. Baranov does not cite the source of the press report(s).

⁷⁵ ibid.

the need to comment on it. However, Baranov's suggestion does direct attention to the question of the wider role of Andreev the *personality* as a means of publicizing his early and later activities.

It would appear that Andreev had in mind the Moscow disappointment, rather than the subsequent short concert tour, when he recalled:

'I understood that, until the 'balalaika' had spent some time abroad and had received, so to speak, a foreign seal of approval, people would not get behind it, it would not be listened to in Russia, and especially not in the provinces.'

'Я понял, что пока «балалайка» не побывает за границей и не получит, так сказать, заграничной пломбы, на нее не пойдут, ее не будут слушать в России, в особенности в провинции'.⁷⁶

4.4.2 Publicising the balalaika *Kruzhok* abroad – Paris 1889

There are several reasons for suggesting Andreev was both working actively towards a publicizing trip abroad and was being prompted in this plan in the meantime by certain circumstances. After a short summer break, the *Kruzhok liubitelei igry na balalaikakh* appeared at two concerts on 25 and 26 September 1888 given at Vyshnii volochek (Tverskaia guberniia).⁷⁷ The programmes for these two concerts were important in relation to overall preparations for an upcoming trip to Paris to perform at the 1889 World Exhibition. Most of the pieces performed were new to the ensemble's

⁷⁶ Andreev, 'Iz vospominanii' in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.124.

⁷⁷ Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, pp.40-41.

repertoire, including several new Russian folk songs and a piece composed by Andreev for balalaika, *Marsh* (see 2.2.2).⁷⁸ Baranov states that the new Russian folk material was designed 'to charm the French'.⁷⁹ On the one hand, there is no record that Andreev said this: Andreev could have also introduced the new material to charm Russian audiences. On the other hand, it must be emphasized that Baranov is not directly saying the new material was *evidence* of Andreev planning a trip to France. The real point about the aforementioned new material is that it appears to have been prepared for concert performance in a very short period of time: less than two months had passed between the previous major concert (Nizhnii Novgorod, 31 July 1888) and the first public performance of the new material, which numbered at least half a dozen new pieces. It is the apparent urgency with which the repertoire was expanded and varied that indicates Andreev was possibly working towards a foreign (or at least major) publicity venture.

By this stage in Andreev's activities (autumn, 1888), there was one good reason why it was in the interest of Andreev to maintain the appeal of the *Kruzhok*. That reason was the emergence of a Moscow-based balalaika ensemble. Notwithstanding any Moscow-St. Petersburg cultural rivalry a Moscow *kruzhok* might have created, this was probably the first real competition with which Andreev was faced within the cultural movement which he had founded. And yet the emergence of other balalaika virtuosi such as Baron Raden and V. V. Abaza⁸⁰ provided such vindication of the worth of Andreev's work that this could only have reinforced his belief that he was contributing something of real value to Russian cultural life. Moreover, Andreev had already

⁷⁸ *ibid.*

⁷⁹ *ibid.*

⁸⁰ Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.49.

incorporated some variety into his own ensemble's concert programmes. For example, he had performed a mandolin and guitar duet with fellow ensemble member A. V. Parigorin at the aforementioned Vishnii volochek concerts.⁸¹ This again demonstrated Andreev's awareness of the need to vary the interest in folk instrumental performance and presentation, even if such variety diverted temporarily from the aim of publicizing Russian folk instrumental music.

However, the emergence of another balalaika *kruzhok* would have presented an altogether different challenge to Andreev's publicistic aims and activities. V. M. Kazhinskii's Moscow-based ensemble numbered seventeen players,⁸² more than double the size of Andreev's *Kruzhok*. The earliest mention of it was made in *Baian* No.25 (1888).⁸³ There were two major differences, however, between Kazhinskii's ensemble and Andreev's. Firstly, the two contrasted in the manner of their *visual* presentation. Andreev's players were characterized by the wearing of formal dress for concerts, whereas Kazhinskii's players wore kaftans and light blue silk shirts (*rubakhi*). Secondly, Andreev's performances were characterized by a mixture of traditional Russian folk pieces and classical extracts and short works arranged for balalaika ensemble. The first St. Petersburg performance of Kazhinskii's *kruzhok* on 16 February 1889,⁸⁴ by contrast, placed much emphasis on its accompanying 'Gypsy choir' (*Tsyganskii khor*), led by the contemporary performer of traditional 'gypsy romances' (*tsyganskie romansy*), N. A. Aleksandrova.⁸⁵ The question arises as to how

⁸¹ Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p.41.

⁸² Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p.42

⁸³ Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p.41

⁸⁴ Tikhonov, *Sozdatei" Velikorusskogo orkestra*, p.18

⁸⁵ Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p.42

much of an incentive a balalaika *kruzhok* from outside St. Petersburg was for Andreev to continue to forge ahead along his own publicistic path. It does seem possible that Kazhinskii's ensemble made it even more of a priority for Andreev to publicize the image of his *Kruzhok* abroad.

Another circumstance which may have prompted Andreev to take his ensemble abroad involved the famous contemporary music publisher and activist M. P. Beliaev. Beliaev announced his plans to organize symphonic performance of Russian music for the forthcoming World Exhibition in Paris, and as a result, Andreev busied himself in preparations for his ensemble's already confirmed inclusion at the Exhibition's Russian Pavilion. He received no subsidies for the trip and bore the expenses himself.⁸⁶ One reason why Beliaev's announcement was important for Andreev's plans is that it presented a real opportunity for Andreev to perform Russian music on folk instruments alongside Russian music performed on *classical* musical instruments. Andreev had at his disposal a *balalaika kruzhok* repertoire which would be demonstrating to a foreign audience that Russian music officially included another presentational and performance dimension to symphonic performance on *classical* musical instruments. There is good reason to suggest, therefore, that Andreev saw Beliaev's involvement in the World Exhibition as healthy competition and a good means of gauging the overall impact of his *Kruzhok* in juxtaposition to Russian classical performance.

Andreev arrived in Paris in September 1889, via concert breaks at Riga, Vilnius and Warsaw – barely eighteen months after the Moscow event and his realization shortly

⁸⁶ Ibid.

thereafter that acceptance of the balalaika abroad was a necessity for successful promotion at home. It was the 1889 Paris trip that would prove whether or not Andreev was right to anticipate that foreign exposure to balalaika performance would be highly significant for increasing the popularity of the balalaika in Russia.

Russian press coverage of Andreev's activities prior to his Paris trip in autumn 1889 proved to be no real indicator of the coverage that was to follow it. The St. Petersburg press, for example, reported one or two updates from his participation in the World Exhibition. Significantly, on 20 September 1889, *Peterburgskaia gazeta* reported the first signs that Andreev's foresight about a trip abroad was correct. The newspaper announced that Andreev had received an invitation from Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov, who was at the Exhibition, to give a concert in Paris.⁸⁷ Of real importance to Andreev and his work was that performing at the concert with him would be the baritone singer *Bilikh*.⁸⁸ Even more significantly, the newspaper report added that the concert was attended by 'representatives of the highest Paris society, including the Duchess of Morny and the Marquise Serrano' ('*predstaviteli vysshego Parizhskogo obshchestva, v tom chisle gertsoginia Morni i markiza Seranno*').⁸⁹

So how far did the Paris trip vindicate Andreev's conclusions after his experience in Moscow and subsequent short tour? And, more specifically, how far did that trip assist Andreev's publicizing activities for the balalaika and Russian folk instrumental music and performance in general?

⁸⁷ Tikhonov, *Sozdate!* *Velikorusskogo orkestra*, p.19

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*

⁸⁹ *Ibid.*

One positive result of the trip was that Andreev secured contacts with members of French higher society, including musicians, artists, state activists, people in finance and journalists.⁹⁰ Representatives of all these groups and professions would subsequently play roles in organizing future foreign trips for the *Andreevskii kruzhok*. The 1892 Paris trip is a case in point (see below). News of the success of the ensemble in Paris created some positive effects, via press reports, regarding the attitudes of sections of cultural, artistic society in St. Petersburg.⁹¹

Another result of the trip, judging by the positive response to his *Kruzhok* and the repertoire it performed, was that Andreev had fully understood the appeal of an ensemble of Russian folk instruments performing a mixed programme of traditional Russian folk music.⁹² The French public valued this combination very much, as well as the virtuosity of Andreev's playing. The positive response to all these aspects of performance pointed to a successful outcome of the trip from a *publicistic* perspective.

There is also evidence to suggest that, having returned from Paris, Andreev had gained extra insight into ways in which he might improve the performance aspect of the *Kruzhok*. It was not long after his return that he added the balalaika *kontrabas* to the range of instruments already included in his ensemble.⁹³ Such a move would improve the ensemble in two ways. Firstly, from an aural point of view, a double-bass added richness, colour and depth to the background of a given piece being performed, thereby enhancing the listening experience. Secondly, the inclusion of a double-bass balalaika would have had a very striking *visual* impact for any audience at that point,

⁹⁰ Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.48

⁹¹ See also Chapter 5

⁹² Baranov, *Vasili Andreev*, p.43. See also Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, pp.62-63

⁹³ Baranov, *Vasili Andreev*, p.44

simply because of the instrument's size and proportions. It is possible that Andreev was advised on this type of addition to his ensemble's range by music experts in France who may have attended the ensemble's performances.

It appears that the Paris trip may have caused Andreev to think more carefully about the necessity of incorporating into his work the assistance of someone with expert knowledge of music theory. Evidence for this lies in the fact that he renewed his contact with the St. Petersburg Conservatoire graduate, Nikolai Petrovich Fomin.⁹⁴ Fomin had first met Andreev at the debut concert of the *Kruzhok liubitelei igry na balalaikakh* on 20 March 1888. He was a very important contact for Andreev because of his knowledge of and interest in national (Russian) musical culture and his work on folklore manuscripts.⁹⁵ Both Fomin and two of his Conservatoire colleagues, M. V. Val'iano and V. A. Lidin, visited Andreev regularly to discuss such matters as the practicalities of balalaika-playing.⁹⁶ It is noteworthy at this point that Baranov appears to link both Andreev's increasing contact with Fomin and his addition of the balalaika *kontrabas* to the *Kruzhok* with the notion that these developments signified the founding of both the performance and *prosvetitel'stvo* activist aspects of Andreev's work.⁹⁷

⁹⁴ Ibid. See also Fomin's 'Vospominaniia', in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty* and 'Andreev i Fomin', in Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, pp.65-68

⁹⁵ Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p.45.

⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁷ Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p.44.

4.4.3 Publicising the balalaika abroad – France 1892

So far, this chapter has identified several developments and events which benefited Andreev's work as a *publitsist* for the balalaika in particular and for Russian folk instrumental performance in general. The balalaika's transition from a crude, village instrument to a superior, concert performance musical instrument was achieved in two ways. Firstly, the instrument's appearance was vastly improved, that is both in visual appearance, and in sound resonance, making the instrument far more striking from both a visual and an acoustic aspect. Secondly, both of those two practical improvements made publicizing the instrument far more viable to a viewing and listening audience. This is because the practical transitions in appearance and sound quality also increased the scope of the instrument from a musicological point of view, in that more demanding and varied music could be played on an instrument whose former, primitive design restricted its musical scope.

It is also clear thus far that reports of the overall impact of Andreev's *Kruzhok*, both at home and during its first exposure to a Western audience in Paris (1889), helped to enhance further any positive *publicity* required for Andreev's work. This was essential in order that Andreev's work in establishing Russian folk instrumental performance might gain momentum.

Some Andreev specialists point to the mid-1890s as the start of an important new phase for Andreev's *Kruzhok balalaechnikov*.⁹⁸ The mid-1890s is often cited as an important period because of the transition of Andreev's *Kruzhok* from balalaika ensemble to Russian folk orchestra. However, the foundations of Andreev's publicist

⁹⁸ Included in this group is F.M. Sokolov.

activity were probably laid in the early 1890s. In 1891, for example, Andreev set about replacing members of his *Kruzhok* with fresh, talented pupils.⁹⁹ Sokolov suggests one reason for this was another, upcoming invitation to France.¹⁰⁰ This is important in terms of the development of the public performance aspect of Andreev's work as *publitsist*. He may have been responding to advice, received on his previous, 1889 Paris trip, concerning ways of improving balalaika performance. In anticipation of any greater success in Paris in 1892, it seems likely that a change in personnel in favour of high-quality musicians was the logical next step towards enhancing the image of the *Kruzhok* in the sphere of public opinion. Such a move attracted a real possibility of a repeat of the kinds of positive reports in the Russian press received in the wake of the first 1889 French tour. Maintaining favourable publicity for his work on Russian folk instrumental performance had now acquired greater momentum from the inclusion of professional musicians.

The *Kruzhok* that embarked on the spring 1892 France tour was now comprised of professional musicians including the St. Petersburg Conservatoire-trained cellists V.A. Lidin and M.M. Val'iano.¹⁰¹ The other of the five new members included F.I. Marser, V.P. Ivanov and the St. Petersburg Conservatoire graduate A.N. Turner, who was also organist in St. Peter's Church, St. Petersburg.¹⁰² Reports in the Russian press about the 1892 tour were positive, noting the "great success enjoyed by the balalaika players currently [in France] with Mr. Andreev as their lead" ('...*chto nakhodiashchiesia v*

⁹⁹ Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.51.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁰¹ Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.52, and Baranov, *Podvizhnik muzyki narodnoi*, p.38

¹⁰² Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.52.

nastoiaščee vremia tam balalaechniki s g. Andreevym v glave – pol'zuiutsia ogromnym uspekhom.')¹⁰³ The same publication reported again on the 'success' of Andreev's balalaika ensemble a few months later.¹⁰⁴ However, of greater significance was the same publication's announcement that Andreev had been made an 'officier de l'Academie'.¹⁰⁵ The honorary title was bestowed on Andreev by the French Minister of Education and Fine Arts in recognition of Andreev 'introducing a new element into music'.¹⁰⁶

Looking at the performances on the French tour from an artistic point of view, Andreev stated in hindsight that:

'I can say that it really was remarkable, as the reviews I have saved from the Paris newspapers report... despite the fact that there were only five of us then, all dilettante players, with a very small repertoire.'

'...я могу сказать, что он действительно был выдающимся, о чем говорят сохранившиеся у меня рецензии Парижских газет...несмотря на то, что тогда нас было всего только пять человек исполнителей-дилетантов с очень незначительным репертуаром.'¹⁰⁷

This contrasts slightly with Baranov's summary of the tour, also from an artistic point of view. He states that, notwithstanding the small number of balalaika players comprising the *Kruzhok*, the orchestra's sound was of sufficient volume and clarity,

¹⁰³ *Novoe vremia*, no. 5833 (27 May [8 June] 1892), cited in Tikhonov, *Sozdateł' Velikorusskogo orkestra...*, p. 32.

¹⁰⁴ *Novoe vremia*, no. 5892 (25 July [6 August], 1892), cited in Tikhonov, *Sozdateł' Velikorusskogo orkestra...*, p. 33.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁶ A. A. Krasnosel'skii, 'Koncertnaia deiatel'nost' V.V. Andreeva', in Karpenok, *Tvorcheskoe nasledie V.V. Andreeva*, p.32.

¹⁰⁷ 'Iz Vospominanii Andreeva' in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 124.

adding that: 'Великолепная сыгранность, богатство нюансов, разработанные партии отдельных балалаек обеспечили небывалый доселе успех.'¹⁰⁸

Notwithstanding Baranov's occasional lapses into overstating events, it would appear more likely that Andreev's above quoted, altogether more sober summary of the same event is a more realistic gauge of how the *Kruzhok* stood in a public performance sense in the summer of 1892. As for the repertoire performed on the France tour, Baranov declares it to have been 'brilliantly prepared'.¹⁰⁹ There is nothing to dispute *per se* regarding Baranov's assessment. What is important is that Andreev's conclusion also reveals his sense that the *Kruzhok* still had much more to offer regarding public performance. However favourable the French press was towards Andreev's *balalaechniki*, we sense in Andreev's above words the constant quest for improvement of the balalaika's appeal. His ensuing work on expanding the range of his *kruzhok* into an orchestra and enriching its repertoire with increasingly sophisticated classical transpositions illustrates this point.

By 1895, there was a danger that the *Andreevskii kruzhok* may become a victim of its own successes. The continuing growth in balalaika ensembles meant that Andreev's was increasingly appearing to be one ensemble among many.¹¹⁰ From the point of view of publicity, the more familiar the sight and sound of a balalaika ensemble, the greater the likelihood that the effect of Andreev's initial work in establishing Russian folk instrumental performance would wane. However novel balalaika ensembles were seven years after Andreev's *Kruzhok* first took to the stage in St. Petersburg, the reality

¹⁰⁸ Baranov, *Podvizhnik muzyki narodnoi*, p.38.

¹⁰⁹ Baranov, *Podvizhnik muzyki narodnoi*, p.39

¹¹⁰ Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.72.

was that Andreev's could have become merely one of a host of musically one-dimensional ensembles. This potential scenario may even have posed a threat to any continued impact from Andreev's ensemble, the possible consequence being that balalaika-playing would have fallen out of favour.

Another problem was that the material position of Andreev's *Kruzhok* was worsening and by the end of 1895, the number of concerts it gave was declining.¹¹¹ Andreev responded to this situation by increasing the number of musicians to sixteen.¹¹² Logic dictates that such a move could only have been prompted by the need to maintain the ensemble's popularity and is an indicator of the kind of publicizing instincts that would characterize Andreev's work in ensuing years.

By 'maintaining popularity', one has in mind impact on the audience via stage performance. From a musicological point of view, the expanded *Kruzhok* already had significant potential, courtesy of N.P. Fomin's input. Fomin was one of the extra musicians brought in, so that Andreev now had a qualified Conservatoire musician assisting with the improvement of the ensemble's musical repertoire, as well as performing as a member of the ensemble. Others recruited included V.T. Nasonov and F.A. Niman, both professional musicians.¹¹³ Moreover, the inclusion of N. I. Privalov (musician, ethnologist, researcher of folk instruments)¹¹⁴ into Andreev's circle of collaborators signalled that Andreev had very serious goals for Russian folk instrumental performance beyond the scope of mere ensemble performance on the

¹¹¹ Ibid.

¹¹² Ibid.

¹¹³ Ibid.

¹¹⁴ Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.73.

public stage. The details and significance of the roles of Andreev's new collaborators are discussed in Chapter 6.

4.5.1 Publicising the *Velikorusskii orkestr*

Andreev had been advised by his new professional colleagues of the importance of introducing new, refreshing and colourful elements into the expanding ensemble.¹¹⁵ Andreev's endeavours from that point evidently focused again on visual and aural presentation. For example, he now began researching the history of Russian music and requested his colleagues to find other Russian folk instruments the possible inclusion of which would enhance the musical and presentational image of Russian folk instrumental performance.¹¹⁶ There were already two other Russian folk instruments to Andreev's knowledge, namely the *gusli* and the *domra*,¹¹⁷ which were obvious candidates for inclusion. However, Andreev did not know what a *domra* looked like, as no authentic image of one was preserved.¹¹⁸ Nonetheless, he saw it as essential to the development of the *Kruzhok*.¹¹⁹

In the summer of 1894, Andreev became acquainted with a carpenter who had worked in Ostrovka village in the *Tver'* region¹²⁰ and was living in Mar'ino. Nikolai Semyonovich Nalimov had produced fine furniture, but had also made musical

¹¹⁵ Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.72.

¹¹⁶ Ibid.

¹¹⁷ Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.73.

¹¹⁸ Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.74.

¹¹⁹ Ibid.

¹²⁰ Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.75.

instruments, including balalaikas.¹²¹ Andreev firstly ordered from Nalimov a balalaika prima, followed by extra balalaikas and, in the late summer of 1896, domras prima, alto and bass.¹²² Considering the fact that the *Kruzhok* already had three ranges of balalaika spanning three separate octaves (prima, sekunda and bass), the addition of a range of domras would prove to elevate the sound and scope of the ensemble to new heights. Andreev's ensemble now included (along with the gusli) a variety of musical instruments and, in the autumn of 1896, he renamed his *Kruzhok liubitelei igry na balalaikakh* the *Velikorusskii orkestr*.¹²³

The re-naming of the ensemble can be seen as a very shrewd publicity move in view of the popularity of balalaika ensembles in St. Petersburg at that time. Andreev effectively re-asserted his position as the prime mover for the popularization and establishment of Russian folk instrumental performance in late nineteenth-century Russia. Apart from its now grander title, the new orchestra was also elevated in its status by means of the reasoning behind Andreev's employment of the word *velikorusskii*. All the orchestra's folk musical instruments originated from central and northern Russia, the ancient Muscovy state.¹²⁴ It seems reasonable to suggest that this link to the orchestra's new name was as much a publicizing statement about the orchestra's status in Russian cultural life, as the expansion of the orchestra's range was a publicizing statement about the musicological viability of Russian folk instrumental performance. It is with these two sub-divisions of the publicizing notion in

¹²¹ Baranov, *Podvizhnik muzyki narodnoi*, pp.44–46. The importance of Nalimov to Andreev's work ranks highly, and is discussed within context in Chapters 3 and 6.

¹²² Baranov, *Podvizhnik muzyki narodnoi*, pp.75-76. Music critics immediately disparaged the domra's introduction into the *Kruzhok*, labelling it an 'Italian balalaika' ('ital'ianskaia balalaika'), or 'Russified mandolin' ('rusifitsirovannaia mandolina').

¹²³ Baranov, *Podvizhnik muzyki narodnoi*, p.77.

¹²⁴ Andreev, 'Kratkaia istoricheskaia spravka' in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.106.

mind that Andreev's following words are afforded a certain resonance. In the 7 November 1896 issue of *Peterburgskii listok*, he was quoted thus:

'My task is the revival and perfection of our ancient national instruments, the propaganda of authentic Russian song'

'...задача моя – возрождение и совершенствование наших древних национальных инструментов, пропаганда истинной русской песни...'¹²⁵

Those words were preceded the previous day by a piece in *Novoe vremia* (7 November 1896), which informed its readers of a concert to be given on 23 November (in the Main Hall of the St Petersburg Mutual Credit Society) by the *Velikorusskii orkestr*:

'...this is the name now given to the first *Society of Lovers of the Balalaika*, led by V.V. Andreev. In addition to the balalaika, V.V. Andreev has improved and introduced into his orchestra other ancient instruments of our pre-Petrine time: *domras*, *gusli* and *gudok*. Andreev collected many songs in the Tver province, which will be performed at the concert in a completely new musical setting... With the introduction of the named instruments, it is obvious that the musical range of such an orchestra has become quite broad'.

'...такое название получает теперь 1-ый кружок любителей игры на балалайках В.В. Андреева. В.В. Андреев усовершенствовал и ввел в свой оркестр помимо балалайки и другие старинные наши инструменты допетровского времени: домры, гусли и гудок. Г. Андреевым собрано

¹²⁵ Tikhonov, *Sozdatel' Velikorusskogo orkestra...*, p.54.

много песен в Тверской губернии, которые в совершенно новой инструментовке и будут исполняться в концерте ... С введением поименованных инструментов очевидно музыкальные средства такого оркестра становятся довольно разнообразными.¹²⁶

Naturally, *Novoe vremia* would have needed to have been informed of the above changes in order to have reported them. But what is quite apparent is that the timing of the above announcement was the result of well calculated publicity, appearing as it did a little over two weeks before the 23 November 1896 concert. In itself, this is not such a novel event in respect of the history of public media relations, for it represents standard publicizing of an imminent event. What is important, however, is how Andreev apparently kept his new developments from the press until the point when he communicated to the press the new revelations about his work. This is despite the fact that he was in the public arena in both the spring and early autumn of 1896 via performances of his original *Kruzhok balalaechnikov*. This conveys a sense of the kind of real anticipation that might otherwise have quickly dissipated had news of his expanded and renamed ensemble leaked into the public arena too far in advance of Andreev being fully prepared to inform the public about it. To emphasize this point further, one must bear in mind, for example, that Andreev had been working towards the expansion of his ensemble with additional Russian folk instruments from the summer of 1894, if his initial contact with Nalimov is taken into account.

The obvious sense of anticipation of the imminent concert via which the expanded orchestra would present its scope to the public exemplifies further Andreev's

¹²⁶ Tikhonov, *Sozdatel' Velikorusskogo orkestra...*, p.53.

judgement and instincts for publicizing his work and the manifestations of it. He was clearly forging ahead, constantly looking for ways to maintain the interest of the public in Russian folk instrumental music and performance. However, much of the work behind the scenes that made Andreev's 1896 publicity move possible was undertaken by important figures such as N.P. Fomin, P.P. Karkin, S.I. Nalimov, V.T. Nasonov, F.A. Niman, N.I. Privalov; this work is described in more detail in Chapter 6.

The first major opportunity for Andreev to gauge the response of the St. Petersburg public to his expanded, renamed orchestra came on Saturday 11 January 1897 at a concert given at the city's *Zal dvoryanskogo sobraniiia*.¹²⁷ Andreev was presenting to the public a newly-named folk ensemble with additional members, new musical instruments and a new concert programme (only *Kamarinskaia* remained from previous performances).¹²⁸ Andreev was also concerned about the newly introduced, improved domra: it would be difficult to counter press reports (prior to the 11 January 1897 concert) that the *domra* was reminiscent of a mandolin¹²⁹ although the appearance of the instrument was definitely not mandolinesque. He need not have concerned himself too much, however, because the press responses were very positive. Various St. Petersburg daily publications spoke of the concert as being a 'huge success', that the *Velikorusskii orkestr* had a bright future, and so on.¹³⁰

The colour and effect of the orchestra's performance was enhanced even further in the short term following the 11 January 1897 debut. N.I. Privalov acquainted Andreev

¹²⁷ Tikhonov, *Sozdatei' Velikorusskogo orkestra...*, pp.78 and 80.

¹²⁸ Tikhonov, *Sozdatei' Velikorusskogo orkestra...*, p.80.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*

¹³⁰ Tikhonov, *Sozdatei' Velikorusskogo orkestra...*, pp.80-81

with the Russian reed-pipe, the *svirel'*,¹³¹ while M.A. Balakirev recommended a simple tambourine, both of which were duly incorporated into the orchestra.¹³² A much more interesting addition arrived courtesy of N.P. Fomin. He took the pedals from an old folk *tsitra*¹³³ and constructed a gusli operated by a keyboard.¹³⁴ These innovations proved beneficial for the orchestra's reputation. The St. Petersburg press followed the activities of the 'tireless' and 'energetic' 'toiler' [*truzhenik*] Andreev as he busied himself with continuing the instrumental growth of the *Velikorusskii orkestr*.¹³⁵ One newspaper reported his trip to Brussels to research the origins of the *gudok*, although, as discussed in Chapter 3, Andreev eventually decided against the idea of incorporating it into his orchestra because he confirmed it was more related to the violin or cello.¹³⁶

It was increasingly clear that, for Andreev, a *Velikorusskii orkestr* of Russian folk instruments would not allow for inclusion of any instrument not proven to be authentically Russian in origin. To that end, Andreev also incorporated the *zvonchatye gusli*, which he modernized himself following his acquaintance with the peasant *gusliar* of the Pskovskaia region, Osip Ustinovich Smolenskii.¹³⁷

The expansion of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* began to attract severe criticism and prejudice in certain sections of the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century St. Petersburg press. However, Andreev had the support of certain of his friends who used the press to counter the media criticism of the *Velikorusskii orkestr*. This exemplified how negative publicity was utilized in order to create positive publicity.

¹³¹ More detail on Andreev's meeting with the Smolensk *svirel'shchik* in Chapter 7

¹³² Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.83.

¹³³ Russian zither

¹³⁴ Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.83.

¹³⁵ Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.83.

¹³⁶ Andreev, 'Kratkaia istoricheskaia spravka...', in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.116.

¹³⁷ Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.84. There is no definitive translation of *zvonchatye gusli*.

Despite all the criticism of the *Velikorusskii orkestr*, the orchestra continued leaving its mark. At the turn of the twentieth century, two events in particular ensured that the orchestra was once again appearing in the pages of the St. Petersburg press. On 16 January 1900, the *Velikorusskii orkestr* gave a concert at the St. Petersburg *Zal kreditnogo obshchestva*, followed by a further concert, with the participation of a Russian armed forces balalaika orchestra, for the benefit of the Russian ballerina M.F. Ksheshinskaia.¹³⁸ Soon afterwards it was announced that the *Velikorusskii orkestr* would be representing 'Russian art' at the forthcoming 1900 World Exhibition in Paris.¹³⁹ Immediate criticism followed in certain Russian music journals and magazines. Andreev effectively responded to the criticism in two ways. Firstly, he set up at the Exhibition a display of improved Russian folk instruments to demonstrate their transition into concert-quality musical instruments of the *Velikorusskii orkestr*.¹⁴⁰ Secondly, by way of complement to the display, he also produced a brochure in French, which elucidated the development of Russian folk instruments, including a full catalogue of individual display items.¹⁴¹ Again, this proved to be an astute publicizing move by Andreev, for both he and his folk instrument craftsman, S.I. Nalimov, were awarded gold medals for their respective contributions to the Exhibition.¹⁴² The effect at home was immediate. The recently negative Russian press was now warmly reporting Andreev's and Nalimov's respective Paris successes.¹⁴³

¹³⁸ Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.89.

¹³⁹ *ibid.*

¹⁴⁰ Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.90.

¹⁴¹ Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, pp.90-91.

¹⁴² Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.91

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*

There was a third event which would have caught the attention of the St. Petersburg media and may have outshone Andreev's and Nalimov's Paris achievements. In 1902, Andreev's *Velikorusskii orkestr* had bestowed upon it official, Imperial Court patronage. Sokolov, writing in 1962, tentatively referred to that *Vysochaishchee pokrovitel'stvo* as 'of no small importance'¹⁴⁴ and recognized that it helped to protect the orchestra from criticism.¹⁴⁵ This was, in fact, rather more significant an event than the mere two sentences of reference in Sokolov's publication, as will be discussed in Chapter Seven where Andreev's connections and associations with the Imperial Court are considered at more length.

Notwithstanding the significance of the 1902 royal patronage to Andreev as publicist, there is reason to suppose that his orchestra's new elevation in status may have strengthened the resolve of Andreev's opponents, as the following case makes clear. In 1904, N.P. Fomin wrote orchestration for the *Velikorusskii orkestr* of the Scherzo from Tchaikovsky's Fourth Symphony.¹⁴⁶ The *Velikorusskii orkestr* was scheduled to perform it together with a full symphony orchestra, conducted by A.L. Gorelov.¹⁴⁷ A piece in the *Muzika i teatr* section of *Vedomosti S-Peterburgskogo gradonachal'stva* urged Andreev to ignore 'the enemies of Russian folk music', and to continue with his work for the Russian balalaika.¹⁴⁸ This was an attitude not shared, however, by Tchaikovsky's brother, Anatolii Il'ich, who had the concert halted, literally as the audience awaited the conductor to take the stage to conduct the *Scherzo*. The conductor failed to appear, and the usher read out a note from Anatolii Il'ich stating

¹⁴⁴ Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.92.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid.

¹⁴⁶ Ibid.

¹⁴⁷ Ibid.

¹⁴⁸ Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, pp.92-93.

the concert would not go ahead.¹⁴⁹ Andreev responded in the press, explaining that 48 of St. Petersburg's leading music critics, writers, experts (including Anatolii Il'ich Tchaikovsky) were invited to rehearsals of the *Scherzo*, and that Anatolii Il'ich was one of the 44 persons who neither replied, nor attended.¹⁵⁰ This dispute over performing Tchaikovsky's *Scherzo* culminated in a court hearing which ruled that Andreev's orchestra was free to perform the piece.

There had been other difficulties for the *Velikorusskii orkestr*, not from a critical, but from a financial point of view. From the early to mid-1890s, Andreev had been increasingly relying on his own finances to keep the orchestra afloat due to a lack of concert appearances.¹⁵¹ By 1897, the orchestra had fallen apart.¹⁵² However, Andreev turned those difficulties to the orchestra's advantage by acting on the suggestion that he should take the *Velikorusskii orkestr* on a foreign tour.¹⁵³

4.5.2 Publicising aspects of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* abroad 1909 - 1911

Having secured that financial support, the foreign trip commenced in 1909.¹⁵⁴ Berlin, London (twice), Paris, New York, Washington, Chicago and Philadelphia were just some of the various towns and cities visited by the *Velikorusskii orkestr*.¹⁵⁵ The regular reports in the St. Petersburg press about the tour were mostly positive. Press coverage

¹⁴⁹ Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, pp.93-94.

¹⁵⁰ Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, pp.94-95.

¹⁵¹ Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.95.

¹⁵² Ibid. There is lack of clarity about that period of time in Andreev's activities raising questions about whether the orchestra disintegrated, or was temporarily disbanded.

¹⁵³ ibid., pp.95, 97 and 99. It is said that F.I. Shaliapin advised Andreev to tour, but no factual basis for this has been found.

¹⁵⁴ Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.99.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid.

from England and the U.S. was also very advantageous to Andreev's publicizing of the *Velkorusskii orkestr*.¹⁵⁶

The remainder of Andreev's life (from 1912) was spent in Russia. During that time, he engaged in concert touring and writing (letters, articles, etc) all for the cause of propagating Russian folk music via his *Velkorusskii orkestr*. He also added a new dimension to his orchestra's public performance by incorporating into the occasions small lectures about Russian folk music, folk instrumental performance, and so on. Sokolov believes that these characteristics of his activities from 1912 marked the beginning of Andreev's publicistic activities.¹⁵⁷

Also during those remaining years, Andreev realized a range of socio-educational initiatives. These included the establishing of balalaika courses for village teachers and, thereby, for folk orchestra instructors in village schools from 1912. Another major achievement was the establishment of balalaika classes in professional railway workers' colleges, also in 1912. However, arguably the most important (although not fully realised) of Andreev's initiatives were the establishment of the House of Folk Music (*Dom narodnoi muzyki*) in 1915 and the Society for the Promotion of Playing Folk Instruments and Collective Singing (*Obshchestvo rasprostranenia i igry na narodnykh instrumentakh i khorovogo peniiia*) in 1916.¹⁵⁸ The purpose of the above initiatives slightly overlaps with the publicistic aspect of Andreev's work. However, they

¹⁵⁶ For example, Sokolov (*Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.100) quotes one English source as saying Andreev had 'made one step towards Anglo-Russian closeness', and an American source as saying Andreev had 'done more for Russia than Russian diplomacy'. Neither of these alleged sources, however, are referenced.

¹⁵⁷ Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.102. Sokolov's view restricts the notion of Andreev the *publitsist* to a six-year period of activity. There is room for debate over what defined Andreev the *publitsist* and Sokolov's view takes no account of all the publicizing activities Andreev undertook from the mid-1880s. Otherwise, Sokolov's suggestion may suggest in turn that there are two types of Andreev *publitsist*.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid.

will be discussed at more length in the following chapter, which concerns his educational activities (*prosvetitel'stvo*).

4.6 Conclusions

In this chapter it has been the intention to illustrate and to contextualize the evolution of Andreev's ideas and instincts in publicizing Russian folk instrumental music via selective examples of key phases and events defining that specific publicizing aspect of Andreev's activities. We have seen how the evolution of those publicizing ideas and instincts were intertwined with the practical necessity to improve Russian folk instruments in terms of: a) their visual appearance; b) their resonance and performance scope; and c) their repertoire. Discussion has included key examples of how the balalaika in particular underwent various stages of development at the instigation of Andreev, sometimes prompted by the advice of others with relevant knowledge and experience of such an undertaking. That undertaking resulted in the elevation of the balalaika and other key Russian folk instruments from the peasant village, through the St. Petersburg salons, up to the professional concert auditorium in the space of a mere 13 years i.e., from Andreev's first public demonstrations of balalaika playing in 1884 up to the first performance of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* in late 1896.

It has also been necessary to define what is to be understood by the term 'publicizing'. The examples cited of Andreev's publicizing instincts demonstrate that publicizing Russian folk instrumental music ought not to be restricted to published material (i.e.,

articles, letters, pamphlets, etc.). In other words, publicizing has been shown best to be attributed to public performance activity. Inevitably, however, publicizing in this context overlaps into publicistic activity, as exemplified by Andreev's awareness and utilization of the press as reporters of his performance-related work as it developed over the first decade of his activities.

It has been hitherto understood that Andreev's activity as *publitsist* generally encompassed his production of printed work promoting his activities. However, this area of Andreev's work can be argued to fall within the broader sphere of his work as *prosvetitel'*. This is discussed in the following chapter.

5. ANDREEV AS *PROSVETITEL'*

5.1 Introduction

Andreev's promotion of the balalaika and other Russian folk instruments via public solo and ensemble performance ran in parallel with another key aspect of his role as *publitsist* and helped to facilitate the popularization of Russian folk instruments and Russian folk music in general. This aspect was Andreev's educational activity (*prosvetitel'skaia deyatel'nost*) which overlaps with the public performance element of his publicistic role. On the one hand, public performance involved presenting the balalaika as a positive visual and musical statement about Russian folk music, with the emphasis on immediate audience impact. On the other hand, it was used as a means of *educating* the public about the musical scope and cultural value of Russian folk instrumental music.

The overlap between Andreev's role as publicist and his role as educator ought not to lead us to neglect the specific quality of Andreev's educational activities, which had a far-reaching and permanent impact on Russian musical culture and Russian society. As described in Chapter Four, the publication of Russia's first balalaika tuition manual, *Shkola dlia balalaiki*, followed on a period of successful performances and growing repute in St. Petersburg. The publication of this volume demonstrates that Andreev did not want simply to create an audience for the balalaika; he wanted to *teach* that audience how to play folk music themselves. Manuals such as *Shkola...* were

intended for use in lessons and self-tuition. In creating these manuals, Andreev clearly sought to find a more permanent footing for the balalaika in Russian culture. Looking at a selection of Andreev's articles, essays and sketches, this chapter illuminates Andreev's motivations in doing so.

Andreev's thinking regarding the educational aspect of his work falls into two key areas: his views on musical education (*muzykal'no-pedagogicheskie vzgliady*) and his ideas about education as enlightenment (*prosvetitel'skie vzgliady*). The former relate to the more practical side of Andreev's pedagogical activities, some of which are discussed in Chapters Two and Four. This is the aspect of Andreev's interest in education that has most interested scholars to date. Soviet scholarship particularly tends to give greater emphasis to Andreev's practical activities to publicize the balalaika and Russian folk instrumental music than to his ideas about enlightenment.

In the essay 'Prosvetitel'skaia deyatel'nost' V.V. Andreeva', for example, Akulovich focuses primarily on the practical results of this activity: Andreev's work in the army and factories, as well as the partial fulfilment of his goal to establish the *Dom narodnoi muzyki*.¹ This focus on Andreev's pedagogical *activities* has led to neglect of his *ideas* about education as a means of 'enlightenment'. These ideas are the subject of this chapter, which seeks to broaden our understanding of why Andreev wanted to educate the Russian public about the balalaika and folk music, and why he went about this in the way that he did.

¹ V.I. Akulovich, Iu. B. Bogdanov, 'Prosvetitel'skaia deyatel'nost' V.V. Andreeva', in Karpenok, *Tvorcheskoe nasledie V.V. Andreeva*, pp.37-38.

5.2 Publication of *Shkola* and its impact

According to the former Andreev *Kruzhok* member Shtiber², Andreev saw the requests for balalaika lessons at the Ol'denburgskii event initially as an opportunity to popularize the balalaika. However, the implications of the publication of *Shkola dlia balalaiki* for Andreev's educational work have been afforded limited significance by other writers on Andreev. Imkhanitskii has noted that, following the publication of *Shkola dlia balalaiki*, there was a gradual emergence of groups of balalaika players. These were led by Andreev's former pupils and exemplified by Andreev's own *Kruzhok* of late 1887.³ Popularization of the balalaika progressed via Andreev's continuing public performances throughout 1887, and this was borne out by the requests for balalaika lessons that Andreev received on the strength of those public appearances. Following the publication of *Shkola dlia balalaiki* on 16 June 1887, the requests increased further, culminating in Andreev's establishment and organization of *Uroki po igre na balalaike* by December of the same year.⁴

The publication of *Shkola* was important in Andreev's educational work for a number of reasons.⁵ Its publication was not only the first of its kind, a manual teaching the performance of Russian folk music on a specific Russian folk instrument, but also a formal presentation of Russian folk music, via the balalaika, and in formal music score. It seems logical to suggest that such a manual presented in this style was ultimately designed to convey the *educational* value of balalaika playing and the artistic value of

² ibid.

³ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, pp.53-7.

⁴ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.57.

⁵ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.55.

folk music performance. This raises the question of whom Andreev's *Shkola* was targeting, or seeking to educate. Although it was an educated society which had generally shunned the balalaika until Andreev formally and energetically introduced it into St. Petersburg, it seems Andreev was aiming for a broader appeal. The title page of *Shkola* declared: 'School for balalaika. Compiled by P.K. Seliverstov with the participation of the famous balalaika player V.V. Andreev, including songs performed by him at concerts' (*Shkola dlia balalaiki. Sostavil P.K. Seliverstov pri uchasti izvestnogo artista igry na balalaike V.V. Andreeva s prilozheniem pesen, ispolnennykh im v kontsertakh*). On 29 June 1887, *Peterburgskii listok*, quoting from the preface of *Shkola*, reported that the authors' aim was 'to give the opportunity, unaided, quickly to learn to play ...folk songs on the balalaika'. This was the aim even for those '...without elementary knowledge of music'.⁶ Moreover, the songs included in *Shkola* were folk songs probably known to many, even without the added impetus for their popularity provided by Andreev's performance of them at various of his concert appearances leading up to the publication of *Shkola*: among the songs included in the first *Shkola* were 'Barinia', 'Po ultse mostovoi', 'Kamarinskaia', 'Nigde milogo ne vizhu', etc. So the appeal of *Shkola* is clear. The music included in it was a mix of pieces which were already generally known, and which Andreev himself had both popularized and reintroduced to the public via his balalaika performances.

With regard to Akulovich's above brief assessment that *Shkola* represented the beginnings of Andreev's *pedagogical* instincts, there are two points to note. Firstly, it introduced balalaika music in music score to a public of varying musical knowledge, or of none. Secondly, as a self-tuition manual (*samouchitel'*), *Shkola dlia balalaiki*

⁶ Baranov, *Vasili Andreev*, p.31.

represented Andreev's pedagogical instincts in the shape of an instructional method for balalaika playing.

Members of the public were initially lured to the balalaika by Andreev's public performances, and the introduction of *Shkola* marked the point from which they came forward in increasing numbers to request balalaika lessons. The public performances, and especially the balalaika manual which utilized music performed at them, turned out to be the perfect tool to bring people to explore the educational value of playing the balalaika. This public interest in learning to play the balalaika ignited by *Shkola* represented the first serious *educational*/impact of Andreev's work. It resulted not only in the *Uroki po igre na balalaike*, but also established individual and group *learning*.

