

**VERA B. VALKOVA**

*Russian Gnesins' Academy of Music  
Moscow, Russia*

*ORCID: 0000-0002-5858-0613, veraval@yandex.ru*

## **Provincial Conflicts: Concerning the Issue of “the Center vs the Periphery” in the Activities of the Imperial Russian Musical Society**

The article examines two particularly exemplary episodes in the development of the relations between the center and the periphery of the Imperial Russian Musical Society (IRMS) at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries – the conflicts involving the personalities of the directors of the Musical Colleges of the Tambov and Rostov-on-Don affiliated with the IRMS: Solomon Starikov and Matvey Pressman. On the basis of archival sources, the similarities and differences of both conflicting situations, as well as the role in them of the St. Petersburg Main Directorate of the IRMS, are traced out. Special attention is allocated to the “Jewish question,” which turned out to be important in both of the conflicts.

The article comes to the conclusion that the mutual relations of the Main Directorate and the representatives of regional authorities (including the sections of the IRMS) uncover a deep mental and moral fissure: justice and delicacy on the part of the enlightened metropolitan directorate, as opposed to the petty interests of provincial society, remote from genuine creative goals. It is presumed that the reason for this was the gulf on the level of cultural development between the capital cities characteristic for Russian culture, as well as an insufficiently effectiveness of the organizational structure of the IRMS.

**Keywords:** The Imperial Russian Musical Society, Tambov, Rostov-on-Don, Solomon Starikov, Matvey Pressman.

*For citation:* Valkova Vera B. Provincial Conflicts: Concerning the Issue of “the Center vs the Periphery” in the Activities of the Imperial Russian Musical Society. *Problemy muzykal'noj nauki/Music Scholarship*. 2018. No. 4, pp. 140–147. DOI: 10.17674/1997-0854.2018.4.140-147.

**В. Б. ВАЛЬКОВА**

*Российская академия музыки им. Гнесиных  
г. Москва, Россия*

*ORCID: 0000-0002-5858-0613, veraval@yandex.ru*

## **Провинциальные конфликты: к проблеме «центр – периферия» в деятельности Императорского Русского музыкального общества**

В статье рассматриваются два особенно показательных эпизода в развитии отношений центра и периферии Императорского Русского музыкального общества (ИРМО) на рубеже XIX–XX веков – конфликты вокруг личностей директоров Тамбовского и Ростовского-на-Дону музыкальных училищ ИРМО Соломона Старикова и Матвея Пресмана. На основе архивных источников прослеживаются сходства и различия обеих конфликтных ситуаций, а также роль в них Петербургской Главной дирекции ИРМО. Специальное внимание уделено «еврейскому вопросу», оказавшемуся важным в обоих конфликтах.

В статье делается вывод о том, что взаимоотношения Главной дирекции и представителей местных властей (в том числе и отделений ИРМО) обнажают глубокий ментально-нравственный разлом: справедливость и деликатность со стороны просвещённой столичной дирекции – и мелкие, далёкие от подлинных творческих целей интересы провинциального общества. Предполагается, что причиной этого был характерный для русской культуры разрыв в уровне культурного развития между столицами и провинцией, а также недостаточно эффективная организационная структура ИРМО.

**Ключевые слова:** Императорское Русское музыкальное общество (ИРМО), Тамбов, Ростов-на-Дону, Соломон Стариков, Матвей Пресман.

*Для цитирования:* Валькова В. Б. Провинциальные конфликты: к проблеме «центр – периферия» в деятельности Императорского Русского музыкального общества // *Проблемы музыкальной науки*. 2018. № 4 (33). С. 140–147. DOI: 10.17674/1997-0854.2018.4.140-147.

The provincial sections of the Imperial Russian Musical Society (in Kiev, Odessa, Tambov, Saratov and Rostov-on-Don), which were opened in the late 19th century, posed a number of new problems for the metropolitan Main Directorate, such that were connected with the necessity to control the activities of these sections. The relations of the provincial sections with the St. Petersburg-based center of the Imperial Russian Musical Society (IRMS) at times developed in complex ways. Two episodes in the development of these relations are especially exemplary – these were conflicts around the personalities of the directors of the Tambov or Rostov-on-Don musical colleges of the IRMS, which received public attention. Two such conflicts may be indicated as “the Pressman affair” and “the Starikov affair.” Their similarities have been noted for a long time, but have never become the object of special research up to the present.

