

# **Heinrich Neuhaus: Aesthetics and Philosophy of an Interpretation**

**Maria Razumovskaya**

**A thesis submitted to the Royal College of Music (London)  
For the degree of Doctor of Philosophy**

**December 2014**



## Abstract

This thesis investigates one of the key figures of Russian pianism in the twentieth century, Heinrich Gustavovich Neuhaus (1888 – 1964). Although Neuhaus is known, particularly in the West, as an important pedagogue of the Moscow Conservatory rather than a performing artist in his own right, this thesis seeks to address the tension between Neuhaus's identities as a pedagogue and his overshadowed conception of himself as a performer – thus presenting a fuller understanding of his specific attitude to the task of musical interpretation.

The reader is introduced to aspects of Neuhaus's biography which became decisive factors in the formation of his key aesthetic, philosophical, pedagogical and performative beliefs. The diverse national influences in Neuhaus's upbringing – from his familial circumstances, European education and subsequent career in Russia – are investigated in order to help locate Neuhaus within the wider contexts of Russian and Central European culture at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In addition, this introduction will highlight ways in which Neuhaus's national identity has been oversimplified in recent literature by both Russian and non-Russian authors. Whilst this thesis draws on a range of contemporaneous and recent international sources throughout its investigation, it presents a substantial amount of Russian-language material that has previously been unavailable in an English translation: this includes many writings and articles by Heinrich Neuhaus, his colleagues and the leading musicologists and critics of his time.

The core of the thesis traces Neuhaus's personal philosophical approach to the act of performance and explores the impact it had on his interpretations of Beethoven and Chopin. This will show that despite aspiring to a modern, *Urtext*-centred approach and sensibility to the score, Neuhaus's Romantic subjectivity meant that he was unafraid of making assumptions and decisions which often misinterpreted or transformed the image of the composer to reflect his own artistic identity. Thus, the investigation of Heinrich Neuhaus as a performing artist, alongside his role as a pedagogue, presents a powerful model of interpretation as a creative process, from which performers today can learn.

## Table of Contents

Abstract .....	iii
Table of Contents .....	iv
Table of Figures .....	vi
Contents of CD.....	viii
Acknowledgements .....	ix
Notes on Translation and Transliterations .....	x
Introduction.....	1
Review of Literature .....	8
Chapter 1 An Introduction to Issues of Cultural Identity and Heritage in Relation to Neuhaus	19
Chapter 2 Heinrich Neuhaus's Aesthetics of Interpretation .....	43
2.1 Forging identities: Relinquishing composition to become a pianist-interpreter .....	46
2.2 The concept of the 'interpreter' in Russian thought .....	50
2.3 Emotional Realism in the Visual Arts.....	57
2.4 Interpretation through the concept of experience as emotion.....	64
2.5 German elements in Heinrich Neuhaus's aesthetics.....	68
2.6 The role of Ferruccio Busoni .....	70
2.7 Approach to the musical score .....	77
2.8 Issues of technique .....	84
2.9 Analytical and poetic approaches to pianism.....	97
2.10 Towards a transformative interpretational process.....	106
Chapter 3 Heinrich Neuhaus's Beethoven: The Romantic Philosopher .....	115
3.1 Beethoven in the context of Neuhaus's career and epoch .....	115
3.2 Neuhaus's identification of Beethoven through philosophy.....	121
3.3 Neuhaus's identification of Beethoven through pianism .....	146
3.4 Building an interpretation: Neuhaus as Beethoven .....	178
Chapter 4 Heinrich Neuhaus's Chopin: The Romantic Enigma.....	209
4.1 Neuhaus's application of philosophical ideas to the image of Chopin .....	210
4.2 Issues of national identity.....	232

4.3 Chopin pianists in Neuhaus's conception.....	252
4.4 The wider artistic consideration of Romantic Realism.....	264
4.5 Neuhaus's performances of Chopin: Case studies .....	276
Chapter 5 Pedagogue, Pianist or Artist-Philosopher?.....	303
Conclusion.....	337
List of Names.....	342
Bibliography .....	367

## Table of Figures

Figure 1 Isaak Levitan's <i>Вечерний звон</i> [ <i>Evening Bells</i> ], 1892. Oil on canvas (0.87m x 1.70m). Tretyakov Gallery, Moscow. ....	59
Figure 2 Hovhannes Aivazovsky. <i>Девятый вал</i> [ <i>The Ninth Wave</i> ], 1850. Oil on Canvas (2.21m x 3.32m). Russian State Museum of Art, Saint Petersburg.....	63
Figure 3 The second bar of the extract in Liszt's <i>Rhapsodie espagnole</i> S. 254.....	89
Figure 4 The third movement of Opus 31 no. 2 <i>Allegretto</i> . Bars 32–56. ....	143
Figure 5 The third movement of Opus 31 no. 2. <i>Allegretto</i> . Bars 64–76 .....	143
Figure 6 Heinrich Neuhaus, photograph c. 1950s as presented on the first page of Yakov Milstein's <i>Heinrich Neuhaus</i> (Moscow: 1983).....	162
Figure 7 'Typhoon over England' – Caricature of Anton Rubinstein in <i>Punch</i> (1886) .....	162
Figure 8 Third movement from Beethoven's Sonata No. 31 in A-flat major Opus 110. Bars 4–6. Schlesinger first edition. ....	168
Figure 9 Third movement from Beethoven's Sonata No. 31 in A-flat major Opus 110. Bars 4–6. Hans von Bülow, Cotta edition. ....	168
Figure 10 Bars 1–8 from the second movement of Opus 27 no. 2 .....	175
Figure 11 Bars 37–44 from the second movement of Opus 27 no. 2 .....	175
Figure 12 Ivan Shishkin's <i>Утро в сосновом лесу</i> [ <i>Morning in the Pine-Forest</i> ] (1889). Oil on canvas (1.39m x 2.13m). Tretyakov Gallery, Moscow. ....	189
Figure 13 The second movement, <i>Allegro molto</i> , from Opus 110. Bars 144–158 .....	198
Figure 14 The third movement from Opus 110. Bars 7–16 .....	200
Figure 15 The third movement of Opus 110. Bars 26 <sup>2</sup> –53.....	205
Figure 16 The third movement of Opus 110. Bars 98–115.....	205
Figure 17 Bars 131–143 .....	207
Figure 18 Photograph, 1937 (unknown photographer). Returning from the Chopin Competition at the Belorussky Rail Station in Moscow. Left to Right: Heinrich Neuhaus with laureates Yakov Zak, Rosa Tamarkina and Nina Emelyanova. ....	243
Figure 19 Heinrich Neuhaus's lesson: Neuhaus is standing behind the piano and Sviatoslav Richter plays. Photograph c. 1940.....	278
Figure 20 Chopin's Sonata No.3 in B minor Opus 58. Bars 1–11. ....	283
Figure 21 Chopin's Piano Sonata No.3 in B minor Opus 58. Bars 41–48 .....	283
Figure 22 The opening of Chopin's Sonata No. 3 Opus 58.....	285
Figure 23 Chopin's <i>Polonaise-Fantaisie</i> Opus 61. Bars 1–3 .....	286
Figure 24 Chopin's <i>Polonaise-Fantaisie</i> Opus 61. Bars 16–22 .....	288
Figure 25 Chopin's <i>Polonaise-Fantaisie</i> Opus 61. Bar 1 .....	289
Figure 26 Chopin's <i>Polonaise-Fantaisie</i> Opus 61. Bars 19–29.....	290
Figure 27 Chopin's <i>Polonaise-Fantaisie</i> Opus 61. Bars 245–251 .....	291
Figure 28 Chopin's <i>Ballade</i> No. 1 in G minor Opus 23. Bars 250–257 .....	296

Figure 29 Chopin's <i>Lento 'Funeral March'</i> from Piano Sonata No. 2 in B-flat minor Opus 35. Bars 36–45 .....	300
Figure 30 Chopin's <i>Lento 'Funeral March'</i> from Piano Sonata No. 2 in B-flat minor Opus 35. Bars 56–60 .....	301
Figure 31 Heinrich Neuhaus surrounded by his students, early 1950s. Image courtesy of the Museum of the Moscow State Conservatory. ....	311
Figure 32 Fryderyk Chopin. <i>Ballade No. 4</i> in F minor Opus 52. Bars 15–18 .....	313

## Contents of CD

1. Excerpt from Mozart: Rondo K. 511  
Heinrich Neuhaus (1950) from Talents of Russia, 1996 [RCD 16244]
2. Excerpt from Beethoven: *Allegretto* from Piano Sonata No. 17 'Tempest' Opus 31 no. 2 (third movement)  
Heinrich Neuhaus (c. 1950s) from Classical Records, 2008 [CR-099]
3. Excerpt from Beethoven: *Allegretto* from Piano Sonata No. 17 'Tempest' Opus 31 no. 2 (third movement)  
Emil Gilels (1982) from Deutsche Grammophon Gesellschaft, 2006 [DGG 4776360/6]
4. Beethoven: *Allegretto* from Piano Sonata No. 14 'Moonlight' Opus 27 no. 2 (second movement)  
Heinrich Neuhaus (c. 1950s) from Classical Records, 2008 [CR-099]
5. Beethoven: *Allegretto* from Piano Sonata No. 14 'Moonlight' Opus 27 no. 2 (second movement)  
Maria Grinberg (c. 1960s) from Melodiya, 2013 [MEL 1002025/4]
6. Beethoven: *Allegretto* from Piano Sonata No. 14 'Moonlight' Opus 27 no. 2 (second movement)  
Emil Gilels (1981) from Deutsche Grammophon Gesellschaft, 2006 [DGG 4776360/5]
7. Beethoven: *Adagio – Fuga* from Piano Sonata No. 31 Opus 110  
Heinrich Neuhaus (c. 1950s) from Classical Records [CR-099]
8. Beethoven: *Adagio – Fuga* from Piano Sonata No. 31 Opus 110  
Maria Grinberg (c. 1960s) from Melodiya, 2013 [MEL 1002025/9]
9. Excerpt from Chopin: *Allegro maestoso* from Piano Sonata No. 3 Opus 58  
Heinrich Neuhaus (1949) from Classical Records, 2006 [CR-084]
10. Excerpt from Chopin: *Allegro maestoso* from Piano Sonata No. 3 Opus 58  
Lev Oborin (1951) from Appian Publications & Recordings Ltd, 2009 [APR5668]
11. Chopin: *Polonaise-Fantaisie* Opus 61  
Vladimir Horowitz (1966) from Sony Classical, 2001 [SX10K89765/89772]
12. Chopin: *Polonaise-Fantaisie* Opus 61  
Heinrich Neuhaus (1958) from Classical Records, 2006 [CR-084]
13. Chopin: *Marche Funèbre* from Piano Sonata No. 2 Opus 35  
Heinrich Neuhaus (1949) from Classical Records, 2006 [CR-084]



## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to express my most sincere gratitude to all those who advised and encouraged me in the writing of this thesis. In particular I would like to thank my directing supervisor Dr Natasha Loges, Dr Amanda Glauert, Professor Dmitri Alexeev and Professor Geoffrey Norris for their kindness and selfless sharing of their expertise.

I am also deeply grateful to the Arts and Humanities Research Council and the Royal College of Music for their generous support of my doctoral studies, without which this thesis would not have been possible.

## Notes on Translation and Transliterations

This thesis draws on many Russian sources which are not currently translated into English, and indeed are currently out of print in Russia. When a few Russian sources are available in translations, namely Heinrich Neuhaus's *About the Art of Piano Playing* translated by K. A. Leibovich (1973), one transcript of Neuhaus's lesson in Christopher Barnes's *The Russian Piano School* (2008) and Konstantin Stanislavsky's work, this thesis has chosen to use the vernacular texts. This is because the translations contain sometimes significant omissions. Also, this thesis chooses to translate some words or sentences in a more specific manner than is reflected across wider literary practice. These instances will be made clear in the text of the thesis itself.

All translations in this thesis are my own unless otherwise stated. The principle in the translations has been to retain, as closely as possible, the idiosyncrasies of the original. Where a word cannot be directly translated, the vernacular is given in square brackets. If a source is Russian, its first appearance as a footnote will be given in Russian first, followed by an English translation. The transliteration of all Russian sources (in accordance with the UNESCO transliteration system) can be located in the bibliography. Subsequently, only the translated title will be footnoted. Any texts by Russian authors which are originally published in English can be differentiated by the source being given *only* in English in both footnotes and the bibliography. All authors and editors of Russian sources can be additionally differentiated by the fact that they are referenced in the footnotes with two initials – name and patronymic e.g. Г. Г. Нейрауз subsequently becomes H. G. Neuhaus. Any foreign language terms (Russian, French, German etc.) are given in that language and appropriate alphabet, with the English translation following in square brackets. This will be particularly vital to differentiate between Russian and other Slavic language terms investigated (*жаль* and *žal*) as transliteration of the Cyrillic will make the discussion nonsensical.

Because it is an established practice in Russia to publish anthologies of articles, some of the sources mentioned might exist in a number of different publications. Whilst most of the footnotes give the location of the article through anthologies, the bibliography also includes their original publication where possible, such as the original musicological journal (*Советское искусство, Советская музыка* etc.) and its year and number. Where there is a difference in two versions or editions, the year will be given to clarify this – for example, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1958) for the first edition, or *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) to indicate the revised edition.

Russian names in the thesis are presented in accordance to their widespread Western spellings and not by the UNESCO transliteration system to avoid confusion, for instance *Heinrich Gustavovich Neuhaus* and not *Genrih Gustavovič Nejgauz*. The names of authors can be found in accordance to the UNESCO transliteration in the bibliography. It must be noted however, that Neuhaus's name can also be found in other variants across a range of other sources including: Henry Neigauz, Genrikh Neuhaus and Henry Neuhaus. Where this is the case, the format will be kept as in the cited source.

Due to the number of unfamiliar names which might appear in this thesis, the dates of persons mentioned is given in the *List of Names*, along with a brief description.



## Introduction

Few pianist-pedagogues of the twentieth century can rival the fame of Heinrich Gustavovich Neuhaus (1888–1964). Fifty years after his death, Neuhaus today remains a much-revered figure in the Moscow Conservatory. During his lifetime his stature was monumental. Known as ‘Heinrich the Great’ [‘Генрих Великий’] since the 1930s, Neuhaus’s persona was immortalized by the country’s greatest poets such as Osip Mandelstam, Boris Pasternak and Bella Akhmadulina.<sup>1</sup> In the supplementary essay to the first edition of Heinrich Neuhaus’s famous book *Об искусстве фортепианной игры: записки педагога* [*About the Art of Piano Playing: Notes of a Pedagogue*] (1958), the musicologist Yakov Milstein wrote: ‘The name Heinrich Neuhaus [...] is inseparable from the successes of the Soviet Piano School.’<sup>2</sup> Taking a broader view in his survey and collection of translated articles, *The Russian Piano School* (2007), Christopher Barnes argued:

During the mid-twentieth century, Neuhaus, [Alexander] Goldenweiser, and [Konstantin] Igumnov were doyens and central pillars of the Moscow Conservatoire piano department, and between them, directly or indirectly, they shaped and polished all the major Russian stars of the last half-century; via pupils they have passed on their legacy to subsequent generations.<sup>3</sup>

Indeed even discounting the ‘hundreds’ of ‘musically defective students’ that ‘passed through’ Neuhaus’s hands, the list of brilliant pianists who counted themselves amongst his students is

---

<sup>1</sup> The musicologist Igor Belza identified the epithet ‘Heinrich the Great’ to have stemmed back to the autumn of 1933 when Karol Szymanowski met Muscovite musicians in the green room of the Bolshoi Zal (Grand Hall) of the Moscow Conservatory, and in the Polish embassy in Moscow (see E. P. Рихтер (составитель), *Вспоминая Нейгауза*, 1992 (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2007) [E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus*, 1992 (Moscow: 2007)] p. 74). Osip Mandelstam wrote the poem *Рояль* [*The (Grand) Piano*], dated 16 April 1931, which is about Neuhaus. Boris Pasternak wrote the poem *Баллада* [*Ballade*] in 1930, but also made covert references in other works. Bella Akhmadulina’s poem *Памяти Генриха Нейгауза* [*In Memory of Heinrich Neuhaus*] was composed after his death in 1977.

<sup>2</sup> Я. И. Мильштейн, ‘Генрих Нейгауз’ in Г. Г. Нейгауз, *Об искусстве фортепианной игры* (Москва: «Государственное Музыкальное Издательство», 1958) [Y. I. Milstein, ‘Heinrich Neuhaus’ in H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (Moscow: 1958)] p. 271. Neuhaus’s work has been translated into many languages including English: H. G. Neuhaus, *The Art of Piano Playing* translated by K. A. Leibovitch (London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1973). Because Leibovitch’s translation has many omissions in comparison to Neuhaus’s 1961 revision, this thesis will refer to Neuhaus’s 1958 and 1961 vernacular versions, and will re-translate the relevant quotations into English.

<sup>3</sup> C. Barnes, *The Russian Piano School. Russian Pianists and Moscow Conservatoire Professors on the Art of the Piano* translated and edited by C. Barnes, 2007 (London: Kahn & Averill, 2008) p. xix.

impressive.<sup>4</sup> In no particular order, these include Emil Gilels and Sviatoslav Richter (two of the most famous pianists of the twentieth century who had studied with Neuhaus in the 1930s); Yakov Zak, Teodor Gutman and Vera Razumovskaya (also students from the first decade of Neuhaus's teaching career who combined performance with pedagogy), Anatoly Vedernikov (best known for his performances with Sviatoslav Richter); Stanislav Neuhaus, Yevgeny Malinin and Lev Naumov (Neuhaus's teaching assistants in the late 1950s, whom he affectionately called his 'Three Bogatyr's');<sup>5</sup> Alexei Lyubimov (who also became a fortepiano specialist); and from Neuhaus's later years of teaching, pianist-pedagogues including Anton Ginzburg, Alexei Nasedkin, Yevgeny Mogilevsky, Vera Gornostaeva, Vladimir Krainev, Eliso Virsaladze and Elena Richter.<sup>6</sup>

As a pianist Neuhaus's persona was such that he could be easily seen to fit into the 'Great Tradition' of 'immortal' pianists which, as identified by Kenneth Hamilton, runs deeply in the consciousness of musicians, critics and audiences in the twentieth century despite the questions it raises.<sup>7</sup> His student Vera Gornostaeva remembered: 'It was as if my whole childhood was a preparation for my meeting with Neuhaus. I first saw his portraits in our home.'<sup>8</sup> The sheer number of accounts which echo this statement demonstrate that Neuhaus was part of a climate where, as described by Hamilton: '[...] the piano was simply a much more vital part of the musical world, and its performers consequently invested with more authority, charisma, and freedom than we pianists would dare to hope for today.'<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Г. Г. Нейгауз, *Об искусстве фортепианной игры*, 1961 (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 1999) [H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing*, 1961 (Moscow: 1999)] p. 166.

<sup>5</sup> 'Три Богатыря' – bogatyr's were characters from Slavic legends and are akin to the 'knight-errant'.

<sup>6</sup> Often Radu Lupu is added to this list: see, for example, the editor's introduction to the English translation of Neuhaus's book, *The Art of Piano Playing* translated by K. A. Leibovitch, 1973 (London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1978); David Fanning's article 'From Russia with Love-Hate' in *International Piano No. 22. Nov–Dec. 2013* pp. 38–41; *The Russian Piano School. Russian Pianists and Moscow Conservatoire Professors on the Art of the Piano* translated and edited by C. Barnes, 2007 (London: Kahn & Averill, 2008) p. xx; and the musical encyclopaedia C. Kammertötöns & S. Mauser, *Lexikon des Klaviers. Baugeschichte, Spielpraxis, Komponisten und ihre Werke, Interpreten. Mit einem Geleitwort von Daniel Barenboim. [Encyclopaedia of the Piano. Architectural History, Performance Practice, Composers and their Works, Performers. With a foreword by Daniel Barenboim]* (Laaber: Laaber-Verlag, 2006). This is an error as Heinrich Neuhaus was already gravely ill at the time. Radu Lupu had played to Heinrich Neuhaus but studied for a time with Neuhaus's assistant and son, Stanislav Neuhaus.

<sup>7</sup> K. Hamilton, *After the Golden Age. Romantic Pianism and Modern Performance* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008).

<sup>8</sup> 'К встрече с Нейгаузом меня как будто готовили с детства. Впервые его портреты я увидела в нашем доме.' В. В. Горностаева, 'О моём учителе' in E. Р. Рихтер (составитель), *Вспоминая Нейгауза*, 1992 (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2007) [V. V. Gornostaeva, 'About my Teacher' in E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus* (Moscow: 2007)] p. 195.

<sup>9</sup> K. Hamilton, *After the Golden Age* p. 256.

However, Neuhaus is so often identified as a pedagogue that it has continually overshadowed his identity as a pianist.<sup>10</sup> Yet, as one of the first internationally significant pianist-interpreters who deliberately relinquished the act of composition, it is Neuhaus's identity as a *pianist* which provides a valuable insight into what it means in practice to combine the idea of a musical 'work' with the creative subjectivity of a pianist from the 'Great Tradition.' Importantly, it is in viewing Neuhaus as a pianist that it is possible to form an understanding of interpretation where the idea of fidelity to a composer's musical 'work' is an integral part of the process through which a performer's creative and individual pianistic 'identity' is given voice. All too often, these two notions have been presented as dichotomies. As argued by Hamilton:

Once a piece of music is released into the world, it can take on a life of its own rather different from any its creator could have expected. Musicologists, on the other hand, tend to ignore performance ideas not derived from or associated with the composer. They regard them as at best irrelevant or at worst corrupting. These performance approaches are sidelined in modern scholarly editions and often treated in books and articles as so much detritus to be cleared away before the composer's conception can once more be revealed to the world in its pristine form.<sup>11</sup>

Thus, instead of presenting the notion of a 'work' and interpretative individuality as a dichotomy, an investigation of Neuhaus's aesthetics and interpretative decisions goes a significant way to readdressing this issue as a dynamic but interdependent movement between the two. Investigating Neuhaus as a pianist-interpreter, this thesis will demonstrate that, as an artist, Neuhaus was concerned with presenting himself as one of the last guard of a great Romantic tradition (stemming from Anton Rubinstein) where subjectivity was a valid argument in the construction of a musical interpretation.

The thesis will address the above question in five parts:

- Chapter 1. *An Introduction to Issues of Cultural Identity and Heritage in Relation to Neuhaus.*
- Chapter 2. *Heinrich Neuhaus's Aesthetics of Interpretation.*

---

<sup>10</sup> This idea is explored later in this thesis. The bibliography to this thesis demonstrates that the main writings on Neuhaus both during his lifetime and today have been concerned with his pedagogy.

<sup>11</sup> K. Hamilton, *After the Golden Age* pp. 260–261.

- Two central chapters which explore how Heinrich Neuhaus's understanding of his role related to specific instances in his pianistic practice with regards to the music of Ludwig van Beethoven and Fryderyk Chopin:
  - Chapter 3. *Heinrich Neuhaus's Beethoven: The Romantic Philosopher.*
  - Chapter 4. *Heinrich Neuhaus's Chopin: The Romantic Enigma.*
- Chapter 5. *Pedagogue, Pianist or Artist-Philosopher?*

The first chapter explores the problems involved in differentiating the various 'national' aspects of Neuhaus's persona. He lived at a time when cultural identity was in many ways still linked with national schools of thought. Terms like 'Russian pianism' and 'Russian emotional Realism' therefore bore much meaning for Neuhaus and his contemporaries. Yet, as will be seen, these meanings need to be seen as distinct, for instance, from those adopted by other musicians and thinkers in Soviet times. Furthermore, Heinrich Neuhaus's cosmopolitan upbringing made him particularly sensitive to the way in which his aesthetic judgements might be understood as being responses to different heritages.

The second chapter sets out the context surrounding Neuhaus's decision to become an interpreter and the factors which influenced this. The discussion is in two parts, reflecting Neuhaus's breadth of cultural acquisitions which underpinned his understanding of what it meant to be a pianist. Firstly, the investigation will focus on the wider artistic context including art, literature, theatre and philosophy. These will be shown to demonstrate a specifically Russian aesthetic of Realism and 'emotive art' on the one hand, and a Germanic framework of ethics on the other. Secondly, the investigation turns to pianistic considerations. This demonstrates how Neuhaus's understanding of the technical aspects of interpretations is a synthesis of German and Russian influences, and focuses on figures including his professors Leopold Godowsky, Karl Barth as well as pianists whose authority Neuhaus recognized such as Anton Rubinstein and Felix Blumenfeld.

The third and fourth chapters show how Neuhaus's understanding of his role as an interpreter in the context of 'emotive art' affected the process by which he created a vision of the composer, and how this vision in turn affected his interpretation of certain works. These chapters fall into three main investigations: philosophical considerations; pianistic considerations; and specific case studies drawing upon his recorded legacy. The reason that these chapters require such extended formats is that the method of investigation aims to piece together the manner in which Neuhaus's vision of the composers was a product of a diverse range of cultural and historical considerations which he assimilated and passed through the



prism of his own distinct aesthetic understanding. The division of these considerations is artificial since Neuhaus's propensity for associative thought meant that there was a certain spontaneity and disorganization in the way he brought together ideas. The breadth of knowledge which he could draw upon to create the vision of the composer is vast, and the different aspects of his vision are interdependent. However, in the framework of a scholarly investigation, an artificial division of these ideas is helpful in forming a clearer view of the mechanisms involved.

The two chapters focus on Beethoven and Chopin because, despite his wide repertory, Neuhaus singled out these two composers as the pillars of all pianism. By the end of this discussion, it will be seen that despite applying a similar interpretational approach to both composers, Neuhaus was indeed left with two markedly different images with which he had to deal. However, in Neuhaus's attempt to, in his own words, 'get closer' to the truth of the *composer's* identity, it will be seen that Neuhaus unmistakably offers an interpretation of *himself*. The identification of how Neuhaus's understanding is reflected in his own pianism through the case studies in these chapters is through the analysis of recordings by Neuhaus and, at times, a selection of other pianists – in most cases, his colleagues or students. The emphasis here is on drawing a connection between Neuhaus's artistic persona, his acquired knowledge and outlook, and the practical characteristics of his pianism.

The final chapter will look at the impact of Neuhaus's legacy chiefly through his two students, Emil Gilels and Sviatoslav Richter, from the perspective of how they understood him. Even so, as will be argued, Neuhaus's views of interpretation in general and in particular relation to Beethoven and Chopin, are too idiosyncratic to be considered in the terms of a concrete legacy. Therefore, the focus will be mainly on what Gilels and Richter can reveal about what Neuhaus was able and willing to share with another talented musician, and which elements of his persona and system of beliefs Neuhaus was reluctant to disclose. Because the ideas of national schools have become too diffuse to trace in any meaningful way, and since Neuhaus's own legacy has arguably become increasingly diluted as time has moved on, this thesis will not consider the impact of Neuhaus's teaching today.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> In the 1980s, one of the leading Western musical critics, Harold Schonberg wrote that the 'Russian style [was] already cross-pollinated with the international style [...]'. Furthermore Schonberg considered that by the middle of the twentieth century 'Russian musicians [...] are trained to international standards. Their teachers are as interested as any Juilliard, Paris Conservatoire or Vienna Conservatory teacher in producing competition winners. The result is a new generation of musicians in the Soviet Union, who are indistinguishable from musicians elsewhere [...]. The new Russian pianists represent the

In this thesis, excerpts from relevant recordings are presented on a CD with the track numbers indicated within the text to which they refer. In certain cases annotated scores are also provided. The main reason for making reference to recordings in this thesis is to provide an indication of how, particularly with the use of *tempo rubato*, Neuhaus's concept manifested itself in his interpretation, and how this compares to the interpretation of his contemporaries. These discussions mainly look at individual phrases of specific works and are not concerned with making a detailed tempo-map to identify the architectonics of the interpretation over an entire work or movement. The metronome markings offered are averages obtained by using a KORG MA-30 metronome which allows the user to tap the tempo they wish to be identified directly into its keypad. Described as 'the traditional approach' by CHARM, it is a method which has been widely employed by musicologists who need to refer to tempo fluctuations.<sup>13</sup> This approach will almost certainly have an element of approximation, however in essence it is not an approximation that has been removed by other methods including CHARM.<sup>14</sup>

The style of pianism, in particular in the understanding of time, exemplified by Neuhaus and pianists of his time was such that there was an expectation for a substantial degree of *rubato* within the phrase whilst maintaining a sense of the 'core' tempo. The exact nature of this manipulation, unlike the 'core' tempo, was reported by numerous sources, including Neuhaus himself, to have been spontaneous and hence changing from one performance to the next.<sup>15</sup> The tempo suggested by the metronome markings in this thesis

---

new international conformity.' H. Schonberg, *The Great Pianists from Mozart to the Present*, 1963, revised edition (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1987) p. 499 & p. 465.

<sup>13</sup> For CHARM citation see [http://www.charm.rhul.ac.uk/analysing/p9\\_1.html](http://www.charm.rhul.ac.uk/analysing/p9_1.html) (accessed 08/09/2013). CHARM (Centre for the History and Analysis of Recorded Music) was established on the 1 April 2004. Musicologists applying the 'traditional' approach include Julian Hellaby, where this data is often used in conjunction with other performance data, and Raymond Holden, where this data is used to discuss the architectonics of an entire symphonic movement: see R. Holden, *Richard Strauss. A Musical Life* (London: Yale University Press, 2011).

<sup>14</sup> The reason that using CHARM's 'Sonic Visualiser' program would not remove the element of approximation discussed above is because it also requires the user's discretion since each 'beat' is input manually by pressing a specified key on the computer keyboard whilst the music is playing – thus again relying on the user's judgement and reflexes. The other issue with using CHARM's 'Sonic Visualiser' is that because it is able to mathematically calculate the small changes in tempo within the internal beats of the bar which have been set by the user (manually 'using both eyes and ears' to indicate their position over the image of the music's sound wave) rather than having to make a judgement that takes into account a broader area within the phrase, the results suggest a level of manipulation in the playing that is beyond the conscious intention of the performer. Refer to [http://www.charm.rhul.ac.uk/analysing/p9\\_1.html](http://www.charm.rhul.ac.uk/analysing/p9_1.html) (accessed 08/09/2013).

<sup>15</sup> This spontaneity therefore does not lend itself well to CHARM's data collection program which treats all tempo modification in the same manner. In order to override Sonic Visualiser's calculation of tempo

may not always seem to be accurate for the pulse between, for example, the third and fourth beats of a certain bar, but they will however represent the core tempo between one bar and the next, and of the phrases to which it refers. When it is necessary to make a distinction between a tempo which seeks to push forward in relation to the 'core tempo', this will be discussed as a tempo on the 'front edge'; a tempo which resists moving with the 'core tempo' will be referred to as on the 'back edge'.<sup>16</sup> The need for such approximation is reflective of the performance practice of the time and is unlikely to undermine the validity of the discussion as it is based on an understanding of tempo in the way it was accepted, applied and taught by Neuhaus.

The importance attached to the investigation of Neuhaus's 'psychological' identification with the composer differentiates this work from studies such as Julian Hellaby's *Reading Musical Interpretation. Case Studies in Solo Piano Performance* (Ashgate, 2009), which, although it sets itself out to be a holistic investigation, is tied exclusively to abstract interpretative parameters which Hellaby defines as tempo, topic, genre and era. The significance of a 'psychological' aspect in performance has been touched upon in Victoria von Arx's *Piano Lessons with Claudio Arrau: A Guide to His Philosophy and Technique* (Oxford University Press, 2014). Although von Arx's study acknowledges Arrau's references to 'psyche' and 'soul' as 'go[ing] beyond cognitive skills such as perceiving, remembering, evaluating, and deciding', it is largely concerned with Arrau's psychological engagement with the physical process of playing the instrument (including arm weight, speed, direction and hand position) rather than with the composer.<sup>17</sup>

An investigation of Neuhaus's beliefs and ideals reveals his dependence on a Realist aesthetic to make sense of his role as a pianist and interpreter. Both this aesthetic, and the literature surrounding it, will be discussed in detail later in this thesis. A crucial distinction to be made when speaking about the Realist aesthetics demanded by the psychological processes of 'emotive art' in this thesis, whether linked to Konstantin Stanislavsky or other figures such as Lev Tolstoy, Pavel Chistyakov and indeed Anton Rubinstein through Ferenc Liszt, is that this is a *Romantic* aesthetic, and not to be confused with 'Socialist Realism'. This has already been

---

between individual beats it is necessary to manually input the desired points to act as 'beats' which returns the task back to the one discussed above, using the computer keyboard.

<sup>16</sup> Referring to the music flowing at the 'front' or 'back' edge of the core tempo is relatively common practice among practicing musicians internationally. It is used in a musicological context by researchers interested in the architectonics of a musical performance such as Raymond Holden. See for example R. Holden, *Richard Strauss: A Musical Life* (London: Yale University Press, 2011), pp. 226–227.

<sup>17</sup> V. von Arx, *Piano Lessons with Claudio Arrau: A Guide to His Philosophy and Technique* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014) p. 77.

argued by Carl Dahlhaus in his work *Musikalischer Realismus: Zur Musikgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts* [*Realism in Nineteenth-Century Music*] (1982) although this was in relation to literature and composition rather than performance. Dahlhaus's aim was to investigate the aesthetics of 'a realism which is not exhausted in "pictorial" reproduction but extends to the reconstruction of the whole contexts of significative and functional nexuses [to offer] the prospect of a music which aspires to perceive and to transmit the substance of a reality beyond the narrow boundaries of Tonmalerei.' This interest is representative of the kind of aesthetic investigation which concerns this thesis. In setting out his parameters for his work, Dahlhaus warned: 'The moral political commitment, without which Marxist aesthetics would not be what it is, was characteristic of Russian nineteenth-century realism, in which socialist realism had its roots, but is not characteristic of realism *per se*.'<sup>18</sup>

## Review of Literature

A significant part of the Western literature to date on Russian music is strongly centred on the implications of Socialist Realism, on which the most influential contemporary authors are Richard Taruskin and Marina Frolova-Walker. Because Richard Taruskin's work, *On Russian Music* (2008) is mainly concerned with issues of composition, it focuses predominantly on the friction between 'Socialist Realism' and the avant-garde. Taruskin points out that Socialist Realism has little to do with Marxist aesthetics, calling it a 'Stalinist perversion'.<sup>19</sup> He identifies its root in Lev Tolstoy – a figure whose aesthetics will prove to be important in this thesis. Taruskin notes:

[In Tolstoy's writing on Art] logical flaws are of course gaping [...] its very slackness made Tolstoy's esthetics endlessly adaptable, or should I say adoptable. [...] Here in embryo is the whole panoply of socialist realist desiderata, in particular that formidable trio, *partiynost'*, *ideynost'*, and *narodnost'*, terms roughly translatable as 'serving the ends of the Party', 'having correct ideological content', and 'being accessible to all of the people all of the time.'<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> C. Dahlhaus, *Realism in Nineteenth-Century Music* translated by Mary Whittall (Cambridge University Press, 1985) p. 5.

<sup>19</sup> R. Taruskin, *On Russian Music* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2009) p. 367.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*

Taruskin's awareness of a Russian Realist aesthetic prior to Soviet power exists in the specific framework of the compositional practices of the 'Mighty Handful'. In *Defining Russia Musically: Historical and Hermeneutical Essays* (1997), Taruskin offers a sceptical view of the term and explores it in conjunction with some issues relating to nineteenth-century Russian opera: 'an extremist, uniquely Russian brand of musical realism that arose out of wholesale rejection of European artifice.'<sup>21</sup> Here, Taruskin's definition is not related to the psychological or 'emotive' Realism of an interpretational process which is explored in this thesis. A review of current Western literature on Russian musical aesthetics shows that the approach to such Realism in an interpretational process is still in its infancy, but nonetheless has advocates, including the American musicologist David Haas, or indirectly, Patrick Zuk.<sup>22</sup>

Despite this thesis focusing on Realism outside a political context, the circumstances of Neuhaus's life make it important to investigate sources of this time with care. Whilst Harold Schonberg's description of the circumstances in which Russian pianism operated as a 'prison camp' may be considered somewhat melodramatic, it must be noted that all writing was censored.<sup>23</sup> Certain passages in Neuhaus's articles, and those of other musicians and musicologists, from the middle of the twentieth century are littered with phrases which praise the progress and superiority of the Soviet system and make necessary allusions to Lenin and Marxist dialectics. Neuhaus, and several other figures investigated in this thesis, were highly educated, intellectual people, and such necessities often 'stick out' from their writing style. Neuhaus, for instance, makes a clear distinction in his writings between 'Marxist dialectic', where it could be seen as a superfluous phrase to 'please' the required authority, and simply 'dialectic' whereby he expects his reader to understand this as an engagement with Hegelian dialectic, which was not officially 'in favour'. Likewise, censorship meant that there were authors or works which could not be mentioned. This thesis will demonstrate, for instance, how Neuhaus was able to work his way around such a limitation with regards to the banned philosopher, Friedrich Nietzsche.

---

<sup>21</sup> R. Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically. Historical and Hermeneutical Essays*, 1997 (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2000) p. 70.

<sup>22</sup> David Haas's application of a 'psychological' portrait to Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov's opera *Ночь перед Рождеством* [*The Night before Christmas/Christmas Eve*] is based on the approach of the Soviet musicologist Boris Asafyev which investigates the idea of 'psychological' Realism. The publication of this particular research is forthcoming in 2015 ('Opera as Applied Psychology: The challenges of *Noch' pered Rozhdestvom* for Western Operatic Criticism' in the *Journal of the Saint Petersburg State Museum of Theatrical and Musical Arts*). Haas's approach can be seen in D. Haas (ed.), *Symphonic Etudes: Portraits of Russian Operas and Ballets by Boris Asafyev* translated by D. Haas (Scarecrow Press Inc., 2008). Patrick Zuk's paper at the international conference 'The Triumph of Russian Music: A Window into the World' (March 2014), *Nikolay Myaskovsky and the Russian Symphonic Traditions*, looked at the biographic influences in Myaskovsky's early symphonic output.

<sup>23</sup> H. Schonberg, *The Great Pianists from Mozart to the Present* p. 465.

In terms of Neuhaus's musical career, there have been suggestions that politics had an impact on his achievements and output. Vera Gornostaeva wrote:

Neuhaus's official award of merit was the '*Народный артист РСФСР*' ['People's Artist of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic' in 1956].<sup>24</sup> There is reason to believe that he was tacitly in disfavour by the authorities [*в негромкой опале у руководства*]. In any case, he wasn't amongst those professors who were promoted 'from above'. By the standards of those times, much cast a shadow on his 'reputation': he studied abroad, was known for his liberal tongue, his mocking temperament, eccentric behaviour.<sup>25</sup>

The alleged political hostility towards Neuhaus was a central thread to Galina Crothers's thesis *Heinrich Neuhaus: Life, Philosophy and Pedagogy* (Birmingham City University, November 2010). Crothers found that 'Neuhaus's large-scale teaching was a kind of response to [Stalin's] anti-human regime [and] evidently Neuhaus considered his activity as an artist and teacher as a political action.'<sup>26</sup> She further suggests that 'the absence' of research into Neuhaus 'can be explained largely by the political situation in the Soviet Union in the past, as Neuhaus was never in favour with the state authorities.'<sup>27</sup> Crothers's findings are based largely on the opinions of Valery Voskoboinikov, whose work, and private interviews with Crothers, have a clear anti-Soviet agenda. Voskoboinikov is inclined to interpret all facts surrounding Neuhaus's biography as political. For instance, Voskoboinikov interprets Neuhaus's serious illness, diphtheria, in 1933 as 'not just an illness, but a manifestation of [Neuhaus's] crisis with the regime [...]'.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>24</sup> The 'People's Artist of the Soviet Union' [*'народный артист СССР*'] was a higher award.

<sup>25</sup> 'Оценка Нейгауза в официальном исчислении сводилась к званию «Народный артист РСФСР». Есть основания думать, что он был в негромкой опале у руководства. Во всяком случае, он не относился к числу профессоров, которых поощряли «сверху». По тогдашним меркам, многое ложилось тенью на его «репутацию»: учился за границей, известен вольным языком, насмешливым нравом, эксцентричностью поведения.' V. V. Gornostaeva, 'About my Teacher' in E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus* p. 194.

<sup>26</sup> G. Crothers, *Heinrich Neuhaus: Life, Philosophy and Pedagogy* pp. 110–111.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.* p. 9.

<sup>28</sup> '[...] не только болезнь, но выявление [...] кризиса с властью [...].' В. М. Воскобойников, 'О самом любимом и дорогом. О самых любимых и дорогих' [V. M. Voskoboinikov, 'About the Most Loved and Dearest Things. About the Most Loved and Cherished Ones'] in А. Ф. Хитрук (составитель), Г. Г. Нейгауз. *Доклады и выступления. Беседы и семинары. Открытые уроки. Воспоминания.* (Москва: «Дека», 2008) [A. F. Hitruk (ed.), H. G. Neuhaus. *Presentations and Appearances. Conversations and Seminars. Open Lessons. Reminiscences* (Moscow: 2008)] pp. 347–419. The citation is also quoted from an alternative source in G. Crothers, *Heinrich Neuhaus: Life, Philosophy and Pedagogy* p. 87 – the journal *Volgograd Fortepiano* (Volgograd: 2004).

Likewise, Crothers draws extensive conclusions about Neuhaus's aesthetics from her private interviews with Harry Neuhaus Junior (the son of Stanislav Neuhaus). Despite the familial connection, this thesis considers Harry Neuhaus Junior as a problematic source because his main interests are political – namely, to demonstrate that his grandfather was an outspoken critic of Soviet policy, and was betrayed by the 'internal' politics of musical institutions who might have acted as informants.<sup>29</sup> Harry Neuhaus Junior claims to have had profound conversations with Heinrich Neuhaus regarding aesthetics, politics and philosophy.<sup>30</sup> Yet, as he was born in 1961, and considering Heinrich Neuhaus died in 1964, it is more likely that such discussions took place at second hand with other family members at a later stage. For this reason, this thesis will not be drawing on materials compiled by Harry Neuhaus Junior which are currently publicly available at [www.neuhausklavier.com](http://www.neuhausklavier.com) (launched 2013).

Within the framework of this thesis, political considerations are largely peripheral because it investigates a philosophical and aesthetic understanding of pianistic interpretation which, as will be seen, is born out of a distinctly Romantic sensibility. Nevertheless there are some political considerations which do have a particular bearing on some issues and these will be discussed only in those specific contexts. The impact of political hostility on Neuhaus's musical career (apart from his arrest and exile during the Second World War) seems to be limited as Neuhaus was one of the most celebrated artists of his time throughout his life in Russia. Despite Vera Gornostaeva's concerns that Neuhaus was not in political favour, she admits that he was not affected as much as might be expected considering the horror of the time: 'A few years [after his return to Moscow in 1944] Neuhaus said with some irony: "It was a difficult epoch which only marginally touched me, without causing significant ill." He knew full well the relativity of his troubles.'<sup>31</sup> His travels abroad were restricted to Socialist

---

<sup>29</sup> See G. Crothers, *Heinrich Neuhaus: Life, Philosophy and Pedagogy* pp. 98–102 for a catalogue of anti-Soviet issues which Harry Neuhaus Junior claims his grandfather discussed and which are supposedly fixed in the interrogation protocol of Neuhaus's arrest after the KGB apparently passed on these documents to the family. The extent of Neuhaus's criticism, as presented by Harry Neuhaus Junior, is so great it seems unlikely that Neuhaus would have articulated this in a formal interview in one of the most notorious prisons of the USSR, and secondly that having done so, he would have left there alive. These supposed protocols were published by Heinrich Neuhaus's daughter: М. Г. Нейгауз, *История ареста Генриха Густавовича Нейгауза* (Москва: Ньюдиамед, 2000) [M. H. Neuhaus, *The Story of Heinrich Gustavovich Neuhaus's Arrest* (Moscow: 2000)], and also by Harry Neuhaus Junior in <http://www.sakharov-center.ru/asfcd/auth/?t=page&num=3597> (accessed 06/05/2014) and at [www.neuhausklavier.com/genrih\\_neuhaus\\_texts.html](http://www.neuhausklavier.com/genrih_neuhaus_texts.html) (accessed 05/05/2014).

<sup>30</sup> See Harry Neuhaus's interview with Mikhail Lidsky (*Интервью с Михаилом Лидским*) published in October 2010 edition of the online journal *Семь искусств*: <http://7iskusstv.com/2010/Nomer10/Neuhaus1.php> (accessed 06/05/2014).

<sup>31</sup> 'Несколько лет спустя Нейгауз с иронией заметил: «Сложная эпоха только самым краем коснулась, не причинив особенного вреда». Он прекрасно понимал относительность своих бед.' V. V. Gornostaeva, 'About my Teacher' in E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus* p. 194.

countries, for example as part of the Soviet delegation in the Chopin Piano Competitions in Warsaw and festivals in Prague. Whilst this factor was indeed limiting, it was not particularly unusual for Soviet artists of the time.<sup>32</sup>

How does the research undertaken in this thesis sit within the core of existing scholarship on Neuhaus? Firstly, it is important to note that despite Neuhaus's stature there is very little contemporary literature which evaluates his achievements and persona in either a pedagogical or pianistic aspect. For instance, beyond his own short autobiographical sketch, *Автобиографические записки* [*Autobiographical Notes*] (written in 1959, revised 1960), there has not been a publication of an independent biography in either Russian or English. Neuhaus's autobiography was not published during his lifetime. It was copied from his handwritten manuscript and first published in 1975 by Yakov Milstein in the anthology *Г. Г. Нейгауз. Размышления, воспоминания, дневники. Избранные статьи. Письма к родителям* [*H. G. Neuhaus. Thoughts, Reminiscences, Diaries. Selected Articles. Letters to his Parents*], subsequently revised as a second edition in 1983.<sup>33</sup> Prior to this publication, Neuhaus's biography had only been presented in short essays by the musicologists Yakov Milstein (as an essay at the end of Neuhaus's book *About the Art of Piano Playing* in 1958), David Rabinovich (1962) and after Neuhaus's death, by Viktor Delson (1966).<sup>34</sup>

Neuhaus's own autobiography is certainly not well known in comparison to his book *About the Art of Piano Playing*. In the West in particular, very few writings beyond Neuhaus's famous book have found a wide readership because they remain published only in the vernacular. Yet, as Neuhaus indicated in both his revised version of *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) and in his private correspondence, it was his intention to write 'a better book –

---

<sup>32</sup> By contrast, Heinrich Neuhaus's son, Stanislav, seems to have been more directly affected: 'In [19]49 Stasik [Stanislav] passed the selection round to the [Chopin] competition in Warsaw. He was meant to fly in the morning on the aeroplane there, but in the night there was a telephone call to say that he had not been granted an exit visa. It was a terrifying blow to all of us, and to Stasik, and was especially shocking in the way that it was so unexpected.' ['В 49-м году Стасик прошел подготовительный отбор на конкурс в Варшаве. Он должен был лететь утром на самолете, а ночью сообщили по телефону, что ему выездной визы не дали. Это было страшным ударом для всех нас и Стасика, особенно поразившим нас своей неожиданностью.'] See З. Н. Пастернак, 'Воспоминания' in Н. М. Зимянина (составитель), *Станислав Нейгауз. Воспоминания. Письма. Материалы* (Москва: «Советский Композитор», 1988) [Z. N. Pasternak, 'Remembrances' in N. M. Zimyanina (ed.), *Stanislav Neuhaus. Remembrances. Letters. Materials* (Moscow: 1988)] p. 25.

<sup>33</sup> Я. И. Мильштейн (составитель), *Г. Г. Нейгауз. Размышления, воспоминания, дневники. Избранные статьи. Письма к родителям. 2 изд.* (Москва: «Советский Композитор», 1983) [Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus. Thoughts, Reminiscences, Diaries. Selected Articles. Letters to his Parents. 2nd edition* (Moscow: 1983)].

<sup>34</sup> Д. А. Рабинович, *Портреты пианистов* (Москва: «Советский Композитор», 1962) [D. A. Rabinovich, *Portraits of Pianists* (Moscow: 1962)]; В. Ю. Дельсон, *Генрих Нейгауз* (Москва: «Музыка», 1966) [V. Y. Delson, *Heinrich Neuhaus* (Moscow: 1966)].



the first part of which seems to be his autobiography – the completion of which was precluded by his death in 1964.<sup>35</sup> Concerning his desire to be remembered for his own literary legacy, Neuhaus's letters reveal the scale of this effort and his desire that his writing stand up to posterity:

How unfortunate that my hand is in pain when I write a lot. God does not like the Neuhauses! He took away my ability to play – can it be that he will also make it impossible for me to write? [...] Although, perhaps to just *live* without striving to do anything is only a little worse *sub specie aeternitatis* [from the perspective of eternity] than writing *Faust* or *Götterdämmerung*.<sup>36</sup>

Neuhaus's autobiography with its distinctive second (and last) chapter, *Автопсихография* [*Autopsychography*], is the most obvious evidence that he did indeed want his unique thoughts and cultural experiences to be shared widely through the written word. Neuhaus's lack of interest in delving into the standard issues associated with biographical studies was reflected in his conversations with the musicologist Igor Belza, in which he claimed somewhat disingenuously that he was unclear as to the exact familial ties of the Neuhaus-Blumenfeld-Szymanowski lines.<sup>37</sup>

As with any self-critique, Neuhaus's autobiography raises the issue of how truthful such a characterization can be. Just as *About the Art of Piano* was considered by the musicologist Lev Barenboim to be clothed in a coquettish manner which allowed Neuhaus to cover his 'deeply suspicious maxims' and lacking in scholarly rigour, the autobiography makes no attempt to hide its conversational tone.<sup>38</sup> In certain ways, Neuhaus makes himself endearing to his 'possible' reader ('if these notes will be published [...]') by taking an overtly

<sup>35</sup> See H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 15.

<sup>36</sup> 'Беда, что рука болит, когда пишу долго. Бог не любит Нейгаузов! Отнял у меня возможность играть, неужели отнимет возможность писать? [...] Пожалуй – просто *жить* и ни к чему не стремиться, и ничего не делать, только немного хуже *sub specie aeternitatis* [с точки зрения вечности], чем писать, «Фауста» или *Götterdämmerung*.' From a letter to E. Sofronitskaya dated 19 July 1960 in A. И. Катц (составитель), *Г. Г. Нейгауз. Письма* (Москва: «Дека», 2009) [A. I. Katz (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus. Letters* (Moscow: 2009)] p. 453.

<sup>37</sup> И. Ф. Бэлза, 'Генрих Великий' [I. F. Belza, 'Heinrich the Great'] in E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus* p. 79.

<sup>38</sup> '[...] весьма сомнительные сентенции.' Л. А. Баренбойм, 'Книга Нейгауза и принципы его школы' [L. A. Barenboim, 'Neuhaus's Book and the Principles of his School'] (*Советская Музыка* 1959, № 5, pp. 116–122) p. 122.

self-deprecating approach to his capabilities as a writer.<sup>39</sup> To a substantial degree it is therefore important to acknowledge that Neuhaus's literary skills were not quite those of the 'dilettante' he was claiming to be.<sup>40</sup> Even Boris Pasternak claimed that Neuhaus's ease of communication through the written word was enviable. However, unlike *About the Art of Piano*, Neuhaus's 'autopsychographical' chapter in his autobiography is a much darker work. In it, Neuhaus reveals his scathing attitude towards pedagogy – which he concluded damaged him as an artist – and a despairing view of the fact that moral and ethical questions seemed to occupy such a marginal position in the development of musicians.

Although the autobiography was written at the end of Neuhaus's life, many of its literary and philosophical aspects can be traced to letters from his youth. Thus, it can be seen that there was no significant alteration between the way in which he documented his experiences and impressions from his youth, and the presentation of these ideas for his intended future reader. This demonstrates that far from being melodramatic writings aimed at gaining sympathy from his readers, Neuhaus's thoughts and concerns expressed in his autobiography can be considered lifelong preoccupations. What further adds weight to the validity of Neuhaus's self-critique is that many aspects which are explored in the autobiography are echoed in independent memoirs and anecdotes by Neuhaus's students and close friends.<sup>41</sup> An additional factor which might suggest that Neuhaus's autobiography could be a more truthful indication of his concerns, compared for example to his numerous articles, is that Neuhaus mentions many philosophical figures and literary writers which are absent from his articles. For example, figures such as Friedrich Nietzsche, who are well-represented in his private correspondence, but were banned in Soviet Russia and therefore are not mentioned in his articles, emerge as important aspects of his life in the text of the autobiography. Thus, this thesis will explore ideas from Neuhaus's autobiography in order to gain a deeper understanding of his views which were often expressed more cautiously in his other literary outputs. As these materials are not widely available and have not been translated, this thesis will be presenting some extensive citations from such writings.

During Neuhaus's lifetime several people did try to sift through his pedagogical ideas to try to demonstrate how his associative thought-process aligned itself with his practical requirements in lessons. The main thesis in this area was written by Neuhaus's own student

---

<sup>39</sup> '(если эти записи будут опубликованы [...]).' Г. Г. Нейгауз, 'Автобиографические Записки. Глава II (автопсихографическая)' [H. G. Neuhaus, 'Autobiographical Notes. Chapter II (Autopsychographical)'] in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 35.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid.

<sup>41</sup> For example, in E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus*.

and assistant, Tatyana Hludova, *О педагогических принципах Г. Г. Нейгауза* [*About the Pedagogical Principles of H. Neuhaus*] (Moscow: 1954). Neuhaus evidently thought highly of this work as he mentioned it at the end of his own book *About the Art of Piano Playing*. The other major effort in this respect was by another student, Berta Kremenstein, published as *Педагогика Г. Г. Нейгауза* [*The Pedagogy of H. G. Neuhaus*] (Moscow: 1984). This is based on her own findings as well as the documentation of Neuhaus's lessons by Boris Teplov, Alexander Vitsinsky and Pavel Lobanov.

Hludova's thesis investigated Neuhaus's work with students at the Moscow Conservatory, and she documented verbatim many of Neuhaus's approaches to certain core works. Likewise, Hludova documented many of the common 'pitfalls' which Neuhaus identified and she quoted the specific terms he used to guard his students against them. Her work therefore provides an organized overview of practical issues which were typical of Neuhaus's lessons as well as a commentary on which features of an interpretation were most discussed with students. Kremenstein on the other hand, juggled a broader representation of 'lessons': Hludova's documented lessons from the Conservatory; and the 'open' lessons for pedagogues in various institutes; and the lessons recorded on magnetic tape by Pavel Lobanov in 1952 and 1962. Thus, Kremenstein's work made it clear that because these are three different types of situation, there were differences in Neuhaus's approach: the 'open' lessons being 'deeper and more profound [...] perhaps because the audience is made up of musician-pedagogues' with the student being nearly irrelevant; the lessons at the Conservatory (Hludova and Lobanov) more specific to the individual student's needs.<sup>42</sup>

Both Hludova's and Kremenstein's works were, as indicated in their titles, concerned with Neuhaus as a pedagogue. Given Neuhaus's stature as the leading pedagogue in Russia of his time, or at least as one of the great triptych at the Moscow Conservatory (alongside Goldenweiser and Igumnov), interest in his pedagogical persona and methods is not surprising. Particularly in Kremenstein's work, the emphasis is on the kinds of methods that Neuhaus employed to coax out of his students a respect of the different possibilities within a work. Although both theses give clues as to the kinds of values that Neuhaus felt were important, as

---

<sup>42</sup> 'В «Показательных уроках» много глубоких, пространных высказываний Нейгауза. [...] Вызвано это, видимо, в первую очередь тем, что слушатели – музыканты-педагоги.' Kremenstein found that Hludova's documentation makes the lessons 'lose their artistic spontaneity and uniqueness' ['теряют свою художественную неповторимость'], whilst Lobanov's recording captured the inflections of Neuhaus's voice and made it possible to differentiate where exactly Neuhaus interrupts the student, and with what frequency. See Б. М. Кременштейн, 'Уроки Нейгауза' [B. M. Kremenstein, 'Neuhaus's Lessons'] in А. В. Малинковская (составитель), *Генрих Нейгауз и его ученики. Пианисты-Гнесинцы рассказывают* (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2007) [A. V. Malinkovskaya (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus and his Students. Gnessim-Pianists Speak* (Moscow: 2007)] pp. 10–11.

well as an idea of the hierarchy of elements when studying a work, neither thesis looks at how Neuhaus applied this to himself. However, as will be seen in the concluding chapter, Neuhaus fought throughout his life to be seen as an artist or pianist-interpreter and not purely as a pedagogue. Despite such a fact, Neuhaus has not been investigated to date as a pianist-interpreter – an imbalance that this thesis seeks to redress.

As an artist, rather than pedagogue, Neuhaus had a highly developed sense of what exactly he was prepared to accept in an interpretation. Therefore investigating Neuhaus from this perspective offers a different view from that of Hludova or Kremenstein, who spoke of Neuhaus's heightened tolerance for interpretative decisions which might not have matched his own vision. Speaking of his professor, Teodor Gutman remarked:

I will not forget how in my naïve narrow-mindedness I dismissed violently any other artistic individuality that was in some way different to that of Heinrich Gustavovich. I was especially irreconcilable with respect to the brightest and most talented individuality of Vladimir Horowitz, [particularly] to his interpretation of Schumann and Chopin. But Heinrich Gustavovich!.. It was incomprehensible how he could hear beauty in an [interpretation] so unlike his own.<sup>43</sup>

This thesis, rather, will explore instances of Neuhaus's sometimes irrational intolerance of other interpretative personalities, notably Alexander Goldenweiser, Maria Yudina, Sergei Rachmaninov and Artur Schnabel. These intolerances reflect the specificity of Neuhaus's personal interpretational concepts and therefore are not so pronounced in his pedagogy – a concept explored in greater depth in the concluding chapter on Neuhaus's legacy. His assurance (as an artist) in his own artistic principles was mirrored by his intolerance of the misalignment between his view and 'fact' being pointed out. This was commented on by Lev Barenboim when he reviewed Neuhaus's book *About the Art of Piano Playing*: '[...] in the pages of his book... [he] sends "to the devil" any critic who disagrees [with him], and promises to shout "he's just dumb" after him.'<sup>44</sup> Exploring the specificity of Neuhaus's own

---

<sup>43</sup> 'Не забуду, как я в, своей наивной ограниченности, воинственно отвергал любую другую творческую индивидуальность, характер трактовки, непохожий на трактовку Генриха Густавовича. Особенно непримирим я был к самому талантливому, самому яркому в своем своеобразии Владимиру Горовицу и, конечно, к его исполнению произведений Шумана и Шопена. А вот Генрих Густавович!.. Было непостижимо, как он мог услышать прекрасное, казалось бы, в не близком ему творчестве.' Article by Teodor Gutman in E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus* p. 29.

<sup>44</sup> '[...] на страницах своей книги... посылает «к черту» будущего критика, который [с ним не согласен], и обещает крикнуть ему в догонку, что «он просто туп».' Л. А. Баренбойм, 'Книга

interpretational concepts this thesis shows, that despite his conviction, many of his ideas and transformations are indeed incongruous and controversial – yet that this friction was a vital part of his interpretative practice.

Viewing Neuhaus as an artist rather than pedagogue may therefore seem to expose evidence of ‘double standards’ – advocating his students to embrace different approaches, whilst himself openly opposing the work of other eminent individuals. Neuhaus was himself aware of the paradox that artistic personalities, particularly the brightest individuals, are prone to disagree rather violently with other strong artistic individuals.<sup>45</sup> His conflict as an artist with eminent figures is in itself nothing new. As identified by Kenneth Hamilton, a whole catalogue of musicians with distinct artistic personalities made acerbic comments on their peers.<sup>46</sup> Neuhaus’s aversion as an artist to the interpretations of his colleagues therefore does not necessarily speak of his blindness towards other possible styles or aesthetics, but rather is an indication of the strength of his own subjective convictions.

Raised with the understanding that subjectivity was a valid part of musical interpretation, Neuhaus was unafraid of admitting conflict or contradiction. Both in the way that Neuhaus was brought up to believe that a pianist was the most noble of professions, and that it was his duty to communicate something of his own spirit to an audience, he fits into the kind of pianistic aesthetic which Hamilton reserved for Liszt, Anton Rubinstein and Josef Hofmann: ‘At the heart of Romantic pianism remains the idea that the performer, not the composer, is the centre of interest.’<sup>47</sup> This notion, however, must sit alongside Neuhaus’s seemingly modern attitude of fidelity to a score. Neuhaus, as will be seen, constantly referred to himself as a ‘servant’ of art. Thus, he engages with one of the chief features of a *Werktreue* concept investigated by Lydia Goehr’s *Imaginary Museum of Musical Works* (1992) whereby ‘performances and their performers were respectively subservient to works and their composers [and their ideal was to allow] the work to shine through and be heard in and for itself.’<sup>48</sup>

As will be seen, Neuhaus’s endorsement of a late nineteenth-century *Werktreue* aesthetic was an unquestioned decision, but also one that existed in an ideological sense only.

---

Нейгауза и принципы его школы’ [L. A. Varenboim, ‘Neuhaus’s Book and the Principles of his School’] (*Советская Музыка* 1959, № 5, pp. 116–122) pp. 121–122.

<sup>45</sup> See H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1958) p. 251.

<sup>46</sup> K. Hamilton, *After the Golden Age. Romantic Pianism and Modern Performance* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008) pp. 14–15.

<sup>47</sup> K. Hamilton, *After the Golden Age* p. 255.

<sup>48</sup> L. Goehr, *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992) pp. 231–232.

Despite his ardent interest in philosophy, he did not consider the existence of works or texts as an ontological question. For Neuhaus, philosophy was reserved for learning about the *human* condition – the ‘programme’ which he felt constituted the essence of all great art. Neuhaus’s writings and lessons show that he did have a critical awareness of the limitations of the score (through limits of notation, the role of editors, and multiple editions), and some awareness of historical performance, as demonstrated in *About the Art of Piano Playing*.<sup>49</sup> However, Neuhaus’s interest in a *Werktreue* concept is tied to his need to find the ‘truth’ of the ‘psychological process’ which he believed was mapped out by a score. Thus, a *Werktreue* concept is an ethical framework which would have allowed Neuhaus to understand his role as an interpreter who has deliberately relinquished composition. Operating within such ethical frameworks did not mean that he was a passive participant or ‘executant’. In fact, as will be seen, his ‘submission’ to a ‘work and [its] composer’ was a belief which Neuhaus engaged with as an ideal – a way by which he stimulated himself to critique and form a relationship with the composer and the piece of music being studied. Through the investigation of Neuhaus’s interpretations, we therefore learn far more about Neuhaus than about the composer.

---

<sup>49</sup> See H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) pp. 218–227.

## Chapter 1

### An Introduction to Issues of Cultural Identity and Heritage in Relation to Neuhaus

One of the key issues that arises from Neuhaus's autobiography, letters and the essays of both Soviet and Western musicologists, is that of his own cultural identity. The assimilation of high culture was a vital part of his process of interpretation. As will be discussed below, Neuhaus not only considered culture to define his potential to understand the composer, but equally to determine the strength of his own 'artistic will' as an interpreter. The fluidity with which different cultural influences merged in Neuhaus's understanding presents challenges to scholars, not least because many of his convictions rely on what might appear to be artificial geographic divisions to explain cultural trends. Aspects of cultural identity in the twentieth century were still often linked to national schools of thought, or even more localized national phenomenon (e.g. Leipzig vs. Weimar, Saint Petersburg vs. Moscow). Since this is an issue which has relevance to the kinds of aesthetic judgements Neuhaus made in defining himself as an interpreter, this chapter will explore the problems inherent in such a discussion, as well as establish the point of view taken in this thesis. This investigation therefore serves as an introduction to the more specific issues relating to Neuhaus's aesthetics and philosophy of interpretation presented in the following chapter.

One of the most striking elements of Heinrich Neuhaus persona is how he became seen as a window into other worlds. In Russia he is still talked about as a figure who represented Central Europe, particularly by his former students.<sup>1</sup> In the West, Neuhaus is largely seen as one of the main figures who can reveal the aesthetics of a distinctly Russian piano tradition. For instance, in his book *Famous Pianists and Their Technique*, Reginald Gerig suggested that Heinrich Neuhaus was a 'contemporary descendant of the Russian School', and singles him out as having had 'an immense impact on Russian study.'<sup>2</sup>

Neuhaus's national identity however, is not as simple as German and/or Russian. In his autobiography, Neuhaus wrote that he was 'at least two-fifths German'.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, whilst

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, В. В. Горностаева, 'Мастер Генрих' [V. V. Gornostaeva, 'Master Heinrich'] in E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus* p. 200.

<sup>2</sup> R. Gerig, *Famous Pianists and Their Technique*, 1974 (Washington: Robert B. Luce Inc., 1975) p. 293.

<sup>3</sup> 'Я [...] немец на 2/5 по крайней мере.' H. G. Neuhaus, 'Autobiographic Notes. Chapter I (Autobiographical)' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 22.

Neuhaus's name (Heinrich 'Harry' Felix Neuhaus) is unmistakably German, he considered his mother-tongue to be Polish, alongside the Russian, German and French also used in his household. Whereas his immediate family was most strongly established in Poland and what is now modern-day Ukraine, his extended family had links in the northern part of Germany, Holland and Austria. Thus, it is no surprise that Heinrich Neuhaus represented a complex amalgamation of different influences.

One of the strands of this thesis is to attempt to identify how Heinrich Neuhaus's interpretations can be seen as a product of his assimilated cultural environment. The internationality and scope of the material, which Neuhaus drew upon when discussing interpretation, can often be traced back to his unique heritage and upbringing. In fact, although the idea of national identities will be seen in to be a significant issue for Neuhaus, often it is merely a way for him to engage with a particular historic figure or event rather than being a direct reference to a fixed geographic location. In a manner that will be shown to be typical for Neuhaus, the way in which he appropriated influences from his environment was filtered through his own persona, and often led to surprising transformations. Thus, whilst it can be considered that the dominant interplay between national identities for Neuhaus occurred between the 'Germanic' and 'Russian', it is the nuances within these which provide the most compelling framework in which to investigate the complexities that his thinking presents.

What kind of complexities does an investigation of Neuhaus's letters and autobiography reveal? Probably the most important fact here is that Neuhaus's German identity is an external influence from his father. Gustav Wilhelmovich Neuhaus was born in 1847 in Kalkar, on the lower Rhine.<sup>4</sup> The son of a German piano maker, Gustav Neuhaus studied with Ernst Rudorff at the Cologne Conservatory, where the director at the time was Ferdinand Hiller.<sup>5</sup> As a young man, he moved to Elisavetgrad to be a teacher of music.<sup>6</sup> Here,

---

<sup>4</sup> Wilhelmovich is a patronymic, customary in Russia and this reflects Gustav Neuhaus's name in Russian as Густав Вильгельмович Нейгауз.

<sup>5</sup> Ernst Rudorff was a musician and successful pedagogue based in Berlin and the Cologne Conservatory. Amongst his students was Leopold Godowsky. Rudorff had studied with Ignaz Moscheles, Louis Plaidy (whose students included Hans von Bülow) and Julius Rietz. For a survey of Wilhelm Neuhaus's piano factory see B. Mühlenhoff, *Die Pianofortefabrik W. Neuhaus Söhne Calcar: Briefe in die Heimat [The Piano Factory on W. Neuhaus & Sons: Letters to the Homeland]* (Norderstedt: Books on Demand, 2009).

<sup>6</sup> Gustav Neuhaus moved to Russia after finishing the Cologne Conservatory in 1870. He seems to have maintained many other intellectual musical interests aside from private teaching. This is demonstrated by his publications *Das Pianoforte mit konkav-radiärer Klaviatur und konzentrischer Anschlagslinie. [The Piano with a Concave Keyboard and Concentric Attack Line]* (Berlin: Walther & Apolan, 1882) [see [http://vlp.mpiwg-berlin.mpg.de/library/data/lit38216/index\\_html?pn=1&ws=1.5](http://vlp.mpiwg-berlin.mpg.de/library/data/lit38216/index_html?pn=1&ws=1.5) for the full text of this



he made the acquaintance of the Blumenfeld family and married Olga Mikhailovna Blumenfeld. Olga Blumenfeld's mother was Maria Szymanowska – a Pole and the sister of Karol Szymanowski's grandfather.<sup>7</sup> Despite Gustav and Olga Neuhaus spending long hours teaching piano at their music school (officially opened in 1898) in Elisavetgrad, and Heinrich Neuhaus's claim that Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov and Alexander Glazunov held the school in high regard, it seems to have been a largely thankless effort with Gustav Neuhaus's most famous students being those from his own extended family: the Russian conductor, pianist, composer and pedagogue Felix Blumenfeld and the Polish composer Karol Szymanowski – Heinrich Neuhaus's uncle and cousin respectively.

It seems that Gustav Neuhaus was keen to make the Wagnerian heritage an important part of his son's upbringing. In 1902 and 1904, between the months of May and August, Heinrich Neuhaus recalled being taken on a quasi-pilgrimage across Germany and Austria, first with his parents and sister, and the second time with the addition of Karol Szymanowski and Felix Blumenfeld. The trips were planned to allow them to attend the Wagner Festival in Bayreuth to hear *Der Ring des Nibelungen*, *Tannhäuser* and *Parsifal* and in Munich's Prinz-Regenten Theater to hear *Lohengrin*, *Der fliegende Holländer*, *Die Meistersinger von Nürnberg*

---

work (accessed 21/05/2014)], a collection of songs, *Lieder aus der Jugendzeit [Songs from Youth]* (Heidelberg: Verlag von Karl Hochstein, c. 1875), and his brochure on the need to reform the system of printed texts, *Das natürliche Notensystem [The Natural System of Notation]* published privately in Bochum in 1906.

<sup>7</sup> In his autobiography, Heinrich Neuhaus described Maria Szymanowska simply as 'as a daughter of Polish landowners'. There are two Maria Szymanowskas in Heinrich Neuhaus's family tree, which has caused some confusion. The celebrated virtuoso pianist and composer, Maria Szymanowska, (born in 1789 in Warsaw as Marianna Agata Wołowska) married Heinrich Neuhaus's great-grandfather Józef Szymanowski, a wealthy landowner. This Maria Szymanowska was one of the first women to have had a successful virtuoso solo career – in certain respects mirroring that of Clara Schumann. The pianist Maria Szymanowska settled in Saint Petersburg (then the Imperial capital) where she lived from the 1820s until her untimely death from cholera in 1831, teaching music and giving concerts as a Tsarina's pianist. Maria Szymanowska was admired by Wolfgang von Goethe and Adam Mickiewicz and was considered to have influenced the music of Fryderyk Chopin. Maria Szymanowska's daughter married Adam Mickiewicz. As part of the extended Szymanowski-Blumenfeld-Neuhaus family, this fact may have been significant for Felix Blumenfeld's interest in the Polish poet. For a brief biography of Maria Szymanowska see M. Trochimczyk, *A Romantic Century in Polish Music* (Los Angeles: Moonrise Press, 2009) pp. 7–10. The other Maria Szymanowska, whom Heinrich Neuhaus mentions, was the daughter of Józef Szymanowski's brother, Zygmunt, and his wife Pelagia Sawicka. Unlike the first Maria who became Szymanowska by marriage, this Maria was a Szymanowska by birth, and married Mikhail Blumenfeld. Their children were Heinrich Neuhaus's mother, Olga, and Felix Blumenfeld.

See M. J. Minakowski, *Genealogia potomków Sejmu Wielkiego [Genealogy of Descendants of Famous Families]*

<http://www.sejmwielki.pl/s/?lang=;em=R&ei=465344&m=NG&select=input&t=PN&et=S&image=on&spouse=on&n=sw.1799> (accessed 19/04/2014).

and *Tristan und Isolde*.<sup>8</sup> In 1905, Heinrich Neuhaus recounted that, in response to advice from Felix Blumenfeld and Glazunov (both of whom taught at the Saint Petersburg Conservatory – the latter being its director), his father made the decision to send him to Berlin to study with Leopold Godowsky.

Despite Gustav Neuhaus's desire to present Germany as an attractive option musically and professionally for his son and daughter Natalia (who did later move to Germany), Heinrich's letters to his parents suggest that he was not impressed. Much to Gustav Neuhaus's dismay, his son's letters particularly mock Berlin for its inflexibility, insincerity and environment of 'police *Bekanntmachungen*' [notices].<sup>9</sup> In 1911 Heinrich Neuhaus wrote to his parents:

It's horrible that I have to wait for July [to return home]. In Berlin [...] there is something stupid and painfully weary [*тягостное*] – in a *Großstadt* it is always this way. [...] Nowhere else does one feel that *nichts ist wahr, alles ist erlaubt* [there is no truth, everything is permitted].<sup>10</sup>

As will be seen in the following chapters, Heinrich Neuhaus was also initially unable to find in either Leopold Godowsky, or his subsequent professor, Karl Barth, a totally sympathetic outlook on pianism and aesthetics. Barth never saw Heinrich Neuhaus as a German. Barth's phrase, '*Sie stecken noch in der russischen Haut*' [You are still stuck in a Russian skin] weaves itself into much of Neuhaus's recollections of his student life, and it is not without a sense of satisfaction that Neuhaus speaks of being able to slowly 'win over' his professor to his own

---

<sup>8</sup> Heinrich Neuhaus recalls the towns and cities that were visited to have included: 'Warsaw, Berlin, Cologne, [visits to Gustav Neuhaus's relatives] in Kalkar and Kleve, as well as in Bochum, Dortmund and Düsseldorf, followed by a wonderful journey by boat on the Rhine from Bonn to Rudesheim [...], Frankfurt am Main and Nuremberg [...]. Following Bayreuth we went to Munich [...] then Vienna [...] and then Krakow [...] from where we returned to Elisavetgrad.' ['Варшава, Берлин, Кёльн, посещение отцовских родственников в Калькаре и Клеве, а также в вестфальских городах Бохум[е] и Дортмунд[е], в Дюссельдорфе на Рейне, затем чудесное путешествие на пароходе по Рейну из Бонна в Рюдесгейм [...], Франкфурта-на-Майне и Нюрнберга [...]. Из Байрёйта мы поехали в Мюнхен [...] затем в Вену [...], а затем – в Краков [...]. Из Кракова мы вернулись в [...] Елисаветград.'] Н. G. Neuhaus, 'Autobiographical Notes. Chapter I (Autobiographical)' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 19.

<sup>9</sup> Heinrich Neuhaus's letter to his parents dated 7 May 1910 in *Letters* p. 134.

<sup>10</sup> 'Омерзительно, что надо ждать до июля [...]. В этом Берлине [...] что-то глупое и вместе с тем тягостное – *Großstadt* – это всегда так [...]. Нигде так не ощущаешь, как здесь, что *nichts ist wahr, alles ist erlaubt*.' Letter to his parents dated 22 January 1911 in *Letters* p. 154.

ways.<sup>11</sup> Neuhaus's relationship with Godowsky seems to be have more congenial, but exactly how much Godowsky can be considered representative of 'German' outlooks at the time is questionable.<sup>12</sup>

Such circumstances, added to the tense European socio-political climate, must have contributed to Heinrich Neuhaus's dislike of Berlin. It must however, be noted that Neuhaus's opinion about Berlin seems to have stemmed from his first visit there in 1902 – nine years earlier at the age of fourteen (three years before he commenced his studies there). Speaking about his diary entries from the time, Neuhaus later recalled:

At the time, as a fourteen year-old adolescent I wanted to live my whole life [in Krakow]. I preferred [small] towns most of all, those with a well-preserved historical monuments, whilst the modern towns [...] like Berlin did not impress me at all.<sup>13</sup>

Therefore, despite Heinrich Neuhaus being brought up by his father to love Wagner, Brahms and Nietzsche, it could be said that Germanic culture and philosophy became a 'spiritual' rather than geographical link for him.<sup>14</sup>

It is significant that Heinrich Neuhaus's autobiography places a greater emphasis on his experiences in Italy, where he resided in 1908 and 1909, than Germany. In his letters of the time, Neuhaus wrote: 'How I love Florence! It is true that no other country or town can give

---

<sup>11</sup> H. G. Neuhaus, 'Autobiographical Notes. Chapter I (Autobiographical)' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 25. As will be seen later in the thesis, these remarks are reflected in Neuhaus's letters which he sent to his parents at the time.

<sup>12</sup> Leopold Godowsky was born into a Jewish Polish family in Soshly, near Vilnius (then part of Imperial Russia, now the capital of Lithuania). One of the most famous pianists of his time, Godowsky is best known for his piano transcriptions rather than 'heavy-weight' repertoire which to a certain degree might have been spurred on by being a protégé of Saint-Saëns in Paris (between 1887–1890), where he played in fashionable salons. See *Grove Music Online*, s.v. 'Leopold Godowsky' (C. Hopkins), <http://www.groveonline.com/> (accessed 01/05/2014).

<sup>13</sup> 'Мне, четырнадцатилетнему отроку, захотелось всю жизнь прожить [в Кракове]. В то время мне больше всего нравились города с хорошо сохранившимися памятниками старины, современные же города [...], вроде Берлина, не производили на меня почти никакого впечатления.' H. G. Neuhaus, 'Autobiographical Notes. Chapter I (Autobiographical)' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 19.

<sup>14</sup> Heinrich Neuhaus's letters to his parents frequently stress his continuing engagement with Brahms, Wagner and Nietzsche and are written in a tone that seeks for this action to be seen with his father's approval. As indicated by Wightman, Karol Szymanowski confirmed that '[Gustav Neuhaus] was a devoted exponent of German literature and philosophy', particularly of Nietzsche. See A. Wightman, *Karol Szymanowski. His Life and Work* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999) p. 9.

me such pleasure.<sup>15</sup> Writing from Florence to his parents, Neuhaus even expressed with great excitement, and certain rashness, his plans to return to Italy in the autumn with the intention of making a career for himself there as a musician. Neuhaus wrote that he anticipated he could 'make a decent existence' and tried to tempt his parents to join him.<sup>16</sup> In his autobiography, Neuhaus relates that his happiness and cultural enrichment in Italy was so great that it inspired his private musical development towards greater productivity and refinement.<sup>17</sup> Returning to Berlin, where his sister was living, then to Manuilovka [Мануйловка] (where the Neuhaus family spent their summers from 1895 to 1914) and finally Elisavetgrad, Heinrich Neuhaus recalled that until the following spring he started to think of suicide and suffered from 'black melancholy'.<sup>18</sup> Neuhaus's autobiography reveals: 'I do not remember any period in my life when I felt such sorrow of the soul <...>'.<sup>19</sup>

Italy therefore became the geographical location which Heinrich Neuhaus saw as a sanctuary for his soul.<sup>20</sup> Nevertheless, Neuhaus linked his most important Germanic

---

<sup>15</sup> 'Как я люблю Флоренцию! Верно, ни одна страна и ни один город не даст мне такого наслаждения.' Heinrich Neuhaus's letter to his parents from Florence dated 22 April 1909 in *Letters* p. 121.

<sup>16</sup> '[...] вполне приличное существование.' Heinrich Neuhaus's letter to his parents from Florence dated 13 May 1909 in *Letters* p. 123. His parents response must have been disapproving as the tone of his next letters (16 May 1909) is subdued and apologetic.

<sup>17</sup> 'Pianistically, I worked carefully every day and evidently, under Italy's influence, its mesmerizing nature and art, my playing shifted towards the better.' ['Пианистически я занимался аккуратно каждый день, и, очевидно под влиянием Италии, её дивной природы и искусства, в моей игре произошли сдвиги к лучшему.'] H. G. Neuhaus, 'Autobiographical Notes. Chapter I (Autobiographical)' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 23.

<sup>18</sup> '[...] чёрная меланхолия.' Ibid. pp. 21 and 23.

<sup>19</sup> 'Я не запомню периода жизни, когда бы я испытывал чувство такой душераздирающей тоски <...>' Ibid. p. 24. <...> is an editorial mark in the edition. It is one of only three such markings in Neuhaus's autobiography and indicates the removal of text during publication. All three markings seem linked to the removal of text which makes reference to Neuhaus's arrest and confinement in the notorious Lubyanka prison in 1941 and subsequent exile to Sverdlovsk until 1944. For example: 'This was how the "Moscow Period of my career" started. It continues to this day, undergoing a certain necessitated pause <...>, when in July 1942 I was sent to Sverdlovsk to work in the Ural and Kiev Conservatories ([the latter] had been temporarily evacuated there). I remained there until October 1944, when I was returned to Moscow to the Conservatory.' ['Так начался «московский период моей музыкальной деятельности». Он продолжается и сейчас, испытыв некую вынужденную паузу <...>, когда в июле 1942 года я был направлен в Свердловск на работу в Уральскую и Киевскую (временно эвакуированную в Свердловск) консерватории. Там я пробыл до октября 1944 года, когда был возвращен в Москву в консерваторию.'] Ibid. p. 33.

<sup>20</sup> In a letter to his parents sent from Florence, dated 27 April 1909, Neuhaus wrote: 'I will find it very difficult to leave Florence; all the feelings which I always found alien to myself, such as affection to a country etc., here become necessary, alive, real, strong and nearly integral parts of everyday psychological reactions.' ['Мне будет страшно тяжело покидать Флоренцию; все чувства, которые мне всегда были совершенно чуждыми, как привязанность к стране и т. д., тут становятся

philosophical and cultural acquisitions to Italy: 'I think with great contentment that Nietzsche also lived in Genoa a long time and wrote his *Morgenröthe* there.'<sup>21</sup> Similarly, Neuhaus linked aspects of Beethoven's piano sonatas not to the Germanic landscape, but for example, to the 'velvet night' of southern Italy, and linked Chopin's Romantic Realism to the Italian Renaissance painters. Neuhaus's Germanic identity is therefore not a clear-cut question. Already it is possible to see that Heinrich Neuhaus's spiritual German heritage is filtered through the symbolism that Italy offered to him.

Italy was also a spiritual refuge for Karol Szymanowski, who had accompanied Heinrich there in 1908.<sup>22</sup> Neuhaus had always admitted that he had been in awe of his older cousin ('I was "in love" with the image of Karol, when I was six, and he was twelve [...] he would read a certain book and I would sit by him and "peer" into that book, looking even more at him. '), and it is likely that to a certain degree Karol Szymanowski's compositional identity began to play on Neuhaus's mind.<sup>23</sup> To cure Heinrich's melancholy, Gustav Neuhaus sent his son to audition for the *Hochschule der Musik und darstellende Kunst* in Berlin (to study with Barth), but it seems that Heinrich Neuhaus insisted that he would also take a complete compositional course with Pavel Juon. Contrary to what it seems Gustav Neuhaus had expected, this move to Berlin became a catalyst for his son's profounder engagement with Russian culture.

Juon was a pupil of Sergei Taneyev, who in turn had studied piano with Nikolai Rubinstein and composition with Piotr Tchaikovsky at the Moscow Conservatory and was a frequent guest of Lev Tolstoy. Neuhaus's autobiography reveals that he actively sought out Juon's advice and company in order to acquaint himself with Taneyev's 'system' of education.<sup>24</sup> The practical link to Russia which Neuhaus was able to thus forge for himself was evidently an important one to him: 'I regret to this day that [my parents sent me to Berlin] and

---

необходимыми, живыми, настоящими, сильными, почти входящими в состав повседневных психических реакций.' See *Letters* p. 121. Neuhaus's fascination with Italy was common to many artistic figures of importance to him including Goethe, Lord Byron, Alexander Pushkin (who never travelled to Italy, but for whom Italy was important symbolically), Friedrich Nietzsche, Thomas Mann and Karol Szymanowski to name but a few.

<sup>21</sup> 'Всегда с наслаждением думаю, что Ницше тоже долго жил в Генуе и написал там *Morgenröthe*.' Heinrich Neuhaus's letter to his parents from Nervi, dated 2 February 1908 in *Letters* p. 84.

<sup>22</sup> See <http://www.karolszymanowski.pl/inspirations/antiquity/> (accessed 22/04/2014).

<sup>23</sup> 'Кстати, я был форменным образом «влюблен» в Карла, когда мне было 6 лет, а ему 12 [...] когда он брал какую-нибудь книгу и принимался читать, я устраивался рядом, «заглядывал» в книгу, но больше заглядывался на него.' Н. Г. Neuhaus, 'Autobiography. Chapter I (Autobiographical)' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 21.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.* p. 25. Taneyev was considered a master of polyphony and a successful virtuoso pianist (who premiered many of Tchaikovsky's works). Taneyev's own composition pupils included Sergei Rachmaninov, Alexander Skryabin and Nikolai Medtner.

not to Moscow or Saint Petersburg.<sup>25</sup> Possibly through Juon's influence, Heinrich Neuhaus displayed a genuine lifelong interest in Russian compositions. Upon his return to Elisavetgrad following the outbreak of the First World War, Neuhaus performed with Karol Szymanowski symphonic arrangements for two pianos of Tchaikovsky's Fantasy-Overture *Romeo and Juliet*, *Francesca da Rimini*, Rimsky-Korsakov's *Scheherazade* and Balakirev's *Tamara*.<sup>26</sup> Neuhaus even organized concerts with Szymanowski to include their performances of Wagner and Mussorgsky. Recalling such an event in 1918, Neuhaus reported: 'I played Bülow's transcription of the overture to [Wagner's] *Meistersinger*, then some of [Mussorgsky's] *Pictures at an Exhibition*, [and two friends sang from] *Khovanshchina*, *Boris Godunov* and even *Isolde's Liebstd* from *Tristan und Isolde*.'<sup>27</sup>

Juon was not the only link Heinrich Neuhaus had to the current developments of Russian music. Neuhaus's uncle, Felix Blumenfeld was a virtuoso pianist, conductor and composer who was highly respected by figures including Balakirev, Rimsky-Korsakov (his composition professor), Glazunov and the music critic Vladimir Stasov.<sup>28</sup> In Neuhaus's autobiography, letters and articles, it is clear that he highly valued the interactions he had with his uncle – both through their mutual conversations as well as their music-making. Neuhaus wrote of Blumenfeld: 'he "made me" into a musician'.<sup>29</sup> According to Neuhaus, the two were united by their love of Wagner, and they made their own transcriptions of his operas. Beyond Wagner, Blumenfeld seems to have encouraged Heinrich Neuhaus to deepen his love of Rimsky-Korsakov (who was influenced by Wagner) and Skryabin.<sup>30</sup> The music-making of

<sup>25</sup> 'Родители [...] решили отправить меня в Берлин (почему не в Москву или Петербург – жалею до сих пор об этом!). Ibid. p. 24.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid. p. 32. This list, according to Neuhaus is representative, but not exhaustive. It is likely they played other works such as Rimsky-Korsakov's *Antar*, Glinka's *Kamarinskaya* and Mussorgsky's *Night on the Bald Mountain*.

<sup>27</sup> '[...] я играл Увертюру из «Мейстерзингеров» в переложении Бюлова, некоторые номера из «Картинок с выставки», а Балановская с одним певцом (фамилию забыл!) пела из «Хованщины», «Бориса Годунова», даже «Смерть Изольды» из «Тристана».' Н. G. Neuhaus, 'Autobiography. Chapter I (Autobiographical)' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 32.

<sup>28</sup> Г. Г. Нейгауз, 'Из воспоминаний (К столетию со дня рождения Ф. М. Blumenфельда)' [Н. G. Neuhaus, 'From my Remembrances (For the Centenary of F. M. Blumenfeld's Birth)'] in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 283. Blumenfeld was also an important part of Boris Asafyev's (Igor Glebov) musical experiences – see Б. В. Асафьев, 'Шопен в воспроизведении русских композиторов' in А. В. Засимова, *Как исполнять Шопена* (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2005) [B. V. Asafyev, 'Chopin in the Interpretations of Russian Composers' in A. V. Zasimova, *How to Interpret Chopin* (Moscow: 2005)].

<sup>29</sup> '[...] он меня «музыкантом сделал».' Н. G. Neuhaus, 'From my Remembrances (For the Centenary of F. M. Blumenfeld's Birth)' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 285.

<sup>30</sup> Neuhaus remembers that their performance of their own transcription of Skryabin's *Prometheus* and *Le Poème de l'Extase* (for four hands) during the Russian Civil War were so well-received in Kiev that they repeated *Prometheus* twice in that recital. Ibid.

Blumenfeld and Neuhaus was a feature of musical life at the time that in turn became important for the wider musical community, particularly in Kiev. As related in Vera Razumovskaya's biography:

In the concerts [held at] the Neuhauses' home, the symphonic works of Wagner, Skryabin, Rimsky-Korsakov and Stravinsky were heard on two pianos performed [and transcribed] by Felix Blumenfeld and Heinrich Neuhaus, as was the music of Prokofiev and Medtner.<sup>31</sup>

Although this kind of exposure to Russian music was an important part of Heinrich Neuhaus's formative years, Blumenfeld was also able to offer what Neuhaus saw as a direct link to the aesthetics of Russian pianism through Anton Rubinstein, widely considered as the founder of Russian pianism.<sup>32</sup> Whilst Rubinstein was not officially Blumenfeld's teacher, Neuhaus considered that the amount of time his uncle had spent with Rubinstein and listened to his playing meant that Blumenfeld was a 'spiritual' kin and inheritor of Rubinstein's pianism. Furthermore, Neuhaus believed that his uncle's pedagogy successfully transmitted 'the commandments of that great teacher'.<sup>33</sup>

The specific elements of Blumenfeld's pianism and aesthetic outlook that were vital to Neuhaus's own pianism will be explored in relation to Chopin later in this thesis. However, at

---

<sup>31</sup> 'В домашних концертах у Нейгаузов звучали симфонические произведения Вагнера, Скрябина, Римского-Корсакова, Стравинского в переложении для двух фортепиано Феликса Блуменфельда и Генриха Нейгауза, исполнялась музыка Прокофьева, Метнера.' С. З. Бейлина, 'Уроки Разумовской' С. З. Бейлина (составитель), *Уроки Разумовской* (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2007) [S. Z. Belina, 'Razumovskaya's Lessons' in S. Z. Belina (ed.), *Razumovskaya's Lessons* (Moscow: 2007)] p. 12.

<sup>32</sup> Harold Schonberg wrote that all Russian pianists from the Soviet Union (until at least the 1950s) were 'spiritual heirs' of Anton Rubinstein [see H. Schonberg, *The Great Pianists from Mozart to the Present Day* p. 464]. Reginald Gerig wrote that despite Anton Rubinstein's titanic stature as a pianist, 'Rubinstein's most lasting effect was felt in Russia where he exerted profound influence in music education circles. [...] Contemporary descendants of [his] Russian School [include] Vladimir Horowitz, Artur Rubinstein, Heinrich Neuhaus and Neuhaus' students, Sviatoslav Richter and Emil Gilels [...].' R. Gerig, 'Russian Nationalism' in *Famous Pianists and Their Technique* pp. 292–293. In Russia figures including David Rabinovich and Lev Barenboim made extensive musicological studies to this effect. See Д. А. Рабинович, *Исполнитель и стиль*, 1981 (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2008) [D. A. Rabinovich, *Interpreter and Style*, 1981 (Moscow: 2008)] and Л. А. Баренбойм, *Антон Григорьевич Рубинштейн 1867–1894. Том 2* (Ленинград: «Государственное Музыкальное Издательство», 1962) [L. A. Barenboim, *Anton Grigorevich Rubinstein 1867–1894. Volume 2* (Leningrad: 1962)].

<sup>33</sup> '[...] Умел передавать заветы великого учителя своим ученикам.' Н. G. Neuhaus, 'From my Remembrances (For the Centenary of F. M. Blumenfeld's Birth)' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 285.

this point it is important to note that one of the greatest influences that Blumenfeld was able to exert on Neuhaus pianistically was his ‘unheard of mastery of the secrets of the piano’s sound’ (a trait that is key to Rubinstein’s own legacy).<sup>34</sup> In terms of Blumenfeld’s general approach to music, there are also aesthetic traits which will be seen in this thesis, to be mirrored in Neuhaus’s own understanding. Of these traits, the idea of a ‘musical image’ or emotional narrative, in essence a web of diverse associations which provides a scaffold for the creation of the interpretation’s trajectory and nuance, is vital to Neuhaus’s artistry. At the heart of this is the idea that the interpretation of music is understood as an ‘emotive art’ which requires the interpreter to be able to ‘feel’ every aspect of the work. As will be seen in this thesis, Neuhaus’s emotional connection to music was so intense that he often found himself in tears over the teaching and practising of certain works – a direct echo of his uncle’s behaviour: ‘[Blumenfeld] was lying on the divan and crying over a score of [Glinka’s] *Ruslan and Lyudmila*.’<sup>35</sup>

These Russian elements in Heinrich Neuhaus’s biography were again, like his German cultural appropriations, linked to the spiritual fabric of his persona. According to documents held at the Neuhaus Museum in Elisavetgrad, he became a Russian subject only in 1907 (the spring before his Italian sojourn); however, it is doubtful that the provincial town of Elisavetgrad would have geographically ever appealed to Neuhaus’s ambitions or even reflected the rich experiences of his uncle.<sup>36</sup> Felix Blumenfeld’s perspectives had come from his studies in the Imperial capital, Saint Petersburg, where he also taught piano between 1885 and 1918. By comparison, Elisavetgrad would have had little to offer culturally and professionally, and it is understandable why it was seen by Heinrich Neuhaus as one of the worst possible outcomes for his future. During his final months at the *Meisterschule* in Vienna with Leopold Godowsky, Neuhaus wrote to his parents:

To stay for a long time (i.e. until the end of my life) in Elisavetgrad is madness as I will have no ways of progressing. I know for certain that starting somewhere I will, with time, gain recognition – and not because of

---

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.

<sup>35</sup> ‘[...] застал дядю лежащим на диване, плачущим над партитурой «Руслана и Людмилы».’ Ibid. p. 286.

<sup>36</sup> <http://www.neuhausmuseum.region.in.ua/neig29a.html> (accessed 24/04/2014). Elisavetgrad did have a certain established musical life particularly since the point when Ferenc Liszt had chosen this small town to be the venue of his last recital in 1847. Yet, the activity within the town would never be able to compete with that of the Imperial capital, Saint Petersburg, of major cities such as Moscow or even Kiev.



my energy and experience of life, but because of my talent and what I can offer.<sup>37</sup>

Two years later, Neuhaus's letters show that he was keen to foster links with Saint Petersburg and Moscow. He began to actively seek out performance opportunities and was elated with his good reviews – 'all the musical elite listened [...]. Now, for sure, Petrograd won't forget me'.<sup>38</sup> It seems that Neuhaus was very much drawn to the idea of a future in one of these two cities:

I am leaving for Tbilisi with a heavy heart, even though I am drawn to the Caucasus. [...] I am anxious [to save enough money from my Tbilisian earnings] to go to Petrograd and Moscow in January! [...] It is a shame to lose my ties with Petrograd. I have fallen in love with it very much and feel that I can settle there quite stably. I'm scared of the provinces.<sup>39</sup>

Neuhaus had undertaken deliberate steps to ensure that he could look to establishing himself as a musician in one of Russia's large cities. Just before the outbreak of the First World War, he returned to Russia. However, Neuhaus states that his studies in 'the noble institution – the *Meisterschule* of the Viennese Academy of Music' were useless since it was 'an Academy of a state which was at war with Russia', which in conjunction with his surname 'would not have boded well'.<sup>40</sup> As he needed a document from a Russian institution in order to be able to

---

<sup>37</sup> 'Оставаться надолго (т.е. до конца моей жизни) в Елисаветграде – прямотаки [sic.] безумие, ибо там у меня абсолютно нет никаких видов на продвижение вперед, и я твердо знаю, что, где-либо начав, я всё же со временем добьюсь признания, и при этом не столько благодаря моей энергии и жизненному опыту, сколько вследствие моего таланта и того, что я умею и что собой представляю.' Letter to his parents from Kalkar dated February 1914 in *Letters* p. 180.

<sup>38</sup> 'Вся музыкальная элита слушала [...]. Теперь уж меня в Петрограде не забудут.' Letter to his parents from Petrograd dated May 1916 in *Letters* p. 183.

<sup>39</sup> 'Уезжаю в Тифлис с тяжёлым сердцем, хотя Кавказ и тянет. [...] Я очень беспокоюсь [...] я же должен скопить себе достаточно, чтобы в январе приехать в Петроград и в Москву! [...] Жаль терять связь с Петроградом. Я очень его полюбил и чувствую, что мог бы там солидно обосноваться. Боюсь провинции.' Letter to his mother from Elisavetgrad dated 30 August 1916 in *Letters* p. 185. Saint Petersburg changed its name to Petrograd in 1914 because the former name was too Germanic sounding, and in this climate deemed unsuitable. In 1924 it became Leningrad.

<sup>40</sup> 'Одного мы, наивные люди, не «запланировали» – а именно: европейскую войну [...]. Так как у меня не было документа об окончании русского высшего учебного заведения, был только документ об окончании весьма, правда «высокого», но в данном случае совершенно бесполезного учереждения – *Meisterschule*, венской Академии музыки, Академия государства, находящегося в данный момент в состоянии войны с Россией, то у меня не было никакой пригодной бумажки, удостоверяющей мое высшее образование. [...] Соединение моей фамилии с

become a professional Russian musician, Neuhaus chose the conservatory where his uncle taught to realize his plans.

Thus, in 1915 Neuhaus passed the exams of the Petrograd Conservatory ‘externally’ (i.e. without attending lectures) with outstanding marks, and became a ‘Free Artist’, which allowed him to pursue an independent performing and pedagogical career across Russia. After his first engagement in 1916 as a professor in the Tbilisi Conservatory (then still called the Specialized Music School of the Imperial Russian Music Society in Tbilisi),<sup>41</sup> Neuhaus considered that he was firmly on the path to become ‘a Russian music teacher and pianist-interpreter’.<sup>42</sup> His subsequent four years at the Kiev Conservatory and finally his four decades at the Moscow Conservatory speak to confirm his prediction: Political unrest as a result of the Russian Civil War necessitated Neuhaus’s return to Elisavetgrad in 1918, from where he was invited to become a professor at the Kiev Conservatory with his uncle Felix Blumenfeld. It was here that he met and married Zinaida Nikolaevna Eremeeva-Giotti, at the time his student at the conservatory. Both Neuhaus and Blumenfeld were transferred to the Moscow Conservatory in 1922 at the request of Anatoly Lunacharsky, the Soviet People’s Commissar for Education.

Neuhaus remained based in Moscow as a professor (and between 1935 and 1937 as Director) of the Conservatory up to his death in 1964 – the best part of 42 years. In Moscow, Neuhaus and Zinaida celebrated the birth of their two sons, Adrian in 1925, who died in 1945, and Stanislav (who later became an important pianist and pedagogue) in 1927. The marriage, however, fractured by 1927 and lasted only until 1930. Zinaida left Neuhaus to live with the close family friend, the poet Boris Pasternak, whom she married in 1932. Despite this, it did not break up the friendship between the Neuhaus and Pasternak families. Neuhaus later lived with Militsa Sergeevna Borodkina and then with the violinist Sylvia Fedorovna Aihinger.<sup>43</sup> In a

---

дипломом венской Академии не сулило ничего хорошего.’ [‘The one thing which we, naïve people, did not “plan” was the war in Europe. [...] I did not have a [degree] from a Russian establishment of higher education, but only the *Meisterschule* of the Vienna Academy of Music – in this case a completely useless establishment as it was the Academy of a country now at war with Russia. Thus, I had no [paperwork] which would confirm my higher education. [...] The link between my surname and the diploma of the Vienna Academy would not have boded well.’] H. G. Neuhaus, ‘Autobiography. Chapter I. (Autobiographical)’ in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 30.

<sup>41</sup> Музыкальное училище Тифлисского отделения Императорского Русского музыкального общества.

<sup>42</sup> ‘Таким образом с октября 1916 года я стал впервые совершенно «официально» [...] на путь русского учителя музыки и пианиста-исполнителя.’ Ibid. p. 31.

<sup>43</sup> Militsa Borodkina and Heinrich Neuhaus had a daughter, Militsa Neuhaus, in 1929. In general there is much confusion about the personal life of H. G. Neuhaus, including why and when the split with Zinaida

politically turbulent time, Neuhaus was not completely immune to hardships. During the Second World War, Neuhaus's German surname and refusal to leave Moscow on account of Adrian's ill-health, led to his arrest in November 1941. He was confined to the infamous Lubyanka prison and in August 1942 exiled to Sverdlovsk where, after the efforts of his friends and colleagues, it was arranged that he could teach there at the Ural Conservatory.<sup>44</sup> Neuhaus was only allowed to return to Moscow in October 1944, when he was reinstated as a professor at the Conservatory. At the time of his death, Neuhaus was a household name not only to aspiring pianists, but to music-lovers across the Soviet Union.

Even such a brief survey of Heinrich Neuhaus's life demonstrates the multifaceted national influences which played their part in his life. Yet, Western sources in particular underplay his cultural diversity.<sup>45</sup> In the short *Grove Music Online* entry by James Methuen-Campbell, Neuhaus is described as a 'Ukrainian pianist and teacher', and while his studies in Berlin, Vienna and Saint Petersburg are mentioned, there is little to suggest how important Neuhaus's critical attitude to his surroundings made his 'cosmopolitanism' (as remarked by Vladimir Horowitz, Artur Schnabel and many others who knew Neuhaus) a much more fluid, and arguably unpredictable, phenomenon.<sup>46</sup> Christopher Barnes's biographical synopsis of Heinrich Neuhaus states that he was 'a pupil of Blumenfeld, and of Godowsky in Vienna. He taught at the Kiev Conservatoire before coming to Moscow [...]' and so passes over the studies with Barth, or even with Godowsky in Berlin as well as the familial ties with Blumenfeld.<sup>47</sup> Likewise, Nicholas Cook's investigation into European performance traditions describes Neuhaus as 'mainly self-taught', mentioning only that 'at one stage [he had a] few lessons with [Aleksander] Michałowski'.<sup>48</sup> Glenn Plaskin's biography of Horowitz suggests that Neuhaus's mentoring of Horowitz encouraged the latter to adopt a specifically 'Russian' approach to pianism and musical aesthetics. Thus, Plaskin does not consider Neuhaus to be in a position to

---

occurred. It is clear from his correspondence to her in the 1930s that he still loved her very much. Neuhaus's relationship with Militsa and Sylvia is also unclear.

<sup>44</sup> In the Ural Conservatory Neuhaus also taught students from the Kiev Conservatory which had been temporarily evacuated to Sverdlovsk.

<sup>45</sup> The cultural diversity of Neuhaus's upbringing is a dominant feature in his autobiography. Neuhaus's autobiography has been widely available for study in Russia through Y. I. Milstein's anthology (see bibliography). Prior to the anthology's publication, Milstein wrote a condensed biography of Neuhaus as an addition to Neuhaus's *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1958). Therefore, later writings tend to be closely based on these two sources.

<sup>46</sup> *Grove Music Online*, s.v. 'Heinrich Neuhaus', <http://www.grovemusic.com/> (accessed 26 April 2014). Methuen-Campbell does not cite Neuhaus's own autobiography in his bibliography, instead indicating other secondary Russian literature.

<sup>47</sup> C. Barnes, *The Russian Piano School. Russian Pianists and Moscow Conservatoire Professors on the Art of the Piano* translated and edited by C. Barnes (London: Kahn & Averill, 2007) p. xxiii.

<sup>48</sup> N. Cook, *Beyond the Score. Music as Performance* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013) p. 197.

represent European influences: He argues that, never having before being exposed to any artists with knowledge of European cultures and despite Neuhaus's mentorship, Horowitz's emigration from Russia as a result of the Revolution was deeply traumatic in a cultural sense.<sup>49</sup>

The opposite perspective in relation to Heinrich Neuhaus's 'German-ness' was recently offered by Galina Crothers. In her thesis, *Heinrich Neuhaus: Life, Philosophy and Pedagogy* (Birmingham City University, November 2010), Crothers argued from several different perspectives that Heinrich Neuhaus cannot be considered as a Russian in any sense. Crothers insists that, had Neuhaus had the opportunity, he would surely have left Russia without any hesitation to join either his sister, Natalia in Berlin, or at the very least, have joined his cousin Karol Szymanowski in Warsaw. Crothers writes:

It is apparent that he never had in his mind any intentions of exploring the cultural capitals of Russia or developing contacts with Russian musicians. His hopes were to continue his future career in the German speaking lands.<sup>50</sup>

As discussed above, however, the clearest indication of Neuhaus writing about a desire to build a career abroad was linked to Italy (namely, Florence) and not Germanic countries. Whilst it seems this desire was driven far more by an emotional reaction to Italy as a symbolic environment of artistic enlightenment rather than by the practicalities of making a living as a musician, it is the only instance in Neuhaus's correspondence to show a particular effort on his part to convince his parents to leave Russia and join him abroad. Furthermore, even the brief biographical survey above demonstrates that although Neuhaus found the provincial town of Elisavetgrad limiting, there is evidence that Blumenfeld exerted a substantial influence on Neuhaus's interest in musical developments in both Saint Petersburg and Moscow, and that Neuhaus chose to become a Russian subject as late as 1907.

As well as presenting Neuhaus as a reluctant Russian in a geographical sense, Crothers argues that Neuhaus's pianism was isolated from Russian aesthetics:

The main influences that he had received in his younger years were those of European culture [...]. As a pianist Neuhaus was educated in the traditions

---

<sup>49</sup> G. Plaskin, *Horowitz. A Biography of Vladimir Horowitz* (London: Macdonald and Co., 1983) pp. 44–48.

<sup>50</sup> G. Crothers, *Heinrich Neuhaus: Life, Philosophy and Pedagogy* (PhD dissertation, Birmingham City University, 2010) p. 52.

of the German and Viennese schools. Neuhaus thus received no direct influences from the Russian piano school [...].<sup>51</sup>

Crothers assumes, like David Fanning, that the Russian and German 'schools' have little in common. Fanning for instance talks about the clear 'friction' between Russian and European directions:

Russians and Germans in particular have very strong views about their respective 'schools'. To say they held 'mutual suspicion' towards each other would be a polite summary.<sup>52</sup>

However, particularly in the late nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth century, these two 'schools' had strong links. This notion has been discussed in Gerig's *Famous Pianists and Their Technique* particularly in 'Chapter 14. Russian Nationalism.'<sup>53</sup> It is also implied by Harold Schonberg in *The Great Pianists from Mozart to the Present* in 'Chapter XVIII. Thunder from the East'.<sup>54</sup> Focusing in detail on the cross-fertilization of the two 'schools' in this period alone would be a substantial topic to investigate and lies outside the scope of this investigation.<sup>55</sup> Beyond this period, such a study probably loses much of its validity as the idea of distinct 'schools' is complicated by the movement of musicians globally, thereby diluting what could have been considered 'national' influences. Schonberg considered that 'in the late 1980s, national styles of music making seemed all but extinct.'<sup>56</sup>

Even in the period in question, the highly developed individuality of various leading pianist-pedagogues in Germany and Russia from the latter half of the nineteenth century onwards make it difficult to speak meaningfully of united or characteristic 'schools' within the two countries, even if this is the way in which such artists understood themselves.<sup>57</sup> Even

---

<sup>51</sup> Ibid. p. 55.

<sup>52</sup> D. Fanning & M. Assay, 'From Russia with Love-Hate' in *International Piano* No. 22. Nov–Dec. 2013 pp. 38–41 (p. 38).

<sup>53</sup> See pp. 287–314 in the above reference. For instance, Russia depended on musicians with links to Germanic schools to establish piano techniques in Russia at different points in time through musicians including Adolf Henselt, Anton Rubinstein, Karl Klindworth, Pavel Pabst and Theodor Leschetizky.

<sup>54</sup> See pp. 269–280 in the above reference.

<sup>55</sup> It is important to note especially the effect Liszt had on encouraging Russia to develop its own compositional and interpretative identity, and also his championing of Russian music and musicians in Germany.

<sup>56</sup> H. Schonberg, 'After the Thaw' in *The Great Pianists from Mozart to the Present* p. 465.

<sup>57</sup> For instance, the Moscow and Saint Petersburg Conservatories were famous for their different tastes and aesthetics right from the outset. The matter of distinct 'schools' at this time is further complicated

Gerig, who does believe in the value of identifying national trends, quotes Artur Schnabel as follows:

I have lived for thirty years in Germany and even so I would not be able to say what the 'German technique' is. For in Germany all kinds of piano techniques were taught [...].<sup>58</sup>

There has however been a long-standing interest by musicians and musicologists to talk of national performing schools, and so whatever the difficulties inherent in such generalities they have been an important part of the way music-making has been defined. In this respect, Schonberg suggested that in the twentieth century, the 'German school' was the most definable and stable:

The German school of piano playing is one of scrupulous musicianship, severity, strength rather than charm, solidity rather than brilliance. It is a school that stresses planning and leaves nothing to chance.<sup>59</sup>

It is a statement that is strikingly similar to the reported views of Theodor Leschetizky in the nineteenth century: 'The Germans he respects for their earnestness, their patient devotion to detail, their orderliness, and intense and humble love of their art.'<sup>60</sup>

As already indicated, and will be discussed further, there are 'Germanic' qualities that Neuhaus himself recognized within the musical institutions of Berlin and Vienna, and thought of with disdain. These were certainly not characteristics attributed to Neuhaus's interpretations by his critics, who as will be seen, talked of Neuhaus as a spontaneous, lyrical and poetic musician. Incongruously, Crothers's insistence that Neuhaus was a product of

---

by some figures such as Theodor Leschetizky who was one of the founding musicians of the Saint Petersburg Conservatory, but is equally considered to have been one of Vienna's most influential pianist-pedagogues. To make matters even more complex, even the two conservatories in Russia, the Moscow and Saint Petersburg, underwent significant aesthetic changes within the twentieth century. Neuhaus for instance considered that due to the influence of Leschetizky and Esipova, the Saint Petersburg Conservatory was at one time marked by its virtuosity. In 2008, Kenneth Hamilton identified the reverse: 'After one of my own recitals in St. Petersburg, a lugubrious gentleman came backstage to tell me, "You play like someone from the Moscow Conservatory." I replied with effusive thanks, flattered at being considered an honorary offspring of the distinguished institution. But a Russian friend quietly whispered in my ear, "That – was not a compliment!"' [K. Hamilton, *After the Golden Age* p. 12].

<sup>58</sup> As quoted in R. Gerig, *Famous Pianists and Their Technique* p. 288.

<sup>59</sup> H. Schonberg, 'Twentieth-Century Schools' in *The Great Pianists from Mozart to the Present* p. 446.

<sup>60</sup> Cited as in R. Gerig, *Famous Pianists and Their Technique* p. 287.

German and Viennese pianism brings her to the conclusion that it was Neuhaus's 'spontaneity' as a pianist which marked him as German against a backdrop of Russian 'academism'.<sup>61</sup>

The discussion of a 'Russian school' in similar terms has proven a rather more contentious issue. Crothers is adamant that Russia was politically unable to produce a distinctive or imaginative piano school. Not only does Crothers believe that Neuhaus was the *first* artist to bring 'European traditions' and emotional exuberance to the 'Russian school', but she also considers that the work of eminent pianists such as Alexander Goldenweiser and Konstantin Igumnov, who also taught at the Moscow Conservatory, were proof of the inadequacies and limitations of the 'Russian school'.<sup>62</sup> Crothers explains that the 'Russian school's' lack of emotionality and spirituality was linked to the absence of interest or knowledge of culture:

Not [being] a product of Russian culture [...] he was a widely educated man of European culture with extensive knowledge of different areas of the humanities. In this, he differed from other members of the Russian school of piano performance such as Igumnov, Goldenweiser, Gnesina, Feinberg and others.<sup>63</sup>

A similar disparaging view of Russian pianism can be traced to Schonberg who, despite not being the most rigorous academic writer, has exerted a strong influence on many later writers on the subject. Although Schonberg recognized the importance of figures like the Rubinstein brothers, he argued that following the initial establishment of Rubinsteinian aesthetics, there followed a long period of 'anachronistic' music-making. Schonberg wrote that whilst 'Western artists [...] reflect a cosmopolitan point of view', the 'inbred' ideas of the 'isolated' Russian musicianship meant that 'Russian teachers such as Heinrich Neuhaus, Alexander Goldenweiser and Konstantin Igumnov [were limited to producing] formidable instrumentalists.' Schonberg suggested that the 'German school' had so many individual artists ('Wilhelm Backhaus, Edwin Fischer, Wilhelm Kempff, Rudolf Serkin and, more recently,

---

<sup>61</sup> See G. Crothers, *Heinrich Neuhaus: Life, Philosophy and Pedagogy* p. 70: 'Neuhaus's style of performance differed [according to Mark Milman] in its "audacious and unusual interpretation, bright emotionality, imagery and spontaneity of expression". [...] This Milman's [sic.] remark was important because it contradicted the assumptions of some Soviet critics that Neuhaus continued the traditions of the Russian piano school. Obviously Milman could not go further and say directly which traditions influenced Neuhaus for ideological reasons.'

<sup>62</sup> G. Crothers, *Heinrich Neuhaus: Life, Philosophy and Pedagogy* p. 93.

<sup>63</sup> *Ibid.* p. 7.

Alfred Brendel.) that it kept renewing itself through this variety.<sup>64</sup> By contrast, Schonberg considered that because Russian musicians could not, until 1955, travel the world, they could not ‘automatically take in the best that their colleagues everywhere have to offer. They [did not] have access to the latest musicological research. They [did not] live and move in a world of ideas, taking from the pool what they find necessary.’ Schonberg repeatedly offered Vladimir Ashkenazy’s view that: ‘Russia creates great sportsmen rather than great artists.’<sup>65</sup>

Recently, David Fanning suggested that Alfred Brendel’s well-known reservations about Russian playing were echoed by a substantial number of critics in the West. Attempting to find some middle ground, Fanning writes: ‘We could offer a working hypothesis for the essence of Russian pianism: “Primary emotions writ large.” For better, that’s a quality that enables artists to embrace and thrill the largest audiences. For worse, it can impose an indiscriminate voice on the music from within [...].’<sup>66</sup> Thus, whilst Fanning writes that ‘Some of the most philistine, Rambo-style piano playing we’ve ever heard has indeed been at the hands of Russians’, he does concede that the ‘Russian school’ at best is characterized by ‘a deep, rich tone; noble eloquence and generosity; colour; power and dexterity; consummate discipline.’<sup>67</sup> Despite Fanning’s more positive outlook, he too does not count a broad sphere of cultural and intellectual acquisitions to be amongst the main elements associated with the pianism of figures like Neuhaus and his colleagues.

