

The LSU College of Music & Dramatic Arts Presents

An abstract painting with vibrant, layered colors including red, yellow, green, blue, and white. The text 'STRAVINSKY IN AMERICA' is overlaid in large, bold, white, sans-serif capital letters. The letters are slightly transparent, allowing the underlying colors of the painting to show through.

**STRAVINSKY  
IN AMERICA**

February 17–19, 2022

**LSU**

---

College of Music  
& Dramatic Arts



## MESSAGE FROM THE DEAN

It is my pleasure to welcome you to the LSU College of Music & Dramatic Arts and *Stravinsky in America*, our symposium dedicated to the study and celebration of iconic composer Igor Stravinsky, focusing in particular on his time here in the United States during a period of great change for the arts and our national identity.

Our college holds a long-standing tradition of excellence in both academic research and music performance. Our halls serve as a valuable inflection point between research, theory, and performance application, brought to fruition by exemplary students, elite faculty, and a diverse and supportive community. Whether you are joining us virtually or in-person, we hope you have the opportunity to partake in our robust collaborative culture and enjoy your time at the symposium.

Geaux Tigers!

Kristin Sosnowsky  
Interim Dean, LSU College of Music & Dramatic Arts

## WELCOME

To mark the 50th anniversary of Igor Stravinsky's death, we warmly welcome you to *Stravinsky in America* hosted by the LSU College of Music & Dramatic Arts. The festival is a three-day affair that will celebrate Stravinsky's music. Igor Stravinsky was one of the most influential composers of the twentieth century, and he is most famous today for *The Firebird* and *The Rite of Spring*, ballets on Russian themes first performed in Paris. Our festival focuses on Stravinsky's later years, spent in America (1939–1971).

The festival will feature three keynote lectures by leading Stravinsky scholars as part of a conference on the festival's theme. Additionally, the festival will include nightly concerts of music by Stravinsky and other composers within his American circle. The concerts include LSU faculty and students, as well as the renowned Bugallo-Williams Piano Duo. The festival will culminate to the final concert at the LSU Union Theater with performances by LSU School of Music ensembles, including a rare performance of Stravinsky's ballet *Agon*, which will be performed by the Bugallo-Williams Piano Duo and feature dancers from the LSU School of Theatre with a Balanchine-inspired choreography by Claudio Ribeiro da Silva, Professional-in-Residence and Co-Head, Dance, College of Music & Dramatic Arts.

We look forward to celebrating Stravinsky's late music with you!

Inessa Bazayev, Director, *Stravinsky in America*  
Paula G. Manship Professor of Music Theory

## EVENT SCHEDULE

### *Stravinsky In America*

February 17–19, 2022

#### Thursday // February 17, 2022

- 9:00–9:05 Inessa Bazayev, Welcome to the Festival  
9:05–11:30 *Analyzing Stravinsky*  
11:30–12:00 Virtual Meet and Greet  
12:00–1:30 Lunch  
1:30–3:00 *Stravinsky's Reception History I*  
3:30–5:00 Keynote: Joseph Straus (CUNY Graduate Center),  
“A Portrait of the Composer as an Old Man”  
7:30–9:00 Chamber Recital

#### Friday // February 18, 2022

- 9:00–11:30 *Stravinsky and the Russian Tradition*  
11:30–12:30 Virtual Meet and Greet  
12:00–1:30 Lunch  
1:30–3:00 *Stravinsky's Reception History II*  
3:30–5:00 Keynote: Lynne Rogers (Mannes School of Music at the  
New School), “From Chinese Checkers to *Abraham and Isaac*:  
Compositional Games in Stravinsky's Late Music”  
7:30–9:00 Chamber Recital

#### Saturday // February 19, 2022

- 9:00–11:00 *Stravinsky: Views from East and West*  
11:00–11:30 Virtual Meet and Greet  
11:30–1:00 Lunch  
1:00–2:30 *American Perspectives on Stravinsky*  
3:00–4:30 Keynote: Stephanie Jordan (University of Roehampton),  
“Serial Stravinsky Dances: Choreomusical Interactions  
with George Balanchine”  
7:30–9:30 Union Theater Concert (with pre-concert presentation  
by Stephanie Jordan)

**Thursday // February 17 // 9:00–11:30 a.m.**

*Analyzing Stravinsky*

Joseph Straus (CUNY Graduate Center), chair

Maureen Carr (Penn State), “Climbing the Tower of Additive Construction: The Final Movement of Stravinsky’s *Symphony in Three Movements*”

Lina Sofia Tabak (CUNY Graduate Center), “Hypermeter in Stravinsky? A Transformational Approach”

David Keep (Hope College), “Ritual Dances: The Tarantella Finale, The ‘Sacrificial Dance,’ and Stravinsky’s Strategies in the *Symphony in Three Movements*”

Jack Boss (University of Oregon), “Stravinskian vs. Schoenbergian Neoclassicism, Reexamined”

Mark Richardson (East Carolina University), “Stravinsky’s Steps Toward Serialism with a Return to Dance: The Genesis of *Agon*”

**Thursday // February 17 // 1:30–3:00 p.m.**

*Stravinsky’s Reception History I*

Lynn Garafola (Barnard College, Columbia University), chair

Chandler Carter (Hofstra University), “Stravinsky’s Love/Hate Relationship with American Opera Companies”

Patrick Domico (Indiana University Bloomington), “Performing Neoclassicism: Koussevitzky and Stravinsky’s Ode”

Craig B. Parker (Kansas State University), “Stravinsky and the Los Angeles Music Festival”

**Thursday // February 17 // 7:30 p.m.**

*Chamber Recital: French House, Grand Salon*

**Friday // 18 February // 9:00–11:30 a.m.**

*Stravinsky and the Russian Tradition*

Inessa Bazayev (Louisiana State University), chair

Anna Schmidtman (University of Oxford, UK), “Stravinsky’s Late Works: Converting Counterpoint?”

