

## Review: *Russian Music and Nationalism from Glinka to Stalin*

Melanie Gudesblatt  
*Cornell University*

---

### Recommended Citation

Gudesblatt, Melanie (2009) "Review: *Russian Music and Nationalism from Glinka to Stalin*," *Nota Bene: Canadian Undergraduate Journal of Musicology*: Vol. 2: Iss. 1, Article 10.  
Available at: <http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/notabene/vol2/iss1/10>

---

Review: *Russian Music and Nationalism from Glinka to Stalin*



---

**Review: *Russian Music and Nationalism from  
Glinka to Stalin***

**Melanie Gudesblatt  
Year IV – Cornell University**

Marina Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism from Glinka to Stalin*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.

I have a confession to make. Though I have for some time been a zealous devotee of Russian music, it turns out that I am as defenseless against the paralyzing forces of Russian music as the amateur who, hypnotized by this music's seductive mystique, accepts its "Russianness" without question. Not only have I allowed my understanding of Russian music and its history to be shaped in terms of the ambiguous edifice of nationality, I have forfeited critical interrogation for immediate sensuous appeal. Nor am I alone. As Marina Frolova-Walker points out in her book entitled *Russian Music and Nationalism from Glinka to Stalin*, much of the musical public, as well as a surprising number of musicologists, has succumbed to this marketable exoticism of Russian identity.<sup>1</sup> Even within contemporary musicological discourse, Russian music is often described as an "other," its independence from Western music warranting only tangential

---

<sup>1</sup> Marina Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism from Glinka to Stalin*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), vii.

connections. Indeed, though we are captivated by the “Russianness” of Rimsky-Korsakov’s *Easter Overture* or Musorgsky’s *A Night on Bald Mountain*,<sup>2</sup> we lack a clear understanding of how we define this quality or how it came to exist as we now understand it. *Russian Music and Nationalism from Glinka to Stalin* clearly and comprehensively demonstrates how wrong we all have been in ignoring these questions.

Frolova-Walker writes that until recently, “the Western and Russian music departments continued along their separate paths, meeting only in the conservatoire canteen for lunch.”<sup>3</sup> It is in light of this polarized past that Frolova-Walker’s book emerges as a refreshing reexamination of the Russian musical tradition. Frolova-Walker is particularly suited to deal with this topic, having begun her study of music in Russia, later pursuing musicology in the United Kingdom. This broad experience affords her both Eastern and Western perspectives on the repertoire under consideration. Perhaps owing to this unusual background, Frolova-Walker’s approach is particularly comprehensive. She traverses many disciplines and skillfully incorporates both Russian and Western sources with great prowess; ultimately, this methodology lends her great credibility as she replaces prior misconceptions with a more balanced scholarly narrative.

Frolova-Walker generally follows the path blazed by an eminent musicologist and scholar of Russian music, Richard Taruskin. Taruskin’s *Defining Russia Musically* (1997) was unprecedented in its critical examination of the relationship

---

<sup>2</sup> Musorgsky’s famous work is commonly referred to by its alternative title, *A Night on Bare Mountain* due to the nuance of the original Russian title; the adjective “lisoy” of the work’s title (“Ivanovna, Noch’ na lisoj gore,” or “St. John’s Night on Bald/Bare Mountain”) reflects both the literal translation “bald” as well as the figurative “bare,” leading scholars and enthusiasts to use the popular “Bald Mountain” as well as the more scholarly title “Bare Mountain” interchangeably.

<sup>3</sup> Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism from Glinka to Stalin*, vii–viii.

## *Nota Bene*

between music and the construction of a national identity in Russia and how both in turn affect broader issues of culture and society. Provocative and insightful, Taruskin's book elevated the study of Russian music history to a position of greater importance and respect, one worthy of higher academic standards. Even so, Taruskin's book merely initiated the immense task of debunking a complicated network of ideas involving exoticism, nationalism and identity, a network that had previously engendered a range of misunderstandings by the public and scholars alike. As Frolova-Walker writes,

*Defining Russia Musically* made musicologists in the West take Russian music much more seriously, and is currently exerting its influence even among Russian musicologists. But the task of dispelling both mystique and hostile prejudice – two sides of the same coin – is nowhere near accomplished.<sup>4</sup>

Frolova-Walker thus clearly identifies the two main postures she opposes. Unsurprisingly then, she structures her argument around concepts of myth and bias as they relate to the Russian musical tradition as well as to a larger cultural tradition. Frolova-Walker uses myth as both her starting point for fruitful discussion and the unifying thread of her book. The six chapters that follow trace the enigmatic “Russian” identity as it changes at the hands of Russian composers and, subsequently, of scholars.

