

УДК 78.091(497.1)"1920/1940"(093.2)  
78.071.1(=161.1)(497.1)"1920/1940"(093.2)

DOI <https://doi.org/10.31212/tokovi.2023.3.gol.85-108>

Оригинални научни рад/Original scientific paper

Примљен/Received: 1. 9. 2023.

Прихваћен/Accepted: 15. 11. 2023.

*Marija GOLUBOVIĆ*

Institute of Musicology SASA, Belgrade

[marija.golubovic@music.sanu.ac.rs](mailto:marija.golubovic@music.sanu.ac.rs)

### **Soviet Music in Interwar Yugoslavia\***

**Abstract:** This paper will present the presence of Soviet music on the musical scene of the Kingdom of SCS/Yugoslavia. Analysis of newspaper articles and critiques, texts from music magazines, and other writings about Soviet music will demonstrate that it was present on concert stages, even though the Kingdom of Yugoslavia refrained from establishing relations with the Soviet Union until June 1940.

**Keywords:** Soviet music, Kingdom of SCS/Yugoslavia, interwar period, Yugoslav-Soviet relations, Dmitri Shostakovich, Alexander Mosolov

The interwar period was characterized by efforts to rebuild after unprecedented wartime destruction. The October Revolution and Civil War transformed Russia into the world's first socialist state, altering its foreign policy and generating new international relations and influences. This also applied to the official policy towards the Balkans. The Yugoslav political elite perceived Soviet Russia as a threat, fearing the spread of revolution to the kingdom's territory. The presence of numerous Russian refugees and their activities within Yugoslavia, ideological differences, political apprehensions, and anti-state actions by Yugoslav communists aimed at societal change all contributed to a two-decade break in diplomatic relations between the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and Soviet Russia.<sup>1</sup>

---

\* This article is the result of research conducted within the Institute of Musicology of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, funded by the Ministry of Science, Technological Development and Innovations of the Republic of Serbia (RS-200176).

1 Александар Животић, *Југословенско-совјетски односи 1939–1941*, (Београд: Филип Вишњић, 2016), 8.

In interwar Yugoslavia, music culture flourished due to the establishment of various musical institutions and societies, driven by the efforts of both domestic and foreign musical enthusiasts who diligently worked and aided the rise of the musical culture. This process was significantly influenced by the white émigrés, who contributed greatly to introducing Yugoslav audiences to Russian and Soviet music. Emigrants were exceptionally interested in events taking place in the Soviet Union. An example is the unique publication throughout Russia Abroad, a bimonthly magazine for Russia's politics, culture, and economy – *Ruski arhiv* (1928–1937). This magazine was published by the Scientific Section of the Belgrade Zemgor to objectively and impartially report on the events in Soviet Russia. Moreover, emigrant theatre troupes included pieces from Russian, contemporary world, and Soviet authors in their repertoire. A prominent researcher of Russian emigration, Alexey Arsenyev, distinguishes “Russian” and “Soviet” to separate authors who worked in pre-revolutionary Russia and then in emigration from those who stayed and created in the Soviet Union.<sup>2</sup> We will use such an approach as well in this paper.

Zinaida Grigoryevna Grickat, a piano pedagogue at the Belgrade Music School “Stanković” and music writer, dedicated several texts to the musical life in the Soviet Union during the 1930s in the magazines *Muzički Glasnik*<sup>3</sup> and *Zvuk*<sup>4</sup> around which the musical left-wing was formed.<sup>5</sup> Interest in contemporary music was present throughout the interwar period, but during the 1930s, there was a noticeable increase in interest in Soviet music, primarily due to socio-political reasons. During that period, the Yugoslav musical left-wing program was formulated, initially relying on experiences and knowledge gained in Czechoslovakia, while from the mid-1930s, it sought inspiration in the Soviet Union. Such a shift was prompted by the actions of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, which aimed to define its artistic program based on the Soviet model.<sup>6</sup>

2 Алексей Арсеньев, „Русская диаспора в Югославии”, *Русская эмиграция в Югославии*, сост. Алексей Арсеньев, Ольга Кириллова, Миодраг Сибинович, (Москва: Индрик, 1996), 57.

3 Зинаида Грицкат, „О руској музици последњих година”, *Музички гласник* 11/1934, 222–225; Зинаида Грицкат, „Стремљења савремене руске музике”, *Музички гласник* 5–6/1940, 78–85.

4 Zinaida Grickat, „Opera u današnjoj Rusiji”, *Zvuk* 6/1934, 212–217; Zinaida Grickat, „Muzički život Lenjingrada”, *Zvuk* 8–9/1935, 337–341.

5 Ивана Весић, *Конструисање српске музичке традиције у периоду између два светска рата*, (Београд: Музиколошки институт САНУ, 2018), 99.

6 Весић, *Конструисање српске музичке традиције*, 171.

Within the Serbian community, Soviet music was greatly promoted by the Association of Friends of Slavic Music [Удружење пријатеља славенске музике, 1939–1941]. They regularly organised concerts featuring Yugoslav, Czech, Polish, Russian<sup>7</sup> and Soviet music. These concert events were accompanied by relevant introductory lectures presented by distinguished intellectuals such as Petar Konjović, Mihovil Logar, Isidora Sekulić, Vojislav Vučković, and Predrag Milošević.<sup>8</sup> The Association also decided to launch its journal, *Slavenska muzika* (1939–1941),<sup>9</sup> in which articles about contemporary Russian and Soviet music were published. This initiative was likely influenced by Vojislav Vučković,<sup>10</sup> who was a student of Czech musicologist and member of the Czechoslovak Communist party, Zdeněk Nejedlý. As the musicologist Ivana Vesić observed, the cooperative spirit of liberal and radical-left artists and intellectuals was vividly displayed within the Association of Friends of Slavic Music. Alongside liberal representatives from Western Europe and Slavic regions, the group included advocates of the “leftist musical front”. The “Slavic platform” acted as a unifying force, successfully promoting contemporary Soviet musical trends and the modernism of Slavic composers from various backgrounds.<sup>11</sup>

After the October Revolution, the USSR implemented a distinctive propaganda mechanism, leading historians to characterise it as a “propaganda state”.<sup>12</sup> Cultural diplomacy was part of that mechanism, also directed towards foreign countries. As early as 1921, *Mir iskusstva* participated in international exhibitions such as “Russian Art in Paris”, while new paintings by Marc

7 This refers to Russian pre-revolutionary composers of the older generation, such as Tchaikovsky and Taneyev.

8 Марија Корен, „Грађа за биографију Војислава Вучковића”, *Војислав Вучковић уметник и борац: лик, сећања, сведочанства*, (Београд: Нолит, 1968), 69.

9 Александар Васић, „Часопис ‘Славенска музика’ (1939–1941) у историји српске музичке периодике”, *Музикологија* 29/2020, 121–147. A comprehensive bibliography of the journal is provided at the end of this article. Александар Васић, „Марксизам и друштвенополитички ангажман у српској музичкој периодици између два светска рата”, *Filozofija i društvo* 3/2013, 212–235. In the article, the author delves into the prevalence of Marxism and its related sociopolitical engagement in national interwar music periodicals.

10 Vojislav Vučković (1910–1942) was a Serbian musicologist, composer, and conductor. From 1933 on, he was a member of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, and in 1934, he obtained his doctorate from Charles University in Prague with a thesis titled *Music as a Propaganda Medium* [Muzika kao sredstvo propagande].

11 Vesić, *Конструисање српске музичке традиције*, 184.

12 Peter Kenz, *The Birth of the Propaganda State: Soviet Methods of Mass Mobilisation 1917–1929*, (Cambridge University Press, 1985), 4.