Gretchen Horlacher (University of Maryland-College Park), “A ‘Russian Popular Tune:’ Stravinsky on Stravinsky”

Ivan Moody (Universidade Nova, Lisbon), “Stravinsky’s *Canticum Sacrum* and *Requiem Canticles* as refractions of Russian Orthodox Musical Culture”

David Smyth (Louisiana State University), “Emblems of Antiquity: Some Sketches for Stravinsky’s Mass”

Campbell Shiflett (Princeton University), “On the Origin of Stravinsky’s *Symphonies of Wind Instruments*”

**Friday // February 18 // 1:30–3:00 p.m.**

*Stravinsky’s Reception History II*

Chandler Carter (Hofstra University), chair

Michael Palmese (Maynooth University, Ireland), “Sovietizing Stravinsky: The 1965 Bolshoi Ballet Production of *The Rite of Spring*”

Jennifer Messelink (McGill University), “‘It’s Not Stravinsky but It’s a Lot of Fun:’ Stravinsky’s Place in Postwar Popular Music”

Lynn Garafola (Barnard College, Columbia University), “The 1936 Production Of *Les Noces* in New York”

**Friday // February 18 // 7:30 p.m.**

*Chamber Recital: French House, Grand Salon*

**Saturday // February 19 // 9:00–11:00 a.m.**

*Stravinsky: Views from East and West*

Maureen Carr (The Pennsylvania State University), chair

Olga Manulkina (St. Petersburg State University), “Stravinsky: A View from Leningrad of the 1960s and 1970s”

Don Traut (University of Arizona), “Olin Downes and America’s Russianization of Stravinsky”

Scott Gleason (Grove Music Online), “Stravinsky in the Princeton School”

Klára Móricz (Amherst College), “The Burden of Chronos: The Genealogy of Stravinsky’s Concept of Musical Time”

**Saturday // February 19 // 1:00–2:30 p.m.**

*American Perspectives on Stravinsky*

Lynne Rogers (Mannes School of Music at The New School), chair

Philip Stoecker (Hofstra University), “George Perle’s Perspectives on Stravinsky”

Danielle Ward-Griffin (Rice University), “Mediating the Middlebrow: Stravinsky’s *The Flood* and Music on American Television”

Paul Mauffray (independent scholar/conductor), “Stravinsky in New Orleans: *The Soldier’s Tale* as Retold by Wynton Marsalis in *A Fiddler’s Tale*”

**Saturday // February 19 // 7:30 p.m.**

Finale Concert, LSU Union Theater



## FESTIVAL ARTISTS BIOGRAPHIES

### **Bugallo-Williams Piano Duo**

The Bugallo-Williams Piano Duo has been presenting innovative programs of contemporary music throughout North America and Europe since 1995. Helena Bugallo and Amy Williams perform cutting-edge new works and masterpieces of the twentieth century for piano four-hands and two pianos. They have premiered dozens of works, many of which were written especially for the Duo, and they have worked directly with such renowned composers as David Lang, Peter Eötvös, Louis Andriessen, Lukas Foss, Steve Reich, Bernard Rands, Betsy Jolas and Kevin Volans. They also collaborate with composers who explore new approaches to the piano through multimedia applications, electronics, and extended techniques.

### **Mark Micchelli**

Mark Micchelli is a pianist, composer, technologist, and scholar whose work bridges the jazz and new music worlds. Recent projects include developing software applications for a wearable motion sensor, arranging a set of jazz standards for piano and electronics, and compiling a detailed analysis of Cecil Taylor's solo piano music. Mark and/or Mark's music have been featured at ICMC, SEAMUS, SPLICE, the Bowling Green New Music Festival, Music on the Edge, the Oh My Ears Festival, and New Music on the Point. Mark is currently pursuing his PhD at the University of Pittsburgh, where he splits his time between the Jazz Studies and Composition/Theory departments.

### **Willis Delony**

In a performing career spanning over four decades, pianist Willis Delony has won acclaim as one of the nation's leading classical/jazz crossover artists. Delony has appeared as piano soloist, guest pianist/arranger or conductor with orchestras throughout the United States as well as orchestras in Canada, the former Soviet Union and China. As a solo and collaborative recitalist, he has performed classical and jazz concerts throughout the U.S.—including a solo recital at Carnegie Hall (October, 2014)—as well as France, Germany, the former Soviet Union, Mexico, Costa Rica, Brazil and Argentina. Delony is the Boyd Professor of Piano and Jazz Studies in the School of Music at Louisiana State University, where he has been a member of the music faculty since 2000.

### **Claudio Riberiro da Silva**

Claudio Ribeiro had over 27 years of intensive dance training, performance and choreography experience both in Brazil and the United States. Most recently, dance instructor in ballet, jazz and aerial dance at the University of Illinois, Urbana- Champaign, IL from 2008–2011. He was a member of the Deborah Colker Dance Company, one of the most important companies of Brazil which toured worldwide. Most recently, in Brazil, he was a member of the Ana Vitória Contemporary Company. Falling in love and moving to the U.S., Claudio studies American modern dance and he holds a Bachelor of Fine Arts degree in dance at the University of Illinois. He also studied massage therapy at New York College of Health Profession and Florida College of Natural Health.