Of the above sources, Schonberg’s book is still one of the more influential Western surveys which tackled the idea of Russian pianism. Gerig’s is the more thorough in examining the early years of the Russian musical institutions and thus is the closest to the manner in which many Russian musicologists highlight the importance of Lisztian aesthetics.<sup>68</sup> However, the substantial differences even within these two surveys demonstrates the need for this thesis to contextualize why it considers that it is possible to speak of Russian aesthetic influences which would have affected Neuhaus. This is particularly necessary since the ideas about the cultural limitations within the large Russian music centres in the early to middle twentieth century, identified by Schonberg and Crothers, are at odds with the findings of this thesis.

---

<sup>64</sup> H. Schonberg, ‘Twentieth-Century Schools’ in *The Great Pianists from Mozart to the Present* p. 446.

<sup>65</sup> H. Schonberg, ‘After the Thaw’ in *The Great Pianists from Mozart to the Present* p. 465.

<sup>66</sup> D. Fanning & M. Assay, ‘From Russia with Love-Hate’ p. 39.

<sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>68</sup> See for instance K. Zenkin, ‘Franz Liszt and Advanced Musical Education in Europe: International Conference (2001)’ in *Akadémiai Kiadó, Studia Musicologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, T. 42*. Soviet authors who talk about Lisztian aesthetics being at the heart of the Russian piano school included David Rabinovich, Yakov Milstein, Grigory Kogan and Lev Barenboim (see bibliography).



During Neuhaus's formative years, and even more so during Blumenfeld's education, it must be remembered that the Russian piano institutions were still relatively new, and arguably therefore still closely connected to the ideals of their founding members. As an indication of the novelty of Russia's musical institutions it should be noted that Anton Rubinstein had set up the *Русское музыкальное общество* [Russian Music Society] in 1859 in Saint Petersburg with the aim of refining musical tastes and increasing musical professionalism in Russia. The first Russian conservatory was founded by Anton Rubinstein in 1862 in the Imperial capital Saint Petersburg, with the Moscow Conservatory following in 1866, founded by his brother Nikolai. The conservatory in Kiev, the closest major Russian city at the time to Elisavetgrad with an emerging musical importance, was established in 1913.<sup>69</sup> Although Rubinstein was seeking to create a Russian tradition, a substantial number of piano professors at the conservatories were invited by him from abroad – many were students of Ferenc Liszt. Thus, during Neuhaus's childhood, it is difficult to speak of a 'Russian piano school' that is not indebted to the Rubinstein brothers or the Lisztian aesthetic.

Through his pianism and the work of the Russian Music Society, Anton Rubinstein redefined the direction of Russian music-making from the intimate amateur and salon circle to the bravura pianism of Liszt and his disciples. Pianistically, the early nineteenth-century Russian scene was dominated by the émigré musicians John Field and Adolf Henselt. In his study *The Liszt Tradition at the Moscow Conservatoire*, Konstantin Zenkin remarked:

Before [the 1840s] in Russia all piano music was written for domestic purposes, not for the concert platform. For instance, some of Glinka's pieces were intended for piano or harp, which shows the way the great Russian composer treated the piano in the post-Beethoven era! In fact, Field did not play the modern instrument but a different one, with a different potential. It was an early rectangular construction without the double action or improved pedal mechanism.<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup> The *Русское музыкальное общество* [Russian Music Society] had branches such as in Kiev (1863) which established music schools. The music school in Kiev (and Odessa) was only given the status of a conservatory in 1913.

<sup>70</sup> 'Franz Liszt and Advanced Musical Education in Europe: International Conference (2001)' in *Akadémiai Kiadó, Studia Musicologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, T. 42 pp. 95–96.

Encapsulated in a largely salon tradition of music-making, Saint Petersburg's first great musical 'stress' was, according to the critic Alexander Serov, brought about by the arrival of Ferenc Liszt in 1842 on concert tour.<sup>71</sup> Serov's colleague, the musician and critic Vladimir Stasov, recalled in his memoirs that following the concert:

Together with [Alexander] Serov, we were like madmen, hardly exchanging but a few words, and both rushing to our homes in order to put in writing to each other our impressions, our dreams, our awe... We were as if in love, as if crazy. And it is no wonder. We had never heard anything like this in our lifetimes [...].<sup>72</sup>

The commotion that Liszt had created in the piano tradition in Russia was amplified even further by the timing of the Anton Rubinstein's own burgeoning fame. Despite Rubinstein's rather complex relationship with Liszt, there can be no doubt that these were two very strong and different individuals who held a deep respect for each other. Liszt's whirlwind concert tours in 1840s Russia were succeeded by Rubinstein's recitals in the 1850s and 1860s. Rubinstein admitted that as a young musician he had imitated Liszt's particular technical style quite successfully and although he had never studied with Liszt, he was widely named as Liszt's heir – factors which will be investigated in this thesis in relation to Beethoven.<sup>73</sup>

Technical considerations, although a major part of the evolution of pianism, were however only background as far as Rubinstein was concerned. For him, notwithstanding his evident technical prowess and obvious astuteness in realizing the potential to be unlocked in the new applications of arm weight, and thus adopting Liszt's ideas of playing with the weight of the arm and hand, matters of technique were never the stimulating factor to drive performing activities or his compositional voice. This contrasted, for example, with those pianists who had come directly from Friedrich Kalkbrenner's 'factory for piano virtuosos' and were inspired by his famous piano method, *Pianoforte-Schule. Méthode pour apprendre le*

---

<sup>71</sup> ' [...] стресс'. А. Н. Серов, *Статьи о музыке (1859). Том 4* (Москва: «Музыка», 1988) [A. N. Serov, *Articles about Music (1859). Vol. 4* (Moscow: 1988)] p. 110.

<sup>72</sup> 'Мы с Серовым были после концерта, как помешанные, едва сказали друг другу по несколько слов, и поспешили каждый домой, чтобы поскорей написать один другому свои впечатления, свои мечты, свои восторги... Мы были как влюбленные, как бешеные. И не мудрено. Ничего подобного мы ещё не слыхивали на своём веку [...]'. В. В. Стасов, *Статьи о музыке в пяти выпусках. Вып. Третий. 1880–1886*. (Москва: «Музыка», 1977) [V. V. Stasov, *Articles on Music in Five Volumes. Volume 3. 1880–1886* (Moscow: 1977)] p. 38.

<sup>73</sup> See А. Г. Рубинштейн, 'Автобиографические рассказы' [A. G. Rubinstein, 'Autobiographical Tales'] in Л. А. Баренбойм, А. Г. Рубинштейн. *Литературное наследие в трех томах. Том I* (Москва: «Музыка», 1983) [L. A. Varenboim, A. G. Rubinstein. *Literary Legacy in Three Volumes. Volume 1* (Moscow: 1983)] p. 70.

*piano à l'aide du guide-mains* Opus 108 (1831);<sup>74</sup> or Kalkbrenner's technical aides such as his chiroplast.<sup>75</sup>

Rubinstein was instead much more preoccupied with aesthetic deliberations such as identifying what it meant to deliver an emotionally captivating performance, and what the role of the pianist was. Liszt was redefining the delivery of a concert recital to accommodate his belief in empowering the piano as an orator capable of speaking for an entire orchestra, and symbolically for all humanity. Rubinstein, both as a composer and pianist, was keen to be a part of this. Rubinstein's importance as a symbol of a virtuosic pianist, for whom technique was merely a tool, was well-documented in the European press at the time. In 1870 on hearing rumours that Rubinstein was abandoning the concert platform, the Dresden-based critic Hartman wrote:

It will be a most sorrowful loss [...]. The singer amongst pianists will fall silent, and if Rubinstein's example ceases to render its poetic effect, then the isolation of technique from music will become unstoppable.<sup>76</sup>

These new ideas were at odds with the largely salon-based piano tradition that Rubinstein confronted upon returning to his Russian homeland in the middle of the nineteenth century, and it is little wonder that he initially met with resistance from musical circles:

In the period of Rubinstein's Saint Petersburg concerts at the start of the [18]50s, reviewers, whilst paying their due to the worth of the young pianist, reproached him for playing 'without niceties' [...]. Neither the gigantic stature, nor the mighty Rubinsteinian impact [...] could satisfy the

---

<sup>74</sup> With this famous exclamation Gottschalk was referring to Kalkbrenner's piano academies in Paris and London. Quoted in S. Starr, *Bamboula – The Life and Times of Louis Moreau Gottschalk* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995) p. 176.

<sup>75</sup> For more information about Kalkbrenner's fascination with technique and how this had an impact on musicians including Gottschalk and Saint-Saëns, as well as early twentieth-century (predominantly German) piano methods, see R. Gerig, *Famous Pianists and their Technique* pp. 130–136 and 334–339.

<sup>76</sup> 'Это будет прискорбная утрата [...]. Певец среди пианистов замолкнет, и, если пример Рубинштейна перестанет оказывать поэтически облагораживающее воздействие, всё безудержнее пойдет изоляция техники от музыки.' Л. А. Баренбойм, *Антон Григорьевич Рубинштейн 1867–1894. Том 2* (Ленинград: «Государственное Музыкальное Издательство», 1962) [L. A. Varenboim, *Anton Grigorevich Rubinstein 1867–1894. Vol. 2* (Leningrad: 1962)] p. 38.

music-lovers of the time [who were] accustomed to the refined grace of 'jeu perlé'.<sup>77</sup>

The more reserved reaction to Rubinstein's playing was eventually overturned. Liszt's recitals were already a shock but were after all by a foreigner, and difference was expected. The 'bewitching beauty of [Rubinstein's] tones, the power and delicacy of his touch' reputedly rivalled Liszt's,<sup>78</sup> but it seems to have been his 'inward fervour which in the heat of passion dares all things, even to indiscretion, rather than pause to reason and reflect' and 'temperament [...] of such compelling force that exhausted Europe yields submissive to his will' that caused the greatest stir.<sup>79</sup>

A generation later, Josef Hofmann, Anton Rubinstein's only private pupil, compared the two artists thus:

Rubinstein excelled by his sincerity, by his demonical, heaven-storming power of great impassionedness, qualities which with Liszt had passed through the sieve of a superior education and – if you understand how I mean that term – gentlemanly elegance.<sup>80</sup>

Evidently there was a directness, a rawness to Rubinstein's playing which challenged the Russian tradition to engage with something that even a wild virtuoso like Liszt had clothed in a more refined manner. Rubinstein's titanic pianism tipped the balance in Russian musical attitudes towards outright emotional integrity over technique. As reported by Goldenweiser, one of the few at the helm of the Russian piano tradition in the twentieth century who had actually heard Rubinstein's playing:

From the very first note, Rubinstein completely captivated his listeners as if infecting them with the hypnosis of his vibrant artistic personality. The listener would lose the ability to reason and analyse: he would be fully

---

<sup>77</sup> 'Еще в период петербургских концертов Рубинштейна начала 50-х годов рецензенты, отдавая должное достоинствам юного пианиста, упрекали его в том, что играет «без приятности». [...] Точно так же ни гигантская масштабность, ни могучий рубинштейновский удар [...] не могли удовлетворить тогдашних меломанов, привыкших к утонченному изяществу «бисерной игры».' Д. А. Рабинович, *Исполнитель и стиль*, 1981 (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2008) [D. A. Rabinovich, *Interpreter and Style*, 1981 (Moscow: 2008)] p. 160.

<sup>78</sup> Eduard Hanslick quoted in C. Bowen, *'Free Artist': The Story of Anton and Nicholas Rubinstein* (New York: Random House, 1939) p. 290.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>80</sup> J. Hofmann, *Piano Playing with Piano Questions Answered*, 1908 and 1909 (New York: Dover Publications, 1976) p. 159.

vanquished by the tempest of his inspiring art – for a time forgetting himself and his own relationship to the work being interpreted.<sup>81</sup>

This emotional integrity will be seen throughout this thesis also to lie at the heart of Heinrich Neuhaus's pianism, which he often referred to as the 'truth of a psychological process' or as the 'artistic image'. Despite never having heard Rubinstein's playing, it will be seen that Neuhaus was keen to be recognized as belonging to the Rubinstein-legacy through his identification of Felix Blumenfeld as Rubinstein's pianistic and spiritual inheritor. Further, Neuhaus was well-versed in Rubinstein's writings and lectures from which he appropriated several thoughts. Liszt's aesthetics, and Anton Rubinstein's adoption of them, had significant consequences in early twentieth-century Russia and this is manifested in the views of Neuhaus and his colleagues. Even as late as the 1980s, major Soviet musicologists were investigating the application and transformation of Liszt's and Rubinstein's aesthetics in pianists from the Moscow and Saint Petersburg (Leningrad) Conservatory. Such investigative surveys include David Rabinovich's *Исполнитель и стиль [Interpreter and Style]* (1981).<sup>82</sup> Although these works do mention Heinrich Neuhaus, they do not focus on how such aesthetics might affect the pianist's interpretation other than in general terms, nor do they look at specific musical instances. This is also the case with works such as Alexander Alexeev's *История фортепианного искусства [The History of Pianistic Art]* (1988), which remains one of the core Russia textbooks on pianism for higher education.<sup>83</sup>

Neuhaus's specific aesthetic and philosophical understanding of his role as an interpreter, and how this manifested itself in his performances, needs to be respected as a dynamic response to the issues introduced in this chapter. Whilst Gustav Neuhaus tried to present Germany as an attractive geographical and cultural option for his son's future, Neuhaus synthesized a much wider and complex critical response to these influences. His time in Italy with Karol Szymanowski served as a catalyst to relocate many of his Germanic influences into this new symbolic landscape. Neuhaus's admiration of Szymanowski drew him

---

<sup>81</sup> 'С первых же звуков Рубинштейн неудержимо захватывал слушателей, как бы заражая их гипнозом своей яркой художественной личности. Слушатель терял способность рассуждать и анализировать, он вполне покорялся стихии его вдохновенного искусства, на время забывая себя и своё отношение к исполняемому произведению.' А. Б. Гольденвейзер, *Воспоминания*, 1958 (Москва: «Дека», 2009) [A. B. Goldenweiser, *Reminiscences*, 1958 (Moscow: 2009)] p. 254.

<sup>82</sup> Д. А. Рабинович, *Исполнитель и стиль*, 1981 (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2008) [D. A. Rabinovich, *Interpreter and Style*, 1981 (Moscow: 2008)].

<sup>83</sup> А. Д. Алексеев, *История фортепианного искусства. Части 1 и 2* (Москва: «Музыка», 1988) [A. D. Alexeev, *A History of the Art of the Piano. Parts 1 and 2* (Moscow: 1988)].

closer to Blumenfeld's sphere of influence. Through Blumenfeld, Neuhaus was introduced to the possibility of seeing Russia as a viable geographic location to continue his career following the outbreak of World War I. His contact with his uncle, however, also presented Russian pianism as an appealing spiritual heritage where Anton Rubinstein's Germanic elements, combined with an unyielding emotional directness, presented a sympathetic musical vision. The complexity though, is that whilst these divisions provide a framework within which we can begin to understand Neuhaus, they are not completely clear-cut. As will be seen in the following chapters, Neuhaus was a complicated and often contradictory figure who saw everything through the prism of his own subjectivity: geographic, cultural, philosophical and musical influences, as he understood them, all come together to define his unique artistry.

## Chapter 2

### Heinrich Neuhaus's Aesthetics of Interpretation

This chapter will introduce the main aesthetic considerations that underpinned Heinrich Neuhaus's understanding of his role as a pianist-interpreter. It therefore serves as the groundwork for the more specific analyses relating to Neuhaus's interpretation of Beethoven (Chapter 3) and Chopin (Chapter 4) later in this thesis. Neuhaus, it must be remembered, was among the first significant interpreters to have deliberately foregone composition despite many of his peers and contemporaries successfully negotiating that 'overlap' of activities. Thus, a significant part of the investigation will centre on the moral framework which Neuhaus developed for himself to differentiate his identity from that of the composer. Neuhaus's aesthetics will first be investigated in the context of the broader cultural climate in Russia at the time, with particular reference to the Russian Realist movements at the close of the nineteenth century in art and theatre – namely, the Peredvizhniki artists and Konstantin Stanislavsky.<sup>1</sup> Coupled with an interrogation of certain peculiarities of the Russian language, these discussions will demonstrate Neuhaus's engagement with the aesthetics of 'emotive' art in the process of interpretation. The second part of this chapter will look at the musical elements which affected Neuhaus's views of interpretation. Key enquiries include Neuhaus's attitude to the score; technique and virtuosity; repertoire and performance. As will be seen, these were often influenced by his European education with his professors Leopold Godowsky and Karl Heinrich Barth, as well as Neuhaus's impressions of the pianism and writing of Ferruccio Busoni.

Whilst Neuhaus drew his understanding from a wide range of disciplines – art, literature, philosophy and music – all of these elements were integrated with one another because of his belief that all knowledge and experience is fundamentally emotive. Accounts of Neuhaus show that it was his wider cultural acquisitions that most impressed his colleagues, and that they considered this to be a vital part of his artistic personality. Brought up to speak in Russian, Polish, German and French in his youth, he had also studied Italian to be able to read works in the vernacular to satisfy his insatiable thirst for knowledge. Neuhaus extensively quoted both Russian and European poetry, literature and philosophy from memory and his strength of associated thought, introduced in this chapter, is such that the boundaries between these diverse elements are much more porous than one might expect. Taken

---

<sup>1</sup> For a general survey of the importance of Konstantin Stanislavsky to the arts written in the English language refer to J. Benedetti, *Stanislavski. An Introduction*, 1982 (New York: Taylor and Francis, 2004).

together, these elements were filtered through Neuhaus's imagination and allowed him to synthesize a supporting network of associations which acted as a scaffold to help refine and motivate his search for the 'truth' or 'image' of the work.

Many of the complexities of Neuhaus's understanding of himself as an interpreter arose in part from his multi-layered view of himself:

'I've thought of a questionnaire for myself since they are in fashion!' With a mocking seriousness he pulled back his fingers and declaimed:

'Number one: Pianist – average.

Number two: Musician – good.

Number three: Artist – excellent.

Number four: Person – committed to good.'<sup>2</sup>

This view, which separates the physicality of playing the instrument as a lesser achievement than artistic individuation through the performance of music, was crucial to the subjective Romantic thinking that underpinned the education of Neuhaus's generation. Musically, this separation had been set down by Anton Rubinstein as one of the guiding principles of his reforms of professional music-making in Russia and was adopted by pianists including Sergei Rachmaninov, Josef Hofmann and Josef Lhévinne as well as Neuhaus's direct colleagues at the Moscow Conservatory: 'Playing [*игра*] on the piano is the movement of the fingers; interpretation [*исполнение*] on the piano is the movement of the soul.'<sup>3</sup> In Europe such a view

---

<sup>2</sup> '«Я придумал тут себе анкету – из четырёх пунктов (сейчас анкеты в моде!)». И, загибая пальцы, с насмешливой серьёзностью продекламировал: «Пункт первый: пианист – тире – посредственный./ Пункт второй: музыкант – тире – хороший./ Пункт третий: художник – тире – отличный./ Пункт четвертый: человек – тире – приверженный к добру»'. V. V. Gornostaeva, 'About my Teacher' in E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus* p. 198. This four-part categorization was obviously very important to Neuhaus since two differently worded versions of the text appears in his own handwriting as the epithet which subtitles his posthumously published *Autobiographical Notes* (see Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* (Moscow: 1983) p. 17). The line crossed out in Neuhaus's manuscript under the epigraph quoted above reads: 'Or another line (perhaps more accurate): weak pianist, not bad pianist, good artist, not a very ordinary person.' [И еще строка (и может быть вернее): слабый пианист, очень недурной музыкант, хороший художник, не совсем заурядный человек'].

<sup>3</sup> 'Игра на фортепиано – движение пальцев, исполнение на фортепиано – движение души.' А. Г. Рубинштейн, 'Короба мыслей', 1897 in Л. А. Баренбойм (составитель), А. Г. Рубинштейн. *Литературное наследие в трех томах. Том I* (Москва: «Музыка», 1983) [A. G. Rubinstein, 'Box of Thoughts', 1897 in L. A. Varenboim (ed.), *A. G. Rubinstein. Literary Legacy in Three Volumes. Volume I* (Moscow: 1983)] p. 178.



was also at the heart of the pedagogy and attitude towards interpretation show by pianists of Neuhaus's generation – notably as shown in the documented lessons of Alfred Cortot.<sup>4</sup>

Neuhaus's particular formation however articulated a philosophical context to his understanding of himself as a pianist-interpreter more overtly than can perhaps be said of most other similar-minded musicians of his time, through the inclusion of the 'person' above the 'artist'. As an example, the repertoire of Neuhaus's near-contemporary Claudio Arrau had significant overlap with that of Neuhaus (Chopin, Schumann, Brahms, Beethoven and Liszt). Likewise, Arrau had also studied in Europe with a professor with links to Liszt (Martin Krause), shared many of Neuhaus's beliefs on interpretation and made a clear distinction between playing 'with technique' and an 'interpretation' in his interviews. Yet, Arrau did not refer to philosophy or the relationship between the 'human' and the 'artist' as a means of defining the 'self' – a question which preoccupied Neuhaus throughout his own life.<sup>5</sup> Writing in *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1958), Neuhaus proposed: 'For every thinking person, the 'I' is not only the subject, but also one of the *objects* for understanding the real world [...]. I will tell you about myself in connection with the question [how understanding becomes] artistic.'<sup>6</sup>

In this belief Neuhaus's understanding was identical to Liszt's, who maintained: 'For the formation of the artist, the first prerequisite is the improvement of the human being.'<sup>7</sup> As will be seen throughout this thesis, Neuhaus was driven by the belief that art was ultimately a reflection of the activities of humankind – that the performance of music was a philosophical act which was capable of defining the self. Such principles which elevate the metaphysical implications of 'artistry' above 'musicianship' themselves derive from the philosophy of Novalis, Schlegel and Schleiermacher, the latter of whom argued that since 'Beauty is produced via human activity more than by anything else, [then artists] are people who make a work of art their own'.<sup>8</sup> In positioning the 'person' above the 'artist' Neuhaus demonstrated how rooted his understanding was in German Romantic philosophy which, in the mind of a

---

<sup>4</sup> See J. Thieffry, *Alfred Cortot's Studies in Musical Interpretation* (London: George G. Harrap & Co. Ltd., 1937).

<sup>5</sup> See J. Horowitz, *Conversations with Arrau* (London: Collins, 1982) pp. 118–121.

<sup>6</sup> 'Для всякого мыслящего человека «я» есть не только субъект, но в то же время один из объектов познания действительного мира [...]. Расскажу о себе в связи с вопросом [как познание становится] художественным.' H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1958) p. 20.

<sup>7</sup> As quoted in A. Walker, 'Liszt the Writer' in *Reflections on Liszt* (New York: Cornell University Press, 2005) p. 221.

<sup>8</sup> F. Schleiermacher, *Ästhetik* (1819/25) as quoted in A. Bowie, 'Art and Interpretation' in *Aesthetics and Subjectivity from Kant to Nietzsche. Second edition*, 2003 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006) p. 203.

figure like Schleiermacher, dictated that art's collective significance relied on the strength of the individual artist's self-consciousness.<sup>9</sup>

This chapter draws on Neuhaus's activity as a student, pianist, critic, pedagogue and person of his time to give a fuller account of how he used the mechanisms of 'emotive art' to create his unique interpretations which were born out of *his own* experience and imagination, but which he believed answered to the 'true' intentions of a composer.

## 2.1 Forging identities: Relinquishing composition to become a pianist-interpreter

Heinrich Neuhaus developed artistically in a time and environment where the relationship between the pianist-composer and the pianist-interpreter were being redefined. Living in a musical household, this redefinition was particularly significant in the formation of his own distinct persona. Neuhaus's family included a number of musicians who combined composition with interpretation – most notably his cousin Karol Szymanowski and his uncle Felix Blumenfeld. Neuhaus's parents, however, believed that the pianist-interpreter could only exist by sacrificing composition and improvisation because the rigorous drill required by the virtuoso-pianist dictated that there was no time for anything else.

Outside of his direct family, as a young man Neuhaus was developing against a backdrop of the giants of the last guard of the composer-interpreter pianists in both Russia and Europe, including Sergei Rachmaninov, Nikolai Medtner and Ferruccio Busoni. Some of Neuhaus's most influential musical colleagues also balanced their pianistic identities with both interpretation and composition: Leopold Godowsky, Alexander Goldenweiser, Samuil Feinberg and to some extent Artur Schnabel, or in a different way, Vladimir Horowitz. Neuhaus himself had shown both a great interest and proficiency in improvisation and composition from a young age. Were it not, in part, for his father's influence, Neuhaus would have, in all probability, joined the illustrious list of interpreter-composers:

My father considered that there could not be a higher person than a pianist. And in some aspect he must have been able to instil this in me, because otherwise I would have most likely gone down a different path.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> See, for example, *Ibid.* pp. 185–200. As summarized by Robert Brandom in this post-Hegelian Romantic view: 'What matters about us morally [...] is the capacity of each of us as discursive creatures to say things that no-one else has ever said, things furthermore that would never have been said if we did not say them.' See R. Brandom, *Articulating Reasons* (London: Harvard University Press, 2000) p. 178.

Despite much encouragement from Juon between 1906 and 1910 in Berlin to study composition as his principle subject, Neuhaus made the conscious decision to restrict himself to the study of counterpoint and the composition of polyphonic exercises such as strict eight-part motets, which he felt would benefit his mind as a pianist. Neuhaus was convinced that for him the activities of composition and interpretation could not coexist. Upon Juon's suggestion that his student should perhaps consider playing less so that he did not 'kill his talent' for composition, Neuhaus wrote to his parents that despite his own urge to compose, he could not undertake such a sacrifice because he agreed with his father that he 'simply must become a pianist'.<sup>11</sup>

As confirmed by Neuhaus's closest friends, the decision to take on a purely pianistic identity and forego composition was not without regret. According to Neuhaus's students, he would often remember the words of his friend, Boris Pasternak: 'It is a pity you don't compose, Harry! You would have had in life a faithful and special friend.'<sup>12</sup> Neuhaus's resolve was however firm. Despite so many of his pianist-friends and colleagues around him composing (including Boris Pasternak), Neuhaus seems to have only relaxed his decision on one occasion, at a time when he realized his marriage to his wife, Zinaida, was over.<sup>13</sup> Pasternak wrote to Zinaida, his future wife, on the 9 July 1931:<sup>14</sup>

Garrik [sic.] played brilliantly [...].<sup>15</sup> Coming out for the tenth time to the cries of the audience and request for encores, through the sudden silence,

---

<sup>10</sup> 'Отец мой вообще считал, что не может быть человека выше пианиста. И в какой-то мере он сумел это внушить мне, а то, вероятно, я пошел бы по другой линии.' Neuhaus's conversation with V. M. Teplov and A. V. Vitsinsky (6 December 1944) in А. Ф. Хитрук (составитель), Г. Г. Нейгауз. Доклады и выступления. Беседы и семинары. Открытые уроки. Воспоминания (Москва: «Дека», 2008) [A. F. Hitruk (ed.), H. G. Neuhaus. Presentations and Appearances. Conversations and Seminars. Open Lessons. Reminiscences (Moscow: 2008)] p. 84.

<sup>11</sup> '[...] но я же, наконец, должен стать пианистом.' Letter to his parents from Berlin dated 4 December 1907 in *Letters* p. 73.

<sup>12</sup> 'Ты зря не сочиняешь, Гарри! У тебя был бы в жизни верный и единственный друг.' Quote from Alexei Nasedkin in Е. Р. Рихтер (составитель), *Вспоминая Нейгауза*, 1992 (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2007) [E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus*, 1992 (Moscow: 2007)] p. 215.

<sup>13</sup> According to reports of close friends this was a turbulent time during which Neuhaus's actions and behaviour could become very erratic. For example there are several accounts from this time that Neuhaus could suddenly stand up and leave the stage in the middle of a work.

<sup>14</sup> Zinaida Nikolaevna Neuhaus married Pasternak in 1934 but her marriage to Heinrich Neuhaus ended already in the autumn 1931.

<sup>15</sup> *Гаррик* [Garrik] and *Гарри* [Garry/Harry] were affectionate names for Heinrich used by his closest friends.

he said that he was unwell, and is hardly able to play and so will perform his own composition. He played his *Prelude*, the one which I love and often sing – the one with the broad cantilena and bell-like second theme. He played it wonderfully, and for me, to hear it was a triumph [...].<sup>16</sup>

It is significant that Neuhaus made no efforts to publish this composition either at the time, or towards the end of his life when writing his autobiographical notes for publication, nor did he himself admit anywhere in his own written legacy to composing in private.

Thus, Neuhaus chose to identify himself strongly as a pianist. In his letters, Neuhaus always said he was happiest when working assiduously at the piano on repertoire, especially in preparation for recitals.<sup>17</sup> Despite the angst and 'black melancholy' that came over him in his drive to achieve his pianistic ideals, he nonetheless wrote to his parents: '[...] Believe me when I say that I have struggled [yet] I work a lot – *on revient toujours à ses premiers amours* [one always returns to his first loves].'<sup>18</sup> In a climate where composition and interpretation were still overlapping activities, Neuhaus's definition of himself as a *pianist* was distinctive. Neuhaus was adamant that, against the odds, without composition – whether original or in the form of virtuosic transcription that was still popular at the time – he would nonetheless become a 'musical authority in a big city'. Neuhaus believed that even in relinquishing compositional activity, his creative merits would find another musical outlet which would make it 'a disgrace and utmost scandal if [he] was forced to become a teacher in Elisavetgrad.'<sup>19</sup>

When talking about his activities as a pianist, Neuhaus constructed himself as an interpreter [*исполнитель*] of other people's works. This identification triggered a

<sup>16</sup> 'Гаррик все играл превосходно [...]. Выходя в десятый раз на вызовы и просьбы бисировать, он среди водворившейся тишины сказал, что нездоров и еле играет и, что исполнит сейчас своё сочинение. Он сыграл свою прелюдию, ту, которую я люблю и часто напеваю, с широкой кантиленой и колокольчикоподобной второй темой. Он изумительно сыграл её, и услышать её было для меня торжеством [...].' As presented in Б. А. Кац (сост.), *Раскат импровизаций... Музыка в творчестве, судьбе и в доме Бориса Пастернака* (Ленинград: «Советский Композитор», 1991) [B. A. Katz (ed.), *Music in the Art, Fate and Home of Boris Pasternak*. (Leningrad: 1991)] pp. 257–258.

<sup>17</sup> See for example *Letters* p. 194: 'I feel good and think with great pleasure about the fact that finally I will play soon.' ['Чувствую себя совсем хорошо и с удовольствием думаю о том, что я, наконец, снова буду играть.'] Letter to his parents from Tbilisi dated 15 January 1926.

<sup>18</sup> '[...] но верьте мне, что и я страдал. Работал последнее время довольно много, *on revient toujours à ses premiers amours* [...].' Letter to his parents from Florence dated 16 May 1909 in *Letters* p. 123.

<sup>19</sup> 'Было бы позором и настоящим скандалом, если бы в Елисаветграде мне пришлось сделаться преподавателем.' Letter to his parents from Vienna dated 10 September 1913 in *Letters* p. 169.

philosophical need to rationalize how he was different to those musicians with whom he was in contact in his formative years who both composed and performed – his uncle, Blumenfeld; his professor, Godowsky; his cousin, Szymanowski. Emphasizing the difference between interpreters and composers almost as two distinct species, Neuhaus considered that it was vital not to apply the ‘morals’ of one to another, yet believed that it was ‘a practice still, alas, not extinct [in the late 1950s]’. In his desperation to make this clear, particularly to critics and musicologists, he resorted to analogy: ‘Let’s say they write about an oak – they praise it for its leaves, height, crown and then add: what a pity though, that it does not have any apples, only acorns.’<sup>20</sup>

Neuhaus positioned the interpreter as the ‘host’ of the composer’s emotional world – an idea that runs throughout his discussions and writings. Primarily Neuhaus achieved this by constantly reminding his audience that the composer is a much higher being than the interpreter, that it is the composer who is endowed with the quasi-divine gift of original musical creation i.e. the ability to clearly see, comment on and document reality. The interpreter, according to Neuhaus, is necessarily limited in his personal expression through his servitude to the composer. On this point Neuhaus wrote that:

How much ‘better’ is the position of the composer than the position of the interpreter! The spiritual facts of his biography (psychography!) are captured in specific artistic images: he speaks for himself in *his own* words, he speaks in the first person, but the interpreters only *vary* the words of others, the thoughts and experiences of others!<sup>21</sup>

Within the parameters of pianism, Neuhaus’s selection of the word ‘interpreter’ to describe his own identity in relation to the piano can be seen in his writings to overtake the word ‘pianist’. In fact, Neuhaus’s application of the word ‘pianist’, as opposed to his specific

---

<sup>20</sup> ‘[...] они описывают, допустим, дуб, хваля его за густую листву, за ветвистость, за высокую крону, а в конце прибавляют: как жаль всё-таки, что на нем не растут яблоки, а только желуди.’ Н. Г. Neuhaus, ‘Autobiographical Notes. Chapter II (Autopsychographical)’ in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 56.

<sup>21</sup> ‘Насколько «лучше» положение композитора, чем положение исполнителя! Духовные факты его биографии (психографии!) запечатлены в конкретных художественных образах, он высказывается *своими* словами, говорит от первого лица, а исполнители только *варьируют* чужие слова, чужие мысли и переживания!’ Г. Г. Нейгауз, ‘Еще о Рихтере (По поводу исполнения трех последних сонат Бетховена 10 и 12 декабря 1963)’ [Н. Г. Neuhaus, ‘More on Richter (About his Interpretation of the Last Three Beethoven Sonatas on the 10 and 12 December 1963)’ in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 290.

use of the term 'pianist-interpreter' [*пианист-исполнитель*], is at times coloured by derogatory connotations of the mindless, and therefore inartistic, fulfilment of muscular movements. As will be shown, for Neuhaus the role of the interpreter was no less *creative* than the role of the composer, but simply bound to a different set of ethical considerations. This distinction between interpreter and composer, based on Neuhaus's idea of 'ethics' and 'morals', will be discussed in detail later in the chapter.

## 2.2 The concept of the 'interpreter' in Russian thought

In Neuhaus's writing, as well as wider musical literature, the Russian word *исполнитель* is often translated in English as 'the performer'. This translation practice does not accommodate the modern English-language trend to make the musicological distinction between 'performer' and 'interpreter'.<sup>22</sup> Yet, this distinction and separation is the crucial dialectic discussion at the heart of Neuhaus's written output and pedagogy. The *Oxford English Dictionary* indeed does define the verb 'perform' as 'to carry out, accomplish, or fulfil (an action, task or function)' and as 'work, function, or do something to a specified standard', and lastly as 'to present a form of entertainment to an audience'. Far from insisting on a creative function, the connotations of such definitions are that the performer is to meticulously execute a set of commands. The Russian verb *исполнить* [*ispolnit'*] bears the more specific definition 'to re-create [*воспроизвесту*]<sup>23</sup> Art for the purpose of listening or observation'.<sup>24</sup> The implication of '*исполнить*' as a creative task is therefore built into the definition itself. This is further reinforced by the existence of a further Russian verb, *выполнить* [*vypolnit'*], which is closely related in derivation to *исполнить*, but meaning specifically the *execution* or *fulfilment* of a task.

---

<sup>22</sup> The cultural critic Edward Said has commented on the rift within pianistic society that has produced two distinct types of artist or performer: the 'mindless virtuosity of the whizzbang pianist' and the interpreter-pianist who 're-establish[es] links between piano playing and other human activities.' See E. Said, 'Remembrances of Things Played: Presence and Memory in the Pianist's Art' from *Music at the Limits* with a foreword by Daniel Barenboim (Columbia University Press, 2008) p. 18. Jean-Jacques Nattiez also warned that 'The word "interpret" is ambiguous: when used of music, as Adorno pointed out, it can mean play, or interpret in a critical sense' and that there needs to be a clear musicological distinction between 'interpreting' and simply 'playing'. J. J. Nattiez, *Music and Discourse. Toward a Semiology of Music* translated by Carolyn Abbate (Princeton University Press, 1990) p. 72.

<sup>23</sup> *Vosproizvesti*: to create anew.

<sup>24</sup> Definition taken from *Словарь русского языка С. И. Ожегова* [*Dictionary of Russian Language* by S. I. Ozhogov] 8<sup>th</sup> edition (1970).

The verb *исполнить* and the person to realize it, *исполнитель*, through their definitions challenge the idea of an executant performer who, although he may carry the highest level of skill to carry out his task, remains relatively passive with regards to the substance of what he delivers. Instead these words have to be considered within the framework of re-creating and therefore re-working and so respectively defined as ‘interpret’ and ‘interpreter’. This distinction between passive fulfilment of a task and the involved process of bringing a work back to life, is captured in Neuhaus’s own definition of the role of the interpreter (*исполнитель*):

The interpreter is a complicated and contradictory being. He loves that which he interprets; criticizes it; submits to it completely; and reworks it in his own way. At other times [...] that critic with the propensity of a prosecutor dominates his soul... In the best moments he feels the interpreted work as if it were his own – and he sheds tears of joy, and feels anxiety and love for it.<sup>25</sup>

The distinction of *исполнить* and *выполнить* under two separate entities ingrained itself as an important question across the arts in Russia under numerous guises.<sup>26</sup> The uniting feature of these guises was the idea of emotional activity that was associated with *исполнить*, and its passivity in *выполнить*. Emphasizing the interpreter as a creative being, an *artist*, became an important aspect of the ideals of Russian culture from the latter part of the nineteenth century and gave rise to the concepts of ‘emotive art’ and Romantic Realism.

Despite his cosmopolitan upbringing, Neuhaus identified this emotional or Romantic Realism – frequently described as ‘artistic truth’ in his words – as a dominant Russian aesthetic:

---

<sup>25</sup> ‘Но ведь исполнитель – это сложное и противоречивое существо. Он и любит то, что исполняет, и критикует его, и подчиняется ему всецело, и перерабатывает его по-своему. В иные минуты [...] в душе его господствует тот самый суровый критик с прокурорскими наклонностями... В лучшие минуты он чувствует, что исполняемое произведение как бы его собственное, и он проливает слёзы от радости, волнения и любви к нему.’ Г. Г. Нейгауз, ‘Великое и простое’ [H. G. Neuhaus, ‘The Great and Simple’] in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 177.

<sup>26</sup> As will be seen in this thesis, the identification of musical questions and tendencies in literature, art, theatre, philosophy plays an important role in Neuhaus’s understanding. This can be seen as a particularly widespread Russian aesthetic which is underpinned by the language: Russian-speakers tend to refer to ‘the arts’ in the singular form, ‘art’ [*искусство*], as a union of all art, far more than as a plural.

There is a direction – and it was born in the deepest strata of the Russian soul and the Russian people – a direction that sought truth in interpretative art: truth with which all great Russian art is marked (Pushkin, Tolstoy, Chekhov, Glinka, Tchaikovsky, Ermolova, Stanislavsky...).<sup>27</sup>

In this statement, Neuhaus's inclusion of writers, poets and actors alongside composers illustrates how widely he understood the concept of emotive art to penetrate the Russian arts.<sup>28</sup> As will be seen in the course of this thesis, this kind of Realism remained distinctly separate from the values of Socialist Realism in that its aim was neither to glorify the collective society, nor to present art as accessible to all.<sup>29</sup> Of the figures mentioned, Neuhaus was not simply listing famous names at random. As will be seen in the subsequent chapters, Pushkin and Tolstoy were important figures whose identities Neuhaus assimilated in order to define his interpretation of Beethoven and Chopin. Tchaikovsky was genuinely considered by Neuhaus to be one of the greatest composers of Western Art music, equal in stature and achievement to Wagner. The actor and theatre director Konstantin Stanislavsky was amongst Neuhaus's essential reference points when talking about interpretation in a pedagogical capacity. Speaking about emotional Realism being evident in all great art, Neuhaus wrote: 'Again and again: *Everything is one*... Read the books of Stanislavsky where this is revealed in a lot of detail most beautifully.'<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> 'Есть направление – и оно родилось в глубочайших пластах русской души и русского народа, – направление, ищущее правды в исполнительском искусстве, той правды, которой отмечено всё великое русское искусство (Пушкин, Толстой, Чехов, Глинка, Чайковский, Ермолова, Станиславский...).' Г. Г. Нейгауз, 'Композитор-исполнитель, 1956' [H. G. Neuhaus, 'Composer-Interpreter, 1956'] in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 199.

<sup>28</sup> As will be explored further, Neuhaus's engagement with Realism was as part of a wider cultural phenomenon which was important in literary spheres (Lev Tolstoy, Fyodor Dostoevsky etc.), fine art (the *Передвижники* [Peredvizhniki] movement) and in the theatre and opera stage (Konstantin Stanislavsky, *Московский художественный театр имени Чехова (МХТ)* [Moscow Artistic Theatre in honour of Chekhov]).

<sup>29</sup> As offered by the editors of *Encyclopaedia Britannica*: 'Socialist Realism follows the great tradition of 19th-century Russian realism in that it purports to be a faithful and objective mirror of life. It differs from earlier realism, however, in several important respects. The realism of Leo Tolstoy and Anton Chekhov inevitably conveyed a critical picture of the society it portrayed. [...] Socialist Realism looks back to Romanticism in that it encourages a certain heightening and idealizing of heroes and events to mould the consciousness of the masses [but the] hundreds of positive heroes—usually engineers, inventors, or scientists — created to this specification were strikingly alike in their lack of lifelike credibility.' See <http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/551721/Socialist-Realism> (accessed 01/12/2014)

<sup>30</sup> 'Опять и опять: *все едино*... Читайте книги Станиславского, там много и прекрасно об этом говорится.' H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 63.



The application of this phenomenon of Realism in the creation of a musical interpretation began to undergo serious musicological investigation in Soviet Russia in the 1930s. It has been a major part of the pedagogical literature, particularly for pianists, well into the latter part of the twentieth century. The central stimulus for this kind of investigation was Konstantin Stanislavsky's *Работа актера над собой в творческом процессе переживания. Дневник ученика* [*The Work of an Actor on Himself in the Creative Process of Experiencing. The Diary of a Student*] (1938).<sup>31</sup> The main principles of this work had already been published in Stanislavsky's work *Моя жизнь в искусстве* [*My Life in Art*] (1924), which had initially appeared in America in 1922. In Russia however, Stanislavsky's work was already extremely well-known through his practice as a theatre and opera director, as well as the work in his established theatre, the Moscow Artistic Theatre or 'МХТ' [*Московский Художественный театр (МХТ)*]. Therefore, no particular urgency existed to publish the 1938 'manual', *Работа актера над собой*. In fact, Stanislavsky and his theatre were so well-known that Mikhail Bulgakov wrote a satirical novel, *Театральный роман (Записки покойника)* [*Theatrical Novel. (Notes of a Deceased)*] in 1936 which is a parody of Stanislavsky, his system and his institutions.

One of the first substantial musicological investigations of Stanislavsky's system and piano-pedagogy was by the Soviet musicologist Lev Barenboim in 1939. Barenboim's thesis, *Некоторые вопросы воспитания музыканта-исполнителя и система Станиславского* [*Some Questions Relating to the Education of Performing Musicians and the System of Stanislavsky*], defended at the Moscow Conservatory, centred on Grigory Kogan's idea of 'психотехника' ['psychotechnics'], or the need to make interpretative and technical decisions, first consciously, and only then subconsciously. In this thesis, Barenboim remarked that whilst Stanislavsky was highly relevant to pianists and musical pedagogy, it was wrong to assume that his work was universally applicable to all epochs and styles of artists. Barenboim argued that Theodor Leschetizky had clear views, but taught in an anti-Stanislavskian aesthetic – 'play as I do' – whereas Liszt 'was able to accept an individual interpretation by a student of a musical

---

<sup>31</sup> К. С. Станиславский, *Работа актера над собой в творческом процессе переживания. Дневник ученика*, 1938 (Санкт-Петербург: «Азбука-Классика», 2010) [K. S. Stanislavsky, *The Work of an Actor on Himself in the Creative Process of Experiencing. The Diary of a Student*, 1938 (St. Petersburg: 2010)]. In the West Stanislavsky's appears as: C. Stanislavski, *An Actor Prepares* translated by Elizabeth Reynolds Hargood (New York: Taylor & Francis Group, 1948). This is a re-translation of a manuscript published in English in the West in 1936 – prior to its appearance in the Soviet Union. Stanislavsky revised his ideas before his death and the 1938 work (above) was his latest version which he wanted to be published. This version is not identical to K. Stanislavski, *An Actor's Work: A Student's Diary* translated by Jean Benedetti (Routledge, 2008). This thesis will refer to the Russian versions only, in translation by the thesis's author, as these were the ones available in Neuhaus's lifetime in Russia. The thesis does not investigate the substantial differences between the English and Russian versions.

work even if it went against his.<sup>32</sup> Because Barenboim believed that the Lisztian aesthetic was the dominant one in Russia, he proposed that Stanislavsky's aesthetics, which he traced to those of earlier nineteenth-century Russian musicians and writers, would be vital for contemporary pedagogical methods.

The prediction of Barenboim's thesis was proved right as Stanislavsky's work became an important part of many musicological writings on pedagogy. Of these, Grigory Kogan's *У врат мастерства. Психологические предпосылки успешности пианистической работы* [*At the Gates of Mastery. Psychological Prerequisites to Successful Piano Practice*] (1958) and Samarii Savshinsky's *Работа пианиста над музыкальным произведением* [*The Work of the Pianist on a Musical Work*] (1964) are examples of two influential works which centre on Stanislavsky's teachings and their application for pianists.<sup>33</sup> Outside of Heinrich Neuhaus's main pedagogical work *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1958, revised 1961), he made references to Stanislavsky's aphorisms in teaching, as can be ascertained from documentation of his lessons.<sup>34</sup>

Stanislavsky's appeal for Neuhaus is obvious – as a representative of what is now broadly called 'realist theatre', Stanislavsky shared a common aesthetic grounding with

<sup>32</sup> Extract from 'Некоторые вопросы воспитания музыканта-исполнителя и система Станиславского' ['Some Questions Relating to the Education of Performing Musicians and the System of Stanislavsky'] in Л. А. Баренбойм, *Вопросы фортепианной педагогики и исполнительства* (Ленинград: «Музыка», 1966) [L. A. Barenboim, *Questions of Piano Pedagogy and Interpretation* (Leningrad: 1966)] p. 13.

<sup>33</sup> The full references for the works cited above are as follows: Г. М. Коган, *У врат мастерства*, 1958 (Москва: «Советский Композитор», 1961) [G. M. Kogan, *At the Gates of Mastery*, 1958 (Moscow: 1961)]; С. И. Савшинский, *Работа пианиста над музыкальным произведением* (Ленинград: «Музыка», 1964) [S. I. Savshinsky, *The Work of the Pianist on a Musical Work* (Leningrad: 1964)]. It is important to note that the questions raised by Stanislavsky's work, or the work of musicologists such as Barenboim, Kogan and Savshinsky, find themselves reflected in certain areas of research today. For example, Patrik Juslin's *Communicating Emotion in Musical Performance: A Review and Theoretical Framework* (Oxford University Press, 2002), and *Feedback Learning of Musical Expressivity* (co-authored with Anders Friberg, Erwin Schoonderwaldt and Jessica Karlsson) investigated how metaphor helps both pedagogues and performers to shape 'musically relevant emotions' (see A. Williamon (ed.), *Musical Excellence* (Oxford University Press, 2004) p. 250). Peter Kivy also suggested the need for differentiating between felt emotions, which he calls the 'garden variety', and their identity as transmuted musical emotions in his work *New Essays on Musical Understanding* (Oxford University Press, 2001). This work however is investigated from the perspective of the listener. Furthermore, where Stanislavsky's work recognizes that the 'psychological truth' of 'emotive art' is a way in which the interpreter can project his own artistic identity when faced with a text, Juslin's study investigates emotional communication outside any dependency on Western art music.

<sup>34</sup> Transcripts of Neuhaus's lessons have been published, for example, in А. Ф. Хитрук (составитель), Г. Г. Нейгауз. *Доклады и выступления. Беседы и семинары. Открытые уроки. Воспоминания*. (Москва: «Дека», 2008) [A. F. Hitruk (ed.), H. G. Neuhaus. *Presentations and Appearances. Conversations and Seminars. Open Lessons. Reminiscences* (Moscow: 2008)], which also included a CD recording of Neuhaus's lessons at the Moscow Conservatory in the 1960s.

Neuhaus. Both artists extensively explored and explained the values that they held, and in doing so they relied heavily on paradox to provide the dynamics for their discussions. Stanislavsky's professional connection to Anton Rubinstein, Piotr Tchaikovsky, Sergei Taneyev and Alexander Siloti through the Russian Music Society, as well as to figures such as Lev Tolstoy and the Tretyakov family, would probably have strengthened Neuhaus's respect for him.<sup>35</sup> What also makes Stanislavsky such a successful pairing to Neuhaus was their mutual search to define their creative territory as artists who were not the authors of the works that they presented. Through the incessant questioning of *who* they were and *what* values and responsibilities they had, both Stanislavsky and Neuhaus used a similar vocabulary to contend with description of their role – the previously mentioned *исполнитель*.

Neuhaus used a handful of analogies and aphorisms taken directly from Stanislavsky in his pedagogical work, most notably in his book *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1958/61) and in some of his lectures.<sup>36</sup> Within his lifetime *About the Art of Piano Playing* became a sought-after publication and was likened in importance to the writing of Stanislavsky.<sup>37</sup> Neuhaus reported:

My modest book is an 'unprecedented' success. It's being translated into different languages, and recently there was a meeting at the МХАТ [МХАТ: *Московский Художественный Академический театр* / Moscow Artistic Academic Theatre] where they really praised me and concluded that *About the Art of Piano Playing* stands alongside Stanislavsky's book *My Life in Art*. Well, I'm very pleased.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>35</sup> The Russian Music Society was set up by the Rubinstein brothers to work in partnership with the conservatories to raise the standard of music in Russia. Stanislavsky had been a director of the Society from 1886. His familial ties with the Tretyakov brothers, Pavel and Sergei, (who give their name to the famous Tretyakov Gallery in Moscow) meant that Stanislavsky was in close contact with figures like Ilya Repin, Ivan Kramskoy, Viktor Vasnetsov, Ivan Turgenev and was a distant relative of Tchaikovsky and Siloti. See [http://www.tretyakovgallery.ru/ru/museum/history/history\\_gallery/history\\_gallery\\_family/](http://www.tretyakovgallery.ru/ru/museum/history/history_gallery/history_gallery_family/) (accessed 25/08/2013).

<sup>36</sup> See for example H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1958) p. 31.

<sup>37</sup> In 1959 Neuhaus wrote to Lucy Pogosova: 'My editor, (the wonderful) Shahnazarova, has said that managers of the music shops say that if [they had the stock] they would sell 2500 copies of my book in a matter of a few days.' ['Мне сказала моя редакторша (очень славная) Шахназарова, что ей говорили директоры (начальники) магазинов (нотных, музыкальных книг), что могли бы в несколько дней продать 2500 экземпляров моей книжки [...].'] See *Letters* p. 435. The success of *About the Art of Piano Playing* is upheld by the request of the publishing house for a revised edition to be published only three years later.

<sup>38</sup> 'Моя скромная книжка пользуется «невиданным» успехом. Переводят на разные языки; недавно было заседание МХАТа, где меня очень хвалили и решили, что «Искусство фортепианной игры» стоит рядом с книгой Станиславского «Моя жизнь в искусстве». Ну, что ж,

Unlike the writings intended for pedagogical purposes, Neuhaus rarely referenced Stanislavsky in his private correspondence or diary. Nevertheless, as will be shown, the ideals of emotional Realism, as set down (but not 'invented') by Stanislavsky, were embedded in Neuhaus's psyche – the basic foundation which he then elaborated with his complex attitude to interpreting specific composers. Importantly, when sharing these ideals with his students, Stanislavsky seems to have been the clearest example for Neuhaus to draw upon to corroborate his own thoughts. Stanislavsky's training method which speaks of technique needing to be guided by a conscious awareness of the goal, rather than technique dictating the result corresponded to Neuhaus's understanding that 'what' determines 'how'. In Neuhaus's case, the absence of Stanislavsky in relation to his own pianism thus speaks more of the distinction between an artist's already internalized knowledge, and a pedagogue's need to find a clear reference-point that would be beneficial to a student who was yet to find his own relationship with these ideas.

To understand the significance of Stanislavsky's contribution to artistic culture in the broadest sense is to realize that his philosophy was unswervingly guided by one definition: 'Art is the *creation of life of the human soul*.'<sup>39</sup> When Stanislavsky decided to formulate his 'method' for revolutionizing, or rather creating the staple *raison d'être* of the Russian acting school, he condensed all artistic endeavours into one of two possible paths. Stanislavsky famously differentiated these two kingdoms of art and gave them the names the 'representational' and the 'emotive'. These two different processes of performing a work provided a vocabulary that was easily applicable even to abstract arts such as music.

The kind of artistic interpretation that Stanislavsky found unacceptable ('representative art' [*искусство представления*]) was one that 'not creating the actual living life of the spirit [...] instead speaks vividly of it.'<sup>40</sup> Stanislavsky believed that

---

очень приятно.' Letter to L. A. Pogosova from Moscow dated 15 January 1962 in *Letters* p. 493. The Moscow Artistic Theatre in honour of Chekhov was founded by Konstantin Stanislavsky and Vladimir Nemirovich-Danchenko in 1898. It was for a time later renamed as the Moscow Artistic Academic Theatre. The name has since been reinstated to the Moscow Artistic Theatre in 2004. There is also a separate theatre called the Moscow Artistic Academic Theatre in honour of Gorky.

<sup>39</sup> 'Искусство – создание жизни человеческого духа.' К. С. Станиславский, *Статьи. Речи. Беседы. Письма* (Москва: «Искусство», 1953) [K. S. Stanislavsky, *Articles. Speeches. Conversations. Letters* (Moscow: 1953)] p. 457.

<sup>40</sup> 'Не создавая самой живой жизни духа, искусство представления образно говорит о ней [...].' К. S. Stanislavsky, *Articles. Speeches. Conversations. Letters* (Moscow: 1953) pp. 457–458.

representative art was a craft that mimicked the ideal or rather the truth within the artwork: 'The truth of [representative art] is not in true passion, but *truth-like* feeling [...] that becomes believable'.<sup>41</sup> He discussed the great skill, particularly of French actors, who had been trained to observe and then meticulously study, copy and refine the externalized actions. He acknowledged the great craft of such actors, yet for him that is all it remained – craft.<sup>42</sup> Infinitely greater in his opinion was the second type of artistic undertaking, that which proclaimed that 'Art is life' – words which Neuhaus happily appropriated throughout his writings.<sup>43</sup>

The goal of emotive art is first and foremost the creation, on stage, of a *living life of the human soul and the reflection of that life in the artistic stage-form*. This life of the human soul is created through [...] the truthful, sincere feeling and sincere passion of the artist.<sup>44</sup>

### 2.3 Emotional Realism in the Visual Arts

In speaking about music, Neuhaus often referred to painting. Whilst it is indeed common for musicians to borrow vocabulary from the visual arts to talk of the line, shape or colour of a phrase, Neuhaus frequently turned to specific works of certain painters in respect of their searching for interpretative truth as an essence beyond the perfection of a surface.<sup>45</sup> The painters mentioned in Neuhaus's pedagogical writings, his correspondence and his diary can all be seen to fall into one of two groups: artists of the High Renaissance (namely Titian, Michelangelo, Raphael, Da Vinci) who will be explored in relation to Neuhaus's interpretation of Chopin; and artists of the Russian *Передвижники* [Peredvizhniki] movement.

<sup>41</sup> 'Правда [искусства представления] не в истине страстей, а в *правдоподобию* чувства [...] для того, чтобы творчество стало убедительно.' Ibid. p. 453.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid. p. 460.

<sup>43</sup> 'Искусство – это жизнь.' See for example Г. Г. Нейгауз, 'К чему я стремился как музыкант (К столетию Московской консерватории)' [H. G. Neuhaus, 'My Aims as a Musician (For the Centenary of the Moscow Conservatory)'] in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* pp. 81–82.

<sup>44</sup> 'Цель искусства переживания заключается прежде всего в создании на сцене *живой жизни человеческого духа в отражении этой жизни в художественной сценической форме*. Такая жизнь человеческого духа может быть создана [...] правдивым, искренним чувством и истинной страстью артиста.' K. S. Stanislavsky, *Articles. Speeches. Conversations. Letters* p. 461.

<sup>45</sup> See for example H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 77.

Well before Stanislavsky, the ideals of emotional Realism were being exemplified from the 1860s through a group of artists who called themselves the 'The Wanderers' (Peredvizhniki). The Russian Realist style which they developed was centred largely on the teaching of Pavel Chistyakov, and was a reaction against the notion of 'high art' held by the reigning conservative art school.<sup>46</sup> The breakaway Peredvizhniki painters instead spoke of an emotional art which united all people through the feeling behind the canvas – a concept mirrored in Lev Tolstoy's essay *Что такое искусство?* [*What is Art?*] (1897) and spurred on as an integral part of the Russian cultural identity. The singer Fyodor Chaliapin, who was revered by Stanislavsky, believed that the emotional art, as exhibited by Isaak Levitan (a landscape painter belonging to this movement) [see Figure 1], changed his entire view of art:

I understood that one should not seek to make an assiduous copy [...] that is not art. I understood that in all art what is more important is feelings and the spirit – that verb with which the prophet was commanded to burn the hearts of men. [...] I carried these impressions into my own work in the theatre.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> For a more detailed exploration of this subject see C. Ely, *This Meager Nature: Landscape and National Identity in Imperial Russia*, 2000 (Northern Illinois University Press, 2009) pp. 257–270.

<sup>47</sup> 'Я понял, что не нужно копировать предметы и усердно их раскрашивать – это не искусство. Понял я, что во всяком искусстве важнее всего чувство и дух – тот глагол, которым пророку было повелено жечь сердца людей. [...] Я сделал из этих новых для меня впечатлений надлежащие выводы для моей собственной работы в театре.' Extract from Fyodor Chaliapin's memoirs *Маска и душа* [*The Mask and the Soul*] (1932) as quoted in <http://isaak-levitan.ru/> (accessed 17/03/2014).



Figure 1 Isaak Levitan's *Вечерний звон* [*Evening Bells*], 1892. Oil on canvas (0.87m x 1.70m). Tretyakov Gallery, Moscow.

The Peredvizhniki movement, little-known in the West, was far-reaching within Russia with exhibitions running from 1871 to 1923, and their subsequent influence leaving its trace further still. Their specifically Russian Realist style stands in sharp contrast to the contemporaneous developments of Central Europe where Fauvism, Expressionism and Cubism were gathering the attention of the cultural elite. Despite the Peredvizhniki's increasingly complex colour palette and generally increasing looseness of brush strokes, the term 'Russian Impressionism' often applied to this aesthetic (especially to artists such as Arkhip Kuindzhi, Isaak Levitan and to the later work of Valentin Serov) is misleading. This was strikingly illustrated by Vassily Kandinsky when in 1896 he saw a painting by Monet for the first time:

That it was a haystack the catalogue informed me. I could not recognize it. This non-recognition was painful to me. I considered that the painter had no right to paint indistinctly. I dully felt that the object of the painting was missing.<sup>48</sup>

Of course, those artists who in particular were affiliated in one way or another to Diaghilev's *Ballet Russes* and who studied in cities such as Paris or became émigrés, were being influenced by and involved with European movements that were moving away from these Realist aesthetic roots. Kandinsky is an example of this. Within Russia, however, the grip of the Peredvizhniki aesthetic even on the more progressive and symbolist painters of the movement such as Mikhail Vrubel cannot be undervalued.

The strong hold that this kind of aesthetic of Realism had for Russian culture at this time is often overlooked even in landmark texts such as Richard Taruskin's *Defining Russia Musically: Historical and hermeneutical essays* (1997) or *On Russian Music* (2009).<sup>49</sup> Furthermore, the length of time that this aesthetic dominated the cultural skyline is frequently underestimated in favour of the interjection offered by post-revolutionary Soviet movements including Socialist Realism, the Avant-garde, and Constructivism. Particularly from a Western perspective the names of Ivan Kramskoy, Ivan Shishkin, Ilya Repin, Valentin Serov and Mikhail Nesterov are mostly unknown and it is largely assumed that it was the likes of Vassily Kandinsky, Natalia Goncharova, Kazimir Malevich and Marc Chagall who were exerting the most direct influence.

---

<sup>48</sup> K. Lindsay, *Kandinsky: Complete Writings on Art* (London: G. K. Hall & Co, 1982) p. 363.

<sup>49</sup> Published by New Jersey: Princeton University Press and Los Angeles: California University Press respectively.



The aesthetics and working practices of the Russian Realist painters, and references to their activities and ideals, served as the staple culturally-didactic models throughout the arts well into the 1960s. In the musical sphere this included such diverse musicians and theorists as Leopold Auer, Konstantin Stanislavsky, Alexander Nikolaev, Grigory Kogan, Samarii Savshinsky and Lev Barenboim. The Realist painters saw their ideals not in capturing photographic likeness, or idealized likeness, but in capturing the living emotional life of their subject by looking ‘through’ its surface. The eminent musicologist Grigory Kogan, whose work Neuhaus greatly admired, saw precisely this as one of the defining actions applicable directly to the musical interpreter. In his book *At the Gates of Mastery* (1958) Kogan looked at Chistyakov, the teacher of Peredvizhniki artists such as Serov and Repin, who said the artist must look more with his eyes – once the eye is trained to let you ‘climb into the skin’ of the subject, the hand will follow.<sup>50</sup> Likewise, Kogan quoted Serov who complained of his ‘accursed eyesight that sees every smallest detail, every pore.’<sup>51</sup>

These arguments are not to say that other artistic movements were not involved with emotion. Yet, being a reaction against idealized appearances valued by academism, Russian Realism was pervaded by emotion as the key to sincerity and truth in a way that is hard to match elsewhere. As summarized by Kogan:

Art is not a depiction of life (reality) as we know it, nor of what it ought to be (in the ideal). It is the depiction (detection) of that which is in real life but that we don’t see, notice or know.<sup>52</sup>

Neuhaus too referred to the painters Serov and Vrubel in *About the Art of Piano Playing*.<sup>53</sup> With particular reference to Vrubel, Neuhaus commented that the depth of his vision of a real emotional essence within his subject was so great that he ‘painted the head of the Demon forty times because he was a genius, and not because he was ungifted.’<sup>54</sup> The cultural prevalence of the Peredvizhniki aesthetic as an analogy for the truth and emotional essence of

---

<sup>50</sup> ‘Влазь, так сказать, в кожу действующего лица.’ G. M. Kogan, *At the Gates of Mastery*, 1958 (Moscow: 1961) p. 26.

<sup>51</sup> ‘У меня проклятое зрение... я вижу всякую мелочь, каждую пору.’ Ibid p. 46.

<sup>52</sup> ‘Искусство это не изображение жизни (действительности), какой мы её знаем, и не изображение её, какой она должна быть (в идеале). Это – изображение (выявление) того, что есть в действительной жизни, но чего мы в ней не видим, не замечаем, не знаем.’ See ‘Об искусстве’ [‘About Art’] in Г. М. Коган, *Избранные статьи. Выпуск 2* (Москва: «Советский Композитор», 1972) [G. M. Kogan, *Selected articles. Issue 2* (Moscow: 1972)] p. 211.

<sup>53</sup> H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 77.

<sup>54</sup> ‘Врубель писал сорок раз голову Демона именно потому, что был гениален, а не потому, что был бездарен.’ Ibid. p. 23.

art meant that Neuhaus could readily appeal to his students through such analogies. Speaking about Skryabin's Second Piano Sonata in G-sharp minor Opus 19 (*Sonata-Fantasia*), Neuhaus alluded to the Realist seascapes of Hovhannes Aivazovsky [See Figure 2] and the emotional ideas of the power of fate within them: 'How the music paints [*живописует*] the sea! It's a thousand times better than Aivazovsky. Not mutiny but the fateful chalice of death.'<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> 'Как музыка живописует море! В тысячу раз лучше всякого Айвазовского. Не мятеж, а роковая чаша смерти.' Quotes from Neuhaus's lessons in E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus* p. 297.



Figure 2 Hovhannes Aivazovsky. *Девятый вал* [*The Ninth Wave*],<sup>56</sup> 1850. Oil on Canvas (2.21m x 3.32m). Russian State Museum of Art, Saint Petersburg.

---

<sup>56</sup> Aivazovsky's output was dominated by various kinds of seascapes – storms, shipwrecks, waves, harbours – most frequently depicting the sheer destructive force of the sea. In the citation above Neuhaus is referring collectively to Aivazovsky's output and the painting. *Девятый вал* [*The Ninth Wave*] is presented here because it remains Aivazovsky's most famous work and one instantly recognized by Russian audiences (as recognizable as perhaps Vincent van Gogh's *Sunflowers* would be in Europe). In Russia, the 'ninth wave' is a symbol of fate and unsurmountable power based on the nautical belief that the ninth wave of a storm is the most powerful and destructive. There are two main interpretations of the painting arising from the usual warmth given to such a subject: firstly, that these are the survivors of the 'ninth wave'; and the more widespread interpretation that although the night is penetrated by the light of dawn the shipwreck survivors are still to face one further trial.

Thus, through appealing to the working practices and aesthetics of the Peredvizhniki artists, Neuhaus was able to identify with an artistic movement which sought to elevate 'self-consciousness' to the highest artistic aim.<sup>57</sup> The aim of the Peredvizhniki was to make collectively significant 'what we don't see, notice or know'. This is not something that can be rationally explained or rationally derived – it is rather the mysterious territory in our existence that art causes us to *feel*, and brings into our conscious awareness. Neuhaus called this phenomenon the 'artistic image of a musical work' [*художественный образ музыкального произведения*] and presented its realization as the main task of the interpreter.

## 2.4 Interpretation through the concept of experience as emotion

Such was the importance of the 'artistic image of a musical work' to Neuhaus that both editions of *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1958 and 1961) open with this phrase as the title of the first chapter. In considering the importance of the emotional and Realist aspects of the word 'interpreter' [*исполнитель*] it cannot be underestimated how vital the 'artistic image' was to Neuhaus's understanding of his role as a pianist. Neuhaus saw the most vital work of the interpreter to lie not in attention to musical aspects but attention to '[...] the direction of feelings, in other words – that through which art lives.'<sup>58</sup>

The idea of even the minutest aspect of a musical interpretation being able to 'live' without emotional input from the interpreter is inconceivable within this aesthetic of Realism. In his article *К чему я стремился как музыкант* [*My Aims as a Musician*], Neuhaus went as far as to equate life and art: 'Art is life – governed by the same dialectic laws as all that we call nature, including man.'<sup>59</sup> Likewise, Stanislavsky's aesthetics of 'living' or emotive art as a

<sup>57</sup> The influence and relevance of Romantic German philosophy, particularly through the thoughts of Hegel and Schleiermacher on the role and interpretation of art, was most likely a key factor which afforded Neuhaus's interest in these artists.

<sup>58</sup> '[...] в сторону чувств, то есть того чем живет искусство.' Г. Г. Нейгауз, 'Беседа с педагогами музыкальных учебных заведений' (9 December 1938. Стенограмма, архив Московской консерватории) [H. G. Neuhaus, 'A Conversation with Pedagogues of Musical Educational Institutions' (9 December 1938. Stenograph, Moscow Conservatory Archive)] in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* pp. 108–109.

<sup>59</sup> 'Искусство – та-же жизнь, подчиненная тем же диалектическим законам, как и всё, что мы называем природой, включая человека.' Г. Г. Нейгауз, 'К чему я стремился как музыкант (К столетию Московской консерватории)' [H. G. Neuhaus, 'My Aims as a Musician (For the Centenary of the Moscow Conservatory)'] in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* pp. 81–82.

creation on stage of a human soul, considers that the interpreter must imbue with feeling every moment of his work:

That which *lives* is created by those who are *alive* [...]. Every person in every minute of his life certainly feels something, experiences<sup>60</sup> something, because if he did not feel he would be dead. Only the dead cannot feel.<sup>61</sup>

The idea that every moment in life is felt, and thus has its place in art, was one that occupied much of Neuhaus's attention. True to the aesthetic of Russian Realism, it suggested that all human experience without exception was emotional:

The power of music over the human mind (its 'ubiquity') would be inexplicable if it was not rooted in the very nature of the human. Everything that we do or think (it is irrelevant whether it is the smallest trifle of an action, or whether it is the most significant: whether it is the purchase of potatoes in the market or the study of philosophy) – everything is tinted with colours of a subconscious spectrum.<sup>62</sup>

Such a concept fits well to the Russian language which has evolved in a way that the word 'feeling', *чувство*, (and 'to feel', *чувствовать*) is strongly related in definition and connotation to 'experience', *переживание*, and the verb 'to experience', *переживать*.<sup>63</sup> This contrasts with the English usage where feeling is defined by the *Oxford English Dictionary* as 'an

---

<sup>60</sup> When considering the cultural significance of linguistic association, the English word 'experience' does not give full justice to the Russian word being translated. *Переживать* would more literally be associated with re-living, re-experiencing. It frequently appears in the context of worrying, of anxiety i.e. of an unstable, changeable, state of the soul, however like many words in the Russian language that predominantly indicate a negative context it is often used in positive situations such as to re-experience happiness, love, reunion, success etc.

<sup>61</sup> '*Живое* создается *живым* [...]. Каждый человек в каждую минуту своей жизни непременно что-нибудь чувствует, переживает, а если бы он ничего не чувствовал, он был бы мертвецом. Только мёртвые ничего не чувствуют.' K. S. Stanislavsky, *Articles. Speeches. Conversations. Letters*. p. 463.

<sup>62</sup> 'Власть музыки над человеческими умами (ее «вездесущность») была бы необъяснима, если бы не коренилась в самой природе человека. Ведь всё, что мы делаем или думаем (безразлично, будет ли это самое пустячное действие или самое значительное, покупка ли картошки на рынке или изучение философии), – всё окрашено цветами некоего подсознательного спектра.' Н. Г. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 41.

<sup>63</sup> There are quite a number of words in the Russian language each pertaining subtle variations in meaning that are nonetheless translated (out of necessity) into the English language as 'feeling'.

emotional state or reaction'; and experience is defined independently of any cross-reference to 'feeling' as:

1. Practical contact with and observation of facts or events.
2. Knowledge or skill gained over time.
3. An event or activity which leaves a lasting impression.

According to the 8<sup>th</sup> Revised Edition of Ozhegov's *Dictionary of the Russian Language* (1970) [*Словарь русского языка С. И. Ожегова*] however, the word *переживание*, translated into English as 'experience', is inherently bound up with the word for 'feeling', *чувство*, which in turn (unlike the *OED*) can be defined in terms of 'understanding':

*Чувство*: 1. The ability to feel/sense [*ощущать*], feel/have [*испытывать*],<sup>64</sup> perceive external stimuli.

*Чувствовать*: 1. To have-felt [*испытывать*] some kind of feeling [*чувство*]. 2. To be able to perceive, understand.

*Переживание*: The soul's state [*душевное состояние*]<sup>65</sup> that expresses/manifests itself in the manner of strong feeling-sensations, impressions having-being-felt [*испытываемых*] by someone.

*Переживать*: 1. See *пережить* (1. Live to the end of something. 2. To have-felt [*испытать*] in life). 2. To worry, to lose peace in connection to something/one, suffer because of something/one.

The ramifications of these definitions are significant when applied to the context of interpretation and the arts, not to mention their impact on metaphysical considerations. Whereas the English definition allows one to gather and process experience independently of feeling, the Russian acknowledges neither experience to be independent of feeling nor feeling to be totally independent of rational experience. In effect, emotion is therefore present in both cognitive and sensory processes. This explains why Neuhaus was able to say with such confidence that for a musician every aspect of his life is emotional and therefore musical:

---

<sup>64</sup> In another peculiarity, *испытывать* is also translated into English as 'feeling'. It is indicative of the relatively large number of Russian words that are used in different contexts and with subtle differences related to feeling but without a direct translatable equivalent in English.

<sup>65</sup> More usually translated into English as 'state of mind'.

This emotional attribute (let's call it the *subconscious* state of the spirit) is found in even the most rational, the most apparently unemotional movements, actions and thoughts... What a musician gains in knowledge is expressed by him in creation or interpretation. This is why I have the right to voice a paradoxical thought: everything knowable is musical (for the musician of course). Or more precisely (and tediously): any knowledge is at the same time experience [*переживание*] [...]. The absence of such experiences – and especially the complete lack of experiences – gives birth to un-soulful, formalistic music and empty, uninteresting interpretation. Everything [...] that lives in the human soul, everything that is 'subconscious' (often it is 'super-conscious') *is the kingdom of music*.<sup>66</sup>

Neuhaus's quest to widen his scope as an interpreter through assimilating experiences [*переживание*] was an important aspect in the identification of his unique persona. Revealing how important this cultural immersion was for him as a way of life, Neuhaus wrote to his parents in 1908:

I played little over these past days, but on the other hand I read a lot (mainly Burckhardt and Dante) and generally I lead a very intense life intellectually. Unfortunately I have a far too clever head to be a pianist, and far too pitiable fingers. I always need to seek other spiritual sources – otherwise I will simply go mad.<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> 'Этого эмоционального признака (назовём его условно подсознательным состоянием духа) не лишены и самые рассудочные, самые с виду неэмоциональные действия, поступки, и мысли... То, что музыкант приобретает в познании, высказывается им в творчестве или исполнительстве. И поэтому я вправе высказать парадоксальную мысль: всё познаваемое музыкально (конечно для музыканта). Или, точнее (и скучнее), – всякое познание есть в то же время переживание [...]. Отсутствие подобных переживаний, а тем более всяких вообще переживаний порождает бездушную, формалистическую музыку и пустое, неинтересное исполнение. Всё [...], что [...] живёт в душе человека, всё «подсознательное» (часто это бывает «сверхсознательным») *и есть царство музыки*.' Н. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 41.

<sup>67</sup> 'Несколько дней совсем не играл, но много читал (особенно Буркхардта и Данте) и вообще интеллектуально жил очень интенсивно. У меня, к сожалению, слишком умная голова для того, чтобы быть пианистом, и слишком плохие пальцы. И мне непременно нужны другие духовные источники, – в противном случае сойду с ума.' Letter dated 10 September 1908 from Manuilovka in *Letters* p. 99. Reference to Burckhardt: Carl Jacob Christoph Burckhardt (25 May 1818 – 8 August 1897), a historian of art and culture.

Such cultural appetites were characteristic of the greatest exponents of the Russian Realist aesthetic, bringing to mind, at the very least, writers like Lev Tolstoy and Fyodor Dostoevsky. Neuhaus spoke with great pride about the fact that he could identify his own cultural acquisitions, made in the name of interpretative truth, with the efforts of such figures – a link which will be investigated in depth in the following chapters.<sup>68</sup>

## 2.5 German elements in Heinrich Neuhaus's aesthetics

So far the discussion has considered Neuhaus's engagement with the dominant *Russian* aesthetic of emotive art which stretched in practice from the mid-nineteenth century, and through didactic models well into the 1960s. Yet, particularly in respect of Neuhaus's cultural acquisitions, the wider consensus in Russia during Neuhaus's lifetime and in the years after his death was that his manner of thought and approach to art was Germanic. To some degree, Neuhaus's German name and education in Berlin and Vienna, would have predisposed him in Russia to be viewed in line with the ideas of national schools which, as already discussed, were still exerting a certain influence on the public's perception of art. However, to a more sophisticated audience, Neuhaus seemed to be a conduit into a certain kind of idealized German world which will be investigated in the coming chapters. For instance, in her poem *Памяти Генриха Нейгауза [In Memory of Heinrich Neuhaus]* (1977), Bella Akhmadulina wrote that Neuhaus represented for her 'that dear country, / where Goethe, the Rhine, and he [Neuhaus], and music – [are] all wonderful, / my Germany, my harmony.'<sup>69</sup>

Neuhaus's paternal Germanic roots and his fluency in the language, coupled with the lengthy time he spent studying in Berlin and Vienna meant he frequently voiced his understanding of interpretation in Germanic terms.<sup>70</sup> If the Russian aesthetic predominantly offered Neuhaus a potentially unlimited scope of emotional nuance as part of his

<sup>68</sup> See H. G. Neuhaus, 'Composer-Interpreter' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 199.

<sup>69</sup> '[...] мне та земля мила, / где Гёте, Рейн, и он, и музыка – прекрасны, / Германия моя, гармония моя.'

<sup>70</sup> Neuhaus's use of foreign terms, particularly German (with French and Latin also being dominant), attracted the criticism of Lev Varenboim. See Л. А. Баренбойм, 'Книга Г. Нейгауза и принципы его школы. (По поводу книги «Об искусстве фортепьянной игры») [L. A. Varenboim, 'H. Neuhaus's Book and the Principles of his School. (In Relation to his Book "About the Art of Piano Playing")]' (*Советская музыка*, 1959, № 5 pp. 116–122).



interpretative arsenal, then Germany provided Neuhaus with an ethical framework to which he consistently returned:<sup>71</sup>

There is no greater lie than the famous thesis ‘nichts ist wahr, alles ist erlaubt’ [‘nothing is true, everything is permitted’]. The interpreter, in the search for truthfulness, will be guided by an opposite formula – *there is truth, not everything is permitted!*<sup>72</sup>

Neuhaus’s search for the ‘truth’ was bound by the idea of ‘morals’ [*морали*] which he warned were different for the composer and the interpreter.<sup>73</sup> The ideas of morals and ethics were vital for Neuhaus’s understanding of interpretation, and as such will emerge in several discussions during this thesis. As will be seen in the following chapters, Neuhaus could only contextualize the music of Beethoven and Chopin within his own distinct, and Germanic, philosophical views. In terms of pedagogy and interpretation, Neuhaus warned that these two activities needed a heightened awareness of ethical differences:

The judgment of criticism [*способность суждения критики*] is no less important for a pedagogue than the critique of judgement [*критика способности суждения*] is for a thinking person – see Kant’s *Kritik der Urteilskraft*.<sup>74</sup>

Neuhaus believed that even at the most ‘rudimentary level of thought’ all people learning to play the piano needed to ‘submit to the command’ of ‘the complex of spiritual culture – questions of morals and philosophy’.<sup>75</sup> Half-mockingly, in *About the Art of Piano Playing*, Neuhaus said that his interest in philosophical considerations was indeed so great that his

---

<sup>71</sup> In the subsequent chapters, Neuhaus’s lifelong preoccupation with questions of ethics and morals will be discussed as an important component of Neuhaus’s distinct identity which he brought to his interpretation.

<sup>72</sup> ‘Ещё раз напоминаю, нет более ложной тезы, чем знаменитое «nicht ist wahr, alles ist erlaubt» («нет истины всё дозволено»). Исполнитель в поисках правдивости будет руководствоваться противоположной формулой – *есть истина, не всё дозволено!*’ H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 220.

<sup>73</sup> Ibid. p. 215.

<sup>74</sup> ‘Способность суждения критики и для педагога не менее важна, чем критика способности суждения для мыслящего человека вообще (см. Kant, *Kritik der Urteilskraft*).’ H. G. Neuhaus, ‘Autobiographical Notes. Chapter II (Autopsychographical)’ in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 48.

<sup>75</sup> ‘[...] образующими комплекс духовной культуры, – вопросами морали, философии.’ Ibid.

proper place was perhaps 'in the meetings of the [group] 'Свободной эстетики' ['Free Aesthetics'], and not in Room 29 at the Moscow Conservatory where I teach.'<sup>76</sup>

## 2.6 The role of Ferruccio Busoni

Much of Neuhaus's interrogation of the concepts of pianist-interpreter and composer-interpreter seems to have arisen from his time in Germany, and centred predominantly on his observations of the playing of Ferruccio Busoni. Busoni was in many respects Neuhaus's hero as a thinker and writer, yet Busoni's approach to the interpretation of music was problematic for Neuhaus in several respects. Two of the most crucial points of friction between the two musicians will be discussed below: firstly Neuhaus's vision of the 'interpreter' as one who carried moral obligations before a composer was at odds with Busoni's view that the composer and performer were not in fact the separate entities of Neuhaus's understanding; and secondly, that they held different understandings on the position of emotion in interpretative art.

As an adult in Russia, Neuhaus was a staunch advocate of Busoni's writing (then untranslated into Russian), which he had studied in depth initially during his time in Europe. Busoni's references to E. T. A. Hoffmann, Goethe, Schopenhauer and Nietzsche would have certainly appealed to Neuhaus, and it is quite likely that in some way it was Busoni's writings which inspired Neuhaus's own literary outputs.<sup>77</sup> Busoni's vision that, as summarized by Erinn Knyt, 'the materials of *Tonkunst* [were] inaudible tones emanating from a vibrating universe shaped according to human ideas, captured in notation during the act of creation, and freed again during the fleeting moment of audible performance', is an idea which, as already seen, Neuhaus tried to re-express in his own manner.<sup>78</sup>

---

<sup>76</sup> 'Место моё было бы, пожалуй, на собраниях «Свободной эстетики», но не в 29-м классе Московской консерватории, где я преподаю.' The group *Свободной эстетики* was a pre-revolutionary association which met to discuss the philosophy of art. H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 42.

<sup>77</sup> For a discussion of which philosophical writings Ferruccio Busoni incorporated into his own writings see E. Knyt, *Ferruccio Busoni and the Ontology of the Musical Work: Permutations and Possibilities* (PhD thesis, Stanford University, 2010) pp. 54–63. All the philosophers mentioned above are an integral part of Neuhaus's writings, especially his 'Autopsychography' which in itself might be considered to be modelled on E. T. A. Hoffmann's *Lebensansichten des Katers Murr* [*The Life and Opinions of Tomcat Murr*].

<sup>78</sup> E. Knyt, *Ferruccio Busoni and the Ontology of the Musical Work: Permutations and Possibilities* (PhD thesis, Stanford University, 2010) pp. 54–55.

In his youth, Neuhaus lavished much praise on Busoni's achievements, both musical and philosophical: 'Studying with Godowsky I thought more and more about Busoni – sometimes even more than about Godowsky.'<sup>79</sup> Of course as a character, Busoni was substantially higher and more interesting.<sup>80</sup> Neuhaus however, became increasingly unsure whether Ferruccio Busoni was able to separate the morals relating to himself as a composer and transcriber to the morals that Neuhaus expected of him as an interpreter of another composer's work:

I can frankly say (without fear of sounding 'impudent') that the greatest impression that Busoni made on me [was in his playing of] Liszt's [transcriptions], in Brahms' *Variations on the Themes of Handel* and of *Paganini*, in Chopin's *Twenty-Four Etudes* (but mainly in a virtuosic way; in a poetic-musical sense, for me many things seemed questionable), in his grandiose Bach organ [transcriptions], in the Sonata Op. 106 of Beethoven (!!), in the *Transcendental Etudes* of Liszt. A great protest on my part was evoked by his interpretations of the four *Ballades* of Chopin, his twenty-four *Preludes*, *Papillons* and *Toccata* by Schumann..., the *Polonaise-Fantaisie* of Chopin etc.<sup>81</sup>

Neuhaus accused Busoni of:

The inexhaustible play of fantasy that reaches wilfulness, and that at times degenerates into unvarnished individualism, that believes the interpreted

<sup>79</sup> Neuhaus had studied with Leopold Godowsky in Berlin (1905–1908) and Vienna (1912–1914).

<sup>80</sup> 'Учась у Годовского, я всё чаще думал о Бузони, иногда больше, чем о Годовском. Конечно, как личность, Бузони был гораздо выше и интереснее.' Г. Г. Нейгауз, 'Выступление на заседании Научного студенческого общества Московской консерватории' (с. 1957. Стенограмма, архив Московской консерватории) [H. G. Neuhaus, 'A Presentation during the Meeting of the Academic Student Union of the Moscow Conservatory' (с. 1957. Stenograph, Moscow Conservatory Archive)] in A. F. Hitruk, *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 50.

<sup>81</sup> 'Откровенно скажу (не побоюсь быть «наглецом»), что самое большое впечатление Бузони производил на меня в фантазиях Листа, в вариациях Брамса на тему Генделя и Паганини, в 24 этюдах Шопена (но главным образом с виртуозной стороны, в поэтическом-музыкальном смысле многое мне казалось сомнительным), в Сонате ор. 106 Бетховена (!!), в трансцендентных этюдах Листа. Сильный протест вызывало во мне исполнение четырех баллад Шопена, его двадцати четырех прелюдий, «Papillons» и «Токкаты» Шумана..., Полонеза-фантазии Шопена и т.д.' Н. Г. Neuhaus, 'My Aims as a Musician (For the Centenary of the Moscow Conservatory)' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 93.

work to be but a *pretext* to express oneself's 'I' and doesn't even seriously consider the task of being faithful to the author.<sup>82</sup>

What the above quote shows is that there was something in the core of Neuhaus's aesthetic understanding of interpretation that differed quite drastically from Busoni's. Because several of Neuhaus's Russian colleagues (including Goldenweiser, Igumnov and Medtner) found the same 'faults' in Busoni as an interpreter, it can be assumed that Busoni's understanding of interpretation was at odds with Russian aesthetic of the time in general, as observed in Stanislavsky and the Peredvizhniki artists.<sup>83</sup> Unlike Neuhaus, who kept convincing himself that composition and interpretation were justifiably separate undertakings, Busoni's strongest legacy is most probably in his view that all performance (and hence interpretation) is in itself an act of *transcription*. Where Neuhaus was continuing in Anton Rubinstein's legacy, explored later in this chapter, of pushing these arts apart, Busoni was exerting substantial efforts in achieving the reverse – in uniting them.

Busoni knew that his own artistic endeavours as both interpreter and composer were impossible unless the 'spirit' of the composer was one which he could closely recognize within an aspect of himself. On this point Busoni explained that, as an interpreter:

Form, imagination and feeling are indispensable to the artist; they are the most precious of all things – those to which he offers sacrifice – the sacrifice of himself. These things I put into my work [...] and in that way it became my own [...] in the spirit of [for example] Bach.<sup>84</sup>

Busoni knew that his self-sacrifice would be distinctive and that he would essentially fight for at least equal ownership of the music with the original author. Since his performance was already transcription, why indeed would Busoni feel the requirement to deny his own compositional voice?

---

<sup>82</sup> 'Есть направление, допускающее неистощимую игру фантазии, доходящей до своеволия и порой вырождающейся в неприкрашенный индивидуализм, который считает исполняемое произведение только *предлогом* для высказывания своего «я» даже не ставит себе всерьёз задачи быть верным автору.' Г. Г. Нейгауз, 'Композитор-исполнитель, 1956' [H. G. Neuhaus, 'Composer-Interpreter, 1956'] in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 199.

<sup>83</sup> The attitude of Neuhaus's colleagues to Busoni will be explored in the next chapter in more detail with regard to Beethoven editions.

<sup>84</sup> F. Busoni, *The Essence of Music and other papers* translated from the German by Rosamond Ley (London: Salisbury Square, 1957) p. 48.

For Busoni, denying an outlet for his compositional voice would mean to be untrue to himself and in so doing make him artistically inauthentic. Yet for Neuhaus, there was a truth that he perceived to be greater than the truth of himself. The truth that Neuhaus was searching for was the truth of another creator, beyond his own self, and so Neuhaus's own self was the medium for the truth's temporal existence as a musical performance. If allegorically the physical score of a work left by a composer is taken to be a vessel, Busoni offered himself as the *new* contents of that vessel. Busoni's study of a score is thus a study to see what scope of himself such a vessel could hold. Conversely, Neuhaus sought to study the vessel to try to deduce the *former* contents of that vessel, and then to use his own 'ingredients' from within his self to replenish it. Both Busoni and Neuhaus imprint their self onto performance, but it is the how and why that is the divisive aesthetic argument that polarizes the two musicians.

Neuhaus believed that Busoni's downfall as an interpreter of emotive art was, to paraphrase Stanislavsky, his awareness and love of *himself* in art. Neuhaus wrote:

Busoni said himself that he was 'in love with form' (in this he was a true Italian) [and this obsession with form] for him didn't open up, but closed, the *truth of the content*. He was such a *histrionic*: he would so individualistically – nearly egoistically – *depict, present* music [that] he was not always able [to reach] the last possible depths of *sincerity* relating to the music and its creators.<sup>85</sup>

Neuhaus's description of Busoni as a 'histrionic' (provocatively written as 'histrion' in Latin characters, and not Cyrillic, presumably to emphasize Busoni's 'otherness') is somewhat incongruous in two main aspects. Firstly, Neuhaus's personality as an artist – and by extension as a pedagogue – has been described as charismatic precisely because of its 'coquettishness', the disarming false modesty and great oratory skill. In his critique of Neuhaus, the Soviet musicologist David Rabinovich wrote:

No matter how significant the content of his inner spiritual world, no matter how significant the content of his artistry, on stage and in life,

---

<sup>85</sup> 'Бузони сам говорил, что он «влюблён в форму» (в этом он был истый итальянец), но я не мог отделаться от впечатления, что часто эта «влюблённость в форму» не открывала, а закрывала *ему правду* содержания; он был настолько *histrion*, так индивидуалистично – почти самовлюблённо – *изображал, представлял* музыку, что дойти до последней черты мышления и чувства, до последнего возможного проникновения в *истинность* музыки и её творцов ему не всегда было дано.' Н. Г. Neuhaus, 'My Aims as a Musician (For the Centenary of the Moscow Conservatory)' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 93.

Neuhaus cleverly and charmingly, perhaps in a Lisztian way 'plays himself' a little. [...] 'Theatre for the self'.<sup>86</sup>

Secondly, Neuhaus was well aware that as a pianist he was also an actor. As such, Neuhaus admitted that he was elated when his friends could recognize this quality in his pianism: 'It gives me great pleasure when my friends [say in the 'Green Room']: "What an amazing actor you are! You can with such assuredness move between one composer and the next"'.<sup>87</sup>

Neuhaus, however, felt his connection as an actor was through Stanislavskian terms of emotional Realism. With Neuhaus's belief that art *is* life, and that all experiences are emotionally felt, deducing the former contents of the vessel (the score) and replenishing it with himself is an act that is only sincere if *every moment* is imbued with emotion. Busoni, on the other hand, held that 'Style *distinguishes* Art from Life'.<sup>88</sup> Explaining the forces required to bring about a musical interpretation, Busoni considered feeling to be a constituent but not a ubiquitous part. Busoni wrote:

I discern three aspects in feeling: feeling as taste, as style and as economy. Each a whole and each the third of a whole... It is wrong to dissipate feeling on what is unimportant.<sup>89</sup>

Neuhaus found it unsatisfactory to be *conscious* of the fact that he was mediating feeling, and observed:

The better quality of performance occurs when I play before the public as sincerely and simply as at home – being together ['one on one'] with music. This sincerity is always linked to [emotional] experience. It happens sometimes that I cannot give such sincerity, that something stands in the way. *In that case* one puts on a 'mask': but that is worse.<sup>90</sup>

---

<sup>86</sup> 'Сколько бы ни было значительно содержание его духовного мира, сколько бы ни было значительно содержание его искусства, Нейгауз, кроме того, на эстраде и в жизни умно и обаятельно, быть может, по – листовски немножко «играет самого себя». [...] «Театр для себя».' D. A. Rabinovich, *Portraits of Pianists* p. 64.

<sup>87</sup> 'После концерта [ко мне приходят музыканты] и говорят мне: «Какой вы удивительный актер! Можете с такой уверенностью переходить от одного автора к другому».' See Neuhaus's conversation with B. M. Teplov and A. V. Vitsinsky (6 December 1944) in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 92.

<sup>88</sup> *Ibid.* p. 179 (Emphasis is mine).

<sup>89</sup> F. Busoni, *The Essence of Music and other papers* p. 179.

<sup>90</sup> 'Лучшее качество исполнения, бывает тогда, когда я играю перед публикой так же искренне и просто, как у себя дома, находясь вдвоём с музыкой. А такая искренность всегда связана с

Interestingly, Neuhaus identified the idea of a 'mask' increasingly as being a part of his experience of Central European aesthetics. In his letters sent to his parents, as will be discussed, Neuhaus was unconvinced by Barth's obsession with efficiency over musicality. Likewise, he was sceptical of Godowsky's attitude, with which he agreed only 'to a point':

Godowsky expressed himself rather coarsely saying: 'One somewhat prostitutes oneself on stage. On stage you give 25% of that which you have inside you because on stage you put on a mask.'<sup>91</sup>

Neuhaus's attitude to emotional sincerity in art was governed by an overriding awareness that the emotion was a spiritual and noble quality – the very essence of being human, and not to be confused with hysteria. This was investigated by Stanislavsky as a vital aspect of emotive art:

The experiences of the artist on stage are not quite those that we know in life. Firstly we should begin with the fact that on stage artists rarely experience so-called primary feelings. More often, nearly always, they live repeated feelings i.e. previously experienced and familiar feelings of life resurrected by remembering [...] resurrected feelings [...] are cleansed from the personal... Time cleans feeling from personal details and crystallizes it, leaving in the memory only the most important and meaningful – [i.e.] feeling or passion in its pure, naked form. This is why so often the real experiences in real life make an un-artistic impression, and the same feelings that have been cleansed by time and are transferred onto the stage become artistic. [...] The artist speaks of the experienced clearly, unwaveringly and beautifully. He is relatively calm, and the audience cries.<sup>92</sup>

---

переживанием. Бывает иногда, что я не могу дать такой искренности, что-то этому мешает. Тогда надеваешь «маску», но это хуже.' А. В. Вицинский, *Процесс работы пианиста-исполнителя над музыкальным произведением*, 1950 (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2008) [A. V. Vitsinsky, *The Process of Work by the Pianist-Interpreter on a Musical Work*, 1950 (Moscow: 2008)] p. 82. (Emphasis mine).

<sup>91</sup> 'Годовский, выражаясь довольно грубо, говорил: «На эстраде несколько простиитуируешь себя. На эстраде вы даете 25 процентов того, что в вас есть, потому что на эстраде вы надеваете маску».' See A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 92.

<sup>92</sup> 'Однако переживания артиста на сцене не совсем те, которые мы знаем в жизни. Начать с того, что на сцене артисты редко переживают, так сказать, первичные чувства. Гораздо чаще, почти

This differentiation of emotion is seen in Neuhaus' descriptions about his own interpretative work:

When I am at home I can sometimes behave somewhat 'indecently'; sometimes getting overly overwrought, and even crying... not from my own playing of course, but over the music. Obviously on stage I would not do so.<sup>93</sup>

Neuhaus even went as far as to say:

There are pieces which I can play only at home... those that I can't play on the stage because they make me overwrought [such as] Schubert's *Der Doppelgänger*, Chopin's *Second Ballade* [F major Opus 38]...<sup>94</sup>

How close, yet how different is Busoni's argument about the role of emotion in the moment of performance. Busoni wrote: 'The artist, if the control over his medium at certain moments is not to be lost, must not be moved when he wishes to move others...'<sup>95</sup> Busoni, does not talk of emotional experience even in a purified, 'crystallized' form during performance, nor does he advocate it in the confines of the practice-room: 'The performer "acts" [or to use Stanislavsky's language: 'represents'], he *does not* experience.'<sup>96</sup> Such a position guarantees the separation of life and art that vitally underpinned Busoni's aesthetics:

---

всегда, они живут повторными чувствами, т.е. ранее пережитыми и знакомыми по жизни чувствами, воскресающими по воспоминанию. [...] они очищены от лишнего. Время очищает, кристаллизует чувство от лишних подробностей, оставляя в воспоминании лишь самое главное, существенное – чувство или страсть в её чистом, голом виде. Вот почему нередко подлинные переживания в реальной жизни производят нехудожественное впечатление, и те же чувства, очищенные временем и перенесённые на сцену, становятся художественны. [...] артист говорит о пережитом понятно, выдержанно и красиво.' К. S. Stanislavsky, *Articles. Speeches. Conversations. Letters* p. 464.

<sup>93</sup> 'Когда я играю дома, я могу вести себя немного «неприлично», иногда слишком поволноваться, могу даже поплакать... не от своей игры, конечно, а от музыки. На эстраде я, разумеется, не стану этого делать.' A. V. Vitsinsky, *The Process of Work by the Pianist-Interpreter on a Musical Work*, 1950 (Moscow: 2008) p. 67.

<sup>94</sup> 'Есть вещи, которые я не могу играть на эстраде, потому, что они меня слишком волнуют. Например, «Двойник» Шуберта, Вторая баллада Шопена...' Neuhaus's conversation with B. M. Teplov and A. V. Vitsinsky (6 December 1944) in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* pp. 92–93.

<sup>95</sup> F. Busoni, *The Essence of Music and other papers* p. 41.

<sup>96</sup> *Ibid.* (My emphasis).



'The onlooker, if the artistic enjoyment is not to be debased to human participation, must never consider it as reality.'<sup>97</sup> This stands in stark contrast to Neuhaus's Stanislavskian view that for the life of the interpreted creation it *must* be taken for reality:

Stanislavsky had a wonderful expression: '[I] don't believe it.' Sometimes an artist would come out twenty times with some word or phrase but Stanislavsky would say: '[I] don't believe it.' This is the most important thing in art: truth, truth and truth.<sup>98</sup>

By denying the interpretation the truth of re-creating an emotional reality existing beyond the interpreter, as in the case of Busoni, the only truth left is the truth of seeing the 'self' imprinted on the resulting transcription of the interpreted work. This particular kind of solipsistic understanding of interpretation was alien to the mainstream ideals held within the Russian piano tradition. The paradox is that emotive art, contrary to representational art, also leaves an imprint of the interpreter on the work and thus can be seen as solipsistic – but, as will be shown in the subsequent chapters, for different reasons. This is because the 'truth' that interpreters like Neuhaus were seeking to re-create depends on the acknowledgement of a reality outside the self, and the belief that in decoding the score this reality could be recreated by the interpreter from *within* his self. In other words the musical statement held within the notation requires the interpreter to act as its host and so the sounding product, the interpretation, is part artist-interpreter and part author-composer.

## 2.7 Approach to the musical score

The imposition of his experiences onto a work is manifested in Neuhaus's attitude to the score. For Neuhaus, the score left by the composer is the only tangible image that the interpreter has to lend himself to the task of re-creating the reality it was meant to represent. Hence that score, that key to the interpreter's existence, becomes an object of veneration. Whilst pianists such as Liszt and Anton Rubinstein spoke of the score with veneration, it was really the pianists of Neuhaus's generation that had fuelled the change that completely frowned upon any re-

---

<sup>97</sup> Ibid.

<sup>98</sup> 'У Станиславского были чудесные слова: «Не верю». Иногда артист выходил двадцать раз с каким-нибудь словом, фразой, но Станиславский говорил: «Не верю». Это и есть самое главное в искусстве: правда, правда и правда.' From Neuhaus's conversation with pedagogues (9 December 1938) in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 115.

touching of the text and committed themselves to this through their own playing.<sup>99</sup> This contrasts with Busoni's understanding which, although shares the same understanding that the physical notation of a score is limited and incomplete, considered it was the interpreter's duty to adapt the notation if he felt it necessary: 'Great artists play their own works differently at each repetition, remodel them on the spur of the moment, accelerate and retard, in a way which they could not indicate with signs [...] therefore whatever liberties the performer may take, it can never annihilate the original.'<sup>100</sup> This difference in approach was identified by the Italian pianist-composer Alfredo Casella, a contemporary of Neuhaus: '[Compared to Anton] Rubinstein and Bülow, pure interpreters, Busoni at the piano was above all a *creator*.'<sup>101</sup>

Neuhaus knew that a great work of art could never be so restrictive as to permit but a single reading. Therefore, despite his insistence that there was *a* truth, he had to find a way to reconcile the fact that there were many truths – that, in fact, 'truth' occupied an immeasurable number of possibilities:

The almost boundless ability to play differently (as 'truth' is also infinite) well and beautifully (although even in variety there is a 'hierarchy!'), is a manifestation that always astonishes me: the same occurs in other arts, the same occurs in nature with its infinite variety of life forms.<sup>102</sup>

Yet, Neuhaus's writing reveals an acute sense of a spectrum, 'hierarchy', governing the truthfulness of an interpretation which was influenced by morals. Illustrating his understanding of how vast the separation between interpretational and compositional morals was, Neuhaus proposed that a great pianist playing his own works was the ideal interpreter. That same pianist however, would not necessarily be able to find a comparable degree of truth when interpreting another's work:

---

<sup>99</sup> In terms of legacy, the unacceptability of altering the composer's score has remained a core principle in most views of interpretation today passed down through Russian (as well as wider international) music pedagogy – a century later.

<sup>100</sup> F. Busoni, 'Sketch of a New Aesthetic of Music' (1911) in *Three Classics in the Aesthetic of Music* (New York: Dover publications, 1962) p. 85–86.

<sup>101</sup> A. Casella, *Il Pianoforte* (Milan: G. Ricordi & Co., 1954) p. 84.

<sup>102</sup> 'Беспредельная почти возможность играть по-разному (ведь «истина» тоже бесконечна), хорошо и прекрасно (но и в многообразии есть своя «иерархия!») – явление приводящее меня всегда в восхищение; то же происходит и в других искусствах, то же происходит в природе с её бесконечным разнообразием жизненных форм.' Н. Г. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 220.

Perhaps I sound paradoxical in my statement (or rather my direct feeling) that the interpretation by Rachmaninov of his own works [...] and on the other hand his interpretation of Chopin's B-flat minor Sonata (as we know it from recordings) – are two different categories of interpretative art. In the first case there is a complete merging of the interpretation with the interpreter, 'truth-ness', truthfulness, the kind that does not allow you to imagine anything truer. In the second – a Rachmaninovized Chopin: an emigrant who has received such a substantial injection of Russian blood and virtually 'Behind-the-Moscow-River' spirit,<sup>103</sup> that to recognize him is difficult after such an operation.<sup>104</sup>

As an interpreter Neuhaus refused to engage with the conscious adaptation of the composer which proved irresistible, for example, to his one-time mentee Vladimir Horowitz, and was necessary to Busoni. Neuhaus's concept of interpretation was such that it demanded a belief in the *reality*, rather than the *potential*, held in a musical statement notated as a score. The reality that Neuhaus was seeking to re-create was an emotional one and he viewed free-handed changes to the score to be an alteration of the composer's intended emotional journey. It is therefore obvious why Neuhaus ridiculed the interpretations of Busoni despite considering him technically a pianistic genius. Following a recital given by Busoni, Neuhaus reported back home:

I was hardly able to sit it out without laughing [...] but he played so well four years ago! [...] The pedalling was awful, no power (on purpose), absolute disrespect for the intentions of the author, free-will and 'egoism' on every corner. A sick mania to avoid any expressiveness – especially feelings.<sup>105</sup>

<sup>103</sup> *Замоскворечье*, translating as 'from behind the Moscow River', is a region in Central Moscow: south of the River Moskva that was historically established in 1365. The phrase implies a certain ruddy, bold character, somewhat uninhibited and high spirited.

<sup>104</sup> 'Быть может, покажется парадоксальным моё утверждение (вернее, непосредственное ощущение), что исполнение Рахманиновым собственных произведений [...] и, с другой стороны, исполнение им же b-молл'ной сонаты Шопена (как мы их знаем по записи) – две различные категории исполнительского искусства. В первом случае полнейшее слияние исполнения с исполняемым, истинность, правдивость, правдивее которой ничего и представить себе нельзя; во втором – рахманизованный Шопен-эмигрант, получивший такую инъекцию здоровой русской крови, почти «замоскворецкой» удали, что и узнать подчас его трудно после такой операции.' Н. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 218.

<sup>105</sup> 'Я с трудом высидел. Мне хотелось смеяться. [...] А ведь как он играл четыре года назад! [...] Педаль ужасная, силы никакой (нарочно). Абсолютное пренебрежение намерением автора,

Despite the praise that Busoni's interpretations garnered from pianists like Claudio Arrau,<sup>106</sup> he did attract negative reactions – not just from Neuhaus. In his autobiography, Artur Schnabel also remembered that he had a mixed reaction to the interpretations of Busoni:

When [Busoni] played the famous *Campanella* it would become a breathtaking experience, although his Beethoven and Chopin, I must admit, left me entirely cold [...], he would approach Beethoven's last sonatas in a sarcastic mood, taking great liberties with tempi and rhythm.<sup>107</sup>

To Neuhaus's understanding such re-arrangement of dynamics, let alone articulation markings or chord spacing, would evoke an alternative emotional trajectory and so lead the interpreter away from the 'truth'. The pedantic attention to the score was an important part of Neuhaus's education with Godowsky. Recalling how extreme his professor's reaction was, Neuhaus wrote:

[Godowsky] would immediately lose all interest in a student who had a defective ear, learnt wrong notes or showed a lack of taste. Due to this a concertizing pianist once 'failed' in her very first lesson and just because she had added an extra note (the third of the chord) into the left-hand triad in the penultimate bar of Chopin's seventh etude (C major) Opus 10.<sup>108</sup>

However, with Godowsky's approach lacking the overt emotional connection that would explain why such meticulousness was required, Neuhaus turned to his reliable 'guiding figures' of Anton Schnabel and Stanislavsky. These figures maintained that a zealous attitude to notation must be followed because the score is precious and yet the restrictions of notation

---

своеволие и «эгоизм» на каждом шагу. Какая-то болезненная мания избегать выразительности, особенно чувства.' Letter to his parents dated 30 October 1910, Berlin, in *Letters* p. 147.

<sup>106</sup> See J. Horowitz, *Conversations with Claudio Arrau* (London: Collins, 1982) pp. 87–88.

<sup>107</sup> A. Schnabel, *My Young Years* (New York: Knopf, 1973) p. 31.

<sup>108</sup> '[Годовский] терял моментально всякий интерес к ученику, который обнаруживал слуховые недочёты, заучивал грубо неверные ноты и проявлял дурной вкус. Так однажды «провалилась» одна уже концертирующая пианистка только потому, что в предпоследнем такте седьмого (до-мажорного) этюда оп. 10 Шопена брала лишнюю ноту (терцию) в левой руке.' H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 27.

mean that ‘composer writes but only one hundredth of what needs to be interpreted.’<sup>109</sup> Therefore, to squander the only tangible ‘hundredth’ would be a reckless and irresponsible act.

It must be remarked that Neuhaus considered it to be the interpreter’s intellectual duty to compare available editions. As will be explored in the following chapter, Neuhaus was keen to find an edition with the least editorial intervention on the one hand, yet also considered it important to consult the editions of certain great musicians, such as Busoni and Hans von Bülow, to look at their performance commentaries.<sup>110</sup> In recommending the comparison of editions, Neuhaus’s attitude is pragmatic – for instance, as will be seen in the next chapter, he did not expect an *Urtext* to be free from error. Therefore, Neuhaus admits that there are elements in all score which cannot be answered beyond all doubt. The truth then, Neuhaus argued, is in the dialectic between the score and personal opinion:

Dialectic must be present in everything. The greatest difficulty for the interpreter is in the contradiction between different editions. [...] On the basis of a thorough study, one must give his own interpretation [толкование].<sup>111</sup>

In giving ‘his own interpretation’, Neuhaus appealed to the acceptance of subjectivity as a valid investigation and representation of the composer’s intentions. Faced with making a decision, Neuhaus considered that the interpreter’s musical experience and strong moral principles of sacrificing the self, in order to serve the composer, should be sufficient to guard him from significantly altering the composer’s vision. However, as will be seen particularly in relation to

---

<sup>109</sup> ‘Композитор пишет одну сотую того, что надо исполнять...’ E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus* p. 298.

<sup>110</sup> Neuhaus’s selection of which musicians he felt it was advisable to turn to in such instances was entirely subjective, and sometimes, as will be seen, rather irrational. Likewise, it is important to note that Neuhaus was not interested in giving a ‘Historically Informed’ performance, and would not have consulted editions in this capacity. Whilst Neuhaus was aware of attempts at Historically Informed Practice in the middle of the twentieth century in Russia, the concept was still very much in its infancy despite it being toyed with since at least the late 1880s: At the end of the nineteenth century Anton Rubinstein had noted interest in the question regarding the use of ‘authentic’ pianos for performing repertoire, but in *Music and Those Who Represent It*, he had dismissed these attempts as inaccurate and futile given that piano technique had changed and the instruments (even in museums in London, Paris and Brussels) were not useful as ‘we have lost the most important thing – the *precise method* [of playing for which they were designed].’ [‘[...] нам неизвестно главное – способ их употребления’]. See A. Г. Рубинштейн, *Музыка и её представители*, 1891 (Санкт-Петербург: «Союз Художников», 2005) [A. G. Rubinstein, *Music and Those Who Represent It*, 1891 (Saint Petersburg, 2005)] p. 115.

<sup>111</sup> ‘Диалектика должна быть во всем. Большую сложность для исполнителя представляют противоречия в различных редакциях [...]. Надо на основании тщательного изучения дать своё толкование.’ E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus* p. 288.

Neuhaus's interpretation of Chopin, there are instances when no volume of evidence is strong enough to limit or curb Neuhaus's personal and subjective view of the music. Thus, Neuhaus's approach to the score is a combination of a Romantic and Modern subjectivity.

Neuhaus believed that the interpreter's ability to make better, more 'truthful' interpretative decisions when reading a score stemmed from his musical training. He considered that the surest way to acquire a sense of what is 'right' for a certain composer was through a thorough survey of their work so that the language of that composer feels 'instinctive'.<sup>112</sup> Interestingly, although Neuhaus uses the term 'style', he is sceptical about defining the 'style' of an epoch: 'Never in my life have I understood fully the word 'style.' Why is it said 'the style of Bach' and not 'Bach'? [...] The word 'style' is for me a foggy measurement.'<sup>113</sup> Instead, 'style', in Neuhaus's understanding is closely linked to the composer's individuality and, in this respect, Neuhaus frequently cites Buffon's famous aphorism: '*Le style c'est l'homme même*' ['Style is the man himself']. Neuhaus explained to pedagogue colleagues that because of its specificity, it is futile to talk of style in itself and an interpreter should rather focus on *how* to get to know the composer:

I like to study not one or two works by a composer, but many. If it's Bach – then all 48 Preludes and Fugues. One must learn to live [*вживаться*] inside the music of that composer, and this is only achieved by learning as many of his works as possible. [...] When I played my first Skryabin sonatas, I learnt all of Skryabin's works.<sup>114</sup>

Thus, Neuhaus's ideas of what is suitable for a particular composer centre on the notion of how *he*, as the interpreter, would use the given language to express himself. Returning to Neuhaus's definition of an interpreter: 'In the best moments he feels the interpreted work as if

---

<sup>112</sup> Neuhaus's conversation with pedagogues (9 December 1938) in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 117.

<sup>113</sup> 'Я слова «стиль» никогда в жизни не понимал как следует. Почему говорится «стиль Баха», а не – «Бах» [...]. Слово «стиль» для меня – туманная величина.' A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 67.

<sup>114</sup> 'Я очень люблю изучать у композиторов не одну, не две, а много вещей. Если Бах – то 48 прелюдий и фуг. Надо вживаться в музыку данного композитора, а для этого надо знать как можно больше его произведений. [...] Когда я играл первый раз сонаты Скрябина, то играл всего Скрябина.' Neuhaus's conversation with pedagogues (9 December 1938) in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 117.

his own.<sup>115</sup> This emphasizes the paradox that although Neuhaus spoke of serving the composer, in actual terms an investigation of the score was a way to investigate *himself*.

This gave rise to the criticism that in effect, Neuhaus was never able to express the composer's style. For example, Emil Gilels said that Neuhaus's personal inclination for Romanticism invaded everything he interpreted:

The traces of the Chopinist [Chopin-interpreter] made their mark on Neuhaus's interpretation of Mozart, and coming from Romanticism it is very hard to enter the clear and simple atmosphere of Mozart.<sup>116</sup>

Taking Neuhaus's recording of Mozart's Rondo in A minor K. 511 made in 1950 [See CD Track 1],<sup>117</sup> Gilels's point is strikingly illustrated for modern ears. For those well acquainted with Neuhaus's recorded performances, or indeed his live performances, the overriding lyrical quality, agogic manner and *rubato* are immediately distinctive of Neuhaus's characteristic interpretative style whether it is in his performances of Chopin, Brahms or Skryabin. Consequently, one can argue that it is not Neuhaus curbing his own individuality to Mozart, but rather Neuhaus demonstrating that he had found and accommodated certain elements of Mozart within himself.<sup>118</sup>

The implications of Neuhaus's approach to the score will be dealt with in more depth in the next chapters. Before this is possible, it is necessary to speak about how his musical training provided him with the means to assimilate what *he believed* to be the composer's individual 'style', and how his pianistic ambitions went against the practices that he encountered during his training.

---

<sup>115</sup> 'В лучшие минуты он чувствует, что исполняемое произведение как бы его собственное.' Н. Г. Neuhaus, 'The Great and Simple' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 177.

<sup>116</sup> 'Следы шопениста сказывались и на нейгаузовской трактовке Моцарта, а, идя от романтизма, очень трудно войти в прозрачную и «малофактурную» атмосферу Моцарта.' See Lev Barenboim's interview with Gilels in Л. А. Баренбойм, *Эмиль Гилельс* (Москва: «Советский Композитор», 1990) [L. A. Barenboim, *Emil Gilels* (Moscow: 1990)] p. 70.

<sup>117</sup> Recorded in 1950. The CD referred to is a re-issue in 1996 by Talents of Russia RCD 16244: *Heinrich Neuhaus. Russian Piano School. Bach, Mozart, Beethoven*. Track 7.

