

=====  
*Twentieth Century Classics*  
=====

Original article

UDC 78.071.1

<https://doi.org/10.56620/2587-9731-2024-2-068-085>

EDN EFPVYB



## Introduction to *New Book on Stravinsky*

**Valery V. Glivinsky**

Independent researcher,

*New York, USA,*

✉ [val.glivinski@gmail.com](mailto:val.glivinski@gmail.com),

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6402-0682>



**Abstract.** A new book is devoted to the work of Stravinsky follows and expands upon the tradition of Boris Asafyev's 1929 monograph. The central analytical object of the new book is the sound fabric unfolding over time in the works of the Russian master. Content-related and semantic interpretations of this object are intended to expand upon, refine, and in some cases correct ideas about Stravinsky's work that exist in the modern musical consciousness.

The book relies on four methodological premises. The historiographical premise stems from an interpretation of Stravinsky's artistic legacy as a musical universe resting on proto-elements formed during the early stage of his creative development. The methodological premise is based on emphasizing the differences between the dynamic-procedural creative method, which is characteristic of the classical and romantic branch of Western European music, and Stravinsky's object-descriptive polymorphism, which is rooted in the traditions of 19th-century Russian music.

Translated by Valery V. Glivinsky

The musical-imagery premise is conditioned on the expressive spheres within Stravinsky's oeuvre which were new to the world of early-20th-century music. In these areas, the composer operates masterfully in realms of the human emotional universe which were previously unrepresented in music. Finally, the cultural and worldview-related premise originates with Stravinsky's unique role in 20th-century musical culture as the most brilliant representative of a new, essentially dialogic, cultural type. The dialogical mental apparatus, the diverse forms of intercultural dialogue in his life and art, and the harmonization of European and non-European strategies for perceiving the world around us — a characteristic feature of Stravinsky's life and work.

**Keywords:** Igor Stravinsky, musical style, composition technique, polymorphism, russkost', dialogicity, St. Petersburg Classic School of Composition

**For citation:** Glivinsky, V. V. (2024). Introduction to *New Book on Stravinsky*. *Contemporary Musicology*, 8(2), 68–85. <https://doi.org/10.56620/2587-9731-2024-2-068-085>

Класси́ки XX ве́ка

Научная статья

**Введение в «Новую книгу о Стравинском»**

**Валерий Викторович Гливинский**

Независимый исследователь,

г. Нью-Йорк, США,

✉ [val.glivinski@gmail.com](mailto:val.glivinski@gmail.com),

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6402-0682>

**Аннотация.** Новая книга, посвященная творчеству Стравинского, развивает традиции монографии Бориса Асафьева, опубликованной в 1929 году. Центральный объект новой книги — разворачивающаяся во времени звуковая ткань произведений русского мастера. Ее содержательно-смысловая трактовка направлена на расширение, уточнение и, в отдельных случаях, коррекцию существующих в современном музыкальном сознании представлений о творчестве гениального композитора.

Композиция книги основывается на четырех методологических предпосылках. Историографическая предпосылка вытекает из трактовки художественного наследия Стравинского как музыкальной вселенной, базирующейся на праэлементах, сформировавшихся на раннем этапе творческого становления. Методологическая основана на подчеркивании различий между динамически-процессуальным творческим методом, свойственным классико-романтической ветви западноевропейского музыкального искусства и объектно-изобразительным полиморфизмом Стравинского, коренящимся в традициях русской музыки XIX века. Музыкально-образная предпосылка обусловлена наличием в творчестве Стравинского новых для музыкального искусства начала XX века выразительных сфер. В них композитор осваивает ранее не представленные в музыке области эмоционально-чувственного мира человека. Наконец, культурно-мировоззренческая предпосылка исходит из особой роли Стравинского в музыкальном искусстве прошлого столетия как ярчайшего представителя нового, диалогического в своей основе культурного

типа. Диалогическая ментальная установка, многообразные формы межкультурного диалога, гармонизация европейской и внеевропейской стратегий восприятия окружающего мира — характерные черты жизни и творчества Стравинского.

**Ключевые слова:** И. Ф. Стравинский, музыкальный стиль, композиционная техника, полиморфизм, русскость, диалогичность, петербургская классическая композиторская школа

**Для цитирования:** Гливинский В. В. Введение в «Новую книгу о Стравинском» // Современные проблемы музыкознания. 2024. Т. 8, № 2. С. 68–85. <https://doi.org/10.56620/2587-9731-2024-2-068-085>

### Introduction

Boris Asafyev's monograph *Kniga o Stravinskom* [A Book about Stravinsky] was published in 1929. The latest composition it analyzed was Stravinsky's ballet *The Fairy's Kiss* (1928). Republished in 1977, that work is still considered a cornerstone of Russian-language Stravinsky studies.<sup>1</sup> The composer himself held it in high esteem, a few disagreements and critical remarks aside.<sup>2</sup>

In the time that has passed since 1929, Stravinsky's work has been confirmed as a key phenomenon in twentieth-century musical culture. Its popularity among the global listening audience grows from year to year. The Russian master has exerted a multifaceted influence on modern composition practices. His legacy has been a vital part of the listening experience both for professionals and for knowledgeable music lovers. By now, music scholars have produced voluminous materials dedicated to practically all aspects of Stravinsky's life and work. The time is right for a new, more precise assessment of his role and place in musical processes around the world.