## ABSTRACTS

**Thursday // February 17 // 9:00–11:30 a.m.**

*Analyzing Stravinsky*

Joseph Straus (CUNY Graduate Center), chair

### **Climbing the Tower of Additive Construction:**

#### **The Final Movement of Stravinsky's *Symphony in Three Movements***

Maureen A. Carr (The Pennsylvania State University)

In his program notes for *Symphony in Three Movements*, premiered by the New York Philharmonic, Ingolf Dahl pointed out the distinction between the new work and *Symphony in C* (1938–40), comparing Stravinsky's compositional method of additive construction to architectural design. This sets the stage for a discussion of the fugal process as it evolves in the final movement of *Symphony in Three Movements*. Following the path of his sketches to the score for this fugue demonstrates a strong echo of his approach to the fugue in *Babel* (1944), written at approximately the same time. This consideration helps explain melodic allusions to *Babel* within *Symphony*. In addition, the resulting block form of the fugue in *Symphony in Three Movements* is reminiscent of the *Rite of Spring*—this time with a more atonal outcome—should not be a surprise, given the fact the presence of texture layering within blocks that enabled Stravinsky to refine his interval writing technique. There is a similar approach in the “Arioso” of the *Concerto in ré* (“Basel,” 1946); returning to the musical ideas evident in some of Stravinsky's earliest works, including the recently-discovered *Funeral Song* (1908) and *Firebird's* (1910) “Carillon Section.”

### **Hypermeter in Stravinsky? A Transformational Approach**

Lina Sofia Tabak (CUNY Graduate Center)

Although much ink has been spilled concerning local rhythmic events in Stravinsky's oeuvre, metrical features above the bar level are equally fascinating—disruptions that often take place at the surface level find parallel equivalents at deeper interpretive levels. However, since much of his music features changing meter, complicating traditional

hypermetrical analysis, Stravinsky's hypermetrical manipulations have been largely undertheorized. I will show that to a surprising extent, these metrically shifting passages can be related to metrically regular prototypes—which the musical surface systematically transforms—that lend themselves more easily to conventional hypermetrical interpretation.

In *Agon's* opening, “Pas-de-Quatre,” as well as in “The Ritual of the Two Rival Tribes” from the *Rite of Spring*, Stravinsky rarely repeats the same melody in an identical metrical context. However, I argue that all variations can be considered to derive from two inversely-related transformations: “insertion,” where Stravinsky adds a beat in a metrical layer, and “deletion,” where he removes one. The frameworks arising from this transformational approach make hypermetrical interpretations plausible in scenes that are so metrically irregular. I apply the same transformations to the hypermetrical level above as well, showing that the metrically irregular surface can be thought of as relating to both a metrical and hypermetrical “middleground.” This transformational approach not only sheds light on Stravinsky's rhythmic practices, but the methodology I develop also paves the way for a new understanding of hypermeter in music with constantly changing surface meter.

### **Ritual Dances: The Tarantella Finale, The “Sacrificial Dance,” and Stravinsky's Strategies in the Symphony of Three Movements**

David Keep (Hope College)

Stravinsky's *Symphony in Three Movements* was commissioned by the New York Philharmonic Symphony Society, written during 1942–45, and premiered on January 24, 1946; this was the composer's first work to be performed after his naturalization as an American citizen in 1945. What did Stravinsky seek to communicate to his new American audiences in the *Symphony*, his last contribution to the genre? I argue that the cathartic third movement of this “war symphony” can be interpreted as a ritual dance. Sonata-cycle finales by German Romantic composers such as Schubert (String Quartet D minor, D. 810, Piano

Sonata in C minor, D. 958) and Mendelssohn (“Italian” Symphony in A major, Op. 90) represent the convention of a tarantella conclusion, ending works at a fever pitch. Instead of fashioning a symphonic tarantella (a dance which had already appeared in *Pulcinella*), Stravinsky boldly alludes to himself by framing the “Sacrificial Dance” from *The Rite of Spring* as a musical topic in the Symphony’s finale. The allusions to the *Rite* motivate the finale’s break from Germanic formal conventions while simultaneously intensifying the energy and release afforded by a closing dance of death. Read in context of the Second World War, the dismantling of a historically German-dominated genre by Russian music from the *Rite* substantiates Stravinsky’s “war symphony” label through political resonance with Allied audiences. In the *Symphony in Three Movements*, Stravinsky directly places himself in the pantheon of composers worth quoting within the Germanic symphonic realm, decisively announcing his music’s canonical status to a new country of residence.

### **Stravinskian vs. Schoenbergian Neoclassicism, Re-examined (with Copious Illustrations)**

Jack Boss (University of Oregon)

In 1982, Alan Lessem contributed the study, “Schoenberg, Stravinsky, and Neo-Classicism: The Issues Reexamined” to *Musical Quarterly*. Lessem made a few insightful observations regarding how the two composers tried to accomplish the same goal—preserving while reinterpreting their common tradition—but went at it in different ways, which reflected their divergent cultural and musical backgrounds. Schoenberg sought to preserve the large forms, phrasing, motivic processes, and most importantly the large narratives of Classical music (what he called “musical idea”), reinterpreting them through completely new and dissonant pitch materials. Stravinsky, for his part, preserved traditional pitch materials (as well as large forms), but created rhythmic and phrasing contexts for those pitch materials (and ways of combining them with one another in progressions and sometimes vertically) that were uniquely his own, in many ways reminiscent of the music of his early

ballets. As Lessem puts it (1982, p.542): “familiar stylistic elements [are] now transposed to a new context.”

I propose to illustrate Stravinsky’s and Schoenberg’s contrary approaches to musical tradition with a pair of analyses. First, I will look at the third of *Schoenberg’s Three Satires* (1925), “Der neue Klassizismus,” with help from my book *Schoenberg’s Twelve-Tone Music* (2014), and then will discuss the last movement of Stravinsky’s *Symphony in C* (1940), one of the first pieces he composed after moving to Hollywood. Both of these pieces are strongly motivated by the notion of synthesis, but (as I will show) they achieve it individually along the lines I have identified above.

