

UDK: 929:78.071.1Lourie A.V.(093.3)
329.7(4+5):78.037(497+571)
DOI: 10.2298/MUZ120229013L

Katerina Levidou
Univeristy of Lausanne
ekaterini.levidou@unil.ch

ARTHUR LOURIÉ AND HIS CONCEPTION OF REVOLUTION*

Abstract: Arthur Lourié’s conception of revolution (political as well as cultural) is explored through his writings, with particular emphasis on its evolution from his Russian period to his Parisian and American exiles. Analysing Lourié’s Eurasianist views specifically I argue that through his association with Eurasianism and his engagement with Neoclassicism Lourié did not abandon his revolutionary disposition; the means through which his revolutionism was pursued as well as the ideals that shaped it were merely redefined, while remaining firmly grounded in the Silver Age.

Keywords: Arthur Lourié, Eurasianism, Russian Revolution

In the chaos of modernity, amidst horrible events that pile up one after the other, one feels completely lost. The most difficult feeling is that of complete loneliness in the surrounding vacuum. Collapse of the old world and emptiness in the new, that is, in the post-war years. And suddenly, from time to time, some outbursts of bright light in one’s soul. Some revelation, for which there are no words. What is it? The conviction that salvation and the light will come from there, from Russia. And not just for Russia, but for the whole world. Whence does salvation come? In what is it to be found? There is only a single way. The overcoming of materialism (Marxism). The spiritual revolution of which we dreamt from the earliest days of the political revolution. Blok infected me precisely with this and “seduced” me at that time. This was what the left socialist revolutionaries dreamt of.

* I am grateful to Tatiana Baranova Monighetti for editing my transcriptions of excerpts from Arthur Lourié’s personal diaries and notebooks and for helping me identify some words, and to Philip Bullock for substantially improving my translations of these extracts into English as well as for his valuable comments on my article. I would like to thank the Paul Sacher Foundation for granting me permission to publish materials from the Arthur Lourié Collection.

Return to the truths of Christianity. Socialism must be realised on Christian foundations. Rectification and purification of the historical line. It will be so, it will be! The historical church should be liberated from ties to the capitalist world.¹

Arthur Lourié, diary entry

(Lourié 1959: entry /in Russian/ dated 25 January 1959)

Nostalgia is not an uncommon symptom of exile, and the post-war personal diaries of the Russian émigré composer Arthur Vincent Lourié (1891/1892–1966) – testimonies of his second exile, the one from Paris to the USA – are indeed awash with entries that evoke glorious past days, lived on the other side of the Atlantic.² A list of his contemporaries' names penned in his 1958 diary – not the only such instance in Lourié's post-war agendas – offers snapshots of a fascinating life at the heart of early twentieth-century cultural developments, experiences that hardly heralded the loneliness and isolation of Lourié's American years, after he settled in Princeton, New Jersey, in 1941:

[Sunday 25 May] Entourage: musicians and agents of musical life/ in Russia/ Glazunov/Prokofiev/ Asaf'ev (Igor' Glebov)/ Miaskovskii/ Kastal'skii A. D./ Briusova N. Ia./ Kussevitskii Sergei/ Ziloti A. I./ Busoni/ Albert Coates/ Ansermet (abroad)/ Stravinsky/ Horowitz/ Charles Münch/ Kolia Berezovskii/ Schloezer Boris/ Grechaninov/ Manuel de Falla/ Maurice

¹ Unless noted, translations are mine. The ALA-LC transliteration scheme has been used (without diacritics) for Romanisation of Russian, although renderings of certain names that have been firmly established in Anglophone musicological literature have been retained (for example Stravinsky instead of Stravinskii).

² Born into a Jewish family, Arthur Vincent Lourié, né Naum Israilevich Lur'e, changed his first name into Arthur in honour of Arthur Schopenhauer and his patronymic into Vincent in admiration of Vincent van Gogh. He converted to Catholicism in 1912 in order to marry the Polish Catholic Iadviga Tsybul'skaia, since mixed marriages were not allowed in Russia at the time. Both acts should also be interpreted as efforts to dissociate himself from his Jewish background in Russia's anti-Semitic milieu (Móricz 2008a: 184; 2008b: 81–82). There is some uncertainty as to the year of Lourié's birth. Klára Móricz proposes 1891 (Móricz 2008a, 2008b) based on Mikhail Kralin's novel on the composer and the poet Anna Akhmatova, who was his lover (Kralin 2000). Most sources, however, state 1892 as the year Lourié was born, including a biographical sketch by Irina Graham, who was very close to Lourié (Graham 1979: 186). Since "1892" is written on Lourié's gravestone as well as on concert programmes during his lifetime, it seems that this was the year Lourié considered as his birth date (or, at least, the year he preferred to be stated as such) – I would like to thank Stefan Hulliger for sharing this comment with me.

Emmanuel/ Florent Schmitt [Monday 26 May] Akhmatova/ Blok/ Viach. Ivanov/ Sologub/ Khlebnikov/ Mandel'shtam/ Kul'bin/ Kuzmin/ Sudeikin/ Sorin/ {Miturich/ Bruni/ Tatlin/ Maiakovskii/ Punin (and the entire group of Futurists to which was dedicated "Nash Marsh" with words by Maiakovskii, published by the state publishing house Meyerhold/ A. M. Remizov/ Shestov/ Chagall/ Jacques Maritain/ José Bergamin/ Jules Supervielle/ Henri Marrou-Davenson/ Jean Laloy/ Jean Mouton/ Pierre Emmanuel/ Philipp Morel. (Lourié 1958: entries /in Russian/ dated 25 May and 26 May).³

Lourié's life and artistic output were marked by two opposing trends, reflected in this list of his contemporaries: on one hand radicalism, on the other hand conservatism. Indeed, the inclusion in his "entourage" of names as irreconcilable as those of Russian Futurists and the neo-Thomist French Catholic philosopher Jacques Maritain – one of his closest friends, his mentor, in certain respects, and an enthusiast of Lourié's music – might come as a surprise to those unfamiliar with this little-known figure (Shadle 2010). Lourié's association with exponents of Neoclassicism, Ferruccio Busoni and Igor Stravinsky, also signifies a withdrawal from the modernist experimentation of early twentieth-century Russian culture after he defected in 1922. While at first glance the evolution of Lourié's aesthetics and outlook on life indicate a retreat from revolutionism to conservatism, a scrutiny of Lourié's post-Revolutionary views, artistic as well as political – focusing particularly on those reflecting the so-called interwar Eurasianist ideology – suggests that, in effect, for Lourié these two tendencies were not mutually exclusive.