A monograph dedicated to the life and creative output of an individual composer can be designed in various ways. Most typical is a chronological characterization of the artist's entire legacy, bringing in facts from his life

<sup>1</sup> Asafyev, B. V. (1977). *Kniga o Stravinskom* [Book on Stravinsky]. *Muzyka* [1]. Among recent publications dedicated to Asafyev's views of Stravinsky's music, especially notable is the article by Svetlana Savenko [2].

<sup>2</sup> An article by Viktor Varunts comments on Stravinsky's marginalia in Asafyev's book. In his conclusion, Varunts includes an excerpt from a September 6, 1934 letter from Prokofiev to Asafyev: "[P. Suvchinsky and I] stopped by to see Stravinsky [...] I asked what the best book about him was, and he said it was Glebov's [i.e., Asafyev's — V.G.]." [3, p. 184]

and work. We can see this organizational principle at work in the books by André Schaeffner, Roman Vlad, Boris Yarustovsky, and André Boucourechliev.<sup>3</sup> In some monographs, authors emphasize either the music or a description of the composer's life and creative path. Examples of the first approach include the works by Pieter van den Toorn, Paul Griffiths, and Steven Walsh.<sup>4</sup> The second approach is applied, with varying degrees of detail, in Michael Oliver's book and in the two-volume work by Walsh.<sup>5</sup>

Often, authors use a two-part structure in their publications, splitting the text between: the history of the composer's life and work and an analysis of his musical legacy (monographs by Francis Routh, Neil Tierney, and Eric Walter White);<sup>6</sup> a chronology and a series of chapters dedicated to various aspects of expressive systems and spheres of activity (the study by Svetlana Savenko);<sup>7</sup> a portrait of the composer and characteristics of his life and work (the book by Alexandre Tansman).<sup>8</sup>

One other group consists of the works by Helmut Kirchmeyer, Mikhail Druskin, and Louis Andriessen and Elmer Schönberger.<sup>9</sup> These authors construct their books as a sequence of more or less extensive essays touching on different historical and theoretical aspects of the composer's musical legacy. Recently, investigations into Stravinsky's personality and work, in diverse contexts, have also drawn attention [4; 5].

### *New Research on Stravinsky and Its Methodological Basis*

The makeup of my *New Book on Stravinsky* takes Asafyev's tradition further, combining a description of the foundations of his artistic thinking, analytical sections devoted to various aspects of his musical language, overviews of genre groupings, analyses of individual texts or fragments thereof, sections pondering the role

<sup>3</sup> Schaeffner, A. (1931). *Strawinsky*. Les Éditions Rieder; Vlad, R. (1978). *Starvinsky*. Oxford University Press; Iarustovskii, B. M. (1982). *Igor' Stravinskii [Igor Stravinsky]*. Muzyka; Boucourechliev, A. (1987). *Stravinsky*. Holmes & Meier.

<sup>4</sup> van den Toorn, P. (1983). *The Music of Igor Stravinsky*. Yale University Press; Griffiths, P. (1992). *Stravinsky*. Schirmer Books; Walsh S. (1993). *The Music of Stravinsky*. Clarendon Press.

<sup>5</sup> Oliver, M. (1995). *Igor Stravinsky*. Phaidon Press Ltd; Walsh, S. (1999). *Stravinsky. A Creative Spring: Russia and France, 1882–1934*. Alfred A. Knopf; Walsh, S. (2006) *Stravinsky. The Second Exile: France and America, 1934–1971*. Alfred A. Knopf.

<sup>6</sup> Routh, F. (1975). *Stravinsky*. J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd; Tierney, N. (1977). *The Unknown Country: A Life of Igor Snravinsky*. Robert Hale Ltd; White, E. W. (1984). *Stravinsky. The Composer and His Works*. University of Caifornia Press.

<sup>7</sup> Savenko, S. I. (2001). *Mir Stravinskogo [Stravinsky's World]*. Compozitor Publishing House.

<sup>8</sup> Tansman, A. (1949). *Igor Stravinsky: The Man and His Music*. G. P. Putnam's Sons.

<sup>9</sup> Kirchmeyer, H. (1958). *Strawinsky: Zeitgtschichte im Persönlichkeitsbild*. Gustav Bosse Verlag; Druskin, M. S. (2009). *Igor' Stravinskii: Lichnost', Tvorchestvo, Vzgliady [Igor Stravinsky: Personality, Creative Work, and Views]*. In Druskin, M. S. *Sobranie sochinenii [Collected Works]* (Vol. 4, pp. 31–285). Compozitor Publishing House — Saint Petersburg; Andriessen, L., Schönberger, E. (2006). *The Apollonian Clockwork: On Stravinsky*. Amsterdam University Press.

and place of the composer's legacy in Russian culture and worldwide. Considering the scope of declared goals, material throughout my book is divided into three parts. The first part examines the principles of Stravinsky's musical thinking. The second one discusses particular traits of his musical language. Making up the third one are surveys of genre groupings. Analyses of particular compositions or their fragments, and historical or theoretical generalizations at varying levels of specificity, can be found in every part.

This study has a methodological foundation that relies on synthesis. It combines elements of holistic, stylistic, and morphological analysis. The latter is considered in its function as a connective link between the world of sounds and the world of words. Thanks to this link, we can minimize semantic losses when translating the content of a musical work into a verbal format. The methodology of musical morphological analysis is one I developed in a series of articles between 2015 and 2023 [6; 7; 8; 9]. Its universality is based on four pillars:

- innate conceptuality of the musical fabric;
- the sound construction as the object of analysis;
- the morpheme-morph categorical pair;
- the polymorphic nature of the music.