### **Stravinsky’s Steps Toward Serialism with a Return to Dance: The Genesis of *Agon***

Mark D. Richardson (Eastern Carolina University)

In the spring of 1952 during a car ride in California, Stravinsky suddenly became depressed and admitted to Robert Craft that he felt he could no longer compose as he had before—that to remain active and effective, he should adopt serialism on his own terms. Dutifully, Stravinsky became a student by listening and studying serial scores by Webern (often with the assistance of Craft, who was conducting and recording several works by Schoenberg and Webern) and experimenting with rows of fewer than twelve notes (such as “Full Fathom Five” from *Three Songs from William Shakespeare*, and *In Memoriam Dylan Thomas* that use rows of seven and five notes, respectively) to gradually develop his new style. Accepting a commission in 1953 to collaborate with Balanchine on *Agon*, he sketched the opening fanfare and studied a 17th-century dance manual to collect characteristics and notated dance rhythms he would use, yet he was frequently pulled away to accept other commissions (such as *Canticum Sacrum* with a full 12-tone row) that allowed him to develop further his work with serialism. The presentation will explore how these serial preparations and interruptions to *Agon* (over a course of four years) actually strengthened his ability to work with and gain confidence in melding its various tonal, atonal and serial movements, and contributed to the successful completion of *Agon*—a work that looks forward to the

serial style he would use in the future, while also incorporating musical elements from the past.

**Thursday // February 17 // 1:30–3:00 p.m.**

*Stravinsky's Reception History I*

Lynn Garafola (Barnard College, Columbia University), chair

### **Stravinsky's Love/Hate Relationship with American Opera Companies**

Chandler Carter (Hofstra University)

Stravinsky's London-based publisher Boosey & Hawkes assumed that his proposed opera *The Rake's Progress* (1948–51) would be performed first by the Royal Opera, but the composer had other ideas. Rejecting a premiere in large theaters like Covent Garden, the Metropolitan Opera or La Scala—what he ruefully referred to as “opera death houses”—the composer's first thought was to have the small but promising summer festival in Central City, Colorado present a sort of out-of-town “preview.” To the great consternation of the company's executive board, a world premiere in Central City never panned out. In fact, it would be years before an American opera house would present a successful production of Stravinsky's largest work. The 1953 American premiere at the Metropolitan Opera flopped with critics and audiences alike, dampening the enthusiasm for more performances in the United States. Stravinsky's personal correspondence and reviews archived at the Paul Sacher Foundation in Basel and production material from Santa Fe Opera and the Sarah Caldwell papers at Boston University shed light on the complex and often fraught negotiations between composer, publisher and opera executives. The finest musicians and singers, extravagant resources, and even the composer's hand-picked production team did not always best serve his work. Ultimately, it would take the efforts of ambitious, determined and even unorthodox visionaries like Santa Fe's David Crosby and Boston's Sarah Caldwell leading as-yet unestablished companies to gain a foothold for the composer's most ambitious work in his adopted country.

## **Performing Neoclassicism: Koussevitzky and Stravinsky's *Ode***

Patrick H. Domico (Jacobs School of Music, Indiana University Bloomington)

As the Stravinskys listened in to Sergey Koussevitzky's broadcast of the second performance of his *Ode* (commissioned by Koussevitzky in memoriam of his wife, Natalya) on October 9th, 1943, Vera noticed her husband becoming increasingly gloomy. Indeed, Stravinsky had hoped to premiere the work himself and had long detested Koussevitzky as a conductor. While Stravinsky had only himself to blame for many errors in the performance due to his lax proofreading, he nevertheless frequently eviscerated Koussevitzky's musicianship in letters and in the late Craft books (as he did with many performers he viewed as "interpreters").

Contrary to how Stravinsky shaped his own reception, I argue that Koussevitzky—with his highly expressive, Romantic performances leading the Boston Symphony Orchestra—proved a monumental force in the popularization of Stravinsky in the United States, especially the neoclassical music. Indeed, Koussevitzky's anti-modernist performance style differed greatly from Stravinsky's own—as I show through an analytical comparison of the two men's highly divergent recordings of the *Ode*. Most obviously, Koussevitzky treats his string section with far lush lyrical depth while toning down the persistent winds and brass. Though Stravinsky famously and influentially defined (through recordings and ghostwritten lectures) his neoclassical, modernist aesthetic as emotionally detached and "objective," I show that Koussevitzky's highly expressive and personalized renderings of Stravinsky's music drove its popularity with audiences. I argue that historically there were "two" neoclassicisms: Stravinsky's ascetic modernism for the elite which treated neoclassical gestures ironically, and Koussevitzky's expressive romanticism which harnessed those conventional idioms for popular appeal.



## **Stravinsky and the Los Angeles Music Festival**

Craig B. Parker (Kansas State University)

From 1947 until 1966, one of the most significant annual musical events in the United States was the Los Angeles Music Festival, founded by Academy Award-winning composer Franz Waxman (1906–1967). Conductors included Waxman, Robert Craft, Eugene Ormandy, and numerous composers leading their own works. During the festival's history, nearly 250 compositions (from the Renaissance onward) were performed, including four world premieres, 14 American premieres, and 41 West Coast premieres.

Igor Stravinsky's music featured more prominently in the festival than did that of any other composer. His early masterworks, *The Nightingale* and *Oedipus Rex*, received their West Coast premieres at this festival. Their 17 June 1957 all-Stravinsky program, commemorating the composer's 75th birthday, featured the world premiere of *Agon* and the West Coast premiere of *Canticum Sacrum*. Most subsequent festivals included at least one Stravinsky work with the composer conducting.

In 1961, Tikhon Khrennikov (Secretary of the Union of Soviet Composers) was a featured composer at this festival. While at this event, Khrennikov invited Stravinsky to return to his homeland for the first time since 1914. Stravinsky's 1962 homecoming marked a significant thawing in the musical relations between the US and the USSR.