Lourié fashioned himself into an artistic revolutionary already through his early career steps. Partly self-taught, although a student of Glazunov's in composition in the St Petersburg Conservatory, he abandoned his studies before graduating in 1913, thus distancing himself from prevalent musical thought. Although Lourié's early works echo Debussy and Scriabin, he experimented with microtones as early as in 1910; his piano piece *Formes en l'air* (1915) – a "prototype of graphic notation" – dedicated to Pablo Picasso, is often noted as a remarkable exponent of musical experimentation (Sitsky 1994: 87). In the 1910s Lourié frequented the notorious avant-garde nightclub "The Stray Dog", and he managed to be regarded as a leading Futurist of his

³ The names appear in a list in the diary. I have used "/" to signify change of line in the list.

generation especially after signing the 1914 Russian Futurist manifesto “We and the West” and composing music for Vladimir Maiakovskii’s poem “Our March” (1918) (Lur’e 1969; Móricz 2008a: 183; Sitsky 1994: 97). Yet certain elements of Lourié’s early output raise the question of the actual extent of his artistic revolutionism even in those days. Concurrently with some radical compositions, Lourié produced numerous fairly conventional works (Sitsky 1994: 88), and several features of his 1910s works could be deemed heralds of his Neoclassical style, including a predilection for simplicity and its spiritual aspects (Sitsky 1994: 87 and 91).

With the outbreak of the 1917 Russian Revolution, Lourié’s radical disposition on the artistic level was coupled with political revolutionary action. Anatolii Lunacharskii, the first Commissar of Narkompros (the Commissariat of Enlightenment) appointed him head of the respective Music Department in January 1918, a post from which Lourié was removed in January 1921, when it was felt that Narkompros should focus on education rather than prioritising the arts (Edmunds 2000: 65; Nelson 2004: 39; Roziner 1992: 37). Following his replacement, Lourié taught at the Petrograd Institute of Art History with Boris Asaf’ev, but soon afterwards fled to the West, while on an official trip to Berlin in 1922 (Edmunds 2000: 54). Eventually he was given permission to settle in Paris in 1924, where he stayed until 1941. In the Parisian capital Lourié became Stravinsky’s right-hand man and his closest attaché during the interwar years – although problems arose in their relationship in the 1930s (Walsh 2006: 24, 51, 75, 410). He met Jacques Maritain on 10 June 1926, who remained a friend and supporter until the end of his life (Walsh 2000: 432).

Lourié’s association with the political revolution ironically earned him his contemporaries’ scorn both inside and outside of Soviet Russia. As a “decadent” who, nevertheless, “in a velvet jacket and a bow tie, established his headquarters as a Musical Commissar of the Department of Education” he was loathed by several of his émigré compatriots in Russia Abroad, just as some had condemned him for this “treason” while in Bolshevik Russia (Lur’e 1969: 127–28; Slonimsky 2004: 98). At the same time, as an émigré he was labelled a formalist and became a *persona non grata* in the Soviet Union (Edmunds 2000: 54). The hostility Lourié faced due to his service as

Commissar is not totally fair, since in his powerful position he was dedicated to promoting the arts – actually, an elitist avant-garde – and facilitated the work of musicians on several occasions (Edmunds 2000: 53–84; Slonimsky 2004: 99). Besides, he recalled those days mostly for the unprecedented aesthetic freedom granted to artists, which, he claimed, was the reason they joined the political revolution (Lourié 1969: 128). Much of the scorn by his compatriots possibly emanated from the fact that he used his authority to promote his own music: “As a musical commissar, he had the State Publishing House print his futuristic pastiches, and at one time, when the paper shortage was great, he was the only publishing composer in all the Russias” (Slonimsky 2004: 99).

Lourié’s post-war diaries contain some powerful impressions of those revolutionary days:

And the Bolsheviks? Well, what sort of contemporaries! They were never my contemporaries. They are like ants, which run around on the grass, like caterpillars, cockroaches, bedbugs, and I do not know what else. So they never really were my contemporaries. Not only the Bolsheviks, but in general – any “socialists” at all. Even in the early years of the Revolution. My contemporaries at the time were: Lenin, Lunacharskii (to a certain extent), Natalia Ivanovna Trotskaia, Nadezhda Constantinovna Krupskaja, the Menzhinskii sisters. But not the Bolsheviks in general, and nobody in power ever was, or ever will be. (Lourié 1946: entry /in Russian/ dated 7 July 1946).

Such a categorical renunciation could be read as an effort to dissociate himself from the “treason” that had tainted his name. However, we should also take into account that at the time the 1917 Russian Revolution broke out, the belief that the political revolution should and would be accompanied by a revolution in the sphere of culture was widespread (Fitzpatrick 1970). After all, initially the Futurists (with whom Lourié had been associated) allied with the Bolsheviks; Marinetti characteristically wrote in 1920 in *Beyond Communism*: “I am delighted to learn that the Russian Futurists are all Bolsheviks and that for a while Futurist art was the official Russian art.” (Rosenberg 1983: 183) The fact that Lourié worked hard to promote avant-garde music during his office confirms that his actions were driven by cultural aspirations.