Musical morphological analysis, a methodological foundation of this study, was a result of my search for new approaches to analyzing Russian music in general, and Stravinsky's work in particular. At the end of the second millennium, music scholarship, especially in the English language, started showing clear signs of a crisis in analytical methodology. Allen Forte tried applying the type of analysis he himself developed, based on the mathematical concepts of Milton Babbitt, to studying the work of the Russian master, but his attempt was unsuccessful, if not to say disastrous [10]. His English-speaking colleagues noticed this failure immediately. Richard Taruskin emerged as Forte's main opponent. The history of the polemics between Taruskin and Forte stretched out for decades [11]. Another work by Forte, this one dedicated to analyzing Stravinsky's works prior to *The Rite of Spring* [12], ended up a complete fiasco. Forte's methodology is most obviously faulty in his set analysis for *Firebird*. His demand for "phenomenological virginity," meaning the exclusion of any outside experience in interpreting the text he analyzed [13, p. 313], resulted in an erroneous interpretation of the musical imagery in the ballet.<sup>10</sup>

After set theory, octatonic theory met with a similar fate. Its progenitor was the American composer and music theorist Arthur Berger. Analyzing *Les Noces*, he focused on what he considered to be the special role of a scale based on tone-half tone sequences in that piece. Berger called this scale "octatonic," and drew a parallel

<sup>10</sup> For more details, see McFarland, M. (1994). *Leit-harmony*, or Stravinsky's Musical Characterization in *The Firebird*. *International Journal of Musicology*, (3), 206–207.

to the second “mode of limited transposition” described by Olivier Messiaen in his *Technique de Mon langage musical* [14, p. 20]. Tracking the role played by the octatonic scale in other works by Stravinsky, however, did not show Berger the way to a cohesive theoretical concept. This role — a thankless one, as events later proved — was taken on by van den Toorn. Twelve years after Berger’s article was published, he declared that the music of the Russian master contained three styles of writing: diatonic (meaning tonal), octatonic, and a mixed diatonic-octatonic style [15, p. 111–112]. The octatonic writing style was based, he believed, on models A and B. These models consisted of six diverging eight-tone (tone-half-tone) sequences and the intervallic structures they produced.

Van den Toorn applied his octatonic theory in practice [16] and found a dedicated supporter in Taruskin. The latter tried to trace the historical roots of Stravinsky’s octatonism to the work of Rimsky-Korsakov, Liszt, Glinka, Schubert, and Beethoven [17]. Starting in the mid 1980s, the Berger – Van den Toorn – Taruskin historical-theoretical concept came to dominate English-language musical scholarship. Its crowning achievement was an impressively large, two-volume, 1757-page study by Taruskin, dedicated to Stravinsky and the Russian tradition [18].

Nevertheless, plenty of people remained unconvinced by octatonic theory. The dissident camp was led by Joseph Straus, who called it a “fallacy” [19, p. 262]. Dmitri Tymoczko delivered the knockout punch to the Berger – Van den Toorn – Taruskin triumvirate. His article, “Stravinsky and the Octatonic: A Reconsideration,” had the clearly stated goal of countering Van den Toorn’s attempt to present Stravinsky as “a systematic rationalist, exploring with Schoenbergian rigor the implications of a single musical idea” [20, p. 68]. Without casting doubt on the particular role the octatonic scale played in the Russian master’s music, Tymoczko examines the scale as merely one among many tools of Stravinsky’s musical expression.

Van den Toorn’s response to this critique of his analytical methodology came without delay [21]. The polemics between the two American music scholars grew into an international conflict between supporters and opponents of octatonic theory which played out in the pages of *Music Theory Spectrum* over the course of 2011 [23]. Both quantitatively and qualitatively, in terms of how convincing their arguments were, octatonism’s opponents ended up on top. The music theory world’s response to this debate was not straightforward. For instance, in an article dedicated to the history of analyzing *The Rite of Spring* before 2013, Jonathan Bernard described the debate as “occasionally entertaining, occasionally depressing, but mostly thought-provoking” [23, p. 295]. A year later, Straus took up another attempt, less successful (or more unsuccessful) than all the previous efforts, to tie Stravinsky’s music

to a universal pitch model. Straus, also an American scholar, believes that the tonal relationships in the Russian master's works can be reduced to a matrix he describes briefly at the start of his article:

Much of Stravinsky's music elaborates two structural fifths separated by some interval. Typically, one of those fifths is deployed harmonically (with various possible harmonic fillings) and the other is deployed melodically as a perfect fourth (with various possible melodic fillings). The harmony and voice leading of Stravinsky's music thus often prolong a *fundamentally bi-quintal structure* [24, p. 1, 4]

The stalemate that has occurred in English-language musical scholarship around the pitch-based analysis of Stravinsky's music is grounded in a positivist methodological foundation. The principles of the positivist approach can be identified most clearly in Forte's set theory. The mathematical foundation, the empiricism of the segmentation of the musical fabric, unburdened by any preliminary metaphysical trappings, and the absence of post-analytical figurative or semantic summarizations and assessments all make set theory the least suitable tool possible for analyzing Stravinsky's music. In camouflaged form, all these shortcomings appear in the concepts espoused by Van den Toorn and Straus. Their octatonic models and intervallic sound matrices are evidence of their conscientious attempts to find a musical-analytical "philosopher's stone" capable of unveiling universal principles of the arrangement of pitches in the Russian master's works. By all appearances, all these attempts view the formulaic brevity defining the universal functional-harmonic model in Riemannian theory as an example. That theory helps boil centuries of Western European musical development down to an essence. But Stravinsky belongs to a different cultural tradition, one based on intercultural dialogue. The creative development of approaches to organizing the musical fabric — approaches which are characteristic of the subvoicing polyphony in Russian folk music — plays an enormous role in his compositional thinking. Most English-speaking music theorists are unaware of that fact. Ignorance, however, does not relieve them of responsibility, both for their erroneous genre and stylistic benchmarks, and for violently cramming music by the most brilliant composer of the twentieth century into artificial pitch models and matrices.