In her preface, Frolova-Walker provides a succinct outline of her argument and briefly states each chapter's main topic. Her preamble is designed to equip the reader with sufficient background knowledge on each broader topic, allowing her to engage immediately in detailed and innovative analysis with her subject matter. In view of her approach, I will employ Frolova-

---

<sup>4</sup> Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism from Glinka to Stalin*, viii.

Walker's own prefatory summary in order to engage in my own critical assessment. Given the sheer length of her account, it is impossible to respond to each point; thus, I will focus on what I consider to be the important aspects of her material, the arguments she raises, and the ramifications of her text.

Though the myth of "Russianness" is based on an intricate network of contradictions, it is ultimately a "myth of otherness."<sup>5</sup> With regard to Russian music, mystification has developed chiefly as a result of two inextricable facts, which Frolova-Walker's text illuminates.<sup>6</sup> First, the West has traditionally marginalized Russian composers or ignored them entirely. Second, the Russians have in the meantime conceived of their musical heritage entirely independently from the West. Each tradition has exacerbated and perpetuated the other. As a result of this relationship between Russia and the West, the "myth of otherness" has been accepted in scholarly circles "in compensation for an inferiority complex."<sup>7</sup> However, not all problems originate in Western academics. The contradictory images of "Russianness" purported by Russian literature (namely the introspection and misanthropy of the nineteenth-century intelligentsia) and Russian music (the idealization of the people based in an epic, legendary past) further confuse matters.<sup>8</sup> Under the influence of social, political, economic and cultural forces, these images form the basis of the "Russian" myth.

In light of this complicated, multifaceted myth, Frolova-Walker's narrative tackles myth in the broadest sense in order adequately to address the confusion surrounding Russian music. She writes:

---

<sup>5</sup> Richard Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically: historical and hermeneutical essays* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), xiv.

<sup>6</sup> Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism from Glinka to Stalin*, vii-viii.

<sup>7</sup> Richard Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically: historical and hermeneutical essays*, xiv.

<sup>8</sup> Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism from Glinka to Stalin*, ix.

## *Nota Bene*

The purpose of this volume is to a large extent to demonstrate how such myths are born and perpetuated, how they flourish and reach the stage of self-defeating absurdity, how they can die off only to be resurrected in an instant. [...] Chapter 1 serves, in part, as a foundation for the later chapters, since it examines the evolution of the national-character myth in Russia. [...] Chapter 2 is devoted to another myth which has assumed great importance for Russian cultural consciousness: the myth of Pushkin, whom Russians habitually refer to as “our everything.” The chapter shows how the construction of the “founding father” myth was driven by political expediency...and how the Pushkin cult served as a useful model for creating the smaller cult for Glinka. [...] Chapter 3 attempts a fresh look at Glinka’s “Russianness” and its perceptions. [...] Chapter 4 is the centerpiece of this book, since it is devoted to the creation of the “Russian style” by the composers of the Kuchka. [...] Chapter 5 moves beyond the Kuchka to the next generation of musical nationalists, who concluded that their predecessors had set out in the wrong direction.<sup>9</sup>

Chapter six is the only section whose thesis is not explicitly stated in the preface; however, labeled “Musical nationalism in Stalin’s Soviet Union,” the final installment of Frolova-Walker’s book is self-explanatory and immediately focuses on the trajectory of music during Stalin’s rule. Thus, Frolova-Walker’s preface immediately outlines the many transformations of musical nationalism, providing readers with a clear and concise roadmap to follow as they delve into new and often unfamiliar territory. Moreover, notwithstanding the absence of chapter six’s

---

<sup>9</sup> Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism from Glinka to Stalin*, ix-xii.

condensed thesis, Frolova-Walker's preface not only highlights salient background information but also immediately begins analyzing these important points.