An even clearer picture of the nature of Lourié's engagement with the Bolshevik Revolution surfaces if his actions are considered in the light of his relationship with Aleksandr Blok, whom he admired greatly (Graham 1979: 202–204). It was right after he read the Symbolist poet's article "The Intelligentsia and the Revolution" that he decided to join the political revolution, following the poet's call: "With all your body, with all your heart, with all your consciousness – listen to the music of the Revolution!" (Lur'e 1969: 128). As Lourié's post-war reflections that are presented as this article's epigraph suggest, what he had anticipated from the political revolution was a more comprehensive transformation of the world: a spiritual revolution. The idea of transforming human consciousness, which such spiritual revolution entailed, builds on the Symbolist aspiration to carry humankind to a higher state of consciousness, which Scriabin notably wished to implement in his *Mysterium*. Blok, significantly, embraced the German idealist perception of music as a direct expression of the world will, a conviction captivated in his conception of the "spirit of music" (Rosenthal 1980: 124). Moreover, he ascribed to music an instrumental role in the revolution. For him the revolution involved not so much political and economical reforms, but a cataclysmic, cathartic, musical experience, which would transform individuals, the nation and possibly humankind itself (Hackel 1975: 44). He actually claimed that, by not partaking in political action, one would "betray music, which we can only hear if we cease to hide from anything at all" (Hackel 1975: 44). Small wonder, then, that Lourié responded instantly to the urge of the person he deemed the most perfect human being he had ever met (Lur'e 1969: 128). He did, after all, defect when he became disillusioned with the cultural situation in the Bolshevik Russia. As we shall see, Blok's association of the Revolution with music outlived Lourié's Bolshevik years and impregnated his émigré worldview.

What is conspicuously absent from Lourié's otherwise generous list of contemporaries is a number of his compatriots with whom he frequented and even collaborated in Russia Abroad in the context of cultural activities organised by the interwar political and intellectual movement called

Eurasianism. Those familiar with recent literature on Lourié's relationship with Stravinsky in particular (for instance Dufour 2006) might be surprised by the absence of the name of Pierre Souvtchinsky (Petr Suvchinskii) – intellectual, art critic and musicologist, and founding member of Eurasianism – who, just like Lourié, was one of Stravinsky's closest associates during the interwar years.⁴ Lourié not only collaborated with Souvtchinsky as co-editor (along with several others) of the Eurasianist journal *Evrasiia* (Clamart, 1928–1929); he also contributed articles on music to this journal as well as to another one published under the auspices of Eurasianism: *Versty* (Paris, 1926–1928). Two exceptions are Alexei Remizov and Lev Shestov, “close collaborators” of *Versty*, according to its cover page; but no other names of collaborators or editors of these two journals or members of the movement come up (for example Dmitrii Mirskii, Sergei Efron, Marina Tsvetaeva, Lev Karsavin, or the weighty names of the linguists, and members of the Prague Linguistic Circle, Nikolai Trubetskoi – Eurasianism's founding member – and Roman Jakobson – attracted to Eurasianism).

Eurasianism, a nationalist movement with a modernist side, was founded officially in 1921 by Souvtchinsky, the linguist and ethnographer Nikolai Trubetskoi, the economist and geographer Petr Savitskii and the Orthodox theologian Georgii Florovskii. In the late 1920s the movement split into two factions, a right- and a left-wing one, and by the 1930s it had dissolved.⁵ Eurasianism's founding was marked by the publication of a collaborative collection of essays entitled *Iskhod k vostoku* (Exodus to the East). It emerged from the attempt of

⁴ Lourié's personal diaries, held at the Paul Sacher Foundation, cover almost two decades, from 1945 to 1964. Although I have not studied them exhaustively, so far I have encountered no mention of Souvtchinsky's name. Souvtchinsky's name does not appear in Jean Laloy's notes, summaries and translations of excerpts of these diaries either (Laloy n.d.).

⁵ Richard Taruskin has argued for a connection between Stravinsky and Eurasianism with reference to what he identifies as proto-Eurasianist ideas, with which Stravinsky could have been familiar in the 1910s, namely before the movement's founding (Taruskin 1997: 360–467). Taruskin portrays Stravinsky's presumed contact with such ideas as a catalyst in the development of Stravinskian neoclassicism. Disregarding the pluralism of voices within the Eurasianist movement, including the concurrent articulation of leftist and right-wing views, Taruskin associates what he recognises as Stravinsky's pro-fascism with his acquaintance with Eurasianist ideology. My analysis of Stravinsky's link with Eurasianism, which partly challenges Taruskin's interpretation, is based on his relationship with Souvtchinsky and Lourié, and highlights the spiritual components of Stravinskian neoclassicism (Levidou 1998).