Both heroes of the conflicts were graduates of the Moscow Conservatory. Matvey Leontyevich (whose name, according to certain documents, were Morduch Lebikovich) Pressman graduated from the Conservatory in 1891, where he was a student of Nikolai Zverev and Vassily Safonov. From 1896 he directed the Musical Classes of the IRMS in his native city Rostov-on-Don. Due to his efforts in 1900 the classes were transformed into a Musical College, and Pressman became its director.

Solomon Moiseyevich Starikov also studied at the Moscow Conservatory, having been a piano student of Pavel Schloezer and Alexander Siloti, having successfully graduated from there in 1892, and having received the diploma of a free artist. Just as Pressman, approximately at the same time period (in 1894) Starikov becomes a teacher and the director of the provincial Musical Classes of the IRMS in Tambov. The Musical Classes there were transformed into a Musical College in 1900, and this event coincided in time with the analogous event in Rostov-on-Don, where Matvey Pressman worked.

Both musicians acted energetically and successfully. Both the Rostov and the Tambov Colleges under their leadership developed and expanded quickly, playing an important role in the musical lives of their cities<sup>1</sup>. Numerous testimonies of the success of Starikov’s and Pressman’s work may be found in a number of contemporary research works (see: [1; 2; 3; 4; 6; 7; 8]).

Another important fact for our theme is that both musicians very consciously and resolutely preserved their Jewish faith, despite the obvious complications

which this circumstance brought into their lives and activities.

The consciousness of such a position is reflected most brilliantly in the unpublished memoirs of Pressman<sup>2</sup>, the content of which is amply used by Aishat Kokkezoza in her dissertation [3]. One of the members of the Main Directorate, the city’s head Khmelnsky suggested to Pressman to convert to Orthodox Christianity as a condition for his work to continue unencumbered. Pressman proudly answered that he did not put himself or his conscience for sale. After this, as Kokkezoza indicates, citing Pressman’s memoirs, “Khmelnitsky, having been the chairman of the Duma, exerted all efforts to deprive the Musical College of city subsidies” [3, pp. 55–56]. In the case of Starikov, his adherence to Judaism being the source of conflict was even more apparent, the testimonies to which would be especially examined a bit later.

Both of our heroes turned for assistance in solving the conflicts to the St. Petersburg Main Directorate of the IRMS, first of all, to Princess Elena Georgievna Saxe-Altenburg, who held a position in the Society. She demonstrated a phenomenal temperance and delicacy, trying not to hurtle any of the sides of the conflicts and not to exacerbate the adversarial relationship with new grievances.

In both cases Sergei Rachmaninoff was brought to inquiry. From all appearances, particularly the complaints of the governor of Tambov on the director of the local Musical College Solomon Starikov impelled the Main Directorate in 1909 to realize the long intended position of the assistant to the Main Directorate and inspector of the educational institutions of the IRMS. This role required the most authoritative musician in Russia, a man with a flawless reputation. The choice of the Directorate fell on Sergei Rachmaninoff, who during the course of several years (from 1909 to 1912) scrupulously carried out the duties exerted on him.

The fates of Starikov and Pressman were united by the lengthy and essentially unresolvable character of the conflict which arose in connection with their activities.

In addition to the described similarity of both of these “affairs,” their differences are no less eloquent. They illumine the characteristic details of the same common problems.

In the Tambov conflict the religious-national question turns out to be at the fore. All the complaints about Solomon Starikov from the local gubernator, chamberlain of His Majesty’s court Nikolai Muratov

are connected with it. He was appointed for the position of gubernator in the autumn of 1906 and showed himself as an energetic and successful leader. Soon Muratov was chosen as a merited citizen of Tambov, in intermediate educational institutions there was even a stipend named after him which was instituted (see: [1; 2]). On April 22, 1909 this respectable person directs to the Main Directorate of the IRMS a complaint of the following content: "I do not refer to the musical abilities of Mr. Starikov, due to the lack of the appropriate attainments, but I cannot refrain from mentioning the information which is reaching me that the musical teaching is carried out very badly, the level is dropping every year, and that Mr. Starikov is driving out Christian faculty members, replacing them with Jews. I presume that a truly Russian city, Tambov deserves that the Musical College present in it, existing on the maintenance of the Imperial Russian Musical Society would have a director who is a Christian, and that the insulting nickname "synagogue," given to the Musical College by the city residents, especially valid in its essence, would be taken away"<sup>3</sup>.