Chagall were presented in Berlin. In 1923, musical advocates attempted to re-establish connections with the outside world.<sup>13</sup> The Association for Contemporary Music [Ассоциация современной музыки] was founded in Moscow as a branch of the International Society for Contemporary Music the following year. Its task was to promote the music of contemporary Soviet composers and to introduce new works of foreign music.<sup>14</sup> Interestingly, Russian composers whose music they endeavoured to promote included Igor Fyodorovich Stravinsky and Sergei Sergeyevich Prokofiev,<sup>15</sup> the former of whom never returned to the homeland after the October Revolution, while the latter did so only in 1936. The association existed only from 1924 to 1931, when its activity was suspended.<sup>16</sup> One of the main characteristics of Soviet cultural diplomacy in the 1930s was incorporating classical artistic achievements to propagate culture within the framework of “socialist realism”. Since Russian music attracted immense attention from audiences in the West, Moscow subtly included the works of Soviet composers in concert programs. In doing so, they leveraged their interest in the pre-revolutionary musical heritage to promote the “new” music.<sup>17</sup>

By the late 1930s, intermittent but increasingly noticeable cultural influences from Soviet Russia were observed in interwar Yugoslavia. Primarily, this phenomenon pertained to books and extended to artistic works and even films. However, unlike in film, where it’s simpler to draw a line on what constitutes a Soviet film, this isn’t as straightforward in music. This is because many composers had started creating music before World War I, and their musical style had primarily been established earlier. Hence, it is necessary to differentiate between music that emerged in the Soviet Union due to political circumstances and “new” Soviet music, particularly considering that the “old” musical heritage was utilised for propagandistic purposes. In this sense, we can initial-

13 Александр Владимирович Голубев, Владимир Александрович Невежин, *Формирование образа Советской России в окружающем мире средствами культурной дипломатии: 1920-е – первая половина 1940-х гг.*, (Москва: Институт российской истории РАН, 2016), 66.

14 Ю. В. Келдыш, „Ассоциация современной музыки”, *Музыкальная энциклопедия*, 1, А–Гонг, (Москва: Советская энциклопедия, Советский композитор, 1973), 239–240.

15 Голубев, Невежин, *Формирование образа Советской России*, 66.

16 Yugoslavia also had its own section within the International Society for Contemporary Music, which was disbanded due to a lack of interest from its leading members: Миленко Живковић, „Међународно друштво за савремену музику (Документ о неуспелом покушају оснивања југословенске националне секције)”, *Музички гласник* 10/1932, 265.

17 Голубев, Невежин, *Формирование образа Советской России*, 86–87.

ly discuss composers born in the early 20th century, such as Alexander Vasilyevich Mosolov and Dmitri Dmitrievich Shostakovich, who underwent creative growth and development throughout the 1920s, reaching a certain level of artistic maturity by the 1930s.

News about Soviet music was primarily conveyed to the Kingdom of SCS/Yugoslavia through music magazines. Articles about art in the USSR could be found in both cultural and social issue magazines. A significant article by Ivan Solertinsky titled *Art in the USSR* [Уметност у СССР-у] was published in 1929 in the Zagreb magazine *Nova Evropa*, where, alongside discussions of dramaturgy, theatre, and painting, music was also covered.<sup>18</sup> Interestingly, the article points out that, beyond striving to create music that would resonate with the lives of the masses, young composers were characterised by their efforts to embrace and creatively develop contemporary Western musical cultures and techniques. This article is unique in drawing attention to the new trend among most Soviet composers and musicians, which used folk songs, ethnography, and folklore, especially from national minorities (Caucasus, Turkestan, Siberia, etc.).<sup>19</sup> However, the question arises as to why, in texts and reviews, we more frequently encounter the term “contemporary Russian music” rather than “Soviet” when discussing music originating in the Soviet Union. Was this a form of protest or denial of the new societal order in Russia, and was the term “Soviet” undesirable? Or perhaps they considered “Russian” and “Soviet” as synonyms because they mostly wrote about music in Soviet Russia, excluding Soviet music of various other countries and minorities? Could it be that they didn’t differentiate between Soviet music and Russian music that emerged in emigration? These several questions should be answered.

The preference for the term “contemporary Russian music” over “Soviet” in texts and reviews discussing music from the Soviet Union in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia could be attributed to various factors. One possible (and the most probable) explanation is that the term “Soviet” may carry political connotations and associations with the Soviet regime, which could have been sensitive or unfavourable in certain contexts. Using the broader term “contemporary Russian music” might have been a way to maintain a focus on the artistic and cultural aspects while avoiding potential political implications and strict

---

18 И[ван Иванович] Солертински, „Уметности у СССР-у”, *Nova Evropa* 6/1929, 169–177.

19 Ibid, 175.

ensorship.<sup>20</sup> The likelihood of considering “Russian” and “Soviet” as synonyms due to a predominant focus on music within Soviet Russia while ignoring musical contributions from diverse regions and minority groups within the broader Soviet Union is deemed unlikely, especially in light of the previously mentioned censorship constraints. With the establishment of diplomatic relations in 1940, there was a visible change in the policy of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia towards the Soviet Union, considering that until that moment, censorship had been extremely strict. This is evident in the seventh art<sup>21</sup> and the music sphere, where the adjective “Soviet” openly becomes present on the concert stage and in reviews and articles.<sup>22</sup>

Zinaida Grigoryevna Grickat wrote in the mid-1930s that “Russian music remains one, despite the circumstances that have divided the Russian people into two parts.”<sup>23</sup> Political and ideological divisions among the people raised the question of whether there was a division in the arts. This question was also explored by musicologist Richard Taruskin in the book *Russian Music at Home and Abroad*, particularly in the essay “Is there a ‘Russia Abroad’ in Music?”<sup>24</sup> Taruskin cites Arthur Lourié’s<sup>25</sup> perspective in the Parisian journal *La Revue Musicale* in 1931, stating that Russian music had left Russia and that what was being created in the homeland was no longer genuinely Russian music.<sup>26</sup> Therefore, we need to underscore that there were various opinions in emigration. While Grickat believes that Russian music is unique regardless of the political situation, Lourié expresses that Russian music is no longer be-

20 For more about the censorship, see Ivana Dobrivojević, „Cenzura u doba šestojanuarskog režima kralja Aleksandra”, *Istorija 20. veka* 2/2005, 51–68.

21 Милана Живановић, „Совјетски филмови на биоскопском репертоару у Краљевини СХС/Југославији”, *Токови историје* 1/2016, 128–129.

22 For example, the title of a music review, “Evening of Soviet Music at the University” (Аноним, „Вече совјетске музике на Универзитету”, *Политика*, 13. 6. 1940, 19) or the text by Reinhold Glier “Decade of Soviet Music” (Р.[ајнхолд] Глиер, „Декада совјетске гласбе”, *Славенска музика* 1–2/1941, 2–6).

23 Грицкат, „О руској музици последњих година”, 223.

24 Richard Taruskin, *Russian Music at Home and Abroad*, (Oakland: University of California Press, 2016), 140–161.

25 Arthur-Vincent Lourié (born Naum Izrailevich Luria, 1892–1966) was a Russian-American composer, music writer, theorist, and critic. He was one of the most active proponents of musical futurism and the Russian avant-garde during the first decades of the 20th century. He went to exile in 1922.

26 Taruskin, *Russian Music at Home and Abroad*, 141. Full reference of Lourié’s article: Arthur Lourié, „Perspectives de l’École Russe”, *La revue musicale* 12, nos. 117–18 (July–August 1931), 160–65.

ing created in the homeland, indicating emigration as the inheritor of Russian musical heritage.

Drawing a parallel between Stravinsky, who, in emigration, abandoned nationalism and turned to neoclassicism as a formal Western canon on the one hand, and contemporary Russia, which was creating a new culture that was not national but universal on the other, Taruskin demonstrates that both shifts were “from the national toward the cosmopolitan or universal: universalist aesthetics on the one hand and universalist politics on the other”.<sup>27</sup> Yet, Soviet music had not escaped unharmed. The musicians of Soviet Russia faced severe isolation from contemporary Western life, which led their music, already lacking certainty in authenticity due to German influence, to regress into a less advanced state. According to Lourié, “Russian music has once more returned to the provincial position it formerly occupied when it crawled along in the rear of Western music”.<sup>28</sup>

Furthermore, it is necessary to discuss the term *contemporary*, as it was used in the press and periodicals of that time for Russian music. Miloje Milojević, a composer and notable music critic, considered the music composed in the spirit of modern musical expression under this term. This is evident in the review of a concert, in which he designates Julius Conus, Fritz Kreisler, Sergei Rachmaninoff, and Max d'Ollone as the names of “from before”.<sup>29</sup> It is significant to mention that Conus and Rachmaninoff emigrated from the USSR after the October Revolution. Consequently, what did musicians consider the term *modern*? In Russian music studies, that term primarily refers to the period of Russian modernism, also known as the Silver Age of Russian culture. In contrast, the term *contemporary* encompasses music that emerges in that moment, regardless of its stylistic characteristics. Therefore, this concept also included post-Romantic music based on The Mighty Five’s legacy.<sup>30</sup> As an illustration of this argument, we can consider the chamber concert held in 1929 at the Music School “Stanković”, organised by the Russian Music Society. This event, titled “An Evening of Contemporary Russian Composers”, featured works by Vasily

27 Taruskin, *Russian Music at Home and Abroad*, 144.

28 *Ibid*, 144.