some expatriate intellectuals to grasp the historical and political circumstances that led to their expatriation and drew – among others – upon the Slavophile nationalist tradition. The Eurasianists redefined Russia as “Eurasia”, which they perceived – in a proto-structuralist fashion – as an autonomous geographical and cultural entity, a closed structure, that effectively covered the space occupied by the former Soviet Union. Ethno-culturally, Eurasia was allegedly marked by the merging of Asian and European features. Eurasianism put forward the idea of the Russian nation’s distinctiveness from and superiority over Europe, denouncing the Western-European, Romano-Germanic (as they called it) civilisation as despotic. Souvtchinsky’s Eurasianist articles specifically were saturated with such modernist rhetoric of a crisis in the modern Western world (Levidou 2011). The Eurasianists deplored Russia’s own Europeanization, as it eventually led to the Bolshevik Revolution (which they condemned for its rejection of religion). They also considered that the social upheaval that came with the Revolution helped free Russia’s Eurasian essence from European admixtures. The ensuing purification signified that it was time for Russia to assume the global mission for which it was destined (a mission whose accomplishment involved integrated political and cultural action): to rescue humanity from the decadent Western civilisation, which had been subdued by reason, and replace it with a “religious” culture. This view places Eurasianism in that strand of Russian intellectual history that was expressive of the so-called “Russian idea”, namely the conviction that “Russia’s native spiritual values and communitarian structures destine it to lead the world in establishing a New Jerusalem: a community bound by fraternal love and shared beliefs” (Kelly 1999: 1). The “religious” culture the Eurasianists envisaged would reconcile the spiritual with the material, implementing a synthesis whose perceived value, according to the Eurasianists, the Bolshevik Revolution failed to appreciate – such criticism of the Bolsheviks, renunciation of materialism and longing for a spiritual revolution, is also reflected in this article’s epigraph. Souvtchinsky, in particular, propagated music’s unique power to transform modern humanity and its instrumental role in effecting the anticipated Eurasianist “religious” culture due to its capacity to overcome time, which rendered it capable of transforming human consciousness of the world (Levidou 2011).

The Silver Age was a major source of inspiration for Eurasianism. Russian Symbolist and Futurist art, and especially the Scythian movement, were instrumental in the shaping of the notion of Eurasia through a fascination with Asia, expressed, for instance, in the poetry of Blok, Andrei Belyi and Velimir Khlebnikov (Riasanovsky 1996: 137). The cover of *Iskhod k vostoku*, designed by the young artist Pavel Chelishchev, notably depicted a galloping mare, which is an allusion to Blok's poem "Na pole Kulikovom" (On the Field of Kulikovo, 1908). Souvtchinsky's cultural agenda, which put forward an awakening of modern humanity's consciousness through music, arguably built on Symbolist views that deemed art as a prism through which the mysteries of life may be grasped intuitively and music, in specific, as being capable of spiritually transforming the world.

The nature of Lourié's relationship with Eurasianism might appear as one reason for the absence of any explicit references to the movement and its members in Lourié's personal diaries. Lourié was arguably the most fervent supporter of Eurasianism among the Russian émigré composers during the interwar years. The 1959 diary entry presented as this article's epigraph is indeed a very succinct synopsis of Eurasianist tenets, capturing a Eurasianist apprehension with a crisis of modernity and the conviction that salvation of humankind would come from Russia by means of a spiritual revolution. However, although he was involved in Eurasianist publications and many of his views reflect Eurasianist principles, it seems that he was not actively engaged in propagating Eurasianist ideology, in a manner that Souvtchinsky was. His religious beliefs could have been a barrier to his full acceptance by other Eurasianists as part of the "elite group" they anticipated would rule the "ideocratic" state they visualised. Eurasianism was firmly grounded in Russian Orthodoxy, while Lourié was a Catholic (a convert from Judaism). Although Eurasianists were willing to embrace the religious diversity of various nations (Laruelle 1999: 218–24), it seems that Russian Orthodoxy was a prerequisite for being active politically. Nevertheless, a sound explanation of the absence of overt references to Eurasianism might be the fate that most Eurasianists faced. Many of them were persecuted, imprisoned or killed by

illiberal regimes, the Nazis or the Soviet army – Souvtchinsky being a notable exception (Glebov 2003: 25) – so Lourié could have simply been wary of providing concrete evidence of his association with Eurasianists.

Eurasianism became for Lourié the new context that accommodated his ideal of a spiritual revolution, a revolution that would transform human consciousness and would redeem humankind from the rotten modern condition, a revolution that he associated with music, as we shall see. The movement's veneration of Blok, in particular, could only have encouraged Lourié's embrace of Eurasianist ideology. During his émigré years Lourié composed several articles, published in Russian, French and English, many of them propagating Stravinsky's work (Dufour 2006). Through those he voiced certain ideas which were in line with, if not inspired by, Eurasianist ideology. The cultural agenda he put forward was symptomatic of the general tendency in the émigré community to reflect on the nation's destiny and role in history. In this context, in the early 1930s Lourié presented a peculiar perspective on music history. He identified three elements in post-First World War musical culture: the German, the Latin (French) and the Slav (Russian) (Lourié 1932). He recognised an alliance between the Slav and the Latin, an alliance which, he asserted, was not based so much on aesthetic tenets, but on their common objective of overthrowing the authority of German music, which had hitherto dominated the other two musical cultures (Lourié 1932: 519).

Lourié's particular vision of music history reflected the cultural and intellectual bonds between Russia and France that had been established long before the Bolshevik Revolution. Ever since Peter the Great had launched the country's official Europeanization, the Russian aristocracy, and, later, the intelligentsia, had sought inspiration in French culture, thought and lifestyle in advancing an Enlightened European face. The profound relationship between Russian and French music should also be taken into account. French music was initially the dominant party, setting the model for Russian music, since its introduction in Russia in the eighteenth century; for example, Hector Berlioz travelled extensively in Russia and had a significant effect on Russian composers, particularly in the realm of orchestration. The rise of nationalism in French culture as a result of the humiliation France experienced after its

defeat in the Franco-Prussian War, and the parallel strengthening of Russian nationalism in the second half of the nineteenth century – which in music took an explicit anti-German character – facilitated the advancement of a Franco-Russian musical alliance. Eventually, the relationship between French and Russian music became one of mutual appreciation and influence, especially since the work of Russian composers also had some impact on their French counterparts – for example Musorgsky on Debussy and Ravel. The enthusiastic reception of the *Ballets russes* surely allowed Russians to feel that Russian and French music were finally standing on equal ground, and, undoubtedly, following the Bolshevik Revolution, only encouraged Russian musicians to settle in the French capital, which became their preferred destination.