5.3.1 Articles, essays, sketches

One reason that Soviet scholars give less consideration to Andreev's *prosvetitel'stvo*, as revealed in and characterized in his writing, is that they tend to focus on what Andreev did with Russian folk instrumental music and Russian folk instruments, rather than what he thought about this activity. Therefore, Andreev is easily perceived more as an activist, than as a thinker. While it is fair to view Andreev's views in print in the context of propagating (that is advocating, or promoting), his writing gave expression to an educating instinct, in the sense of clarifying, or enlightening.

In considering Andreev's educational activities, the following sections will deal with examples from his own writing and the printed records of his views: 'Predislovie k Skhole dlja balalaiki'; 'Iubilej balalaiki'; 'K voprosu o russkoi narodnoi muzyke'; 'O

'Velikorusskom orkestre'; 'Velikorusskii orkestr pered sudom inostrantsev'; 'Otvetы na voprosy korrespondenta russkikh gazet'; 'Pis'mo v redaktsii'; 'Beseda s korrespondentom Moskovskikh vedomostei'; 'Interv'iu gazete Obozrenie teatrov'; and 'Balalaika i simfoniia'. These examples were published over a period of approximately twenty years and appeared in publications whose readership ranged from the general public through to individuals and groups with more expert and academic interests in music culture.

5.3.2 'Predislovie k Shkole dlia balalaiki'⁷

In the Foreword to the 1894 edition of *Shkola dlia balalaiki*, Andreev openly acknowledged that the balalaika was derogated by its critics and detractors as symbolic of *antimuzykal'nost'*, or the antithesis of what was generally accepted as music in educated circles. But his conviction of the musical scope that the balalaika was capable of conveying moved him towards having the 'neglected' instrument improved to demonstrate its capabilities. Having thereby facilitated the spread of the instrument, both in Russia and abroad, he felt fortunate that he had, as a result, 'done his bit for Russian folk art'.⁸ He also thought that, in the future, the instrument would be returned to the people who had created it, but in a better, improved form.

Andreev also states here that the improved balalaika placed it alongside other 'instruments of that particular type', such as 'the Spanish guitar and Italian mandolin'.

⁷ Granovskii, in an endnote, writes: 'Polnoe nazvanie: "Shkola dlia balalaiki s prilozheniem pesen, aranzhirovannykh dlia piati balalaek V.V. Andreeva. Sobstvennost' avtora, - [St. P'burg], 1894". *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 305.

⁸ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.31

³⁵² ibid. On 'antimuzykal'nost' and 'balalaika', see N. Findeisen, 'Po povodu orkestra balalaek g. Andreeva', *Russkaia muzykal'naia gazeta*, issue 5, vol. 6 (1898): 614.

He further anticipated negative comparisons between balalaikas and mandolins, etc., by pointing out that he wanted to show that the balalaika, although having only three strings, was not inferior to other instruments similar to it.³⁵² In fact, it was the *domra* which was arguably more comparable to the mandolin, although it was yet to be included in Andreev's ensemble, and would not be presented to public scrutiny in an orchestral setting until early 1896.

There is a sense from certain of Andreev's words in the Foreword to *Shkola* that, for him, *antimuzykal'nost'* was not an issue and was an unnecessary distraction from what he saw as the balalaika's scope and potential.⁹ For example, Andreev clarifies here the craftsmanship carried out on the early, improved balalaikas. He recalls that V.V. Ivanov made the first balalaika *primas*, and that F.S. Paserbskii made accompanying balalaikas (bass, al'to, '...i drugie').¹⁰ This brings to the attention of the reader the fact that scope (in this instance in terms of the range of musical pitch of the improved balalaikas) was a valid consideration in the same way as it is taken for granted with other stringed musical instruments, ranging from violin, through viola, cello and up to double bass.

In the final two paragraphs of the Foreword, Andreev states that the *Shkola* contained pieces (songs/ refrains), both for balalaika prima, and for five balalaikas (i.e., balalaika quintet), and that this was to show the possibilities of the publication, in that it would be 'accessible for everyone'. He also pointed out that the same pieces would be

⁹ See again Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 31

¹⁰ *ibid.*

³⁵² *ibid.*

published as separate publications, but arranged for solo balalaika and pianoforte accompaniment, as well as for five balalaikas.³⁵⁵

The above examples from the Foreword represent almost a statement of defiance regarding Andreev's intentions in the face of criticism and doubt up to that point. Although not the place to respond to criticism, there is a sense that the Foreword was, for Andreev, a subtle declaration of his intention to press forward with his plans: everyone was welcome to get involved in balalaika playing, whatever the critics may have thought of the idea. Of equal importance is how the Foreword served to *enlighten* the reader concerning the scope and possibilities for both solo and group balalaika playing and performance. It represented the genesis of thoughts which would soon develop into a more far-reaching idea concerning the question of Russian folk music, the folk instruments on which it was to be performed, and the broadening of the scope of Russian folk music performance. This idea came to fruition as his balalaika ensemble expanded into a more sophisticated collective in the form of the first *Velikorusskii orkestr*, from 1889 to 1896. It was through that transition from balalaika ensemble to national folk instrument orchestra that Andreev found expression for his musical instincts and his ability to enlighten the public via the printed word. We can gain a sense of those enlightening instincts through what he had to say about the importance of Russian folk music performance and its place in Russian musical culture.

5.3.3 'The Anniversary of the Balalaika'¹¹

Andreev gave this interview on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the 20 March 1888 debut of his *Kruzhok* in the Main Hall of the St. Petersburg Mutual Credit Society.

¹¹ Full title: 'lubilei balalaiki u V.V. Andreeva', published in *Peterburgskaia gazeta*, 20 March, 1898, No.77.

He reflects on and assesses the progress of his work from that debut up to the anniversary concert of 22 March 1898 at the *Zal dvoryanskogo sobraniia*. The reporter introduces the interview by referring in superlative terms to the anniversary concert and the background to it. The anniversary event was to be a 'grand concert' with the participation of '250 amateur balalaika players'. Andreev himself is presented as the 'originator' of the 'resurrection of the balalaika', and as having undertaken the 'propaganda' of the instrument with 'growing success'.¹² This leaves the reader in no doubt as to the scale and importance of the event.

Andreev's reflections are set in the broader context of his work as a whole, and not in the narrower context of his educational work. However, the interview gives an indication of his thinking on the latter. Andreev's opening comment in the interview hypothesizes that he might have been dismissed as insane if he had expressed the thought of such a grand event as the tenth anniversary concert when he debuted in St. Petersburg ten years earlier. The reporter precedes that hypothesis with the assertion that Andreev himself did not anticipate such a successful landmark as the one he had reached by March 1898 in St. Petersburg. There is, though, a sense of Andreev being rather coy in his comments immediately following this assertion. He prompts the reader to consider that there were at least twenty-thousand amateur balalaika players in St. Petersburg at that time.

From this early point in the interview he provides a number of important facts and clarifications. Andreev informs readers that those playing the balalaika include 'not

¹² 'Iubilei balalaiki' in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.41.

only men' but also 'many women from high society' who 'play the balalaika with the greatest interest.' This demonstrates that the balalaika was not a musical instrument to be regarded lightly, as enthusiasm for playing it was to be found in 'higher society'.

To add emphasis to his point, Andreev named a 'Baron Raden' and a 'V.V. Abaza'¹³ as two people 'in high society circles' who were playing the balalaika. Of Andreev's 'numerous talented students', Baron Raden and Abaza had become 'almost' virtuoso balalaika players.¹⁴

There is particular poignancy in this reference to Baron Raden's and Abaza's elevated social background ('svetskoe obshchestvo'), given the balalaika's humble early status and origins. Andreev was acutely aware of the *intelligentnoe obshchestvo* among the readership of the St. Petersburg press, and his airing of such facts as these indicates the sections of society he was aiming to enlighten regarding the balalaika and Russian folk music.¹⁵ He was aware of the numerous voices in the media who expressed scepticism about his activities.¹⁶ Andreev's reference to *velikosetskoe obshchestvo* figures playing the balalaika specifically serves to remind readers at the time that the phenomenon, born of his own determination to introduce the balalaika into the public arena, was one worthy of serious consideration and of respect, even if it was not appreciated by everyone.

¹³ Granovskii identifies Raden as an 'amateur balalaika player' (*balalaechnik-liubitel'*) and Abaza as an 'amateur balalaika player and organiser and leader of the orchestra of Russian folk instruments in Petersburg' (*balalaechnik-liubitel' – organizator i rukovoditel' orkestra russkikh narodnykh instrumentov v Peterburge*). *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.306.

¹⁴ *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.42. See point 'd' below.

¹⁵ It is unclear from source text whether Andreev is referring to separate sections of higher society, or whether both are interchangeable

¹⁶ i.e., Findeizen, 'Po povodu orkestra balalaek g. Andreeva', *Russkaia muzykal'naia gazeta*, issue 5, vol. 6 (1898): 614,

³⁶² Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.42.

Andreev also pointed out how broadly the balalaika had spread across varying sections of society, from secondary schools, through to the armed forces, and even into the legal profession.³⁶² And he then made the assertion that balalaika *kruzhki* were being formed ‘everywhere’. These simple statements again clarify for the reader the effects and result of his work.

Andreev takes the opportunity to inform and to clarify for readers his promotion of the balalaika. The reporter asks Andreev how the idea came to him to promote the balalaika. Andreev initially reflects on his first hearing the balalaika on his family estate (in Bezhetsk) in *Tverskaia guberniia* and his subsequent decision to devote a whole year to studying the instrument. But when he had arrived in St. Petersburg with the balalaika – for the purpose of finding a craftsman to improve it – a ‘Professor’ Bystrov¹⁷ heard him play the instrument, with the result that he ‘persuaded’ Andreev ‘to perform in musical society’ (*vystupit’ v muzykal’nom obshchestve*). Although Andreev was ‘terrified’ by such a suggestion, he was ‘blessed’ with great success on taking the balalaika into the public arena, and balalaika-playing consequently spread quickly around St. Petersburg.¹⁸

Andreev does not mention in what context or setting Bystrov heard him play the balalaika. But it is clearly important that readers understood that it was a ‘Professor’ who had encouraged him into musical society, which serves to demonstrate again that the instrument was viewed as having potential in a broader public setting. Moreover,

¹⁷ Sokolov identifies this figure as “N.M. Bystrov – a teacher in the St Petersburg Conservatoire in the piano class. Historiographers of Andreev mistakenly ascribe the title of professor to N.M Bystrov and get his initials wrong (N.I.).’ V.V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.31fn14.

¹⁸ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, pp. 42-3.

one can only speculate as to whether or not Andreev explained to the interviewer the background and profession of Bystrov. It may be that Andreev did say more about Bystrov, but it was not included in the printed piece. However, even if he did not, it is likely that Andreev was aware that there were those among the readership of *Peterburgskaia gazeta* who understood and appreciated Bystrov's role in his early 'propagating' of the balalaika.

Andreev had been 'encouraged' by the initial success of his first public appearances as a balalaika player, which had caused him to 'throw himself' into devoting time to the balalaika. This involved making changes and improvements to the instrument. For example, he stated (not for the first time in print) that with the help of craftsmen he improved the instrument's sounding-board and created a range of balalaikas 'po tonam' (i.e., according to their respective tuning) ranging from double-bass to piccolo. For Andreev, the improvement and expansion of the balalaika's range was the catalyst for propagating the instrument abroad: he took it to France in a sextet of players in 1889 and 1892.¹⁹ Andreev viewed his role on those two visits as a concert performer, but it is clear that he mentions the France tours in the context of propagating the balalaika.

Andreev then says to the reporter in conclusion to the above points:

'Now I can even say with complete certainty that the balalaika will in a few years also be widely propagated abroad. After our trip abroad, our success will be assured.'

¹⁹ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.306.

‘Теперь я даже могу высказать полную уверенность, что через несколько лет балалайка за границей найдёт также большое распространение.

*После поездки за границу успех наш уже был обеспечен.*²⁰

Clearly, the success of a ‘propagating’ concert tour in France enhanced the balalaika’s already rising popularity at home, more than would have been the case had he focused his propagating activities within Russia alone. This clarification could only have increased readers’ understanding of how both domestic and foreign propagating benefited the balalaika’s position in Russia.

Andreev also takes the opportunity in this interview to clarify the accessibility of the balalaika. He states, the balalaika was ‘not a complex instrument’, and that its ‘melodious motif and the ease with which it can be played, without lengthy or difficult preparation, makes it accessible to the masses.’ To clarify this point, he concludes that: ‘I could teach you to play “Baryniu” on the balalaika in three minutes’. However, the instrument also had its demands: being a ‘subtle’ instrument to play, it could demand ‘half a year’s’ study in order to play several other works.²¹

With regard to the semi-virtuoso ‘high society’ balalaika players Baron Raden and V.V. Abaza (see above point ‘a’), there are two points to consider: first, the balalaika’s accessibility, and second, its appeal in relation to its artistic and technical demands. On the one hand, the examples from ‘high social circles’ that Baron Raden and Abaza represented strengthen Andreev’s assertions that the balalaika was a serious musical instrument of which it was possible to be a virtuoso player. On the other hand, however,

²⁰ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.43, emphasis mine.

²¹ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.43.

and no less importantly, Andreev's assessment of Raden and Abaza as 'semi-virtuoso' balalaika players suggests that the balalaika demanded greater dexterity and temperament than was assumed by many of its detractors at the time. Therefore, although it was an accessible instrument, its demands lent support to Andreev's view that the balalaika ought to be considered seriously within musical cultural opinion.

As for the balalaika's place in Russian society, Andreev asserted that it had now become 'a much-loved instrument in our intelligent society' (*v nashem intelligentnom obshchestve*).²² However, he viewed the balalaika's future place ultimately to be 'among the folk' (*v narode*). As he explained, it would reach the folk "through discharged soldiers, who are currently being taught how to play the balalaika."³⁶⁹

All this reveals: a) the value of both 'intelligent society' and of those outside it (i.e., soldiers); and b) the unifying message that the balalaika was accessible for everyone. Although Andreev saw the role of soldiers as key to the *dissemination* of the balalaika, his comments do not categorically exclude the role played by those in 'intelligent' and 'high' society. This is thus not only the same idea as expressed in the Foreword to the 1894 *Shkola* (see above section 5.3.2), but is also evidence of the burgeoning of that same idea several years after its publication. However, there was also an educational role for the balalaika in the *narod*. This touches on the question of what Andreev viewed the *narod* to be, and this is explored in Chapter Eight.

²² Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.42.

³⁶⁹ Ibid.

5.3.4 'K voprosu o russkoi narodnoi muzyke'²³

Andreev asked the editor of *Rossiya* not to refuse this piece a place in his journal. He stated that this 'letter' was important for many reasons, and that it served "as an answer to frequently asked questions from the press and society regarding my activities in a completely new sphere, one that is as yet little studied".²⁴ He then juxtaposes the lack of research in that field of culture with the statement that he had already been engaged for over ten years in improving Russian folk instruments and that these had been the vehicle for disseminating the Russian folk song. The first steps along that road had been initially uncertain and weak. However, 'with every year my task has become clearer to me, and the path to attaining the goal I have set more direct'. He adds, however, that 'after these ten years, I have developed a well-defined program of activities for the benefit of the folk music cause.'²⁵

His piece is rather more than a 'letter'. It is a series of answers to key questions and objections which he uses to explain his plans, and effectively to clarify his statement above about having worked out a 'defined programme of action' for the benefit of activities in the sphere of Russian folk music. In explaining his responses to those 'frequently asked questions', Andreev covers six areas of contention regarding his work. His responses are persuasive clarifications, as revealed in the following examples.

²³ Full title: 'K voprosu o russkoi narodnoi muzyki – pis'mo v redaktsiyu'. Granovskii notes that this was published in the newspaper *Rossiia*, No. 190, on 4th November 1899'. *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 306.

²⁴ V. Andreev, 'K voprosu o russkoi narodnoi muzyke', in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 44.

²⁵ *ibid.*

(i) 'Why would you perfect and revive the folk instruments of the *narod* which the *narod* themselves have neglected and replaced with others?'²⁶ Andreev refutes this with three clarifications:

- a) The *narod* had never abandoned their musical instruments. They could not be improved or disseminated due to the religious suppression of music in Russia from the early Christian era through to the eighteenth century. Andreev then provides clarification for this statement by referring the reader to two works: Mikhnevich's *Istoricheskie etiudi* and Famintsyn's *Skomorokhi na Rusi*.²⁷
- b) Those instruments consequently reached the present time in a primitive condition and were not able to conform to musical culture of the current period. This meant that:
- c) the *narod* substituted those primitive instruments with the *garmonika*. The *garmonika* could not be played in the minor key, which 'killed' the [Russian] folk song because the instrument did not have the means accurately to transmit it, as the folk song was constructed mainly in the minor key.³⁷⁵

²⁶ 'Зачем совершенствовать и возрождать музыкальные орудия народа, которые он сам оставил и заменил другими?' *Ibid.*

²⁷ Granovskii's endnote (*Materialy i dokumenty*, p.306) says Andreev means the works 'Mikhnevich, VI., *Istoricheskie etyudy russkoi zhizni*, t. 1-3, SPb., 1879-1886; Famintsyn, Al. S., *Skomorokhi na russii: Issledovanie*, SPb., 1889; Perepelitsyn, P.D., *Istoriia muzyki v rossii s drevnyeishikh vremen i do nashikh dnei: uchebnoe rukovodstvo i posobie*, SPb., M., 1888'.

³⁷⁵ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.45.

(ii) 'Improved and contemporary Great Russian [folk] instruments had lost their cultural significance/ appeal and were imitations of the mandolin and guitar'.²⁸ There are two claims in this statement, to which Andreev responds in turn:

- a) Improved, contemporary folk instruments could not lose their importance and meaning as such because he who played a simple, unimproved balalaika could also play an improved balalaika much better and without difficulty. This was also the case with other folk instruments (i.e., *gusli*, *brelna*). Andreev concludes 'All this has been verified by my experience', which draws a subtle distinction between himself and those who did *not* have his practical experience of folk instruments and the means of playing them.
- b) Russian folk instruments were not 'imitations' of instruments like the mandolin and guitar. Andreev explains that the domra, an 'independent', or free-standing instrument, had been in existence among Russians since the sixteenth century. He then refers the reader to published sources regarding this claim, Zabelin's *Byt russkikh tsarits* and Famintsyn's *Domra i srodyne ei instrumenty*.²⁹ He adds that the same domra was still in circulation among Russians in Viatka province. The domra that Andreev had restored was reconstructed according to that original model. The same Russian *narod* had spontaneously created the balalaika without any borrowing from other models. Andreev's balalaika was improved not in its essence (i.e., not altering

²⁸ 'Усовершенствованные и цивилизованные великорусские инструменты потеряли свое народное значение и являются подражанием мандолины и гитары.' *Ibid.*

²⁹ Granovskii's endnote (*Materialy i dokumenty*, p.306) says this refers to the books 'Zabelin, I., *Domashnii byt russkikh tsarits v XVII st.*, M., 1869; Famintsyn, Al. S., *Domra i srodyne ei muzykal'nye instrumenty russkogo naroda: balalaika, kobza, bandura, torban, gitara: Istoricheskii ocherk*, SPb., 1891'.

its standard/ traditional shape and appearance), but in terms of the quality of materials used to construct it, of the correctness of form and size of parts, as well as of its appearance, ‘thanks to which its type [the balalaika’s] and nationality remained untouched’—exactly as it was, he concludes, with all the other [Russian folk] instruments he had improved.³⁰

(iii) ‘Why did I introduce different types of balalaika, such as the contra-bass, the bass, the bass-piccolo, and others, as well as the bass, small and other domras, when there was only one balalaika among the folk (*narod*)?’³¹ Andreev explains that:

- a) Stringed instruments in circulation among other peoples (i.e., outside Russia) had always appeared in ‘families’ (i.e, a range of tones). For example, the Slavs had their *tamburitsa*, *bisernitsa*, *brach*, all plucked instruments of one type and of matching appearance. Whereas the Italians had their mandolin, mandola, lute, etc., the Russians had their *domras* of similar appearance, e.g., *domra basistaia*, *domra malaia*, or ‘*domrikha*’.³²
- b) It was on the basis of the above examples of the *domra*, created by the *narod* itself, that Andreev produced the varieties of his already improved balalaikas and domras. He then concludes that, even if orchestras similar to his own had not spread amongst the *narod*, in any case, they already had improved instruments which were very close to them and which conveyed the indigenous Russian folk song.³³ Andreev adds that the length of his letter did not permit the detailed inclusion of a history of the

³⁰ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.45.

³¹ *ibid.*

³² Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.46.

³³ ‘in any case, in its hands there are improved, independent instruments, which are suited to its spirit and mindset, and which perfectly convey the indigenous folk song.’ (...во всяком случае, в его руках есть усовершенствованные, самостоятельные инструменты, свойственные его духу и складу, в совершенстве передающие коренную народную песню.’) *Ibid.*

origins of 'our people's instruments'. However, their history, construction and the reasons for their revival would be explained in detail in a book he was finishing, entitled 'Velikorusskie muzykal'nye instrumenty, prichiny ikh upadka i vozrozhdeniiia'.³⁴ It is not certain whether this book was completed or published.³⁵ However, Andreev made sufficient explanation of the history and origins of Russian folk instruments in various of his written materials (see Chapter 1.2.2).

c) Concerning those improved Russian folk instruments (i.e., instruments 'of our folk' (*nashego naroda*), it was Andreev's deep conviction that they were independent, entirely original and quintessentially Russian examples of the international family of folk instruments. Moreover, the instruments in their current form would satisfy the needs of the Russian *narod* for hundreds of years.³⁶ Given the available evidence, it is difficult to dispute these two latter assertions.

Andreev was equally certain that the same Russian folk instruments by virtue of their musical merits needed to be disseminated abroad and occupy a leading position amongst comparable instruments.³⁷ In light of the original objections to including balalaikas and domras of similar appearance in his orchestra, and Andreev's above explanations of the merits of so doing, this concluding remark has particular clarifying force. Other folk and national instruments, such as those to which Andreev refers in the above examples, were even then viewed and enjoyed by Russians on their own

³⁴ *ibid.*

³⁵ Granovskii's endnote (*Materialy i dokumenty*, p.306) says: 'Такой книги нет в выявленных материалах Андреева'.

³⁶ *Ibid.*

³⁷ '...в силу своих музыкальных достоинств должны распространиться за пределами своего отечества и занять среди себе подобных выдающееся место.' Andreev, 'K voprosu...' in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 46

merits. Having demonstrated that the origins and development of the balalaika and domra can be viewed as having equal merit to other national folk instruments, there is no difficulty in understanding why he stated the need for Russian folk instruments to be disseminated beyond Russia's borders, as was taken for granted in the case of other nations' musical instruments of folk origin and status.

(iv) 'Opinions and views tend to differ drastically with regard to the harmonization and performance of the Russian folk song.'³⁸

a) Andreev clarifies that such contradictory views and opinions are at times expressed by 'highly-talented' figures, i.e., Russian composers and collators of Russian folk songs such as M.A. Balakirev, N.A. Rimskii-Korsakov, P.I. Tchaikovsky, Mel'gunov, Prokunin, the 'researcher' Sokal'skii, Pal'chikov. Again, Andreev refers the reader (via a footnote) to an academic source, Famintsyn's *Domra i srodyne ei instrumenty*.³⁹ He then singles out T.I. Filippov as the foremost expert of the Russian folk song who had collected fine examples of the genre.⁴⁰

Andreev then addresses the reproach expressed by many that his *Velikorusskii orkestr* had distanced itself from 'purely' communicating folk song, and that 'just this sort of communication should be its sole purpose.' Andreev clarifies his position with the following illustrations.

³⁸ 'Относительно гармонизации и передачи [то есть исполнения] русской народной песни мнения и взгляды разноречивы...' Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.46

³⁹ Granovskii's endnote (*Materialy i dokumenty*, p.306) says: 'См[отри] примеч. 2 к настоящей статье'.

⁴⁰ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.46. Granovskii's endnote 6 (*Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 306) says: 'Имеются в виду собиратели и исследователи народных песен Ю.Н. Мельгунов (1846-1893), В.П. Прокунин (1848-1910), П.П. Сокальский (1832-1887), Н.Е. Пальчиков (1838-1888), Т.И. Филиппов (1826-1899).'

Firstly, with regard to the notion of 'harmonization' in music performance, he explains that individual and group singing, i.e., '*khorovoe penie*', had prevailed among Russia's *narod*. Combined instrumental music, however, was a rare occurrence (he mentions the *rozhechniki* - horn players - as an example). The song of the *narod* was inextricably linked to text, in that it had lyrics. Thus:

The degree of monotony in unison singing, especially for a musically educated listener, is redeemed by the words of the song, which is inaccessible to the instrument. Therefore, in addition to an example of strictly folk-style performance, I allow a variety of instrumentation in the performance of the *Velikorusskii orkestr*, which makes the song more interesting and colourful, while trying to strictly preserve its basis as much as possible, which, of course, I have observed in relation to the melody itself. I would add that I do not see any harm in the artistic reworking of folk songs according to the norms of folk art.

Некоторое однообразие унисонного пения, в особенности для музыкально образованного слушателя, искудается словами песни, что недоступно инструменту. Поэтому кроме образчика строго народной передачи я допускаю в исполнении Великорусского оркестра еще разнообразие инструментовки, которое делает песню более интересной и колоритной, стараясь притом по возможности строго сохранить ее основу, что, безусловно, соблюдено мною по отношению к самой мелодии. Затем прибавлю, что не усматриваю вреда в

художественной обработке народных песен, согласно законам народного творчества.⁴¹

He links to this his response to a related observation that the adaptation of the folk song according to the principles of European music theory was beyond the comprehension of the *narod*. Andreev concedes that this is the case at present, but states his conviction that there would be a time when the appreciation of the *narod* would develop on this point (principles of European music theory). He complements this view with a clear statement of why the *narod* would come to appreciate this music, namely that 'the melody is a native one (*rodnaia*); the instruments which convey it are their own, easily accessible to them in all respects, and as far as love for music is concerned, our people (*narod*) have it in abundance.'⁴² 'Moreover, 'the propagation of traditional Russian songs which are strictly harmonized in an accessible way, grows with every year within the army' (i.e., regarding those without formal music education).⁴³

(v) Andreev links to the objections and responses outlined in above point 5.3.4 (iv) the claim that 'the *Velikorusskii orkestr* performs waltzes, marches and pot-pourri, as do the lower ranks in the army during their music lessons, and this is contradictory to the dissemination of the Russian folk song...'⁴⁴ He responds to this with three points:

⁴¹ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.47

⁴² Andreev footnote: 'Народные инструменты распространились в настоящее время в огромном количестве, создав целую отрасль торговли и кустарной промышленности. Мне удалось вызвать конкуренцию между инструментальными мастерами, чем значительно улучшилась их работа, и в то же время удешевилась цена на инструмент'. *Ibid.*, p. 47

⁴³ *Ibid.*

⁴⁴ 'Великорусский оркестр исполняет вальсы, марши и по-пурри, равно как и при обучении в войсках нижние чины играют то же самое; что это противоречит задаче распространения русской песни...' Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, pp. 47-48.

a) It would be 'needless purism' to limit a musical instrument to conveying (through performance) the [Russian] folk song alone, when the same could be done with other (non-folk) pieces.⁴⁵

b) He adds that for every 100 folk songs performed, no more than 10-15 were foreign pieces. But he emphasizes that when learning a [musical] repertoire, the lower ranks in the forces ('nizhnye chiny') in a chorus of balalaika players must not be restricted to performing exclusively [Russian] folk songs. Life itself was monotonous, and a daily diet of cabbage soup and *kasha* was wearisome.⁴⁶

c) He then emphasizes the huge interest and genuine love for Russian folk music and performance being displayed by the 'lower ranks' who were studying balalaika-playing in the forces, and their strikingly rapid success in that undertaking. This best of all confirmed 'that the business of perfecting and disseminating folk instruments and songs is a living business, a fundamental (*pochvennoe*) one and the inner, urgent need of the nation itself.'⁴⁷

(vi) 'The perfected balalaika circulating in intelligent society has bred a form of dilettantism and has led to a lowering in musical taste as a result of which society has lost interest in serious music...'"⁴⁸

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 48.

⁴⁷ Ibid.

⁴⁸ 'Усовершенствованная балала[а]йка, распространяясь в интеллигентном обществе, породила дилетантизм и вызвала упадок музыкальных вкусов, благодаря чему общество перестало интересоваться серьезной музыкой...' Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, pp. 48-49.

a) Andreev replies that the dilettantism resulting from Russian society's familiarity with fine Russian folk songs and Russian instruments is by no means as harmful 'as the large orchestra of amateurs who interpret Wagner or Tchaikovsky in a dilettante manner.'

b) He goes on to say that, although the overwhelming interest of the *intelligentsia* in the balalaika was transitory, their interest had important implications for the *narod*. The *intelligentsia* could access a wide variety of entertainment, and, Andreev believed, it would eventually abandon the balalaika. But having been influenced by educated people which the *intelligentsia* represented, the *narod* would then inherit the balalaika and identify themselves with the very improved and revived [folk] instruments the *intelligentsia* would abandon. In the same way as someone would not abandon their 'lawful, beloved child', who had returned home in better shape after a long period of separation, the *narod* would not abandon its balalaika. The balalaika would compensate most beneficially as relief from their endless, arduous labours.⁴⁹

Andreev's opening remarks in his letter 'K voprosu...' that the piece would serve as an 'answer' to frequently asked questions concerning his work demonstrate his clarifying instincts. His reminder that the area of culture in which he was engaged was still little researched is contrasted immediately with the statement that he had already been engaged in his work for ten years or so, which suggests that the press and society as a whole need to be informed accurately about the meaning and significance of what he was trying to achieve. As has been seen, Andreev employs

⁴⁹ Ibid.

both academic and practical examples to clarify any given question or objection. Andreev is so confident in his views that he states at the end of this article that he stands to be corrected by people with knowledge and appreciation of Russian folk music.⁵⁰

5.3.5 'O velikorusskom orkestre'⁵¹

In this article Andreev's clarifications are sometimes forthright and persistent, and yet this does not detract from his efforts to inform and to enlighten the reader on key points of contention regarding his work. He expresses himself earnestly, as might a tutor patiently re-clarifying for a pupil who had failed to grasp the main points. He introduces his piece by commenting on the 'confused' and 'contradictory views' in the press and among music 'activists' concerning his work, and on how some of those views had been 'unjustly offensive'. This in his view was a consequence of the improvement of Russian folk instruments, a novel matter the full appreciation of which demanded 'special knowledge'. He considered it timely, therefore, 'to clarify the true meaning' of that novelty for the reader who, by implication, did not generally have the specialist background knowledge to object constructively to his work. The article also reveals a methodical approach to clarifying his own position in light of both the merits of his work with Russian folk instruments and the varying objections to that work.

⁵⁰ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 49.

⁵¹ Full title: 'O velikorusskom orkestre [pis'mo v redaktsiyu]', published in illustrated supplement to the newspaper *Novoe vremia*, 29 May, 1902, No. 9422.

Andreev sets out his clarifications sequentially (albeit not strictly chronologically) and they encompass a range of key sub-topics, three of which are discussed below. 'O velikorusskom orkestre' also includes his explanations and clarifications regarding his aim in resurrecting and improving Russian folk instruments; his attraction and reaction to his initial acquaintance with Russian folk music; his understanding of Russian choral music; the question of the folk and classical repertoire of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* and the orchestra's impact abroad. Although of interest to discussion in this section, owing to limitations of space these topics are presented in context in Chapters 2, 4 and 8.

(a) Andreev explains the origins and development of Russian folk instruments. All of the Great-Russian folk instruments which he had introduced into his orchestra had been restored according to existing prototypes found in the *narod*, and according to historical and literary data and sources. He asserts that those instruments were of undoubted authenticity, and that each of them was a completely independent 'type' to be considered as the unborrowed inheritance of the *narod*. He had reached that conclusion as a result of many years' research into musical instruments which were in circulation among the *narod*. Andreev asserts that his conclusions were based on existing literature on the topic, as well as on the authority of academic researchers of Russian folk music.⁵² He then briefly explains the history and development of both the domra and balalaika from the eighteenth century, emphasising that his restoration and improvement of those instruments did not deviate from the historical examples of them that he had found both in Russia's Viatka province and, in the case of the balalaika, in provinces of Great Russia more generally. He similarly clarifies the introduction of Russian folk wind instruments to his orchestra, placing in historical context the origins

⁵² V. Andreev, 'O Velikorusskom orkestre' in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, pp. 52-53.

and development of the *svirel'* (in wide circulation in Smolensk province) and the *brelnka*, as well as their related instruments, i.e. the *zhaleika*.⁵³

(b) Andreev states that the existence of the domra and other Russian folk instruments of varying sizes was supported by historical evidence. It was on this basis that he constructed a varying range of domras and balalaikas, which allowed him to establish an orchestra of 'original musical instruments' used by the *narod*. He then distinctly observes that:

'By doing this, I did not go beyond the boundaries of folk art, but only anticipated the thought of the people, who, perhaps, would have gone as far as creating a folk orchestra themselves if they had not been stopped in their musical development by the persecution of the clergy.'

'Этим я не удалился от грани[ц] народного творчества, но только предвосхитил мысль народа, который, быть может, и сам бы дошел до создания народного оркестра, если бы он не был остановлен в своем музыкальном развитии гонением духовенства.'⁵⁴

This clear implication that the development of a Russian folk orchestra was waiting to happen is helpful to the uninformed reader. It complements the significance of Russian folk instruments within the historical context which Andreev explains in the first portion of his article. The phrasing of melody in many Russian folk songs is reminiscent of similar phrasing in Russian church music, so that the clergy's suppression of folk

⁵³ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 53.

⁵⁴ *ibid.*

instruments in previous centuries is one possible reason why they did not find an outlet into wider Russian society. It also shows Andreev to be exercising some critical distance from his own work in establishing a Russian folk orchestra. Had there been no suppression of folk instruments, history may have taken a different course, with orchestras of the *narod* evolving along the same lines as Andreev's, but over a longer period of time.

Andreev then explains that the seventeenth century was witness to the *skomorokhi* who went about in crowds of about a hundred people or more with their marionette theatre performances and with musical accompaniment played on Russian folk instruments, such as the *gusli* and *buben*. The background to the introduction of the *gusli* to his orchestra is similar to that of the orchestra's foundational instruments (the domra and balalaika), i.e. the *gusli* was an ancient Russian folk instrument of which he found several versions in Russia. The horizontal version was used in Andreev's orchestra. It was mounted on four legs and had a table-like appearance. He emphasizes that that particular type was now copied by the 'Schreder' firm of fortepiano manufacturers.⁵⁵ The inclusion of this fact neatly elevates the status of the *gusli* in the readers' imaginations. His restoring and improving of the *svirel'* and *brelna* are afforded similar, albeit brief clarification in historical and musical context.

(c) The wide variety of instruments in the *Velikorusskii orkestr*, Andreev continues, further coloured and enriched tonally the overall instrumentation. However, the wide range of instrumentation in the symphony orchestra could not be rivalled by a single

⁵⁵ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 54
403 *ibid.*

folk orchestra. For this reason, Andreev was extremely cautious about the opportunity to add further instruments to enhance the instrumentation of his orchestra, even though the instruments would ameliorate the instrumentation. He exercised such caution because the instruments were either not of purely Russian origin, or because they would lose their national character once they had been improved. Therefore, to attempt to introduce into the folk orchestra bowed instruments, such as the *gudok*, would be unjustifiable.⁴⁰³

Andreev further illustrates this by pointing out that not a single Great Russian folk instrument was included in any other contemporary instrumental orchestra. The combination of Great Russian instruments was something quite independent, having nothing in common with contemporary, European orchestras, or with other so-called folk orchestras for that matter. As an example, Andreev explains that orchestras in Europe combined mandolins and guitars, i.e. Italian and Spanish instruments respectively. Moreover, in Romania the *kavalli* (type of flute) and *cymbal* were combined with common European instruments, i.e., with violin and cello. But the *Velikorusskii orkestr* consisted exclusively of folk instruments from Russia's central and northern belt, that is from the ancient state of Muscovy. Therefore, it stood quite independently as a folk orchestra, justifying its title *Velikorusskii*.⁵⁶

These three examples reveal the historical and musicological clarification which Andreev felt compelled to provide in response to objections to his work. They

⁵⁶ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, pp. 54-55

⁴⁰⁵ Granovskii states: 'Polnoe nazvanie: "Velikorusskii orkestr pered sudom inostrantsev: beseda s V.V. Andreevym", opublikovano v gazete *Peterburgskii listok*, No. 356, 27 Dec., 1908' (Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, endnote, p. 308).

demonstrate further how Andreev could educate the reader on the finer points within the broad context of Russian folk instrumental music in a manner that is both intellectually persuasive and constructive. His approach is academic and yet of a clarity which reaches out to a wider readership.

5.3.6 'Velikorusskii orkestr pered sudom inostrantsev'⁴⁰⁵

Andreev gave this interview following the month-long concert tour of Germany by the Velikorusskii orkestr (from mid-November to mid December 1908).⁵⁷ The orchestra's twenty-three concerts were given in Berlin, Leipzig, Hamburg, Lüneburg, Lübeck and Halle.⁵⁸ There are four main elements to the interview:

- a) The reporter introduces Andreev as that '...energetic pioneer in the field of [Russian] national music' and poses the question whether he is satisfied with the results of his 'artistic touring'.⁴⁰⁸ Andreev's satisfaction was 'undoubted'. He admits to being insecure on heading for Berlin regarding the possible reaction to his orchestra. This was because foreign audiences were little acquainted with 'our [Russian] art, especially with that expressed in works of folk music'. To emphasize this, he reminds the reporter that he had had to endure a stubborn, continuing struggle at home to show that the balalaika 'exquisitely' conveyed all shades of the Russian soul'. Andreev is deliberate in his choice of words here, such as his references to 'our [Russian] art', the 'artistic expression' of Russian folk instrumental

⁵⁷ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, pp. 54-55

⁵⁸ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.60

music, and the balalaika's place in it. This has the effect of preparing the reader to consider his work in a serious, artistic context.

He continues that his *Velikorusskii orkestr* gained its success slowly and that the musicians required 'almost supernatural energy'. But being inspired by the examples of Stanislavsky, Chaliapin and Tchaikovsky before him, he felt the time was right for foreigners to take a serious interest in Russia. And having taken the risk, the reality of his tour exceeded all the orchestra's expectations.⁵⁹

b) As well as at the aforementioned locations, the orchestra gave a concert at Stettin (then in Prussia). Andreev states that this was at the invitation of the 'great Herzog' (of Prussia?), thus highlighting for readers the prestige of the occasion. Concerning the attitude of the Berlin concert audiences, Andreev states that the start of the tour could have unsettled any artist. The attendances were feeble, but once the German public had got accustomed to the orchestra, the first reviews began to appear in the newspapers and 'the ice then immediately melted'. He then places emphasis on the fact that the German 'general muzik-direktor', a Dr. Muck, was reportedly present at one particular *Velikorusskii orkestr* concert in Berlin. He presents Muck as a figure highly esteemed in German cultural circles. Muck's post had been specially founded for 'the great Meyerbeer' in 1842.⁶⁰ Giacomo Meyerbeer (born Jacob Liebmann Beer) was a man also highly regarded in his field. Andreev refers to him as 'the creator [of the opera] "Les Huguenots"', whose respected status had caused him to be lured at

⁵⁹ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 60.

⁶⁰ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.308.

great effort to that same Berlin office. He then explains that the post was subsequently occupied by Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy and that only after a break of 60 years was a worthy successor to the famous composer found in Muck.⁶¹

Andreev argues that the distinguished (albeit short) lineage of the Berlin music director post was culturally important. This adds weight to his subsequent illustration of Muck's response to the *Velikorusskii orkestr*: having heard one performance, Muck conveyed his appreciation to Andreev and his delight at the orchestra prompted the press who were present to speak enthusiastically about Andreev.⁶²

Andreev illustrates further the responses of other leading figures in music. His orchestra's concerts were also attended by the Italian composer Ruggero Leoncavallo and the highly acclaimed Hungarian conductor Arthur Nikisch, as well as other 'luminaries of music'. Andreev was 'touched' by how well he was treated by Leoncavallo, and refers to him as the 'composer of "Pagliacci"', an opera of Leoncavallo's which was very well known at that time. He makes the further point that Leoncavallo had only just arrived in Berlin for the staging of his opera *Zaza* when, having heard of their concerts, he went to listen to the 'Russian balalaika-players'. Leoncavallo firmly invited Andreev and his musicians to Berlin's 'Central Hotel', where they were the centre of attention.⁶³

Andreev draws readers' attention to two particular details. Leoncavallo stayed 'until the end of the concert' and he had attended in preference to being the guest of honour

⁶¹ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 60.

⁶² Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 60.

⁶³ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 60.

at the staging of *Zaza*.⁶⁴ These facts contrast markedly with Andreev's experiences in his own country, where some leading figures in music shunned invitations to attend his orchestra's performances, invitations which were offered in order to help clarify his reasons for promoting Russian folk music and instrumental performance.

Arthur Nikisch was not expected to attend the concerts of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* but his attendance was announced by his cry of 'Bravo!' during a short pause in the orchestra's performance. Andreev then went to a concert conducted by Nikisch to thank him personally for showing his appreciation of Russian folk instruments. The detail is related in such a way as to imply that Nikisch's status rendered his approval of Andreev's orchestra all the more exemplary. Andreev colourfully relates Nikisch's being surrounded by pretty ladies in his 'luxurious office' and his abruptly interrupting his conversation to rush to seize Andreev warmly by the hand on his arrival. This is clearly meant to impress readers, and the subsequent report of Nikisch's appreciation of Andreev's orchestra is intended to indicate that leading figures in music culture understood the meaning and relevance of Andreev's work. For example, Andreev quotes Nikisch as saying that it was not possible to convey in words the impression the Russian folk instruments had made on him. One needed to hear for oneself the *Velikorusskii orkestr*.⁶⁵

Andreev notes in an aside that German music critics were saying the same thing, stating for example that Russia's [folk] instruments merited being the 'first among folk

⁶⁴ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 60-61.