In further developing the tradition of Russian and European music, Stravinsky creates his own original style, recognizable in every moment of every one of his works. This style is grounded in the cumulative effect of compositional approaches combining tradition and innovation. I offer a morphological analysis of the musical fabric in the Russian master's compositions, characterizing it using sound constructions (morphemes) with a clearly audible innate conceptual basis.



The extent to which specific information can be identified regarding how these sound constructions are textually realized in the finished musical work determines how successful the morphological analysis can be in each specific case. Of my other starting premises, I will list the four that are most important.

The *historiographical* premise underlying this approach stems from an interpretation of Stravinsky's artistic legacy as a musical universe resting on proto-elements formed during the early stage of his creative development. The two-phase temporal development of this universe can be identified from an array of factors, most importantly (a) the cultural environment of St. Petersburg, which played the decisive role in facilitating (b) the formation of his musical mastery, which had as its foundation (c) the idea of order.

The *methodological* premise is based on emphasizing the differences between the dynamic-procedural creative method, which is characteristic of the classical and romantic branch of Western European music, and Stravinsky's object-descriptive polymorphism, which is rooted in the traditions of 19th-century Russian music.

The *musical-imagery* premise is conditioned on the expressive spheres within Stravinsky's oeuvre which were new to the world of early-20th-century music. In these areas, the composer operates masterfully in realms of the human emotional universe which were previously unrepresented in music.

The *cultural and worldview-related* premise originates with Stravinsky's unique role in 20th-century musical culture as the most brilliant representative of a new, essentially dialogic, cultural type. Multiple, diverse forms of intercultural dialogue in Stravinsky's life and work were described in new research by Natalia Braginskaia [5]. The dialogical mental apparatus, the harmonization of European and non-European strategies for perceiving the world around us, all so characteristic of Stravinsky, find specificity in analyses concerning how the composer's stylistic dialogue with folklore, jazz, and baroque rhetoric, as well as with the idioms of classical and romantic European music, Renaissance canon, and serial and rotational-serial technique, manifest themselves in his musical texts.

The idea of the morphological analysis I am proposing occurred to me as I listened to various strata of Russian music from the 19th and early 20th centuries. The growing role, within that music, of spatial and temporal, subconscious and emotional, bodily-movement, object-descriptive, and cultural-dialogical elements of music expression served as my starting point for a contextual allocation of morphemes, sound constructions with specific innate conceptuality. Currently, the corpus of morphemes includes about ten sound constructions [9, p. 10]. A style belonging to any individual, national, or temporal category can be subject to morphological analysis. Nevertheless, I want to specifically address Russian music as the source of this new analytical method.

*Stravinsky and the St. Petersburg Classic School of Composition*

Beyond a doubt, Russian music is a vital component of global musical culture, one with clearly audible national characteristics. Just as in German, French, and Italian music, there is a special character of sound that is innate to Russian music, making its style identifiable from even a brief fragment. The uniqueness of Russian music rests on quite concrete foundations. One of these deserves special attention. This is the central position, in the 20th century, of the work of three geniuses: Stravinsky, Prokofiev, and Shostakovich. Their works constitute the developmental peak of 20th-century musical culture, something reflected in my concept of the *St. Petersburg Classic School of Composition*.<sup>11</sup> This permits us a new look at 19th-century and early 20th-century Russian music, as well. The legacy of Stravinsky, Prokofiev, and Shostakovich can be seen as the *historical amalgamation* of the diverse ideas, experiments, aesthetic statements, creative feats, and the entire artistic experience of their predecessors.

As we know, a musical work's place in the historical process can be examined from three angles:

- as an inherited experience from the past;
- as a means of enriching modern-day creative practices;
- as an anticipation of future artistic trends.

Russian music scholarship has done an enormous amount of successful work on the first two points as they apply to the work of 19th- and early-20th-century Russian composers. When it comes to how the music anticipated future artistic trends, the situation is different. There is no clear concept of two interrelated questions: (1) which 20th-century phenomena were inherited from the 19th century, and (2) who personally reinforced the image of Russian music during that time, and how.

Stravinsky, Prokofiev, and Shostakovich's works contain distinct traces of a new creative method: *object-descriptive polymorphism*, in which the arena of thought and speech, the incarnation of conscious emotions, remains in the background. What is foregrounded is the diverse, object-based universe, and the subconscious emotions which arise in the process of its perception. The procedural-dynamic method characteristic of Austrian and German music can be likened to an intellectual conversation. As they discuss the topic at hand, the participants of this conversation introduce arguments for and against, find points where their opinions coincide, and reach a final compromise solution. The object-descriptive polymorphism of the St. Petersburg Classic School more resembles the observation of an externally existing object and an emotional response to how it changes.