At the same time, Lourié's analysis of the relationship between these three musical cultures reflected the Eurasianist vision of Russia as a protagonist in world history after the outbreak of the Bolshevik Revolution. In this spirit, he reinvented the place of Russian music in music history, portraying it as a catalyst in the relationship between the German and the Latin musical cultures. He claimed that the acquaintance of French music with its Russian counterpart – especially its contact with what he describes as Russian music's barbaric novelty and freshness – had led to the recognition of the French musical character, and the overcoming of Wagner's influence – a comment which might appear ironic in the light of Wagner's influence on Russian culture and music (Bartlett 1995). Therefore, the Slav element had induced the Latin element to stand up against the German, which had seemed invincible at the time. In other words, the Slav had purportedly instigated indirectly the conflict between the Latin and the German elements, a clash that marked the music history of the turn of the twentieth century.

Lourié visualised the unravelling of recent music history by means of a (Hegelian) dialectical historical circle, which had already come to completion (Lourié 1933). Starting with the rejection of the German classical foundations in the late nineteenth century, the circle proceeded with the rise and decline of modernism, which was itself succeeded by a return to the classical tradition in the 1920s (Lourié 1933: 95). Lourié perceived the German element as the thesis

of this dialectical historical circle, represented by Brahms's music. Brahms tried to reconcile classicism with romanticism and essentially leaned towards the latter (Lourié 1933: 98). The equilibrium of musical components within form, which typified German music and derived from German classicism, was disturbed with the advent of modernism. Modernism constitutes the antithesis in Lourié's dialectical historical circle, and signified a transfer of the centre of musical developments from Berlin to Paris, that is, a shift of "power" from the German to the Latin elements. This disruption took place in two successive steps: first the Impressionistic focus on harmony, and subsequently the concentration on rhythm. According to Lourié, the focus on rhythm was effected in Stravinsky's "Russian" output, and signalled the decay of the Latin element (Lourié 1933: 98). The latter step was also accompanied by the break from traditional tonality. On one occasion, Lourié talked about the two outstanding modern musical schools: the first concentrated on rhythm, and the second was German and Austrian Expressionism (Lourié 1929–1930: 7). This is rather confusing, since it contradicts his argument that with modernism Paris assumed the leading role in music history.

The synthesis of the two opposite historical forces and the restoration of classical principles, primarily the reinstatement of balance among the elements of musical form, were attempted by the "polemical method" of Neoclassicism (Lourié 1933: 100). This signified the completion of the dialectical historical circle in question. Lourié did not hesitate to portray this completion by drawing a metaphor between music politics and state politics. Since the circle of music history under question involved a succession in power of the German element by the Latin, its conclusion denoted the "disarmament" of the musical world (Lourié 1933: 95):

In these days the question of disarmament appears to be one of the most real. Men are striving to eradicate the very possibility of war. I have no intention of expressing here my opinion on this political problem, nor of solving it in a positive or negative sense. I do not know if military disarmament, should it be accomplished, would lead to universal peace. One thing I do know, and that is that the musicians of our time have anticipated the politicians.

Lourié contended that the disarmament of the musical world was taking place under the flag of Neoclassicism, which acted as a peace-maker among the three elements in contemporary music.

As the circle of music history was progressing, and with the advent of modernism, form had developed into a leading preoccupation, Lourié argued, and as a result its balance with content had been lost. The dry interest in form in contemporary music had eventually turned into formalism. Even the style that had become known as Neoclassicism had ultimately been seized by formalist tendencies, and had degenerated into barren restoration of classical forms. Thus, it had been falsely termed Neoclassicism. Lourié explained that the focus on “empty form” reflected the wrecking of humanistic culture, the contemporary materialistic civilisation, and was the product of an age saturated by anti-spirituality (Lourié 1933: 101). The manifestation of spiritual values in art had been rejected as an unnecessary, extra-musical supplement, which distracted artists from their one and only true objective, namely the quest of a balanced form. Yet, art that is devoid of spiritual meaning is of no use, Lourié insisted; for the restoration of the lost equilibrium between form and content may only be accomplished by resorting to spiritual forces.

Lourié anticipated the emergence of a new type of form, which would restore the lost equilibrium between form and content, and hence would reinstate spiritual meaning in art (Lourié 1933: 103).⁶ This, according to him, would be the genuine Neoclassical music. On one occasion, though, Lourié outlined briefly the issue of the predominance of harmony and rhythm in modernist music, and concluded by enquiring whether the time for melody had come to assume a leading role, to synthesise and overcome the “problems” of harmony and rhythm (Lourié 1929–1930). In any case, unsurprisingly, Russia was the strongest candidate for accomplishing “spiritual music”. For Lourié, Russian music, unlike French music – and although it did not employ the German method – had managed to create its own “dialectic” (Lourié 1933: 97). This allowed Lourié to wonder whether Russian music was ultimately

⁶ Lourié attempted to implement this equilibrium between form and content in his own work already at that time, for instance in *Sinfonia dialectica* (1930) (Levidou 2008: 154–199). He maintained this artistic credo until the end of his life; the increasing religious orientation of his creation was put at the service of this artistic ideal.

destined to resolve the long-standing opposition in music history, in other words, whether the Slav element could become the synthesis of the Latin and the German, and thus inaugurate a new musical era (Lourié 1933: 97).

Lourié was reluctant to name any composer specifically. This was probably due, to some extent, to the fact that by the early 1930s he was confident enough as a creator to aspire to hold this place alongside (or perhaps instead of) the one musician he had indicated for this position in the past: Stravinsky. Indeed, in a 1929 article that appeared in *Evrasiia*, Lourié had unreservedly identified Stravinsky as world music's hope for the future (Lur'ë 1929: 8). On a different occasion, one year earlier, in 1928, Lourié had even suggested that, given the relapse of the so-called Neoclassicism to pseudo-classicism, Stravinsky should no longer be named a Neoclassicist, since the movement had degenerated into fetishism of form (Lourié 1928: 8). Lourié acknowledged that Stravinsky represented the "objective style", which rose in opposition to the egocentric style of Expressionism. Within his "Neoclassical forms", though, Stravinsky had achieved the limitation of the individualistic principle by subordinating the ego to superior and eternal values, an aspect which endowed Stravinsky's work with the spiritual content Lourié had been anticipating (Lourié 1928: 6).