The St. Petersburg Main Directorate in the person of Princess Elena Georgievna of Saxe-Altenburg was required to react to this complaint. It was at that time that the necessity arose to direct a well-known musician to Tambov with inspection, whose conclusions would be incontestable for everyone and would extinguish the immanent conflict as soon as possible. As it has been stated before, Sergei Rachmaninoff, who was invited to this role, was swiftly appointed to the position of "Assistant Chairman of the Society in its Musical Affairs," which was communicated in circular orders distributed to all the respective sections of the IRMS on May 6, 1909.

In the first days of May Rachmaninoff stayed in Tambov and familiarized himself with the state of affairs in the Musical College. His conclusions expounded in his letter to the Princess of Saxe-Altenburg from May 7, 1909 was published numerous times and are well known. It is important that the newly-baked inspector was compelled to report not only about the state of the musical affairs in the college directed by Starikov, but also the seemingly existent national-religious discrimination, that is, about the oppression of Orthodox Christian citizens by a Jewish director. The conclusions Rachmaninoff came up with refuted all the accusations contained in the governor's complaint; he expounded them in an interview given to a journalist in a local newspaper, which summed up: "It is pleasant to observe that our musical college

received a flattering comment from such a famous Russian composer and, of course, a strict critic that Mr. Rachmaninoff is"<sup>4</sup>.

All hopes notwithstanding, not only did the conflict not exhaust itself with this, but, on the contrary, flared up with an even greater force. In the subsequent letters to the Main Directorate Nikolai Muratov indicates at the alleged negligence of the inspection carried out by Rachmaninoff, continues to accuse Starikov of incompetence of running the college, and insists on a new inspection. The conflict assumed a prolonged character, having extended itself to the duration of several years – until 1912, when Muratov left Tambov after having been appointed to the position of gubernator in Kursk.

It is impossible to expound all the details of this story here, nor is it necessary. Let us merely mention that the gubernator was not alone in his pretensions, of course. His position had public backing in Tambov, a fact which he frequently referred to in his complaints. The character of this backing is testified by the collective letter sent on November 10, 1911 to Alexandra Naryshkina, who at that time was a trustee of the Ekaterina Teachers' Institute in Tambov, a member of the Tambov Ladies' Committee. This letter was passed to the Chief Directorate of the IRMS to the Princess of Saxe-Altenburg. The same complaints and requests were repeated there as those in the letters of the gubernator. Despite the fact that the signatories of the letters placed the accent on the unacceptability of Starikov's pedagogical methods, the national issue clearly comes through in their formulations: "During the entire time of his directorship of the Tambov Musical College Solomon Starikov has always demonstrated impermissible rudeness, indefensible audacity and unlimited cupidity towards all the students (with the exception of the Jews)"<sup>5</sup>.

Of certain interest also is the social status of the persons who signed this letter (altogether 8 people placed their signatures). These people come from different strata of the Tambov population, and they also include two musicians – the director of the choral class P. Bogdanov and the student of the Moscow Conservatory Yakov Ogorodnikov. At present it is difficult to form a perception of to what extent these eight signatures were placed willfully. However, there were other voices which have sounded in this conflict. On March 22, 1912 a statutory report about the work of the Musical College came in, signed by the chairman of the Directorate by the chamberlain of His Majesty's court, Prince Cholokayev<sup>6</sup>. The report refuted all the accusations against Starikov, and the

facts cited by the gubernator were acknowledged as being falsified.