Chapter one, then, sets the stage for the book by identifying Russia's multifarious (and sometimes paradoxical) national characteristics against a historical background. Her fifty-one-page crash course in Russian history from Peter the Great through Stalin focuses mainly on the diametrically-opposed national identities of Russian literature and Russian music; as such, this chapter offers a valuable historical context in addition to a solid introduction to the associated ideas of identity and myth. Further discussion of this chapter is important insofar as it introduces Frolova-Walker's delightful narrative style. First and foremost, she is comprehensive, supplementing her literary and musical investigations with references to related disciplines. Incorporating topics such as the development of the Russian language, economic conditions, and political dynamics, Frolova-Walker creates a narrative which itself reflects the intricate network of factors that contribute to the delicate Russian identity. This broad approach is maintained throughout her book and ultimately saves her from an overly-insular engagement with her subject matter. Significantly, her drier, historical observations are enlivened by anthropological and psychological insights as well as frequent citations from primary documents. Collectively, this woven historical narrative recreates the tension of identity crisis in nineteenth-century Russia. The result is an effective outline of the dynamic and entangled factors that have influenced Russian identity and that have subsequently fostered the creation and perpetuation of the Russian myth.

Each subsequent chapter provides a similar reinterpretation of prior knowledge in new and exciting dimensions, thereby greatly expanding our understanding of this vast and complicated subject. For example, chapter two looks at the correlation

## *Nota Bene*

between Alexander Pushkin and Mikhail Glinka and the cults that worshipped (and continue to worship) them. Both artists have been elevated to enjoy universal acclaim. However, such exaltation has precipitated exaggerated and misleading claims. As Frolova-Walker points out, Slavophiles, for example, often resorted to aggrandizement while looking to reconcile Pushkin's wit and cosmopolitanism with the constructed, tragic, Russian soul; Pushkin's universality was construed as a national virtue and "a sign of future times, when other nations would look toward Russia to save them."<sup>10</sup> The ramifications of these claims reach far beyond Pushkin and Glinka, and have in turn affected the Russian demigods, "The Five," and other musical successors alike, damaging scholarship and clouding these figures in a haze of "Russian" mystique. Thus, clarifying the Glinka cult is a necessary prerequisite for addressing issues such as the aims of "The Five" or their relationship to their "westernized" colleague, Tchaikovsky. Frolova-Walker examines the formation and evolution of the Pushkin and Glinka cults through various media (such as historical accounts, opera settings, and film projects) to illuminate the intricate balance of social context and political appropriation that invariably shaped their development. Her analysis provides an enlightened methodology for approaching – and understanding – the complexities of the Russian musical tradition. Furthermore, she invites a large-scale rectification of the problems that have beset related scholarship. Tchaikovsky studies, for example, have been riddled with the thorny issues of his homosexuality and "Russianness," or lack thereof; such issues, fueled by political, social, and cultural expediency, have problematized musicological research.<sup>11</sup> Frolova-Walker's

---

<sup>10</sup> Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism from Glinka to Stalin*, 55.

<sup>11</sup> See Richard Taruskin, *On Russian Music* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009); see especially Chapter 6: "Pathetic Symphonist: Chaikovsky, Russia, Sexuality and the Study of Music," 76-113.

successfully interdisciplinary, historical approach optimistically points the way toward a methodology with the potential to clarify this area of scholarship.

Chapter three offers an extensive reevaluation of Glinka, the “Father of Russian Music.”<sup>12</sup> Frolova-Walker’s familiar caution lends her remarkable insight, leading her to highlight an often-ignored distinction, that between presence and consistency. In spite of numerous sources citing Glinka’s “instinctive” and “unprecedented” “Russianness,” Frolova-Walker proves that Glinka merely elevated preexisting musical characteristics associated with a Russian idiom. Unfortunately, in her zeal to prove her innovative perspective on Glinka’s “Russianness” (namely, that his work was of a superior quality but employed techniques not unique to Glinka’s works), Frolova-Walker falters in a moment of vague diction. She scrutinizes the common contention that Glinka’s incorporation of harmonized folk tunes in *A Life for the Tsar* was an unprecedented and definitive national characteristic. As Frolova-Walker explains, “Glinka only provided harmony to one folk melody...and on that occasion he proved much more willing to sacrifice the melody to harmonic conventions than the reverse.”<sup>13</sup> Thus, to contest a colleague’s claim that “Glinka discovered the whole system of Russian melody and harmony,”<sup>14</sup> Frolova-Walker concludes that “[We must] be clear: this cannot be regarded as the foundation stone for the ‘system of Russian melody and harmony,’ but, on the contrary, it is evidence that Glinka, for one, had no interest in any such thing.”<sup>15</sup> While the content of her conclusion is astute, the sentence’s end, “Glinka...had no interest in any such thing,”

---

<sup>12</sup> Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism from Glinka to Stalin*, vii.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 86.

<sup>14</sup> Mel’gunov, “Glinka i yego muzikal’niye sochineniya,” in *Livanova and Protopov*, vol. 2, 202-9. Cited in Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism from Glinka to Stalin*, 86.