Lourié exposed a dialectical unravelling of music history from a Russian perspective as well. Discussing the evolution of Russian modernist music specifically, he spoke of a historical circle that started with Skryabin, whom Lourié juxtaposed with the early Stravinsky (of the Russian period) (Lur'ë 1944). In an admittedly reductionist fashion, Lourié claimed that the two composers brought about revolution on the harmonic and the rhythmic planes respectively. Skryabin's harmonic revolution and Stravinsky's rhythmic revolution should, according to Lourié, be absorbed dialectically by a new component, that of melodism, upon which the music of the future should be established. For Lourié, the Russian and the Western dialectical circles of early-twentieth-century music history were unfolding parallel to one other. There are evident analogies between the two. In both cases a loss of balance in musical form is identified, and this is attributed firstly to the reign of the element of harmony (Skryabin on the one hand, and Debussy/Impressionism

on the other) and subsequently to that of rhythm. The two circles converged with Stravinsky and were both leading towards a Eurasianist music to be accomplished in the future. The “Russian” circle does disclose the Russian/Eurasian foundations of the forthcoming new form, which would overcome formalism effecting an equilibrium between all musical elements (harmony, rhythm and melody), and a synthesis of form and content. Clearly, for Lourié, all historical forces, national and international, were showing the way to such Eurasianist music of the future.

Lourié was certainly not a pioneer in suggesting a dialectical unfolding of the evolution of art. A dialectical notion of history and the history of art that was well-known and influential in the 1910s and 1920s was that by the author and literary critic Evgenii Zamiatin (Shane 1975; Zamyatin 1975a, 1975b). Zamiatin identified three schools in recent art: affirmation, negation and synthesis. These correspond to Realism, Symbolism and what he named “Neorealism” or Synthetism. Zamiatin conceived Synthetism as a new kind of realism that nevertheless fuses fantasy and reality, which he saw implemented in the work of the artist Iurii Annenkov (1889–1974). Zamiatin’s dialectical perception of history and the evolution of art are conditioned by a feeling of a never ending dissatisfaction, since for him there was no final synthesis, no final revolution. The succession of dialectical circles and revolutions would be infinite.

The sense of dissatisfaction is a quality that Lourié’s dialectical conception of historical evolution could be said to have in common with Zamiatin’s, and is generated by the multiple expositions of his historical dialectical model, and the presentation of various options for synthesis. Indeed, in one case melody is suggested as the synthesis; in another, form. Besides, a third dialectical circle is outlined in “Neogothic and Neoclassic”, where Schoenberg and his individualism constitute the thesis and Stravinsky and his objectivity the antithesis, anticipating Theodor Adorno’s dialectical juxtaposition of the two composers in his *Philosophie der neuen Musik* in 1949 (Adorno 2006). As regards this particular dialectical circle, Lourié even doubted that a synthesis of the two opposites could be achieved (Lourié 1928: 8). However, the source of such volatility is different in Lourié’s case. For Zamiatin, synthesis, the revolution, lay in the future, but he denied that there

would be a final revolution. Yet, Lourié clearly embraced the Eurasianist aspiration that there would be a conclusion, which would arrive when the Eurasian nation took on a leading role in world history. Apparently he remained faithful to the conviction of a spiritual revolution effected by the Russian nation until the end of his life, a revolution in which artistic creativity would play a significant part, as many of his diary entries, such as the following one, suggest:

A new Christianity and a new church. In the light of this idea, synthesis of everything written and dreamt about by the finest people at the beginning of the century. Both the Symbolist poets as well as Russian thinkers, principally Berdyaev and Shestov, spoke of nothing but this, but no one would listen to them. The terrible path of the Russian Revolution leads to the kingdom of the Spirit. Toward a new, free consciousness. Towards a new man, and through him, to a new collectivity [sobornost']. True collectivity [sobornost'], which is realised for the first time in history. There are moments when it seems that this process of realisation is already nigh. Then, one gets tired in loneliness and again there is decline in energy and despair. But this is just a momentary weakness. One must believe and not lose heart. It will be so, it will be! Here as well as in Europe it is more difficult to understand this than there. Karl Barth is right. And he is not the only person to realise and sense this. But the surrounding darkness is very intense and almost impenetrable. It is necessary to find a way out by means of creativity. (Nocturnal thoughts) (Lourié 1959: entry /in Russian/ dated 26 January 1959).

Consequently, the uncertainty and volatility in Lourié's discussions of music history, the shift of angles and conclusions should rather be attributed to personal circumstances: changes in his relationship with Stravinsky, as well as his growing appreciation of and confidence in his own music. After all, the Maritains were becoming gradually convinced that "the time would come when Lourié would be recognized as the greatest composer of the century" (Speaight 1966: 27). The evolution of Lourié's compositional idiom (even after his second emigration) towards a neoclassicism that would effect equilibrium between form and content – fostered by increasing expressions of his religiosity – did justice to the Maritains' faith in him, although the composer's name and work fell into oblivion.