<sup>11</sup> The main tenets of this concept are laid out in articles [25; 26]. Much has been written about Stravinsky's links with the Petersburg musical tradition; see, in particular, the recent collection by Valery Smirnov [27] and the article by Graham Griffiths [28].

In the work of Stravinsky, Prokofiev, and Shostakovich, the artistic realization of this method is characterized by the principle of unity in diversity. The unified artistic-exploratory strategy allows for an individually characteristic choice of objects for observation, and for their specific, original interpretation.

Object-descriptive polymorphism finds its natural expression in *psychologically enriched tone painting*, thanks to which the depiction of the chosen object includes a description of its spatial, kinetic, and temporal properties, but also the emotional response triggered by these properties. That last result is achieved through the broad use of *generic and stylistic associativity*. The choice of objects plays a decisive role both in shaping the artistic profile of a specific work and in each specific artist's oeuvre as a whole. The object-based foundation of psychologically enriched tone painting varies significantly in the *inventive* Stravinsky, *harmonic* Prokofiev, and *conflictive* Shostakovich.<sup>12</sup> This fact does not, incidentally, preclude the existence of quite telling similarities and parallels. These similarities and parallels surface at different levels of the creative process. They form the foundation of the seminal stylistic unity that links the three Russian geniuses, each so irreducibly individualistic, in the second classic school in the history of world music.<sup>13</sup>

Object-descriptive polymorphism presumes to be a corrective to existing historical assessments, theoretical concepts, and methods of analyzing music. This corrective could be applied to resolving several long-standing tasks in Russian music scholarship, including the following:

- a multifaceted functional analysis of the dynamic-procedural and intonational foundations of a musical work, and efforts to identify within it the signs of symphonism, applied in works by Asafyev and several other researchers.
- the historical tracing of changes to the way national folklore is transformed into professional works by Russian composers.
- research into the interaction between verbal and musical texts, to which many of Yekaterina Ruchyevskaya's works are devoted.

Furthermore, we face the task of studying various aspects of composers' languages and styles, the historical stages of development for the art of music, and more.

The first three tasks are applicable, to varying degrees, to the creative legacy of Stravinsky, Prokofiev, and Shostakovich. For instance, the implementation of national folklore in works by professional composers is extremely important for Stravinsky. In his triad of ballets (*Firebird* — *Petrushka* — *The Rite of Spring*),

<sup>12</sup> For more details, see [26, p. 28–31].

<sup>13</sup> The first step in this journey was the article [29].

as well as in other works from the 1910s, we can identify the impetuous evolution of tools used to effect this implementation. For Prokofiev (except for his latest creative period), and especially for Shostakovich, this was a less pressing issue. Symphonism, manifesting as a special type of dynamically tensional processuality, is most evident in Shostakovich's instrumental music. It is less characteristic of Stravinsky.

The word, and its musical incarnations, play a different role in the work of Russia's 20th-century musical geniuses, compared to that of their predecessors. The arenas where their unique individuality shines most brightly are the ballet (for Stravinsky and Prokofiev) and the symphony (for Shostakovich). We will apply an intonational analysis, using the concept of "intonation" as a synonym for the content of the musical text as broadly understood, to describing the works of all three of these masters. Precisely referring to a specific musical fragment in each case will help guarantee our success. For Stravinsky, for example, the sound construction is such a fragment.

As of this writing, the universality of the content and imagery components of Stravinsky, Prokofiev, and Shostakovich's work, based on the characteristic national sound of their compositions, has not been provided with an adequate theoretical foundation. As a methodology, object-descriptive polymorphism can help to address this issue. The relevant questions are as follows.

Why "object-descriptive"? For a very long time, the outside world and depictions of objects and events inside it have been a component of the imagery in European composers' works. In the 19th century, this was helped along by the concept of the romantic duality of worlds, which permitted a temporary distraction from the tense life of the spirit and a departure into the outside world. A romantic hero could spend time admiring natural phenomena and find resonance there with his own internal emotional state. Romantic program music made significant contributions to methods of handling images from the outside world. Works of painting, sculpture, and architecture could all be brought in to serve, and there were discernible efforts to craft sonic recreations of natural phenomena (the sunrise, a storm, a flowing river, waves on the surface of the water, birdsong, etc.). Specific expressive tools were used to do so: sound effects, associative sound descriptions, the graphical interpretation of the musical genre, and amalgamation across genres. Very often, the recreation of phenomena from the surrounding world was accompanied by a type of lyrical "commentary."

Starting in the baroque era, the language of European music developed in close connection with speech as a verbalized manifestation of human thought. The logical, structural, and syntactic patterns of speech exerted an enormous influence on musical language and musical form. In the second half of the 19th century, the diametrical

opposite of this tendency could be seen. Works were being created, in Russian music, based on the *reorientation of musical imagery from the internal, human world to the outside, natural world*. Within the internal-external and subject-object dyads, the external and the object won out. The outside world and its diversity of objects penetrates into musical imagery when the spatial and temporal intuition and ideas, possessed by every human being, spring into action. In the way the music fabric is deployed, in the way its elements repeat, the signs of polymorphism become easier and easier to track. All these phenomena and processes are recreated with help from specific expressive tools, and these tools are the focus of a morphological analysis of music.