This paper enumerates the importance of the Los Angeles Music Festival in Stravinsky's career and details his participation. Sources for this paper derived primarily from interviews with festival participants and from documents in the Franz Waxman Papers at Syracuse University and the papers of John Vincent (festival co-director) at UCLA.

**Friday // February 18 // 9:00–11:30 a.m.**

*Stravinsky and the Russian Tradition*

Inessa Bazayev (Louisiana State University), chair

**Stravinsky's Late Works: Converting Counterpoint?**

Anna Schmidtman (Oxford University, UK)

It has been widely observed that Stravinsky's late works show a heightened concern for counterpoint. Yet despite gathering considerable analytical attention, the intellectual and biographical contexts that inspired this stylistic reorientation still remain to be disentangled. While the influence of Ernst Krenek on Stravinsky's late works has been widely discussed through the lens of pitch-class set theory, Krenek's *Studies in Counterpoint* (which probably introduced Stravinsky to the serial method) has not garnered much attention yet. Moreover, the musical ramifications of Stravinsky's discussion of the connection between serial technique and (pre-)Renaissance polyphony in his *Conversations with Craft* are still unclear. Similarly, *Memories and Commentaries* provide some intriguing glimpses into Stravinsky's fascination for Sergei Taneev's treatise on counterpoint, *Moveable Counterpoint in the Strict Style*, a study which had been introduced to the English-speaking world through articles by Thomas Hartmann and Jacob Weinberg in the 1950s. This paper will examine the motivation behind Stravinsky and Craft's references to Krenek and Taneev, and explore to what extent the different theories and instructions presented in *Studies in Counterpoint and Convertible Counterpoint in the Strict Style* might offer new insights into Stravinsky's late works. Through analytical discussions of selected works from the 1950s–60s, I will argue in particular that the concept of contrapuntal stratification well-established in Stravinsky analysis is best understood as a two-dimensional polyphonic "nexus" governed by different voice leading strategies.

## **A “Russian Popular Tune”: Stravinsky on Stravinsky**

Gretchen Horlacher (University of Maryland-College Park)

Stravinsky famously borrowed musical ideas from others. In 1965, he borrowed his own music—the “Coronation Theme” that closes the 1911 *Firebird*—for the short fanfare *Canon on a Russian Popular Tune*, a memorial for the recent death of the conductor Charles Monteux. Honoring the conductor who premiered the *Rite of Spring* with a Russian tune seems reasonable but here the tune is manipulated in far more radical ways. The superimposed canonic subject stops and starts in typical Stravinskian fashion as it incorporates classical contrapuntal techniques of augmentation and stretto. Throughout his career Stravinsky ended major works with codas tending toward apotheosis, where a sense of infinity unfolds as two or more repeating lines are layered (think of *Les Noces* and *Apollo*). Stravinsky’s recasting of the *Firebird*’s grand apotheosis into an abstract canon lets us hear the composer’s voice at the start of his life, and at its end. In the first case, a simple folk tune reaches an overly ornate finish, referencing nineteenth-century Russian ballet. The tune plays out more-or-less in a goal-oriented way, closing with an enormous perfect authentic cadence as the prince and princess ascend toward a Russian palace. More than fifty years later, as he worked on the *Requiem Canticles*, Stravinsky created a vastly different canonic apotheosis, one that neither clearly begins or ends. The piece speaks to a lifetime temporal experimentation where an earlier easy closure becomes in his last years vastly more ambiguous.

## **Stravinsky’s *Canticum Sacrum* and *Requiem Canticles* as refractions of Russian Orthodox Musical Culture**

Ivan Moody (Universidade Nova, Lisbon, Portugal)

Stravinsky’s *Canticum Sacrum* (1955) and *Requiem Canticles* (1966) exhibit a number of features that might make one consider that there lies behind it the shadow of Russian Orthodox musical tradition, which the composer took with high seriousness. Traditions would, of course, be a better word, especially given Stravinsky’s dislike of 19th-century Russian

sacred repertoire, and the fact that his early forays into sacred music (*Otche nash*, *Bogoroditse Devo*, *Veruyu*) led him explicitly to eschew any kind of sentimentalism.

These preferences continue to be felt in the Mass (1944–48) and, I would argue, in the works of the composer's serial period, such as *Canticum Sacrum* and *Requiem Canticles*. I propose in this paper to explore these aspects of Stravinsky's compositional practice and aesthetics, in particular as they relate to these two works. Specifically, I intend to consider such details as the resonance of bells (and the space in which they are heard), the pared-down quality of the writing in both works, the use of declaimed text and the idea of the functionality of liturgical music as it relates to the composer's earlier engagement with the ideas of Jacques Maritain and the concept of the *homo faber*.

### **Emblems of Antiquity: Some Sketches for Stravinsky's *Mass***

David Smyth (Louisiana State University)

Why Stravinsky composed a setting of the Roman Catholic Mass remains something of a mystery: he was not Catholic, there was no commission, nor was the piece composed for a particular occasion. He completed the first two movements by the end of 1944, but only finished the work in March 1948. Stravinsky's sketches provide valuable insights into his invention and revisions of basic ideas (melodic, harmonic, and rhythmic) and compositional devices (particularly, canonic imitation) and his fashioning of formal units through repetition and variation. Clearly, Stravinsky worked assiduously to ensure that the entire composition would cohere by virtue of recurring use of certain emblems of antiquity (including straightforward diatonic and triadic references, directed stepwise motion, and white-note writing), all of which are evident in his sketches. We shall briefly consider precedents for some of these elements in nearly contemporary works, including the cantata *Babel* (1944) and *Orpheus* (1947). But the *Mass* also departs in radical ways from traditional settings, and here again, the sketches provide glimpses of his inventive experimentation with highly individual

approaches to text setting, rhythm, and textures. Of particular interest are the deployment of instrumental passages and alternations of solo and tutti writing in the creation of large-scale form. Although the sketches cannot tell us why Stravinsky wrote his *Mass*, they do offer clues as to how he fashioned this lovely and challenging work, and they can prompt and focus profitable analytical inquiries.