Essentially isolated from major artistic activities and trends during his post-War American years – especially compared to the life he led in St Petersburg and Paris – Lourié appeared unwilling to partake in political action and to be associated with any party that would seek power – such as the Bolsheviks, and even the Eurasianists, had been – as his diary entry dated 7 July 1946, quoted earlier, suggests. However, by no means did he turn apolitical. Neither did he hesitate to recognise the Second World War as an instance of Russia’s “Eurasianist fate”:

One might think that the “mystical theme” about Russia, what we are used to calling the myth about her, was eliminated in the process of revolution. Its last outburst was the dreams of Blok and Andrei Belyi, in connection with the movement of the “left Socialist Revolutionaries”, in which both poets were involved, and to which they were both close ideologically. In the wake of this began a period of lengthy emptiness and coldness. The rejection of the national – supra-national sense of Russian culture and history was a direct consequence and conclusion from Marxist dogma, which penetrated into every sphere of Russian life. The war returned to the overgrown tradition. The messianic problem of Russia surfaced again with all its force; a Russia that would save Europe, save the entire world, despite the entire dominant Marxist revolutionary dogma. Old prophecies about Europe come true as well. “The sacred graveyard”, as it was for Russian visionary thinkers (of the 19th century), has now become a desecrated graveyard. The sense of an imminent breakdown in the world has not yet been grasped there, and they do not want to understand the necessity of “resurrection” in the spirit and complete change. Materialistic “godless” Russia appeared incomparably more alive spiritually in defence of life and of all that is sacred to man. What for? For the salvation of its soul... (Lourié n.d.b /original in Russian/: 7).

Just as was the case with his involvement in the Bolshevik Revolution, Lourié’s perception of political action remained firmly interlinked with artistic creation. At the moment the opportunity emerged, he did not hesitate to act “politically” in his own peculiar fashion. His motet “Anathema” (1951) – a typical exponent of his post-war idiom, an idiom that evolved his European neoclassical style, merging influence of earlier masters (such as Palestrina and Monteverdi) with sacred genres (both of Roman Catholic and Orthodox

Christianity) – was composed as a reaction to suppression of artistic freedom by the Soviet regime. More specifically, it was created in response to Prokofiev's oratorio "On Guard for Peace" (1950), dedicated to Stalin.

So, the title of Prokofiev's work, as well as the explanation that he gives of it, demonstrate that his oratorio is a political work. The motet "Anathema" wants, so to speak, to take up the challenge. Although strictly canonical in its structure and its content, and mystical in its atmosphere, it is also of a "political" nature, in the sense that it is inspired by the conflict that rips the world. These two compositions, situated at opposite poles, are an expression of our time; for, in our days politics and aesthetics are intertwined as they were never before. (Lourié n.d.a /original in French/).

By insisting in composing music with "spiritual content", even if in a style remote from what at that time constituted artistic revolutionism, Lourié was convinced he was pursuing the path towards salvation of much more than his own soul: the path towards the spiritual revolution of the future.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Adorno T. W. (2006) *Philosophy of New Music*, ed. and trans. R. Hullot-Kentor, Minnesota and London: University of Minnesota Press.

Bartlett R. (1995) *Wagner and Russia*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dufour V. (2006) *Stravinski et ses exégètes (1910–1940)*, Brussels: Editions de l'université de Bruxelles.

Edmunds N. (2000) *The Soviet Proletarian Music Movement*, Bern: Peter Lang.

Fitzpatrick S. (1970) *The Commissariat of Enlightenment: Soviet Organization of Education and the Arts under Lunacharsky*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Glebov S. (2003) "Science, Culture, and Empire: Eurasianism as a Modernist Movement", *Slavic and East European Information Sources* 4 (4): 13–31.

Graham I. (1979) "Arthur Sergeevic Lourié – Biographische Notizen", *Hindemith Jahrbuch* 8: 186–207.

Hackel S. (1975) *The poet and the revolution: Aleksandr Blok's "The Twelve"*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Karlin M. (2000) *Artur i Anna*, Tomsk: Izdatel'stvo Vodoley.
- Kelly A. M. (1999) *Views from the Other Shore*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Laloy J. (n.d.) "Extraits et résumés traduits par Jean Laloy", Doss. 8, Arthur Lourié Collection, Paul Sacher Foundation.
- Laruelle M. (1999) *L'idéologie eurasiiste russe ou comment penser l'empire*, ed. and pref. P. Sériot, Paris and Montreal: L'Harmattan.
- Levidou E. (1998) *The Encounter of Neoclassicism with Eurasianism in Interwar Paris: Stravinsky, Suvchinsky, and Lourié*, unpublished DPhil thesis, University of Oxford.
- Levidou K. (2011) "The Artist-Genius in Petr Suvchinskii's Eurasianist Philosophy of History: The Case of Igor' Stravinskii", *Slavonic and East European Review* 89 (4): 601–629.
- Lourié A. (n.d.a) "Note sur le motet 'Anathema'", Doss. 20 bis 1, Arthur Lourié Collection, Paul Sacher Foundation.
- Lourié A. (n.d.b) "Quatre cahiers ms : 'The Paragon Series Compositional Book'", Doss. 37.3, Arthur Lourié Collection, Paul Sacher Foundation.
- Lourié A. (1928) "Neogothic and Neoclassic", *Modern Music: A Quarterly Review* 5 (3): 3–8.
- Lourié A. (1929–1930) "An Inquiry into Melody", *Modern Music* 8 (1): 3–11.
- Lourié A. (1932) "The Russian School", *Musical Quarterly* 18 (4): 519–529.
- Lourié A. (1933) "The Crisis of Form", *Music and Letters* 14 (2): 95–103.
- Lourié A. (1946) "Agenda 1946", Doss. 81, Arthur Lourié Collection, Paul Sacher Foundation.
- Lourié A. (1958) "Agenda 1958", Doss. 81, Arthur Lourié Collection, Paul Sacher Foundation.
- Lourié A. (1959) "Agenda 1959", Doss. 81, Arthur Lourié Collection, Paul Sacher Foundation.
- Lur'e A. (1929) "Krizis iskusstva (The Crisis of Art) 2", *Evraziia* 8: 8.
- Lur'e A. (1944) "Linii evoliutsii russkoi muzyki (Lines of Evolution of Russian Music)", *Novyi zhurnal* 9: 257–275.
- Lur'e A. (1969) "Nash Marsh (Our Marsh)", *Novyi zhurnal* 94: 127–142.
- Móricz K. (2008a) "Decadent Truncation: Liberated Eros in Arthur Vincent Lourié's *The Blackamoor of Peter the Great*", *Cambridge Opera Journal* 20 (2): 181–213.
- Móricz K. (2008b) "Shadows of the Past: Akhmatova's *Poem without a Hero* and Lourié's *Incantations*", *Twentieth-century Music* 5 (1): 79–108.