29 Милоје Милојевић, „Концерт г. Владимира Слатина”, *Политика*, 19. 11. 1928, 7.

30 The Five or the Mighty Five was a group of Russian composers that emerged in the late 1850s-early 1860s. They consider themselves successors to the tradition of Mikhail Ivanovich Glinka, aiming to embody the Russian national idea in music. This group consisted of Mily Alexeyevich Balakirev, Modest Petrovich Mussorgsky, Alexander Porfiriyevich Borodin, Nikolai Andreyevich Rimsky-Korsakov, and César Antonovich Cui.

Andreyevich Zolotaryov,<sup>31</sup> Alexander Tikhonovich Gretchaninov, Sergei Vasilyevich Rachmaninoff, and Ivan Alexandrovich Persiyani<sup>32, 33</sup> Within Serbian criticism, the term *modern* refers to avant-garde paths in the development of music. Dragutin Čolić (1907–1987), an avant-garde composer of the “Prague Group”, wrote about Mosolov’s *The Iron Foundry* that it was “an excellent work, which can entirely represent *contemporary Russian modern* [italicised by M. G.] music”.<sup>34</sup> The periodisation of musical modernism supports this, according to which the middle or “classical” modernism encompasses the period between the two World Wars. Sergei Prokofiev, Igor Stravinsky, Paul Hindemith, and Arnold Schoenberg are the composers who marked that era.<sup>35</sup>

Interestingly, the Czech musicologist Zdeněk Nejedlý also used the term *contemporary Russian music* in the title of his article “Trends of modern Russian music” [Стремљења савремене српске музике] published in the Belgrade journal *Slavenska muzika*.<sup>36</sup> Writing about composers educated in pre-revolutionary Russian traditions who worked on constructing the new Soviet music, Nejedlý mentions avant-garde composers Nikolai Andreyevich Roslavets and Alexander Vasilyevich Mosolov. He draws particular attention to Mosolov’s most famous orchestral composition, *The Foundry*, which wildly succeeded in music centres worldwide. He designates Shostakovich as a representative of modern Russian music. Readers could also learn about the basic details of the composer group ProKoll<sup>37</sup> from Nejedlý’s article. According to Lourié, the most characteristic Soviet composers were the Moscow Proletarians, associated with organisations like RAPM<sup>38</sup> or ProKoll.<sup>39</sup> However, Ne-

31 Vasily Andreyevich Zolotaryov (1872–1964) was a Russian and Soviet composer and music teacher. He studied music at the Saint Petersburg Conservatory under the direction of Mily Balakirev and Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov.

32 Ivan Alexandrovich Persiyani (1872–1930) was a Russian diplomat who relocated from Rome to Belgrade in 1927. Upon arriving in Belgrade, he was an active member of the Russian Musical Society until his death. He was a student of Anatoly Konstantinovich Lyadov at the Saint Petersburg Conservatory.

33 П[етар]. Ј. Крстић, „Вече савремених руских композитора”, *Правда*, 27. 2. 1929, 6.

34 Д[рагутин]. Чолић, „Симфониски концерт Београдске филхармоније поводом прославе двадесетпетогодишњице уметничког рада г. Ивана Брезовшека”, *Правда*, 27. 4. 1934, 9.

35 Мелита Милин, „Етапе модернизма у српској музици”, *Музикологија* 6/2006, 99.

36 Здењек Неједли „Стремљења савремене руске музике”, *Славенска музика* 2/1939, 12–15; Здењек Неједли „Стремљења савремене руске музике”, *Славенска музика* 3/1940, 21–23.

37 Proizvodstvennyj kolektiv studentov-kompozitorov Moskovskoj konservatorii.

38 Rossijskaâ Associaciâ Proletarskih Muzykantov.

39 Taruskin, *Russian Music at Home and Abroad*, 144.



jedlý's article contains factual errors, raising questions about the accuracy of information (for example, Rimsky-Korsakov did not emigrate (he passed away in 1908),<sup>40</sup> and the ProKoll group was founded in 1925, not 1927, as stated in the text).<sup>41</sup> Time has shown that many of the composers he mentions as significant have been forgotten. Still, he doesn't mention those who have emerged as prominent representatives of Soviet music, such as Aram Ilyich Khachaturian and Dmitri Borisovich Kabalevsky. According to our information, their works were not performed in interwar Yugoslavia.

The Zagreb daily newspaper *Hrvatski dnevnik* published an article titled "Decade of Soviet Music" [Декада совјетске гласбе] by Soviet composer Reinhold Moritsevich Glière, which was reprinted in the first issue of *Slavenska muzika* for the year 1941.<sup>42</sup> The article is about autumn music festivals that were held as part of the Decades of National Art<sup>43</sup> and their significance for the musical art of the Soviet Union. The Decade of 1940 and previous music festivals introduced many new names and works, prompting Glière to mention Lev Konstantinovich Knipper, Nikolai Petrovich Rakov,<sup>44</sup> Dmitri Borisovich Kabalevsky, Vissarion Yakovlevich Shebalin, Georgy Gustavovich Kreitner, Vladimir Robertovich Enke, and Vladimir Mikhailovich Yurovsky. He writes: "The new Soviet music is filled with optimism and vitality. There is no trace of pessimism, fatigue, or disillusionment in it. Moreover, it is not intrusive but rather rich in serious content. Composers strive to uncover humans' most diverse emotions and feelings through music. This aspiration is particularly evident in new operatic works".<sup>45</sup> I have no doubts that this description was why the editorial board decided to publish this article to promote the receptivity of Soviet music. Except for Nikolai Myaskovsky, Yugoslav audiences had the opportunity to become acquainted with the works of these composers only after The Second World War.

If we single out the names of Russian/Soviet musicians who were actively creating music during the interwar period from *Letopis muzičkog živo-*

40 Hejedly, „Стремљена савремене руске музике”, *Славенска музика* 2/1939, 13.

41 Hejedly, „Стремљена савремене руске музике”, *Славенска музика* 3/1940, 21.

42 Глиер, „Декада совјетске гласбе”, 2–6.

43 About Decades of National Art see: И. М. Ямпольский, П. Н. Коннова, „Декады национального искусства”, *Музыкальная энциклопедия*, 2, Гондольера–Корсов, (Москва: Советская энциклопедия, Советский композитор, 1974), 186–187.

44 In the article (page 4), there is an error where „Drakow” is mistakenly written instead of „Rakov”.

45 Глиер, „Декада совјетске гласбе”, 5.

*ta u Beogradu* [Chronicle of Music Life in Belgrade],<sup>46</sup> they can be categorised into three groups: (1) Russian émigré composers (A. T. Gretchaninov, A. K. Glazunov, N. N. Tcherepnin, S. V. Rachmaninoff, N. K. Medtner, I. F. Stravinsky); (2) elderly generation composers active in the USSR (N. Y. Myaskovsky, M. M. Ipolitov-Ivanov, V. A. Zolotaryov, R. M. Glière, P. G. Chesnokov); (3) younger generation composers pioneering “new” music in the USSR (A. V. Mosolov and D. D. Shostakovich). Sergei Sergeevich Prokofiev is an exception; after initially residing in the West following the October Revolution, he eventually returned to the Soviet Union with his family in 1936.<sup>47</sup>

According to the mentioned *Letopis, Glasnik Muzičkog društva “Stanković”*,<sup>48</sup> which documented events and concerts in the country, as well as other music magazines and daily newspapers, we can conclude that the repertoire primarily featured the first, generationally and creatively diverse, group of composers. Among them, the works of I. F. Stravinsky and S. S. Prokofiev were frequently performed, encompassing pieces for solo instruments to stage works such as ballets and operas.<sup>49</sup> Piano compositions by the mentioned composers were frequently featured in the repertoire of prominent pianists who performed in Yugoslav cities. Among them were Russian emigrant pianists Alexander Borovsky and Nikolai Orlov. However, based on the reviewed materials, it appears that visiting musicians didn’t perform Soviet music but rather contemporary Russian music that was emerging in the West.