One other question: Why “polymorphism”? Music theory contains an array of concepts describing repetitions of material, whether precise or in altered form. These include references to ostinato, variability, variation, and development. Though different, what they have in common is their linearity, which presumes a more or less discernible stepwise change of the core material as originally given. But what if, from the very start, we have two or more similarly constructed sets of core material? And what if each of them moves along its own trajectory? In this sort of situation, the definitions provided by modern-day music theory are insufficient. Using the term “polymorphism” may be a solution to that conundrum. Translated from the Greek, “polymorphic” means “having many forms.” A group of objects marked by more or less obviously expressed similarities can be considered polymorphic. The polymorphic principle of diversity in unity, or unity in diversity, we can take as a given; it demands no linear progression. How does polymorphism differ, for example, from variability? There is no firm boundary between them. Both concepts describe a *plurality* of forms in which a particular object exists. At the same time, the invariant-variant pair is used, as a rule, to describe a linear process, in which the starting point and its structural (melodic, rhythmic, textural) features are a factor in the recognizability of all subsequent transformations. A polymorphic object, in contrast, is the sum total of individualized forms which are structurally similar at their foundation. The foundation of polymorphic unity in music is a sound construction with a typical set of characteristic traits: a morpheme. What represents this idea in a specific musical text is a morph. The invariant and variant are linked by their structural and syntactic similarity. The morpheme and morph are connected both in terms of construction and content, in innately conceptual ways.

Present in embryonic form in Rimsky-Korsakov, Mussorgsky, Borodin, and Tchaikovsky, this object-descriptive polymorphism found its fullest expression in the work of the St. Petersburg Classic School in the 20th century. Its members’ role in European music of that century is similar to the role played by Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven in the musical culture of the 18th

and early 19th century. Similar to those Viennese classics, the Petersburg classics reached the heights of compositional mastery in their work, and embodied the most vital traits of the contemporary human worldview in perfect artistic form. Thanks to their achievements, Russian musical genius served as a decisive factor in the development of 20th-century musical culture around the world.

The expressive tools used for the textual realization of the morphemes of *environment*, *time*, *event*, *space*, and *motion* constitute a specific sound-construct layer that serves as an intermediary between objects and events belonging to the outside world and the listener's spatial-temporal intuitions and ideas. This layer can be seen as the most important national trait of Russian music. Italian music can be recognized by the supremacy of its melodic source, French by its elegance of form and rhythmic variability, German by its logical sequences of music development. Russian music, in contrast, establishes a unique brand of emotional contact with the surrounding world. Its orientation outward, toward crossing beyond the limits of individual insularity, contributes to the formation of a special, irreproducible, and profoundly exciting emotional aura, one that is palpable in every moment of a masterwork by Stravinsky, Prokofiev, or Shostakovich.

Aside from terms related to morphological analysis and concepts linked with the method of object-descriptive polymorphism, we can also use the categories of objectivism and objectivity as epoch-defining musical and stylistic definitions, which indicate, similarly to in the baroque, classical, or romantic periods, specific traits of the artistic vision of the world in the 20th century.

### *Resume*

The corpus of Stravinsky's musical texts, a gaping hole in which was filled in 2015,<sup>14</sup> is notable for the way in which it records the composer's intentions as precisely as possible given the notational system that existed at the time. As opposed to many examples of 20th-century music that are characterized by a randomness (aleatoricism) of form in the whole or its parts, the Russian master's creative legacy sets the stage for an objective comparative analysis, both within that legacy and outside of it. In this book, comparisons between Stravinsky's works and those of other composers follow certain rules. The most important of these is to identify actual sound similarities as a manifestation of generic and stylistic connections. No less important are structural analogs revealing similarities in compositional decision-making.

<sup>14</sup> Here, I mean the discovery of the orchestral parts to Stravinsky's Funeral Song in the archives of the Rimsky-Korsakov Conservatory library in St. Petersburg on February 26, 2015 [30, p. V].

As long as a musical work has been created within the system of equal-temperament halftones, it can be compared with any other composition based on the same acoustic principles. Here, a danger arises we can call “similarities without borders,” based on the use of a scale broken up into octaves and halftones. Similar pitch constructions in texts belonging to different eras and styles must be given a critical examination. This book uses analogs reinforced by contextual relationships, whether stylistic, generic, or compositional. These are the comparisons that form the foundation for my semantic, historical, and aesthetic conclusions.