Also important in this story is the argumentation of the position of the gubernator in which the “Jewish question” assumes the important position. Apparently, any form of national or religious intolerance is of irrational nature, and any arguments and facts brought in favor of this type of intolerance acquire the distinct character of myths implemented into the mass consciousness. The letters of Muratov are also saturated with such characteristic myths. Here, for example, is a very exemplary fragment from the letter of Tambov gubernator to the Main Directorate from August 25, 1909 (in this letter Muratov answers the arguments of the Princess of Saxe-Altenburg brought in response to his denunciations): “It is perceived as strange that I have begun my campaign against Starikov now, and not before, and that such a campaign had not been attempted by my predecessors. The latter, especially Mr. Daunitz, did not deem the affair important enough; it befell me to proceed with the liquidation of the Jewish emancipatory movement and summarizing those pretensions which Russians began making upon Jews and their supporters. <...> It is groundless to assume that here there is a certain fear of subordination or any unsympathetic influences for Jews present here. I can assure you that nobody is carrying on any agitation here, and it is not necessary to carry it out, since the estrangement towards the alien person, who had marched in the forefront of the notorious Russian revolution, which has infiltrated the flesh and blood of the awakened Russian person, is in evidence here. This estrangement does not threaten Jews with any forms of violence, but is reflected in any non-monetary affair which a Jew tries to approach”<sup>7</sup>.

As we can see, Muratov had his own ideology which aspired towards universal significance. Possibly, it existed only in his imagination. However, it was quite likely that at that time it was shared by a certain segment of Russian society<sup>8</sup>.

No less exemplary, too, was the reaction to the invectives of the Tambov gubernator from the Main Directorate of the Imperial Russian Musical Society – first of all, from the Princess of Saxe-Altenburg. Her position was supported by all the representatives of the metropolitan section of the IRMS – the deputy chairman Prince Alexander Obolensky, the secretary of the directorate Vladimir Napravnik and others.

Admonishing the Tambov gubernator to cease his attacks on the director of the local musical college, the

Princess of Saxe-Altenburg demonstrated a firmness of a practical and a moral position. In one of a series of responses to Muratov (from September 22, 1909) she reacts not without wit to a demand for a repeated inspection of the Musical College: “...taking into consideration that from the content of your report from August 25, 1909, it demonstratively follows that all of your displeasure with Mr. Starikov and your unwillingness to see him the D[irect]or of the Mus[ic] Col[lege] stem from his belonging to the Jewish nation – for me even the aim of such an inspection is perceived to be incomprehensible, since the fact itself of Mr. Starikov being a representative of the Jewish people is not prone to any doubt and does not require any verification”<sup>9</sup>.

It is important to note here that the Princess of Saxe-Altenburg left to Muratov his right for his own position intact, without repudiating or denouncing it.

For a further comparison of the two stories we shall take note of several important observations. In the case of Starikov all the protests came only from the gubernator and his group of associates, while the local management of the IRMS was entirely on the side of the director of the Musical College. The Main Directorate in St. Petersburg, in essence, assumed the position of non-interference, albeit, it determinedly rejected all the pretensions towards Solomon Starikov. It is not clear how this confrontation would have ended, had Nikolai Muratov not left Tambov in 1912, having been appointed to a new position elsewhere. It is quite possible that, notwithstanding his successful work and the intercession of the Main Directorate of the IRMS, Starikov would have been forced to leave his work position, which is what happened with our other hero, Matvey Pressman.

The beginning of the conflict around the Rostov Musical College pertains already to the first years of Pressman’s directorship. Thus, in 1900 the Rostov newspaper “Priazovskiy kray” [“The Near-Azov Region”] lamented: “A new history has begun since the time the supervision of the musical classes passed to Mr. Pressman, upon the invitation of the directorate. <...> In the opinion of Mr. Pressman, from now on, instead of the directorate and all of society, only Mr. Pressman may exist. <...> I quite agree with those who acknowledges in Mr. Pressman’s actions a direct violation of the social authorization, which in the life of the local section of the Musical Society must be maintained by the directorate, and not by Mr. Pressman. There exist authorized limitations, even for such energetic people in whom dictatorial inclinations are developed uncommonly broadly”<sup>10</sup>.

These complaints did have real foundations. Testimonies of the harshness of Pressman's methods may also be found in later documents pertaining to the time of his work in the position of inspector of the Saratov Conservatory. There his disciplinary penalties aroused protests from several teachers at once, which found expression in their complaints to the director of the conservatory<sup>11</sup> (although the true motives of these complaints have still to be elucidated, which for now does not form a part of our goals).