The Croatian National Theatre in Zagreb (HNK Zagreb) boldly kept pace with the times, directing the latest theatrical works. As early as 1928, they were preparing the jazz opera *Jonny spielt auf* by Ernst Krenek, composed in 1927. A year prior, with great success, they premiered the ballets *Pulcinella* (1920) by Igor Stravinsky and *Chout* (1915/1921) by Sergei Prokofiev.<sup>50</sup> These were initially composed on commission for the renowned Russian impresario in Paris, Sergei Diaghilev, and his troupe, the Ballets Russes. In the same season (1927–1928), the Opera of the National Theater in Ljubljana staged *Love*

46 Слободан Турлаков, *Летопис музичког живота у Београду (1840–1941)*, (Београд: Музеј позоришне уметности Србије, 1994).

47 Daniel Jaffé, *Sergey Prokofiev*, (London: Phaidon Press, 1998), 116–138.

48 *Glasnik Muzičkog društva „Stanković”* (1928–1934, 1938–1941). In January 1931, the name was changed to *Muzički glasnik*.

49 Sergei Prokofiev performed on January 15, 1935, at the hall of the Croatian Music Institute in Zagreb, and on January 16 of the same year, he held a piano recital in the Grand Hall of Kolarac People’s University. He presented his piano compositions.

50 Lujo Šafranek-Kavić, „Из музичког живота. Југославија и словенске земље. Опера. Zagreb”, *Музика* 2/1928, 50–51.

for the *Three Oranges* by Sergei Prokofiev, which, contrary to all expectations, achieved incredible success with the audience. The Ljubljana Opera triumphed with this performance in Zagreb and Belgrade as well. Slovenian composer Slavko Osterc considered the production of *Love for the Three Oranges* “the most outstanding achievement of all time”. Up to that point, the opera had only been performed in five theatres, so the audience could largely credit the director and conductor of the opera for bringing such a work to them.<sup>51</sup> During that season, Prokofiev’s opera took the spotlight with the highest number of performances among all Yugoslav opera houses – 14 times. Comparing the statistics of the Belgrade and Ljubljana operas in that season, no opera was performed as often. Petar Krstić’s opera *Zulumčar* came in second place.<sup>52</sup> On the other hand, Belgrade could not boast of modern Russian/Soviet opera until the premiere of *Vanka the Housekeeper* by Nikolai Tcherepnin in 1933 and *Katerina Izmailova* (Lady Macbeth of the Mtsensk District) by Dmitri Shostakovich in 1937.<sup>53</sup> During the same season, the Belgrade Ballet staged three Russian ballets among six new productions – *The Firebird* and *Petrushka* by Stravinsky and *Raymonda* by Glazunov.<sup>54</sup> In an article, Dragutinović wrote on this occasion that “the staging of Stravinsky’s ballets *The Firebird* and *Petrushka* means not only the culmination of the season but also a significant contribution of the National Theater to the idea of promoting and popularising modern music.”<sup>55</sup>

The program of the 10th anniversary celebration of the Zagreb Philharmonic Orchestra can exemplify modern music’s presence in orchestras’ repertoire in interwar Yugoslavia. Alongside works by composers like Leoš Janáček, Josef Suk, Claude Debussy, Maurice Ravel, and Béla Bartók, the repertoire featured pieces by Igor Stravinsky (*Fireworks*) and Nikolai Myaskovsky (*Sixth*

51 Slavko Osterc, „Kratek pregled operne in koncertne sezone v Ljubljani”, *Музика* 8–9/1928, 247.

52 Рикард Шварц, „Из оперске статистике”, *Музика* 8–9/1928, 255–259.

53 Nadežda Mosusova, “Vanka the Housekeeper by Nikolay Tcherepnin and Lady Macbeth by Dmitry Shostakovich: Contemporary Russian Opera in Interwar Belgrade”, *Russian Émigré Culture: Conservatism or Evolution?* ed. Christoph Flamm, Henry Keazor, Roland Marti, (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013), 245–255.

54 Шварц, „Из оперске статистике”, 257. For more on the legacy of the Diaghilev Ballet in the Balkans, see Nadežda Mosusova, “Diaghilev’s Ballets Russes and the Ballet in the Balkans and the other European Countries, 1920–1944 (Marking the Centenary of Diaghilev’s Ballets Russes, 1909–2009)”, *Music and Society in Eastern Europe*, Vol. 6, ed. Jelena Milojković-Djurić, (Idyllwild: Charles Schlacks Publisher, 2011), 1–16. The same text in: *Српски музички театар. Историјски фрагменти*, ур. Мелита Милин, (Београд: Музиколошки институт САНУ, 2013), 39–54.

55 Б.[ранко] Драгутиновић, „Из музичког живота. Југославија. Београд”, *Музика* 8–9/1928, 261.

Symphony).<sup>56</sup> The performance of works by Myaskovsky, a student of Anatoly Lyadov and Rimsky-Korsakov, is intriguing because he became a leading Soviet composer in the 1920s and 1930s and is regarded as a founder of Soviet symphonism. Nicolas Slonimsky characterised Myaskovsky as a “symphonist by nature”, asserting that he embodied the essence of a true romantic composer.<sup>57</sup> The “Russian Mahler”, as Slonimsky referred to him, blended traditional and modern elements, making his music an excellent tool for Soviet cultural diplomacy and propaganda efforts aimed at projecting a positive image of the Soviet Union on the international stage. The *Sixth Symphony* performed by the Zagreb Philharmonic, marked the end of his first symphonic period, characterised by introspective and mystically inclined pre-revolutionary sentiments. It was “the culminating point of these individualistic moods, although it was conceived in 1922 when Miaskovsky began to revise his intellectual outlook in the direction of a more realistic composition scheme”.<sup>58</sup> Chamber works by Russian/Soviet composers were also performed in Zagreb. For instance, Reinhold Glière’s *String Quartet in A major* was presented at the second public concert of the Music Institute (Glazbeni zavod).<sup>59</sup> In a brief announcement in the magazine regarding this concert, Glière was labelled as a Russian composer. Consistently adhering to his post-Romantic style, Glière composed in the USSR, representing the “vestiges” of pre-revolutionary Russia. In this context, it’s worth noting again the frequent use of the term “Russian” for the older generation of composers. The composers we have categorised into the third group, Mosolov and Shostakovich, were born in the 20th century, and their artistic development unfolded within the new social and political order. It is precisely with their names as representatives of the younger generation that was stepping onto the musical scene during the interwar period that we most commonly encounter the term “Soviet composers”. Several concerts of contemporary Soviet music were organised in Belgrade at that time. Among them, one of the most remarkable took place in June 1940 at the Faculty of Law, featuring an introductory lecture titled “Development of Music in the Soviet Union” by Vojislav Vučković. The program included Dmitri Shostakovich’s *String Quar-*

56 „Десетогодишњица Загребачке Филхармоније”, *Гласник музичког друштва „Станковић”* 8/1929, 151–152.

57 Nicolas Slonimsky, *Writings on Music: Russian and Soviet Music and Composers*, ed. Electra Slonimsky Yourke, (Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2006), 44.

58 *Ibid*, 44.

59 „Други друштвени концерт Глазбеног завода”, *Музички гласник* 9–10/1931, 295.