⁶⁵ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 61

⁴¹⁶ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.61.

instruments' and that they were struck by the artistic discipline and degree of accomplishment demonstrated in playing them.⁴¹⁶

(c) Andreev also maintains the popular and respected image of his orchestra by referring to further invitations and proposals he had received on the strength of the orchestra's success during the German tour. He emphasizes, however, that he was unable to fulfil those requests. This draws attention to the contrast between his orchestra's aforementioned lofty critical acclaim and the humble status of its musicians. On the strength of strong ticket sales for remaining concerts, it was proposed that Andreev's orchestra should give several private concerts. He had also been invited to America with the offer to set up a joint stock venture in producing 'national (i.e., Russian folk) instruments' (see Chapter 4 and below 5.3.7. for additional context). These proposals were not viable, however, due to the orchestra comprising only amateur musicians: their main work in public office limited the time they could spend on touring with the orchestra. Moreover, despite many other proposals to perform, including in New York and London, Andreev could not oblige for these same reasons.⁶⁶ The implication is that such constraints would not be an issue with a folk orchestra comprised of fully-paid musicians. Such an orchestra would then have professional status, as would be merited by the acknowledged high quality of its musicians' technical and artistic performance.

(d) Andreev also focuses on the factors that made his German concert tour so morally satisfying: (i) 'Our folk instrument' (balalaika) 'made a huge impression', gaining interest in 'the most serious music circles'; (ii) he was receiving many letters

⁶⁶ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 61.

from Germany reporting the establishment of *kruzhki* for learning to play the balalaika, and requesting his instructions to that effect; (iii) Russia's folk instrument did not 'fall flat on its face in the dirt before Europe', meaning that it survived the German tour with its dignity intact.⁶⁷ Andreev admittedly waxes lyrical in his concluding remarks that the balalaika had shown once again the untapped spring of spiritual strengths concealed in the Russian people and the sometimes 'astonished' responses to this. He understandably uses another press opportunity to maintain a positive impression of his work and responses to it. However, it is clear from both his reference to the 'Russian spirit' conveyed in balalaika playing, and from the other examples in this interview as a whole, that Andreev is utilizing the positive reaction of the non-Russian audience and critic to clarify for Russian readers why criticism of his work at home had been unjustified and ill-conceived. He demonstrates again that appreciation of Russian folk instruments is expressed in intellectual *and* emotional responses, both of which he considered valid.

5.3.7 'Otvetы на вопросы корреспондента russkikh gazet'

Although it is not clear whether this interview precedes or follows that presented and discussed in 5.3.6.,⁶⁸ the following serves conveniently to expand on some of the points Andreev raised in the interview above. The following five examples illustrate

⁶⁷ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, pp. 61-62.

⁶⁸ Granovskii's endnote (*Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 308) says: 'Ed, khr. 20, l. 5-10 ob. V prosmotrennykh pechatnykh materialakh dannyi dokument neobnaruzhen. Data dokumenta – 1908 g. – ustanovlena po soderzhaniyu.'

further Andreev's opportunism in clarifying his work for the public and his reasons for undertaking that work.

(a) The reporter begins the interview by asking Andreev his view on how the German press treated him and the *Velikorusskii orkestr* on their tour there in November and December 1908. Andreev points to the 'quality of the [German press] reviews alone', from which it could be seen what interest had been aroused in Germany by his orchestra's concerts. Adding a literary air to his response, he states that those 'feuilletons' devoted to him and his orchestra pleased him. But he also attests to the particular importance to his work of the attendance at his orchestra's concerts of 'leading authorities' such as music director Muck, (conductor Arthur) Nikisch, Prof. Lesmans, Bukward, and Ruggero Leoncavallo. But they had not merely attended his orchestra's concerts. He emphasizes that they had visited the concerts '...several times, acquainting themselves with and studying the balalaika'.⁶⁹ This again contrasts with the attitudes and responses of similarly 'leading authorities' of music in Russia.

(b) There is also additional detail about the reasons for his invitation to America while in Berlin (see 5.3.6.(c)). The American gentleman who had invited Andreev to America is referred to as 'Mr. Simpson'. Simpson had attended the Berlin concerts of the *Velikorusskii orkestr*. This caused him to express a view that accentuates Andreev's consistent line about the artistic quality of Russian folk instruments. Simpson reported that the mandolin was widely disseminated in his country. However,

⁶⁹ 'Otvetы на вопросы корреспондента русских газет', Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 62

he was of the opinion that Americans would drop the mandolin as soon as they had attended concerts by Andreev's Russian folk instrument orchestra. The reasons for this, Simpson believed, were that Russia's folk instruments were of a much higher standing in terms of their quality than the mandolin. Americans had not hitherto considered the mandolin could be replaced by 'a better [musical] instrument'.⁷⁰ But the question of Andreev taking his orchestra to America was for him at that time an 'extremely important' one for the future of his work abroad as a whole. He was convinced that following the exclusive success of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* in Germany, there would now appear imitators who would be trying to trace afresh and to exploit his orchestra's success. Moreover, those imitators might 'expropriate' that work, using firms to turn folk instruments into useless commodities. This would undermine the prestige of his work and the reputation of 'our [Russia's] folk instruments' with which Americans had not yet been familiarized via his orchestra's performances.⁷¹ It is clear, therefore, that Andreev was acutely aware of what constituted genuine support for the cause of Russian folk instruments, as clarified by him later in this interview (see 5.3.7.(c)). His work had nothing to do with financial gain.

(c) Andreev did not wish to commit to the possibilities that a trip to America might have opened for his overall work abroad. Why exactly was this, given its 'critical importance' to the 'interests of the novel undertaking' his orchestra represented? The short answer was that he had 'no orchestra': he had no musicians who would be able to devote themselves and their free time to such an undertaking.⁴²³

⁷⁰ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.62.

⁷¹ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 63.

⁴²³ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.63.

(ii) But that then raised the question of how they managed to tour Germany at all. His musicians, Andreev explains, were white collar workers in St. Petersburg, which meant that it was at great effort that they had toured in Germany for two months. Moreover, several of his musicians were even prepared to lose their jobs in order to go on the German tour. 'Professional balalaika players', Andreev adds, '...don't exist'. The reporter hypothesizes that the musicians of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* were 'doomed to remain permanently in Petersburg'. This prospect is taken seriously by Andreev. Underlining again the artistic value of his 'novel undertaking', he replies that such a scenario could inflict a 'damaging blow' on his work. That would have meant abandoning its progress and development at the most critical time of its acceptance, not only in its own country, but also abroad, i.e. in Germany, 'the music capital of the world'. The response to his orchestra on its recent tour there had opened up for Russia's folk instruments such an honoured, broad pathway into other countries, too'.⁷² This raises the question of the ways and means by which Andreev sought to gain broader artistic respect and acceptance for his work and his *Velikorusskii orkestr*. He is clearly marking out Germany for singular importance to that end. He had already taken the opportunity in interviews discussed both in this section and in 5.3.6. to persuade the reader that the responses to his work and orchestra on the German tour were a key factor in understanding the artistic merit of Russian folk instrumental performance. And, therefore, it was Germany that was the stepping-stone on the path to the broader acceptance which, as his above responses reveal to the reader, he envisaged for Russian folk instrumental music and Russian folk instruments.

⁷² Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.63.

d) Finances were still a key factor, though, in determining whether he could continue that work. Asked what he thought could be done to that end, Andreev mentions that he had turned to the State Duma (via the Minister of State for Industry) for financial support ‘even before departure abroad’ [to Germany]. Andreev had requested permanent pay for his orchestra’s members. This would afford special status to the orchestra so that its participants could remain in the clerical posts which otherwise prevented them from travelling outside the boundaries of Petersburg to tour for long periods.⁷³

e) The reporter states that it was well known from the newspapers that the State Duma’s Budget Commission had turned down Andreev’s request. That was ‘unfortunately... true’ and, Andreev adds, he had been ‘grieved to learn about it’. He uses the opportunity to combine his sense of frustration over that decision with his view of the importance of his work. He had been expecting different treatment from the ‘public’s representatives’ regarding the ‘original folk art’ for which he ‘had been labouring for 20 years’, and for which he had achieved such results by that time.⁷⁴

5.3.8 ‘Pis’mo v redaktsiiu’⁷⁵

As its title and publication date suggests, this short piece appeared close to the date (20 March 1888) of the original St. Petersburg debut of the *Kruzhok liubitelei igry na*

⁷³ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.63.

⁷⁴ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 64.

⁷⁵ Granovskii’s endnote (Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.309) says: ‘Opublikovano v gazete «Den», 1913, 4 apr[elia], No.91’.

balalaikakh. On the occasion of that 25th anniversary of his work, Andreev's words are at times colourful, and convey the same persuasiveness of argument and conviction.

(a) He begins by expressing his gratitude on receiving so many letters, telegrams, greetings and good wishes during the time leading up to the 25th anniversary. He tells the reader specifically that he was hardly able to express in words the depth of his feelings of gratitude to all figures and institutions that had honoured him with their attention. What was especially 'precious' to him in those greetings was the 'recognition' that his work was improving the standing and significance of the *narod*. He had been living and working, he states, for precisely that recognition. But there was no disguising the fact that he had achieved his goal through arduous, incessant labour, and had even suffered for it. And yet, his happiness to serve his 'motherland' made it all worthwhile, however great the suffering he had endured for the sake, benefit and prosperity of his country. He continues in this vein by speaking of having felt the might of that happiness in its entirety: one could give absolutely every last bit of oneself for it without a thought.⁷⁶

This again illustrates that Andreev was not reticent about expressing his emotions in connection with his work insofar as this expression helped clarify his position. The significance of his work in relation to the *narod* was key to his trying to explain to readers what that work truly represented for the Russian people, as well as for himself.

⁷⁶ Andreev, "Pis'mo v redaktsiyu po povodu moego 25-letnego yubileia", Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.80

(b) Andreev also hoped that society's recognition of his work would inspire, encourage and energize others working in this sphere,⁷⁷ i.e. anything that would benefit the 'motherland' in cultural and artistic terms. He further hoped that, inspired with such energy, this would give his fellow *truzheniki* the necessary patience for their labours. They would be strengthened thereby in the firm knowledge that their well-intentioned and honest labour would be seen through to its conclusion, and that it would always be recognized for its merits by the motherland.

Finally, Andreev's words exhibit a poetic tone, speaking of how the motherland had a multitude of treasures concealed in the depths of the people. Those treasures were also waiting for their turn to be born, as had occurred with the 'little balalaika'.⁷⁸

Andreev then makes an appeal:

(c) He calls on young people to play their part. Their selfless, focused commitment to the motherland made them 'our best future'. Using analogies drawn from his own experience, he states that it was important that young people overcame any obstacles with the self-belief '...to labour through to the end for the benefit of the <...> *narod*'.⁷⁹ That was the reward for perseverance and commitment which Andreev confirms he himself knew and had tasted.⁸⁰⁴³²

⁷⁷ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.80

⁷⁸ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.80

⁷⁹ It is not clear whether the bracketed ellipses here indicate a portion of illegible/ damaged text, or a redacted portion of text. The textual omission, therefore, may otherwise suggest a redaction to put into Soviet context Andreev's words. The inclusion of the full text of the sentence would clarify this.

⁸⁰ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, pp. 80-81.

(d) Andreev concludes this piece by focusing attention again on his achievement thus far. He was hugely thankful to his ‘fellow countrymen’ and ‘friends’ of his work. He also expressed his pure joy and great appreciation owing to their priceless support. Such approval of his work had been warmly expressed to him both in person and in writing at the time of the [25th] anniversary of his work.⁸¹

The reader is left in no doubt here that there were many in Russian society who were aware of the importance and value of Andreev’s artistic contribution to Russian culture. We recall that Andreev had similarly expressed his enthusiasm and appreciation for the responses to his *Velikorusskii orkestr* from figures in *German* music culture (see above sections 5.3.6 and 5.3.7.). He refers to the ‘friends’ of his work and his ‘fellow countrymen’ as if to assert that the recognition of his work was something which especially ought to have been embraced by Russians generally. This is borne out by his words regarding the role he anticipated for young people in benefitting the *narod*. Brief as this piece may be, it serves to highlight that Andreev embraced society beyond his own social and cultural circles as equal beneficiaries of his work.

5.3.9 ‘Beseda s korrespondentom *Moskovskikh vedemostei*’⁸²

Although entitled a ‘discussion’, this article is effectively a statement of Andreev’s views on a number of key issues arising from his work. It serves further to illustrate his tendency to educate and inform readers about his work and its implications for Russian musical culture.

⁸¹ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 81

⁸² Granovskii’s endnote (*Materialy i dokumenty*, p.309) says: ‘Опубликовано в газете «Московские ведомости», 1913, 4 апр., №.78. Название: Петербургские вести: Беседа с В.В. Андреевым’.

(a) The interview continues the theme of reflection on the 25th anniversary of Andreev's work. However, he states from the outset that the anniversary was not his personal celebration. It was a celebration of the anniversary of the *Velikorusskii orkestr*, or, more precisely the anniversary celebration of an 'idea' which he had invested in his work. He impresses on the reader that his idea had only been realized through assiduous perseverance as far as his energy, strengths and extraneous circumstances had allowed him.⁸³ The question of the investment of his own energy and resources into his work was a vexed one when considering the future of his *Velikorusskii orkestr* (see 5.3.9 (c) below).

He suggests that no-one could deny the significance and meaning of art and music. To illustrate this claim, he makes a comparison between the needs of 'educated society' and those of the *narod*. Music, he states, had hitherto been the 'privilege' of educated society, and yet its significance for the people (*narod*) in general was undoubted. The *narod* also had its 'spiritual' needs - that is to say they needed an artistic outlet - which were being left unfulfilled. At the end of a working day, Andreev asks, what was left to do for labourers in the villages or factory? Only one thing – to be blind drunk.⁸⁴

(b) And what was the evidence that the *narod* had such needs which had to be fulfilled artistically? Andreev answers by veering into poetic prose with his example of the now blossoming factory workers' balalaika orchestras. The streams of this musical

⁸³ V. Andreev, 'Beseda s korrespondentom *Moskovskikh vedomostei*', Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.81.

⁸⁴ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.81.

trend were pouring vivaciously into 'dull' factory life. Self-taught musicians and talents had appeared, and with them a competitive spirit. Factory orchestras were enjoying huge success at local level. In Andreev's view, this was proving that music answered the needs of the *narod*, as it answered the needs of the *intelligentsia*.⁸⁵ At this point in the text of this interview as published in Granovskii's *Materialy i dokumenty*, an omission of original text is indicated. It is not clear whether or not this is a redaction in line with Soviet editorial slant. The assumption for the purpose of this section is that Andreev's reference to the *intelligentsia* is synonymous with *obrazovannoe obshchestvo*, to which he refers earlier in the text of this interview.

(c) Turning to the example of his orchestra, Andreev demonstrates how it served to appeal to and to nurture those very artistic needs of the *narod*. His view was that the *Velikorusskii orkestr* which he had organized 'over the course of a 25-year period' was the first 'hotbed' of national music'. Yet, despite his own energetic and resourceful input into his orchestra – we take this in context to mean for the cause of Russian folk (i.e., 'national') music – he expresses concern over the speculative, uncertain future of the orchestra he had created.⁸⁶ He felt that there was doubt over how his work could be consolidated to stand independently of him, or, as he puts it, independently of his 'personality'.⁸⁷ This adds another dimension to the notion of how Andreev defines the role of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* in fulfilling his work. It raises the question of the extent to which the orchestra's success was dependent on its own artistic appeal, and how far it was due to the charisma of the man who was so unequivocally associated with it (see Chapter 8). But in practical terms, Andreev envisaged a role to be played by the

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.81.

⁸⁷ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, pp. 81-82

state in the fulfilling of his work. He establishes the premise that the state appreciated the role which national music played in the education of the ordinary people ('narodnykh mass'). Therefore, he believed, the state could secure the future of *his* work which, as we have seen above, also harnessed that ideal and aimed to realize it.⁸⁸ To that same end, Andreev suggests the state could support and develop the production of folk musical instruments. It was well known that the treasury already had income from this, as it had from all other branches of industry.⁸⁹ At the time Andreev gave this interview, the Department of Trade and Industry was proposing to the State Duma subsidies for the *Velikorusskii orkestr* to secure the position of its musicians. He asserts that those musicians were devoted to the cause of folk music and were 'propagating' it via their concerts.⁹⁰ This clearly implies that the orchestra and its musicians were fulfilling the same educational role for the people which the state already recognized in the broader context of national music.

(d) Andreev concludes that the amount of government provision secured to support folk instrument production and the musicians in his *Velikorusskii orkestr* would be materially of such insignificance that '...surely there could be no serious objections to it'. This was especially the case when considered in the broader context of the artistic goals to which 'national music' was aspiring.⁹¹

⁸⁸ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 82

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ Ibid.

⁹¹ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 82

Viewed as they are presented in the interview, Andreev's arguments clarify why Russian folk music was as important an artistic outlet for ordinary people as art and music more generally were for the educated person. Andreev focuses on the artistic needs of ordinary people in order to make the case for state support to encourage expression of those artistic needs. However, in doing so, he does not denigrate the artistic needs of the educated in Russian society, but rather elevates the condition of the uneducated to demonstrate to the reader that his *Velikorusskii orkestr* and the work it represents is not the preserve of any single section of society.

5.3.10 'Interv'iu gazete "Obozrenie teatrov"⁹²

As with the previous interview discussed in 5.3.9, Andreev's words are presented on the whole in the manner of a statement of views and observations. Notwithstanding some instances of overlapping detail, this interview can be divided into three areas:

(a) Andreev was preparing his *Velikorusskii orkestr* for a charity performance at Petrograd's *Narodnyi dom* on 7 March 1915. The *Zal dvoryanskogo sobraniia* was unavailable at that time, which was inconvenient for Andreev and his orchestra. He remarks on his reluctance at having to try to play even once in a situation which was new for him.⁹³ His reluctance was due to the fact that his orchestra would not be playing on the actual stage, but on a separate stage which was being specially constructed for 'our orchestra' above the place usually housing the opera's

⁹² Granovskii's endnote (*Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 310) says: 'Опубликовано в газете «Обозрение театров», 1915, 6 марта, №.2692'.

⁹³ 'Interv'iu gazete «Obozreniye teatrov」, Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.83

orchestra.⁹⁴ This meant that his orchestra would be situated, as it were, in the public (i.e., the audience) itself.⁹⁵ The implication at least is that the orchestra would be more visible and present among the listening public. It is not quite clear from the text whether such an innovation of stage setting was to be done with visual presentation in mind. However, the close proximity of his orchestra's musicians to the audience would have been an ideal opportunity to enhance the listening experience for the public.

(b) Andreev then makes two points which remind the reader of his orchestra's artistic scope and capabilities. He had assembled a full orchestra of 'more than 50' musicians, despite the fact that many of the regular members of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* were serving in the army at that time. Yet, compared to the size of his regular orchestra, his orchestra for the upcoming charity concert had an even greater number of musicians.⁹⁶ He follows this by briefly explaining how he and his orchestra had had to put much energy and effort into preparing for that particular concert. That effort went especially into learning 'such a serious piece as the new *Fantaziia* by (their) 'indefatigable' N.P Fomin, i.e., his 'Great fantasia on a motif from the opera 'Zhizn' za tsaria' ('Life for the Tsar').'⁹⁷

Andreev here clearly draws the readers' attention to Fomin's skill as a composer and arranger for tackling such a 'serious' piece from Glinka's compositions. And he then briefly explains why that was artistically important for his own *Velikorusskii orkestr*.

⁹⁴ Granovskii's endnote (ibid., p. 310) says: 'Речь идет о выступлении в Народном доме в Петрограде'. There are bracketed redaction ellipses at either end of this opening statement, possibly indicating government/ political disruption regarding the concert venue. Granovskii's endnote does not make this clear.

⁹⁵ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 84

⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁷ Granovskii's endnote (*Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 310) says: "'Fantaziia' was first performed in a concert at the *Narodnyi dom* on 7 March 1915.'

There is a poetic hue to his words when explaining how he had dealt with *Zhizn' za tsaria*. He had approached the opera with a 'particular affection' because the character of that 'immortal work', it seemed to him, had a spiritual closeness to his *Velikorusskii orkestr*. His orchestra had 'seized the work with relish'. However this was *not* with the aim of competing with symphony orchestras. Their [his orchestra's] aim, he asserts, was 'to show that the *Velikorusskii orkestr* is also capable of performing not only folk songs but also more complex works' (*pokazat'*, *chto Velikorusskii orkestr tozhe sposoben k peredache ne tol'ko odnikh narodnykh pesen, no i bolee slozhnykh proizvedenii*'.⁹⁸

(c) Andreev further asserts his considered view about the artistic commitment of his colleagues in the *Velikorusskii orkestr*. He speaks of their being especially desirous to deliver the aims which he had set for them. By way of example, he says that his orchestra's musicians had been earnestly rehearsing their concert programme for more than a month. He underlines those artistic demands further by referring to other pieces his orchestra was preparing for the same concert. As well as Russian folk songs, it would be giving its performance debuts to a number of other classical pieces. These included Tchaikovsky's "Sladkaia greza", the waltz from the tale "Elka" by Rebikov, as well as the 'Little Russian song', "Okh, ia neshchastnii, shcho maiu diliati?".⁹⁹ Continuing emphasis on his orchestra's varied repertoire is exemplified by his statement that artists from the Imperial Opera would be taking the stage to perform solo at the same concert. These soloists, he informs his interviewer, had participated

⁹⁸ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 84

⁹⁹ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 84

compassionately for no fee in some of his orchestra's previous charitable concerts,¹⁰⁰ which serves to assert the association of his *Velikorusskii orkestr* with serious classical artists. These artists included the *coloratura* (lyric) soprano E.A. Bronskaia, M.E. Markovich and E.N. Nikolayeva (both mezzo-soprano), as well as the baritone Mr. M.N. Karakash.¹⁰¹ Not for the first time in the text of an interview, Andreev lists the names of classical artists in connection with his orchestra's performances with reference only to their surnames. This implies that their respected status was such that no full name references were required. This adds a sense of prestige to his orchestra in light of its collaboration with such esteemed contemporary artists.

The above helps to illustrate further Andreev's clarifications on key points which served to educate and inform the public about the role of his *Velikorusskii orkestr*. In particular: (i) visual presentation was a means of closely acquainting the public with the orchestra; (ii) in re-asserting the notion of artistic scope and the capabilities inherent in his *Velikorusskii orkestr* of improved Russian folk instruments, he points both to the size of the orchestra and to the technical complexities and challenges of performing classical, or 'serious' pieces on Russian folk instruments. His explanations also re-assert his view that such a level of performance was acceptable alongside the performance of folk pieces in a concert setting; (iii) his established connections with Imperial Opera artists asserts further the artistic status of his orchestra. This illustrates how he reminds the reader that his folk instrument orchestra's repertoire was varied, thus serving to reassert his broad view that the orchestra had a versatility to its music

¹⁰⁰ ibid.

¹⁰¹ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, pp 84, 310

performance, from the simple folk tune to more sophisticated classical pieces. His statement that his orchestra aimed to show that it was able to convey not only folk songs but also more sophisticated (as in complex) works, finds further expression in his article *Balalaika i simfoniiia* (see 5.3.11.)

5.3.11 ‘Balalaika i simfoniiia’¹⁰²

In this interview Andreev tackles the (for him) vexed question of the balalaika and the symphony orchestra. This dispute centred around varying comparisons of the musical and artistic scope of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* with recognized symphonic music performance. This issue was touched upon by Andreev in previous interviews and articles, as seen in above sections of this chapter. As with the previous interviews covered in sections 5.3.9 & 5.3.10, much of this interview is presented as a statement of views in response to given objections.

Andreev begins the interview with an air of disdain about his ‘having to listen to and to read’ those ‘varying views and opinions’ directed against his *Velikorusskii orkestr*.¹⁰³ He initially focuses on others’ objective views and opinions on the *repertoire* of his orchestra and its implications for the orchestra’s defined performance role. He subsequently handles the varying objections, fuelling that dispute directly and persuasively: using simple analogies and comparisons, the manner of his argument further illustrates his desire to educate and to clarify for the public his position and that of his Russian folk instrument orchestra.

¹⁰² Originally published in the newspaper, *Obozrenie teatrov*, no. 2941 (24 November 1915). Granovskii (*Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 310).

¹⁰³ V. Andreev, ‘Balalaika i simfoniiia’, in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, pp. 84-85.

The interview covers three main areas of debate, together with Andreev's responses and clarifications within that debate:

(a) He begins by introducing four main objections concerning the question of the repertoire of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* compared with that of the symphony orchestra: (i) that it was not necessary to introduce anything other than the Russian folk song into the repertoire of an orchestra comprised of folk instruments and that, therefore, his orchestra was clearly destined to perform exclusively Russian folk songs¹⁰⁴ – see also 5.3.11 (b); (ii) that his orchestra needed to vary its repertoire by including works by both Russian and foreign composers; (iii) that his orchestra's repertoire needed to be light ('salonnyi'), otherwise it would be striving to compete with symphony orchestras, by which striving it was 'alleged' the *Velikorusskii orkestr* would be overstretching itself; and (iv) that others emphasized the demands of performing a serious music programme, the implication being that Russian folk instruments could not meet such demands. This objection suggests that the *Velikorusskii orkestr* would not, therefore, be restricted if it were performing a repertoire exclusively comprising Russian folk songs. But, Andreev points out, this ignored the view that, despite the colour and merit of Russian folk songs, such a restricted folk song repertoire would itself render the orchestra's concerts monotonous and even boring.

Andreev viewed these opinions themselves to be equally 'monotonous', and even at odds with each other. Nevertheless, he believed he was maintaining the 'perfect

¹⁰⁴ In an interview with *Birzhevye vedomosti* on 30 November 1915, Andreev expressed this objection similarly, i.e., that 'for some reason everyone had become convinced that the *Velikorusskii orkestr* needed to perform works of an exclusively folk character'.

balance' within his orchestra's performance programme between Russian folk song and classical works.¹⁰⁵

b) He begins his responses to the above four objections by stating that priority was given to the Russian folk song in his orchestra's repertoire.¹⁰⁶ He then explains the basic practical implications of that 'perfect balance', in terms which help to focus on his orchestra's musical strengths and merits. He considers this from the perspective of a person of another nationality who had mastered several other languages. Even though that person was fluent in foreign languages, it would always suit him best to speak (that is to express himself) in his native language. So it was with a national (in context a folk musical) instrument, for it conveyed its own folk song (language) best of all.¹⁰⁷

This simple analogy clarifies immediately that, even for Andreev, the Russian folk instrument's strength was its inherent, native musical language. However, its strengths in that respect *did not* limit its scope for expressing itself in other musical languages (i.e., performing classical works). And to emphasize his point, Andreev continues that it did not necessarily follow that the same foreign national would speak *exclusively* in his own language. To claim otherwise would not only be wrong, but would also be a plain impossibility.¹⁰⁸ The fact that his *Velikorusskii orkestr* was performing classical works at all supports his view up to this point, whatever the arguments at that time about how well Russian folk instruments were able to do so.

¹⁰⁵ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 85

¹⁰⁶ Ibid.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

¹⁰⁸ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 85

In light of his foreign language analogy, he then clarifies the wider implications of it for the *Velikorusskii orkestr*. The orchestra had never set about competing with the symphony orchestra. And, moreover, emulating the symphony orchestra had never entered into his objectives for his own Russian folk instrument orchestra (see from next paragraph to end of this section 5.3.11 (b)). But nevertheless, with the gradual development of the scope and versatility of his orchestra (that is of its folk instruments) and with it of the technique of its musicians, artistic works of even a *symphonic* character had now become accessible for his orchestra. To restrict the orchestra's trend towards that *repertoire* would be at least a mistake in his view.¹⁰⁹

Granovskii reveals that there is a note to the 24 November 1915 interview referring to a concert by Andreev's *Velikorusskii orkestr* scheduled for 30 November 1915.¹¹⁰ Included in the programme for that concert would be 'sophisticated works' such as the suite from Grieg's *Peer Gynt* and the fantasia from Rimsky-Korsakov's opera *Tsar' Saltan*. The orchestra would also be debuting their performance of Mozart's minuet from his 'symphony in E Flat Major', i.e., the third movement of Symphony No.39. Folk pieces such as 'Skazka o myortvoy tsarevne i semi bogatyryakh' and 'others' would also be performed.¹¹¹

The works listed here underline Andreev's above points regarding: (i) the maintenance of a balanced programme of Russian folk and classical pieces (although which 'other'

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

¹¹⁰ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 310

¹¹¹ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 85. It is not clear whether this extra detail about the concert programme was omitted by Andreev himself from the interview he gave to *Obozrenie teatrov* published on 24 November 1915, or whether it was an editorial decision to omit it. The former is doubtful, given previous examples of his opportunism for revealing such detail in advance of a *Velikorusskii orkestr* performance.

folk pieces would be included in this particular concert programme were not listed); and (ii) the developing scope and versatility of his orchestra and how he sought to demonstrate that this enabled it to perform more sophisticated (symphonic) pieces.

The performing of the Mozart minuet exemplifies the orchestra's developing scope for handling increasingly sophisticated works. Part of the appeal of that minuet is its intriguingly unconventional *arpeggio* for second clarinet. Performing it on folk instruments would have been an equally intriguing audio experience for those in the audience familiar with the piece in its symphonic setting.

And yet the same minuet has implications for Andreev's conviction about his orchestra's balanced programme repertoire. The melody of the minuet is claimed to be an Austrian 'drinking' folk song (*Ländler*). This fact may have been known to Andreev (see Chapter 6 re: N.P. Fomin). Performing the minuet in light of this fact would suggest Andreev was stating artistically on stage that including works of a symphonic nature in the repertoire of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* of folk instruments was equally as valid as Mozart including music of folk origin in the symphonic setting of his minuet.

Granovskii also reveals that in the evening edition of *Birzhevye vedomosti* (dated 30 November 1915) an interview with Andreev was published which was similar in content to that which he gave to *Obozrenie teatrov* on 24 November 1915, and which interview is the subject of this section.¹¹² With further allusions to his 24 November 1915 comments regarding his orchestra's scope and versatility enabling access to sophisticated works, Andreev states in the 30 November 1915 interview that he was

¹¹² Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 85

always trying to introduce a ‘symphonic element’ into his orchestra’s repertoire. He reasserts, however, that this did not mean that his orchestra was trying to compete with the symphony orchestra, because it nevertheless prioritized the ‘Russian national song’.¹¹³

In the same *Birzheye vedomosti* interview, Andreev also spoke of his intention to broaden and to add formality to the concert programme of the *Velikorusskii orkestr*. He had the opportunity to speak about this with his contemporary, the Russian composer A.K. Glazunov who, Andreev says, was supportive of his idea. Andreev hoped, therefore, that ‘even our serious composers’ would ‘take notice of the balalaika’ and would ‘compose for that Russian national instrument’¹¹⁴ – see 5.3.11 (c).

(c) Andreev next responds to *the above objections* by focusing on the ‘theoretical correctness’ of [musical] arrangements, i.e., of music transposed for performance on the Russian folk instruments of the *Velikorusskii orkestr*. The work on transposing those classical, or ‘serious’ pieces was being undertaken by ‘experienced’ and ‘educated’ musicians, whose arrangements ‘completely adhered to the strictest musical requirements’ of performance. Nothing amateurish (‘dilettantism’) was permitted to find its way into those musical arrangements. And, moreover, no

¹¹³ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 85

¹¹⁴ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 85. The question of a balanced programme reflecting a broad repertoire appears not to have been an issue with the French music critics in 1892, i.e., 23 years previously. Andreev stated in his *Vospominaniia* the following: ‘Что касается нашего *артистического успеха*, я могу сказать, что он действительно был выдающимся, о чем говорят сохранившиеся у меня рецензии парижских газет, [и это] несмотря на то, что тогда нас было всего только пять человек *исполнителей-дипломантов с очень незначительным репертуаром*.’ (V. Andreev, ‘Из воспоминаний’, Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.124).

opportunity was even taken to make the slightest change to what the composer intended in respect of how the given work should be performed.¹¹⁵

What the above clarifications reveal are that, in Andreev's view: the balance between Russian folk and symphonic elements in the repertoire of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* was his orchestra's strength; such a repertoire underlines versatility and scope of performance in a way that was detrimental neither to the status of Russian folk instruments and music, nor to the respected status of classical, or symphonic works; his work was being valued by respected music professionals, whether actively engaged in transposing classical pieces for his orchestra (e.g., N.P. Fomin), or whether acknowledging the merit of his ideas (e.g., A.K. Glazunov).

His above clarifications also reveal a knowledge and understanding of music which served to enlighten and to inform the public about the artistic position of his orchestra and its performance role. This does not mean that Andreev routinely succeeded in convincing all of his detractors of his views and objectives. It demonstrates, though, how he tried to inform and to explain in respect of the professional standards to which he aspired with his orchestra in both repertoire and performance.

¹¹⁵ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 85

6. ANDREEV AND HIS SORATNIKI

6.1 Introduction

This chapter focuses on the roles of Andreev's colleagues in shaping and developing his musicians' collective from amateur *Kruzhok balalaechnikov* through its transition, expansion and consolidation into a *Velikorusskii orkestr* of Russian folk instruments. The broad range of his colleagues' contributions in summary included: improving Russian folk instruments and verifying their origins and authenticity; identifying, collecting and authenticating Russian folk songs already performed by, and subsequently introduced into the repertoires of both *Kruzhok* and *Velikorusskii orkestr*, composing music for *Kruzhok* and orchestra, as well as adapting and transposing classical music pieces for Russian folk instrument performance.

These contributions to Andreev's work were made by both amateur enthusiasts and professionally qualified persons representing various strata of Russian society. Included among those numerous contributors were the classical string instrument craftsmen such as Ivanov and Paserbskii (see Chapter Three), followed by the peasant carpenter turned Russian folk stringed instrument craftsman S.I. Nalimov. The varying roles played by professionally trained St. Petersburg Conservatoire pupils in Andreev's work cannot be over-estimated. For example, Conservatoire graduate artists such as Nikolai Fomin and Anatolii Liadov and their connections and associations with cultural luminaries such as Rimsky-Korsakov had great significance for the development and progress of Andreev's 'new genre' of collective Russian folk

instrumental performance. Other music professionals were similarly valuable to Andreev.

Among other non-professional figures of influence on Andreev's work was Mitrofan Beliaev whose role in connecting Andreev to influential cultural figures was vital in the early stages of Andreev's activities as both Russian *balalaika* ensemble musician and propagator of Russian folk music. The work undertaken in collecting Russian folk songs by the *chinovnik* Tertii Filippov coincided with Andreev's work with his developing *balalaika Kruzhok*. Filippov's work would prove to be beneficial in expanding the folk song repertoire of Andreev's *Kruzhok*.

The intellectual ideas and perspectives of those in Andreev's circle of colleagues inclined towards a democratic view of music culture. This view was mirrored in Andreev's belief in musical '*prosvetitel'stvo*' which, in turn, was arguably reflected in his convictions about the dissemination of Russian folk instruments. *Prosvetitel'stvo*, as mentioned in general context by Baranov,¹ is to be understood in a broader sense than *prosvetitel'stvo* via the written word discussed in Chapter Five, i.e., not limited to Andreev's published articles and interviews as a means of enlightening the reader about his ideas and aspects of his work in promoting Russian folk music. The roles played by Andreev's colleagues are introduced in this chapter according to the sequence in which individuals became associated with him as his work with the *Kruzhok* and orchestra developed.

6.2 Collaborations with St. Petersburg craftsmen

Andreev's search for the best craftsman of *balalaiki* and, later, other stringed Russian

¹ Baranov, *Podvizhniiki muzyki narodnoi*, p.27.

folk instruments began and concluded with peasant carpenters in the course of approximately a decade, i.e., from V. Antonov² (1884) through to S.I. Nalimov (1895). Bracketed in between these two craftsmen was the work on further improvements to the *balalaika* undertaken by V.V. Ivanov and F.S. Paserbskii (1885-mid 1890s - see Chapter 3.1, 3.2.1 & 3.2.2. and below section 6.7). Nalimov effectively perfected the work of Ivanov and Paserbskii and contributed improvements and innovations of his own. Ivanov, Paserbskii and Nalimov all contributed to the increasingly professional direction in which Andreev's work was progressing with successive improvements which widened the scope and range of *balalaika* performance. From the late 1890s, the craftsmen P.V. Oglomin and I.A. Zyuzin made folk instruments which were also beneficial to Andreev's work with his orchestra and the teaching role of some of its members.

6.2.1 Ivanov and Paserbskii

Andreev and his family moved to St. Petersburg in the mid-1880s and he brought with him the Antonov *balalaika* made for him on the recommendations of Paskin (see Chapter 3.1 and 3.2.1). Andreev's ideas for improving the *balalaika* beyond Antonov's model were fuelled by his experience of playing the instrument. This included playing his Antonov *balalaika* with piano accompaniment by P.O. Saveliev at private gatherings with his new St. Petersburg friends and acquaintances.³ These gatherings would have provided opportunities for him to discuss and to evaluate with his friends this early *balalaika*'s strengths, weaknesses and potential with a view to improving it

² RGALI, f.695, op.1, ed. khr.130 ('Pis'ma Antonova, V. k Andreevu, Vasiliyu Vasil'evichu').

³ A.N. Lachinov, 'Genial'nyi samorodok. Slovo o V.V. Andreeve', in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.278.

further. And it was from this time that he commenced intensive work on a new, further improved type of *balalaika* which would be crafted by the violin master Ivanov (see Chapter 3.2.1. & 3.2.2.). Paserbskii would soon afterwards (1887) craft a similar *balalaika* to that of Ivanov's using Andreev's designs. The first Ivanov and Paserbskii models became known as the '*piatiladovaia*' *balalaika*, because they had permanent frets inlaid into the neck of the instrument, replacing the primitive gut, moveable frets. These permanent frets were in ascending order of the diatonic scale of A major in accordance with the top string's tuning to the pitch of A major.⁴ However, this very limited scale still restricted their performance scope and potential.

One of the ways in which Andreev learned more about the potential of the early Ivanov and Paserbskii *balalaiki* was when working with his *balalaika* pupils in mid-1887 in preparation for forming his *Kruzhok* later that year. Teaching by oral command and visual demonstrations of playing techniques, this collective playing revealed to Andreev the deficiencies and limitations of the existing instruments. This led to the creation of new *balalaiki* in partnership with Paserbskii.⁵

Andreev's comments on the *balalaiki* made by both Ivanov and Paserbskii reveal the advances made in *balalaika* crafting in only a few years. Ivanov's instrument (*balalaika prima*) had an 'excellent tone' and produced a 'fine sound'. Paserbskii's 'accompaniment *balalaiki*' (*al't, bas* and 'others') similarly had an 'immaculate' sound.⁶ The Paserbskii accompanying *balalaiki* to which Andreev refers were a quartet of instruments of varying sizes and ranges made in 1887 and were later complemented

⁴ ibid. and endnote 2. to 'V.V. Andreev, 'O russikh narodnykh instrumentakh', ibid., p.305.

⁵ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.14

⁶ V.V. Andreev, 'Predislovie k «Shkole dlia balalaiki»' in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.31

by a Paserbskii *kontrabas balalaika*.⁷ This development anticipated the contributions of Conservatoire professional Fomin (see below section 6.3.1) who recommended further expansion of the *balalaika* range to realize the extent of the adaptation and transposition work he began to undertake from late 1889.

Lachinov helpfully lists the main differences between the original (primitive) Russian folk *balalaika* prototype and the improved versions made by Paserbskii (see also Chapter 3.1 – 3.2.2 inclusive) 1. the neck of the instrument was shortened (like Ivanov's model) for easier playing; 2. the gut frets were replaced (as with Ivanov's model) by permanent metal frets; 3. the number of frets was increased, i.e., from five to fifteen in the chromatic scale; 4. the positioning of the bridge (кобылка) was made permanent, i.e., the chromatic scale eliminated the need to move the bridge to different positions along the deck to change key and pitch; 5. the *balalaiki* of different sizes and ranges allowed for the creation of the ensemble's unique sound.⁸ These changes helped the development of playing styles and range of performance and also anticipated the growth of the ensemble into an orchestra.

It appears that the working relationship between Andreev and Paserbskii had ended by about the mid-1890s. Correspondence held in the RGALI archive reveals a dispute between the two after Paserbskii had tried to misappropriate Andreev's patent for improved *balalaiki*. Paserbskii brought the legal action against Andreev on the issue, but lost the case.⁹ This is one possible reason why Andreev found a new craftsman in Nalimov in 1895. It is ironic, however, that the termination of Paserbskii's working

⁷ Endnote to Letter No.1, F.S. Paserbskii to Andreev, 1 March 1887, St. Petersburg, Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, pp.317-318 and p.162

⁸ Lachinov, 'Genial'nyi samorodok', p.281

⁹ Endnote to Letter No.1, F.S. Paserbskii to Andreev, 1 March 1887, Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, pp.317-318 and p.162

relationship with Andreev over the patent issue was advantageous to the dissemination of stringed Russian folk instruments. Proof of this is that the demand for *balalaiki* and *domry* was increasing around 1894 to 1896 at the time when Paserbskii was sending more than 100 stringed Russian folk instruments per year to the Russian provinces.¹⁰

6.2.2 Zyuzin, Ogloblin and others

The roles of I.A. Zyuzin and P.V. Ogloblin were in parallel to Nalimov's. Relatively little is known about Zyuzin's associations with Andreev and it is unclear to what extent, and in which capacity he may have contributed to Andreev's work. Published letters hint at Zyuzin's possible working involvement with Andreev. Andreev himself, for example, spoke highly of Zyuzin's craftsmanship of Russian *balalaiki*, stating that, aside from Nalimov's work, he did not know of other instruments which were 'so distinguished by their musical qualities.'¹¹ And yet Ivan Abramovich Zyuzin's associations with Andreev date from the late 1890s. This is revealed by Zyuzin's April 1897 letter in which he expressed his gratitude to Andreev for supporting his *balalaika* crafting.¹² It is known that Nasonov and Andreev were in agreement regarding the quality of Zyuzin's craftsmanship (see Chapter 5.). This can only indicate Zyuzin's possible role in advancing Andreev's work.