<sup>118</sup> The point can be further emphasized if Neuhaus's interpretation is compared, for instance, to that of Mitsuko Uchida (Decca Music Group, released on 9 July 2006, B001RFG1V4, Track 4) – a modern pianist playing Mozart in a 'style' that is remarkably different to her pianism in her interpretations of Schumann. It is this difference in pianism that is much less pronounced in Neuhaus's interpretations.

## 2.8 Issues of technique

Neuhaus was quick to acknowledge that a solid technique was necessary to separate the professional pianist-interpreter from an amateur. He understood that without colossal technical mastery, being a pianist in a post-Lisztian era was hopeless, yet his obsession with technique is often overlooked, largely in favour of discussing his emotive artistry. This has been a substantial issue with regards to the way Neuhaus's image is portrayed particularly in Western musicological literature. Aside from the persistent concept that Neuhaus 'did not pursue a concert career because he suffered from stage fright',<sup>119</sup> influential figures such as David Dubal considered that Neuhaus was 'delicate' and as a pianist, best suited to musically sensitive miniatures. Dubal found that Neuhaus, unlike his son Stanislav, lacked the full-bodied tone and daring of a 'colorful-virtuoso' [sic].<sup>120</sup>

The issue of Neuhaus and pianistic technique is not exclusively a Western or contemporary misunderstanding. Within literature by leading Soviet musicologists, such as by David Rabinovich, Alexander Vitsinsky or Sofia Hentova, there are insinuations that Neuhaus was never actually interested enough in technique to warrant his being viewed as a virtuoso pianist in the first place. This perceived lack of interest in technique has been widely attributed to Neuhaus's all-consuming interest in culture and to his innate musicality. According to David Rabinovich for example, people did not come to hear Neuhaus's technical prowess but rather came for the poetry and erudition of his playing.<sup>121</sup> Neuhaus's references to his parents about his own technical underachievement were the beginning of a basis of life-long self-deprecation on the issue: 'My time will come. But it is a fact that I am not stupid enough to be a virtuoso, but equally not adequately endowed professionally.'<sup>122</sup>

Despite Neuhaus's own lifelong protests that his technical achievements had always been poor, it seems that the main issue had always been Neuhaus's reluctance to think about technique as a separable *characteristic* of virtuoso-pianism. When Neuhaus described his pedagogical mission as encompassing 'first – music ("the artistic conception"), second – its

<sup>119</sup> W. Lyle, *A Dictionary of Pianists* (London: Robert Hale Ltd., 1985) p. 199.

<sup>120</sup> D. Dubal, *The World of the Concert Pianist* (London: Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1985) p. 358.

<sup>121</sup> Rabinovich raises this issue in both of his major works: *Portraits of Pianists* and in *Исполнитель и стиль*, 1981 (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2008) [D. A. Rabinovich, *Interpreter and Style*, 1981 (Moscow: 2008)] p. 75.

<sup>122</sup> 'Придёт ещё моё время. Но это факт, что я недостаточно глуп, чтобы быть виртуозом, но также и недостаточно профессионально одарён.' Letter to his parents dated 10 September 1908, Manuilovka, in *Letters* p. 99.



constituents: rhythm and sound, third – all technique as a whole and in details’, he knew full well that these three pillars could only hold up the mammoth task of interpretation if they are all present.<sup>123</sup> Yet, because the definition of emotive art is not linked immediately to its technical achievement there has been a widespread tendency to consider the actual mechanics involved as unimportant to the aesthetic. This has often given the impression that emotive art is a purely intuitive occurrence that is largely the domain of the self-taught – lacking the specialist knowledge that would raise it to greater technical refinement. A survey of Neuhaus’s letters, and indeed of his writing published during his lifetime, shows that the reverse is true. Much like Stanislavsky’s fictional character Tortsov, who teaches his students to walk properly, gymnastics, fencing, elocution and singing in amongst the discussions of emotive art, Neuhaus too understood the need of technical facility.<sup>124</sup> Just as Stanislavsky taught his students the craft of acting, for without it the creative will cannot be externalized convincingly, Neuhaus knew that without technical training the doors of pianistic expression were closed to him.

Nevertheless, Neuhaus had a complicated relationship with the idea of developing and maintaining a technique throughout his life. Contrasting with the apparent lack of interest in technical matters as a mature artist, the years of Neuhaus’s youth were characterized by an obsessive attitude to acquiring a virtuoso piano technique. In 1913 he wrote to his parents from Vienna where he was studying with Godowsky:

Nature was not kind to me [...]. Do not forget [that one cannot change nature’s gifts] and also do not forget that I will do everything possible with my hands. It is after all a fact that to be a pianist one must also be an acrobat – skilful, light, lively, nimble and quirky.<sup>125</sup>

Neuhaus’s attention to technique was first instilled into him by his father. The technical drills that Gustav Neuhaus saw as central to pianistic development, and which formed the basis of

---

<sup>123</sup> ‘[...] Первое – музыка («художественный образ»), второе – её основные слагаемые: ритм и звук, третье – вся техника в целом и в деталях.’ Г. Г. Нейгауз, ‘Автобиографические Записки. Глава II (автопсихографическая)’ [H. G. Neuhaus, ‘Autobiographical Notes. Chapter II (Autopsychographical)’] in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 55.

<sup>124</sup> Tortsov is a fictional theatre director in Stanislavsky’s work *Работа актера над собой в творческом процессе переживания. Дневник ученика* (1938), known in English – as already indicated in this thesis – as *An Actor Prepares*.

<sup>125</sup> ‘Природа по отношению ко мне поступила очень некрасиво [...]. Не забывайте об этом, но не забывайте тоже, что я всегда стараюсь и буду стараться сделать со своими руками всё, что возможно. Ибо это факт, что, для того чтобы быть пианистом, надо в тоже время быть и акробатом – ловким, лёгким, живым, проворным и изворотливым.’ Letter to parents dated 8 November 1913 in *Letters* p. 174.

the training in the Neuhaus Piano School, were later described by his son as being 'old school' and were remembered by him as a traumatic experience:

I was playing something and repeating several times very slowly a passage that was not very difficult, but listening to it intently, obviously feeling something when my father came in [...] and shouted: 'Why are you learning that when it will come of its own accord – work on technique and repeat the hard parts!' Another time: '*Du spielst nur immer, du studierst nicht*' [sic. 'You are forever playing and never studying'].<sup>126</sup>

Neuhaus took it upon himself to spend hours practising Czerny and Clementi studies to improve his facility: 'I will be doing a lot more work on Czerny etudes: now when I sit down to play all sorts of works by Chopin, they seem like toys.'<sup>127</sup> This work became almost as a preliminary ritual before regularly setting out to conquer the heights of the virtuoso repertoire: '*Don Juan* – it came out without any effort!!!'<sup>128</sup>

In addition to the challenges Neuhaus set for himself, the technical benchmark must have been set high for him by his professors, Godowsky and Barth – renowned for their relentless training and especially in the case of Godowsky, for astounding facility ('*ein Hexenmeister der Technik*').<sup>129</sup> Judging from the types of pieces that Neuhaus was given permission by his professors to programme into his public recitals, the effort he put into technical training was productive. The pieces, and sheer size of his programmes, were hardly the territory of one lacking anything but the highest technical bravura and stamina: Liszt's *La Campanella* S. 141/3 and B minor Sonata S. 187, Chopin's Piano Sonata No. 3 in B minor Opus 58, Brahms's *Variations on a Theme of Paganini* Opus 35, Schumann's *Kreisleriana* Opus 16,

<sup>126</sup> 'Я что-то играл и несколько раз повторил одно совсем нетрудное место, вслушиваясь в него и, вероятно, что-то испытывая; через комнату проходил отец [...] – он крикнул мне на ходу: «Зачем ты это учишь, это само пойдет, занимайся техникой, учи трудные места!» Или, в другой раз, тоже на ходу: «*Du spielst nur immer, du studierst nicht!*» Н. G. Neuhaus, 'Autobiographical Notes. Chapter II (Autopsychographical)' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 40.

<sup>127</sup> 'Как только «осяду», снова буду практиковаться в этюдах Черни; теперь, когда я играю Шопена, самые разные вещи – они мне кажутся игрушкой.' Letter to his parents dated 2 February 1908 in *Letters* p. 85.

<sup>128</sup> '«Дон-Жуан» – без всякого труда получился!!!' Liszt's opera fantasy *Réminiscences de Don Juan* (S. 418) is notoriously one of the most difficult works for piano. Quote from letter to parents dated 22 May 1908 from Kalkar in *Letters* p. 99.

<sup>129</sup> H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 26.

Saint-Saëns's Piano Concerto No. 2 in G minor Opus 22, Strauss's *Burlesque* etc.<sup>130</sup> Neuhaus's performances must also have been of a very high level as he was only one of the few scholarship students in Berlin and Vienna, received glowing professional reviews from many of his recitals, and graduated from Vienna with the *Staatspreis*.<sup>131</sup>

Whilst Neuhaus's father and Barth did understand the importance of 'musicality', they seemed to advocate the development of technique outside the development of an interpretation. For Heinrich Neuhaus, technique was a hidden structure which supported the interpreter's pianism, and as such was difficult to isolate outside specific technical exercises, studies and etudes. In this respect, although he happily reported the benefit his study of Czerny had brought, Neuhaus found it disturbing and unnatural to deliberately work on technique through his repertoire as demanded by Barth. In 1910 Neuhaus reported to his parents:

Barth said '*Sie spielen ja so wunder musikalisch, aber Sie haben gar keine Kraft, es ist alles viel zu schwach*' [You play with such wonderful musicality, but you have no strength and everything is so weak]. He instructed me to raise the *poignée* [wrists], turn out [*выворачивать*] my hands – things which I hate, but will patiently carry out to see whether it may help me to achieve anything.<sup>132</sup>

It is clear that despite his aversion, Neuhaus persevered with Barth's regime in the hope of developing himself into a better pianist:

If only you heard how I practise now – it is completely different from how I practise in Elisavetgrad – I pound [*колотить*] the piano with all my strength, play fast, don't pay as much attention to accuracy or the nobility

<sup>130</sup> These are selections of repertoire that Neuhaus was especially anxious to surprise his parents with in his letters. See *Letters* various letters between 1906 and 1914. Pieces quoted in text are found in pp. 132–133 and p. 135.

<sup>131</sup> In the beginning of the 1920s a reviewer held that: 'Neuhaus's technique is at that a high level when the interpreter can make one forget about it entirely.' [*Техника у Нейгауза на такой большой высоте, когда исполнитель может заставить вовсе забыть о ней.*] In 1927 his technique was described in another review as 'faultless' [*безукоризненна*]. Quoted from and discussed in D. A. Rabinovich, *Portraits of Pianists* (Moscow: 1962) pp. 55–56.

<sup>132</sup> 'Барт сказал: "*Sie spielen ja so wunder musikalisch, aber Sie haben gar keine Kraft, es ist alles viel zu schwach.*" Велит мне поднимать *poignée*, выворачивать руку – вещи, которые я не терплю, но которые всё же буду делать, чтобы посмотреть, не удастся ли этим способом чего-нибудь достигнуть.' Letter to parents from Berlin, 17 April 1910, in *Letters* pp. 130–131.

of sound so that I may again gain courage and virtuosic impudence  
[наглость] [...] but I don't like it.<sup>133</sup>

But by December 1910, Neuhaus was already experiencing the adverse consequences of Barth's recommendations:

I feel so terrible. Things are bad with my hand – I really can't play strongly: I can just about manage a tentative *piano*, but *poigné*, octaves, forte etc. is almost impossible [...] and I have to play [the Piano Concerto No. 2 Opus 22 in G minor by Saint-Saëns] on Saturday.<sup>134</sup>

From this point it seems that Neuhaus returned to his prior practices of consciously studying the *music* of his repertoire rather than the means, and resigned himself to the fact that he would simply have to accept any unevenness in his technical achievement.

Having gone through such an experience, in his adulthood Neuhaus was suspicious of pianists whose playing indicated to him that their technical development may have been acquired at the expense of working predominantly on the aesthetic considerations of interpretation. For instance, in trying to explain why Neuhaus initially did not acknowledge the talent of the young Emil Gilels, Yakov Zak attributed this to the difference in the way Neuhaus expected technique to be understood at the Moscow Conservatory, and the culture (heavily reminiscent of Barth's drills) of pianistic training in Odessa:

I remember [in Odessa] we played scales from the earliest years and in all our exams. We played an enormous quantity of etudes [...] I know for sure that I played all the Opus 740 Czerny etudes as well as Clementi and Cramer, and then of course, octave etudes. Five to six hours of *only* etudes.

---

<sup>133</sup> 'Если бы Вы слышали, как я сейчас совсем иначе занимаюсь, чем в Елисаветграде, колочу изо всех сил, играю быстро, не слежу так за точностью и благородством тона, лишь бы снова набрать немного смелости и виртуозной наглости [...]. Я этого не люблю.' Letter to parents from Berlin, 27 April 1910, in *Letters* pp. 132–133.

<sup>134</sup> 'У меня такое подавленное настроение, что прямо ужас. С рукой плохо – совсем не могу сильно играть; когда играю *piano* и осторожно, еще идет, но *poigné*, октавы, forte и т. д. почти невозможно. [Мне Второй Концерт Сен-Санса Opus 22] играть уже в субботу.' Letter to parents dated 8 December 1910 in *Letters* p. 151. The subsequent letters show that in fact, the concerto appearance was cancelled due to the practice-related injuries Neuhaus sustained to his hands.



was at fault in the initial 1958 publication.<sup>138</sup> Consequently, Neuhaus presented an *addendum* to his chapter on technique which looked in detail at several issues of fingering and hand position as well as at the use of exercises, such as by Brahms and Godowsky, to develop the hand's agility. Even outside *About the Art of Piano Playing*, Neuhaus emphasized that his understanding of interpretation hinged on the assumption that, technically, there should be a tight affinity between player and instrument:

It is important not just to think, feel, imagine, understand etc. It is important to do so pianistically. A person who doesn't link his visions with a concrete pianistic perspective is a vegetarian. Without 'meat', without pianistic 'food', [interpretation] doesn't happen.<sup>139</sup>

Part of the problem in speaking about Neuhaus's own playing has stemmed from his unevenness as a performer. As already indicated in his youth, Neuhaus's playing was highly regarded by Godowsky and even Barth, both of whom gave their permission for Neuhaus to perform challenging works in concert, accomplishable only by those possessing a bravura technique. In 1927 reviewers called Neuhaus's technique 'infallible'.<sup>140</sup> Yet, the strenuous teaching career that Neuhaus led, first in Elisavetgrad, and the Tbilisi and Kiev Conservatories, and especially later at the Moscow Conservatory from 1922, meant that wading through 'pedagogical mud' left little time for his own practice.<sup>141</sup> There is no doubt that such an undertaking, practically from dawn to dusk, would have left its mark on the technical reliability of his performances. In 1933, a well-known Russian critic K. Grimih, wrote: '[...] it is unfortunate when [Neuhaus's] pianism is marked here and there by stains and splashes – it is

---

<sup>138</sup> Л. А. Баренбойм, 'Книга Г. Нейгауза и принципы его школы. (По поводу книги «Об искусстве фортепьянной игры»)» [L. A. Varenboim, 'H. Neuhaus's Book and the Principles of his School. (In Relation to his Book "About the Art of Piano Playing")'] (*Советская музыка*, 1959, № 5 pp. 116–122).

<sup>139</sup> 'Однако важно не только мыслить, чувствовать, представлять, понимать и пр. Важно к этому подходить именно пианистически. Человек, упускающий, вернее, не связывающий органически свои представления с конкретной пианистической стороной, – это какой-то вегетарианец. А без «мяса», без фортепьянной «пищи», тут не обойтись.' А. А. Николаев, 'Взгляды Г. Г. Нейгауза на развитие пианистического мастерства' [A. A. Nikolaev, 'The Views of H. Neuhaus on the Development of Pianistic Mastery'] in A. А. Николаев (составитель), *Мастера советской пианистической школы* (Москва: «Государственное Музыкальное Издательство», 1961) [A. A. Nikolaev (ed.), *Masters of the Soviet Piano School* (Moscow: 1961)] p. 174.

<sup>140</sup> For an investigation into the reviews of Neuhaus's playing see D. A. Rabinovich, *Portraits of Pianists* pp. 55–56.

<sup>141</sup> This is how Neuhaus often referred to his teaching in his letters – 'педагогическая грязь'.

especially unfortunate that Neuhaus plays not only worse than he wants, but worse than he can.<sup>142</sup>

Neuhaus's colleague at the Moscow Conservatory, Goldenweiser – who was well aware himself of the toll that teaching took on his playing, wrote in his diary following at least two solo recitals given by Neuhaus in Moscow in 1927 and 1928 respectively:

Neuhaus: the first half (Bach cis I [sic.], *Kreisleriana*, three etudes and *Ballade As* [sic.] by Chopin) played like a bad student – crumpled, rushed, torn – nothing sounded. The second half (2, 7 and 5<sup>th</sup> Skryabin Sonatas) much better, in some places very good indeed. [...] I feel sorry for him. He is such a gifted musician.<sup>143</sup>

I was at Neuhaus's concert yesterday. The first half (Sonata by Krein [...], second Sonata by Myaskovsky, Bartók's *Hungarian Songs* and Ravel's *Sonatine*) were amazing – talented, fresh and with technical clarity. The second half (Chopin *Polonaise-Fantaisie*, three *Mazurkas*, fourth *Ballade*, Liszt's *Angelus* and *Mephisto Waltz* [No. 1]) – apart from the *Mazurkas* which were very good indeed, the *Polonaise* and *Angelus* were colourless, and the *Ballade* and *Mephisto* – torn, crumpled, rushed – as if he had been switched...<sup>144</sup>

---

<sup>142</sup> '[...] Досадно, когда в его пианизме то тут, то там проступают пятна или летят брызги; особенно досадно, что Нейгауз играет не только ниже чем хочет, но и ниже чем может.' As quoted in D. A. Rabinovich, *Portraits of Pianists* p. 56.

<sup>143</sup> 'Нейгауз: первое отделение (Бах cis I, Крейслериана, 3 этюда и баллада As Шопена) играл как плохой ученик, – комкал, торопил, рвал – ничего не звучало. Второе отделение (2, 7 и 5-я сонаты Скрябина) гораздо лучше, местами очень хорошо. [...] Жаль его. Он очень даровитый музыкант.' А. Б. Гольденвейзер, *Дневник. Тетради вторая – шестая: 1905–1929* (Москва: «Тортуга», 1997) [A. B. Goldenweiser, *Diary. Books Two – Six: 1905–1929* (Moscow: 1997)] p. 136. When reading the above remarks it is important to note that the relationship between Neuhaus and Goldenwieser, as will be seen in the next chapter, was marked by a professional rivalry and that there was a degree of friction between them as artists which left its mark on some disparaging comments they voiced about each other.

<sup>144</sup> 'Был вечером в концерте Нейгауза. 1 отделение (соната Ю. Крейна [...] 2-я Мясковского, венгерские песни Бартока и сонатину [sic.] Равеля) он играл чудесно – талантливо, свежо и отлично технически. Второе отделение (Шопен Полонез-фантазия, три мазурки, четвёртую балладу [sic.] и Лист *Angelus* и Мефисто-вальс) кроме мазурок, которые были очень хорошие, бесцветно полонез и *Angelus* и просто слабо балладу и Мефисто – рвал, комкал и гнал – как будто его подменили...' Ibid. p. 252.

Likewise, it is difficult to judge Neuhaus's studio recordings as an accurate indication of his technical ability. By Neuhaus's own account, the recording conditions offered to him were less than favourable, not least because of the sterile studio environment. Neuhaus had to contend with single takes, because of the expense of editing, usually recorded late at night. Neuhaus lamented that if he had even a fraction of the technology and time that was available to Rachmaninov in America he would have been able to produce much better results:

What I find very difficult [...] – is to come at two in the morning to the studio and play for a recording. Rachmaninov had a machine at home for recording; he could record fifteen, twenty times and leave the good takes. I too could [go through the recording process] if it was at home or on the stage. Rachmaninov does not have bad recordings, and that is because he destroyed many of the records and re-did them many times. [...] In 1941 when we were under aerial bombardment, I was called to play with [Sviatoslav] Knushevitsky to record the Grieg Sonata. It didn't work... I have some kind of fear of recording which I cannot conquer.<sup>145</sup>

In fact, Neuhaus considered his studio recordings unfit for posterity and asked his son to arrange to have them destroyed.<sup>146</sup> Musicians who had heard Neuhaus's live playing were also wary that his recorded legacy would be misleading. Nikolaev for example remarked that:

For those who did not hear this wonderful musician in concert, or were not present in his lessons, these recordings will only capture a small fraction of what his audience felt when he brought them into [his] creative world.<sup>147</sup>

<sup>145</sup> 'Еще что для меня очень трудно, [...] это прийти в два часа ночи в студию и играть для записи на пластинку. Вот у Рахманинова аппарат для записи был дома; запишет раз пятнадцать-двадцать и хорошее оставит. И я мог бы записываться, если бы это было дома или в концерте. У Рахманинова нет плохих записей, но это потому, что он много пластинок бил, по многу раз переигрывал. [...] В 1941 году, когда у нас были бомбёжки, позвали меня вместе с Кнушевицким играть для записи Сонату Грига. И ничего не вышло... У меня какой-то страх перед записью, которого я не могу преодолеть.' Neuhaus's conversation with B. M. Teplov and A. V. Vitsinsky (6 December 1944) in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 106.

<sup>146</sup> 'Find out for definite from Vladimirovsky, Nikonovich, whether they destroyed the [Chopin] *As-dur* and *H-dur Mazurkas* and *Valse* from my record? I simply suffer when I remember that it was such a shameful recording – and playing.' ['Узнай точно у Владимирского, Никоновича, уничтожили ли запись на моей пластинке мазурок *As-dur*, *H-dur* и вальса [Шопена]? Я просто мучаюсь, когда вспоминаю, что это вышло, позорная запись – и игра.'] Letter to his son, Stanislav dated 7 July 1964 in *Letters* p. 548.

<sup>147</sup> 'Для тех, кто не слышал этого замечательного музыканта в концертах и не присутствовал на его уроках, эти записи, правда, донесут лишь немного из того, что испытывали слушатели, когда он вводил их в мир шопеновского творчества.' А. Д. Алексеев, *История фортепианного искусства*.



Given the incongruity of Neuhaus's evident proficiency and technical interest being met with the frequent criticism that he was blinded by 'content', perhaps the issue lies in the division of pianistic types. Although the separating of pianists into crude 'pianistic types' is a slippery practice, even Neuhaus was aware that Godowsky's playing was such that it demanded absolute technical precision in order for it to be convincingly delivered. Equally he was aware that Anton Rubinstein famously said he played enough wrong notes to compose an entire piece and yet reports show that it did not detract from the audience's experience. This was an issue that was looked at in detail by the Soviet musicologist Rabinovich in the 1960s and 1970s, and although his resulting categorizations are debatable, his general formulation of identifying different pianistic types is pertinent:

There are pianists whose virtuosity lies not only in their playing, but also in their nature and psyche [...]. If the emotionality of 'virtuosic types' is itself virtuosic, then with performing musicians of the emotional type the virtuosity is emotional. With the former their performance destroys and crushes the auditorium. [...] Despite even a deeply profound interpretation, their technical might overwhelms the listener. With the latter, despite the most volcanic playing, the technique goes, so to speak, unnoticed.<sup>148</sup>

Neuhaus has always been understood by his peers and critics as a pianist of the emotional type. In one of Rabinovich's earlier works written prior to his development of the theory of pianistic types, he argued: '[Neuhaus] has gone down in the great history of Russian pianism as one who most embodies the Romantic epithet "tempestuous" – not "brilliant" [...] but "tempestuous".'<sup>149</sup> Rabinovich was not alone in calling Neuhaus a poet and 'a Romantic

---

*Части 1 и 2* (Москва: «Музыка», 1988) [A. D. Alexeev, *A History of the Art of the Piano. Parts 1 and 2* (Moscow: 1988)] p. 210.

<sup>148</sup> 'Есть пианисты, у которых виртуозность лежит не только в их игре, но и в натуре, психике [...]. Если у «виртуозов» сама эмоциональность виртуозна, то у концертантов эмоционального типа виртуозность эмоциональна. У первых их исполнение сокрушает, раздавливает аудиторию. [...] При всей, даже гениально проникновенной глубине их интерпретаций, техническая мощь таких концертантов подавляет слушателей. У вторых и в самых вулканических трактовках техника кажется, как говорят, незаметной.' D. A. Rabinovich, *Interpreter and Style* p. 39.

<sup>149</sup> '[Нейгауз] вошел в большую историю русского пианизма, наиболее подходящим представляется романтический эпитет «бурно» – не «блистательно» [...], а именно «бурно».' D. A. Rabinovich, *Portraits of Pianists* p. 36.

with a forever restless spirit'.<sup>150</sup> Alexander Nikolaev thought that an important characteristic of Neuhaus's playing was his constant 'searching'. Nikolaev likewise believed:

The pianistic mastery of H. G. Neuhaus attracted not through effects of bravura virtuosity, but through the bright and colourful ability to use the rich sonic palette of the piano – his ability to use the instrument to give the most nuanced shades of feelings, images and to realistically develop the artistic idea of every piece.<sup>151</sup>

Similar opinions are abundant in the descriptions of his colleagues and in the reminiscences of his students. With the flourishing piano tradition penetrating deeply into Russian culture through its increasing number of very distinctive and varied exponents by the late 1930s, it became inevitable that audiences and critics would cluster together certain exponents into stylistic 'bands' in accordance to a set of assumed overriding characteristics. The three pianists consistently singled out as 'emotional', 'poetic' and 'Romantic' were Neuhaus, Igumnov and Vladimir Sofronitsky, whereas 'brilliance' was often attributed to pianists like Grigory Ginsburg and the young Gilels, and 'intelligence' to Goldenweiser and Samuil Feinberg.

Neuhaus too sensed that his style of delivery, despite his ability at the height of his technical powers, would never compete with the lacquered finish that was a distinctive characteristic of many of his colleagues. Although he continued to blame this on his hands, there are reasonable indications that he knew even with better suited 'pianistic' hands the difference would most likely still be there:

When I listen to pianists like Backhaus, Rosenthal, Lhevinne – and primarily Godosya [sic. – Neuhaus's nickname for Godowsky] himself – then I become very sad. It is after all a fact that I have the worst, most inflexible, unwieldy

---

<sup>150</sup> '[...] Романтик с вечно беспокойным духом.' Ibid. p. 54.

<sup>151</sup> 'Пианистическое мастерство Г. Г. Нейгауза привлекало не эффектами бравурной виртуозности, а умением ярко и красочно использовать богатство звуковой палитры фортепиано, передать на этом инструменте тончайшие оттенки чувств, образно и реалистично раскрыть художественный смысл каждого произведения.' А. А. Николаев, 'The Views of H. Neuhaus on the Development of Pianistic Mastery' in А. А. Николаев (ed.), *Masters of the Soviet Piano School* p. 168. Although published in 1961, this article attempts to characterize Neuhaus's pianism at the height of his powers in the 1920s – 1930s. As explained in the editorial footnote, the article was written 'long before' ['задолго до'] the publication date (see p. 167).

and underdeveloped hands in the whole *Meisterschule* – but in spite of this I am still the best pianist in the *Meisterschule*.<sup>152</sup>

Neuhaus's preoccupation with technique was not as an isolated layer, and so outside of its practise in exercises or etudes it was a subsidiary to other considerations. It took Neuhaus, however, the best part of his life to be able to find a way of linking his understanding of technique with an artistic aim. He finally discussed this in *About the Art of Piano Playing*:

A wise writer once said about writers that 'to perfect style is to perfect the thought. [...] This is the correct way of understanding technique (style)! I often tell students that the word 'technique' comes from the Greek 'τέχνη', and 'techne' meant – art.<sup>153</sup>

Neuhaus was not generally inclined to think that his interpretation could be improved if the technical details were 'sharpened' or 'cleaned'. Instead he was more prone to thinking an interpretation could be improved only by working on the idea behind the interpretation – working on the *will* of the interpreter: the clearer the idea, the greater the clarity that will be technically bestowed onto it. In effect Neuhaus's attitude to technique, as understood in relation to a seasoned concert-pianist, was 'if you know what you want to hear, the hand will follow' – a slight modification of the mantra held by Realist painters already mentioned.<sup>154</sup> Extrapolating this idea, technique actually becomes a measure of *style*: a solid technique is achieved through solid thought, and solid thought equates to a thorough understanding of the style of the work.

As a concept, virtuosity is heavily related to technique and therefore problematic to use as a differential between interpreters and performers, and the two are often interchanged. Neuhaus's definition of virtuosity however has nuanced differences from his

---

<sup>152</sup> 'Когда я слушаю таких пианистов, как Бакхауз, Розенталь, Левин – и прежде всего самого Годоса, то в самом деле становится грустно. Факт, что у меня худшая, самая твердая, самая мало гибкая, самая мало разработанная рука во всей *Meisterschule* – но несмотря на это, я все же первый пианист *Meisterschule*.' Letter to his parents from Vienna dated 8 November 1913 in *Letters* p. 174.

<sup>153</sup> 'Один умный писатель сказал о писателях: «Усовершенствовать стиль значит усовершенствовать мысль». [...] Вот правильное понимание техники (стиля)! Я часто напоминаю ученикам, что слово «техника» происходит от греческого слова «τέχνη», а «технэ» означало – искусство.' H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 17.

<sup>154</sup> See G. Kogan, *At the Gates of Mastery* p. 26.

definition of technique. Virtuosity was for him, a measure of the mental and emotional inner world of the interpreter:

The intellectual side of music cannot be opened without such qualities as temperament, will, passion, sensitive ear and feeling, the unity of concept and lastly without virtuosity in its fullest and broadest sense. [...] the word 'virtuosity' comes from the Latin 'virtus' which means valour.<sup>155</sup>

Thus, if technique is Neuhaus's measure of grasping the style of a *work*, a concept linked to the 'nature' of the composer, then virtuosity is the *personal style* of the interpreter – the measure by which the interpreter brings the concepts of daring and courage of commitment to an interpretation.

Because for Neuhaus true virtuosity was understood as a manifestation of the interpreter's distinct personality, or his artistic will, it was a quality that far outweighed, for him, the attraction of 'virtuosic brilliance' as the ability to simply get around the instrument. Neuhaus's view of virtuosity as a measure of the expression of the interpreter's unique 'self' meant that it related to an audience the emotional and intellectual acquisitions of that interpreter. Interestingly, although Neuhaus talked about relinquishing the activity of composition in order to define himself as an interpreter, he considered that 'virtuosity' was the living legacy of the silenced composer within the interpreter – the idea that an interpreter too needs to have a strong desire to communicate from the self. Thus, Neuhaus spoke of the successes of his student, Sviatoslav Richter, as of a virtuoso pianist and identified that this arose from his 'potential' as a great composer:

The 'secret' of Richter's interpretative art is simple: he is a composer and this is combined with his tempestuous pianistic (virtuosic) talent.<sup>156</sup>

---

<sup>155</sup> 'Но смысловая сторона музыки не может быть раскрыта без таких качеств, как темперамент, воля, страстность, тонкость слуха и чувства, цельность концепции, наконец, без виртуозности в её самом широком и полном смысле. [...] слово «виртуозность» происходит от латинского *virtus*, что означает доблесть.' Г. Г. Нейгауз, 'Искусство Эмиля Гилельса' [H. G. Neuhaus, 'The Art of Emil Gilels'] in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 265.

<sup>156</sup> «Секрет» его исполнительского творчества прост: он – композитор, и притом превосходный. К этому надо прибавить его стихийное пианистическое (виртуозное) дарование.' H. G. Neuhaus, 'Sviatoslav Richter' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 189.

## 2.9 Analytical and poetic approaches to pianism

Since for Neuhaus the interpreter's means of expression was linked to his assimilated experiences, a broad repertoire was one of the most important aspirations for a pianist. As a believer that 'quantity transfers into quality' in this respect, his knowledge of the piano literature was encyclopaedic. With composers with whom he was determined to have an especially close affinity, Neuhaus was often able to play that composer's entire piano oeuvre so that he could 'live himself' [*вживаться*] into the composer's being.<sup>157</sup> Reporting his vast concert programmes to his parents, Neuhaus's letters show he also found the time to acquaint himself intimately with all of Bach's Preludes and Fugues, Beethoven's piano sonatas, and in one letter (dated 1908) proclaimed:

Pianistically I've surprised myself – I just played from memory [Schumann's] *Abegg-Variations, Papillons, Carnaval, Allegro Opus 8* and nearly all the *Davidsbündler*. I played them a few times carefully as I usually do – and then it somehow immediately fitted inside my poor head.<sup>158</sup>

Even as a successful concert pianist juggling a busy full-time teaching career at the Moscow Conservatory, where he taught from 1922, Neuhaus's programmes showed no respite. In February 1929 for example, Neuhaus's concert tour to Kiev included the following pieces (most probably given within the same week):<sup>159</sup>

**Beethoven:** Piano Sonatas in D minor Opus 31 (*Tempest*); A major Opus 101; B major Opus 106 (*Hammerklavier*)

**Bach-Liszt:** *Prelude and Fugue* in A minor S. 462; a selection of *Organ Chorale Preludes*

**Schumann:** *Fantasie* Opus 17, *Vogel als Prophet* from *Waldszenen* Opus 82

<sup>157</sup> Neuhaus was known for giving regular 'monographic' [*монографический*] concerts – these were concerts dedicated to the works of one composer. This was a practice that, according to his son Stanislav Neuhaus, had been mainly linked to the artistry of his father, Igumnov, Sofronitsky and Lev Oborin. See С. Г. Нейгауз, 'Устарел ли романтизм?' [S. H. Neuhaus, 'Is Romanticism Outmoded?'] in Н. М. Зимянина (составитель), *Станислав Нейгауз. Воспоминания. Письма. Материалы* (Москва: «Советский Композитор», 1988) [N. M. Zimyanina (ed.), *Stanislav Neuhaus. Reminiscences. Letters. Materials* (Moscow: 1988)] p. 195.

<sup>158</sup> 'Пианистически я устроил себе сюрприз, а именно, играл на память *Abegg-Вариации, Papillons, Карнавал, Allegro op. 8* и почти целиком «*Davidsbündler*». Проиграл себе это несколько раз внимательно, по моей хорошей привычке, и сразу же в моей дурной башке всё как-то поместилось.' See *Letters* p. 99.

<sup>159</sup> Letter sent by Neuhaus to his parents from Kiev, February 1929 in *Letters* p. 202.

**Chopin:** *Ballades* No. 3 in A-flat Opus 47 and No. 4 in F minor Opus 52; a selection of *Preludes*; a selection of *Mazurkas*; two *Nocturnes*; *Barcarolle* Opus 60; two *Valses*

**Liszt:** *Mephisto Waltz* S. 514; *Valse oubliée* S. 215; *Ave Maria*; two *Petrarch Sonnets* from *Années de Pèlerinage*

**Medtner:** Sonata in G minor Opus 22; *Funeral March* Opus 31 no. 2

**Prokofiev:** complete *Visions Fugitives* Opus 22; *March, Dance, Minuet, Gavotte*; *Old Grandmother's Tales* Opus 31

**Myaskovsky:** Sonata No. 2 in F-sharp minor Opus 13

**Skryabin:** a selection of *Preludes*; a selection of *Etudes*; a selection of *Poems*

**Ravel:** *Sonatine*; *Alborada del gracioso*

**Brahms:** two *Rhapsodies* and three *Intermezzi*.

The ability to perform different and challenging programmes in recitals taking place within a narrow space of time is in certain respects linked to the legacy of Romantic pianism at the end of the nineteenth century. Neuhaus's musicianship evolved in the shadow of Anton Rubinstein's mammoth concert programmes given across Europe.<sup>160</sup> Anna Esipova too emulated Rubinstein's achievement in New York where between 25 April and 3 May 1877 she presented seven mixed-programme recitals of different works.<sup>161</sup> Of Neuhaus's contemporaries who were influenced by this tradition, Josef Hofmann's programmes between 1897 and 1923, as well as those of the young Artur Rubinstein (Neuhaus's classmate studying with Barth), were particularly notable for their variety (and duration) within the same week, let alone season.<sup>162</sup> What is remarkable in Neuhaus's case, however, is that none of the pianists mentioned above had to combine this kind of intense programming with full-time pedagogical commitments. For a famous pianist of the musical intelligence and stature of Leopold Godowsky or Edwin Fischer, who did have large repertoires, their pedagogical work seems to have dramatically affected the number of different programmes they would perform within a

<sup>160</sup> These will be mentioned later in the thesis in relation to Beethoven, but encompassed many other composers. As an indication of the sheer scale of Rubinstein's recitals, in his 'Historical Lectures' for instance, out of a series of seven recitals dedicated to different composers and played over the course of a week, his fourth concert was dedicated to Schumann and included *Carnaval* Opus 9, *Fantasie* Opus 17, *Etudes symphoniques* Opus 13, *Kreisleriana* Opus 16, Sonata in F-sharp minor Opus 11. See A. Г. Рубинштейн, *Лекции по истории фортепианной литературы*, 1889 (Москва: «Музыка», 1974) [A. G. Rubinstein, *Lectures in the History of Piano Literature*, 1889 (Moscow: 1974)] pp. 98–100.

<sup>161</sup> See G. Kehler, *The Piano in Concert Volume I (A-L)* (London: Scarecrow Press, 1982) pp. 356–357.

<sup>162</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 552–558 and G. Kehler, *The Piano in Concert Volume II (M-Z)* (London: Scarecrow Press, 1982) pp. 1096–1099 respectively.

season, with the same works being performed even in venues of close geographical proximity.<sup>163</sup>

Outside the piano literature Neuhaus was equally well-versed. He spent much of his free time in his youth playing four-handed arrangements of symphonies and operas with his cousin Karol Szymanowski and later with any willing fellow students at the *Hochschule and Meisterschule*.<sup>164</sup> Neuhaus had studied Wagner's operas and Strauss's tone-poems so thoroughly that he reputedly could play them by heart. The habit of such score-reading became a feature of Neuhaus's adult life even when the availability of records meant that the way most musicians accustomed themselves to musical literature was changing. It was an activity that Neuhaus singled out as the most satisfying in terms of musical engagement that he was able to share with, for example, Emil Gilels. Equally, it was also an aptitude that Neuhaus was later to value so highly in Sviatoslav Richter.

In cultivating such a broad yet thorough knowledge of the repertoire, including chamber and orchestral works, Neuhaus felt that he was encouraging both himself and his students to get closer to the mindset of the composer. Neuhaus's belief that certain attributes of a compositional mind must be present in an interpreter was so strong that he retained a heightened sympathy for those of his students who composed. As testified by Lev Naumov and Alexei Nasedkin, their theoretical or analytical predisposition, and 'hands on' understanding of authorship, granted for them Neuhaus's extended tolerance to their interpretative deficiencies. Naumov, for example, recollected:

Even with the most talented students [Neuhaus could easily] become enraged [and once even] threw a cast-iron ashtray at the student playing. [...]. I must say that Heinrich Gustavovich was always kind towards me [even though] when I studied with him I always felt myself more as a composer, did not practise enough [and] had obvious technical deficiencies in comparison to the rest of the class.<sup>165</sup>

<sup>163</sup> See G. Kehler, *The Piano in Concert Volume I (A-L)* (London: Scarecrow Press, 1982) pp. 376–375 and pp. 460–461.

<sup>164</sup> See for example, Neuhaus's letter dated 30 October 1910 in *Letters* p. 147.

<sup>165</sup> 'На уроках [Нейгауз легко] раздражался даже очень одарёнными [учениками]. [Как-то] Нейгауз рассвирепел, схватив чугунную пепельницу и запустил ею в играющего. [...] Должен похвастаться, что ко мне Генрих Густавович всегда относился доброжелательно. В пору моих занятий с ним я больше чувствовал себя композитором, занимался относительно мало, технически явно отставал от класса.' Lev Naumov in E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus* pp. 133–135. Similar testimonies from Naumov, with regard to himself and other composers studying in Neuhaus's class can be found in

Neuhaus was keenly aware that there were certain mental processes and attitudes that were at a composer's disposal intuitively or at least subconsciously due to the actual practice of the compositional craft. As an illustration of this, Neuhaus confided to his diary:

Oh, how much easier it would be for me to speak and reason with a composer, even without any so called 'virtuosic brilliance', than with hundreds of girls who are destined in the best instance, despite their brilliance, to 'play for Auntie Mania's parties'!<sup>166</sup>

Neuhaus believed that if a performer could hone these compositional skills it would give his interpretation much greater insight, and so developing a compositional awareness of a work's architecture was one of the most pressing priorities in Neuhaus's class:

One of my most passionate requirements is for the ability to clearly and intelligently talk about the piece... We call everything by a separate name. [...] Theory, harmony and even analysis in relation to an artistic interpretation [however] is no more than geography, because if I say 'Neapolitan sixth' it does not say much essentially, but these terms must be known. It is a rather deep problem. When we study with students difficult, substantial works like, for example, Beethoven's Sonata Opus 106, Tchaikovsky's B-flat minor Concerto or Sonata, we begin to delve really far into pure musical analysis – we are actually, honestly speaking, having a lesson in composition.<sup>167</sup>

---

his memoirs. See: Л. Н. Наумов, *Под знаком Нейгауза* (Москва: «Антиква», 2002) [L. N. Naumov, *Under the Sign of Neuhaus* (Moscow: 2002)].

<sup>166</sup> 'Насколько легче было бы мне говорить и договариваться с композиторами, даже не имеющими малейшего понятия о «виртуозном блеске», чем с сотнями милых девушек, которым предстояло, несмотря на блеск, в лучшем случае – «играть на именинах у тети Мани».' Diary entry for 24 November 1962 in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 77.

<sup>167</sup> 'Одно из самых моих страстных требований в нашем педагогическом деле – это чтобы ясно и умно рассказать о вещи... [...] Мы всё называем своими именами. [...] Теория, гармония и даже анализ это по отношению к художественному исполнению [...] не более как география, потому что если я скажу «неаполитанский секстаккорд», этим ещё ничего по существу не сказано, но эти названия надо знать. Проблема страшно глубокая. Когда мы проходим с учениками трудные, значительные вещи, скажем, Сонату ор. 106 Бетховена, b-moll'ный Концерт или Сонату Чайковского, мы начинаем настолько углубляться иногда в чисто музыкальный анализ, что занимаемся, откровенно говоря, уроком композиции.' Neuhaus's conversation with pedagogues (9 December 1938) in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* pp. 128–129.



Neuhaus's wish for the pianist to be able to speak coherently about the structure and harmony can be seen to manifest itself against the wider emergence of analysis as a musical discipline. Although it is uncertain how well Neuhaus knew the work of his contemporary Heinrich Schenker, for example, it is known that he was influenced by the idea of the *Urtext* – which will be discussed in the following chapter – and did make an effort to study the writings of Hindemith (most likely *The Craft of Composition*, 1942).<sup>168</sup> However, in many ways Neuhaus represented an alternative view to the score-centred analyses of figures like Schenker, who despite acknowledging the ambiguity of notation, contributed to the *Werktreue* ideals which saw interpreters as informed and inspired reproducers of notation. Neuhaus's demand for understanding the 'geography' of a work is best likened to the reading of a map. He believed that a good 'map-reader' had a clearer idea of what the music sought to express, its essence, but that 'only one-hundredth of the music itself was notated'.<sup>169</sup> Thus, to accomplish this, Neuhaus's analyses of music often fell back on narrative, rather than abstract theoretical means, where a thorough understanding of the specific harmonic, melodic and structural occurrences were first identified and then re-clothed in evocative language.<sup>170</sup>

As already indicated, Neuhaus called the music's essence – the 99% of music which eluded notation – its 'image' [*образ*]: 'The greater the *musician*, the more music is like an open book for him, and the smaller (insignificant) becomes the *problem* of working on an image.'<sup>171</sup> By calling the essence of a work its 'image', Neuhaus did not seek to simplistically illustrate music. Instead, Neuhaus's concept of the 'image' is a complicated process of the interpreter evoking an unfolding state of emotional connections to the work:

Is it not clear that the Periodic Table as a discovery, as a great achievement of the human mind, as a method of *understanding nature* (with which the

<sup>168</sup> See Neuhaus's letter to A. G. Gabrichevsky dated 2 August 1959 in *Letters* p. 439.

<sup>169</sup> See E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus* p. 295.

<sup>170</sup> The use of narration in relation to analysis (especially for the performer) continues to be an important issue debated today. Carolyn Abbate is one of a relatively small group of contemporary musicologists who stands in defence of narration as analysis. She noted: '[...] as Jean-Jacques Nattiez has intimated, that musical analysis is itself born of a narrative impulse, that we create fictions about music to explain where no other form of explanation is possible, and may look to literary categories to endorse them. Nattiez makes the obvious point that music analysis and criticism tend to tell the story of a piece.' C. Abbate, *Unsung Voices. Opera and Musical Narrative in the Nineteenth Century*, 1991 (Princeton University Press, 1996) p. 40.

<sup>171</sup> 'Чем крупнее музыкант, чем более музыка для него – открытая книга, тем меньше (незначительнее) становится проблема работы над образом.' Н. Г. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) pp. 22–23.

artist is sometimes linked more closely than the scientist studying it) goes far beyond the strict borders of chemistry: and that the musician who realizes it, if he is able to make associative connections – to think in broad analogies (without falling into the temptation of light-minded, amateurish identifications – the same sin as 'illustration') will often remind himself of it [...].<sup>172</sup>

Neuhaus's analogies are considered perhaps the strongest part of his pedagogic legacy. His evocative language and imagery were a recognizable part of his persona to both his students and onlookers:

When I am working with averagely talented students who do not possess a bright artistic imagination I often provoke their creative imagination through different associations [...]. It helps to lead their thoughts to the creation of artistic strategies.<sup>173</sup>

While many pedagogues used such a strategy with their students, and continue to do so today, it is clear that many Russian pianists of the time (some of whom are mentioned below) used emotional narratives and associative imagery as an integral part of their preparation of an interpretation for performance.<sup>174</sup> In this respect Neuhaus's attitude has explicit similarities once again to that of Igumnov who maintained that:

It is not enough to tell a story, the story must be interesting – it must have content. To have content there must be something that pushes you towards that content. This is why I cannot think about a musical work in a

---

<sup>172</sup> 'Разве не понятно, что периодическая таблица как открытие, как великий подвиг человеческого ума, как метод *познания природы* (с которой художники бывают иногда более тесно связаны, чем учёные, исследующие её) далеко выходит за строгие границы химии и постигший её музыкант, если он обладает способностью к ассоциативным связям, к мышлению широкими аналогиями (не поддаваясь соблазну легкомысленных дилетанских уподоблений – тот же грех, что и «иллюстрирование»), – такой музыкант не раз вспомнит о ней [...].' Ibid. pp. 40–41.

<sup>173</sup> 'Имея дело со средними по способностям учениками, не обладающими яркой художественной фантазией, я часто прибегаю к возбуждению их творческого воображения путем различных ассоциаций. [Это] дает ученику ясную перспективу дальнейшей работы, придаёт определенную целеустремленность его творческим исканиям.' A. A. Nikolaev, 'The Views of H. Neuhaus on the Development of Pianistic Mastery' in A. A. Nikolaev, *Masters of the Soviet Piano School* p. 173.

<sup>174</sup> Of course emotional narratives and associative imagery were not confined to Russian pianists or those trained in bordering areas of Eastern Europe. Most obviously the same approach can be distinctly seen in the attitude of Neuhaus's Franco-Swiss contemporary Alfred Cortot.

completely abstract way. I always want some analogies from life. [...] I simply cannot imagine music for the sake of music without human experience. [...] I cannot say that I must always imagine a programme for the work. It is not a programme but some thoughts and associations that help me to find the analogous mood to that which I want to evoke through my interpretation.<sup>175</sup>

Importantly, whereas Neuhaus's use of imagery has been identified as a vital pedagogical tool, it must be acknowledged that it remained a tool he could apply to his own interpretative practice. Although he claimed that the problem of working on an artistic image was greatly diminished for an experienced musician, it must be understood that it was the *problem* and not the *work*, or effort, which was reduced. Despite Neuhaus's experience, the following chapters of this thesis will demonstrate how vital associative thought remained for Neuhaus's interpretative conceptions. Furthermore, it will be shown that experience allowed Neuhaus to make disjointed, and often perverse, kinds of associations which did not necessarily even attempt to be true to what the composer might have envisaged.

As will be demonstrated, Neuhaus's 'images' were deeply idiosyncratic and built upon a web of personal associations. The series of associations were a scaffold that stimulated a dynamic emotional chain for him as an interpreter. It was the resultant emotional movement that was meant to mirror the intention of the composer and approach the 'truth' in the music. The scaffold, meanwhile, was expected to serve its functional purpose and fall away. The essence of an association hence leads to that same essence in a different form; the form and association are never presumed to be equated and are only paralleled to capture the essence:

It is natural that upon contact with any art form, one can sense closely related understandings and feelings, and translate them into another language. In physics and electronics there are such wonderful apparatuses that translate light into sound, and sound into light. Understandably there

---

<sup>175</sup> 'Но конечно, мало рассказывать, нужно чтобы рассказ был интересным, содержательным, чтобы в нем было содержание, что-то такое, что могло натолкнуть на этот рассказ. И поэтому я не могу мыслить музыкальное произведение совершенно абстрактно. Мне всегда хочется каких-то житейских аналогий. [...] Я не могу представить себе музыки ради музыки, без человеческих переживаний. [...] Нельзя сказать, чтобы я обязательно представлял себе программу произведения. Это не программа, но это какие-то мысли и сопоставления, которые помогают вызвать настроения, аналогичные тем, какие хочешь передать при помощи своего исполнения.' A. V. Vitsinsky, *The Work-Process of the Pianist-Interpreter on a Musical Work* p. 64.

is some kind of apparatus in our brain that makes it fully acceptable to have poetic, pictorial, religious, philosophical, moral interpretations of music – only one must know the measure so that one does not hinder the other.<sup>176</sup>

The later use of imagery and analogies to evoke an emotional narrative in the Russian school of pianism owed its greatest debt to figures such as Neuhaus. Along with likeminded individuals, Neuhaus championed an imagery-based approach that was typical of the Romantic era at a time when the grip of Romanticism was being challenged by other Soviet aesthetics and beginning to fade. It is however important to recognize that the resistance to programmatic concepts did not come from the within the followers of the Russian pianistic aesthetic of interpretation being discussed, but rather from the emergence of alternative ideals of interpretation. For instance it is often believed that figures such as Goldenweiser, who is widely portrayed as an 'academic' type of pianist,<sup>177</sup> were responsible for laying the ground for an understanding of interpretation that saw musical language as an abstract concept that did not root itself in programmatic concepts or associative thought.

In fact the reverse holds true. Despite different temperaments, Neuhaus and Goldenweiser shared much in common in terms of their values. Far from rejecting a programmatic approach to creating an interpretation Goldenweiser, like Neuhaus, had always held it as an important point of reference. This can be seen most vividly in the fragments of his unpublished lectures about the meaning of programmatic music (dated 1895) as well as his

---

<sup>176</sup> 'И естественно, что при соприкосновении с любым искусством человек может ощущать смежные понятия и чувства и переводить их на другой язык. В физике и технике есть такие замечательные аппараты, которые переводят свет в звук и звук в свет. Понятно, что в мозгу у нас есть какой-то такой аппарат который делает вполне уместными поэтические, живописные, религиозные, философские, моральные толкования музыки. Только нужно знать меру, чтобы одно другому не мешало.' H. G. Neuhaus, 'Seventeenth Sonata by Beethoven' in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 151–152.

<sup>177</sup> See for example Rabinovich's *Interpreter and Style* where Goldenweiser is juxtaposed against Neuhaus as supposedly representing the embodiment of two completely different aesthetics (i.e. the rational approach vs. the emotional). In the West the idea of Goldenweiser as an academic, 'anti-Romantic' type of pianist can be seen in commentaries by David Dubal (*The Art of the Piano: Its Performers, Literature, and Recordings*, 1989) and in CD booklets where he is described as a 'academic' and 'non-conformist' influenced by Busoni (even though as already mentioned in this thesis, Goldenweiser did not have a particularly high opinion of the latter) <http://www.toccatoclassics.com/artistdetail.php?ID=25> (accessed 14 /09/2013). Similar beliefs have filtered their way into more modern Russian accounts including those of Goldenweiser's former students such as Dmitri Paperno (see D. Paperno, *Notes of a Moscow Pianist* (Oregon: Amadeus Press, 1998) and into the television and radio interviews of Dmitri Bashkurov. A substantial number of Neuhaus's former students also saw Goldenweiser as the anti-Romantic figure who stood in direct opposition to Neuhaus (see E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus*).

own diary entries.<sup>178</sup> A posthumously published autograph by Goldenweiser dated 31 March 1895 reads:

*'Chopin. Twenty-four Preludes.' Images which paint themselves in my imagination when I listen to these.*

XV (Des-dur)

She is dead!... She is being buried... It is a beautiful day. The sun is brightly shining; nature is pure and fresh like at the beginning of spring. I remember such a day. How beautiful she was then! How we loved each other! [...] I forgot she had died and saw her alive before me... An involuntary cry escapes from within me [...] – she is no more... Yet time, like the funeral knell, beats steadily, steadily...<sup>179</sup>

The above extract surely calls into question the possibility of viewing Goldenweiser as an archetypal 'academic' who could stand in direct contrast to Neuhaus. Musicologists and musicians who nonetheless do see Goldenweiser as the academic antipode to Neuhaus maintain sceptically that Goldenweiser's programmatic inclinations were a passing phase and symptomatic of the naivety of youth. As an older and more experienced musician Goldenweiser did indeed shy away from his programmatic narrations: 'In my youth I was carried away with designating programmes and even wrote my own [...]. Now I find this endeavour alien.'<sup>180</sup> The important distinction that is missed, however, is that Goldenweiser did not reject his view that programmatic associations had the ability to *focus* the emotional content of musical language. Instead, like Neuhaus, Goldenweiser felt that for an experienced

<sup>178</sup> А. Б. Гольденвейзер, *Дневник. Первая тетрадь (1889–1904)* (Москва: «Тортуга», 1995) [A. B. Goldenweiser, *Diary. Book 1 (1889–1904)* (Moscow: 1995)] pp. 56–63.

<sup>179</sup> «Шопен. Двадцать четыре прелюдии». Картины, которые рисуются в моем воображении, когда я их слушаю. XV (Des-dur) Она умерла! Её хоронят... Чудесный день. Ярко светит солнце: вся природа чиста и свежа, как ранней весной. Мне вспомнился такой же ясный день. Как хороша была она тогда! Как мы любили друг друга! [...] Я забыл, что она умерла, и увидел её, как живую перед собой... Невольный крик отчаяния вырвался у меня из груди... – её уже нет... А время как похоронный колокол стучит мерно, мерно... Extract from full programme printed in Д. Д. Благой, А. Б. Гольденвейзер. *О музыкальном искусстве* (Москва: «Музыка», 1975) [D. D. Blagoi (ed.), *Alexander Goldenweiser. About Musical Art* (Moscow: 1975)] pp. 364–365.

<sup>180</sup> «В молодости я увлекался программными обозначениями и даже написал свою программу [...]. Ныне мне чуждо это стремление.» А. Б. Гольденвейзер, «О Шопене» [A. B. Goldenweiser, 'About Chopin'] in D. D. Blagoi (ed.), *Alexander Goldenweiser. About Musical Art* p. 149.

musician the verbalized programmatic scaffold falls away more quickly because 'Music is able to disclose the deepest feelings without *concrete designated* programmes.'<sup>181</sup>

The freedom which Neuhaus brings to the idea of the artistic image challenges the rigidity usually implied by the aesthetic belief that an interpreter re-creates the truth of the composer by creating a truthful likeness from within the self requires a readiness – on a certain level – to sacrifice the self's independence. Neuhaus was inclined to believe that it was a sacrifice of *individualism* [индивидуализм] ('I noticed that many pianists have a feature that might be formulated thus: don't get in the way of my character, I am allowed everything') rather than of *individuality* [индивидуальность].<sup>182</sup> In fact, Neuhaus believed that the closer one forced himself to observe the markings in the score, the richer his associative thought would need to be – thus, the more individual. The interpreter therefore juggles the paradox that through pursuing a sincere ambition of fidelity to the composer, his own individuality increases rather than diminishes.

## 2.10 Towards a transformative interpretational process

Interpreters, and musicologists, of Neuhaus's time were in need of a model through which it could be shown that 'individuality' was an inherent part of an interpretational process that nonetheless was driven by a desire to observe meticulously the markings in a score. As a result, many interpreters were drawn to Stanislavsky's explanation of how to reconcile a creation that in effect was faithful to two masters. Stanislavsky offered the following explanation:

The result of the creation through emotive art is a living being. It is not a mould of a role [or musical work] exactly as the poet bore it; and it is not the artist exactly as we know him in life and reality. The new creation – the living being – has inherited characteristics of the artist, who conceived and gave birth to it, and of the role that fertilized it. The new creation is spirit of the spirit, and flesh of the flesh of the role and artist. By the inscrutable laws of nature herself, that living, organic being is the only thing that can be

<sup>181</sup> 'Музыка способна поведать о самых глубоких чувствах помимо *конкретных программных обозначений*.' Ibid. (My emphasis).

<sup>182</sup> 'Затем я заметил у очень многих пианистов другое свойство, которое можно было бы сформулировать так: нраву моему не препятствуй, мне все позволено.' Neuhaus's conversation with B. M. Teplov and A. V. Vitsinsky (6 December 1944) in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 112.

born from the merging of spiritual and bodily elements of the human-role and the human-artist.<sup>183</sup>

Adopting such an aesthetic would ideally free the pure interpreter from the issues that affect composer-performers, the desperation to impose the self's creativity as identified by Neuhaus, for example, in the cases of Rachmaninov and Busoni as discussed above. A composer-performer is almost always inescapably trapped in solipsism because the moment he takes to interpreting the work of another composer, his own composer's voice within him would seek to wrestle with the other composer. Within literary criticism, Harold Bloom vindicated this by maintaining that 'Poetic strength comes only from a triumphant wrestling with the greatest of the dead, and from an even more triumphant solipsism.'<sup>184</sup> Theoretically, the pure interpreter has sacrificially silenced the composer within, and with this silencing, the interpreter is free to engage with the author without conflict – he has achieved what Neuhaus called the 'feeling of objectivity and fairness that a composer cannot have...'<sup>185</sup>

This universality and objectivity that Neuhaus aspires to is, however, utopian. Even Neuhaus had to concede:

In reality though, it is often the case, occurring all the time, that the interpreter prefers one kind of music to another (for one Brahms is closer, for another, Skryabin etc.). Interpreters often consciously advocate one way, one style, but not all or different ones. This is a natural occurrence – it is life itself.<sup>186</sup>

Neuhaus's success as an interpreter of composers such as Beethoven and Chopin was fuelled by a clear intellectual and conscious activity rather than a coincidental temperamental and

---

<sup>183</sup> 'Результатом творчества искусства переживания является живое создание. Это не есть слепок роли, точь-в-точь такой, каким её родил поэт; это и не сам артист, точь-в-точь такой, каким мы знаем его в жизни и действительности. Новое создание – дух от духа, плоть от плоти роли и артиста. Это то живое, органическое существо, которое только одно и может родиться по неисповедимым законам самой природы от слияния духовных и телестных органических элементов человека-роли и человека-артиста.' K. S. Stanislavsky, *Articles. Speeches. Conversations. Letters* p. 469.

<sup>184</sup> H. Bloom, *A Map of Misreading*, 1975 (Oxford University Press, 1980) p. 9.

<sup>185</sup> '[...] чувством объективности и справедливости, которым не может обладать автор...' H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) pp. 215–216.

<sup>186</sup> 'В действительности, конечно, бывает сплошь и рядом, что исполнитель предпочитает одну музыку другой (одному ближе Брамс, другому – Скрябин и т. д.). Исполнители часто сознательно пропагандируют одно направление, один стиль, но не все и не разные. Это – явление закономерное, это сама жизнь.' *Ibid.*

aesthetic similarity between himself and these composers. His definition of an interpreter, already quoted, places a spotlight on the idea that as an interpreter there is a '*critic* with the propensity of a prosecutor [who] dominates his soul'.<sup>187</sup> Such a statement highlights Neuhaus's conviction that an interpreter must be prepared to interrogate the numerous choices that the score leaves open for consideration rather than simply travel along the path of least resistance. This has been supported by Soviet musicologists who had been heavily influenced by Neuhaus's example, including Viktor Delson, who wrote: 'Every interpreter both *intuitively* and *consciously* brings to the foreground that which he feels as an artist to be especially important.'<sup>188</sup>

Neuhaus's belief that it is not 'how' to play but rather '*what*' to play as the question of primary importance, further indicates that an interpreter does not exist in passive submission to the composer's will.<sup>189</sup> Neuhaus took it for granted that an interpreter had to have his own artistic will [*воля*] – a burning and insatiable desire to communicate. To Neuhaus's understanding, this artistic will was a far-reaching concept and not one that just manifested itself as a final ingredient in a public performance. The whole process of preparation for a public performance was seen as tempering the evolving interpretation to become ever closer to the composer's 'image' in carving out a path or trajectory by an increasingly focused artistic will. In the course of the interpreter's daily practise Neuhaus was adamant that: 'Successful work [only] occurs when a person is ruled by real passion, i.e. desire, multiplied by will.'<sup>190</sup>

Neuhaus's understanding of artistic will was as that elusive quality that made the pianist not just a musician or artist but a 'poet' – a word he reserved for describing those interpreters who had, in his opinion, reached the highest possible of level of emotional and intellectual engagement with their art.<sup>191</sup> Tirelessly requesting his students to find the poetry within the music Neuhaus argued: 'The heart of all art, its most profound essence and most

<sup>187</sup> '*Критик* с прокурорскими наклонностями господствует в его душе.' H. G. Neuhaus, 'The Great and the Simple' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 177 (Emphasis mine).

<sup>188</sup> 'Каждый исполнитель и *интуитивно* и *сознательно* выдвигает на первый план то, что ему кажется как художнику особенно важным.' В. Ю. Дельсон, *Генрих Нейгауз* (Москва: «Музыка», 1966) [V. Y. Delson, *Heinrich Neuhaus* (Moscow: 1966)] p. 106 (Underlining mine, author's emphasis).

<sup>189</sup> A. A. Nikolaev, *Masters of the Soviet Piano School* p. 170 (Neuhaus's emphasis).

<sup>190</sup> '[...] график всякого успешного труда, когда человеком руководит настоящая страсть, то есть желание, помноженное на волю.' H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 127.

<sup>191</sup> See T. A. Hludova, 'About the Pedagogical Principles of H. Neuhaus' in M. G. Sokolov (ed.), *Questions of Piano Interpretation. Issue 1* p. 185.



sacred thought, is poetry.<sup>192</sup> Neuhaus's fixation on the interpreter being a poet who should seek out and deliver the poetry of a work is all the more pertinent since the essence of a work cannot be notated by metric means. Neuhaus's son Stanislav, who is often considered his truest musical heir, shared his father's opinion that interpreters must possess the necessary artistic will to become poets. Stanislav Neuhaus went as far as to say that great interpreters achieved their stature on the condition that they were ultimately the greatest poets:

The greater the presence of poetry [...] in an interpretation, the greater its hold on the listener – it wakes the sleeping, calms the restless and leaves a deep impression in our souls, sometimes forever.<sup>193</sup>

Neuhaus believed that the strength of the artistic will, and therefore of the poetry in an interpretation, was dependent on the interpreter completely excluding all possibilities except that one specific path to which his interpretation subscribed. To Neuhaus, the success of interpretation thus was constantly underpinned by the paradox that despite the many truths latent within a score, an interpretation can only contain one. In his critique of Neuhaus, Nikolaev considered that the overpowering impression left by Neuhaus's live performances was indeed representative of this view:

It seems like only this way and exactly this way the given music must be understood – that this sounded-out [version] is the only possible interpretation [...] of the given artistic image.<sup>194</sup>

With such an attitude, even if the artistic will is seemingly tempered to the design of the composer, it nonetheless remains the exclusive will of that *interpreter*. As observed by Neuhaus's hero, Goethe:

---

<sup>192</sup> 'Сердцевина всякого искусства, его глубочайшая сущность и сокровенный смысл есть поэзия.' Г. Г. Нейгауз, 'Поэт фортепиано' [H. G. Neuhaus, 'Poet of the Piano'] in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 191.

<sup>193</sup> 'Чем очевиднее в [...] исполнении присутствие поэзии, тем сильнее оно действует на слушателя, будит дремлющих, успокаивает мятущихся и оставляет глубокий след в нашей душе, а иногда на всю жизнь.' S. H. Neuhaus, 'About Poetry' in N. M. Zimyanina (ed.), *Stanislav Neuhaus. Reminiscences. Letters. Materials* (Moscow: 1988) p. 201.

<sup>194</sup> 'Кажется, что только так, и именно так должна быть понимаема данная музыка, что только в этом звучании она может быть исполнена и познана как определенный художественный образ.' А. А. Николаев, 'The Views of H. Neuhaus on the Development of Pianistic Mastery' in A. A. Nikolaev, *Masters of the Soviet Piano School* p. 174.

Every great artist seizes hold of us, infects us. Everything in us which has the same kind of capacity stirs, and as we have some mental image of greatness and a certain disposition for it, we quite easily imagine that the same seed is at work within us.<sup>195</sup>

When a strong-willed interpreter such as Neuhaus 'sheds tears of joy, and feels anxiety and love for [a work]' he cannot remain as the ideal objective observer discussed above.<sup>196</sup> Instead the more an interpreter like Neuhaus falls 'in love' with a work, and the more he understands it and feels he can embody its essence – the louder the poet inside him speaks.

As observed by the musicologist and pedagogue Samarii Savshinsky, whose work was heavily indebted to the ideas of interpretation exemplified by Neuhaus, 'one cannot love generally. One loves certain characteristics.'<sup>197</sup> The poet within a particularly powerful interpreter will seize certain aspects from what he observes in the score and create a vision of the work. He will then steadfastly only allow the interpretation to follow that specific vision. In this way a strong artistic will causes a necessary degree of blindness in an interpreter. Interestingly, this stubborn blindness still acknowledges the supremacy of the composer. As in the case of Neuhaus, he still thinks that he is creating an interpretation that is faithful to the composer's image (i.e. not conflicting with the composer through his own silenced compositional instinct). In reality however, the supremacy of the composer is only accommodated because the poet within the interpreter has challenged and fought with him. The unintentional but vital wrestling of the composer of a work by the poet within the interpreter causes the interpreter to manipulate the composer and the work's musical statement to his *own* image. The greater the artistic will of the interpreter, the stronger the wrestling. The greater the battle, the stronger the interpreter's individuality is exposed making the interpretation come across as 'powerful'.

Despite the interpreter's conviction that he is finding the truthfulness within himself to re-create his interpretation in the image of the composer's intended musical statement, the poet within the interpreter actually bends the image of the composer to his own will. Thus,

---

<sup>195</sup> J. Goethe, *Maxims and Reflections* translated by Elisabeth Stopp (London: Penguin Books, 1998) p. 141.

<sup>196</sup> '[...] проливает слёзы от радости, волнения и любви к нему.' Н. Г. Neuhaus, 'The Great and Simple' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 177.

<sup>197</sup> 'Любят не вообще. Любят конкретные свойства.' С. И. Савшинский, *Работа пианиста над музыкальным произведением* (Ленинград: «Музыка», 1964) [S. I. Savshinsky, *The Work of the Pianist on a Musical Work* (Leningrad: 1964)] p. 77.

when Neuhaus talks about the importance of being truthful to the style of the composer, i.e. observing the link with the composer's 'history, culture, ways of life',<sup>198</sup> he vanquishes the independent and objective existence of that composer and instead brings him into his own sphere of influence.

The manner of the super-conscious manipulation of the composer in the name of interpretative faithfulness by Neuhaus will be investigated in detail in the following chapters in relation to the specific examples of Beethoven and Chopin. These manipulations that expose the 'self' occur as paradoxical conditions for subscribing to the Realist concept of self-sacrifice as an interpreter. The same process is indicative of the understanding of interpretation that was ingrained in the core aesthetics of the Russian piano school from its nineteenth-century foundations. For instance, the aesthetic definition that Anton Rubinstein gave to the role of interpretation became a cornerstone of the system of musical practice that he was setting out to create in Russia, and it is clearly a system adopted by Neuhaus.<sup>199</sup> Writing on the subject in his quasi-treatise, Rubinstein curtly observed:

Music is a type of language, one of hieroglyphic sounding properties. It is necessary to first of all analyse these hieroglyphs, then you will have read everything that the composer wanted to say, and then what is left is the interpretation – that is the challenge for the interpreter.<sup>200</sup>

Judging from further texts and from reports of Rubinstein's own playing it is clear that the interpretation of 'hieroglyphics' was a task that went beyond the letter of the score. The interpretative challenges were for Rubinstein first and foremost emotional, as can be seen in

---

<sup>198</sup> See A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 117: '[...] тесно связан с историей, культурой, бытом, с тем, что происходит в жизни.'

<sup>199</sup> Anton Rubinstein was quick to gauge the fact that he was the most natural leader of the newly establishing Russian piano school. Considering his immense concert commitments Rubinstein wrote extensively on the subject of music and gave important lecture series. In short, Rubinstein had the power to establish the defining principles of Russian piano aesthetics and education, and the means to disseminate them to a wide and influential audience.

<sup>200</sup> 'Музыка есть своего рода язык, правда иероглифического звукообразного свойства. Нужно прежде эти иероглифы разобрать, тогда прочтёшь всё, что сочинитель хотел высказать, и остаётся только толкование, а это последнее и составляет задачу исполнителя.' А. Г. Рубинштейн, *Музыка и её представители*, 1891 (Санкт-Петербург: «Союз Художников», 2005) [A. G. Rubinstein, *Music and Those Who Represent It*, 1891 (Saint Petersburg: 2005)] p. 15. The book was written by Rubinstein to read as an interview but is in fact completely imagined. Rubinstein provides answers to questions that he felt were of didactic importance and would strengthen the legacy that he wanted to be remembered for.

his lengthy discussion of interpreting Beethoven's 'Les Adieux' Sonata Opus 81a,<sup>201</sup> or this more succinct account of Chopin's *Ballade* No. 2 in F major Opus 38:

Is it possible for an interpreter not to feel [the *Ballade*'s] need to present to the listener: a meadow flower, the blowing of wind, the interplay between the wind and the flower, the resistance of the flower, the tempestuous gusts of the wind, the pleading of the flower for mercy and finally its death?<sup>202</sup>

Rubinstein's understanding of how to investigate the emotional meaning behind the notes was unashamedly Romantic. He was of course well aware of how easily his words might be misjudged and descend into a farcical illustrative application where the narrated image or action becomes the ultimate goal. Like with Neuhaus, the narratives that Rubinstein proposed were only ever meant to prompt and never to dictate, nor to assume compatibility with the composer's thought. Rubinstein explained:

I stand for the guessing and inputting of programme into music, but not for a fixed, set programme. I am convinced that all composers wrote not only in a particular tone, particular size and particular rhythm of notes, but also infused a known mood of the soul, i.e. programme, into his composition with the confidence that the interpreter and listener will be able to guess it... This is my understanding of programme music – and not in the sense of pre-meditated imitation of sounds of specific things or events.<sup>203</sup>

Neuhaus, who had the intelligence and means to engage with alternative interpretative models, specifically chose to engage with the interpretative model discussed

---

<sup>201</sup> A. G. Rubinstein, *Music and Those Who Represent It* pp. 15–16.

<sup>202</sup> 'Возможно ли, чтобы исполнитель не чувствовал потребности представить в ней слушателю полевого цветка, дуновение ветра, заигрывание ветра с цветком, сопротивление цветка, бурные порывы ветра, мольбу цветка о пощаде и, наконец, смерть его.' *Ibid.* p. 16.

<sup>203</sup> 'Я стою за угадывание и вкладывание в музыкальное сочинение программы, а не за определенную, данную программу. Я убежден, что всякий сочинитель пишет не только в каком-нибудь размере и в каком-нибудь ритме ноты, но вкладывает известное душевное настроение, т.е. программу, в своё сочинение, с уверенностью, что исполнитель и слушатель сумеют её угадать... Так я понимаю программную музыку, но не в смысле преднамеренного звукоподражания, известным вещам или событиям.' *Ibid.* pp. 16–17.

above. Neuhaus was aware already within his lifetime that the Romantically-induced model of interpretation that he followed was slipping away. He lamented: 'Romantic art is disappearing from modern life. It's understandable – which does not make me happy – but it is nonetheless a fact.'<sup>204</sup> Neuhaus's link of himself with disappearing aesthetics was characteristic throughout his life and was not without a sense of pride: 'I am drawn to the wonderful things, elegant and artistic, which are now no more. *Je suis conservateur au plus haut point et je deviens davantage quand je vois de si belles choses...* [I am conservative to the highest degree, and become all the more so when I see such wonderful things].'<sup>205</sup>

Even Neuhaus's son was keenly aware of this issue and counted his father, Igumnov, Sofronitsky and Oborin amongst the last guard of a great tradition.<sup>206</sup> As a result of his Romantic convictions and practices, Neuhaus is often described both colloquially and in published writing as being 'old-school'. For example Grigory Gordon, a former student of Neuhaus, has recently been using his publications and media appearances as a platform to criticize his professor on numerous issues, including what he presents as Neuhaus's inability to accept change. In 2010 Gordon defended his position by maintaining: 'I don't criticize – our time criticizes.'<sup>207</sup>

What such an attitude fails to grasp, however is that the late Romantic concept of being an interpreter is one that does not need to evolve: It remains current through its goal of the interpreter striving for omniscience. Furthermore, the interpreter's aim of fidelity to a composer's musical statement, as notated in a score, prohibits him from protesting and *consciously* challenging the superiority of the composer. Without the naïve devotion to being an interpreter, this model of interpretation loses its existence. As noted by Stanislavsky, and often paraphrased by Neuhaus:

---

<sup>204</sup> 'Романтическое искусство уходит из жизни современника. Это закономерно, это меня не радует, но это факт.' As quoted in E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus* p. 299.

<sup>205</sup> 'Меня привлекают чудесные вещи, изящные и артистичные, каких теперь нет. *Je suis conservateur au plus haut point et je deviens davantage quand je vois de si belles choses...*' Letter to his parents from Nervi, Italy, on the 15 February 1908 in *Letters* p. 87.

<sup>206</sup> Article by Stanislav Neuhaus, 'Has Romanticism become Out-Moded?' in N. M. Zimyanina (ed.), *Stanislav Neuhaus* p. 195.

<sup>207</sup> 'Это не я критикую – а наше время критикует.' Г. Б. Гордон, *Эмиль Гилельс и другие. Книга в разных жанрах* (Екатеринбург: 2010) [G. B. Gordon, *Emil Gilels and Others. A Book in Many Genres*. (Ekaterinburg: 2010)] p. 89.

An artist must to the end of his days remain a big child. When he loses his childhood immediacy in perceiving the world – he is no longer an artist.<sup>208</sup>

As demonstrated with the analogy of the vessel, Neuhaus used the score to deduce the contents of a vessel. Drawing on his broad knowledge and experience, Neuhaus then sought to fill the vessel with *himself* with what he believed were comparable contents. Thus, despite acting in the faith of respecting the composer's intentions, the ultimate creative act belonged to Neuhaus as the interpreter. Neuhaus's interpretation is thereby a paradox where 'the pianist is at the one and same time the "law-maker and interpreter", the "master and servant"'.<sup>209</sup> Neuhaus saw the interpreter as responsible for bringing a piece of music to life in the manner he judges to be the intention of the composer. Yet, the interpreter cannot shirk away from the fact that the result is *his* distinct re-creation. Thus, the next part of the thesis will explore the ways in which Neuhaus presented himself as the interpreter of the law as well as the servant in relation to the original creator, the composer, and how in fact this reveals him as a law-maker and master over his own dramatic transformations.

---

<sup>208</sup> 'Художник до конца дней своих остается большим ребёнком, а когда он теряет детскую непосредственность мироощущения – он уже не художник.' As quoted in Н. И. Сац, 'Как создавался "Петя и Волк"' in С. И. Шлифштейн, (сост.), *С. С. Прокофьев. Материалы, документы, воспоминания. Издание второе, дополненное* (Москва: «Государственное музыкальное издательство», 1961) [N. I. Satz, 'How the Story of "Peter and the Wolf" was Created' in S. I. Shlifstein (ed.), *S. S. Prokofiev* (Moscow: 1961)] p. 513.

<sup>209</sup> 'Пианист – одновременно является «законодателем и исполнителем», «хозяином и слугой».' Н. Г. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 217.

## Chapter 3

### Heinrich Neuhaus's Beethoven: The Romantic Philosopher

Ludwig van Beethoven occupied a central position in the repertoire of Heinrich Neuhaus. Deeper than this, however, along with Fryderyk Chopin, Beethoven was for Neuhaus a colossus who defined the responsibilities and morals of the pianist-interpreter: 'Two absolutely different worlds. [...] Beethoven and Chopin – that is an enormous circle.'<sup>1</sup> Neuhaus's desire to define the interpreter's relationship with Beethoven drew him to analyse this composer's persona with far more interest and insight than the purely theoretical aspects of his music. Through Neuhaus's investigation of Beethoven it is clear that he felt that for the pianist-interpreter this was the composer to regard as the ultimate Romantic philosopher who embodied the enigma of speaking for all humanity, yet was inaccessible for the majority of spiritually-uninitiated humankind. The vast part of Neuhaus's documented exploration revolved around how Beethoven can be seen in relation to philosophers such as Kant and Spinoza. Neuhaus also sought to underpin his findings by following them through in distinct and unique trajectories of thought derived from pianistic lineages which he believed to stem from Ferenc Liszt, Beethoven's inheritor.

Both channels of investigation however, are problematic as they expose a collision between Neuhaus's findings and his own personal sympathies. This chapter will investigate what these fractures in Neuhaus's understanding reveal about him as an interpreter. In showing how Neuhaus appropriated and assimilated philosophical, pianistic and literary influences, the chapter will subsequently demonstrate that rather than adjust his understanding to accommodate for irregularities, Neuhaus instead superimposes his *own* being onto that of Beethoven.

#### 3.1 Beethoven in the context of Neuhaus's career and epoch

Pianists will recognize the obvious joy that overcame Neuhaus after he successfully 'tackled' a piece such as Liszt's *Réminiscences de Don Juan* (S. 418) in his youth, or in 1944, following a

---

<sup>1</sup> 'Это совершенно разные миры. [...] Бетховен и Шопен – это огромный круг.' Neuhaus's conversation with B. M. Teplov and A. V. Vitsinsky (6 December 1944) in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 100.

time of personal hardship and uncertainty, of successfully 'being able to play Liszt's *Rhapsodie espagnole* [S. 254] three times in a row'.<sup>2</sup> Despite Neuhaus's eagerness to share such experiences with those around him, he was quick to assert that he was always 'drawn to other music'.<sup>3</sup> First on this list of 'other' music was Beethoven. Of Beethoven, Neuhaus exclaimed: 'I love him, I worship him, I experience him as the most significant event in my life.'<sup>4</sup> It was by the music of Beethoven that Neuhaus habitually defined, and indeed defended, his own pianistic abilities throughout his life. Already in his youth Neuhaus turned to the works of Beethoven as a rite of passage:

When I was eighteen years old I learnt Beethoven's *Hammerklavier* Sonata in six days.

I have played [Opus 111] ever since the time when I first learnt it at the age of twelve.<sup>5</sup>

Once he became an established and recognized musician, Neuhaus regularly reflected on his success as an interpreter by the audience's reaction to his performances of Beethoven:

When the public, and even other musicians, come to the green-room and begin to say [things like] what a wonderful composer Beethoven is – as if they had heard him for the first time – that makes me really happy. [...] I

---

<sup>2</sup> Quotes from Neuhaus's conversation with B. M. Teplov and A. V. Vitsinsky (6 December 1944) in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 95. ['Сегодня, например, я три раза подряд сыграл «Испанскую рапсодию» Листа.'] For *Don Juan* reference see previous chapter [Letter dated 22 May 1908 from Kalkar in *Letters* p. 98]. According to Neuhaus's daughter-in-law, Galina Neuhaus, in the first days of November 1941 Neuhaus had been arrested and sent to the infamous Lubyanka prison. In August 1942 he was sent to Sverdlovsk where it was arranged that he could teach at the Conservatory. The poor living conditions which Neuhaus experienced were exacerbated by the fact that this was during World War II. Neuhaus was only allowed to return to Moscow in October 1944. E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus*, 1992 (Moscow: 2007) p. 127.

<sup>3</sup> 'Но меня все-таки больше прельщала другая музыка [...].' Neuhaus's conversation with B. M. Teplov and A. V. Vitsinsky (6 December 1944) in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 96.

<sup>4</sup> 'Я его люблю, я его боготворю, я его переживаю как значительнейшее событие моей жизни [...].'  
H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 32.

<sup>5</sup> 'Hammerklaviersonate Бетховена я выучил в восемнадцать лет за шесть дней.'; 'Я уже играл [Opus 111] когда мне было двенадцать лет [...].'  
Ibid. p. 97 and p. 101 respectively.



get such a sense of satisfaction if the Adagio from the *Hammerklavier* makes the public listen intently.<sup>6</sup>

Whilst Neuhaus did not play or record a Beethoven-cycle, his letters to his parents show that as a student he had studied all of Beethoven's sonatas as a matter of principle (including those for cello and violin) and was even dismayed that this practice was not widespread amongst his peers.<sup>7</sup> Neuhaus considered several of the Beethoven piano sonatas to be his 'lifelong companions' and 'loves' of the 'soul'.<sup>8</sup> Bearing in mind that Neuhaus was remembered within his own lifetime largely for his natural affinity with the music of Fryderyk Chopin, Johannes Brahms and Alexander Skryabin, it is significant that he revealed one of his favourite recital programmes to be: '[As in Sverdlovsk, c. 1943] to play five Beethoven sonatas in one evening: *Pathetique*, *Moonlight*, *Aurora*, *Appassionata* and the last one (Opus 111).'<sup>9</sup>

Deriving from his pianistic practice, Neuhaus's written and spoken work was heavily underpinned by his own critical investigations of Beethoven's music and persona. In addition to his famous article dedicated specifically to the work of Beethoven, *О последних сонатах Бетховена* [*About the Last Beethoven Sonatas*], initially printed in *Советская музыка* 1963 № 4, Neuhaus continually referred to Beethoven in his other writings.<sup>10</sup> In choosing topics for a series of 'open lessons' in 1937 and 1938 for the Institute of Advanced Studies for Musicians-Pedagogues of Peripheral Schools (*Институт повышения квалификации музыкантов-педагогов периферийных учебных заведений*), Neuhaus elected to use all his visits to look at Beethoven's piano sonatas: No. 7 in D major Opus 10 no. 3, No. 11 in B-flat major Opus 22, No.

<sup>6</sup> 'И когда ко мне в артистическую пришли кое-кто из публики, даже из музыкантов, и стали говорить о том, какой Бетховен замечательный композитор, как будто они впервые его услышали, – вот это было приятное ощущение. [...] такое наслаждение, если какое-нибудь Адажио из Hammerklaviersonate заставит публику заслушаться.' Ibid. p. 107.

<sup>7</sup> See Neuhaus's letter to his parents from Berlin sent in 1910, quoted in previous chapter [*Letters*. p. 143].

<sup>8</sup> 'Таких разных «любвей» очень много в душе.' Neuhaus's conversation with B. M. Teplov and A. V. Vitsinsky (6 December 1944) documented in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 101.

<sup>9</sup> '[Как с. 1943] в Свердловске, я играл в одном концерте пять сонат Бетховена: «Патетическую», «Лунную», «Аврору», «Аппассионату» и последнюю (Opus 111).' Ibid. p. 100. The *Aurora* [*Аврора*] Sonata is the title by which the Sonata No. 21 in C major Opus 53 (*Waldstein*) is commonly referred to in Russian. The idea of Neuhaus being closely associated with Chopin, Skryabin and Brahms is clearly illustrated in Neuhaus's biographical 'portrait' by the musicologist David Rabinovich (*Портреты пианистов* [*Portraits of Pianists*] first printed in 1962). The link with these three particular composers is highlighted in the numerous anthologies that were written upon Neuhaus's death as part of the recollections and tributes.

<sup>10</sup> Neuhaus's *About the Last Beethoven Sonatas* has been subsequently reprinted in several anthologies (see bibliography).

31 in A-flat major Opus 110, No. 12 in A-flat major Opus 26 and No. 28 in A major Opus 101. A further transcript shows that Neuhaus also used an invitation in 1945 to give a seminar-presentation at the Glinka Museum of Musical Culture (*Музей музыкальной культуры имени Глинки*) to explore Beethoven's Sonata No. 21 in C major Opus 53 *Waldstein*.

The dominance of Beethoven in Neuhaus's output is not altogether unusual. Most notably Alexander Goldenweiser and his pupil Samuil Feinberg, esteemed pianists and colleagues of Neuhaus at the Moscow Conservatory, also focused much of their artistic efforts on Beethoven and left important documented legacies to this effect.<sup>11</sup> Likewise, despite lacking the same written legacy, pianists such as Maria Grinberg (whose studio recording of the complete Beethoven Piano Sonatas during the 1960s, released in 1970 by *Melodiya*, was the first such set in the Soviet Union) were also important in keeping Beethoven very much in the public's eye.<sup>12</sup> Throughout the entirety of Neuhaus's life then, there was an atmosphere that expected both amateurs and professional musicians to be well-acquainted with the works of the German composer. Indeed the atmosphere of Russian musical life was so inextricably linked to Beethoven that it made it possible for the *Appassionata* (Sonata No. 23 in F minor Opus 57) to be performed by Vladimir Sofronitsky in Leningrad in the devastating winter of 1941/2 as the city was being besieged by the Nazis.<sup>13</sup> Sofronitsky related:

In the hall of the Alexandrinka [the Alexandrinsky Theatre] it was minus three degrees. The audience – the defenders of the city – were in fur coats. I played in gloves with cut-out fingers. But how I played and how they listened! I understood [...] that we, artists of this Soviet country, must use

---

<sup>11</sup> These include extensive references to Beethoven in С. Е. Фейнберг, *Пианизм как искусство*, 1965 (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2001) [S. E. Feinberg, *Pianism as an Art*, 1965 (Moscow: 2001)] and the smaller articles С. Е. Фейнберг, *Сонаты Бетховена*. [S. E. Feinberg, *Beethoven's Sonatas*.], С. Е. Фейнберг, *Путь к мастерству*. [S. E. Feinberg, *The Path to Mastery*.], С. Е. Фейнберг, *О фортепианной музыке Моцарта и Бетховена. Стенограмма беседы*. [S. E. Feinberg, *About the Piano Music of Mozart and Beethoven. A Stenograph of a Conversation*.], А. Б. Гольденвейзер, *Об исполнении произведений композиторов классиков. Стенограмма открытого урока* [A. B. Goldenweiser, *About the Interpretation of Works by Classical Composers. A Stenograph of an Open Lesson*.] originally published in musical journals (such as *Советская музыка*) and subsequently reprinted in anthologies including M. G. Sokolov (ed.), *Pianists Speak* (see bibliography).

<sup>12</sup> Maria Yudina's controversial interpretative style was also underpinned by Beethoven to a large extent. In the later generation pianists such as Emil Gilels and Sviatoslav Richter, who had both studied with Neuhaus, were authoritative interpreters of Beethoven. Gilels's intent to make a complete set of Beethoven Sonatas for *Deutsche Grammophon* was cut short by his death.

<sup>13</sup> The Siege or Blockade of Leningrad lasted from September 1941 to 1944. Out of Leningrad's population of 2 500 000 citizens, 200 000 died by January 1942 through the cold and starvation as the Nazis cut-off all major supplies to the town.

our art to raise the spiritual and physical strengths of the people to defeat the enemy. I realized why I need to play and felt how I need to play. [...] Perhaps only in these days did I genuinely understand Beethoven's *Appassionata* [...] and as I played [it] in these concerts I was unspeakably happy when I felt that I found the listeners' hearts beat in unison with my own – a pianist and patriot, Soviet citizen and Leningrader [*ленинградца*].<sup>14</sup>

The reason for Beethoven's importance to Eastern European musicians in the twentieth century is frequently attributed to the image of Beethoven fitting with the political ideologies of Communism. Such views were expressed within the Soviet Union in works like Yuli Kremlev's *Фортепианные сонаты Бетховена [Beethoven's Piano Sonatas]* (1953/70):

The great leader and founder of our Soviet state, V. I. Lenin, highly valued the creations of Beethoven. From the time of the revolution [1917], the music of Beethoven became to us one of the most loved and dear. This music unrelentingly demands the lively attention of interpreters, concert organizers, composers, musicologists, the Soviet press and – most importantly – millions of Soviet listeners.

Our first Soviet People's Commissar of Enlightenment [*советский нарком просвещения*], A. V. Lunacharsky [said of] Beethoven: 'Beethoven is closer to our day, Beethoven is a more intimate neighbour to Socialist art, than the chronological neighbours of the past decades.'

---

<sup>14</sup> 'В зале Александринки было три градуса мороза. Слушатели, защитники города, сидели в шубах. Я играл в перчатках с вырезанными кончиками пальцев. Но как меня слушали и как мне игралось!.. Я понял [...] мы, художники Советской страны, должны своим искусством поднимать духовные и физические силы народа на разгром врага. Когда мне стало ясно, для чего надо играть, я почувствовал, как надо играть. Многие произведения, любимые прежде, стали казаться мелкими. Требовалась музыка больших чувств, музыка героическая, зовущая к борьбе. Может быть, только в эти дни по-настоящему я понял и почувствовал величие бетховенской «Аппассионаты» [...]. На первых же концертах я был несказанно обрадован, ощутив, что я нашел путь к сердцам слушателей, бившимся в унисон с моим сердцем пианиста и патриота, советского гражданина и ленинградца.' V. V. Sofronitsky, <http://www.ruskiymir.ru/magazines/article/141889/> (accessed 23/01/2014).

[...] The Great Patriotic War [World War II] and our movement into a communist future have deepened and strengthened the Soviet people's love of Beethoven.<sup>15</sup>

As a result, much of the Soviet-era Beethoven legacy, such that documented in reviews and musicological articles, is today often dismissed by musicologists as untruthful. Discussions about the programmatic potential or emotional narratives evoked by Beethoven's music, important 'scaffolds' (as discussed in the previous chapter) by which pianists like Neuhaus structured their interpretation, continue to be regarded with scepticism. In *Defining Russia Musically*, Taruskin suggested that the ideas of moral battle and struggle that musicologists of Soviet times identified in Beethoven's music, particularly his symphonies, were largely printed as a result of political propaganda:

Ideologists of the RAPM like the young Yurii Keldish consigned composers of the past wholesale to the dustbin of history, excepting only Beethoven [in order to] cultivate the only authentically proletarian genre, the marchlike 'massovaya pesnya', the 'march song', through which proletarian ideology could be aggressively disseminated.<sup>16</sup>

In considering the significance of Beethoven to both musicians and the audience, Neuhaus's high regard of Beethoven extended beyond a role-model in a musical sense, and became an important ideal for humanity. Thus, because Neuhaus emphasized his view of Beethoven as a saviour of humanity with deep relevance to 'today', and therefore echoing to some extent the thoughts of figures like Lunacharsky or Boris Asafyev (Igor Glebov), it might be

---

<sup>15</sup> 'Гениальный основатель советского государства В. И. Ленин высоко ценил творчество Бетховена. С времён революции музыка Бетховена стала в нашей стране особенно любимой, особенно дорогой. Эта музыка неуклонно продолжает привлекать живейшее внимание исполнителей, концертных организаций, композиторов, музыковедов, советской прессы и – главное – миллионов советских слушателей.

Первый советский нарком просвещения А. В. Луначарский хорошо охарактеризовал непреходящее значение творчества Бетховена словами: «Бетховен ближе к грядущему дню, Бетховен более интимный сосед искусству социализма, чем хронологические соседи последних десятилетий». [...] события Отечественной войны и движения к коммунистическому будущему только упрочили и углубили любовь советского народа к музыке Бетховена.' Ю. А. Кремлев, *Фортепианные сонаты Бетховена*, 1958 (Москва: «Советский Композитор», 1970) [Y. A. Kremlev, *Beethoven's Piano Sonatas*, 1958 (Moscow: 1970)] pp. 25–27.

<sup>16</sup> R. Taruskin, *Defining Russia Musically. Historical and Hermeneutical Essays* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997) p. 512.

construed that Neuhaus's rhetoric might be driven by a need to conform to the ideology of his environment:

Not only the greatest musician, but also the greatest person; not only a genius in the realm of art, but also a person of great moral height; not only a hero, but also a comforter; not only a deep thinker, but also a tireless worker; not only a secluded creator of high art, but also a warrior for the revolutionary ideals of mankind [...]. Proud, fiery, passionate and generous in spirit... This is Beethoven, and thus he remains in time.<sup>17</sup>

To view Neuhaus's characterization of Beethoven purely through a political lens, however, undervalues his engagement with the Romantic pianistic tradition in Russia with which he strove to publically align himself throughout his lifetime. This is a notion highlighted by Boris Schwarz's general investigation of Soviet musical-history where he warned against the temptation to tar all descriptions of musical ideals, particularly in relation to Beethoven, with the same brush of political ideology. Schwarz maintained that despite the 'idolization of Beethoven as a revolutionary hero [becoming] a Soviet obsession, stimulated by Lunacharsky, Asafyev and many other authors', Russia had, from the nineteenth century, a 'unique attitude towards Beethoven which is admiring and possessive'. Schwarz concluded that many of the efforts by musicians in Soviet-era Russia, such as the *Русская книга о Бетховене* [*Russian Book on Beethoven*] published in 1927 and known to Neuhaus, was 'not a propagandist book in the ideological sense'.<sup>18</sup>

### 3.2 Neuhaus's identification of Beethoven through philosophy

For Neuhaus, Beethoven was neither a symbol of the European revolutionary spirit of his time, nor of the Russian Revolutions. Instead, in speaking of Beethoven as a 'warrior for the

---

<sup>17</sup> 'Не только величайший музыкант, но и величайший человек; не только гений в области искусства, но и человек огромной нравственной высоты; не только герой, но и утешитель; не только глубокий мыслитель, но и неутомимый деятель; не только уединённый создатель высокого искусства, но и борец за революционные идеалы человечества... Гордый, пламенный, страстный и великодушный... Таков Бетховен, таким он останется в веках.' From Neuhaus's article 'Beethoven' in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 14.

<sup>18</sup> B. Schwarz, *Music and Musical Life in Soviet Russia 1917 – 1970* (London: Barrie & Jenkins Ltd., 1972) p. 97.

revolutionary ideals of mankind', Neuhaus saw him as a reflection of a timeless aesthetic striving common to all philosophical thought. Neuhaus saw Beethoven as a philosopher and believed that 'his music expresses all aspects of spiritual life, and likewise all the philosophical depth of understanding life.'<sup>19</sup> In his book *About the Art of Piano Playing*, Neuhaus wrote:

When I was fifteen I felt really sorry that Beethoven did not 'process' his music into philosophy as I thought that his philosophy would have been better than Kant's or Hegel's – deeper, more truthful and more human.<sup>20</sup>

Neuhaus was keen to stress how much Central European philosophy he had assimilated by his early twenties. He reinforced this through his frequent use of aphorisms, particularly from the main French and German philosophers including Descartes, Voltaire, Kant, Goethe and Nietzsche. He was keen to be seen as continuing his engagement with philosophy throughout his later life and made a conscious and public effort to be seen engaging with the work of the writers Thomas Mann and Albert Schweitzer.

Neuhaus's engagement with philosophy, as will be demonstrated in the ensuing discussion must, however, be seen as a subjective process of assimilation and appropriation. Rather than a search for specific answers, it was instead a process that provided the filter through which he passed his interpretative judgements. Rather than limit himself to the engagement with philosophers contemporary to Beethoven, Neuhaus used Beethoven to reflect his own preoccupation with humanism:

Since my childhood I was infected not only by the musical bacillus, but to an even greater degree by morals, 'moralin':<sup>21</sup> aesthetic questions, questions of dignity, human values, of the beauty of man's soul, of spiritual greatness concerned me not less, if not more, than the most beautiful sonata of Beethoven.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>19</sup> Open lesson on the 3 November 1937 documented in A. F. Nitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* pp. 202–203.

<sup>20</sup> 'Когда мне было лет пятнадцать, я жалел о том, что Бетховен не «перемолол» свою музыку на философию, ибо я думал, что эта философия была бы лучше кантовской и гегелевской, глубже, правдивее и человечнее.' H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 19.

<sup>21</sup> Play on words to prescribe a medicinal connotation.

<sup>22</sup> 'Что и говорить, я был с детства инфицирован не только музыкальной бациллой, но в еще большей степени моральной, «моралином»: этические вопросы, вопросы достоинства, ценности человека, его душевной красоты, духовного величия волновали меня не меньше, если не больше,

Despite Neuhaus's unquestionable philosophical grounding and his belief that this engagement with the literature widened his scope as an interpreter, he rarely discussed what this actually meant for him in practice. In a way, the elusive nature of the philosophical associations that Neuhaus chose to make was in itself an important reflection of the music's own inherent enigma.

It is possible that Neuhaus saw his preoccupation with philosophy as a way to link himself with Central Europe – a geographical space which he undoubtedly saw as the seat of culture and erudition. Thus, when Neuhaus did make a more expansive reference to philosophy affecting his interpretation of Beethoven, he supported his claim through the, often covert, allusion to another Central European thinker of stature. Describing what he acknowledged to be one of his most beloved of Beethoven's sonatas, Neuhaus said:

It is difficult for me to describe my relationship to Beethoven's Opus 111. For me it is a Schiller[ian] – Kant[ian] work. The fact that it is in two parts makes it so grand, so convincing. [...] Opus 111, roughly speaking, is a juxtaposition of the earthly and of that which is 'beyond this world.' [...] The passionate emotions of the first part – it is the world of earthly passion, and then the second part – nirvana: such a long, long sojourn in C major, such frozen [in time and space], as if eternal, music.<sup>23</sup>

In this case it is interesting to note how Neuhaus's metaphoric description of the second movement as 'nirvana' could be considered a reference to Hans von Bülow's footnote in his own edition of the work. It demonstrates that rather than being an idiosyncratic metaphor, Neuhaus's engagement with this idea positions him in a Romantic interpretative tradition which can be traced to Beethoven's early biographer, Wilhelm von Lenz:

---

чем самая прекрасная соната Бетховена.' H. G. Neuhaus, 'Autobiographical Notes. Chapter II (Autopsychographical)' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p.44.

<sup>23</sup> 'Трудно рассказать о моем отношении к сонате Бетховена ор. 111. Для меня это – вещь шиллеровски-кантовская. То, что эта Соната двухчастная, – это так грандиозно, так убедительно. [...] Соната ор. 111 – это, грубо говоря, противопоставление земного и потустороннего. [...] Страстная взволнованность первой части – это мир земных страстей, а потом вторая часть – нирвана: такое долгое-долгое пребывание в до мажоре, такая застывшая, как бы вечная музыка.' Neuhaus's conversation with B. M. Teplov and A. V. Vitsinsky (6 December 1944) in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 100.

This last pianoforte-sonata of the Master is held by some, and not without reason, to be the most perfect amongst those of the 'third' period; for in it a most profound conception is wedded to so plastic a form, that all aesthetic-poetical disquisitions for elucidating its meaning can be regarded as superfluous. Nevertheless, we advise the player to familiarize himself with the thoroughly excellent analysis presented by Herr von Lenz [...]. He quite aptly summarizes his characterization of the two movements in the headings 'Resistance-Resignation' or, still better, 'Sansara-Nirvana'.<sup>24</sup>

Neuhaus's philosophical allusions when talking about Beethoven became some of the most lasting memories of his teaching. For instance, the pianist Yakov Zak recollected: 'Once in my youth, I remember, I played for him one of the late Beethoven sonatas when suddenly I heard his reproachfully-questioning [remark]: "You've not read Kant?!"'<sup>25</sup> In another interview, Zak explained that nearly every new student in Neuhaus's class was destined to hear the rebuke: 'What rubbish you are playing! You haven't read Kant', before being sent swiftly home.<sup>26</sup> What struck Zak, and many others studying in Neuhaus's class, was the complete lack of explanation to follow such a remark. In relation to such incidents Zak observed: 'Heinrich Gustavovich often avoided painstaking, scrupulously detailed work on the [musical] material – especially in the years before the war. In his pedagogical manner there was something different: the free, sweeping creative gesture.'<sup>27</sup>

What had Neuhaus expected his students to gain from experiencing the terror of hearing such comments? As far as the evidence shows, Neuhaus never explained himself, and merely suggested: 'Behind the exterior of extreme intellectuality and discipline, students often don't understand Beethoven as a musician who is philosophical, and precisely because of

<sup>24</sup> *Ludwig van Beethoven. Sonatas for the Piano.* Revised and fingered by Dr Hans von Bülow and Dr Sigmund Lebert, translated by Dr Theodore Baker (New York: G. Schirmer, Inc., 1923) p. 658.

<sup>25</sup> 'Как-то раз, еще в молодые годы, я сыграл ему, помнится, одну из последних сонат Бетховена, и вдруг слышу его укоризненно-вопрошающее: «Вы не читали Канта?!»' From an excerpt of a conversation between Y. I. Zak and G. M. Tsipin in A. M. Меркулов (составитель), *Уроки Зака* (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2006) [A. M. Merkulov (ed.), *The Lessons of Zak* (Moscow: 2006)] p. 24.

<sup>26</sup> '«Что за ерунду вы играете!.. Вы Канта не читали...»' A. V. Vitsinsky, *Conversations with Pianists* p. 167.

<sup>27</sup> 'Генрих Густавович ведь кропотливой, скрупулезно детализированной работы над материалом, бывало, избегал – особенно в довоенные годы. В его педагогической манере было иное: свободный, размашистый творческий жест...' A. M. Merkulov (ed.), *The Lessons of Zak* p. 24.



this, difficult.<sup>28</sup> Perhaps a part of Neuhaus's intention had been to humble the young pianists to feel the 'inaccessibility' of Beethoven. To Neuhaus, who advocated dialectical thinking as the most natural way to stimulate a search for artistic stimulation (if not answers), the idea of transcendence which was an important element of Kant's philosophy might have been a tantalizing concept, particularly in Beethoven's last works. It is possible that Neuhaus felt an indifference or constraint in his students' playing of Beethoven, particularly as many of them would have been technically extremely proficient and wanting to test their new-found pianistic strength on more bravura repertoire. The implication that Beethoven's music had captured even some small fraction of an experience that is beyond the human might have been therefore intended as an enticement. Encouraging his students to think dialectically about the distinction between mankind and a transcendent God, Neuhaus was possibly aiming to emphasize the distance between these two states and in doing so ignite his student's interest of what might be 'beyond this world'.<sup>29</sup>

Neuhaus's lifelong vision of Beethoven as an artist struggling to go beyond 'music', of a composer who instead used the language of music to write about the richness of the soul and its ethical existence, must have been tested by the countless prosaic interpretations of his students, thereby explaining his irritation:

I wanted to *drag the student* into the sphere of spiritual culture, to the sphere of moral understanding – and the only way I had to do this was through *teaching how to play the piano!!* [sic.] What a weak, miserly means for such challenges!<sup>30</sup>

Kant's notion of transcendence, and his dialectic presentation of man and God, would have been sympathetic to Neuhaus's desire to engage with Beethoven as a *human* figure. In accessing the great spiritual and moral height of Beethoven, Neuhaus stressed that it grew from Beethoven's humanness:

---

<sup>28</sup> 'За оболочкой чрезвычайной интеллектуальности и строгости ученики часто не понимают Бетховена как музыканта, который философичен и именно потому труден.' Neuhaus's seminar for music teachers held on the 9 December 1938 as documented in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 110.

<sup>29</sup> Neuhaus's conversation with B. M. Teplov and A. V. Vitsinsky (6 December 1944) in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 100.

<sup>30</sup> 'Хотелось *протащить ученика* в область духовной культуры, в область нравственных начал, а единственным средством, которым я мог пользоваться, было *обучение игре на фортепиано!!* Какое слабое, какое мизерное средство – в свете таких задач!' Г. Г. Нейгауз, 'Автобиографические Записки. Глава II (автопсихографическая)' [H. G. Neuhaus, 'Autobiographical Notes. Chapter II (Autopsychographical)'] in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 47.

I am often drawn to Bach, Mozart. But to them my attitude is... 'divinus': godly. But about Beethoven one can say: human. This is the difference. This is the strength of Beethoven, but also it is his downside (if it is even possible to talk of downsides here): there is something higher than him.<sup>31</sup>

Thus, Beethoven was morally high in Neuhaus's opinion because he was driven by something greater than himself through his striving or will towards 'the good'. To some extent this idea must have accentuated Neuhaus's association of Beethoven with Kant, particularly in relation to the latter's work on ethics, since Kant maintained: 'Nothing in the world — indeed nothing even beyond the world — can possibly be conceived which could be called good without qualification except a good will.'<sup>32</sup>

Neuhaus's engagement with Kant to interpret Beethoven must have arisen to a certain degree from a desire to attempt to imagine Beethoven's persona through figures whom he could believe to have been influential in the composer's life. In particular, in communicating the great spiritual height embodied in Beethoven's last works, the way in which Neuhaus borrowed Beethoven's own allusion to Kant cannot be altogether coincidental. For instance, Neuhaus described Beethoven's Piano Sonata No. 31 in A-flat major Opus 110 as expressing the 'heights over which extends a starlight blanket', and the *Variations* from Piano Sonata No. 30 in E major Opus 109 as a radiant sunset over the mountains which turns into 'deepest night [СИНЯЯ-СИНЯЯ НОЧЬ]<sup>33</sup> and silence [which emphasizes] the heavens above'.<sup>34</sup> These images bear a strong relation to Beethoven's well-known diary entry: 'The moral laws within us, and the starry heavens above us – Kant!!!'<sup>35</sup>

<sup>31</sup> 'Меня тянут к себе Бах, Моцарт. Но к ним такое отношение... «divinus»: божественный. А о Бетховене можно сказать: человеческий. В этом их различие. В этом сила Бетховена, но в этом и минусы его, если только здесь можно говорить о минусах: есть что-то ещё более высокое, чем у него.' Neuhaus's conversation with B. M. Teplov and A. V. Vitsinsky (6 December 1944) documented in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 101.

<sup>32</sup> I. Kant, *Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals* quoted in M. Heidegger, *The Essence of Human Freedom. An Introduction to Philosophy* (2002) translated by Ted Sadler (London: Continuum Books Ltd., 2005) p. 191.

<sup>33</sup> Literally: 'blue-blue night'. In Russian, repeating a word is used for additional emphasis.

<sup>34</sup> 'Спускается на землю синяя, синяя ночь [...]. Тишина...' Б. Б. Бородин & А. П. Лукьянов (составители), *Мысли о Бетховене* (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2010) [B. B. Borodin & A. P. Lukanov (ed.), *Thoughts on Beethoven* (Moscow: 2010)] p. 124.

<sup>35</sup> Beethoven's handwritten record in a Conversation Book dated February 1820 in A. Thayer's, *Life of Beethoven. Volume 2*. (1921) Revised and edited by Elliott Forbes (Princeton University Press, 1991) p. 747. Also quoted in the Russian biography of Beethoven written by Neuhaus's student: A. A. Альшванг,

Despite Neuhaus's prominent juxtaposition of Kant and Beethoven, an evaluation of his writings demonstrates that he nonetheless did not find Kant a completely satisfactory companion. In particular, Neuhaus seems to have had some difficulty in relating his view of Beethoven as a human who had been able to ascend 'beyond the world' into the 'stratosphere', with the idea of that there were some things that were not realizable in experience as implied by Kantian transcendence.<sup>36</sup> Instead, Neuhaus expressed his view, alongside figures mentioned in his writings (including Busoni, Anton Rubinstein and Stasov), that Beethoven spoke for all humanity and that his music was able to convey the most spiritual experiences.<sup>37</sup> Thus the spiritual, which Neuhaus proposed was 'see[n] clearer than anyone else' by Beethoven's genius, must have been contained throughout all mankind.<sup>38</sup>

Tying in with his obsession that an artist must firstly be a great (moral) man, Neuhaus maintained that Beethoven's music contained within it 'all aspects of spiritual life' – and so the good, and godly, must have been latent within his soul.<sup>39</sup> Consequently, the immanence of God implied by such an outlook probably caused Neuhaus to turn his attention to Spinoza, at least as a counterweight to Kant: 'Not *aut Deus, aut Natura* (either God, or nature), but *Deus sive Natura* (God, or nature) [...]. Beethoven is incomprehensible outside a pantheistic attitude towards nature.'<sup>40</sup> Neuhaus conceded that the idea of a God was vital to Beethoven. The fact that the music of Beethoven and Bach were the notable exceptions in the repertoire where Neuhaus chose to use adjectives such as 'divine', 'pious', 'godly' is significant given his own

---

*Людвиг ван Бетховен. Очерк жизни и творчества* (Москва: «Советский Композитор», 1971) [A. A. Alshwang, *Ludwig van Beethoven. An Outline of his Life and Work* (Moscow: 1971)] p. 403.

<sup>36</sup> H. G. Neuhaus, 'Autobiographical Notes. Chapter II (Autopsychographical)' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 60.

<sup>37</sup> Stasov wrote to Balakirev: 'Mozart was not able to *embody* the mass of humanity. Only Beethoven could think and feel for it. [His music is about] all men in different moments of their life, their needs and pleas.' ['Мозарт не мог *воплотить* массу человечества. Только Бетховен мог думать и чувствовать за него. [Его музыка] говорит о всех людях в разные моменты их жизни, о всех их потребностях и просьбах.'] See В. Д. Комарова (составитель), *Переписка Балакирева и Стасова* (Москва: «Музгиз», 1935) [V. D. Komarova (ed.), *The Correspondence of Balakirev and Stasov* (Moscow: 1935)] p. 144. Busoni called Beethoven a 'symbol of musical humanity.' (F. Busoni, *The Essence of Music* p. 131). Quote in text from Neuhaus already mentioned from H. G. Neuhaus, 'Autobiographical Notes. Chapter II (Autopsychographical)' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 60.

<sup>38</sup> 'Большой человек [...] яснее, чем кто-нибудь другой, видит [...].' H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 213.

<sup>39</sup> '[...] его музыка выражает все стороны духовной жизни и, между прочим, всю философскую глубину познания жизни.' Open lesson on the 3 November 1937 documented in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* pp. 202–203.

<sup>40</sup> 'He «*aut Deus, aut Natura*», но «*Deus sive Natura*». [...] Бетховен вообще немислим вне пантеистического отношения к природе.' From a seminar for pedagogues on the 28 January 1946 documented in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus*. 152–153.

difficult relationship with Christianity from his youth, which will be discussed in the next chapter. For instance, speaking of Opus 109 Neuhaus considered:

The third movement! A godly song of prayer and divine variations! [The last variation] the prayer-theme is hardly audible and falls into silence – sleep – the comforter of earthly labours [*земных трудов отрада*].<sup>41</sup>

Even if Neuhaus himself did not completely embrace the idea of a biblical God, pantheism ('everything composes an all-encompassing, immanent God')<sup>42</sup> afforded him a uniting universal force that underpinned his view of life, and consequently art, where 'everything is one'.<sup>43</sup> Neuhaus's writings show he understood 'Nature' as the common, uniting essence of all that is alive – the 'spirit'. As such, this allowed Neuhaus to share in the same roots as the aesthetics of Stanislavsky's 'emotive art' discussed earlier. The practicality, in terms of thinking about the role and possibilities of interpretation, afforded by the spiritual being *within* the reach of human experience would have consolidated Neuhaus's core beliefs: 'Art is *life*, but in its highest manifestation – a crystallization of life that is governed by the same dialectic laws as all that we call *nature*, including man.'<sup>44</sup>

As an interpreter, Neuhaus believed that being able to scale the 'nearly inaccessible heights' of spirituality, as expressed by Beethoven's music, was an experience of enlightenment. Neuhaus tried to communicate, in a way relevant to his time, how the notion of immanence might be experienced by man sufficiently prepared for such enlightenment:

It is difficult to express in words what I feel in this part of the *Arietta* [from Opus 111, second movement]: here the human spirit transforms into a lark, and soars into the stratosphere to such a height that it becomes nearly invisible from the earth, but he can see from this height the whole earth –

<sup>41</sup> 'Третья часть! Божественная песня-молитва и божественные вариации! Например, последняя вариация [...] постепенным угасанием спускается на землю [...] замолкают её последние звуки, наступает сон, земных трудов отрада.' В. В. Borodin & А. Р. Lukyanov (ed.), *Thoughts on Beethoven* (Moscow: 2010) p. 124.

<sup>42</sup> P. Edwards (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (New York: Macmillan and Free Press, 1967) p. 34.

<sup>43</sup> H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 63.