*tet*, Nikolai Myaskovsky's *Piano Suite*, Alexander Mosolov's *The Iron Foundry*, Yuliy Meitus's *Dneprostroj*, and Grigory Lobachev's *Turkmen Folk Songs*.<sup>60</sup>

*Music of Machines and Russian Avant-Garde*

The work of Alexander Vasilievich Mosolov (1900–1973) represents an essential and original phenomenon in Russian Soviet music. Alongside Igor Stravinsky, Dmitri Shostakovich, Sergei Prokofiev, Arthur Lourié, Nikolai Rostlavets, Ivan Alexandrovich Vyshnegradsky, and others, Mosolov embarked on a path of new musical aesthetics. He graduated from the Moscow Conservatory (1925), where he studied composition under Reinhold Glière and Nikolai Myaskovsky and piano under Konstantin Nikolayevich Igumnov. He was a member of the Association for Contemporary Music. His creative output during the interwar period embodies the spirit of the new post-revolutionary era and the establishment of a contemporary society and its aesthetic dominant – the Russian avant-garde. His avant-garde expression included anti-traditionalism, anti-romanticism, a “futurological focus”, and respect for experiments. Mosolov consistently developed the themes of urbanism and revolution as the most significant in the art of the 1920s.<sup>61</sup> During the 1920s and early 1930s, Mosolov's music was frequently performed in concert halls and theatres in the USSR, Europe, and the USA. The symphonic episode *The Iron Foundry* from his unfinished ballet *Steel* toured nearly all of Europe and the USA in the early 1930s. Audiences in Berlin, Vienna, Paris, Liège, Rome, New York, Chicago, and other metropolises could hear it.<sup>62</sup> The list of cities also included Belgrade, Zagreb and Ljubljana. Despite the significant achievements of “leftist” artists, the period between 1929 and 1932, known as the “Great Break”, was marked by a crisis in the avant-garde movement due to internal factors like exhausted artistic concepts and unresolved contradictions, as well as external factors such as political tensions and repression. The years after 1932 marked the demise of the Russian avant-garde, symbolised by the creative or physical destruction of its leaders. Mosolov was accused of anti-Soviet propaganda in 1937.<sup>63</sup>

60 Аноним, „Вече совјетске музике на Универзитету”, *Политика*, 13. 6. 1940, 19.

61 Игорь Воробьев, *Русский авангард и творчество Александра Мосолова 1920–1930-их годов*, (Санкт-Петербург: Композитор, 2006), 10.

62 Воробьев, *Русский авангард и творчество Александра Мосолова*, 9.

63 *Ibid*, 69, 72.

In addition to Arseny Avraamov's *Symphony of Sirens* (1922),<sup>64</sup> Arthur Honegger's symphonic movement *Pacific 231* (1923),<sup>65</sup> and Sergei Prokofiev's ballet *The Steel Step* (*Le pas d'acier*, 1927),<sup>66</sup> *The Iron Foundry* (1927) by Alexander Mosolov represents the most successful symphonic work illustrating the sounds of machinery.

Mosolov's *The Iron Foundry* was performed in Zagreb at the third concert of the Zagreb Philharmonic in the 1933/1934 season. The soloist was pianist and composer Karol Szymanowski, while renowned Polish conductor Grzegorz Fitelberg led the orchestra. This concert program featured only works by modern composers: *Classical Symphony* by S. S. Prokofiev, *Symphony No. 4* for piano and orchestra by K. Szymanowski, and *Serenata per piccola orchestra* by Alfredo Casella. The last two pieces were dedicated to "machine music". Although Zagreb was previously familiar with Honegger's *Pacific 231*, *The Iron Foundry* by Russian modernist A. Mosolov was presented for the first time. The orchestra illuminated the stage by entering into the intentions of the

64 Arseny Mikhaylovich Avraamov (1886–1944) is one of the prominent representatives of the Russian musical avant-garde of the 1920s. He attempted to merge art and technology in his work. His most famous work is the *Symphony of Sirens*, where various impacts, clanging, and rumbling of machines, gunshots, factory sirens, steam whistles, and other "mechanical" sounds are heard. For more about the *Symphony of Sirens*, see Сергей Хисматов, „Симфония гудков”, *Opera musicologica* 6/2010, 100–124.

65 Arthur Honegger (1892–1955), a Swiss-French composer, was one of the most active members of the French composer group Les Six, which also included Georges Auric (1899–1983), Louis Durey (1888–1979), Darius Milhaud (1892–1974), Francis Poulenc (1899–1963), and Germaine Tailleferre (1892–1983). The group emerged as a neoclassical response to preceding musical styles, wanting to make music more straightforward and accessible to a broader audience. The sounds of a steam locomotive inspired Honegger's most famous work, *Pacific 231*. While *Pacific 231* was generally admired, not everyone fully grasped its innovative nature. One critic said the piece sounds like a "collage of train noises" (Roger Nichols, *The Harlequin Years: Music in Paris 1917–1929*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002), 233).

66 *The Steel Step* (*Le pas d'acier*) is a one-act ballet that S. S. Prokofiev composed on a commission from S. P. Diaghilev for his Ballets Russes. It was an "unexpected and challenging commission" – a "Bolshevik" ballet about contemporary Soviet Russia (Сергей Сергеевич Прокофьев, *Дневник. Том 2 (1919–1933)*, предисловие Святослава Прокофьева, (Paris: sprkfv [DIAKOM], 2002), 331). The emigrant newspapers were furious about *The Steel Step*, considering it a sign of Soviet propaganda, why they referred to Diaghilev as a "hardened Kremlin entrepreneur". The dissatisfaction of reactionary circles didn't imply that Diaghilev's production of *The Steel Step* indeed depicted revolutionary events in Russia. According to them, it was more of an extravagance that conveyed some "Bolshevik exoticism" (Израиль Владимирович Нестьев, *Жизнь Сергея Прокофьева*, 2-е переработанное и дополненное издание, (Москва: Советский композитор, 1973), 274–275).

dictatorially suggestive conductor and with their virtuoso playing. The enthusiastic audience applauded the repetition of *The Iron Foundry*.<sup>67</sup>

During a symphony concert by the Belgrade Philharmonic Orchestra commemorating the twenty-fifth anniversary of conductor Ivan Brezovšek's (1888–1942) work on April 25, 1934, two works by contemporary Soviet composers were performed at Kolarac People's University. The program included Tchaikovsky's symphonic fantasy *Francesca da Rimini* and Dvořák's *Cello Concerto*, Shostakovich's *First Symphony* in F minor, and Mosolov's symphonic movement *The Foundry*. What were the reactions of the audience and critics to this four-minute piece at the Belgrade concert, given that they were more accustomed to the "classical" concert repertoire spanning from Mozart to Tchaikovsky, with sporadic inclusions of modern composers like Béla Bartók, Igor Stravinsky, Sergey Prokofiev, Leoš Janáček, Paul Hindemith, and others?

Nearly all prominent music critics of that time wrote about this concert, including Miloje Milojević, Rikard Švarc, Kosta Manojlović, Jovan Dimitrijević, Milenko Živković, and Dragutin Čolić. One of the more intriguing articles came from the pen of Dragutin Čolić (1907–1987), a young composer educated in Prague and an excellent connoisseur of contemporary musical trends. Aware that the music of Shostakovich and Mosolov was unfamiliar to the audience, he elucidated in the introductory part that the art of the great Russian contemporary masters has a social foundation because their creative work is closely connected to the broader masses for whom their art is intended. Regarding compositional technique, especially in instrumental music, he drew parallels between them and contemporary European composers: Arnold Schoenberg, Paul Hindemith, and Alois Hába as their prominent representatives. However, Čolić concludes: "The essential difference between modern Russian and European composers would be that European contemporary music is isolated from the masses, 'l'art pour l'art, while the art of Russian composers has a social foundation and is firmly connected to the masses, which accept it". Dragutin Čolić described *The Iron Foundry* as an "excellent work that can fully represent contemporary Russian modern music".<sup>68</sup> Despite being a left-wing intellectual, Čolić had to use the terms "modern Russian composer" and "Russian modern music" to avoid censorship. Rikard Švarc was more de-

67 Lujo Šafranek-Kavić, „Operna i koncertna sezona u Zagrebu”, *Sveta Cecilija* 6/1933, 186.

68 Д[рагутин] Чолић, „Симфонијски концерт Београдске филхармоније поводом прославе двадесетпетогишњице уметничког рада г. Ивана Брезовшека”, *Правда*, 27. 4. 1934, 9. In this article, the work of Mosolov is translated as *Factory* (Фабрика), while in all other texts, it is mentioned as *The Iron Foundry* (Ливница).