More is known of St. Petersburg craftsman P.V. Ogloblin's role in Andreev's work. Ogloblin was given charge of making Russian folk stringed instruments for the Russian armed forces orchestras early in World War I. The number of such orchestras was

¹⁰ Lachinov, 'Genialny somorodok', p.287

¹¹ Letter No.19, Andreev to I.A. Zyuzin, 29 October 1908, Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.155

¹² See Zyuzin's letter No.10, 17 April 1897, Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.166

increasing and, with it, the demand for new stringed instruments. Ogloblin's role was to oversee the manufacture of new instruments and their distribution in the forces.¹³ It is not clear from exactly what point Ogloblin was entrusted with that responsibility. However, it is unlikely he was fulfilling any role vacated by Nalimov when the latter died in 1916. Nalimov's craftsmanship of Russian folk instruments was undertaken for musicians of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* and privately for individual *balalaika* players (see below section 6.7). In any event, it is not clear why Ogloblin was chosen as the army folk instrument craftsman, given Andreev's high appraisal of Zyuzin's Russian folk instruments as second only to those produced by Nalimov up to 1915. It can only be assumed that Ogloblin's craftsmanship was adjudged to have superseded Zyuzin's work at a later stage, i.e., after 1908 and to have rivalled the 'excellent' craftsmanship of the folk instrument 'Levsha' Nalimov.¹⁴

Specific details of Ogloblin's role in Andreev's work in the Russian armed forces are found in two letters from Andreev's colleague G.A. Aryamov.¹⁵ Aryamov confirms in 1915 that a 'Vasilii Vasil'evich Katsan' had received 'domry' from Ogloblin' to be used in teaching classes for soldiers.¹⁶ Aryamov confirms the progress of work later that year in 'correctly organizing' *balalaika* orchestras and of the general dissemination of

¹³ P.A. Obolenskii, 'Vospominaniia ob Andreeve', Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.245

¹⁴ L.S. Lench, 'Vasilii Vasilevich', Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.249. Lench's reference to Nalimov as 'Levsha' alludes to a Russian craftsman in N.S. Leskov's tale 'Skaz o tulskom kosom Levshe i o stalnoi blokhe' (1881). The story centres around Tsar Alexander I bringing home to Russia a life-size mechanical, dancing flea from England. The flea is shown to three Tula craftsmen who acknowledge they do not have the technical skill of the English craftsman who made it. However, a Tula 'Levsha' crafts shoes which can only be seen to have been fitted to the flea's feet through a magnifying glass and which bear the master's name engraved onto them. But the tiny shoe nails cannot be seen even through the magnifying glass.

¹⁵ G.A. Ariamov first approached Andreev about becoming a *balalaika*-playing member of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* in a letter dated 21 January 1912, Letter No.53, G.A. Ariamov to Andreev, in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.187.

¹⁶ Letter No.80, 1 July 1915 from G.A. Ariamov to Andreev, Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.205

that work in Petrozavodsk. For this purpose, he was using the teaching manual written by Nasonov which utilised the author's *tsifrovaia sistema*', i.e. an alternative music score notation for teaching soldiers with no previous music theory training. And for a scheduled 'teaching seminar', Oglolbin was making twelve-stringed instruments, including three prima *balalaiki*.¹⁷ The standard of Oglolbin's craftsmanship was confirmed by another Andreev army assistant, A.P. Maksimov, who stated in summary that the instruments were of 'very good' quality.¹⁸

It is important in the context of the progress of Andreev's work to consider briefly the contributions to *gusli* craftsmanship made by A.I. Gergens and A.A. Gartman. Andreev explains the method of adding a keyboard to the *gusli* mechanism as an idea which originated with Fomin. However, it was 'the master' Gergens who realized this idea after much labour on the project.¹⁹ Gergens was a piano craftsman and the owner of a piano factory in St. Petersburg.²⁰ His essential preliminary work on the *gusli* keyboard mechanism provided the basis for Nalimov 'considerably to improve' and to simplify that innovation. Andreev adds that Nalimov was engaged (i.e., about 1908) in making an even more accomplished *gusli* keyboard mechanism 'based on A.A. Gartman's system'.²¹

An example of the unique role of *Velikorusskii orkestr* members in advancing Andreev's broader objectives is the individual role undertaken by A.A. Gartman. He was an 'outstanding virtuoso' of the mechanical *gusli* who was credited with bringing

¹⁷ Letter No. 85 dated 'before 1 October 1915' from A.P. Maksimov, Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.209

¹⁸ Letter No. 87 dated 1 December 1915 from A.P. Maksimov to Andreev, Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.210

¹⁹ V.V. Andreev 'Kratkaia istoricheskia spravka o proiskhozhdenii narodnykh muzykal'nykh instrumentov, voshedshikh v sostav Velikorusskogo orkestra', Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.114

²⁰ Endnote 1 to letter No.9, Andreev to Fomin, 27 May 1908, Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.314

²¹ V.V. Andreev 'Kratkaia istoricheskia spravka', Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.114

the playing technique of the instrument to very high standards. As a member of the *Velikorusskii orkestr*, he was lauded for his ‘invaluable advice and originality’. This ‘greatly facilitated’ the construction and improvement of the keyboard *gusli* mechanism which simplified the technique for playing the instrument.²²

Of equal significance to Gartman’s contribution to *gusli* craftsmanship is that of fellow *Velikorusskii orkestr* member O.U. Smolenskii. He advised Andreev and Nalimov on the correct stringing for the *gusli* “яворчатые”.²³ Smolenskii (1871-1920) played *gusli* and *zhaleika* in the orchestra and also organized and led a folk *gusli* ensemble.²⁴ Like Gartman, his knowledge and experience of *gusli* playing enabled Nalimov to improve craftsmanship which he passed on to pupils such as Oglolbin.

The legacy of the contributions of key craftsmen to Andreev’s work is partly revealed by instruments used in Andreev’s orchestra which were recovered and preserved during the Leningrad blockade of World War II. On 25 April 1943, many of those instruments were found at the Leningrad *Simfonia*, in soldiers’ quarters and in the homes of former orchestra members. These included a V. Ivanov double-bass *balalaika*, *gusli mekhanicheskie* and *gusli shchipkovye* by A. Gergens, 38 instruments made by Nalimov (ranges of *balalaiki*, *domry* and *gusli* from 1895 onwards – see below section 6.7), and three instruments by I.A. Zyuzin (*domra al’t*, *balalaika prima* and *balalaika kontrabas*).²⁵

²² *ibid.*

²³ This refers to ‘явор’ (*iavor*), the maple wood which was considered the best material from which to craft the body of this instrument – see Letter No. 64, O.U. Smolenskii to Andreev, 13 August 1912, and endnote 1 to ‘«*Gusli zvonchaty*»’, *vvedennye v velikorusskii orkestr v 1913 godu*’, Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.195 and pp.308-309

²⁴ Endnote 1 to ‘«*Gusli zvonchaty*»’, Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.309.

²⁵ Lachinov, ‘Genial’nyi samorodok’, Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.298

6.2 Professional amateurs?

The development and expansion of Andreev's *Kruzhok liubitelei igry na balalaikakh* and *Velikorusskii orkestr* were aided by input from both amateur and professional participants in these two collectives. The major contributions made by key musicians of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* towards developing and expanding the orchestra musically and pedagogically are explained in subsequent sections of this chapter.

Available source material does not reveal what, if any, specific contributions to Andreev's work with the *Kruzhok* were made from autumn 1887 by the participants

A.A. Volkov, B.A. Panchenko, A.B. Parigorin, A.F. Solov'yov and D.D. Fyodorov, aside from performing in the ensemble on their respective *balalaika* types. This is also the case regarding the cellist M.M. Val'iano, and the organist A.F. Turner (*balalaika bas*).²⁶

Another cellist, however, the *balalaika prima* player V.A. Lidin, is known to have fulfilled a more active role supporting Andreev's work (see below). The latter three Conservatoire-trained musicians were invited by fellow Conservatoire musician

N.P. Fomin to join as *balalaika* players with the remaining amateur members of the *Kruzhok* when several dissenting participants resigned in late 1889/ early 1890 in protest at Fomin's moves to help to organize it into a more academic, professional collective.²⁷

One figure with whom Andreev collaborated during the earliest phases of the development of the *Kruzhok* was A.F. El'man. El'man provided *pianoforte* accompaniment to Andreev's solo *balalaika* performances as part of Kruzhok concert

²⁶ RGALI f. 695, op. 1,2, d. 1116.

²⁷ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p. 68; p.89.

programmes.²⁸ Imkhanitskii refers to El'man as *kontsertmeister* (orchestra leader) regarding his participation in *Kruzhok* performances,²⁹ the implication being that he was as much an assistant to Andreev as he was an accomplished accompanist to solo *balalaika* performance. Evidence of this is that El'man was also a piano teacher who, therefore, had theoretical and practical knowledge of music. He is known to have given much help and advice to Andreev during the first rehearsals of the original *Kruzhok balalaechnikov*.³⁰

Fomin's introduction of V.A. Lidin into the *Kruzhok* brought with it an extra artistic and professional dimension. Lidin and Fomin were Conservatoire pupil friends and it was Lidin who advised Fomin to attend the 20 March 1888 *Kruzhok* public performance debut by offering to procure for him a complimentary ticket to the event. Lidin felt the event to be of potentially specific relevance to Fomin's own passion for Russian folk song. Fomin attended the event and it was Lidin who introduced Fomin to Andreev during the debut concert interval.³¹

Lidin helped to advance the pedagogical role of the *Velikorusskii orkestr*, as well as the ongoing development of its repertoire, through his leadership of a Russian folk instrument orchestra based at Tashkino village in *Smolenskaia guberniia*. As one of the teacher members of the *Velikorusskii orkestr*, Lidin organized and led the Tashkino orchestra, which was comprised of pupils from the local school and was the first Russian folk instrument orchestra to perform the introduction from Fomin's opera

²⁸ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, endnote on p. 319 to Letter No.13, El'man to Andreev, 22 March 1898, p.169. In this letter, El'man confirms his early association with Andreev by beginning his letter 'Позвольте мне, как старейшему и ближайшему свидетелю Вашей музыкальной деятельности, от души поздравить Вас с сегодняшним днём.', referring to the tenth anniversary of Andreev's *Kruzhok* debut.

²⁹ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p. 59

³⁰ *Ibid.*

³¹ N.P. Fomin, 'Otryvki iz vospominanii' in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 224

Skazka o myortvoi Tsarevny i syemi bogotyryakh on 6 August 1904. It seems quite plausible from a letter from Lidin to Andreev that this performance had been a trial for a future *Velikorusskii orkestr* performance of the piece which took place on 14 November the same year.³² In the same letter, Lidin endorses Andreev's idea for it to be performed by 300 musicians, which highlights the kind of artistic ambitions Lidin and Andreev shared regarding Russian folk music performance.

Velikorusskii orkestr member F.E. Rennicke was one of three musicians in the orchestra whom Andreev posted abroad to help establish Russian folk instrument orchestras. Fellow orchestra teacher-members A.S. Chagadaev and V.S. Pogorelov were active in this regard in England and America respectively.³³ Owing to limitations of space, an example of F.E. Rennicke's role in Germany in promoting Russian folk music by establishing Russian folk orchestras is afforded only brief attention here.

Rennicke was a long-standing member and activist in both the *Kruzhok* and its subsequent *Velikorusskii orkestr*. As a member of the latter, he successfully established his own Russian folk music orchestras comprised of soldiers in the German armed forces,³⁴ mirroring the work being undertaken by Andreev and many of his orchestra's colleagues in Russia. Rennicke's 18 February 1912 letter to Andreev summarizes preliminary work being undertaken with soldiers based at Danzig (modern-day Gdansk, Poland, which in 1912 hosted a large German population). Rennicke confirms receipt and distribution of Russian folk instruments and outlines his plans to introduce Russian folk song pieces to the soldiers. He felt that the Russian

³² ibid., endnote 1, p. 322. The 18 October 1904 letter from Lidin to Andreev (No.27, p. 175), to which this endnote refers, includes Lidin's advice to Andreev that Fomin had all the music score drafts of the introduction to *Skazka o mertvoi Tsarevne*, suggesting it was Lidin's initiative to perform the piece on Russian folk instruments.

³³ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, pp. 132-133

³⁴ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 326

folk song *Svetit mesyats* and some ‘simple marches’ would be useful introductions and requested that Andreev send the score for those pieces for him to teach the new soldier participants.³⁵ The Danzig soldiers’ orchestra was one of several which Rennicke established on German territory following the successful tour of Germany by the *Velikorusskii orkestr* in 1908, in which Rennicke was one of the orchestra’s performers. Rennicke continued to be active in *Orkestr imeni V.V. Andreeva*, as it was re-named after Andreev’s death.³⁶

Pyotr Petrovich Karkin (real name Rurik Karkineinen, of possible Finnish origin) deserves particular mention as a talented *Kruzhok* and *Velikorusskii orkestr* member who developed rapidly into a musician of professional standing. Karkin was a plumber (слесарь-механик) by profession³⁷ who became a *Kruzhok* member in 1894 as first *domra* player.³⁸ He was the author of many adaptations of Russian folk songs, including transpositions for *domra a/t*.³⁹ These innovations for the *domra* (clearly novel for their time) became firmly established as part of the overall Russian folk orchestral repertoire.⁴⁰ Karkin also established himself as a talented teacher member of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* and was the founder, indeed ‘pioneer’ of the *Domra* Performance School (*Ispolnitel’skaia shkola igry na domre*).⁴¹

Reflecting the undoubted importance of Karkin’s legacy, both for the *Velikorusskii orkestr*, and for Russian folk music performance, Lachinov correctly recognizes the

³⁵ Letter No. 56, F.E. Rennicke to V.V. Andreev, 18 Feb. 1912, Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 189.

³⁶ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 326.

³⁷ In the endnotes to ‘Konspeky dokladov o Velikorusskom orkestre’ in ‘Poiasneniia i materialy dlia obrisovki deiatelnosti i znachenii Velikorusskogo orkestra’, ‘Granovskii points out that Andreev’s note ‘o Karkine’ refers to P.P. Karkin the ‘plumber’, Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 311.

³⁸ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov*, p.76.

³⁹ V. V. Andreev, ‘Spravochnik ili kratkoe rukovodstvo dlia oborudovaniia Velikorusskogo orkestra’, in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.104.

⁴⁰ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.76

⁴¹ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.16

status of Karkin (and N.I. Privalov – see below section 6.6) alongside *Kruzhok* and *Velikorusskii orkestr* members and associated professionals including Fomin, V.T. Nasonov and F.R. Niman. Lachinov adds: ‘Our domra players are indebted to him [Karkin] for the development of all the basic techniques of domra sound production, as well as the first editions of arrangements of folk songs for domra with piano’.⁴²

6.3.1 Fomin – pupil of N.I. Rimsky-Korsakov

In Chapter 3.3, Nikolai Petrovich Fomin was introduced as an important organizational figure in the growth and transition of Andreev’s *Kruzhok balalaechnikov* into the *Velikorusskii orkestr*. Fomin’s connection and subsequent work and association with Andreev can be traced to the 20 March 1888 debut concert of the *Kruzhok* and its impact in sections of St. Petersburg’s dilettante community.

The success of that debut resulted in the formation of other *balalaika Kruzhki* in imitation of Andreev’s original ensemble. This enthusiastic public response posed an immediate problem for Andreev - the question of the quality of performance of those imitator ensembles and how that reflected on his work. Specifically, other amateur *balalaika* ensembles were copying ‘literally every artistic step’ made by Andreev’s ensemble.⁴³ Andreev, however, was acutely aware of the potential damage to the newly re-established image of the *balalaika* and that of his own ensemble posed by artistically unpolished amateur *balalaika* players’ collectives.

Pieces which had first been heard performed by Andreev’s *Kruzhok* had been learned by ear by the *Kruzhok* imitators. The results were artistically unconvincing with

⁴² Lachinov, ‘Genial’nyi samorodok. Slovo’, p.284

⁴³ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.65

inadequate attention paid to the quality of music performance. Group ‘music-making without sheet music’, as Imkhanitskii points out, ‘betrayed a clear foray into dilettantism’.⁴⁴ But the real problem was that Andreev’s ensemble itself shared this defect with its imitators, and this distracted attention from its overall artistic merit as the first *balalaika* ensemble of its kind. Fomin entered into collaboration with Andreev against this background and would take a leading role alongside him in elevating Russian folk instrumental performance to a truly professional level.

Fomin was the great grandson of Evgenii Ignatovich Fomin, an accomplished eighteenth-century composer and creator of Russian opera. Nikolai Fomin was taken regularly by his parents to symphony orchestra and ballet performances from an early age. He began playing the violin at age six, receiving lessons from the violinist Kaminskii, a pupil of Henryk Wieniawski. Fomin then took up the pianoforte from age 10.⁴⁵ In 1883, he entered the St. Petersburg Conservatoire, where he initially studied pianoforte under A.D. Dubasov, and music theory and harmony under A.K. Liadov. Fomin’s talents were already attracting the attention of Liadov, A.G. Rubinstein and N.I. Rimsky-Korsakov. About two years later, he enrolled as a pupil of Rimsky-Korsakov in music composition, and also transferred to F.F. Stein’s pianoforte classes. In 1889, he entered the Conservatoire’s new conducting class as a pupil of A.G. Rubinstein, a class created and headed by Rubinstein himself. Fomin graduated as pianist, composer and conductor in 1888, 1889 and 1891 respectively.⁴⁶

⁴⁴ *ibid.*

⁴⁵ ‘Nikolai Petrovich Fomin’, in A. S. Ilyukhin (ed.), *Materialy k kursu istorii ispolnitel’stva na russkikh narodnykh muzykal’nykh instrumentov*, Vypusk 1 (Ministerstva kul’tury RSFSR, Moscow, 1969), pp.17–18.

⁴⁶ *ibid.*

As stated in Chapter 3.3., Fomin's presence at the 20 March 1888 St. Petersburg debut performance of Andreev's *balalaika Kruzhok* was on the firm advice of two of his course peers at the Conservatoire, the cellists V.A. Lidin and M.M. Val'iano (see also 6.2 & 6.3.2).⁴⁷ While a student at the St. Petersburg Conservatoire, Fomin had the opportunity to exercise his keen interest in Russian folk song, producing his own variations of Russian folk pieces, as well as working on the harmonization and adaptations of authentic folklore song transcriptions.⁴⁸ Regarding the latter, he received guidance from Liadov, M.A. Balakirev and his composition tutor Rimsky-Korsakov.⁴⁹

Fomin's presence at the *Kruzhok* debut has an air of inevitability given the interest in Russian folk song and music espoused by such Conservatoire figures as Rimsky-Korsakov, who once stated about his own creative process as a composer: 'I listened to the voices of folk art and nature and took what they sang and suggested as the basis of my work'.⁵⁰

The effects on Fomin's artistic instincts and sensitivities of hearing Andreev's *Kruzhok liubitelei igry na balalaikakh* were considerable and arguably prepared the ground for his subsequent collaborations with Andreev less than two years later. Of that experience of hearing collective *balalaika* playing, Fomin wrote:

'Walking home, I thought, why is it so successful? Originality, completely new sonority, excellent playing, surprisingly clear rhythm and flexible phrasing. The melodies of Russian folk songs sounded in my ears, replacing one another. I

⁴⁷ Imkhanitskii., *U istokov...*, p.67

⁴⁸ Imkhanitskii., *U istokov...*, p.66

⁴⁹ Imkhanitskii., *U istokov...*, pp.66–67

⁵⁰ Ilyukhin, *Materialy k kursu istorii ispolnitel'stva*, p. 17

thought – what originality, what beauty lurks in them; there is nothing they are not able to express with their sincerity...'

'Идя домой я думал, в чем причина успеха? Оригинальная, совершенно новая звучность, прекрасная сыгранность, удивительно четкий ритм и гибкая фразировка. Мелодии русских народных песен так и звучали в моих ушах, сменяя одна другую. Мне думалось – какая самобытность, какая красота таится в них, чего только не способны они выразить своею искренностью...'.⁵¹

These words illustrate his immediate appreciation and understanding, as a professionally trained musician, of the idiosyncrasies and characteristics of the improved *balalaiki*. His appreciation of the practicalities of playing Russian folk music on *balalaiki* is underlined thus:

'I've heard a lot of songs from different nations, but none can compare with our folk song. And the balalaika is an amazing instrument, as if specially created to express a Russian song. What a beautiful, original sonority, what a rich ability to express a variety of moods, what flexibility in nuances, what a rhythm, as if everything is that simple, artless.'

'Много слышал я песен разных народов, но ни одна не может идти в сравнение с нашей народной песней. А балалайка – удивительный инструмент, как будто специально созданный для выражения русской песни. Какая красивая, оригинальная звучность, какая богатейшая

⁵¹ Ilyukhin, *Materialy k kursu istorii ispolnitel'stva*, p.19

способность к выражению разнообразных настроений, какая гибкость в нюансах, какой ритм, как будто все так просто, безыскусственно'.⁵²

It is understandable in the context of Fomin's academic and professional training at the St. Petersburg Conservatoire that he was hesitant before agreeing to become the director of Andreev's *Kruzhok*. Aside from his academic commitments, the immediate obstacle he would have to overcome was that the ensemble musicians could not read music. But not only was there the need to eradicate the *Kruzhok* musicians' method of learning to play music by ear: the *balalaika* collective also needed to be coached rigorously in rehearsals according to the rules of music notation indicated in music score for specific *orchestral* roles. Fomin also proposed that all instruments in the ensemble should each have a 'квартовая настройка' (tuned at the *fourth* degree from the main tone) as an *obligato* requirement in folk instrument accompaniment.⁵³

These initiatives were not only important in paving the way for the renewal of the ensemble's repertoire, necessitated by the introduction of new adaptations of music and the introduction of original pieces and transpositions. They also showed the value of Fomin's role in leading the ensemble's transition into an orchestra. His aforementioned insistence on *orchestral* roles for the musicians underlines this.

The drastic changes Fomin was demanding were met with resistance by original members of the *Kruzhok*. They labelled Fomin's new approach and methods for improving the collective's performance and repertoire as 'академизм' and refused to work under his direction. This led to the renewal of the collective, with those critical of the new academic input being replaced by trained Conservatoire musicians. The

⁵² Ilyukhin, *Materialy k kursu istorii ispolnitel'stva*,
⁵³ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.67

musicians Fomin persuaded to join him in his work in the Andreev collective were also his Conservatoire friends. Among those 'academic specialists' he introduced into the *Kruzhok* were those who had urged him to attend the 1888 *Kruzhok* debut performance, the cellists V.A. Lidin and M.M. Val'iano. They were also joined by the organist A.F. Turner.⁵⁴ While these additions and replacements to original *kruzhkovtsy* were of undoubted benefit to the improving *balalaika* collective from an academic point of view, some of those original members who had left the *Kruzhok* in opposition to Fomin nonetheless returned to the fold.⁵⁵

Imkhanitskii states that Andreev was fully aware of the limitations of the majority of his colleagues' ability to perform the ancient Russian peasant folk song to the highest artistic level through folk instrument orchestral performance.⁵⁶ It may equally be the case that Andreev's understanding of those limitations was significantly broadened by Fomin's educative influence on him even during the initial stages of their acquaintance. Either way, and notwithstanding Andreev's own formal piano lessons under the tutelage of Conservatoire violinist and director N.V. Galkin, Andreev was not a trained composer. Moreover, others among his assistants, such as Privalov, Nasonov, Karkin, Niman, Danilov and Lenets had other roles to play (see relevant subsequent sections in this chapter). He therefore needed a progressive, professional composer of Fomin's artistic stature and outlook to realize those high performance standards.

Fomin's artistic credentials were indeed impressive: he had written operatic, symphonic and piano works, as well as oratorio-cantatas.⁵⁷ In light of this broad spectrum of ability and experience, Fomin's interest in Russian folk song and Russian

⁵⁴ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, pp.67–68

⁵⁵ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.68, and Fomin's reminiscences in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*.

⁵⁶ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.113

⁵⁷ *ibid.*

folklore bordered on providential to Andreev's emerging and developing *balalaika* collective. Fomin's deep affection for ancient Russian folk songs was instilled in him by his Conservatoire tutors Liadov and Rimsky-Korsakov, and he aspired to convey Russian folk song in his own compositions.⁵⁸

Fomin selected Russian folk songs for adaptation for folk instrument performance from works by M.A. Balakirev, V.P. Prokunin, I.V. Nekrasov, N.I. Abramychev and T.I. Filippov (see section 6.7.). His choice of songs was varied, from traditional *byliny*, through to *protyahnye pesni*, choral pieces and also wedding songs (*svadebnye pesni*).⁵⁹

Fomin adapted what he considered to be the best examples of Russian folk song for performance by the expanding *Kruzhok*. A talented young composer of his calibre would have easily understood the complexities involved in expressing Russian folk song via musicians capable of performing on a wider range of instruments made possible by the ranges of folk instruments introduced into the *balalaika* collective. Fomin, as Imkhanitskii suggests, had to find the 'perfect balance' between combining particularities of the folk song's vocal essence and his own encompassing music.⁶⁰ His adaptations of folk songs for collective folk string instrument performance are rich in examples of how he achieved this. The multi-vocal harmonies typical of old Russian folk songs were reproduced for folk instruments by juxtaposing the *domra al't* playing the solo part with the choral response from a leading voice of a second part, a group of background, supporting voices. Examples of this are found in his early variations of

⁵⁸ ibid.

⁵⁹ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.114

⁶⁰ Ibid.

‘*Ekh, da uz vy, noch’i*, ‘*Vaniusha-kliuchnik*’, ‘*Druzhki-podruzhki*’ and ‘*Nad rekoiu, and bystroiu*’.⁶¹

An indication of Fomin’s unique, progressive qualities in developing to the maximum the background, second voices in orchestral performance, was the singling out of the *domra piccolo* (the weakest vocal register in the *domra* range) in ‘*Ванюша-ключник*’. He exploits the low register of this otherwise high-pitched instrument by assigning to it a contrapuntal line played on its lowest-pitched string.⁶² This kind of ‘branching out’ of musical (tonal, vocal) textures is similarly found in early variations of Fomin’s adapted pieces. The most characteristic of urban melodies familiar to him at that time – accordion-*garmonika* accompaniment – shines through more strongly in concluding variations to adapted pieces. Almost all of his adaptations are characterized by a consolidation, or resolving of strength/crescendo as the developed second voices reduce to two distinct elements. The *domra* sections take charge of the main theme in full unison with accompaniment from the *balalaiki* and *gusli*. Fomin was thereby able to combine not only the idiosyncrasies of ancient peasant and urban melodies, but also to create on this basis a distinct compositional pattern – to develop textures from the second voices of early variations into a *homophonic*, harmonic whole.⁶³

6.3.2 A.K. Liadov

Anatolii Konstantinovich Liadov was the son of the composer, *kapellmeister* and conductor of the St. Petersburg Russian orchestra Konstantin Nikolaevich Liadov

⁶¹ *ibid.*

⁶² *Ibid.*

⁶³ *ibid.*

(1820-1871).⁶⁴ Anatolii Liadov was musically gifted and his talents were guided and nurtured by his father. He had composed four romances by the age of nine. He studied counterpoint, harmony and fugue under Yu. I. logansen [Johanssen] and graduated from Rimsky-Korsakov's orchestration and free composition class in 1878;⁶⁵ he would himself eventually become one of N.P. Fomin's tutors at the St. Petersburg Conservatoire. He was acquainted with the *Balakirevskii kruzhok* of artistic friends and associates, his own association with Balakirev particularly broadening his musical horizons.⁶⁶ Liadov became a working colleague of both Balakirev and Rimsky-Korsakov whilst still a Conservatoire student, assisting them in editing for publication the orchestral scores of Glinka's operas '*Zhizn' za tsaria*' and '*Ruslan i Liudmila*'.⁶⁷ Liadov's compositional output was relatively modest (about 75 opera in total)⁶⁸ and he is not considered to be a major composer. However, his connection with Andreev is significant as he was a part of that lineage of musical inheritance which successfully became a feature of the repertoire of Andreev's *Velikorusskii orkestr*. Liadov's own compositional works did reveal inheritances from Chopin, Schumann and, in later works, from Scriabin.⁶⁹ But the major influences on and colouring of his works are clearly reminiscent of both Glinka and especially of Russian folk song. These artistic qualities would subsequently enhance the repertoire of Andreev's Russian folk instrument orchestra as it developed into the twentieth century.

⁶⁴ *Novaia entsiklopediia slov. Brokgauza Effrona*, vol. 35, p.271. Among K.N. Liadov's works were his orchestration of the ballet 'Satanilla', his successful romances, dances and the composition 'Vozle rechki, vozle mosta'. Anatolii Liadov's uncle (brother of K.N. Liadov) was Aleksandr Nikolaevich Liadov (1818-1871) who was St. Petersburg *Kapellmeister* and conductor of the St. Petersburg Ballet for over twenty years.

⁶⁵ *Novaia entsiklopediia slov*, vol. 25, pp.268-269

⁶⁶ *ibid.*

⁶⁷ *ibid.*

⁶⁸ *ibid.*

⁶⁹ *ibid.*

It is difficult, however, to gauge the true extent of Liadov's influence on Andreev's *Velikorusskii orkestr*, given the consistently sketchy nature of available source references to Liadov's input into Andreev's work. The fact that he did not write any music specifically for Andreev's orchestra does not mean, though, that his works did not influence the orchestral performance of Andreev's folk instrument collective. It is significant in this sense that the Russian folk song's influence on Liadov's Russian classical work was a factor in causing his contemporaries to consider him to be a prominent figure of the 'New Russian Musical School' of the then 'younger generation' of talented musicians (see Chapter 1.2.2).⁷⁰

Although Liadov was not directly involved with Andreev's *Velikorusskii orkestr*, there is no record of him objecting to any of his works being included in the orchestra's repertoire for public performance. And it was the performance of Liadov's Russian folk song adaptation which was most popular of Liadov's works among *Velikorusskii orkestr* audiences. Indeed, Liadov's 'Eight Russian Folk Songs' (*Vosem' russkikh narodnykh pesen*) would become a regular feature of future *Velikorusskii orkestr* performances.⁷¹

One major artistic advantage for Andreev's orchestra was that Liadov's reworkings and adaptations of Russian folk songs were (as they still are) considered to be highart achievements. They were essentially folk pieces in a classical setting, several of the collections being scored for solo female voice with pianoforte accompaniment and for vocal quartet.⁷² Liadov's published collections of adapted Russian folk songs

⁷⁰ *Bol'shaia sovetskaiia entsiklopedia*, vol.15, p.129, col.373-374.

⁷¹ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.163

⁷² *Novaia entsiklopediia slov*, vol. 25, pp. 268-269

appeared among various other similar collections and compilations published from the 1860s onwards by the likes of Tchaikovsky, Rimsky-Korsakov and Balakirev (see Chapter 1.2.2). Liadov's own adaptations of Russian folk songs appeared in compilations including: '10 Russian Folk Songs for Male Choir' (*10 russkikh narodnykh pesen dla muzhskogo khora*, 1899); '8 Russian Folk Songs' (*8 russkikh narodnykh pesen*, 1906) for symphony orchestra; and '5 Russian Folk Songs' (*5 russkikh narodnykh pesen*, 1910) for female voice choir and symphony orchestra.⁷³ His '120 songs of the Russian folk' (*120 pesen russkogo naroda*) comprised a selection of adapted Russian folk songs collected by the Imperial Russian Geographical Society's 'Song Commission'.⁷⁴

It appears that the foundations for Liadov's connections to Andreev may have been laid in about the autumn of 1889. Fomin recalls in his reminiscences an evening event organized by Mitrofan Petrovich Beliaev, a well-known figure in St. Petersburg's artistic and cultural circles (see below 6.4).⁷⁵ Beliaev had invited Andreev's *Kruzhok* to perform at his home before the scrutiny of the composers Tchaikovsky, Glazunov, as well as that of Conservatoire composer-tutor-associates of Fomin, Rimsky-Korsakov and Liadov. Also present were A.V. Verzhbilovich, F.M. Blumenfeldt (Conservatoire pupil of Rimsky-Korsakov) and the music critic V.V. Stasov.

Liadov was an important figure in the background of Fomin's work with Andreev. As briefly mentioned in Chapter 3.3 (c), Liadov was a music theory and harmonization tutor to Fomin at the St. Petersburg Conservatoire. The two consulted each other on

⁷³ Imkhanitiskii, *U istokov...*, p.41

⁷⁴ *Novaia entsiklopediia slov*, vol. 25, pp. 268-269

⁷⁵ Beliaev and his associates were referred to collectively as the 'Beliaevsky kruzhok'.

⁵⁴³ N. P. Fomin, 'Otryvki iz vospominanii', in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.226

the harmonization and adaptation of Russian folk extracts and, as with other Conservatoire tutors, Rimsky-Korsakov and Balakirev, Liadov and Fomin shared their mutual artistic appreciation and affection for the Russian folk song.⁷⁶ It cannot be purely coincidental that Liadov and Fomin were present at the same Andreev *Kruzhok* event at Beliaev's St. Petersburg residence. Liadov, along with Rimsky-Korsakov and Balakirev, already had a well-established tutor-pupil association with Fomin at the Conservatoire and their shared interest in Russian folk music gave their presence together that evening an air of inevitability. Andreev and his *balalaika kruzhkovtsy* had recently returned from a highly successful series of concerts in Paris for which they had received favourable St. Petersburg press coverage. There was undoubtedly interest, therefore, among the Conservatoire composer-tutors attending the Beliaev event. It is also virtually certain that Liadov was well aware that his own pupil Fomin had attended the 1888 *Kruzhok* debut, given the interest it had aroused among Conservatoire pupil-musicians at the time.

There is, however, a certain irony about this important lineage connecting Andreev to Liadov through Fomin, especially given Liadov's broad musical perspectives instilled in him by Balakirev. Fomin himself had not been officially invited to that evening in Beliaev's apartment, but was observing from aside as a student lodger of Beliaev. Conservatoire associate and tutor Liadov approached and informed Fomin 'with a smile' that Andreev and his friends were coming 'to play their *balalaiki*'. Fomin had discerned in Liadov's tone that he was not taking the occasion seriously.⁷⁷

⁷⁶ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.113

⁷⁷ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 226.

Whether or not Fomin's instincts about Liadov at that moment were accurate, it is helpful to consider this against the broader implications of highly respected Russian composers publishing their adapted Russian folk song compilations in the context of *Velikorusskii orkestr* performance repertoire. The credibility of Russian folk song owed much to those 'greater' composers' published adaptations of works of that genre. The inclusion of similar adaptations by a lesser composer such as Liadov in the repertoire of Andreev's orchestra would therefore not have been either ill-conceived or misplaced.

6.4 M.P. Beliaev and St. Petersburg's cultural society

Mitrofan Petrovich Beliaev is a name well known in Russian classical music culture for its associations with Russian composer luminaries including, among others, Tchaikovsky, Rimsky-Korsakov, Liadov, Balakirev, and Glazunov. His name is also synonymous with the group of music intellectuals by which these men became collectively known, the *Beliaevskii kruzhok*. This circle would prove to be valuable even from the early phase of Andreev's work in promoting, arranging and performing Russian folk instrumental music, as already seen with Liadov in 6.3.2.

Beliaev himself was a respected figure both in Russian cultural circles and in wider classical music and cultural society. He was born and based in St. Petersburg and was closely connected to the St. Petersburg Conservatoire through the composers with whom he was in association. His roles both as a patron and activist for Russian composers and their music, and as music publisher of works by Russian composers helped to enhance the artistic integrity of Russian music both in Russia and abroad.

His legacies to Russian music culture are numerous. He founded in 1884 the 'Glinka prizes', which he presented anonymously through V.V. Stasov on 27 November each year.⁷⁸ From 1898 to 1903 he held the Chair of the St. Petersburg-based 'Chamber Music Society' ('*Obshchestvo kamernoi muzyki*). It was for this music society that from 1892 he organized annual competitions for best *chamber* music composition by a Russian composer. Beliaev had also established the 'Russian Quartet Evenings' a year earlier.

His democratic inclinations in music culture are revealed in his organization from 1884/5 of the 'Accessible Russian Symphonic Concerts' ('*Obshchedostupnye russkie simfonicheskie kontserty*'). There were approximately six performances of these concerts a season, held for the general public at St. Petersburg's *Zal dvoryanskogo sobraniiia* and opened by Rimsky-Korsakov from 1886 to 1900. These concerts did much in raising the profile of Russian composers and their music.

In 1885, Beliaev founded the music publisher 'M.P Beliaev, Leipzig', which was dedicated to publishing music exclusively by Russian composers. Its published works ranged from romances to symphonic and operatic works.⁷⁹ Beliaev saw his publication of Russian music as a means to fuel growth in interest in Russian works abroad. His publications of Russian choral works, for example, demonstrate this aim. They contained song lyrics in both Russian and European languages to assist the potential non-Russian enthusiast's understanding and appreciation of the music. It is of relevance to Andreev's own aims and sentiments about popularizing Russian folk

⁷⁸ This date marked the premieres of Glinka's operas "Zhizn' za tsaria" and 'Ruslan i Lyudmila'.

⁷⁹ Beliaev bequeathed 582 volumes of his publications to Russia's Imperial Public Library in 1902. *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar' Brokgauza i Efrona*, p. 350.

instrumental music outside Russia that Beliaev shared a similar aim for Russian music through his publishing work. Many of the Russian works he published included Russian folk songs.⁸⁰

It was against Beliaev's multi-faceted musical background that like-minded Russian musicians and composers of the then 'New Russian School' gathered around him to form the Beliaev Circle in the 1880s and 1890s. Beliaev himself was an enthusiastic amateur musician of reputably good standing, playing second violin in respective amateur *kruzhok* quartets he had organized in both St. Petersburg and Arkhangel'sk. And in 1882 in St. Petersburg he organized his Friday 'chamber music' evenings, his chamber ensemble ('piatnichnyi kvartet') being central to much of the entertainment. Rimsky-Korsakov, Glazunov and Liadov were regular attendees at these weekly musical gatherings, which grew into the 'Beliaev evenings' or 'Beliaev Fridays'. Others in attendance were A.P. Borodin, A.V. Ossovskii, S.I. Taneyev and A.N. Scriabin, as well as other 'guest' musicians including the pianist, violinist and (most famously) conductor Arthur Nikisch.⁸¹

Beliaev played in the quartet which provided entertainment for these events. The performance of new works by Russian composers was a main focus. But although Beliaev's interest was chiefly in Russian composers and their music, classical works from non-Russian composers were also included in the performances of the quartet.⁸² A brief piece in the 1970 edition of the *Bol'shaia sovetskaia entsiklopediya* states that Beliaev 'did not promote any particular artistic ideological programme' at these

⁸⁰ 'Beliaevskii kruzhok' in *Bol'shaia sovetskaia entsiklopediia*, 30 vols. (Moscow: Sovetsk. entsikloped., 1968-1986) vol. 3 (197), p.188.

⁸¹ *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar' Brokgauza i Efrona*, p. 349.

⁸² A large number of select songs which were written expressly for these musical evenings were published by Beliaev in two compilations entitled 'Piatnitsy'. *Ibid.*

evening events.⁸³ This is only partly true, however, when one also considers the influences on the music of the main figures in Beliaev's circle and his own aforementioned passion for Russian music. Not only Rimsky-Korsakov, but also composers such as Glazunov and Liadov (see 6.3.1 & 6.3.2) placed emphasis on the Russian folk influences inherent in their music compositions. And although non-Russian works were performed at the Beliaev gatherings, there was still much emphasis on Russian compositions. These included new Russian works submitted for the annual 'quartet music' competition which Beliaev had established for the St. Petersburg Quartet Music Society.⁸⁴ It was the attraction of new, fresh *Russian* music, particularly that of Glazunov, which influenced Beliaev into devoting himself as a servant to Russian music from the early 1880s, to which his initiatives testify.⁸⁵ He bequeathed a considerable sum of money so that his work for Russian music might continue after his death (he died in 1903).⁸⁶

6.4.1 Andreev and the *Beliaevskii kruzhok*

It appears that Andreev's first direct artistic association with the *Beliaevskii kruzhok* occurred in the autumn of 1889 (see 6.3.2.). And it seems likely that it was Andreev's successful concert tour of Paris weeks earlier in September 1889 that had aroused the interest of Beliaev and his 'Salon of Professionals'. This conclusion is based on the premise of Imkhanitskii's clarifications about the timing of Beliaev's performance invitation to Andreev's *balalaika Kruzhok*. The details of the period between the 1889

⁸³ 'Beliaevskii kruzhok', p.189.

⁸⁴ *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar' Brokgauza i Efrona*, p. 350.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

Paris trip and the Beliaev invitation are vague in available sources, leaving contradictory claims about the timing of the Beliaev evening as the only means by which to draw any relevant conclusions. For example, A.S. Chagadaev states that the Beliaev gathering took place in 1892.⁸⁷ Fomin, however, states in his own reminiscences about that evening that he 'felt almost a boy' in the company of his 'Conservatoire professors' (e.g., Rimsky-Korsakov) who were present.⁸⁸ Imkhanitskii is correct to state that these details confirm that Fomin was still a student at the St. Petersburg Conservatoire at this time. He graduated from that establishment in 1890.⁸⁹ This was two years before the date Chagadaev provides for the Beliaev invitation.

This clarification of autumn 1889 as the likely time of the Beliaev invitation is helpful in determining the extent of the artistic influences of Beliaev's *kruzhok* members on the early stages of Andreev's work with his *balalaika* collective. Andreev had introduced his *balalaika Kruzhok* to foreign, including professional scrutiny in September of 1889 at the Paris World Exhibition and subsequent tour in the city with great success. He achieved this before he had been introduced to Beliaev and his circle of music professionals. Therefore, Andreev's success in Paris was logically achieved mainly on the strength of his own enterprise, as there is no suggestion in available sources that he had received significant professional advice in preparing his *Kruzhok* for the 1889 Paris appearances. The only advice Andreev received from a professionally trained musician before the Paris trip came from Fomin (see Chapter 3.3), who was still a Conservatoire student at that time and not a member of Beliaev's circle.

⁸⁷ A. S. Chagadaev, V. V. Andreev, 'Muzgiz', Moskva-Leningrad, 1948, p.10

⁸⁸ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.226

⁸⁹ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, pp.63-64, footnote 2

Aside from Fomin making Andreev's acquaintance soon after the March 1888 *Kruzhok* debut in St. Petersburg, the Beliaev invitation was the first occasion on which Andreev was afforded direct acknowledgement of his work by professional Russian musician-composers. The favourable reception of Andreev's *Kruzhok* in France, however, may have served as the catalyst for the interest shown by Beliaev, although there had been prior interest in the 1888 *Kruzhok* debut among Conservatoire staff and pupils.

The impact of the Beliaev event on Andreev and his work is speculative on one level. Fomin's reminiscences reveal Tchaikovsky's enthusiastic response to the *Kruzhok* performance he had witnessed at Beliaev's home, when he reportedly commented: 'What a wonder these balalaikas are! What an amazing effect they can give in an orchestra; in timbre it is an indispensable instrument!' (*Kakaia prelest' eti balalaiki! Kakoi porazitel'nyi effect mogut oni dat' v orkestre; po tembru eto nezamenimyi instrument!*)⁹⁰

Imkhanitskii asserts that Tchaikovsky's above comments (often quoted in Andreev sources) about timbre, and reference to the collective as an 'orchestra', may have been the 'stimulus' for Andreev in transforming his *Kruzhok* into the *Velikorusskii orkestr*.⁹¹ This is a reasonable assertion. However, Tchaikovsky was commenting on the instruments he had heard in Andreev's *Kruzhok*, i.e., *balalaiki* which already ranged from piccolo to double-bass *balalaiki* at that early stage. This range was achieved following suggestions to him by Paserbskii about varied *balalaika timbre* ranges from about the second half of 1887 (see chapter 3.2.1 and 3.2.2). Moreover, Andreev's ensemble as it stood in the autumn of 1889 did not include additional kinds

⁹⁰ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.227 and Imkhanitskii, *U istokov*, p.64.