<sup>15</sup> Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism from Glinka to Stalin*, 86.

## *Nota Bene*

places her in treacherous territory. Speculation involving a composer's intent is an approach that, with limited exceptions, can easily jeopardize an otherwise persuasive argument. Even if we accept her bold assertion, Glinka's compositional vision remains ambiguous; does Frolova-Walker suggest that Glinka only retained an interest in creating a Russian musical identity in other works, or rather that he evaded the nationalist discussion completely?

Nevertheless, Frolova-Walker keenly elucidates Glinka's position in the Russian musicological narrative subsequently by focusing on his tripartite musical legacy. Her critical observations regarding Glinka's three distinct nationalistic paths, which are exemplified by his operas *A Life for the Tsar* (1836) and *Ruslan and Lyudmila* (1842) and his "creation of a Russian national church music through a hybridization of Russian folksong and Palestrina,"<sup>16</sup> are comprehensive and insightful. In analyzing various facets of Glinka's nationalism, she incorporates historical narrative, primary sources, and musical examples to draw an innovative and accurate picture of Russia's first mature national style. Indeed, in comparing and contrasting these three vignettes of national character, Frolova-Walker clearly contextualizes the basis for the yawning gap of identity in Russia of the mid- to late-nineteenth century.

Fair-weather enthusiasts of Russian music should skip right to chapter four. Confirming her prefatory remarks, she designs this chapter as the main feature of the book, dealing with the "celebrities" of Russian music. As such, it is perhaps the most incendiary chapter. Indeed, at eighty-six pages it is the longest of all her chapters, yet despite its length, it is here that Frolova-Walker's argument falters, in large part due to the incomplete narrative she traces. For all her fruitful discussion of "The Five,"

---

<sup>16</sup> Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism from Glinka to Stalin*, x.

Frolova-Walker reduces the group to an aggregate represented by Rimsky-Korsakov. That Rimsky-Korsakov played a central role as the consolidator of the “Russian” style, was a reviser of and collaborator on works such as *Prince Igor* and *Boris Godunov* (which would have otherwise gone uncompleted), and was a conductor who was instrumental to the dissemination of his colleagues’ works remains undisputed. Frolova-Walker’s mistake is in treating the five members of the Kuchka, both as individuals and as a collective, as static figures. She ignores not only each member’s individual growth and evolving ideas of identity but the dynamics of their interpersonal relationships as well. In the case of Rimsky-Korsakov, the problems and merits of this reduction are two sides of the same coin. While Rimsky-Korsakov did initially embody the musical idiom of “The Five” with regard to his harmonic palate and predilection for folk subjects, he eventually became disenchanted with the group and subverted the musical objectives he had helped to define. By the end of his career, Rimsky-Korsakov positioned himself entirely in opposition to his counterparts, instead drawing inspiration from Western sources and theories about music; this stark reversal was not shared by any of the other four members of “The Five,” who continued to compose in a distinctly “Russian” idiom. Thus, although Rimsky-Korsakov was indeed the architect behind the Russian style of the Kuchka as well as its most prolific and influential composer, his evolution as a Russian nationalist and his eventual undermining of the Kuchka and its style are merely one side of a complicated story of changing aesthetics and politics.

Furthermore, Frolova-Walker’s premise entails a more egregious error – the marginalization of Modest Musorgsky. Admittedly, with the space limitations Frolova-Walker faces, Cui and Borodin are easily explored in the minimal time and space she allots, and even Balakirev, the great founder of “The Five,” is

## *Nota Bene*

given sufficient attention in her examination. Musorgsky, however, is unfairly relegated to a negligible role. Considered the “most strikingly individual Russian composer of the later 19<sup>th</sup> century” by Robert W. Oldani in his article for the *New Grove*, Musorgsky was revolutionary in his treatment of a musical nationalism.<sup>17</sup> Consequently, compared to his contemporaries, Musorgsky’s rejection of all German and Italian musical idioms was more pronounced and his incorporation of Western inspiration less overt. This is in stark contrast to Rimsky-Korsakov who, as Frolova-Walker acknowledges, ultimately incorporated Western models of form and harmony. Frolova-Walker spends numerous pages detailing the similarities between some of Rimsky-Korsakov’s pieces and his Western influences; specifically, the four pages she devotes to illustrating the musical and textual similarities between pieces by Liszt and works by Rimsky-Korsakov confirm the latter’s Western-inspired techniques. To be fair, she references similar instances of Western musical inflections in works by Borodin and Musorgsky, though these instances are outnumbered by examples from Rimsky-Korsakov. Moreover, Frolova-Walker’s general statements that “the examples given above demonstrate that Liszt’s influence on Rimsky-Korsakov and the rest of the Kucha was by no means limited to chromatic harmony” and “the Kuchka’s assimilation of Lisztian harmony was selective” are misleading and suggest an exaggerated espousal of Western techniques on behalf of all five of the Kuchka. In addition, Musorgsky actively explored new techniques to represent Russians and “Russianness” more explicitly through music. While his compatriots largely looked to folk tunes, Musorgsky developed a musical idiom that reflected patterns of Russian