Here the important distinction of "the Pressman affair" from "the Starikov affair" has been revealed: if the attacks on Starikov possessed the character of a "sporadically declared war," in the case of Pressman the conflict matured slowly during the course of several years, without having burdened the Main Directorate, which was first compelled to turn its attention to it in 1911.

The other no less significant difference from the situation on Rostov-on-Don consisted in the fact that the main motive for the persecution of Pressman was in the methods of his directorship, while the complaints arose predominantly from members of the regional directorate of the IRMS. The nationality issue also played a noticeable role here, too (testimonies of which have been cited above), but in the official complaints directed to St. Petersburg this motive did not spring up – maybe because in Rostov the story of Starikov had already been known, as was the position taken up by the director in St. Petersburg.

The beginning of the conflict was clearly indicated in Sergei Rachmaninoff's well-known letter to the Princess of Saxe-Altenburg, in which the assistant chairman of the IRMS, who already had experience of inspections of provincial colleges, himself asks to be directed to Rostov to investigate the aroused conflict: "Yesterday the director of the college M. Pressman arrived from Rostov-o[n]-D[on] to see me. The aim of his arrival was to tell me about those squabbles, nitpickings and pinpricks which are spattering on him from the local Directorate. <...> Personally I consider Pressman to be a most honest person, a highly qualified pedagogue, who loves his work to the level of self-forgetfulness. <...> Could you find it possible and desired... to authorize me to carry out an investigation, having officially notified the Rostov directorate about this?" [5, pp. 36–37].

Here it is important to note that all the pretensions towards Pressman, just as in the case with Starikov, possess an obvious irrational, purely emotional character. The representatives of the local management of the IRMS and their supporters from

the Rostov administration, just as the local journalists, do not bring out practically any functional argument against Pressman's administrative actions. All the reproaches come down to cases of peeved self-esteem and resentments at the harsh independence of the judgments and actions of the director of the college.

Apparently, this was seen and understood very well by Sergei Rachmaninoff, since he recounts in his report letter to Prince Alexander Obolensky from September 29, 1911 about the investigation of "the Pressman affair": "If I were asked what I thought about a brief inspection of this affair, I would say the following: in the case of both sides this conflict has passed onto a personal level, that both sides are at fault to various degrees: the Directorate is at fault for its censoriousness and its pressing, as well for its wish to get rid of an undesired person at all costs, and Pressman – for his stubbornness and certain amount of harshness. But if I were asked, whom I would forfeit, in the end, for the sake of justice, I would answer, that I would forfeit the Directorate, even though I understand that this answer is insufficiently substantiated and heretical" [Ibid., pp. 38–39].

Here already we can see the beginning of the confrontation of the Central Directorate and Rachmaninoff, who was ready to renounce his position of assistant chairman of the IRMS in protest against the incapability of the St. Petersburg section to take decisive measures.

It is perceptible from the published written correspondence connected with these circumstances that both sides rejected making any concessions, and the result of all of the efforts to quench the conflict was a telegram from the Princess of Saxe-Altenburg directed to Pressman: "[To] my great regret, in light of the unsuccessful attempt at a reconciliation and the impossibility for you to continue your service, despite the unanimous decision of the Directorate, I consider it [that] any further participation on my part can no longer have any beneficial consequences, and for this reasons I urge you to act according to your sole discretion" [Ibid., p. 388].

It was customary for all present-day commentators to evaluate such a decision as a morally assailable position of withdrawal: "the directorate simply washed its hands" one author sums up the situation [3, p. 49].

A similar evaluation of this situation was also given by many of the contemporaries of the participants of the conflict. This is testified by a post by Vyacheslav Karatygin published in the newspaper "Rech" ["Speech"] on June 2, 1912: "...a new and rather pitiable incident in our musical world broke



out. As it is known, even from the previous summer in the Rostov Section of the Imperial Russian Musical Society a conflict ‘worked out’ between the respectable musical activist, the director of the mus[ical] college affiliated to the Rostov Section of the Imperial Russian Musical Society Mr. Pressman and the directorate of the selfsame section. <...> It came to an investigation of the incident in the Central Directorate... Meanwhile, the side of Pressman was taken up by the well-known composer-pianist, conductor and musical public figure – Sergei Vassilievich Rachmaninoff, who declared that if Pressman is removed from his job, he, Rachmaninoff will also resign from the board of the Main Directorate. <...> It ended with an outcome which was unlikely from the perspective of ordinary human logic, but which was similar as two drops of water to the outcomes of the majority of conflicts of living people with formalist clerks. Pressman was fired. Rachmaninoff resigned from the Main Directorate”<sup>12</sup>.