⁹¹ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.64

of folk instruments, the introduction of which was the reason for re-naming the *Kruzhok* the *Velikorusskii orkestr* in 1896.

However, the Beliaev invitation arguably had a positive impact on Andreev's work and his future *Velikorusskii orkestr* in respect of the connections Andreev established with the composers present. Glazunov in particular became well associated with the Russian folk instrument orchestra into which Andreev's *Kruzhok* evolved through the 1890s. Glazunov composed his 'Русская фантазия' for the *Velikorusskii orkestr* to perform at the 1900 World Exhibition in Paris.⁹² For Andreev to be associated with the Beliaev circle so closely through the highly esteemed Russian composer Glazunov was vital for the artistic reputation of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* (see 6.5).

6.5 A.K. Glazunov

Aleksandr Konstantinovich Glazunov was also a native of St. Petersburg. Born there in 1865, he was of the same generation as Andreev, and as a highly respected composer and conductor he was also a major figure in St. Petersburg's cultural society until he emigrated in 1928.⁹³ Like Nikolai Fomin and Aleksandr Liadov (see 6.3.1 and 6.3.2), Glazunov had been a St. Petersburg Conservatoire pupil of the Russian 'Romantic Nationalist' composer Rimsky-Korsakov, and the first of his nine symphonies debuted in 1882 under the baton of another Rimsky-Korsakov pupilgraduate, Balakirev. Glazunov conducted in Paris in 1889 and in London in 1896-97 and became Director of the St. Petersburg Conservatoire from 1905.⁹⁴

⁹² See Chapter 4.5.3.

⁹³ 'Aleksandr Konstantinovich Glazunov' in M. Kennedy (ed.), *Oxford Dictionary of Music* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), p.345,

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*

The contribution of Glazunov to the repertoire of Andreev's *Velikorusskii orkestr* is a logical one considering his close association with Rimsky-Korsakov, who himself openly acknowledged the Russian folk inheritance in his own music. But this connection with Rimsky-Korsakov was probably less of a factor in respect of Glazunov's association with the *Beliaevskii kruzhok* as a whole. Although Beliaev and his circle of professional artists did place great artistic value on Russian music (including Russian folk-influenced symphonic music – see 6.4), Glazunov and that circle did not exclusively cling to the music of their homeland. They readily embraced other musical styles and influences from outside Russia. Glazunov himself, for example, had met Franz Liszt at Weimar and was influenced by his and Richard Wagner's music (Wagner owed a considerable portion of his musical inheritance to Liszt). The latter Wagnerian influence in particular was arguably in some ways an important factor in Glazunov's contribution to the repertoire of the *Velikorusskii orkestr*. This is not to say that Wagner's music *per se* found its way into the music Glazunov composed for Andreev's Russian folk orchestra. Of relevance to Glazunov's contribution to the *Velikorusskii orkestr* repertoire was the Wagnerian innovation of composing for and including into the symphonic collective a number of improved, but contemporaneously unconventional musical instruments.⁹⁵ This was an innovation which Glazunov embraced in principle and which he utilized in composing, as a symphonic composer, for the Russian folk instruments of Andreev's orchestra.

Andreev's association with open-minded, progressive artists such as Glazunov was a defining and necessary factor from the perspective of the artistic progression of the *balalaika Kruzhok* and subsequent Russian folk instrument orchestra. This is

⁹⁵ Imkhanitskii – page ref. for mention of Wagner, Haydn and Mozart.

exemplified by Glazunov's contribution of his composition 'Русская фантазия' to the *Velikorusskii orkestr* repertoire, for this was arguably the natural progression from the innovative contributions of Fomin's adaptations of both Russian folk songs and classical pieces for folk orchestral performance.

6.5.1 Glazunov's *Russian Fantasia* ('*Russkaia fantaziiia*')

Glazunov's first meeting with Andreev at the invitation of Beliaev in autumn 1889 (see 6.3.1 and 6.3.2) helped pave the way for the future *symphonic* transition of Andreev's yet to be expanded *balalaika Kruzhok*. And yet the artistic transition the composer himself was to make from symphonic to folk instrumental composition was a vindication of Andreev's belief in the scope and artistic credibility of Russian folk instrumental performance.

Imkhanitskii takes the view that Rimsky-Korsakov's opera 'Kitezh' (or, to give it its full title, '*Skazanie o nevidimom grade Kitezhe i deve Fevronii*') was the main stimulus for Glazunov in composing 'Русская фантазия' for Andreev's *Velikorusskii orkestr*.⁹⁶ Contrasting with this view was that which seemingly prevailed prior to Imkhanitskii's 1987 publication, i.e., that Tchaikovsky's Third Movement *Scherzo* from his Fourth Symphony (1877-8) was Glazunov's inspiration for composing '*Russkaia fantaziiia*'. This latter view is merited, for example, by the fact that Glazunov's composition was the logical next step forward from the Conservatoire graduate Fomin's adaptation of the Tchaikovsky *Scherzo* for Andreev's orchestra. Another reason to support the latter view may be that, although Fomin adapted other classical pieces for the *Velikorusskii orkestr*, his adaptation of the Tchaikovsky *Scherzo* develops and highlights specific

⁹⁶ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, pp.118-119.

balalaika and *domra* playing characteristics. The movement's *scherzo* is a *pizzicato-ostinato*, i.e., constantly repeating passages of plucked string melody.⁹⁷

The combination of both balalaikas and domras performing this piece naturally highlighted the contrasting *timbres* of both types of Russian folk instrument, as well as the range of their artistic scope and dynamics. The exploitation of the scope of these instruments was taken to new levels by Glazunov's '*Russkaia fantaziia*'.

Glazunov's work on '*Russkaia fantaziia*' was completed in November 1905 and was dedicated to Andreev's *Velikorusskii orkestr*. It has been long recognized as a work which has contributed greatly to the Russian folk orchestral repertoire generally, as well as to the repertoire of Andreev's orchestra in particular, given the originality of Glazunov's creation at that time. It is a composition which is constructed around two juxtaposing themes. The slow, measured first theme takes its influence from the characteristic recitation of traditional Russian folk *byliny*. The second theme is an energetic, traditional Russian folk-dance style. The music overall is grand and highminded, projecting a wide variety of images, colours and textures.⁹⁸

Imkhanitskii shows that Glazunov's composition seemingly bears a significant relation to Rimsky-Korsakov's opera '*Kitezh*'. Both themes of '*Russkaia fantaziia*' are similar in *intonation* to the two themes in the Rimsky-Korsakov opera. This is largely due to the fact that the original version of the score to '*Kitezh*' included parts for a Russian orchestra of *domry* and *balalaiki*. The opening melodies of '*Kitezh*' and '*Russkaia*

⁹⁷ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p. 117. The Trio section includes other orchestral sections, i.e., strings, brass, woodwind (the only percussion is the timpani). The symphony's Fourth Movement also has strong folk music connections, with a secondary melody based on the Russian folk song 'Vo pole bereza stoiala'.

⁹⁸ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p. 120

fantazia' confirm, in Imkhanitskii's view, that the themes of both versions are perceptibly similar to each other.⁹⁹

Another major influence on Glazunov's composition is Glinka's '*Kamarinskaia*'. Tchaikovsky himself stated in his diaries that the whole of Russian symphonic music was contained in '*Kamarinskaia*', 'just as the whole oak is contained in the acorn'. For Glazunov to be in association with Tchaikovsky, Rimsky-Korsakov and other Russian artists of similar ilk was important in itself for the direction of Russian folk instrumental music. In the case of Glazunov specifically, it was only to the advantage of Russian folk orchestral culture that such a widely-acclaimed symphonist as he took it upon himself to make such a major contribution to that genre. The Soviet musicologist V.A. Tsukerman provides a neat summary of this view when he asserts regarding '*Russkaia fantazia*' that it represented 'the first work for the folk orchestra, developing the traditions of Glinka on a high level'.¹⁰⁰

Tsukerman's view is not misplaced or overstated considered alongside further analysis of '*Russkaia fantazia*'. As in Glinka's '*Kamarinskaia*', Imkhanitskii explains, 'Glazunov gives the two contrasting themes an intensive variational development'. He points out that this was the 'first time in a Russian folk instrumental orchestra' that *polyphony* was utilized 'as an important tool' for such a purpose. Both the slow and rapid themes are developed mainly with the help of those *polyphonic* tools, with *contrapuntal* resolutions intertwining with distinctive accompaniments which then resolve together into a *reprise*, and which are illuminated with elements of mirroring *polyphony*. These compositional qualities alone illustrate how '*Russkaia fantazia*' is

⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid. Imkhanitskii refers here to V.I. Tsukerman, '*Kamarinskaia*' *Glinki i ee traditsii v russkoi muzyke* (Moscow: Gos. muzykal'noe izd-vo, 1957), p.409.

highly regarded as ‘the first example of a [Russian] folk orchestra’ embodying ‘purely symphonic music’ [my emphasis]. The striving for the synthesis of both themes into a *reprise*, the ‘polyphonically intense fabric’ and the ‘relatively complex’ modulations are firm evidence of a work composed by an accomplished and experienced composer. This is also apparent in Glazunov’s principles of developing thematic material in the piece. He sections off the dance theme into sub-sections, with different keys and a combination of separate melodies (and their variations). Glazunov typically employed these methods for the intonational development in many of his own symphonies.¹⁰¹

And yet Glazunov’s compositional approach to a Russian folk instrument orchestra is different to that of a symphony orchestra. He explained that with the symphony orchestra he was trying to achieve a sound ‘similar to that of the ideal piano in the hands of the ideal pianist’. With ‘*Russkaia fantazia*’, however, Glazunov had to take account of the small number of *timbres* of a Russian folk instrument orchestra at that time, i.e., early 1900s. Therefore, he tried to maximize the strength of each individual group of instruments. This was achieved by there being almost no occasions when *domry*, *balalaiki* and *gusli* repeat each other. The *balalaika* group is almost free from functioning as accompanying harmony. The *balalaika* section becomes melodically *domra*-esque in its own right with its frequent soloing passages. Moreover, all the *balalaika* parts are developed melodically, including not only the *balalaika* primas, but also the *sekund*, *al’t* and bass *balalaiki*, which would normally be used almost exclusively for accompaniment. This is exemplified in the opening to the second development of the (second) dance theme.

¹⁰¹ ibid.

The piece is also notable from an artistic point of view for its unusual five-barred sectioning of the melody, a detail characteristic of the poetic art of Russian folk music. Future artists of Russian folk music composition were guided by this trait of Glazunov's music score, as well as those of the extreme branching out of its polyphonic fabric, the grand technical dynamics scored for the instruments, and the grand scale of the overall composition.

In conclusion, there are two factors which underline the magnitude of Glazunov's '*Russkaia fantazia*' for Andreev's work and its legacy. Firstly, the piece played a significant role in the development of other Russian folk orchestras contemporaneous to Andreev's orchestra as it 'forced critics of Andreev's Russian folk instrument orchestra to change their opinions' about it. This was a vindication for Andreev's work. Andreev realized this well when he wrote to Glazunov:

'The *Velikorusskii orkestr*, proud of the worldwide fame of its native composer, is happy that at this moment it can say "great thanks" to you for the precious new gift that you wished to contribute to the treasury of native art. You were the first to write a special composition for the *Velikorusskii orkestr*, and thus became the founder of literature for Russian folk instruments; if Glazunov's name stands at the head of this literature, is it possible to doubt its further development and prosperity?'

'Великорусский оркестр, гордясь всемирной славой родного композитора, счастлив, что в эту минуту может сказать Вам «великое спасибо» за драгоценнейший новый дар, который Вы пожелали внести в сокровищницу родного искусства. Вы первый написали специальное

сочинение для Великорусского оркестра, и тем самым стали основателем литературы для русских народных инструментов; если же во главе этой литературы стоит имя Глазунова – возможно ль сомневаться в дальнейшем её развитии и процветании?’¹⁰²

Secondly, a respected St. Petersburg music critic, writing in the newspaper *Slovo* a few months after the 26 February 1906 premiere of ‘*Russkaia fantaziia*’, spoke of a ‘new era’ beginning for Russian folk musical instruments. He added that the *Velikorusskii orkestr* had been accepted as of ‘individual, artistic value’ in respect of ‘its sound and technical abilities.’ The basis for this conclusion, he explained, was that [Andreev’s] instrumental collective had ‘...an original, beautiful and, in some cases, inimitable sound’, paving the way for similarly sophisticated compositions in the future.¹⁰³

6.6 N.I. Privalov: Scholar of Russian Folk Instruments

This chapter has hitherto mainly focused on certain of Andreev’s colleagues whose classically trained and professional Conservatoire backgrounds had singled them out as ideal collaborators in Andreev’s work. But there were some among Andreev’s main colleagues who, not being exclusively classically trained Conservatoire musicians, contributed additional professional qualities conducive to the development and appeal of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* on a musically artistic level. Nikolai Ivanovich Privalov (1868-1928) is one such figure.

¹⁰² Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p. 120

¹⁰³ Ibid.

It is precisely Privalov's multi-faceted professional background which testifies to the significance of the work he undertook and achieved both with Andreev, and for the advancement of the Russian folk instrumental music genre. He was a graduate of the St. Petersburg Mining Institute and for many years worked as a geological engineer. He took a serious interest in music composition and began studying both composition and music theory with Professor N.F. Solov'yov of the St. Petersburg Conservatoire. He also undertook lessons in harmony, counterpoint, instrumentation under other well-established St. Petersburg musicians, in particular V.E. Savinskii, K.N. Chernov and I.V. Labinskii. Privalov's grounding in music enabled him to write four operas, as well as two symphonies and music for stage dramas. This is especially significant as the majority of his compositions were written for Russian folk instrument orchestra accompaniment.¹⁰⁴ According to Privalov himself, he had by the early 1900s written 'up to 5,000 songs, arrangements, compositions, transpositions and pot-pouri' for Russian folk instrument orchestra, most of which 'had been played, or were still being performed'. One of his pieces which enjoyed particular success at concerts featuring Andreev's *Velikorusskii orkestr* was Privalov's 'Polianka', a dance theme from the second act of his opera 'Na Volge' (see 6.6. b)).¹⁰⁵

Privalov was also important for his educational work, very much mirroring the *pedagogical* aspect of Andreev's educational activities. For example, he organized free folk music classes for 'working people' at a St. Petersburg People's House (*Narodnyi dom*). As part of those classes, he organized both a 'velikorusskii' orchestra (like Andreev's orchestra, comprising folk instruments found in *Velikorossia*) and an 'ancient Russian folk orchestra', i.e, consisting of the ancient Russian folk instruments

¹⁰⁴ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, pp.74-75.

¹⁰⁵ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p. 75.

the *domra*, *gusli* and a choir of Russian horns (*rozhki*). Other similarities between Privalov's and Andreev's work were that: a) his Russian folk instrument orchestra performed not only his own pieces (e.g., Russian folk pieces adapted and transposed for folk instruments), but also famous 'classical', Russian operatic works such as M.M. Sokolovskii's 'The Miller Who Was a Wizard, a Cheat and a Matchmaker' (*Mel'nik – koldun, obmanshchik i svat*) and M.I. Glinka's 'Ivan Susanin'; b) he also wrote and compiled a self-tuition manual for *gusli zvonchatye* (1903), and for the *balalaika* (1927); c) he authored articles on methods of organizing Russian folk instrument orchestras. Andreev published his *A Reference Book or Short Guide for the Equipment of the Great Russian Orchestra (Spravochnik ili kratkoe rukovodstvo dlja oborudovaniia Velikorusskogo orkestra)* in 1916 (see Chapter 3.3(c)). Additionally, Privalov was an editor of the journal 'Music and Singing' (*Muzyka i penie*) between 1914 and 1917.¹⁰⁶

Privalov was also an ethnographer. Between 1908 and 1919 he was Associate professor of Music Folklore at the St. Petersburg Archaeological institute. The numerous historical and ethnographic research papers he published after the 1917 Revolution on Russian musical instruments ought to have been of great significance both to the continuation of Andreev's work and to the cause of Russian folk instrumental music generally. However, as Akulovich points out, his work in this area has not received the recognition it deserves by 'modern researchers' on Andreev (see conclusion to this section). Akulovich adds that instrumentology researchers who have analysed Privalov's work on the history of Russian musical instruments have criticized the 'dilettantism of his work'. But he notes the 'high value' of those portions of

¹⁰⁶ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.75fn4, and V.I. Akulovich, 'N.I. Privalov – issledovatel' russkikh narodnykh muzykal'nykh instrumentov' in Karpenok, *Tvorcheskoe nasledie V.V. Andreeva*, p.85.

Privalov's work focusing on the 'Russian folk instruments then in existence' and, in particular, his 'ethnographic observations' about them.¹⁰⁷

As a graduate of the St. Petersburg Archaeology Institute (1903), much of Privalov's study of the history of Russian folk instruments was undertaken from the academic perspective of a professional archaeologist. This interest found expression in, and was consolidated by the Department of Folk and Song Creativity' (*Kafedra narodno-pesennogo tvorchestva*) which he both founded, and later headed for some considerable time. Imkhanitskii describes as 'truly educational' the database Privalov compiled on Andreev's work on creating a Russian folk instrument orchestra. And writing a year prior to Akulovich, Imkhanitskii apparently contradicts accusations of 'dilettantism' levied against Privalov by asserting that 'the publications of this academic' (i.e., Privalov) which are 'dedicated to the origins of the *domra*, *balalaika*, *gudok* and various Russian wind and percussion folk instruments 'still remain significant up to the present day'.¹⁰⁸

6.6.1 Privalov and Andreev's *Velikorusskii orkestr*

Privalov's ethnographical interest in musical instruments pointed his direction into Andreev's *Velikorusskii orkestr*. Underlining that interest was Privalov's enthusiasm for the zither, which he played to a reasonable standard. A musical instrument disseminated around Austria and Germany, the zither is a plucked, stringed instrument, having the appearance of a box (i.e., body) with strings, and often with a fretted neck

¹⁰⁷ Akulovich, 'N.I. Privalov', p.85.

¹⁰⁸ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p. 75

attached to it.¹⁰⁹ Both the construction, and the method of playing the zither were not so dissimilar to that of the *gusli*. Therefore, Privalov would prove to be an ideal *gusli* player (see quote from Andreev below). Moreover, it was for his prowess as a solo and accompaniment *gusliar* that Privalov became a highly regarded member of Andreev's *Velikorusskii orkestr*.

However, Privalov's early participation in Andreev's Russian folk instrumental collective began with Andreev teaching him to play the *prima balalaika*.¹¹⁰ And yet, Privalov made an immediate contribution of his own to Andreev's work. He introduced to Andreev a number of various ancient Russian folk instruments which he had collected around Russia. These included not only *balalaiki*, but also other instruments which would expand the range and richness of the *timbre* of the *Velikorusskii orkestr*, i.e., horns and the *zhaleika*.

Andreev fully recognized the importance of Privalov's contribution in expanding Andreev's Russian folk instrument collective. He wrote to Privalov concerning the incorporation into the *balalaika* collective of the *gusli* and Russian folk wind and percussion instruments as follows:

'I am thinking of restoring all the instruments played by the people of the state of Moscow, that is, the central part of Russia; I am adding domras to my balalaikas... then I will restore the *gusli*, making them from mahogany with luxurious decoration and gilding. I ask you to take part in this new orchestra of mine as a *guslar*, which will not be difficult for you as a guitarist. Next, I add

¹⁰⁹ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, pp. 74-75

¹¹⁰ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, pp. 74-75

your “*zhaleika*” to the orchestra, as well as *rozhki*, and, probably, *gudki* (if you can find them in popular circulation, finally, other percussion instruments)’¹¹¹

‘Я думаю восстановить все инструменты, на которых играл народ государства московского, то есть средней полосы России; к моим балалайкам присоединяю я домры... затем восстановлю гусли, изготавив их из красного дерева с роскошной отделкой и позолотою. Прошу Вас принять участие в этом новом моём оркестре в качестве гусляра, что Вам как цитристу будет нетрудно. Далее, я присоединяю к оркестру и Вашу «жалейку», а также рожки, вероятно, гудки (если удастся найти их в народном обращении, наконец, накры и другие ударные)’.¹¹¹

Among those ‘other percussion instruments’ to which Andreev refers were ancient Russian *lozhki* (*metal spoons*). Privalov introduced these Russian folk percussive instruments into the *Velikorusskii orkestr* quite successfully. This was especially the case in his 1902 opera ‘*Na Volge*’ (‘On the Volga’) specifically in the piece ‘*Tanets skomorokhov*’ (‘Dance of the Minstrels’), which was based on a theme of the Ural dance ‘*Polianka*’ (‘Little Glade’) (see 6.6 a)).¹¹²

It was from September 1896 that Privalov became a full member of Andreev’s renamed *Velikorusskii orkestr* as a *gusli* player. He also undertook several other roles in that capacity. These included not only his contribution of a wide selection of his musical compositions and other pieces from that time (see 6.6 a)). As with other

¹¹¹ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, pp. 75-76. Imkhanitskii quotes this from N. Privalov, ‘Tridtsatiletie velikorusskogo orkestra’, *Smena*, No.240, 17 Oct., 1926. This correspondence from Andreev to Privalov is not included in Granovskii’s *Materialy i dokumenty*.

¹¹² Akulovich, ‘N.I. Privalov’ , p. 96

Velikorusskii orkestr members, Privalov also undertook a role in teaching Russian folk instrumental playing in the army. In that capacity he became Andreev's assistant.¹¹³

In musicological terms, Privalov's careful study of the history and origins of the *gusli* remains a very important factor in strengthening the viability of the Russian folk orchestral collective into which Andreev's *balalaika* ensemble expanded by 1896. Being an established archaeologist, Privalov dedicated many years of his life to researching the origins and evolution of folk instruments. His research work on the *gusli* illustrates the depth of that dedication. It is indeed reasonable to assert its relevance academically and musicologically to the genre of Russian folk instrumental and orchestral performance on account of the fact that the research was undertaken by a *Velikorusskii orkestr* member. For example, we learn from Privalov's article 'Zvonchatye *gusli* in Rus' about the 'evolution of the *gusli* from its 'most ancient type' (five-stringed version) up to the modern type as it stood at the time Privalov was writing.¹¹⁴ Among Privalov's detailed observations in the article are: descriptions and explanations of peasant *gusli* performers from both past and present; descriptions of their methods of *gusli* playing; descriptions and explanations of the structure of the instrument itself.¹¹⁵

Akulovich has remarked on the difficulties in accessing Privalov's academic works on the origins of Russian folk musical instruments. He surmises that this inaccessibility is due to many pre-1917 articles published in periodicals and other 'specialist' editions being lost in the upheaval of the 1917 revolution. This, Akulovich adds, is reflected by the fact that 'even the most reputable' catalogue sources do not contain full lists of

¹¹³ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.76

¹¹⁴ Akulovich, 'N.I. Privalov', p.96. This article was originally published in the journal *Muzika i penie* in 1908, issue no. 7.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*

Privalov's published works.¹¹⁶ The works which do remain available to scrutiny, however, illustrate quite adequately the academic calibre of Privalov's research as a valuable contribution to Andreev's work (see Chapter 2.3).

It is difficult to disagree with Imkhanitskii's view that Privalov played a leading role in founding 'the principles' for the reconstruction, improvement and introduction of Russian folk musical instruments into the Russian folk *orchestral* collective.¹¹⁷ This is well illustrated by the work Privalov undertook (along with Andreev) with the peasant carpenter and craftsman Semyon Nalimov, who was entrusted with crafting Russian folk stringed instruments for the *Velikorusskii orkestr* from 1897 (see 6.5).

6.7 S.I. Nalimov: 'Stradivarius' of the Russian *balalaika*

Semyon Ivanovich Nalimov (1 February 1857-22 August 1916) was, like Karkin (see section 6.2), another of Andreev's collaborators whose sophisticated contribution to Andreev's work belied his background. Nalimov was a joiner ('*stoliar*') by occupation, although he was also conscripted in 1878 and served until 1884 when he was discharged with the rank of *starshii unter-ofitser*. His military records refer to him as 'semi-literate', but as someone who 'knows his craft of carpentry'.¹¹⁸ In Nalimov's postscript to a letter he wrote in 1908, he confirms his status and title as a 'peasant of the Vil'gotdka volost' and village, Ust'-Sysol'sky uezd, Vologda region (retired lower rank, senior non-commissioned officer)."¹¹⁹

¹¹⁶ Akulovich, 'N.I. Privalov', p. 97.

¹¹⁷ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.76

¹¹⁸ A.I. Peresada, *Balalaechnykh del master* (Syktyvkar: Komi knizhnoe izdatelstvo, 1983), p.13

¹¹⁹ Letter No. 32, S.I. Nalimov to Andreev, 10 May 1908 and endnotes 1. and 2, in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.177, p.323

The high quality of Nalimov's craftsmanship of Russian folk string instruments was recognized by experts among his contemporaries. A.V. Ossovskii (musicologist and professor at the St. Petersburg (subsequently Leningrad) Conservatoire) hailed him as the 'Stradivarius of the Russian *balalaika*'.¹²⁰ This high praise appeared in print in 1907 in connection with the creation of Andreev's *Velikorusskii orkestr* of Russian folk instruments, for which Nalimov crafted the instruments.¹²¹

It is also testimony to Nalimov's work that Russian folk string (i.e. plucked) instruments have undergone 'little change' since Nalimov (in collaboration with Andreev) 'improved them': contemporary craftsmen continue to follow Nalimov's examples to this day.¹²² Of the Russian folk instruments he crafted (he also contributed towards the improvement of the *gusli* – see section 6.1), Nalimov's main focus was crafting *balalaiki* and *domry*.

6.7.1 Balalaika

Peresada takes the view that it is a 'complete certainty' that *balalaiki* and *domry* would never have been perfected to the level Nalimov achieved, had Andreev not 'had the fortune of meeting him'.¹²³ However, as with other forms of artistic inheritance, Nalimov himself inherited some of his craftsmanship from Ivanov and Paserbskii and based his initial *balalaiki* on the two St. Petersburg craftsmen's models (see Chapter 3.2.1 & section 6.1.).¹²⁴ Questions about the beginnings of Nalimov's craftsmanship

¹²⁰ An allusion to the outstanding violin, viola and cello craftsmanship undertaken by the Italian Stradivari family (esp. Antonio Stradivari) during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

¹²¹ Peresada cites Ossovskii's words from *Izvestiia Sankt-Peterburgskogo obshchestva muzykalnykh sobranii*, in Peresada, *Balalaechnykh del...*, p.3

¹²² Peresada, *Balalaechnykh del...*, p.7

¹²³ *ibid.*

¹²⁴ *ibid.*

of *balalaiki* for Andreev have been clarified by Peresada. He points out that, according to A. Ilyukhin, Nalimov began working for Andreev in 1890. Fomin contradicts this in his memoirs about Andreev. Although he provides no specific date from which Nalimov began working for Andreev, Fomin ascribes the start of Nalimov's crafting of *balalaiki* to 1894. On 21 July 1895, however, a military superior of *Ust'-Sysol'skii uezd* reported to the *Politseiskoe upravlenie* that Nalimov was based temporarily at *Vyshnevolutskii uezd* of *Tverskaia guberniia* and had moved to 'another temporary residence in the town of Bezhetsk', *Tverskaia guberniia*. Peresada states that it follows that this was the date and year that Andreev summoned Nalimov to work for him as his musical craftsman.¹²⁵ Bezhetsk was Andreev's hometown and was situated on his estate where he would later base his workshop (see above 6.1).

As with Andreev's work with his Russian folk instrument collectives (*Kruzhok* and orchestra), Nalimov's skill as a craftsman evolved over time. And yet even the first *balalaika* prima made by him from Andreev's drawings was 'a rare masterpiece by the standards of that time'.¹²⁶ This view is supported by comments Fomin made on two Nalimov *balalaiki* shown to him by Andreev. St. Petersburg Conservatoire professional musician Fomin stated in his memoirs that they were instruments of 'exquisite' quality. One immediate innovation by Nalimov was that he cut a 'window' instead of the standard resonator holes into the decks and inlaid them with various types of wood for decoration. This alternative resonator hole may not have made a significant improvement in itself to the overall *timbre* of the two instruments, although Fomin's observations are an indication of the overall quality of Nalimov's work. This is

¹²⁵ Peresada, *Balalaechnykh del...*, pp. 17-18

¹²⁶ Lachinov, 'Genial'ny samorodok', p.283

significant considering that these instruments represented the first of Nalimov's attempts at making *balalaiki*.¹²⁷

Other modifications Nalimov made as his craftsmanship developed included lengthening the *balalaika*'s *chromatic* scale. There were three transitional stages to this work. Nalimov's *prima balalaiki* originally had 16 frets up to C sharp of the second (12 note) octave, then 19 frets up to E of the second (12 note) octave, and then finally 24 frets up to A at the start of the third octave. There is evidence, however, that Nalimov's *balalaiki* still varied in the lengths of their chromatic scales after the transition to 24-fretted models. Attention is drawn to this fact in a letter V.M. Laletin (a *balalaika* player from Tomsk) wrote to Andreev in 1913. Laletin commented on his new Nalimov *balalaika* having only 19 frets. Laletin was expecting his new *balalaika* to have 24 frets, the chromatic range of the *balalaika* owned and shown to him several months earlier by B.S. Troianovskii (see below), by then the former virtuoso soloist of Andreev's *Velikorusskii orkestr*. Laletin wondered whether 24 frets would possibly impede some of the resonance of the *balalaika*'s sound.¹²⁸ This is uncertain as available sources do not reveal any detail on who possessed which *balalaiki* of any given chromatic range in Andreev's orchestra. However, a 24-fretted *balalaika* increased its scope, including for orchestral performance.

The success of Nalimov's work assisted Andreev's aim to disseminate the *balalaika* more widely. Andreev explains an example of this in his article 'The *Velikorusskii orkestr* and its significance for the *narod*'. Bringing down the cost of *balalaiki* available to the *narod* was possible by creating competition between *balalaika* craftsmen.

¹²⁷ Peresada, *Balalaechnykh del...*, p. 19.

¹²⁸ Endnote to Letter No. 69, V.M. Laletin to Andreev, 14 March 1913 in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.328.

Nalimov's craftsmanship was the basis of realizing this idea. Therefore, Andreev established a workshop on his estate in *Tverskaia guberniia*, the work-base of his 'outstanding "художник-мастер"' Nalimov. Andreev gave Nalimov's models of *balalaiki* (and *domry*) to other craftsmen as examples which they were free to use for creating their own instruments to the accuracy of Nalimov's models.¹²⁹ One such craftsman was the Nalimov 'pupil' P.V. Oglomin (see section 6.1). Evidence of the expertise in *balalaika*-making he had inherited from Nalimov is found in the reminiscences of N.A. Osipova, wife of the virtuoso *balalaika* player Nikolai Osipov (1900-1942). Andreev recommended to the talented young Osipov's parents that they should purchase from Oglomin a *balalaika kvarta* for the burgeoning virtuoso.¹³⁰

Other descriptions of the quality of Nalimov's craftsmanship are also found in another of Laletin's letters to Andreev. On inspecting Troianovskii's *balalaika* (a gift from Andreev), Laletin was struck by the quality of Nalimov's work. This 'wonderful instrument' was 'without decoration' and, in common with many of Nalimov's models, visually distinguished only by the way it was made and by Nalimov's insignia at the back (shoulder) of the instrument. Decoration was not a consideration for Laletin who asserted that the most important characteristics of a Nalimov *balalaika* were its sound and *timbre*.¹³¹

¹²⁹ Andreev, 'Velikorusskii orkestr i ego znachenie dlia naroda', in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.143

¹³⁰ N.V. Osipova, 'Andreev v zhizni Osipova', in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.264. The *balalaika kvarta* was dimensionally somewhere in between the *balalaika piccolo* and *balalaika prima* and would have been recommended by Andreev as it was more suited for playing by a child.

¹³¹ Letter No. 67, V.M. Laletin to Andreev, 6 December 1912, and endnote in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.196 and p.327.

6.7.2 Domra

The Nalimov *domra* first appeared in Andreev's Russian folk instrument collective in 1896 during the latter stages of its transition from *Kruzhok* to the *Velikorusskii orkestr* (see 'Karkin', section 6.2). For the tenth anniversary of Andreev's ensemble (1898), Nalimov made the first set of string instruments (*balalaiki* and *domry*) for the Russian orchestra for performance by sixteen players.¹³² This set of instruments included a range of *domry* to complement that of the *balalaiki*. The new *domra* range included the *tenor* and *contrabass* (double-bass) models. Peresada correctly observes that the introduction of these two *domra* ranges marked the completion of Nalimov's work on expanding the *domra* range.¹³³ However, the completion of this work also represents the full realization of the scope and potential of the *balalaika* and *domra* sets in orchestral performance.

6.7.3 Nalimov's Russian folk string instruments after 1896

By the turn of the twentieth century, the manufacturing of *balalaikas* was being undertaken by several companies, including I. Vinokurov, P. Rozmyslov and Yu. Zimmerman.¹³⁴ It is notable that it was also at the turn of the twentieth century that further contributions Nalimov made to Andreev's work with the *Velikorusskii orkestr* were confirmed by the success both collaborators enjoyed at the 1900 World Exhibition in Paris.¹³⁵

¹³² Peresada, *Balalaechnykh del...*, p.24.

¹³³ Ibid.

¹³⁴ Peresada, *Balalaechnykh del...*, pp.40-41

¹³⁵ There is some initial confusion surrounding the medal Nalimov received for his exhibited work at the 1900 Paris World Exhibition. This confusion arises from a letter he wrote in 1908 to thank Andreev for receiving what Granovskii says was a 'bronze' medal in recognition of his folk instrument craftsmanship at Andreev's Mar'ino workshop. This medal was delivered to Nalimov by S.L. Popov, a member of the

On 10 February 1899, Andreev successfully sought permission from the General Commissar of the Russian section of the Exhibition to set up a stall to exhibit Nalimov's improved Russian folk string instruments. This arguably served to maintain focus on Nalimov as the craftsman to be credited most for improvements in Russian folk string instruments. The quality of Nalimov's work on show at the 1900 Paris event was demonstrated by exhibiting comparisions of each improved instrument with its corresponding prototype.¹³⁶ An exhibition staged in St. Petersburg in 1907 displayed various Russian craftsmen's *balalaiki* and *domry* which were based on Nalimov's models.¹³⁷

The 1907 St. Petersburg Exhibition was staged in the same year that Ossovskii's *Izvestiya* article about the *Velikorusskii orkestr* appeared (see above). In the same article, the value of Nalimov's work is asserted by Ossovskii. Praising as 'exemplary' Andreev's workshop in Mar'ino (Vyshevolotskii uezd), Ossovskii adds that the 'Russian *balalaika* Stradivarius' (Nalimov) was by then making *balalaiki* and *domry* which were already valued at up to 300 roubles as a result of their 'superior musical qualities' and 'the beauty of their decoration'.¹³⁸ Nalimov continued crafting his

Velikorusskii orkestr (see Letter No. 32, S.I. Nalimov to Andreev, 10 May 1908 and endnotes 1. and 2. in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.177 and p.323.) It seems initially Ironic that the Russian *balalaika* craftsman Nalimov, hailed as the 'Stradivarius' of his work in his own lifetime, should have received only a bronze medal, while Andreev received a gold medal. The Nalimov letter itself is published in Granovskii's *Materialy i dokumenty* with redacted text, compounding the confusion regarding the type of medal to which Nalimov refers. Some clarity is offered by a letter Andreev wrote to a V.V. Ulvarov in 1906 in which Andreev expresses his belief that 'Rabota S.I. Nalimova nagrazhdena zolotoi medal'yu na Parizhskoi vystavke...' in 1900 (see Peresada, *Balalaechnykh del...*, pp.25-26.). The apparent late delivery of Nalimov's 1900 medal may be explained by Andreev's comments. It is likely that the medal to which Nalimov refers in his above letter is, in fact, the gold medal initially awarded to Andreev in 1900, and that Andreev gave it to Nalimov eight years later.

¹³⁶ Peresada, *Balalaechnykh del...*, p.24

¹³⁷ Peresada, *Balalaechnykh del...*, p.41

¹³⁸ Peresada, *Balalaechnykh del...*, p.3

superior Russian string instruments up to just before he died and his latest *balalaika* (№.170) was completed some time in 1915.¹³⁹

It is of some detriment to the history of Russian folk music culture that the fate of many of Nalimov's instruments remains unknown. Peresada confirms that some of them are in the hands of professional and amateur performers. Another 14 items are permanently exhibited in the (formerly Leningrad) Russian State Institute of Performing Arts, St. Petersburg, and another five preserved in the Glinka Museum of Music Culture in Moscow.¹⁴⁰

Nalimov's wider legacy concerning the inheritance of his craftsmanship by other contemporary craftsmen is evident from section 6.1. The continuing adherence to his very high standards of craftsmanship into the twenty-first century is further evidence of that wider legacy. His legacy concerning the contributions to Andreev's work with the *Velikorusskii orkestr*, in particular, is confirmed by the rapid growth of Andreev's *balalaika* collective into a Russian folk orchestra which was made possible by the addition of Nalimov's high-quality musical instruments to the expanding collective. This is echoed by Lachinov. He points to the increase in the number of the collective's group players, its orchestral colours and gradual development of the musicians' playing techniques in combination with the 'excellent sound' of the new set of instruments made in 1898 by Nalimov. This contribution by Nalimov allowed Andreev, with the participation of Fomin, Nasonov and later Niman, to enrich significantly the

¹³⁹ Peresada, *Balalaechnykh del...*, p.33

¹⁴⁰ Peresada, *Balalaechnykh del...*, pp.36-37

repertoire of the group, and to reorganise the *balalaika* group into the *Velikorusskii orkestr*.¹⁴¹

6.8 T.I. Filippov

Terentii (Tertii) Ivanovich Filippov¹⁴² is a figure whose educational background, state and social activities and pursuits in Russian music culture identify him as a key supporter of Andreev's work.¹⁴³ Filippov was a graduate of the *Istoriko-filologicheskii fakul'tet* of Moscow University and was a teacher of Russian language at a Moscow *gimnaziya* until 1856. He was also an honorary member of various institutions and societies, including the *Imperatorskaia Akademiya nauk* and the *Imperatorskoe russkoe geograficheskoe obshchestvo*. He held positions of responsibility and influence, including that of *chinovnik* of the Russian Orthodox Church's 'Святейший синод', as well as serving in the *Gosudarstvennyi kontrol'* from 1864, where he remained for the rest of his life. He became *Gosudarstvennyi kontrolyor* in 1889, in which capacity he provided assistance to Andreev (see also Chapter 7.2.1).¹⁴⁴

Of undoubted significance and relevance to Andreev's work was Filippov's interest in Russian folk songs and his activities in that sphere. He was a collector, highly reputed amateur performer (singer) and propagator of this aspect of Russian folk art. He was respected as an expert on the Russian folk song, being one of the first to emphasize the 'social and artistic significance' of Russian folk songs and traditions. The first public

¹⁴¹ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.285. The date and source of publication are not noted here.

¹⁴² Born in Rzhev, *Tveskaia oblast'*, 24 December 1825/5 January 1826–1899.

¹⁴³ Andreev himself acknowledges the contributions of other collectors and researchers of Russian folk songs to the debate about how Russian folk songs should be performed, i.e., Yu.N. Mel'gunov (1846–1893), V.P. Prokunin (1848–1910), P.P. Sokal'skii (1832–1887), N.E. Pal'chikov (1838–1888). See Andreev, 'K voprosu o russkoi narodnoi muzyke' (1899), in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.46 and endnote 6, p.306

¹⁴⁴ 'Filippov, Tertii Ivanovich', in *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar' Brokgauza i Efrona*, pp. 759–760

expression of his interest in the Russian folk song genre was the publication in 1882 of a manual entitled *40 Folk Songs, Collected by T.I. Filippov and Harmonized by N.A. Rimsky-Korsakov*.¹⁴⁵ Rimsky-Korsakov was the tutor of some of the St. Petersburg Conservatoire students who became either members or associates of Andreev's *balalaika Kruzhok* and orchestra (see sections 6.2, 6.3.1, 6.3.2 & 6.5). The majority of the songs included in the 1882 manual were examples of that genre which Filippov had heard both in his home town of Rzhev, and in Tver'.¹⁴⁶

The culmination of Filippov's passion for the Russian folk song was in 1884, when he organized and became the head of the 'Song Commission' for the collection, research and (from 1887) publication of Russian folk songs under the auspices of the Russian Geographical Society.¹⁴⁷ This initiative is highly significant when considered in light of its coincidental timing with the early phases of Andreev's work on improving the Russian *balalaika* and the establishment of his *balalaika Kruzhok* a few years later.

Emphasizing the 'enormous support' that Filippov gave to Andreev, Lachinov confirms Filippov's attendance at a concert given by the *Andreevskii kruzhok* (date and location unstated). It was on hearing that *Kruzhok* performance that Filippov was impressed by 'Andreev's idea', i.e., of collective Russian folk instrumental performance.¹⁴⁸

An example of the role and influence of Filippov and the Song Commission on Andreev's work is revealed in a letter Andreev wrote to Fomin in 1898. As well as requesting Fomin to work on writing 'Carmen', Andreev instructs Fomin to work on adaptations of folk songs from 'the manual' published by Filippov's Commission.

¹⁴⁵ ibid.

¹⁴⁶ ibid.

¹⁴⁷ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.40

¹⁴⁸ Lachinov, 'Genial'ny samorodok', p.285

Andreev emphasized his thought that many of the manual's wide range of songs would have artistic value, therefore implying that as such they would be suitable for adaptation.¹⁴⁹ It ought to be clarified here that Fomin did not rely on Filippov's manuals alone for adapting Russian folk songs for *Velikorusskii orkestr* performance generally; he also utilized the best examples of folk songs from M.A. Balakirev (see below in this section), V.P. Prokunin, I.V. Nekrasov, and N.I. Abramychev.¹⁵⁰ The 'collection' to which Andreev refers Fomin, is likely to be the 1894 edition of *Songs of the Russian Folk*.¹⁵¹ It was one of a number of manuals published by the Commission.

Another example of Filippov's support of Andreev occurred in the fifth year of Andreev's work teaching *balalaika*-playing to soldiers in the Russian army (1896).