### **On the Origin of Stravinsky's *Symphonies of Wind Instruments***

Campbell Shiflett (Princeton University)

American musicology has long been fascinated with the origins of Stravinsky's *Symphonies of Wind Instruments*, whether conceiving of them in terms of a musical germ, aesthetic aim, or historical situation. This fascination is sustained by a peculiar pattern wherein each analysis, in positing an origin for the piece, demonstrates its blindness to some seemingly more significant one, which another study arrives to correct. This paper imagines Stravinsky's *Symphonies* accordingly as a *pastorale*, recalling a utopian Arcadian origin—not simply to defend this as the work's true source, but to illustrate the forces that underlie critics' idealization of origins. Imagining the piping winds of the *Symphonies* as a chorus of Arcadian shepherd-musicians sheds light on critics' other proposed origins of the work: From its dialogue with Debussy and its memorial program to its connections to Russian musical traditions and its neoclassic pursuit of absolute music. But what is more, to the extent that the myth of Arcadia reveals that such idealized origins exist only as they are imagined, it also suggests how the work anticipates later critics' deconstructions of these origins. For instance, along these lines the work's famously fragmented form would already reflect the destructive drives involved in a melancholic attempt to preserve an idealized origin that could never have been. Thinking of the *Symphonies* this way can guide ongoing reflections on the origins not only of the *émigré* Stravinsky and of his much-disputed works, but also of an American tradition of Stravinsky analysis for which origins remain of fundamental significance.

**Friday // February 18 // 1:30–3:00 p.m.**

*Stravinsky's Reception History II*

Chandler Carter (Hofstra University), chair

**Sovietizing Stravinsky: The 1965 Bolshoi Ballet Production of *The Rite of Spring***

Michael Palmese (Maynooth University, Ireland)

In May 1966, Natalia Kasatkina and Vladimir Vasiliev met Stravinsky in Washington during the Bolshoi Ballet tour of the United States. The conversation centered on Kasatkina's and Vasiliev's production of *The Rite of Spring*, which had served as the ballet's premiere in the Soviet Union in June 1965 and was currently being shown to American audiences in April and May 1966. Kasatkina and Vasiliev interjected a love interest between the Chosen One and a shepherd, as well as a demoniac that functioned as the personification of the pagan Slavic deity Dazhbog. The scenario culminates in the shepherd, following the sacrifice of the Chosen One, plunging a dagger into a central totem onstage that shatters. Stravinsky responded positively while the Soviet Minister for Culture, Yekaterina Furtseva, was troubled by Western enthusiasm for the production. At the same time, others viewed the production as propagandistic, emphasizing in particular the perceived militant atheism embedded into this "Sovietized" *Rite*.

This paper examines the creative genesis of Kasatkina's and Vasiliev's *Rite*, detailing how the production occupies an ideological grey area within the broader contours of the cultural Cold War. Although reflecting intersections between resurgent pan-Slavism, Soviet archaeology, and renewed cultural repression under Brezhnev, the production also dispenses with strict Stalinist socialist realism while not being overtly dissident, subversive, or even especially politically partisan. As a result, this *Rite* stood as an inkblot test into which critics and audiences could read whatever salient traits most confirmed their ideological aims, desires, fears, and anxieties.

## **It's Not Stravinsky but It's a Lot of Fun: Stravinsky's Place in Postwar Popular Music**

Jennifer Messelink (Schulich School of Music, McGill University, Canada)

During the postwar period Stravinsky figured prominently in the popular music press. Throughout the 1940s he had dabbled with popular music forms, jazz, and commercial ventures: Disney's *Fantasia* (1940); *Tango* (1940); *Circus Polka* (1941); *Scherzo à la russe* (1944); and the *Ebony Concerto* (1945). The project that received the most attention in the press was Stravinsky's 1949 lawsuit against Leeds Music Corporation for "making him feel declassed" (*Billboard* March 19, 1949). The lawsuit concerned the song "Summer Moon," a vocal arrangement based on a theme from Stravinsky's *Firebird* (1910). Stephen Walsh (2006) argues that Stravinsky was forced into the unfamiliar commercial American musical marketplace in order to survive because the U.S. was not a signatory to the Berne Convention. The lawsuit, and the publicity that followed it, involved not only questions of copyright, but also of reputation, musical hierarchy, value, and genre. I suggest that the lawsuit was heavily reported on because it occurred during a dramatic shift in the music industry in which recordings were central to the debate concerning the boundaries between so-called serious and popular music. With the rollout of the LP in 1948, record labels embraced mood music and increasingly promoted popular arrangements of classical works. Stravinsky was frequently invoked by arrangers such as Les Baxter, whose album *Ritual of the Savage* (1950) was marketed as a "jungle tone-poem." In this presentation, I draw from theories of musical genre (Brackett 2016) to examine Stravinsky's place in the emerging "middlebrow" sphere of the music industry.

## **The 1936 Production of *Les Noces* in New York**

Lynn Garafola (Barnard College, Columbia University)

In 1936 Stravinsky's reputation as a composer of ballets was limited in the United States to *Firebird* and *Petrouchka*. To be sure the premiere of *Apollon Musagète* took place at the Library of Congress in 1928 and the League of Composers produced versions of *Les Noces* in 1929 and *The Rite of Spring* in 1930. However, with the partial exception of *The Rite of Spring*, these events had little impact. Hence, the importance of the New York revival of *Les Noces* in 1936 by the Ballet Russe company directed by Colonel Wassily de Basil. Staged by Bronislava Nijinska, who choreographed the original 1923 work, with the original Natalia Goncharova designs and a full Russian chorus, the production was received with enthusiasm, even if Stravinsky's music was not universally admired. Although slated to open the following summer in London, *Les Noces* was dropped from the repertory, with tragic consequences both for the survival of the ballet, which remained unperformed for the next thirty years. The 1937 Stravinsky Festival, which cemented the composer's alignment with Balanchine, signified the realignment that would dominate Stravinsky's years in America.