### References

1. Asafyev, B. V. (1977). *Kniga o Stravinskom* [A Book about Stravinsky]. Muzyka.
2. Savenko, S. I. (2022). Igor Stravinsky's Oeuvre in Boris Asafiev's Studies. *Music Academy*, (4), 116–133. <https://doi.org/10.34690/274>
3. Varunts, V. P. (1992). Comments on Marginalia ...Schoenberg on Stravinsky. ...Stravinsky on Asafyev. *Music Academy*, (4), 182–184.
4. Griffiths, G. (Ed.). (2020). *Stravinsky in Context*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108381086>
5. Braginskaya, N. A. (2023). *Muzykal'nye Dialogi Igorja Stravinskogo* [Igor Stravinsky's Musical Dialogues]. Izdatel'stvo imeni N. I. Novikova.
6. Glivinsky, V. V. (2019). Rethinking Stravinsky Historically and Theoretically. *Scientific Herald of Tchaikovsky National Music Academy of Ukraine*, 124, 133–150. <https://doi.org/10.17674/1997-0854.2019.1.077-088>
7. Glivinsky, V. V. (2020). Rethinking Igor Stravinsky Historically and Theoretically. *Scientific Herald of Tchaikovsky National Music Academy of Ukraine*, 128, 142–160. <https://doi.org/10.31318/2522-4190.2020.128.215206>
8. Glivinsky, V. V. (2022). Rethinking Igor Stravinsky Historically and Theoretically. *Scientific Herald of Tchaikovsky National Music Academy of Ukraine*, 133, 145–159. <https://doi.org/10.31318/2522-4190.2022.133.257332>
9. Glivinsky, V. V. (2022). The Listener and the Work as the Dualistic Basis for the Morphological Analysis of Music. *Problemy muzykal'noi nauki / Music Scholarship*, (4), 110–126. <https://doi.org/10.56620/2782-3598.2022.4.110-126>
10. Forte, A. (1978). *The Harmonic Organization of The Rite of Spring*. Yale University Press.
11. Glivinsky, V. V. (2016). “Fly in borsch” or the Story of Quarrel between Allen Fort and Richard Taruskin. *Musicology*, (10), 44–50.
12. Forte, A. (1986). Harmonic Syntax and Voice Leading in Stravinsky's Early Music. In J. Pasler (Ed.), *Confronting Stravinsky: Man, Musician, and Modernist* (pp. 95–129). University of California Press.
13. Taruskin, R. (1986). Letter to the Editor from Richard Taruskin. *Music Analysis*, 5(2/3), 313–319.
14. Berger, A. (1963). Problems of Pitch Organization in Stravinsky. *Perspectives of New Music*, 2(1), 11–42.

15. van den Toorn, P. C. (1975). Some Characteristics of Stravinsky's Diatonic Music. *Perspectives of New Music*, 14(1), 104–138
16. van den Toorn, P. C. (1987). *Stravinsky and The Rite of Spring. The Beginnings of a Musical Language*. University of California Press.
17. Taruskin, R. (1985). Chernomor to Kashchei: Harmonic Sorcery; Or, Stravinsky's Angle. *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 38(1), 72–142.
18. Taruskin, R. (1996). *Stravinsky and the Russian Traditions: A Biography of the Works through Mavra* (Vols. 1–2). University of California Press.
19. Straus, J. (1982). Stravinsky's Tonal Axis. *Journal of Music Theory*, 26(2), 261–290.
20. Tymoczko, D. (2002). Stravinsky and the Octatonic: A Reconsideration. *Music Theory Spectrum*, 24(1), 68–102.
21. van den Toorn, P. C. , & Tymoczko, D. (2003). Stravinsky and the Octatonic: The Sounds of Stravinsky. *Music Theory Spectrum*, 25(1), 167–202.
22. *Music Theory Spectrum*, 33(2). (2011).
23. Bernard, J. (2013). *Le Sacre Analyzed*. In H. Danuser, & H. Zimmermann (Eds.), *Avatar of Modernity: The Rite of Spring Reconsidered* (pp. 284–305). Boosey & Hawkes.
24. Straus, J. (2014). Harmony and Voice Leading in the Music of Stravinsky. *Music Theory Spectrum*, 36(1), 1–33.
25. Glivinsky, V. V., & Fedoseev, I. S. (2013). Sankt-Peterburgskaja klassicheskaja shkola: mif ili real'nost'? [St. Petersburg Classical School: Myth or Reality?]. In N. I. Degtyareva & N. V. Braginskaya (Eds.), *Sankt-Peterburgskaja konservatorija v mirovom muzykal'nom prostranstve: kompozitorskie, ispolnitel'skie, nauchnye shkoly 1862–2012* [St. Petersburg Conservatoire in the World Music Space: Composer, Performing, Scientific Schools 1862–2012] (pp. 454–463). Izdatel'stvo Politehnicheskogo universiteta.
26. Glivinsky, V. V., & Fedoseev, I. S. (2015). Creative Archetypes of Classical Schools of Composition. *Music Academy*, (2), 143–148.
27. Smirnov, V. V. (2020). *Igor' Stravinskij: metamorfozy stilja* [*Igor Stravinsky: Metamorphoses of Style*]. Skifia-Print.
28. Griffiths, G. (2020). The “Consanguinity” Between Rimsky-Korsakov and Stravinsky Revisited: Pathways to Neoclassicism and Other Symmetries. *Opera Musicologica*, 12(4), 6–18. <https://doi.org/10.26156/OM.2020.12.4.001>
29. Glivinsky, V. V. (2019). On the Particular Commonalities of Compositional Approach in the Works of the St. Petersburg Classics. *Problemy muzykal'noi nauki / Music Scholarship*, (1), 77–88. <https://doi.org/10.17674/1997-0854.2019.1.077-088>
30. Braginskaya, N. V. (2017). Preface. In *Igor Stravinsky. Funeral Song*. Score. Boosey & Hawkes (pp. V–IV).