<sup>44</sup> 'Искусство – та же *жизнь*, только в высоком её проявлении, – некая кристаллизация жизни, подчиненная тем же диалектическим законам, как и всё, что мы называем *природой*, включая человека.' H. G. Neuhaus, 'My Aims as a Musician (For the Centenary of the Moscow Conservatory)' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* pp. 81–82.

that it is round – in the same way as they will be seen by future stratonauts  
[sic].<sup>45</sup>

Neuhaus's attitude to the *Arietta* from Opus 111 reiterates his own artistic obsession with unity and the idea of being able to see, in the same capacity as a creator, the completeness of a 'world'. The challenge of an interpreter being able to accommodate both elements of 'man' and 'God' as the one whole ('Nature') was an aspiration that consistently manifested itself throughout Neuhaus's written and spoken output. Indeed, expressing pantheism as a pianist-interpreter was judged by Neuhaus as a task that was successfully achieved by only the smallest minority of musicians:

[In Richter's interpretations] you clearly feel the whole work – be it even gigantic in size – lies before him like a vast landscape: it is seen as a whole and in all its detail as if by the flying eagle, from an extraordinary height and unbelievable clarity. I must say once and for all that I have never witnessed such completeness, organicism, such musically-artistic *scope* from any other pianist known to me – and I have heard all the 'greats' [...].<sup>46</sup>

Yet, just as Neuhaus seems to have had a degree of difficulty in relating to Beethoven through a Kantian outlook, the Spinozian too presented Neuhaus with problems. Neuhaus's own philosophical ideas collided with the philosophy with which he felt he should be engaging in order to understand Beethoven – and the tension caused evident fractures. For instance, in the same sentences where Neuhaus had claimed Beethoven to be 'incomprehensible' without Spinoza and pantheism, he argued: 'Both Goethe and Beethoven [...] are laced with a Spinozian outlook. Both [Beethoven and Goethe] were men of Nature, of immense intuition – not

<sup>45</sup> 'Мне трудно передать словами то, что я чувствую в этом месте Ариетты: здесь человеческий дух превратился в жаворонка, вознесся в стратосферу на такую высоту, что стал почти невидим с земли, но ему с этой высоты видна вся земля, видно, что она круглая, так увидит нашу землю будущий стратонавт...' Н. Г. Neuhaus, 'Autobiographical Notes. Chapter II (Autopsychographical)' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 60. Neuhaus uses the term 'stratonauts' and the conditional tense in his manuscript as it was written in 1960, before Yuri Gagarin becoming the first 'cosmonaut' and human to journey into space in 1961. There are subsequent editions of this passage which have editorial alterations to correct the term and tense.

<sup>46</sup> '[У Рихтера]: ясно чувствуется, что всё произведение – будь оно даже гигантских размеров – лежит перед ним, как огромный пейзаж, видим сразу целиком и во всех деталях с орлиного полета, с необычайной высоты и с невероятной ясностью. Должен уж сказать раз и навсегда, что такой целостности, органичности, такого музыкально-художественного *кругозора* я не встречал ни у одного из известных мне пианистов, а я слышал всех «великих» [...]' Н. Г. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 59.

rationalists.<sup>47</sup> Spinoza, like Kant, was a rational philosopher. As an interpreter and critic however, Neuhaus believed that the pantheistic understanding, which he valued so greatly, could only be interrogated *subjectively*. Furthermore, despite Neuhaus's 'deepest respect for the brain' and desire to be seen as an intellectual,<sup>48</sup> erudite figure himself, it must be remembered that for Neuhaus the intellect was primarily something to fall back on particularly in the absence of 'intuition or talent'. Ultimately, as discussed in the previous chapter, Neuhaus defined 'knowledge' as subjective: 'the sphere of experience and anxiety [волнений]<sup>49,50</sup>'.

Neuhaus transferred his own understanding of knowledge as emotional experiences that reside in the soul and spirit, and not the mind, onto Beethoven. In his desire to understand and artistically inhabit his hero, and in the light of being unable to see Beethoven convincingly through figures like Kant and Spinoza, Neuhaus's subconscious imposition of his own aesthetics and beliefs becomes more apparent. Neuhaus was keen to point out the deeply personal nature of knowledge embodied by Beethoven as an individual: 'Mozart – this comes from above, but Beethoven – this grows from the person, from his musical genius.'<sup>51</sup> Neuhaus believed that Beethoven's deafness was one of the most important and decisive factors that proved that he, possibly more than any other composer, was forced to create a style of pianistic writing that came 'out of his *spirit* [...] and strength of feeling'.<sup>52</sup> As will be seen later in the chapter, this view positioned Neuhaus within a Romantic tradition of understanding Beethoven which had strong links to figures including Anton Rubinstein, and was still an important aspect of the philosophical critique of Beethoven offered by pianists of the younger generation such as Samuil Feinberg.

<sup>47</sup> 'И Гёте и Бетховен [...] пронизаны Спинозовским мировоззрением – именно Спиноза. Оба [...] люди большой Природы, большой интуиции, не рассудочные.' From a seminar for pedagogues on the 28 January 1946 documented in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* pp. 152–153.

<sup>48</sup> 'К мозгу я питаю величайшее уважение.' H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 219.

<sup>49</sup> In the Russian language *волнение* refers to any kind of state (positive or negative) in which emotions are felt i.e. it is not restricted to anxiety in the sense of nervousness in anticipation of fear.

<sup>50</sup> '[...] область переживаний и волнений.' Г. Г. Нейгауз, 'Раздумья о Шопене (1960)' [H. G. Neuhaus, 'Thoughts on Chopin (1960)'] in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* pp. 233–234.

<sup>51</sup> 'Моцарт – это что-то слетает сверху, а Бетховен – это растёт от человека, от его музыкального гения.' Neuhaus's conversation with B. M. Teplov and A. V. Vitsinsky (6 December 1944) documented in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 101.

<sup>52</sup> 'Фортепианный стиль Бетховена так ясно вытекает из его духа, [...] и силы чувства.' H. G. Neuhaus, 'Autobiographical Notes. Chapter II (Autopsychographical)' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 60.

In his analysis Neuhaus maintained that having suffered deafness, Beethoven's only access to sound was through emotional feeling:

The reason why late Beethoven is particularly difficult for the pianist lies not only in that in these works his artistic spirit transcended to nearly inaccessible heights, but also, as everyone agrees, in that they were written by a completely deaf person. The real sound as experienced by the senses, and accessible to any musician, was for him in his past – he could only *remember*, and how bitter was this remembrance – we have some idea from his Heiligenstadt Testament.<sup>53</sup>

In speaking about the 'bitterness' of Beethoven's remembrances in the wake of his deafness, Neuhaus found a way of highlighting and embracing the subjectivity that he attributed to be a central feature of Beethoven's artistic output. Additionally through this view, Neuhaus was able to contextualize Beethoven as the supreme Romantic figure: 'With Beethoven, for example, there are pages and pages of such heavy grief and sorrow that it cannot be found even in the Romantics.'<sup>54</sup> In this view, Neuhaus joins the legacy of Russian musicians whose critical articles he valued highly including Tchaikovsky, Rimsky-Korsakov, Rubinstein, Serov and Stasov.<sup>55</sup> Yet, as an extension to their collective views of Beethoven chronologically as the first Romantic, Neuhaus's attitude goes further to present the provocation that Beethoven perhaps ought to be considered as the most Romantic composer of Western Art Music.

A figure who was responsible in no small part for the propagation of the view of a Romantic Beethoven in the early twentieth century was Romain Rolland. His writing on Beethoven was well-known in professional musical circles – greatly appreciated for instance by Neuhaus's colleague Alexander Goldenweiser – and indeed had prompted Neuhaus's own

---

<sup>53</sup> 'Причина, почему Бетховен последнего периода особенно труден для пианиста, лежит не только в том, что в этих произведениях его творческий дух поднялся почти на недостижимую высоту, но и в том – это признается всеми – что писал их совсем глухой человек. Реальное, чувственно воспринимаемое звучание, доступное любому музыканту, для него отошло в область прошлого, он мог его только *вспоминать*, и как горько было это воспоминание, мы знаем хотя бы по его Гейлигенштадтскому завещанию.' Ibid. p. 58 (Neuhaus's emphasis).

<sup>54</sup> 'У Бетховена есть страницы такой большой грусти и печали, каких нет даже у романтиков.' From a conversation with pedagogues on the 9 December 1938 in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 112.

<sup>55</sup> 'These I name as a small part of the most valuable in our musicology.' ['Я называю только малую часть всего ценного, что создано у нас в музыковедении.'] H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 222.

critical response.<sup>56</sup> Not only were Rolland's descriptions of Beethoven's music intensely programmatic, but so was his presentation of Beethoven as a tormented, ill-fated and misunderstood genius: '[Beethoven's music] expresses the implacable force of the Destiny that subdues the shudders of the revolting soul, suddenly smitten to its knees and subsiding from cries to silent tears.'<sup>57</sup> Rolland's work on Beethoven, published as several essays between 1903 and 1930, was intended to 'inspire Frenchmen to shake off their malaise' of the Franco-Prussian defeat.<sup>58</sup> But, influenced by the Tolstoy-idea of joy and redemption through suffering, Rolland's work had also captured the imagination of Russian thinkers. In his investigation of the Beethoven sonatas, the musicologist Kremlev mentioned that on the verge of the 1917 revolution, Maxim Gorky wrote to Rolland imploring him of the need to write a biography of Beethoven to inform people that 'man alone is responsible for the misfortune of the world, and yet to man belongs the glory of all the goodness in life.'<sup>59</sup> Rolland's influence as a Beethoven-scholar, however, extended well beyond the unstable times of the revolution: his views being a key feature of the significant Russian monograph, *Beethoven*, by Arnold Alshwang (a former pupil of Neuhaus in Kiev) published in 1952, and even more so in the expanded edition of 1963.

Neuhaus was well-acquainted with Rolland's numerous writings on Beethoven. On the topic of Rolland's work, Neuhaus noted:

It is worthy and sensible that the author tries to prove to the reader that a great man has a greater capacity for suffering than a normal one. [It is commendable that Rolland shows] that the chasm which separates [a great man] from the surrounding world is deep, if not bottomless, and that it is a tragedy that the path of a genius is a thorny one.<sup>60</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> See Goldenweiser's diary entries in which he frequently refers to the interest in reading Rolland's work in 1927 for example: A. B. Goldenweiser, *Diary. Books two – six* pp. 135–137.

<sup>57</sup> R. Rolland, *Beethoven the Creator. The Great Creative Epochs: From the Eroica to the Appassionata* translated by Ernest Newman (London: Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1929) p. 129.

<sup>58</sup> D. Dennis, 'Beethoven at Large: Reception in Literature, the Arts, Philosophy and Politics' in G. Stanley (ed.), *Cambridge Companion to Beethoven* (Cambridge University Press, 2000) p. 296.

<sup>59</sup> 'Нужно, чтобы человек понял, что он творец и господин мира, что на нем лежит ответственность за все несчастья на земле и ему же принадлежит слава за доброе, что есть в жизни.' Y. A. Kremlev, *Beethoven's Piano Sonatas* p. 9.

<sup>60</sup> 'Достойное и разумное желание автора доказать читателю, что большой человек обладает большей способностью к страданию, что пропасть, отделяющая его от окружающего мира, глубока, если не бездонна, и что это трагедия, что путь гения – тернистый путь.' H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 213.



In a significant distancing from the mainstream musicological analysis of the time, however, Neuhaus was not prepared to accept Rolland's vision of Beethoven:

With all my respect for Romain Rolland, to his noble humanistic striving, I must say [...] that despite his deep admiration for Beethoven and his immense knowledge, I find that everything he wrote about the great composer seems nervous and distorted – in some way even unpleasant. Rolland's tendency to depict Beethoven as a 'bundle of misery', a life of complete suffering, is too great. [...] Rolland consciously diminishes those comforts and joys that an artist receives from his creations [...] Only a true artist is given the strength to 'erase the casual features' [that cloud his path] – and this is made all the more difficult for him because he sees clearer than anyone else and acknowledges all the 'evil of the world' and suffers it much more.<sup>61</sup>

In Neuhaus's mind, Rolland's depiction of Beethoven was too simple and thus excessively Romantic in a negative, unhelpful way (in the sense that Neuhaus's friend, the writer and poet Boris Pasternak, had criticized in his essay, *Chopin* (1945) – explored in the subsequent chapter).<sup>62</sup> Neuhaus considered that Rolland's presentation of Beethoven as a suffering god-like hero, a redeemer of humanity, came about through a misunderstood view of Romanticism – a blind desperation to communicate an image that results in a gilding of the lily as opposed to challenging the complexities and paradoxes of a phenomenon. Despite Neuhaus's own Romantic inclinations, he warned that it was the oversimplification of Beethoven that often yielded unsatisfactory interpretational results:

---

<sup>61</sup> 'При всем моем уважении к Ромену Роллану, к его благородным гуманистическим устремлениям я должен сказать [...], что, несмотря на любовное его преклонение перед Бетховеном и большую осведомленность, всё, что он писал о великом композиторе, мне кажется неверным и искаженным, даже в какой-то мере неприятным. Слишком уж велика тенденция Романа Роллана изобразить Бетховена как «комочек несчастий», его жизнь как сплошное страдание [...]. Роллан умышленно преуменьшает те утешения и радости, которые доставляют художнику само творчество [...]. Только настоящему художнику дана сила стереть [...] «случайные черты», а это тем более трудно, что он яснее, чем кто-нибудь другой, видит и сознаёт всё как «зло мира» и больше от него страдает.' Ibid.

<sup>62</sup> As will be shown in the next chapter, Neuhaus makes several references to Pasternak's ideas, work and critical essays, particularly on the definition of Romanticism. Likewise, Neuhaus seems to have exerted a significant influence on Pasternak's thinking. Essay mentioned is Б. Л. Пастернак, 'Шопен' [B. L. Pasternak, 'Chopin'] in N. M. Zimyanina (ed.), *Stanislav Neuhaus. Reminiscences. Letters. Materials* (Moscow: 1988) pp. 106–199.

[Beethoven often uses] modest, economic means [...] to produce the most wonderfully exultant music! People who are used to the grandeur of Liszt's style, which sometimes expresses more than is often necessary, play Beethoven very dryly.<sup>63</sup>

Neuhaus's emphasis of the 'exultant' in Beethoven's writing is significant. Despite acknowledging the 'heavy grief' and 'sorrow' of Beethoven's fate and works, Neuhaus understood all too well the ease with which it is possible to portray Beethoven as a brooding Romantic. As will be explored in further detail in relation to Chopin, the concept of Romanticism was for Neuhaus equally, if not more, bound to the ideas of radiance and joy. Neuhaus was convinced that Beethoven had always retained a hold on the greatest breadth of emotional experience, even towards the end. For example, Neuhaus urged his readers to remember:

Beethoven was able, with an unheard of wit and boldness, to make a certain *salto mortale* of the soul, to 'fall from the sky to earth'... I will remind you at least of the transition between the third movement (Andante, Variations) of the Trio in B-flat Opus 97 ['Archduke'] and the last, the finale (there, after a divine, disappearing *ppp* in D major, suddenly there is a deafening *sforzato* on the E-flat dominant seventh chord upon which begins the folk merriment of the last movement). [...] In the fifth Piano Concerto Opus 73 in E-flat major, after the azure-golden [sic. (лазурно-золотистого)] glow of the second movement you find yourself immediately in the Viennese park, Prater: carousels spin, happy couples dance, jugglers show their tricks...<sup>64</sup>

<sup>63</sup> '[Бетховен использовал] скромные, экономические средства [...] для создания прекрасной ликующей музыки! Люди, привыкшие к пышному великолепию листовского стиля, в котором выражается даже больше, чем нужно, – эти люди играют Бетховена порой очень сухо.' Open lesson on the 3 November 1937 documented in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 202.

<sup>64</sup> 'Бетховен умел с неслыханной остротой и дерзостью проделать некое душевное *salto mortale*, «упасть с неба на землю»... Напомню хотя бы переход от третьей части (Andante, вариации) большого Трио В – dur op.97 к последней, финалу (там после божественного, совершенно исчезающего *ppp* в D-dur вдруг раздается оглушительное *sforzato* на доминантсептаккорде Es-dur и начинается народное веселье последней части) [...]. В Пятом фортепианном концерте op. 73 Es-dur, когда после лазурно-золотистого сияния второй части вы попадаете сразу в венский парк Пратер: кружатся карусели, танцуют веселые пары, жонглеры показывают свои фокусы...' Г. Г. Нейгауз, 'О Последних сонатах Бетховена' [H. G. Neuhaus, 'About Beethoven's Last Sonatas'] in M. G. Sokolov (ed.), *Questions of Piano Interpretation. Issue 2* p. 16.

In seeing Beethoven being able to overcome the tragedy of his fate, and compose music which captured the essence of something beyond his wretched state, Neuhaus saw what he believed to be the proof that Beethoven was a true Romantic – able to communicate all aspects of life because they had been impressed upon the ‘self’. The view of the world through emotional experience [*переживание*], as explored in the previous chapter, was the highest kind of knowledge for Neuhaus: the ‘super-conscious’ state.<sup>65</sup> Neuhaus accentuated Beethoven’s spiritual journey into a ‘super-conscious’ state (which consequently created an inner world that embodied the whole of humanity) as being the truest and ‘clearest’ possible view of a world.<sup>66</sup> Devoid of distractions from an outside world, Neuhaus saw Beethoven’s deafness compelling him to musically experience the world purely and exclusively from his soul:

What happiness for *us*, not for him of course, that he was completely deaf!<sup>67</sup> His spirit, which was now undisturbed by any noise of this divine and damned world, was able to be in that *silence*, that real silence to which other artistic people aspire and sometimes attain at such a cost. He heard only the *imagined* sound of the piano – but for such a person the imagination was greater and more real than actuality.<sup>68</sup>

In viewing Beethoven’s genius as the gradual movement from a talented artist engaging with the outside world in his early opuses, through to the artist who is able to speak for the whole of humanity because his silenced outer-world means he engages *only* with his

---

<sup>65</sup> ‘сверхсознательное’. Н. Г. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 41.

<sup>66</sup> See Heinrich Neuhaus thoughts transcribed in E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus* p. 281.

<sup>67</sup> Neuhaus’s statement is striking in its similarity to that penned by Anton Rubinstein. Neuhaus’s appropriation of Anton Rubinstein’s thoughts on Beethoven is explored later in this chapter: ‘Oh, the deafness of Beethoven – what a terrible unhappiness for him, and what a happiness for art and humanity!’ [‘О, глухота Бетховена, какое страшное несчастье для него самого и какое счастье для искусства и человечества!’] A. G. Rubinstein, *Music and Those Who Represent It* p. 44. Neuhaus’s use of phrases which could be traced directly to von Bülow’s Beethoven edition have already been discussed in this chapter.

<sup>68</sup> ‘Какое счастье для *нас*, не для него, конечно, что он был совершенно глухой! Его дух, которому никакие шумы этого божественного и проклятого мира больше не мешали, мог пребывать в той *тишине*, реальной тишине, к которой иные творческие люди так стремятся и иногда с таким трудом ее обретают. Он слышал только *воображаемый* звук фортепиано, но для такого человека воображение было больше и реальнее действительности.’ Н. Г. Neuhaus, ‘Autobiographical Notes. Chapter II (Autopsychographical)’ in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 58.

inner-world and attains 'super-consciousness', Neuhaus's interpretation can be seen to reflect the Hegelian idea of the spirit. Hegel was a Romantic philosopher, often mentioned by Neuhaus in his writings, whose notions of subjectivity would have resonated with Neuhaus's own philosophical sympathies and understanding which he endeavoured to superimpose onto Beethoven's persona.

It is certain that Neuhaus was well acquainted with Hegel's *Phänomenologie des Geistes* [*The Phenomenology of the Spirit*] (1807) given his life-long interest in philosophy, fluent knowledge of German and the references he made to Hegelian dialectics in his writing and speeches.<sup>69</sup> *The Phenomenology of the Spirit* describes the spirit as undergoing three stages of evolution: the first (implied) stage is of the unconsciousness; the second sees the spirit acquiring a mind but misinterpreting that which it understands as something beyond the self; and finally, self-consciousness when the spirit understands itself as all reality (including all humanity) and that it is, in a pantheistic manner, 'God', or the 'divine'.<sup>70</sup> It is the transition of the spirit from the second stage to the third, which is particularly brought to mind by the journey charted for Beethoven by Neuhaus.

The vision of Beethoven operating within such Hegelian principles directly reflects Neuhaus's own understanding of an artistic spirit. Neuhaus had said that, according to the dialectical laws of Nature, he understood the need to recognize 'man as the creator of thought, the creator of art.'<sup>71</sup> Thus, Neuhaus's pantheistic acceptance of God resonated with Hegelian principles. Neuhaus's belief that a great artist ought to be a great man, in order to have the highest echelons of spirituality accessible to his artistry, likewise confirms his sympathy with the Hegelian idea that upon man reaching his greatest potential, God can be recognized in man's spirit:

Man, a finite spirit, is to be seen as a finite 'moment' of the infinite divine Spirit, who is God [...]: 'man is God only to the extent that he transcends the naturality and finitude of his spirit and elevates himself to God.'<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>69</sup> The author of this thesis has not found any documented reference by Neuhaus to this specific work, unlike for instance Kant's *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* [*Critique of Pure Reason*] and *Kritik der Urteilskraft* [*Critique of Judgement*].

<sup>70</sup> <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/hegel/> (accessed 19/12/2013).

<sup>71</sup> '[...] Человека [...]: творца мысли, творца искусства.' H. G. Neuhaus, 'My Aims as a Musician (For the Centenary of the Moscow Conservatory)' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* pp. 81–82.

<sup>72</sup> Q. Lauer, *Hegel's Concept of God* (Albany: State University Press of New York, 1982) p. 141. Hegel is quoted in translation from *Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Weltgeschichte* [*Lectures on the Philosophy of History*] (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1970) p. 329.

Neuhaus's philosophical explorations, which intensified dramatically in his analyses of Beethoven, were not altogether typical and left many of his Russian colleagues alienated. Maria Grinberg, a pianist twenty years younger than Neuhaus, who had been influenced for much of her life by him or the extended Neuhaus family, made conscious attempts to detach herself from any such philosophical interpretations.<sup>73</sup> In an interview in 1949 for example, Grinberg articulated her view that the music of Beethoven should be interpreted in such a way as to make it *accessible* to the current time and all people. In a thinly-veiled reference she criticized Neuhaus's philosophical over-complications and what she believed to be an outmoded interpretational approach:

I often had meetings and conversations with people of a very high intellectual level, who it seemed were Soviet, but if you dug deeper, then you realized [...] that they valued things of the past more highly. [...] emotionally they were convinced that there is something, to put it frankly, 'up there'.

I went through such a period when I believed that that was the essence of greatness – that apart from the world there is another force which governs it. I abandoned this view very quickly. I felt the greatness of a material view of the world – that it can be analysed, it is accessible, it is about a nature that is made up of electrons, atoms – that is greatness! From my perspective this has a thousand times more greatness than the most extraordinary Hegelian 'spirit'.<sup>74</sup>

---

<sup>73</sup> Grinberg had studied with Neuhaus's uncle, Felix Blumenfeld at the Moscow Conservatory prior to studying with Konstantin Igumnov upon Blumenfeld's death. Her student performances had caused her talent to be noticed and singled out by Neuhaus.

<sup>74</sup> 'У меня часто были встречи и разговоры с людьми очень высокого интеллектуального уровня, которые как будто бы были вполне советскими людьми, но, если покопаться поглубже, то для них овеяно каким-то ореолом всё то, что было раньше: всё, что было раньше, кажется им гораздо лучше, чем то, что есть сейчас. [...] эмоционально они уверены, что есть что-то такое, будем прямо говорить, на небе. И у меня был такой период, когда мне казалось, что в этом и состоит величие, что кроме мира есть ещё какая-то сила, которая им управляет. Но я очень быстро отошла от такого взгляда. Я почувствовала величие материалистического мировоззрения – что это можно проанализировать, что это доступно, что это природа, которая состоит из электронов, атомов, – в этом величие! С моей точки зрения, в этом в тысячу раз больше величия, чем в самом необыкновенном гегелевском «духе».' From an interview dated 10 April 1949 in A. V. Vitisinsky, *Conversations with Pianists* pp. 225–226.

Neuhaus's Hegelian understanding of Beethoven also departs from the theories of his German contemporary, Theodor Adorno. However, given that Neuhaus does not mention Adorno in his writings or speeches it is uncertain how much of Adorno's work he actually knew, especially given his limited travel abroad after his return to Russia following the outbreak of World War I. What is certain though, is that Neuhaus did know the works of Thomas Mann in the vernacular and particularly, *Doktor Faustus* (1947), which had been substantially influenced by Adorno. In 1950 Neuhaus wrote: 'I have re-read again my favourite *Doktor Faustus* by T. Mann and again I poured hot tears over it. It is a stunning, nearly unbearable book in its strength and depth!'<sup>75</sup>

Many of Neuhaus's students remember their professor's obsession with the novel which was frequently provoked by his work with them on the music of Beethoven. For example, Vera Adueva-Kelman admitted: 'I remember his indignation [when he realized] that I had such a poor understanding of Thomas Mann's works.'<sup>76</sup> Neuhaus's student and assistant, Lev Naumov, remembered:

Neuhaus despised those who had not read, for example, Thomas Mann's *Doktor Faustus*. [...] *Doktor Faustus* in his discussions about literature was a leitmotif like, say, the theme of the ring in Wagner's *Nibelungen*.<sup>77</sup>

That Neuhaus did indeed spend much time actively investigating the significance of *Doktor Faustus* in relation to his own views of humanism, history, and music is verified by his daughter-in-law, Galina Neuhaus:

In the last year of Boris Leonidovich [Pasternak's] life,<sup>78</sup> Neuhaus rarely came to Peredelkino, but when he did, they had heated arguments. The main theme of their discussions was Thomas Mann. Heinrich Gustavovich

---

<sup>75</sup> 'Я тут перечёл опять моего любимого «Doktor'a Faustus'a» Т. Манна и опять обливал его горячими слезами. Это потрясающая, почти невыносимая по своей силе и глубине книга!' Neuhaus's letter to L. A. Pogosova from Moscow dated 16 November 1950 in *Letters* p. 360. References that Neuhaus was already reading *Doktor Faustus* can be found in letters as early as 1948.

<sup>76</sup> 'Помню, как он возмущался тем, что я плохо представлял себе творчество Томаса Манна.' From Adueva-Kelman's article on Neuhaus in E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus* p. 33.

<sup>77</sup> 'Нейгауз презирал тех, кто не читал, скажем, «Доктора Фаустуса» Томаса Манна. «Доктор Фауст» [sic.] в его речах о литературе был таким же лейтмотивом, как скажем тема кольца в «Нибелунгах» Вагнера. From Naumov's article on Neuhaus in E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus* p. 138.

<sup>78</sup> Pasternak died on the 30 May 1960.

loved his works very deeply and re-read them with awe – and *Doktor Faustus* was particularly dear to him. Neuhaus said that it was a work of genius in which every phrase was laden with profound thought that made you think. Boris Leonidovich was surprised by this awe and did not see anything original and interesting in *Doktor Faustus*. Heinrich Gustavovich would become angry, argue and cite large chunks of the novel by heart.<sup>79</sup>

Adorno shared much common philosophical grounding with Neuhaus, most notably through the investigation of Kant, Hegel, Nietzsche and Adolf Marx (whom Neuhaus certainly knew from his investigations of József Gát's *The Technique of Piano Playing [Die Technik Des Klavierspiels]*, 1956). Neuhaus's strong Germanic intellectual experience through his independent literary study, his familial inclinations and his musical studies in Berlin and Vienna, must have also exerted a degree of influence over his willingness to engage with the Adorno-Mann critiques. Rose Subotnik's proposal of why Mann and Adorno were able to synthesize such a compelling work as *Doktor Faustus* can be extended in many ways to Neuhaus – a figure who was considered a truer German than Russian by many of his colleagues:

[...] Mann was able to produce a discursive complement to Adorno's fragmentary criticism, at least in part, because the two men, as twentieth-century Germans, were driven by the same tormenting experience: a view from the inside of how an incomparably civilized intellectual heritage could lead with apparent continuity, and even necessity, to total barbarism.<sup>80</sup>

Subotnik's notion of an insider-view of how a heritage of high art could descend into such violence can be compared with Neuhaus's experience of witnessing a freshly created late nineteenth-century Russian compositional heritage, based so heavily on the music and image

---

<sup>79</sup> 'В последний год жизни Бориса Леонидовича Нейгауз стал реже бывать в Переделкине, а когда приезжал, между ними всегда возникали горячие споры. Основной темой их разговоров был Томас Манн. Генрих Густавович очень любил его произведения, с восторгом их перечитывал, а к «Доктору Фаусту» у него было особое отношение. Генрих Густавович сердился, спорил, читал наизусть большие отрывки из романа.' From Galina Neuhaus's article in E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus* pp. 128–129.

<sup>80</sup> R. R. Subotnik, 'Adorno's Diagnosis of Beethoven's Late Style: Early Symptom of a Fatal Condition' (*Journal of the American Musicological Society*, Vol. 29, No. 2 Summer, 1976, pp. 242–275) p. 244.

of Beethoven, caught up in brutality of the revolutions and subsequent political terror of Soviet power.<sup>81</sup>

Like Neuhaus, Adorno believed that humanity's great achievement was the 'self-conscious human being with the freedom to determine his own destiny, above all as Kant defined freedom, through the exercise of moral choice'.<sup>82</sup> Subotnik explains:

From Adorno's Kantian-Hegelian viewpoint, this highest of all conceptions of the human could become a reality only through the coincidence of individual and social interests into a condition of human wholeness or integrity [...] represented in music by Beethoven's second period style.<sup>83</sup>

Neuhaus, however highly he valued the aesthetic and cultural significance of the works of Beethoven's middle period, had seen them as the composer's awakening into the fully fledged philosophical self-consciousness, or 'super-consciousness' of the third or last period. Yet, in contrast to Adorno's theory of Beethoven's second period being a coincidental point of individual and social unity (i.e. objective reality), in Neuhaus's opinion the second period was already 'inaccessible' to the outside world. For Neuhaus, Beethoven had already broken free from the spirit's need to recognize anything outside of itself. Therefore, he saw the creations of second period oscillating from pantheistic unity that the spirit had recently discovered, which developed into the late style, to the disparity that had subsequently arisen and intensified between the inner and outer worlds as the spirit's understanding of reality increasingly moved from without itself to within:

My subjective feeling is that [in a work like the (*Tempest*) Sonata No. 17 in D minor Opus 31 no. 2] aside from the idea of man and nature, *there is some*

---

<sup>81</sup> For discussions about the identity of 'Russianness' in music and the role of Beethoven in its creation, from a compositional point of view, in the middle and late nineteenth century see M. Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism from Glinka to Stalin* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007). For an investigation of how the Soviet State affected composers and the commissions of their work see M. Frolova-Walker & J. Walker, *Music and Soviet Power 1917–1932* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2012) and B. Schwarz, *Music and Musical Life in Soviet Russia 1917–1970* (London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1972).

<sup>82</sup> R. R. Subotnik, 'Adorno's Diagnosis of Beethoven's Late Style: Early Symptom of a Fatal Condition' (*Journal of the American Musicological Society*, Vol. 29, No. 2 Summer, 1976, pp. 242–275) p. 245.

<sup>83</sup> *Ibid.* The 'second period' refers here to the three-period view of Beethoven as initiated by Wilhelm von Lenz, and understood by musicologists including Romain Rolland and Theodor Adorno – and not to the two periods as understood, for instance by Anton Rubinstein.



*kind of struggle with the every-day* – a heavy feeling, yet tender and very wary.<sup>84</sup>

In Adorno's mind the process that initiated 'the severing of subjective freedom from objective reality', represented in its final stages in the music of Schoenberg, had only *begun* in the late style of Beethoven.<sup>85</sup> For Neuhaus, the ahistoricising of the artistic spirit, philosophically, had been achieved by Beethoven's late works: 'frozen, [...] external music.'<sup>86</sup>

Neuhaus's view of Beethoven's middle period as already being the musical manifestation of the struggle caused by the spirit's change in understanding its own being might be inferred from his interpretation of the third movement, *Allegretto*, of the Piano Sonata in D minor Opus 31 no. 2. Neuhaus considered that the tonality alone, D minor, was indicative of the instability of a spirit who had freed itself on the one hand from its need to recognize the outer world, but was enslaved by its inability to yet fully know itself:

The tonality itself, D minor – it is a dual tonality: on the one hand it is the tonality of the every-day, but on the other it is the 'highest' possible tonality. Take [Opus 31 no. 2] and the D minor Symphony... They have a lot in common [but] the [latter] ends with the *Ode to Joy*, yet here it is the opposite.<sup>87</sup>

Neuhaus's interpretation of the *Allegretto* oscillates from surging agitation to a promise of peace (*Classical Records*).<sup>88</sup> Moving forward through the upbeats [see Figure 3 and CD Track 2] into the first beat, Neuhaus's tempo – on the 'front-edge' of the overall pulse – gives the impression impatience refusing to be consoled. This is particularly obvious when Neuhaus's

<sup>84</sup> 'Моё субъективное ощущение такое (хотя можно толковать конечно совсем иначе), что, кроме идеи человека в природе, здесь какая-то борьба с буднями, какое-то тяжёлое чувство, и нежное, и вместе с тем очень настороженное.' From a seminar for pedagogues on the 28 January 1946 documented in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* pp. 153–154. Emphasis in main text is mine.

<sup>85</sup> R. R. Subotnik, 'Adorno's Diagnosis of Beethoven's Late Style: Early Symptom of a Fatal Condition' (*Journal of the American Musicological Society*, Vol. 29, No. 2 Summer, 1976, pp. 242–275) pp. 245.

<sup>86</sup> 'Такая застывшая, как бы вечная музыка.' Neuhaus's conversation with B. M. Teplov and A. V. Vitsinsky (6 December 1944) in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 100.

<sup>87</sup> 'Сама тональность ре минор – тональность двойственная: с одной стороны – это тональность будней, а с другой стороны – самая «высокая» тональность. Возьмите эту сонату и Симфонию ре минор – как-то недаром они соприкоснулись. [...] Последняя кончается одой «К радости», здесь же – наоборот.' From a seminar for pedagogues on the 28 January 1946 documented in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 154.

<sup>88</sup> Catalogue number CR-099: *The Art of Henry Neuhaus. Beethoven Sonatas no. 14 "Moonlight", no. 17, 24, 30, 31* released 2008. Recorded c. 1950s. Track 6.

opening is compared to Gilels's interpretation of the movement (*Deutsche Grammophon*: see CD Track 3).<sup>89</sup> Both pianists take the opening core-pulse at dotted crotchet = 80, but Gilels's interpretation, on the 'back-edge' is expansive with the upbeat figuration played with equality. Neuhaus takes his tempo forward from bar 38, so that bar 43 (the second theme) is at the 'front-edge' of dotted crotchet = 88 [see Figure 4: 0.33 min on CD Track 2]: thereby increasing the allusion to the sense of impatience and struggle. Gilels meanwhile retains the dotted-crotchet = 80 pulse, and in so doing can be considered to unify the opening and the second theme. Conversely, Neuhaus's more urgent tempo ratchets up the tension which subsequently highlights the *sf* in bar 47<sup>2</sup> rather surprisingly as a release of tension. Neuhaus carries on this release through to bar 50 (0.38 min on CD Track 2) – the end of the statement of the second theme in both the attack of sound and a slackening of the tempo.

Not only does Neuhaus's interpretation emphasize the instability of the movement by delineating the first and second themes, but the second theme itself is one of two halves: an intensified struggle, and at its height – a glimmer of peace. The following interruptions of the second theme in variation (split octaves) occur in the 'knowledge' of this promised peace, and in Neuhaus's interpretation they can be argued to follow inevitably, rather than strictly *subito*, into the *piano* at bar 67 [see Figure 5: 0.51 min on CD Track 2]. The *piano* with its promised peace influences the way in which Neuhaus interprets the repeat of the first theme. In the repeat, Neuhaus's tempo is now dotted-crotchet = 84, but the pulse is kept on the 'back-edge'. Despite the faster tempo, the character of the repeated first subject is more consoled. Leading into the first half of the second theme this time, the tempo once again increases, this time to dotted-crotchet = 92. However, just as the first theme had changed from gravitating from impatience to consolation, the second theme too has changed. Instead of the release of tension of the second theme's second half calming the interruptions, this time they provoke a greater struggle and anguish. With each octave variation the tempo moves further onto the 'front-edge', isolating the *piano* at bar 67 (1.58 min CD Track 2) as an island of introverted calm, before resuming the struggle into the development at bar 95.

---

<sup>89</sup> Catalogue number DGG 4776360: *Emil Gilels. Beethoven 29 Piano Sonatas*. 9 CD-set released 13/11/2006. Recorded October 1981. CD 6 Track 6.



Figure 3. The third movement of Opus 31 no. 2 *Allegretto*. Upbeat and bars 1 – 5.



Figure 4 The third movement of Opus 31 no. 2 *Allegretto*. Bars 32–56.



Figure 5 The third movement of Opus 31 no. 2. *Allegretto*. Bars 64–76







<p><b>Opening</b></p> 	<p><b>From bar 38 (bridge into second theme)</b></p> 	<p><b>Second theme at bar 43</b></p> 	<p><b>Sf at bar 47</b></p> 	<p><b>Approaching the piano in bar 67</b></p> 	<p><b>From bar 77 (approaching repeat or development)</b></p> 
<p><b>Exposition:</b> Neuhaus plays on the front edge of dotted crotchet = <b>80</b></p>	<p>Neuhaus uses this passage to move the tempo forwards</p>	<p>Dotted crotchet = <b>88</b></p>	<p>Neuhaus sees the <i>sf</i> as a release of tension which he uses to make the tempo broaden out</p>	<p>The <i>piano</i> was preceded by a slackening of tempo and sounds inevitable or resigned</p>	<p>Tempo moves forward with some resistance</p>
<p><b>Repeat:</b> Neuhaus plays on the back edge of dotted crotchet = <b>84</b></p>	<p>Neuhaus uses this passage to move the tempo forwards</p>	<p>Dotted crotchet = <b>92</b></p>	<p>Neuhaus moves onto the front edge of the tempo to build up further tension</p>	<p><i>Subito piano</i> – momentarily introverted with the tempo held back before building up again towards the development</p>	<p>Tempo moves forward with a sense of urgency</p>
<p>Gilels plays here on the back edge of dotted crotchet = <b>80</b></p>	<p>Dotted crotchet = <b>80</b></p>	<p>Dotted crotchet = <b>80</b></p>	<p>Core tempo remains stable</p>	<p><i>Subito piano</i></p>	<p>Building up of dynamic level is interpretationally more significant than tempo modification</p>

Table to summarize the key aspects which frame Neuhaus's use of tempo in the exposition of the *Allegretto* (third movement) of Piano Sonata No. 17 in D minor Opus 31 no. 2.

Unlike Neuhaus, Gilels's interpretation seems to exist in a much more stable equilibrium. There is of course conflict in the sudden changes of dynamic and in the approach to characterization, but it might be seen to be a different kind of struggle. Perhaps it could be said to be a struggle within one world, and in this sense there is a feeling of overall balance – all conflict inevitably seems to resolve into, or at least gravitate towards, a common 'centre'. By resorting to using the 'front-edge' of a tempo only for climactic effect, the stability evoked corresponds to Gilels's understanding that Beethoven's work incorporates an element of 'distance' in his view of the world – an idea Gilels voiced to Lev Barenboim when he called Beethoven one of the most 'objective composers' of Western Art Music.<sup>90</sup> Neuhaus's interpretation can be understood as a struggle between two worlds: an existence in limbo where recognizable elements are fraught with instability as they changeably resolve into one of two opposing 'centres'.

Adorno saw the Western musical continuum from a compositional point of view, and as made explicit symbolically in *Doktor Faustus*, tied to its historical reality. Subotnik summarized Adorno's argument:

The whole history of music from Beethoven's late period to Schonberg's represents at once the winding down of human history and a prolegomenon to the music of a post-historic world, which since it continues to exist physically, Adorno considers to have entered into a meaningless, ahistoric stasis [...] the music of our time, must be considered essentially the art of a post-human species. There is no other way of interpreting such a remark as, 'To write poetry after Auschwitz is barbaric.'<sup>91</sup>

Neuhaus too was inclined to see compositional creativity as a historically-reflective continuum that he identified in its momentary form as 'culture': 'Culture is formed historically in different periods of time and in different places in different ways.'<sup>92</sup> Perhaps through *Doktor Faustus*, Neuhaus did indeed genuinely engage with Adorno's view of the continuum that led from

<sup>90</sup> Lev Barenboim in Л. А. Баренбойм, *Эмиль Гилельс* (Москва: «Советский Композитор», 1990) [L. A. Barenboim, *Emil Gilels*. (Moscow: 1990)] p. 70.

<sup>91</sup> R. R. Subotnik, 'Adorno's Diagnosis of Beethoven's Late Style: Early Symptom of a Fatal Condition' (*Journal of the American Musicological Society*, Vol. 29, No. 2 Summer, 1976, pp. 242–275) pp. 245–246.

<sup>92</sup> 'Культура создается исторически в разные периоды и в разных местах по-разному.' Neuhaus's seminar for music teachers held on 9 December 1938 as documented in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 111.

Beethoven to a modern, 'shipwrecked' and post-human music – and given his own deliberate silencing of his strong compositional urge, it may be that Neuhaus was tempted to consider how his compositional voice would have operated in such a theory.<sup>93</sup>

Being an interpreter, however, is what really differentiated Neuhaus's aesthetical and philosophical interaction with such a continuum from Adorno's. As a musicologist-philosopher, Adorno saw Beethoven's late style as the insinuation of the end of humanity – a collapse of a universe. As a pure interpreter, Neuhaus saw Beethoven's ahistoricized and 'super-conscious' spirit necessitating the birth of a *new humanity* that could raise and initiate itself to those spiritual heights. In Neuhaus's view, Beethoven's late piano style had necessitated the most noble kind of artist – the pianist-interpreter [*пианист-исполнитель*] who would willingly dedicate his whole life to the ethics which Beethoven had been the first musician to 'discover' and express in music.<sup>94</sup>

### 3.3 Neuhaus's identification of Beethoven through pianism

The role and responsibilities of an interpreter, as understood by Neuhaus, had been defined largely by two figures perceived as the most natural 'inheritors' of Beethoven's spirit: Liszt and Rubinstein. Thus an interpreter of the new humanity, who, as already discussed in the previous chapter, must be able to live an existence beyond his own historic moment and instead encompass *all* historic moments of all composers, essentially rose from Beethoven's ashes. Neuhaus's engagement with the ideas and practices of other pianist-interpreters is therefore the complementary context which is needed to gain a better understanding of Beethoven's persona and music through Neuhaus's interpretation.

The importance of Neuhaus's dual identity, caused by his Russian birth, familial home and subsequent career whilst his formative years had been spent in Europe, is a vital part of understanding the context that pianism provided to his interpretations. As an established professional in Russia from the 1920s, Neuhaus attempted to connect his own persona as both

<sup>93</sup> 'Modern music sees absolute oblivion as its goal. It is the surviving message of despair from the shipwrecked.' T. Adorno, *Philosophy of Modern Music*, 1948 translated by Anne Mitchell & Wesley Blomster (New York: Continuum Publishing Group, 2003) p. 133.

<sup>94</sup> As already discussed in the previous chapter, Gustav Neuhaus had wanted his son to be a pianist-interpreter rather than composer as it was the noblest calling he knew: 'My father considered that there could not be a higher person than a pianist.' [*Отец мой вообще считал, что не может быть человека выше пианиста.*] See Neuhaus's conversation with B. M. Teplov and A. V. Vitsinsky (6 December 1944) in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 84.

a pianist and pedagogue closely to that of Anton Rubinstein. This can be traced through Neuhaus's allusions to Rubinstein's pedagogical and interpretative values, and practices especially in his seminars and book, *About the Art of Piano Playing* through both covert and hidden references to Rubinstein's *Лекции по истории фортепианной литературы* [*Lectures in the History of the Piano Literature*] (1889) and Josef Hofmann's *Piano Playing* (1909). Yet, as already discussed, Neuhaus stressed that the years studying in Europe had defined his destiny to become a pianist.

Consequently, as will be demonstrated, musicians including Brahms and Hans von Bülow became key 'Liszt disciples' whom Neuhaus considered to stand alongside Rubinstein. However, in considering the impact of figures such as Liszt and his 'disciples' on Neuhaus's interpretation of Beethoven, it is necessary to acknowledge the fact that Neuhaus constructed his own distinct and specific trajectory of thought in this respect. This trajectory retains its logic and coherence only through Neuhaus's specific vision of these musicians as pianists. Furthermore, it is a trajectory that is constructed *entirely* in Neuhaus's mind since he had never heard the playing of any of these musicians.

Firstly, in considering the extent of Rubinstein's influence on Neuhaus, it is necessary to note that in the middle and late nineteenth century Russia was only just finding its own compositional voice. Devoid of the same kind of creative musical heritage as Europe, the Nationalist movement in Russia appropriated Beethoven as one of its founders.<sup>95</sup> The extent to which Beethoven had become an ideal for the young Russian musical tradition can be seen for instance in Rimsky-Korsakov's letter to the music critic Semyon Kruglikov in 1891: 'Do you know what is lacking in Russian music? It lacks soul. Beethoven has a mighty soul.'<sup>96</sup> Thus, Beethoven had been an important influence on Russian composers, interpreters and critics and their aesthetic ideals since at least the middle of the nineteenth century.<sup>97</sup> Numerous nineteenth-century Russian critics observed that Beethoven was amongst the most widespread composers to be performed or studied in both professional and amateur circles:

---

<sup>95</sup> For more detailed discussion of this point see M. Frolova-Walker, *Russian Music and Nationalism from Glinka to Stalin* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007).

<sup>96</sup> 'Вы знаете чего нет в Русской музыке? У неё нет души. У Бетховена великая душа.' Letter dated 23 September 1891 in Н. Римский-Корсаков, *Полное собрание сочинений: Литературные произведения и переписка. Том 8* [N. Rimsky-Korsakov, *Complete Works: Written Works and Correspondence. Volume 8*] (Moscow: 1981) p. 194.

<sup>97</sup> It should be noted that there were earlier significant ties between Beethoven and Russia, namely in a number of Beethoven's patrons including Nikolai Galitzin (an amateur cellist who commissioned the last string quartets) and Andrei Razumovsky (an amateur violinist who commissioned the three 'Razumovsky' String Quartets Opus 59).

He is equally loved by artists and amateurs [...]. There is not a single music school without a score of [Beethoven's] sonatas, nearly every pianist's recital [includes at least one of his sonatas]; in the most remote places and in the most modest circumstances, if one looks on the music shelves there will certainly be a volume of Beethoven sonatas.<sup>98</sup>

Rubinstein's historic lectures on the subject of the piano repertoire given in 1889/90, which Neuhaus knew intimately through their written transcription, confirm a similar point of view to that of Rimsky-Korsakov:

So far we have acquainted ourselves with piano music that is playful and graceful (Couperin), with majesty (Bach), with amiability or rather warm-heartedness (Haydn, Mozart), but so far we have not met either soul or drama. There was expression from the heart, but there was no expression from the soul. The person who put soul and drama into music was *Beethoven*.<sup>99</sup>

Given that Rubinstein was the founding father of the official Russian musical institutions, and a pianist who had taken the Continent, let alone Russia by storm, he had the stature to dictate not only musical tastes but also to set out the paths for mainstream cultural development. Notwithstanding Rubinstein's vast repertoire ranging from Rameau and Couperin right the way through to his own works, it was his interpretations of Beethoven that left some of the most lasting musical impressions. Neuhaus's colleague Goldenweiser, who unlike the former had actually heard Rubinstein's playing in recitals, wrote in his memoirs:

---

<sup>98</sup> 'Его одинаково чтут и любят артисты и дилетанты [...]. Без его сонат не обойдется ни одна музыкальная школа, почти ни один концерт пианиста; в самой далекой глуши, в самой скромной обстановке, на музыкальной этажерке непременно найдется тетрадь бетховенских сонат.' Р. В. Геника, *Бетховен: Значение его творчества в области фортепианной композиции* [R. V. Genika, *Beethoven: The Importance of his Art in the Sphere of Piano Composition*] (Saint Petersburg: 1899) p. 1.

<sup>99</sup> 'До сих пор мы познакомились в фортепианной музыке с игривостью и грацией (Куперен), с величием (Бах), с любезностью, а пожалуй даже и сердечностью (Гайдн, Моцарт), но пока мы в ней не встречали ни души, ни драматизма. Было выражение сердечное, не было выражения душевного. Человек, который вложил в музыку душу и драматизм, был *Бетховен*.' А. Г. Rubinstein, *Lectures in the History of Piano Literature* p. 47.



Out of Rubinstein's interpretations of the Beethoven sonatas, I vividly remember the first part of the C-sharp minor Sonata (*Quasi una fantasia*): the bare, nearly unpedalled sound of the triplet background that gave a matt colouration; and at the same time the bright, rich sound of the singing top voice. I remember also the unstoppable, passionate flow of the finale with the *sforzando* chords onto which Rubinstein pounced. I also remember the incomparable interpretation of the D minor Sonata Opus 31 – the caressing charisma of the sound in the finale which I recall so vividly and try so hard to recreate in my own interpretation.<sup>100</sup>

Likewise Sergei Rachmaninov also linked some of his most defining experiences of musical life in Moscow with Rubinstein's interpretations of Beethoven:

In the first year of my studies with Zverev, Anton Rubinstein arrived in Moscow. One can imagine the feverous excitement with which we – boys who saw themselves as future pianists – anticipated this event. [...] Rubinstein did not come with the intention of giving solo recitals, but rather as a conductor [nevertheless] he played for us Beethoven's F-sharp major Sonata Opus 78. [...] In his next visit Rubinstein gave his famous 'Historic Lectures' [...]. It was not so much his amazing technique that astounded, but rather the deep, inspired, sensitive musicality that filled every note, every bar [...] and made him the most unique and original pianist in the world. Of course, I did not miss a note of his recitals and remember how shaken I was by his interpretation of the *Appassionata*.<sup>101</sup>

<sup>100</sup> 'Из исполнения Рубинштейном сонат Бетховена мне ярко вспоминается 1-я часть до-диез-минорной сонаты (*Quasi una fantasia*): скупая почти беспедальная звучность триольного фона, что давало матовую окраску; в то же время – яркая, насыщенная звучность певучего верхнего голоса. Помню также неудержимый, страстный поток финала с его аккордами sforzандо, на которые Рубинштейн всякий раз как бы обрушивался. Вспоминается также несравненное исполнение ре-минорной сонаты ор. 31: ласковое обаяние звучности её финала, которое я так ярко помню и так тщетно пытаюсь воспроизвести в собственном исполнении.' А. Б. Гольденвейзер, *Воспоминания*, 1958 (Москва: «Дека», 2009) [A. B. Goldenweiser, *Reminiscences*, 1958 (Moscow: 2009)] pp. 254–255.

<sup>101</sup> 'В первый год моих занятий у Зверева в Москву приехал Антон Рубинштейн. Можно себе представить лихорадочное возбуждение и нетерпение, с которым мы, мальчики, считавшие себя будущими пианистами, ждали этого события. [...] Рубинштейн приехал в Москву не с концертами, он должен был продирижировать, сотым представлением своей оперы. Но он сел за рояль и сыграл фа-диез мажорную Сонату Бетховена ор.78. [...] В следующий приезд Рубинштейн давал свои знаменитые Исторические концерты. Ошеломляла не столько его великолепная техника, сколько глубокая одухотворенная, тонкая музыкальность, наполнявшая каждую ноту, каждый такт, который он играл, и делавшая его единственным в своём роде, самым оригинальным и ни с

Rubinstein's championing of Beethoven's oeuvre was an impressive feat in itself as both a pianist and conductor. As a pianist, one of the most famous recital programmes Rubinstein performed as part of his 'Historical Concerts of the Piano Literature', presented at the conservatories in Moscow and Saint Petersburg in 1885/6 and 1888/9, included in one single evening:

Sonata No. 14 in C-sharp minor *Quasi una fantasia* Opus 27 no. 2 ('Moonlight')

Sonata No. 17 in D minor Opus 31 no. 2

Sonata No. 21 in C major Opus 53 ('Aurora')

Sonata No. 23 in F minor Opus 57 ('Appassionata')

Sonata No. 27 in E minor Opus 90

Sonata No. 28 in A major Opus 101

Sonata No. 30 in E-flat major Opus 109

Sonata No. 32 in C minor Opus 111.<sup>102</sup>

It must be remembered, that aside from the sheer stamina required for such an achievement, at this point such programmes were a rarity, echoing only the all-Beethoven recitals given by Liszt and his pupil, von Bülow.<sup>103</sup> Rubinstein's 'Historical Lectures of the Piano Literature', which corresponded to these concerts, looked at *all* 32 sonatas and some of the sets of variations.

The connection between Liszt and Anton Rubinstein was a vital part of the Russian understanding of Beethoven both historically and aesthetically – and remained so in Neuhaus's time. Certainly Liszt's and Bülow's famous nickname for Rubinstein, 'Van II' – in light of his characteristically scruffy appearance, fiery temperament and perceived physical likeness to

---

кем не сравнимым пианистом мира. Естественно я не пропускал ни ноты на его концертах, и помню, как потрясло меня его исполнение «Аппасионаты».' О. Риземан, *Сергей Рахманинов. Воспоминания*, 1934, перевод В. Н. Чемберджи (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2008) [O. Rieseemann, *Sergei Rachmaninov. Reminiscences*, 1934, translated by V. Chembergy (Moscow: 2008)] pp. 34–37.

<sup>102</sup> The Piano Sonata No. 17 in D minor Opus 31 no. 2 is not known as the 'Tempest' in Russian and perhaps explains why Rubinstein attributes Beethoven's famous reference to Shakespeare's 'The Tempest' to the 'Appassionata' Sonata instead. 'Aurora' is the title by which, in Russia, the 'Waldstein' Sonata is referred to.

<sup>103</sup> Liszt and Bülow performed all thirty-two piano sonatas, with Bülow famously performing the last five in one evening and reputedly repeating Opus 106 as the encore.

Beethoven – became widespread in Russia and surely helped to strengthen the audience’s association between the musicians:<sup>104</sup>

[...] a small man with a large head shuffled awkwardly and tentatively towards the piano, and placing one hand on the piano bowed to the audience. That was Rubinstein. Immediately one recognizes the face of Beethoven – ugly in its profile, but very attractive *en face*, familiar from the portraits.<sup>105</sup>

Hans von Bülow’s own concert activities in Russia (1886) had indeed led him to the observation that in fact it was futile to shake the public’s perception that ‘[Anton Rubinstein] is considered to be the one and same person as Beethoven and Liszt’.<sup>106</sup>

Despite Rubinstein’s vocal dismissal of Liszt as a composer, Rubinstein nonetheless remained a devoted advocate of Liszt as an interpreter, and perhaps more importantly as an educator (‘a musician-enlightener’).<sup>107</sup> Furthermore, he would have been aware of how his

<sup>104</sup> The resemblance between Anton Rubinstein and Beethoven was also noted by Ignaz Moscheles. Famously, rumours quickly spread that Rubinstein was the illegitimate son of Beethoven – notwithstanding Rubinstein’s date of birth superseding Beethoven’s death by three years. Rubinstein never spoke out to resolve this mistake.

<sup>105</sup> ‘Взор сотен людей [застыл, когда они увидели] маленького человека с большой головой, который появился из дверей в глубине сцены, странной шатающейся походкой идет к рампе, осторожно подходит к роялю и, положив одну руку на рояль, кланяется наконец публике. Это Рубинштейн. Сразу узнаешь лицо Бетховена, некрасивое в профиль, но очень привлекательное анфас, знакомое по портретам.’ Review from 9 April 1884 as quoted in Л. А. Баренбойм, *Антон Григорьевич Рубинштейн Том 2* (Ленинград: «Государственное Музыкальное Издательство», 1962) L. A. Barenboim, *Anton Grigorevich Rubinstein Volume 2* (Leningrad: 1962) p. 262.

<sup>106</sup> From H. Bülow, *Briefe und Schriften IV* (Leipzig: 1886) p. 228 quoted and translated into Russian in L. A. Barenboim, *Anton Rubinstein Volume 2* (Moscow: 1962) p. 176 (‘[...] Антона Рубинштейна, которого считают здесь в одном лице за Бетховена и Листа [...]).’

<sup>107</sup> ‘музыкант-просветитель’. А. Д. Алексеев, *История фортепианного искусства. Части 1 и 2* (Москва: «Музыка», 1988) [A. D. Alexeev, *A History of the Art of the Piano. Parts 1 and 2* (Moscow: 1988)] p. 215. Despite the widespread notion that Liszt and Rubinstein’s relationship was terse, Rubinstein wrote: ‘I was in Weimar and stayed with Liszt [...]. Liszt was a man about whom I ought to write a book if I want to analyse him. I can simply tell you that as a persona he is one of a kind – as artist, as man and as a writer. [...] I admit that I learnt much from him, and many things would have gone unnoticed by myself had I not known Liszt and had we not exchanged thoughts.’ [‘В Веймаре, я жил у Листа. [...] Лист – это человек, о котором я должен был бы написать книгу, если бы захотел проанализировать его. Могу тебе только сказать, что это во всех отношениях личность, каких мало, – и как артист, и как человек, и как писатель. [...] Я признаю, что многому научился у него и что многие вещи прошли бы для меня незамеченными, если бы я его не знал и если бы мы не обменивались мыслями.’] See Rubinstein’s letter to K. M. Fredro dated July 1854 in Л. А. Баренбойм, *А. Г. Рубинштейн. Избранные письма* (Москва: «Музгиз», 1954) [L. A. Barenboim, *A. G. Rubinstein. Selected letters* (Moscow: 1954)] pp. 33–34.

championing of Beethoven mirrored Liszt's. Whether Rubinstein adopted the values derived from Liszt's interpretation of Beethoven, or whether it was simply that Liszt's way of engaging with Beethoven resonated with Rubinstein's own interpretative inclinations, is difficult to tell. In any case, the Russian understanding of Beethoven as a poetic, heroic, soulful and autobiographic, and therefore programmatic, composer derived from the synthesis of the two musicians. Crucially, it was still evident as late as 1956. As noted by Yakov Milstein:

Let us not forget that the starting point of the artistic development of Liszt was Beethoven [...]. Liszt was one of the [most significant] artists who inherited the high aesthetic principles of Beethoven's art which always remained for him the highest artistic ideal.<sup>108</sup>

Throughout his career, as discussed in the previous chapter, Neuhaus had certainly sympathized with Liszt's and Rubinstein's shared attitude that all music is in essence 'programmatic'. The strength of Neuhaus's desire to be considered alongside the persona of Rubinstein puts him in many respects into the same league as other leading Russian pianists such as Hofmann, Igumnov, Rachmaninov and Goldenweiser who also advocated a Rubinsteinian attitude to 'programme' in music. Neuhaus's efforts are all the more significant given that of this group, he was the only one never to have heard a note of Rubinstein's playing. This did not preclude musicologists, such as David Rabinovich, sincerely believing in the connection between the pianism of Neuhaus and Rubinstein:

After Rubinstein listened to the boy [Alfred] Cortot playing the *Appassionata* to him, he said: 'Little boy, never forget what I am going to tell you: Beethoven should not be played, simply played; he needs to be rediscovered anew each time.' This is clearly the very same way in which Neuhaus played and taught Beethoven!<sup>109</sup>

<sup>108</sup> '[...] отправной точкой художественного развития Листа являлось творчество [...] Бетховена. [...] В сущности Лист был одним из художников, принявших высокие эстетические принципы искусства Бетховена, которые всегда оставались для него высшим художественным идеалом.' Я. И. Мильштейн, *Лист. Том 1* (Москва: «Государственное Музыкальное Издательство», 1956) [Y. I. Milstein, *Liszt. Volume 1* (Moscow: 1956)] p. 221.

<sup>109</sup> 'Исключительно интересны слова, сказанные Рубинштейном мальчику Корто после того, как тот сыграл ему «Аппассионату»: «Малыш, никогда не забывай то, что я тебе скажу: Бетховена нельзя играть, просто играть; его нужно каждый раз заново открывать». Ведь именно так играл Бетховена и учил играть Бетховена сам Нейгауз!' D. A. Rabinovich, *Interpreter and Style*, 1981 (Moscow: 2008) p. 169.

When it came to Beethoven in particular, Neuhaus's pedagogical efforts relied heavily on analogy and metaphor. Specifically regarding the issue of interpreting Beethoven, Neuhaus borrowed a number of Anton Rubinstein's own images. For instance, in speaking of Beethoven's last sonata (Opus 111), Neuhaus had spoken of the human spirit 'soaring' into the stratosphere.<sup>110</sup> The similarity is striking when compared to the image used by Anton Rubinstein: 'The Thirty Second Sonata, C minor Opus 111: The last; exceptionally soulful, without academicisms. The *Arietta* – a flight into the clouds, the soul soars into the highest spheres.'<sup>111</sup> Rather than trying to conceal these similarities, Neuhaus considered it important that different pianists could communally relate to a suggested image – that through the suggestion of words he could rely on a particular emotional response, an inner understanding, being conveyed to a student or colleague. This notion is certainly traceable to Rubinstein's writings detailing his own attitude to music as a pianist:

In Beethoven's Sonata [No. 26] in E-flat Opus 81 the first movement is marked *Les adieux* (a farewell), but the character of the *Allegro* after the introduction does not correspond to the sorrowful mood expected during a farewell – how should these hieroglyphs be deciphered? The chaotic preparations before a journey, the endless goodbyes, the participation of those who remain, the thoughts of the long journey to come, wishing all the best to loved ones. [...] Is it possible that an interpreter does not feel the need to express exactly all this?<sup>112</sup>

---

<sup>110</sup> See H. G. Neuhaus, 'Autobiographical Notes. Chapter II (Autopsychographical)' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 60.

<sup>111</sup> 'Тридцать вторая соната, с-молл оп. 111. Последняя, исключительно душевная, без учености. Ариетта в ней – полет в облака, душа возносится в высшие сферы.' A. G. Rubinstein, *Lectures in the History of Piano Literature* p. 54.

<sup>112</sup> 'В сонате Es-dur оп. 81 первая часть озаглавлена: «*Les adieux*» (прощание), но характер первого Аллегро после интродукции не соответствует общепринятому понятию о горестном настроении при прощании; – что же нужно разобрать в этих иероглифах? Хлопоты и приготовления перед путешествием, бесконечное прощание, участие остающихся, различные представления о дальней дороге, пожелания благополучия и вообще все сердечное, выражающееся при разлуке с любимым существом. [...] Возможно ли, что исполнитель не чувствует потребности что-нибудь выразить.' A. G. Rubinstein, *Music and Those Who Represent It* p. 15.

It delighted Neuhaus when he saw for himself how universal an 'artistic image' could be, and how it could show two different musicians striving, in their own unique way, for the same musical essence:

I was sitting next to K[onstantin] N[ikolayevich] Igumnov, and we listened to how one student played the Sonata [No. 30] in E major Opus 109. I always tell students about the end of this sonata – that there is a glimmering, that they must imagine for themselves, a sunset somewhere in the mountains when first we see a golden shining, then scarlet, and then a change to a violet shade – and then night falls. I see this clearly, and it usually helps students... I wanted to tell Igumnov this very thing, but that same minute he leant over to me and said: 'Do you know – it's just like a sunset.'

Why do I talk about this? Because this poetic image must come about generally in respect of this sonata: Igumnov expressed it in exactly the same words that I myself feel. This mutuality of feelings and images gave me a lot of joy as a musician, particularly because in this case the image was absolutely identical.

I said to him: 'And night falls.' He repeated: 'Yes, yes, and night falls...'  
The Sonata is so clear and expressive that it *should* command such images.'<sup>113</sup>

Yet, it must be noted that the 'joy' which Neuhaus talks about upon realizing, through shared imagery, that he is among kindred spirits is not necessarily something that common to all musicians. Alfred Cortot, a pianist known for his rich imagination and love of poetic imagery to describe his own interpretational processes, can probably be considered as the closest pianistic contemporary of Neuhaus in terms of his outlook and values outside of Eastern Europe – an observation that Neuhaus instinctively recognized in his critique, *Три художника*

---

<sup>113</sup> 'Почему я об этом говорю? Потому, что этот поэтический образ, очевидно возникает вообще по поводу этой сонаты, и К. Н. Игумнов это выразил теми же словами, как чувствовал и я сам. Эта общность чувств и образов доставила мне как музыканту большую радость, тем более, что здесь совпадение образа было совершенно точное. Я говорю ему: «И ночь спускается». Он повторяет: «Да да, и ночь спускается». Эта соната вообще настолько выразительна и ясна, что должна вызывать такие образы.' Open lesson in 1938 as documented in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* pp. 206–207.

[*Three artists*], written following Cortot's tour to Russia.<sup>114</sup> Nevertheless, Cortot seems to have held a different opinion on the matter, finding it highly suspect that another musician might use the same imagery to describe his own relation to the music:

When I tried to express in a few phrases the nature of feelings that each of Chopin's preludes aroused in me I was astonished to see some of my most eminent colleagues use the same phrases in their turn, adopting with the formula which had attracted me the very words I had employed in my attempt to render an entirely personal emotion more accessible. I should have preferred [...] that they should have had recourse to their own imagination.<sup>115</sup>

Neuhaus's reliance on imagery as a way to direct and focus another musician's understanding of Beethoven was reflective of a widespread pedagogical practice of the time – helping grasp something that defies words. Yet, even when talking to his colleagues about Beethoven – themselves often famous Beethoven interpreters – Neuhaus seems to have retained his need for resorting to an unashamedly poetic language to highlight the emotionally-led narrative power of the music. Neuhaus's effortless command of programmatic associations must therefore be seen beyond the framework of a pedagogical tool and instead understood as being symptomatic of his view of Beethoven, in the vein of Liszt and Rubinstein, as a Romantic.

Despite Neuhaus's use of imagery as a scaffold to build both his own and his students' interpretations, paradoxically like Rubinstein, he did not tolerate this being seen as a way to make Beethoven 'accessible'. As already discussed, Neuhaus had reproached Rolland's work on Beethoven based on his view that Rolland had desired to make Beethoven accessible to all. Likewise Neuhaus had used Kant to highlight Beethoven's inaccessibility. Thus, when speaking about imagery Neuhaus warned that the scaffolds he relied on so heavily in his pedagogical work on the composer were not to make the work 'accessible' to either the player or the audience, but to make the *process* of creating an interpretation accessible: 'I ask you to remember that I never "illustrate" music. I say [an image] can bring about the spiritual and

---

<sup>114</sup> *Советское искусство*, 17 April 1936.

<sup>115</sup> J. Thieffry, *Alfred Cortot's Studies in Musical Interpretation* (London: George G. Harrap & Co. Ltd., 1937) p.17.

visual impression; symbolize it. Music is only ever that music.<sup>116</sup> Similarly, Rubinstein had said that imagery was merely the 'thread' that guides the interpreter as he prepares 'to express the mood of the soul' – a 'process', but not a result.<sup>117</sup>

For Neuhaus Beethoven was a pinnacle of artistic and human achievement, and so the gap between what his music expressed and what an uninitiated listener could receive was hopelessly large. Neuhaus maintained:

When you play the last Beethoven Sonatas the listener must bring with him a huge richness, only then will he be in unison with your mood. It is said in vain that one can bring these last Beethoven sonatas to an unprepared listener.<sup>118</sup>

Neuhaus was never convinced of the idea that art could, or should, be accessible. He believed that 'a lot of stupidity was committed in the name of the *'всенародность'* [literally: 'all-peopleness'] of art:

Pushkin is less widely read than [Mikhail] Zoschenko [...]. It is possible to convince that Pushkin is better than Zoschenko, or Bach and Beethoven are better than Albeniz, but it is not all done at once. One needs to be led to such a conclusion.<sup>119</sup>

However with regards to Beethoven, Neuhaus's concerns on this issue were deeper, and quite separate from the political agenda surrounding the issue of *'всенародность'* at the time.<sup>120</sup> Although Neuhaus had wanted to give the impression that Beethoven's music, including the

---

<sup>116</sup> 'Прошу помнить, что я никогда не «иллюстрирую» музыку [...]. Я говорю, что она может вызвать духовное и зрительное впечатление, символизировать его. Всякая музыка есть только данная музыка.' Н. Г. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 39.

<sup>117</sup> A. G. Rubinstein, *Music and Those Who Represent It* p. 16.

<sup>118</sup> 'Когда играешь последние сонаты Бетховена, слушатель должен сам принести с собой громадное богатство; тогда он будет в унисон с твоим настроением. Напрасно говорят, что можно к неподготовленному слушателю сразу прийти с последними сонатами Бетховена.' Neuhaus's conversation with B. M. Teplov and A. V. Vitsinsky (6 December 1944) in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 107.

<sup>119</sup> 'Пушкина читают меньше, чем Зощенко [...]. Можно убедить, что Пушкин лучше, чем Зощенко или Бах и Бетховен лучше чем Альбениз, но это делается не сразу. К этому надо подвести.' Ibid.

<sup>120</sup> Namely, like with many pianist-interpreters of the time, Neuhaus's engagement with *'всенародность'* needs to be seen as a separate issue from the ideas of Social Realism which had such a significant effect on composers of the time. This issue of music belonging 'to the people' will be returned to in the next chapter in relation to Neuhaus's understanding of Chopin.



last sonatas, had been a central part of his childhood and youth, he was keen to point out the anomaly of his own early enculturation. In this sense Neuhaus was engaging with the concerns of musicians from the late nineteenth century, including Rubinstein (who stated: 'Beethoven [is difficult because he] expresses the metaphysical, the mystical'), or Rubinstein's student Piotr Ilyich Tchaikovsky who warned:<sup>121</sup>

[The works belonging to Beethoven's] late period will never be accessible to the understanding of even competent musical audiences [and will only be understood by] musician-specialists.<sup>122</sup>

Despite Neuhaus's belief that the majority of the audience was destined to be eluded by Beethoven's music, his constant championing of that composer's work, whether from the concert platform or as part of his pedagogical duties, demonstrates that he believed it was the interpreter's duty to offer the listener the chance (but not the right) to receive this music. Neuhaus's contrasting attitude to the music of J. S. Bach, whom he revered, was such that he did not feel a similar obligation, as an interpreter, to share this music with an audience: Although Neuhaus was known to have a vast Bach repertory; he would only rarely be coaxed to play Bach on the stage.

Neuhaus's sense of duty which he believed to fall onto a Beethoven interpreter is echoed in Rubinstein's statement:

He who performs Beethoven's sonatas must feel himself a missionary that turns the heathen towards the path of truth: he should feel in himself a priest who proclaims the holy word. It is a high challenge, and not an easy one!<sup>123</sup>

---

<sup>121</sup> '[...] до метафизического, до мистицизма.' A. G. Rubinstein, *Music and Those Who Represent It* p. 41.

<sup>122</sup> '[Позднее] Бетховен никогда не будет доступен даже компетентным музыкальным слушателям, и он останется доступен только музыкантам-специалистам.' П. И. Чайковский, *Музыкально-критические статьи* сост. Яковлев В. В. (Москва: «Государственное музыкальное издательство», 1953) [P. I. Tchaikovsky, *Articles of Musical Criticism* compiled by V. V. Yakovlev] (Moscow: 1953) p. 251.

<sup>123</sup> 'Кто исполняет сонаты Бетховена должен себя чувствовать миссионером, обращающим язычников на путь истины, должен в себе чувствовать жреца, провозглашающего святое слово. Задача высокая, но и не легкая!' A. G. Rubinstein, *Lectures in the History of Piano Literature* p. 95.

Neuhaus, who actively sought to be seen as following in Rubinstein's footsteps, would have been aware of the missionary-role Rubinstein carved out for the Beethoven interpreter – a role that under the guise of a different language he was keen to take on. Using nature, rather than religion, Neuhaus expressed his understanding of the interpreter's goals when performing Beethoven:

Not to lower the height, not to transmit the 'high style', but to make this very height comprehensible and natural – this inaccessibility and inapproachability: to show that the Alps and Himalayas are just as natural occurrences as ravines, fields and meadows.<sup>124</sup>

Just as Beethoven was not, in Neuhaus's opinion, a composer to be understood by the masses, it was very hard even for a great Beethoven interpreter to meet with Neuhaus's approval. Even a pianist such as Glenn Gould, whom Neuhaus considered 'a huge talent, a master, an extraordinary spirit and deep soul', did not satisfy Neuhaus with his Beethoven following his 1957 Moscow recital:<sup>125</sup>

Beethoven's Sonata No. 30 Opus 109 [...] did not move me in the same way as the Bach (especially Bach!) and the Alban Berg. All Gould's wonderful qualities – flawless mastery, clarity of thought, enchanting division of the phrase and ability to 'gather everything into a whole' (the entirety of the idea) were there. But I thought that he tries, like Artur Schnabel, to make Beethoven 'more accessible' than he really is. [The question of how] to make understandable and natural [Beethoven's] height [...], forgive me, but I believe that this challenge has not been solved by Gould.<sup>126</sup>

---

<sup>124</sup> 'Не снижать высоту, не передавать «высокий слог», а сделать понятной и естественной именно эту высоту, эту недоступность и неприступность, показать, что Альпы и Гималаи – явление столь же естественное, как равнины, поля и луга.' Г. Г. Нейгауз, 'Глен Гульд' [H. G. Neuhaus, 'Glenn Gould'] in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* pp. 211–212.

<sup>125</sup> '[...] огромный талант, большой мастер, высокий дух и глубокая душа [...].' Ibid.

<sup>126</sup> 'Однако 30-я соната Бетховена ор. 109, которую я слышал, произвела на меня далеко не столь сильное впечатление, как Бах (особенно Бах!) и Альбан Берг. Остались, конечно чудесные свойства Гульда – безупречное мастерство, ясность мысли, изумительное членение фразы и умение все собрать воедино (целостность замысла), – но мне казалось, что он старается, подобно Артуру Шнабелю, сделать Бетховена «доступнее», чем он есть на самом деле. [Вопрос, как] сделать понятной и естественной именно эту высоту [...], простите меня, но мне кажется, что эта задача еще не вполне разрешена Гульдом.' Ibid.

With the limited exchange of musical ideas from 'West' and 'East', Neuhaus admitted he knew little of Gould's work prior to the 1957 recital with the exception of a few records. Yet, in his analysis of Gould's performance aesthetics, it seems Neuhaus had stumbled on a tendency in Gould's understanding that was eventually voiced by the Canadian pianist in its more developed form in 1966. This tendency was the aspiration to make music not only more 'accessible' to each individual listener, but to allow that listener the ability to exert control on the result. Gould believed: 'fuller participation [will be] the future of the art of music' through recorded 'performance kits.'<sup>127</sup> For Neuhaus, the idea that the musical interpretation could be controlled by anyone other than the pianist, the figure who had taken on the responsibility of a composer's delegated authority, was an alien concept in reason and spirit that trespassed on the sanctity of the recital.

Neuhaus's sensitivity to the issue of oversimplifying Beethoven's persona extended even to Beethoven himself. For instance, Neuhaus admitted:

There are some things of Beethoven that I simply don't like. I don't like some of his pieces in G major, I don't like some of the Bagatelles – they are just bagatelles and nothing more. Of course they aren't bad, but they could have been written by other composers.<sup>128</sup>

In comparing Neuhaus's most disliked G major works, such as the Sonata No. 16 in G major Opus 31 no. 1 (which Rubinstein too deemed to be 'the weakest of Beethoven's sonatas') with an obvious example of one he adored, the Piano Concerto No. 4 in G major Opus 58, it is apparent that Neuhaus considered the works with little development of ideas, and a general lack of the intensity generated by conflicting themes, to be unworthy of Beethoven.<sup>129</sup> Similarly, Neuhaus seems to have been less than impressed that a figure of Beethoven's power might compose such nonchalant miniature works as the *Écossaises* and *Bagatelles* – works that

---

<sup>127</sup> From Gould's article 'The Prospects of Recording' as explored in K. Bazzana, *Glenn Gould. The Performer in the Work* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997). The idea of the 'performance kit' was, as explained by Bazzana to allow the listener to 'splice together segments from different performances of the same work... The future performer, in turn, might, instead of issuing completed performances, issue "kits" containing the raw materials (i.e. variant takes) from which the listener could splice together at home his own ideal version of a piece.' p. 80.

<sup>128</sup> 'Кое-что у Бетховена я просто не люблю. Не люблю вообще его некоторых пьес в соль мажоре, не люблю некоторые багателли – это именно багателли, и больше ничего. Конечно они не дурны, но их могли бы сочинять другие композиторы.' From an undated seminar for pedagogues documented in A. F. Nitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* pp. 164–165.

<sup>129</sup> 'Это, вероятно, самая слабая из сонат Бетховена.' A. G. Rubinstein, *Lectures in the History of Piano Literature* p. 51.

were too accessible in Neuhaus's mind through their lack of substance and intellectual challenge: '[Beethoven] needs vast horizons to express himself. He has so much Romanticism!'<sup>130</sup>

The exact details of what made a Beethoven-interpretation fail against Neuhaus's personal judgement of the negative concept of 'accessibility' is always going to remain a deeply subjective and contentious question. It is possible however, to consider Neuhaus's analogies in order to get a sense of the 'inaccessibility' that he wanted to express in his interpretations. The underlying framework around which Neuhaus centred his understanding of Beethoven was that the notion of 'inaccessibility' was linked to his understanding of Romanticism. In proposing that Beethoven, as an ultimate Romantic, needs vast canvases to express himself, Neuhaus indicates that through 'Romanticism' he does indeed mean 'conflict'. Neuhaus's explanation of why Beethoven is so elusive to interpreters indicates that the idea of conflict permeates not only the construction of music material, but also the essence of Beethoven: 'One of the greatest difficulties in transmitting Beethoven's music is that it is very passionate, lyrical, soulful and at the same time it stays on a cold, somewhat cold, or in other words – highly intellectual level.'<sup>131</sup>

In talking about Beethoven, Neuhaus frequently highlighted the 'extreme intellectuality and discipline' that he considered inherent to the music – characteristics that notably lack special emphasis in Anton Rubinstein's numerous descriptions of the composer in favour of underlining the heroic and tempestuous emotional strife in his work.<sup>132</sup> For instance, the photograph of Neuhaus dating from the 1950s, reproduced many times including on the inner cover to the anthology *Heinrich Neuhaus* (Y. Milstein (ed.), 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, Moscow: 1983), captures Neuhaus in a characteristic learned-pose with an *Urtext* edition of the Beethoven Piano Sonatas [see Figure 6].

The erudite manner captured in the photograph ties well to critical opinion of Neuhaus at the height of his pianistic career in the 1930s: 'Through his [interpretation of] *Beethoven*

---

<sup>130</sup> 'Ему же нужны большие горизонты, чтобы высказаться. У него столько романтики!' From an undated seminar for pedagogues documented in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* pp. 164–165.

<sup>131</sup> 'Одна из главных трудностей в передаче музыки Бетховена состоит в том, что она очень страстная, лирическая, душевная и одновременно пребывает на холодном, условно-холодном, другими словами высокоинтеллектуальном уровне.' From a seminar for pedagogues on the 28 January 1946 documented in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 151.

<sup>132</sup> Neuhaus's seminar for music teachers held on the 9 December 1938 as documented in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 110.

[Neuhaus] is one of the brightest representatives of the Soviet artistic intelligentsia.<sup>133</sup> Likewise, the intellectuality mirrors the seriousness with which Neuhaus expected an audience to receive his interpretations of Beethoven:

I do feel pleased with success superficially, but [...] [o]nce when in Tbilisi I played [the *Hammerklavier* Sonata Opus 106] exceptionally well, the public went wild – shouted as if I were a singer. It really irritated me, and in the green room I said: ‘I’m not a ballerina; I’m an old professor. Why are they screaming?’<sup>134</sup>

The predominantly intellectual manner that Neuhaus’s relationship with Beethoven evoked in the minds of Russian critics and audiences contrasts with the inspired but tumultuous impression that Rubinstein’s interpretations of the composer had left. Harold Schonberg’s analysis highlighted the overriding perception, which had already become famous through caricatures such as that printed in *Punch* in 1886 [see Figure 7]:

He looked like Beethoven and he played like Beethoven, making the piano erupt volcanically and not always very disciplined about it [sic.]. Wrong notes, broken strings – these did not matter. The audience went home limp, knowing it had run into a force of nature.<sup>135</sup>

---

<sup>133</sup> ‘[...] в Бетховене [Нейгауз] один из ярких представителей советской художественной интеллигенции.’ From an article by K. Grimih [К. Гримих] (1933) quoted in D. A. Rabinovich, *Portraits of Pianists* (Moscow: 1962) p. 58.

<sup>134</sup> ‘Мне доставляет удовлетворение и внешний успех, но [...] [к]ак-то в Тифлисе я играл [Наммерклавьерсонате] с большим подъёмом, и публика страшно неистовствовала, кричала, как будто бы я певец. Меня это рассердило, и я говорю в артистической: «Я же не балерина, я старый профессор. Что же они орут?»’ Neuhaus’s conversation with B. M. Teplov and A. V. Vitsinsky (6 December 1944) in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 107.

<sup>135</sup> H. Schonberg, *The Great Pianists from Mozart to the Present* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1987) p. 269.



Figure 6 Heinrich Neuhaus, photograph c. 1950s as presented on the first page of Yakov Milstein's *Heinrich Neuhaus* (Moscow: 1983)



Figure 7 'Typhoon over England' – Caricature of Anton Rubinstein in *Punch* (1886)

Neuhaus's years studying abroad in Europe allowed him to trace his desire to engage with the intellectual aspect to Beethoven through his pianistic roots. Whereas Neuhaus had constructed for himself a pianistic lineage through Rubinstein to Liszt to engage with the view of Beethoven as the first Romantic composer based on Liszt's ideology of interpretation and advocacy of the composer, he also created something of a counter-lineage. This counter-lineage can be identified as coming through Neuhaus's professor Karl Heinrich Barth. Barth had himself been a student of Hans von Bülow – widely considered as a very academic musician and antipode to Anton Rubinstein.<sup>136</sup> Barth had also been a long-term accompanist of the violinist Joseph Joachim who had publicly dissociated himself from Liszt's Weimar *Neudeutsche Schule* and was a close collaborator of Brahms.

Neuhaus's two distinct pianistic lineages which he created to grapple with the conflict of emotion and intellect in Beethoven therefore mirrored to a certain degree the heated late-nineteenth century debates: one side which continued to recognize Liszt as the inheritor of Beethoven's spirit, and the other which saw Beethoven as an unsurpassable end of an era with Brahms displacing Liszt for the title of Beethoven's successor and inheritor by the 1860s.<sup>137</sup> At this same time, Russia had managed to bypass both Brahms and an equivalent Leipzig-Berlin movement: As Bülow's celebrated aphorism of the 'three Bs in music' ('I believe in Bach the father, Beethoven the son, and Brahms the holy ghost of music') had gripped Europe,<sup>138</sup> Rubinstein (who was both widely travelled and well acquainted with Bülow) deliberately spoke about only 'two musical Titans' in his Historic Lectures – Bach and Beethoven.<sup>139</sup>

Thus, Neuhaus's early studies in Europe must have given him a balance of aesthetic understanding in relation to Beethoven that he simply would not have encountered in the Russian musical establishments at the time. In the early years of the twentieth century Brahms's piano music was only heard in specialist groups and remained a rarity in Eastern

---

<sup>136</sup> See for example extracts from Russian and Central European musical criticism in L. A. Barenboim, *Anton Rubinstein Volume 2* pp. 174–176 or in Western literature: H. Schonberg, 'Chapter XVI 'Tyrant and Intellectual' in *The Great Pianists from Mozart to the Present* pp. 243–254 and Chapter XVIII 'Thunder from the East' pp. 269–280; and A. Walker, *Hans von Bülow. A Life and Times* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010) pp. 7 & 215.

<sup>137</sup> In Robert Schumann's last published piece of musical criticism, 'Neue Bahnen' printed in the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* in 1853, he claims that the then unknown twenty-year-old Johannes Brahms was the inheritor of Beethoven's spirit. This view was upheld by Eduard Hanslick and Hans von Bülow (who famously called Brahms's first symphony 'Beethoven's tenth').

<sup>138</sup> A. Walker, *Hans von Bülow. A Life and Times* p. 7 (citation from an interview with Bülow in *The Etude*).

<sup>139</sup> A. G. Rubinstein, *Lectures in the History of Piano Literature*. An example of such a citation can be found on p. 94.

Europe even by the 1940s. Konstantin Igumnov talked about being aware of the organization of a small 'Brahms circle', *Brahmsverein*, set up by a handful of Leipzig-educated musicians in Moscow only in the late 1900s.<sup>140</sup> From accounts of many of the most famous Soviet pianists and pedagogues in the mid-twentieth century it is evident that Brahms was rarely heard in concert (a notable exception being the *Variations and Fugue on a Theme by Handel* Opus 24 and, less so, the two books of *Paganini Variations* Opus 35): In particular, the piano cycles that are now considered central to Brahms' oeuvre such as Opuses 10, 76, 116, 117, 118 and 119 were seldom learnt or performed. It is also significant that Neuhaus, whose performing career in Russia began to come to the wider public's attention in the 1920s, was considered one of the pioneers in terms of introducing Brahms to the Russian and Soviet musical and wider cultural spheres.<sup>141</sup>

While studying with Barth in Berlin, Neuhaus eagerly followed his professor's recitals in which the programme frequently paired the works by Beethoven and Brahms such as on the 19 November 1910: 'Beethoven Sonata cis-moll [*Moonlight*] and Brahms's *Paganini-Variations* [Opus 35] (!)'<sup>142</sup> Neuhaus too took an interest in studying the works of Brahms alongside his beloved Beethoven. He wrote to his parents in 1909 that whilst preparing the Beethoven Sonatas 'D-dur [No. 15 in D major Opus 28, *Pastorale*], d-moll [No. 17 in D minor Opus 32 no. 2, *Tempest*] and e-moll [No. 27 in E minor Opus 90]' he was also looking at some small works by Brahms including the Rhapsody in G minor Opus 79 no. 2.<sup>143</sup> Further, in 1910 Neuhaus wrote to his parents to inform them that he had brought for his advancement the four-handed

---

<sup>140</sup> К. Н. Игумнов, 'О творческом пути и исполнительском искусстве пианиста. Из бесед с психологами. Редакция и комментарии М. Смирнова' in М. Г. Соколов (составитель), *Пианисты рассказывают. Выпуск второй* (Москва: «Музыка», 1984) [K. N. Igumnov, 'About the Artistic Path and Art of the Pianist's Interpretation. From Conversations with Psychologists. Edited with commentaries by M. Smirnov' in M. G. Sokolov (ed.), *Pianists Speak. Issue 2* (Moscow: 1984)] p. 37. It must be noted that Sergei Taneyev made his Moscow debut as a pianist performing Brahms's First Piano Concerto in D minor Opus 15 in 1875. See D. Brown, *Tchaikovsky: The Crisis Years 1874–1878* (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1983) p. 15.

<sup>141</sup> If the opinions of Neuhaus' close friend, Boris Pasternak, are anything to go by as a barometer of wider cultural feeling, then it can be seen as significant that Pasternak saw Brahms as a symbol of the Neuhaus-Pasternak relationship. To this effect Pasternak composed an untitled poem in which he laments that in years to come he will hear Brahms being played and will be moved beyond tears and that in the 'meadow' of the intermezzo [Opus 117] he sees the shadows the Neuhaus-Pasternak families. (The poem is published in Н. М. Зимянина (составитель), *Станислав Нейгауз. Воспоминания. Письма. Материалы* (Москва: «Советский Композитор», 1988) [N. M. Zimyanina (ed.), *Stanislav Neuhaus. Reminiscences. Letters. Materials* (Moscow: 1988)] pp. 45–46).

<sup>142</sup> Neuhaus's letter to his parents from Berlin in *Letters* p. 149.

<sup>143</sup> Neuhaus's letter to his parents from Florence sent 15 March 1909. *Ibid.* p. 116.



arrangements of Brahms's symphonies which he planned to study 'most diligently and play them' as a 'matter of great urgency!'<sup>144</sup>

Neuhaus's desire to engage with a more cerebral or intellectual approach to Beethoven as a counter-balance to the Romanticism he had found for himself in the image of Rubinstein, was likewise reinforced in his studies with Godowsky. According to Neuhaus:

Some people considered that Godowsky's strict, business-like method of teaching was of little interest. [...] Godowsky was not an artist with a tempestuous temperament like Anton Rubinstein. His interpretation was not as captivating, there was no boiling, volcanic passion. But, the precision of the finish, the crystal-clear phrasing and perfect technical mastery always amazed his listeners.<sup>145</sup>

Despite Neuhaus's attempts to align himself to his professor's erudite manner, Godowsky nonetheless perceived Neuhaus's natural pianism as one suffused with Romantic inclinations: 'You have your own, different individuality and so I shall not violate it.'<sup>146</sup> Likewise, Neuhaus's attempts to please Barth and accommodate the more laconic pianism from Bülow's legacy were also apparently not completely convincing for, as already mentioned, Barth noted: '*Sie stecken noch in der russischen Haut!* [I see very clearly that you are stuck in a Russian skin!]'<sup>147</sup>

One of the clearest manifestations then of the two pianistic lineages which Neuhaus devised for his interpretation of Beethoven is in his attitude to the score – a collision of the intellectuality of his 'modern' European schooling and the emotionality of his Romantic, Rubinsteinian imagination. In complete unison with today's mainstream pianistic training at conservatory-level, Neuhaus's pedagogical work emphasized the need for textual fidelity in general. By extension, Neuhaus thus demanded access to an edition with the least editorial interference. His keen knowledge of contemporary and historical editorial editions is evident

---

<sup>144</sup> 'основательно проиграть и изучить. [...] У меня в этом огромная потребность.' Neuhaus's letter to his parents from Berlin sent in 1910. See *Letters* p. 144.

<sup>145</sup> 'Годовский не был художником стихийного темперамента, вроде Антона Рубинштейна. Исполнение его не так захватывало, в нём не было кипучей вулканической страсти. Но точность отделки, кристальная ясность фразировки, совершенство технического мастерства всегда изумляли слушателей.' Г. Г. Нейгауз, 'Памяти Леопольда Годовского' (1939) [H. G. Neuhaus, 'In Memory of Leopold Godowsky' (1939)] in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 171.

<sup>146</sup> 'У вас есть собственная индивидуальность, – сказал Годовский, – и я не буду её насиловать.' *Ibid.*

<sup>147</sup> 'Отлично вижу, что Вы застряли в русской шкуре.' Neuhaus's letter to his parents sent from Berlin dated 20 May 1910 in *Letters* p. 136.

from the references to the topic he made in *About the Art of Piano Playing*, as well as in his lessons.<sup>148</sup> Neuhaus's editorial collaborations with Yakov Milstein on some of the Chopin editions corroborate his interest in editorial practices and confirm through the extensive appendices that this was a scholarly undertaking examining source materials.<sup>149</sup> Yet, Neuhaus's demand for a pianist to work from a suitable edition was most unyielding and fraught in relation to Beethoven. Given his training with Godowsky and Barth, who were notoriously pedantic to the letter of the score, it is unsurprising that he was drawn to the *Urtext* edition, a fact confirmed by the photograph referred to earlier [Figure 6]: 'I have looked at different editions and have to say that the one I like most is the one which Beethoven himself had seen – the "Urtext" edition.'<sup>150</sup>

It is interesting to note however, that Neuhaus did not simply accept the Beethoven-*Urtext* as a source that reflected Beethoven's exact intentions. In fact, rather than consider the *Urtext* as a scholarly undertaking, Neuhaus saw it rather as an opportunity to be as close as possible to Beethoven's persona: '[In the *Urtext*] there are absurd misprints – but their absurdity is dear to me because Beethoven saw them and was angry at them, and wrote those fuming letters.'<sup>151</sup> Neuhaus's needs from an edition of Beethoven's work went beyond the convenience of a score that presented the most accurate notation of a piece. Neuhaus saw a score as a means for his own intellectual stimulation: he was not deterred by 'absurd misprints' if he could find a justification that his own reaction to them was mirroring Beethoven's.

This critical attitude to the *Urtext* can be seen for instance in Neuhaus's interpretation of the third movement of Beethoven's Sonata No. 31 in A-flat major Opus 110.<sup>152</sup> Here, according to his recording of the work, Neuhaus does not play the repeated A in bar 5 in

<sup>148</sup> See the published transcripts to Neuhaus's lessons in 'Open Lessons' (A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus*) as well as the recordings of some of Neuhaus's last lessons made by Pavel Lobanov.

<sup>149</sup> Neuhaus contributed to the edition of the four Chopin *Ballades* published by «Музгиз» ['Muzgiz'] in 1951 as well as the *Valses* in 1953. The project of a complete Chopin edition was meant to be a collaboration between Lev Oborin, Heinrich Neuhaus and Yakov Milstein. Work on the project took place between 1951 and 1962 but was never completed. See [http://www.chopin.pl/score\\_publications.en.html](http://www.chopin.pl/score_publications.en.html) (accessed 08/12/2013).

<sup>150</sup> 'Смотрел в разные издания и должен сказать, что больше всего я люблю то, которое сам Бетховен просматривал, – издание уртекста.' From a seminar held on the 28 January 1946 in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 161.

<sup>151</sup> 'Там есть некоторые нелепые опечатки, но их нелепость мне дорога уже потому, что Бетховен их видел и сердился на них, писал злобные письма.' *Ibid.*

<sup>152</sup> Recording from the early 1950s (Moscow) issued on Classical Records. Catalogue number CR-099: *The Art of Henry Neuhaus. Beethoven Sonatas no. 14 "Moonlight", no. 17, 24, 30, 31* released 2008. Track 14.

accordance to widespread editorial practice stemming from the Schlesinger (Berlin: 1822) first edition (still found in the G. Henle Verlag *Urtext* in print today).<sup>153</sup> Instead Neuhaus adds the apparently missing semiquaver after the first dotted quaver to complete the otherwise incomplete rhythm (see Figure 8). This has the consequence that the slurs are adjusted accordingly as given in the edition by Hans von Bülow published by J. G. Cotta (Stuttgart: 1875) (see Figure 9). How much of this decision is indebted to the Bülow edition, or whether it is a coincidence, is impossible to say.

---

<sup>153</sup> Edited by Bertha Antonia Wallner.



Figure 8 Third movement from Beethoven’s Sonata No. 31 in A-flat major Opus 110. Bars 4–6. Schlesinger first edition.



Figure 9 Third movement from Beethoven’s Sonata No. 31 in A-flat major Opus 110. Bars 4–6. Hans von Bülow, Cotta edition.

It is known however, that Neuhaus was also drawn to the performing editions of the sonatas by Hans von Bülow. Neuhaus frequently encouraged students and audiences at his seminars and open lessons to interest themselves in Bülow's edition and often quoted the editorial remarks from it. Neuhaus maintained that the Bülow edition was amongst the most valuable resources open to a pianist. Undoubtedly Neuhaus's studies with Barth must have contributed significantly to the respect that he felt for Bülow: Neuhaus insisted that the beauty of Bülow's edition was the way it enabled one, through its suggestions and alterations, 'to observe the "handwriting" of a great musician', thus demonstrating how important it was for Neuhaus to be able to engage with Bülow's own legacy as an interpreter.<sup>154</sup>

Intriguingly, Neuhaus's admiration for Bülow's work did not translate itself to the editorial work of other leading Beethoven interpreters and thereby reiterates how important status and legacy, rather than pure rationale, were for Neuhaus's interpretative decisions. Neuhaus had a notable aversion to the performing editions of Artur Schnabel (published by Simon & Schuster, 1935) and even more so to those of Goldenweiser (published in 1937 by the *Государственное музыкальное издательство* [State Music Publishing House], and a subsequent revised second edition in 1957). Neuhaus's irate reaction towards a student who dared to bring Goldenweiser's edition to class was summed up by one of his students, Valery Voskoboinikov: 'Heinrich Gustavovich threw the volume of Beethoven sonatas edited by Goldenweiser, which he could not stand, onto the floor. He was frightfully irritated that his students used such an edition.'<sup>155</sup> A similar reaction can also be heard during one of the lessons recorded by Lobanov in 1954, where Neuhaus worked on the *Finale* of the *Aurora/Waldstein* Sonata with T. Grodskaya.<sup>156</sup>

Neuhaus's reaction is surprising given that Goldenweiser's editorial work followed closely in the footsteps of Bülow. Both editions offer detailed performing commentaries with advice that the musicians felt clarified the composer's wishes. Both editions include editorial revisions such as phrase marks, redistributions of textures, fingerings, pedalling and variants of

<sup>154</sup> From a seminar held on the 28 January 1946 in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 161.

<sup>155</sup> 'Генрих Густавович швырнул том сонат Бетховена в редакции Гольденвейзера, которую он терпеть не мог, страшно раздражённый тем, что его ученики пользуются таким изданием.' В. М. Воскобойников, 'О самом любимом и дорогом. О самых любимых и дорогих'. [V. M. Voskoboinikov, 'About the Most Loved and Dearest Things. About the Most Loved and Cherished Ones.']. in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 353.

<sup>156</sup> Track 1 on CD accompanying A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus*. A selection of Neuhaus's lessons was issued on *Melodiya* as an LP *Уроки профессора Нейгауза* [*The Lessons of Professor Neuhaus*] in 1971 [33Д-022885, 33Д-022886, 33Д-022887, 33Д-022888, 33Д-019959, 33Д-019960]. Other recordings which were part of Lobanov's private archive have also now been released on a CD with this anthology.

pitch, and Goldenweiser's clearly delineates his own editorial work as such. Like Bülow, and indeed Neuhaus, Goldenweiser had felt a deep, even sacred reverence before what he believed to be the composer's wishes. In the preface to his edition Goldenweiser confirmed:

We know that the genius pianist Anton Rubinstein and his famous student Josef Hofmann insistently preached [for the need of] an accurate execution of the author's text – which did not hinder either of them in being brightly expressive artistic individuals, absolutely different to each other. [...] When working on the sonatas of Beethoven it is of the utmost importance to thoroughly and accurately learn and render the text.<sup>157</sup>

Largely, the only issue that could have upset Neuhaus in Goldenweiser's 1937 edition would have been the fact that many slurs had been changed (although one must note that Bülow too had changed many slurs and phrase marks). Samuil Feinberg, also an authoritative Beethoven interpreter and former student of Goldenweiser, noted:

Goldenweiser's edition is one of the best because it uses the texts of those editions that were published within the lifetime of Beethoven [...], because of the commentaries it has and the deciphering of a whole range of ornaments [...]. I will however allow myself to criticize one thing. It seems to me that Alexander Borisovich changed Beethoven's slurs because he understood them in a contemporary way: the slur ends and the hand is lifted. Now the sonatas will come out in a new edition by Goldenweiser, and all the slurs will be reinstated. Alexander Borisovich has acknowledged his mistakes.<sup>158</sup>

---

<sup>157</sup> 'Мы знаем, что гениальный пианист Антон Рубинштейн и его замечательный ученик Иосиф Гофман, оба настойчиво проповедовали точное выполнение авторского текста, что не мешало им быть ярко выраженными и абсолютно друг на друга не похожими артистическими индивидуальностями. [...] При работе над сонатами Бетховена совершенно необходимо тщательное и точное изучение и воспроизведение их текста.' *Людвиг ван Бетховен. 32 Сонаты для фортепиано*. Редакция А. Б. Гольденвейзера (Москва: «Государственное музыкальное издательство», 1957) [*Ludwig van Beethoven. 32 Sonatas for Piano edited by Alexander Goldenweiser* (Moscow: 1957)] p. 6.

<sup>158</sup> 'Издание Гольденвейзера – одно из самых замечательных прежде всего потому, что в нем сохранен текст тех изданий, которые вышли еще при жизни Бетховена [...] по комментариям, которые имеются, и по той расшифровке целого ряда украшений [...]. Но одну вещь я разрешу себе покритиковать. Мне кажется, что Александр Борисович потому переменил бетховенские лиги, что он понял эти лиги в современном смысле: лига кончается, и надо снять руку. Сейчас

Yet, in changing the slurs, Goldenweiser had evidently not meant to encroach upon, or recompose the author's text. Rather, as with the pedal suggestions, he was obviously trying to adjust the notation to fit with a more contemporary understanding. Specifically, as explained by Feinberg, the understanding of contemporary pianists evolved around the pedal. This means that slur markings are understood as whole phrases, whereas Classical slurs reflected 'bow markings'. Hence, a modern pianist reading a Classical slur must be aware that he is looking at a bow change, and not at the beginning or end of a melodic phrase.<sup>159</sup> That Goldenweiser only sought to clarify this issue in his Beethoven edition, rather than modify, can be seen from his memoirs:

I once heard Busoni's interpretation of Beethoven's Fifth Concerto sitting next to Nikolai Medtner. I will never forget how Busoni's offhand attitude to Beethoven's text disturbed [Medtner] – I fully shared in his reaction. [...] Busoni did not want to understand the difference between a transcription, where the transcriber is up to a point the author [...] and an edition. Busoni did not understand that when a musician is not a transcriber but an editor, this attitude to the composer's work is unacceptable. The editor's role is first and foremost to give the interpreter the opportunity to understand the author's text in complete immunity.<sup>160</sup>

Goldenweiser was not the only twentieth-century musician to have compensated for Beethoven's different understanding of slurs. Schnabel prefaced his 1935 Beethoven edition with the remark:

---

сонаты Бетховена выйдут в новой редакции Гольденвейзера, и все лиги будут восстановлены: Александр Борисович признал свои ошибки.' С. Е. Фейнберг, 'О фортепианной музыке Моцарта и Бетховена. Стенограмма беседы' [S. E. Feinberg, 'About the Piano Music of Mozart and Beethoven. Stenograph of a Conversation'] in M. G. Sokolov (ed.), *Pianists Speak. Issue 2* pp. 217–218.

<sup>159</sup> Ibid. p. 217.

<sup>160</sup> 'Помню, случилось мне однажды слушать 5-й концерт Бетховена в исполнении Бузони, сидя в зале с Н. К. Метнером. Я никогда не забуду его возмущения бесцеремонностью обращения Бузони с бетховенским текстом, возмущения, которое я вполне разделял. [...] Бузони не хотел понять разницы между транскрипцией, где транскриптор является до известной степени автором, [...] и редакцией. Бузони не понимал, что, когда музыкант является не транскриптором, а редактором, такое отношение к произведению композитора совершенно недопустимо. Цель редактора прежде всего и главным образом должна заключаться в том, чтобы дать возможность исполнителю уяснить в полной неприкосновенности авторский текст.' А. В. Goldenweiser, *Reminiscences* pp. 401–402.

Slurs, as well as accents and indications relating to touch, are sometimes marked so carelessly and confusingly in the original (especially in the earlier works) that the editor has felt it his right and even musical duty to change these to correspond with logic, idea and taste: to shorten, lengthen, add and interpret [*'zu verkürzen, zu verlängern, zu ergänzen, zu deuten'*].

Unlike Goldenweiser, Schnabel warned that 'changes of this kind are not especially noted'.<sup>161</sup>

Aware that the revised slurring was a contentious issue, Goldenweiser rectified this in his subsequent (second) edition. In the preface to the new 1957 edition Goldenweiser acknowledged:

The main change concerns the slurs. [...] I allowed myself in the previous edition to change Beethoven's slurs in relation to how I understood the idea of their 'syntax' in his music. Now however I have become convinced that despite the mentioned inaccuracies and ambiguities, in Beethoven's slurs one can see much more than it seems at first glance.<sup>162</sup>

Despite this correction, Neuhaus did not feel this had redeemed Goldenweiser's editorial effort and did not write or speak to acknowledge this second edition. Neuhaus remained stubbornly unconvinced as to the validity of Goldenweiser's interpretative decisions and taste in general. For instance, he mocked what he believed to be Goldenweiser's 'sanitary', 'safe' and 'academic' pedalling.<sup>163</sup> The well-documented criticism that the two musicians held for each other sat strangely with their ardent respect for one another as colleagues as shown by documents such as Goldenweiser's diary: 'Many of [Neuhaus's] ideas are proper and valuable. It is amazing – with such a drastic difference in style, so much in essence, coincides with my thoughts.'<sup>164</sup> Neuhaus's aversive attitude towards Goldenweiser's edition therefore may not have been entirely objective or logical. Most likely, personal preferences and professional

<sup>161</sup> *Ludwig van Beethoven. 32 Piano Sonatas edited by Artur Schnabel* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1935).

<sup>162</sup> 'Главное изменение касается лиг. [...] В настоящее время я убедился, что, несмотря на указанные недочёты и неясности, в лигах Бетховена можно распознать гораздо больше, чем это кажется на первый взгляд.' *Ludwig van Beethoven. 32 Sonatas for Piano edited by Alexander Goldenweiser* (Moscow: 1957) p. 3.

<sup>163</sup> '[...] санитарная [...] академическая педаль.' V. M. Voskoboynikov, 'About the Most Loved and Dearest Things. About the Most Loved and Cherished Ones' in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 353 and D. Paperno, *Notes of a Moscow Pianist* (Oregon: Amadeus Press, 1998) p. 104.

<sup>164</sup> *Ibid.* p. 105.



relationships were not entirely absent from Neuhaus's judgements regarding Goldenweiser's achievements either as a pianist or editor.

Whether or not the alterations of slurs had caused Neuhaus to dismiss Goldenweiser's and Schnabel's Beethoven edition, recordings of Neuhaus playing Beethoven show that his understanding of articulation and phrasing *does* take into account the idea of a Classical string-orientated slur.<sup>165</sup> The short phrase marks in the *Allegretto* from Beethoven's Sonata No. 14 in C-sharp minor Opus 27 no. 2 'Moonlight', recorded by Neuhaus at some point between 1947 and 1950, are a particularly good illustration of this.<sup>166</sup> Neuhaus's approach to the end point of the first phrase (bar 2<sup>1</sup>) is such that, rather than anticipate and elongate the rest at bar 2<sup>2</sup>, it lingers so as not to actively highlight the staccato [see Figure 10 and CD Track 4]. The subsequent staccato crotchets (bars 2<sup>3</sup>, 3<sup>1</sup>, 3<sup>3</sup> and 4<sup>1</sup>: Refer to CD Track 4; first six seconds) are treated in a detached but not sharp stroke. This more docile staccato which answers the initial slurred motion serves to link the two short phrases – a device which pianistically requires the hand to remain in motion between the two sets of contrasting material, similar to a change in the bow direction but not a termination of its movement.

Neuhaus's treatment of the slurs in the *Trio* of the same movement [see Figure 11 and CD Track 4 beginning at 0.49 min] is striking in his reluctance to allow the marked slurs to break up the line. The slurs give the passage inflection, but Neuhaus does not allow for the sounds of the final note of the slur and the neighbouring note to be separated by silence. Neuhaus accentuates the length of the resulting phrase (from the anacrusis to bar 37 to bar 44) by once again letting the staccato (e.g. bar 39<sup>3</sup> – CD Track 4 at 0.53 min) take on a lingering separation such as that achieved in 'brushing' the key rather than taking the fingers actively off the key. By underplaying the interruption of both the *sf* and *fp*, Neuhaus uses these markings to emphasize the syncopation of the slurred motif and thus avoids disruption to the line.

Neuhaus's interpretation of the slur in this movement contrasts to the manner in which it manifested itself in the playing of many pianists that had evolved under Neuhaus's wider pedagogical influence. The interpretation of this same movement by Maria Grinberg in her 1961 recording, as part of her complete Beethoven set, shows a much greater desire to highlight the difference between the staccato and slurred elements of the movement [CD

<sup>165</sup> In fact, Neuhaus's interpretation of the slurs sits comfortably with Goldenweiser's modified longer slurs that accommodate for the modern understanding of slurs on the piano.

<sup>166</sup> Classical Records. Catalogue number CR-099: *The Art of Henry Neuhaus. Beethoven Sonatas no. 14 "Moonlight", no. 17, 24, 30, 31* released 2008. Track 2.

Track 5].<sup>167</sup> Grinberg had studied with Neuhaus's uncle, Felix Blumenfeld, and later with Konstantin Igumnov, yet said that she had consciously struggled to free herself from Neuhaus's influence.<sup>168</sup> The first sounds of Grinberg's slurs are much more uniformly defined than Neuhaus's, resulting in the syncopation throughout the movement being more persistent as a structural feature as opposed to being a lilting part of the inflection heard in Neuhaus's interpretation.

The interpretation of Emil Gilels (who had studied with Neuhaus at the Moscow Conservatory between 1935 and 1937) for his Beethoven set in 1983 [CD Track 6], shows an even more extreme difference in the juxtaposition of the slurred and staccato elements.<sup>169</sup> Gilels's approach to the staccato articulation in the movement is much sharper; with the resulting notes sounding longer than in either Neuhaus's or Grinberg's recording. In the *Trio* (See Figure 11: 1.00 min to 1.16 min on CD Track 6) Gilels's approach to the slurs follows that identified by Feinberg as the 'modern' approach – where the slur ends, the hand is audibly lifted. As a result, Gilels's line in the passage finds its shape and direction as a mosaic of individually differentiated and sculpted elements as designated by the slur marking.

---

<sup>167</sup> *Melodiya*. Catalogue number B000OGT2D6: *Maria Grinberg. Beethoven Piano Sonatas Nos. 11, 12, 13, 14 (Volume IV)*. Released 2011. Recorded 1966. Track 15.

<sup>168</sup> See Maria Grinberg's interviews in А. В. Вицинский, *Беседы с пианистами, 1944/9* (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2007) [A. V. Vitsinsky, *Conversations with Pianists, 1944/9* (Moscow: 2007)] pp. 216–228.

<sup>169</sup> 'Deutsche Grammophon' Catalogue number DGG 4776360: *Emil Gilels. Beethoven 29 Piano Sonatas*. 9 CD-set released 13 November 2006. Recorded September 1980. CD 5 Track 6.



Figure 10 Bars 1–8 from the second movement of Opus 27 no. 2



Figure 11 Bars 37–44 from the second movement of Opus 27 no. 2

Neuhaus's avoidance of disrupting the unity of the line, despite the juxtaposition of contrasting articulation, was an issue about which he felt very strongly. He often remarked that students often did not make transitions between different elements in Beethoven quickly enough and thus weakened their effect.<sup>170</sup> In the case of the *Moonlight Sonata* however, Neuhaus clearly saw the main interpretational aspect to the work as its definition into three contrasting movements, and thus to present each movement within the framework of a defined and consistent character. In the mock-lesson that Neuhaus offers on the work in *About the Art of Piano Playing*, he is unable to restrain his Romantic inclination for the use of poetic images. Neuhaus's Rubinsteinian need to concentrate the interpreter's attention beyond the surface and letter score takes the upper hand as he recalls Liszt's advice to see the overarching structure of the sonata as encompassing '*une fleur entre deux abîmes*' ['a flower between two abysses']. Neuhaus expanded:

The first movement is the expression of the deepest sorrow, and the third – despair (*disperato*). [They] are clearer and more definite, stronger in their stunning expressiveness than the unsteady, 'modest', and refined yet frightfully simple – almost weightless *Allegretto*. The 'comforting' mood of the second movement (in the spirit of a Consolation) can, with the insufficiently sensitive student, easily turn into a merry *scherzando* that from its very root contradicts the meaning of the piece.<sup>171</sup>

Neuhaus's attempt to unify the 'unsteady' *Allegretto* is revealed in his extension of Liszt's flower-analogy which Neuhaus hoped would inspire a way to understand 'not only the spirit, but also *the form* of the piece'. In this capacity Neuhaus expressed the idea that the slurred part of the melody should 'inadvertently remind one of the cup of a flower' and the staccato – 'leaves suspended on the stem.'<sup>172</sup> This analogy of the flower, with its evocative ideas of delicacy and beauty, naturally discourages sharp staccato and strong contours.

<sup>170</sup> For instance, see Neuhaus's conversation with pedagogues on the 9 December 1938 in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 110.

<sup>171</sup> 'Первая часть – выражение глубочайшей скорби – и третья – отчаяния (*disperato*) – более ясны и определённы, более сильны в своей потрясающей выразительности, чем зыбкое, «скромное», утончённое и одновременно страшно простое, почти невесомое *Allegretto*. «Утешительное» настроение (в духе *Consolation*) во второй части у недостаточно чутких учеников легко переходит в увеселительное *scherzando*, в корне противоречащее смыслу произведения.' Н. Г. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 38.

<sup>172</sup> '[...] первые такты мелодии напоминают поневоле раскрывающуюся чашечку цветка, а последующие – свисающие на стебле листья.' *Ibid* p. 39.

Likewise, the unity of the object (the bloom itself and the leaves) is connected through the stem, and so encourages nuanced inflection rather than any abrupt separation of elements.

Neuhaus's dependence on subjective imagery in the interpretation of Beethoven, despite his desire to be seen as a modern pianist through his constructed lineage to the intellectuality of Brahms and Bülow, could be understood as simply a way to coax out a satisfactory interpretation of Beethoven from his students: 'I notice that students as a rule understand him too distinctly, prosaically. Maybe this is because the composer is so substantially far from our time and his music is highly intellectual.'<sup>173</sup> His need to Romanticize Beethoven, however, can also be seen as arising from his own need as an interpreter to see himself in the composer's music – to feel Beethoven's 'work as if his own'.<sup>174</sup> To this extent Gilels recalled that Neuhaus was a 'product of his time', of a Romantic age, and that this influenced everything that he did:

I studied Beethoven's *Aurora* [No. 21 Opus 53] with Neuhaus. The second movement (Adagio molto) according to Neuhaus, is a 'velvet night'; a southern-Italian velvet night which is followed by dawn. It is beautiful, but it is excessively brought about by feelings – the desire to express the personally gained pleasure from this 'velvet night'; a Romantic modification. There is no distance that is so characteristic of Beethoven (and for the great landscape artists): 'I stand somewhere above all this and gaze from here on what is happening in nature.' Later I played this sonata completely differently to Neuhaus.<sup>175</sup>

<sup>173</sup> 'Я замечаю, и это почти как правило, что ученики понимают его слишком отвлеченно, прозаично. Может быть, потому что композитор значительно отдалён от нашего времени и музыка его высоко интеллектуальна.' From a conversation with pedagogues on the 9 December 1938 in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 110.

<sup>174</sup> Already quoted. See Г. Г. Нейгауз, 'Великое и простое' [H. G. Neuhaus, 'The Great and Simple'] in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 177.

<sup>175</sup> 'Проходил я у него бетховенскую «Аврору». Вторая часть (Adagio molto) по Нейгаузу – «бархатная ночь», южно-итальянская бархатная ночь, за которой следует рассвет. Это красиво, но здесь переизбыток чувственного начала, стремление передать лично получаемое наслаждение от этой «бархатной ночи», некая романтическая модификация. Нет дистанции, характерной в этих случаях для Бетховена (как и для великих живописцев): «Стою где-то над этим и взираю отсюда на происходящее в природе». Потом я играл эту сонату по-другому, чем Нейгауз.' From Emil Gilels's conversations with Lev Varenboim in Л. А. Баренбойм, *Эмиль Гилельс* (Москва: «Советский Композитор», 1990) [L. A. Varenboim, *Emil Gilels*. (Moscow: 1990)] pp. 69–70.