**Saturday // February 19 // 9:00–11:00 a.m.**

*Stravinsky: Views from East and West*

Maureen Carr (The Pennsylvania State University), chair

## **Stravinsky: A View from Leningrad of the 1960s and 1970s**

Olga Manulkina (St. Petersburg State University, Russia)

As it happened (not by accident), the year of Stravinsky's death was also a year of *Dialogues*—the only publication of Stravinsky's and Craft's conversation books, that for many Soviet musicians and intellectuals became a kind of bible of bygone pre-revolutionary Russian and unapproachable contemporary Western music, art, and culture. To mark that event, I will discuss three aspects of the reception of Stravinsky in postwar Soviet Russia that still need more detailed approach.



The first aspect implies the need for dividing the postwar period into several sub-periods and for introduction for several additional dates: the ones that influenced Soviet Stravinsky scholarship (i.e., 1949, the year of the “musicologists on trial”); the ones that signaled a turn in official attitude to Stravinsky (i.e., 1959, the year of Leonard Bernstein’s and New York Philharmonic tour); and the publication dates of two Stravinsky’s books in Russian (1963—*Chronicle of My Life*, and 1971—*Dialogues*). The second aspect concerns unofficial, private histories of the reception of Stravinsky, undercurrents of research and discussion, as well as those of performance and listening. Finally, I would argue that while one could claim that there was one “official” Stravinsky (and it is not surprising that it were mostly Moscow musicologists who whom the regime used as its mouthpieces), the unofficial histories were different in different places and much more depended on the musicians’ and scholars’ personalities. I will concentrate on “the Leningrad Stravinsky” to discuss the city’s specific challenges and obstacles as well as possibilities.

### **Olin Downes and America’s Russianization of Stravinsky**

Don Traut (Fred Fox School of Music, University of Arizona)

In his 2010 essay, “Just How Russian Was Stravinsky?,” Richard Taruskin outlines how American critics, analysts, and even concert promoters seek to “Russianize” Stravinsky’s late music, despite the composer’s embrace of serialism—the “seemingly least Russian” of compositional methods—shortly after his move to the United States. The current paper adds to this longstanding discussion of Stravinsky’s “Russianness” by exploring the role perceptions of race played in comments published by the New York Times music critic Olin Downes during Stravinsky’s first visit to America in 1925. Downes used the American premieres of the Octet and Piano Concerto to develop a narrative regarding what he saw as Stravinsky’s decline. Contrary to many other critics, Downes saw these pieces as “symptoms” of a “restless” composer still searching for another *Rite of Spring*. Downes’s rationale emerges over the course of four columns, beginning with praise for the heartfelt use of folk tunes

in *The Firebird*, but ending with disdain for the new compositions, which Downes saw as “inauthentic” failures precisely because they lack the “racial” connection to Stravinsky’s Russian heritage and therefore have “no echo of the passions of the human heart.” “Is this music?,” he asks. He even suggests that Stravinsky has become an “artistic alien” and hopes the composer will visit Russia soon and reconnect with his homeland before he “forfeits his artistic future.” The premium Downes put on “racial” authenticity in many ways foreshadows Taruskin’s points about how much is at stake in defining Stravinsky’s nationality.

### **Stravinsky in the Princeton School**

Scott Gleason (*Grove Music Online*)

After World War II, Milton Babbitt and the composer-theorists collected around him at Princeton University extended Schoenbergian serial and social practices. After Stravinsky’s serial turn, Babbitt offered a reevaluation of the master, thus courting the Stravinskian legacy. After the 1960s, some members of the Princeton School “dropped out,” writing experimental texts and improvising, in stark contrast with their earlier high-modernist poetics. In 1986 Joseph Kerman suggested that this dissolution of the Princeton School around 1971 occurred because of Stravinsky’s death that year: the loss of the master and the living tradition he represented.

In this talk I discuss Stravinsky reception within the Princeton School, and therefore within Cold War American (academic) musical culture. After discussing Stravinsky’s advice to leave the academy, Babbitt’s reading of Stravinsky’s proto-serial procedures acting on timbre and texture in *The Rake’s Progress*, and Babbitt’s reading of Stravinsky’s “verticals” in *Movements*, I discuss Princeton composer Benjamin Boretz’s readings of Stravinsky’s incorporation of pitch structure into durational structure in the first scene of *Petrushka* and *The Rite of Spring* generally. I discuss Princeton composer J. K. Randall’s compositional use of series of pitches fewer than twelve as a Stravinskian conceit. Lastly, I discuss Babbitt and Boretz’s purging of impressionistic language in favor of formalist discourses as a kind of Stravinskian poetics.

This combination of Stravinskian poetics and serialism with the oft-discussed Schoenbergian socialization and serialism demonstrates an attempt by members of the Princeton School to unite the two principal strands of European modernism in their own American high-modernism.

### **The Burden of Chronos: The Genealogy of Stravinsky's Concept of Music Time**

Klára Móricz (Amherst College)

Stravinsky's *Symphony in C*, begun in France in 1939, and completed in the United States in 1940, ends with a slow wind chorale from which all accidentals disappear, allowing the music to radiate an untainted purity. By 1940, a familiar type of ending in Stravinsky's oeuvre, it has special meaning in the *Symphony*. It gives the feeling of Stravinsky wiping the slate clean, erasing the past, and moving beyond the present toward divine immobility. The composer Nicolas Nabokov heard the gesture as the burying of Chronos, the musical time that Stravinsky's earlier music had supposedly measured with cold equilibrium.