scriptive: “Mosolov takes a different path in his *Foundry*, an anthem to labour, machinery, and the modern world. The rhythm and pulse of ironclad logic in musical development, new and uncompromising, the hardness of the orchestral palette that emphasizes the massiveness and steel brilliance of the directed poetic idea, have produced a profound impression”.<sup>69</sup> Although he wrote of Tchaikovsky as a “great master of the symphony in Russia”, Švarc avoided using the adjectives “Russian” or “Soviet” for Shostakovich and Mosolov. On the other hand, Milenko Živković was not enthusiastic about the *Foundry*. While he noted that alongside Prokofiev’s *The Steel Step* and Honegger’s *Pacific 231*, this work represents the “most successful illustration of machine music”, he believed that art should not imitate industry.<sup>70</sup> However, unlike the first two, Živković singled out Shostakovich and Mosolov as “two young Soviet composers who already stand out as leaders of the new Russian school”. This is particularly intriguing due to the reasons mentioned earlier, coupled with the fact that the article was published in *Vreme*, a daily newspaper associated with the court and aligned with the radical regime.<sup>71</sup> Although some critics wrote about Mosolov’s *Foundry* as a representative piece of contemporary Russian or specifically Soviet music, their articles do not show that this label influenced their opinion of the mentioned composition. Regardless of the differing opinions of critics, the audience enthusiastically demanded an encore of *Foundry*. This fact is exceptionally significant as it demonstrates that despite being generally accustomed to the “classical” repertoire, the audience was very open to new experiences, namely music entirely unfamiliar. Mosolov’s *Foundry* achieved such success that it was repeated on June 3rd at the opening of the summer season of symphonic concerts at the Pavilion of the Guards House in Topčider. On that occasion, the Royal Guard Orchestra performed under the baton of conductor Dragutin Pokorni. Miloje Milojević welcomed the performance of *Foundry*, this “resounding anthem of the machinery noises”, as he advocated the inclusion of modern works in the repertoire.<sup>72</sup> Mosolov’s *Foundry* was once again performed at the first concert of the Belgrade Philharmonic in the season 1940/1941 under the baton of Lovro Matačić.<sup>73</sup> The press labeled this compo-

69 Rikard Švarc, „Beogradska filharmonija”, *Zvuk* 7/1934, 269–270.

70 Миленко Живковић, „Концерт Београдске филхармоније”, *Време*, 28. 4. 1934, 6.

71 Вук Драговић, *Српска штампа између два светска рата: основа за библиографију српске периодике 1915–1945*, (Београд: Српска академија наука, 1956), 54.

72 Др. М[илоје] М[илојевић], „У павиљону Гардијског дома у Топчидеру почели симфонијски концерти”, *Политика*, 6. 6. 1934, 10.

73 „Први симфонијски концерт Београдске филхармоније”, *Време*, 26. 9. 1940, 8.



sition a “gem” of the symphonic repertoire.<sup>74</sup> On this occasion as well, Miloje Milojević drew attention to the “peculiar” piece by Mosolov, praising his masterful realism in depicting the “life” of machinery in the foundry.<sup>75</sup> *The Foundry* could also be heard on Radio Belgrade during the broadcast of a symphony orchestra concert dedicated to the “Ikarus” aircraft factory workers, conducted by Stevan Hristić and Voja Ilić.<sup>76</sup> According to all evidence, this short and impactful composition had enormous success with the audience and the performers, as it was frequently performed.

Different from Belgrade and Zagreb, the concert scene in Ljubljana needed more consistency. The only institution that regularly organised concerts during the mid-1930s was Glasbena Matica, while the Ljubljana Philharmonic did not exhibit significant achievements. However, even Ljubljana had the opportunity to hear Mosolov’s *The Iron Foundry* in 1936 during a large summer concert organised by Glazbena Matica. *The Foundry* attracted the most attention.<sup>77</sup>

#### *Soviet opera and Shostakovich’s realism*

Dmitri Shostakovich’s four-act satirical tragedy, *Lady Macbeth of the Mtsensk District*, based on the novella by Nikolai Leskov, had its premiere on January 22, 1934, in Leningrad. Alongside Prokofiev’s opera *The Love for Three Oranges*, it became a widely acclaimed Soviet opera internationally. While Prokofiev’s opera was only performed by the Ljubljana Opera and achieved tremendous success, *Lady Macbeth* caught the attention of musical authorities in all three major cities – Ljubljana, Zagreb, and Belgrade. However, acquiring the musical score was not straightforward since diplomatic relations between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union were nonexistent. Cultural collaboration with the Soviet Union was confined to private connections: leftist members of the Russian diaspora and local communists could obtain Soviet newspapers and literature, while plays by Soviet authors were staged in the interwar period.<sup>78</sup> Shostakovich’s *Lady Macbeth* on opera stages in Yugoslavia is intriguing

74 „Први симфониски концерт Београдске филхармоније ове године”, *Правда*, 5. 10. 1940, 7.

75 др. М[илоје] М[илојевић], „Концерт Београдске филхармоније, први у овој сезони”, *Политика*, 10. 10. 1940, 12.

76 „Радио”, *Време*, 8. 12. 1940, 9.

77 Marijan Lipovšek, „Poglavje o našem koncertnem življenju”, *Ljubljanski zvon* 6/1936, 371–372.

78 Mosusova, “Vanka the Housekeeper by Nikolay Tcherepnin and Lady Macbeth by Dmitry Shostakovich: Contemporary Russian Opera in Interwar Belgrade”, 251.

for several reasons. As previously mentioned, there were no diplomatic and, consequently, no official cultural relations between the two countries. However, when discussing *Lady Macbeth*, it is essential to note the article published on January 28, 1936, in the Moscow leftist newspaper *Pravda*, titled *Сумбул вместо музыки* [Chaos instead of Music]. In a report by an anonymous author, Shostakovich's opera was subjected to sharp criticism for its “antinational” and “formalistic” nature. Although this article resonated within the USSR, it did not disturb the Yugoslav music scene. Interestingly, even Marxists among the Yugoslav intellectuals did not react, although it is almost unquestionable that news about removing Shostakovich's opera from all stages in the Soviet Union has reached them. Consequently, *Lady Macbeth* was premiered tremendously in Ljubljana on February 12, 1936, Zagreb on June 16, 1937, and Belgrade on November 12, 1937. The opera was staged in Belgrade under the same title as on its Moscow premiere: *Katarina Izmajlova*.

**НАРОДНО ПОЗОРИШТЕ**  
У БЕОГРАДУ

---

Вечерња претстала Код Словеника

**Г. Марио Шимени, тенор, као гост**

У петак, 12 новембра 1937 године  
(први пут)

# КАТАРИНА ИЗМАЈЛОВА

(Леди Магбет мценског среза)

Опера у четири чина (петак чина). Музика написао  
Д. Шостакович. Либрето по Лескову, Пушкин, Барановић  
Редактор: д. р. Милан

Л И Ц А

Борис: Тимофејев	Иванова, примада: г. Јанковић	Кордони	—	—	г. Нисољ
Звонко: Борисов	Иванова, његов син, супруга	г. Петровић	Надирова жена	—	г. Обрадовић
Катерина: Леонова	Иванова, Завонина жена	—	Учитель	—	г. Богдан
Српки: разни	—	г. Јурић	Синцова	—	г. Царић
Запушени мужици	—	г. Поповић	Командант струма	—	г. Марковић
Ласина, разни	—	г. Поповић	Стрелар	—	г. Труфунчић
Радници у млину	—	г. Поповић	Полковник	—	г. Брковић
Турочани: младици	—	г. Поповић	Вође страже	—	г. Поповић
Плеи	—	г. Поповић	Стрелар	—	г. Поповић
Други	—	г. Поповић	Синцова, реферанца	—	г. Савић
Трупа	—	г. Поповић	Стари робовани	—	г. Царић
			Робованица	—	г. Марковић

Радници, разници код Иванова: глуми на сценама,  
композитори у оркестру и робовани  
Догоди се у предграђу Русија

---

Сценариј: г. Ждановић Костими по вајаркиња гђе Бабаћ

Технички радници: г. Јанковић, итд.