However, within a few years the sad outcome of this history turned out for the good. Matvey Pressman, who after his dismissal from Rostov was working in the recently opened Saratov Conservatory received in November 1913 the following collective letter, which held 73 signatures:

“To Professor  
of the Saratov Conservatory  
Mr. Matvey Leontyevich Pressman  
Dear Highly Esteemed  
Matvey Leontyevich.

From the time of your departure to Saratov, we, to our deepest regret, have been deprived of a highly experienced, talented and conscientious pedagogue, which you had been. Up to now we have not been able to achieve full satisfaction in our search for such a pedagogue. For this reason, we have resolved to make the attempt to ask you, whether you would deem it possible to settle in our city of Rostov-on-Don, where you could once again be able to assume direction in the dissemination of the true art of playing the piano.

Rostov-on-Don, November 21, 1913”<sup>13</sup>.

Pressman responded to this appellation and soon returned to Rostov-on-Don, where he opened his own private conservatory, avoiding thereafter any

cooperation with the IRMS. After 1921 he successfully worked in Baku and Moscow, where he died in 1941.

The fate of the first director of the Rostov Musical College poses a number of important questions: could “the Pressman affair” have ultimately been completed in his favor, had the Main Directorate in its due time taken decisive measures and as a disciplinary measure stopped the persecution of Pressman? Maybe, then would the conflict have gone into the depths, having turned into an abscess which was impossible to heal? Could Pressman’s countrymen and contemporaries have evaluated his immense contribution to the development of musical culture, had they not been deprived of his presence in the city for an entire year? And also – did the Main Directorate have any disciplinary levers of influence on the participants of the conflict? All of these questions demand further special careful examination.

For the present, let us draw a few conclusions. First of all, the interrelations of the Main Directorate and the representatives of the local authorities (including the sections of the IRMS) unsheathe a deep mental and moral fissure: justice and delicacy from the side of the enlightened big city managements and the petty interests of provincial society, remote from genuine artistic goals. The reason for this, in all likelihood, was the gulf on the level of cultural development between the capital and the provinces, characteristic for Russian culture and always fraught with conflicts<sup>14</sup>. Also of great significance was the artistically insufficiently effective organizational structure of the IRMS, marked for a long time by researchers, in which the local managements consisted predominantly of representatives of the government and the commercial elites of the cities (thus, during the period of the particularly acute conflict with Pressman he remained the sole musician in the Rostov directorate of the IRMS). It must be said, that structure was at the time in many ways forced and the only possible one.

However, the most important thing that both examined stories bear witness of is the great devotion to their work and the self-sacrificing attitude of Russian musicians, who in the most difficult conditions created the cultural traditions of the Russian province.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Differently, albeit in some ways somewhat similarly, the musical educational institutions developed outside of the structure of the IRMS. Frequently a

crucial role in them was played by musicians who received their education in the two Russian capitals (see, for example: [8]).

<sup>2</sup> Pressman M. L. *Moi vospominaniya o Muzykal'nom uchilishche v Rostove-na-Donu* [My Reminiscences about the Musical College in Rostov-on-Don. Notebook 1]. *Personal Archive of S. G. Medvedev*.

<sup>3</sup> Letter of the gubernator of Tambov N. P. Muratov to the Main Directorate of the IRMO from April 22, 1909. *Central State Historical Archive of St. Petersburg (TsGIA SPb)*. F. 408. Inv. 1. D. 574, p. 33. Copy.

<sup>4</sup> Reviziya muzykal'nogo uchilishcha [Inspection of the Musical College]. *Tambovskiy vestnik [Tambov Herald]*. 1909. May 9 (22), p. 3.

<sup>5</sup> Collective letter to A. N. Naryshkina from November 10, 1911. *TsGIA SPb*. F. 408. Inv. 1. D. 574, p. 132.

<sup>6</sup> See: Letter of Prince N. N. Cholokayev to the Main Directorate of the IRMS from March 22, 1912. *Ibid.*, p. 134–135.