In this paper I reconstruct the genealogy of Stravinsky's concept of Chronos, first presented in his Harvard Lectures in the fall and spring of 1939/1940. Tracing the concept of Chronos from Henri Bergson through Alexander Blok, Arthur Lourié, Gilbert Brangue, Pyotr Suvchinsky, and Gisèle Brelet to Stravinsky reveals an important reversal of values that transformed Bergson's deeply human concept of time into Stravinsky's sterilized, mechanical clockwork. The restored layers of philosophical discourse behind Stravinsky's aesthetic stance suggest that Stravinsky's "pure" ending of the *Symphony in C* is not simply a gesture of wiping the slate clean, but also an effort to mask remnants of historical and personal trauma.

**Saturday // February 19 // 1:00–2:30 p.m.**

*American Perspectives on Stravinsky*

Lynne Rogers (Mannes School of Music at The New School), chair

### **George Perle's Perspectives on Stravinsky**

Philip Stoecker (Hofstra University)

Following the death of Igor Stravinsky on April 6, 1971, the American composer and theorist George Perle (1915–2009), who co-founded the Alban Berg Society with Stravinsky and Hans Redlich, wrote that “[t]his is the first time since Guillaume de Machaut [c. 1300–1377] that the world is without a great composer” (Robert Craft, *Stravinsky: Chronicle of Friendship* [1994], p.548). Perle’s exceptionally high praise of Stravinsky may seem surprising since the music of Berg, not Stravinsky, had the greatest influence on Perle’s compositional and scholarly output. Whereas it is well-documented that Perle was continually inspired by Berg’s music, the significance of Stravinsky’s music for Perle is not as well-known. My presentation will provide a renewed look at Perle’s analyses, writings, and thoughts about Stravinsky’s music. The “George Perle Papers” in the New York Public Library and an unpublished interview provide the source material for my talk. In the unpublished interview, Perle includes George Balanchine (1904–1983) in his discussion of Stravinsky: “I have a very important feeling about Balanchine and about what he and Stravinsky did with the New York City Ballet. I think there is the invention of a new art form in something like *Agon*.” In addition, the “George Perle Papers” contains a file labeled “Legal document re: Stravinsky’s Archive,” which consists of ten folders. These legal documents along with other materials from the “George Perle Papers” and the unpublished interview provide new insights into Perle’s perspectives on Stravinsky.

## Mediating the Middlebrow: Stravinsky's *The Flood* and Music on American Television

Danielle Ward-Griffin (Rice University)

Described as a “flop,” the 1962 CBS television production of *The Flood* has usually been regarded as an ill-fated attempt to merge mass culture with high art (Joseph, Rose, Todd). But instead of seeing *The Flood* as an individual failure, this paper argues that the work represents the culmination of middlebrow aesthetics, as popularized on television in the 1950s and 1960s. Intended to elevate the taste of its viewers, *The Flood* recalled the rhetoric and modes of production of *Camera Three* and *Omnibus*, as well as the NBC Opera Theatre series. Situating *The Flood* vis-à-vis these programs, I examine how and why the promotion for the CBS special focused on the composer, rather than the work, and what this can tell us about Stravinsky's standing in American culture in the 1960s.

At the same time, *The Flood* marked an important shift in how composers envisioned the middlebrow potential of television, as they increasingly moved away from naturalism and towards fantasy (Barnes). Although Stravinsky was concerned about comparison with Gian-Carlo Menotti's 1951 hit *Amahl and the Night Visitors*, *The Flood* more closely resembles Menotti's TV opera, *The Labyrinth* (1963), which premiered one year after Stravinsky's work. This talk analyzes how these two works sought to exploit television's resources, resist generic classification, and challenge viewers to move beyond televisual and musical norms. Although both pieces were popular failures, their efforts to engage a broad range of viewers in experimental art ultimately epitomizes, and highlights the pitfalls of, television's middlebrow aesthetics.

## **Stravinsky in New Orleans: *The Soldier's Tale* as retold by Wynton Marsalis in *A Fiddler's Tale***

Paul Mauffray (independent scholar/conductor)

Stravinsky's *The Soldier's Tale* of 1918 holds a unique place in music history as one of the first significant works, if not perhaps the very first, influenced by jazz. His "Tango, Valse, & Ragtime" even predates other works more prominently imitative of jazz such as Milhaud's *La Création du Monde* and Gershwin's *Rhapsody in Blue*. Stravinsky acknowledged that jazz patterns and jazz instrumental combinations influenced him, and after 80 years, Stravinsky's homage to jazz has been reciprocated in *A Fiddler's Tale* by Wynton Marsalis.

Stravinsky's *The Soldier's Tale* was a fundamental part of the curriculum taught by Baton Rouge composer Bert Braud at the New Orleans Center for Creative Arts where Wynton Marsalis studied as a teenager. This music stayed with Marsalis throughout his life, and in 1998 he recorded Stravinsky's *The Soldier's Tale* with an ensemble including noted jazz musicians David Taylor, Edgar Meyer, and Stefon Harris. In that same year, Marsalis composed *A Fiddler's Tale* which is both a contemporary update of the same story of the musician who sells his soul to the devil and an homage to *The Soldier's Tale*, mirroring the exact movements and form with the same instrumentation.

In this comparative analysis of the two works, we ask what makes Stravinsky sound like jazz and what makes Marsalis sound like Stravinsky. By examining melodic, harmonic, and rhythmic similarities, we see how Marsalis not only makes reference to Stravinsky but even aspires to bring this music back home to its jazz origins which originally inspired the Russian composer.



**LSU**

---

**College of Music  
& Dramatic Arts**

191 Music & Dramatic Arts Building • Louisiana State University  
Baton Rouge, LA 70803