The Romantic attitude to Beethoven, adopted by Neuhaus, is reflected in his evocative language when speaking of the composer, and is a clear instance of his bending Beethoven to his own artistic will. Importantly, this demonstrates that he was not simply passively engaging with analogies and metaphors arising from the Rubinsteinian legacy. Given that, according to Neuhaus, Godowsky and Barth were laconic in their discussion of music in terms of 'poetic imagery' (a concept that occupies a central position in Neuhaus written output) the Romantic elements of Neuhaus's temperament must have indeed been deeply-rooted in his nature.

### 3.4 Building an interpretation: Neuhaus as Beethoven

Neuhaus's search for Beethoven through both his philosophical and pianistic priorities exposed fractures between the concepts Neuhaus believed he should engage with, and the concepts that were embedded in his own nature. For instance, already discussed above, as a pianist Neuhaus was unable to find a rational explanation why his colleagues' scholarly editions and commentaries offended him whilst he had accepted Bülow's much more liberal editorial standards. As a thinker, Neuhaus's vision of Beethoven as 'a man of intuition', and thus a Romantic, could only fit with his attempt to contextualize the kinship of Beethoven with Spinoza by proclaiming that Spinoza was not a rationalist. Rather than change his own understanding or sympathies however, Neuhaus embraced this conflict as if it was a reflection of the fact that his attempt to 'become closer' to Beethoven was an active part of his 'work on himself' [*работа над собой*] as an interpreter.<sup>176</sup>

Neuhaus explored conflict in the sphere of philosophy through dialectics. To Neuhaus's mind, philosophy was the way to reconcile such contradictions as emotion and intellect, structure and spontaneity, mankind's will and fate. Neuhaus's attempts to tackle the question of interpreting Beethoven in philosophical terms ultimately always returned to the question of what Beethoven's *persona* meant to himself as the interpreter. All music, it must be remembered, was seen by Neuhaus as a documentation of experience [*переживание*] and therefore spiritually autobiographic, or to borrow Neuhaus's own term 'autopsychographic' [*автопсихографическое*]. In re-imagining the 'autopsychography' of Beethoven, the only

---

<sup>176</sup> H. G. Neuhaus, 'Thoughts on Chopin' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 234. The idea of 'working on the self', as discussed in the previous chapter, was an important part of the emotional Realism in the ideals of interpretation and figures heavily in the writings of Stanislavsky, Kogan, Vitsinsky and Savshinsky. As already explored, it was a term that was significant not only to Neuhaus's pedagogy and interpretation but also that of his colleagues Goldenweiser and Igumnov.

comparable means available to Neuhaus was his own 'autopsychography'. Consequently, Neuhaus's desire as an interpreter to embody aspects of another figure often resulted in a certain distortion of the boundaries between himself and the interpreted subject.

Usually the greater the respect and interest Neuhaus had for a figure, and the deeper his investigation, the more difficult it subsequently becomes to untangle where the embodied subject ends and Neuhaus's own being begins. Beethoven, whom Neuhaus 'love[d] and worship[ped]', was no exception.<sup>177</sup> In fact, Neuhaus's critics, colleagues and former students characterized him in many of the same words as Neuhaus had described Beethoven. Viktor Delson's famous article on Neuhaus as an artist, pedagogue and man, is a typical example of how he was perceived in his time:

[Neuhaus's work was inseparable from his life]. In his various roles: fiery, generous [...], tireless, [...] passionately persuasive, [...] inspired, [...] at once descended deep into thought then tempestuously involved.<sup>178</sup>

Delson's description echoes the traits that Neuhaus had reserved specifically for Beethoven: 'Not only a deep thinker, but also a tireless worker [...]. Proud, fiery, passionate and generous in spirit.'<sup>179</sup>

It was not simply temperamental characteristics that Neuhaus transferred from himself onto the composer. Neuhaus's constant quest to understand Beethoven in the context of the philosophical models that the composer himself was meant to have valued, as discussed in relation to Kant and Spinoza, is evident. Deeply sceptical of objectivity, Neuhaus's own philosophical beliefs had instead always been directed to the subjective. Describing Beethoven as a man of 'intuition, not rationalism', they were words that could easily be turned onto Neuhaus himself. Neuhaus's ideal of a 'super-conscious' state as a result of introspective analysis of the self, silencing the 'outer' world, which he found so alluring and evident in Beethoven, reflected his own existential tendencies.

<sup>177</sup> '[...] я его люблю, я его боготворю [...].' H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 32.

<sup>178</sup> 'Как артист, педагог, как общественный деятель, [это] единый образ: горячий, щедрый [...], полный энергии и решительности, [...] страстно убеждает, спорит [...], вдохновенный, [...] то сурово углубленный, то стихийно увлекательный.' В. Ю. Дельсон, 'Генрих Нейгауз' (1937) [V. Y. Delson, 'Heinrich Neuhaus' (1937)] quoted in D. A. Rabinovich, *Portraits of Pianists* p. 39.

<sup>179</sup> 'Не только глубокий мыслитель, но и неутомимый деятель [...]. Гордый, пламенный, страстный и великодушный.' From Neuhaus's article 'Beethoven' in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 14.

It was in the last years of Neuhaus's life that he began to identify his own moral and philosophical ideals with the term 'existentialist'. His diary entry for the 13 November 1962 reads:

I might be asked: can you say what it is you want? I can. I would like to have been... a saint... in the oldest and newest sense of the word. [...] *If only I had the abilities of a genius* in some kind of sphere of spiritual life and activity [...] then my secret anguish about 'saintliness', my never-to-be dream of serving good and only good [...] would finally 'find its place' [...]. 'Existentialism' begins where genius originates.<sup>180</sup>

In reality however, those qualities that are considered central to existential philosophy can be discerned in Neuhaus much earlier, if not from his youth. His adolescent 'infection' with 'moralin' as well as his desire for 'saintliness' in his last years were driven through a personal ethos rather than as a response to accountability before a deity. In line with existentialist thought, throughout his entire life Neuhaus saw it as his own responsibility to create the meaning for his life and ultimately to become a master of his own fate.<sup>181</sup> For him, Beethoven embodied the prime example of such a life: '[Beethoven was] the great master of his own fate. From the solitary confinement in which his deafness imprisoned him resounded triumphant monologues.'<sup>182</sup>

Like his beloved Nietzsche, widely credited for being one of the founding thinkers of existentialism, Neuhaus found meaning for his life in art. Neuhaus described himself as a 'servant of art' who 'Exists [...] to tune the voice of the ignorant, the unsophisticated into unison with [his] own [to] eradicate indifference and to multiple knowledge, to awaken love

---

<sup>180</sup> 'Меня могут спросить: вы могли бы точно сформулировать, чего вы собственно хотите? Могу. Я хотел бы быть... святым... в самом старом и самом новом смысле этого слова. [...] *Если бы у меня были гениальные способности в какой-нибудь области духовной жизни и деятельности* [...], тогда моя тайная тоска по «святости», моя никогда не осуществлённая мечта о служению добру, только добру, [...] всё это «стало бы на своё место» [...]. «Экзистенциализм» начинается там, где начинается гениальность.' Neuhaus's diary extract in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 73 (Neuhaus's emphasis).

<sup>181</sup> See 'The Meaning of Existence' in R. Solomon, *From Rationalism to Existentialism. The Existentialists and their Nineteenth-Century Backgrounds*. (Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2001) p. 83–89.

<sup>182</sup> '[Бетховен был] великим мастером своей судьбы. Из одиночного заключения, из тюрьмы, на которую обрекла его глухота, раздались торжественные монологи.' Н. Г. Neuhaus, 'Beethoven' in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 14.



and inspire reverence!<sup>183</sup> Equally, Neuhaus was convinced that the only reason why Beethoven did not commit suicide was because his 'calling' to serve art was so great that 'it brought him back to life.'<sup>184</sup> According to Neuhaus, Beethoven had not only been returned to life by his selfless servitude of art, but had attained a newly found inner peace in his last period as he 'sung to the world' his monologues 'for the ideals of mankind' with great assurance, leaving behind the struggle and angst of the Heiligenstadt Testament.<sup>185</sup>

Neuhaus idealized the stillness that he believed Beethoven to have attained, and magnified its significance by his own view of himself hopelessly anguishing over his own self-worth as a 'servant of art':

What can I do if the self-knowledge [*самопознание*] (the Socratic '*Nosce te ipsum*') has been my ailment since my childhood, maybe even my *vice*? There are people in this world, amongst them some brilliant minds, who have an extremely negative attitude to self-knowledge. The first place amongst these must go to the poet-psychologist-philosopher-moralist, Friedrich Nietzsche. [He] believed that self-knowledge was 'ignoble' ('*nicht vornehm*'); that a man who respects himself – an unmistakable sign of the soul's nobility – will not indulge in self-analysis. I believe that my self-analysis, aside from my congenital inclination for it, is indebted in its origin to the influence of 'unspent', unused *inner* strength of the soul [*душевных*] and life, which inevitably then turn *inwards*, and inevitable – against the self.<sup>186</sup>

<sup>183</sup> 'Существуем мы [...], чтобы настроить голос незнающего, неискущённого, в унисон с нашим! Поубавить равнодушия и прибавить знания, разбудить любовь, и внушить благоговения.' H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 212.

<sup>184</sup> '[...] вера в искусство вернула его к жизни.' H. G. Neuhaus, 'Beethoven' in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 14. Neuhaus must have based his conviction on Beethoven's *Heiligenstadt Testament* – 'But how humiliating it was, when someone standing close to me heard a distant flute, and I heard *nothing* [...]. Such incidents almost drove me to despair; at times I was on the point of putting an end to my life – *art* alone restrained my hand.' Quoted here from *Beethoven's Letters with Explanatory Notes by Dr. A. C. Kalischer* translated by J. Shedlock (New York: Dover Publications, 1972), p. 38.

<sup>185</sup> '[...] раздавались торжественные монологи: песни [...], обращенные ко всему миру. [...] за идеалы человечества.' From Neuhaus's article 'Beethoven' in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 14.

<sup>186</sup> 'Что делать, если самопознание (сократовское «*Nosce te ipsum*») с детства было моим недугом, может быть даже *пороком*? Ведь есть люди на свете, и между ними некоторые блестящие умы, относившиеся к самопознанию крайне отрицательно. Первое место среди них принадлежит поэту-психологу-философу-моралисту Фридриху Ницше. Он не обинуясь говорит, что самопознание «неблагородно» (*nicht vornehm*); что человек, уважающий себя, – а это несомненный признак душевного благородства – не станет копаться в самом себе. Мне не раз казалось, что мой самоанализ, кроме врожденной склонности к нему, обязан своим

Yet, although Neuhaus talks about Nietzsche's negative attitude to self-knowledge, he seems to understand Nietzsche's 'self-respect' as only being attainable as an *ideal* – a useful dialectic to oppose the actual struggle that must first be fought. After all, Neuhaus's ideal of 'sainthood' implies his own torment just as Beethoven had to first suffer the anguish of his deafness before attaining the 'spiritual nobility' of his last period.

The angst-ridden nature of self-identity is considered a vital constituent of existential thought.<sup>187</sup> However, Neuhaus would not necessarily have needed to look towards Central European figures beyond Nietzsche who are credited with existential thought today: Kierkegaard, (whose works began to be translated in the first half of the twentieth century), Sartre, Heidegger. Closer to home, Neuhaus's thorough knowledge of Lev Tolstoy, who he counted as one of the most significant thinkers and aestheticians to influence interpretation, would have no doubt appealed to his understanding of Beethoven as a 'tireless worker' with and unmatched 'generosity of spirit', and view of him as both a 'hero' and 'comforter'.

Neuhaus's vision of Beethoven's artistic mission was inspired by his reading of the Heiligenstadt Testament, in his view, a symbol of Beethoven's philosophy:

Oh! It seemed as if I could not quit this earth until I had produced all I felt within me, and so I continued this wretched life. [...] O Divine Being, Thou who lookest down into my inmost soul, Thou understandest; Thou knowest that love for mankind and a desire to do good dwell therein. [...] If [death] come before I have had opportunity to develop my artistic faculties, it will come, my hard fate notwithstanding, too soon, and I should probably wish it later [...].<sup>188</sup>

The links between this extract and Tolstoy's definition of an artist could not have passed unnoticed by Neuhaus:

---

происхождением влиянию «нерастрченных», не использованных вовне душевных и жизненных сил, которые неминуемо обращаются тогда *вовнутрь*, и неминуемо-против себя.' H. G. Neuhaus, 'Autobiographical Notes. Chapter II (Autopsychographical)' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 53.

<sup>187</sup> R. Solomon, *From Rationalism to Existentialism. The Existentialists and their Nineteenth-Century Backgrounds*. (Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2001) p. 8.

<sup>188</sup> 6 October 1802, Heiligenstadt in *Beethoven's Letters with Explanatory Notes by Dr. A. C. Kalischer* translated by J. Shedlock (New York: Dover Publications, 1972) p. 39–40.

A thinker and artist will never sit still on the heights of Olympus [...], a thinker and artist must suffer with mankind in order to find salvation or consolation. [...] He suffers because he is always anxious: he may have decided and said that which would have given good to mankind, liberated them from their suffering and given them consolation – but he did not say it in the way he [wanted], actually he had not decided and had not said, and tomorrow may be too late – he will die.<sup>189</sup>

Furthermore, Neuhaus himself revealed similar anxieties:

I work like an ox and receive from art a great sense of satisfaction as always, but the soul is sad – it is hurting and cries. It is not possible to dream of so-called ‘happiness’. I can only imagine peace and freedom. Maybe it is stupid, but before Death [comes] I want to do so much. I have lived through [пережил]<sup>190</sup> a lot and thought a lot over [передумал], and I want to leave a little something after myself.<sup>191</sup>

As a Romantic figure, Tolstoy appealed to Neuhaus. Moreover, in Tolstoy’s uneasy relationship with Beethoven, expressed in Tolstoy’s *Что такое искусство?* [*What is Art?*] (1897), and dislike of Shakespeare (who Neuhaus considered to be the non-musical personification of Beethoven) Neuhaus saw not the contradiction, but the *similarity* between Tolstoy and Beethoven.<sup>192</sup> Neuhaus considered:

---

<sup>189</sup> ‘Мыслитель и художник никогда не будут спокойно сидеть на олимпийских высотах [...], мыслитель и художник должен страдать вместе с людьми для того, чтобы найти спасение или утешение. Кроме того, он страдает еще потому, что он всегда, вечно в тревоге и волнении: он мог решить и сказать то, что дало бы благо людям, избавило бы их от страдания, дало бы утешение, а он не так сказал, не так изобразил, как надо; он вовсе не решил и не сказал, а завтра, может будет поздно – он умрет.’ Л. Н. Толстой, ‘Так что же нам делать?’ [L. N. Tolstoy, ‘What Then, Shall we Do?’] in В. В. Основин, (составитель), *Л. Н. Толстой: Что такое искусство?* (Москва: «Современник», 1985) [V. V. Osnovin (ed.), *Lev Tolstoy: What is Art?* (Moscow: 1985)] p. 103.

<sup>190</sup> Literally: ‘re-lived’.

<sup>191</sup> ‘Работаю, как вол, от искусства получаю громадное удовлетворение, как всегда, а душа грустна – болит и плачет. О так называемом «счастье» не может быть и речи. Мерещится только покой и воля. Может быть, это глупо, но перед Смертью хочется еще много сделать. Уж очень много я пережил и передумал, и хочется хоть немного оставить после себя.’ Letter to L. A. Pogosova from Moscow dated 24 September 1950 in *Letters* p. 358.

<sup>192</sup> ‘Lev Tolstoy’s disgust towards Shakespeare [...] places me, for some reason, into a state of uncontrollable mirth. If it wasn’t for these fisticuffs [...], a sight more interesting than boxing or football – then it would be a great bore to live on this earth.’ [‘Отвращение Льва Толстого к Шекспиру [...] приводит меня почему-то всегда в состояние неудержимого веселья. Если бы не было этих

All strong individuals strive to tempestuously extend themselves 'onto the whole world' and happily they are met with similar individualities which creates conflict.<sup>193</sup>

Neuhaus seems to have concluded that Tolstoy spent much time considering the significance of Beethoven in the process of 'untangling' of two similar and Romantic souls. Thus, Neuhaus would have found a way of associating his own personality (as summarized by Viktor Delson: 'anxious, fervent [горячий]<sup>194</sup> and suffering'<sup>195</sup>) with Beethoven's through Tolstoy's definition of serving art such as from the article *Так что же нам делать?* [*What then, shall we do?*] (1886). Tolstoy's article surely carries hallmarks of existentialist thought:<sup>196</sup>

Smug, glib thinkers and artists do not exist. Spiritual activity and its expression, genuinely needed by others, is the greatest calling of man – [his] cross as conveyed in the Gospel. The only indisputable sign that the calling [exists in one] is selfless dedication – the sacrifice of the self to articulate that which is embedded in the person to give others strength. Without anguish the spiritual fruit cannot be born.<sup>197</sup>

As has been already discussed, historical lineages were an important aspect of Neuhaus's interpretative understanding. Thus, the artistic link which Tolstoy might have to

потасовок [...], этого восхитительного зрелища, гораздо более интересного, чем бокс или футбол, – скучно стало бы на белом свете.' Н. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 215.

<sup>193</sup> 'Всякая мощная индивидуальность стремится стихийно распространится «на весь мир», но, к счастью, встречается с подобными же индивидуальностями, отчего и возникают столкновения.' Н. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 215. Alexander Goldenweiser – who documented his close contact with Lev Tolstoy in his diaries and in his book *Вблизи Толстого. Записки за пятнадцать лет* [*Near Tolstoy. Notes over Fifteen Years*] (1922) – found that although Tolstoy expressed his disapproval of Beethoven in certain essays, he would nonetheless very happily and eagerly listen to Goldenweiser's interpretations of Beethoven and comment on how wonderful the music was.

<sup>194</sup> Literal translation – 'hot'.

<sup>195</sup> '[...] взволнованный, горячий, страдающий.' D. A. Rabinovich, *Portraits of Pianists* pp. 38–39.

<sup>196</sup> Tolstoy is not widely considered to be one of the founders of existentialism.

<sup>197</sup> 'Гладких, жуирующих и самодовольных мыслителей и художников не бывает. Духовная деятельность и выражение её, действительно нужные для других, есть самое тяжёлое призвание человека – крест, как выражено в евангелии. И единственный несомненный признак присутствия призвания есть самоотвержение, есть жертва собой для проявления вложенной в человека на пользу другим людям силы. Без мук не рождается и духовный плод.' L. N. Tolstoy, 'What then, shall we do?' in V. V. Osnovin (ed.), *Lev Tolstoy: What is Art?* p. 104.

Neuhaus could explain why the latter overlooked Tolstoy's apparent disfavour of Beethoven.<sup>198</sup> Neuhaus keenly wanted to engage with the philosophy of Goethe and his work frequently cites Goethe's aphorisms as well as refers his audience to works such as *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* (1795). Most likely, it was the connection to Goethe through his own 'autopsychographic' [sic. – Neuhaus's own term, 'автопсихографическое'] understanding that Neuhaus most craved. For Neuhaus, Goethe would have provided the most direct and natural way to engage with Beethoven's persona in terms of his ethics and aesthetics. Neuhaus's diary describes his anguish over his constant state of self-studying with the following words: 'My cyclothymia (*himmelhoch jauchzen*[d], *zu Tode betrübt* [sic. – 'elated to the skies, saddened to death']) still plays rather cruel jokes on me. There is no peace, no comfort.'<sup>199</sup> For a man of Neuhaus's intelligence, his reference to Goethe's *Egmont* (in the above citation) can hardly be construed as accidental in the context of his seeking the spiritual freedom that he believed that Beethoven attained through spiritual 'super-consciousness' – the freedom gained by the spirit's complete knowledge of the self.

In interpreting Beethoven, Neuhaus's inability (on this particular occasion) to contend with Nietzsche's Classical 'nobility of the spirit' meant that Neuhaus categorically refused to use his own Nietzschean sympathies to work back historically, and more arguably more directly, from Nietzsche to Goethe.<sup>200</sup> '[...] *ich bin nicht vornehm* – I am a *raznochinets* [*разночинец*], I have always felt myself as such.'<sup>201</sup> Tolstoy's writings had mirrored several traits of thought that would overtly connect him to Goethe's Romanticism – and in Neuhaus's view, to Beethoven. For instance, Tolstoy's study and admiration of Goethe resulted in the former's resurrection of the *Sturm und Drang* period in his own literary efforts.<sup>202</sup> The

<sup>198</sup> For a critical investigation on the role that Goethe had on Tolstoy as a thinker and writer see D. Orwin, *Tolstoy's Art and Thought, 1847-1880* (Princeton University Press, 1993).

<sup>199</sup> 'Моя циклотимия (*himmelhoch jauchzen*[d], *zu Tode betrübt*) проделывает со мной до сих пор довольно жестокие шутки. Нет покоя, нет успокоения.' H. G. Neuhaus, 'Autobiographical Notes. Chapter II (Autopsychographical)' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 54.

<sup>200</sup> Conversely, in the following discussion about Neuhaus's interpretation of Chopin, Nietzsche's 'Classical spirit' will be seen as the dominant idea influencing Neuhaus's view of Chopin.

<sup>201</sup> *Разночинец* – literally meaning 'persons of miscellaneous/other ranks'. The term arose in the Russian Empire in seventeenth century with the category abolished in the eighteenth century. In later times the term resurfaced and in pre-revolutionary speech denoted men possessing a high education who were not noble by birth or linked to the church but could apply for 'personal distinguished/honorary citizenship' [*личное почетное гражданство*]. Quotation is from H. G. Neuhaus, 'Autobiographical Notes. Chapter II (Autopsychographical)' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 54: '[...] *ich bin nicht vornehm*, я – разночинец, таковым я осознавал себя всегда.'

<sup>202</sup> The Soviet literary critic M. M. Chistyakova considered that Tolstoy did not make any stylistic decisions that were not influenced by Goethe. She considers the *стихийность* ['tempestuous spontaneity'] of Tolstoy to be directly influenced by Goethe's '*Sturm und Drang*' (M. M. Чистякова, *Толстой и Гёте* (Москва: 1933) [M. M. Chistyakova, *Tolstoy and Goethe* (Moscow: 1933)] p. 118). See

aesthetics of *Sturm und Drang* were considered by Neuhaus as integral to Beethoven's, rather than Haydn's, music.<sup>203</sup> Secondly, as emphasized by Thomas Mann – Tolstoy and Goethe were 'children of nature', and so for Neuhaus obvious kin to Beethoven.<sup>204</sup>

Neuhaus's desire to engage with Beethoven's love of nature, which he saw as a feature reinforced, if not emulated, by Goethe can be traced as a defining aesthetic in Tolstoy's literary works and in the way that Tolstoy was understood by Russian thinkers and artists.<sup>205</sup> Tolstoy's personal attitude to nature echoed Goethe's pantheistic remark that in nature man can find the image of the spirit: "Nature hides God!" But not from everyone!<sup>206</sup> Tolstoy's diary from Switzerland (1857/8) reveals his preference for the ruggedness and inaccessibility of the landscape as well as his desire to identify his own self and nature with the landscape:<sup>207</sup>

I do not love the so-called majestic and famous views – they are cold in some way.<sup>208</sup> [...] I love nature when it surrounds me from all sides and then develops endlessly into the distance but when I am in this nature. I love it when [...] when the same air which you breathe makes the deep blue hue of the unending sky – when you are not alone in your exultation and joy over nature, but when around you buzz and hover myriads of insects [...] and everywhere the birds sing.<sup>209</sup>

---

also D. Orwin, *Tolstoy's Art and Thought, 1847-1880* Chapter 2 'The Young Tolstoy's Understanding of the Soul' pp. 31–36.

<sup>203</sup> It does not seem like Neuhaus was not particularly interested in Haydn's music or persona in general.

<sup>204</sup> T. Mann, 'Goethe and Tolstoy' (1925) in *Essays of Three Decades* translated by H. T. Lowe-Porter (London: Alfred A. Knopf, 1948) p. 113.

<sup>205</sup> Tolstoy's routine of walking around his estate, Yasnaya Polyana [*Ясная Поляна*], as well as his work alongside the peasants during harvest to make his own writing more Realistic, was an important artistic hub visited by artists including Anton Chekhov, Ivan Turgenev, Maxim Gorky, Valentin Serov, Ilya Repin, Alexander Goldenweiser and Sergei Rachmaninov.

<sup>206</sup> J. W. Goethe, *Maxims and Reflections* p. 109.

<sup>207</sup> For discussion about the importance of landscape for Tolstoy see Chapter 6 'Literary Duellist, Repentant Nobleman' and Chapter 7 'Husband, Beekeeper, Epic Poet' in R. Bartlett, *Tolstoy: A Russian Life*, 2010 (New York: Harcourt Publishing Group, 2011).

<sup>208</sup> It seems that Tolstoy here is referring to a location popular with tourists in Montreux on Lake Geneva.

<sup>209</sup> 'Я не люблю этих, так называемых, величественных и знаменитых видов: они холодны как-то. [...] Я люблю природу, когда она со всех сторон окружает меня и потом развивается бесконечно вдаль, но когда я нахожусь в ней. Я люблю, когда [...] тот самый воздух, которым вы дышите, делает глубокую голубизну бесконечного неба, когда вы не одни ликуете и радуетесь природой, когда около вас жужжат и вьются мириады насекомых, [...] везде кругом заливаются птицы.' П. И. Бирюков (сост.), *Биография Л. Н. Толстого. Том 1* (Москва: «Художественная литература», 1935) [P. I. Biryukov (ed.), *The Biography of L. N. Tolstoy. Volume 1* (Moscow: 1935)] p. 320.

Neuhaus himself had loosely made connection between Tolstoy, Goethe and the Spinozian as revealed in one of his letters written towards the end of his life:

Every day I think of Lev Tolstoy [...] reverence of life drives [one's] work and is the extension and legacy of the Spinozian *Deus sive natura*, the extension of the outlook onto the world felt in Goethe – everything which I understand and love most of all in life on our poor, sinful and wonderful Planet.<sup>210</sup>

As a link to the emotional-Realist aesthetics discussed in the previous chapter, Tolstoy's idea of unity between man and nature – particularly the distinction of civilized nature as symbolized by 'famous' landscapes, and the wild nature which reflected the complexities of man's spirit – would have been significant for Neuhaus. In considering Beethoven's inaccessibility in relation to philosophy, Neuhaus believed it was the ability to embrace these pantheistic tendencies which defined interpreters and audiences who were spiritually prepared to recognize the essence of all human spirits and souls in Beethoven's music:

[The essence of Beethoven's music speaks of nature] whereby man and nature, together, make up a rather formidable whole, something somewhat Spinozian. Not *aut Deus, aut Natura* (either God, or nature), but *Deus sive Natura* (God, or nature).<sup>211</sup>

Neuhaus's Romantic view of nature, akin to Tolstoy, was as a territory of inner conflict, and Beethoven's compositional style was for Neuhaus the ultimate statement of contradiction and conflicting ideas.<sup>212</sup> In explaining this conflict, Neuhaus wrote: '[Beethoven's] ties with

<sup>210</sup> 'Ежедневно вспоминаю Льва Толстого [...] благоговение перед жизнью, – продолжение и наследие спинозовского *Deus sive natura*, продолжение мирозерцания – ощущения Гёте, всего, что я лучше всего понимаю и больше всего люблю в жизни нашей бедной, грешной и прекрасной Планеты.' Neuhaus's letter to Z. M. Kaline dated 18 March 1963 in *Letters* p. 511.

<sup>211</sup> '[В музыке Бетховена чувствуется его связь с природой], где человек и природа составляют вместе нечто страшно цельное, нечто спинозовское. Не «*aut Deus, aut Natura*» [или Бог, или природа], но «*Deus sive Natura*» [Бог, или природа].' From a seminar for pedagogues on the 28 January 1946 documented in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* pp. 152–153.

<sup>212</sup> See for instance Neuhaus's conversation with pedagogues on the 9 December 1938 in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 110.

nature are strongly felt – but Nature with a capital letter... Not Shishkin's "Bears".<sup>213</sup> Neuhaus's quip about Ivan Shishkin's painting *Утро в сосновом лесу* [*Morning in the Pine Forest*] (1889) [See Figure 12], was a reference that Neuhaus was documented as using on a number of occasions to warn against the dangers of the accessibility of Art. Neuhaus was not attacking the aesthetics and work of the famous landscape artist of the Peredvizhniki movement (see discussion in previous chapter), but rather the fate of this particular work that had become so entangled with the mundane life of every Russian and tied with Shishkin's name for many of the wrong, inartistic reasons.<sup>214</sup>

---

<sup>213</sup> 'Очень чувствуется [у Бетховена] связь с природой, но с Природой с большой буквы... Это не «Мишки» Шишкина.' Ibid. p. 152.

<sup>214</sup> Known for his poetic and emotional depictions of nature, Shishkin allowed his fellow artist, Konstantin Savitsky, to add the bears to his pine-forest landscape. See <http://russiapedia.rt.com/prominent-russians/art/ivan-shishkin/> (accessed 13/12/2013). The bears themselves are uncharacteristic for Shishkin's canvases – making tame Shishkin's artistic style, which otherwise often depicts desolation, even violence of the forest landscapes light-up in the radiant glow of sunlight. Procured by the Tretyakov Gallery in Moscow: the resulting painting had an instant appeal and became known affectionately as '«Мишки» Шишкина' ['Miški' Šiškina' – meaning 'Shishkin's "Bears"']. The accessibility of this work guaranteed it such success that it had the 'honour' of being on the wrapper of one of the first and most popular Russian confectionary items, «Мишка косолапый» [literally: 'Little Bear with Inward-Pointing Feet'] produced by the firm ОАО «Красный Октябрь» ['Red October'] from at least 1925 to this day.





Figure 12 Ivan Shishkin's *Утро в сосновом лесу* [*Morning in the Pine-Forest*] (1889). Oil on canvas (1.39m x 2.13m). Tretyakov Gallery, Moscow.

As noted earlier, Neuhaus's analogies used in his teaching, particularly of Beethoven, derived heavily from nature: amongst those already indicated being an extension of Liszt's 'flower between two abysses' (Opus 27 no. 2), the deep Italian night and glowing dawn (Opus 53), the mountains (Opus 109). Alluding to nature in this way seems to have allowed Neuhaus to feel that he was evoking with some certainty a comparable emotional reaction from his student as well as using nature to act as a symbol of the human spirit. Thus, Neuhaus would have been able to use nature as a way to represent the complexities and contradictions of Beethoven's emotional states which otherwise, apart from in his music, are mute to words.

Beethoven's autobiographic emotional narrative was arguably the most Romantic quality that Neuhaus would have identified. Neuhaus likewise recognized Romanticism in both Tolstoy's and Goethe's work through their autobiographical essence, and thus their subjectivity. The importance of autobiographical essence in the works of Tolstoy and Goethe was investigated by Thomas Mann, whose own work had many autobiographical elements itself. Mann's essay *Goethe und Tolstoi* (1921, revised 1925) concluded that 'love of ego' should be identified with 'love of the world'.<sup>215</sup> As summarized by Hannelore Mundt, Mann's *Goethe und Tolstoi* demonstrates:

To project one's self into one's art, to give one's individual life an important story worth telling, is not considered narcissistic by Mann [who assumes] that whoever loves himself, loves life and the world.<sup>216</sup>

Neuhaus did not only consider the 'autobiographicality' encased within a work to be potentially the highest compositional achievement possible, but also that it was one of the greatest tests for an interpreter. In his essay on Neuhaus, Rabinovich acknowledged this view: 'The strength of Neuhaus's artistry shows his self in everything.'<sup>217</sup> Furthermore, in his preface to the revised edition of *About the Art of Piano Playing*, Neuhaus defended himself against the criticism, mainly voiced by Lev Barenboim, of excessive subjectivity and self-importance: 'All that comes from the self is unavoidably *autobiographical*.'<sup>218</sup>

---

<sup>215</sup> T. Mann, 'Goethe and Tolstoy' (1925) in *Essays of Three Decades* translated by H.T. Lowe-Porter (London: Alfred A. Knopf, 1948) p. 103.

<sup>216</sup> H. Mundt, *Understanding Thomas Mann* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2004) p. 111.

<sup>217</sup> 'Убеждающая сила нейгаузовского артистизма проявляет себя во всём.' D. A. Rabinovich, *Portraits of Pianists* p. 62.

<sup>218</sup> 'Ведь всякое сообщение о своём личном опыте неизбежно *автобиографично*.' H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 12 (Neuhaus's emphasis).

Neuhaus's need to justify the subjective, 'autobiographical' elements of his writing is symptomatic not only of his understanding of pianistic interpretation, but also of the fragility that comes with such an approach. Beethoven's sonatas, particularly the late ones, were seen by Neuhaus as embodying a 'psychological cryptogram' – a score documenting the innermost workings of the soul.<sup>219</sup> The responsibility of interpreting such an 'autobiography' is not only a challenge, but also leaves the interpreter's own self completely exposed to the listener and therefore vulnerable and open to doubt: 'Sometimes I so want the reassurance, the full reassurance, that what I am doing, my work, is done in the best possible manner, that I have found the key to all the riddles of the mysterious work [which I undertake].'<sup>220</sup>

Neuhaus often turned to dialectical thought to find reassurance in his interpretational actions. In his seminars Neuhaus often remarked that the truth of any situation lies in the combination of dialectical argument. For instance, recalling Feinberg's proposition that only a great man can be a great pianist, Neuhaus concluded:

Samuil Evgenevich Feinberg said most wonderfully: 'Person – artist – musician – pianist'. Right! But to make this formula dialectical, it is necessary to change it: 'Pianist – musician – artist – person'. [...] If we say: a thoughtful [intellectual] person, a wonderful person [with] high moral qualities, a wonderful artist who understands everything in the world – but a bad pianist. Would we count him as a pianist? No, of course not! We need first and foremost a pianist, then a musician, artist and person. *It is the conjunction of the two formulas that give us the definition of 'pianist'*.<sup>221</sup>

<sup>219</sup> '[...] психическ[ая] (тайнопись) криптограммы.' H. G. Neuhaus, 'Autobiographical Notes. Chapter II (Autopsychographical)' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 61.

<sup>220</sup> 'Иногда так хочется уверенности, полной уверенности в том, что делаешь своё дело наилучшим образом, что нашел ключ ко всем загадкам этого загадочного дела.' *Ibid.* p. 54.

<sup>221</sup> 'Самуил Евгеньевич Фейнберг замечательно сказал: «Человек – художник – музыкант – пианист». Правильно! Но для того, чтобы эта формула стала диалектической, [нужно] её перевернуть: «ты пианист, музыкант, художник и человек» [...]. Мы будем говорить: мыслящий человек, замечательный человек, высокие моральные качества, художник замечательный, понимает всё на свете – а пианист никакой. Будем мы его считать пианистом? Нет, не будем. Нам нужен прежде всего пианист, потом музыкант, художник и человек. *Сопоставление этих двух формул дает определение, что такое «пианист».*' From Neuhaus's seminar (undated) for the Student Academic Society at the Moscow Conservatory [*Научного студенческого общества Московской консерватории*] documented in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 70 (Emphasis is mine).

For Neuhaus, the philosophers that he chose to help him to engage with Beethoven, even if he did run into difficulty in the process as seen with Kant and Spinoza, were all dialecticians. However, those thinkers with whom Neuhaus most actively identified in his search for Beethoven, namely Hegel and Tolstoy, were Romantic philosophers where he could identify, as demonstrated in the citation above, the 'conjunction of the two formulas' providing the definition i.e. a Hegelian thesis-antithesis-synthesis dialectic model.

Neuhaus's desire to engage with Beethoven through a dialectical understanding is manifested through his attempts to consider philosophically the implications of Beethoven's musical forms. The dialectical question Neuhaus explored most frequently, particularly as documented in his open lessons, was how Beethoven could juxtapose two themes so contradictory in character that it seems they are unrelated until later on when they reveal a tight unity and synthesis. In many of Neuhaus's documented seminars and lectures he refers repeatedly to his colleague Samuil Feinberg to illustrate this verbally:

Many of you were present in the presentation by Samuil Feinberg about Beethoven. A very interesting presentation. I would like to highlight especially one of the thoughts from it – that about what is always most striking in Beethoven. Remember, Feinberg even quoted that wonderful part from Gogol's *The Terrible Revenge* [«*Страшная месть*»] that 'suddenly all parts of the world became visible' [«*вдруг стало видно во все части света*»]. It is true – when one plays Beethoven one feels his unbelievably large scope.<sup>222</sup>

Respected for his keen academic tendencies that supported his pianism, much of Feinberg's work, such as his public lectures, looked at Beethoven's musical form as a process:

What is musical form? We know that music is an art where everything exists either in the past, or in the future. Every moment in music instantly becomes the past. [...] The moment that should just arrive instead slips

---

<sup>222</sup> 'Многие из вас были, кажется, на докладе С. Е. Фейнберга о Бетховене. Очень интересный доклад. Я хочу особенно подчеркнуть в нём одну мысль – о том, что особенно поражает всегда в Бетховене. Помните, С. Е. Фейнберг даже процитировал это замечательное место из «Страшной мести» Гоголя, что «вдруг стало видно во все части света». И действительно, когда играешь Бетховена, чувствуешь его невероятно большой охват.' From a seminar for pedagogues on the 28 January 1946 documented in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* pp. 164–165.

through the present and instantly becomes the past. How then is it possible to create form in such instability? [...] Beethoven, like no one else, extended the limits of the moment flowing through the present – into huge, unified, unforgettable musical forms.<sup>223</sup>

If, as Janet Schmalfeldt suggests, in Central European musicology 'For Dahlhaus, like Adorno, it is first and foremost Beethoven's music that invites our perception of form as a dialectical process in the precise Hegelian sense', then in many ways Feinberg can be considered Russia's equivalent to these two figures.<sup>224</sup> Like Dahlhaus, Feinberg felt the need to distinguish between the Beethoven who existed as an individual (what Dahlhaus would describe as a 'biographical subject'), and the Beethoven who sustained the musical process (Dahlhaus's 'aesthetic subject').<sup>225</sup> Because of this distinction, Feinberg suggested that Beethoven was the first composer to have been able to suppress the 'individual' sufficiently 'to give the ghostly veil of music strength and validity of an architectural mass.'<sup>226</sup> Feinberg proposed that this dialectic existence of Beethoven's 'self' made it possible for 'Beethoven [...] to use his will to juxtapose absolutely contradictory ideas, contradictory thoughts and contradictory feelings. In this his form is more dialectical than any other composer.'<sup>227</sup>

Feinberg's identification of Beethoven's will existing in two spheres – the 'inner' that creates the musical essence, and the 'outer' which moderates and shapes, has remarkable similarities to the work of the German pianist and musicologist, Carl Martienssen, in his 1930

<sup>223</sup> С. Е. Фейнберг, 'Сонаты Бетховена' [S. E. Feinberg, 'Beethoven's Sonatas'] in M. G. Sokolov, *Questions of Piano Interpretation. Issue 1* p. 130.

<sup>224</sup> J. Schmalfeldt, *In the Process of Becoming: Analytic and Philosophical Perspectives on Form in Early Nineteenth-Century Music* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011) p. 23.

<sup>225</sup> For a discussion about Dahlhaus see J. Schmalfeldt, *In the Process of Becoming: Analytic and Philosophical Perspectives on Form in Early Nineteenth-Century Music* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011) p. 34.

<sup>226</sup> '[...] поборовшим в себе индивидуальное начало, чтобы придать призрачным покровам музыки прочность и общезначимость твердых архитектурных масс.' С. Е. Фейнберг, 'Судьба музыкальной формы' in И. В. Лихачева (составитель), *С. Е. Фейнберг. Пианист, композитор, исследователь* (Москва: «Советский Композитор», 1984) [S. E. Feinberg, 'The Fate of Musical Form' in I. V. Lihacheva (ed.), *S. E. Feinberg. Pianist, Composer, Researcher* (Moscow: 1984)] p. 75.

<sup>227</sup> 'Бетховен смело [...] по своей воле сопоставляет совершенно противоположные идеи, противоположные мысли и противоположные чувства. В этом смысле его форма более диалектична, чем у всех других композиторов.' S. E. Feinberg, 'Beethoven's Sonatas' in M. G. Sokolov (ed.), *Questions of Piano Interpretation. Issue 1* p. 131.

*Die individuelle Klaviertechnik auf der Grundlage des schöpferischen Klangwillens.*<sup>228</sup> Martienssen's work was introduced to Russia in the middle of the twentieth century and disseminated by Grigory Kogan (whose work was admired by both Feinberg and Neuhaus). As a result, Martienssen's influence can be felt earlier than the publication date (1966) of his work in Russian translation would suggest. As direct contemporaries of Martienssen, Neuhaus and probably Feinberg knew his work, and both pianists did use two expressions common to Martienssen, in Russian translation, in some of their writing.<sup>229</sup> Martienssen talked about *Gestaltwille* ('will to form' [воля к форме]) and *Gestaltungswille* ('creative will': translated in Russian as 'forming will' [формирующая воля]). Like Feinberg, Martienssen found that compositions by a genius such as Beethoven's have an architecture that is only possible because it has not been clouded by feeling:

The 'will to form' is that force which appears to life in the creative act of the composer. [...] The 'will to form' lives in the soul of the composer during the creative act and exists as a kind of overarching view (*Gesamtschau*) of the creative process. [...] This overarching view subordinates all the details to itself. They are needed to the whole only in the same manner that the whole lives in each detail. [...] A creation dies as quickly as it was born if the 'will to form' is lulled to sleep by feeling. [...] When the 'will to form' of a work has been *felt* from within and *implemented* through the purely personal forces of the soul of the interpreter – this is what we shall call the 'forming will'.<sup>230</sup>

It is doubtful that Neuhaus was particularly interested in the investigation of musical form as a process in a theoretical sense as undertaken by Feinberg independently of, although

<sup>228</sup> Published in 1966 as *Индивидуальная фортепианная техника на основе звукотворческой воли* based on Martienssen's revised 1953 edition.

<sup>229</sup> Neuhaus mentioned Martienssen in some of his letters in the 1960s. For instance, Martienssen is mentioned in a letter written by Neuhaus to his son, Stanislav, on the 7 July 1964 (see *Letters* p. 548).

<sup>230</sup> 'Воля к форме – это та сила, которая живительно проявляется в творческом акте композитора. [...] Воля к форме живет в душе композитора при творческом акте, как своего рода общий обзор (*Gesamtschau*) творимого произведения. [...] Такой общий обзор подчиняет себе все детали. Они нужны целому лишь постольку, поскольку целое живет в каждой детали. [...] Произведение умирает так же быстро, как оно было сотворено, если воля к форме усыпляется размягченным чувством. [Когда] воля к форме произведения была внутренне прочувствована, но выполнена она была чисто личными душевными силами исполнителя – назовем этот чисто личный элемент в музыкальном исполнении «формирующей волей».' К. А. Мартинсен, *Индивидуальная фортепианная техника на основе звукотворческой воли* (Москва: «Музыка», 1966) [К. А. Martienssen, *Individual Piano Technique on the Basis of Creative Sound-Will* (Moscow: 1966)] pp. 34–35.

not dissimilar to, Adorno or Dahlhaus. It is more probable that Neuhaus alluded to Feinberg out of the academic appeal he felt for his colleague's work, and because of the importance Feinberg commanded as a Beethoven expert. In this respect it is notable that from all the dense theoretical discussion, typical in Feinberg's lectures and essays, Neuhaus was most struck by the literary analogy, Gogol's *The Terrible Revenge*, which his colleague had provided. This would not have been the only occasion where Neuhaus had wanted to be associated with Feinberg but had not committed himself fully: Neuhaus remembered how once he had struggled to learn Feinberg's piano sonata 'out of a deep respect' for Feinberg but not the work itself.<sup>231</sup>

Whether Neuhaus, as he conceded many times, did not have a 'rigorous enough' academic background to engage with Feinberg's particular theoretical analysis of form, or whether he was simply drawn to other ways of engaging with such questions is ambiguous. What is significant, however, is that Neuhaus tackled the same opposition of *Gestaltwille* and *Gestaltungswille* (or 'aesthetic' vs. 'biographic') which was raised by Beethoven's work in his own personal way. Discussing Beethoven's late works, particularly Opus 106 and Opus 110 – which Neuhaus insisted was 'For me, the closest music of a philosophical nature', he said:<sup>232</sup>

Perhaps I have not felt so strongly with any other great composer that perfection of form that is dictated by the perfection of *the truth of the psychological process* that lies at the heart of the given work and expressed in it.<sup>233</sup>

Rather than Beethoven's 'will to form' presiding over the individuality or subjectivity, as Feinberg or Martienssen suggested, Neuhaus was convinced of the reverse. For Neuhaus, especially in Beethoven's late period, the 'perfection of form' is an incidental feature that is a result of what he saw as a complete sublimation of Beethoven into the subjective. As opposed to what Feinberg described as the suppression of the individuality which allowed Beethoven's

---

<sup>231</sup> Neuhaus had admitted: 'Some time ago I learnt Feinberg's sonata because of my love and respect for its author. Yet, playing it in concert I made a mess of it because I did not like it.' ['Я как-то выучил сонату Фейнберга из любви и уважения к автору и всё же, играя на концерте, что-то там наврал, потому что она мне не нравилась.'] See Neuhaus's conversation with B. M. Teplov and A. V. Vitsinsky (6 December 1944) in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 97.

<sup>232</sup> 'Самая близкая для меня музыка – это музыка философического порядка.' Ibid. p. 104.

<sup>233</sup> 'Быть может, ни у кого из великих композиторов я не чувствовал с такой силой, что совершенство формы обусловлено совершенством, *правдой психического процесса*, лежащего в основе данного произведения и выраженного в нем.' H. G. Neuhaus, 'Autobiographical Notes. Chapter II (Autopsychographical)' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 61.

music to become an 'architectural mass', Neuhaus saw the amplification and concentration of the individuality, undistracted by external influence, creating that architecture.

Neuhaus's view of the perfection in the 'psychological process' of Beethoven's late works is atypical. For instance, Adorno considered that the 'psychological approach fails' in relation to these works.<sup>234</sup> Adorno concluded that in the late piano works:

[Beethoven] no longer draws together the landscape, now deserted and alienated, into an image. [...] The fragmented landscape is objective, while the light in which alone it glows is subjective. He does not bring about their harmonious synthesis. As a dissociative force he tears them apart in time, perhaps in order to preserve them for the eternal.<sup>235</sup>

Neuhaus was inclined to attribute the fragmented nature of these works to Beethoven's ever more focused ability to capture the essence of the soul's different 'states': 'Beethoven is true to his soul – he, as a composer, observes the psychological truth, he simply uses sounds to create this truth.'<sup>236</sup> Furthermore, Neuhaus was convinced that the interpreter should be able to find a naturalness in the movement from one 'state' to the next, even if it entailed the most extreme opposition of 'states' – an attitude that he explicitly shared with Rubinstein. Referring to the Piano Sonata No. 31 in A-flat major Opus 110, with this in mind Neuhaus wrote: 'What can be more truthful than that change of the soul's states, the psychological cryptogram, of which this sonata tells?'<sup>237</sup>

Opuses 106 and 110 were significant to Neuhaus because to his mind they contained the ultimate psychological test for the interpreter – the fugue as an inner movement within the sonatas. The task of psychologically justifying a fugue after some of the most emotional music imaginable ('an abyss of sorrow' in the *Arioso dolente* in Opus 110, and 'utterly sorrowful-loneliness' in the Adagio of Opus 106) led Neuhaus to consider Opus 106 as the

<sup>234</sup> T. Adorno, 'Moments musicaux' (1934) in T. Adorno, *Beethoven. The Philosophy of Music. Fragments and Texts* edited by Rolf Tiedemann and translated by Edmund Jephcott (Polity Press, 1998) p. 125.

<sup>235</sup> *Ibid.* p. 126.

<sup>236</sup> 'Бетховен верен своей душе, он, как композитор, соблюдает психологическую правду, он попросту звуками творит эту правду.' H. G. Neuhaus, 'Autobiographical Notes. Chapter II (Autopsychographical)' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 64.

<sup>237</sup> 'Что может быть правдивее той смены душевных состояний, психической (тайнописи) криптограммы, о которой повествует эта соната?' *Ibid.* p. 61.



most philosophical work ever composed, and Opus 110 as *'ein Prüfstein für Pianisten'* ['a touchstone for pianists'].<sup>238</sup>

Neuhaus considered it important that, in Opus 110, the 'psychological states' of the soul in the movements leading up to the fugue were already inevitably unfolding towards it. Thus, despite innocence of the first movement, the lack of any kind of strong 'emotional or musical' impulse should be understood as a deceptive stillness that exists only on the surface:

The first movement, *Moderato cantabile* (nearly *andante*) *con amabilità* – welcoming, well-wishing, friendly, amiable [...] with a tender care that wraps the listener into something soft and warm, lowering him into a sea of spiritual purity (A-flat major! – the tonality of [moral] chastity!) that refreshes his thoughts with the light of lyrical contemplation.<sup>239</sup>

Underneath the contemplative appearance, Neuhaus maintained that psychologically:

The soul and music are in a state of 'unstable equilibrium' (*'labiles Gleichgewicht'*), and as any instability it is *fraught with the future* (this is felt from the outset), and what a future!<sup>240</sup>

The second movement of Opus 110 was seen by Neuhaus as providing the contrast which highlights its preceding serenity, and the sorrow that follows it. Psychologically, the function of the movement can be likened to a comic scene in Shakespearian tragedy. Neuhaus explained:

<sup>238</sup> 'бездна скорби'; [...] самой скорбной, *одиноко-скорбной* музыки в мире.' H. G. Neuhaus, 'Autobiographical Notes. Chapter II (Autopsychographical)' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 63 and p. 58 respectively. In the footnote to Neuhaus's description of the Opus 106 Adagio as 'sorrowful-loneliness' (p. 63) he quoted Nietzsche's poem *Pinie und Blitz* (1882): "*Hoch wuchs ich über Mensch und Tier,/ Und sprech'ich, niemand spricht mit mire...*" [Over man and animal I grew too tall,/ Now when I speak – no one speaks with me at all...] Одиночество [Loneliness]!'

<sup>239</sup> 'Первая часть *Moderato cantabile* (почти *andante*) *con amabilità* – приветливо, благожелательно, дружелюбно, любезно [...], с нежной заботливостью, как бы закутывающей слушателя во что-то мягкое и теплое, погружающей его в море душевной чистоты (As-dur! – тональность целомудрия!), освещающей его мысли светом лирического созерцания.' Ibid. p. 61.

<sup>240</sup> '[...] и душа и музыка как бы пребывают в состоянии «неустойчивого равновесия» (*'labiles Gleichgewicht'*), и как всякая неустойчивость она *чревата будущим* (это чувствуется с самого начала), и каким будущим!' Ibid.

Waking suddenly from his dreams and lyric contemplations, the person suddenly finds himself outside on the street – in a crowd, amongst the chaos of contradictory occurrences [...] a *Gassenhauer* is heard: 'I am slovenly, you are slovenly' [Whilst the Trio] is like a dancer on a tightrope high above the square brimming with people.<sup>241</sup>

The resolution into F major in the coda of the second movement, Neuhaus called a 'magic cloth' which 'erased all the visions of the crowd and street' [see Figure 13].<sup>242</sup> Neuhaus particularly stressed the importance of the resolution following on from the dominant without the pause, set up by the preceding material. The end of the coda from the second movement, already from bar 152 and explicitly from bar 155, psychologically in Neuhaus's opinion is the soul turning inwards into the 'solitude [of] a genius'.



Figure 13 The second movement, *Allegro molto*, from Opus 110. Bars 144–158

It is through such 'solitude' that Neuhaus believed the opposing forces of thought and feeling are synthesized, and the soul is in its purest self-conscious state:

Soon thought and feeling crystallize – one voice is born: *Arioso dolente* (A-flat minor), a sorrowful song. Anton Rubinstein said that even in the best

<sup>241</sup> 'Как бы очнувшись внезапно от мечтаний и лирической созерцательности, человек сразу очутился на улице, в толпе, в сутолоке с её противоречивыми явлениями [...]; вот слышен напев *Gassenhauer*'а (уличной песенки): «Я – неряха, ты – неряха...» («Ich bin liederlich, du bist liederlich...»). Вот и трио (*Des-dur*): как будто канатный плясун танцует над площадью, наполненной народом...' Ibid. p. 62.

<sup>242</sup> '[...] разрешение в F-dur'е как будто «стирает» магической тряпкой все толпы и улицы [...]' Ibid.

operas of the world there can hardly be found such a beautiful aria, with such strength and profound expression of human sorrow.<sup>243</sup>

As a concept, the ‘crystallization’ of thought and feeling into ‘one voice’ identified here by Neuhaus carries strong overtones of Hegelian synthesis, already discussed above – the final stage of dialectic reasoning whereby thesis and antithesis are resolved and re-identified through their unification.

Just as philosophically Neuhaus considered the ‘superconsciousness’ of the soul that arises from silencing the outer world – solitude – to be a Romantic occurrence, pianistically Neuhaus’s recording of the *Adagio* reflects this [CD Track 7].<sup>244</sup> Aspects such as complex half-peddalling to create swells of harmonic colour, and the expressive separation of hands (where Neuhaus allows the right hand to enter audibly behind the left hand: bars 9<sup>1</sup>, 10<sup>3</sup>, 13<sup>1</sup> and 15<sup>2</sup> – refer to CD Track 7 from 1.12 min to 1.50 min) to emphasize the large intervallic distances in the melody are all traits common to Neuhaus’s recordings of Schumann, Chopin, Brahms and Rachmaninov [see Figure 14: occurrences where the hands are separated are indicated by the boxes].

In addition, Neuhaus alludes to the introspection of the soul literally through his manipulation of the interpreted tempo away from the ‘absolute’ tempo. Firstly, there is an inflection of tempo away from the ‘absolute’ that responds harmonically to the micro-occurrences (understood by Neuhaus as ‘intonation’ [интонация] within *rubato*). This typifies the playing of Neuhaus and the majority of his colleagues of the time. Neuhaus, though, also draws attention to tempo in a broader sense. By playing the first seven bars of the third movement on the ‘fast edge’ of his core *Adagio* tempo, Neuhaus gives the impression of needing to narrate, of a need to live on. By contrast, he takes the *Arioso dolente* on the ‘back edge’ of the tempo that only moves forward to the ‘front edge’ once in bars 13 – 14 with the rising melody in *crescendo* – one last reaching out before resigning back into its solitude through the return to a more restrained motion [see Figure 14: Arrows to the right represent movement on the ‘fast edge’, to the left that on the ‘back edge’].

<sup>243</sup> ‘[...] вскоре мысль и чувство кристаллизуются: раздается скорбный голос – *Arioso dolente* (as-moll), жалобная песня. Антон Рубинштейн говорил, что даже в лучших операх в мире вряд ли можно найти арию столь прекрасную, с такой силой и проникновенностью выражавшую глубочайшую человеческую скорбь.’ Н. Г. Neuhaus, ‘Autobiographical Notes. Chapter II (Autopsychographical)’ in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 62.

<sup>244</sup> Classical Records. Catalogue number CR-099: *The Art of Henry Neuhaus. Beethoven Sonatas no. 14 “Moonlight”, no. 17, 24, 30, 31* released 2008. Recorded c. 1950s. Track 14.

10 (122)

Adagio, ma non troppo.

(Klagender Gesang)  
Andante dolente.

*dim. il corde* *cresc.* *dim.* *p*

*p* *p cresc.*

*decrease.*

Figure 14 The third movement from Opus 110. Bars 7–16

The 'one voice' of the soul singing in the *Arioso dolente*, is to Neuhaus, the musical portrayal of a soul on the edge of its existence. Neuhaus deemed that at this point the desolation and that should have been expressed by the interpreter should raise the question:

How [is it possible for Beethoven] to continue his narrative – how to finish it after the music had reached such an abyss of sorrow that it seems that not only the music, but also all life should cease [?]<sup>245</sup>

Despite Neuhaus's recognition of Beethoven's capacity, and wit, for *salto mortale*, as already discussed, in Opus 110 (as in Opus 106) he found it psychologically incredible: 'But is it possible to follow such deep sorrow immediately with an expression of gaiety, joy – *does this happen* (?!) in people?'<sup>246</sup> As an interpreter Neuhaus could not envisage the soul's return to life at the end of the *Arioso dolente* – the sorrow had been too pure, too profound:

The soul [*душа*] now *does not feel anything*, emotions are frozen – they have been bound by an icy cold. What is left of life? Nothing except the cold mind, the ability to *think*.<sup>247</sup>

This proposition however undermines, if not negates, Neuhaus's concept of art as only being able to sustain itself on an emotional level. As previously discussed, he shared the Stanislavskian view which dictated:

Every person in every minute of his life certainly feels something, experiences something, because if he did not feel he would be dead. Only the dead cannot feel.<sup>248</sup>

<sup>245</sup> '[Как] продолжить своё повествование, чем закончить его после того, как музыка достигла такой бездны скорби, что, казалось бы, не только музыка, но и вся жизнь должна прекратиться, заглохнуть, всё должно умереть...' Н. Г. Neuhaus, 'Autobiographical Notes. Chapter II (Autopsychographical)' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 63.

<sup>246</sup> 'Но разве можно после такой глубокой скорби сразу и непосредственно перейти к выражению веселья, радости, *разве это бывает* (?!) у людей?' Ibid. p. 64.

<sup>247</sup> 'Душа уже *ничего не чувствует*, эмоции застыли, их сковывает ледяной холод, что же осталось от жизни? Ничего кроме холодного ума, способности *мыслить*.' Н. Г. Neuhaus, 'About the Last Sonatas of Beethoven' in M. G. Sokolov (ed.), *Questions of Piano Interpretation. Issue 2* p. 16.

<sup>248</sup> 'Каждый человек в каждую минуту своей жизни непременно что-нибудь чувствует, переживает, а если бы он ничего не чувствовал, он был бы мертвецом. Только мёртвые ничего не чувствуют.' К.С. Станиславский, *Статьи. Речи. Беседы. Письма* (Москва: «Искусство», 1953) [K. S. Stanislavsky, *Articles. Speeches. Conversations. Letters* (Moscow: 1953)] p. 463.

Art, it must be remembered, in Neuhaus's mind was emotional: a movement of feelings, a change in the 'states' of the soul.<sup>249</sup> With the soul being no more, he would have had to concede that there can be no further 'narrative' in Opus 110. In order to resolve the situation, Neuhaus redefines 'thought' so that it is no longer an antipode to 'feeling' and 'experience': 'Philosophical thinking [...] is the musical incarnation of Descartes's "*cogito ergo sum*".'<sup>250</sup> Neuhaus understood philosophy as a combination of intellect and emotion, and so philosophical-thought defined experience – the experience not of the soul, but of the *spirit*. Neuhaus accordingly seats this 'thought' outside the 'soul' and instead, in the 'spirit'. Thus, in Opus 110:

Only the spirit [дух] survives in these heights over which extends a starlight blanket [through the] exceptional cold... The expression of these kinds of states of the *spirit* in music are characteristic of the *fugue*, [suiting it] like no other musical form.<sup>251</sup>

When confronted with the difficulties that Beethoven's fugue made for an interpreter with his aesthetics, Neuhaus felt as though he needed to justify the 'fugue' as 'real music'. He was adamant that the fugue was not simply an 'intellectual construction' – a position which would otherwise simply make it 'anti-musical'. Neuhaus blamed the view of the fugal form as 'intellectual' for causing many great musicians such as Alexander Glazunov to overlook it as a potent musical form which could express life at the limits of being. Neuhaus blamed Glazunov's indifference on his inability to understand that it expressed, in instances such as Opus 110, a 'shattering spiritual energy'.<sup>252</sup> Defending the validity of the fugue as a form capable of expression, Neuhaus points to 'the "Romantic" Chopin who [explained] to Delacroix that philosophical thought could be expressed in music.'<sup>253</sup>

---

<sup>249</sup> Neuhaus's seminar for music teachers held on 9 December 1938 as documented in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* pp. 108–109.

<sup>250</sup> '[...] философское размышление, воплощённое в музыке декартовское "*cogito, ergo sum*".' H. G. Neuhaus, 'About the last sonatas of Beethoven' in M. G. Sokolov (ed.), *Questions of Piano Interpretation. Issue 2* p. 16.

<sup>251</sup> '[...] только дух выживает в этих высотах, над которыми простирается звёздный покров ночи и непомерной стужи... Выражение таких состояний духа в музыке свойственно *фуге*, как ни одной другой форме композиции.' Ibid. p. 16 (Neuhaus's emphasis).

<sup>252</sup> 'сокрушительная духовная энергия.' Ibid. p. 17.

<sup>253</sup> 'Об этом говорил еще «романтик» Шопен, когда отвечал на вопрос Делакруа, возможно ли в музыке выражение философских мыслей.' Ibid. p. 16.

Despite a certain overlap in meanings between ‘spirit’ [дух] and ‘soul’ [душа], Neuhaus is consistently careful in his work with regards to which of the two words he uses.<sup>254</sup> In his presentation of ‘soul’ and ‘spirit’ as different elements, it is important to note that he does not seek to present them as a dichotomy of the emotional and the rational. In the aftermath of the *Arioso dolente*, the spirit does not bring ‘back to life’ through *rational* thought, but because the spirit (and not the soul, as defined by the *Oxford English Dictionary*) is the ‘immaterial, immortal being’ of a person.<sup>255</sup> Moreover, ‘inner moral strength’ and ‘psychological ability (consciousness, thought) that compels into action, activity’ are attributes of the ‘spirit’. The ‘soul’ is understood to be ‘the inner, psychological world of a person, his consciousness’ and ‘particular features of a [person’s] character.’ Whereas the *Oxford English Dictionary* defines ‘spirit as the ‘seat of emotions and character’, the Russian definition makes no mention of emotion, rather consciousness, in either ‘spirit’ or ‘soul’, and considers character to be a part of the ‘soul’.

Therefore, the expression of the *individual*, the ‘soul’ [душа] can be understood to be subdued or crushed.<sup>256</sup> Man’s ‘psychological world’, his ‘consciousness’ can be restored through the ‘strength’ and ‘psychological ability’ of the ‘spirit’ [дух]. The juxtaposition that Neuhaus makes, between ‘soul’ and ‘spirit’ is one of an *inner world* and the *process* which made it: Neuhaus’s own version of *Gestaltungswille* and *Gestaltwille* – the individual’s biographic ‘forming will’, and the individual’s aesthetic ‘will to form’. The ‘spirit’ is understood as the *process* that builds the inner world, and thus is the re-building force of a destroyed inner world. The view of the spirit’s process of restoration, and therefore creation, revealed in its purest and undiluted musical form of fugue, led Neuhaus to declare:

[In the transition into the] fugue I feel as if I am *present during an act of birth* (in art): I am consumed by a feeling of joy, wonder and ‘holy awe’, and almost a terror about what is taking place before my eyes.<sup>257</sup>

<sup>254</sup> In the translations presented in this thesis the differentiation between дух and душа has been carefully observed. Where required, texts have been translated ‘of the soul/the soul’s’ instead of the more customary ‘spiritual’ etc. to preserve Neuhaus’s distinctions.

<sup>255</sup> 8<sup>th</sup> Revised Edition (1970) «Словарь русского языка С. И. Ожегова» [Ozhegov’s Dictionary of Russian Language]. OED referred to here is the 11<sup>th</sup> edition.

<sup>256</sup> Proverbially, in the Russian language it is possible to exclaim: ‘don’t break my soul!’ [не ломай мне душу!].

<sup>257</sup> ‘[...] в переходе от Largo к фуге я как будто присутствую при акте рождения (в искусстве); меня охватывает одновременно чувство радости, восторга и «священный трепет», почти ужас, от того, что происходит на моих глазах.’ H. G. Neuhaus, ‘Autobiographical Notes. Chapter II (Autopsychographical)’ in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 64 (Neuhaus’s emphasis).

Neuhaus's interpretation of the fugue reflects the regaining of life, 'the finding of *the way out into life*, the return [to life] after the last glimmer of hope has all but died'.<sup>258</sup> He begins the theme of the fugue tentatively, very much on the 'back-edge' of the tempo. The first sounding of the fugal subject itself moves slightly towards the 'front-edge' as it approaches bar 28<sup>2</sup> and 29<sup>1</sup> [See Figure 15 – refer to CD Track 7 from 2.46 min to 2.53 min]. This 'micro' tempo-inclination foreshadows the larger movement of tempo from its cautious 'back-edge' to its gradual shift forwards by the trill and subsequent *forte* in bar 45 (CD Track 7 at 3.17 min). He builds the assuredness and triumph of the fugue to its climax in the *fortissimo* in bar 110 [See Figure 16 – refer to CD Track 7 at 4.50 min] by maintaining an overall dynamic increase, and increase in 'depth' of sound. In addition Neuhaus judges his tempo so that he strives to drive forward from the 'front-edge' of the absolute, which it finally reaches in bar 101<sup>2</sup> (CD Track 7 at 4.37 min). Neuhaus uses the *piano* and *diminuendo* markings however, as a reminder of the fragility from which the fugue was born by returning the tempo-inclination once again, this time less obviously, towards the 'back-edge'.

---

<sup>258</sup> '[...] *выходом в жизнь*, возвращением к ней после того, как почти угас последний проблеск надежды.' Н. Г. Neuhaus, 'About the Last Sonatas of Beethoven' in M. G. Sokolov (ed.), *Questions of Piano Interpretation. Issue 2* p. 15.



Fuga.  
Allegro, ma non troppo.

sempre piano

cresc.

f

diminuendo

p

Figure 15 The third movement of Opus 110. Bars 26<sup>2</sup>–53

cresc.

f

f

p

cresc.

f

dim.

cresc.

p

Listesso tempo di Arioso.

B. 154.

Figure 16 The third movement of Opus 110. Bars 98–115

The return to the *Arioso*-theme in bar 116 is preceded by Neuhaus taking the tempo back already from bar 110<sup>2</sup>. The triumphant climax at bar 110 looks ahead to the relapse into sorrow. Neuhaus said:

It is hard to imagine anything more expressive that grips the soul! This time the complaining song is not only *complaining*, but it is *ill*: its melody, unlike its first narration, in G minor is fragmented, and the pauses prevent its flow so that one hears the suffering breathing [...] until we hear the pulse, nine times – the pulse that is ill, of one whose heart is about to fail [‘refuses to serve’].<sup>259</sup>

Here, despite the heavy significance and tragedy of the spirit seemingly being unable to revive the soul, Neuhaus keeps the tempo of the second *Arioso* much more tightly bound to the absolute. There is a feeling that the music’s movement is kept within tight bounds, almost without *rubato*. In this way he creates contrast with the fluctuation of the reviving fugue just heard, but also, through the strictness of the time, is able to heighten the impact of the syncopations and interruptions.

The inversion of the fugue, from bar 136<sup>2</sup> [see Figure 17] is, for Neuhaus, the spirit’s ultimate attempt to return to life:

Thought strengthens, and the [theme] becomes more complex finally achieving its fastest possible statement (diminution). It seems that the blood begins to flow through the capillaries: the theme starts to lose its ‘thematic’ character – and truly it becomes merely an accompaniment to the triumph and victory [...] rising upwards! To give in a few pages such an ‘emotional trajectory’: from the abyss of sorrow, illness to ecstatic joy, [and] triumphant affirmation of life – one needs to be Beethoven!<sup>260</sup>

<sup>259</sup> ‘Трудно представить себе нечто более выразительное, сильнее захватывающее душу! На этот раз жалобная песня не только жалобная, она больная, мелодия её, в отличие от первого изложения в g-moll, стала прерывистой, постоянные паузы нарушают её плавное течение, слышится короткое болезненное дыхание [...] затем девять раз подряд [...] удары больного пульса, сердце отказывается служить.’ Н. G. Neuhaus, ‘About the Last Sonatas of Beethoven’ in M. G. Sokolov (ed.), *Questions of Piano Interpretation. Issue 2* p. 18.

<sup>260</sup> ‘[...] мысль крепнет, осложняется [тема], наконец, достигает крайнего ускорения (уменьшения). Кажется, что кровь начинает струиться по капиллярам: тема почти утрачивает свой тематический» характер – и вправду, она становится лишь сопровождением торжественно и победно возвышающейся над ним темы [...] неуклонно стремящейся все выше и выше [...]! Дать на

Neuhaus's interpretation of the inverted fugal subject is determined, with the tempo reflecting this. He had already used the 'heartbeats' in bars 133 – 134 [see Figure 17 – refer to CD Track 7 from 6.40 min] to move the overall tempo forward from the *Arioso*, giving an illusion of the tempo pushing forwards off the 'front-edge' and gaining momentum. Unlike the previous treatment of the fugal material, he is much less inclined to allow the tempo to sit on the 'back-edge' as he aims to take the remaining part of the movement, the restoration to health and life, in one affirming sweep.

14 (126) *L'istesso tempo della Fuga.*  
*Poi a poi di nuovo vivente.*  
*(Nach und nach wieder auflebend)*

*sempre una corda*  
*L'inversione della Fuga. (Die Umkehrung der Fuge.)*

Figure 17 Bars 131–143

---

нескольких страницах такую «эмоциональную траекторию»: от бездны скорби, болезни, до ликующей радости, победного жизнеутверждения – для этого надо быть только Бетховеном!  
 Ibid.

Neuhaus's use of tempo modification in this way to shape, and narrate, the fugue contrasts with the approach of Maria Grinberg [CD Track 8].<sup>261</sup> Grinberg treats the tempo of the fugue very strictly, without the suggestion of hesitancy as it follows the *Arioso*, and corroborates this with a more terraced approach to the dynamics [refer to CD Track 8 from 4.15 min and the inverted fugue at 9.29 min]. In this way, although Grinberg's interpretation of the *Arioso* shares many of the Romantic features with Neuhaus, the fugue could be said to have a Baroque-like majesty and grandeur. Grinberg's interpretation of the third movement therefore can arguably be heard as the opposition of Romantic and Baroque, and so possibly of subjectivity and objectivity.

Neuhaus's interpretation of Opus 110 is conceived as one psychological narrative. Desiring to make this narrative as close as possible to what he believed Beethoven's persona would have been, Neuhaus made an extensive web of associations from different spheres which he considered significant to Beethoven's life – the historic, the philosophical and the pianistic. To make sense of this information Neuhaus's process of assimilation dictated that these must 'fall into [his] soul' and become a part of his own self. Thus, the psychological narratives which Neuhaus created for Beethoven were forged out of associations that had been filtered through Neuhaus's own being.

As an interpreter searching for the truth of Beethoven, Neuhaus's aim was to seek out the subjective truth. The numerous irrational and incongruous statements or conclusions which he made in his journey of investigation and appropriation regarding Beethoven's persona did not bother him. Beethoven was not interesting to Neuhaus as an independently existing individual. Instead, it was the resulting Stanislavskian-synthesis, through which certain aspects of Beethoven merged with his own interpretative personality, which was so vital for Neuhaus. Likewise, the juxtaposition of 'soul' and 'spirit', as presented in Opus 110, was only relevant to Neuhaus because of their apparent unity – their role in human (super-) consciousness. Neuhaus strove to see Beethoven as a Romantic philosopher, and through this desire he found a way of reflecting his *own* philosophical self.

---

<sup>261</sup> Melodiya. Catalogue number MEL CD 1002025: *Maria Grinberg. Ludwig Van Beethoven Sonatas*. 9 CD-set released 2012. CD 9 Track 6.

## Chapter 4

### Heinrich Neuhaus's Chopin: The Romantic Enigma

Heinrich Neuhaus remains inconceivable without the music of Fryderyk Chopin. Along with Beethoven, Chopin was considered by Neuhaus to be the complementary fundamental pillar of pianistic understanding – the two opposite ends of ‘an enormous circle’.<sup>1</sup> However, if Neuhaus allowed himself to criticize Beethoven (‘I am not always on Beethoven’s side [...] he has his minuses’), this was never the case with his reverent attitude to Chopin.<sup>2</sup> Thus, despite Neuhaus’s singling out of Beethoven and Chopin above so many other composers who were obviously important to him as a pianist, there are significant differences in his understanding and engagement with them.

Whilst Neuhaus manipulated the images of Beethoven and Chopin through similar processes of appropriation and assimilation, his distinct view of Beethoven resonated within a wider shared idea of heroism and of speaking for humanity. For the most part, Neuhaus was able to select elements from the established ‘Beethoveniana’ which appealed to his own understanding and sympathies, and thus imposed himself onto Beethoven’s image. When it came to Chopin, however, despite Neuhaus’s own recognition that there was a wealth of established Central European and Slavic thought on the Polish composer, he nonetheless subjected Chopin to a radical re-characterization of identity to fit in accordance to his own individual conception. Despite Neuhaus’s claim that Beethoven and Chopin stood at opposing ends of pianism, he desired to mould Chopin within the same concepts of heroism and existential philosophy that were so striking in his vision of Beethoven. It will be seen that Neuhaus believed he was a spiritual ‘brother’ of Chopin and sincerely felt that the composer embodied his own unique way of thinking and as well as his aesthetical views. Through the exploration of issues presented by language and perceptions of national identity, this chapter will investigate the radical adjustments that Neuhaus was prepared to create in order to present Chopin as the ultimate Slav – and how the strength of Neuhaus’s charisma and artistic convictions managed to conceal these from his peers and critics.

---

<sup>1</sup> ‘[...] огромный круг.’ Neuhaus’s conversation with B. M. Teplov and A. V. Vitsinsky (6 December 1944) in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 100.

<sup>2</sup> ‘Я ведь не всегда и не совсем на стороне Бетховена. У [него есть] и минусы.’ *Ibid.* p. 101.

This chapter will explore Neuhaus's transformation of Chopin through the prism of his own imagination by investigating his engagement with a range of philosophical ideas, and ideas appropriated from his knowledge of the poetry, literature and both historical and contemporary pianism. Although this method of enquiry mirrors itself on the previous chapter, it necessarily traces different influences including those of Fyodor Dostoevsky, Friedrich Nietzsche, Felix Blumenfeld, Adam Mickiewicz and Boris Pasternak to take into account the key figures to whom Neuhaus turned to define Chopin. The chapter will once again be divided into three key sections: philosophical ideas, musical influences and interpretative case studies.

Because of the nature of Neuhaus's complex, multi-layered relationship with Chopin, certain key ideas will be investigated from several different angles. For instance, Neuhaus will be seen to use Nietzsche as a prism to form his own understanding of Classicism and Antiquity in relation to Chopin, yet he also draws on Nietzsche's descriptions of Apollonian and Dionysian characteristics to define Chopin as an ahistoric phenomenon. Further, it will be seen that the connotations of the Apollonian and Dionysian have often been a culturally significant dichotomy through which critics perceived Neuhaus's own pianism, but that these definitions stand outside of Nietzsche's writings. The discussion below will also reveal that many of Neuhaus's ideas on Chopin lack clear delineation. In this manner, his presentation of Chopin as the ultimate Slav, a Beethovenian hero, or as the 'universal man' (*всечеловек*) must be taken as aspects of his understanding of the composer which, in his mind, have significant areas of overlap and cannot be readily separated. Therefore it will become apparent that it is the summative understanding of many ideas that gives a better indication of Neuhaus's relationship with his idealized vision of Chopin.

#### **4.1 Neuhaus's application of philosophical ideas to the image of Chopin**

Philosophical thought was Neuhaus's tool to make sense of himself as both an individual and as an interpreter. Neuhaus's keen interest in exploring his own 'autopsychography', as a psychological process of identification, has already been explored in this thesis as a vital part of his engagement with the late works of Beethoven. For reasons which will be detailed below, the dependence upon 'autopsychography' is arguably heightened in his approach to Chopin. Arising from Neuhaus's engagement with his 'autopsychography' was the desire to define the enigmatic element of the interpreter's self – the soul. Chopin's music, as will be discussed in detail, symbolized for Neuhaus the idea of a generous, loving and therefore 'noble' soul. In

considering Chopin be the truest mirror of the interpreter's soul, Neuhaus saw great interpretations of the composer's work to be attainable by only the noblest of people:

It seems to me that Chopin demands from the interpreter an unusually large [kind of] love, a love which we come across in life as rarely as we come across an enormous talent. This is why Chopin is so hard for the pianist.<sup>3</sup>

Chopin's 'nobility of the soul' was of such significance to Neuhaus's vision of Chopin, that he felt the need to contextualize it for himself within Nietzsche's writings on many different levels. The interaction of these ideas and their impact on Neuhaus's understanding of Chopin's image will be considered in the following discussion. An important transformation, instigated by Neuhaus's view of Chopin through a Nietzschean lens, is the elevation of Chopin to the status of *Übermensch* – a transformation which also appeared in Neuhaus's thought as Dostoevsky's *всечеловек*.<sup>4</sup> The heroic status therefore bestowed by Neuhaus on Chopin is one that is linked, in his mind, to the ideals of Ancient Greece. This positioning of Chopin within what he considered to be Classical thought is a factor that separates Neuhaus's Chopin from his Beethoven. As will be investigated, in defining Chopin as the epitome of Antiquity, Neuhaus paradoxically moulded him into an ahistorical phenomenon. Neuhaus's Beethoven spoke for all humanity but was understood only by those *initiated* by an experiential process of the intellect into the world of a Romantic philosopher. Neuhaus's Chopin spoke of a poetic, timeless and universal quality – love, understood by *all*, but expressed only by the worthiest.

In order to understand the rationale behind Neuhaus's radical transformation of Chopin, let us first consider the strength of his self-identification with the composer. The sheer extent to which Chopin dominated Neuhaus's repertoire, concert programming, teaching and even writing is a striking testament to the reverence that he had for the Polish

---

<sup>3</sup> '[...] мне кажется, что Шопен требует от исполнителя особенно большой любви, любви, которая бывает в жизни столь же редко, как очень большой талант. Вот почему Шопен так труден для пианиста.' Г. Г. Нейгауз, 'Ван Клиберн' [H. G. Neuhaus, 'Van Cliburn'] in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 242.

<sup>4</sup> Although *Übermensch* translates as 'superman' or 'overman', and *всечеловек* translates as 'all-man', this chapter will focus on the idea that both are superior men who justify the existence of mankind. The author is aware of the negative reception of the idea of an *Übermensch*, following its selective appropriation by Hitler and Mussolini, in the years up to World War II. See for example M. Newton, *The Path to Tyranny: A History of Free Society's Descent into Tyranny*, 2003. Second Edition (Eleftheria Publishing, 2010) p. 169.

composer. Regarded as one of the undisputed 'Chopinists' of his day, Neuhaus's name had always been synonymous with that of Chopin. Reflecting this prevailing view, Rabinovich wrote: 'How many captivating artistic discoveries are held in his Chopin! It is enough just to consider one interpretation of a mazurka [to remind us of] his charisma and innovation [...]'.<sup>5</sup> In Alexander Alexeev's textbook on Russian pianism, *История фортепианного искусства* [*A History of the Art of the Piano*] (1967/88) readers are invited to become acquainted with the diversity of Neuhaus's pianism principally through his recordings of Chopin: 'Amongst the significant recordings of interpretations of Chopin made by Soviet pianists of the older generation, the artistry of H. Neuhaus is most fully represented'.<sup>6</sup> Neuhaus's colleague Igumnov had even publicly stated: 'For me, Neuhaus's interpretations of Chopin are the closest to my [heart]. I really do find all other interpretations of Chopin very distant from myself'.<sup>7</sup> Vladimir Sofronitsky too, wrote: 'The best interpreters of Chopin are Heinrich Neuhaus and Lev Oborin'.<sup>8</sup>

Russian pianism in the twentieth century was peppered by handfuls of famous 'Chopinists' including Igumnov, Sofronitsky and in the later generation Oborin, Zak and Stanislav Neuhaus. What consistently caused these artists to single out Neuhaus as a great Russian Chopin interpreter was their belief that Chopin was Neuhaus's cultural birthright. As will be discussed later, on a certain level this must have been driven by Neuhaus's national identity, which was Polish from his mother's side – and certainly being a cousin of Karol Szymanowski would have added weight to the idea that Neuhaus was a kinsman to Chopin.

Neuhaus felt he had a particularly close 'bond' with Chopin from his 'earliest childhood', as the music of the composer always filled the house and was 'worshipped' by all

<sup>5</sup> 'Сколько захватывающих творческих открытий заключает его Шопен! Достаточно напомнить хотя бы одну мазурку [исполненную] так обаятельно и неожиданно, вопреки сложившимся традициям [...]' D. A. Rabinovich, *Portraits of Pianists* p. 59.

<sup>6</sup> 'В существующих записях исполнения Шопена советскими пианистами старшего поколения относительно более полно представлено искусство Г. Нейгауза.' А. Д. Алексеев, *История фортепианного искусства. Части 1 и 2* (Москва: «Музыка», 1988) [A. D. Alexeev, *History of the Art of the Piano. Parts 1 and 2* (Moscow: 1988)] pp. 210–211.

<sup>7</sup> 'Ближе всего мне исполнение Шопена Нейгаузом. Что касается других интерпретаций Шопена, то я действительно от них далек.' Я. И. Мильштейн, *Константин Николаевич Игумнов* (Москва: «Музыка», 1975) [Y. I. Milstein, *Konstantin Nikolaevich Igumnov* (Moscow: 1975)] p. 250.

<sup>8</sup> 'Среди лучших исполнителей Шопена – Г. Нейгауз и Л. Оборин.' В. В. Софроницкий, 'О Шопене (фрагмент)' [V. V. Sofronitsky, 'About Chopin (a fragment)'] in М. Г. Соколов (составитель), *Вопросы фортепианного исполнительства. Выпуск второй* (Москва: «Музыка», 1968) [M. G. Sokolov (ed.), *Questions of Piano Interpretation. Issue 2* (Moscow: 1968)] p. 60.



those around him.<sup>9</sup> Thus, Chopin's revered status in the Neuhaus household must have left a particularly strong imprint on the boy's developing mind. From Neuhaus's earliest letters to his last, Chopin is presented as a spiritual beacon embodying the highest ethical and moral values of life. As already shown in the previous chapter, Neuhaus's lifelong preoccupation with raising his own self to such values of 'saintliness', exercised a great power over his interpretative decisions and ideals. Neuhaus raised his image of Chopin to such an aesthetic height and thus set his own moral values in life so high, that despite his evident desperation to shape his life according to these ideals, he was forced to admit that he faltered. His own autobiographic struggle in chasing the ideals which he chose Chopin to embody and safeguard for him are personified in his lament to Goldenweiser: 'I love life, but not myself in it...'<sup>10</sup>

The extent to which Neuhaus saw *himself* within Chopin is evident from his personal correspondence. Whereas in his public articles dedicated to Chopin Neuhaus wrote with humility that he became 'close' to Chopin through sheer 'hard work', his private writings show a different perspective.<sup>11</sup> Writing in a time of personal crisis in 1931, shortly after his wife, Zinaida, had left him for Pasternak, Neuhaus's letter indicates that he understood himself as a kinsman rather than disciple of Chopin:

Today I played all evening – I played so wonderfully. [...] It was that very unique, sacred playing that was imbued with emotional experience [пережитое] through [from start] to finish, and it simply flowed out of me – that which is sometimes so torn, polluted, maimed and tormented [as I try to express it], that which I love, and what I live for and makes me a *brother* to Chopin [...].<sup>12</sup>

<sup>9</sup> 'Мне кажется, что я рожден с [музыкой Шопена]. Шопена в нашей семье боготворили.' Г. Г. Нейгауз, 'О Шопене' [H. G. Neuhaus, 'About Chopin'] (*Советская музыка*, 1960 №2) in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 230.

<sup>10</sup> 'Да, я люблю жизнь, но не себя в ней...' Neuhaus's phrase is in itself a re-working of a famous Stanislavsky-adage which Neuhaus very often quoted in class and in his writings: 'to love art in oneself but not oneself in art.' The quotation presented in the text is taken from a letter sent by Neuhaus to Alexander Goldenweiser between the end of December 1957 and the beginning of January 1958 that was found by Goldenweiser's former student, Dmitri Bashkirov. The letter seems to be a confirmation of the falling out between the two musicians and is a request for forgiveness on the part of Neuhaus for his actions. See *Letters* p. 408.

<sup>11</sup> See H. G. Neuhaus, 'Thoughts on Chopin' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 234.

<sup>12</sup> 'Я сегодня весь вечер играл – чудно играл [...] это было именно то самое, единственное, сокровенное, до конца пережитое и совсем просто выливающееся, что иногда во мне так искромсано, загрязнено, искалечено и измучено, то, что я люблю, для чего живу и что меня делает братом Шопена [...].' Letter to Zinaida Pasternak dated 1 August 1931, Zinovevsk in *Letters* p. 217 (Emphasis mine).

Neuhaus's statement reveals in no uncertain terms the great spiritual height of his vision of Chopin, and that his desire to mirror it indeed falters at times. More importantly, Neuhaus disclosed his belief that he psychologically identifies himself with Chopin. As fitting with his general aesthetic understanding, Neuhaus considered that Chopin's experiences 'of the soul' [душевные переживания] manifested themselves in his music. He considered his own soul to have accumulated these very same experiences and so confirmed him spiritually, or through the soul, as Chopin's kin.

In her analysis of Neuhaus as a pedagogue, his student, Berta Kremenstein indicated that Neuhaus considered the way in which the biographical element of Chopin's persona imprinted itself into the music to be its very essence. Echoing the views of many other artists in contact with Neuhaus's ideas, Kremenstein emphasized that she believed this to be a way of engaging with music that was highly specific to Neuhaus:

[...] Neuhaus characterized the most important feature of Chopin's art as its 'autobiographicality' [автобиографичность], undoubtedly meaning the soulfulness, genuineness and depth of feeling expressed, and all this with restraint and simplicity. [...] But the idea of 'autobiographicality' is significant for Neuhaus – it is a specifically 'Neuhausian' idea.<sup>13</sup>

In clarifying what he had meant by identifying Chopin's music as the pinnacle of autobiographic art, Neuhaus revealed an important paradox. Although an engagement with 'autobiographicality' intended to allow the interpreter to get closer to the 'real' Chopin, it was not essentially an engagement with *Chopin's* biography that Neuhaus was advocating. Rather, Neuhaus had meant that the interpreter 'looks into himself [since] complete giving of the self [in the process of] self-understanding and self-analysis are methods and criteria of studying reality':<sup>14</sup>

<sup>13</sup> [...] Нейгауз характеризует важнейшую черту творчества Шопена как «автобиографичность», несомненно имея в виду душевность, подлинность и полноту чувств, выраженных вместе с тем сдержанно и изысканно просто. [...] Но идея автобиографичности показательна для самого Нейгауза, это типично «нейгаузовская» идея.' Б. М. Кременштейн, 'Уроки Нейгауза' [B. M. Kremenstein, 'Neuhaus's Lessons'] in A. V. Malinkovskaya (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus and his Students. Gnessin-Pianists Speak* (Moscow: 2007) p. 33.

<sup>14</sup> [...] лишь часто «глядя в себя» [...]. Полная самоотдача [в процессе] самопознания и самоанализа [дают] метод и критерий изучения действительности.' Ibid.

Chopin is unusual primarily because of the untold [неслыханной] autobiographicality [автобиографичность] of his art, which exceeds by far that of any other great artist be it Goethe, Pushkin, Wagner, Tchaikovsky or anyone else you wish... In other words, to fully understand and transmit him, it is necessary to wholly submit your own soul into his unique soul. This immersion into another 'I' is only given to people in the state of love.<sup>15</sup>

Neuhaus's idea of 'autobiographicality' in Chopin being the ultimate reflection of the interpreter's self was a notion that became a strong part of his pedagogical legacy. Thus, Neuhaus's belief that Chopin required the interpreter to offer unconditionally and freely his entire soul in order to offer a meaningful voice to the music was a belief that was adopted by students and spread more widely. For instance, Vera Razumovskaya's essay exploring the responsibilities and morals of interpreters indicates how she absorbed her professor's convictions. Not only did Razumovskaya choose Chopin as the criterion by which she defined the highest levels of interpretational integrity, but she also demonstrated that an interpreter unavoidably discloses his own spiritual autobiography through such music:

What should a young interpreter do in order to have the right to come close to the treasure-trove of thoughts, ideas and feelings embodied in Chopin's music? First of all, he should try to cleanse himself of his human limitations. An interpreter does not only interpret music, but whether he wants to or not, he involuntarily reveals himself in the music – gives his portrait [...].<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> 'Шопен необычен, прежде всего, неслыханной автобиографичностью своего творчества, далеко превосходящей автобиографичность любого великого художника, будь это Гёте, Пушкин, Вагнер, Чайковский, кто хотите... Другими словами, чтобы его до конца понять и передать, надо всецело, всей душой погрузиться именно в его единственную душу. Это погружение в чужое «я» удается людям только в состоянии любви.' Г. Г. Нейгауз, 'Ван Клиберн' [H. G. Neuhaus, 'Van Cliburn'] in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), Heinrich Neuhaus p. 242.

<sup>16</sup> 'Что же должен сделать молодой исполнитель, чтобы иметь право подойти близко к такой сокровищнице мыслей, идей и чувств, какой является музыка Шопена? Прежде всего, стараться очистить себя от своих человеческих недостатков. Исполнитель не только исполняет музыку, а хочет он этого или не хочет, невольно в музыке показывает себя, дает свой портрет [...].' В. Х. Разумовская, 'Об ответственности исполнителя и его моральном облике' [V. H. Razumovskaya, 'About the Responsibilities of an Interpreter and his Moral Character'] in С. З. Бейлина (составитель), *Уроки Разумовской* (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2007) [S. Z. Belina (ed.), *Razumovskaya's Lessons* (Moscow: 2007)] p. 132.

The idea that Chopin's music is the purest kind of reflection of the interpreter's soul caused Neuhaus to insist that the great moral and spiritual height of Chopin was latent in every person. Its expression in actions and art required that person to work incessantly 'on the self' [*работа над собой*] – an action 'not given lightly [*с кондачка*]. It needs efforts, concentrated will, loyalty and reverence.<sup>17</sup> Neuhaus wrote:

I often think about Dostoevsky's famous speech about Pushkin, about the universal man [*всечеловек*]... He did not speak only about the great genius of Russian poetry, he spoke about the Russian person and the qualities of his soul – Pushkin was merely the brightest example, embodying this in the highest form.<sup>18</sup>

Speaking of the 'universal man', Neuhaus spoke of a man who has risen spiritually above others, and who is able to accommodate and communicate *all* aspects of human life within the nobility of himself. If in Russian literature this figure for Neuhaus was Pushkin (considered by some in the West to be Russia's equivalent of Mickiewicz),<sup>19</sup> then in music, Neuhaus considered that only Chopin could share this mantle: 'Chopin [...] embodied in sound the immortal words of Pushkin: *прекрасное должно быть величаво* [the beautiful must be majestic]!'<sup>20</sup>

Seeing Chopin as what Dostoevsky called a *всечеловек* demonstrates that rather than trying to define Chopin in relation to nineteenth-century circumstances, Neuhaus once again found it more important to see Chopin through the filter of *his* own assimilated experiences. Significantly, Neuhaus had a lifelong passion for Dostoevsky's novels: 'Again, that familiar and

<sup>17</sup> '[...] это стоит иногда немало труда. Настоящая культура не дается «с кондачка». Она требует усилий, напряжения воли, преданности и благоговения.' The phrase that Neuhaus uses «с кондачка» has no direct translation into English. It describes that the object it refers to has been acquired unjustly, through luck and without any effort, preparation or forward-thinking. Citation from H. G. Neuhaus, 'About Chopin' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* pp. 233–234.

<sup>18</sup> 'Я неизбежно вспоминаю о знаменитой речи Достоевского о Пушкине, о всечеловеке... Правда, ведь он говорил не только о величайшем гении русской поэзии, он говорил вообще о русском человеке, о его душевных качествах – Пушкин был для него только ярчайшим примером, высшим их воплощением.' Г. Г. Нейгауз, 'Лучезарный талант' [H. G. Neuhaus, 'A Radiant Talent'] in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 247.

<sup>19</sup> See the research on this by M. M. Dziediszyska, 'Chapter III. From the Naïve vs. Sentimental to the Romantic Dialogue: Mickiewicz as Pushkin's Poetic Other.' *The Romantic Other: Adam Mickiewicz in Russia 1824-1829* (PhD, Columbia University, 2003).

<sup>20</sup> '[Шопен] воплотил в звуках бессмертные слова Пушкина: прекрасное должно быть величаво!' H. G. Neuhaus, 'Thoughts on Chopin' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 236.

new shock [of re-reading Dostoevsky's *Brothers Karamazov*] awaits me.'<sup>21</sup> The philosophy encapsulated in Dostoevsky's novels would surely have appealed directly to Neuhaus's spiritual and intellectual dependence on the subject ('I played little over these past days, but on the other hand I read a lot [...], I always need to seek other spiritual sources – otherwise I will simply go mad!').<sup>22</sup> Dostoevsky's views, foreshadowing what would become existentialist thought, were thus deeply ingrained into Neuhaus's own sympathies.

Dostoevsky's deliberations on the *всечеловек* and the idea of humility in order to love all other nations implied the suffering endured before being able to call oneself a 'brother' of all men.<sup>23</sup> In Neuhaus's view of Chopin speaking for all men, he characterized Chopin's soul in Dostoevskian terms as expressing simultaneously: 'Sorrow [and] a love towards people, a breadth [generosity/openness] of the heart...'<sup>24</sup> Neuhaus, who did not seek to interpret 'love' outside the idea of tragedy, would have found in Dostoevsky common ground that he could bring to his view of Chopin.

The generous and all-encompassing love that was nonetheless necessarily tinged with anguish or sorrow can be seen to stem directly from Neuhaus's appropriation of Dostoevsky's existentialist tendencies. As noted by Ilya Klinger: 'Dostoevsky's protagonists are metaphysically distilled, pared down to the essence of what it means to be human.'<sup>25</sup> The essence of humanity, as already explored in relation to Neuhaus's interpretation of Beethoven, was inextricably linked in Neuhaus's mind to pantheism and thus with the ability to embrace and accept *all* facets of life. Neuhaus talked about 'those comforts and joys that an artist receives from his creations [which] "erase the casual features" [that cloud his path. Despite] seeing clearer than anyone else [...] all the "evil of the world" and suffer[ing] it much more.'<sup>26</sup>

<sup>21</sup> '[...] на днях мне дадут «Братьев Карамазовых»; опять предстоит столь знакомое и новое потрясение.' Neuhaus's letter to A. G. Gabrichevsky dated 2 August 1959 in *Letters* p. 439.

<sup>22</sup> '[...] несколько дней совсем не играл, но много читал [...], мне непременно нужны другие духовные источники, – в противном случае сойду с ума.' Letter dated 10 September 1908 from Manuilovka in *Letters* p. 99.

<sup>23</sup> See D. Rancour-Laferriere, *The Slave Soul of Russia* (New York: New York University Press, 1995) p. 239–240.

<sup>24</sup> '[...] выражение скорби, но и любовь к людям, широта сердца...' H. G. Neuhaus, 'About Chopin' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 233.

<sup>25</sup> I. Klinger, 'Dostoevsky and the Novel-Tragedy: Genre and Modernity in Ivanov, Pumpyansky and Bakhtin' in *The Journal of the Modern Language Association of America*, 2011 (pp. 77–87) p. 75.

<sup>26</sup> '[...] те утешения и радости, которые доставляет художнику само творчество [и которому] дана сила стереть «случайные черты», а это тем более трудно, что он яснее, чем кто-нибудь, видит и сознаёт все «зло мира» и больше от него страдает.' H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 213.

The acceptance of fate which Neuhaus saw to be projected by both Chopin and Dostoevsky was not an abstract concept that was only relevant to Neuhaus's ideal vision of an interpreter. The continuing love of life and people in the face of tragedy was highlighted by Neuhaus as an important aspect to Chopin's work. Neuhaus talked about the 'joy', rather than darkness or anguish, which Chopin brings to music and considered his music (particularly the Third *Ballade* Opus 47, *Barcarolle* Opus 60, *Polonaise-Fantaisie* Opus 61) to be amongst the most life-affirming possible: 'I don't know anything that raises the spirit more.'<sup>27</sup> The same ability see the greatness of life despite the cruellest trials of fate was identified by Konstantin Mochulsky as an inherently autobiographical feature in Dostoevsky's output:

[Dostoevsky's letter penned in the hours after the aborted execution was that of a man] who had just seen death before him. In the letter the bewilderment of the soul and joyous excitement of a return to life are sounded.<sup>28</sup> Trials and suffering are nothing in comparison to the *supreme value* of life. 'Life is a gift, life is happiness' – Dostoevsky felt intensely the divine mystery of existence, the *grace of life*. [...] The grace of life, which is greater than understanding, greater than its justification, is also spoken of by Prince Myshkin and Ippolit in *The Idiot* [...] and by Zosima in *The Brothers Karamazov*. Dostoevsky's sinners are saved through their love of 'living life' (Raskolnikov, Ivan Karamazov); hearts that are apathetic and numb perish despite all their wisdom.<sup>29</sup>

Dostoevsky's philosophical views, tempered by his fate, must have resonated to a substantial degree with Neuhaus's own biographical fate. Berta Kremenstein expressed her view of her professor's plight:

If we try to compare the life of Heinrich Gustavovich, even just by skimming the surface, with that of his classmate and friend Artur Rubinstein, we suddenly see the tragedy of Neuhaus's fate. For a long time he was torn away from the cultured world. We now know that he had suffered his

---

<sup>27</sup> 'He знаю ничего, более подымающего дух.' Н. Г. Neuhaus, 'About Chopin' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 233.

<sup>28</sup> Dostoevsky had been sentenced to death by firing squad on the 23 December 1849 but with minutes to spare was commuted by the Tzar, instead Dostoevsky was sent to a Siberian labour camp.

<sup>29</sup> K. Mochulsky, *Dostoevsky: His Life and Work* (1947) translated by Michael Minihan (Princeton: University Press, 1967 reprinted 1973) p. 142.

arrest [November 1941 to August 1942], deportation [to a labour camp and subsequent exile from Moscow in Sverdlovsk until 1944], the loss of those closest to him, his relatives, friends, all his awards, financial struggle... But for me – simply his student, who had never risen above the boundary of ‘teacher-student’ – it was as if Neuhaus’s character had never been affected by his biographical facts. He remained himself. [...] Neuhaus always returned to the discussion about *what* work gives to an artist, and he believed that a creative individual cannot look pessimistically upon life – in art is joy.<sup>30</sup>

Neuhaus’s evocation of Chopin as a *всечеловек* carries a resemblance to Nietzsche’s *Übermensch*. In light of an official Soviet ban of Nietzsche’s writings from 1922, including its presence in all libraries, which lasted into the late 1970s, it is conceivable that Neuhaus took advantage of such a resemblance particularly to give himself a way to express his vision of Chopin in print.<sup>31</sup> Given that Neuhaus’s private correspondence and diaries focused heavily on Nietzsche, it is likely that his extrapolation of analogous ideas from Dostoevsky was, to a certain degree, a cover for his lifelong engagement with the writings of Nietzsche when he tried to share his aesthetic ideals with a wider audience.

---

<sup>30</sup> ‘Если попытаться даже поверхностно сопоставить жизненный путь Генриха Густавовича, например, с ходом бытия его «одноклассника» и друга Артура Рубинштейна, сразу обнаруживается трагичность судьбы Нейгауза. Он долгое время был отторжен от всего культурного мира. Мы знаем, что ему пришлось пережить и арест, и ссылку, потерю близких, родных, друзей, всех наград, испытывать материальные лишения... Но мне – просто его ученице, никогда не переходившей грани взаимоотношений «учитель – ученик», – представляется, что на характере Нейгауза и его связях с действительностью факты его биографии существенным образом не сказались. Он оставался самим собой. [...] Нейгауз постоянно возвращался к размышлениям о том, что даёт художнику его работа, и верил: личность творческая не может пессимистически смотреть на жизнь, в творчестве – счастье.’ Berta Kremenstein’s article in E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus* p. 280.

<sup>31</sup> Ю. В. Синеокая, «Российская Ницшеана» [Y. V. Sineokaya, ‘Russian Nietzscheana’] pp. 2–3. Online journal, [http://anthropology.rchgi.spb.ru/pdf/02\\_Sineokaya.pdf](http://anthropology.rchgi.spb.ru/pdf/02_Sineokaya.pdf) (accessed 17/02/2014) from *Ницше: Pro et Contra (Антология)*, Санкт Петербург: 2011 [*Nietzsche: Pro et Contra (Anthology)*, St. Petersburg: 2011]. For a general overview of Nietzsche in Soviet Russia see: R. Overy, *The Dictators: Hitler’s Germany and Stalin’s Russia*, 2004 (London: Penguin Books, 2005). Б. М. Сарнов, ‘Зачем мы открываем запасники’ [B. M. Sarnov, ‘Why we Need to Open the Storage’] (*Огонёк* 1990 № 3) identifies a letter by Maxim Gorky dated 8 November 1923: ‘Out of the news that simply shatters the mind in Russia [...] the following are banned: Plato, Schopenhauer, Kant, Nietzsche, Lev Tolstoy [...] and many other heretics.’ [‘8 ноября 1923 года М. Горький писал В. Ходасевичу: «Из новостей, ошеломляющих разум, могу сообщить, что... в России [...] запрещены для чтения: Платон, Кант, Шопенгауэр, Ницше, Л. Толстой [...] и ещё многие подобные еретики.»’].

Nietzsche's proposition that men were not all created equal, and that some will rise above the masses to speak for them, strongly mirrors Neuhaus's concept of Chopin: a poet of Poland understood by all not because he descends to their level, but because he is able to awaken in other people the realization of the human essence concealed within them. As identified by Heidegger: 'The name *Übermensch* designates the essence of humanity.'<sup>32</sup> Nietzsche considered Art to be the 'greatest stimulans [sic.] to life [because it] lifts a thing beyond itself, enhances it' – a point of view upheld by Neuhaus.<sup>33</sup> Accordingly, great art such as Chopin's, in both Neuhaus's and Nietzsche's view, offered a bridge from man to the sublimity of super-man.

What particularly ties Neuhaus's idea of a *всечеловек* to Nietzsche's idea of the *Übermensch* is the fact that, in both concepts, the transcendence into a super-human granted man to reflect beauty yet not because they had only seen and felt beauty, but because they had learnt to 'love' all aspects of life. Because they reflected all aspects of life into art through a noble soul, including suffering and sorrow, their reflection in art was thus beautiful. In *Ecce Homo*, Nietzsche wrote:

My formula for greatness in a human being is *amor fati*: that one wants nothing to be different, not forward, not backward, not in all eternity. Not merely to bear what is necessary, still less conceal it [...] but to *love* it.<sup>34</sup>

Neuhaus's elevation of Chopin to Nietzsche's *Übermensch* went hand-in-hand with other radical transformations of Chopin's identity which can be traced to Nietzsche's writings. Of these, perhaps surprisingly, is Neuhaus's symbolic relocation of Chopin's homeland away from Poland to Italy.

The placement of Chopin within a Mediterranean and Classical climate was a phenomenon which does have its place amongst other pianist-thinkers. Most commonly, however, the link is made with Majorca – where Chopin famously spent the winter of 1838/9 with George Sand. For instance, in his book *Aspects de Chopin* (Paris, 1949) [*In Search of Chopin*] Cortot linked Chopin's heightened creativity to the promise of Majorca's

<sup>32</sup> A. Schrift, *Nietzsche and the Question of Interpretation: Between Hermeneutics and Deconstruction* (London: Routledge Inc., 1990) p. 27.

<sup>33</sup> Quote in *Ibid.* p. 51.

<sup>34</sup> See B. Magnus, 'The Deification of the Commonplace: "Twilight of the Idols"' in R. Solomon (ed.), *Reading Nietzsche*, 1988 (Oxford University Press, 1990) p. 171.



Mediterranean climate, and Chopin's bursts of optimism and brilliance to the warmth and brightness of spring and summer:

Everything in Chopin points to the existence of a secret link between the radiance of nature and the internal blossoming of his musical ideas; the unconscious reaction of the creative mind to the seasons, coinciding with the period of the year when his cough eased and his fits of suffocation became less frequent. [...] One pays even closer attention to that natural instinct which bound the frail musician to physical phenomena which seem to bear no relation to his art, but which he suffered to enter into him in the way that a still pool holds the heat of the sun's rays. 'A reflection of reflections' – his conversation with Delacroix comes to mind.<sup>35</sup>

In terms of a wider Mediterranean connection, Cortot also alluded to the natural assimilation of Italian *bel canto* in Chopin's melodic lines. However, these kinds of relocation are temporary phenomenon – experiences of a traveller which he brings back to his homeland, the warmth of the sun's rays which is all too soon to be overcast, and impressions which colour an otherwise Polish character.

Unlike Cortot, Neuhaus's writings do not mention Chopin in connection with Majorca. Furthermore, his relocation of Chopin to Italy was not a vision based on climate (in contrast to the bleakness of many Slavic lands, including Poland, in the depths of winter) in the manner that Cortot found necessary. Instead Neuhaus's relocation of Chopin came about from the *cultural* landscape that Italy offered. Importantly, his connection of Chopin with Italy lies rooted not geographically, but in the way he transformed the composer's psychological identity – his 'autopsychography', and thus needs to be recognized as a permanent transformation in contrast to Cortot's suggestion of a temporary influence.

Neuhaus's letters to his parents, written in his early twenties from his time in Italy (between 1908 and 1909), indicate an intensified period of study of Chopin's music. As mentioned in the first chapter, Italy was also evidently biographically a significant place for Neuhaus who, according to his letters, left only reluctantly.<sup>36</sup> Neuhaus asserted in his letters that this increased interest in Chopin was brought about by his exposure to the art and

<sup>35</sup> A. Cortot, *In Search of Chopin* translated by Cyril and Rena Clarke, 1951 (New York: Dover Publications Inc., 2013) p. 72.

<sup>36</sup> It was already mentioned in this thesis that Neuhaus had seriously considered making Florence his permanent home.

literature of the Italian Renaissance and the works of thinkers of the Enlightenment such as Leopardi (in the vernacular, as he boasted).<sup>37</sup> Neuhaus evidently began to see his interest in certain spheres of the Italian Renaissance as the link to a practical working-model of artistry engaging with ethics of Classicism in 'the most pure definition of the word': *Antiquity*.<sup>38</sup> The catalyst that brought together Italy, the idea of antiquity, and Chopin, was Neuhaus's study of Nietzsche. Reporting to his parents from Florence, Neuhaus summarized: 'The most important thing is that here I have several volumes of Nietzsche.'<sup>39</sup>

That Nietzsche did in fact have a profound influence on Neuhaus's thoughts in the time he spent in Italy can be seen quite strongly in Neuhaus's sudden conviction that he detested Christianity. Against a substantial backdrop of correspondence in which questions of religion did not preoccupy Neuhaus's thoughts, his conviction is particularly surprising. Neuhaus wrote to his parents:

There are however some things [amongst all the wonders here] that impress such a sadness – especially the *Forum romanum* around which those damned towers of churches poke out everywhere with that brusque and sardonic sign of the Catholic cross that mocks and shames man [...] only here in Rome can one completely feel and see with one's own eyes the difference between the Christian world and Classical Antiquity – *soit disant* [sic.], the pagan world. [...] the Cathedral of Saint Peter did not impress me in the least, but the Palatine Hill, the Baths of Caracalla [...] showed me what it is that I really love and find wonderful. [...] What can I do if I find the very shape of the dome to be un-aesthetic, paintings depicting exhausted saints – repulsive, and generally all aesthetic manifestations of Christianity to be vulgar in the highest order (*à propos*, Michelangelo and others who *only appeared to be painting saints* [but] were in fact, *pagans* [язычники] *par excellence*.<sup>40</sup>

<sup>37</sup> See Neuhaus's letter to his parents from Florence dated 1 December 1908 in *Letters* p. 103.

<sup>38</sup> '[...] классик, в самом точном понимании этого слова.' See quotation above from Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 234.

<sup>39</sup> 'Главное, что у меня тут несколько томов Ницше.' Letter from Florence dated 1 December 1908 in *Letters* p. 103.

<sup>40</sup> 'А при этом некоторые вещи производят такое безмерно грустное впечатление – особенно *Forum romanum*, вокруг которого повсюду торчат проклятые башни церквей с этим грубым и издевательским знаком католического креста, предназначенным первоначально для того, чтобы высмеять и посрамить людей [...] лишь тут в Риме можно до конца почувствовать и собственными глазами убедиться в разнице между христианским миром и классической древностью, *soit disant*

Neuhaus's statement shows links with Nietzsche's views of Christianity, the examples of which are abundant not only in *Der Antichrist* [*The Anti-Christ*] (1888, published 1895) but also in many earlier works such as the following extract from *Menschliches, Allzumenschliches* [*Human, All Too Human*] (1878):<sup>41</sup>

The Greeks did not see the Homeric gods above them as master and themselves below them as servants, as did the Jews. They saw, as it were, only the reflection of the most successful specimens of their own caste, that is, an ideal, not a contrast to their own nature [...].

Christianity, on the other hand, crushed and shattered man completely, and submerged him as if in deep mire... Christianity wants to destroy, shatter, stun, intoxicate: there is only one thing it does not want: *moderation*, and for this reason, it is in its deepest meaning barbaric, Asiatic, ignoble, un-Greek.<sup>42</sup>

Neuhaus's rift with Christianity, at this point in his life, seems to have led to a reluctance in identifying religion as an important facet in Chopin's persona.<sup>43</sup> There is evidence in Neuhaus's late diary entries, and some of his final letters, that he was reconsidering his attitude towards Christianity through the work of Albert Schweitzer. This, however, comes largely after Neuhaus's main writings on Chopin were published, and the distinct lack of consideration of Chopin's Catholicism in Neuhaus's analyses contrasts to those in Liszt's *Chopin*, and the

---

[sic.] языческим миром. [...] собор Св. Петра не произвёл на меня почти никакого впечатления, а руины Палатина, термы Каракаллы [...] только показали мне, что я люблю действительно и что считаю прекрасным. [...] но что я могу поделаться, если для меня форма купола – неэстетична, картины, изображающие святых, – омерзительны, и вообще все эстетические проявления христианства кажутся в высшей степени грубыми (*à propos*, Микеланджело и другие, которые будто бы писали картинки святых, были как раз *par excellence* язычниками).<sup>41</sup> Neuhaus's letter to his parents from Rome dated 23 – 28 March 1908 in *Letters* p. 91.

<sup>41</sup> Neuhaus wrote to A. G. Gabrichevsky on the 16 July 1959 that when reading Nietzsche's '*Menschliches*' he felt that he was 'amongst good men' ['решил окружить себя хорошими людьми']. See *Letters* p. 437.

<sup>42</sup> F. Nietzsche, *Human, All Too Human* (1878) translated by Marion Faber and Stephen Lehman (London: Penguin Books, 2004) p. 85.

<sup>43</sup> Due to censorship of printed text in the Soviet era, religion would have been a highly sensitive matter to write about. However, as seen in the previous chapter, Neuhaus did express himself quite openly about the idea of religion and spirituality being integral aspects of his vision of Beethoven.

emphasis of Chopin's devoutness as presented in the significant biography, *Frédéric Chopin as Man and Musician* (1889) by Frederick Niecks.<sup>44</sup>

Although this rejection of religion might be explained to a degree by the political climate of Neuhaus's time, it is interesting to note that in relation to Beethoven, as discussed in the previous chapter, Neuhaus publicly alluded to religious considerations. The choice therefore not to do the same in relation to Chopin cannot be ignored. In identifying 'Michelangelo and others' as pagans [язычники] he talks of them as a pre-Christian and therefore as belonging in aesthetic to Antiquity (to Neuhaus it seems the aesthetics of Ancient Rome and Ancient Greek were entirely interchangeable). Bearing in mind that 'Raphael and Pushkin' were Neuhaus's other '*pagans par excellence*', and that as discussed, Chopin could be seen as the musical embodiment of Pushkin, the summation of these considerations suggests that Neuhaus's elimination of Chopin's Catholicism from his identity was deliberate.<sup>45</sup>

The image of Chopin that Neuhaus passed onto his students at the Kiev Conservatory, where he had taught alongside Blumenfeld between 1919 and 1922, were in the terms of the Greek idea of a hero – an idea discussed further later in the chapter. Neuhaus's Greek hero however, is a distinct merging of the *всечеловек* or *Übermensch* with the paganism of Antiquity, and so is a unique amalgamation resulting from his need to see his ideas through the prism of Nietzsche. Neuhaus's student Razumovskaya, thus chose Chopin to symbolize the highest *morals* and self-sacrifice for greater good of humanity:

[...] the unusual soul of Chopin – a charismatic soul, pure as crystal, touching. A soul that is virtuous, proud and at the same time passionate, a soul that is young, heroic, sacrificing, passionately loving its people and patriotic.

[...] He could comprehend everything – he accumulated everything into himself and felt everything. He understood life, felt like no one else the high tragedy of death, the death of any person because he loved people,

---

<sup>44</sup> Among the several allusions to Chopin's religion, Liszt wrote: 'He poured out his soul in composition as others do in prayer: expressing in music those effusions of the heart, that unexpressed sorrow, that indescribable grief, which pious souls pour into their communion with God. He expressed in his works what others only say on their knees: those mysteries of passion and pain that man understands without words because they cannot be expressed in words.' [*Chopin* as printed in *Liszt's Chopin. A New Edition translated from the French, edited and with an introduction by Meirion Hughes* (Manchester: University Press, Manchester 2010) p. 98].