<sup>7</sup> Letter of N. P. Muratov to the Main Directorate of the IRMS from August 25, 1909. *Ibid.*, p. 48.

<sup>8</sup> In the two examined stories xenophobia and antisemitism were displayed predominantly by representatives of regional administrations and commercial circles. However, such attitudes were at times also seized by the musical community, to which Richard Taruskin imposingly turns his attention in his research works (see, for example: [11]).

<sup>9</sup> Letter of E. G. Saxe-Altenburg to N. P. Muratov from September 22, 1909. *TsGIA SPb*. F. 408. Inv. 1. D. 574, p. 54.

<sup>10</sup> Nebessmertny. *Zloby dnya* [Not Immortal. Topics of the Day]. *Priazovskiy kray [The Near-Azov Region]*. 1900. October 5, p. 2.

<sup>11</sup> See: *Zayavleniya prepodavateley Saratovskoy konservatorii* [Statements of Faculty Members of the Saratov Conservatory]. *TsGIA SPb*. F. 408. Inv. 1. D. 318, pp. 179–183.

<sup>12</sup> Karatygin V. G. *Otstavka Rakhmaninova [Rachmaninoff's Resignation]*. *Rech [Speech]*. 1912. June 2 (15), p. 5.

<sup>13</sup> *Pis'mo-obrashchenie gruppy pedagogov Rostovskogo-na-Donu muzykal'nogo uchilishcha M. L. Presmanu* [A Letter of a Group of Pedagogues of the Rostov-on-Don Musical College to M. L. Pressman]. *Russian National Museum of Music*. F. 11. D. 264. P. 1–1 backside. The orthography of the document has been preserved.

<sup>14</sup> The traditionally complex relations between the Russian province and the country's cultural centers are specially examined in contemporary research works (see, for example: [9; 10]).

## REFERENCES

1. Belkin A. M. *Tambovskiy kray naveki v serdtse: kraevedcheskie ocherki* [The Tambov Area Retained Forever in the Heart: Essays of Regional Lore Study]. Tambov: Tambovpoligrafizdat, 2007. 157 p.
2. Kaz'mina E. O. *Muzykal'naya kul'tura Tambovskogo kraya, 1786–1917: dis. ... kand. iskusstvovedeniya* [The Musical Culture of the Tambov Area, 1786–1917: Dissertation for the Degree of Candidate of Arts]. Moscow, 2000. 256 p.
3. Kokkezova A. M. *Muzykal'no-obshchestvennaya deyatel'nost' M. L. Presmana i ee rol' v razvitiy muzykal'noy kul'tury Rostova-na-Donu v kontse XIX – nachale XX veka: dis. ... kand. iskusstvovedeniya* [The Musical-Educational Activities of M. L. Pressman and Its Role in the Development of the Musical Culture of Rostov-on-Don in the Late 19th and Early 20th Century: Dissertation for the Degree of Candidate of Arts]. Rostov-on-Don, 2017. 237 p.
4. Krylova A. V. The Role of the Imperial Russian Musical Society in the Formation of the Musical Infrastructure of Rostov-on-Don. *Problemy muzykal'noj nauki/Music Scholarship*. 2016. No. 1, pp. 83–89. (In Russ.) DOI: 10.17674/1997-0854.2016.1.083-089.
5. Rakhmaninov S. V. *Literaturnoe nasledie: v 3 t.* [Rachmaninoff, Sergei V. Literary Heritage in 3 Vol.]. Compilation, Edition, Introduction, Commentaries, Index by Z. A. Apetian. Moscow: Sovetskiy kompozitor, 1980. T. 2: Pis'ma [Vol. 2: Letters]. 583 p.
6. Romashchuk I. M. Opyt proshlogo kak proektsiya budushchego. Matvey Leont'evich Presman [An Experience of the Past as a Projection of the Future: Matvey Leont'evich Pressman]. *Obrazovanie v sfere kul'tury* [Education in the Sphere of Culture]. 2013. No. 1, pp. 29–35.
7. Smetannikova A. Yu. *Rol' tvorcheskikh soyuzov i kontsertnykh uchrezhdeniy v organizatsii muzykal'noy zhizni provintsial'nogo goroda v kontse XIX – nachale XX veka: na primere g. Rostova-na-Donu: dis. ... kand. iskusstvovedeniya* [The Role of Artistic Unions and Concert Institutions in Organizing Musical Life in Provincial Town from the Late 19th to the Early of the 20th Century: On the Example of the City of Rostov-on-Don: Dissertation for the Degree of Candidate of Arts]. Rostov-on-Don, 2016. 216 p.
8. Stroy L. R., Tsaryova E. S. The Role of Pavel Ivanov-Radkevich in Forming the Cultural Space of Krasnoyarsk in the Late 19th and Early 20th Centuries. *Problemy muzykal'noj nauki/Music Scholarship*. 2017. No. 4, pp. 143–150. (In Russ.) DOI: 10.17674/1997-0854.2017.4.143-150.