Andreev sought Filippov's advice about allowing 80-100 of Andreev's soldier *balalaika* players to perform in a concert staged annually in the Mariinsky Theatre for the benefit of disabled people. Approving Andreev's plan, Filippov wrote to General N.I. Bobrikov of the St. Petersburg Garrison. Filippov emphasized Andreev's unpaid, hitherto five-year army teaching role and its positive results for the soldiers as a reason not to refuse his request. Filippov's letter prompted an invitation for Andreev to meet with Bobrikov. Andreev was told initially to 'wait another year', as his request had been submitted too late for consideration for his soldiers' inclusion in the *Mariinskii teatr* concert. This, Bobrikov advised, would mean another year for Andreev to promote the *balalaika* in the army. Although one year later Andreev's request for his soldiers' participation in the same annual charity concert was refused, he was certain this was

¹⁴⁹ Letter No.3, Andreev to Fomin, 6 July 1898, in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.146

¹⁵⁰ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, pp.113-14

¹⁵¹ Published under the names F.M. Istomin and G.O. Dyutsh (Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, endnote 2 to above letter to Fomin, p.313).

due simply to ‘prejudice’ against Russian folk instruments.¹⁵² On this occasion, the reluctance of military personnel to include Russian folk instruments in a charity concert event was arguably not fuelled by any serious artistic evaluations of Andreev’s work and, therefore, does not render the refusal of Filippov’s request on Andreev’s behalf a failure.

Filippov’s assistance and influence in higher circles did yield results for Andreev’s army teaching work. It was only with Filippov’s help that Andreev was successful in securing Government permission for a group of eleven of his *balalaika* teachers to be employed in the St. Petersburg Garrison starting from September 1897. This officially recognized arrangement included Andreev being made ‘Head Folk Music Teacher for Troops of the Guards’ (*Zveduiushchii prepodavaniem narodnoi muzyki v voiskakh gvardii*).¹⁵³

This successful appointment of Andreev and his *balalaika* teachers to their new, official positions in the army may have its roots in a concert which Filippov helped Andreev to organize earlier in the same year. For this 4 January 1897 concert, Fomin contributed adaptations of eight Russian folk songs from Filippov’s *sbornik* for performance by the *Velikorusskii orkestr*. Filippov himself organized his own choir to perform with the orchestra. There was also participation from classical artists, i.e., the opera singers Nikolai Figner (lyric *tenor*) and Medea Mei-Figner (*mezzo-soprano*) and the cellist A.V. Verzhbulovich. The event was staged before the ‘cream of [Russian] society’.¹⁵⁴

¹⁵² Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, pp.130-133

¹⁵³ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.71

¹⁵⁴ Baranov, *Podvizhni muzykoi narodnoi*, p.57

Andreev's own writings demonstrate how importantly he viewed his army teaching work (see Chapter 7.2.1). It seems likely, therefore, that this 4 January 1897 concert was staged to draw attention to the artistic potential of Russian folk instrumental and choral performance at the time when he was planning to seek, with the help of Filippov, state support for his teaching work in the Army, so crucial for the *dissemination* of Russian folk instruments in Russia. It was shortly after this concert that Filippov was allowed to apply (on behalf of Andreev) for the provision of the teaching of Russian folk music in the army for 'higher [Government] consideration'. Subsequently, on 22 March 1897, the Government issued its order concerning Filippov's army teaching request (the 'government decree on teaching lower ranks to play the balalaika'). This order secured for Andreev a salary (albeit modest) for his work and, most importantly, officially recognized status in Russian society (see also Chapter 7.2.1).¹⁵⁵

This aspect of Andreev's work grew in impetus with further assistance from Filippov. In a letter Andreev wrote to Filippov in 1899, Andreev requested guidance about further increasing the number of army teachers, thus expanding the sphere of their work in order to facilitate the wider dissemination of Russian folk instruments in the *narod*. Subsequently, the number of teachers increased significantly.¹⁵⁶

Filippov's support for Andreev did not initially impress one of Russia's then established artists. The pianist, conductor and composer Milii Alekseyevich Balakirev (1837-1910) warmed to Andreev's work with the *Velikorusskii orkestr* after originally harbouring negative views about the role of Russian folk music and Andreev personally. He expressed those views to Filippov in a letter of 10 July 1895 in an attempt to dissuade

¹⁵⁵ *ibid.*

¹⁵⁶ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.15

Filippov from supporting Andreev's work in the army. Balakirev spoke disparagingly in the letter about the 'Andreevskii idea' of teaching the 'art of *balalaika* playing' to the soldiers and stressed that, 'it's too risky to make an alliance with the *balalaika* player Andreev. I don't know him, but I have grounds not to trust him...' In the same letter, Balakirev advocated that the soldiers should have the opportunity 'to sing as they sang in villages without the civilized *balalaika* of Andreev'.¹⁵⁷

Gosudarstvennyi kontroler Filippov was not influenced by Balakirev's view, as is evident from the above examples of the support Andreev received from him after 1895. And in the context of Filippov's association with Andreev's work, the choreographer and *ballettmeister* M.M. Fokin (11[23] April 1880–22 August 1942) briefly assesses Filippov's artistic interests as being inclined towards 'all that was original' in art.¹⁵⁸ This view is afforded some credibility given Fokin's own involvement with two Russian folk instrumental orchestras. Around the end of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, he was a participant in an orchestra founded and led by P.O. Saveliev which featured *gudok* players among its musicians (see Chapter 2.2.3). He also participated in Andreev's *Velikorusskii orkestr*, and was introduced by Andreev to Filippov who, Fokin had heard, was a friend of the poet and playwright Aleksandr Nikolaevich Ostrovskii (31 March [o.s.] 1823–2 June [o.s.] 1886) and 'a very important person in the realm of the arts'.¹⁵⁹ This and above examples underline the importance that Filippov attributed to Andreev's artistic endeavours for Russian folk music in spite of his detractors.

¹⁵⁷ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.90fn3.

¹⁵⁸ M.M. Fokin, 'Andreev i moi vystupleniia v orkestre narodnykh instrumentov', in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.229

¹⁵⁹ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.229 and endnote p.335. Note: Ostrovsky gives his greatest heroine, Katerina, folk songs to sing as part of her assertion of her autonomous identity in the play *Groza* ('The Thunderstorm').

6.9 – V.T. Nasonov

Another St. Petersburg Conservatoire pupil who was lured by Andreev's work was the classically trained flautist Vladimir Trifonovich Nasonov (1860-1918). His association with Andreev is said to have begun as early as 1888 with the *Kruzhok liubitelei igry na balalaikakh*, although available source material does not provide any specific details of that early involvement. His direct participation in Andreev's soon to be renamed *Kruzhok* did not begin, however, until 1895.¹⁶⁰

Nasonov's versatility was a great asset to Andreev's expanded orchestra. In addition to his professional training on the flute, he proved to be an accomplished *al't* and *kontrabas balalaika* player.¹⁶¹ And as Andreev's Russian folk instrumental collective was expanded, Nasonov also performed in the orchestra on the Russian folk woodwind instruments the *brelka*¹⁶² and the *svirel'*¹⁶³ – see Chapters 1.2.2 and 2.2.3.⁶³⁶ He also contributed his own original works to the orchestra's repertoire, as well as adaptations and transpositions of classical pieces. His main input, however, was as a teacher-trainer of Russian folk instruments in the Russian armed forces. He was already undertaking this army role soon after becoming a participant in Andreev's Russian folk orchestra, proving in that capacity to be an indispensable assistant to Andreev in helping to organize soldiers' *domra-balalaika* collectives.

¹⁶⁰ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.74

¹⁶¹ *ibid.*

¹⁶² A wooden wind instrument with vibrating reed mouthpiece having five or six fingerholes, the latter six finger hole version improved by Andreev. This instrument was introduced to him by Afanasii Ykovlev, a peasant *brelka* player of Tver' province's *Vyshnevolotskii uezd*. Andreev, 'O brelke i igroke na nei krest'ianine Afanasii Iakovlev' in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.40

¹⁶³ Ancient wind instrument with two reedpipes played simultaneously, dating from 11th century *Rus'*, 'Nakry i svirel' (short feature/interview published in 'Peterburgskaia gazeta' No.297, 29 October, 1898) in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.43

⁶³⁶ Imkhanitski, *U istokov...*, p.74

The value of his contribution to Russian folk instrumental music theory is demonstrated by the many *balalaika* and *domra* self-tuition manuals he produced, as well as by his manuals and guidebooks for Russian folk instrumental orchestras. He also facilitated the writing and publication of a large collection of manuals for singing accompaniment to the repertoire of Andreev's *Velikorusskii orkestr*. Among the music scores he contributed to Andreev's orchestra were included a number of adaptations and *fantasias*, as well as many transpositions for the Russian folk instrument orchestra.¹⁶⁴

6.9.1 Nasonov as *помощник* to Andreev

Andreev clearly esteemed Nasonov highly as a professional musician. This is revealed, for example, in Andreev's letter to him in April 1911 in which he entrusted Nasonov with taking charge of a rehearsal of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* for its upcoming benefit concert. Andreev lent 'particular significance' to the rehearsal, both musically, and with regard to the discipline of the orchestra's musicians. He placed emphasis on the importance of 'paid teaching staff' (such as Nasonov) 'scrupulously undertaking their responsibilities as teachers' of Russian folk instruments in the St. Petersburg garrison, as well as the responsibilities of the 'other members' of the orchestra itself.¹⁶⁵

Andreev himself was reputedly a disciplinarian as a *balalaika* teacher, both in his own orchestra and in his teaching role in the army. The measure of his trust in Nasonov's professionalism in maintaining high standards during rehearsal is underpinned by Andreev's closing remarks on orchestral discipline. Under Nasonov's direction,

¹⁶⁴ loc.cit

¹⁶⁵ Letter 23, V.V. Andreev to V.T. Nasonov, 8 April 1911, in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, pp.157 & 316

Andreev says, 『I have no doubt that the members of the orchestra will treat their duties with full conscientiousness, and I consider violation of such duties unacceptable』 (『Ne somnevaius», *chto chleny orkestra otnesutsia s polnoi dobrosostnost'iu k svoim obiazannostiam, i narushenie takovykh schitaiu nedopustimym»*.)¹⁶⁶

And several items in Nasonov's published correspondence confirm his reliability as an assistant to Andreev in practical and in academic matters pertaining to the functions, roles and impact of the *Velikorusskii orkestr*. His letter of January 1912 covers two areas of interest. Alluding initially to his *Velikorusskii orkestr* activist role as a teacher in the armed forces' *Tsarskoe selo* garrison, Nasonov is mindful of the need for four hours practice per day to maintain the 'integrity' of their (i.e. his and Andreev's) 'success'. He also reveals the high standards expected of him by promising to report in person to Andreev 'как лист перед травой', by 8.00pm the following evening, to deliver a full report, including all paperwork on his recent army teaching work.¹⁶⁷

Also of interest in this letter are the concerns Nasonov expresses about a specific order for Russian folk stringed instruments from Germany. This 'order for Germany' likely relates to the then ongoing interest in Russian folk music which the *Velikorusskii orkestr* generated on its 1908 tour of that country. Nasonov is clearly determined to ensure this order did not fall into the wrong hands and he requests Andreev's support in having the order fulfilled by P.V. Ogloblin who, Nasonov adds '...isn't doing well'. Nasonov is most likely alluding to a lack of orders for Russian folk instruments from Ogloblin, who himself was a craftsman schooled in that art by Semyon Ivanovich Nalimov (see sections 6.1 & 6.7).¹⁶⁸ In order to establish a good set of [Russian folk]

¹⁶⁶ Letter 23, V.V. Andreev to V.T. Nasonov in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.157

¹⁶⁷ Letter No.54, Nasonov to Andreev, 25 Jan. 1912 in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.187

¹⁶⁸ N. V. Osipova, 'Andreev v zhizni Osipova' in Letter No.54, Nasonov to Andreev, 25 Jan. 1912, Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.264

instruments, Nasonov advises Andreev on the necessity of taking *domry*, *basy* and *kontrabasy* from Ogloblin, as well as *primy*, *sekundy* and *al'ty* from I.A. Zyuzin (also a *balalaika* craftsman – see below).¹⁶⁹ And the importance of Ogloblin to Andreev's work was not limited to his connections with Nalimov. He also crafted and sold diatonic *gusli* *zvonchatye* and is notably referred to in that capacity in the 1916 publication *A Reference Book or Short Guide for the Equipment of the Great Russian Orchestra*.¹⁷⁰ It is also highly significant that he organized military wind orchestras (*voenno-dukhovye orkestry*) in the St. Petersburg *Tsarskoe selo* garrison.¹⁷¹

Given Ogloblin's expertise in Russian folk instrument craftsmanship, it is curious that the above advice and opinion of the classically trained Nasonov are evidently resisted by another of Andreev's classically trained colleagues, the German-born Fyodor Avgustovich Niman (see section 6.10). Nasonov points out that after he had written to Niman requesting his support for Ogloblin, Niman had responded directly to Ogloblin saying instead that Nasonov '*...had nothing to do with this!*'.¹⁷² Whatever the circumstances of that difference of opinion between the two colleagues, there is a sense that Nasonov's plea for Andreev to support Ogloblin against the wishes of Niman suggests that Andreev's view would match that of his own. Evidence for this lies in Nasonov's additional concern that the musical instrument manufacturer and music publisher Zimmerman may have profited from Ogloblin losing the German order

¹⁶⁹ Letter No.54, 25 Jan. 1912, Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.187

¹⁷⁰ V.V. Andreev, *Spravochnik ili kratkoe rukovodstvo dlja oborudovaniia Velikorusskogo orkestra*., Petrograd, 1916, p.10

¹⁷¹ Andreev, 'Predrassudok', in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.133

¹⁷² Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.187

(see Chapter 6.10). This kind of concern reflects Andreev's inclination to involve Russian craftsman in providing Russian folk musical instruments as a means of fulfilling his aims for disseminating them both in Russia and abroad.

Ivan Abramovich Zyuzin was a craftsman of ranges of *balalaiki*, as Nasonov's advice to Andreev indicates. Andreev's associations with Zyuzin date from the late 1890s. In his published letter of April 1897, Zyuzin is thankful to Andreev for supporting his *balalaika* crafting.¹⁷³ A published letter from Andreev himself acknowledges the quality of Zyuzin's Russian folk instruments, declaring them to be second only to Nalimov's.¹⁷⁴ Therefore, Nasonov and Andreev were in agreement on this aspect of Russian folk instrument production and provision represented by Zyuzin's input. Although Andreev saw a role for the state to play in investing in the manufacture and distribution of Russian folk instruments, he cautioned against any commercial exploitation to that end. Both Zyuzin and his teacher-mentor Nalimov represented a more ethical approach to disseminating Russian folk instruments. As independent craftsmen, both were driven by affection for Russian folk instruments and music rather than by aspirations towards producing Russian folk instruments for maximum financial gain (e.g., see chapter 5 and 6.5).

Like Privalov, Nasonov also made valuable academic and practical contributions to Andreev's work with regard to the *gusli*. Although his academic contribution in this area was not as comprehensive as Privalov's scholarly work in the same field, Nasonov did much for the advancement of the *gusli* as a musically viable Russian folk instrument. In his letter to Andreev of 19 June 1912, Nasonov outlines his plans to

¹⁷³ See Zyuzin's letter No.10, 17 April 1897, Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.166

¹⁷⁴ Letter No.19, 29 October 1908, Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.155

revive a project to improve the ‘Черемисские гусли’.¹⁷⁵ The idea for this originated a few years previously when Nasonov was approached by the musical instrument and sheet music retailer Zimmersmans with a request for him to publish a self-tuition manual (Школа) for the *Cheremisskie gusli*. Zimmersmans then withdrew their request for the manual ‘to save money’, although Nasonov had already begun work on improving the *gusli* in preparation for drafting his *gusli Shkola*. He informs Andreev that he had mislaid the sketches he had made for improving the *Cheremisskiye gusli*, having seen ‘no support’ for his idea ‘even from the masters’, i.e., *gusli* craftsmen.¹⁷⁶ As Nasonov was a classically trained professional musician, however, his idea evidently did not depend on the approval of those craftsmen and he was quite able to explain to Andreev his ideas for improving the *gusli* in question.

The main purpose behind Nasonov’s plan for improving the *Cheremisskiye gusli* was for its incorporation into the *Velikorusskii orkestr*.¹⁷⁷ It is significant for the question of the respective contributions of individual *Velikorusskii orkestr* members that Nasonov’s ideas and sketches for the improvements were based on the principle of a folk zither. It would not be conjecture to assume Nasonov would have received advice in this area from the orchestra’s zither expert Nikolai Privalov. As for the physical crafting of the *Cheremisskiye gusli* itself, Nasonov readily acknowledges in his letter the contribution to that end of another of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* ‘соратники’, Simyon Ivanovich Nalimov. An example of the close working relationships between various of Andreev’s colleagues is that Nasonov envisages in his letter that both he and Nalimov would have been working on the ‘minor details’ for the improvement and crafting of

¹⁷⁵ i.e., ‘*mariiskiye, shlemovidnye gusli*’ having, as the name implies, a helmet or hood-shaped body (such as the ‘psaltyr’). Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.326

¹⁷⁶ Letter 59, Nasonov to Andreev, 19 June 1912, Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.191

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*

the *gusli* already, were it not for the fact he was living in St. Petersburg, and Andreev and Nalimov were in *Mar'ino*.¹⁷⁸

Nasonov's plan for improving the *Cheremisskiye gusli* covered two areas. What Nasonov refers to as the minor details was the practical application of his sketches for attaching pedals to the *gusli* for softening and opening its strings, based on the same playing facility for the piano.¹⁷⁹ To do this would not be difficult for him to explain, and, in his view, the two manual push pedals could be made and attached with ease. Secondly, he advises on what he considers to be the main improvement, that semitones should be included on the 'indicated strings', i.e., as Nasonov suggests in his sketches. To achieve this, he instructs that the fret can be extended to one and a half tones for all strings. This could be done by placing a fret under all strings to raise them by half a tone. These suggestions for raising the string pitches by a semitone were, in his words, 'nothing new' and he asserts that such an improvement would allow the *gusli* to be played in their 'ensemble' (orchestra) 'without difficulty'.¹⁸⁰ It is reasonable to suggest that Nasonov's application of his musicological expertise to means of improving the tonal range of the folk *gusli* in question is as innovative as similar improvements to other *gusli* incorporated into the *Velikorusskii orkestr* prior to 1912. The improvement represented by expanding the tonal range of the *Cheremisskiye gusli* was of such necessity that he further advises that this should be done, even if none of his other suggestions were to be put into effect.¹⁸¹ And yet at the same time the principle of preserving the essential Russian folk elements of the improved *balalaika* and *domra* was also maintained with the *Cheremisskiye gusli*. For

¹⁷⁸ ibid.

¹⁷⁹ ibid.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid.

¹⁸¹ ibid.

example, Nasonov advises that there is ‘no point in making a *gusli* with more than twelve strings’. To do otherwise would not allow ‘enough fingers on the left hand to mute the strings’.¹⁸²⁶⁵⁵ Therefore, no alteration or improvement was to be made to infringe upon the unique means of playing this ancient *gusli*, thereby preserving an essential characteristic of its folk origins.

These examples of the practical contributions Nasonov made to the development of Andreev’s work with the *Velikorusskii orkestr* demonstrate Nasonov’s willingness to take the lead without arrogating to himself any authority to do so. He is clear that his ideas for improving the *gusli* are subject to Andreev’s consideration and approval, indicating a balanced working relationship between the two collaborators. This was not limited to the practical concerns for the various folk instruments of the orchestra. Although Nasonov, unlike Andreev, was a classically trained graduate of the highly esteemed St. Petersburg conservatoire, his contribution on academic matters pertaining to the role and influence of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* equally demonstrated a balance between initiative and consultation.

A clear example of this is found in Nasonov’s letter of September 1912 in which he requests Andreev’s input into a planned new publication centring around the academic branch of their work with conductors of other *velikorusskie orkestry*. Nasonov ostensibly dispels Andreev’s apparent misunderstanding of certain details of what contribution he required from Andreev regarding his proposal. Nasonov explains that he wanted to have both Andreev’s opinion and instructions in order to reach such other ‘*velikorusskii orkestr*’ conductors who, by force of circumstances, were isolated in the more remote parts of Russia. Alluding to any forthcoming advice from Andreev,

¹⁸² Ibid.

Nasonov emphasized that he did not need ‘a Sacchetti,¹⁸³ Berlioz or any other’ who had written instructions for director-conductors and whose guide books were only understood by ‘professional musicians’. It is clear that Nasonov was specifically mindful of assisting conductor-teachers of ‘velikorusskiye orkestry’ and their musicians who were not professionally trained. Those orchestras, he explained, were ‘ordinarily comprised of amateurs’ who had ‘merely hearsay understanding of music’. For the purpose of ‘making [i.e., properly organizing] a real’ orchestra, the ‘conductor needed to be specifically velikorusskii’, likely implying to be of Russian birth. He then adds that ‘the directing of other, even “velikorusskii” orchestras’ was ‘completely different’ due to the specifics of the ‘playing technique’ of their musicians. In Nasonov’s view, the conductor of a ‘velikorusskii orkestr’, therefore, ‘almost always’ needed to be a ‘conductor-teacher’, and his invitation to Andreev was to provide instructions specifically to such personnel.¹⁸⁴

Nasonov’s request for Andreev’s input into this area is quite logical given Andreev’s dual role as conductor and teacher of his own *Velikorusskii orkestr*. And yet the inference from Nasonov’s viewpoint is that Andreev was more than capable of contributing to the academic aspect of explaining and instructing others in a conductor-teacher capacity, an academic field otherwise assumed to be the preserve of professional academics. Nasonov’s explanation of his request also implies that Andreev’s misunderstanding about it was based on his assumption that an academic guide of the kind Nasonov was proposing should only be written by professional academics to render it a more acceptable, reputable guide for conductor-teachers.

¹⁸³ i.e., L.A. Sacchetti (1852-1916), music historian and critic who was a professor at the St. Petersburg Conservatoire from 1886. Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.320

¹⁸⁴ Letter No. 65, 15 Sep. 1912, Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.195

6.10 F.A. Niman

Fyodor Avgustovich Niman (1860-1936) entered into the Andreev *balalaika Kruzhok* in 1894¹⁸⁵, at about the same time as Karkin and Nasonov (see above sections 6.2 and 6.9). As with Nasonov and Fomin (see above section 6.3), Niman introduced into the *Kruzhok* and *Velikorusskii orkestr* his own highly professional musicianship which found expression in both of these Russian folk collectives. Niman had all of the musical pedigree essential for facilitating the development of the repertoire of the *Velikorusskii orkestr*, and, therefore, its artistic and performance credentials.

As his name suggests, Niman was born in Germany. He was a multi-instrumentalist.

At age thirteen, he was already a symphony orchestra flautist in Switzerland and, later, an oboist based in Nuremberg. He became a Russian national in 1893, but was already living in Russia – he moved there in 1880 – when Andreev and his *balalaika Kruzhok* were emerging into the St. Petersburg cultural and artistic scene. Both before and during his membership of Andreev's *Kruzhok* and orchestra, Niman himself was active as a professional *symphonic* musician in St. Petersburg. He was a soloist in the orchestra of the Mikhailovskii Theatre from 1887 to 1890; from 1890 to 1907 he developed a reputation as one of the Mariinskii Theatre orchestra's best solo performers on both oboe and *cor anglais*.¹⁸⁶

Niman's professional training on violin, flute, oboe and *cor anglais* was valuable in helping him to understand and undertake work on adapting and transposing musical pieces for string and woodwind Russian folk instruments introduced into Andreev's

¹⁸⁵ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.74

¹⁸⁶ Ibid.

orchestra. The many such adaptations and transpositions he produced for the *Velkiorusskii orkestr* illustrate how Niman's contributions to the artistic development of the orchestra into a serious musicians' performance collective rank alongside those of Fomin and Nasonov.

Niman contributed variously to the adaptation of Russian folk songs in much the same way, but no less importantly, as Andreev, Nasonov, Karkin and Privalov. Andreev's adaptations of Russian dance tunes and 'urban' folklore such as '*Svetit mesiats*', '*Kak pod iablon'koi*' (also adapted by Nasonov), were and still are recognized as fine examples of Russian folk instrumental music. His '*Pliaska skomorokhov*' was based on the main motif of Glinka's adaptation of the Russian folk dance '*Kamarinskaia*'. In addition to those by Andreev, the adaptations by his colleagues of the Russian folk songs '*Vo luziakh*' and '*Vdol' po Piterskoi*' (Karkin), '*Polianka*' (Privalov) and '*Utushka*' (Niman) also stood out from similar songs widespread in urban areas of Russia.¹⁸⁷

Two other pieces which Niman introduced into the *Velikorusskii orkestr* repertoire better exemplify how professional music training brought the best out of Russian folk instrumental performance of traditional Russian folk songs. His adaptations of the lyrical songs '*Solntse skrylos' za gorou*' and '*Uzh ty, sad'* were an ideal means of demonstrating the colour and *timbre* of Russian folk instrumental orchestration.¹⁸⁸ As these songs were adapted as long, drawn-out pieces, this allowed for developing themes, motifs, phrasing, and harmonization, which in turn demonstrated the *timbre* of the range of musical instruments.

¹⁸⁷ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.111.

¹⁸⁸ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.113.

A number of Niman's adaptations and transpositions of Russian folk pieces were published in varying forms. Pieces for single *balalaika* solo with upright piano accompaniment appeared jointly in the names of Niman and A. Lenets (another orchestra member),¹⁸⁹ and in 1898 five publications appeared entitled *Leisure Hours (Chasy dosuga)*, handbooks containing adaptations and transpositions of pieces for *balalaika* and *pianoforte*. The titles were authored by both Nasonov and Niman and edited by Andreev.¹⁹⁰ Other, more substantial transpositions which were published under Niman's authorship included the waltzes 'Vospominaniia o Gatchine' and 'Orkhideia' which were published as handbooks of 'light music score for Russian [folk instrument] orchestra'.¹⁹¹ The fundamental contribution to Andreev's work by the publication of these manuals was to facilitate the development of other orchestras on the same principles as the *Velikorusskii orkestr*.

Examples of Niman's contributions to the more musically sophisticated aspects of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* repertoire are noted in an article by Andreev and in a letter to him by the composer César Cui (Tsezar' Antonovich Kyui). Andreev emphasized his orchestra's upcoming debut performance on 14 January 1917 of Borodin's 'V Srednei Azi' (known in English as 'In the Steppes of Central Asia'), as well as Olenin's 'Charochka' and the Waltz from the opera 'Faust'. Andreev stated these pieces to be 'fine transpositions' by Niman for his orchestra's performance.¹⁹² Cui's letter (written fifteen years earlier) mentions an upcoming *Velikorusskii orkestr* concert to be

¹⁸⁹ V.V. Andreev, 'Noty i samouchiteli', in V.V. Andreev, 'Kratkaia istoricheskia spravka o proiskhozhenii narodnykh muzykalnykh instrumentov, voshedshikh v sostav Velikorusskogo orkestra', in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.104

¹⁹⁰ Lachinov, 'Genial'ny samorodok', p.288.

¹⁹¹ Lachinov, 'Genial'ny samorodok', p. 290

¹⁹² V.V. Andreev, 'Pochemu Velikorusskii orkestr redko daet svoi kontserty' (published in *Obozrenie teatrov*, №.3334, 12 Jan., 1917) in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.120.

performed on 13 January 1902 in which the orchestra would debut Niman's adaptation of 'Pesnia Indiiskogo gostia' from Rimsky-Korsakov's opera 'Sadko'.¹⁹³

In addition to Niman's published adaptations and transpositions for solo *balalaika* (with upright and *pianoforte* accompaniment), he also published music for the Russian folk woodwind instrument, the *svirel'*. In a 26 January 1918 letter to Andreev, N.F. Deshkin mentions Niman's publication entitled *Self-tuition manual for the svirel'*. *Ancient Russian Wind Instrument (Smolensky province), improved by V.V. Andreev*.¹⁹⁴ This further illustrates the versatility of the multi-instrumentalist Niman. The woodwind accompaniment to Andreev's orchestra provided by the *svirel'* enhanced the ancient Russian folk character of the orchestra's collective *timbre*. The publication of Niman's *svirel'* self-tuition manual emphasizes the instrument's importance alongside the *balalaika* and *domra*.

Not all of Niman's efforts to improve the *Velikorusskii orkestr* were successful. He collaborated with Andreev in efforts to find a place for the Russian *garmonika* in the *Velikorusskii orkestr*. Over a protracted period from the second half of the 1890s those efforts were not realized. Evidence of this unsuccessful pursuit lies in Niman's unpublished manuscript for the instrument, 'Waltz of the Harmonika'.¹⁹⁵ This was not the only unsuccessful venture to introduce additional ancient Russian folk instruments into Andreev's orchestra. N.P. Shtiber, an original *balalaika prima* playing member of

¹⁹³ Letter No.23, César Cui [Tsezar' Antonovich Kyui] to V. Andreev, 12 Jan., 1902 and endnote 1, Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.173 and p.321. The letter was first published in Ts.A. Kyui, *Izbrannye pis'ma* (Leningrad: Gos. muzykal. izdat., 1955), p.266

¹⁹⁴ Letter No.100, N.F. Deshkin to V. Andreev, 26 Jan. 1918 and endnote 2, Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.218 and p.332. Niman's 'Samouchitel dlia svireli...' was compiled under the name N.A. Fyodorov, Niman's Russified name.

¹⁹⁵ Lachinov, 'Genialny samorodok', p.288

the 1888 debut *Kruzhok*, maintained collaborations with Andreev regarding the *gudok* question for nearly ten years after leaving the ensemble. Shtiber was certain it had a place in Andreev's orchestra, as revealed in his letter to Andreev of 1 September 1897. This project, as with the *garmonika*, was abandoned by Andreev (see Chapter 2.3.).

A letter of 25 January 1912 to Andreev suggests a conflict of interest between the letter's author, Nasonov, and Niman regarding an order for Russian folk string instruments from Germany. Nasonov was keen for P.V. Ogloblin, an independent craftsman of balalaikas and gusli, to fulfil the German order (see above 6.9). Nasonov had explained the same in a letter to Niman, but, according to Nasonov, he responded to Ogloblin saying that Nasonov had '...nothing to do with this!'. Nasonov expresses the view that 'It would be a shame if the master [Ogloblin] remains without support and Zimmerman [the German manufacturer of Russian folk instruments who Niman preferred] should profit' from the order.¹⁹⁶

This apparent difference of opinion is of interest for two reasons. Firstly, Nasonov's view suggests his preference that Russian folk stringed instruments, at least for dissemination abroad, should be manufactured by Russian craftsmen. One can speculate that this was a point of view fuelled by a sense of patriotic sentiment regarding Andreev's work and its foreign impact. Secondly, Andreev clearly valued Niman. For example, Niman became one of Andreev's closest associates after joining the *Kruzhok* in 1894 and in 1898 Andreev appointed him as second conductor of the *Velikorusskii orkestr*.¹⁹⁷

¹⁹⁶ Letter No.54, V.T. Nasonov to Andreev, 25 Jan. 1912, Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.187

¹⁹⁷ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.74.

6.11 – The members of Andreev’s orchestra: professional and social characteristics

Andreev’s Russian folk instrument collective evolved rapidly into an orchestra comprising both amateur and professional musicians. The *Kruzhok liubitelei igry na balalaikakh* was ‘amateur’ by name, but included among its participants professionally trained musicians, i.e., the *pianoforte* accompanist A.F. El’man, and the St. Petersburg Conservatoire trained organist A.F. Turner (*balalaika*) and cellists A.V. Lidin and M.M. Val’iano (*balalaiki*). These figures brought their professional musicianship into the expanding collective, including their knowledge of music theory and its practical applications to folk instrumental performance. The St. Petersburg Conservatoire pupils Liadov, Glazunov, Fomin and Nasonov shared interests and passions for the Russian folk song which they channelled into Andreev’s orchestra. Nurtured in their enthusiasm by their tutor Rimsky-Korsakov, they each contributed adaptations, transpositions and compositions of Russian folk and classical works for performance by the *Kruzhok* and *Velikorusskii orkestr*.

Fomin and Nasonov combined this contribution with their active participation in the orchestra as *balalaika* players. The major role of Fomin was undoubtedly important for the professional appeal and performance of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* in view of the range and sophistication of his particular adaptations, transpositions and compositions. Nasonov’s multi-instrumental talents as a member of Andreev’s orchestra (*al’t* and *balalaiki-kontrabas, brelka* and *svirel’*) were complemented by his many *domra* and *balalaika* self-tuition manuals, his music score adaptations and transpositions, as well as his Russian folk instrument teaching and training in the army. These roles facilitated both the appeal and the roles of the *Velikorusskii orkestr*.

The role of Niman did not extend to the army, but it was no less important than Nasonov's as a member of the *Velikorusskii orkestr*. This is affirmed by Niman's published scores for *balalaika* with upright piano and *pianoforte* accompaniment and his *svirel'* self-tuition manual. His professional input to his participation as a *svirel'* player was vital to expanding the colour and scope of Andreev's orchestra to the inclusion of a Russian folk woodwind section. Privalov's and Karkin's virtuoso musicianship on *gusli* and *domra al't* respectively defied their amateur musician standing among professionals within both *Kruzhok* and *Velikorusskii orkestr* and ranked them alongside the professional participant collaborators Fomin and Nasonov. Karkin did for the *domra* what fellow amateurs Andreev and Privalov did for the *balalaika* and *gusli*, namely to compile the self-tuition manual, *Shkola igry na domre*. However, he emulated his professional colleagues Fomin, Nasonov and Niman in his adaptations and transpositions for *domra* performed by Andreev's orchestra. And the innovations of *domra*-playing, as well as inventions of playing styles and techniques which he introduced into the orchestra, complemented existing *balalaika* playing techniques. As with Nasonov, one should also not underestimate the benefit to Andreev's work of Karkin's teaching role in the army, an endeavour which Andreev himself began in 1891, as will be discussed at more length in the next chapter.

Lachinov is correct to underline how Nalimov's superior quality Russian folk instruments, which were introduced into Andreev's *Kruzhok* and *Orchestra*, facilitated the contributions of Fomin, Privalov, Nasonov and Niman to the repertoire of the two collectives.¹⁹⁸ However, this must not detract from the individual contributions of those four of Andreev's collaborators in enhancing the collectives' increasingly professional

¹⁹⁸ Lachinov, 'Genial'ny samorodok', p.283

image. It is important to note, for example, that Fomin did not initially have the advantage of utilizing Nalimov's further improved string instruments. The limitations within which he was working prior to Nalimov's contributions did not prevent Fomin from successfully adapting and transposing works for *balalaika* performance before Nalimov's instruments were introduced from 1895.

This comparison of individual Andreev *sotrudniki* serves to illustrate the importance and value of both their individual and collective contributions to Andreev's work. The uniqueness of Andreev's Russian folk collectives is evident from the wider picture of the way professional and amateur, educated Conservatoire professional, manual labourer and peasant labourer collaborated in the inception, growth and development of *Kruzhok* and orchestra. The wider role of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* and Andreev's work in particular reflect this.

7. ANDREEV AND RUSSIAN SOCIETY

7.1. Introduction: Society and Higher Society

This chapter focuses on influential figures of Russia's upper social strata through whom Andreev tried to expand the impact of his work. Social connections feature prominently in all aspects of Andreev's work and activities for the advancement of Russian folk instruments and music. For Andreev to undertake this role to the degree to which he aspired necessarily involved engaging and collaborating with people from across Russia's social spectrum. Chapters 3 & 6 have shown that the task of improving the Russian balalaika beyond its primitive design and scope required craftsmanship from both village peasant carpenters and classical instrument-maker masters, including Antonov, Ivanov, Paserbskii and Nalimov. Andreev's original balalaika *Kruzhok* of mainly amateur, untrained musicians restricted the artistic growth and development of the collective. Most of the *Kruzhok* participants were wage dependants in blue- and white-collar occupations which also limited their availability for rehearsals and performances. Andreev, therefore, soon entered into close collaboration with individuals in artistic society. These included musically educated and trained figures who took a keen interest in Andreev's work, some of whom were invited in stages into *Kruzhok* and orchestra. These individuals included the musician and composer professionals Lidin, Val'iano, Fomin, Nasonov and Niman. With the exception of the 'plumber' Karkin, whose talent as a *domra* player ranked alongside professional musicians in the *Andreevskii* collective, Andreev also attracted the interest of members of society from academia and government. The archaeologist Privalov and civil servant Filippov brought into Andreev's work their expertise in

Russian folk instrument and folk song research respectively, with Privalov additionally participating in Andreev's orchestra as a virtuoso *gusli* player.

This chapter discusses and examines the interplay between Andreev and other key figures of higher social class and positions of influence in advancing Russian folk music culture. It demonstrates how all key areas of Andreev's work and activities, from his army work, through organising worker ensembles and the securing of financial sustenance for his work relied chiefly on the support and cooperation of individuals of class, title and position. This shows how the progress and success of Andreev's work consequently relied on the cooperation of representatives of two successive regimes with supposedly contrasting cultural ideologies. Andreev's work in the army relied on individuals such as Prince M.S. Putiatin who assisted Andreev's work in the army from 1891 and V.S. Kochubei of the *Ministerstvo imperatorskogo dvora* and Aide-de-Camp to Tsarevich Nikolai Aleksandrovich from 1892. After October 1917, the Soviet authorities recognised Andreev's army teaching role as useful to the Soviet Republic which helped to protect the property Andreev inherited as a *dvorianin*.¹ Other figures included Count P.A. Obolenskii whose factory workers' orchestra served the dissemination of Russian folk instruments among village workers. This raises the question of how that orchestra represented Andreev's view of dissemination among factory workers before and after 1917. This also correlates with Andreev's plans in light of Russia's 'People's Houses' (*Narodnye doma*), namely the socio-cultural role that his proposed House of Folk Music (*Dom narodnoi muzyki*) was to play for the people.

¹ RGALI F.695, op. 1,2, No.1010 – see also below in section 7.2.1.

Andreev's talent and motivation helped to establish favour and recognition for his work within the Imperial Court. His connections with A.P. Ol'denburgskii and Nikolai Aleksandrovich Romanov were borne out of the interests in Russian folk culture that he shared with Alexander III and Nikolai Aleksandrovich. This mutual interest continued between Andreev and Nikolai after the latter became Nikolai II. This recognition was the spur for Andreev's determination to endure the battle for subsidies to preserve his Russian folk instrument orchestra and to advance its work and influence in Russian society. The struggle was highlighted through communications with Government and Imperial Court figures and S.D. Sheremetev and Prince Vladimir Romanov. It was a struggle which continued after the severance of Andreev's and his orchestra's connections with the Imperial Court from February 1917, as revealed in Andreev's dealings with the Provisional Government over the subsidies issue.

7.2.1 – Andreev and the Army

Andreev's work in the army began in 1891 in the *Svodno-Pekhotno-Novocherkasskii*, *Preobrazhenskii*, *Finlyandskii* and *Grenaderskii* regiments. He quickly organized in each of these regiments what he refers to as 'orchestras of balalaika players'², at that time likely organized similarly to that of his own *Kruzhok*, i.e., comprising ranges of balalaikas only. The *Svodno-Pekhotno-Novocherkasskii* regiment was the first military unit from which Andreev organized soldiers into a balalaika collective. This heralded what became a major focus of Andreev's work in disseminating Russian folk instruments and music, continuing up to his death in 1918. Yet it seems that Andreev

² V.V. Andreev, 'Predrassudok' in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*. p.128

might not have originally undertaken such an initiative but for suggestions for him to do so by Prince Mikhail Sergeyevich Putiatin.³

Both Putiatin and Andreev owned estates in *Tverskaia guberniia* and the two were 'well acquainted'⁴ prior to Andreev beginning his work in the army regiments. This fortuitous connection between the two was reinforced by Putiatin's military background which undoubtedly facilitated Andreev's route into the armed forces. Putiatin's position of influence in 1891 is not known, although his Naval College education prior to 1891 and various governmental and court duties from 1895 testify to his higher social connections, including courtier of the royal household. He was also active in cultural circles, including (from 1913) being a member of the Commission of the Museum of Pre-Petrine Art and Daily Life (*Komissiya Muzeya Dopetrovskogo iskusstva i byta*).⁵

There were various ways in which Andreev's work embraced diverse social groups. The influence of Andreev's work in the armed forces and its related activities is also evident from his involvement in charitable events. It was the *voinskie chiny* who were the means of initially returning improved balalaikas and, later, other Russian folk instruments to the *narod* in the provinces to facilitate the dissemination of those instruments. In terms of public performance, the role played by his soldiers' balalaika collectives in the annual Marinsky Theatre charity concerts was also socially significant for two reasons. Firstly, it demonstrated to the wider public present at those events the success of his balalaika teaching amongst the *voinskie chiny* in the armed

³ Ibid.

⁴ Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p.53

⁵ Other positions he held included: Staff Captain to the *Preobrazhenskii* regiment's Life Guards (from 1895); *polkovnik* of the Preobrazhenskii regiment (from 1 January 1909); Staff Officer duties at the *Gofmarshal'skaia chast'* of the *Ministerstvo Imperatorskogo Dvora*; *nachal'nik* of the *Tsarskosel'skoe Dvortsovoe Upravlenie* (from 1 January 1911); original board member of the *Rossiiskoe genealogicheskoe obshchestvo* (1898-1901).

forces. This was affirmed, for example, by the numbers of soldier balalaika-players participating in the concerts, totalling up to 100 soldier-musicians at each annual event. Secondly, it afforded positive publicity to Andreev's work in respect of his soldiers collectives' participation in an annual event which was for the benefit of under-privileged sections of Russian society, such as invalids.

The practical obstacles Andreev had to overcome in order to advance his army teaching activities included the bureaucratic resistance of some in the office of military officials. This is evident from the frequency with which Andreev had to approach Government Finance for grants to support his work (see below section 7.4). Imkhanitskii's generic reference to other obstacles as being from 'other authorities' understates the magnitude of the major barrier to Andreev's work posed by the lack of financial subsidies provision.⁶ To surmise that Andreev's army teaching endeavour was 'dependent on the whim of one or other regiment commander' obscures this issue as a source of frustration for Andreev regarding his efforts to secure the status and financial security of his teaching staff in the armed forces, a project he had begun devising from 1895.⁷ And these frustrations evidently caused Andreev to seek advice on the relevance of his work with Russian folk music generally, as revealed in his correspondence with the Russian novelist Lev Tolstoy. Being convinced that art was for all the people, Tolstoy assured Andreev that his work was important for preserving the 'charming' Russian folk songs in the *narod*, and so endorsed his 'chosen path' that he felt certain would lead him to his goal.⁸ This echoed the encouragement Andreev received from Alexander III in February 1887 and may have helped to focus Andreev's

⁶ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.70

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ See Letter No.8, Tolstoy to Andreev, 20 March 1896, in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.164

drive towards the successful establishment of paid armed forces teaching staff by 1897.