<sup>45</sup> H. G. Neuhaus, 'Thoughts on Chopin' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 234.

and was the most humane of the humane [человечнейшим из человечнейших].<sup>46</sup>

The efficiency with which Neuhaus assimilated Nietzsche's ideas and merged them with his own is a strong indication that he would almost certainly also have been affected by the latter's open admiration of Chopin. Nietzsche's view of Chopin as an epitomized Classicist, and by extension a Renaissance figure, as expressed for example in his *Der Wanderer und sein Schatten* [*The Wanderer and His Shadow*] (1880) would no doubt have further reaffirmed Neuhaus's views of Chopin as joyous and intelligible:

Chopin, the last of the modern musicians, who gazed at and worshipped beauty, like Leopardi [...] Chopin had the same princely punctilio in convention that Raphael shows in the use of the simplest traditional colours. The only difference is that Chopin applies them not to colour but to melodic and rhythmic traditions. He admitted the validity of these traditions because he was born under the sway of etiquette. But in these fetters he plays and dances as the freest and daintiest of spirits, and, be it observed, he does not spurn the chain.<sup>47</sup>

In speaking about Chopin as figure indebted to Classicism, Neuhaus's and Nietzsche's emphasis of Chopin's radiance (harmonically), structural perfection of his forms and clarity of his thoughts are opposed to the fervent yet suffering and ill figure offered for instance, by Liszt's analyses which are explored in more detail later. As summarized by the philosopher François Noudelmann:

In the symbolic geography of Nietzsche's mind, Chopin's music belongs to Italy. It has Italy's lightness, simplicity, and elegance. Chopin's music thus

---

<sup>46</sup> '[...] необычайная душа Шопена, душа обаятельная, кристально-чистая, трогательная. Душа целомудренная, гордая и страстная одновременно, душа молодая, героическая, жертвенная. Страстно любящая свой народ, патриотическая душа. Он всё мог и всё постигал, всё вбирал в себя, всё чувствовал. Он понимал жизнь, чувствовал, как никто, высокую трагедию смерти, смерти любого человека, так как он любил людей, был человечнейшим из человечнейших.' В. Х. Разумовская, 'Об ответственности исполнителя и его моральном облике' [V. H. Razumovskaya, 'About the Responsibilities of an Interpreter and his Moral Character'] in S. Z. Belina (ed.), *Razumovskaya's Lessons* (Moscow: 2007) p. 132.

<sup>47</sup> F. Nietzsche, *Human, All Too Human. Part II. The Wanderer and His Shadow* (1880) translated by Paul Cohn (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1913) p. 271.

falls within a paradigm Nietzsche would hammer out little by little that pitted the Germanic north against the Mediterranean south, the Romanticism of abyssal mists against the Romanticism of a dry and luminous climate.<sup>48</sup>

Building on this, one of Neuhaus's most significant characterizations of Chopin relied heavily on defining the composer through the merits of Apollonian art. Neuhaus wrote:

I have always been held captive by Chopin's music: the highest clarity, intelligibility, the ability to give joy, the ease with which potential difficulties are overcome – all this points to the Classical legacy in Chopin's music, and it is not coincidental [Chopin] causes one to think of his name in relation with that of Raphael and Pushkin...

Chopin does not fall into the categorization of 'Romantic'. He is equally, if not more, a Classicist in the most pure definition of the word. This is dictated at the very least by his perfection of form, unity and harmony of his creations. It is no accident that Schumann said that if Mozart was alive he would be writing Chopin's concertos.<sup>49</sup>

Neuhaus's belief that Chopin embodied Apollonian qualities like no other figure indicates that, perhaps subconsciously, Neuhaus was aligning himself to the ideals of the composer whom he admired so deeply – for Chopin too, it was claimed, cared little for art outside the Italian Renaissance and his favourite painter Raphael.

The strong accentuation of Chopin's Apollonian traits by Neuhaus is nonetheless considered by him in conjunction with, and not isolation from, the Dionysian. However, in

---

<sup>48</sup> F. Noudelmann, *The Philosopher's Touch: Sartre, Nietzsche, & Barthes at the Piano* translated by Brian J. Reilly (Columbia: University Press, 2012) p. 58.

<sup>49</sup> '[Музыка Шопена] так ясна, что я остался до конца жизни в плену у неё. Это конечно, заслуга самого Шопена: высшая понятность, доходчивость, умение доставлять радость, легко преодолевающую возможные затруднения в восприятии – всё это – классическое наследие музыки Шопена, и недаром при встрече с ним всплывают в сознании имена Рафаэля и Пушкина... Шопен никак не укладывается в понятие «романтик». Он в такой же мере, если не больше, классик, в самом точном понимании этого слова. Об этом говорит хотя бы совершенство формы, цельность и гармоничность его творчества. Недаром Шуман сказал, что если бы сейчас жил Моцарт, он написал бы концерты Шопена.' Н. G. Neuhaus, 'Thoughts on Chopin' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 234.

order to create Chopin's image as a synthesis of the two Neuhaus did not seek out the turbulent or anguished elements in the composer's art, which ordinarily might be associated with the Dionysian. Instead, Neuhaus engaged with a very specific and nuanced understanding of what Dionysius could be seen to present through Nietzsche's *Die Geburt der Tragödie aus dem Geiste der Musik* [*The Birth of Tragedy*] – a work which he mentioned on numerous occasions in his letters:<sup>50</sup>

I received a great sense of satisfaction from the Greek notes [*Birth of Tragedy*] of Nietzsche. He is a philologist of genius – his historical background is boundless. It is the same three thousand years as with Faust, and unless a person is aware of this, he is always merely *eine Eintagsfliege* [a mayfly].<sup>51</sup>

In *The Birth of Tragedy*, despite Nietzsche's assertion that the Apollonian is the manifestation of 'the simple, transparent and beautiful [...] a language of precision and lucidity', he is clear that musical art expresses itself only in 'the intricate relation of the Apollonian and Dionysian [where] Dionysus speaks the language of Apollo; and Apollo, finally the language of Dionysus; and so the highest goal of [...] all art is attained.'<sup>52</sup>

Nietzsche summarized the Dionysian force: 'not as individuals, but as *one* living being, with whose creative joy we are united.'<sup>53</sup> Chopin's universality – the idea of speaking with 'the highest intelligibility' for *all* people – which was so important to Neuhaus particularly in relation to his notion of the *всечеловек* or *Übermensch*, ties in with this very specific Dionysian element of Neuhaus's Chopin. Likewise, the notion of *amor fati*, discussed as an important facet of Neuhaus's understanding of Chopin's persona and music, is in essence a manifestation of the Dionysian characteristic which is accepting of temporal fears because of the ability to see the universal 'joy' beyond them. As identified in *The Birth of Tragedy*:

Dionysian art, too wishes to convince us of the eternal joy of existence: only we are to seek this joy not in phenomena, but behind them. We are to

<sup>50</sup> See *Letters* p. 437 already mentioned above.

<sup>51</sup> 'Получил опять огромное наслаждение от греческих записей Ницше. Он – гениальный филолог, его исторический фон бездонно глубок. Это – те же 3000 лет, как в Фаусте, без внимания к которым человек всегда лишь *eine Eintagsfliege*.' Neuhaus's letter to A. G. Gabrichevsky dated 2 August 1959 in *Letters* p. 439.

<sup>52</sup> F. Nietzsche, *The Birth of Tragedy* translated by Walter Kaufmann (New York: Random House, 1967) p. 67 and p. 130 respectively.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 104–105.

recognize that all that comes into being must be ready for a sorrowful end; we are forced to look into the terrors of the individual existence – yet we are not to become rigid with fear: a metaphysical comfort tears us momentarily from the bustle of the changing figures. [...] Dionysian art [...] cries to us with its true, undissembled voice: ‘Be as I am! [...] eternally finding satisfaction in the change of phenomena!’<sup>54</sup>

However, if Dionysius could represent the *universality* of Chopin, then Apollo offers for Neuhaus’s vision of Chopin the paradox of his complete *individuality*. Neuhaus’s sense of Chopin as an individual was extreme to the extent that he considered him to be divorced from any historical, even cultural, lineage. Ahistoricizing Chopin, Neuhaus wrote: ‘It is impossible to view Chopin as a link in a historical progression (for example, Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven...). His predecessors – Polish folk *melos*, some Italians, Bach and Mozart – they are not, in the full sense, his forefathers.’<sup>55</sup> This stance in relation to Chopin is significant. As an interpreter and thinker, Neuhaus considered that all great works of art were part of a historical continuum which he defined as ‘culture’. Neuhaus proposed: ‘Culture, starting with Hesiod and Homer (and even substantially earlier) up to our day, is *a conceivable whole* that can not only be understood, but also felt, in other words emotionally experienced.’<sup>56</sup> Furthermore, Neuhaus believed that aside from the micro-currents responsible for uniting cultural occurrences existing in close temporal and geographical proximity, all Western Art contained common threads. According to Neuhaus, these common threads, in the understanding of an erudite person, allowed one to see seemingly different manifestations of culture in the context of one unified continuum: ‘For a truly cultured person three or four thousand years is a ridiculously short span of time.’<sup>57</sup>

Neuhaus’s student Teodor Gutman, who was widely seen to personify his professor’s pedagogical style, was one of many musicians who subsequently propagated the idea of

---

<sup>54</sup> Ibid.

<sup>55</sup> ‘Его невозможно рассматривать как звено исторической последовательности (например, Гайдн, Моцарт, Бетховен...). Его предшественники – польский народный мелос, некоторые итальянцы, Бах и Моцарт – всё-таки не в полную меру его прародители.’ Н. Г. Neuhaus, ‘Van Cliburn’ in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 242.

<sup>56</sup> ‘Культура, начиная от Гесиода и Гомера (и значительно раньше) вплоть до наших дней, является *обозримым целым*, которое можно не только понять, но и почувствовать, то есть эмоционально пережить.’ Н. Г. Neuhaus, ‘Thoughts on Chopin’ in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 233.

<sup>57</sup> ‘Мне кажется, что для подлинно культурного человека 3 – 4 тысячелетия – до смешного короткий срок.’ Н. Г. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 212.



music's interconnectedness. Gutman's student, Vladimir Tropp, identified this as a trait that was typical to Neuhaus:

I think it was Neuhaus who influenced [Gutman] the most with his passionate lessons. [Many of Neuhaus's traits] found their way into Gutman [...]. Gutman was able to sensitively capture the moments of confluence between the styles from different epochs. [...] However, this does not interest all musicians. I once asked Maria Israilevna Grinberg whether or not in playing the work of a particular composer she feels the influence of other composers. She answered: 'I would not allow it.' Gutman, on the other hand, felt that to hear these influences was very important.<sup>58</sup>

Interestingly, unlike Neuhaus who saw Chopin as a distinct individual who existed outside the historical perspective, and thus could not be likened to any other figure, Gutman did not share this view. Thus, although inheriting his professor's general understanding of music as an interacting continuum, Gutman did not adopt Neuhaus's vision of Chopin standing beyond this. Tropp remembered: 'Gutman saw the way in which composers [influenced each other's writing] and identified in Chopin the obvious influence of Beethoven.'<sup>59</sup>

The idea of cultural continuity had been a crucial underpinning to Neuhaus's understanding and interpretation of Beethoven. His engagement with Beethoven's persona was as the composer who had flung open the door and entered into Romanticism. Neuhaus saw Beethoven as a product of his time – a 'warrior for the revolutionary ideals of mankind' who had brought ethics and morals to the forefront of musical interpretation. Thus, he was keen to be seen interacting with Beethoven's cultural predecessors (Kant, Spinoza) and his contemporaries (Hegel, Goethe) in his recreation of Beethoven's image. Similarly, Neuhaus sought to trace Beethoven's lineage forwards to its pianistic inheritors Liszt, Brahms, von

---

<sup>58</sup> 'Многое идущее от Нейгауза [стало] важным [для] Гутмана. [Гутман] очень тонко улавливал какие-то моменты общности в стилях разных эпох. [...] На это обращают внимание не все музыканты. Я как-то спросил Марию Израилевну Гринберг, не ощущает ли она, играя сочинения какого-либо автора, влияния на него других композиторов. Она ответила: «Я этого не допускаю». Гутман, наоборот, считал, что слышать влияния очень важно.' В. М. Тропп, 'Педагогика – продолжение исполнительства. О Нейгаузе и Гутмане' [V. M. Tropp, 'Pedagogy – The Continuation of Interpretation. About Neuhaus and Gutman'] in A. В. Малинковская (составитель), *Генрих Нейгауз и его ученики. Пианисты-Гнесинцы рассказывают* (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2007) [A. V. Malinkovskaya (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus and his Students. Gnessin-Pianists Speak* (Moscow: 2007)] p. 38.

<sup>59</sup> 'Например, у того же Шопена [Гутман] усматривал очевидное влияние Бетховена.' Ibid.

Bülow and Rubinstein. Thus, claiming that Chopin had no predecessors, nor by implication true inheritors, is an important differentiation in Neuhaus's vision of the two composers.

The decision to accommodate a view of Chopin that radically differed from the way in which he saw other composers demonstrates just how important it was for Neuhaus to be able to identify the Apollonian individual in Chopin's persona. As discussed by Ofelia Schutte, Nietzsche's understanding of the Apollonian was an ahistoric element that stands outside of ideas of continuity:

Apollo stands for the principle of individuation and the perfected beauty of the individual phenomenon [...]. Part of the Apollonian is to portray the individual as eternally beautiful [...]. With the immense power of its image, its concept, its ethical teaching [...] the Apollonian process [makes the individual see] the world solely from its standpoint – as if it were the only standpoint.<sup>60</sup>

It is clear that Neuhaus considered Chopin in a similar vein. Neuhaus advocated Chopin as a composer with '*his own, inimitable*' view of the world who cannot stand 'anywhere in the same line with other Romantic figures'.<sup>61</sup> Furthermore, Neuhaus wrote:

There are those phenomena in art which are not only objectively beautiful, but their [concept] is so convincing, that to apply the term 'effort' to the process of getting closer to them loses its meaning. [Chopin's] music, the spirit of its expression, is so clear and infinitely beautiful that [it seems] to be the only 'conceivable' view [...]<sup>62</sup>

In seeing Chopin as a pagan figure from Antiquity, rather than as a devoutly Catholic Polish émigré, Neuhaus was able to position Chopin along with 'Hesiod and Homer' at the beginning of his trajectory of culture. Neuhaus's Chopin as the amalgamated Ancient Greek *Übermensch*,

---

<sup>60</sup> O. Schutte, *Beyond Nihilism: Nietzsche without Masks*, 1984 (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1986) p. 18.

<sup>61</sup> 'У Шопена есть свое, неподражаемое. Никак не могу поставить его в один ряд с другими романтиками.' H. G. Neuhaus, 'About Chopin' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 232 (Neuhaus's emphasis).

<sup>62</sup> 'Но бывают явления искусства, которые не только объективно прекрасны, но так понятны, что слово «усилие» в процессе приобщения к ним теряет свой смысл. [Музыка Шопена], дух её высказывался так ясно, так единственно прекрасно [...].' H. G. Neuhaus, 'Thoughts on Chopin' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 234.

who still spoke for all humanity today as strongly as ever, therefore symbolically stood on the most conceivably ahistoric territory.

Thus, Nietzsche provided Neuhaus with a language with which he could transform Chopin in his own imagination. A synthesis of ahistoric Apollonian simplicity, clarity, individuality and radiance with Dionysian universality, change, fate and *amor fati*, Neuhaus's Chopin navigates a complex territory. This synthesis is not a resolution of dialectics, but rather the dynamic movement between two distinct spheres of influence. Neuhaus's Nietzschean vision of Chopin does not resolve disparity by finding common ground between the Apollonian and Dionysian, but instead becomes a way where 'Apollo speaks the language of Dionysus': the radiance of love projected through the complete acceptance of fate.

The volatility of such a synthesis is demonstrated by the way in which Neuhaus was momentarily thrown during his seminar presentation by a student asking him to elaborate on what he felt the difference to be between the Funeral Marches from Chopin's Second Piano Sonata in B-flat minor Opus 35, and from Beethoven's Piano Sonata No. 12 in A-flat major Opus 26. Upon Neuhaus's suggestion that he was not convinced with the comment made by eminent musicians that the two Funeral Marches were alike, a voice from the audience offered his view that Chopin's Funeral March could be seen as the embodiment of a deeply personal misfortune, and Beethoven's as one expressing a shared tragedy. Neuhaus answered that rather than Chopin expressing his own personal loss:

I believe that Chopin's *Funeral March* is linked to the emotional experience of all the unfortunate Polish emigrants of the uprisings who all the time think of their motherland and suffer. Chopin also said of his *gis-moll* etude that it is the Polish men sent into exile walking on the Siberian tract and the snow covers them. Chopin had many images linked to those who took part in the [Polish] uprisings, and therefore your idea that Chopin is more personal and Beethoven is the more collective is not right.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> 'Мне кажется, что у Шопена похоронный марш связан с переживанием об участи несчастных польских повстанцев-эмигрантов, которые все время думают о своей родине и страдают. И о *gis-moll'*ном этюде Шопен говорил, что это польские сосланные идут по сибирскому тракту и их засыпает снег. Таких представлений, связанных с печальной участью повстанцев, у Шопена было много, и потому не совсем правильна ваша мысль, что у Шопена больше личного, а у Бетховена больше общественного.' Seminar given by Neuhaus in 1937. Transcribed by B. M. Teplov, published in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 206.

Yet, whilst Neuhaus sought out to show Chopin as the more universal with his answer, on this occasion, he actually achieved the reverse. Speaking about Beethoven's *Funeral March*, Neuhaus's suggestion of the imagery from which to build an interpretation is potentially even more universal. Unlike Neuhaus's concept of Chopin, his view of Beethoven's music, in this one instance, is detached from both country and history: 'The epitaph "The hero has died, but his work lives" is a beautiful expression which accurately formulates our attitude towards, our understanding, of death.'<sup>64</sup> It seems that inadvertently in this juxtaposition of works, and in the pressure of the moment, despite setting out to demonstrate Chopin as the *universal*, Neuhaus had chosen imagery which highlighted Chopin as the more historical and personal – showing how with such a complex and multi-layered understanding, even he could sometimes falter in keeping a clear hold of his own beliefs.

## 4.2 Issues of national identity

Straddling the antithetical ideas of universal and individual identities is the concept of nationality. As already indicated, much of Neuhaus's own claim to being a kinsman to Chopin arose from his partly shared national identity and language with the composer. Further, Neuhaus's family ties with two influential musicians connected to Poland – his cousin, Karol Szymanowski and uncle, Felix Blumenfeld – had led many pianist-pedagogues and musicologists to regard Chopin as being an integral part of Neuhaus's birthright. Neuhaus's 'Polishness' was an important aspect to Rabinovich's (1962) and Delson's (1966) characterization of his interpretations of Chopin, and equally was highlighted by the musicologist, Sofia Hentova: 'Tied in kinship to the famous Polish musical surname Szymanowski, Neuhaus understood and sensitively felt the national sources of Chopin's poetry.'<sup>65</sup> The idea that shared nationality somehow enhances one's ability to understand a compatriot, or phenomenon, inevitably raises the recurring issues regarding the natural 'ownership' of Chopin's music.

The issues of Neuhaus's own multifaceted national identity, and the ease with which he philosophically relocated Chopin's homeland to ahistoricized Antiquity, point to the supposition that Neuhaus engaged with Chopin as an international phenomenon. Whereas

---

<sup>64</sup> Ibid.

<sup>65</sup> 'Связанный узами родства со знаменитой польской музыкальной фамилией Шимановских, Нейгауз понимал и чутко ощущал национальные истоки поэзии Шопена.' С. М. Хентова, *Лев Оборин* (Ленинград: «Музыка», 1964) [S. M. Hentova, *Lev Oborin* (Leningrad: 1964)] pp. 107.

Neuhaus had a strong sense that Beethoven existed in, and as a result of Germanic thinking, he could not point to Chopin merely through a nationally Polish school of thought. Neuhaus's position with regards to the importance of nationality in relation to his interpretation of Chopin arises because the appropriated Germanic and Ancient Greek elements are seen through an additional layer – the Slav. Thus, Chopin's persona is shaped by what Neuhaus believed to be an interaction between the international with the national:

Internationalism, in the highest definition of the word, which I see in the art of great Russian artists, is the proof of the unquestionable truth which dictates that to raise oneself up to the international, one must do so through the national. In other words, he who strongly loves his people is able to love another's people – he is on the path to becoming a 'universal man' [всечеловек] (to use Dostoevsky's word).<sup>66</sup>

In order to observe the mechanisms of this interaction it is first necessary to consider Chopin in the context of Neuhaus's time, and secondly to isolate the particular issues that characterize Neuhaus's Chopin as a Slav and Pole.

Writing in remembrance of the centenary of Chopin's death, Neuhaus claimed: 'Chopin is one of the most popular, most loved composers in the whole world (along with Beethoven, Schubert and Tchaikovsky).'<sup>67</sup> While speaking about the international significance of Chopin, it seems however that Neuhaus was keen to emphasize Chopin's significance specifically to Russia – to present Chopin's 'authentic' essence as equally attainable by both Poles and Russians. Although this can be cynically attributed to a simple adherence to political agendas, the cultural and historical links between the two neighbouring countries is not farfetched. Western European interpretations of history are quick to highlight the persecution suffered by Poles at the hands of Russian conquest and the forced uprooting of their national identity. However, they often fail to acknowledge the longstanding and strong attraction that

---

<sup>66</sup> 'Интернационализм в высоком понимании этого слова, который я усматриваю в искусстве больших русских художников, является наглядным примером, как бы «вещественным доказательством» известной и бесспорной истины, что возвыситься до интернационализма можно только через национальное. Или, говоря проще, кто крепко любит свой народ, тот способен полюбить и другой народ, он на пути к тому, чтобы стать «всечеловеком» (выражаясь словами Достоевского).' Г. Г. Нейгауз, 'Лучезарный талант' [H. G. Neuhaus, 'A Radiant Talent'] in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 247.

<sup>67</sup> 'Ибо Шопен – один из популярнейших, наиболее любимых во всем мире композиторов (наряду с Бетховеном, Шубертом, Чайковским).' H. G. Neuhaus, 'Thoughts on Chopin' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 233.

Russia had for its Slavic neighbour. Historically in fact, Polish culture had enjoyed a high regard and closeness in the late eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries in Imperial Russia. Manifestations of this were concentrated in Russia's much-loved ditties of the time, the most famous (even throughout the twentieth century) being Ogiński's *Polonaise*.<sup>68</sup> Furthermore, it cannot be accidental that Polish dances such as the polonaises and mazurkas became such an important part in the output of Tchaikovsky, Glinka, Rimsky-Korsakov, Mussorgsky and Lyadov – representatives of the Russian Nationalist School.<sup>69</sup>

The problem is that Chopin's popularity in Russia, however, was not consistently able to boast the level of stability implied by Neuhaus. Indeed at certain points in the first quarter of the twentieth century, Chopin was considered old-fashioned on the one hand, liable to the excesses of misappropriated and vulgar 'romanticism' and, to organizations such as the *Российская Ассоциация Пролетарских Музыкантов*, (РАПМ) [Russian Association of Proletarian Musicians (RAPM)], politically problematic on the other.<sup>70</sup> Of these two issues, the political issue was one that is not specifically discussed by Neuhaus in his written output – yet needs to be mentioned briefly if only to demonstrate that at the height of Neuhaus's performing career the reception of Chopin was not at its unchallenged universal height.

<sup>68</sup> Michał Kleofas Ogiński (1765 – 1833). Polish diplomat and politician, Lithuanian Grand Treasurer and Russian senator. In 1794 Ogiński wrote his thirteenth polonaise, *Pożegnanie ojczyzny* [*A Farewell to the Homeland*], which in Russia still enjoys a status similar to that occupied by Pachelbel's 'Canon' or Boccherini's 'Minuet' in Europe despite its strong connection symbolically, as well as possibly literally, to Poland's struggle for independence.

<sup>69</sup> For an indication of the adoption of the Polish polonaise in Russia (including as the country's national anthem at the time of Catherine the Great) see H. Goldberg, 'Appropriating Poland: Glinka, Polish Dance, and Russian National Identity' in D. Ransel & B. Shallcross, *Polish Encounters, Russian Identity* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005) pp. 74–88. The degree to which Russia adopted Poland's musical and literary culture even in the generation preceding Heinrich Neuhaus's can be seen in the subject matter selected by composers such as Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov: In *Music in Chopin's Warsaw* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), Halina Goldberg talked about the importance of Adam Mickiewicz's ballad *Świtezianka* in the formation of Polish narratives on national identities by composers such as the composer Maria Szymanowska (see p. 99). It is interesting to note in relation to this that in 1897 Rimsky-Korsakov composed the cantata *Свитезянка* [*Svitezjanka*] Opus 44, dedicated to Sergei Taneyev. This was considered at the time as an important contribution to the aesthetics of Russian musical Nationalism.

<sup>70</sup> *Российская Ассоциация Пролетарских Музыкантов*, РАПМ: This was an organisation that existed between 1923 and 1932. It worked alongside the *Производственный коллектив студентов Московской консерватории, ПРОКОЛЛ* [*Manufacturing Collective of Students of the Moscow Conservatory, PROKOLL*] established in 1925. Their aim was to cleanse music of the un-Proletarian. The RAPM published critiques and statements in two journals: «*Пролетарский музыкант*» [*The Proletarian Musician*] (1929–1932) and «*За пролетарскую музыку*» [*For Proletarian Music*] (1930–1932).

In the early years of Soviet power there had certainly been no qualms about Chopin symbolizing the spirit of the 'Soviet' people. Neuhaus wrote:

Amongst the vivid creative experiences that are linked to the interpretation of Chopin, are my performances before a new kind of listener in the immediate aftermath of the establishment of Soviet rule in Ukraine. Along with my cousin, Karol Szymanowski, we were officially made responsible for the organization of concerts [...]. In the programmes, the Polonaises, Waltzes, Mazurkas and Ballades of Chopin occupied a central position. Especially 'reaching' ['*доходил*'] the audience, was the A-flat major Polonaise ['Heroic' Opus 53]. A little later when I was already teaching at the Kiev Conservatory [1919 – 1922], I continued to play [Chopin] in the [Workers'] Clubs and in the Red Army barracks. I was even given an honorary title by the 12<sup>th</sup> division of the Red Army [*почетного красноармейца Упроформа 12-й армии*].<sup>71</sup>

In the 1920s and early 1930s that political position wavered somewhat. The RAPM branded Chopin as a 'nihilist, bourgeois composer' who 'relaxes the will and [contributes to] the upbringing of a hysterical person.'<sup>72</sup> Such a stance, coming from an organization that felt a need to ban the music of Tchaikovsky and Rachmaninov – thought by RAPM to be 'foreign' to the Soviet people – would arguably have been counterbalanced however, by the continual support that these composers received at the hands of the influential musicians, including Neuhaus, in the major Russian cities. Thus, RAPM's influence would have, most likely, been more pronounced in the 'provincial' towns.<sup>73</sup> For instance, analysing the repertoire of Gilels, Lev Barenboim suggested:

<sup>71</sup> 'К числу ярких творческих переживаний, связанных с исполнением Шопена, относятся мои выступления перед новым слушателем вскоре после установления Советской власти на Украине. Тогда мой двоюродный брат Кароль Шимановский и я были приглашены в Елисаветградский наробраз, где нам поручили заведование Музыкальным отделом. Было организовано множество концертов. [...] В программах постоянно звучали полонезы, вальсы, мазурки, баллады Шопена. Особенно «доходил» ля-бемоль-мажорный Полонез. Несколько позже, уже работая в Киевской консерватории, я продолжал выступать в клубах и красноармейских частях. Мне было даже присвоено звание «почетного красноармейца Упроформа 12-й армии».' H. G. Neuhaus, 'About Chopin' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 232

<sup>72</sup> 'Шопен нигилистически третировался как композитор, который-де «расслабляет волю, воспитывает истеричного человека».' Review quoted in D. A. Rabinovich, *Portraits of Pianists* p. 62

<sup>73</sup> А. Н. Познанский, *Пётр Чайковский. Биография* (Санкт-Петербург: «Вита Нова», 2009) [A. N. Poznansky, *Piotr Tchaikovsky* (St. Petersburg: 2009)] p. 583. In both Imperial Russia and the USSR the application of the term 'provincial' towns does not necessarily signify only the smallest villages, but

It is hard to establish in whose 'leftist' brains came the ridiculous idea in the 1920s to cross out of our culture the music of Rachmaninov – an idea upheld by the RAPM. In Moscow and Leningrad this thought was indignantly thrown out, and that part of my generation which studied in second part of the 1920s (and of course, later) in the metropolitan conservatories [Moscow and Saint Petersburg], did go through the 'school of Rachmaninov' – we knew and played his music. In the peripheries, and places like Odessa, the ripples of [RAPM] were still being felt. 'I remember with a bitter feeling' says Gilels, 'that in my young years I passed Rachmaninov by, I didn't have the right to play his music – only in Moscow, where his music was played everywhere, did I hear for the first time a whole range of his works [...].'<sup>74</sup>

Although the RAPM's guidelines and sanctions would have primarily affected the acceptance or criticism of composers' writing styles where their main interests lay, and some aspects of concert programming, rather than *interpretational styles* of established performing musicians, RAPM's judgements have been shown to have targeted Neuhaus's colleagues in Moscow.<sup>75</sup> Milstein recalled:

A review signed 'B. S.' in the «*Пролетарский музыкант*» [*The Proletarian Musician*] which had [...] obviously been born out of the RAPM spirit [wrote

---

actually also encompassed towns with quite developed cultural activities e.g. Novgorod, Rostov. In this way Odessa was often referred to as 'provincial' at the time in question.

<sup>74</sup> 'Трудно ныне установить, в каких приспособленческих «левацких» мозгах в 20-х годах возникла нелепая мысль о необходимости вычеркнуть из нашей культуры музыку Рахманинова, мысль поддержанная затем РАПМом. В Москве и в Ленинграде мысль эта была вскоре же с негодованием отброшена, и та часть моего поколения, которая училась во второй половине 20-х годов (и, разумеется, позже) в столичных консерваториях, прошла «школу Рахманинова», знала, любила и играла его музыку. Но на периферии, в частности в Одессе, круги на воде от кем-то брошенного камня продолжали ещё расходиться. «Я с горьким чувством вспоминаю, – говорит Эмиль Григорьевич, – что в юные годы миновал Рахманинова, не имел права играть его музыку; лишь в Москве, где полным ходом исполнялась его музыка, познакомился с рядом его произведений.» Л. А. Баренбойм, *Эмиль Гилельс* (Москва: «Советский Композитор», 1990) [L. A. Varenboim, *Emil Gilels*. (Moscow: 1990)] p. 42

<sup>75</sup> For an indication of how RAPM affected composers refer to B. Schwarz, *Music and Musical Life in Soviet Russia 1917–1970* pp. 54–60. Numerous specific references in translated articles and commentaries are presented in M. Frolova-Walker & J. Walker, *Music and Soviet Power 1917–1932* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2012).



that Igumnov's playing] 'although makes a strong impression [...] was by its nature close only to a certain socially-limited circle of people', that [...] 'it does not raise the will of the listener, but conversely, moves it to the passive state of self-reflection' [...] I remember [Igumnov's] painful irritation on seeing this review, [...] and likewise I remember how deeply Igumnov was hurt by other attacks from the RAPM in the early 1930s [who pursued] interpreters of disfavoured composers.<sup>76</sup>

Against this backdrop Neuhaus was seen by many musicians and musicologists to be a defiant representative of Chopin's 'true' voice. Even if Neuhaus himself did not discuss the effect that political forces such as RAPM held for the interpretation of Chopin, certain musicologists were keen to portray Neuhaus standing at the frontlines of the counterattack on RAPM by the capital's leading musicians in defence of Chopin. Rabinovich counted Neuhaus's challenges to the position of the RAPMists in the 1930s through his all-Chopin recitals as amongst the most significant moments of pianistic history:

With *polemic acuity* the pianist passionately argued with the RAPM with music from the concert stage. [Neuhaus] accentuated as far as possible the elements of drama, protest, activity in the creations of Chopin to hit at the vulgarization of the RAPM.<sup>77</sup>

An example of Neuhaus's all-Chopin programme from the time of RAPM's attack on Chopin does indeed seem to be carefully structured to reveal Chopin as a creator who is able to reflect

---

<sup>76</sup> 'Рецензия, появившаяся на страницах журнала «Пролетарский музыкант» за подписью «Б. С.» [...] явно [с] предвзятым, порожденном духом РАПМ [писала что, игра Игумнова] «хотя и производит сильное впечатление, по природе своей близка социально-ограниченному кругу людей», что «она носит интимно-рафинированный характер», что «в ней нет естественно-простого выражения чувств», что «она не будит энергию, не подымает волю слушателя, а наоборот, склоняет его к пассивному состоянию самоуглубления», и т.д, и т.п. [...] Надо ли говорить о том, как тяжело переживал Игумнов [...] и другие нападки РАПМ, участившиеся в начале 30-х годов, [которые] огульно охаивали [некоторых композиторов] а заодно с ними и их исполнителей.' Y. I. Milstein, *Konstantin Nikolaevich Igumnov* pp. 247–248.

<sup>77</sup> '[...] полемически заостренной трактовкой пианист – не словами, а музыкой, с концертной эстрады – страстно спорил с РАПМ, сколь возможно акцентируя элементы драматизма, протеста, активности в творчестве Шопена, «бил по вульгаризациям РАПМ».' D. A. Rabinovich, *Portraits of Pianists* p. 62.

all the possible emotions from the tragedy of the *Prelude* in C minor and radiance of the Third *Ballade*.<sup>78</sup>

16 October 1926. Small Hall, Odessa.

*Prelude* in C minor Opus 28 no. 20

*Etude* in C minor Opus 10 no. 12 'Revolutionary'

*Prelude* in A-flat major Opus 28 no. 17

*Etude* in F minor Opus 25 no. 2

*Polonaise-Fantaisie* Opus 61

*Nocturne* in B major<sup>79</sup>

2 *Mazurkas* (unknown opuses)

Sonata No. 3 in B minor Opus 58

*Ballade* in F minor No. 4 Opus 52

*Berceuse* Opus 57

*Scherzo* in E major No. 4 Opus 54

*Ballade* in A-flat major No. 3 Opus 47

It is however difficult to be completely sure that this kind of programming for Neuhaus was a direct challenge to the climate created by RAPM. Neuhaus performed all-Chopin recitals throughout his career, and these too had programmes that encompassed the large scope of different emotions and character to be found in Chopin's work. Stanislav Neuhaus recalled: 'Igumnov, Oborin, Sofronitsky, Neuhaus gave very frequent monographic-concerts (sometimes several times a year) of the works of Schumann, Chopin, Schubert and other Romantics.'<sup>80</sup> Neuhaus's programme for 25 January 1940 at the Grand Hall of the Moscow Conservatory confirms that he did in fact continue to programme Chopin in a similar way well after the influence of RAPM and raises the possibility that his all-Chopin recitals were an integral part of his identity as a pianist, and were simply appropriated by certain individuals to speak for an anti-RAPM cause.<sup>81</sup>

<sup>78</sup> G. Kehler, *The Piano in Concert. Volume II (M-Z)* (London: The Scarecrow Press, 1982) pp. 894–895.

<sup>79</sup> Which *Nocturne* in B major is unclear. There are three: Opus 9 no. 3; Opus 32 no. 1 and Opus 62 no. 1. Neuhaus had all three of the B major *Nocturnes* in his repertory.

<sup>80</sup> 'Игумнов, Софроницкий, Нейгауз давали очень часто (иногда по несколько раз в году) концерты-монографии из произведений Шопена, Шумана, Шуберта и других романтиков.' ('Monographic concerts' is a term still used today in Russia to denote concerts that programme only one composer). С. Г. Нейгауз, 'Устарел ли романтизм?' [S. H. Neuhaus, 'Has Romanticism become Outmoded?'] in N. M. Zimyanina (ed.), *Stanislav Neuhaus. Reminiscences. Letters. Materials* (Moscow: 1988) p. 195

<sup>81</sup> G. Kehler, *The Piano in Concert. Volume II (M-Z)* (London: The Scarecrow Press, 1982) pp. 894–895.

*Polonaise* in C-sharp minor Opus 26

*Polonaise* in F-sharp minor Opus 44

Selection of 6 *Preludes* from Opus 28

*Nocturne* in B major Opus 62 no. 1

Sonata No. 3 in B minor Opus 58

4 *Mazurkas* (unknown)

*Concert Allegro* Opus 46

In any case, RAPM's motivation to dissociate Chopin from the Soviet consciousness was destined to be short-lived. The first International Chopin Piano Competition in Warsaw in 1927, chronologically coinciding with the middle of RAPM's existence, was seen as a great Soviet success with the first prize been taken by Lev Oborin (Igumnov's student), and fourth by Grigory Ginzburg (Goldenweiser's student).<sup>82</sup> Neuhaus's cousin Karol Szymanowski conveyed the overwhelming superiority of the Russian competitors taking part:

The Russian pianists who recently played here in Warsaw, Lodz, Krakow, Lvov, Poznan and Vilno [...] simply captivated our musical world. They came, played and won... This was not a success, not even a furore. It was a victorious march, a triumph!<sup>83</sup>

Politically, the triumph of the Russian pianists at the competition had indicated that rather than Chopin being 'foreign' to the Russian or Soviet hearts and minds as argued by the RAPM,

---

<sup>82</sup> Four pianists in total from Russia went to compete in the Chopin Competition of 1927: from Moscow – Oborin, Ginzburg, Briushkov, and from Leningrad: Shostakovich. They represented the three more dominant 'Russian piano schools' at the time (Igumnov, Goldenweiser and Nikolaev). Neuhaus had only recently started teaching at the Moscow Conservatory in 1922, whereas Goldenweiser had been a professor from 1895 and Igumnov from 1899. Leonid Nikolaev had taught at the Saint Petersburg Conservatory from 1909; from 1912 as a professor.

<sup>83</sup> 'Поскольку речь идет о русских пианистах, выступавших недавно у нас в Варшаве, Лодзи, Кракове, Львове, Познани и Вильно, то [...] они просто покорили наш музыкальный мир. Пришли, поиграли, и победили... Это нельзя назвать успехом, даже не фурором. То было сплошное победное шествие, триумф!' Karol Szymanowski's interview as reported in A. Мисуловин, 'Польский композитор о русском пианизме' [A. Misulovin, 'Polish composer on Russian Pianism'] (*Слово (Варшава)* 20 February 1927) as quoted in S. M. Hentova, *Lev Oborin* p. 75.

the reverse held true: 'Diplomacy was forced to take a back seat, and Poles to admit that Chopin was played best of all by *moskal'*.'<sup>84</sup>

The role that the successes at the Chopin Competition had on the subsequent intensified desire for Russia to be recognized as a nation of natural Chopin-interpreters, was summarized by Oborin:

[Before the competition] we had no idea of the consequences this event, for which we prepared only in a matter of weeks and had no hopes of winning, would have. From today's point of view such a competition is yet another passing occurrence. But then? Back then, all the world's newspapers were writing about it, the artist Boris Efimov included an illustration into the [newspaper] *Известия* where I was shown with the competition diploma in my hand, and [Winston] Churchill clutching his head, dispirited by Moscow's success.<sup>85</sup>

In such a politically charged climate however, the genuine interpretational need for interpreters to express themselves in Chopin's music transcended the narrow confines of propaganda. The aim to identify with Chopin became a genuine part of the pianistic psyche. Oborin remembered:

[Immediately] I was announced to be a 'Chopinist'. First I was surprised. I won't lie – I was happy. Then I began to 'rebel', to protest against what I felt to be a limitation. [But] then his music became vital for me – I felt a need to play it, to converse with Chopin, and eventually there was no composer closer to me.<sup>86</sup>

<sup>84</sup> '[...] дипломатии пришлось ступать и полякам признать, что лучше всех исполняет Шопена «москаль».' И. Эренбург, 'В Польше' [I. Erinburg, 'In Poland'] (*Красная новь*, March 1928) as quoted in S. M. Hentova, *Lev Oborin* p. 74. *Moskal'* [москаль] is a derogatory racial slur for 'Russian' in the Polish, Ukrainian and Belorussian languages.

<sup>85</sup> 'Тогда мы не представляли, во что выльется это событие [шопеновский конкурс в Варшаве], к которому мы готовились всего несколько недель, без надежды на успех. С нынешней точки зрения такой конкурс – еще одно проходящее событие. А тогда? Тогда о нем писали газеты во всех странах; художник Борис Ефимов поместил в «Известиях» рисунок, где я был изображен с дипломом конкурса в руке, а Черчилль хватался за голову, удрученный успехами Москвы.' L. N. Oborin, 'About Chopin. Extracts from a Conversation with S. Hentova' in A. V. Zasimova (ed.), *How to Perform Chopin* (Moscow: 2005) p. 185.

<sup>86</sup> 'Меня объявили шопенистом. Сперва я удивился. Не скрою – обрадовался. Потом стал «брыкаться». Протестовать против такого, как мне казалось, ограничения. [Но] его музыка стала

Even though Neuhaus's students did not take part in the 1927 Chopin Competition, his emerging influence as an interpreter and pedagogue was seen as a vital contribution to the overall dynamic and attitude towards the issue of interpreting Chopin. Hentova believed that Neuhaus was one of the leading pianists who helped to install 'authentic' values into the Russian Chopin-tradition:

[In the years leading up to first International Chopin Piano Competition in Warsaw (1927)] Heinrich Neuhaus often performed his interpretations of Chopin's works. His handling of the large scale forms especially stood out: the concertos, *Fantasia* [Opus 49], *Ballades*. [...] If Igumnov, sometimes without willing it, gave Chopin's intonations the shadings which remind one of the lyricism of Tchaikovsky, and the warmth of his interpretations was understood as intimacy – that was devoid of sharp, dramatic collisions – then Neuhaus put forward many other psychological traits: the depth of a wounded pride of an ill but courageous man, the feeling of hope, the call for justice.<sup>87</sup>

In the subsequent Chopin Competition of 1932 Neuhaus's students Teodor Gutman and Emanuel Grossman were laureates who took the eighth and tenth prizes.<sup>88</sup> By the third Chopin Competition, 1937, Neuhaus's stature as a leading Russian Chopin-interpreter and pedagogue had burgeoned. Not only was Neuhaus the only Soviet jury member in the 1937 competition, but his student Yakov Zak was unanimously awarded both the first prize and Mazurka prize. In 1949, Neuhaus's student Yevgeny Malinin took the seventh prize.<sup>89</sup> By the 1960 Chopin

---

необходимостью. Она нужна была не только на концертах, я хотел не только играть её публично – ощущал потребность играть себе, беседовать с Шопеном, видел его перед собой, и уже не было ближе композитора.' Ibid.

<sup>87</sup> 'В эти годы он [Нейгауз] часто выступал с интерпретацией произведений Шопена, выделяясь в особенности трактовкой крупных форм – концертов, Фантазии, баллад. [...] Если Игумнов, порой невольно, придавал интонациям Шопена оттенок, напоминавший лирику Чайковского, и теплота его трактовок воспринималась как интимность, лишённая острых драматических коллизий, то Нейгауз выдвигал многие другие психологические черты: глубину раненой гордости больного, но мужественного человека, чувство надежды, призыв к справедливости.' S. M. Hentova, *Lev Oborin* pp. 107–108.

<sup>88</sup> <http://en.chopin.nifc.pl/chopin/persons/detail/name/gutman/id/2825> and <http://en.chopin.nifc.pl/chopin/persons/detail/name/grossman/id/2828> (accessed 14/01/2014).

<sup>89</sup> <http://en.chopin.nifc.pl/chopin/persons/detail/name/malinin/id/2843> (accessed 14/01/2014).

competition, Neuhaus was once again a jury member – this time alongside Zak, Pavel Serebryakov and vice-chairman, Dmitri Kabalevsky.

Further competition triumphs by Neuhaus's students, outside of the Chopin Competition, were marked out by the quality of their interpretations of the composer. Emil Giles's victory at the Ysaÿe Competition in 1938 had for instance been attributed in no small part to the first impression made by his first-round performance of Chopin's Sonata No. 2 in B-flat minor Opus 35, which he had studied with Neuhaus. Chopin's *Ballade* No. 1 in G minor Opus 23, which became a staple of Giles's repertoire in the late 1930s and part of his programme for the 1936 Vienna Competition where he took the second prize, was a work that he had himself associated with his studies with Neuhaus.<sup>90</sup> Furthermore, many of Neuhaus's students who were not selected or allowed to travel abroad to take part in foreign competitions, such as his son Stanislav Neuhaus, nevertheless became significant Chopin-interpreters within the borders of the USSR.

The international approval that was bestowed on Russian pianists would not have merely remained a factor of interest in specialized musical circles. The USSR's competition winners were greeted as heroes upon their return and attracted significant press coverage [see Figure 18]. High-profile competitors, such as Gilels and Zak were required to write articles detailing their preparation which were published in periodicals and newspapers.<sup>91</sup> Musician-pedagogues such as Neuhaus were expected to make written analyses of the proceedings and results of major competitions. Neuhaus contributed three major articles, one reporting about the 1937 Chopin Competition, and two referencing the Chopin Competitions:<sup>92</sup>

‘Международный Шопеновский конкурс пианистов в Варшаве’  
[‘International Chopin Competition for Pianists in Warsaw’] (*Советская музыка*, 1937 №5);

‘Желаю удачи!’ [‘All the Best!’] (*Советская музыка*, 1962 №2);

<sup>90</sup> L. A. Barenboim, *Emil Gilels* p. 69. Yakov Flier won the first prize in the 1936 Vienna Competition.

<sup>91</sup> Emil Gilels wrote for the *Литературная газета* [*Literaturnaya gazeta*] about his preparation for the Ysaÿe Competition (see Г. Б. Гордон, *Эмиль Гилельс. За гранью мифа* (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2007) [G. B. Gordon, *Emil Gilels. Beyond the Myth* (Moscow: 2007)] p. 64).

<sup>92</sup> Articles about other piano competitions, such as the Tchaikovsky International Piano Competition, by Neuhaus include: ‘Всесоюзный конкурс дирижеров’ [‘The All-Union Competition of Conductors’] (*Известия*, 10 September 1938); ‘Мои впечатления’ [‘My Impressions’] (*Советская музыка*, 1958 №6); ‘После конкурса’ [‘After the Competition’] (*Юность*, 1958 №6); and ‘Размышления члена жюри’ [‘Thoughts of a Jury Member’] (*Журнал РТ*, 1966, № 6.7).

‘Страсть, интеллект, техника...’ [‘Passion, Intellect, Technique...’]  
(Юность, 1962 №7)



**Figure 18** Photograph, 1937 (unknown photographer). Returning from the Chopin Competition at the Belorussky Rail Station in Moscow. Left to Right: Heinrich Neuhaus with laureates Yakov Zak, Rosa Tamarkina and Nina Emelyanova.

Of course these articles, both by Neuhaus and those by his students detailing their preparation with him, were commissioned to a substantial degree as a propaganda tool to highlight the successes of Soviet-era culture and its associated specialist training. However, Neuhaus's writing on Chopin in this context would have given him a valuable communicative outlet to express his views to a broad audience and must have strengthened the wider public's association of Neuhaus's persona as a Chopin-specialist. Furthermore, Neuhaus was keenly aware of the importance of a written legacy, and had a deep-rooted urge to write: 'I madly want to *write*, black on white, ink on paper to express what lives in my thoughts and feelings [...]'.<sup>93</sup> These articles, which will be explored in more detail, are unlikely to have been squandered opportunities by Neuhaus to voice his sincere thoughts on the subject of Chopin.

Added to Neuhaus's familial ties to Poland, the publication of Neuhaus's views on Chopin in the press, as well as the publicized success of his students' Chopin interpretation, would have strengthened Neuhaus's position as an authority in this field. Neuhaus's 'Polishness' was emphasized at a time when questions of race still mattered in pianism. The influence of musicians like Theodor Leschetizky, one of the first piano professors in the Saint Petersburg Conservatory, who were adamant that nationality did have an effect on interpretation, had still not subsided:

The English [are] good musicians, good workers, and bad executants; doing by work what the Slav does by instinct; their heads serving them better than their hearts. [...] The Russians stand first in Leschetitzky's opinion. United to a prodigious technique, they have passion, dramatic power, elemental force, and extraordinary vitality. Turbulent natures, difficult to keep within bounds, but making wonderful players when they have the patience to endure to the end. The Pole, less strong and rugged than the Russian, leans more to the poetic side of music. Originality is to be found in all he does; refinement, and exquisite tenderness, and instinctive rhythm. [...] The Germans he respects for their earnestness, their patient devotion to detail, their orderliness, and intense and humble love of their art. But their outlook is a little grey.<sup>94</sup>

<sup>93</sup> '[...] мне безумно хочется *писать*, чёрным по белому, чернилами на бумаге запечатлеть то, что живёт постоянно в моих мыслях и чувствах [...]'. Neuhaus's diary entry for 25 January 1962 in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 65

<sup>94</sup> Cited as in R. Gerig, *Famous Pianists and Their Technique* p. 287.



Outside of Russia, second-generation Chopin-pupils were also involved in this debate: ‘The Slavic and Magyar races are your only true Chopin interpreters.’<sup>95</sup> Even Neuhaus himself, writing in 1937, was inclined to observe national temperament in pianists. Evaluating the competitors in the Chopin Competition he wrote:

The representatives of the French school were strong. [...] The pianists all have a good command over the piano and have a bright, brilliant technique. But, they play with a certain inherent French rationalism – somewhat dryly. [...] The Hungarians [played] with the typically over-improvised manner, with too much freedom [*отсебятины*] especially in the scheme of dynamics. [The Germans] suffered the same typical problems with their interpretation of Chopin: effeminacy and mannerisms.<sup>96</sup>

Thus, to the public the claims of national ‘authenticity’ associated with Neuhaus’s Chopin would have had considerable leverage.

Rather than to draw attention to Chopin as a Pole however, and concentrate on how a pianist should express this ‘Polishness’ in his interpretations, Neuhaus used his leverage to link together the ideas of ‘Polishness’ and ‘Russianness’ in order to emphasize the common *Slavic* roots of both identities. This tendency was detected by numerous musicologists and musicians including Delson, who remarked:

The ability to open in the images of Chopin’s music the features of mankind’s shared humanism (features which are characteristic of progressive Romantics) and their specifically Polish (sometimes broader – Slavic) refractions, is an aspect that differentiates Neuhaus’s interpretations.<sup>97</sup>

<sup>95</sup> J. Huneker, *Chopin. The Man and his Music* (New York: Dover Publications, 1966) p. 54.

<sup>96</sup> ‘Состав [французской школы] был очень сильный. Все пианисты хорошо владеют фортепиано, обладают блестящей, яркой техникой. Но играют они с некоторым присущим французам рационализмом – немного суховато. [...] Венгры однако, [страдают] излишней импровизационностью, допуская много отсебятины, особенно в плане динамического движения. [...] довольно типичными для немцев приёмами в исполнении Шопена: изнеженность, манерность.’ Н. Г. Neuhaus, ‘International Chopin Competition for Pianists in Warsaw’ in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* pp. 147–148.

<sup>97</sup> ‘Умение раскрыть в образах музыки Шопена именно черты общечеловеческого гуманизма (черты, характерные для прогрессивных романтиков) и их специфически польском (иногда шире – славянском) преломлении – также отличительная сторона исполнительства Нейгауза.’ V. Y. Delson, *Heinrich Neuhaus* (Moscow: 1966) pp. 108–109.

Neuhaus sought to explore the Slavic commonality of temperament and identity primarily through the similarity of the Polish and Russian language. In particular, Neuhaus drew on a word which was, according to Liszt, one that Chopin explicitly identified as being central to his work:

[Chopin explained] that, whatever his transitory joys, he had never been free from a feeling that had become the seed-bed of his heart, and for which he could find no appropriate expression except in his own language: the Polish word 'Żal'.<sup>98</sup>

Today, as pointed out by Meirion Hughes, Liszt's biography of Chopin is more often than not disputed and 'ignored at our peril'.<sup>99</sup> In *About the Art of Piano Playing* however, Neuhaus considered Liszt one of the greatest writers and music critics of all time who, in Neuhaus's opinion, should be seen as a role-model for musicologists.<sup>100</sup> Furthermore, Neuhaus openly indicated that he believed that Liszt's biography of Chopin was an invaluable and truthful source:

We know very well Liszt's wonderful book on Chopin. When he writes about the works of his friend the wording can sound excessively melodramatic to our [modern] ear, but this is so understandable – a genius musician feels the helplessness of words when faced with the need to express such high feelings, strong emotions, which he could have so easily expressed in his playing [...] and so he uses multiple exclamation marks and cannot keep within the more rigorous and professional confines [of language] to express his thoughts and feelings. Yet – he is no less clever than Balzac when he writes about the 'person of society', about [Chopin's] inner self and conduct.<sup>101</sup>

---

<sup>98</sup> M. Hughes, *Liszt's Chopin. A new edition translated from the French* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010) p. 83.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.* ('Introduction' to Liszt's biography of Chopin, by Meirion Hughes) p. 40.

<sup>100</sup> H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 222.

<sup>101</sup> 'У нас хорошо известна прекрасная книга Листа о Шопене. Когда он пишет о произведениях своего друга, слог его для нашего слуха бывает излишне патетичен, выпретен, но это так понятно – гениальный музыкант, чувствуя беспомощность слова в передаче высоких чувств, сильных эмоций, которые он так легко передавал средствами своей игры [...], ставил множество восклицательных знаков, естественно чураясь более хладнокровного делового изложения своих

Although it is hard to prove whether Neuhaus's assertion, that the strength of Liszt's *Chopin* lay in its ability to link Chopin's compositional style to Chopin's life, had directly influenced pianists, it was a view that was held by other Russian pianists. Lev Oborin wrote:

For some reason when speaking of Chopin some researchers separate his personality, his life from his art; they give his art a somewhat objective notion. I do not agree. Liszt, who knew Chopin better than anyone, and what is more had the talent of a writer-psychologist remarked exactly the opposite: the connection between the music of Chopin and his personality.<sup>102</sup>

The predominant literary source that Neuhaus used to draw his understanding of Chopin would therefore have resonated with the sympathies of many of his colleagues. Rather than disputing the validity or motivation of Liszt's writing, Neuhaus and his colleagues sought to re-imagine Chopin's persona through Liszt's narrative. With Neuhaus's mother-tongue being Polish, the 'slightly lisped accent of which coloured his Russian',<sup>103</sup> he would have indeed stood out as an obvious pianist to translate the meaning and qualities associated with the 'strange noun [...] *żal* [which] tinged Chopin's oeuvre' and to transmit its essence in practice.<sup>104</sup>

Neuhaus did set down his definitions of *żal* in both his teaching and in his writing. His article 'Раздумья о Шопене' ['Thoughts on Chopin'] published in the journal *Культура и жизнь*, 1960, № 3 [*Culture and Life*] contains one of his most detailed translations of the word.

мыслей и чувств. И наряду с этим – он не менее умен, чем Бальзак, когда пишет о «человеке общества», о его внутреннем складе и поведении.' Ibid. p. 223.

<sup>102</sup> 'Почему-то, говоря о Шопене, некоторые исследователи отделяют его личность, его жизнь от творчества, придают творчеству некий объективный смысл. Не согласен. Лист, который лучше кого бы то ни было знал Шопена и к тому же обладал талантом писателя-психолога, отмечал как раз обратное: соответствие между музыкой Шопена и его личностью.' L. N. Oborin, 'About Chopin. Extracts from a Conversation with S. Hentova' in A. V. Zasimova (ed.), *How to Perform Chopin* (Moscow: 2005) p. 184.

<sup>103</sup> 'Undoubtedly the *Polish* element was extremely strong in Neuhaus through [his links with] Blumenfeld and Szymanowski (and incidentally Polish was [Neuhaus's] first mother-tongue).' ['Бесспорно силен в Нейгаузе и польский элемент – через Блуменфельдов и Шимановских (кстати сказать, польский язык был его первым родным языком).'] D. A. Rabinovich, *Portraits of Pianists* p. 57.

<sup>104</sup> M. Hughes, *Liszt's Chopin. A new edition translated from the French* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2010) p. 84.

In this definition, he argued that Chopin's *żal* was an element that bound together the Polish and Russian people and was an integral part of their common national sensibilities:

Those writing about [Chopin], especially Poles, highlight one characteristic trait in his artistic creation that they define with the Polish word – ‘*żal*’! It is a Slavic word, perhaps best likened to the Russian ‘*жалеть*’ in the sense that the people [i.e. country folk] use it – *он её жалеет, то есть любит...* [he loves her...].<sup>105</sup>

Neuhaus of course knew that the Russian word *жалеть* [IPA: ʒɪ.ˈlʲetʲ] is ordinarily used in the language to denote a feeling of compassion, regret, sorrow, distress and a desire to spare someone or something. Neuhaus's readers would have often themselves used the exclamation ‘*жаль!*’ [IPA: ʒalʲ] in these contexts.<sup>106</sup> It is significant therefore that Neuhaus asked his readers to consider the term in an archaic sense still used today in the Russian countryside. The remoteness of the countryside allowed the Russian language to retain a tighter link to the old Slavonic – and the usage of ‘*жаль*’ can still be heard in place of the word ‘love’ [*любить*]. In Neuhaus's article, *О Шопене* [*About Chopin*], he qualifies the idea of *жаль* being understood as love in the highest and purest sense by reiterating: ‘For me ‘*żal*’ is linked to the Russian ‘*жалеть*’, it is not only an expression of sorrow, but also a love towards people, a breadth [generosity/openness] of the heart...’<sup>107</sup>

In giving this definition Neuhaus made an important decision to find the Polish word *żal* reflected in the two Russian words deriving from *жаль*, both of which have links to the idea of compassion – *жалеть* and *жалость*. Neuhaus purposefully seems to have avoided mentioning or identifying a third word of common, rather than archaic, use in the Russian language which could be argued to come from the same Slavic roots. The Russian word *жаль* can be understood as the imperative of *жалить* [IPA: ʒɪ.ˈlʲitʲ] meaning to sting or bite – separated from *жалеть* by a mere vowel sound. By keeping his silence over this, Neuhaus

<sup>105</sup> ‘Среди пишущих о нем [Шопене] многие, особенно поляки, подчеркивали одну характерную черту его творчества, которую они обозначали польским словом – «*żal*»! Это славянское слово, пожалуй, лучше всего можно уподобить русскому «жалеть» в том смысле, как народ говорит – он её жалеет, то есть любит...’ Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 236.

<sup>106</sup> Transliteration: *żal*’.

<sup>107</sup> ‘Для меня это «*żal*» связано с русским «жалеть», это не только выражение скорби, но и любовь к людям, широта сердца...’ H. G. Neuhaus, ‘About Chopin’ in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 233.

concealed the negative connotations of hurt and venom that are therefore associated with *жаль*, and in doing so guided his audience to the rarer and nobler, archaic definition instead.

This decision is particularly striking given how Liszt's definition of *żal* does combine the two contrasting aspects that Neuhaus's definition obscured:

Used in differing contexts, it brings together all the tenderness and humility of a resigned regret (that silently bows before the fiat of necessity and the inscrutable decrees of Providence)<sup>108</sup> [but] it can also signify seething malice, censure, thoughts of vengeance and an implacable menace that feeds on sterile bitterness!<sup>109</sup>

Although it is possible to assume that Liszt's work (as a French and German-speaking Hungarian) may have been less than authentic, it was nonetheless written with the help of his companion Carolyne zu Sayn-Wittgenstein – a Polish woman. The definition *żal*, as given in Liszt's *Chopin*, tallies with its modern Polish usage as a somewhat archaic word with generally less-than-positive connotations: grief; sorrow; repentance; compassion; regret; bear a grudge; to show hatred; to air one's grievances. Likewise, it might be tempting to assume that the Russian translation of this passage of Liszt's biography may have shown signs of accidental or ideological adjustment or misunderstanding. The 1936 and 1956 editions however show that this too is not the case and that the more negative elements of the word *żal* are presented in both translations.<sup>110</sup>

The resulting modification of *żal* created by Neuhaus erases all negative characteristics associated with the word, and focuses exclusively on the noble. Whether this was deliberate, or part of a subconscious process of Neuhaus moulding Chopin's image to his *own* ideals, is difficult to ascertain. It is likely that a certain degree of conscious manipulation can be argued. For instance, despite Neuhaus's declaration that he saw Liszt's *Chopin* as an accurate likeness of Chopin, he guided his audience away from one of the most prominent criticisms that Liszt

<sup>108</sup> Additional translation enclosed in brackets has been completed by the current author from the French language edition F. Liszt, *Chopin* (Paris: Archipoche Editions, 2010), that is otherwise missing in Meirion Hughes's *Liszt's Chopin*.

<sup>109</sup> F. Liszt, *Chopin* as printed in M. Hughes, *Liszt's Chopin* pp. 83–84.

<sup>110</sup> A reprint of the 1936 edition of the passage in question can be found in A. В. Засимова (составитель), *Как исполнять Шопена* (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2005) [A. V. Zasimova (ed.), *How to Perform Chopin* (Moscow: 2005)] p. 103. The 1956 edition was published by the Moscow publishing house «Государственное музыкальное издательство» [Gosudarstvennoe Muzikal'noe Izdatel'stvo].

brought to Chopin and Slavic character. Beyond the word *żal*, Liszt's *Chopin* had raised the issue of the duality of Slavic character in no uncertain terms:

It was easy to misjudge what he was really thinking, as is generally the case with Slavs whose loyalty and frankness, familiarity and a captivating ease of manner do not imply confidence or openness. Their feelings are kept half-hidden, half-revealed, like the coils of an entwined serpent, and it is naïve to take at face value their politeness or their outward humility.<sup>111</sup>

The idea of 'contradiction' and 'double-facedness' were likewise important to Alfred Cortot's view of Chopin.<sup>112</sup> Neuhaus, on the other hand, refused to acknowledge such suspicions and stressed the character of Chopin as open, sincere, empathetic – feeling and suffering with and for his people. Thus, Neuhaus's misinterpretation of *żal*, despite his fluency in both Polish and Russian, could be seen as his re-writing of Chopin's biography in order to elevate the composer to the noble status defined in the philosophic terms of *Übermensch*.

Regardless of their opposing positions, both Liszt's and Neuhaus's desire to define *żal* was directly linked to the question of how Chopin's music ought to be interpreted in practice. As already discussed, both pianists shared the aesthetic belief that the work of a composer was directly related to his emotional experiences. Liszt was therefore convinced that the duality expressed in *żal*, and in the complex Polish temperament, was expressed in Chopin's music:

His works swirl with the passionate rancour of a man suffering from wounds more serious than he is prepared to acknowledge, just as shattered beams and spars swirl around a sinking ship.

These resentments were all the more important in Chopin's life because they so obviously manifested themselves in his music. [...] Almost suffocating and weighed down by repressed violence, in the [mature] works he uses art to speak to himself of his own tragedy.

---

<sup>111</sup> F. Liszt, *Chopin* as printed in M. Hughes, *Liszt's Chopin* pp. 64–65.

<sup>112</sup> A. Cortot, *In Search of Chopin* translated by Cyril and Rena Clarke, 1951 (New York: Dover Publications Inc., 2013) pp. 175–179.

[...] A Chopin melody is sometimes so tormented, so nervous, so desperately persistent in its reworking of motifs, that it becomes as painful as watching the sufferings of body and soul where death is the only relief. Chopin was prey to a disease which, getting worse from year to year took him while still young – and in the music of which we speak may be found traces of the acute sufferings that devoured him, like the claw marks of a bird of prey on a beautiful body.<sup>113</sup>

Neuhaus's writing does not emphasize Chopin's illness, suffering or premature death. In contrast to Liszt, Neuhaus wrote exclusively of the generosity and Nietzschean nobility of Chopin's soul:

The combination of pity [*жалость*],<sup>114</sup> tenderness, compassion and love that is expressed by the Polish word *żał*, found its expression in the music of Chopin with an unheard-of strength and it is rightly thought of as one of the most substantial facets of his art.

[...] From the other qualities, I would firstly mention his *majesty*, his inimitable *human dignity* [which] suffuse all of his *Allegro maestoso* [works].<sup>115</sup>

Neuhaus's interpretation of Chopin as the international *всечеловек* (explored earlier) was therefore a product of the qualities he argued to be inherent to the cultural and national identity of the Slav. Neuhaus saw Chopin's Polish identity as manifested through *żał* and argued that its common Slavic derivations such as the Russian *жаль* proved that this identity lay of the heart of the Russian too. Since Neuhaus's transformation of Chopin led him to ahistoricize the composer, and essentially position him at the birth of culture, Neuhaus presented Chopin as the supreme Slav who defined the essence of all future Slavic identities.

<sup>113</sup> F. Liszt, Chopin as printed in M. Hughes, *Liszt's Chopin* pp. 64–65.

<sup>114</sup> *Жалость* – the desire to spare someone from some sorrow or to show compassion for someone's feelings.

<sup>115</sup> 'Соединение жалости, нежности, сострадания и любви, выражаемое польским словом *żał*, нашло в музыке Шопена такое неслыханно сильное выражение, что по праву считается некоторыми исследователями одной из самых существенных сторон его творчества. [...] Среди [...] других черт я бы назвал в первую очередь его *величавость*, неподражаемое *человеческое достоинство*, которыми пронизаны все его *Allegro maestoso*...' H. G. Neuhaus, 'Thoughts on Chopin' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 236.

This can be observed in Neuhaus's decision to offer Chopin in recitals organized within the framework of an ideology of defining the new post-revolutionary Ukrainian identity in 1922. Likewise, it is a decision that which can be seen to colour the ideology of his critiques of Russian Chopin-interpretation in which Neuhaus stated that, in terms of national identity, the Russian offers the same psychological authenticity to the interpretation of the Polish composer.

However, Neuhaus's internationalization of Chopin across and beyond Slavic borders comes at a cost – the cost to the faithfulness of the very national identity Neuhaus sought to define. Neuhaus's deliberate and radical alteration of *žal* reveals his creation of a new, shared 'national' identity: the identity of the 'universal man' [*всечеловек*]. The transcendence through the national into the international is but an illusionary process of individuation, self-identification, self-purification and expressing that 'super' – and therefore international – self through the music of Chopin.

### 4.3 Chopin pianists in Neuhaus's conception

As with his interpretative vision of Beethoven, the philosophical and aesthetic considerations appropriated by Neuhaus to transform Chopin were underpinned by influences from pianism. Neuhaus's engagement with pianistic considerations which informed his interpretation of Beethoven reflected a fusion of two distinct lineages – the Russian through his imagination of Anton Rubinstein and, through his studies with Godowsky and Barth, the Germanic. Contrastingly, Neuhaus's interpretation of Chopin seems to be more concentrated within his direct familial inheritance. His ideal seems to have been set within his home, and Neuhaus's studies abroad did little to add to, or detract from this. For instance, although Neuhaus's appreciation of Godowsky's interpretations of Chopin is evident in his letters, articles and lectures, it seems the 'filigree finish of detail' was always alien to his personal pianistic ideals and technical style.<sup>116</sup> Godowsky recognized this difference in Neuhaus's ideals and respected it. Illustrating this point, Neuhaus opened his article of Godowsky as follows:

Leopold Godowsky was my best teacher and friend. I remember my first meeting with this wonderful pianist. [Felix Mikhailovich] Blumenfeld held Godowsky's talent in high regard, and persuaded my father to send me to

---

<sup>116</sup> '[...] филигранная отделка'. H. G. Neuhaus, 'In Memory of Leopold Godowsky' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 171.



Godowsky in Berlin. The small, round and very lively man spoke with me in a business-like manner, and very simply. He listened attentively as I played Chopin's F minor Piano Concerto [No. 2 Opus 21]. 'You have your own individuality' said Godowsky, 'I will not stand in its way.'<sup>117</sup>

Neuhaus's uncle, on the other hand, was a Chopin interpreter whose advice and aesthetic judgment were crucial to Neuhaus.<sup>118</sup> He considered Blumenfeld to have been 'a musician from head to toe' and Blumenfeld's strong attachment to Chopin's music (evident for instance in his compositional style) was a feature that embedded itself deeply in Neuhaus's memory:<sup>119</sup> 'A most dear remembrance from my life is interpreting Chopin's E minor Piano Concerto in my graduation recital with Felix Blumenfeld accompanying me.'<sup>120</sup> Thus as a pianist, Neuhaus returned to the memory of his uncle's interpretations of Chopin as an ideal, existing within his living memory (rather than in his imagination as in the case of Anton Rubinstein), when sourcing his own practical approaches and associations to bring to this music.

Neuhaus's personification of his uncle in the same terms that he reserved for his transformed characterization of Chopin is an illustration of how strong this influence was. Blumenfeld's ability to accept and encourage different approaches, often alien to his own

<sup>117</sup> 'Леопольд Годовский был моим лучшим учителем и другом. Вспоминается первая встреча с замечательным пианистом. По совету Ф. М. Блуменфельда, высоко ценившего талант Годовского, отец послал меня учиться к нему, в Берлин. Маленький, полный, очень живой человек необычайно просто, по-деловому разговаривал со мной. Он внимательно выслушал как я играл f-moll'ный Концерт Шопена. «У вас есть собственная индивидуальность», сказал Годовский, «и я не буду ее насиловать».' Ibid.

<sup>118</sup> An indication of Felix Blumenfeld's stature was summarized by Jonathan Powell in his paper 'Felix Blumenfeld: an initial appraisal': 'Blumenfeld was highly regarded by his fellow musicians. Stasov considered him a "great pianist, and musician of the first rank." [...] As a lauded exponent in four fields, Blumenfeld's career can only be compared in scope to Rachmaninoff's in Russia during that period. His abilities as a pianist were such that Paderewski was "amazed that he had not devoted himself wholly to performance." [...] he was also a source of inspiration for [Vladimir] Sofronitsky.' See H. A. Римский-Корсаков и его наследие в исторической перспективе. Материалы международной конференции 19–22 марта 2010 года. (Санкт-Петербург: «Санкт-Петербургский Государственный Музей Театрального и Музыкального Искусства», 2010) pp. 356–372 [N. A. Rimsky-Korsakov and his Legacy in a Historical Perspective. Materials from an International Conference 19–22 March 2010 (Saint Petersburg: 2010)] p. 356.

<sup>119</sup> Г. Г. Нейгауз, 'Из воспоминаний' [H. G. Neuhaus, 'From my Remembrances'] (*Советская музыка*, 1963 №4) in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 283.

<sup>120</sup> 'Дорогим воспоминанием моей жизни является исполнение на выпуске ми-минорного концерта Шопена, когда мне аккомпанировал Ф. Блуменфельд.' H. G. Neuhaus, 'About Chopin' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 231.

conservative tastes, led Neuhaus to consider his uncle in a certain way as a symbol of the universal essence of Chopin's art. Neuhaus saw Blumenfeld's 'breadth of soul' to be clearly manifested in his uncle's pianism. Despite Blumenfeld's quiet and retiring nature, Neuhaus described his musicianship encapsulating 'music as *large*, boundless and deep as the sea.'<sup>121</sup> Echoing the importance of the soul as a psychological process of identification, and love of *all* life in spite of fate as characterized in both *amor fati* and *zai*, Neuhaus talked of his uncle's 'warmth of heart' and 'breadth' [generosity] of the soul:

The [ability to understand not only that which is close to you, but also other things] shows the breadth of mind and understanding which is only given to those people with a great talent and a great soul. This is how I remember F. M. Blumenfeld [...].<sup>122</sup>

Unlike Neuhaus's active transformation of Chopin into a figure existing entirely as a fiction of his own individual conception, Neuhaus's characterization of his uncle was one that would have been widely recognized. For instance, Blumenfeld's student, Lev Barenboim, wrote of his professor:

It seemed that [Blumenfeld] was the inspiration for a well-known story: about people with a highly sensitive soul and great humanity, whose warmth of their hands reflected the warmth of their heart – and who could touch the tight bud of a flower and make it bloom in all its splendour.<sup>123</sup>

Neuhaus's appropriation of Blumenfeld's practices benefitted from his ability to observe his uncle at home as well as on the concert platform. As a result, Neuhaus was privy to the vital preparatory stages in which an interpretation is formed that otherwise remain hidden from public view. Neuhaus's personal contact with his uncle no doubt allowed him to furthermore

<sup>121</sup> H. G. Neuhaus, 'From my Remembrances' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 285.

<sup>122</sup> '[...] широта ума и понимания, которые свойственны только людям большой одарённости и большой души. [Такой был] Ф. М. Блуменфельд.' Г. Г. Нейгауз, 'Несколько слов об Александре Федоровиче Гедике' [H. G. Neuhaus, 'A Few Words about Alexander Fedorovich Gedike'] in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 230.

<sup>123</sup> 'Казалось, что именно о нём была кем-то сочинена байка: о людях высокой душевной чуткости и человечности, теплота рук которых, отражающая их сердечную теплоту, способна заставить тугой бутон цветка распуститься во всём своём великолепии.' Л. А. Баренбойм, 'На уроках Ф. М. Блуменфельда' [L. A. Barenboim, 'In the Lessons of F. M. Blumenfeld'] in М. Г. Соколов (составитель), *Вопросы фортепианного исполнительства. Выпуск первый* (Москва: «Музыка», 1965) [M. G. Sokolov (ed.), *Questions of Piano Interpretation. Issue 1* (Moscow: 1965)] pp. 202–203.

hear him *speak* about his own interpretations with a degree of detail which possibly superseded that which found its way into Blumenfeld's pedagogical communications. The extent to which Neuhaus incorporated his uncle's approach to Chopin is testified by the way in which his own writing mirrors the main aspects of Blumenfeld's practice – the concept of sonority and intonation [интонация].

The musicologist Boris Asafyev (Igor Glebov) for instance, genuinely felt that he had been privileged to hear Blumenfeld's interpretations of Chopin both on the stage and on a handful of sporadic occasions in the domestic environment. Asafyev recognized Blumenfeld as one of the most significant musicians at the helm of the Russian tradition of Chopin interpretation. He felt he was fortunate to have been a participant of the 'aural tradition' of hearing Chopin interpreted by Russian composers: Balakirev, Lyadov, Glazunov, Blumenfeld and Rachmaninov.<sup>124</sup> Yet, of all these names Blumenfeld symbolized for Asafyev the height of this tradition because of his alluring ability to draw the listener in to engage with the sound of the piano:

As through a magnifying glass, like a jeweller, he admired the play of Chopin's thought in the details of a precious fragment – once in his fingers, his *intonation* of it convinced the attention of the listeners.<sup>125</sup>

In talking about his own practice, Neuhaus's choice of language and imagery is striking in its similarity:

I used to learn pieces in the 'traditional' way. Later, I especially came to love a particular method of playing: when one plays very slowly, but with all the nuances, as if looking through a magnifying glass to see 'what it is made of'. [...] When you work a lot, you keep digging the earth to find a precious diamond.<sup>126</sup>

---

<sup>124</sup> '[...] «устной традиции».' В. В. Асафьев, 'Musical Criticism on Chopin Interpretation' in A. V. Zaslomova (ed.), *How to Perform Chopin* (Moscow: 2005) p. 200.

<sup>125</sup> 'Словно в лупу, он, как ювелир, любовался игрой шопеновской мысли в деталях драгоценного фрагмента, тут же в пальцах своих обладая им, и своим *интонированием* убеждал внимание слушателя.' Ibid. p. 199.

<sup>126</sup> 'Раньше я учил вещи, если можно так выразиться, «ганонным» образом. Позже я очень полюбил один метод игры. Это – когда играешь очень медленно, но со всеми оттенками, как бы рассматривая в увеличительное стекло, «из чего это сделано». [...] Когда много работаешь, все копаешь землю, чтобы найти дорогой алмаз.' А. В. Вицинский, *Процесс работы пианиста-исполнителя над музыкальным произведением*, 1950 (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2008) [A. V.

The idea of intoning sounds [*интонирование*] on the piano was an important concept to Neuhaus. Linked more to the idea of time required to inflect the unfolding sonority of the music to mimic the expressive inflections of speech than to the idea of *tempo rubato*, which affects a significantly broader part of a phrase, playing with 'intonation' shifts the emphasis from the rhythm controlling musical 'time', to the sound. In *About the Art of Piano Playing* Neuhaus clarified this stance by explaining that although 'rhythm and sound are inseparable', he nevertheless identified an additional concept of 'sound in time' [*звук во времени*] which required the interpreter to work on 'sound-time' [*временем-звуком*] as opposed to rhythmic time.<sup>127</sup> Thus Neuhaus, whose pianism was famous for its striking manipulation of tonal colour, advised: 'Since music is sound, then the main concern, the first and most important obligation of any interpreter, is to *work on sound*.'<sup>128</sup>

For Neuhaus sound was the means to 'humanize' the piano, to make the 'mechanical box [...] live and breathe'. As with all gifts, the ability to command it required a lot of effort – and it is significant that Neuhaus chose to speak of investing 'effort' into piano-playing in his chapter of sound, and not technique:

If in *Conversations with a Financial Inspector*, Mayakovsky talks about poetry requiring one to eat a pood [*пуд*] of salt to become a poet, then the piano requires a tonne of salt.<sup>129</sup>

In the same way that Neuhaus described the effort of 'digging the earth' in the search for intoned nuance, he took every opportunity possible to characterize sound as precious. For instance, Neuhaus singled out Emil Gilels's pianistic sonority:

I can hardly think of another pianist in whose sound there is so much noble 'metal', pure gold of the highest carat [*червонного золота 96-й пробы*],

---

Vitsinsky, *The Process of Work by the Pianist-Interpreter on a Musical Work*, 1950 (Moscow: 2008)] pp. 65–66.

<sup>127</sup> H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 66.

<sup>128</sup> 'Раз музыка есть звук, то главной заботой, первой и важнейшей обязанностью любого исполнителя является *работа над звуком*.' Ibid. p. 64.

<sup>129</sup> 'Если Маяковский в «Разговоре с фининспектором» говорит, что с поэзией надо пуд соли съесть, чтобы стать поэтом (стихотворцем), то я скажу: с фортепиано надо тонну соли съесть.' Ibid. p. 67. A 'пуд' [pood] is a pre-revolutionary weight unit measuring 16.38 kg.

that ‘metal’ that we hear in the voices of the greatest singers (Caruso, Gigli, Chaliapin).<sup>130</sup>

And likewise, Neuhaus shared Anton Rubinstein’s aphorism: ‘Every note in Chopin is pure gold!’<sup>131</sup> Neuhaus’s physical manner of producing a sound on the piano furthermore was reminiscent of moving the earth in the search for precious stones. As related by Neuhaus’s student, Valeri Starodubrovsky: ‘[Both Heinrich and Stanislav Neuhaus] played very close to the keyboard, as if clinging onto the keys, caressing them – calling this kind of playing “хватандо” [‘hvatando’].’<sup>132</sup> The practical manifestations of Neuhaus’s view of sound as a ‘precious diamond’, and his manipulation of sound as a master jeweller, will be investigated in the impending case studies below.

Returning to the idea of Blumenfeld’s ‘intonation’ in Chopin as proposed by Asafyev, its link to poetry would have been significant to Neuhaus particularly as he upheld the view of Chopin as the unconditional ‘poet of the piano’. Asafyev wrote:

[Blumenfeld’s playing of Chopin] can be summarized in one phrase: he played like he read Mickiewicz, and in his fingers Chopin’s music sounded like the poetry of the great Polish poet – Romantic in its fullest sense, lyricism of a soul with endless power. I remember that in the summer in Ukraine, Blumenfeld was never without a volume of Mickiewicz and the Polish language in his intonation flowed into the music – I still hear the *Crimean Sonnets*.<sup>133</sup>

<sup>130</sup> ‘[...] я с трудом нахожу другого пианиста, в звуке которого было бы столько благородного «металла», червонного золота 96-й пробы, того «металла», который мы слышим в голосе величайших певцов (Карузо, Джильи, Шаляпина).’ Ibid. p. 98.

<sup>131</sup> ‘У Шопена каждая нота – чистое золото!’ A. V. Malinkovskaya (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus and his Students. Gnessin-Pianists Speak* (Moscow: 2007) p. 38.

<sup>132</sup> ‘хватандо’ is a word made-up by Heinrich Neuhaus from the words ‘grip’ and the suffix ‘-ando’. [‘Они играли очень близко к клавиатуре, как бы зацепляя клавиши, лаская их, называя этот прием «хватандо».’] From an untitled article in N. M. Zimyanina (ed.), *Stanislav Neuhaus. Reminiscences. Letters. Materials* (Moscow: 1988) p. 141.

<sup>133</sup> ‘[Игру Blumenфельда] описать можно в одной фразе: играл так, как читал Мицкевича, и шопеновская музыка звучала в его пальцах, как стихи великого польского поэта, романтика в полном смысле, лирика неизбывной душевной силы. Blumenфельд, помнится, летом на Украине не расставался с томником Мицкевича, и польский язык в его интонировании переливался в музыку – до сих пор слышу «Крымские сонеты».’ B. V. Asafyev, ‘Musical Criticism on Chopin Interpretation’ in A. V. Zasimova (ed.), *How to Perform Chopin* (Moscow: 2005) p. 197.

Neuhaus's discussions and musicianship with his Blumenfeld would have exposed him directly to his uncle's habits of considering Chopin alongside Mickiewicz. Furthermore, Neuhaus would have been receptive to the idea that Blumenfeld's stature as a leading Chopin interpreter was indebted to the perception that he articulated Poland's musical essence through his affection for the poetry of its national poet. Just as Neuhaus's definition of *żal* and the Polish nuances of Chopin's Slavic nature were accepted as 'authentic' and true by the musicians and musicologists around him because of their partly shared national identity, Blumenfeld's ardent engagement with Mickiewicz in the vernacular raised his status to that of a profound Chopin interpreter.

That Chopin's persona and Chopin's music were meant to have found their reflection in Mickiewicz was taken by Neuhaus and Blumenfeld as a given. It seems that both pianists eliminated the untrusting relationship and scathing remarks that characterized the interaction between the composer and poet. As investigated by Jonathan Bellman's *Chopin's Polish Ballade: Opus 38 as Narrative of National Martyrdom* (Oxford University Press, 2010), Chopin's and Mickiewicz's nationalism and understanding of the Polish essence were marked by distinct differences politically, aesthetically and temperamentally – more so, in any case than that which Neuhaus was prepared to identify. For instance, Mickiewicz had allegedly considered Chopin a 'moral vampire' and exclaimed:

How come, instead of developing in yourself the gift of touching souls, you prance around the Faubourg St. Germain? You could stir crowds, but instead you only exert yourself to tickle the nerves of aristocrats!<sup>134</sup>

Ignoring, or possibly even being unaware of, the fraught relationship between Chopin and Mickiewicz, Neuhaus related that his own 'thoughts' on Chopin interpretation were 'directly related to Mickiewicz'.<sup>135</sup> Even more specifically, Neuhaus too referred, without any further explanation, to Mickiewicz's *Crimean Sonnets*:

---

<sup>134</sup> Quoted in J. Bellman, *Chopin's Polish Ballade: Opus 38 as Narrative of National Martyrdom* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010) p. 140.

<sup>135</sup> '[...] многие мысли о Шопене у меня связаны с Мицкевичем.' From a seminar for pedagogues on the 28 January 1946 documented in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 152.

Is it a crime that instead of Chopin's B-flat minor Sonata [No. 2 Opus 35] I hear the poetry of Mickiewicz? I can't help it, but it's true.<sup>136</sup>

I sometimes have poetic associations. Once, I played the *Largo* from Chopin's B minor Sonata [No. 3 Opus 58] and began to remember the *Crimean Sonnet* by Mickiewicz: how in the silence of the night he hears a voice which calls to him. That connection made itself forever. Now, as a general rule, I always hear this when I play it.<sup>137</sup>

Whilst the connection between Chopin and Mickiewicz is one that is widespread as national symbols of Poland, the connection, in all honesty, appears for many pianists to be little more than a required 'nod'. Writing in 1841, Robert Schumann connected Chopin's *Ballades* to the ballades of Mickiewicz: '[...] certain poems of Mickiewicz had suggested his ballade to him. On the other hand, a poet might easily be inspired to find words to his music; it stirs one profoundly.'<sup>138</sup> The unintended result of this connection has been to see Chopin's music simplistically in relation to Mickiewicz as a musical illustration – notably in relation to the resulting disputes whether Mickiewicz's *Konrad Wallenrod* was meant to influence Chopin's Opus 23 or 38 and whether *Świtezianka* was connected to Opus 38 or Opus 47. Significantly, these were not questions that interested Neuhaus in his writings on Chopin, nor on programme music. Suggesting that it was Chopin's Piano Sonata No.2 Opus 35, and not the second *Ballade* (one of the key interpretative achievements of Blumenfeld singled out by Asafyev) which provoked the inescapable association with Mickiewicz, Neuhaus firmly distanced himself from this tradition.

The mark of Mickiewicz's poetry on the music of Chopin has continually stimulated interest in musicological spheres, particularly in Poland and the West, where it is suggested that Mickiewicz's poetry is a symbol of the Polish identity. For instance, Karol Berger proposed

<sup>136</sup> 'Потом разве это преступление, если вместо b-moll'ной Сонаты я слышу стихи Мицкевича? Я не виноват, но это так.' Transcript of Neuhaus's conversation with pedagogues at a seminar published in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 138.

<sup>137</sup> 'Иногда бывают поэтические ассоциации. Раз как-то играл *Largo* из h-moll'ной Сонаты Шопена, и вспомнился «Крымский сонет» Мицкевича: как он в тишине ночной слушает какой-то голос, который зовёт его. И это связалось раз и навсегда. Теперь я всегда, как правило, слышу это, когда играю.' Neuhaus's conversation with B. M. Teplov and A. V. Vitsinsky (6 December 1944) in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 96.

<sup>138</sup> R. Schumann, *On Music and Musicians* translated by Paul Rosenfeld and edited by Konrad Wolff, 1946 (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1983) p. 143.

that just as Mickiewicz became an émigré whose poetry spoke of pilgrimage and wandering, '[the relationship between] temporal structures of Chopin's musical narrative and the historical narrative in terms of which the composer's contemporaries established their identity [which] provided the community Chopin identified with most closely, the Polish [émigrés], with a sense of who they were.'<sup>139</sup> Significantly before these kinds of associations were being seriously discussed, at least in early twentieth-century Russian musicology, Neuhaus seems to have genuinely seen Mickiewicz as the poetic *alter ego* of Chopin.

If as already discussed, 'autobiographicality' was seen by Neuhaus as the most dominant trait in Chopin's music then perhaps along with Blumenfeld, he saw Mickiewicz's *Crimean Sonnets* offering this link. The *Crimean Sonnets* are descriptive of the poet's wandering and pilgrimage to his elusive heartland in the search for his identity. The final verse of the poem draws together the essence of Neuhaus's Chopin – a composer who poured out his life into music, but whose great suffering does not cloud the 'joy' of his art:

Thus, Poet, in your youth when storms are wild  
And passions break upon the heart and brain,  
To leave their ruin there – shipwrecked and waste –  
Pick up your lute! Upon it indefiled  
You'll find song – pearls that your heart-deeps retain,  
The crown the years have brought you, white and chaste.<sup>140</sup>

Neuhaus's vision of Chopin as a composer who could speak with 'majesty' and 'nobility' in a way that was universal and all-encompassing, whilst speaking lyrically or compassionately to the individual, are qualities long associated with Mickiewicz. What seems to be even more significant to Neuhaus, however, was that these qualities pointed to the idea of the Greek epic poets, fused with the urgent Romantic emotive narrative. As pointed out by Monika Dudli:

[Mickiewicz] like Pushkin represents an amalgamation of the most diverse devices – classical, romantic, realistic – with the result that [Mickiewicz lies] 'between two general modes of poetry: the logical-rhetorical structure of

<sup>139</sup> K. Berger, 'Chopin's *Ballade* Op. 23 and the Revolution of the Intellectuals' pp. 72–83 in J. Rink & J. Samson (ed.), *Chopin Studies 2* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994) pp. 76–77.

<sup>140</sup> A. Mickiewicz, *Crimean Sonnets* (final verse) translated by Edna Underwood. See [www.sonnets.org/mickiewicz.htm](http://www.sonnets.org/mickiewicz.htm) (accessed 08/02/2014).



the Renaissance, Baroque, and Enlightenment, and the emotional-expressive structure of romanticism.’ [...] Epic objectivity is balanced by romantic vividness and lyricism, classical control by a free flow of images, rhetoric by the use of a rich, colloquial language. In the words of Czesław Miłosz, [Mickiewicz’s poetry] ‘spoke of the return of a prodigal son to Homer and Vigil, but the prodigal returned rich in experience [...]’<sup>141</sup>

Hence, the Homeric qualities in Mickiewicz’s poetry were perhaps pertinent to Neuhaus’s view of Chopin’s Apollonian roots, already discussed.

Seeing Mickiewicz as the poet of the word to symbolize (rather than illustrate) Chopin as the poet of the piano, Neuhaus was able to engage with Blumenfeld’s ‘heroic conceptions’ of Chopin.<sup>142</sup> This would tie in with Asafyev’s overriding impression of Blumenfeld’s playing was through heroic terms:

[...] a manifestation of the reality of Chopin’s and Mickiewicz’s world, through the music flared up the Poland’s flames, the great Slavic country with its centuries old suffering and battle to be itself!<sup>143</sup>

Neuhaus was concerned that Chopin was far too often simplified to be a ‘poet of intimate lyricism’ without the heroic depth to his concept of *śal*.<sup>144</sup> Yet, the fact that Neuhaus could trace the heroic element through his uncle directly to Anton Rubinstein would have surely consolidated his belief that the heroic was a vital facet to Chopin’s persona:

The most important and significant impression in [Blumenfeld’s] life in the sphere of pianism was, of course, Anton Rubinstein whom he often heard and knew very well. Not an actual student, he was nonetheless one spiritually in the full sense of the word [especially relating to] the *heroic*

<sup>141</sup> M. Dudli, *Pushkin, Mickiewicz and the Overcoming of Romanticism* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, Honors Essays, 1976) pp. 33–34.

<sup>142</sup> H. G. Neuhaus, ‘From my Remembrances’ in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 285.

<sup>143</sup> ‘[...] действительность вокруг насыщалась эпохой Мицкевича и Шопена, вспыхивало сквозь музыку пламя Польши, великой славянской страны, с её вековечным страданием и борьбой за право быть самой собою!’ B. V. Asafyev, ‘Musical Criticism on Chopin Interpretation’ in A. V. Zasimova (ed.), *How to Perform Chopin* (Moscow: 2005) p. 197.

<sup>144</sup> H. G. Neuhaus, ‘About Chopin’ in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 233.

conception of his interpretations [which did not] sacrifice the grand concept, the daring nature of the thoughts and feelings.<sup>145</sup>

Rubinstein was himself a musical symbol of Chopin interpretation in Russia. His iconic interpretation of the Second Piano Sonata Opus 35 conceived the changes to Chopin's text to accommodate the idea of 'the funeral procession approaching and then moving on, and the howling gusts of wind' – a tradition subsequently incorporated in Neuhaus's own teaching and performance of the work.<sup>146</sup> Yet, demonstrating just how usual it was to emphasize Chopin's music through the prism of the heroic, Rubinstein's interpretations certainly did not win over everyone outside Russia. James Huneker, a contemporary of Rubinstein, observed:

Anton Rubinstein, when I last heard him, played Chopin inimitably [...]. Yet, the Chopin pupils, assembled in judgment at Paris when he gave his Historic Recitals, refused to accept him as an interpreter. His touch was too rich and full, his tone too big. Chopin did not care for Liszt's reading of his music [...]. Von Bülow was too much of a martinet to revel the poetic quality, though he appreciated Chopin on the intellectual side; his touch was not beautiful enough.<sup>147</sup>

Rubinstein's heroic colourations were not accidental or clumsy encroachments of his own pianistic temperament. As with Neuhaus, the heroic aspect in Chopin was a conscious and intellectual appropriation about which Rubinstein declared:

---

<sup>145</sup> 'Самым большим, решающим впечатлением его жизни в области пианизма был, конечно, Антон Рубинштейн, которого он много слушал и знал великолепно. Не будучи фактически его учеником, он был им духовно в полном смысле слова и умел передавать [...] его героическое воссоздание музыкальных образов [без] отказа от крупных замыслов, от больших дерзаний, мыслей и чувств.' Н. G. Neuhaus, 'From my Remembrances' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 285 (Neuhaus's emphasis).

<sup>146</sup> '[...] приближение и удаление похоронного шествия, а в финале порывы бури.' A. G. Rubinstein, *Lectures in the History of the Piano Literature* p. 80. Sergei Rachmaninov was the generation of pianists who had heard Anton Rubinstein's interpretation of the Chopin Sonata Opus 35 and perpetuated his concept. By the time Neuhaus talked about the 'howling wind' in *About the Art of Piano Playing* (in relation to the use of sustaining pedal in the final movement) this idea was widespread within the Russian Chopin tradition.

<sup>147</sup> J. Huneker, *Chopin. The Man and his Music* (New York: Dover Publications, 1966) p. 54.

Great people have given *their* most sacred, I would even say most beautiful, to the piano – but the *piano's* bard and rhapsode, its soul and spirit, was Chopin. [...] Tragedy, Romanticism, lyricism, heroicness, dramaticism, the fantastic, the soulful, the heart-felt, the dreaming, the brilliant, majestic, simplicity – all possible expression is held in his work in the most beautiful form!<sup>148</sup>

Never having known Rubinstein's playing, but yearning to be considered as a musician who stood in line with Rubinstein's pianistic and pedagogical legacy, Neuhaus's distinct philosophical view of Chopin emulated the image left in Rubinstein's written output. The existentialist idea of Chopin's artistic persona offered by Rubinstein would have resonated with Neuhaus's personal philosophical sympathies:

Personal suffering and the suffering of his people determine the atmosphere of Chopin's piano works. [...] Once alien to all, now he is akin to the whole world. Suffering, all his life he did not take off the wreath of thorns, and in return the grateful children wove him an eternal wreath of laurel.<sup>149</sup>

The interplay between the personal, the Polish and the universal, as set out by Rubinstein within the realm of existentialism, must have proved attractive to Neuhaus in light of his own personal need to make sense of the implications of his own mixed national identity and heritage. Likewise the heroism indicated by Rubinstein as a characteristic of Chopin was key to Neuhaus's vision of the composer's nobility represented by the *Übermensch*. Having this concept reinforced in his uncle's 'broad', expansive pianism – supposedly inherited from Rubinstein – and through his 'generous' and loving soul, acted to strengthen Neuhaus's willingness to appropriate ideas from this pianistic trajectory. Being able to connect so directly

---

<sup>148</sup> 'Великие люди отдавали всё своё сокровеннейшее, я бы даже сказал прекраснейшее, фортепиано, но бард, рапсод, дух, душа *этого инструмента* – это Шопен. [...] Трагизм, романтизм, лирика, героическое, драматическое, фантастическое, задушевное, сердечное, мечтательное, блестящее, величественное, простота, вообще все возможные выражения находятся в его сочинениях для этого инструмента, и всё это звучит на нем в самом прелестнейшем образе!' A. G. Rubinstein, *Music and Those Who Represent It* p. 73–74.

<sup>149</sup> 'Личные страдания и страдания его народа обусловили основное настроение фортепианных произведений Шопена. [...] Всем чужой когда-то, он теперь имеет своей родиной весь мир. Страдающий, он во всю жизнь не снимал тернового венца и за то благодарное потомство сплело ему вечный лавровый венок.' A. G. Rubinstein, *Lectures in the History of the Piano Literature* pp. 103–105.

through his uncle to the imagined manner in which Rubinstein interpreted Chopin, Neuhaus must have felt he was part of an important lineage. That this lineage of great Chopin interpretation could be seen to flow directly through the Blumenfeld-Neuhaus household would have given Neuhaus's pianistic identity as a 'Chopinist' a certain stature, pride and credibility.

#### 4.4 The wider artistic consideration of Romantic Realism

Neuhaus's engagement with Blumenfeld's pianism highlights the immense gravity that wider artistic considerations exerted over his pianistic engagement with ideas. Speaking of Blumenfeld's importance in the creation of his own distinct transformation of Chopin, Neuhaus cited not practical but cultural considerations – the poet Mickiewicz. To Neuhaus, Mickiewicz's poetry brought together, in a different but comparable medium, the philosophical questions forming the essence of Chopin's music: the soul's 'autobiographicality', the journey of self-identification through the national, individual and universal. Poetry as a wider concept however, was a powerful symbol for Neuhaus which alluded to the Romantic spirit of Chopin's music – it allowed Neuhaus to deal with the enigmatic nature of pianistic sound which defies notation on the one hand, and with the enigmatic communicative essence of music beyond the notes on the other.

Looking at poetry as the enigma of sound, Neuhaus considered sound as the life-giving force of the piano – the voice of its soul. Stressing the preciousness of sound, Neuhaus spoke of it as a mysterious quality: 'Sound should be *wrapped in silence*, sound should *rest* [покоиться] *in silence*,<sup>150</sup> like a precious stone in a velvet casket.'<sup>151</sup> Furthermore, Neuhaus considered that the illusive nature of an individual's sound at the piano reflected the reality, or perhaps mystery, of life:

The highest achievements in interpretative art (the playing of Mozart or Bach, Anton Rubinstein or Rachmaninov, Paganini or Liszt for example) *come and go, and go forever*. But one must not grieve - others are born to

---

<sup>150</sup> *Покоиться*: find peace.

<sup>151</sup> 'Звук должен быть закутан в тишину, звук должен покоиться в тишине, как драгоценный камень в бархатной шкатулке.' H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 89.

take their place. In this way, the life of art is comparable to the reality of nature.<sup>152</sup>

Equally for Neuhaus, however, the intonation of sound was a process that lived in the imagination. The beginnings of sound were born in the interpreter's soul from ideals that were unconcerned by reality and undeterred by it: 'Only demanding the impossible from the piano are you able to attain the possible.'<sup>153</sup> Intonation of sound, therefore, was the truest reflection of scope and breadth of the interpreter's soul.

The enigmatic power of sound meant for Neuhaus that like an invisible force arising from within the interpreter's imagination, for its duration, it had the ability to *change reality*:

Every master-pianist has his own individual sound palette. I feel this so strongly that it sometimes seems to me that the Grand Hall of our [Moscow] Conservatory responds to the playing of certain pianists (for example, Richter, Sofronitsky, Gilels) and even [appears] to be lit up differently – as if it changes its architectural appearance. I know that this is a fantasy, but it is a fantasy that remarkably reminds me of reality.<sup>154</sup>

Neuhaus emphasized that the interpreter's intoning of sound first exists as a will to evoke and to sympathize: 'One must understand and love the 'self' of the piano in order to understand and command it.'<sup>155</sup> By virtue of the fact that the interpreter's will to create the intoned sound should in its strength and purity of its conception be beyond that attainable in reality, Neuhaus believed that this inevitably raised the quality and state of the actual resultant reality. As a pedagogical concept, Neuhaus felt all interpretational effort must: '[...] know and understand the "stratosphere" into which he will one day creep. He should divine the far, guiding star to

---

<sup>152</sup> '[...] высочайшие достижения исполнительского искусства (например, игра Моцарта или Баха, Антона Рубинштейна или Рахманинова, Паганини или Листа) *приходят и уходят, уходят навсегда*. Но горевать не приходится; на их место рождаются новые. Жизнь искусства в этом смысле совершенно подобна самой природе.' Ibid.

<sup>153</sup> 'Только требуя от рояля невозможного, достигаешь на нем всего возможного.' Ibid. p. 75.

<sup>154</sup> 'Каждый пианист-мастер обладает своей индивидуальной звуковой палитрой. Я это чувствую до того сильно, что мне кажется иногда, будто Большой зал нашей консерватории в зависимости от игры того или иного пианиста (например, Рихтера, Софроницкого, Гилельса) даже освещён по-другому, даже меняет свой архитектурный облик. Я знаю, что это фантазия, но фантазия, удивительно напоминающая действительность.' Ibid. p. 76.

<sup>155</sup> 'Надо знать и любить это индивидуальное, особенное «я» рояля, чтобы до конца его постигнуть и овладеть им.' Ibid. p. 75.

which he will unceasingly strive.<sup>156</sup> It was in these same terms that Neuhaus viewed Chopin, the composer who Neuhaus considered to have understood and captured the very essence of the piano like no other. Chopin's 'love' and ability to sympathize with humanity – to see it with his 'unique, charismatic soul [that was] pure as crystal' – changed the reality of his personal suffering and made his music so radiant.

Neuhaus directly called music's enigmatic ability to speak of reality and yet to change it, as manifested in a musical performance by the interpreter's intonation, *poetry* [поэзия]. Thus, it is evident why engaging with the questions of Blumenfeld's pianism Neuhaus was unable to bypass Mickiewicz. Although Neuhaus does not specifically explore the Greek root of the word poetry, *ποίησις* [poiēsis], in his writing, it is unthinkable that it did not influence his aesthetic understanding.<sup>157</sup> The modern word 'poetry' [поэзия] derives itself from a verb – an action of transforming and the making of a world. Neuhaus's idea of 'sound-time' or intoned sound being able to change reality was not as a superficial and vain depiction of the interpreter's abilities, but as a response to the poetic essence of the music which was calling to be given a voice.

Neuhaus considered Chopin's music to be suffused with the spirit of poetry which afforded Chopin the title of 'poet of the piano': 'The sacred essence and depth of thought of Chopin's artistry is *poetry*, which we, interpreters, must reveal.'<sup>158</sup> Accepting that 'poetry' was a definition that escaped words and contributed to the difficulty of performing Chopin's music, Neuhaus nonetheless considered that it was a concept that needed to be instilled into a musician from his earliest training:

At the source of all art lies *poetry*. When a pupil [even at the early stages of development] plays a certain melody you should apply all your efforts to making sure that he understands the poetic content of this melody.<sup>159</sup>

---

<sup>156</sup> '[...] знать и помнить о «стратосфере», в которую ему когда-нибудь надлежит проникнуть, должен угадывать очень дальнюю путеводную звезду, к которой он будет непрерывно стремиться.' Transcript of Neuhaus's conversation with pedagogues at a seminar published in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 127.

<sup>157</sup> For instance, Neuhaus's derivation of technique from the Greek *τέχνη* and virtuosity from the Ancient Roman concept of *virtus* has already been discussed in this thesis.

<sup>158</sup> 'Сокровенной сущностью и глубочайшим смыслом шопеновского творчества является поэзия, которую мы, исполнители, должны открывать.' H. G. Neuhaus, 'About Chopin' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 232.

<sup>159</sup> 'В основе всякого искусства лежит поэзия. Когда ученик играет какую-нибудь мелодию, вы должны приложить все усилия к тому, чтобы заставить его понять поэтическую сущность этой

Poetry was for Neuhaus the ‘*spirit of Romanticism*’, a ‘strength of direct feeling’ which he felt could not be replaced by ‘intellect [and] constructive strength.’<sup>160</sup> Neuhaus presented poetry as the universally-felt and undisputed content of art, and enjoyed the mysticism of such a position which he did not seek to rationalize or dispel. In turn, Stanislav Neuhaus summarized:

Poetry, music, art, architecture – all these in essence speak of the same things in their own language: about the beauty of the world and human soul, about the height of thought and striving of thought, about the joy and tragedy of life. [...] There is something that is present in all genuine Art which makes its essence [...] and gives Art its unusual power of influence.

That is *Poetry*. [...] it wakes the sleeping, consoles the anguished and leaves a deep imprint in our souls, sometimes forever.<sup>161</sup>

If poetry is seen as the enigmatic communicating essence of music, what then does it speak of? Neuhaus’s answer to such a question was always – the soul’s experiences. Thus, the enigma of poetry returns us to the concept of music being an autobiographic trace, and as already discussed, Chopin’s music for Neuhaus was the most conceivably autobiographic. Neuhaus’s understanding of ‘autobiographicality’, it must be remembered, was as the deepest manifestation of Romanticism. It was precisely in this way that, as discussed in the previous chapter, Neuhaus defined Beethoven as one of the most Romantic composers in the pianist’s repertory.

Neuhaus’s concept of poetry being linked to ‘autobiographicality’ made its mark literally through poetry in the wider artistic sphere. The link between Chopin and

---

мелодии.’ Neuhaus’s seminar for music teachers held on 9 December 1938 as documented in A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 108.

<sup>160</sup> ‘дух романтизма’; ‘сила «непосредственного чувства»’; ‘интеллект, конструктивные силы’. H. G. Neuhaus, ‘Thoughts on Chopin’ in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 235.

<sup>161</sup> ‘Поэзия, музыка, живопись, архитектура, каждая на своём языке, говорит в сущности об одном: о красоте мира и человеческой души, о высоте помыслов и устремлений мысли, о счастье и трагичности жизни. [...] есть что-то, что всегда присутствует в любом подлинном произведении искусства, что составляет его главную сущность, [...] и, что придает искусству необычайную силу воздействия. Это – Поэзия, [которая] будит дремлющих, успокаивает мятущихся и оставляет глубокий след в нашей душе, а иногда на всю жизнь.’ С. Г. Нейгауз, ‘О Поэзии’ [S. H. Neuhaus, ‘About Poetry’] in N. M. Zimyanina (ed.), *Stanislav Neuhaus. Reminiscences. Letters. Materials* (Moscow: 1988) p. 203.

'autobiographicality' was a key element that underpinned Boris Pasternak's understanding of the composer. Pasternak had remained a special friend of Neuhaus for much of his life, and the two families were close. Sharing similar values in music (notably: Bach, Beethoven, Chopin, Skryabin and Wagner) and literature, it is evident from their correspondence that Neuhaus and Pasternak exchanged views and influenced each other's aesthetic standpoints. Notably, Pasternak's own analysis of the significance of Chopin's persona carries recognizable traits which are present in Neuhaus's. Instead of using Neuhaus's term 'autobiographicality', Pasternak's descriptions of Chopin refer to Realism:

Bach and Chopin [...]. Their music is abundant in detail and produces the impression of a chronicle of their lives. Reality, more than with anyone else, emerges from their sounds. Speaking of Realism in music, we do not mean the illustrative element of programme or operatic music. Rather [...] artistic Realism is the depth of the biographical imprint which becomes the main driving force of an artist [...]. Chopin is a Realist in the same way as Lev Tolstoy. His art is thoroughly original not because of its difference from his competitors, but because of its affinity to his own nature. He is always biographic, but not out of egotism, but because like all great Realists Chopin looked at his own life as a way to understand all life on this earth [...].<sup>162</sup>

In much the same way as for Neuhaus, Pasternak's engagement with Chopin's music was an act of profound self-analysis. As noted by Boris Katz, who compiled the anthology of materials detailing Pasternak's relationship with music:

---

<sup>162</sup> 'Бах и Шопен [...]. Их музыка изобилует подробностями и производит впечатление летописи их жизни. Действительность больше, чем у кого-либо другого, проступает у них наружу сквозь звук. Говоря о реализме в музыке, мы вовсе не имеем в виду иллюстративного начала музыки, оперной или программной. Речь совсем об ином [...]. Художественный реализм, как нам кажется, есть глубина биографического отпечатка, ставшего главной движущей силой художника [...]. Шопен реалист в том же самом смысле, как Лев Толстой. Его творчество нассквозь оригинально не из несходства с соперниками, а из сходства с натурою, с которой он писал. Оно всегда биографично не из эгоцентризма, а потому, что, подобно остальным великим реалистам, Шопен смотрел на свою жизнь как на орудие познания всякой жизни на свете [...]' Б. Л. Пастернак, 'Шопен' [B. L. Pasternak, 'Chopin'] in Б. А. Кац (составитель), *Раскат импровизаций... Музыка в творчестве, судьбе и в доме Бориса Пастернака* (Ленинград: «Советский Композитор», 1991) [B. A. Katz (ed.), *The Peal of Improvisation... Music in the Creativity, Fate and Home of Boris Pasternak* (Leningrad: 1991)] pp. 96–97.



Chopin was not for Pasternak an object of auditory contemplation, but like Lev Tolstoy, a ‘companion in life’ and was not unlike the poet’s doppelgänger. Pasternak listened intently to Chopin in the same way as one looks into a mirror to understand himself through his reflection.<sup>163</sup>

Pasternak’s identification of Chopin with Tolstoy draws on the well-known love that Tolstoy had for the composer’s music. As related by Alexander Goldenweiser, who knew Tolstoy personally and played for him: ‘Sometimes after listening to a certain work by his beloved Chopin [Tolstoy] would exclaim: “This is how one should write!” or “*Das ist Musik!*”’<sup>164</sup>

Pasternak defined Chopin’s music in language that reflected Tolstoy’s own characterization of a ‘true’ artist. As explored in the previous chapter, Tolstoy’s existentialist vision of an artist’s fate being that of ‘sacrificing [and articulating] the self’ was described by him as the necessary ‘cross’ that he carried ‘as conveyed in the Gospel.’<sup>165</sup> Furthermore, Tolstoy’s article, *Что такое искусство?* [*What is Art?*], advocated that the only true art was ‘Realist’:

All true artists learn not in schools, but in life – following the example of all other great masters. [...] The art of the future will be a response to the [artist’s] common knowledge of life [...] and his identification with [...] feelings [which will be filtered through Christianity]: Those of brotherhood, equality, and love.<sup>166</sup>

<sup>163</sup> ‘Шопен для Пастернака не объект слухового созерцания, а, подобно Льву Толстому, «пожизненный собеседник», чуть ли не превращающийся в двойника поэта. Можно было бы сказать, что Пастернак вслушивался в Шопена, как всматриваются в зеркало, чтобы понять себя через своё отражение.’ Б. А. Кац, ‘Пробужденный Музыкой’ [B. A. Katz, ‘Awakened by Music’] in B. A. Katz (ed.), *The Peal of Improvisation... Music in the Creativity, Fate and Home of Boris Pasternak* (Leningrad: 1991) pp. 26–27.

<sup>164</sup> ‘Иногда, прослушав какую-нибудь вещь своего любимого Шопена, он вскрикивал: – Вот как надо писать! – или: – *Das ist Musik!*’ А. Б. Гольденвейзер, *Вблизи Толстого* (Москва: «Государственное издательство художественной литературы», 1959) [A. B. Goldenweiser, *Near Tolstoy* (Moscow: 1959)] p. 380.

<sup>165</sup> ‘[...] слугитель искусства [...] с самоотвержением будет исполнять своё призвание [...], крест, как выражено в евангелии..’ L. N. Tolstoy, ‘What then, shall we do?’ in V. V. Osnovin (ed.), *Lev Tolstoy: What is Art?* p. 104.

<sup>166</sup> ‘Всякий истинный художник и теперь учится не в школе, а в жизни, на образцах великих мастеров. [...] Искусство будущего будет составлять выражение чувств, испытываемых человеком, живущим свойственной всем людям жизнью [...]. Чувства, вытекающие из религиозного сознания [...], братство, равенство, любовь’ Ibid. pp. 267–269.

In his article, *Шопен* [Chopin] (1945), Boris Pasternak synthesized these two ideals from Tolstoy's writing which strongly echoed Neuhaus's views:

For a Realist-artist, his work is his cross and destiny [...]. What makes a Realist-artist, what creates him? Impressionability from his earliest childhood, we think, and the timely conscientiousness in his maturity. Exactly these two forces sit him to work [...] and push him towards innovation and originality.<sup>167</sup>

However, despite the convergence of Neuhaus's and Pasternak's views through their reading of Tolstoy, the idea of 'autobiographicality' or 'Realism' also becomes the ground that separates the aesthetic positions of these two figures. Although categorically separate from the ideas of Socialist Realism, Pasternak's evaluation of artistic Realism is nonetheless different to Romanticism:

Realism is evidently that decisive degree of creative detailing which does not require general aesthetic rules, nor contemporary listeners or audiences. This is the exact point where Romanticism stands and is contented. How little [Romanticism] needs to flourish! At its disposal are stilted pathos and pretentious affection - every form of the artificial [*искусственности*] are at its service. [...] A Romantic artist knows nothing of work and conscientiousness.<sup>168</sup>

Neuhaus was aware of the negative connotations that overshadowed Romanticism in the twentieth century:

---

<sup>167</sup> 'Совсем в ином положении художник-реалист. Его деятельность – крест и предопределение. [...] Что делает художника реалистом, что его создает? Ранняя впечатлительность в детстве, думается нам, и своевременная добросовестность в зрелости. Именно эти две силы сажают его за работу [...] и толкают его на новаторство и оригинальность.' В. Л. Pasternak, 'Chopin' in В. А. Katz (ed.), *The Peal of Improvisation... Music in the Creativity, Fate and Home of Boris Pasternak* (Leningrad: 1991) p. 96.

<sup>168</sup> 'Реализм есть, вероятно, та решающая мера творческой детализации, которой от художника не требуют ни общие правила эстетики, ни современные ему слушатели и зрители. Именно здесь останавливается всегда искусство романтизма и этим удовлетворяется. Как мало нужно [для] его процветания! В его распоряжении ходульный пафос, ложная глубина и наигранная умильность, – все формы искусственности к его услугам. [...] добросовестность и работа, романтическому художнику неведомы и для него необязательны.' Ibid.

As a pedagogue, I know that the interpretation of Chopin presents huge difficulties, especially today. Here it is necessary to remind one of a certain important detail of our musical evolution, particularly over the last fifty years. It is no secret that young talented musicians, composers, and sometimes even interpreters, turn their back on Romanticism – on the very *spirit* of Romanticism. They are ready to proclaim Josquin de Prez, Palestrina and others – not to mention their idol Johann Sebastian Bach [...]. The later epoch of Romanticism that is decorated with the names of late Beethoven, Schumann, Chopin, Liszt and others – despite being acknowledged for some of the achievements of these named composers – is for them a lowering of the heights of the world’s musical creations [...].