---

**ЦЕНЕ МЕСТА**

ПАРТЕР	ПРВА ГАЛЕРИЈА	ДРУГА ГАЛЕРИЈА	ТРЕЋА ГАЛЕРИЈА
Лево . . . . . док. 240	Лево . . . . . док. 240	Лево . . . . . док. 120	Балкон . . . . . док. 10
Фотала I ред . . . . . 50	Фотала балкона . . . . . 35	Фотала у валу . . . . . 30	Седиште . . . . . док. 10
Фотала II ред . . . . . 40	Фотала I ред . . . . . 32	Седиште I ред . . . . . 20	Седиште . . . . . 10
Седиште . . . . . 40	Фотала II ред . . . . . 24	Балкони II ред . . . . . 18	Задња галерија . . . . . 10

Субота, 12 новембра: АРМИЈА И ШЕХЕРЗАДА — Цене исто од 3 до 35 к

Почетак тачно у 8 часова увече

ТЕАТРА „НАРОДНО“ — БЕОГРАД

(Premier poster for Shostakovich's opera *Katerina Izmailova*,  
Collection of the Museum of Theatrical Arts of Serbia, Inv. No. 12273-6)

While the critic Marijan Lipovšek from Ljubljana wrote enthusiastically about the young Soviet composer's opera,<sup>79</sup> the articles from Belgrade critics reveal a sense of admiration, albeit expressed in a more reserved manner. In Belgrade, performances that received such lengthy reviews from critics were rare. Some of them focused on the story itself and the relationship of the libretto to Leskov's novella, some on the music, and some on the "new" Russian opera. Nevertheless, it is challenging to avoid the impression that the story and dramaturgy of the opera appeared distant to them, preventing them from fully grasping the contemporary Russian life it portrayed.

Belgrade critic Branko Dragutinović provided a lengthy introduction to the opera performance, discussing opera as a musical-dramatic form and the creation of a new opera in Soviet Russia. According to him, there is a noticeable tendency for Alexander Dargomyzhsky to express words directly through tone and achieve realism, similar to Musorgsky's desire to depict life realistically through music. However, Dragutinović sees Shostakovich's opera leaning more towards a pro-Western European orientation than continuing the tradition of The Mighty Five. Besides Stravinsky and Prokofiev, he observes the influences of European modernist composers, mainly German: Richard Strauss, Alban Berg, Paul Hindemith, and Ernst Krenek. Therefore, he concludes: "Musically linked to Europe, he is ideologically and dramatically in Russia". The main criticism is that the contrast between European music and the Russian dramatic substance is incompatible stylistically. The audience received Shostakovich's opera "more with astonishment than enthusiasm. The first Soviet opera passed through our opera scene with little applause".<sup>80</sup> A concise and significant work lasting 4 minutes, such as Mosolov's *The Foundry*, had more tremendous success than an almost three-hour modern opera. The vocalists and the performers seemed unaccustomed to the sound and dramaturgy of such an opera, resulting in the performance being moderately successful despite their efforts. Considering the condemnations this opera faced in its home country, it is interesting that Yugoslav communists did not protest against its staging. The interest in "new" Russian music gaining popularity in Europe and America triumphed over political attitudes.

\*\*\*

Compared to contemporary music from other European countries, Soviet music in Yugoslavia had a limited presence on the scene and was not ex-

79 Marijan Lipovšek, „Problem slovenske opere in letošnje novitete”, *Ljubljanski zvon* 3/1936, 176–178.

80 Бранко Драгутиновић, „Премијера опере ‘Катарина Измајлова’ од Димитрија Шостаковића, *Правда*, 14. 11. 1937, 8.

tensively performed. This is especially apparent when we consider the “new” Soviet music generated by generations maturing during the interwar period. Shostakovich’s *First Symphony* was performed in Belgrade on April 25, 1934, at the same concert where Mosolov’s *The Foundry* was performed.

The situation only started to change in June 1940 when Soviet-Yugoslav relations were finally established. The Yugoslav embassy in Moscow invested significant efforts in developing mutual cultural connections. The Soviet authorities responsible for international cultural cooperation requested that gramophone records and sheet music of works by Soviet musicians be broadcast on radio stations. The broadcasting of the Soviet anthem on Yugoslav radio stations was also sought.<sup>81</sup> Therefore, the conductor Stevan Hristić’s decision during the concert of the Belgrade Philharmonic on November 18, 1940, is highly intriguing. He omitted a “distinctive part” from Glière’s *Heroic March*, which represent the conceptual focal point of the piece.<sup>82</sup> There is no doubt that this involves the Soviet anthem, which emerges at one point throughout the composition. Even though Yugoslav musical scenes featured the music of Glière and Myaskovsky as representatives of the “older” generation, as well as Mosolov and Shostakovich from the “new” era of Soviet composers, its presence was undoubtedly sporadic. This intermittent presence owed itself to the enthusiasm of some ideologically inclined individuals and several institutions that followed what was modern and popular in Europe. Yugoslav-Soviet musical connections and cultural influences would culminate in the first decade following the Second World War.<sup>83</sup>

### Summary

The paper delves into the presence of Soviet music within the interwar Yugoslav musical scene. This topic is fascinating, given that Yugoslav-Soviet diplomatic relations were only established on the eve of World War II. Although the subject’s scope turned out to be wider than expected, an effort was made to include a wide range of content. Considering Russian music holistically, without segregating it into emigrant and Soviet categories, it had a remarkable presence in Yugoslavia’s musical life. Thus, the paper categorises Russian composers into three groups: 1) Russian émigré composers; 2) elderly genera-

81 Животић, *Југословенско-совјетски односи 1939–1941*, 268, 271.

82 Миленко Живковић, „Други концерт Београдске филхармоније”, *Време*, 21. 11. 1940, 14.

83 Горан Милорадовић, *Лепота под надзором. Совјетски културни утицаји у Југославији 1945–1955*, (Београд: Институт за савремену историју, 2012).

tion composers active in the USSR; and 3) younger generation composers pioneering “new” music in the USSR. This division facilitated the identification of “new” Soviet music in the Yugoslav scene, focusing on two figures: Alexander Mosolov and Dmitri Shostakovich.

The paper focuses on the symphonic composition *The Iron Foundry* by Mosolov and Shostakovich’s opera *Lady Macbeth of the Mtsensk District*. We have endeavoured to place the performances of these mentioned works within the context of their time and environment while also demonstrating the reception they received from both the audience and critics. The paper concludes that during the 1920s, Soviet music was scarcely performed, with its sporadic presence becoming more noticeable by the late 1930s.

### Sources and Literature

- Arsenëv, Aleksej. „Russkaja diaspora v Jugoslavii”. *Russkaja jemigracija v Jugoslavii*, sost. Aleksej Arsenëv, Ol’ga Kirillova, Miodrag Sibirnovich, 46–99. Moskva: Indrik, 1996. (Russian Cyrillic)
- „Desetogodišnjica Zagrebačke Filharmonije”. *Glasnik muzičkog društva „Stankovič”* 8/1929, 151–152. (Cyrillic)
- Dobrovojević, Ivana. „Cenzura u doba šestojanuarskog režima kralja Aleksandra”. *Istorija 20. veka* 2/2005, 51–68.
- Dragović, Vuk. *Srpska štampa između dva svetska rata: osnova za bibliografiju srpske periodike 1915–1945*. Beograd: Srpska akademija nauka, 1956. (Cyrillic)
- „Drugi društveni koncert Glazbenog zavoda”. *Muzički glasnik* 9–10/1931, 295. (Cyrillic)
- Dragutinović, B[ranko]. „Iz muzičkog života. Jugoslavija. Beograd”. *Muzika* 8–9/1928, 260–263. (Cyrillic)
- Glier, R[ajnhold]. „Dekada sovjetske glazbe”. *Slavenska muzika* 1–2/1941, 2–6. (Cyrillic)
- Golubev, Aleksandr Vladimirovich i Vladimir Aleksandrovich Nevezhin. *Formirovanie obraza Sovetskoj Rossii v okružhajushhem mire sredstvami kul’turnoj diplomatii: 1920-e – pervaja polovina 1940-h gg*. Moskva: Institut rossijskoj istorii RAN, 2016. (Russian Cyrillic)
- Grickat, Zinaida. „Muzički život Lenjingrada”. *Zvuk* 8–9/1935, 337–341.
- Grickat, Zinaida. „O ruskoj muzici poslednjih godina”. *Muzički glasnik* 11/1934, 222–225. (Cyrillic)
- Grickat, Zinaida. „Opera u današnjoj Rusiji”. *Zvuk* 6/1934, 212–217
- Grickat, Zinaida. „Stremljenja savremene ruske muzike”. *Muzički glasnik* 5–6/1940, 78–85. (Cyrillic)
- Hismatov, Sergej. „Simfonija gudkov”. *Opera musicological* 6/2010, 100–124. (Cyrillic)