- Nelson A. (2004) *Music for the Revolution: Musicians and Power in Early Soviet Russia*, University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Riasanovsky N. V. (1996) “Afterword: The Emergence of Eurasianism”, in I. Vinkovetsky and C. Schlacks Jr. (eds.) *Exodus to the East: Forebodings and Events: An Affirmation of the Eurasians*, trans. I. Vinkovetsky et al, Idyllwild California: Charles Schlacks Jr. Publisher, 115–142.
- Rosenberg H. (1983) *Art on the Edge*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rosenthal B. G. (1980) “Eschatology and the Appeal of Revolution: Merezhkovsky, Bely, Blok”, *California Slavic Studies* 11: 105–139.
- Roziner F. (1992) “The Slender Lyre: Arthur Lourié and his Music”, *Bostonia* 8: 34–41.
- Shadle D. (2010) “Messiaen’s Relationship to Jacques Maritain’s Musical Circle and Neo-Thomism”, in A. Shenton (ed.) *Messiaen the Theologian*, Farnham: Ashgate, 83–99.
- Shane A. M. (1975) “Introduction: Zamyatin the Critic”, in M. Ginsbury (ed.) *A Soviet Heretic: Essays by Yevgeny Zamyatin*, trans. M. Ginsbury, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, xi–xviii.
- Sitsky L. (1994) *Music of the Repressed Russian Avant-Garde, 1900–1929*, Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Slonimsky N. (2004) “The Strange Case of Arthur Vincent Lourié”, in E. Slonimsky Yourke (ed.) *Nicolas Slonimsky. Writings on Music*, vol. 1, New York and London: Routledge, 97–99.
- Speaight R. (1966) “Arthur Lourié: A Study in the Artistic Conscience”, *New Blackfriars* 48 (557): 27–33.
- Taruskin R. (1997) *Defining Russia Musically: Historical and Hermeneutical Essays*, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Walsh S. (2000) *Stravinsky: A Creative Spring: Russia and France, 1882–1934*, London: Jonathan Cape.
- Walsh S. (2006) *Stravinsky: The Second Exile: France and America, 1934–1972*, New York: Alfred A Knopf.
- Zamyatin Y. (1975a) “On Synthetism”, in M. Ginsbury (ed.) *A Soviet Heretic: Essays by Yevgeny Zamyatin*, trans. M. Ginsbury, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 81–92.
- Zamyatin Y. (1975b) “On Literature, Revolution, Entropy, and Other Matters”, in M. Ginsbury (ed.) *A Soviet Heretic: Essays by Yevgeny Zamyatin*, trans. M. Ginsbury, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 107–112.

*Катерина Левиџу*АРТУР ЛУРИЈЕ
И ЊЕГОВА КОНЦЕПЦИЈА РЕВОЛУЦИЈЕ
(Резиме)

У животу и стваралаштву, руски емигрант, композитор Артур Венсан Лурије (1891/1892–1966), руководио се сопственим, како политичким, тако и културним идеалом револуције. Као револуционар наметнуо се уметничкој сцени већ на почетку свог стваралачког рада, а посебно након приступања руским футуристима. Ипак, поред радикално осмишљених дела, он је у истом периоду написао и низ веома конвенционалних композиција, у којима је успоставио своју верзију неокласичног стила. Са избијањем Револуције у Русији током 1917, Луријеово радикално позиционирање у уметничкој сфери било је праћено и револуционарним политичким делањем. Прихватајући позив Александра Блоха на „ослушкивање музике Револуције“, он се прикључује бољшевичким активностима преузимајући место директора музичког одељења Комесаријата за просвећивање (1918–1921). Током своје службе, Лурије је посебну пажњу посветио промовисању авангардне уметности. Непосредно након што је разрешен дужности, обрео се у Берлину (1922), а потом је одлучио да остане у западној Европи. У Париз се преселио 1924. године, где је постао десна рука Игору Стравинском. У француској престоници борао је до 1941, када одлази у САД. Ту ће његова постигнућа полако пасти у заборав.

Лурије је у Паризу био близак међуратном руском емигрантском политичком и интелектуалном покрету названом евразијанизам. Укрштајући национализам и модернизам, евразијанци су пропагирани руску месијанску улогу у спасавању човечанства од декадентности западне цивилизације путем преобликовања људске свести. У исто време, Лурије је постао присталица варијанте неокласицизма коју је неговао Стравински. За њега је прави неокласицизам требало да доведе до споја формалних трагања са наклоњеношћу духовном садржају. Оријентисан према евразијанству и неокласичном покрету, Лурије истовремено остаје веран идеалу

револуције који се, у његовом концепту, заснивао на револуцији духа. Музика је требало да буде кључно средство у овом процесу. Луријеови специфични погледи на улогу музике и Русије у очувању човечанства испољавали су се и у његовој анализи историје музике, следећи хегелијански дијалектички метод. Био је доследан тим гледиштима до краја живота. Дневници и свеске овог композитора настали после Другог светског рата потврђују истрајавање у наклоњености дистинктивној замисли револуције коју је покушао да спроведе у сопственој варијанти неокласицизма.