Intellect, constructive strength of the mind are often valued more highly today than the strength of ‘direct feeling’ that was still quite recently so trusted and believed in by Tchaikovsky, Tolstoy and many, many others... Not only the dizzying advances of science and technology, but also their methods have had an effect on contemporary attitudes towards art. For the modern young pianist it is so much easier to play a Prelude and Fugue of Shostakovich or a Prokofiev Sonata than, for example, Chopin’s *Barcarolle*.<sup>169</sup>

He was not alone in this fear. A similar sentiment was prominently expressed in the writings of Igumnov and Feinberg and thus makes a convincing case for considering these

---

<sup>169</sup> ‘И всё же как педагог я знаю – исполнение Шопена представляет огромные трудности именно сейчас. Здесь надо упомянуть об одной немаловажной детали нашего музыкального развития особенно за последние пятьдесят лет. Ни для кого не тайна, что молодые талантливые музыканты, композиторы, да иной раз и исполнители, всё чаще поворачиваются спиной к романтизму, к самому духу романтизма. Они готовы превозносить Жоскена Дебре, Палестрину и других, не говоря уж об их кумире Иоганне Себастьяне Бахе [...] а последующая затем эпоха романтизма, украшенная именами позднего Бетховена, Шумана, Шопена, Листа и других, – для них, несмотря на признание ими некоторых заслуг названных композиторов, является снижением мирового музыкального творчества [...].’

Интеллект, конструктивные силы ума уже сейчас порой ценятся выше, чем сила «непосредственного чувства», в которое так верили, которому так доверяли ещё недавно Чайковский, Толстой и многие, многие другие... Не только головокружительное развитие науки и техники, но и методы их, оказали на современное отношение к искусству своё неоспоримое воздействие. Современному молодому пианисту куда легче хорошо сыграть прелюдию и фугу Шостаковича или сонату Прокофьева, чем, например, Баркаролу Шопена.’ Н. G. Neuhaus, ‘Thoughts on Chopin’ in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 235.

thoughts as an accurate socio-cultural barometer of the concerns of this generation of pianists.<sup>170</sup> The misinterpretation and sidelining of Romanticism was a contentious issue, attracting much debate particularly regarding Chopin's persona. Having survived the incoherent political ideologies of organizations such as the RAPM, and risen above the political propaganda associated with the Chopin Competitions, Chopin's music seemed to be facing a crisis of complacency from the younger generation who were not prepared, or able, to see Romanticism as a philosophical and aesthetic concept that far transcended the narrow confines of opulent textures, harmonies and effects.

Illustrating the perceived gravity of the crisis, Stanislav Neuhaus – a more shy, and quietly-spoken character – felt the need to comment on the situation in the early 1970s, nearly a decade after his father's death. In one of his very few pieces of writing, an article entitled *Устарел ли романтизм?* [*Has Romanticism become Outmoded?*] Stanislav Neuhaus lamented that:

In the last few years discussions have intensified about the fact that pianists of the younger generation are playing the works of Romantic composers more and more rarely, especially Chopin – and if they do, then the quality of their interpretation trails behind the quality of their interpretation of the

---

<sup>170</sup> See for example Y. I. Milstein's monograph on his professor, Konstantin Igumnov, which was based on Igumnov's teaching as well as his interviews and articles: Я. И. Мильштейн, *Константин Николаевич Игумнов* (Москва: «Музыка», 1975) [Y. I. Milstein, *Konstantin Nikolaevich Igumnov* (Moscow: 1975)] p. 421. Similar sentiments can be found throughout Feinberg's work. Although Feinberg's writings were marked by a particular interest in some of the more 'academic' aspects of interpretation, he was concerned that modernity should never mean the simplification of questions raised by Romanticism. See С. Е. Фейнберг, *Пианизм как искусство*, 1965 (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2001) [S. E. Feinberg, *Pianism as an Art*, 1965 (Moscow: 2001)]. Maria Yudina, who was known for her championing of composers including Hindemith, Berg, Webern, Schoenberg and Stravinsky, still considered these to derive from 'Romantic' thought. She was anxious to advocate a wider meaning of 'Romanticism' to students as well as her public as shown by her lecture series *Романтизм. Истоки и параллели* [*Romanticism. Sources and Parallels*] at the Moscow Conservatory in April/May 1966 (see С. Я. Левит (составитель), *Мария Юдина. Нереальность зла. Переписка 1964–1966 гг.* (Москва: «Российская политическая энциклопедия», 2010) [S. Y. Levit (ed.), *Maria Yudina. The Non-Reality of Evil* (Moscow: 2010)] pp. 388–389). These lectures were remembered to be pivotal by the pianist Dmitri Alexeev in his talk at the Royal College of Music, *Romanticism and the Legacy of the Russian Piano School*, on the 13 February 2014. Teodor Gutman also encouraged his students at the Moscow Conservatory to understand Romanticism as an approach to all music and thus beyond the confines of a particular epoch. See В. М. Тропп, 'Педагогика – продолжение исполнительства. О Нейгаузе и Гутмане' [V. M. Tropp, 'Pedagogy – the Continuation of Interpretation. About Neuhaus and Gutman'] in А. В. Малинковская (составитель), *Генрих Нейгауз и его ученики. Пианисты-Гнесинцы рассказывают* (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2007) [A. V. Malinkovskaya, (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus and his Students. Gnessin-Pianists Speak* (Moscow: 2007)] pp. 38–39.

Classical, Post-Romantic and contemporary music. This is confirmed by the results of the last Chopin Competitions [in Warsaw] [...] We hear more and more often the use of the term 'minus 19' in reference to pianists, which is supposed to mean that the pianist does not play (or does not want to, or cannot play) composers of the nineteenth century, i.e. the Romantics, or the patronizing remarks of some musicians that these composers 'have grown old'. [...] The Soviet pianistic school has given the world many excellent pianists, and it would be sad if this tradition ceased to exist.<sup>171</sup>

When Heinrich Neuhaus said that 'Romantic art is fading away from modern life. It is only natural, it does not make me happy, but it is a fact', he was referring not to a compositional movement, but as an interpreter to a manner of responding to any given composition.<sup>172</sup> Neuhaus was lamenting the imminent loss of a tight synthesis of elements, discussed in various forms in this chapter, which he identified to appear in their highest degrees in the music and persona of Chopin: unconditional love and compassion; unlimited imagination and will to change reality; and a personal spiritual generosity and purity. All these qualities, whether defined philosophically, poetically or observed in the pianism, are entirely subjective:

It seems to me that the main difficulty in [interpreting Chopin today] is in the ability to get as close as possible to that degree of spirituality [одухотворенность] which is so natural for these authors. When you hear a good interpretation of [Chopin] it is as if you hear not the sounds of the piano, but the living voice of the soul overflowing with a great kindness

---

<sup>171</sup> 'В последние годы участились разговоры о том, что пианисты молодого поколения все реже играют произведения композиторов-романтиков, особенно Шопена, а если играют, то качество исполнения отстает от качества исполнения классиков и композиторов постромантизма и новой музыки. Об этом говорят и результаты последних шопеновских конкурсов [...]. Все чаще слышишь в применении к пианистам выражение «минус 19», которое должно означать, что данный пианист не играет (не хочет или не умеет играть) композиторов XIX века, то есть романтиков, и снисходительные реплики некоторых музыкантов, что эти композиторы «устарели». [...] Советская пианистическая школа дала немало выдающихся пианистов, и было бы печально, если бы эта традиция нарушилась.' Citation from Stanislav Neuhaus's article *Устарел ли романтизм? [Has Romanticism become Outmoded?]* in N. M. Zimyanina (ed.), *Stanislav Neuhaus. Reminiscences. Letters. Materials* (Moscow: 1988) p. 195. The article is thought to date from the beginning of the 1970s, published in the internal newspaper of the Moscow Conservatory. See [http://www.all-2music.com/neuhaus\\_romantizm.html](http://www.all-2music.com/neuhaus_romantizm.html) (accessed 26/12/2012).

<sup>172</sup> 'Романтическое искусство уходит из жизни современника. Это закономерно, это меня не радует, но это факт.' Neuhaus's words in E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus* p. 299.

and love for people. To approach this degree of spirituality one needs to have the greatest sincerity and passionate love towards the author's works [...] Chopin, like no other, is sensitive to the degree of this love and sincerity, and requires [of the interpreter] that heated passion and [inner] tension to his work which we call inspiration and conscience [...].<sup>173</sup>

Aware of the twentieth century's desire for objectivity, Neuhaus's Romantic relationship to music and to the piano, which demanded that his audience often took 'a leap of faith' to understand him, was becoming a target of criticism. In Russia, for instance Lev Barenboim wrote: 'H. Neuhaus makes many mistakes [...]. From an academic point of view some of H. Neuhaus's assertions lack specificity [...] such as his equating of the emotional with the subconscious.'<sup>174</sup> In the decade after Neuhaus's death, the translation of *About the Art of Piano Playing* in the West was also met with some suspicion:

It has a special interest in that the author was the teacher of Sviatoslav Richter, a pianist of exceptional quality, even if there are some composers that he does not seem to understand as well as others. Neuhaus's [...] philosophizing may be felt to occupy too much space [...].<sup>175</sup>

Refusing however to conform to such pressures within his own lifetime, Neuhaus asked his audiences to embrace Romantic subjectivity, not only for the sake of composers like Chopin, but for the sake of 'emotive art' – an art that put the self into the centre of its essence.

---

<sup>173</sup> 'Мне кажется, что основательная трудность заключается в максимальном приближении к той степени одухотворенности, которая так свойственна этим авторам. Иногда, когда слушаешь этих авторов в хорошем исполнении, кажется, будто слышишь не звуки рояля, а живой голос души, преисполненный великой доброты и любви к людям и жизни. Чтобы приблизиться к этой ступени одухотворенности, исполнителю необходимы величайшая искренность и страстная влюбленность в произведения этих авторов [...]. Шопен как никто другой чувствителен к мере этой любви и искренности и требует в работе того жара и того духовного напряжения, которое мы называем вдохновением, а также величайшей совести [...]' S. H. Neuhaus, 'Has Romanticism become Outmoded?' in N. M. Zimyanina (ed.), *Stanislav Neuhaus. Reminiscences. Letters. Materials* (Moscow: 1988) p. 195.

<sup>174</sup> 'Г. Нейгауз не всегда проверяет факты о которых пишет, и порой ошибается [...]. С научной точки зрения некоторые формулировки Г. Нейгауза лишены точности [...], например, отождествление эмоционального и подсознательного.' L. A. Barenboim, 'H. Neuhaus's Book and the Principles of his School. (Concerning the book "About the Art of Piano Playing")' in *Советская музыка*, 1959, № 5 pp. 116–122, pp. 120–121.

<sup>175</sup> 'The Art of Piano Playing by Heinrich Neuhaus translated by K. A. Leibovitch. Review by F. M.' in *Music & Letters*, Vol. 54, No. 3 (Oxford University Press, July 1973), p. 360.

The philosophy behind Neuhaus's pianism is openly solipsistic. In relation to the interpretation of Chopin, the lack of artefacts and personal possessions that survived from the composer's death, as well as his private nature, has always left Chopin especially vulnerable to recompositions of his identity. Given that Neuhaus felt he was 'born with Chopin's music' and that it 'fell so easily into his soul', it is obvious why his solipsism is so profoundly manifested in Chopin.<sup>176</sup> In Neuhaus's identification of Chopin as the most 'autobiographical' composer to have lived, and yet only having his *own* autobiography to mirror, the significance of Chopin is reduced to be a reflection of Neuhaus's self. The deliberate misinterpretation by Neuhaus of his own mother-tongue in relation to the Slavic understanding of *żal* is the most overt evidence of such solipsism. Neuhaus's bending and moulding of Chopin to his own will, out of a desire of 'getting closer' to the composer, followed Stanislavsky's aesthetic that a work of art is neither author, not interpreter but a new living synthesis of the two.

Just as Neuhaus's philosophical self was observed in his vision of Beethoven through presenting him as inaccessible to the uninitiated or undeserving, Neuhaus indicated a level of inaccessibility in Chopin's persona and music. This inaccessibility, however, was not an intellectual kind as with Beethoven. Instead, it nested in Neuhaus's vision of Chopin as the personification of music's enigmatic nature that could not be rationalized, but rather accepted and loved. Neuhaus's famous aphorism dictated: 'To be a good artist, one must imagine that which is not there.'<sup>177</sup> As shown, Chopin, the poet of the piano, was for Neuhaus the composer whose music intoned the 'soul' – a subjective concept which relies on the unquestioning faith put into the idea of love and raising the spiritual level of the self. In the same manner as Neuhaus spoke of the immense work one had to put into the search for a noble and communicative sound ('digging the earth to find a precious diamond'), he returned to the poetic metaphor of the earth being the source of spiritual beauty.<sup>178</sup> Speaking of the need of self-purification and spiritual height, the attributes of 'love' Neuhaus instilled into *żal*, Neuhaus bound together all those appropriated qualities which amalgamated to form his Chopin:

---

<sup>176</sup> 'Мне кажется, что я рождён с [музыкой Шопена]; 'легко западают в душу'. H. G. Neuhaus, 'About Chopin' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 230 and H. G. Neuhaus, 'Thoughts on Chopin' *Ibid.* p. 234.

<sup>177</sup> 'Чтобы быть хорошим художником, надо воображать то, чего нет.' E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus* p. 299.

<sup>178</sup> '[...] все копаешь землю, чтобы найти дорогой алмаз.' A. V. Vitsinsky, *The Process of Work by the Pianist-Interpreter on a Musical Work*, 1950 (Moscow: 2008) pp. 66–67.

In my opinion, the concept of *man's worth* (his beauty, strength, superiority, charm, 'effectiveness' [*действенность*], etc., etc., many more epithets can be added...) cannot be determined by any *prepared* moral, religious, philosophical, aesthetic, socio-political principles. They must directed, or *created anew*, and only then will they grow and bloom in the way that all that lives blooms and becomes higher and higher. An old proverb says: the higher the tree tops rise to the sky, the deeper into the earth their roots must go.<sup>179</sup>

#### 4.5 Neuhaus's performances of Chopin: Case studies

The significant position of Chopin in Neuhaus's recital programmes and written legacy is irrefutable. In his performing and literary practice, Neuhaus's Chopin undergoes a complex transformation which nonetheless can be traced to certain sources of appropriated ideas. Because Neuhaus's vision of Chopin was so clear, and was afforded such a high status amongst his musical community, it is understandable that many students (not necessarily his own) and observers, flocked to the famous 'Room 29' at the Moscow Conservatory to be allowed to witness it for themselves [see Figure 19].<sup>180</sup> Relating the frequency with which students brought Chopin to his lessons, Neuhaus complained that it seemed to him as if his students knew no other repertoire. Despite his complaints and protests it seems those present in

<sup>179</sup> 'По-моему, понятие *ценности человека* (его красота, сила, превосходство, обаяние, «действенность» etc., etc., тут можно перебрать еще много эпитетов...) не может быть установлено никакими *готовыми* моральными, религиозными, философскими, эстетическими, социально-политическими принципами, а должно быть непрерывно, как бы *творимо заново*, только тогда оно будет расти и развиваться, как развивается всё живое, и становиться всё выше и выше. Старая притча гласит: чем выше в небо подымается верхушка дерева, тем глубже в землю уходят его корни.' Н. G. Neuhaus, 'Autopsychography' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 48.

<sup>180</sup> Elena Richter related: '[...] Room 29 was regularly frequented not only by Heinrich Gustavovich's students, but also those of other professors and specialisms, teachers of music schools and music lovers. [...] Neuhaus addressed the student, someone in the audience and sometimes the entire auditorium. The gestures, intonation, facial expressions of Neuhaus were often not less expressive than his words.' ['[...] в 29-й класс регулярно приходили не только ученики Генриха Густавовича, но и студенты других кафедр и специальностей, преподаватели музыкальных школ, любители музыки. [...] всегда подвижный Нейгауз, обращавшийся к ученику, сидевшему за роялем, к кому-либо из присутствовавших, ко всей аудитории в целом. Жесты, интонации, мимика Нейгауза подчас были не менее выразительны чем слова, которые он произносил.'] E. P. Richter, 'В 29-м классе' [E. R. Richter 'In Room 29'] in E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus* pp. 286–287.



Neuhaus's class nevertheless waited patiently for him to inspire them as he rediscovered the influence of Chopin on his self.<sup>181</sup> Neuhaus too recognized this:

There are hundreds, thousands, tens of thousands 'especially beautiful' passages such as the *Fugato* on [Chopin's] fourth *Ballade* [F minor Opus 52] – like beautiful views of landscapes which captivate the wayfarer and make him return to them again and again. I am sometimes surprised at myself – and those present in the class too are evidently surprised – that when working on Chopin's *Barcarolle* [Opus 61] (which we have already studied a hundred times before) we delve into its untold beauty (especially the transition to the recapitulation [...] after the second subject in A major, there begin the trills in the right hand to the dominant F-sharp major – C-sharp minor) the process of this purely analytical work nonetheless makes me fall into infantile awe – I hardly keep back tears of joy that there is such a miracle on earth.<sup>182</sup>

---

<sup>181</sup> Vera Gornostaeva explained that Neuhaus's lessons were so spontaneous that there was never any guarantee what would happen: 'He taught very unevenly. Sometimes he came all sleepy, quiet and wearily said: 'Carry on!' He could be cranky and would sit hunched in his armchair. Later he would come to life and approached the piano. The moment of inspiration would dawn. His best hours were when he delved into the music for a long time, infecting us with his keenness. These were not lessons where one could rationally gain mastery.' ['Он очень неровно занимался. Иногда приходил какой-то невыспавшийся, неразговорчивый, устало говорил: «Дальше!». Капризничал, сидел нахохлившись в кресле. Позже вдруг оживал, подходил к роялю. Наступал момент подъема, вдохновения. Самыми лучшими были часы, когда он подолгу углублялся в музыку, заражая всех нас увлеченностью. Это ни в коем случае не были уроки рационального приобретения мастерства.'] В. В. Горностаева, 'О моем учителе' [V. V. Gornostaeva, 'About my Teacher'] in E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus* p. 197.

<sup>182</sup> 'Само собой понятно, что таких «особо прекрасных» мест, как фугато в Четвертой балладе, в музыке сотни, тысячи и десятки тысяч – столько же, сколько прекрасных видов в природе, надолго приковывающих к себе путника-пешехода и заставляющих его часто к ним возвращаться. Я иногда сам себе удивляюсь, да и присутствующие в классе, вероятно, удивлялись, что при работе с учеником, скажем, над «Баркаролой» Шопена (которую я уже проходил сотни раз), при углублении в её неслыханные красоты (особенно в переходе к репризе) [...] после второй темы в A-dur, начиная с трели в правой руке и до доминанты Fis-dur'a – Cis-dur'a), я при этой чисто разъяснительной аналитической работе часто впадаю в инфантильный восторг и с трудом удерживаю слёзы от радости, что этакое чудо существует на свете.' Н. Г. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 173.



**Figure 19** Heinrich Neuhaus's lesson: Neuhaus is standing behind the piano and Sviatoslav Richter plays. Photograph c. 1940.<sup>183</sup>

Unlike Neuhaus's teaching of Beethoven which often reverted to elaborate and frequent metaphor and imagery – well documented though his seminars – his teaching of Chopin is not surrounded by any such specific legacy. Whereas Neuhaus specifically chose to write, or talk, at length about works such as Beethoven's Opuses 31, 106, 109 or 110 to demonstrate his unique philosophical and intellectual engagement with them, he was surprisingly laconic in taking his audience through his associations with Chopin. Despite his usual willingness to share the associations which surrounded his interpretational concepts, with regards to Chopin, Neuhaus was remarkably disinclined to allow his audience this privilege. When pushed by some interviewers about his artistic image in Chopin, Neuhaus curtly replied that he did not want to speak about it. Not without a feigned air of self-derogation Neuhaus said: 'B minor is an autumnal tonality... Chopin [brings about in me] so many poetic associations. [...] Though I have the most ridiculous associations... I won't even

<sup>183</sup> Although this photograph is most certainly posed (and probably not even in Room 29) it is nonetheless a representative of the manner in which students and observers were said to crowd themselves into the room, standing at the back and sitting on windowsills. A photograph capturing an actual moment, in panoramic view, of a typical lesson by Neuhaus in his Room 29 is given in E. R. Richter (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* pp. 286–287. Photograph here is from <http://neuhaus1.narod.ru/richter1940.jpg> (accessed 08/03/2014).

describe them.<sup>184</sup> This situation is clearly illustrated in Vera Gornostaeva's memories of her studies with Neuhaus:

His lessons were so different! I remember in my fourth year I had difficulty with the Chopin *Mazurkas*. I was playing inflexibly, with a student-like constraint. I came early into the room thinking I might be able to warm up before Neuhaus arrived, but he was already there – unusually early without any students. Seeing me:

'Well? Did you bring the *Mazurkas*?'

'Yes' I replied, 'but I won't play them for you today.'

'Why?'

'Something about them is not working...'

Then he took the volume of *Mazurkas* and put them onto the piano. [Neuhaus] started to play them one after another from the page, genuinely delighting in the music. He played more than half from memory for a long time – two hours in his empty room. I turned the pages, stood and listened. Only when the door opened and someone came in did he close the music, looked at me and asked:

'Understand?'

'Yes, I understand', I said, but to myself I actually thought I should not play the Chopin *Mazurkas*. [...] This often happened in his lessons.<sup>185</sup>

Perhaps seeing Chopin as the most 'autobiographical' artist to have existed had made the specific associations which Neuhaus felt with Chopin's music too personal to share. After all, the radical transformation of Chopin's identity, in order for it to fit with his own, was on a

<sup>184</sup> 'H-moll – это осенняя тональность... [От музыки Шопена] бывают поэтические ассоциации. [...] Иногда бывают самые дурацкие ассоциации... Их даже не опишешь...' From Neuhaus's conversation with B. M. Teplov (6 December 1944) in A. F. Nitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* p. 96.

<sup>185</sup> 'Какими разными были его уроки! Помню, на четвёртом курсе никак не удавались мазурки Шопена. Играла непластично, ученически скованно. И вот прихожу заранее в класс, рассчитывая до появления Нейгауза разыграться, а он уже там – необычно рано, никого из учеников нет. Увидел меня: – Ну что? Мазурки принесла? – Да. Но, знаете, вам сегодня играть не буду. – Почему? – Да что-то не получается... Тогда он взял том мазурок, поставил на рояль. Начал их играть подряд с листа, откровенно наслаждаясь музыкой. Больше половины играл почти наизусть, долго, два часа в пустом классе. Я переворачивала страницы, стояла, слушала. И только когда открылась дверь и кто-то вошёл, он закрыл ноты, посмотрел на меня и спросил: – Поняла? – Да, поняла. – А про себя подумала, что мне не надо играть мазурок Шопена. [...] Так нередко бывало с его уроками.' V. V. Gornostaeva, 'About my Teacher' in E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus* p. 197.

scale unmatched by his manipulation of Beethoven's image. The considerations of this chapter can however be applied to Neuhaus's performances of Chopin to suggest how his specific psychological approach to the composer manifested itself in practice.

Firstly, let us consider how Neuhaus's distinct temperament was revealed in Chopin's music. Lev Naumov, Neuhaus's student and assistant, considered Chopin to have been the pinnacle of his professor's pianism. More than this, Naumov claimed Chopin's music was inconceivable without some kind of synthesis with Neuhaus's distinct persona. Naumov categorically believed: 'Chopin must, without fail, be played in a Neuhausian way [*по-нейгаузовски*].'<sup>186</sup> With particular reference to this, Naumov highlighted the volatility of Neuhaus's character which he considered imprinted itself in his pianism:

Neuhaus played in a way that took rather a lot of risks and he even recognized this himself: 'Despite my small hands, I always wanted to play in a way that takes risks to give a romantic, free impression.'<sup>187</sup>

In the following generation, Naumov's student, Vladimir Viardo, likewise reflected that it was the volatility that characterized Neuhaus's playing:

I do belong to the famous Russian (pianist) Heinrich Neuhaus' Dionysian school [where] the main thing is to live the moment you are playing, to be in the middle of the process rather than show how well you're prepared for what comes next.<sup>188</sup>

Characterizing Neuhaus, David Rabinovich also highlighted the Dionysian element in his playing and temperament:

In Neuhaus everything was 'tempestuous' – the character not only of his artistic temperament, but his own personal nature. He is always in a state of impulse [*в порыве*], forever overflowing with effervescent thoughts and

---

<sup>186</sup> 'Но вот Шопена, скажем, надо обязательно играть по-нейгаузовски.' Л. Н. Наумов, *Под знаком Нейгауза* (Москва: «Антиква», 2002)[L. N. Naumov, *Under the Sign of Neuhaus* (Moscow: 2002)] p. 43.

<sup>187</sup> 'Между прочем, сам Нейгауз играл довольно рискованно и об этом с гордостью писал: «Несмотря на мои маленькие руки, я всегда хотел играть рискованно, чтобы производить романтическое, свободное впечатление».' Ibid. p. 45.

<sup>188</sup> Interview with Vladimir Viardo: L. Slate, 'Viardo's Bowl Debut Tonight. First U.S. Concert in 13 years' (23/08/1988) *Los Angeles Times*. See [http://articles.latimes.com/1988-08-23/entertainment/ca-838\\_1\\_bowl-debut-tonight](http://articles.latimes.com/1988-08-23/entertainment/ca-838_1_bowl-debut-tonight) (accessed 04/02/2014).

feelings. Even when he speaks it seems like the speed of his soul's processes overtake the fast and impulsive speech.<sup>189</sup>

In his own book on Neuhaus, Delson even criticized Rabinovich's descriptions of Neuhaus's 'tempestuousness' as *not* far-reaching enough. Delson considered Rabinovich had shifted the balance too far in favour of depicting Neuhaus's Chopin as 'optimistic' and instead reflected:

In Neuhaus's interpretations of Chopin, the tempestuous, aroused, dramatic and impetuosity, the burning passion and the tragic were not accented less than the profound poeticism, the living breath of the delicate cantilena, the aromatic scent of the harmonic colourings, the sensitivity and elegance of the form [...] Neuhaus's interpretations of Chopin were distinct because of their many facets – in his ability to *reveal equally* the dark and the light.<sup>190</sup>

The categorization of pianistic 'types' into the Apollonian and Dionysian was deeply rooted into the Russian critical vocabulary. For instance, Lev Oborin's playing of Chopin has been described as 'Apollonic' [sic.] and is often presented as the opposite of Neuhaus's.<sup>191</sup> The difference between Oborin's and Neuhaus's vision of Chopin can be heard for instance in their respective interpretations of the first movement, *Allegro maestoso*, from the Piano Sonata No. 3 in B minor Opus 58.<sup>192</sup> That this is a manifestation of Neuhaus's own distinct pianistic temperament, rather than his 'acting' of the temperament of his idealized Chopin, can be

---

<sup>189</sup> 'В Нейгаузе все «бурно» – тонус не только артистического темперамента, но и самой его природы. Он всегда в порыве, вечно переполнен вскипающими в нём мыслями, чувствами. Даже когда он разговаривает, кажется, что темпы его душевных процессов как бы обгоняют быструю и импульсивную речь.' D. A. Rabinovich, *Portraits of Pianists* p. 38.

<sup>190</sup> 'В интерпретации Нейгаузом Шопена бурная возбужденность, драматизм и стремительность, обжигающая страстность и трагедийность акцентировались не меньше, чем проникновенная поэтичность, живое дыхание нежной кантилены, аромат гармонического колорита, тонкость и изящество формы [...]. Специфика же нейгаузовской интерпретации Шопена именно в её многогранности, и умении в *равной* степени раскрыть и тёмное и светлое...' V. Y. Delson, *Heinrich Neuhaus* (Moscow: 1966) pp. 107–108.

<sup>191</sup> D. K. Alexeev, *Interview for the Fryderyk Chopin Institute*, 2013

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Pos3hQa3CvA> at 1 min. 15 sec. (accessed 22/01/2014).

<sup>192</sup> The CD recordings used in this comparison are Catalogue number CR-084: *The Art of Henry Neighaus. Chopin Fantasy, Polonaise-Fantasia, Sonatas nos. 2 & 3* released 2006. Recorded 1949s. Track 7; Catalogue number APR5668: *The Russian Piano Tradition. The School of Igumnov: Lev Oborin* released 2009. Recorded c. 1951. Track 10.

discerned from the fact that Neuhaus's writing about Chopin as a Classicist, and a Mozartian, arguably more readily reflects Oborin's inherently Apollonian pianistic style.

Neuhaus's core tempo for the movement is around crotchet = 112. Already in the first bar, however, there is a broadening out of tempo to crotchet = 104, with the slower point being between the third and fourth beat. Through the quick change of harmony over the quavers in second bar, Neuhaus pushes the tempo forward to around crotchet = 122 – restoring the pulse back to crotchet = 112 only in bar 3<sup>2</sup> [see Figure 20 and refer to CD Track 9]. The surging pulse is a pronounced feature of Neuhaus's recording not only for its deviation away from the core of crotchet = 112, but because it was preceded by a broadening of time. Neuhaus makes use of this device thematically in the movement. Thus, despite writing about the inherent majesty of Chopin's *Allegro maestoso* markings, Neuhaus's interpretation is marked by a certain tempestuousness and volatility. In contrast, Oborin's recording has a much tighter centring around his chosen core pulse, crotchet = 120. Oborin's fluctuations to allow for a certain forwards momentum in the *staccato* quavers, but only to around crotchet = 124. Likewise, Oborin allows himself some space (especially evidently in bar 7<sup>2</sup> – bar 8<sup>3</sup>), but this too keeps within much tighter parameters at around crotchet = 118 [refer to CD Track 10].

Core tempo (112) ← c. 104 → c. 122 → Core tempo (112) ← c. 104 → c. 122 →

**Allegro maestoso.**

Core tempo (112) → c. 128 → Core tempo (112)

Figure 20 Chopin's Sonata No.3 in B minor Opus 58. Bars 1–11.

50 *a tempo sostenuto*

*p*

*m.d.*

Figure 21 Chopin's Piano Sonata No.3 in B minor Opus 58. Bars 41–48

Neuhaus's approach to the nuances of tempo fluctuation in the opening phrase, an occurrence called 'microphrasing' [*микрoфразировка*] by Rabinovich, was reserved as a specific interpretative device.<sup>193</sup> For instance, despite melodic inflection, Neuhaus's treatment of the second subject [see Figure 21: 1.25 min on CD Track 9] shows minimal tempo modification in the left hand away from the movement's core tempo. This contrasts with many interpretations of the Sonata, particularly by his students Gilels and Zak, where the opening is much stricter in the rigidity of the tempo than Neuhaus; but the second subject is much more flexible and often taken well below the tempo of the first subject.

Whereas the dichotomous identification of Apollonian or Dionysian pianism stemmed from Greek mythology, rather than the banned *The Birth of Tragedy*, Neuhaus's engagement is undeniably Nietzschean. The constant state of flux which he himself identified in his pianism as being a reflection of his own Dionysian temperament can therefore be seen as a direct expression of *amor fati* – the embracing of changing phenomenon and finding joy in fate. Although Neuhaus's Chopin interpretations, particularly of the mazurkas (such as the *Mazurka* in C-sharp minor Opus 50 no. 3) capture Chopin 'as a singer of intimate lyricism',<sup>194</sup> the larger-scale works such as the *Polonaise-Fantaisie* Opus 61 and the *Fantaisie* Opus 49 contrast this with a full-blooded tone and expansive, dramatic, gestures.<sup>195</sup> Yet, the fuller tone and heightened drama are not anguished, agitated or nervous. Just like the nobility and self-assuredness of the *Übermensch*, the drama and heroism of Neuhaus's pianistic conception finds itself in the broad expanses of his playing that supposedly typified that of Blumenfeld.

Neuhaus's engagement with the Apollonian and Dionysian through Nietzsche also afforded him not only a dichotomous view, but a dialectical one. Neuhaus's thought-process relied heavily on Hegelian dialectic and thus the desire for the unification of opposing concepts. In *About the Art of Piano Playing*, Neuhaus wrote:

A musical phrase contains a *struggle of contradiction* [...] a thesis and antithesis. But all phrases as a whole are the *synthesis*. [...] Dialectic is not

<sup>193</sup> D. A. Rabinovich, *Portraits of Pianists* p. 41.

<sup>194</sup> 'Шопен – певец интимной лирики.' H. G. Neuhaus, 'About Chopin' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 233.

<sup>195</sup> Catalogue number CR-084: *The Art of Henry Neighaus. Chopin Fantasy, Polonaise-Fantaisie, Sonatas nos. 2 & 3* released 2006. Tracks 1 (1958) & 2 (1949).



metaphysics – it is not somewhere in the air above us, but part of our lives everywhere.<sup>196</sup>

In this light, Neuhaus's treatment of the opening phrase of the Piano Sonata Opus 58, discussed above, can be taken an illustration of the consequences of such a notion. Neuhaus's change in the treatment of time makes the first phrase one of two halves: the 'thesis' and 'antithesis' quoted above. The slower changes of harmonic time in the first section allow for a broadening of time, whilst the harmonic changes on each *staccato* quaver move time forward [see Figure 22]. Within a larger consideration of time across the phrase, the differences are reconciled with the upbeat and bar 1<sup>1</sup>, and bar 3<sup>3</sup> into the first half of bar 4, being at the same metric time as each other and the core tempo for the movement – synthesis.

The image shows a musical score for the opening of Chopin's Sonata No. 3 Opus 58. The tempo is marked 'Allegro maestoso.' and the dynamics range from *f* to *ff*. The score is divided into four measures. A red bracket above the first two measures is labeled 'Thesis', and a red bracket above the last two measures is labeled 'Antithesis'. A larger red bracket above all four measures is labeled 'Synthesis'. Below the score, the tempo is indicated for each measure: Crotchet = 112, Crotchet = 104, Crotchet = 122, and Crotchet = 112.

Figure 22 The opening of Chopin's Sonata No. 3 Opus 58.

Neuhaus's pianistic desire to unify can be regarded as an application of his Hegelian dialectic to Apollo and Dionysus. The synthesis here would be in Neuhaus's interpretation seeking to present Apollo speaking the language of Dionysius – or in light of his concept of 'autobiographicality' extended to Chopin speaking the language of Neuhaus. His interpretation of Chopin's *Polonaise-Fantaisie* Opus 61 can be seen to illustrate the strength of his desire for unity. The opening *Allegro Maestoso* of the *Polonaise-Fantaisie* is in many interpretations seen as a crystallization of the two contrasting elements out of which the rest

<sup>196</sup> 'Музыкальная [фраза] – очевидная *борьба противоречий* [... её] можно охарактеризовать как тезу и антитезу. Но вся фраза в целом есть *синтез*. [...] Диалектика – не метафизика, она не носится где-то в воздухе над нами, а присутствует всюду в жизни.' Н. Г. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) pp. 226–227.

of the piece grows: the impatient, energetic syncopation of the chord [see 'A' in Figure 23], and the lyrical, introspective improvisation [see 'B'].



Figure 23 Chopin's *Polonaise-Fantaisie* Opus 61. Bars 1–3

This kind of approach, which emphasizes the duality of the composition and Chopin's style, sits within an understanding which relates directly to Liszt:

[The] *Polonaise-Fantaisie* is overshadowed by a fevered anxiety. [...] An elegiac sadness prevails, broken by alarming movements, melancholy smiles and sudden jerks. There is a restless calm such as is felt by those who have been surprised by an ambush, and surrounded on all sides, cannot see any hope on the vast horizon. Despair [...] irritability close to delirium. [...] Like all depictions of last moments, of death agonies and groans, of muscle contractions when the nerves cease to be the organs of the will, [they] leave man the passive prey of despair!<sup>197</sup>

Jim Samson's 'Biographic Sketch' (1985) of Chopin too highlights the duality of the composer with particular reference to the significance of revolt and militarism that counterbalances Chopin's melancholy and lyricism:

<sup>197</sup> F. Liszt, *Chopin* as printed in M. Hughes, *Liszt's Chopin* p. 75.

[The Polish uprising] was a key moment in Chopin's life [...]: 'Oh God! [Why] do you not take vengeance! Haven't you witnessed enough crimes from Russia? [...] Mother, sweet suffering mother, you saw your daughter die, and now you watch the Russian marching in over her grave to oppress you. [...] God, god, move this earth – let it swallow the people of this century.' [Chopin's] tragic, passionate tone [reflected] a commitment to express Poland's tragedy in his music. 'Guns smothered in flowers', was Schumann's famous phrase.<sup>198</sup>

The sense of contradiction is heard, for example, in Vladimir Horowitz's 1966 interpretation of the opening *Allegro Maestoso* [CD Track 11].<sup>199</sup> Horowitz separates the two opposing elements by giving each of them a distinct tempo and momentum: the syncopations to the fermatas ('A') are given a strong forward impetus while the improvisatory figuration that follows ('B') is presented in a slower, new tempo which, from the outset, increasingly becomes more *perdendo*. Thus, Horowitz's first bar starts ('A') at crotchet = 72, whilst section 'B' is interpreted freely centring around the pulse of 64, tailing off through a marked *ritenuto*. The second bar echoes this, moving from crotchet = 64 ('A') to around crotchet = 58 in section 'B', which again slows through a *ritenuto*.

At the close of the introductory *Allegro Maestoso* into to the *a tempo giusto* [see Figure 24], Horowitz reiterates his view of the *Polonaise-Fantaisie* being a work of dichotomous character. Horowitz interprets bars 17<sup>2</sup> – 21 (refer to CD Track 11 between 1.31 min and 1.44 min) with the same kind of direction as the 'B' figuration earlier, giving it a pedalled melancholic, dreamlike state. Yet, upon arriving to the octave fanfare on the *tempo giusto* in bar 22 (CD Track 11 at 1.45 min), Horowitz treats it like an interruption. The *legato* pedalled sound is now an abrupt, unpedalled *staccato*, the warmth of the singing tone and inflected melody is now impersonal and unhuman – a sudden awakening into reality through a distinctly militaristic call.

<sup>198</sup> J. Samson, *The Music of Chopin*, 1985 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994) pp. 12–13.

<sup>199</sup> The *Polonaise-Fantaisie* is taken from a Carnegie Hall recital of 17 April 1966. Columbia Records 'Horowitz plays Chopin': LP M 30643 re-released by Sony Music Entertainment Inc. 1971 (Track 1).



Figure 24 Chopin's *Polonaise-Fantaisie* Opus 61. Bars 16–22

Neuhaus's interpretation, on the other hand, seeks to unify the two elements of the *Allegro maestoso*. Firstly, unlike Horowitz, he gives the first semiquaver of element 'A' its fullest possible length making the tempo appear to look 'backwards' as opposed to Horowitz's active forward-drive. The longer semiquaver gives Neuhaus's interpretation a breadth in the piano's sonority which gives the element the feeling of majesty that he referred to as one of the defining factors of Chopin's style. Secondly, in his movement into element 'B', Neuhaus keeps the same basic pulse. As a result, this second element appears to be a continuation of the preceding resonance rather than a characterization of a new voice. Neuhaus does inflect the tempo of the rising line of element 'B' – but rather than Horowitz's manipulation of tempo through actual change in speed, Neuhaus uses pianistic illusion.

Whereas Horowitz interpreted the minim with fermata of 'A' as five crotchets in length, Neuhaus holds the minim for precisely the equivalent of two crotchets. Neuhaus's fermata is therefore the time needed to complete 'B', rather than be seen as a part of 'A'. Neuhaus begins element 'B' on the 'front edge' of the tempo set in 'A' which broadens out to its more laid back manifestation. Thus, as the tempo appears to settle simply through moving within the boundaries of the same pulse, Neuhaus only needs to allow himself an actual *ritenuto* in the final five notes of the figuration. Consequently, unlike Horowitz, Neuhaus is able to take the entire 'B' in three crotchet beats (two for the figuration and one for the rest) recognizably present from element 'A' [see Figure 25]. This gives the illusion of elements 'A' and 'B' occurring within the same rhythmic plane – one long bar of 6/4, a single unified sweep.



Figure 25 Chopin's *Polonaise-Fantaisie* Opus 61. Bar 1

Similarly, in Neuhaus's approach to the militaristic fanfare in bar 22 (CD Track 12 at 1.31 min) differs from Horowitz's in its aspiration of unity. Although the *forte* dynamic is a strong contrast to the *pianissimo* before it in both Horowitz's and Neuhaus's interpretations, unlike Horowitz's abruptness, Neuhaus interprets the fanfare as if a sudden intensification of energy is already latent in the musical material. In terms of tempo, Neuhaus underplays the *rallentando* marking, instead focusing on just how far he can take the music onto the 'back edge' of the core tempo. This means that where Horowitz's arrival at the *a tempo giusto* is a marked change (from around crotchet = 62 to 88), Neuhaus's interpretation at this point hardly requires any tempo change and centres, more or less, at crotchet = 82. Hence, Neuhaus uses a unified tempo to organically link the introduction through into the *mezza voce* melody in bar 24. Furthermore at the fanfare, unlike Horowitz, Neuhaus's fanfare is both pedalled and inflected in dynamic. This creates the impression of a wave of sound coming through the texture and receding back in readiness to show its intensity once more in the left-hand semiquavers in bars 25 and 29 [see Figure 26 – refer to CD Track 12 at 1.37 min and 1.45 min respectively].



Figure 26 Chopin's *Polonaise-Fantaisie* Opus 61. Bars 19–29

The treatment of the culmination point of the *Polonaise-Fantaisie* is interesting in the way it exposes the different understanding that Neuhaus and Horowitz bring to their interpretations of the work [see Figure 27: culmination point at bar 250]. Neuhaus wrote about this climax that it expressed an unparalleled flight of joy: 'I don't know anything that raises the spirit more.'<sup>200</sup> His optimism is manifested in an unbroken, almost relentless, movement of the tempo forwards in anticipation of the *fortissimo* in bar 250. This takes place over a large span – from the *pianissimo* restatement of the opening motif in bar 214 (CD Track 12 at 8.18 min), and is particularly pronounced from the *forte* in bar 238 (at 9.26 min). Neuhaus helps in the creation of this forwards inertia with the use of pedal, making the impression of the sound surging in waves [see CD Track 12 from 8.47 min. Bar 250 is at 9.51 min].

Despite this recording (1958), at the age of seventy, not showing Neuhaus at his best technical form, it still gives us a clear idea of how by the point of culmination at bar 250, the accumulated sound though the pedal gives the impression of elasticity between the notes and this allows Neuhaus to express this moment of joy in broadening out. Horowitz, on the other hand, chooses to tackle this same stretch with very little sustaining pedal [CD Track 11 from 10.56 min]. Therefore, coming into bar 250, where Neuhaus could almost 'let go' and let the

<sup>200</sup> 'Не знаю ничего, более поднимающего дух.' Н. Г. Neuhaus, 'About Chopin' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 233.

inertia carry him forward, Horowitz relies on driving the energetic cascade of the individual chords [refer to CD Track 11 at 11.42 min (bar 250)]. Perhaps it might be said that Neuhaus's joy is of a soaring spirit, while Horowitz's is a more Mephistophelian dance.

Figure 27 Chopin's *Polonaise-Fantaisie* Opus 61. Bars 245–251

Neuhaus's clear intentions to bring unity to the work's many emotional elements, and to see them as shades of a discernible emotional ascent into the radiance of the finale, are particularly evident when compared to an interpretation such as Horowitz's. However, it is important to remember that these two great interpreters of Chopin are not as alien to each other's interpretational aesthetic as may appear – and hence the value of their comparison in the differences they reveal. Horowitz had studied with Neuhaus's uncle, Felix Blumenfeld and

considered Blumenfeld both artistically and technically one of his most important formative influences.<sup>201</sup>

As already discussed, arguably the most important pedagogical concept which Blumenfeld was evidently able to offer his students and those around him, was the idea of an interpreter needing to find a way to reconcile ideas that seem to be at odds with one another. Horowitz resolved this with his mercurial control of the contrasting material – revelling in how one idea shimmers in the light of its antipode, evoking the same effect in sound for his audience as perhaps a shoal of fish suddenly changing direction. Neuhaus, on the other hand, dealt with contrasting ideas by finding an emotional or psychological unifying thread between them in Hegelian dialectical terms. Neuhaus's contrasts can therefore be seen as nuances of one common greater state. In relation to Neuhaus's understanding of Chopin, sorrow, for instance, was a facet of love since to feel the sorrow of another man meant to be in a state of love and compassion – *żal*.

An important facet to Neuhaus's vision of Chopin was the idea of enigma, and thus, Romantic subjectivity. Neuhaus's search to define the essence of Chopin's persona is a distinct process by which Neuhaus realigned his own definition of Romanticism. Exhibiting both Romantic and Classical traits, Neuhaus's Chopin is seemingly precariously positioned between two worlds – a position mirrored by the two poets, Pushkin and Mickiewicz, who Neuhaus appropriated as symbols of Chopin. This positioning, as already discussed, needs to be seen as symptomatic of the wider cultural effort of the time to redefine, or more specifically to reclaim, Romanticism. This same issue in relation to Chopin, which will be explored in more detail below, can be identified in the remarks Russian pianists of the most varied temperamental and stylistic natures. For instance, Oborin wrote:

I do not belong to those musicians who give a resolute preference to either the Classical or Romantic manner of interpreting Chopin. Firstly, it is important to separate the Romantic school from that 'other' romantic direction which, for all its brilliance, allows for pretentiousness and sentimentality. Secondly, Romanticism in the contemporary sense, I understand above all to be a certain kind of outlook on the world, a personal trait: in the understanding of Romanticism I count the inclination

---

<sup>201</sup> D. Dubal, *Evenings with Horowitz: A Personal Portrait*, 1991 (New York: Amadeus Press, 2004) p. 10.



towards lyricism, to the unhindered expression of feeling, the poetifying [опоэтизацию] of a country.<sup>202</sup>

Neuhaus's efforts to reclaim Romanticism as a concept befitting such an enigmatic figure as Chopin can be seen to arise from the aesthetic disposition central to Nietzsche's *The Birth of Tragedy*, whereby *life* is a work of art. The issue that immediately arises for an interpreter in response to such a view – particularly an interpreter with a strong creative will such as Neuhaus's – is where the boundary between himself and the composer lies and how this boundary is perceived by the listener. Intellectually, this issue was presented by Neuhaus as the greatest musical enigma. At the piano, he engaged practically with this issue through sound, which as already seen, he believed to be the unique manifestation of the pianist's own 'soul' and therefore was the most enigmatic physical property of musical performance.

Neuhaus's students return continually to the idea of sound as the proof that their professor was able to access a spiritual territory beyond that open to their own faculties. Gornostaeva wrote:

He touched the keys and you felt that your sound is poor in comparison to that which arose from underneath his fingers. The sound which he commanded was like a tuning fork – you understood that you are listening to a different piano, to a different type of thought. [...] 'Slava plays better than you not just because he is talented', he would say about Richter, 'but also because he wants it more than all of you!' The school of Neuhaus, for me, remained the school of searching.<sup>203</sup>

---

<sup>202</sup> 'Я не принадлежу к музыкантам, отдающим предпочтение одной из манер интерпретации Шопена – романтической или классической. Важно, во-первых, отделить романтическую школу от того «бокового» романтического направления, которое, при всей своей яркости, допускало вычурность, чувствительность. Во-вторых, романтизм в современном представлении я понимаю прежде всего как некое особое мировосприятие, склад личности; в понятие романтического я включаю и склонность к лиризму, к непосредственному выражению чувства, опоэтизацию страны.' L. N. Oborin, 'About Chopin. Extracts from a Conversation with S. M. Hentova' in A. V. Zaslomova (ed.), *How to Perform Chopin* (Moscow: 2005) p. 186.

<sup>203</sup> 'Он прикасался к клавишам, и вы чувствовали, что ваш звук – бедный по сравнению с тем, что возникало под его пальцами. Звучание, которым он владел, – как камертон; вы понимали, что имеете дело с другим роялем, иной породой мышления. [...] «Слава играет лучше всех вас не только потому, что он одареннее, – говорил он о Рихтере, – но ещё и потому, что он хочет больше вас всех!»'. V. V. Gornostaeva, 'My Teacher' in E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus* p. 286.

Adding to the idea of pianistic sound being enigmatic, is the fact that it is not simply a response to the depression of a key, but that the pedals can change the production and perception of the sound in a way that defies verbalization. As already shown, Neuhaus considered 'poetry' to be the soul of music. His concept of sound was as a 'precious diamond' enclosed in a 'velvet casket' of silence. The essence of poetry for Neuhaus, revealed itself through intonation – a will for expression. This will, as a process, was understood by Neuhaus to take place in the *apparent* silence between the notes. Thus, symbolically if the piano is an extension of the interpreter's soul, then the symbolic 'soul of the piano' is too revealed through an apparently silent influence which has the power to change the sound: the pedals.<sup>204</sup> In *About the Art of Piano Playing*, Neuhaus wrote: 'The *Finale* of [Chopin's] B-flat minor Sonata [Opus 35] proves what a magical means the pedals provide in the hands (or rather, feet) of those who know their secrets.'<sup>205</sup>

As remarked by Yakov Zak, Neuhaus's 'pedal-magic' [педальная магия] went hand-in-hand with his 'truly magical sound and colour' which he could demonstrate at the piano. Yet, as noted by Zak, 'how to achieve this was left up to the student to discover'.<sup>206</sup> As a true magician, Neuhaus seemingly preferred to allow his students (and readers) tantalizing glimpses, but not explanations, of how non-standard pedal techniques had the power to bring certain hidden elements of the music to life:

It is of course possible to play the *Presto finale* of Chopin's B-flat minor Sonata [No. 2] without the right pedal especially if one has command of a great evenness, agility and sensitivity of nuance. But the howling of the wind asks for the pedal, especially considering that this unison single line has many wonderful harmonies that lie secreted away having been covered by the blizzard of snow.<sup>207</sup>

---

<sup>204</sup> The pedals were called 'the soul of the piano' [душа рояля] by Anton Rubinstein – an aphorism which was subsequently quoted by pianists including Rachmaninov, Hofmann, Lhevinne. Neuhaus quotes Rubinstein's words in *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961). See p. 165.

<sup>205</sup> 'В финале из сонаты b-moll [Шопена] можно доказать, какое волшебное средство педаль в руках (точнее, под ногами) того, кто знает ее тайны.' Н. Г. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 164.

<sup>206</sup> '[...] но вот как конкретно этого добиться – доискиваться предоставлялось самому ученику.' From G. M. Tsipin's interview with Zak in A. M. Merkulov (ed.), *The Lessons of Zak* p. 24.

<sup>207</sup> 'Финал (Presto) сонаты b-moll Шопена можно, конечно, исполнять совсем без правой педали при огромной ровности, беглости и тонкой нюансировке. Но вой ветра на погосте просит педали, тем более, что в этом унисонном одноголосии скрыты засыпанные снежной метелью многие чудесные гармонии.' Н. Г. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 163.

It is interesting that while much of the attention on the use of the right pedal tends to focus on its over-use and the dangers it poses to obscuring or ‘dirtying’ the musical lines and voices, Neuhaus talked of its potential to *uncover* new ones. Neuhaus was particularly averse to ‘academic’, ‘sanitary’ or ‘professorial’ pedalling.<sup>208</sup> The sustaining of sound for *legato* lines was perhaps the least interesting quality that Neuhaus associated with the right pedal. The sustaining of *legato* lines with the pedal was, in a way, a simple matter of necessity with little else in it to raise its interest to a level above the ordinary.

Neuhaus seems to have been particularly attuned to how, by raising the dampers, he could allow sympathetically vibrating strings to influence each other – the raised dampers allow for the play of overtones and sympathetically resonating strings to change the ‘appearance’ of the notes. Thus, rather than a simple technical device to allow *legato* playing on the piano, Neuhaus considered the right pedal acoustically as a means of giving rise to new sounds that were not born as a result of a hammer stroke. This rare attitude towards the right pedal has been remarked by many of Neuhaus’s students, often in their own capacity as teachers. Stanislav Neuhaus was a key figure who propagated the ‘magic’ of such a pedalling technique, attempting to pass it on to his students at the Moscow Conservatory, and to his own son:

Once when I played Chopin’s first *Ballade* [in G minor Opus 23] to [Stanislav Neuhaus] he suddenly asked: ‘Do you know how your grandfather used to play this passage?’ We were discussing the two last scale passages and the following chords [see Figure 28] in the coda. Sitting himself down at the piano, father pressed the right pedal and played the first scale. Then, without changing the pedal, he [depressed] the first chord silently and afterwards quickly changed the pedal. This created the impression that the chord grows from the nothingness [*небытия*]. He did the same with the second scale. Then smiling, said: ‘But now, of course, it is not allowed to play in this way.’<sup>209</sup>

<sup>208</sup> See for example H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) pp. 162–163.

<sup>209</sup> ‘Однажды, когда я играл ему Первую балладу Шопена, он вдруг спросил меня: «А ты знаешь, как играл это место твой дедушка?» Речь шла о двух последних гаммах и последующих аккордах в коде. Папа, сев за рояль, нажал правую педаль и сыграл первую гамму. Затем, не сменив педали, беззвучно взял первый аккорд, а потом быстро сменил педаль. Создавалось впечатление, что аккорд вырастает из небытия. То же самое он сделал и после второй гаммы. Потом, улыбнувшись, сказал: «Но сейчас, конечно, так играть нельзя».’ Untitled article by H. S. Neuhaus,

Figure 28 Chopin's *Ballade* No. 1 in G minor Opus 23. Bars 250–257

Neuhaus brought the same concept of a string responding to an invisible influence, rather than to the strike of a hammer, to his understanding of the left pedal:

Few of those studying the piano know that the greatest charm of the left pedal is not just that the hammer hits two strings, instead of three, but in that the first (of the three) is not struck (as the mechanism moves from left to right) *sounds* together with the two that have been struck – it doesn't answer to the hammer, but because the damper above it lifts, it sounds exclusively from sympathy to the tuned unison of the neighbouring strings. This is the most '*un-percussive*' [*неударный*] sound possible on the piano and for this reason it is impossible not to love it for this feature.<sup>210</sup>

---

son of Stanislav Neuhaus, in N. M. Zimyanina (ed.), *Stanislav Neuhaus. Reminiscences. Letters. Materials* (Moscow: 1988) p. 131.

<sup>210</sup> 'Не все учащиеся знают, что главное очарование левой педали не в том только, что молоточек ударяет две струны, а не три, что звук тише, а в том, что первая (из трёх), неударяемая струна (так как механизм передвигается слева направо) *звучит* вместе с ударяемыми струнами, не понуждаемая к этому ударом молоточка, а так как над ней поднимается глушитель (демпфер) и

The enigmatic nature of the piano creating sound not in response to the pianist's finger, but all of its own accord because the strings 'sympathized' for each other was the one feature Neuhaus felt linked Chopin to Beethoven. Neuhaus believed that Beethoven's increasing deafness had sensitized him to imagining with an intensified conviction these 'hidden' voices within the *una corda* sound. Chopin's inventiveness of harmony and unparalleled understanding and dedication to the instrument, according to Neuhaus, took the complexity of sympathetic resonance to a new level.<sup>211</sup>

Neuhaus's concept of what the pedals offered to interpretation was so bound up with the poetic idea of transformation and hidden essence, that it actually exerted an influence on the work of other artists in his milieu. Pasternak, for instance, was reputedly influenced by Neuhaus's attitude to the piano. Investigating Pasternak's poetry, Boris Katz identified Neuhaus's vision of 'hidden' sound to translate into hidden words:

Pasternak [adopted] a way of [working in the name of his musical God, Skryabin] into his poetry as an overtone of other words.<sup>212</sup> In this same way a sound is made piano, upon the application of the left pedal [...] the string simply answers to its neighbour's choir – this, the only un-percussive sound possible on the piano, was greatly loved by the poet's friend, Heinrich Neuhaus. Thus, Pasternak's poetry incorporated Скрябин [Skryabin] [echoing Neuhaus's musical revelation], for example [in the poem *Музыка* [*Music*], 1956]:

До слёз Чайковский потрясал  
Судьбой Паоло и Франчески.<sup>213</sup>

---

она звучит исключительно из сочувствия к настроенным с нею в унисон струнам – соседкам. Это самый «неударный» звук, какой только возможен на фортепиано, и нельзя его не любить за это особенно.' Н. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 164.

<sup>211</sup> Ibid. pp. 162–164.

<sup>212</sup> Skryabin was also one of the most important composers for Heinrich Neuhaus, and along with Chopin, Neuhaus was most associated with his Skryabin interpretations. He did much to advocate Skryabin's music in concert and on record such as playing the complete set of Skryabin sonatas in recital.

<sup>213</sup> '[Скрябин был для Пастернака богом в музыке, и часто в] строфе прозвучит имя Скрябина. Оно звучит отзвуком, обертоном других слов. Так звучит на рояле при игре с левой педалью струна, не задеваемая молоточком: она лишь откликается на звучание двух соседних струн хора (это единственное неударное звучание, доступно роялю, очень любил друг поэта Генрих Нейгауз). И в пастернаковской «Музыке» имя Скрябина прозвучало в заключительных строках стихотворения: До слёз Чайковский потрЯсал / СудьБой Паоло И ФраНчески.' Б. А. Кац, 'Пробужденный музыкой'

Neuhaus's manipulation of 'sound-time', the idea of intoning the space between the notes to express the illusive *poetry* in the music, is exposed in his recording of the third movement, the *Funeral March*, from the Piano Sonata No. 2 in B-flat minor Opus 35. The degree to which Neuhaus's audience responded to the power of his interpretation is preserved on record – a live concert-recording from Moscow, 1949, which would have undoubtedly been part of a performance dedicated to the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Chopin's death.<sup>214</sup> Neuhaus's ability to control the piano sound to influence the unfolding structure of his interpretation caused the audience to erupt in spontaneous applause at the end of the *Funeral March* which carried on some way into the fourth movement. Although it must be noted that Neuhaus's interpretation follows in the tradition of Anton Rubinstein, namely the revision of the dynamics to give the impression of a funeral procession approaching and then walking away into the distance, it is the dynamic and tonal nuance that goes beyond that which can be possibly be marked in a score that is of particular interest here.

Throughout the lyric interlude of the movement (starting in bar 31 – CD Track 13 from 2.02 min), Neuhaus sets up the character of an uninvolved, steady left hand and a 'singing' right hand melody. The distinctly different sound of the two hands heightens the awareness of the expressively warm quality of the right hand sonority. Its cathartic beauty, after the weight of the funeral march motif, lulls the listener into a sense of how simple Neuhaus's pianistic conception seems. In the context of this apparent simplicity, Neuhaus's most impressive manipulations of time are driven not by active rhythmic manipulation of the right hand, *tempo rubato*, which cause asynchronicity against the unyielding left. Instead, he employs a subtler pianistic means in the way in which the apparently 'uninvolved' left hand influences the

---

[B. A. Katz, 'Awakened by Music'] in B. A. Katz (ed.), *The Peal of Improvisation... Music in the Creativity, Fate and Home of Boris Pasternak* (Leningrad: 1991) p. 28. The lines of poetry quoted are the conclusion to Pasternak's poem *Music* and translate: To tears Tchaikovsky moved [us] with the fate of Paolo and Francesca.

<sup>214</sup> According the *Гостелерадиофонд, ГТРФ* [Gosteleradiofond – acronym for the State Archive for Television and Radio Programmes, *Государственный фонд телевизионных и радиопрограмм*] catalogue there is a tape of Neuhaus's all-Chopin concert, 5 March 1949, in the Grand Hall of the Moscow Conservatory (T-016844). The programme on the tape is: Sonata No. 3 in B minor Opus 58; 2 *Nocturnes* Opus 56 (nos. 1 & 2); *Fantasia* in F minor Opus 49; Sonata No. 2 in B-flat minor Opus 35; 3 *Mazurkas* Opus 59 (nos. 1, 2, 3); Waltz No. 5 Opus 42; *Mazurkas* Opus 6 no. 4 and Opus 63 no. 1; *Nocturne* Opus 15 no. 2; and *Mazurka* Opus 68 no. 4. Present re-release referred to in this thesis: *The Art of Henry Neighaus. Chopin: Fantasy, Polonaise-Fantasy, Sonatas no. 2, 3*. Classical Records, 2006 CR-084.

perception of time through its direct affect the right hand *sonority*: Neuhaus's concept of 'sound-time'.

Wanting to create an increased urgency through the beginning of the second lyric episode, bars 39 – 42, Neuhaus slightly pushes the tempo forward to crotchet = 68 (from crotchet = 66 in bars 31 – 38). At bar 42, the left hand C in the bass is taken much more resonantly than the B-flats in the preceding bars [see Figure 29 and CD Track 13: bar 39 is at 3.07 min; bar 42 at 3.8 min]. Arguably, this is the first time the listeners' attention has been drawn so strongly to the presence of the left hand – but this appearance is designed for a specific purpose. Since Neuhaus is using pedalled sound, the raised dampers mean that due to the more energetic striking of the bass C, the sympathetic vibration of strings causes more sound to accumulate. As a direct consequence of the more prominent bass sonority, it will take more time for richer sound of the right hand to decay and it naturally seems to ask for a broadening of the time to allow it to 'speak' which the unyielding flow of the left refuses. Neuhaus uses this principle to cause the illusion of the sonority, especially of the right-hand melody, having to exist within a 'faster' moving temporal space – as if the preceding note falls into the territory of its preceding neighbour before it has had time to decay and suggesting the impatient moving forward of the tempo. In fact, the tempo for the duration of these four bars has remained at crotchet = 68.

At bar 43<sup>1</sup> the pedal change is delayed, probably through the use of a half-pedalled change on the first left-hand quaver, and a further one on the third. As a result, resonance from the preceding bar is carried over into beginning of bar 43. The richness in sonority marks 43<sup>1</sup> (CD Track 13 at 3.24 min) as a high-point in the lyrical interlude stretching from bar 31. Structurally therefore, Neuhaus wants to now give the impression of this culmination of calming down. The unwinding of the tension created by the accumulated dynamic and richness of sonority can only be achieved by allowing the notes to run their natural course of decay. In other words, the calming of such an occurrence requires more *time*. Thus, the elongated notes in the melody from bar 43 suddenly force the tempo back to crotchet = 64. As each note begins to incrementally fade, Neuhaus is able to draw the listener into the sound. Using the quaver rest in bar 44<sup>3</sup> and 45<sup>3</sup> to help the sonority disappear further Neuhaus is able to make the illusion of taking the flow of time to its limit, 'time standing still', at the end of bar 45 (CD Track 13 at 3.31 min and 4.36 min in the repeat). However, this too is a manifestation of 'sound-time' rather than *rubato*, as Neuhaus retains the tempo at crotchet = 64.

Crotchet = 68

max.

Crotchet = 64

min.

**Figure 29** Chopin's *Lento 'Funeral March'* from Piano Sonata No. 2 in B-flat minor Opus 35. Bars 36–45

Line with Arrowhead represents intensity of accumulated sonority (gradient and length of line is representative of perceived sonority).

'max' and 'min' relate to perceived level of sound in relation to the norm of the lyric episode (bars 31 – 39).

Box highlights the notes which are emphasized to accumulate sonority.

Asterisks refers to delayed pedal change.



A further manifestation of Neuhaus's use of pedalled sonority as a creative device which influences the listeners' perception of reality, can be heard in the return to the funeral march motif at bar 56 (CD Track 13 at 5.18 min). Here, according to Rubinstein's conception, the procession is approaching the bystander.<sup>215</sup> Whereas in all the previous appearances of this theme Neuhaus voiced the chords from the top, here he voices strongly from the bass fifth (B-flat to F) in the left hand [see Figure 30]. Neuhaus must have coupled this voicing and the sustaining pedal with a fast touch and release of the key to allow the string to vibrate unhindered for as long as possible. The result enhances the sympathetic vibration of the strings and allows the left hand to sound as if it is all an octave lower than written – an effect that is particularly enhanced by Neuhaus playing certain (but not all) bass notes in the lower octave [refer to CD Track 13 from 5.18 min to 6.12 min]. Neuhaus uses this illusion to a chilling effect – bringing the motif, already heard so many times, to the forefront of the listeners' experience. The *ff* statement of the funeral march theme, by comparison in bar 77 (CD Track 13 at 6.44 min), is less harrowing in its presence than this *p* statement – and indeed feels like it comes somewhere from a distance with the *ff* reflected in the intensity of the articulation, but not the overall dynamic.



Figure 30 Chopin's *Lento* 'Funeral March' from Piano Sonata No. 2 in B-flat minor Opus 35. Bars 56–60

Even through these few examples presented here, Neuhaus's pianistic practice can be seen to embody all the key facets in his intellectualized transformation of Chopin's identity. Neuhaus's strong artistic will meant that in his quest to find the 'true' Chopin, he instead imposed his own distinct Hegelian dialectic and philosophical engagement with the ideas of Nietzsche onto his interpretation. Neuhaus's belief that he was a spiritual 'brother' of Chopin manifested itself in the pride with which he offered his own reflection in the mirror of Chopin's

<sup>215</sup> Rubinstein was supposed to have taken the section at bar 56 at a *fortissimo* dynamic. Neuhaus however observes Chopin's *piano* marking here. Therefore, if we speak of artistic 'conception' Neuhaus's procession has only started to noticeably approach the bystander.

music. Consequently, imposing his understanding of *amor fati* and the elevation of Chopin to the status of *Übermensch* (expressed publicly as Dostoevsky's *всечеловек*) led Neuhaus to transform Chopin's identity by altering the definition of *żal*.

Presenting Chopin's transformed persona as the truest symbolic essence of the Slavic peoples, Neuhaus's Polish familial roots afforded him an unquestioned 'authenticity' beyond that of many other eminent Chopin interpreters. Paradoxically, Neuhaus's recognition of himself in Chopin's mirror however, excluded his interest in Chopin as a real, historical being. Neuhaus's engagement with the composer was through the prism of values appropriated into his own 'autopsychographical' self. Where external fact did not align with his own system of beliefs, Neuhaus allowed himself the deliberate misinterpretation of Chopin.

The analysis of Chopin's persona, as offered by Neuhaus, is a delicate balance of definition and enigma. Neuhaus's lamentation that Romantic subjectivity was losing its hold and meaning in contemporary life unfailingly returned to the idea of interpreting Chopin. Neuhaus's engagement with poetry and philosophy was the predominant way in which he re-articulated his definition of Romanticism. Despite the misconstrued and unfashionable connotations that 'Romanticism' was facing, Neuhaus fought for his view of art as being necessarily subjective and enigmatic. Neuhaus's ahistoricized Chopin transcended beyond the constraints of politics and nationality. Instead Neuhaus's Chopin's music spoke of the deepest and constant essence of humanity which defied rational explanation – the human soul, and its practical manifestation as the 'intonation' of piano sound. The combination of all the above considerations presents a distinct image of Chopin, born in Neuhaus's imagination, and shared with the world as the ultimate Romantic enigma.

## Chapter 5

### Pedagogue, Pianist or Artist-Philosopher?

The thesis has evaluated Heinrich Neuhaus's attitude to his role as a pianist-interpreter and how this understanding manifested itself in the way he formed his vision of Beethoven and Chopin. In the case of both composers, Neuhaus spoke of finding the 'truth' of their beings – their spiritual autobiography – and its expression in the music. Striving to reveal for himself the spiritual autobiography of the two composers, Neuhaus could only do so by passing the facts surrounding their identities through the filter of his own experiences – making sense of them through his *own* life. Given the uniqueness that is inherent in such an approach, it is important to acknowledge that the charisma with which Neuhaus presented his ideas secured the idea of creating a far-reaching legacy.

This concluding chapter will look at the ways in which Neuhaus's persona can be seen in relation to the notion of a legacy. In doing so, the chapter will focus on a range of pianists who had directly studied with Neuhaus to ascertain what they believed to be the unique central pianistic and interpretational aspects which they 'inherited' from their professor. This discussion will be separated into two parts. First, the chapter investigates what we can learn from a range of figures such as Vera Gornostaeva and Lev Naumov, who wanted to be publicly recognized as Neuhaus's students, and who went on to teach at the Moscow Conservatory. Secondly, the idea of a Neuhausian legacy, as proposed by these figures, is discussed in relation to the two most famous individuals to have passed through Neuhaus's class – Emil Gilels and Sviatoslav Richter, neither of whom subsequently were involved in substantial pedagogical activities. Artists of the stature and individuality represented by Gilels and Richter will always be problematic when speaking of a legacy, and thus a phenomenon that implies some kind of commonality. Despite this, their insights can be considered to have a greater critical distance, which, in turn allows us to observe in closer detail the way in which Neuhaus could extend a different meaning for different people.

Neuhaus's apparent legacy is a complicated issue. On the one hand, Neuhaus himself considered that he was directly responsible for influencing the younger generation. Reflecting on his life and achievements in his *Autopsychography*, Neuhaus wrote:

There are kind people who (not without cause) will comfort me: you have created a whole school, one of the best in the [Soviet] Union, you have given so many wonderful concerts, your cultural direction is valued not only in the motherland, but also abroad etc.<sup>1</sup>

However, as will be explored in this chapter, Neuhaus's identification of Emil Gilels and Sviatoslav Richter as his most successful students throws into question whether his 'cultural direction' or actions can in fact be seen in the comfortable terms of an inheritable legacy at all. Not only were Gilels and Richter arguably the two most famous pianists of the twentieth century to have come out of Neuhaus's 'School', but they were artistically and temperamentally very different.

Before considering what the views of Neuhaus's students might offer to our own understanding of their professor, it is necessary to acknowledge that the question of Neuhaus's legacy is further complicated by the fact that within his own mind there was a substantial conflict surrounding his identity as a pedagogue. Neuhaus is unthinkable without pedagogical activity. In lectures and seminars Neuhaus often referred to the broad spectrum of abilities he encountered over the course of his career – as a teaching assistant to Leopold Godowsky in Vienna, helping to teach in his parents' music school in Elisavetgrad, and as a professor in the conservatories in Tbilisi, Kiev, Moscow and Sverdlovsk. His most famous book, *About the Art of Piano Playing*, indeed carries the subtitle *Notes of a Pedagogue*. Yet, throughout his life Neuhaus complained that he spent much energy 'stuck in pedagogical mud' more out of necessity than personal desire:

During the course of my life I have suffered too much from pedagogy to consider myself a real pedagogue *par vocation*. [Sometimes] my dissatisfaction with pedagogy would turn into hatred: from the inhuman burden, lack of rest, leisure and *free air* [вольного воздуха], all that without which an artist cannot live.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> 'Могут найтись и добрые люди, которые (не без основания) станут меня утешать: ведь вы создали целую школу, одну из лучших в Союзе, вы дали столько прекрасных концертов, ваша культурная направленность ценится не только на родине, но и за рубежом.' Н. Г. Neuhaus, 'Autobiographical Notes. Chapter II (Autopsychographical)' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 41.

<sup>2</sup> 'В течении моей жизни я очень много страдал от занятий педагогией, чтобы я мог себя считать настоящим педагогом *par vocation* [по призванию]; моя педагогическая неудовлетворённость, переходившая иногда в отвращение: от нечеловеческой перегрузки, отсутствие отдыха, досуга, вольного воздуха, всего того, без чего художник жить не может.' Ibid.

From Neuhaus's letters, diary entries and published writing, it is clear he saw himself first and foremost as a pianist-interpreter. This identity, according to Neuhaus, cannot co-exist harmoniously with that of a pedagogue. In *About the Art of Piano Playing* Neuhaus explained:

If an interpreter is too burdened with pedagogical work, then every minute he is aware of the ill which this brings to his beloved work – performing. [...] From personal experience, I know that if I have been over-burdened with pedagogical work and I have little time to practise, then my teaching becomes worse – it lacks temperament, flight of thought – all because my soul is overcast with cloud [*пасмурно*] and dreary. Dreary, because I am stationary [...] not developing myself!<sup>3</sup>

With such a conflicted attitude towards pedagogy, the question then stands: how much of Neuhaus's teaching, both direct and indirect, can be said to have formed his particular legacy? Already within his own lifetime, this question was tackled by his student and assistant Tatyana Hludova. As already mentioned, Hludova's work was based on her systematic documentation of Neuhaus's lessons and sought to capture the detailed remarks he made to his students in the course of his teaching. Neuhaus evidently valued Hludova's efforts, as discussed at the start of this thesis, since he made arrangements to realize the publication of certain chapters from her thesis (Moscow: 1954) which were being reworked into a book – an ambition which was precluded by Hludova's untimely death in 1957.<sup>4</sup> In his preface to the published extracts of Hludova's work, ironically published after his own death, Neuhaus wrote:

---

<sup>3</sup> 'Если исполнитель загружен педагогической работой, он каждую минуту сознаёт вред, который эта чрезмерная работа наносит его любимой деятельности – исполнительской. [...] По личному опыту знаю: как только я из-за чрезмерной преподавательской нагрузки начинаю сам мало заниматься, сейчас же моё преподавание становится хуже, не хватает ни темперамента, ни полёта мысли, потому что в душе пасмурно и тоскливо. А тоскливо потому, что я стою на месте, не двигаюсь, не совершенствуюсь.' Н. Г. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 167.

<sup>4</sup> As indicated by Mikhail Sokolov, Neuhaus asked Vera Gornostaeva to edit Hludova's chapter describing the work on sound for publication into the anthology М. Г. Соколов (составитель), *Вопросы фортепианного исполнительства. Выпуск первый* (Москва: «Музыка», 1965) [М. G. Sokolov (ed.), *Questions of Piano Interpretation. Issue 1* (Moscow: 1965)] which was published to coincide with the 100th anniversary of the Moscow Conservatory in 1966. Neuhaus also mentioned the work of Hludova on the final page of his own book, *About the Art of Piano Playing*, indicating that he had anticipated Hludova's posthumous effort to be published as a supplement to his work so that readers can observe his pedagogic metaphors and remarks in her documentation. See *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 228.

When one speaks of music, one frequently remembers the Hamletian ‘All this, as you see, are words, words, words’. I think that much more convincing than words, will be the *deeds* of my students – some of whom, as we say, ‘belong to history’ (Richter, Gilels, etc.).<sup>5</sup>

Neuhaus’s selection of Richter and Gilels as the two standard bearers for his pedagogical legacy is both thought-provoking and problematic especially as, writing this preface in the final years of his life, he could easily have mentioned his current generation of students who were proving themselves as successful artists: Yevgeny Malinin, Alexei Nasedkin, Anatoly Vedernikov, Eliso Virsaladze, Vladimir Krainev, Alexei Lyubimov. In fact, there were other students who themselves actively advocated the idea of a ‘Neuhaus legacy’ far more than could be said for either Gilels or Richter. Already mentioned in this thesis, Teodor Gutman, Vera Razumovskaya (Neuhaus’s Kiev graduates) or Lev Naumov and Vera Gornostaeva (Moscow graduates) can be seen as much more likely and willing candidates to perpetuate the idea of a ‘Neuhaus legacy’ through their own teaching. Therefore, before investigating the significance of what Gilels and Richter offer to the understanding of Neuhaus’s legacy, let us first examine what these many other students offer in the sense of a tangible legacy in terms of actual pianist practices.

One of the central ideas which is proposed by many of the contributors, predominantly former students, to the book *Remembering Neuhaus* was that of being able to detect a ‘Neuhausian sound’ [*нейгаузовский звук*] at the piano.<sup>6</sup> Lidiya Fichtenholz was adamant that people identified her as Neuhaus’s student through her sound.<sup>7</sup> In his memoirs, Lev Naumov, himself Neuhaus’s main assistant, pointed to the resultant ‘beautiful sound’ of the piano as the primary hallmark of Neuhaus’s students.<sup>8</sup> The belief in the ‘Neuhausian sound’ is also a particularly important aspect to Vladimir Krainev, Vera Gornostaeva and Elena

<sup>5</sup> ‘Когда говоришь о музыке, особенно часто вспоминаешь гамлетовское: «Всё это, видите ль слова, слова, слова». Думаю, что более убедительными, чем слова, окажутся *дела* моих учеников; некоторые из них, как говорится, «уже принадлежат истории».’ Neuhaus’s preface to an extract of Hludova’s thesis published in M. G. Sokolov (ed.), *Questions of Piano Interpretation. Issue 1* (Moscow: 1965) p. 167.

<sup>6</sup> The book in question is E. P. Рихтер (составитель), *Вспоминая Нейгауза*, 2007.

<sup>7</sup> Л. И. Фихтенгольц, [L. I. Fichtenholz] in E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus* p. 96.

<sup>8</sup> L. N. Naumov, *Under the Sign of Neuhaus* p. 45. To back up his point about the uniqueness of Neuhaus’s sound, Naumov speaks of the famous sound researcher, Nikolai Alexandrovich Garbuzov, who investigated the sounds of leading pianists. Naumov makes the point that Heinrich Neuhaus and Vladimir Sofronitsky had the greatest range between their *pianissimo* and *fortissimo*.

Richter who all refer to Neuhaus's lessons being, in his own words, 'at least three-quarters of the time, devoted to working on sound.'<sup>9</sup>

Many of Neuhaus's students recall his distinctive manner of sensitizing the ear to sound by building up an understanding of sound from its quietest artistic manifestation. Naumov recalled how it was characteristic for Neuhaus to try and instil in his pupils the ability to play at the point within *pianissimo* where 'noise' just became a feasible 'artistic' occurrence: 'this is not yet sound' [*это еще не звук*], 'this is sound' [*это уже звук*].<sup>10</sup> Neuhaus's distinct attitude to the piano's sound seems to have been as much a feature of his early pedagogy as that at the height of his experience and fame. His request for students to play a C major scale with the right hand with a 'quiet, divine sound in ideal legato' and to accompany it with light chords in the left was a task that he had set Vera Razumovskaya at her first lesson in Gustav Neuhaus's Music School in Elisavetgrad (1914).<sup>11</sup>

Along with the specific attention to sound production, Neuhaus's students talk about the possibilities that Neuhaus consequently demonstrated in the voicing of polyphonic textures especially in the context of an 'ideal legato' produced by both the fingers and pedals. Whereas, as already discussed, Neuhaus rarely played Bach in recital; it was a staple of his pedagogical and personal ritual largely for its significance in training a pianistic attitude to sound. It is difficult to find a testimony of a Neuhaus student who does not talk about Bach in one way or another. Razumovskaya underwent a thorough study with Neuhaus of the Bach *Three-Part Inventions* in Elisavetgrad, and learnt thirty-three of the *Preludes and Fugues* from the *Well-Tempered Klavier* in Kiev.<sup>12</sup> Such an experience seems to have been typical for

---

<sup>9</sup> See articles in E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus*. The quote about working on sound is from *About the Art of Piano Playing* (Moscow: 1958) p. 68. It is directly quoted or paraphrased by the pianists mentioned above. Vera Gornostaeva talks about the 'Neuhaus sound' in the documentary *Master Heinrich* [*Мастер Генрих*] 39 мин, 2008г. Режиссёр: Никита Тихонов, автор фильма: Юлия Тихонова. (Телекомпания «Гамаюн» 2008 для Телеканала «Культура»: Генрих Нейгауз – 120 лет со дня рождения) [Producer: Nikita Tihonov, author: Yulia Tihonova (Produced by *Gamajun* for Television Channel *Kul'tura* for the 120<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of Heinrich Neuhaus)]. Vladimir Krainev said that 'the main thing which Neuhaus worked on with me, was my sound – the beauty of the tone, on the legato, piano, forte.' [*Основное, чем он занимался со мной, это работа над звуком, над красотой звучания, над легато, пиано, форте.*] See Krainev's article in E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus* p. 218. Lev Naumov's own memoirs, *Under the Sign of Neuhaus*, also highlight this at considerable length throughout the book.

<sup>10</sup> L. N. Naumov, *Under the Sign of Neuhaus* pp. 45–46. According to Naumov, Neuhaus was equally sensitive to harsh sounds as to sounds which reminded him of one speaking through a sore throat. Neuhaus apparently asked students to remember that sound should not be made from plaster, but from marble.

<sup>11</sup> S. Z. Belina, 'The Shoots of an Artistic Path' in S. Z. Belina (ed.), *Razumovskaya's Lessons* p. 11.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*

Neuhaus's students. Neuhaus's students studied Bach in great quantities to develop the independence of voice leading and sound production: Naumov remembered that Neuhaus offered his students to work on their octaves by playing the *Two-Part Inventions* by doubling each voice.<sup>13</sup> This tradition of extensive Bach-study as a way to work specifically on legato was adopted, amongst others, by Naumov in his own extensive teaching practice.<sup>14</sup>

Interestingly, these two very specific pianistic facets to sound, which Neuhaus's pupils share and define as part of his 'school', are considered as the main out-workings of a greater legacy which called for students to conceive of their performances in elevated terms. A broad range of accounts of interactions with Neuhaus reveals that issues such as sound were to be understood as *emotional* – a 'product of the [interpreter's] persona'.<sup>15</sup> Gornostaeva related that according to Neuhaus, sound was the 'expression of the soul' [*тон души*].<sup>16</sup> Elena Richter relates how, in her opinion, Neuhaus's specific remarks on sound and voicing are meaningless unless understood within the context of Neuhaus as a persona who engaged with art, literature and philosophy.<sup>17</sup> Similarly, Mark Milman suggested that Neuhaus's comments on aspects such as sound and polyphony were a balance between the pianistically specific and the illusive or provocative discussions on art, history and culture which could only be tangentially related to the work in question. Typically, Milman considered that Neuhaus's specific comments were expected to raise the student's curiosity for wider culture and for discovering himself.<sup>18</sup> Whilst this dimension of Neuhaus's legacy has widely been isolated as potentially the single, most important aspect to his influence, it has also proven itself to be the most elusive to define and seems to have required a willing and open mind from the receiver. Drawing attention to this issue, Gornostaeva wrote:

---

<sup>13</sup> Neuhaus also recommended Naumov to study the fast Bach *Preludes* to 'develop his fingers' instead of scales. L. N. Naumov, *Under the Sign of Neuhaus* p. 62.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.* p. 44.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.* p. 46.

<sup>16</sup> В. В. Горностаева, 'Мастер Генрих' [V. V. Gornostaeva, 'Master Heinrich'] in E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus* p. 202.

<sup>17</sup> E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus* p. 7.

<sup>18</sup> 'Woe to the student who was indifferent to the beauty of art and to assimilation of knowledge. "One needs to read more: to read, to see, to hear, to feel!" – Neuhaus would shout.' [*Горе ученику, проявлявшему равнодушие к красоте, искусству, к познанию жизни. «Читать надо больше, читать, видеть, слушать, чувствовать!» – кричал Нейгауз.*] М. В. Мильман, 'Памяти учителя' [M. V. Milman, 'In Memory of my Teacher'] in E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus* p. 100.



He had a brilliant wit for which, by the way, he was criticized – people said that he ‘knew how to put dust in people’s eyes’ [*он умеет пускать пыль в глаза*] (I heard all this myself: there was never a lack of fault-finders).<sup>19</sup>

Thus, there was evidently a substantial degree of pianistic focus which was delivered within a vast framework of aesthetic, historic and moral questions. Neuhaus’s desire to have these key aspects of his approach linked to his name for posterity saw him actively engage in the creation of his image for the wider public which would support this. Apart from his writing, this was achieved through photographs, many of which seem to have been devised and choreographed with a lot of thought. Such photographs were important to underpinning the idea of a distinct Neuhaus school within his own lifetime, but it seems that Neuhaus equally intended for them to remain as a symbol of his endeavours after his death. According to Leonid Levit, who took the famous portrait-photographs of Neuhaus in the months before his death in 1964, Neuhaus was aware of the power of photography to make an impression that held a more immediate power than words. Levit related that prior to making photographs Neuhaus conversed at length about the kind of image that was intended, what it revealed about him, and worked together with the photographer to materialize its creation.<sup>20</sup>

The photograph below [Figure 31] from the early 1950s, although not by Levit, can be assumed to have produced under similar conditions. It shows Neuhaus (sitting at the piano) surrounded by Nataliya Fomina, Yevgeny Malinin, Anton Ginzburg and Vera Gornostaeva (left to right) – some of his most significant students to later talk about a Neuhausian legacy. However, it is the setting of the photograph that is of importance in terms of how it upholds the key points to Neuhaus’s legacy as identified in the discussion above. The piano appears to be Neuhaus’s Bechstein – famous for being unyielding and thus, for many students symbolized their struggle to attain a beautiful sound. His Bechstein was equally known for the

<sup>19</sup> ‘Он блистал острословием, за которое, кстати, его критиковали, говорили, что он «умеет пускать пыль в глаза» (это я всё слышала: хулителей у него было немало).’ V. V. Gornostaeva, ‘About my Teacher’ in E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus* p. 195.

<sup>20</sup> Leonid Levit wrote: ‘[We needed to make sure] that he would not be “less than Neuhaus”. We talked about this and I felt that he was ready to make a huge effort. [...] He was wonderful: handsome, emotional, lively [...]. We created, discussed and took nine independent portraits.’ [...] нужны значительные усилия, чтобы его портрет не был «ниже Нейгауза». Мы поговорили об этом, и я почувствовал его готовность к волевому усилию. [...] Он был великолепен: красив, эмоционален, подвижен [...]. Мы построили, обсудили и сняли девять самостоятельных портретов.’ See E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus* pp. 247–248.

‘transformation’ which the piano seemed to undergo under its master’s hands.<sup>21</sup> Neuhaus is holding a score of Bach’s *Preludes and Fugues*, and likewise it can be faintly made out that the reading desk is holds a further a score of Bach. Rachmaninov, considered in Russia to be the ultimate polyphonic composer for the piano not least by Neuhaus himself, is represented by a photograph on the bookcase directly behind Neuhaus. The bookcase, spanning the best part of the wall of the room, is filled with books rather than scores. Their haphazard positioning seems to indicate their constant use and symbolically provides a physical cultural framework to the musical space.

---

<sup>21</sup> Naumov explained: ‘At home he had two ‘Bechsteins’ – both really atrociously bad instruments, wildly battered [by regular heavy use]. I remember playing some Debussy *Preludes* to Neuhaus. He made a few remarks, then sat at the piano and played – and how he played! I thought to myself: “Yes, this instrument is horrendous, but how on earth did he make it play this way?!” I was dumbfounded.’ [‘Дома у него стояли два «Бехштейна» – один другого хуже, ужасные инструменты, дико разбитые. Помню, как я играл Нейгаузу прелюдии Дебюсси. Он сделал мне довольно мало замечаний, а потом вдруг сел за рояль и сыграл все, да как! И я подумал: «Да, инструмент жуткий, но как же он сделал так, чтобы всё звучало?!» Был просто поражён.’] L. N. Naumov, *Under the Sign of Neuhaus* p. 42.



**Figure 31** Heinrich Neuhaus surrounded by his students, early 1950s. Image courtesy of the Museum of the Moscow State Conservatory.

Numerous student accounts show that Neuhaus was prepared to put in an extraordinary amount of time to help to structure, focus and deepen the appreciation of a work's interpretation.<sup>22</sup> Naumov related that Neuhaus was prepared to spend two to three hours with a mediocre student on the main theme of Chopin's E minor Piano Concerto Opus 11 or Beethoven's Piano Sonata No. 17 in D minor Opus 31 no. 2, delving into the work in a great deal of detail.<sup>23</sup> These lessons would have varied in content to the 'open' lessons which have mainly been explored in this thesis to gain insights into Neuhaus's interpretative ideas. Whereas Neuhaus's 'open' lessons and lectures focused on the delivery of ideas to an audience and held the playing as an almost inconsequential aspect, the lessons to which Naumov refers are those where the associative flow of ideas emerges only in the gaps between hard graft. The lessons would have included those recorded by Pavel Lobanov onto magnetic tape which demonstrate that certain pieces were studied particularly frequently (such as the Chopin *Ballades* No. 1 and 4) – many of these with mediocre students.<sup>24</sup>

Hearing Neuhaus playing on the second piano alongside the student reveals that he had certain expectations about the agogic nuances of the phrase, tempo and *rubato* in these works. In calling for the student to show more 'plasticity' [*пластичность*],<sup>25</sup> Neuhaus's shadowing of the melodic contours is so specific that it could be argued to form a particular performance tradition if adopted by his students outside the classroom. Comparing Neuhaus's lesson on Chopin's fourth *Ballade* with Irma Yudina and Ese Elinaitė, both recorded at various points in 1962, their choice of tempo is very similar, fluctuating around quaver = 94 - 98. In both lessons Neuhaus draws their attention to the hairpins and the kind of *rubato* he

---

<sup>22</sup> This is a point that is also directly reflected in Neuhaus's own characterization of his lessons. In *About the Art of Piano Playing*, Neuhaus wrote about teaching Liszt's B minor Sonata to a talented, musical student: '[...] discussions, corrections, demonstrations, persuasion and repetitions began from the very first note of the Sonata. Every bar needed analysis and was edited, so to speak. Sometimes we spent a long time on one note or chord [...] not to mention my short "lecture" on the meaning of the content in the Sonata. We spent more than three hours, and only covered a third [...].' ['[...] обсуждения, исправления, показы, внушения и повторения начались с первой же ноты, буквально каждый такт должен был быть просмотрен, так сказать, отредактирован, иногда мы подолгу останавливались на одной ноте, на одном аккорде [...]. Не говорю уже о краткой «лекции», которую я прочёл о смысле и содержании всей сонаты. Мы занимались больше трёх часов и успели пройти около трети сонаты.] pp. 179–180.

<sup>23</sup> L. N. Naumov, *Under the Sign of Neuhaus* p. 44.

<sup>24</sup> It must be acknowledged that Lobanov's recordings of the lessons also have their limitations. Namely, it is apparent that Neuhaus is somewhat inhibited by the technology and that it takes him time to feel free enough to engage with his pupil and audience.

<sup>25</sup> For example see Neuhaus's lesson with Irma Yudina on Chopin's fourth *Ballade* (1962) at 3 minutes 36 seconds [Track 12 on the CD *Звучащие уроки Нейгауза* [*The Sounded Lessons of Neuhaus*] as a supplement to A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus*]. This is not however exclusive to this lesson and is a feature of all of the recorded lessons on this CD.

expected. In the lesson with Elnaite (at 2 minutes 44 seconds)<sup>26</sup> Neuhaus clearly demonstrates at the second piano the urgency he wants in the interpretation with the *crescendo* marking, and the broadening with the *diminuendo* and subsequent reluctance to leave the final quaver [see Figure 32]. In Yudina's lesson, Neuhaus does not stop at this early point in the work, but the exaggerated manner of the *rubato* at these hairpins suggests that this has been a point already discussed. The further instances where Neuhaus finds Yudina's playing rigid, he calls for the treatment of similar hairpins in the same broad manner (for example in bars 58 – 61).



Figure 32 Fryderyk Chopin. *Ballade No. 4* in F minor Opus 52. Bars 15–18

Yet, despite Neuhaus being so apparently thorough in his teaching, and thereby providing a wealth of specific pedagogical devices, performance suggestions and aphorisms which might be seen as his legacy, testimonies reveal that this approach did not extend to all of his students. Naumov observed that Neuhaus did not want to teach 'talented and independent' students and would spend most of his time with the mediocre ones.<sup>27</sup> Berta Kremenstein suggested:

Here is the paradox: Neuhaus, undoubtedly was more interested in the better, more talented artists, but worked with them in a more restrained manner, and simply spent less time with them.<sup>28</sup>

Therefore, it could be argued that the most direct inheritors of a potential legacy in terms of direct pianistic application might actually be those students with a *less* developed individuality, ability or artistic temperament.

<sup>26</sup> *The Sounded Lessons of Neuhaus* as a supplement to A. F. Hitruk (ed.), *H. G. Neuhaus* Track 13.

<sup>27</sup> L. N. Naumov, *Under the Sign of Neuhaus* p. 44.

<sup>28</sup> 'Нейгауз, несомненно, испытывал наибольший интерес к лучшим, одарённым исполнителям, но занимался с ними и сдержаннее и просто меньше, чем с другими учениками.' В. М. Кременstein, 'Neuhaus's Lessons' in A. V. Malinkovskaya (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus and his Students* (Moscow: 2007) p. 31.

The more talented students seem to have experienced Neuhaus's influence from a distance, mainly as observers of other lessons or in conversations outside the teaching environment. Nataliya Fomina considered that her conversations with Neuhaus were 'much more valuable than his lessons' – an attitude that was echoed by Yakov Zak.<sup>29</sup> Alexei Nasedkin too said that his best lessons with Neuhaus were those when Neuhaus felt free to talk about his own life and experiences, rather than specifically about the music.<sup>30</sup> Because more talented students, some of whom have been mentioned in the above discussion, were given less individual time and generally learnt through observing the lessons of others, they are arguably more likely to be successful in expressing their own artistic temperaments. It is in this context that Gilels and Richter, effectively Neuhaus's two most talented students who arguably had the greatest critical awareness of Neuhaus and his practices, are interesting in what they can reveal about their professor. Their ambivalence in various aspects of Neuhaus's teaching and persona accentuates the question why Neuhaus selects them as his 'inheritors'.

Neuhaus's choice of Richter and Gilels to represent his pedagogical legacy may be cynically dismissed as a marketing ploy. Yet, aimed at a Russian, rather than international readership, Neuhaus's audience would have known that he had risen to fame as both a pianist and pedagogue long before either Gilels or Richter joined his famous class in 'Room 29'. It was no secret that both Gilels and Richter had already come to Neuhaus's class as professional pianists with distinctive artistic identities of their own, and clear expectations of what they were hoping to gain from their studies. Thus, they are able to be much more articulate about what they felt Neuhaus did offer them, and what they felt Neuhaus was not able, or looking to share. The latter question in particular was evidently beyond the scope of Neuhaus's mediocre students, whilst the former is tested on a higher level by the potential, expectations and needs of artists like Gilels and Richter.

---

<sup>29</sup>'[...] ещё ценнее, чем его уроки.' Н. А. Фомина [N. A. Fomina] in E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus* p. 181. For a description of Zak's attitude to Neuhaus as a pedagogue see his interview in A. V. Vitsinsky, *Conversations with Pianists* p. 170–175. Zak commented: 'When I became Neuhaus's assistant, in those three years I never missed his classes [...]. I received far more [in this situation] than when I sat at the piano in his class as a student. [...] When you sit and listen from a distance, you feel what Heinrich Gustavovich says, what he shows and co-think and co-feel this.' ['Когда я стал его ассистентом, я в течение трех лет ни разу не пропустил его занятий [...] причем в эти годы я получил гораздо больше, чем сидя за роялем в классе как ученик. [...] Когда вы сидите в стороне, вы слушаете, чувствуете, что Генрих Густавович говорит, что он показывает, вы это со-осмысливаете, со-переживаете.'] p. 172.

<sup>30</sup> А. А. Наседкин [A. A. Nasedkin] in E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus* p. 216.

The circumstances of Gilels's and Richter's training prior to joining Neuhaus's class were very different, let alone their artistic personalities. This factor, coupled with the musicological hostility (predominantly in Russia and Germany) which has presented Gilels and Richter as opponents may make it seem unlikely that juxtaposing the two pianists may provide any constructive answers.<sup>31</sup> However, this following discussion will explore Gilels's and Richter's comments with the sole intention of extricating the common elements in their views of what Neuhaus offered to other musicians who were able to receive this at a high level. Therefore, the views of Gilels and Richter on particular questions will be explored side by side.

By the time Gilels had enrolled as a student in Neuhaus's class in the *Meisterschule* of the Moscow Conservatory in 1935, he had already accumulated a formidable virtuoso repertoire and embarked on extensive concert tours around the USSR following his training with Berta Reingbald at the Odessa Conservatory and his victory at the 1933 All-Union Competition for Pianists.<sup>32</sup> Although Richter claimed he had no formal training before coming to Moscow, he too had already made a name for himself in Odessa as a soloist, accompanist and *répétiteur* at the Odessa Opera – playing Chopin's fourth *Ballade* in F minor Opus 52 and Beethoven's Piano Sonata No. 15 in D major Opus 28 (*Pastorale*), as well as some of his own works, for his admission to Neuhaus's class in 1937. Richter's pianistic ability was at the level where amongst the pieces Neuhaus set for him his first year at the Moscow Conservatory was

---

<sup>31</sup> The question of the complex, and at times evidently strained relationship between Neuhaus and his two students is intentionally not explored in this thesis. Generally, the main attack is that within his own lifetime, Neuhaus was disproportionate in praising Sviatoslav Richter's achievements and musical qualities and was blind to the successes of other students and even other pianists. Neuhaus did not recognize Gilels as a significant talent and independent musician when Reingbald arranged for Gilels to play for Neuhaus ahead of the All-Union Competition in 1933. However, when Richter played for his 'audition' Neuhaus immediately hailed him as a genius. This issue had already been raised by the musicologist Lev Barenboim in his criticism of Neuhaus's book, *About the Art of Piano Playing*, and was explored in the framework of three hypotheses in his unfinished monograph, *Emil Gilels: An Artistic Portrait* (Moscow: 1990): 'We must note straight away: the theme "Neuhaus - Gilels" is complicated and needs a great deal of tactfulness. *Tact, but also truthfulness* [...]'. ['Заметим сразу же: тема «Нейгауз - Гилельс» – сложная тема и подход к ней требует тактичности. *Тактичности, но и правдивости* [...]']. p.66. The author of this thesis however does recognize that issue of Neuhaus-Richter-Gilels has recently resurfaced and become a much debated topic, particularly in Russia, and refers the reader to the work of Г. Б. Гордон, *Эмиль Гилельс: За гранью мифа* (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2007) [G. B. Gordon, *Emil Gilels: Beyond the Myth* (Moscow: 2007)] and its sequel *Эмиль Гилельс и другие. Книга в разных жанрах* (Екатеринбург: 2007) [*Emil Gilels and Others. A Book in Different Genres* (Ekaterinburg: 2007)].

<sup>32</sup> A biographical sketch of Emil Gilels can be found in L. A. Barenboim, *Emil Gilels: An Artistic Portrait* (Moscow: 1990). Gilels was enrolled in Neuhaus's class until the spring of 1938, and taught there until 1941 (see p. 64). Gilels's repertoire list of works studied with Berta Reingbald between 1930 and 1936 can be found on pp. 41–42.

the Liszt Sonata.<sup>33</sup> Evidently then, Gilels and Richter had travelled to Moscow in search of something other than what Neuhaus called 'pure pedagogy'.<sup>34</sup>

If Richter and Gilels already had formed musical identities of their own and had technical abilities that evidentially exceeded Neuhaus's, what stimulated them to consider joining Neuhaus's class? Firstly, it must be noted that both Gilels and Richter were attracted by its reputation. By the 1930s Neuhaus was at the height of his active pianistic and pedagogic careers and thus a natural choice for a pianist wishing to further his art. As summarized by Richter:

The three pillars of the Russian piano school [...] were Goldenweiser, Igumnov and Neuhaus. Goldenweiser represented the older tradition, a pianist of the pedantic kind. [...] Igumnov was an excellent musician and an original pianist [...] his tone was radiant and refined, but fairly limited in range. He belonged to another generation, he was much older than Neuhaus, and it was to Neuhaus that all the pianists in Moscow beat a path.<sup>35</sup>

Gilels too acknowledged how significant Neuhaus's persona was at the time for young pianists as well as for general musical opinion: 'Neuhaus was a gifted and complex individual who aroused the admiration and attention of those around him. For many he was the symbol of high art.'<sup>36</sup>

Neuhaus was aware of the scale of pianistic talent which he was responsible for nurturing in Gilels and Richter, particularly given the technical facility which was so highly developed in the two pianists. Contending with what he saw as his own modest pianistic means, Neuhaus observed:

When Gilels played Liszt's *Spanish Rhapsody* for me, I always thought that I will never be able to play the octaves as quickly, brilliantly and as loudly as

---

<sup>33</sup> B. Monsaingeon, *Sviatoslav Richter. Notebooks and Conversations* (1998) translated by Stewart Spencer, 2001 (London: Faber and Faber Ltd., 2001) p. 25.

<sup>34</sup> Neuhaus uses this expression in many writings including *About the Art of Piano Playing*.

<sup>35</sup> B. Monsaingeon, *Sviatoslav Richter. Notebooks and Conversations* p. 30.

<sup>36</sup> 'Нейгауз – одарённая и сложная натура, возбуждавшая толки и приковывавшая к себе внимание окружающих. Для многих он стал символом высокого искусства.' L. A. Varenboim, *Emil Gilels: An Artistic Portrait* p. 68.



he could – should / therefore teach him, or should he go to a pianist who can play it even better than he could (alas, that is rather difficult to find)?<sup>37</sup>

Gilels himself was adamant that it was Berta Reingbald, his professor in Odessa, who had ‘formed’ his technical pianism through the intensive study of piano transcriptions.<sup>38</sup> Thus, Gilels told his biographer, Barenboim, that he was irritated with the ‘rumour’ that Neuhaus ‘made’ him. With regards to Richter however, Neuhaus simply corroborated Richter’s own view that he was already very proficient in getting what he wanted out of the piano: ‘Richter is an uncommon phenomenon [...] with huge virtuosic capabilities.’<sup>39</sup>

Considering the issue of Gilels’s and Richter’s respective pianism and the technical aspects reputed to have been central to Neuhaus’s legacy as outlined by other students, it would seem that he had a minimal impact on either musician. Unlike Gilels, Richter did claim that some of his pianistic techniques were indebted to Neuhaus – in particular the ‘Neuhaus sound’:

With the Opus 110 Sonata [Beethoven] Neuhaus taught me to obtain a singing tone, the tone that I’d always dreamed of. It was probably already in me, but he freed it by loosening my hands and teaching me to open up my shoulders.<sup>40</sup>

However, Richter’s statement must be taken with a degree of caution. Despite Neuhaus’s arguably disproportionate praise of Richter’s abilities, he never singled out Richter’s sound as one of particularly striking beauty. In fact, the harshness of Richter’s sound is one of the main criticisms that Neuhaus extended to his pianism.<sup>41</sup> Furthermore, even though Gilels was famous for his rich sound, which Neuhaus called the most ‘noble’ and ‘golden’ of all pianists, this was one of the hallmarks of his pianism *before* he had joined Neuhaus’s class.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> ‘Когда Гилельс играл у меня «Испанскую рапсодию» Листа, то мне всегда приходила в голову мысль, что октавы я не могу сыграть так быстро, блестяще и так громко, как он, а поэтому стоит ли именно *мне* заниматься с ним и не будет ли правильнее, чтобы он занимался у пианиста, который ещё лучше может сыграть подобные вещи (увы, не так легко его найти)?’ H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) pp. 180–181.

<sup>38</sup> L. A. Barenboim, *Emil Gilels: An Artistic Portrait* pp. 38–39.

<sup>39</sup> ‘Рихтер – явление незаурядное. [...] он обладает огромными виртуозными данными.’ Г. Г. Нейгауз, ‘Святослав Рихтер’ [H. G. Neuhaus, ‘Sviatoslav Richter’] in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 179.

<sup>40</sup> B. Monsaingeon, *Sviatoslav Richter. Notebooks and Conversations* p. 29.

<sup>41</sup> See for example in H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 98.

<sup>42</sup> H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 98. In his article on Gilels, *Щедрость художника* [*Generosity of an Artist*], Yakov Flier wrote that he was sure that ‘already aged sixteen,

The extensive study of polyphony, which many of Neuhaus's students identified as a key to their professor's distinct pedagogical approach to the development of voicing, is largely irrelevant to either Gilels's or Richter's experience. Working on developing Gilels's lyrical sound, Reingbald said that her greatest triumph in this respect was in making Bach Gilels's favourite composer.<sup>43</sup> Gilels remembered that every lesson with Reingbald he played Bach's two-part inventions in octaves – a pedagogical device which Naumov had considered Neuhausian. Richter had believed that his own serious interest in Bach's music was lifelong and atypical of his time, going so far as to imply that he was the first significant pianist to pay attention to the values of Bach's music in the Soviet Union.<sup>44</sup>

Consequently, neither pianist can be said to have successfully tempered their own pianistic manner to reproduce the famous hallmarks of Neuhaus's playing: Richter never became known for a lyrically nuanced Neuhausian sound, whilst Gilels had already distinguished himself in this respect before coming to Moscow. Both pianists also did not need Neuhaus to instil in them a love and respect for polyphony as one of the most significant outlets for their sound at the piano. Therefore, it can be concluded that for a pianist of Gilels's or Richter's calibre and uniqueness it is irrelevant to speak of a technical legacy which stems from their interaction with Neuhaus – even if, as in the case of Richter, the idea of such a legacy with respect to the 'Neuhaus sound' was anticipated and invited by the pianist.

The lack of specific, technical guidance that was extended to both Richter and Gilels stands at the heart of the central paradox that they both presented with regards to being Neuhaus's chosen 'inheritors': Both pianists confirm Neuhaus's own belief that he was *not* a pedagogue, particularly for pianists who came to him with a highly developed artistic vision. Gilels believed that Neuhaus's 'faults' as a pedagogue stemmed from the fact that, at heart, he never fitted into such a role. Gilels explained:

---

Gilels was a world-class artist' whose pianistic qualities had already been evident at a level 'of great artistic height'. [‘Я абсолютно убежден, что уже в шестнадцать лет Гилельс был пианистом мирового класса [и уже тогда] добился подлинных исполнительских высот.’] See E. B. Dolinskaya & M. M. Yakovlev (ed.), *Yakov Flier. Articles. Reminiscences. Interviews* (Moscow: 1983) p. 235.

<sup>43</sup> Б. М. Рейнгвальд, 'Годы учебы Э. Гилельса' (*Советское искусство*, 24/06/1938) [B. M. Reingbald, 'E. Gilels's Years of Study'] quoted in L. A. Barenboim, *Emil Gilels: An Artistic Portrait* p. 40.

<sup>44</sup> 'Because the traditional Romantic repertory was so well established, Bach was rarely played by pianists in the Soviet Union. The *Well-Tempered Clavier* never appeared on concert programmes. [...] Before me (and, later, Maria Yudina), I see that only Samuel Feinberg included them in his recitals.' B. Monsaingeon, *Sviatoslav Richter. Notebooks and Conversations* p. 48.

A concertizing artist, regardless of what he says, as a general rule cannot be a good teacher: he burns on the stage and gives himself completely there. He needs to hold a large repertoire in his hands and practise regularly. A pedagogue cannot rush, and a true teacher must, first of all, have an exceptional patience. He is busy with his students and can spend hours with them – together they polish both the technical and emotional aspects of the playing. This brings him real satisfaction *if* he is a genuine pedagogue.<sup>45</sup>

An artist cannot be a teacher. This is why Neuhaus had substantial pedagogical defects.<sup>46</sup>

Richter too considered that Neuhaus was an *artist* rather than teacher, and irritatedly would say that Neuhaus was wasting his time with students: ‘Don’t you understand Heinrich Gustavovich – they won’t play any better anyway!’<sup>47</sup>

Neuhaus’s naming of Gilels and Richter as his heirs in the preface to the extract of Hludova’s work, mentioned above, is provocative in the way it allows him to shift the balance of his legacy *away* from his role as a pedagogue. Given the fact that Neuhaus did not leave Eastern Europe after the outbreak of the First World War, his identity as a pedagogue has always been the dominant one in the West – ironically through the association with Gilels and Richter.<sup>48</sup> In Russia, knowledge of Neuhaus as a pianist has meant that the oscillation between

---

<sup>45</sup> ‘Концертирующий артист, что бы там не говорили, как правило не может быть хорошим учителем; он сгорает на эстраде, он весь отдаёт себя ей. Ему нужно держать в руках большой репертуар, нужно регулярно заниматься. Педагог же может не торопиться, а ведь истинный учитель – это прежде всего неистощимое терпение. Он занят учениками, часами может возиться с ними, вместе доделывать техническую и эмоциональную сторону игры. И в этой работе он испытывает удовлетворение, *если* он, конечно истинный педагог.’ L. A. Varenboim, *Emil Gilels: An Artistic Portrait* p. 36.

<sup>46</sup> ‘Артист не может быть учителем. Поэтому у Нейгауза были педагогические недостатки.’ Ibid. p. 148.

<sup>47</sup> ‘Поймите же, Генрих Густавович, что они все равно лучше играть не будут.’ From Neuhaus’s diary entry for 27 January 1962 in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 66.

<sup>48</sup> James Methuen-Campbell’s short biography of Neuhaus in *Grove Music Online* highlights Neuhaus’s pedagogical accomplishments especially as a teacher of Gilels and Richter. Methuen-Campbell suggested that as a pianist Neuhaus was not successful since he ‘lacked the force and bravura of a seasoned virtuoso’. See <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com> (accessed 17/04/2014). Reviewing *About the Art of Piano Playing* in *The Musical Times*, Vol. 114, No. 1567 (September 1973 p. 900), Frank Dawes only talked about Neuhaus as ‘one of the greatest teachers of his generation.’ As mentioned at the start of this thesis, there is surprisingly little other specific Western literature on Neuhaus which might serve to contradict such views.

Neuhaus-the-pianist and Neuhaus-the-pedagogue is more dynamic, but also largely tends towards the 'pedagogue'. As noted by Larissa Kirillina at the International Conference 'Russian Music: A Window to the World' (23 March 2014 in Saint Petersburg), Neuhaus is today predominantly considered as a pedagogue by musicians at the Moscow Conservatory.<sup>49</sup> As discussed in the introduction, the main theses to date on Neuhaus have also gravitated towards investigating Neuhaus's pedagogical methods and results. Thus, Neuhaus's artistic identity has been overshadowed by his pedagogical identity – an imbalance that this thesis has sought to correct.

Richter claimed that it was Neuhaus's persona as a pianist and artist that formed his initial and lasting view of him, rather than his reputation as a pedagogue:

I'd already heard Heinrich Gustavovich Neuhaus during one of his visits to Odessa and had been bowled over by his playing – he played Beethoven's *Hammerklavier* Sonata – and, indeed, by his whole manner. There was something about his appearance that strongly reminded me of my father, but he was really much more light-hearted.<sup>50</sup>

It is significant that Richter used his interview with Bruno Monsaingeon, which he knew would be widely disseminated in the West, to try and make the West conscious of Neuhaus as a *pianist-interpreter*:

Although he had only small hands, he was a tremendous pianist, but as he was never allowed to travel abroad, it was only his reputation as a teacher that reached the outside world. [...] His performance of Chopin's E minor Concerto and Beethoven's *Emperor* were so astounding that I always refused to include them in my own repertory. But his playing was sometimes uneven, as he spent so much time teaching that he had no time left for practising. Teaching is a terrible thing. It kills you as a pianist. [...] I remember a Schumann recital that he gave. He'd begun with the sonatas and played them like a cobbler, with masses of wrong notes in every bar.

---

<sup>49</sup> The opinion was voiced by Dr Kirillina, current-professor of the Moscow Conservatory, in the open discussion arising after the presentation of the paper M. Razumovskaya, 'A Window East and West: The Implications of National Identity on the Interpretations of Chopin by Heinrich Neuhaus'.

<sup>50</sup> B. Monsaingeon, *Sviatoslav Richter. Notebooks and Conversations* p. 25.

Next on the programme came the *Kreisleriana* – marvellous. As for the *Fantasie*, you'd have thought it was Schumann himself at the piano.<sup>51</sup>

Richter believed that Neuhaus's pianism had an inimitable quality and deeply personal identity which could be compared to the highest levels of artistic individuality such as that embodied by Vladimir Sofronitsky and Maria Yudina.<sup>52</sup>

Yet, where Richter saw Neuhaus's pianistic strength, Gilels was never completely convinced that Neuhaus was a great pianist:

By artistic nature, or more specifically, in his soul, he was a big artist (however, he never had perfected the [necessary] pianistic mastery).<sup>53</sup>

Unlike Richter, Gilels identified a further, third aspect which he considered to outweigh Neuhaus's importance as a pedagogue or pianist: the person. Gilels talked of the 'novelty' of Neuhaus's 'alluring' manner, his overtly expressed 'love of art, and the fact that he was always searching'.<sup>54</sup> Thus, in his interviews with Lev Barenboim, Gilels considered Neuhaus's charisma and magnetism to stem not from his work, but from his being. Gilels suggested that Neuhaus captivated those around him because of the intrigue and richness presented by his 'soul', or in other words, through the glimpses that Neuhaus allowed into his own unique experiences and world-view.

As already demonstrated in this thesis, Neuhaus's understanding of the interpreter's soul, his 'autopsychography', was dependent on the interpreter's holistic cultural acquisitions:

I ask not to be understood wrongly, but in the way in which a person (a musical one, for whom, as we have already agreed, everything that is knowable is musical) plays a Beethoven sonata, one can feel which books he has read, which paintings he has seen, whether or not he knows the

---

<sup>51</sup> Ibid. p. 28.

<sup>52</sup> Y. A. Borisov, *In the Direction Towards Richter* (Moscow: 2011) p. 151.

<sup>53</sup> 'По артистической природе, точнее в душе, он был большим артистом (хотя пианистическое мастерство его совершенным никогда не было).' L. A. Varenboim, *Emil Gilels: An Artistic Portrait* p. 68.

<sup>54</sup> 'Меня он привлекал влюблённостью в искусство и тем, что он был в постоянном поиске.' Ibid. p. 64.

historical epoch in which the great, genius composer created [his works], in short, one sees his general culture.<sup>55</sup>

Neuhaus's ability to draw his broad knowledge of European culture into the Russian cultural world seemed to open up new horizons which could impact on interpretative decisions. In a country with restricted cultural exchange and official censorship of certain European ideals, Neuhaus arguably provided two things: a view into a barred world (the Europe of Neuhaus's youth), and a way of nonetheless identifying with such barred phenomenon within the language and framework of a Russian cultural aesthetic.

Identifying breadth of culture as an integral part of Neuhaus's persona, Gilels attributed Neuhaus's success as a musical authority to his literary output: 'He had a literary talent which was polished by his friendship with a variety of eminent humanitarians. The literary word, as noted by someone, is power and strength.'<sup>56</sup> Thus, Gilels attributed Neuhaus's influence not through musical deed, but through the written word – an aspect that is given comparatively little emphasis by Richter. The substantial written and verbal documentation of Neuhaus's innermost concerns and views on music and culture does not, however, provide the guarantee that it has the capacity to form a tangible legacy for the reader. Even for a musician of Gilels's calibre, in the years of his studies at the Moscow Conservatory, he came across barriers in deciphering Neuhaus's distinct 'autopsychography'. Gilels recalled how many of Neuhaus's remarks and associations simply did not touch him as an interpreter, and that it was evidently noticed by Neuhaus:

I always left his lessons lonely, and had to rely on my own musical intuition to pull through. I never became someone with whom he spoke openly from the soul [*задушевым собеседником*]. Evidently, he thought I had not grown up to it.<sup>57</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> 'Пусть не поймут меня превратно, но в том, как человек (музыкальный, разумеется, для которого, как мы уже условились, всё познаваемое музыкально) играет сонату Бетховена, чувствуется, какие книги он читал, какие картины видел, знает ли он историческую эпоху, в которую творил великий, гениальный композитор, короче видна его общая культура.' Н. G. Neuhaus, 'Passion, Intellect, Technique' in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 274.