- Jaffé, Daniel. *Sergey Prokofiev*. London: Phaidon Press, 1998.
- Jampol'skij, Izrail' Markovich, P. N. Konnova. „Dekady nacional'nogo iskusstva”. *Muzykal'naja jenciklopedija*, 2, *Gondol'era–Korsov*. Moskva: Sovetskaja jenciklopedija, Sovetskij kompozitor, 1974, 186–187. (Russian Cyrillic)
- Keldysh, Jurij Vsevolodovich. „Associacija sovremennoj muzyki”. *Muzykal'naja jenciklopedija*, 1, A–Gong. Moskva: Sovetskaja jenciklopedija, Sovetskij kompozitor, 1973, 239–240. (Russian Cyrillic)
- Kenez, Peter. *The Birth of the Propaganda State: Soviet Methods of Mass Mobilisation 1917–1929*. Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Koren, Marija. „Građa za biografiju Vojislava Vučkovića”. *Vojislav Vučković umetnik i borac: lik, sećanja, svedočanstva*. Beograd: Nolit, 1968, 13–93.
- Lipovšek, Marijan. „Poglavje o našem koncertnem življenju”. *Ljubljanski zvon* 6/1936, 371–375.
- Lipovšek, Marijan. „Problem slovenske opere in letošnje novitete”. *Ljubljanski zvon* 3/1936, 172–178.
- Milin, Melita. „Etape modernizma u srpskoj muzici”. *Muzikologija* 6/2006, 93–116. (Cyrillic)
- Miloradović, Goran. *Lepota pod nadzorom. Sovjetski kulturni uticaji u Jugoslaviji 1945–1955*. Beograd: Institut za savremenu istoriju, 2012.
- Mosusova, Nadežda. “Diaghilev’s Ballets Russes and the Ballet in the Balkans and the other European Countries, 1920–1944 (Marking the Centenary of Diaghilev’s Ballets Russes, 1909–2009)”. *Music and Society in Eastern Europe* Vol. 6, ed. Jelena Milojković-Djurić, 1–16. Idyllwild: Charles Schlacks Publisher, 2011.
- Mosusova, Nadežda. “Vanka the Housekeeper by Nikolay Tcherernin and Lady Macbeth by Dmitry Shostakovich: Contemporary Russian Opera in Interwar Belgrade”. *Russian Émigré Culture: Conservatism or Evolution?* ed. Christoph Flamm, Henry Keazor, Roland Marti, 245–255. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013.
- Nejedli, Zdenjek. „Stremljenja savremene ruske muzike”. *Slavenska muzika* 2/1939, 12–15. (Cyrillic)
- Nejedli, Zdenjek. „Stremljenja savremene ruske muzike”. *Slavenska muzika* 3/1940, 21–23. (Cyrillic)
- Nest'ev, Izrail' Vladimirovich. *Zhizn' Sergeja Prokof'eva*, 2-e pererabotannoe i dopolnennoe izdanie. Moskva: Sovetskij kompozitor, 1973. (Russian Cyrillic)
- Nichols, Roger. *The Harlequin Years: Music in Paris 1917–1929*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- Osterc, Slavko. „Kratek pregled operne in koncertne sezone v Ljubljani”. *Muzika* 8–9/1928, 247.
- Prokof'ev, Sergej Sergeevich. *Dnevnik. Tom 2 (1919–1933)*, predislovie Svjatoslava Prokof'eva. Paris: sprkfv [DIAKOM], 2002. (Russian Cyrillic)

- Slonimsky, Nicolas. *Writings on Music: Russian and Soviet Music and Composers*, ed. Electra Slonimsky Yourke. Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2006.
- Solertinski, I[van Ivanovich]. „Umetnost u SSSR-u”. *Nova Evropa* 6/1929, 169–177. (Cyrillic)
- Švarc, Rikard. „Iz opereke statistike”. *Muzika* 8–9/1928, 255–259.
- Šafranek-Kavić, Lujo. „Iz muzičkog života. Jugoslavija i slovenske zemlje. Zagreb. Opera. Zagreb”. *Muzika* 2/1928, 50–51.
- Šafranek-Kavić, Lujo. „Operna i koncertna sezona u Zagrebu”. *Sveta Cecilija* 6/1933, 183–186.
- Taruskin, Richard. *Russian Music at Home and Abroad*. Oakland: University of California Press, 2016.
- Turlakov, Slobodan. *Letopis muzičkog života u Beogradu (1840–1941)*. Beograd: Muzej pozorišne umetnosti Srbije, 1994. (Cyrillic)
- Vasić, Aleksandar. „Časopis ‘Slavenska muzika’ (1939–1941) u istoriji srpske muzičke periodike”. *Muzikologija* 29/2020, 121–147. (Cyrillic)
- Vasić, Aleksandar. „Marksizam i društvenopolitički angažman u srpskoj muzičkoj periodici između dva svetska rata”. *Filozofija i društvo* 3/2013, 212–235. (Cyrillic)
- Vesić, Ivana. *Konstruisanje srpske muzičke tradicije u periodu između dva svetska rata*. Beograd: Muzikološki institut SANU, 2018. (Cyrillic)
- Vorobëv, Igor’. *Russkij avangard i tvorcestvo Aleksandra Mosolova 1920–1930-ih godov*. Sankt-Peterburg: Kompozitor, 2006. (Russian Cyrillic)
- Živanović, Milana. „Sovjetski filmovi na bioskopskom repertoaru u Kraljevini SHS/Jugoslaviji”. *Tokovi istorije* 1/2016, 115–140. (Cyrillic)
- Živković, Milenko. „Međunarodno društvo za savremenu muziku (Dokument o neuspelom pokušaju osnivanja jugoslovenske nacionalne sekcije)”. *Muzički glasnik* 10/1932, 265–274. (Cyrillic)
- Životić, Aleksandar. *Jugoslovensko-sovjetski odnosi 1939–1941*. Beograd: Filip Višnjić, 2016. (Cyrillic)
  
- *Politika* 1928, 1934, 1940 (Cyrillic)
- *Pravda* 1929, 1934, 1937, 1940 (Cyrillic)
- *Vreme*, 1934, 1940 (Cyrillic)
  
- Digital National Library of Serbia  
<https://digitalna.nb.rs/>
- Digital Library of Slovenia  
<https://www.dlib.si/>

## Резиме

Марија Голубовић

### СОВЈЕТСКА МУЗИКА У МЕЂУРАТНОЈ ЈУГОСЛАВИЈИ

**Апстракт:** У раду ће бити приказано присуство совјетске музике на музичкој сцени Краљевине СХС/Југославије. Анализа новинских чланака и критика, текстова из музичких часописа и других написа о совјетској музици показале да је била присутна на концертним сценама, иако је Краљевина Југославија одбијала да успостави односе са Совјетским Савезом све до јуна 1940. године.

**Кључне речи:** совјетска музика, Краљевина СХС/Југославија, међуратни период, југословенско-совјетски односи, Дмитриј Шостакович, Александар Мосолов

У раду се говори о присуству совјетске музике на музичкој сцени међуратне Југославије. Ова тема је веома интересантна ако имамо у виду да су југословенско-совјетски односи успостављени тек у предвече Другог светског рата. Иако се испоставило да је тема обимнија него што је у првом тренутку деловало, потрудили смо се да обухватимо што више материјала. Ако посматрамо руску музику у целини, без поделе на емигрантску и совјетску, она је била веома присутна у музичком животу Југославије. Стога смо у раду направили поделу на три групе руских композитора: (1) руски композитори у емиграцији, (2) старија генерација композитора која ствара у Совјетском Савезу и (3) млађа генерација композитора-пионира „нове“ музике у Совјетском Савезу. То нам је помогло да уочимо шта је „нова“ совјетска музика на југословенској сцени, те су нам се посебно издвојила два имена – Александар Мосолов и Дмитриј Шостакович.

У раду је пажња посвећена симфонијском комаду *Ливница* Мосолова и Шостаковичевој опери *Леди Магбет Миценског округа*. Потрудили смо се да извођења споменутих дела ставимо у контекст времена и средине, као и да покажемо какав је одјек био код публике и критике. У раду смо дошли до закључка да се током 1920-их година совјетска музика готово уопште није изводила, док се њено спорадично присуство уочава крајем 1930-их година.