Imkhanitskii correctly asserts that Andreev gained the 'important government directive' which secured the status of his army teaching staff 'only with the help of T.I. Filippov of the Russian Geographical Society's Song Commission'.⁹ However, this distracts from the wider picture of the support Andreev was seeking for his army commitments from the mid-1890s. This is a key factor to consider in order to gauge the wider social implications of Andreev's work, including the relevance of the historical figures from whom he sought advice and assistance. For example, as seen in 6.8, the September 1897 directive which formally recognized and established Andreev and his teaching staff in the St. Petersburg garrison was underpinned by government funding for teaching salaries. However, this did not permanently resolve this aspect of Andreev's work which would necessarily require further financial aid to cover its growth and expansion. This is confirmed, for example, by Andreev's letter to Filippov of 1899 in which Andreev outlined his plans for increasing the number of Russian folk instrument teachers in the armed forces, and, thereby, broadening the sphere of their work in order to facilitate the wider dissemination of Russian folk instruments in the *narod*.¹⁰ However, notwithstanding the undoubted importance to Andreev's army teaching initiatives of Filippov's assistance from his governmental position, Andreev was not limited in his options to one government official in trying to secure support for his work.

Another figure from whom Andreev sought assistance was Prince Viktor Sergeyevich

⁹ Imkhanitskii, *U istokov...*, p.71

¹⁰ Letter No.5, Andreev to T.I. Filippov, 1899, in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.147

Kochubei. In April 1910, Andreev drafted a document ‘to be handed to’ His Excellency Kochubei, then serving in the *Ministerstvo imperatorskogo dvora*.¹¹ This document confirms the ongoing subsidies issue which was hampering Andreev’s drive to expand teaching work in the armed forces. The document’s plea included a request for funding of sixteen musician-teachers of the *Velikorusskii orkestr*, as well as for funding of the orchestra’s Russian and foreign tours. Andreev explains his request in the context of the value and benefit of his orchestra and its teaching work to Russian culture.

Andreev was rewarded at various stages of his activities during the Imperial regime with the bestowing of honours in recognition of his services to Russian society and to the Russian nation. These services included his work disseminating Russian folk instrumental music and Russian folk instruments through his activities in the Imperial armed forces. Andreev shared with both Putiatin and Kochubei the ‘Order of Saint Stanislav’ in recognition of their services to pre-revolutionary Russian society.¹² It seems that Andreev’s awards were as much to do with his commercial contribution to the Russian nation, as they were to do with his social and cultural contribution to the Russian nation and society. It was partly through the dissemination of Russian folk instruments among the *narod*, via the Russian soldier, that Andreev contributed to the overall commercial success for Russia of the improved balalaika and other Russian folk instruments. The recognition of Andreev’s major contribution in this area contrasts

¹¹ RGALI, F.695, 1,2, 1023 – ‘Dokladnaia zapiska’ V.V. Andreevym o subsidiakh...’.

¹² Putiatin also received (as well as the Орден Святого Станислава 1-й ст. (1913)): the Орден Святой Анны 2-й ст. (1901); the Орден Святого Владимира 3-й ст. (1909); the Орден Святой Анны 1-й ст. (1915). Kochubei’s honours included: the орден Святого Владимира 3-й ст. (1902); Орден Святого Станислава 1-й ст. (1904); Орден Святой Анны 1-й ст. (1907); Орден Святого Владимира 2-й ст. (1913); Орден Белого Орла (1915). орден св. Станислава первой степени и св. Владимира второй степени.

somewhat wryly with the Imperial regime's honouring of Kochubei partly for his contribution towards successful wine-making in the Crimea!

A further irony in connection with the value to Russian society of Andreev's work in the armed forces is revealed in post-Imperial handling of his property status. The new political order's recognition of the major contribution to society of Andreev's armed forces work secured for him the property he owned in the estate he inherited in Mar'iino, *Tverskaia guberniia*, and in St. Petersburg and absolved him of any financial penalties in connection with his ownership of those properties.¹³

Andreev's life was cut short barely a year after the October Revolution. The question of how he and his work would have fared further into the post-Imperial period is a question for speculation and conjecture. He lived to see his work in the armed forces at least to be secured in light of its service to the *narod*, albeit as far as that was of benefit to the propagation of the post-Imperial regime's cultural ideology.

7.2.2 Workers ensembles and collectives

Andreev viewed the formation and organization of Russian folk instrument ensembles and collectives as a means to advance the dissemination of Russian folk instruments in Russia's provincial cities, towns and villages. The main vehicle in the armed forces for realizing this objective was teaching the lower ranks to play the balalaika, work in which he was actively engaged from 1891. This objective, however, was not limited to teaching work in the army. The creation and emergence of workers' ensembles and

¹³ RGALI, f. 695, op. 1,2, d. 1010 ('Udostovereniia Andreeva, V.V., na pravo pol'zovaniia zemlei, o prave prozhivaniia v s. Mar'inskem i dr.', 1917-1918').

collectives expanded the potential of dissemination and, with it, the social impact of Andreev's work.

Engaging directly in working with workers' ensembles and collectives was not a priority for members of Andreev's orchestra until the political changes of February 1917 induced the orchestra's committee proactively to redefine the overall function of the orchestra and its members. In the years preceding the February 1917 events, Andreev was clear about the need to involve town and village-dwelling peasants in organizing and participating in Russian folk instrument ensembles in order to broaden Russian folk music in the *narod*. As late as 1915 he wrote about the importance and, indeed, the 'urgency' of supporting the organization and progress of such Russian folk collectives. This was proven by the fact that Andreev himself received Russia-wide requests for advice on how to organize 'folk orchestral activities', as well as requests for him to send instructors to help with those activities. He was also variously invited to become a member of provincial orchestras in order to impart his knowledge and experience of the Russian folk music orchestra at first hand. This signified progress in the organization of Russian folk instrument collectives among provincial town and village-dwellers. The momentum of this progress, Andreev asserted, was powered by the 'engine' of the 'artistic activity' of his own 'Imperial' *Velikorusskii orkestr*. It was the 'professionalism' of that orchestra's musicians which was appreciated by those lower levels of society who heard it. And the 'beneficial effect' of this was a more acceptable alternative to that of peasants having 'no entertainment' other than 'singing *chastushki*¹⁴ to *garmonika* accompaniment'.¹⁵ However, Andreev also indirectly acknowledged his and his orchestra's limitations in meeting requests to assist

¹⁴ i.e., a two- or four-line rhymed poem or ditty on a topical or humorous theme.

¹⁵ RGALI, f. 695, op. 1,2, d. 12 ('K sozdaniyu Doma narodnoi muzyki'), pp. 7-8

provincial Russian folk collectives. He stated that it was not possible for him 'to satisfy everyone' and that he had 'done all he could' to help with such collectives.¹⁶

Also alluding to the lack of opportunities in artistic pursuits for lower levels of Russian society, Andreev noted that the peasants' active participation in Russian folk instrument collectives also had potential benefits for their well-being if such collectives were able to progress. The only means for those collectives to attain a high artistic level was for them to receive proper instruction and leadership from persons trained in teaching to play Russian folk instruments. Due in part to the support of the Ministry of Education¹⁷, there were by then (1916) teachers and pupils undertaking summer courses, in village seminaries and primary schools respectively, devoted to Russian folk instruments (i.e., instruments introduced into the *Velikorusskii orkestr*). These 'future folk teachers' were being taught high standard balalaika-playing techniques, as well as music theory, form and harmony with the aim of producing 'instructors' who would organize Russian folk collectives comprised of peasant children.¹⁸ Peasant collectives organized in the factories, however, could not aspire to and emulate the artistic standards of Andreev's orchestra because they did not have adequate leaders and instructors: they were either only newly acquainted with music via Russian folk instruments, or were 'dilettantes'.¹⁹

Andreev singled out an 'outstanding' factory workers' Russian folk orchestra as an exception to the overall organizational condition of similar workers' collectives.²⁰

¹⁶ *ibid.*

¹⁷ i.e., Minister of Education (or of Enlightenment): this Russian Imperial Government ministry was first established in 1802. Between 1817 and 1824, it was a part of the Ministry of Religious Affairs and Public Education (*Ministerstvo po delam religii i narodnogo obrazovaniia*) and was headed by Aleksandr Golitsyn during that period. It reverted to the Ministry of Public Enlightenment (*Ministerstvo Narodnogo Prosveshcheniya*) from 1824 and remained in existence until 1917.

¹⁸ RGALI, f. 695, op. 1,2, d. 12 ('K sozdaniyu Doma narodnoi muzyki'), pp. 6–7

¹⁹ RGALI, f. 695, op. 1,2, d. 12 ('K sozdaniyu Doma narodnoi muzyki'), p. 7

²⁰ *ibid.*

Count Pyotr Aleksandrovich Obolenskii (14 October 1889–31 December 1964/9?) organized and directed this orchestra, which was one of the first Russian folk collectives comprising ‘worker-amateur music enthusiasts’.²¹ Andreev’s orchestra had inspired many families to organize their own balalaika ensembles by the turn of the 1900s.

Obolenskii’s family was one of many St. Petersburg-based families who were similarly inspired to play Russian folk instruments. Obolenskii and his three brothers formed a balalaika quartet of *prima*, *sekunda*, *al’t* and *bas* balalaika players.²² This quartet represented one example of many which testify to the impact of Andreev’s orchestra, performances of which were ‘never missed’ by Obolenskii’s family in St. Petersburg.²³ According to his own reminiscences, it was in 1902, aged only 13, that Obolenskii first organized his workers’ Russian folk orchestra from workers of the crystal factory based in the village of Nikol’skoe-Petrovka in Penzenskaia *guberniya*, south-east of Moscow. The success of his orchestra led him to return to St. Petersburg in 1907 in order to meet with Andreev and to bring to his attention provincial newspaper reviews of the Nikol’sko-Petrovka workers’ collective. Andreev was grateful to Obolenskii for advancing the dissemination of Russian folk instruments in that locality.²⁴ Obolenskii does not report any recollections of Andreev’s reaction beyond this, which suggests that Obolenskii’s work for the dissemination of Russian folk instruments was the priority interest of Andreev at that time. Supporting this conclusion are Andreev’s words inscribed on a photograph he gave to Obolenskii at their 1907 St. Petersburg

²¹ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 336.

²² P.A. Obolenskii ‘Iz vospominanii ob Andreeve’ in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 241

²³ *ibid.*

²⁴ *ibid.*

meeting which expressed Andreev's 'deepest respect for his wonderful labours, ennobling the people with the music made available to them'.²⁵

Andreev responded positively to Obolenskii's work by also inviting him to rehearsals of his *Velikorusskii orkestr*. It is clear that this was arranged to assist Obolenskii in the finer aspects of organizing and leading a Russian folk instrument orchestra, the very qualities which many orchestras similar to Obolenskii's were lacking, as explained by Andreev above. Obolenskii himself gained considerable knowledge and experience from his attendance at that, and subsequent *Velikorusskii orkestr* rehearsals. Not only did he benefit from Andreev's example of organizing and conducting the orchestra, but he also gained knowledge and experience of the arrangement and expressed nuances of pieces adapted and composed for the Russian folk orchestra. He was specifically grateful to have observed Nikolai Petrovich Fomin's advice to Andreev and the former's artistic contributions to rehearsals of the *Velikorusskii orkestr*. According to Obolenskii, Fomin's intuition about Russian folk instruments was then unparalleled, as evidenced by his adaptations of Russian folk songs for the orchestra (see Chapter 6.3.1).²⁶

Paradoxically, however, there is one fact which underlines the apparent limited nature of Andreev's interest in factory workers' folk collectives, beyond their advantages for dissemination. It is notable that it was not until the autumn of 1917 (ten years after he first met with Obolenskii) that he visited Obolenskii's orchestra in *Nikol'sko-Pestrovka* to provide the kind of experienced leadership, the absence of which he had previously decried regarding workers' factory collectives.²⁷

²⁵ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 242

²⁶ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, pp. 242–43

²⁷ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p. 242

It is possible that this trip was prompted by debates (confirmed in protocols of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* committee from 7 March 1917) in which Andreev and other leaders of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* were engaged at this time regarding the orchestra's role in relation to the current political and social situation in Russia following the February 1917 revolution. As we have seen, however, Andreev's interest in workers' orchestras long predicated this revolution, as did his interest in musical education; the trip might equally have been prompted by renewed efforts to make collective folk instrumental performances ever more accessible, an aim which gave rise to Andreev's idea for a House of Folk Music.

7.2.3 House of Folk Music

In the final decade of his life, Andreev's endeavours to advance and to broaden accessibility to Russian folk instrumental performance were characterized by a more socio-cultural approach and this led him to conceive ideas for establishing cultural institutions with an exclusive Russian folk music-teaching remit. Examples include instituting balalaika courses for village-based Russian folk orchestra teacher-instructors in village schools (1912), railway workers' balalaika classes in railway workers' colleges (1912) and the 'Society for the Propagation of Playing Folk Instruments and Collective Song' (*Obshchestvo rasprostraneniia igry na narodnykh instrumentakh khorovoii peniia*, 1916). In addition to these initiatives was his proposal for the creation and establishment of the House of Folk Music (1915).²⁸

His idea for the House of Folk Music was an original one in terms of focusing on Russian folk music culture and on teaching and collective performance. The evidence

²⁸ Sokolov, V.V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.102

suggests, however, that his idea for establishing the institution itself was derived from the example of People's Houses already established in Russia by the early 1900s. These freely accessible centres promoted education and 'healthy entertainment', providing opportunities for the wider Russian public to undertake a broad range of academic, cultural and leisure pursuits.²⁹ And yet the People's Houses were not a uniquely Russian innovation, but were modelled on similar establishments in Europe. The first of these establishments was 'The People's Palace' which was unveiled in east London by Queen Victoria in 1887 to serve as an alternative to the so-called 'ginpalaces' of that locality.³⁰

By 1916 there were 15 such establishments in England. They catered for the 'varied needs of working people', providing a hygienic, morally acceptable environment in which they could relax and spend 'quality' time. Similar establishments in English provincial towns were organized by local churches.³¹ Of particular relevance to the Russian People's Houses and their inception are the social and philanthropic ideas of John Ruskin and Thomas Carlyle which had influenced the establishment of the English precursors of the Russian People's Houses. These ideas are stated in the 1916 New Encyclopaedic Dictionary to be the inspiration behind a social movement characterised by the notion of a 'going to the people' ('khozhdenie v narod'). This would partly involve a pro-active role undertaken by university-educated youth (referred to in the aforementioned Russian source as 'molodezh') in the creation of 'settlements' in the poorer areas of English towns and cities. The aim was for these

²⁹ *Novy entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*, izdanie aktsionernogo obshchestva «Izdatelskoe delo byvshee Brokgauz-Efron». Petrograd, 2/03/1916, vol. 27, coll. 946.

³⁰ In Germany, for example, equivalent *narodnye doma* were founded in Dresden by the local 'Verein Volkswohl' Society (founded in 1888) which had associations with the anti-alcohol movement (*ibid.*, coll. 947-8).

³¹ *ibid.*, coll. 946-7.

‘youth’ to interact with the lower classes in order to elevate ‘unenlightened’ social strata.³² In Russia, the interest of the *molodezh'* (i.e., university-educated youth) in the lower-class peasantry and their culture has loose, accidental connotations with notions of England’s university-educated youth. However, unlike in England, the aim of the Russian *molodezh'* was to elevate lower-class (peasant) culture to an intellectual level. This idea is reflected in Andreev’s proposals for the House of Folk Music.

Interest in People’s Houses in Russia was fuelled by the introduction of the ‘Wine monopolies’ (*Vinnye monopolii*). These measures gave the State and individuals exclusive rights to produce and sell alcoholic drinks, causing the temperance society, ‘Guardianship of the People’s Sobriety’ (*Popechitel’stvo o narodnoi trezvosti*) to make attempts (albeit unsuccessful) to organize People’s Houses, although some of these establishments were successfully organized from the time of the universal congress of the Russian *zemstva* in 1905 (*Obshchezemskii s”ezd*).³³ A ban on wine-selling in 1914 revived interest in the importance of People’s Houses,³⁴ likely due to alcohol dependants finding new, unsavoury means of acquiring drink of dubious quality and origin. Therefore, the importance of Russia’s People’s Houses was based on the need for educating people about instilling sobriety by the ‘healthy use of leisure time’. However, they also mirrored their English models as centres for extra-curricular education and activities, in Russia providing facilities such as a reading room and book depository, as well as opportunities to partake in adult educational courses and group activities such as group reading, theatre, choirs, orchestras, sports, exhibitions and cinema. The Ministry of Home Affairs also helped in a Russia-wide project dedicated

³² *ibid.*, coll. 947.

³³ *ibid.*, coll. 948

³⁴ *ibid.*

to developing People's Houses. St. Petersburg's People's House (named for Nikolai II), for example, benefited from this project. Opened in 1900, it was supervised by the municipal temperance society, 'Urban Guardianship of the People's Sobriety', and provided (as well as above examples) opera and drama theatres, organized concerts, and also held classes in choir singing and folk music.³⁵

It was against this socio-cultural scene that Andreev formulated his ideas for the establishment of a cultural institution with specific focus on the inclusive participation of disadvantaged society in Russian folk music-making and performance. One should not, however, disregard Andreev's overall aim of including all strata of Russian society in this cultural genre. Sokolov correctly states, for example, that it was 'in the interest of advancing improved Russian folk instruments in peasant circles' that Andreev drew up proposals such as for the House of Folk Music.³⁶ But this tendency of Soviet writers on Andreev to direct attention towards peasants and workers regarding Andreev's work shifts attention away from the all-inclusiveness of that work. This perspective does not diminish the importance of Andreev's proposals for the House of Folk Music, for they were a key aspect of that same all-inclusiveness.

Andreev outlined his reasons for proposing the establishment of the House of Folk Music in his undated manuscript 'Towards the creation of a "House of Folk Music" (*K sozdaniu 'Doma narodnoi muzyki'*)'.³⁷ He introduces his ideas by making a number of statements and observations about the then current state of entertainment for the peasants, highlighting the necessity of providing to the *narod* reasonable, sobering

³⁵ *ibid.*

³⁶ Sokolov, V. V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*, p.102

³⁷ RGALI, f. 695, op. 1,2, d. 12 ('K sozdaniyu Doma narodnoi muzyki'). This manuscript is not included in Granovskii's *Materialy i dokumenty* of 1986.

entertainment.³⁸ The urgency of meeting their need for 'sober leisure time' had been recognised by both society generally, and by the Government, as seen in their taking various 'appropriate measures', including organising People's Houses.³⁹ These initiatives, however, were not reaching the outlying factory townships, and were only at best reaching the larger towns. The 'countless' small, distant villages were remaining untouched and were still being deprived of whatever entertainment was available despite the number of People's Houses established in the major centres.

There would always be the opportunity and means in the towns, and even in the larger village, to establish a People's House, reading room, and so on, because the average townsman would engage in leisure activities such as reading and music. But a peasant from the nearest villages would hardly bother going 'even five to six versts, let alone a greater distance to use a People's House, or to get to town to attend the theatre, to listen to a lecture or to listen to music', particularly the latter which was 'so beneficial to their well-being'.⁴⁰

Andreev then explained that it was a fact that village people were interested not only in participating in playing orchestral music, but also in organizing new orchestras. Wine-selling had all but ceased in the villages due to the 1914 law prohibiting this. This vindicated further the benefits of organising, and participating in Russian folk instrumental performance to those who, until now, had no alternative entertainment. Concerning the oft posed question as to why it was necessary to introduce imperfect Russian folk instruments into the villages alongside already existing 'better', i.e., symphonic instruments, Andreev's response was 'why not give to the peasant a car

³⁸ This has been summarised contextually in above section 7.2.2.

³⁹ RGALI No.12, p.1

⁴⁰ Ibid.

instead of a cart?' No-one had forced peasants to take to improved Russian folk instruments, but they had 'just taken to them themselves'. The success of those instruments in the villages had not been immediate, but having had them for twenty five years, this was proof that the peasants had accepted them.

Andreev also asserted that the 'artistic activities' of his 'Imperial *Velikorusskii orkestr*' had motivated peasant interest and participation in Russian folk instrumental performance.⁴¹ But the proliferation of newly-organized orchestras in Russia, including in the Army divisions, in colleges, factories, and in other places had created the pressing need for them to be organised and led by figures capable of progressing those collectives to high standards of performance. Prince P.A. Obolenskii's initiative of organising and leading a Russian folk instrument orchestra of the Nikolaevsko-Petrovska factory⁴² was almost certainly realised due to the connections and related support for that project that he would have received in light of his social status. With regard to the many other factory Russian folk instrument collectives, Andreev had 'done everything' he could to help them, but could not satisfy everyone, even though he recognized the importance of the urgency of supporting them.⁴³

Andreev's above thoughts and sentiments suggest that it was out of a genuine desire to help those of the lower, less advantaged social strata to organise and to develop their own Russian folk orchestras that he aimed to establish the House of Folk Music. As Andreev himself stated, such an institution would serve not to limit 'the need to develop the advantageous initiative' of involving the *narod* in such a healthy cultural activity. In seeking to establish the House of Folk Music, Andreev's aims and

⁴¹ See also above section 7.2.2.

⁴² RGALI No.12, pp.7-8: see also above section 7.2.2.

⁴³ RGALI No.12, p.8

objectives for it 'lay namely in giving wide access to *all* [my emphasis] wishing to learn how to establish, to organise and to lead *Velikorusskie orkestry*, as well as choral singing'. His ambition was to ensure that all willing participants in Russian folk instrumental learning and performance would be led by highly educated figures, and universally known music activists of undoubted success. Andreev's earlier point that the 'Ministry of People's Education' was the first to respond to the 'reasonable endeavour of enriching village leisure time with revitalising and ennobling entertainment'⁴⁴ is a clear indication that he saw the future development of Russian folk instrumental collective performance within the general populace as a worthy objective to be supported by current and future Government.

Andreev's reference to developing the organisation of, and participation in Russian folk instrumental music-making for the disadvantaged had a particular resonance regarding the high standards he set for this activity. This is evinced by another key reason why he sought to institute the House of Folk Music. Andreev's stringent application of those 'ennobling' and high 'quality' standards to Russian folk instrument teaching and performance contrasted with what he felt was being compromised in the People's Houses. It was to Andreev's consternation that N.I. Privalov's own initiative in organising balalaika teaching and ensemble performance in St. Petersburg's People's House met with the approval of *Russkaia muzykal'naia gazeta* editor and Andreev critic Findeisen. Andreev viewed Findeisen as one of the 'enemies of [Russian] folk music' on account of the latter's cynical assessments of aspects of Andreev's work. Moreover, Andreev strongly disapproved of Privalov using his own,

⁴⁴ Ibid.

lesser ‘quality’ compositions for Russian folk instrument teaching classes and ensemble performance in the People’s House. This resulted in an acrimonious split between Andreev and Privalov in 1912, a dispute and its consequences which Privalov regretted for the remainder of his life.⁴⁵ The fact that this dispute could conclude with Andreev’s loss of one of his closest and most trusted *soratniki* fundamentally affirms the importance of the example of high music repertoire and performance standards set by Andreev’s orchestra, particularly as an Imperial Court approved standard bearer for all other Russian folk instrumental collectives to follow.

7.3.1 Early Court associations

Andreev’s social status opened opportunities for him to advance the cause of the balalaika into higher Russian society from the early stages of his activities. As a landowner in *Vyshnevolotskii uezd* of *Tverskaia gubernia*, he found himself as one of a circle of ‘artists’ by the mid-1880s. It was through that circle that he heard about an upcoming visit to his home region by Prince Vladimir Aleksandrovich of the Russian Imperial Court. On Saturday 1 June 1885, the prince was to fulfil a fact-finding visit to an ‘underprivileged’ students’ orphanage located by Lake *Mstino* in the northern part of the *uezd*.⁴⁶ Andreev managed ‘to garner’ an invitation to perform at this event from its organizer,⁴⁷ an unlikely arrangement had Andreev not belonged to the gentry (*dvorianstvo*). This was Andreev’s first invitation to a formal function before highly distinguished figures and in the capacity of a balalaika musician.⁴⁸

⁴⁵ Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p.136. Correspondence of Andreev and Privalov in 1913 sheds more light on this dispute.

⁴⁶ Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, pp.28-29

⁴⁷ Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p.28

⁴⁸ *ibid.*

Andreev's presence at the *Vyshnevolotskii* orphanage event was important because the 'great Prince' Vladimir was at that time the President of the Academy of Arts (*Akademiiia tvorchestva*). This was an ideal occasion to demonstrate to the high-profile arts president Vladimir the artistic qualities of an improved Russian folk instrument (then V.V. Ivanov's improved balalaika model). The Russian folk musical entertainment provided by balalaika virtuoso Andreev was supplemented by the coincidental inclusion of a *gusli* performance, courtesy of the son of a local citizen (*meshchanin*). It is almost certain that the positive impression that Vladimir Aleksandrovich gained from Andreev's participation in this *intermezzo* established the early acquaintance between the two personalities. Vladimir's future support of Andreev's work, therefore, may have been largely due to the Arts President's impressions of Andreev from that first meeting in June 1885 (see below section 7.3.2). It is also reasonable to assert that this early acquaintance made Andreev's name known to Imperial family even before the widespread, positive local press reports of his first official public solo performance in St. Petersburg in December 1886. However, it was only after that performance that Andreev received an official invitation from the Imperial family itself to perform for members of the royal household.

This invitation to Andreev to participate in a private Imperial family concert came from Prince Aleksandr Petrovich Ol'denburgskii (21 May 1844 – 6 September 1932).⁴⁹ Comments made by Tsar Alexander III to Andreev at the end of this 29 February 1887 event are significant in light of Andreev's future endeavours to broaden the

⁴⁹ V. I. Fedorchenko, 'Dom Romanovykh', *Entsiklopedia biografii* (Moscow: Olma-Press, 2003), p.59. The three available sources in which Ol'denburgskii's invitation is mentioned (Shtiber's *V. V. Andreev: Ocherk ego deiatel'nosti* and Baranov's *Podvizhniki muzyki narodnoi* and *Vasili Andreev*) do not include the Prince's full name or initials. It is certain, however, that Aleksandr Petrovich is the Ol'denburgskii in question as his son, Pyotr Aleksandrovich, was only aged 19 when Andreev's invitation to perform was fulfilled at the February 1887 concert.

accessibility of the balalaika and other Russian folk instruments. In reply to Andreev's outline of his then plans for the balalaika, the Tsar said he was 'very pleased' that, thanks to Andreev's talent, 'the balalaika will again be taken up by the people (*voidet v narod*) and again become a popular Russian instrument'. This royal approval was not only significant for having the effect of attracting to Andreev pupils from St. Petersburg's high society (including members of the nobility) wishing to learn to play the balalaika.⁵⁰ It is also an indication of the influential chain of royal court associations Andreev was forging from an early stage and which afforded to his future work a significant degree of support and recognition from within Imperial court circles (see below 7.3.2). Original Andreev Circle member N.P. Shtiber recalled in 1898 Andreev's pleasure regarding the royal 'attention' to his art at the 1887 Ol'denburgskii concert evening.⁵¹ This suggests the future *Velikorusskii orkestr* founder and organizer understood the importance of Imperial court recognition of his plans for Russian folk music.

As well as the link with the Romanov family through his acquaintance with *kniaz'* Vladimir Aleksandrovich Romanov, Andreev's association with A.P. Ol'denburgskii in February 1887 affirmed Andreev's connections with the future Tsar, Nikolai Romanov. Prince A.P. Ol'denburgskii (great-grandson of Emperor Pavel I) had an only son, Pyotr Aleksandrovich (9 November 1868 – 18 March 1924, great-grandson of Emperor Nikolai I). The reputedly 'kind-hearted' and 'noble' Pyotr Aleksandrovich had already been in close friendship with the future Tsar Nikolai II since the day of the assassination of Tsar Alexander II on 1 March 1881. This close bond to Nikolai Romanov was further secured by Pyotr Aleksandrovich's marriage to Nikolai's

⁵⁰ Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p.31.

⁵¹ Shtiber, V.V. *Andreev: Ocherk deiatel'nosti*', p.3.

daughter, Grand Duchess Ol'ga Aleksandrovna Romanov in 1901.⁵² The feasibility of Pyotr Aleksandrovich's introduction to Andreev in 1887 underlines the importance of that year's Ol'denburgskii invitation for Andreev's future advancement of Russian folk instrumental music and the accessibility of Russian folk instruments. And having already met with Grand Duke Vladimir Romanov in 1885, there is a sense that Andreev's early associations with at least three Imperial personages had made it inevitable that recognition and support would be forthcoming from the Imperial Court as Andreev's work became more clearly defined as a long-term, socially and culturally impacting project. Testimony to the value of those early court connections is that the growth of his work in the army and the development of his balalaika ensemble into the *Velikorusskii orkestr* necessitated court approval and patronage respectively.

Royal patronage undoubtedly elevated the status of beneficiaries of such high-profile recognition, as would be testified by the royal patronage of Andreev's future *Velikorusskii orkestr*. Andreev's early associations with social groups and organizations supported and recognized by Imperial court patronage suggest that Andreev had connections which could help to secure future support for his burgeoning balalaika collective. One such court-patronaged organization with which Andreev was associated was the 'Imperial Humane Society of the Institute of the Blind'. This *obschchestvo* received Andreev's support on 21 November 1888, well before he had begun teaching and organizational work in the army and, to a lesser extent, with workers collectives.⁵³ Very shortly after Andreev's *Kruzhok* debut on 20 March 1888, Il'ya Gavrilovich Perebiinosov, the Director of the Institute of the Blind, had himself

⁵² Fedorchenko, 'Dom Romanovykh', pp. 59 & 60-61

⁵³ RGALI, f. 695, d. 944.

organized in St. Petersburg an amateur (*liubitel'skii*) collective of balalaika players comprising seven members of his own family. This was the first such balalaika ensemble to be organized after Andreev's *Kruzhok*. Descended of a Ukrainian Zaporozhian chieftain (*zaporozhskii ataman*), Perebiinosov soon organized another balalaika ensemble, this time comprised of blind players. From that point he began to give concerts in St. Petersburg to propagate the balalaika.⁵⁴

Absent from Baranov's brief summary of Perebiinosov's work is any mention of assistance Andreev provided to Perebiinosov and blind pupils of the Imperial Institute for the Blind. This is revealed by a 23 November 1888 letter Perebiinosov wrote to Andreev. The letter expressed at considerable length his gratitude for the help, support and encouragement that Andreev had given to the Institute's blind pupils to prepare them to participate in a concert performance. Although the venue of the concert is not mentioned, Perebiinosov indirectly reveals that it was a charity event in aid of the Institute by referring to the financial benefits the institute gained from the event. The Director also hinted at the sense of well-being for the blind pupils whose participation had brought 'great pleasure' both to themselves, and to the listening public. Perebiinosov was hopeful the institute might receive further help from Andreev and his *Kruzhok* in the future.⁵⁵ This example of Andreev involving his *Kruzhok* in organizing other balalaika ensembles and events for the benefit of underprivileged and disadvantaged members of Russian society demonstrates the social impact even of his early activities. The leverage of Imperial Court approval for his contribution to Russian music culture did much to enhance his and his Russian folk orchestra's credibility in its dual role of entertainment and teaching.

⁵⁴ Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p.41.

⁵⁵ RGALI, f. 695, d. 944.

7.3.2 – The *Velikorusskii orkestr* of the Russian Imperial Court

It was indicated at the close of Chapter 2.3 that the principal impetus behind Andreev's drive towards the realization of his aims was Imperial Court approval of his work. His aims for the dissemination of improved balalaikas and, later, of other Russian folk instruments throughout the *narod* were a synthesis of practical, ideological and sentimental ideas and instincts. This appealed to the sentiments of Aleksandr III and Nikolai II who valued the artistic and cultural merits of Russian folk music. Such royal approval found expression in the Imperial Court's recognition and support of Andreev's attempt to promote and advance Russian folk music in the *narod* through his work in the Army linked to the performance and teaching role of his *Velikorusskii orkestr*.

Andreev was known to the Imperial Court from 1885 when he was introduced to Prince Vladimir Romanov (see 7.3.1), about eighteen months before his official December 1886 debut balalaika performance brought him to the attention of the wider St. Petersburg public. It seems inevitable, therefore, that those two events were followed by Prince A.P. Ol'denburgskii's 1887 invitation to Andreev to perform for members of the royal household in the presence of Tsar Aleksandr III and his son, the future Tsar Nikolai II, given their interest in Russian folk art.

As Tsar, Nicholai II did try to continue to support and, indeed, to encourage the 'tradition' of his father's interest in Russian folk art.⁵⁶ The son of Nikolai II and heir to the Russian Imperial throne, Tsarevich Alexei Nikolaevich, for example, was a keen balalaika-player whose affection for this Russian folk instrument is affirmed by the fact

⁵⁶ A.I. Dobkin and A.V. Kobak, *Nevskii arkhiv: istoriko-kraevedcheskii sbornik*, vol. 6 (Saint Petersburg: Sankt-Peterburgskii fond kul'tury, 'Atkheneum', 2003), p.193.

that he 'never parted' with his copy of the *Shkola igry na balalaike* authored by Andreev's colleague V.T. Nasonov 'even to the final days of his life'. Moreover, the Emperor Nikolai II often wrote in his diaries about his impressions of listening to the balalaika.⁵⁷ Further evidence of Nikolai II's commitment to the cause of Russian folk music is the official recognition that he bestowed upon Andreev's orchestra and his work (see below in this section).

The Prince Ol'denburgskii invitation of 27 February 1887 (see section 7.3.1) was a life defining occasion for Andreev. In 1895, he recalled Tsar Aleksandr Aleksandrovich's words: 'I am very glad that thanks to your talent the balalaika will once again enter the *narod* and will again become a popular Russian instrument.' Andreev's sentiments about these words express significantly and reverently the mutual affection for Russian folk music art he shared with the former Emperor. Moreover, Andreev's concluding words in the following example are an explicit and assertive statement of the motivational effect of Aleksandr III's appraisal of the prospects for his work: 'These words became a dear testament (*dorogoi zavet*) to me, a source of strength and energy in my labors. Blessed with the Royal approval, loving Russian art with all my soul and realizing all its moral significance for the people, I devoted myself and all my modest means to the development of the cause dear to me.'⁵⁸ Andreev then concludes with what represents a clear declaration that his work for the advancement of Russia's 'national instrument' (balalaika) was yet intrinsic to the royal will: 'The significance of the Russian national instrument as a mouthpiece of folk songs will be forever confirmed by the gracious will of Your Imperial Majesty, and will bring me personally

⁵⁷ V.A. Averin, *Balalaechnoe ispolnitel'stvo v Sibiri: opyt monograficheskogo issledovaniia* (Krasnoiarsk: Krasnoiarskaia gosudarstvennaia akademiiia muzyki i teatra, 2013), p.214.

⁵⁸ RGIA f.468, op. 42, d.2053, ll. 2–3 ('Proshenie V.V. Andreeva na vysochaishee imia Vashe Imperatorskoe Velichestvo Vsemilostiveishii Monarkh', 26 December 1895).

the greatest happiness in the consciousness that, after 8 years of work, my selfless love for purely Russian art has been awarded the Monarch's attention.⁵⁹

A source of recollections of Andreev's activities confirms the degree of interest shared between Andreev and the Imperial Court in returning Russia's national folk instruments to the *narod*. This aspect of dissemination was represented by Andreev's work in the armed forces from 1891 (see above section 7.2.1). The development of this work teaching the balalaika to the *nizhniye chiny* (lower ranks) between 1891 and 1897 brought with it further requests for Andreev to extend his teaching to other *Gvardeiskiye polki* (The Guards' Regiments). It is stated that, for Andreev, these increasing teaching requests 'met the wishes of the late MONARCH [source emphasis], now reposing with our Lord, regarding returning to the people its national instruments' (*shli navstrechu mysli nezabvennogo v Boze pochivshego MONARKHA o vozvrashchenii narodu ego natsional'nykh instrumentov*). This statement directly challenges Soviet publications' presentations of this 'idea' as Andreev's alone and, yet, as an 'idea' that reflected a Soviet ideological approach to Russian folk culture⁶⁰.

Regarding the mutual means of 'dissemination' in the *narod*, Andreev was acutely aware that it '...exceeded the strength of one man' to satisfy the increase in teaching requests from other army regiments. And the close affinity Andreev shared with the Imperial Court's fondness for Russian folk art is confirmed by the fact that he should have approached the then reigning Emperor Tsar Nikolai II directly to propose a project which would help him to organize teaching staff for Russian folk music

⁵⁹ RGIA f.468, op. 42, d.2053, ll. 2–3 ('Proshenie V.V. Andreeva na vysochaishee imia Vashe Imperatorskoe Velichestvo Vsemilostiveishii Monarkh', 26 December 1895).

⁶⁰ A.S. Chagadaev, V.V. Andreev (Moscow and Leningrad: 'Muzgiz', p.40), The author quotes a statement allegedly made by Boris Sergeyevich Troianovskii (the former balalaika soloist in Andreev's orchestra), that Andreev's work with Russian folk instruments represented his endorsement of Soviet ideals in that aspect of music culture.

instruction in the army's lower ranks. Nikolai Romanov accepted Andreev's project and officially recognized it on 22 March 1897 [see also Chapter 6.8]. The same 'Памятная записка...' concludes that by this 'high level' sanctioning of Andreev's project, 'The SOVEREIGN EMPEROR [source emphasis] gave a wide opportunity and solid ground for the unconditional realization of the thought of His MOST AUGUST PARENT' (i.e., Aleksandr III) (*GOSUDAR' IMPERATOR dal shirokuiu vozmozhnost' I tverduiu pochvu k bezuslovnomu osushchestvleniiu mysli Svoego AVGUSTEISHEGO RODITELIA*).⁶¹

The above examples help to explain the reasons for the nature and level of communication between Andreev and the Imperial Court of two successive Russian sovereigns. However, available archival sources also shed light on the impact of Andreev's work with Russian folk music at Imperial Court level. This was not confined to endorsements of Andreev's teaching initiatives in the army. Collective balalaika performances of Russian folk instrumental music were a feature of Imperial palace entertainment, confirming that the popularity of improved Russian balalaikas and their artistic merits had been actively embraced at the highest social level by the second half of the 1890s. Evidence for this is a letter written to Andreev in 1897 from the Head of the Court orchestra, Konstantin Shtakel'berg (see below). General Baron Konstantin Karlovich Shtakel'berg (Stackelberg – 15 June 1848 - 30 March 1925) was a minor composer of musical works under the pseudonym 'Ceeste'. He also initiated public 'free-access' concerts, including a series of concerts with a music instructional and educational theme.⁶² However, it was in his capacity of service to Imperial Court

⁶¹ RGIA f.1405, op. 539, d. 311 ('Pamiatnaia zapiska o deiatel'nosti Vasiliiia Vasil'evicha Andreeva').

⁶² *Trudy russkogo issledovatel'skogo tsentra v Estonii*, vols 2-4 (Tallinn, 2008), p.187; and S.S. Prokof'ev, *Avtobiografija* (Moscow: Vsesoyuznoe izdatel'stvo «Sovietskii kompozitor», 1982), p.598.

music entertainment that he was connected to Andreev. He was appointed in August 1882 to take charge of the Royal Court's Music Choir (*Muzykantskii khor*) which had been established by Aleksandr III and which 'belonged to the army cavalry' (*chislilsia po armeiskoi kavalerii*). The group was re-organized into the Court orchestra in 1897, with Shtakel'berg being appointed its leader and remaining in that post until May 1917. In 1901 he founded the 'Aleksandr III Memorial Museum of the Court Orchestra', to which he contributed a personal collection of musical instruments.⁶³ This interest in musical instrument artefacts is likely to have appealed to Andreev's similar interest regarding the history and development of Russian folk instruments.

As early as 1879 he co-founded and, soon afterwards, became the Chairman of the St. Petersburg Society of Lovers of Music⁶⁴ nearly a decade before Andreev's *Kruzhok liubitelei igry na balalaikakh* entered into St. Petersburg's varied cultural 'society' of amateur music enthusiasts. It is also significant that, as with Andreev, Shtakel'berg's musical activities extended to the Russian armed forces. Between 1910 and 1912 he headed the Commission for the Improvement of the Musical Section in the Armed Forces and Navy' which devised a 'system' for preparing armed forces musicians.⁶⁵ Shtakel'berg's undoubted interest in the Russian balalaika is affirmed by the fact that his own daughter, Anna ('Ania') played the instrument.⁶⁶

Shtakel'berg's 29 December 1897 letter on behalf of Nikolai II requests Andreev's assistance regarding an upcoming performance of a waltz Andreev had composed

⁶³ Igor' Zimin, *Liudi Zimnego Dvortsu. Monarshie osoby, ikh favoriti i slugi* (St. Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo Tsentrpoligraf, 2014), p.557; and Prokofiev, *Avtobiografiiia*, p.598.

⁶⁴ Prokofiev, *Avtobiografiiia*, p.598.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Ania Shtakel'berg is said to have been 'expelled' from school for, among other misdemeanours, 'playing the balalaika during school lessons' (A.K. Botinenko, *Lyudi i sud'by na rubezhe vekov* (Moscow: Liki sud'by, 2000), p.237).

and dedicated to Tsar Nikolai's wife, Empress Aleksandra Fyodorovna. Shtakel'berg asks Andreev to send him the music score to the waltz to fulfil the Emperor's command that the Court orchestra's 'balalaika players' choir' (*khor balalaechnikov*) in Shtakel'berg's charge should learn to play and perform the piece. The same composition had its performance debut at St. Petersburg's *Petergofskii Dvorets* in the summer of 1897 during the *sojourn* of the President of the French Republic, Félix Faure (1841-1899).⁶⁷ Although Shtakel'berg's letter does not mention who gave the debut performance, it is quite certain that it was Andreev's own Russian folk orchestra. The orchestra had been recently renamed the *Velikorusskii orkestr* and it was of likely mutual interest to both Royal Court and Andreev for the orchestra to perform at the occasion of the Imperial Court's hosting of the French President. The appeal of the performance debut of Tsarina Aleksandra Fyodorovna's waltz to the Imperial sovereign would almost certainly have served to consolidate the Court's recognition and support of Andreev's work and of its affection for his attractively expanded orchestra. The aim of staging the performance with its obvious Russian flavour may also have been to appeal to French President Faure who was seeking closer ties with Russia at that time. Andreev himself was already well known and respected among France's artistic elite and was intending to return to Paris for another World Exhibition presentation of his developing work with Russian folk instruments.