---

<sup>17</sup> Robert W. Oldani, “Musorgsky [Mussorgsky; Moussorgsky], Modest Petrovich,” *Grove Music Online*, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/> (accessed June 21, 2009).

speech while retaining a comparatively modern style. This innovative musical style was influential in its own right, inspiring both Ravel and Debussy. Thus, all things considered, Musorgsky deserves a larger role alongside Rimsky-Korsakov in the “centerpiece” chapter of Frolova-Walker’s narrative.

To be fair, she does qualify her decision to focus on Rimsky-Korsakov both in the book’s preface and again at the beginning of the chapter in question, writing that “within the given space, a detailed discussion of all five composers’ contributions would not have been possible.”<sup>18</sup> Still, the excuse of space merely justifies condensed narratives, not disproportionate ones. Certainly, the reader might expect that in her search for a comprehensive and demystified Russian musicological narrative, Frolova-Walker would allot sufficient room to the discussion of all of history’s important players. Nevertheless, spatial concerns remain a relatively minor criticism of an otherwise brilliant account.

Within her critical reassessment of the “celebrities” of Russian music, Frolova-Walker challenges Taruskin in this centerpiece chapter. Although her criticism of Taruskin’s writings on Russian orientalism is unforgiving, her censure sheds new light on an important claim.<sup>19</sup> As Taruskin rightly points out, many musicologists have considered “‘the Orientalist element’ as one of the four distinguishing – and, of course, progressive – features of [the so-called] ‘New Russian School.’”<sup>20</sup> His argument emphasizes the importance of the “Kuchka Pattern” (here

---

<sup>18</sup> Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism from Glinka to Stalin*, x.

<sup>19</sup> Taruskin addresses this topic more specifically in his book entitled *Defining Russia Musically* and two articles. See Richard Taruskin, “‘Entoiling the falconet’: Russian musical orientalism in context,” *Cambridge Opera Journal*, Vol. 4, no. 3 (November 1992): 253-280; Richard Taruskin, “Russian Musical Orientalism: A Postscript,” *Cambridge Opera Journal*, Vol. 6, no. 1 (March 1994): 81-84.

<sup>20</sup> Richard Taruskin, “‘Entoiling the Falconet’: Russian musical orientalism in context,” 253.

## *Nota Bene*

“KP”), a harmonic progression favoured by the group of composers.<sup>21</sup> He ascribes an explicitly sexual quality to the “KP;” as Frolova-Walker notes, he goes so far as to call it “‘the essential *nega* undulation’...*nega* being a Russian term for sexual pleasure,”<sup>22</sup> subsequently associating it exclusively with the erotic side of orientalism. Citing Glinka’s *Ruslan and Lyudmila*, Borodin’s *Prince Igor*, and Tchaikovsky’s *Romeo and Juliet*, Taruskin provides substantial evidence for the intersection of orientalism and seduction in the “KP.” Musical examples are supplemented by convincing epistolary proof. A letter from Balakirev to Tchaikovsky regarding the “love” theme from *Romeo and Juliet*, for example, prompts Taruskin to deduce that, “Balakirev’s letter confirms the surmise that Chaikovsky used the orientalist trope metonymically, to conjure up not the East as such, but rather its exotic sex appeal.”<sup>23</sup>

Frolova-Walker’s meticulous reinvestigation of the Russian cultural consciousness, however, reveals that Taruskin’s claim actually perpetuates the mystification of Russian music. Having completed an extensive analysis of the “KP” in works of the members of “The Five,” Frolova-Walker concludes:

The instances of #5/b6 chromaticism...are by no means limited to the representation or evocation of the Orient.