### Список литературы

1. Асафьев Б. В. Книга о Стравинском. Л.: Музыка, 1977.
2. Савенко С. И. Творчество Игоря Стравинского в исследованиях Бориса Асафьева // Музыкальная академия. 2022. № 4. С. 116–133. <https://doi.org/10.34690/274>



3. Варуц В. П. Комментарии к маргиналиям ...Шёнберга о Стравинском. ...Стравинского об Асафьеве // Музыкальная академия. 1992. № 4. С. 182–184.
4. Stravinsky in Context / ed. by G. Griffiths. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108381086>
5. Брагинская Н. А. Музыкальные диалоги Игоря Стравинского. СПб.: Издательство имени Н. И. Новикова, 2023.
6. Glivinsky V. V. Rethinking Stravinsky Historically and Theoretically // Scientific Herald of Tchaikovsky National Music Academy of Ukraine. 2019. Vol. 124. P. 133–150. <https://doi.org/10.17674/1997-0854.2019.1.077-088>
7. Glivinsky V. V. Rethinking Igor Stravinsky Historically and Theoretically // Scientific Herald of Tchaikovsky National Music Academy of Ukraine. 2020. Vol. 128. P. 142–160. <https://doi.org/10.31318/2522-4190.2020.128.215206>
8. Glivinsky V. V. Rethinking Igor Stravinsky Historically and Theoretically // Scientific Herald of Tchaikovsky National Music Academy of Ukraine. 2022. Vol. 133. P. 145–159. <https://doi.org/10.31318/2522-4190.2022.133.257332>
9. Glivinsky V. V. The Listener and the Work as the Dualistic Basis for the Morphological Analysis of Music // Problemy muzykal'noi nauki / Music Scholarship. 2022. No. 4. P. 110–126. <https://doi.org/10.56620/2782-3598.2022.4.110-126>
10. Forte A. The Harmonic Organization of *The Rite of Spring*. New Haven; London: Yale University Press, 1978.
11. Гливинский В. В. «Муха в борще», или Рассказ о том, как поссорились Аллен Форт с Ричардом Тарускиным // Музыковедение. 2016. № 10. С. 44–50.
12. Forte A. Harmonic Syntax and Voice Leading in Stravinsky's Early Music // *Confronting Stravinsky: Man, Musician, and Modernist* / ed. by J. Pasler. Berkley; Los Angeles; London: University of California Press, 1986. P. 95–129.
13. Taruskin R. Letter to the Editor from Richard Taruskin // *Music Analysis*. 1986. Vol. 5, no. 2/3. P. 313–319.
14. Berger A. Problems of Pitch Organization in Stravinsky // *Perspectives of New Music*. 1963. Vol. 2, no. 1. P. 11–42.
15. Toorn van den, P. C. Some Characteristics of Stravinsky's Diatonic Music // *Perspectives of New Music*. 1975. Vol. 14, no. 1. P. 104–138.
16. Toorn van den, P. C. Stravinsky and The Rite of Spring. The Beginnings of a Musical Language. Berkley; Los Angeles; London: University of California Press, 1987.
17. Taruskin R. Chernomor to Kashchei: Harmonic Sorcery; Or, Stravinsky's Angle // *Journal of the American Musicological Society*. 1985. Vol. 38, no. 1. P. 72–142.
18. Taruskin R. Stravinsky and the Russian Traditions: A Biography of the Works through Mavra. In 2 vols. Berkley; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1996.
19. Straus J. Stravinsky's Tonal Axis // *Journal of Music Theory*. 1982. Vol. 26, no. 2. P. 261–290.
20. Tymoczko D. Stravinsky and the Octatonic: A Reconsideration // *Music Theory Spectrum*. 2002. Vol. 24, no. 1. P. 68–102.

21. *Toorn van den, P. C., Tymoczko D.* Stravinsky and the Octatonic: The Sounds of Stravinsky // *Music Theory Spectrum*. 2003. Vol. 25, no. 1. P. 167–202.
22. *Music Theory Spectrum*. 2011. Vol. 33, no. 2.
23. *Bernard J. Le Sacre Analyzed // Avatar of Modernity: The Rite of Spring Reconsidered*. London: Boosey & Hawkes, 2013. P. 284–305
24. *Straus J.* Harmony and Voice Leading in the Music of Stravinsky // *Music Theory Spectrum*. 2014. Vol. 36, no. 1. P. 1–33.
25. *Гливинский В. В., Федосеев И. С.* Санкт-Петербургская классическая школа: миф или реальность? // Санкт-Петербургская консерватория в мировом музыкальном пространстве: композиторские, исполнительские, научные школы 1862–2012. СПб.: Издательство Политехнического университета, 2013. С. 454–463
26. *Гливинский В. В., Федосеев И. С.* Творческие архетипы классических композиторских школ // *Музыкальная академия*. 2015. № 2. С. 143–148.
27. *Смирнов В. В.* Игорь Стравинский: метаморфозы стиля. СПб.: Скифия-принт, 2020.
28. *Гриффитс Г.* Еще раз о «кровном родстве» Римского-Корсакова и Стравинского: пути к неоклассицизму и другие совпадения // *Opera Musicologica*. 2020. Т. 12, № 4. С. 6–18. <https://doi.org/10.26156/OM.2020.12.4.001>
29. *Glivinsky V. V.* On the Particular Commonalities of Compositional Approach in the Works of the St. Petersburg Classics // *Problemy muzykal'noi nauki / Music Scholarship*. 2019. No. 1. P. 77–88. <https://doi.org/10.17674/1997-0854.2019.1.077-088>
30. *Braginskaya N. V.* Preface // *Igor Stravinsky. Funeral Song*. Score. London: Boosey & Hawkes, 2017. P. V–IV.

Information about the author:

**Valery V. Glivinsky** — Dr. Sci. (Art Studies), Independent Researcher.

Информация об авторе:

**ГЛИВИНСКИЙ В. В.** — доктор искусствоведения, независимый исследователь.

The article was submitted 18.03.2024;  
approved after reviewing 14.05.2024;  
accepted for publication 02.06.2024.

Статья поступила в редакцию 18.03.2024;  
одобрена после рецензирования 14.05.2024;  
принята к публикации 02.06.2024.