Andreev and his orchestra's status in Russian High Society was ultimately confirmed on 30 January 1903 when Tsar Nikolai II announced his decision to accept the *Velikorusskii orkestr* under his 'highest patronage'.⁶⁸ A concert which the orchestra

⁶⁷ RGALI, f. 695, op. 1,2, d. 941 ('Pis'mo k V.V. Andreevu ot Nachal'nika Pridvornogo Orkestra', 29 December 1897). Felix Faure was a colonial expansionist and President of the French Republic from 1895 to 1899, including during the *Dreyfus Affair*.

⁶⁸ Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p.102.

gave before the Imperial Court family at Tsarskoe Selo on 5 May that year⁶⁹ was the likely occasion to celebrate that confirmed status. Of the patronage of those of 'high standing' generally, Baranov surmises that Andreev 'did not...beg for patronage, but it came to him by a happy accident'.⁷⁰ The patronage of the Imperial Court was undoubtedly an important declaration of the high esteem in which Andreev's work was now held, notwithstanding the timing of the Tsar's announcement. It was six years following the unveiling of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* that Andreev's work was rewarded with official Imperial Court recognition. And Andreev had been actively bringing to fruition Tsar Aleksandr III's desire to broaden the appeal of Russian folk music since at least 1891 when he began teaching and organizing Russian folk collectives in the army. Nevertheless, there is direct evidence that Nikolaiii II's patronage of 1903 was a beneficial means of asserting the artistic and social status of Andreev's orchestra in the minds of others yet to be introduced to the Imperial Court's *Velikorusskii orkestr*.

One such example is that of Prince Vladimir Romanov's support. The Great Prince Vladimir Aleksandrovich Romanov (10 April 1847–4 February 1909) was the third son of Tsar Aleksandr II. His main occupations were in the Russian military in which he held various positions of command, including Commander-in-Chief of the St. Petersburg military command region. He also served as a member of the State Council, as well as President of the Academy of Arts.⁷¹ Prince Vladimir's personal interest in the Russian Arts is exemplified by the 'generous' financial support he provided to Sergei Pavlovich Diagilev's 'revolutionary blend' of music, poetry, painting and

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ Baranov, *Vasilii Andreev*, p. 87.

⁷¹ *Bol'shoi entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*, vol. 1 (Moskva: «Sovietskaia entsiklopedia», 1991), p.228; A.N. Bokhanov, *Nikolai II* (Moskva: «Ast-Press», 2002), p.198; G.N. Korneva and T.N. Cheboksarova, 'Delovye, rodstvennye i druzheskie sviazi velikogo kniazia Vladimira Aleksandrovicha,' *Iz glubiny vremen* 10 (1998); Iu. A. Kuz'min, *Rossiiskaia imperatorskaia familia. 1797– 1917* (Saint Petersburg: Dmitrii Bulanin, 2005).

dancing'.⁷² Whether or not Prince Vladimir considered Andreev's work as progressive, his support for the two Russian art activists demonstrates a broadminded evaluation of Andreev's contribution to Russian music culture, the very kind of broadminded evaluation which faced contention from some individuals in other Russian artistic circles (see Chapter 5).

Prince Vladimir's 1908 Letter of Recommendation (*Rekomendatel'noe pis'mo*) suggests that Andreev's orchestra benefited from the leverage of Royal Court endorsement of its work. As the brother of Aleksandr III, Prince Vladimir would have been well acquainted with the former Tsar's interest in Russian folk art. His 1908 Letter of Recommendation opens with an immediate declaration of the high regard for Andreev's orchestra demonstrated by Imperial Court patronage: 'The high patronage given to the Great Russian Orchestra speaks sufficiently about its merits' (*Vysokoe pokrovitel'stvo, okazannoe Velikorusskomu Orkestru, v dostatochnoi mere govorit o ego dostoinstvakh*). Vladimir continues his letter with an explicit commendation of the work of the orchestra's leader and states the purpose of its upcoming 'aim' in words reminiscent of Aleksandr III's sentiments (see above): the orchestra, he writes 'travelled beyond the borders of the Empire with the special goal of familiarizing Western States with the national instruments of old Rus' which he [Andreev] has improved' (*vyekhal za predely Imperii so spetsial'noi tsel'iu oznakomit' zapadnye Gosudarstva s usovershenstvovannymi im natsional'nymi instrumentami staroi Rusi*). Prince Vladimir concludes in his letter that, on the basis of 'knowing V.V. Andreev

⁷² J. Van Der Kiste, *The Romanovs 1818-1959* (Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 2003), p.198.

personally and taking interest in his work...', he wishes that Andreev (together with his orchestra) should be treated as appropriately 'as he fully deserves'.⁷³

Despite the patronage bestowed upon Andreev's orchestra, the struggle to maintain the collective and its work continued in Russia. Baranov's statement that Imperial Court patronage secured the position of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* is not reflected in the subsidies issue which consumed Andreev's time and energy for the remainder of his life's work.⁷⁴ However, that issue did evidently intensify when Andreev's connections to the Imperial Court were severed by the changes in the socio-political order which began in February 1917.

7.4. The battle for subsidies

Imperial Court Patronage elevated the status of Andreev's orchestra to the 'Great Russian Orchestra of the Imperial Court' (*Velikorusskii orkestr Imperatorskogo Dvortsya*). Prior to Nikolai II's proclamation of this status on 30 January 1903, Andreev was galvanized in his endeavours to advance Russian folk instrumental music in the *narod* by the Royal Court's approval of his work (see above 7.3.2). However, in order to secure financial subsidies for that work prior to 1917, it was still necessary to submit funding requests to government departmental figures, although it seems royal patronage of his orchestra was assurance for Andreev to approach government figures with Imperial Court connections for that purpose. In the case of S.D. Sheremetev, for example, that connection was anchored by a shared interest in the art and culture of Russian folk music, which was fostered at the highest Imperial Court

⁷³ RGALI, f. 695, op. 1,2, d. 1082 (Kniaz' Vladimir [Romanov], 'Rekomendatel'noe pis'mo', 1908).

⁷⁴ Baranov, *Vasili Andreev*, p.102.

level and which had helped to forge Andreev's favour with two successive Imperial rulers.⁷⁵

The precarious financial position of Andreev's orchestra, despite its elevated social status from early 1903, is partly illustrated in a sheet appended to a draft letter of 12 January 1909.⁷⁶ This confirms Andreev is attaching details (not included with the archive draft source) of Royal Court reserve (*ordenskii kapital* or *o. kapital*) expenditure. Andreev confides in Sheremetev a claim from a certain 'Konarzhevskii'⁷⁷ (who provided the Royal Court reserves expenditure document and insisted on its prompt return to him) that there were 'no strict rules' regarding this expenditure for the 'needs of the church'. This suggests that those rules were being used to preclude Andreev's orchestra from receiving funds from the stated source. In the letter Andreev asserts that the financial needs of his orchestra's members were such that they could not wait beyond 10 May 1909 for guaranteed funds to subsidise their teaching and performance roles. Should the latest case for subsidies be refused, Andreev warns that he would be 'left without an orchestra'. It is a conspicuous detail that Andreev should also advise Sheremetev that, according to the same 'K.[onarzhevskii]' the case for further subsidies would 'not be approved' if it were laid before the 'Minister of the Court'. Everything concerning the rules about Royal Court reserves expenditure was dependent on the 'Supreme Will' (*Vysochaishaia Volia*), i.e., of the Tsar himself. Even six years after Imperial Court patronage had been bestowed on the *Velikorusskii*

⁷⁵ Count Colonel Sergei Dmitrievich Sheremetev (14 (26) November 1844 - 17 December 1918) held numerous positions of influence including as member of the Russian State Duma and the State Council as well as active social, cultural and academic positions. Both he and his younger brother Aleksandr Dmitrievich Sheremetev (1859-1931) led Imperial Court music ensembles.

⁷⁶ RGALI, f. 695, op. 1,2, d. 100, l.1-1 ob. ('Pis'mo k gr.[afu] Sheremet'evu, S.D. – Chernovik', 12 January 1909). This additional sheet to the main RGALI document is neither included, nor referenced in Granovskii's *Materiały i dokumenty*, where only the main letter appears (letter No.21, p. 156).

⁷⁷ Full name not given. This was possibly the son or brother of Enriikh Al'bertovich Konarzhevskii (1833-1906).

orkestr, the indications from Andreev's advice are that there were still obstructions at government departmental level to efforts to secure the financial support for his work. Sheremetev was clearly a Court minister on whom Andreev was dependent to overcome such obstacles and to influence decisions affecting his orchestra's financial future.

A further case pleading for financial subsidies was drafted for S.D. Sheremetev's attention the following year (1910). As with the previous example, the 1910 draft demonstrates how the progress and development of Andreev's work relied on the beneficence of influential figures connected to the Imperial Court, including some, like Sheremetev, with whom Andreev had himself become connected. The intention behind the 1910 subsidies plea was for Sheremetev to pass it on to the Ministry of Finance, Trade and Industry and to mitigate Andreev's orchestra's case in the application process. This draft is consistent with other applications for financial support for Andreev's work after 1903, for it implies that the need for continued state financing of the orchestra's work also encompassed support for the roles the orchestra was entrusted to fulfil under the status of its Imperial Court patronage.⁷⁸ The performance, teaching and organizational roles and aims of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* are introduced and summarized, with emphasis on their benefits to the *narod*, e.g., that the orchestra's artistic merits had 'gripped the attention "of all levels (vsekh sloev) [my emphasis] of the Russian *narod*".⁷⁹ The original draft of this included in its introductory statement a reference to the admiration of 'foreign monarchs' and learned musicians for the orchestra's showcasing of the richness of Russian folk music.⁸⁰ This was

⁷⁸ See RGALI, f.695, khr. d.1022 ('Dokladnaia zapiska Sheremet'evu, grafu S.D. - Gof Marshalu - o predostavlenii denezhnykh sredstv na sozdanie orkestra,' March 1910), p.1.

⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁸⁰ Ibid.

omitted from the document's final text, possibly because it was considered to add little weight to the document's core plea for funding in light of the orchestra's importance to the Russian people. In lieu of that omitted statement is a brief, general point about appreciation of the orchestra and its work abroad. Monarchical endorsement of Andreev's work is therefore denoted exclusively by the citing of the Russian Imperial Court's patronage of his orchestra.

The drafters of the 1910 plea explain that the strength of the orchestra's calling lay in the significance of its major work in the *narod*. Andreev's Russian folk collective was accordingly encouraged to bolster the interest it had stirred among the *narod* through the orchestra's activities. It is made clear, however, that the attempt to fulfil that aim was becoming 'unsustainable' both 'personally and financially'.⁸¹

Personifying the aims and needs of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* in the name of Andreev was likely intended to influence Sheremetev's view of this 1910 request for support by appealing to his own interest in that burgeoning sphere of culture endemic to the Russian nation. The *Gof Marshal* had by now been well acquainted for over 20 years with Andreev and his shared interest with the Imperial family in engaging the *narod* in Russian folk instrumental music activities. And the appeal to that interest is borne out by the document's concluding statement. The point is made about Andreev's work being 'deservedly' valued overseas and that he was receiving proposals to transfer his 'great work' abroad in return for 'contractual gain'. However, the emphasis then immediately switches to the Russian national complexion of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* director's work. It was Andreev's 'esteemed duty' as a *Russian* to 'bear to the end the

⁸¹ Ibid.

weight of his labour [...] for the Russian people.⁸² This is one example of how requests for financial subsidies sought to adduce a supportive response from officials of state by appealing to national, or patriotic sentiment towards Russian artistic and cultural identity.

The numerous applications for state subsidies submitted by Andreev and his colleagues also testify to their reliance on Royal Court connections with regard to the increasing need financially to consolidate and to supplement Andreev's work. Their April 1910 plea, submitted to Prince Viktor Sergeyevich Kochubei, resembles the above example drafted about a month earlier for Sheremetev.⁸³ It repeats the appeal for funds to establish a second, model orchestra, to increase the number of teachers and to secure for them annual salaries. This would maintain their performance tours in Russia and abroad, thus not confining the teaching and performance roles to St. Petersburg. The priority aim of concert touring in Russia is stated and defined as providing impetus to the wide dissemination of improved, accessible Russian folk instruments within the *narod* (see Chapter 2.3).⁸⁴ Clarifying the focus of this aim in these terms may explain Andreev's apparent reticence over approaching the 'Minister of the Court' on the subsidies issue a few months earlier. The benefits of Andreev's work to the *narod* had by then been long endorsed by the Imperial Court. But even royal patronage of his orchestra was not in itself the leverage by which Andreev could automatically procure subsidies from the custodians of Imperial Court reserves.

⁸² 'Dokladnaia zapiska Sheremet'evu, grafu S.D.', p.4.

⁸³ Prince Kochubei (11 Oct. 1860 – 4 Dec. 1923) was an Aide-de-Camp General, whose closeness to Tsar' Nikolai II is shown by his service both as Aide-de-Camp to the Imperial throne successor Tsarevich Nikolai Aleksandrovich from 1 January 1892 to 21 October 1894, and as Major (Brigadier)General to His Imperial Highness from 1899 to 1906 (*Rossiiskii arkhiv: Istoriiia Otechestva v svidetelstvakh i dokumetakh XVIII-XX vv.*, vol 8 (Moscow: Studiya TRITE: Rossiiskii arkhiv, 1998), p.447.

⁸⁴ RGALI, f. 695, khr. d.1023 ('Kniaziu Viktoru Sergeevichu Kochubeiu (o subsidiakh)', April 1910).

Like Sheremetev, Kochubei was a conduit for petitioning for subsidies and was another Imperial Court Ministry official whose close association with Russian royalty would have made him aware of the Romanov family interest in the progress of Andreev's endeavours. The fact that he held various positions in the military from 1879 onwards suggests a link to Andreev's work in the army via their respective royal court connections. The April 1910 plea is thus introduced as from the 'staff leader of the armed forces teachers', etc., Andreev. It emphasizes the benefit to the Russian people of the orchestra's profoundly national cause and refers to the pressing need for financial help, without which Andreev would not be able to advance its work or even to continue to operate in Russia. In the final two paragraphs Andreev explains the need for accommodation for himself and his 'precious' instruments as well as for space to work with the orchestra which had increased in size to 45 musicians. And he advises that subsidies could be paid out of the Royal Court reserve (*ordenskii kapital*), possibly on the basis of the information about its expenditure provided by Konarzhevskii (see above).

Throughout the 1910s, the struggle to secure subsidies continued as it had since the 1890s, as revealed by archive sources covering a range of proposed *Velikorusskii orkestr* activities.⁸⁵ After the February Revolution of 1917, however, a new approach to subsidy requests was needed. This had been effectively decided at a meeting in March 1916 to establish the Society for the Promotion of Playing Folk Instruments and Collective Singing (*Obshchestvo rasprostraneniia igry na narodnykh instrumentakh i khorovogo peniia*) which affirmed the wider Russian relevance of subsidising the work

⁸⁵ See, for example RGALI f. 695, op. 1,2. d.1013 ('Prosheniia i dokladnye zapiski Frederiksu, V.B., Ministru dvora i udelov ob otpuske sredstv na soderzhanie orkestra i o poezdke orkestra na Vsemirnuyu vystavku v Parizhe', 1900-1914); RGALI f. 695, op. 1,2. d. 1020 ('Dokladnye zapiski Ministru finansov o predostavlenii sredstv orkestru ANDREEVA, V.V.,' 1908-1917).

of Andreev's orchestra.⁸⁶ But when, from 2 March 1917, the Provisional Government took charge of Imperial court funds for re-distribution, Andreev was forced to re-apply for subsidies.⁸⁷ Consequentially, this also enforced a swift change in the use of the orchestra's profile to justify and to secure those subsidies.

Four key communications to the Provisional Government illustrate the orchestra's continuing battles for subsidy in the immediate post-imperial era. In the first of these, a 'Dokladnaia zapiska' of March 1917,⁸⁸ a request is made for continuation of funding originally paid from the Imperial Chancery (or finance office) to maintain the orchestra. The request draws attention to the 28-year-long contribution of Andreev's promotion of Russian folk music instruments, in particular in military establishments. It emphasises further the role of free courses provided in villages and factories in enriching the leisure and the cultural life of Russian people. It seeks to persuade by pointing to the economic value of the orchestra, with the production of instruments alone generating in excess of 1.5 million roubles.⁸⁹

Less than a month later, on 5 April 1917, Andreev writes to the Provisional Government to ask whether, in light of the new political situation, the *Velikorusskii orkestr* will continue to receive its 2,500-rouble monthly subsidy to pay the salaries of orchestra members.⁹⁰ Here he underlines the worries that the situation is causing the members of the orchestra and urges the Government to expedite matters.

⁸⁶ P.A. Obolenskii, 'Iz vospominanii ob Andreeve' in Granovskii, *Materialy i Dokumenty*, pp.244-45 & p.336fn1.

⁸⁷ Granovskii, *Materialy i Dokumenty*, pp.269-70.

⁸⁸ RGALI f. 695, op. 1,2. d. 1029 *"Dokladnaia zapiska predsedatelyu soveta ministrov Vremennogo pravitel'stva s pros'boi o vydache orkestru iz summ, naxodiashchikhsia v vysheupomianutom uchrezhdenii", 3 March 1917).

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ RGALI f. 695, op. 1,2. d. 1033 ('Proshenie Vremennomu pravitel'stu o subsidiakh', 5 April 1917).

A lengthier note to the Provisional Government dated May 1917 refers once again to orchestra salary payments made hitherto but also refers to the 25,000 roubles per annum made for library maintenance, accommodation, note transcription, and the offices and salary of Andreev himself.⁹¹ The document then sketches the plight of *Velikorusskii orkestr* members resulting from the non-receipt of funds for two months and insists on the urgency of continued funding; finances, it is claimed, will only last until 20 May. The note refers to the advice of Commissar N.N. Glebov that subsidies could only be paid to an institution, not an individual, and it reports that on 7 March the orchestra was duly legally constituted as a “musical society” (registered as a ‘corporate institution on legal grounds’, *korporativnoe uchrezhdenie na iuridicheskikh osnovaniakh*), which had been officially registered that same month. And it was on this basis that the renewed request for subsidy was now being made. A warning is then given that loss of subsidy would mean the end of the orchestra’s varied activities, including:

‘teaching in regiments, classes in courses for invalids, running a training workshop, arranged for the same people, for production of folk instruments, as well as the activities of many folk music organizations that he brought to life and spread throughout Russia’

(преподавание в полках, занятия на курсах для инвалидов, заведование учебной мастерской, устроенной для них же, для выделки народных инструментов, и так же деятельность многих народномузыкальных

⁹¹ RGALI f. 695, op. 1,2. d. 1036 (‘Proshenie Vremennomu Pravitelstvu o subsidiakh’, May 1917). The document records that this note was: ‘peredano Iv. Sem. Klyuzhevui dla M.V. Rodzianko’.

организации, вызванных им к жизни и распространившихся по всей России).

The document ends by proposing that the orchestra and its teaching staff should be taken care of by the Ministry of Defence (*Voennoe Ministerstvo*), as teaching in the army had been ongoing since 1897.

In yet another (undated, but logically following RGALI No.1036) approach to the Provisional Government, the Committee of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* shifts the emphasis to the artistic scope of orchestra members and details reasons why funding for the ensemble and its army work should continue (i.e., nearly all regiments now had their own *Velikorusskii orkestr* and some of their musicians could compete with professional musicians on account of their very high standard of playing).⁹² The Committee requests that, if the ongoing subsidy is not to be confirmed by the State Finance Office, it at least be extended to 1 January 1918 in accordance with the credit agreed for the current year by the former Imperial Chancery.

The abdication of Tsar Nikolai II on 2 March (O.S.) 1917 was followed by three emergency meetings on 7, 8 and 10 March 1917 of the now 'former Imperial Velikorusskii Orkestr' Committee. At the latter meeting the Committee accepted 'V.V. Andreev's suggestion to send a telegram to Maksim Gorky with a request to collaborate in our activities' (*predlozenie V.V. Andreeva poslat' Maksimu Gor'komu telegrammu s pros'boi o sodeistvii nashemu delu*).⁹³ The end of the Tsar's reign also ended Imperial Court patronage of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* which required its Committee to secure an alternative public figure to connect with the orchestra and to

⁹² RGALI, f. 695, op. 1,2. d. 1037 ('Proshenie Vremennomu Pravitelstvu o subsidiakh', 1917).

⁹³ RGALI, f. 667, op. 1, ed. khr. 48, l. 3. See also 'V.V. Andreev v 1917-1918 godakh', in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, pp. 337 and 268.

help to maintain its artistic and cultural profile (see above section 7.3.3). Available sources reveal little about Gorky's connection to Andreev's orchestra.⁹⁴ Therefore, it is not known what role, if any, and to what extent Gorky contributed to the cause of the *Velikorusskii orkestr* during the critical period from February 1917 and beyond.⁹⁵

It seems that the rapidly deepening funding crisis compelled Andreev and his fellow orchestra Committee members into hastening measures to mitigate their subsidies case. On 4 May, 1917, Vladimir Nabokov of the Provisional Government Treasury (канцелярия) wrote to Andreev to affirm its original decision (reviewed at a Treasury meeting of 27 April 1917) not to continue the annual 30,000 rubles subsidy for the orchestra; the Treasury had found no basis for even 're-considering its initial decision'.⁹⁶ An intriguing detail of a *protocol* of a *Velikorusskii orkestr* Committee meeting of 20 April 1917 (i.e., two weeks prior to Nabokov's 4 May decision letter) reveals that the Committee voted 'unanimously' to stage a concert in aid of political exiles, rather than in aid of their own orchestra.⁹⁷ Nabokov had already declined an invitation to him and his ministerial colleagues to attend a performance of Andreev's orchestra the previous month.⁹⁸ This concert invitation could only have been made with the intention to elicit a favourable outcome to subsidy renewal applications and appeals. The same is quite possible regarding the staging of a concert to aid political exiles, despite the severity of the orchestra's own financial predicament at that time.

⁹⁴ See, for example, Lachinov 'Genialny samorodok', p.287 & pp.292-3. It is known that that Gorky, as well as other leading artistic luminaries from Russia and Europe, sent a telegram to Andreev congratulating him on the 25th anniversary (1913) of his work and Gorky is said to have 'valued highly Andreev's talent'.

⁹⁵ The only other available source revealing the Andreev-Gorky connection is a 12 April 1914 letter from Gorky (signed in his real name 'A. Peshkov') to Andreev, handed to the A.M. Gorky archive of the *Tsentral'nyi Gosudarstvennyi Literaturnyi Arkhiv* (now RGALI) on 11 March 1948, f.695, khr. 635. Gorky apologetically declines Andreev's invitation to an unstated event due to 'forgetting' about a prior engagement

⁹⁶ RGALI f. 695, op. 1,2. d. 580 (Vlad. Nabokov, 'Pis'ma k Andreevu, V.V.', 4 May 1917).

⁹⁷ Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.268.

⁹⁸ RGALI f. 695, op. 1,2. d. 580 (Vlad. Nabokov, 'Pis'ma k Andreevu, V.V.', 18 March 1917).

But there are no indications of whether the concert was staged and, in any event, the subsidies crisis precipitated by the Tsar's abdication continued into 1918.

It is ironic that the future of Andreev's work and his orchestra was eventually secured by a new regime which was instrumental in terminating Imperial Court patronage. The new 'patronage' of the Soviet Government hinged on a 1918 meeting between Andreev and the then 'Minister for Enlightenment' Anatolii Vasil'evich Lunacharskii.⁹⁹ The basis of the protection and support of Andreev's orchestra from this point was a different interpretation of the role of Andreev's work and his Russian folk 'collective' within the Russian *narod* to that envisaged by the Imperial Court which had spurred the impetus and direction of Andreev's work from the latter 1880s.

⁹⁹ P.A. Obolenskii 'Iz vospominanij ob Andreeve' in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, pp.245-6

8. CONCLUSION

This thesis has discussed the role of Vasili Vasil'evich Andreev in changing attitudes towards Russian folk instruments and music in Russia. It explains how Andreev exercised this role through the progress and development of his aims via his activities as a largely successful organiser, publicist and educator and through his collaborations with talented, dedicated cultural and societal figures who his own tireless dedication attracted to his cause.

This thesis acquaints Western music culture scholarship with Andreev's largely forgotten, yet highly significant position within the history and progress of Russian music culture. In so doing, it establishes him as an important figure and personality deserving of a prominent position in the history of the development of Russian music culture generally and of Russian folk music culture in particular. It reminds Western music scholars of the enormous contribution of Andreev's work, achievements and legacy to Russia's cultural landscape.

One aspect of locating Andreev's position in Russian music culture relates to his activities against the background of intellectual thought within Russian culture. It is not a straightforward task to place him within any particular ideological movement. One cannot say with certainty, for example, that his work and ideas were definitively Slavophile, or Russian nationalist. It is simpler to say that his activities for the music culture of the Russian *narod* did not represent Soviet notions that the music culture of the Russian *narod* was an expression of a cultured proletariat. Andreev was evidently more of a patriot of his nation with love of its folk music culture. His work and ideas form a prism through which the colours in the spectrum of Russian cultural and ideological thought are visible for our scrutiny, including, for example, representations

of *narodnost'*, Russianness and Russian patriotism through his activities and his orchestra. This is one area of Andreev's work and activities which deserves more research.

Another area deserving of more investigation is Andreev's associations with the Imperial Court. Space within this thesis has not permitted more detailed examination and discussion of this area of Andreev's activities. The sources of information in this area are almost exclusively archival and have only relatively recently (to the undertaking of this thesis) tentatively begun to see the light of day. Strict archive rules compromised access to Imperial Court-related sources. This limited to a minimum the number of archival sources that could be used in this thesis to shed light on the Imperial Court as a major factor in Andreev's work.

Regarding Andreev's plans for a *Dom narodnoi muzyki*, writers of the Soviet period seemingly conflate this with other of his plans to further the dissemination of Russian folk instruments and music. For example, Sokolov mentions Andreev's ideas for courses for village teachers to train folk orchestra instructors in village schools (1912) and plans for balalaika classes in railway workers' colleges (1912) alongside plans for a *Dom narodnoi muzyki* (1915) and plans for an *Obshchestvo rasprostraneniiia igry na narodnykh instrumentakh i khorovogo peniia* (1916). And although Andreev aimed to improve and enrich the cultural life of the *krest'yanskaia sreda* through the fulfilment of these ideas and projects, this aim was not driven by political ideology.

This thesis has shown that the plan to create a *Dom narodnoi muzyki* was loosely akin to a seemingly borrowed concept, or 'working-out' of English/ European equivalents of *Narodnye doma* out of which Andreev devised his idea for a *Dom narodnoi muzyki*. His idea had no commonality with any Soviet cultural perceptions of Andreev

benefiting the proletariat, nor was it a pre-emptive pseudo-Soviet idea. As explained in Chapter 7, the aim of the Western version of *narodnye doma* was purely to improve the lot of the general public – the equivalent of the *narod* - from the simplest folk through to those of higher stations.

They were established in England as a distraction and diversion away from a detrimental drinking culture and provided opportunities for a wide range of academic, cultural and leisure pursuits. The first of these was created in England at modern-day Mile End, East London, and opened by Queen Victoria in 1887.¹ The premier opening of the Russian equivalents was in St. Petersburg in 1900, in the name of the Russian Imperial crown. This *Narodnyi dom*, and the others that followed it, was also established to counter new liberal regulations for alcohol production. Although Andreev's own idea for the 'Dom narodnoi muzyki' was not fully realised, those ideas deserve more research to ameliorate understanding of the broad spectrum of Andreev's ideas for further advancement of Russian folk music culture.

It is not without a certain irony that support for Andreev's orchestra bestrode two seemingly ideologically opposed regimes, Imperial and Soviet, for separate nationalistic/ patriotic reasons. The long-term security of Andreev's orchestra which had enjoyed the patronage of the head of the Imperial regime was ultimately guaranteed by the very regime that overthrew it.

L.S. Lench expressed the view after Andreev's death that the *Velikorusskii orkestr* founder's 'deep *narodnost'*... had been revealed in his discovery of the village

¹ These 'People's Palaces' as they were collectively known had equivalents in North London (Alexandra Palace), South London (Crystal Palace), and West London (Earls Court), with similar institutions soon appearing in Germany, Holland and France. See also *Novyi entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*, vol. 27 (Petrograd: Izdatel'skoe delo byvshie Brokgauz-Efron", 1916), cols. 946-949

carpenter S.I. Nalimov, an ‘excellent craftsman (“левша”)’ from the *Tver* region of Russia’s central belt. Nalimov’s ‘hands of gold’ had expressed that *narodnost*’ in the crafting of ‘Andreev’s famous balalaika’. This is a fair statement which correlates with Andreev’s reasoning that the *narodnost*’ of his *Velikorusskii orkestr* was intrinsic to the improved Russian folk instruments that comprised it. Lench then concludes that Andreev’s ‘love towards’ the Russian *narod* had led the ‘former soloist of His Majesty into the revolutionary camp during the tempestuous year of the Civil War [1917 Revolution] <...>’ [editor’s redaction].² But the reality was that the political and social upheaval of 1917 almost obliterated all that Andreev had toiled to achieve over several decades for his orchestra and Russian folk instruments. He feared that, after his death, all that he had achieved could be lost unless other of his colleagues still living had the same determination to progress and to develop those achievements into the future. It was natural, therefore, that Andreev was forced by the turmoil of 1917 to respond pragmatically to try to safeguard that future. The root of that determination was his passion for Russian folk instrumental culture and he adapted to political change to preserve it.

It was revealed early in this thesis that the debate over *narodnost*’ was expressed in a dispute between A.S. Famintsyn and V.V. Stasov. Did Andreev’s Russian folk instrumental music have features of *narodnost*’ which benefited from European opera’s influence on Russian music generally, or did it express its own Russian folk derivations and influences? The *narodnost*’ of Andreev’s orchestra indeed lay in its composition of uniquely Russian folk instruments. But its artistic expression reflected both sides of the Famintsyn and Stasov debate. The orchestra’s performance of

² L.S Lench, ‘Vasilii Vasil’evich’, in Granovskii, *Materialy i dokumenty*, p.249

classical, including operatic extracts, alongside the 'folk', with the Glazunov folksymphonic in between, both mirrored and echoed the broader paradoxes and contradictions of Russian culture which equally paradoxically enrich it. Andreev's orchestra was an example of the generally contradictory nature of Russian culture which accounts for much of its appeal. This is also an area deserving of more research, especially in light of R. Taruskin's detailed analysis of aspects of the folk and *narodnost'* in the Russian symphonic sphere in the nineteenth century.³

³ Taruskin, R., *Defining Russia Musically*, Princeton University Press, Princeton and Oxford, Third Edition, 2000

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi arkhiv literatury i iskusstva (RGALI), f. 695, op. 1,2, d. 8

(‘Zamechaniiia po povodu proshchenii sotrudnikov orkestra Andreeva, V.V. v gosudarstvennuiu dumu o subsidiakh (chernovoi avtograf’)).

RGALI, f. 695, op. 1,2, d. 12 (‘K sozdaniyu Doma narodnoi muzyki’)

RGALI, f. 695, op. 1,2, d. 51 (‘Pis’ma k grafu Kokovtsevu, Vladimiru Nikolaevichu, (Ministru finansov), 20 March, 14 June 1908).

RGALI, f. 695, op. 1,2, d. 100 (‘Pis’mo k gr.[afu] Sheremet’evu, S.D. – Chernovik, 12 January 1909).

RGALI, f. 695, op. 1,2, d. 580 (‘Nabokov, Vlad., Pis’ma k Andreevu, V.V., 4 May 1917).

RGALI, f. 695, op. 1,2, d. 941 (‘Pis’mo k V.V. Andreevu ot Nachal’nika Pridvornogo Orkestra’, 29 December 1897).

RGALI, f. 695, op. 1,2, d. 944 (‘Obshchestvo instituta slepykh, 22 November 1888).

RGALI, f. 695, op. 1,2, d. 1010 (‘Udostovereniiia Andreeva, V.V., na pravo pol’zovaniia zemlei, o prave prozhivaniia v s. Mar’inskem i dr., 1917-1918).

RGALI, f. 695, op. 1,2, d. 1013 (‘Prosheniiia i dokladnye zapiski FREDERIKSU, V.B., Ministru dvora i udelov ob otpuske sredstv na soderzhanie orkestra i o poezdke orkestra na Vsemirnyu vystavku v Parizhe’, 1900-1914).

RGALI, f. 695, op. 1,2, d. 1020 (‘Dokladnye zapiski Ministru finansov o predostavlenii sredstv orkestru ANDREEVA, V.V.’, 1908-1917).

RGALI, f. 695, op. 1,2, d. 1021 (‘Ob’iasnenie na zamechanie biudzhetnoi komissii Gosudarstvennoi dumy ob assignovaniii neobkhodimykh sredstv dlia orkestra Andreeva, V.V.’, 22 January 1909).

RGALI, f. 695, op. 1,2, d. 1022 ('Dokladnaia zapiska Sheremet'evu, grafu S.D. - Gof Marshalu - o predostavlenii denezhnykh sredstv na sozdanie orkestra', March 1910).

RGALI, f. 695, op. 1,2, d. 1023 ('Dokladnaia zapiska V.V. Andreevym Kniaziu Kochubeiu, Viktoru Sergeevichu', April 1910).

RGALI, f. 695, op. 1,2, d. 1029 ('Dokladnaia zapiska predsedateliu soveta ministrov Vremennogo pravitel'stva s pros'boi o vydache orkestru iz summ, naxodiashchikhsia v vysheupomianutom uchrezhdenii', 3 March 1917).

RGALI, f. 695, op. 1,2, d. 1116 *'Spiski sotrudnikov orkestra Andreeva V.V.', 1888-1917).

RGALI, f. 695, op. 1,2, d. 1033 ('Proshenie Vremennomu pravitel'stvu o subsidiakh', 5 April 1917).

RGALI, f. 695, op. 1,2, d. 1036 ('Proshenie Vremennomu Pravitelstvu o subsidiakh', May 1917).

RGALI, f. 695, op. 1,2, d. 1037 ('Proshenie Vremennomu Pravitelstvu o subsidiakh', 1917).

RGALI, f. 695, op. 1,2, d. 1082 ('Rekomendatel'noe Pis'mo Kniazia Vladimira [Romanova] s pros'boi o pokrovitel'stve orkestra Andreeva, V.V., v ego poездakh v zapadnykh gosudarstvakh', 1908).

Rossiiskii gosudarstvennyi istoricheskii arkhiv (RGIA), f. 468, op. 42, d. 2053 ('Proshenie V.V. Andreeva na vysochaishee imia Vashe Imperatorskoe Velichestvo Vsemilostiveishii Monarkh', 26 December 1895).

RGIA, f. 1405, op. 539, d. 311 ('Pamiatnaia zapiska o deiatel'nosti Vasiliia Vasil'evicha Andreeva').

Aksiuka, S.V., and F.V. Sokolov, eds. *Russkaia narodnaia balalaika: sbornik narodnykh balalaechnykh naigrayshei*. Moscow: Sovetskii kompozitor, 1962.

Andreev, V.V. *Spravochnik ili kratkoe rukovodstvo dlia oborudovaniia Velikorusskago orkestra*. Petrograd: Otechestvennaia tipografiia, 1916.

Arsen'ev, K.K., ed. *Novaia entsiklopediia slov Brokgauza i Efrona*. Saint Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo F.A. Brokgauz - I.A. Efron, 1911.

Averin, V.A. *Balalaechnoe ispolnitel'stvo v Sibiri: opyt monograficheskogo issledovaniia*. Krasnoiarsk: FGBOU VPO KGAMiT, 2013.

Baranov, Iu. E. *Podvizhnik muzyki narodnoi*. Moscow: Moskovskii rabochii, 1988.

———. *Vasilii Andreev*. Tver': Russkaia provintsiia, 2001.

Bokhanov, A.N. *Nikolai II*. Moscow: Ast-Press, 2002.

Bonitenko, A.K. *Liudi i sud'by na rubezhe vekov: vospominaniia, dnevniki, pis'ma (1895-1925)*. Moscow: Liki sud'by, 2000.

Chagadaev, A.S. V.V. Andreev. Moscow and Leningrad: Muzgiz, 1948.

Cheboksarova, T.N., and G.N. Korneva. "Delovye, rodstvennye i druzheskie sviazi velikogo kniazia Vladimira Aleksandrovicha." *Iz glubiny vremen* 10 (1998).

Chistiakov, V.V. "Orkestr russkikh narodnykh instrumentov i problemy vospitaniia dirizhera." *Trudy GMPI (RAM) im. Gnesinykh* 85 (1986).

Doub, Austin. "Understanding the Cultural and Nationalistic Impacts of the moguchaia kuchka." *Musical Offerings* 10.2 (2019): 49–60.

Famintsyn, A.S. *Domra i srodyne ei instrumenty russkogo naroda*. Saint Petersburg: Tipografiia E. Arngol'da, 1891.

Fedorchenko, V.I. "Dom Romanovykh." *Entsiklopediia biografii*. Moscow: OLMA Press, 2003.

Findeisen, N. "Balalaika v simfonicheskem orkestre." *Russkaia muzykal'naia gazeta* 2 (1904): 45–46.

———. “Iz oblasti proizvodstva muzykal’nykh instrumentov.” *Russkaia muzykal’naia gazeta* 2 (1908): 57.

———. “Po povodu orkestra balalaek G. Andreev.” *Russkaia muzykal’naia gazeta* 5.6 (1898): 614.

Frolova-Walker, Marina. *Russian Music and Nationalism—from Glinka to Stalin*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.

Granovskii, B.B., ed. *V.V. Andreev: Materialy i dokumenty*. Moscow: Muzyka, 1986.

Iliukhin, A.S. “Nikolai Petrovich Fomin.” In *Materialy k kursu istorii ispolnitel’stva na russkikh narodnykh muzykal’nykh instrumentakh*. 1. Moscow: Ministerstvo kul’tury RSFSR, 1969.

Imkhanitskii, M.I. “Predposylnki formirovaniia domrovo-balalaechnogo sostava v russkom kollektivnom muzitsirovaniii XVI – XIX vekov.” *Trudy GMPI (RAM) im. Gnesinykh* 85. Special issue: Orkestr russkikh narodnykh instrumentov i problemy vospitaniia dirizhera (1986).

———. *U istokov russkoi narodnoi orkestrovoi kul’tury*. Moscow: Muzyka, 1987.

Karpenok, E.P., ed. *Tvorcheskoe nasledie V.V. Andreeva i praktika samodeiateльnogo instrumental’nogo ispolnitel’stva*. Leningrad: Leningradskii Institut kul’tury, 1988.

Kennedy, M., ed. *Oxford Dictionary of Music (Revised Edn.)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

van der Kiste, J. *The Romanovs: 1818-1959*. Stroud: Sutton Publishing, 2003.

Kolomiitsev, V. *Stat’i i pis’ma*. Leningrad: Muzyka, 1971.

———. *V.V Andreev i ego Velikorusskii orkestr*. Saint Petersburg: Tipografiia A.S. Suvorina, 1909.

Kuz’miin, Iu. *Rossiiskaia imperatorskaia familiia (1797–1917)*. Saint Petersburg: Dmitrii Bulanin, 2005.

Maes, Francis. *A History of Russian Music: From Kamarinskaya to Babi Yar*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

Maksimov, E.I. "Boris Sergeyevich Troianovskii." In *Rossiiskie muzykanty-samorodki: fakty, dokumenty, vospominaniia*. Moscow: Sovetskii kompozitor, 1987.

———. "Vasilii Vasil'evich Andreev." In *Rossiiskie muzykanty-samorodki: fakty, dokumenty, vospominaniia*. Moscow: Sovetskii kompozitor, 1987.

Olkovsky, Yuri. *Vladimir Stasov and Russian National Culture*. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1983.

Osovskii, A.V. "Velikorusskii orkestr." In *Muzykal'no-kriticheskie stat'i*. Leningrad: Muzyka, 1971.

Peresada, A.I. A. *Dobrokhoto*. Krasnodar: Vserossiiskoe muzykal'noe obshchestvo, 2001.

———. *Balalaechnykh del master: ocherk o zhiznennom i tvorcheskem puti S.I. Nalimova*. Syktyvkar: Komi knizhnoe izdatel'stvo, 1983.

———. *Balalaika*. Moscow: Muzyka, 1990.

Petukhov, M. *Narodnye muzykal'nye instrumenty muzeia S-Peterburgskoi konservatorii*. Saint Petersburg: Tipografiia Imperatorskoi Akademii nauk, 1884.

Prokhorov, A.M., ed. *Bol'shaia sovetskaia entsiklopediia*. 3rd ed. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo "Sovetskaia entsiklopediia," 1970.

———, ed. *Bol'shoi entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo "Sovetskaia entsiklopediia," 1991.

Prokof'ev, S.S. *Avtobiografiia*. Moscow: Sovetskii kompozitor, 1982.

Rossiiskii arkhiv: Istorija Otechestva v svidetelstvakh i dokumentakh XVIII-XX vv. Vol. 8. Moscow: Studiia TRITE, 1998.

Rovinskii, D.A. *Russkiie narodnye kartinki*. Saint Petersburg: Tipografiia imperatorskoi akademii nauk, 1881.

Sergeant, Lynn M. *Harmony and Discord: Music and the Transformation of Russian Cultural Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Shtiber, N.P. V.V. *Andreev: ocherk ego deiatel'nosti*. Saint Petersburg: Sirotinka, 1898.

Sokolov, F.V. V.V. *Andreev i ego orkestr*. Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe muzykal'noe izdatel'stvo, 1962.

Taruskin, Richard. *Defining Russia Musically. Historical and Hermeneutical Essays*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.

Tikhonov, A.V., ed. *Sozdatel' Velikorusskogo orkestra: V.V. Andreev v zerkale russkoi pressy – 1888-1917 gody*. Saint Petersburg: Predpriiatie Sankt-Peterburgskogo soyuza khudozhnikov, 1998.

Vertkov, K. "Instrumenty i ansamбли v narodnom bytu i ispolnitel'skoi praktike drevnei Rusi i Rossii v XI – IXX vekakh." In *Russkie narodnye muzykal'nye instrumenty*. Ed. K. Vertkov. Leningrad: Muzyka, 1975.

Zabelin, I. *Domashnii byt russkikh tsarei v XVI i XVII stoletiiakh*. Saint Petersburg: Tipografiia V. Gracheva i Kompaniia, 1872.

Zimin, I. *Liudi Zimnego dvortsu: Monarshie osoby, ikh favoriti i slugi*. Saint Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo Tsentrpoligraf, 2014.