9. Trembovel'sky E. B. Organizatsiya kul'turnogo prostranstva v Rossii: otnoshenie tsentrov i periferii [The Organization of Cultural Space in Russia: The Relations between the Center and the Periphery]. *Musykal'naya akademiya* [Musical Academy]. 2003. No. 2, pp. 132–137.

10. Parts L. The Russian Provinces as a Cultural Myth. *Studies in Russian and Soviet Cinema*. 2016. Vol. 10, No. 3, pp. 200–205.

11. Taruskin R. *Defining Russia Musically. Historical and Hermeneutical Essays*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2000. 561 p.

*About the author:*

**Vera B. Valkova**, Dr.Sci. (Arts), Professor at the Music History Department, Russian Gnesins' Academy of Music (161069, Moscow, Russia), **ORCID: 0000-0002-5858-0613**, veraval@yandex.ru

 **ЛИТЕРАТУРА** 

1. Белкин А. М. Тамбовский край навеки в сердце: краеведческие очерки. Тамбов: Тамбовполиграфиздат, 2007. 157 с.

2. Казьмина Е. О. Музыкальная культура Тамбовского края, 1786–1917 гг.: дис. ... канд. искусствоведения. М., 2000. 256 с.

3. Коккезова А. М. Музыкально-общественная деятельность М. Л. Пресмана и её роль в развитии музыкальной культуры Ростова-на-Дону в конце XIX – начале XX века: дис. ... канд. искусствоведения. Ростов-на-Дону, 2017. 237 с.

4. Крылова А. В. Роль Императорского Русского музыкального общества в формировании музыкальной структуры Ростова-на-Дону // Проблемы музыкальной науки. 2016. № 1. С. 83–89.  
DOI: 10.17674/1997-0854.2016.1.083-089.

5. Рахманинов С. В. Литературное наследие: в 3 т. / сост.-ред., авт. вступ. ст., коммент., указ. З. А. Апетян. М.: Советский композитор, 1980. Т. 2: Письма. 583 с.

6. Ромашук И. М. Опыт прошлого как проекция будущего. Матвей Леонтьевич Пресман // Образование в сфере искусства. 2013. № 1. С. 29–35.

7. Сметанникова А. Ю. Роль творческих союзов и концертных учреждений в организации музыкальной жизни провинциального города конца XIX – первой половины XX века: на примере г. Ростова-на-Дону: дис. ... канд. искусствоведения. Ростов-на-Дону, 2016. 216 с.

8. Строй Л. Р., Царёва Е. С. Роль П. И. Иванова-Радкевича в формировании культурного пространства Красноярска конца XIX – начала XX века // Проблемы музыкальной науки. 2017. № 4. С. 143–150.  
DOI: 10.17674/1997-0854.2017.4.143-150.

9. Трембовельский Е. Б. Организация культурного пространства в России: отношение центров и периферии // Музыкальная академия. 2003. № 2. С. 132–137.

10. Parts L. The Russian Provinces as a Cultural Myth // *Studies in Russian and Soviet Cinema*. 2016. Vol. 10, No. 3, pp. 200–205.

11. Taruskin R. *Defining Russia Musically. Historical and Hermeneutical Essays*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2000. 561 p.

*Об авторе:*

**Валькова Вера Борисовна**, доктор искусствоведения, профессор кафедры истории музыки, Российская академия музыки им. Гнесиных (161069, г. Москва, Россия), **ORCID: 0000-0002-5858-0613**, veraval@yandex.ru