---

<sup>21</sup> The “Kuchka Pattern” is characterized by an upper voice moving in the pattern of scale degrees 5-#5-6-b6-5, often over a static bass; this specific type of chromaticism is unfamiliar to Western tonal harmony and as such has been considered a marker of orientalism. Gerald Abraham, scholar of Russian music, concludes that “the use of this particular chromatic effect is one of the commonest [sic] characteristics of nineteenth-century Russian harmony; one finds it on page after page of any Russian ‘nationalist’ score and on a good many of Tchaikovsky’s.” Gerald Abraham cited in Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism from Glinka to Stalin*, 142.

<sup>22</sup> Richard Taruskin cited in Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism from Glinka to Stalin*, 143.

<sup>23</sup> Taruskin, “Russian Musical Orientalism: A Postscript,” 82.

Indeed, there are simply too many of these non-Oriental occurrences for us to be able to say with any confidence that contemporary audiences would have interpreted the harmonic feature as an Oriental marker.<sup>24</sup>

Thus, her explanation reveals the fallacy of Taruskin's proposition that the "KP" is inextricably linked with both eroticism and orientalism. In reference to the exclusive association of orientalism with the "KP," Frolova-Walker remarks that while Oriental contexts provide identifiable instances of the "KP," the milieu in which it is appropriated suggest a broader significance rather than "an exclusively Orientalist trope."<sup>25</sup> As for Taruskin's *nega*, Frolova-Walker provides evidence to suggest a rather more ambiguous effect inherent in the "KP." In response to Taruskin's postscript, she writes: "The appearance of *nega* together with the Persian lovers is a real gift to Taruskin, and might, at first, seem to settle the matter."<sup>26</sup> She continues to deconstruct Taruskin's argument by questioning his diction. In the eighteen pages that follow, Frolova-Walker overwhelms Taruskin's musical selections with extensive musical proof of her own, leading her to conclude that "for Taruskin to extract his 'essential *nega* undulation' from such conventional material is more than a little reminiscent of the Procrustean-bed approach to motivic analysis."<sup>27</sup> Combining theoretical analysis, a fresh perspective and witty common sense, Frolova-Walker's groundbreaking assertion is much more than a simple critique.

Ultimately, Frolova-Walker traces the evolution of the myth of Russian music's "otherness" from a simple dichotomy to a

---

<sup>24</sup> Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism from Glinka to Stalin*, 144.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, 143.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, 159.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 159.

## *Nota Bene*

complex amalgamation of misunderstood facts. She exposes the so-called “Russian style” as a façade of exoticism, misinterpreted nationalism, and a Western condescension (both real and perceived), which together culminate to form an evasive enigma. Ironically, the exotic Russian mystique is always economically packaged for consumption and perpetuated by the Russians themselves, a type of cultural exportation exemplified by twentieth-century impresario Sergey Diaghilev, who “exported folklore-quoting operas and ballets to Paris and London, providing well-heeled audiences with the exotic Russia of their imaginations.”<sup>28</sup> Fortunately, Frolova-Walker’s book successfully avoids unhelpful polemical or dialectical discussion in order to engage with an elusive subject matter. Furthermore, her analysis is provocative and insightful, forcing the reader to abandon unspecific mythology and to engage seriously with Russian music. *Russian Music and Nationalism from Glinka to Stalin* has clearly earned a place in the library of anyone with an interest in Russian music.

---

<sup>28</sup> Simon Morrison, “Review of Richard Taruskin’s *Defining Russia Musically: Historical and Hermeneutical Essays*.” *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, Vol. 53, no. 2 (Summer 2000): 412-425, 412.

**Works Cited**

- Frolova-Walker, Marina. *Russian Music and Nationalism from Glinka to Stalin*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.
- Morrison, Simon. "Review of Richard Taruskin's *Defining Russia Musically: Historical and Hermeneutical Essays*." *Journal of the American Musicological Society*. Vol. 53, no. 2 (Summer 2000): 412-425.
- Oldani, Robert W. "Musorgsky [Mussorgsky; Moussorgsky], Modest Petrovich." *Grove Music Online*. *Oxford Music Online*, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/> (accessed 21 June 2009),
- Taruskin, Richard. *Defining Russia Musically: historical and hermeneutical essays*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.
- . "Entoiling the falconet?: Russian musical orientalism in context." *Cambridge Opera Journal*. Vol. 4, no. 3 (November 1992): 253-280.
- . *On Russian Music*. Berkley: University of California Press, 2009.
- . "Russian Musical Orientalism: A Postscript." *Cambridge Opera Journal*. Vol. 6, no. 1 (March 1994): 81-84.