<sup>56</sup> 'Он владел литературным талантом, отшлифованным дружбой с рядом видных гуманитариев. А литературное слово, как было кем-то сказано, – это сила и власть.' L. A. Varenboim, *Emil Gilels: An Artistic Portrait* p. 68.

<sup>57</sup> 'Уходил я от него какой-то одинокий и продолжал некоторое время надеяться на свою музыкальную интуицию – не вывезет ли она меня? Задушевым собеседником его я не стал. Он, по-видимому, считал, что я не дорос до этого.' *Ibid.* pp. 71–72.

Neuhaus's approach to Gilels both publicly and privately was indeed marked by his belief that Gilels needed guidance in his aesthetic or spiritual artistic development. In *About the Art of Piano Playing*, Neuhaus had concluded that besides 'octaves, temperament, rhythm, artistic will, unified concept, virtuosic brilliance, penetrating sound' already apparent in Gilels's playing, there were deeper issues with regards to the work's 'essence' which he needed, as an *artist*, to share with Gilels.<sup>58</sup>

This stood in contrast to Neuhaus's relationship with Richter, which seems to have been more collegial from the outset, and possibly in part because of Richter's German heritage, more like that of father and son.<sup>59</sup> Neuhaus admitted that his stance in Richter's lessons was on the basis of 'friendly neutrality': 'To teach a learned one, spoils him. Most likely, I helped him a little in his development, but mostly he helped himself [...]'<sup>60</sup> It is known for instance, that Neuhaus liked to set Richter musical puzzles which drew from a broad spectrum of cultural events and literature, and that this was a practice that Richter too

<sup>58</sup> The most contentious public remark by Neuhaus in respect of Gilels in *About the Art of Piano Playing* has done much to fuel the musicological tension between the different 'supporters' of Gilels, Richter and Neuhaus: 'When E. Gilels came to study with me in the [postgraduate] course at the Moscow Conservatory, I had to tell him once: you are a grown man, can eat beef steaks and drink beer, but up to now you have been fed with a baby's bottle.' ['Когда Э. Гилельс приехал учиться у меня в аспирантуре МГК, мне пришлось сказать ему однажды: ты уже мужчина, можешь есть бифштексы и пиво пить, а тебя до сих пор вскармливали детской соской.'] (H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 169). However, what writers such as Grigory Gordon, examining this fractured relationship between Neuhaus and Gilels fail to observe is that Neuhaus was not the only pedagogue to voice the criticism of Gilels needing greater spiritual development as an artist. Alexander Goldenweiser wrote: 'In the First All-Union Competition [for musician-interpreters in 1933], the wonderful pianistic talent of the young Emil Gilels made a vivid impression, mainly through his superb interpretation of Liszt's *Fantasia on themes from Mozart's 'Figaro'*. In the competition his interpretation of Brahms's *Variations on a theme of Handel* was not special.' ['На Первом всесоюзном конкурсе ярко выделилось превосходное пианистическое дарование юного Эмиля Гилельса, отличившегося главным образом прекрасным исполнением листовской Фантазии на темы «Фигаро» Моцарта. Исполнение им же на конкурсе вариаций Брамса на тему Генделя ничем особенным не отличалось.'] See 'Итоги Второго всесоюзного конкурса музыкантов-исполнителей' ['The Results of the Second All-Union Competition of Musician-Interpreters'] in Д. Д. Благой, А. Б. Гольденвейзер о музыкальном искусстве (Москва: «Музыка», 1975) [D. D. Blagoi, A. B. Goldenweiser on Musical Art (Moscow: 1975)] p. 265.

<sup>59</sup> Richter recounted: 'My paternal grandfather was a German from what is now the Western Ukraine [sic.] but was then in Poland [...] who set himself up as a piano-maker in Zhitomir. [...] In Odessa, we lived in the German quarter. My father [...] taught piano at the Conservatory. At home, we spoke more Russian than German, but as we had lodgers, one of whom, Fräulein Stabuch, was virtually a member of the family [...] who taught me German.' (B. Monsaingeon, *Sviatoslav Richter. Notebooks and Conversations* pp. 7–11). Richter talked about the similarities between Neuhaus and his own father in some detail and considered 'Neuhaus was like a second father to me.' Ibid. p. 26.

<sup>60</sup> 'В занятиях с Рихтером я чаще всего придерживался политики «дружественного нейтралитета» [...] ученого учить – только портить. Вероятно, я ему помог немного в его развитии, но больше всего помог он сам себе [...]' H. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 179.

adopted with his closest associates. Richter seems to have been highly receptive to Neuhaus's metaphors and poetic descriptions:

Heinrich Gustavovich taught me the recitative [from Sonata No. 17 Opus 31 no. 2, *Tempest*]. He would place his foot on the pedal much earlier than he took the first chord. In other words, he opened the piano's pores. I couldn't do it. Then he asked me to 'speak' the recitative in the voice of Diogenes from a barrel.<sup>61</sup> He joked in this way... but for me, it worked!<sup>62</sup>

Neuhaus made no secret of his delight in sharing what he called his 'absurd associations' with Richter. Likewise, he seemed genuinely interested to hear Richter's own ideas, and supposedly kept up a 'game' of comparing complex programmes for works:<sup>63</sup>

Sometimes we have conversations with [Sviatoslav] Richter where we tell each other our thoughts, thought-lets [*мыслишки*] and conceptions.

---

<sup>61</sup> Diogenes of Sinope was a Greek philosopher (412 BC – 323 BC). Diogenes lived in poverty and was said to live and sleep in a large jar – often translated as barrel.

<sup>62</sup> 'Этому речитативу меня учил Генрих Густавович. Он ставил ногу на педаль значительно раньше, чем брал первый аккорд. То есть открывал у рояля поры. У меня так не выходило. Тогда он попросил «произнести» речитатив голосом Диагена из бочки. Это он так шутил..., а у меня получилось!' Y. A. Borisov, *In the Direction Towards Richter* (Moscow: 2011) p. 57.

<sup>63</sup> '[Heinrich Gustavovich and I had a certain 'game']'. He asked me: 'What does Brahms's h-moll *Rhapsody* remind you of? What subject?' This question came totally out of the blue. I anguished over it for days, and could not think of anything. I even thought he might forget about his question. But he asked again. [...] My subject: a knight-troubadour falls in love with a princess, whom he has never seen. She takes an interest in the troubadour's friend... The troubadour succumbs to a fatal illness and the proud princess enters a monastery. Heinrich Gustavovich sat thinking, and then said "Interesting... Interesting... I would never have thought of this. Yet, this is devilish. If you had read [...] Anatole France, you would have understood what happens in the *Rhapsody*." He showed me on the piano how the elder curses the abode of contention, how he clasps his lyre to his breast and rises onto the highest cape... I have never heard such a *Rhapsody*. Such passion and such self-burning. That is when I thought that I will never play the h-moll *Rhapsody*.' [ '[У Генриха Густавовича была игра]. Он спросил меня: «Что тебе напоминает h-moll'ная рапсодия Брамса? Какой сюжет?» Это было полной неожиданностью. Я мучился целые сутки, ничего придумать не мог. Думал, что про задание он забудет. А он опять спрашивает. [...] Так вот, сюжет: рыцарь-трубадур влюбляется в принцессу, которую никогда не видел. А она увлечена другом этого трубадура... Трубадура настигает смертельный недуг, а гордая принцесса уходит в монастырь. Генрих Густавович сидел задумчиво, а после начал меня хвалить: «Интересно... Интересно... Мне бы никогда и в голову не пришло. Но всё-таки это от лукавого. Вот если б ты прочитал «Кимейского певца» Франца, то понял бы, что происходит в рапсодии». И он показал на рояле, как старец проклинает обитель раздора, как прижимает лиру к груди и как поднимается на высокий мыс... Я не слышал больше ни у кого такой рапсодии, чтобы так играли. Такая страсть и такое самосожжение! Я тогда и решил, что h-moll'ную рапсодию играть никогда не буду.' ] Y. A. Borisov, *In the Direction Towards Richter* (Moscow: 2011) p. 46.



From the outside we must seem mad – but we need this. Richter told me that the third movement of Prokofiev’s concerto [No. 2] is so harrowing that it is a dragon devouring children. It is a rather wild idea but [...] I cannot protest about such an image-led thought process, and instead consider it necessary.<sup>64</sup>

However, it is important to note that despite such overt similarities between Neuhaus’s and Richter’s need to use imagery, to underpin or direct their interpretative decisions with such scaffolds, Richter did not consider this to be part of Neuhaus’s influence over him. Richter was resolute that he already had such a predisposition before coming into contact with Neuhaus:

One must not play just what is in the notes, but what is *between the notes*. Like a good artist – he reads *between the lines*. That is hard. One learns this throughout their whole life, although no one teaches this. No one taught me this specifically – I just soaked it up like a sponge. [...] I don’t teach because of my belief that one cannot teach anything in the classroom!<sup>65</sup>

In the terms that Richter saw it, his interaction with Neuhaus was valuable as an opportunity to observe at close proximity the workings of an artistic mind. Like Gilels, Richter evidently was not interested in being told how to think about music. Instead, he enjoyed challenging the depth of his own perceptions, and in this respect, Neuhaus seems to have been a sympathetic and likeminded counterpart. For Richter, Neuhaus was a spiritual role-model whose influence was one that had to be invited by the receiver. Richter said that if the student was open to

---

<sup>64</sup> ‘У нас иногда с Рихтером бывают такие разговоры, и каждый высказывает свои мысли, мыслишки и представления. Если посмотреть со стороны, может показаться, что мы сумасшедшие, а нам это нужно. Рихтер мне говорил: в концерте Прокофьева третья часть такая страшная, это дракон пожирает людей. Это довольно дикая идея, но у него именно такое представление, так что я не только не протестую против такого образного мышления, но, наоборот считаю его совершенно закономерным.’ Г. Г. Нейгауз, ‘Мастерство пианиста. Стенограмма беседы.’ [H. G. Neuhaus, ‘The Mastery of a Pianist. A Stenograph of a Conversation’] in M. G. Sokolov (ed.), *Pianists Speak. Issue 2* (Moscow: 1984) p. 161. The image seems to have been inspired to some degree by the myth of Kronus (Saturn) devouring his children.

<sup>65</sup> ‘Играть не только то, что в нотах, но и между нот. Как хороший артист – читает *между строк*. Это трудно. Этому учишься всю жизнь, хотя никто этому не учит. И меня специально никто не учил – я только впитывал как губка. [...] Я и не преподавал из убеждения: нельзя ничему научить в классе!’ Y. A. Borisov, *In the Direction Towards Richter* (Moscow: 2011) p. 134.

Neuhaus's influence, he would always be enriched by the interaction: '[Maria] Yudina [was kind] but her individuality crushed yours. [...] Heinrich Gustavovich opened your individuality, got into your soul.'<sup>66</sup>

It cannot be said that Gilels lacked the intellectual capacity which would have potentially enabled him to engage with Neuhaus's complex philosophical and literary associations. The pianist Yakov Flier characterized Gilels as an artist with a 'rare fusion of artistic intellect and artistic imagination'.<sup>67</sup> Yakov Zak had spoken of Gilels's acquaintance with the famous musicologist Boris Tyuneyev in Odessa, who actively sought out talented pianists (who along with Zak and Gilels also included Maria Grinberg and Sviatoslav Richter) to discuss philosophy and aesthetics with them, placing his vast library at their disposal. Zak wrote:

I must say that in Odessa there were professors who had a profound influence on our general cultural and aesthetic development. For instance, the music historian Tyuneyev had a great influence on the formation of our artistic views and principles,<sup>68</sup> and such musicians as [...] Richter owed a lot to him. I was very close to him [...] therefore when [Neuhaus scared new students with his expression: 'You haven't read Kant...'], although I indeed had not read Kant in the original, I understood what Heinrich Gustavovich meant because of Tyuneyev.<sup>69</sup>

Gilels's situation therefore illustrates just how specific Neuhaus's web of assimilated and appropriated ideas were to himself. Practically, in the terms of his own pianistic

---

<sup>66</sup> 'Мария Юдина была доброй, но её индивидуальность подавляла. [...] Генрих Густавович раскрывал твою индивидуальность, влезал в душу.' Ibid. p. 135.

<sup>67</sup> Я. В. Флиер, 'Щедрость художника' [Y. V. Flier, 'Generosity of an Artist'] in Е. Б. Долинская и М. М. Яковлев, *Яков Флиер. Статьи, воспоминания, интервью* (Москва: «Советский Композитор», 1983) [E. B. Dolinskaya & M. M. Yakovlev (ed.), *Yakov Flier. Articles, Rememberances, Interviews* (Moscow: 1983)] p. 236.

<sup>68</sup> Борис Дмитриевич Тюнеев [Boris Tyuneyev].

<sup>69</sup> 'Надо, однако сказать, что в Одессе были профессора, которые оказывали на нас громадное влияние в смысле общекультурного, эстетического развития. Например, историк музыки Тюнеев имел очень сильное влияние на формирование наших художественных взглядов, принципов, и такие музыканты, как Рихтер, многим ему обязаны. Я был к нему очень близок [так что, когда] мне не раз приходилось слышать, как [Нейгауз] раздражённо говорил ученику: «Что за ерунду Вы играете!.. Вы Канта не читали...», то, если я даже и не читал Канта в подлиннике, понимал, что имел в виду Генрих Густавович, потому что очень многое знал благодаря Тюнееву.' A. V. Vitsinsky, *Conversations with Pianists* (Moscow: 2007) pp. 166–167.

development, Gilels recognized how unsuccessful it had been for him to try and to copy the 'cultural world' that Neuhaus offered:

When I came to Neuhaus, he made changes to my repertoire. He offered that we study Wagner-Liszt's *Isolde's Liebestod*, I learnt it, performed it in concert. I quickly realized that I am not doing it my way – that I am playing not only following someone else's words, but also someone else's emotions. Neuhaus, of course, had heard the opera and had been to the Wagner festivities. I had never had the opportunity to hear the opera. The piano transcription does not create a worthy impression – there are no voices, no colours and, most importantly, there is no atmosphere of the theatre. One needs not only to hear, but to see the opera. Without all this, there was no reason for me to play *Isolde's Liebestod*. I could not understand the short-sightedness of the critics [who claimed] this piece had changed me, made me into someone new. I would shudder at these words – words of those who did not understand that I did not want to merely copy someone else, and should not have done so.<sup>70</sup>

Through this, it can be discerned that although Neuhaus sought to share the dynamic movement between his own experiences or associations and the interpreted music, they were not necessarily directly transferable to another individual. Neuhaus's fleeting thoughts and more detailed deliberations, which allow a glimpse into how he assimilated and appropriated cultural thought, are best considered as a stimulus for another pianist-interpreter to delve deeper into his own consciousness in preparing an interpretation. It is clear that the work on constructing an interpretation based on the self's assimilated experience had to be done

---

<sup>70</sup> 'Когда я пришёл к Нейгаузу, он внес некоторые изменения в мой репертуар. В частности, предложил разучить «Смерть Изольды» Вагнера-Листа. Я разучил. И сыграл тогда это произведение в концертах. Но вскоре понял – делаю не своё дело, играю не только с чужих слов, но и с чужих эмоций. Нейгауз, конечно, слышал эту оперу и бывал на вагнеровских спектаклях. У меня же возможности послушать оперу не было. Клавираусцуг не создаёт должного впечатления, там нет ни голосов ни красок, ни главное, атмосферы театра. Надо было не только услышать, но и увидеть оперу. Без этого не имело для меня никакого смысла играть «Смерть Изольды». И я диву давался непонятности и близорукости критиков, которые почему-то воспевали моё исполнение этой пьесы и к тому же утверждали, что именно она сделала меня каким-то другим, каким-то новым. Меня прямо-таки в дрожь бросало, когда я читал эти строки, строки тех, кто не понял, что копирующим чужого я и не хотел, и не должен был быть». L. A. Barenboim, *Emil Gilels: An Artistic Portrait* p. 68.

assiduously by that individual interpreter from his own free will and in his own distinct way. As summarized by Gilels:

Heinrich Gustavovich was often irritated when pedagogical intervention was required in relation to myself. He taught according to his mood, and if something made him angry then he simply said: 'Ducky, [голубчик] you know everything yourself – [just go and] learn it.'<sup>71</sup>

Therefore, even if Neuhaus was willing to share the results of his own cultural self-interrogation, he was not willing to give anyone answers – least of all to talented pianists. As already mentioned, the contradiction of leaving a student to find his own 'way out' in a situation where there were aspects of the playing which were in need of guidance was amplified in Neuhaus's relationship with the most talented pianists. In this way, Gilels spoke of how his learning from Neuhaus only really took form outside the traditional didactic context. Gilels explained:

The only time when Neuhaus opened up before me was in the war years. He was facing a hard time in Sverdlovsk, and I visited him there.<sup>72</sup> He put aside his prejudice towards me and shared his feelings and thoughts. We made wonderful music together and played four-handed arrangements – it was peaceful and without any irritation.<sup>73</sup>

Neuhaus himself seems to have felt a certain guilt over the way in which he knew that his influence over a talented musician like Gilels could only really have a meaningful resonance in offering, rather than in forcing, a critical interaction with art. Neuhaus was aware of Gilels's disappointment in him as a pedagogue, and wrote in *About the Art of Piano Playing*:

---

<sup>71</sup> 'У Генриха Густавовича, – возникало не редко чувство раздражения, когда требовалось какое-то педагогическое вмешательство по отношению ко мне, и он, занимаясь по настроению, порой, если его что-то злило, просто отмахивался: «Сам голубчик, всё знаешь, надо выучить».' Ibid. p. 74.

<sup>72</sup> Following Neuhaus's arrest, as was already mentioned, he spent the time of his enforced exile from Moscow in Sverdlovsk.

<sup>73</sup> 'Единственное время, когда Нейгауз раскрывался передо мной, были военные годы. Ему было трудно в Свердловске и я его там навещал. Он, забывал о некоторой предвзятости по отношению ко мне, делился своими чувствами и мыслями. Мы с ним великолепно музицировали в четыре руки, спокойно и без раздражения.' L. A. Varenboim, *Emil Gilels: An Artistic Portrait* pp. 71–72.

I shall not hide my sins! With someone like Gilels, the best method – apart from looking at repertoire – would be the daily sight-reading, preferably in four-hand [arrangements], of all the boundless symphonic and chamber repertoire and looking at ‘non-pianistic’ literature.<sup>74</sup>

However, even under the veil of guilt, Neuhaus remained steadfast in his position of offering scope for assimilation, but not answers relating to the specific method of its appropriation or manifestation in the context of subsequent pianistic interpretation. This kind of influence-by-consent was in itself an appropriation akin to Neuhaus’s appropriation of musicians investigated in this thesis. As discussed, this kind of appropriation was far-reaching because its elusive nature meant it could be based, as illustrated in the case of Anton Rubinstein and Neuhaus, on an imagined and modified response. In a certain respect Neuhaus’s persona was not to be seen as a template outlining the role of interpretation, but as a mirror which showed up your current limitations – which you had to work to improve by yourself. Addressing this issue in different terms, Vera Gornostaeva proposed: ‘[Neuhaus] led you into the world of art, if you *wanted* to. Not everyone wanted it.’<sup>75</sup>

As already discussed in the thesis, Gilels demonstrated a critical attitude to Neuhaus’s own interpretations as a pianist: ‘he saw stylistic truth through the lens of Romantic spectacles. [...] Neuhaus was a product of the traditions of the last [nineteenth] century.’<sup>76</sup> In particular this related to Neuhaus’s dependence on metaphor, such as the famous ‘southern Italian velvet night’ which Neuhaus proposed in Beethoven’s *Aurora* [Waldstein] Sonata. Gilels’s much more laconic and direct manner in speaking about music was probably a result of his own temperament as much as a change in the times. Yet, it cannot be ignored that Gilels had grown up in a society which demanded more objectivity and arguably, driven by industrialization and modernism, a greater demand for ‘precision’.

---

<sup>74</sup> ‘Чего греха таить! С такими как Гилельс, наилучшим методом было-бы – кроме прохождения положенного репертуара – ежедневное чтение с листа, предпочтительно в четыре руки, ознакомление со всей неисчерпаемой камерной и симфонической, да и всякой другой «внефортепианной литературой».’ Н. G. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) p. 175.

<sup>75</sup> ‘Он вводил вас в мир искусства – если вы этого *хотели*. Не все хотели.’ Extract from an interview with Vera Gornostaeva from the documentary film «Мастер Генрих» [*Master Heinrich*] (2008) at 23 seconds (film length 39 min 05 seconds).

<sup>76</sup> ‘Он смотрел на эту «стилевую правду» сквозь стёкла романтических очков. [...] Нейгауз сформировался в традициях прошлого века.’ L. A. Varenboim, *Emil Gilels: An Artistic Portrait* p. 69.

Gilels was representative of the generation for which, as already seen in the previous chapter, Neuhaus lamented that ‘Romanticism is fading away’. Perhaps it is this generational distance that had meant that Neuhaus’s and Gilels’s artistic personalities were unable to fuse and thus created the friction in their relationship. In this respect Neuhaus’s and Gilels’s relationship might be considered to mirror Neuhaus’s more Wagnerian attitude to music and Gilels’s more modernistic ideas of music as architecture as proposed by figures such as Arnold Schoenberg through the foundations of Eduard Hanslick.<sup>77</sup> It must be remembered that Neuhaus did see music as an independent, ‘absolute’ language in itself, despite his propensity for metaphor. Gilels, however, striped back Romantic metaphysics and ‘programme’ from his engagement with music far more overtly. Rather than speak, like Neuhaus, of getting to know a piece by over-indulging in it and ‘weeping’ over its beauty at home, Gilels talked about this same stage of interpretative preparation as a strategic ‘chess game’.<sup>78</sup> Gilels’s discussions about musical interpretation with Lev Barenboim are typified by definite instructions relating to speed, dynamic and phrase length much more than to evocative moods.

The absence of evocative language or metaphor in Gilels’s interpretative process can be traced in the language of other pianists of that generation: Yakov Zak and Maria Grinberg for instance, who had nonetheless impressed Neuhaus with their interpretations. As indicated in this thesis, these pianists saw themselves as breaking free from the limitations of Romanticism which they believed were typified by Neuhaus. Gilels advised:

The language of music is wide. Romanticism is only one aspect of music – there are others, and these have their own worlds, their own traditions, their own laws. [Unfortunately, Neuhaus’s Romanticism] imprinted itself on everything.<sup>79</sup>

Thus, it is evident that in respect of ‘poetic imagery’ and the verbalization of elusive metaphors, which were indispensable to Neuhaus’s mind, carried less weight in the ideals of the next generation.<sup>80</sup> However, although pianists like Gilels considered they had successfully

---

<sup>77</sup> For an investigation of the Wagner-Hanslick conflict see C. Dahlhaus, *The Idea of Absolute Music* (1978) translated by Robert Lustig, 1989 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991) pp. 32–37.

<sup>78</sup> ‘Она напоминает игру в шахматы.’ L. A. Barenboim, *Emil Gilels: An Artistic Portrait* p. 147.

<sup>79</sup> ‘Язык музыки широк. Романтизм лишь одна из областей музыки; есть и другие области, и в них какой-то свой мир, свои традиции, свои закономерности.’ Ibid. p. 70.

<sup>80</sup> The reluctance to engage with poetic imagery, and the desire for objectivity in interpretation was a noticeable occurrence, but was by no means exclusive. Whereas Gilels seems to have found Neuhaus’s extensive allusions to extra-musical associations superfluous, as already seen, Richter was more than happy to oblige.

negotiated the limitations of Neuhaus's Romantic subjectivity, it is nonetheless interesting that poetic imagery does appear from time to time in their discussions on interpretation, often in the most unexpected contexts. For instance, writing about Prokofiev's melodic language, Gilels compares it to an 'alpine flower' and speaks of the pianist needing to be in awe of its scent and beauty.<sup>81</sup>

What the evaluations of Gilels and Richter have demonstrated so far, is that Neuhaus's influence did not arise out of a traditional didactic capacity which explored issues such as technique and artistic individuality, nor did his influence lie in any apparent universality or accessibility of his metaphors and extra-musical associations. Is it possible to speak therefore of other factors which are common to both Richter and Gilels and which might be said to stem from Neuhaus's influence? What Neuhaus seems to have encouraged, if not developed, in both Gilels and Richter was their faith in the enigmatic nature of music based on the deepest respect for the markings in a score. Neuhaus's idea of the interpreter needing to have a highly developed moral duty, explored in this thesis, was one shared by Gilels and Richter. Speaking of the spiritual and moral height required of an interpreter, Gilels wrote:

Communication with Classical music is for me the greatest spiritual act – the expression of life's greatest 'credo'. One requires immense and absolute purity to stand one-on-one with the work and look it straight in the eyes (without 'veils' or 'curtains'), capture its features and expression. Every time you turn over the first pages, you strive to understand what the author thought and felt. Evidently, each time the result is not quite right, and so you solve this question again and again – your whole life.<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>81</sup> 'I feel that it is apt to compare it to an alpine flower. When you find it you are astounded by its scent and beauty.' ['Мне кажется уместным сравнить её с горным цветком. Когда его найдёшь – поражаешься аромату и прелести.'] Э. Г. Гилельс, 'Великий соотечественник' [E. G. Gilels, 'My Great Compatriot'] in S. I. Shlifstein (ed.), *S. S. Prokofiev. Materials, Documents, Reminiscences*. (Moscow: 1961) p. 455.

<sup>82</sup> 'Общение с классической музыкой для меня величайший духовный акт, выявление главного жизненного «кредо». Требуется совершенная, абсолютная чистота, чтобы, оставшись один на один с произведением, словно глядя глазами в его глаза (никаких заслонов, никаких «занавесок»), поймать его черты, запечатлеть его выражение. Каждый раз, открывая первые листы, решаешь задачу, стремишься понять, что думал и чувствовал автор. Вероятно, каждый раз решение оказывается не совсем правильным, и поэтому решаешь его снова и снова – всю жизнь.' Д. Д. Благой, 'Эмиль Гилельс': *Люди искусства – Герои Социалистического Труда* (Москва: 1978) [D. D. Blagoi, 'Emil Gilels' in *Men of Art – Heroes of Socialist Labour* (Moscow: 1978)] p. 267.

Like Neuhaus, Gilels believed in the humility that an interpreter needed to have in recognizing the superiority of the composer. Refusing to squander the emotional implication of any small marking left by the composer to the interpreter, in the same way as Neuhaus, Gilels considered that it was his duty to play from an *Urtext* edition and with a critical awareness of the composer and his time:

Any work, created by an author is felt and thought through. As an interpreter, apart from knowing the tonality [etc.] I must investigate what that artist really thought and felt. I must know his aesthetics, his philosophy, his thoughts...<sup>83</sup>

The fact that Gilels's approach to his role as an interpreter must have been influenced to some degree by Neuhaus, can be seen in his own admission that he had not been accustomed to such a pedantic approach during his rigorous studies in Odessa:

In my youth I was sometimes careless with my attitude to the score, and even Reingbald sometimes ignored this, or did not notice it. To be let-off with such textual inaccuracies with Neuhaus was impossible: like an inspector of the ГАИ [GAI – traffic police] on the street, he immediately stopped and 'fined' you. And thank God that I came across such control!<sup>84</sup>

Furthermore, despite Gilels's suspicion of bringing a Romantic aesthetic to all interpreted works, his understanding of his role as an interpreter followed the Romantic Realist aesthetics, modelled by Stanislavsky, as adopted by Neuhaus. Gilels talked about an interpreter needing to adapt *himself* to the work and to embody the composer's feelings and thoughts as he believes are indicated through the score: 'An interpreter needs to be, if you like, a chameleon

---

<sup>83</sup> 'Любое произведение, сочинённое автором, безусловно им осмысленно и прочувствованно, а мне как исполнителю, кроме знания тональности, только ещё предстоит это проделать: что же думал автор, что он чувствовал? Надо знать его эстетику, его философию, его мысли...' L. A. Varenboim, *Emil Gilels: An Artistic Portrait* p. 137.

<sup>84</sup> 'В детстве и ранней молодости, – в моём отношении к записанному в нотах иной раз проглядывало верхоглядство, и даже Рейнгалд, случалось, то ли проходила мимо этого, то ли этого не замечала. Проскочить с такого рода неточностями в тексте у Нейгауза было невозможно: как инспектор ГАИ на улице, он моментально останавливал и «штрафовал». И слава Богу, что на моём пути появился настоящий контроль.' Ibid. p. 69.



– an interpreter must adapt to the composer all the time, “change his colours”.<sup>85</sup> Thus, Gilels recognizes spiritual and cultural height in an interpreter as necessary, rather than desirable, to be able to embody the experiences of a composer expressed in a composition.

Richter, despite his own compositional talents, subscribed to the same ideals of interpretation.<sup>86</sup> He considered that it was of vital importance to observe the accuracy of markings, and saw the interpreter embodying the work, by way of being its reflection:

The interpreter is really an executant, carrying out the composer’s intentions to the letter. He doesn’t add anything that isn’t already in the work. If he’s talented, he allows us to glimpse the truth of the work that is in itself a thing of genius and that is reflected in him. He shouldn’t dominate the music, but should dissolve into it.<sup>87</sup>

Yet, despite these shared aspects, there is a crucial difference which sets both Gilels’s and Richter’s definitions of interpretation apart from Neuhaus’s. When Neuhaus talked about the interpreter, he talked of someone who does not simply reflect or attempts to capture a likeness, he talked about one who, faced with a composition, ‘reworked it in his own way’.<sup>88</sup> As demonstrated in this thesis, faced with the task of interpretation, Neuhaus was unafraid to pass the identity of the composer through the filter of his own imagination to make it fit within his unique set of experiences. The resultant transformation of a composer, albeit at times unconscious, was such that it directly took on aspects of Neuhaus’s own ‘self’. Indeed, in Neuhaus’s case, ‘interpretation’ was not the composer’s work reflected in the interpreter as identified by Richter. Rather, ‘interpretation’ was a process in which the symbol of the work provides a window into the most intimate and complex elements of the interpreter’s own ‘soul’. Therefore, in seeking to interpret a composer, despite Neuhaus’s claim that all his actions were dictated by moral and ethical considerations which placed him in a role of unquestioning servitude and quasi-religious fervour before a composer, the result was – as

---

<sup>85</sup> ‘Исполнитель должен быть, если хотите, хамелеоном: исполнитель должен все время приспосабливаться к композитору, менять «окраску».’ Ibid. p. 147.

<sup>86</sup> Neuhaus remarked that Richter was a talented composer, and considered that it would have been a real shame if Richter did not have the time or energy to fulfil his potential in this respect. See H. G. Neuhaus, ‘Sviatoslav Richter’ in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 189.

<sup>87</sup> B. Monsaingeon, *Sviatoslav Richter. Notebooks and Conversations* p. 153.

<sup>88</sup> ‘[...] перерабатывает его по-своему.’ Г. Г. Нейгауз, ‘Великое и простое’ [H. G. Neuhaus, ‘The Great and Simple’] in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 177.

demonstrated in this thesis – that Neuhaus undertook a solipsistic journey of self-interpretation.

Neuhaus's view of interpretation put the pianist-interpreter into the centre of the argument (composer-score-interpreter) in a way that was avoided by both Gilels and Richter. Even speaking about their own interpretations, neither of the two pianists spoke of their own potentially transformative influence over the music. Richter, for instance, denied that he did anything other than 'play' exactly what is 'on the page'.<sup>89</sup> During the course of the thesis it has been shown that Neuhaus was much more forthcoming about the possibility of misinterpretation as a result of the processes of assimilation and appropriation which were inherent in his particular Realist aesthetic of interpretation. This is particularly significant given that an admission of misinterpretation is problematic for an interpreter who, like Neuhaus, demonstrates a 'modern', pedantic sensibility to the score as it seems to undermine his quest for 'truthfulness' and authenticity.

Intriguingly, despite Neuhaus's obsession for moral frameworks, he was unfazed by the conflict that was produced when interpreter and composer do not see 'eye-to-eye'. Neuhaus embraced conflict as a fertile ground that was necessary for the interpreter to find and give voice to his own individuality as long as it followed that paradox of searching not for the self, but for trying to 'fall in love' with 'another "I"'.<sup>90</sup> As investigated in this thesis, Neuhaus consistently spoke of conflict as a dialectic and not a dichotomy. Neuhaus's understanding of art and life was suffused with his inclination for Hegelian thought: 'Dialectic is in everything. [...] Based on thorough examination, one must give one's own interpretation.'<sup>91</sup> Thus, as an interpreter searching for the 'truth' of a work, Neuhaus must have ultimately accepted that the interpreted work was neither his own 'I', nor that of the composer – but, as identified by Stanislavsky – a synthesis of the two, where the 'I' of the interpreter is *no less* important: 'Truth is born in conflict.'<sup>92</sup>

Can Neuhaus's paradox of demanding textual fidelity, yet producing an artistic transformation of a work, as investigated in this thesis in relation to Beethoven and Chopin, be

<sup>89</sup> B. Monsaingeon, *Sviatoslav Richter. Notebooks and Conversations* p. 153.

<sup>90</sup> '[...] всецело, всей душой погрузиться в [...] чужое «я», [что] удастся только в состоянии любви.' Г. Г. Нейгауз, 'Ван Клиберн' [H. G. Neuhaus, 'Van Cliburn'] in Y. I. Milstein (ed.), *Heinrich Neuhaus* p. 242.

<sup>91</sup> 'Диалектика должна быть во всем. [...] Надо на основании тщательного изучения дать своё толкование.' Neuhaus's aphorisms in E. R. Richter (ed.), *Remembering Neuhaus* p. 288.

<sup>92</sup> 'В споре рождается истина.' *Ibid.*

considered as his particular legacy? As a pianist who had specifically relinquished composition in order to become an interpreter, Neuhaus emphasized the different ‘morals’ of composers and interpreters and spoke of them as if different species. Furthermore, developing artistically at the close of the nineteenth century, Neuhaus was one of the new wave of internationally significant ‘non-composing’ interpreters. The deliberateness of such an act seems to imply that, yes, Neuhaus was opening the gate into a new era which would define what it meant to live as an interpreter of another’s art. Yet, it must be remembered that Neuhaus’s definition of ‘interpretation’ is one that took the mantle directly from Liszt:

The virtuoso is not a mason, who, with the chisel in his hand, faithfully and conscientiously cuts his stone after the design of the architect. He is not a passive tool who reproduces feeling and thought without adding any himself. [...] He creates just like the composer himself [...]. He breathes life into the lethargic body, infuses it with fire, enliven it with the pulse of gracefulness and charm. He changes the clay-like form into a living being, penetrating it with the spark which Prometheus snatched from the fire of Jupiter.<sup>93</sup>

Perhaps instead, it is more meaningful to think of Neuhaus’s inheritance of Liszt’s definition as the *final* Romantic act. Modifying Liszt’s celebrated formulae: it is the ‘breaking out’ of the composer-interpreter ‘chrysalis’ into the interpreter as a butterfly.<sup>94</sup> Neuhaus accepted his role as an interpreter – a role that had reached its ultimate independence from composition whilst maintaining a highly creative footing. He also accepted that he was to act as a guardian of this role for, although as a concept interpretation could now be seen as an ahistoric act, it is nonetheless all a role that is highly dependent on a complex system of beliefs.

Removing the composer-interpreter ‘chrysalis’, where is the creative impulse which wants directing into its metamorphosis as a butterfly? For Neuhaus this impulse was the

---

<sup>93</sup> As quoted in A. Friedheim, *Life and Liszt, The Recollections of a Concert Pianist* (New York: Taplinger Publishing Company, Inc., 1961) p. 52.

<sup>94</sup> Liszt’s departure from the concert stage at the age of thirty-five to devote his life to composition led him to declare: ‘The time has come for me (*Nel mezzo del cammin di rostra vita* – thirty-five years old!) to break out of my virtuoso’s chrysalis and allow my thought unfettered flight.’ See David Trippett’s investigation into the impact of Liszt’s decision in his article, ‘*Après une Lecture de Liszt: Virtuosity and Werktreue in the “Dante” Sonata*’ (*19th-Century Music*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 52–93), argues that ‘Liszt’s deliciously mixed metaphor suggests that the composer-as-butterfly had finally metamorphosed from virtuoso-as-caterpillar, the theatrical performer had presented only an embryonic stage in artistic development.’ pp. 52–53.

*artistic creative will* of the interpreter, seated in his soul. Being the product of the specific range of assimilated experience and appropriated thought, there is nothing more complex and unique than a person's soul – his spiritual identity. Thus, if we are to speak of Neuhaus's legacy, it must be of one which seeks interpretation as an expression of the self and that is unafraid of transforming, with the self, all that it comes into contact with. What we are observing therefore, is the legacy of an artist-philosopher. This expressive desire of one's artistic will is neither something that can be directly taught nor inherited. The expression of one's artistic will can, however, be encouraged through example, and its scope widened by the assimilation of a wealth of emotional and intellectual experiences. As indicated by Neuhaus, the metamorphosis into an interpreter-butterfly lies in the hands, or rather soul, of each individual pianist. All that can be done is to create the environment in which the unique transformations may take shape:

Let me use a crude metaphor: imagine that someone who passionately loves flowers has a piece of land which is made up of sand and stone [...]. His passion is stronger than the stones and sand, and he patiently drags humus to this spot [...] so that the flowerbed blooms. [...] When I [...] use metaphor, quote poetry etc., all I am doing is trying to create the *earth*, the humus, where *perhaps* with good care beautiful flowers might grow.<sup>95</sup>

---

<sup>95</sup> 'Разрешите для ясности прибегнуть к грубоватой метафоре: представьте себе, что страстный любитель цветов обладает кусочком земли, состоящим из песка и камня [...]. Но его страсть сильнее, чем камень и песок, и он будет терпеливо таскать чернозём из отдалённых мест [...] и добьётся того, что у него расцветёт желанный цветник. [...] Когда я [...] прибегаю к метафорам, аллегориям, цитирую стихи и т.д., то я пытаюсь создать *почву* для восприятия музыки, тот чернозём, на котором при хорошем уходе, *может быть*, и вырастут прелестные цветы.' Н. Г. Neuhaus, *About the Art of Piano Playing* (1961) pp. 176–177.

## Conclusion

2014 marks fifty years from the death of Heinrich Neuhaus. During his lifetime, he was one of the most recognized pianists within the Soviet Union. Today, his name, particularly in Russia, still carries weight for artists and students who claim to derive their practice from the Neuhaus tradition. This thesis has explored several facets of Heinrich Neuhaus's complex identity which, despite his fame, have often been misrepresented or overlooked. It examined Neuhaus's response to his cultural environment and how it was appropriated into his artistic persona. This interaction derived itself from an amalgamation of influences from his immediate family, his studies and travel in Central Europe and Italy, and his subsequent career as a pianist and pedagogue in Russia as seen through the prism of his personal judgement. The thesis showed how, in an environment of pianist-composers, his decision to become a pianist-interpreter came with a conscious and deliberate relinquishing of composition.

Neuhaus's decision brought with it a system of beliefs and aspirations relating to the interpreter's role and responsibilities in which he fused the experiences of his inner world with his perception of the composer to create a dynamic synthesis. Above all, the thesis attempted to use these observations to extricate the principles underlying Neuhaus's approach to interpretation and to offer a view on how these might be seen to impress themselves on his interpretation of Beethoven and Chopin through his writing, recorded performances and the critiques of his contemporaries. Finally, it was proposed that in fact the inner world supporting his interpretations was so specific to Neuhaus – a unique and inimitable fusion of certain Central European and Slavic experiences of his time – that it precluded this being passed on as an inheritable legacy.

As revealed in this thesis, Neuhaus's spontaneous manner of thought meant that he made elaborate associative connections from a diverse range of sources. Relying on Neuhaus's own words to reveal these connections presents its limitations – a situation made more problematic by the presence of censorship in published writing of the time – his thoughts have been corroborated by additional evidence wherever possible. The more pressing issue in investigating Neuhaus's thought is that despite his erudition, he was often uninterested in presenting a cohesive or thorough argument, or in the consistency and accuracy of his information. This indicates that, for him as an interpreter, the process, rather than result, carried the greater artistic significance. Preferring to present his ideas as fleeting commentaries in open lessons, lectures, letters and short articles, Neuhaus relied on

combining impressions from his own experiences, knowledge of other arts and philosophy, his imagined position within a cultural legacy and personal musical taste to create his interpretations. The elusive nature of the synthesis of ideas he created inevitably brings with it limitations. For instance, focusing on Neuhaus's interpretation of Beethoven and Chopin – the two composers he considered to be the 'pillars' of pianism – represents an important but small part of Neuhaus's repertoire. Furthermore, the division of Neuhaus's thought into broad categories (philosophical, literary and musical) in this thesis is artificial, but provides the reader with a sense of how he used his wealth of cultural acquisitions to illuminate certain concepts from different perspectives. Such a division also highlighted how untroubled Neuhaus was by contradictions in his own views, instead believing that the resultant tension between ideas would bring him closer to the 'truth'.

It has been shown that Neuhaus's great stature as a pedagogue resulted in a strong desire for pianists to be recognized as being a part of Neuhaus's legacy. Whilst this has resulted in detailed accounts and transcripts of Neuhaus's lessons, this must be viewed in conjunction with his own admission that he had deficiencies as a pedagogue – a view upheld by several of his students including Emil Gilels and Yakov Zak. Thus, whilst Neuhaus was unquestionably drawn to his more talented students, he paradoxically spent less time with them, preferring them to discover their own interpretative visions. His reluctance to explain ideas, rather than to demonstrate them, similarly meant that many nuances of his pedagogy escape written documentation, while his primitively recorded lessons made towards the end of his life show him to be ill at ease with the set-up.

Even in the case of students who worked closely with Neuhaus for many years, their subsequent practice and memories of their professor when asked about the influence of Neuhaus highlights how elusive the study of musical interpretation presents itself. It also contributed to the reason why it was beyond the scope of this thesis to attempt to trace Neuhaus's wider legacy: In bringing their own artistic personality to their art, and through the unavoidable adaptation of their professor's persona through the filter of their own experiences and views, each of these students represent a different 'Neuhaus' in relation to what he meant to them. With passing generations, the essence of what 'Neuhaus' represents necessarily becomes more diluted due to changes in performance trends or expectations, as well as the evolution of historical and cultural contexts which new experiences provide.

In today's global musical community, the very notion of contemporary national piano schools which were understood by Neuhaus as reflections of the practices and ideals of a small

but respected long-serving group of professors in an institution, has really become too diffuse to trace in a meaningful way. In the latter half of the twentieth century, pianists including Emil Gilels and Dmitri Paperno (who emigrated to the USA) both noted that with the death of Goldenweiser in 1961, and Neuhaus in 1964, the dynamics of the piano department of the Moscow Conservatory changed dramatically and lost its 'unified direction'.<sup>1</sup> Many of those who trained with Neuhaus, or attended his classes as observers, subsequently settled across the globe making it difficult to trace a like-minded community which might closely base its work on those older practices. With this, many of the 'threads' which bound a national school – certain localized cultural movements, traditions and linguistic practices – to aid the movement between dominant aesthetic ideas and their practical manifestations, become lost. Whereas aphorisms associated with the leading figures of such national schools retain their immediate appeal, they are being understood against a new network of 'threads' and so acquire new meanings.

It is quite certain that many of Neuhaus's aphorisms have indeed become embedded in new contexts. Where Neuhaus might have anticipated his words to have resonated in a particular way for those around him, even within the less internationally mobile society around him, he had already identified changes in his own lifetime. He lamented the fading away of the subjective Romantic aesthetic, with its links to Russian Realism, and spoke with concern of the more result-driven Soviet aesthetic which for him typified efficiency and the desire for objectivity. Today, where cultural developments can be disseminated internationally with both ease and speed, we have arguably fewer pockets of distinct national schools. Therefore, instead of seeing one aesthetic dominate over others, we need to recognize that there are numerous, simultaneously co-existing aesthetics responding to different aspects of 'Neuhaus'. Whilst this potentially creates a rich cultural environment, we can only really investigate Neuhaus as an individual if we look beyond the aphorisms and attempt to reimagine the web

---

<sup>1</sup> Speaking at some point around the 1970s, Gilels's remarked in interview: '[In the 1930s] The piano faculty had strongly directed opinions and arguments between the youth. "Igunnovites", "Goldenweiserites", "Neuhausians", "Feinbergites" [...]. What a pity that all this levelled out and everything was then replaced by one thing – competitions and a programme of four etudes, a polyphonic work and a virtuosic piece etc. But back then we had arguments and direction!' '[В 1930-х годах] на факультете, шли острые споры между молодыми. «Игумновцы», «гольденвейзеровцы», «нейгаузовцы» и «фейнберовцы» [...]. Как жаль, что произошло нивелирование, и всё в конечном счете стало упираться в одно – конкурсы и программы из четырёх этюдов, полифонического и виртуозного сочинений и т.п. А тогда были споры и направления!']. L. A. Varenboim, *Emil Gilels: An Artistic Portrait* p. 66. Paperno, who was not formally Neuhaus's student, wrote: '[Receiving the news of Neuhaus's death] in our minds we were saying farewell to a person who had become the symbol of artistry and high spirituality in music. For me this loss severed my ties with the Conservatory [...] which had meant so much to me.' D. A. Paperno, *Notes of a Moscow Pianist* (Moscow: 2008) p. 151.

of 'threads' as they might have occurred within his mind. This thesis has made such an attempt, but given the complexity of Neuhaus's persona there are still many aspects to be investigated.

Given that so many of the contexts surrounding Neuhaus's artistry have changed, what benefits does the study of his interpretational aesthetics and decisions bring to us today? Neuhaus was one of the most charismatic and loved cultural figures of his time. Led by the idea of serving the composer's intentions, his pianism was unique and instantly recognizable to his audience. When performing the music of composers such as Beethoven and Chopin, pianists today are still extremely concerned with combining an informed interpretation with the ideal of artistic individuality.<sup>2</sup> Yet, modern pianism has been criticized for supposedly being unable to successfully reflect this ideal. Hamilton considers that despite 'talent', modern pianism is 'often more uniform and strait-laced [...] than that of the 'Great' Romantic tradition.'<sup>3</sup> Alan Walker's pessimism is even more evident:

Today we live in an age of anonymity. For the first time in musical history pianists seem willing to suppress their artistic personalities. [...] They are to be heard in most of the large concert halls of the world every season, to say nothing of the teeming hundreds vacating the world's conservatories year after year, en route to oblivion.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> By 'informed' it does not necessarily mean that pianists will perform the repertoire on relevant historical keyboard instruments with adapted technique, or even in the intended setting or programme format. 'Informed' can also reflect the critical choices pianists make regarding the kind and amount of editorial intervention they seek in a score, the kinds of performance tradition (particularly encountered through recordings) they might engage with and why, the kind of historic and cultural considerations they might choose to react with.

<sup>3</sup> K. Hamilton, *After the Golden Age. Romantic Pianism and Modern Performance* p. 259. By the 'Great Tradition', Hamilton includes a range of pianists and decades predominantly from Liszt and his pupils, to Glenn Gould, Sviatoslav Richter and Vladimir Horowitz.

<sup>4</sup> A. Walker, 'Liszt's Sonata in B minor' in *Reflections of Liszt* (Cornell University Press, 2005) p. 135. The issue of anonymity has also been well represented by culture-critics in the national press in the UK: Martin Kettle reporting for the *Guardian* wrote an article 'Why are today's concert pianists so boring?' (5 September 2002) where he argued that 'If there were a softer and gentler way of saying this, then I would say it. But in my view, modern concert pianists have become boring. Very few of them have anything very interesting to say, at least to me. [...] There can be no real dispute that the age of the pianistic "lion" – the age of Liszt and Rachmaninov – is dead. It died with Vladimir Horowitz in the same month that the Berlin Wall fell. [...] What is more striking, I think, is that the age of the intellectual pianist, the priestly interpreter of the classic works, is disappearing too.' See <http://www.theguardian.com/music/2002/sep/05/classicalmusicandopera.artsfeatures> (accessed 03/08/2014).



While no modern pianist deliberately aims for ‘anonymity’, and whilst it is possible to suggest numerous exceptions, a detailed investigation into how a pianist such as Neuhaus, who combined an approach to the score that many musicians would recognize today with a deeply personal reading, can only be beneficial to musicians looking to explore ways in making their own individuality an inherent part of their interpretations.

Finally, Neuhaus’s belief that a great pianist-interpreter is a ‘noble’ and erudite being is still upheld particularly in conservatories today. Whereas we might feel Liszt’s or Tolstoy’s descriptions of the artist in quasi-religious terms as speaking from the altar to be archaic, musicians generally still agree that the greatest works of Western art music communicate the highest kinds of spiritual experiences and are capable of enriching the lives of others. In order for a pianist to be able to evoke these experiences in his interpretations, the expectation remains that he should have attained a certain spiritual stature. For instance, the pianist András Schiff advised that pianists ought to refrain from performing Beethoven’s last piano sonatas until they had earned such a right with age, historical and philosophical study, and life-experience.<sup>5</sup>

To give a ‘profound’ reading, there is the expectation from other musicians and the audience that the pianist-interpreter is widely read not only in musical texts, but is aware of the cultural cornerstones and texts of wider cultural movements. Yet, how exactly this broad spectrum of assimilated knowledge is meant to enrich a pianist’s interpretation is, for the most part, shrouded in mystery. Without seeking to simplify the relationships between Neuhaus’s appropriated knowledge and his vision of the morals governing the role of the interpreter, this thesis has offered a study of how Neuhaus’s spiritual and cultural ‘stature’ manifested itself in aspects of his distinct pianism. Rather than give prescriptive answers (the values of which are limited by trends and personal preferences), a study of Neuhaus’s pianism and aesthetics can bring something more valuable: In an age that has been accused of anonymity, Neuhaus shows a way in which interpretation is understood as a reflection of the individual’s ‘autopsychography’. Neuhaus empowers each interpreter to realize that, rather than fearing the task of becoming a mirror for a composer’s intentions which he discerns in a score, the score liberates the interpreter’s voice as it becomes the mirror for his ‘soul’.

---

<sup>5</sup> Lecture recital at the Royal Academy of Music, 2007 recorded by ‘The Masterclass Media Foundation’: *András Schiff. Late Piano Sonatas* (MMF 003).

## List of Names

This list of names clarifies some of the more unfamiliar names those specific to this research. Names of towns are given as they would have been recognized at the time in question hence Saint Petersburg, Petrograd and Leningrad refer to the same geographical location at different times. In this list, countries are defined by their borders at the time in question, therefore many towns are referred to here as being part of Imperial Russia.

**AIVAZOVSKY, Hovhannes (Ivan) [АЙВАЗОВСКИЙ, Иван Константинович]** (1817–1900). Born in the Black Sea port of Feodosia to an Armenian family, Hovhannes Aivazovsky became one of the most prominent Russian painters of his time. Based mainly in his native Crimea, Aivazovsky was famous for his seascapes.

**ALEXEEV, Alexander [АЛЕКСЕЕВ, Александр Дмитриевич]** (1913–1996). Musicologist Alexander Alexeev studied piano at the Moscow Conservatory with Alexander Goldenweiser, graduating from his class in 1938. As a postgraduate Alexeev studied history and theory of pianism with Grigory Kogan, graduating in 1941. Alexeev taught the history of the piano, piano method and theory of pianism at the Moscow Conservatory from 1943. In 1951 Alexeev became a professor of the Gnessin Institute.

**ALEXEEV, Dmitri [АЛЕКСЕЕВ, Дмитрий Константинович]** (b. 1947). Russian pianist Dmitri Alexeev was born in Moscow and studied at the Moscow Conservatory with Dmitri Bashkirov. Alexeev is Professor of Advanced Piano at the Royal College of Music in London.

**ALSCHWANG, Arnold [АЛЬШВАНГ, Арнольд Александрович]** (1898–1960). Musicologist and pianist Arnold Alschwang was born in Kiev. He studied at the Kiev Conservatory between 1911 and 1922: piano with Grigory Hodorovsky, who had studied with Liszt in Weimar, and later with Heinrich Neuhaus; and composition with Boleslav Yavorsky and Reinhold Glière. Alschwang went on to teach at the Kiev Conservatory and gave recitals. He moved to Moscow in 1924. Between 1930 and 1934 Alschwang lectured at the Moscow Conservatory. Alschwang's writings on Beethoven and Skryabin were particularly influential.

**ASAFYEV, Boris [АСАФЬЕВ, Борис Владимирович]** (1884–1949). Born in Saint Petersburg, Boris Asafyev became an important Soviet musicologist (writing under the pseudonym Igor Glebov from 1914) and composer. Asafyev had studied composition with Anatoly Lyadov at

the Saint Petersburg Conservatory. In 1917 Asafyev helped to establish the music department at the Petrograd Institute for History of the Arts, and became the department's director in 1920 as well as being a professor of theory, history and composition at the Leningrad Conservatory. From 1943 Asafyev was Director of Research at the Moscow Conservatory, and 1948 was made Chairman of the Union of Soviet Composers.

**AUER, Leopold** (1845–1930). Hungarian violinist, conductor and pedagogue, Leopold Auer was born in Veszprém in Austria-Hungary. His most important formative influence was that of Jakob Dont and later Joseph Joachim. Auer's concert success was noticed by Anton Rubinstein who at the time was looking for a violin professor for his newly established Conservatory in Saint Petersburg. Initially agreeing to a three year contract in 1868, Auer stayed for forty-nine years in this position. In Russia, Auer was an important driving force of the Russian Musical Society [*Русское музыкальное общество*]. In 1918 Auer moved to the USA. His most famous students included Mischa Elman, Jascha Heifetz, Nathan Milstein, Efrem Zimbalist and Oscar Shumsky.

**BACKHAUS, Wilhelm** (1884–1969). German pianist and pedagogue particularly noted for his interpretations of Beethoven, Wilhelm Backhaus was born in Leipzig. Backhaus studied at the Leipzig Conservatory with Alois Reckendorf and then privately with Eugen d'Albert. In 1905 Backhaus won the Anton Rubinstein competition and a concert career quickly followed. In 1930 Backhaus became a Swiss citizen.

**BALAKIREV, Mily** [**БАЛАКИРЕВ, Милий Алексеевич**] (1837–1910). Born in Nizhny Novgorod, Balakirev studied music with Alexander Dubuque and with Karl Eisrich. Balakirev was one of the key composers and pianists of the time although he had studied mathematics at the University of Kazan. Balakirev's influence in musical spheres grew, particularly in the creation of a Russian Nationalist Style, and he mentored César Cui and Modest Mussorgsky. In 1861 his circle of disciples was joined by Nikolay Rimsky-Korsakov and Alexander Borodin forming the group known as 'The Five'. In 1862 he joined the Free School of Music which had been opened in opposition to Anton Rubinstein's Saint Petersburg Conservatory.

**BARENBOIM, Lev** [**БАРЕНБОЙМ, Лев Аронович**] (1906–1985). Eminent Soviet musicologist and pianist, Lev Barenboim was born in Odessa but studied at the Moscow Conservatory with Felix Blumenfeld. In 1961 he became head of the departments of musical history, theory and musicology at the Leningrad Conservatory.

**BARTH, Karl Heinrich** (1847–1922). Born in Prussia (now Baltiysk, Russia) Karl Barth studied with the leading pianists of Liszt's circle: Hans von Bülow, Hans von Bronsart and Carl Tausig. Barth regularly performed with Joseph Joachim, and Joachim's wife, the singer Amalie Schneeweiss. His most influential teaching position was from 1910 as a professor at the Berlin *Hochschule für Musik*, where his students included Arthur Rubinstein, Wilhelm Kempff and Heinrich Neuhaus.

**BLUMENFELD, Felix** [БЛУМЕНФЕЛЬД, Феликс Михайлович] (1863–1931). Born near Kirovograd in Imperial Russia, Blumenfeld was one of the most influential and respected musicians of his time in Russia. Blumenfeld studied piano with Fyodor Stein and composition with Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov at the Saint Petersburg Conservatory. He was a composer, conductor, pianist and pedagogue in Kiev, the Petrograd Conservatory and the Moscow Conservatory. His most famous students included Vladimir Horowitz, Simon Barere, Maria Yudina and Maria Grinberg.

**CHALIAPIN, Fyodor** [ШАЛЯПИН, Федор Иванович] (1873–1938). Born in Kazan, Fyodor Chaliapin was largely self-taught but became one of the most influential opera singers of his time. He was known for his deep and expressive bass voice. Although he possessed a wide repertory, his signature role became that of Boris Godunov by Mussorgsky. His connections with Sergei Rachmaninov and Konstantin Stanislavsky had important consequences for musical life, artistic tastes and cultural expectations in Russia. After 1921 Chaliapin left Russia and became based mainly in Paris.

**CHISTYAKOV, Pavel** [ЧИСТЯКОВ, Павел Петрович] (1832–1919). Pavel Chistyakov was a Russian painter and one of the leading reformers of the pedagogical systems for art in Russia. Chistyakov called for greater professionalism in art and spoke against the 'academic' manner of painting. Chistyakov was central to the development of the Russian Realist style of the latter nineteenth century. His students included Viktor Vasnetsov, Mikhail Vrubel, Vasily Polenov, Ilya Repin, Valentin Serov and Vasily Surikov.

**CORTOT, Alfred** (1877–1962). Franco-Swiss pianist and conductor, Alfred Cortot is especially remembered for his interpretations of Chopin, Schumann and Debussy. Cortot studied at the Conservatoire de Paris with Émile Descombes, who considered himself Chopin's pupil. In 1919 Cortot founded the *École Normale de Musique de Paris*. Cortot was appointed Professor by Gabriel Fauré at the Conservatoire de Paris in 1907, replacing Raoul Pugno, where he

continued to teach until 1923. Cortot was widely recorded by the standards of the time and his tour to Soviet Russia in 1920 made an important impact there.

**DELSON, Viktor** [*ДЕЛЬСОН, Виктор Юльевич*] (1907–1970). Influential Soviet musicologist and pianist, Viktor Delson was born in Saint Petersburg. He studied with Vladimir Sofronitsky and Leonid Nikolaev in Leningrad. Delson graduated from the Moscow Conservatory where he had studied in the piano class of Lev Oborin and in the theory and history class of Grigory Kogan.

**ERMOLOVA, Maria** [*ЕРМОЛОВА, Мария Николаевна*] (1853–1928). Born and died in Moscow, Maria Ermolova was considered by Konstantin Stanislavsky to be the greatest actress he had ever known. Ermolova was the first person to be awarded the honour of 'People's Artist' [*Народная артистка*] in 1921.

**FEINBERG, Samuil** [*ФЕЙНБЕРГ, Самуил Евгениевич*] (1890–1962). Born in Odessa, the eminent pianist, composer and theorist Samuil Feinberg was raised in Moscow. He later studied with Alexander Goldenweiser at the Moscow Conservatory. Feinberg presented both books of Bach's *Preludes and Fugues* for his graduation recital and became known as a Bach-specialist. From 1922 Feinberg was a professor of the Moscow Conservatory. As well as his interpretations of Bach, Feinberg wrote many transcriptions, was one of the influential interpreters of Skryabin and Beethoven, and was a composer in his own right. Feinberg was also known for his intellect and was the author of many significant articles, and an important but unfinished book *Пианизм как искусство* [*Pianism as an Art*] published posthumously in 1965.

**FIELD, John** (1782–1837). Irish composer and pianist, John Field was born in Dublin and moved to London to study with Muzio Clementi. Visiting the Imperial Russian capital of Saint Petersburg, Field decided to stay and from 1804 became an important figure in musical life there. Field is best known for developing the 'nocturne', but also made a significant impact on the evolution of Russian pianism through his concerts and teaching.

**FICHTENHOLZ, Lidiya** [*ФИХТЕНГОЛЬЦ, Лидия Израилевна*] (b. 1924). Born in Odessa, Fichtenholz studied piano with Berta Reingbald before coming to Moscow to study with Heinrich Neuhaus between 1936 and 1946 at the Central Music School for Children, and then at the Moscow Conservatory.

**FLIER, Yakov** [**ФЛИЕР, Яков Владимирович**] (1912–1977). Born in Orekhovo-Zuevo, Yakov Flier underwent his pianistic training at the Moscow Conservatory with Konstantin Igumnov. He concertized widely from 1934 and was known particularly for the sensitive Romantic style of his pianism. Flier ceased playing in 1949 until 1959 due to problems with his hand. In the 1960s he made international tours to Europe, Japan and the USA. Flier started to teach as an assistant at the Moscow Conservatory in 1937, becoming a professor in 1945 until his death. Flier's most famous students included Mikhail Pletnev, Bella Davidovich and Rodion Schedrin.

**FOMINA, Natalia** [**ФОМИНА, Наталия Александровна**] (1930–2013). Natalia Fomina studied piano with Heinrich Neuhaus at the Moscow Conservatory between 1953 and 1960. She went on to teach at the Kazan Conservatory of Music.

**GILELS, Emil** [**ГИЛЕЛЬС, Эмиль Григорьевич**] (1916–1985). One of the most famous pianists of the twentieth century, Emil Gilels was born in Odessa. Marked by an early facility at the piano, his first prize at the All-Union Piano Competition in 1933 secured him the status of a symbol of 'Soviet Art' in the USSR. He studied at the Odessa Conservatory with Berta Reingbald and, from 1935 to 1937, at the Moscow Conservatory with Heinrich Neuhaus. Gilels was enormously successful as a pianist and was one of the first Soviet musicians to play in the USA after the Second World War. Gilels had a sporadic teaching position at the Moscow Conservatory but this was constantly interrupted by his concert tours.

**GINZBURG, Anton** [**ГИНЗБУРГ, Антон Гулиарович**] (1930–2002). Pianist Anton Ginzburg studied with Heinrich Neuhaus at the Moscow Conservatory in 1953. Ginzburg (sometimes performing under the pseudonym Anton Osetrov) was particularly known for his ensemble performances with cellist Daniil Shafran.

**GINZBURG, Grigory** [**ГИНЗБУРГ, Григорий Романович**] (1904–1961). Born in Nizhny-Novgorod, Grigory Ginzburg studied piano at the Moscow Conservatory with Alexander Goldenweiser. In 1927 Ginzburg was the fourth-prize winner at the International Chopin Competition in Warsaw. Ginzburg became a professor at the Moscow Conservatory in 1935 (after being an assistant from 1929). Ginzburg was particularly important for his role in the revival of Liszt's transcriptions in Russia.

**GLAZUNOV, Alexander** [**ГЛАЗУНОВ, Александр Константинович**] (1865–1936). Alexander Glazunov was not only an important composer who reconciled many of the different tendencies of the Nationalist composers, but was also a conductor and important pedagogue.

Glazunov was a professor of the Saint Petersburg Conservatory from 1899 and its director between 1905 and 1928. His most successful student was Dmitri Shostakovich. Glazunov settled in Paris in 1929 and said he did not return to Russia due to ill health.

**GLEBOV, Igor** [**ГЛЕБОВ, Игорь**] (1884–1949). See ASAFYEV, Boris

**GODOWSKY, Leopold** (1870–1938). Pianist, composer and pedagogue, Leopold Godowsky was born in Soshly near Vilnius in Imperial Russia. Briefly studying with Ernst Rudorff at the *Königlich Akademischen Hochschule* in Berlin he considered himself largely self-taught. Godowsky was one of the first pianists to talk about the idea of 'weight principle' which remains important to many pianists today. A protégé and friend of Camille Saint-Saëns, Godowsky widely concertized in Europe and America. Godowsky taught in America between 1890 and 1900 before returning to Berlin. In 1906 he took over Busoni's masterclasses at the Vienna Academy of Music. At the outbreak of World War I, Godowsky left Vienna for the USA. Godowsky's most significant pupils were Issay Dobrowen and Heinrich Neuhaus.

**GOLDENWEISER, Alexander** [**ГОЛЬДЕНВЕЙЗЕР, Александр Борисович**] (1875–1961). Alexander Goldenweiser was one of Russia's most important pedagogues and pianists as well as a composer and writer. Goldenweiser was born in Kishinev, Imperial Russia, and studied piano at the Moscow Conservatory with Alexander Siloti and Pavel Pabst. Additionally he studied composition with Mikhail Ippolitov-Ivanov, Anton Arensky and Sergei Taneyev. Goldenweiser was one of Lev Tolstoy's close acquaintances and often played for him and discussed musical aesthetics. Goldenweiser became a professor of the Moscow Conservatory from 1906 and held this position until his death in 1961. Between 1922 and 1924, and then 1939 and 1942, Goldenweiser was also the director of the Moscow Conservatory. Goldenweiser was involved in setting up the *Центральная средняя специальная школа при Московской консерватории им. П. И. Чайковского* [Central Music School], a music school for gifted children. Goldenweiser's most famous students included Samuil Feinberg, Rosa Tamarkina, Tatyana Nikolayeva, Grigory Ginzburg, Dmitri Kabalevsky, Dmitri Bashkirov, Lazar Berman and Nikolai Kapustin.

**GONCHAROVA, Natalia** [**ГОНЧАРОВА, Наталья Сергеевна**] (1881–1962). Born in Tula in Imperial Russia, Natalia Goncharova was a famous avant-garde painter and set designer. Goncharova studied at the Moscow School of Painting, Sculpture and Architecture. Goncharova was instrumental in founding various Russian artistic groups which tried to establish a Russian school of modern art which was independent of European influence.

Goncharova moved to Paris in 1921 where she worked for the *Ballets Russes* and became a French citizen in 1939.

**GORDON, Grigory** [ГОРДОН, Григорий Борисович] (b. 1936). Grigory Gordon is a Soviet pianist, pedagogue and musicologist. Gordon graduated from Heinrich Neuhaus's class at the Gnessin Institute in 1952. Gordon has been teaching at the Gnessin Institute since 1963.

**GORNOSTAEVA, Vera** [ГОРНОСТАЕВА, Вера Васильевна] (1929–2015). Pianist and pedagogue, Vera Gornostaeva studied with Heinrich Neuhaus at the Moscow Conservatory from which she graduated in 1955. Between 1955 and 1959 Gornostaeva taught at the Gnessin Institute and from 1959 at the Moscow Conservatory where she became a professor in 1966.

**GOULD, Glenn** (1932–1982). One of the most celebrated pianists of the twentieth century, Canadian-born Glenn Gould was particularly known for his interpretations of Bach and for his clear polyphonic articulation. Rejecting most of the Romantic piano literature by his adolescence, Gould had a wide repertoire from Sweelinck to Hindemith and Schoenberg. Gould stopped giving concerts at the age of thirty-one and became famous for his studio recordings. Gould was also an active broadcaster, writer, conductor and composer.

**GRINBERG, Maria** [ГРИНБЕРГ, Мария Израилевна] (1908–1978). Maria Grinberg initially studied piano in her hometown, Odessa, with David Aisberg. Grinberg continued her studies at the Moscow Conservatory with Felix Blumenfeld, and after his death, in the class of Konstantin Igumnov. After initial hardships, including the arrest and execution of her husband and father, she became a much sought-after pianist in the USSR. When she was later allowed to tour abroad, she undertook fourteen concert tours. Grinberg was the first Soviet pianist to make a complete recording of the Beethoven Sonatas released in 1970. She was only made a professor of the Gnessin Institute in 1969.

**GROSSMAN, Emanuel** [ГРОССМАН, Эмануил Иосифович] (1913–1954). Born in Moscow, Emanuel Grossman was a Russian pianist and laureate of the 1932 International Chopin Competition in Warsaw. Grossman studied with Heinrich Neuhaus at the Moscow Conservatory, graduating in 1935. Between 1931 and 1953 Grossman taught at the Moscow Conservatory and between 1943 and 1951 at the Gnessin Institute.



**GUTMAN, Teodor** [*ГУТМАН, Теодор Давидович*] (1905–1995). Teodor Gutman was born into a musical family in Kiev, Imperial Russia. After initially studying piano at the Kiev Conservatory with Josef Turchinsky, he continued his studies in the class of Heinrich Neuhaus. After teaching at the Kiev Conservatory between 1924 and 1926, Gutman spent another five years studying with Heinrich Neuhaus at the Moscow Conservatory where he became Neuhaus's assistant. Gutman had a successful recital career and was a laureate of the International Chopin Competition in Warsaw in 1932. Gutman taught at the Moscow Conservatory between 1930 and 1943. In 1944 he became a professor at the Gnessin Institute and from this point concentrated heavily on his pedagogical work, almost ceasing to concertize.

**HENSELT, Adolf** (1814–1889). The German pianist, composer and pedagogue Adolf Henselt was born in Schwabach, Bavaria. His studies with Nepomuk Hummel prepared him for a successful pianistic career. In 1838 Henselt emigrated to Russia, and its Imperial capital, Saint Petersburg, became his home until his death. Henselt is considered to have created the main developments in Russian pianism after John Field. His velvet sound and legato were the hallmarks of his style.

**HENTOVA, Sofia** [*ХЕНТОВА, Софья Михайловна*] (1922–2002). Born in Vitebsk in Soviet Russia, Sofia Hentova studied piano at the Leningrad Conservatory graduating in 1949. Hentova went on to teach piano at the Leningrad Conservatory from 1954. Hentova is best known as a musicologist who wrote around forty books, mainly on pianists, and for her series on Shostakovich.

**HLUDOVA, Tatyana** [*ХЛУДОВА, Татьяна Алексеевна*] (1915–1957). Tatyana Hludova was a Soviet pianist, organist and pedagogue. She studied with Heinrich Neuhaus at the Moscow Conservatory, graduating in 1941. Hludova went on to become Neuhaus's assistant from 1947 but died of cancer only ten years later. Hludova's documentation of Neuhaus's lessons, the basis of her doctoral thesis (Moscow, 1954), was highly valued by Neuhaus.

**HOFMANN, Josef** (1876–1957). Pianist and pedagogue, Josef Hofmann was born in Podgórze in Austria-Hungary near Krakow. Hofmann was a child prodigy and was famously Anton Rubinstein's only private pupil. Hofmann became one of the most celebrated pianists of his time. Hofmann also composed, publishing under the pseudonym Michel Dvorsky. In 1926 Hofmann became an American citizen and the first head of piano at the Curtis Institute of

Music, Philadelphia, becoming the Institute's director between 1927 and 1938. Hofmann was also an inventor and helped to make improvements to the Steinway piano action in America.

**HOROWITZ, Vladimir [ГОРОВИЦ, Владимир Самуилович]** (1903–1989). Vladimir Horowitz was born in Kiev in Imperial Russia. Horowitz studied at the Kiev Conservatory with Sergei Tarnowsky and later Felix Blumenfeld. In Kiev Horowitz sought out Heinrich Neuhaus as a mentor. Horowitz quickly became one of the most successful pianists in Russia, but in 1925 with the apparent intention to study with Artur Schnabel, left Russia. Horowitz settled in the USA becoming arguably the most successful pianist of the twentieth century through his recitals and records.

**IGUMNOV, Konstantin [ИГУМНОВ, Константин Николаевич]** (1873–1948). Konstantin Igumnov was one of Russia's most important pedagogues, working alongside Goldenweiser and Neuhaus at the Moscow Conservatory. Born in Lebedyan, near Tambov, in Imperial Russia he showed his musical talent from an early age. Igumnov studied piano privately with Nikolai Zverev in Moscow from 1887 alongside Sergei Rachmaninov and Alexander Skryabin. In 1888 Igumnov studied at the Moscow Conservatory with Alexander Siloti and later with Pavel Pabst. Igumnov studied composition with Sergei Taneyev. Upon graduating from the Conservatory in 1894 Igumnov became an acclaimed pianist and sought-after pedagogue. In 1899 Igumnov became a professor at the Moscow Conservatory, and between 1924 and 1927 was its director. Igumnov's most famous students included Lev Oborin, Maria Grinberg, Yakov Flier, Bella Davidovich, Yakov Milstein and Rosa Tamarkina.

**JUON, Pavel [ЮОН, Павел Федорович]** (1872–1940). Pavel Juon was born in Moscow into a Swiss-German family. Juon studied composition at the Moscow Conservatory with Anton Arensky and Sergei Taneyev, and violin with Ivan Grzimali. Juon pursued further studies in composition in Berlin. In 1906 Juon replaced Joseph Joachim as the professor of composition at the *Hochschule für Musik* in Berlin (*Königlichen Akademischen Hochschule für Musik*). Following the October Revolution in 1917, Juon emigrated to Switzerland.

**KABALEVSKY, Dmitri [КАБАЛЕВСКИЙ, Дмитрий Борисович]** (1904–1987). Composer, Dmitri Kabalevsky was born in Saint Petersburg. He studied, against his father's wishes, at the Moscow Conservatory in the piano class of Alexander Goldenweiser, and composition with Nikolai Myaskovsky. Kabalevsky became a professor at the Moscow Conservatory in 1932. In the same year Kabalevsky helped to create the Moscow branch of the Union of Soviet Composers. Kabalevsky wrote in many genres and is particularly remembered today for his

pedagogical pieces for children. His work is considered to be faithful to the ideas of Socialist Realism.

**KELDISH, Yuri** [**КЕЛДЫШ, Юрий Всеволодович**] (1907–1995). Important Soviet musicologist, Yuri Keldish was born in Saint Petersburg. He studied theory of composition at the Moscow Conservatory with Ivanov-Boretsky, a pupil of Rimsky-Korsakov, graduating in 1930. Between 1926 and 1932, Keldish was a member of the RAPM (Russian Association of Proletarian Musicians) [*Российская Ассоциация Пролетарских Музыкантов, РАПМ*]. After the disbanding of RAPM, Keldish became a member of the Union of Soviet Composers. From 1930 Keldish taught at the Moscow Conservatory, becoming a professor of the history of Russian music in 1957. At the same time, Keldish taught music history at the Leningrad Conservatory. Between 1957 and 1961 he was the chief editor of the journal *Советская музыка* [*Soviet Music*].

**KLINDWORTH, Karl** (1830–1916). Karl Klindworth was a German pianist, composer, violinist and music publisher. Klindworth was a pupil of Liszt from 1852 in Weimar and became one of his closest friends and disciples. In 1868 Klindworth accepted Nikolai Rubinstein's invitation to teach piano at the Moscow Conservatory. While in Russia, Klindworth made influential editions of Beethoven's sonatas and Chopin's works. In 1882 Klindworth returned to Germany.

**KNUSHEVITSKY, Sviatoslav** [**КНУШЕВИЦКИЙ, Святослав Николаевич**] (1808–1963). The Russian cellist Sviatoslav Knushevitsky was born in Petrovsk in Imperial Russia and studied at the Moscow Conservatory with Semyon Kozolupov. Knushevitsky's partnership with David Oistrakh and Lev Oborin as a piano trio was well-known. Knushevitsky also played as part of the famous 'Beethoven Quartet'. He taught at the Moscow Conservatory from 1941, becoming a professor in 1950.

**KOGAN, Grigory** [**КОГАН, Григорий Михайлович**] (1901–1979). Influential pianist, musicologist and pedagogue, Grigory Kogan was born in Mogilev in Imperial Russia. In 1920 Kogan graduated from the Kiev Conservatory in the piano class of Puhalsky, and compositional class of Gliere. Kogan went on to teach history and theory of pianism at the Kiev Conservatory, and became a professor in 1922 to 1926. In 1926 Kogan started to teach at the Moscow Conservatory. There, he quickly became a professor and later was made the head of the academic department in 1932 until 1943. Between 1932 and 1968 he toured different conservatories in the USSR with his famous series of lectures on pianism.

**KRAINEV, Vladimir** [**КРАЙНЕВ, Владимир Всеволодович**] (1944–2011). Pianist and pedagogue, Vladimir Krainev was born in Krasnoyarsk in Russia. After studying at the Central Music School in Moscow Krainev studied at the Moscow Conservatory with Heinrich Neuhaus, graduating in 1967 and undertaking postgraduate studies there until 1969. Krainev became a professor of the Moscow Conservatory in 1987. Krainev also became a professor at the *Hochschule für Musik und Theater* in Hannover in Germany.

**KRAMSKOY, Ivan** [**КРАМСКОЙ, Иван Николаевич**] (1837–1887). Ivan Kramskoy was one of the leading painters and intellectuals in Russia of his time. Born in Ostrogozhsk in Imperial Russia, he studied at the Saint Petersburg Academy of Arts. Kramskoy was disillusioned with the 'academic' art which he saw at the Academy and led a group, the 'Revolt of the Fourteen', which caused his expulsion. Kramskoy spoke of the moral substance of art and the need for a psychological Realism, and founded the group known as the Peredvizhniki.

**KREIN, Alexander** [**КРЕЙН, Александр Абрамович**] (1883–1951). Alexander Krein was a composer, born in Nizhny-Novgorod in Imperial Russia, who studied composition at the Moscow Conservatory with Sergei Taneyev, Leonid Nikolaev and Boleslav Yavorsky. In the Soviet Union, Krein held several official musical administrative positions. He died in Staraya Ruza.

**KREMENSTEIN, Berta** [**КРЕМЕНШТЕЙН, Берта Львовна**] (1923–2008). Pianist, pedagogue and musicologist, Berta Kremenstein studied with Heinrich Neuhaus at the Gnessin Institute, graduating in 1950. Prior to this she had studied at the Kiev Conservatory. Kremenstein later taught at the Gnessin Institute.

**KREMLEV, Yuli** [**КРЕМЛЕВ, Юлий Анатольевич**] (1908–1971). Musicologist and pianist, Yuli Kremlev was born in Yessentuki in Imperial Russia. Kremlev studied at the Leningrad Conservatory in the piano class of Maria Yudina, and history and theory with Boris Asafyev. Kremlev went on to teach at the Leningrad Conservatory.

**KUINDZHI, Arkhip** [**КУИНДЖИ, Архип Иванович**] (1842–1910). One of the most famous Russian landscape painters, Arkhip Kuindzhi was born in Mariupol in Imperial Russia. Kuindzhi studied at the Saint Petersburg Academy of Arts. He became a member of the Peredvizhniki and was particularly influenced by Aivazovsky. Kuindzhi taught at the Saint Petersburg Academy of Arts but lost his professorship for supporting student protests.

**LENZ, Wilhelm von** (1809–1883). Wilhelm von Lenz was an important pianist and writer. Born in Riga, von Lenz spent most of his life in Russia and died in Saint Petersburg, but by all accounts he spoke Russian so poorly that he wrote mainly in French and German. He was well acquainted with Liszt, Berlioz and Chopin. He is best known for his biography of Beethoven and for his recollections on Chopin. Von Lenz studied in Russia but was also a piano student of Ignaz Moscheles in Germany. He was a particularly close associate of Henselt and Serov.

**LESCHETIZKY, Theodor** (1830–1915). Theodor Leschetizky was a Polish pianist, pedagogue and composer. Born in Łańcut, Leschetizky was a child prodigy and studied with Czerny. By the invitation of Anton Rubinstein, Leschetizky taught in Saint Petersburg in 1852. He remained in Saint Petersburg until 1877 and was instrumental in founding the Saint Petersburg Conservatory with Rubinstein. In Russia he married one of his most famous pupils, Anna Esipova. In 1878 Leschetizky returned to Vienna to create one of the most famous private piano studios of Europe. His students included Ignaz Friedman, Ignacy Jan Paderewski, Artur Schnabel, Mark Hambourg, Alexander Brailowsky, Benno Moiseiwitsch, Paul Wittgenstein, Ossip Gabrilowitsch, Elly Ney and Mieczysław Horszowski.

**LEVIT, Leonid** [*ЛЕВИТ, Леонид Александрович*] (b. 1925). Photographer, Leonid Levit was born in Moscow. Levit made famous portrait photographs of Heinrich Neuhaus, Sviatoslav Richter, Dmitri Shostakovich and many other Soviet artists.

**LEVITAN, Isaak** [*ЛЕВИТАН, Исаак Ильич*] (1860–1900). Russian landscape painter, Isaak Levitan was born in Kibarti in Imperial Russia. Levitan was known for being able to capture the 'mood' of a landscape. Levitan had studied at the Moscow School of Painting, Sculpture and Architecture. His work received great acclaim and he became part of the Peredvizhniki movement. He was also a lifelong friend of the writer Anton Chekhov.

**LHÉVINNE, Josef** [*ЛЕВИН, Иосиф Аркадьевич*] (1874–1944). Pianist and pedagogue, Josef Lhévinne was born in Oryol in Imperial Russia. Lhévinne studied at the Moscow Conservatory with Vasily Safonov, making his debut as the soloist at the age of fourteen in Beethoven's Emperor Concerto conducted by Anton Rubinstein. Lhévinne moved to Berlin in 1907, and then to the USA in 1919 where he taught at the Juilliard School. Lhévinne was considered to have a supreme technical facility admired by pianists such as Vladimir Horowitz.

**LUBIMOV, Alexei** [*ЛЮБИМОВ, Алексей Борисович*] (b. 1944). Alexei Lubimov is a Russian pianist, organist and harpsichordist. Lubimov studied at the Central Music School, and then at

the Moscow Conservatory between 1963 and 1968 with Heinrich Neuhaus and Lev Naumov. Lubimov's development was also influenced by Maria Yudina. Lubimov taught chamber music at the Moscow Conservatory between 1968 and 1975, and between 1997 and 2010 was head of the Historical Music department. From 1998 he has taught piano at the Mozarteum in Salzburg.

**LUNACHARSKY, Anatoly [ЛУНАЧАРСКИЙ, Анатолий Васильевич]** (1875–1933). Anatoly Lunacharsky was the first Soviet People's Commissar of Education (*первый нарком просвещения РСФСР*) in charge of education and culture. Lunacharsky was born in Poltava in Imperial Russia but studied at the Zurich University. Lunacharsky held the Narkompros position given to him after the October Revolution in 1917 until 1929 and worked to improve culture and literacy in the Soviet Union. Proficient in eight languages, Lunacharsky had an interest in philosophy, being fond of Nietzsche, and corresponded with H. G. Wells, Bernard Shaw and Romain Rolland. Lunacharsky lost his important positions in power with the rise of Stalin. Appointed the Soviet Ambassador to Spain in 1933, Lunacharsky died in Menton on his way there.

**LUPU, Radu** (b. 1945). Romanian pianist, Radu Lupu was born in Galați. Lupu studied at the Bucharest Conservatory with Florica Musicescu and then at the Moscow Conservatory with Galina Eghyazarova, and for a time, with Stanislav Neuhaus.

**LYADOV, Anatoly [ЛЯДОВ, Анатолий Константинович]** (1855–1914). Russian composer and pedagogue, Anatoly Lyadov was born in Saint Petersburg into a family of eminent musicians. From 1878 Lyadov taught at the Saint Petersburg Conservatory. His most famous pupils included Sergei Prokofiev, Nikolai Myaskovsky, Mikhail Gnessin and Boris Asafyev. Lyadov is mainly known for his miniatures, particularly based on Russian subjects, given that his devastating self-criticism made it difficult for him to commit to longer works.

**MALEVICH, Kazimir [МАЛЕВИЧ, Казимир Северинович]** (1879–1935). Russian abstract painter and theorist, Kazimir Malevich was born near Kiev in Imperial Russia. Malevich studied at the Moscow School of Painting, Sculpture and Architecture between 1904 and 1910. He joined Natalia Goncharova's circles. Around 1913 Malevich founded the artistic movement Suprematism, made famous by his *Black Square* (1915).

**MALININ, Yevgeny [МАЛИНИН, Евгений Васильевич]** (1930–2001). Russian pianist, Yevgeny Malinin studied with Heinrich Neuhaus at the Moscow Conservatory, graduating in 1954.

Malinin became an assistant of Neuhaus as well as embarking on a recital career. Malinin taught at the Moscow Conservatory from 1958. In the 1990s Malinin relocated to Germany.

**MARTIENSSEN, Carl Adolf** (1881–1955). German pianist, pedagogue and musicologist, Carl Martienssen studied piano with Karl Klindworth (Liszt's pupil) in Berlin, and later with another Liszt-pupil, Alfred Reisenauer, at the Leipzig Conservatory. Martienssen taught piano at the Leipzig Conservatory from 1914, becoming a professor in 1932. Between 1946 and 1950 he taught at the *Musikhochschule* Rostock, and from 1950 at the State Conservatory of East Berlin (now 'Hans Eisler'). Martienssen was famous predominantly as an editor, and for his three works: *Die individuelle Klaviertechnik auf der Grundlage des schöpferischen Klangwillens* (1930), *Methodik des individuellen Klavierunterrichts* (1937) and *Schöpferischer Klavierunterricht* (1954).

**MEDTNER, Nikolai** [**МЕДТЕР, Николай Карлович**] (1879–1951). Russian pianist and composer, Nikolai Medtner was born in Moscow. Medtner studied at the Moscow Conservatory with Vasily Safonov, Pavel Pabst and Sergei Taneyev. With the support of Taneyev, Medtner decided to give up performing in favour of composition. Medtner's compositions were well received but considered somewhat conservative. Medtner left Russia in 1936 and settled in London.

**MENDELEYEV, Dmitri** [**МЕНДЕЛЕЕВ, Дмитрий Иванович**] (1834–1907). Russian chemist and inventor who formulated the Periodic Law and created the periodic table of elements.

**MICKIEWICZ, Adam** (1798–1855). Born in Imperial Russia, Adam Mickiewicz is regarded as the national poet of Poland, Lithuania and Belarus. He is most famous for his epic poems *Pan Tadeusz*, *Konrad Wallenrod* and *Grażyna*. Mickiewicz's *Crimean Sonnets* are considered to be some of the finest examples of Polish lyric poetry.

**MILMAN, Mark** [**МИЛЬМАН, Марк Владимирович**] (1910–1995). Born in Moscow, Mark Milman was a Soviet composer. Milman studied with Heinrich Neuhaus at the Moscow Conservatory, graduating in 1935. He undertook postgraduate studies until 1937. Milman taught at the Moscow Conservatory between 1935 and 1942, and then from 1943. He became a professor in 1964.

**MILSTEIN, Yakov** [**МИЛЬШТЕЙН, Яков Исаакович**] (1911–1981). Yakov Milstein was a pianist, pedagogue and musicologist. Milstein was born in Voronezh, Imperial Russia, and his

mother was a distant relative of Anton and Nikolai Rubinstein. Milstein came to the Moscow Conservatory to study with Sergei Kozlovsky in 1925, and from 1929 to 1932 studied with Konstantin Igumnov. Milstein seemed destined to make a career as a virtuoso pianist but this was cut short by problems with his hands. In 1935 Milstein became an assistant of Konstantin Igumnov until 1948. After the death of Igumnov, Milstein continued to teach and also write extensively becoming an important authority on Liszt.

**MYASKOVSKY, Nikolai** [*МЯСКОВСКИЙ, Николай Яковлевич*] (1881–1950). The composer Nikolai Myaskovsky was born in Novogeorgiyevsk near Warsaw, Congress Poland in Imperial Russia. Myaskovsky was brought up in Saint Petersburg. In 1906 he entered the Saint Petersburg Conservatory and studied composition with Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov and Anatoly Lyadov. In Lyadov's class, Myaskovsky befriended Sergei Prokofiev. Myaskovsky became one of the leading composers in the USSR and was known as the 'Father of the Soviet Symphony'. Myaskovsky taught at the Petrograd and then Moscow Conservatories. Myaskovsky's students included Aram Khachaturian, Dmitri Kabalevsky, Vissarion Shebalin, German Galynin and Rodion Schedrin.

**NASEDKIN, Alexei** [*НАСЕДКИН, Алексей Аркадьевич*] (b. 1942). Pianist and pedagogue Alexei Nasedkin was born in Moscow. Nasedkin studied with Heinrich Neuhaus at the Moscow Conservatory in 1961, and after Neuhaus's death continued with his studies with Lev Naumov until 1966. Nasedkin started teaching piano at the Moscow Conservatory in 1966 and became a professor in 1982.

**NAUMOV, Lev** [*НАУМОВ, Лев Николаевич*] (1925–2005). Mainly remembered as an important pedagogue, Lev Naumov was also a pianist and composer. Born in Rostov in Russia, Naumov studied at the Moscow Conservatory, graduating in 1950 from the composition class of Shebalin and Alexandrov, and in 1951 from Heinrich Neuhaus's piano class. Between 1950 and 1953 Naumov underwent further composition studies at the Conservatory. Naumov started to teach at the Gnessin Institute in 1953 to 1955, and between 1955 and 1957 was an assistant of Lev Mazel's musical analysis class. In 1956 Naumov became Heinrich Neuhaus's chief assistant. From 1963 to 2005 Naumov held his own class at the Moscow Conservatory, becoming a professor in 1972.

**NESTEROV, Mikhail** [*НЕСТЕРОВ, Михаил Васильевич*] (1862–1942). Born in Ufa in Imperial Russia, Mikhail Nesterov was one of the most important artists of his time. Nesterov studied at the Moscow School of Painting, Sculpture and Architecture. He later studied in Saint



Petersburg with Pavel Chistyakov and became a member of the Peredvizhniki circle. Nesterov became a representative of religious symbolism in Russian art.

**NEUHAUS, Gustav** [*НЕЙГАУЗ, Густав Вильгельмович*] (1847–1938). Born in Kalkar in Germany, Gustav Neuhaus was a piano pedagogue and inventor. Gustav Neuhaus studied at the Cologne Conservatory with Ernst Rudorff. He moved to Russia as a piano teacher. In 1899 he set up a music school in Elisavetgrad with his wife, Olga Blumenfeld. Gustav Neuhaus was the father of Heinrich Neuhaus.

**NEUHAUS, Olga** [*НЕЙГАУЗ, Ольга Михайловна*] (1859–1937). Sister of Felix Blumenfeld, Olga (née Blumenfeld) was the wife of Gustav Neuhaus and mother of Heinrich Neuhaus.

**NEUHAUS, Stanislav** [*НЕЙГАУЗ, Станислав Генрихович*] (1927–1980). Stanislav Neuhaus was born in Moscow and was the son of Heinrich and Zinaida Neuhaus. Stanislav Neuhaus was brought up by his mother and Boris Pasternak. Stanislav Neuhaus studied at the Gnessin Music School and went on to study with his father at the Moscow Conservatory, graduating in 1950. He completed his postgraduate studies in 1953. Stanislav Neuhaus is often said to be the most faithful inheritor of Heinrich Neuhaus's pianism and often played with his father as a piano duo. He went on to combine a successful recital career with teaching at the Moscow Conservatory, first as his father's assistant, and later with his own class, becoming a professor in 1975.

**NIKOLAEV, Leonid** [*НИКОЛАЕВ, Леонид Владимирович*] (1878–1942). Pianist and pedagogue, Leonid Nikolaev was born in Kiev in Imperial Russia. In 1897 he began his piano studies at the Moscow Conservatory with Vasily Safonov and later composition with Sergei Taneyev and Mikhail Ippolitov-Ivanov. From 1909 Nikolaev started to teach at the Saint Petersburg Conservatory where his students included Vladimir Sofronitsky, Dmitri Shostakovich, Maria Yudina, Alexander Krein, Pavel Serebryakov and Natan Perlman.

**NIKONOVICH, Igor** [*НИКОНОВИЧ, Игорь Владимирович*] (1935–2012). Russian pianist and pedagogue, Igor Nikonovich graduated from the Moscow Conservatory in the class of Heinrich Neuhaus in 1958. His work at the Skryabin Museum put him in close contact with Vladimir Sofronitsky in the late 1950s. From 1962 Nikonovich taught at the Gnessin Institute.

**OBORIN, Lev** [*ОБОРИН, Лев Николаевич*] (1907–1974). Pianist and pedagogue Lev Oborin was born in Moscow. In 1921 he completed studies with Elena Gnessina, a pupil of Busoni, at

the Gnessin Institute. Oborin went on to study piano at the Moscow Conservatory with Konstantin Igumnov as well as composition with Nikolai Myakovsky and Grigory Katuar. In 1927 Oborin rose to fame by winning the first International Chopin Competition in Warsaw. Oborin went on to teach at the Moscow Conservatory becoming a professor in 1935. Oborin continued his pianistic career alongside his teaching until his death.

**OGINSKI, Michał** (1765–1833). Polish composer, diplomat and politician, Michał Kleofas Ogiński is best known for his polonaise *Pożegnanie Ojczyzny* (*Farewell to the Homeland*). His Polonaises influenced a generation of musicians including Maria Szymanowska.

**PAPERNO, Dmitri** [**ПАПЕРНО, Дмитрий Александрович**] (b. 1929). Born in Kiev, pianist and pedagogue Dmitri Paperno studied with Alexander Goldenweiser at the Moscow Conservatory, graduating in 1951. Paperno also studied extensively with Maria Grinberg. From 1967 Paperno taught at the Gnessin Institute. Paperno emigrated to the USA in 1976 and teaches piano at the DePaul University in Chicago.

**PASTERNAK, Boris** [**ПАСТЕРНАК, Борис Леонидович**] (1890–1960). Russian poet, novelist and translator, Boris Pasternak was born in Moscow into an artistic family and initially studied piano at the Moscow Conservatory in the hope of becoming a professional pianist. Famous in the West for his novel *Doctor Zhivago* [*Доктор Живаго*], Pasternak's poetry served as a role model for many younger Russian poets. Pasternak was close, lifelong friends with Heinrich Neuhaus.

**PASTERNAK, Zinaida** [**ПАСТЕРНАК, Зинаида Николаевна**] (1897–1966). Zinaida Pasternak (née Eremeeva-Giotti [*Еремеева-Джотти*]) studied at the Kiev Conservatory with Heinrich Neuhaus, and was his wife between 1918 and 1930. In 1932 Zinaida married Boris Pasternak. She was the mother of Adrian Neuhaus, Stanislav Neuhaus and Leonid Pasternak.

**PETRI, Egon** (1881–1962). Dutch pianist, Egon Petri was born in Hanover and brought up in Dresden. Petri studied with Busoni and considered himself more a disciple than a student. In 1923 Petri became the first non-Soviet soloist to perform in the Soviet Union. Petri left for the USA in 1939 and became an American citizen in 1955. Petri's most famous students include Earl Wild and John Ogdon.

**RABINOVICH, David** [**РАБИНОВИЧ, Давид Абрамович**] (1900–1978). Eminent Soviet musicologist and pianist, David Rabinovich was born in Kharkov in Imperial Russia. Rabinovich

studied at the Petrograd Conservatory with Leonid Nikolaev and in 1930 graduated from the Moscow Conservatory in the class of Konstantin Igumnov.

**RAZUMOVSKAYA, Vera** [**РАЗУМОВСКАЯ, Вера Харитоновна**] (1904–1967). Pianist and pedagogue Vera Razumovskaya was born in Kiev in Imperial Russia. Razumovskaya studied at Gustav Neuhaus's music school in Elisavetgrad. She went on to study with Heinrich Neuhaus at the Kiev Conservatory. Between 1922 and 1924 Razumovskaya taught at the Kiev Conservatory later moving to the Leningrad Conservatory to continue her studies with Leonid Nikolaev, graduating in 1931. In 1933 Razumovskaya started to teach at the Leningrad Conservatory and became a professor in 1946 – a post she held until her death.

**REINGBALD, Berta** [**РЕЙНГБАЛЬД, Берта Михайловна**] (1897–1944). Berta Reingbald was one of the most significant pedagogues based at the Odessa Conservatory. She taught Emil Gilels, Berta Marants, Lidiya Fichtenholz, Tatiana Goldfarb – who all then went on to study with Heinrich Neuhaus – and also Maria Grinberg.

**REPIN, Ilya** [**РЕПИН, Илья Ефимович**] (1844–1930). Born in Chuguev in Imperial Russia, Ilya Repin was noticed by Ivan Kramskoy and Vladimir Stasov who helped him to get his work exhibited. Repin, known for the way he captured human emotions, was respected by Lev Tolstoy and associated with members of the Peredvizhniki movement, particularly Arkhip Kunidzhi, Valentin Serov and Mikhail Vrubel.

**RICHTER, Elena** [**РИХТЕР, Елена Рудольфовна**] (b. 1938). Pianist and pedagogue Elena Richter was born into a family of musicians in Moscow. In 1961 Richter graduated from Heinrich Neuhaus's piano class at the Moscow Conservatory, and between 1964 and 1967 continued postgraduate studies with Stanislav Neuhaus, becoming his assistant. Later Richter was an assistant to Vera Gornostaeva and Yevgeny Malinin. Richter became a professor of the Moscow Conservatory in 1999.

**RICHTER, Sviatoslav** [**РИХТЕР, Святослав Теофилович**] (1915–1997). Sviatoslav Richter was one of the most famous pianists of the twentieth century. Richter was born near Zhytomyr in Imperial Russia. His father was a German pianist, organist and composer. Richter was brought up in Odessa and claimed he was self-taught. As an adolescent, Richter taught at the Odessa Conservatory and accompanied rehearsals at the Odessa Opera. Richter came to Moscow, joining Heinrich Neuhaus's class at the Moscow Conservatory, in 1937 where he quickly rose to fame and remained a close friend of his professor.

**ROLLAND, Romain** (1866–1944). Romain Rolland was a French historian and writer, awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1915. His work on Beethoven was a central work to Russian and early Soviet concepts of the composer.

**ROSENTHAL, Moritz** (1862–1947). Moritz Rosenthal was a pupil of Karol Mikuli (Chopin's pupil) at the Lvov Conservatory, and then Rafael Joseffy, before studying with Ferenc Liszt in Weimar and Rome. Rosenthal was important in Russian musical circles. He moved to New York in 1939 where he set up his own music school.

**RUBINSTEIN, Anton** [*РУБИНШТЕЙН, Антон Григорьевич*] (1829–1894). Anton Rubinstein was considered the only pianist to rival Ferenc Liszt. Born in Vkhvatinetz in the Podolsk district of Imperial Russia, Rubinstein was a child prodigy and studied with Alexander Villoing in Moscow. Rubinstein hoped to become Liszt's student but Liszt did not allow it. Rubinstein returned to Russia and established himself as Russia's most formidable virtuoso pianists as well as being an active conductor and composer. He went on to found the *Русское музыкальное общество* [Russian Musical Society] in 1859 and the first Russian conservatory in the Imperial capital Saint Petersburg in 1862. Anton Rubinstein reformed musical education in Russia but did not take private piano students – the most notable exception being Josef Hofmann. Famously, Rubinstein taught composition to Piotr Tchaikovsky.

**RUBINSTEIN, Nikolai** [*РУБИНШТЕЙН, Николай Григорьевич*] (1835–1881). Nikolai Rubinstein was the younger brother of Anton Rubinstein. Also studying with Alexander Villoing, Nikolai Rubinstein was also a child prodigy but known more for his sensitivity, restrained manner and clarity unlike the bravura of his elder brother. Nikolai Rubinstein co-founded the *Русское музыкальное общество* [Russian Musical Society] with his brother in 1859 and set up the Moscow Conservatory in 1866. Nikolai Rubinstein's most famous students included Emil von Sauer, Alexander Siloti and Sergei Taneyev.

**SAFONOV, Vasily** [*САФОНОВ, Василий Ильич*] (1852–1918). Russian pianist, conductor and pedagogue, Vasily Safonov was brought up in Saint Petersburg where he studied privately with Theodor Leschetizky. Later Safonov studied at the Saint Petersburg Conservatory with Louis Brassin. Safonov quickly made a name for himself as a soloist, and also in ensemble with Leopold Auer and Karl Davidov. From 1885 Safonov taught at the Saint Petersburg Conservatory, and following the invitation of Piotr Tchaikovsky, at the Moscow Conservatory, becoming its director in 1889. Safonov's most famous students included Alexander Skryabin,

Nikolai Medtner, Josef and Rosina Lhévinne. He also published a book on pianism, *Новая формула* [*New Formula*] (1916).

**SAVSHINSKY, Samarii** [**САВШИНСКИЙ, Самарий Ильич**] (1891–1968). Samarii Savshinsky was a pianist and pedagogue. Born in Saint Petersburg, Savshinsky studied at the Petrograd Conservatory with Leonid Nikolaev. Savshinsky taught at the Leningrad Conservatory where his students included Lazar Berman and Vitaly Margulis. Savshinsky's books on pianism were important studies, including *Пианист и его работа* [*The Pianist and his Work*] (1961), *Режим и гигиена пианиста* [*Routine and Hygiene for a Pianist*] (1963), *Работа пианиста над музыкальным произведением* [*Working on a Musical Work*] (1964) and *Работа пианиста над техникой* [*The Work of a Pianist on Technique*] (1968).

**SCHNABEL, Artur** (1882–1951). Artur Schnabel studied piano with Anna Esipova and then Theodor Leschetizky in Vienna. He also studied composition with Eusebius Mandyczewski, an assistant of Johannes Brahms. Schnabel made the first complete recording of Beethoven's Piano Sonatas in 1935 and was also particularly known for his interpretations of Mozart and Schubert.

**SCHWEITZER, Albert** (1875–1965). German theologian, organist, philosopher and medical missionary, Albert Schweitzer received the 1952 Nobel Peace Prize for his philosophy of 'Reverence for Life' [*Ehrfurcht vor dem Leben*].

**SEREBRYAKOV, Pavel** [**СЕРЕБРЯКОВ, Павел Алексеевич**] (1909–1977). Pianist and pedagogue Pavel Serebryakov was born in Tsaritsyn (now Volgograd) in Imperial Russia. He studied piano with Leonid Nikolaev at the Leningrad Conservatory, graduating in 1930 and taking postgraduate studies until 1932. He taught at the Leningrad Conservatory from 1932, also being its rector between 1938 and 1951, and 1961 and 1977.

**SEROV, Alexander** [**СЕРОВ, Александр Николаевич**] (1820–1871). An important Russian composer and music critic, Alexander Serov was the father of the painter Valentin Serov. Serov was born in Saint Petersburg and in his lifetime made a greater impression as a composer than writer. Today however, his writings are a cultural barometer of his time. Serov was a strong advocate for the music of Mozart, Glinka and Beethoven and he knew, and corresponded with, both Liszt and Wagner.

**SEROV, Valentin** [*СЕРОВ, Валентин Александрович*] (1865–1911). Valentin Serov was a Russian painter who became one of the most important portraitists of his time. Serov was born in Saint Petersburg and studied with Ilya Repin and Pavel Chistyakov. Later in his life Serov focused on the dramatic depiction of artists and musicians such as Chaliapin, Ermolova and Gorky.

**SHISHKIN, Ivan** [*ШИШКИН, Иван Иванович*] (1832–1989). Ivan Shishkin was arguably Russia's most famous landscape artist associated with the Peredvizhniki movement. Born in Yelabuga in Imperial Russia, Shishkin studied at the Moscow School of Painting, Sculpture and Architecture, and later at the Saint Petersburg Imperial Academy of Arts between 1856 and 1860. Shishkin went on to make a successful career as an artist for himself and also taught at the Academy in Saint Petersburg.

**SILOTI, Alexander** [*ЗИЛОТИ, Александр Ильич*] (1863–1945). Russian pianist, conductor, composer and pedagogue, Alexander Siloti was born near Kharkov in Imperial Russia. Siloti studied piano at the Moscow Conservatory with Nikolai Zverev, then Nikolai Rubinstein and briefly with Anton Rubinstein. He also studied harmony and counterpoint with Piotr Tchaikovsky and Sergei Taneyev. Siloti went on to study with Liszt in Weimar and co-founded the Liszt-Verein in Leipzig. Returning to Russia in 1887, Siloti taught at the Moscow Conservatory where his most famous students included his cousin Sergei Rachmaninov, Alexander Goldenweiser and Konstantin Igumnov. Prior to the Revolution in 1917 Siloti was one of the most famous musicians in Russia. In 1918 he fled Soviet Russia and settled in New York in 1921.

**SOFRONITSKY, Vladimir** [*СОФРОНИЦКИЙ, Владимир Владимирович*] (1901–1961). Russian pianist and pedagogue, Vladimir Sofronitsky was born in Saint Petersburg. He studied at the Petrograd Conservatory with Leonid Nikolaev along with Maria Yudina and Dmitri Shostakovich. Sofronitsky taught at the Leningrad Conservatory between 1936 and 1942, and then at the Moscow Conservatory until his death. Sofronitsky is however mostly known for his own pianism and was especially noted for his interpretations of Skryabin, Chopin and Schumann. Sofronitsky was a close friend of Heinrich Neuhaus.

**STANISLAVSKY, Konstantin** [*СТАНИСЛАВСКИЙ, Константин Сергеевич*] (1863–1938). Konstantin Stanislavsky was the pseudonym of Konstantin Alexeev. Born in Moscow, Stanislavsky was the most famous theatre and opera directors, actors and pedagogues of his time. Developing a 'Realist' style of acting which was based on the creation of an emotionally

true character, Stanislavsky reformed acting. In 1898 he co-founded the *Московский Художественный театр (МХТ)* [Moscow Artistic Theatre] with Vladimir Nemiroch-Danchenko. Stanislavsky was the chairman of the Russian Musical Society, set up by the Rubinstein brothers, from 1886.

**STASOV, Vladimir** [**СТАЦОВ, Владимир Васильевич**] (1824–1906). Vladimir Stasov was one of the most respected art critics of his time. Born in Saint Petersburg, Stasov actively supported the Peredvizhniki artists and coined the term *Могучая кучка* [the Mighty Handful], known in the West as 'The Five' (Mily Balakirev, César Cui, Modest Mussorgsky, Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov and Alexander Borodin).

**SZYMANOWSKI, Karol** (1882–1937). Karol Szymanowski was born in Tymoszkówka in Imperial Russia. Szymanowski was the cousin of Heinrich Neuhaus and studied with Gustav Neuhaus (Heinrich Neuhaus's father) in Elisavetgrad. In 1901 he studied at the Warsaw Conservatory. Szymanowski settled in Warsaw in 1919 and became one of Poland's most important composers, and from 1926 was the director of the Warsaw Conservatory.

**TROPP, Vladimir** [**ТРОПП, Владимир Мануилович**] (b. 1939). Russian pianist and pedagogue, Vladimir Tropp first studied at the Gnessin Institute, and then at the Moscow Conservatory with Teodor Gutman. Upon completing his studies Tropp became a pedagogue at the Gnessin Institute.

**TANEYEV, Sergei** [**ТАНЕЕВ, Сергей Иванович**] (1856–1915). Russian composer, pianist and pedagogue Sergei Taneyev was born in Vladimir. Taneyev studied piano with Nikolai Rubinstein at the Moscow Conservatory and composition with Piotr Tchaikovsky. Taneyev taught at the Moscow Conservatory, initially harmony, and was its director between 1885 and 1889, teaching until 1905. Resigning in 1905, Taneyev resumed his career as a soloist and composer.

**TYUNEYEV, Boris** [**ТЮНЕЕВ, Борис Дмитриевич**] (1883–1934). Russian musicologist and critic Boris Tyuneyev was born in Odessa in Imperial Russia. Tyuneyev taught at the Odessa Conservatory in the 1920s until his death. Tyuneyev was widely educated and had a vast library which he encouraged talented pianists in Odessa to become familiar with.

**VEDERNIKOV, Anatoly** [**ВЕДЕРНИКОВ, Анатолий Иванович**] (1920–1993). Anatoly Vedernikov studied piano at the Moscow Conservatory with Heinrich Neuhaus in 1936. In the

1940s and 1950s Vedernikov famously collaborated with Sviatoslav Richter. In 1958 he started to teach at the Gnessin Institute and from 1980 at the Moscow Conservatory, becoming a professor in 1985.

**VIARDO, Vladimir** [**ВИАРДО, Владимир Владимирович**] (b. 1949). Pianist and pedagogue Vladimir Viardo was born in Krasnia Polyana in Russia. Moving to Moscow Viardo studied with Irina Naumova at the Gnessin College and then with Lev Naumov at the Moscow Conservatory. Despite his talent Viardo was only permitted to accept engagements in the West after 1987. Becoming an artist-in-residence in the University of North Texas College of Music department in 1989, Viardo has become one of the most sought-after pedagogues in the USA.

**VIRSALADZE, Eliso** [**ВИРСАЛАДЗЕ, Элисо Константиновна**] (b. 1942). Born in Tbilisi, Eliso Virsaladze first studied piano with her grandmother, a student of Anna Esipova, and later at the Moscow Conservatory with Yakov Zak. Virsaladze often played to Heinrich Neuhaus in Tbilisi and later in Moscow and considered him both as her pedagogue and mentor. She taught at the Moscow Conservatory from 1967 as an assistant of Lev Oborin and then Yakov Zak. From 1977 Virsaladze led her own class at the Moscow Conservatory.

**VITSINSKY, Alexander** [**ВИЦИНСКИЙ, Александр Владимирович**] (1904–1984). The musicologist Alexander Vitsinsky was born in Sevastopol in Imperial Russia. Vitsinsky studied with Konstantin Igumnov, Lev Oborin and Alexei Chichin. Vitsinsky was evidently a talented pianist who played Balakirev's *Islamey* and Prokofiev's Third Piano Concerto for his graduation recitals in 1929. From 1936 Vitsinsky started teaching at the Moscow Conservatory and turned his energy to the piano-pedagogy department until 1979. Vitsinsky became an influential musicologist who wrote about the psychology of interpretation in the Stanislavsky tradition.

**VOSKOBONIKOV, Valery** [**ВОСКОБОЙНИКОВ, Валерий Михайлович**] (b. 1939). Valery Voskoboinikov studied with Heinrich Neuhaus and now lives in Italy where he was the President of the Neuhaus Association.

**VRUBEL, Mikhail** [**ВРУБЕЛЬ, Михаил Александрович**] (1856–1910). Mikhail Vrubel is often regarded as a Russian symbolist painter – a label which he himself disputed. Vrubel, born in Omsk, studied with Pavel Chistyakov and associated with the artists of the Peredvizhniki movement. Vrubel became interested in late Byzantine art and Early Renaissance painting and along with Orientalism, some of this deriving from Russian folklore and stories, which influenced his style and subject matter.



**YAVORSKY, Boleslav** [**ЯВОРСКИЙ, Болеслав Леопольдович**] (1877–1942). Russian musicologist, composer, pedagogue Boleslav Yavorsky was born in Kharkov in Imperial Russia. Yavorsky studied composition at the Moscow Conservatory with Sergei Taneyev as well as piano with N. Shishkin. Between 1915 and 1921 Yavorsky taught at the Kiev Conservatory. Yavorsky was a close friend of Heinrich Neuhaus, and like Neuhaus was transferred to Moscow to teach at the Conservatory by Anatoly Lunacharsky in 1921.

**YUDINA, Maria** [**ЮДИНА, Мария Вениаминовна**] (1899–1970). Russian pianist and pedagogue, Maria Yudina studied at the Petrograd Conservatory with Anna Esipova, Felix Blumenfeld and then Leonid Nikolaev. Yudina taught for a time at the Tbilisi and Moscow Conservatories, and between 1944 and 1960 at the Gnessin Institute. Her interest and association with modern Western composers (Stravinsky, Boulez, Hindemith, Berg, Schoenberg, Messiaen) and overt Russian Orthodoxy meant she lost her job and was banned, for a time, from giving public recitals.

**ZAK, Yakov** [**ЗАК, Яков Израилевич**] (1913–1976). Russian pianist and pedagogue, Yakov Zak was born in Odessa and studied initially at the Odessa Conservatory. Later Zak came to Moscow to study with Heinrich Neuhaus, graduating from the Moscow Conservatory in 1935. Zak was the winner of the Third International Chopin Competition in Warsaw in 1937 which established him as a recitalist. Zak played as a piano duo with Emil Gilels for a time. Zak taught at the Moscow Conservatory from 1935, and was given his own class in 1938, becoming a professor in 1947. His most notable students included Nikolai Petrov, Yevgeny Mogilevsky and Eliso Virsaladze.

**ZOSCHENKO, Mikhail** [**ЗОЩЕНКО, Михаил Михайлович**] (1895–1958). Born in Saint Petersburg, Mikhail Zoschenko was a popular Soviet satirist and writer.

**ZVEREV, Nikolai** [**ЗВЕРЕВ, Николай Сергеевич**] (1832–1893). Nikolai Zverev was a Russian pianist and pedagogue. After initial studies with Alexandre Dubuque, Zverev studied piano with Adolf Henselt in Saint Petersburg. Zverev was invited to Moscow by Nikolai Rubinstein where he taught both privately and in the newly established Moscow Conservatory. Zverev's most important students included Alexander Siloti, Sergei Rachmaninov, Konstantin Igumnov and Alexander Skryabin. Zverev was also known for holding regular musical evenings where the participants included, amongst others, Taneyev, Tchaikovsky, Arensky, the Rubinstein brothers and Safonov.



## Bibliography

Where Russian sources are indicated they are given in transliteration following the UNESCO transliteration convention, the vernacular and in translation. All translations are by the author of this current dissertation unless otherwise indicated. Where important Russian-language articles or transcripts are reprinted in alternative sources to the anthology listed, their titles and/or original sources are shown. Russian sources are listed in English-alphabetical order by their transliterated author and title.

ABBATE, CAROLYN. *Unsung Voices. Opera and Musical Narrative in the Nineteenth Century*, 1991 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996)

ADORNO, THEODOR. *Aesthetic Theory* translated by Robert Hullot-Kentor (London: The Athlone Press, 1997). Originally: *Ästhetische Theorie*, 1970

ADORNO, THEODOR. *Beethoven. The Philosophy of Music. Fragments and Texts* edited by Rolf Tiedemann and translated by Edmund Jephcott (London: Polity Press, 1998)

ADORNO, THEODOR. *Philosophy of Modern Music*, 1948, translated by Anne Mitchell & Wesley Blomster (New York: Continuum Publishing Group, 2003)

ADORNO, THEODOR. *Prisms*, 1967, translated by Anne Mitchell and Wesley Blomster (New York: Seabury Press, 1973)

ALEKSEEV, A. D. *Istorija fortepiannogo iskusstva. Časti 1 i 2* (Moskva: Muzyka, 1988)

АЛЕКСЕЕВ, А. Д. *История фортепианного искусства. Части 1 и 2* (Москва: «Музыка», 1988)

[ALEXEEV, ALEXANDER. *A History of the Art of the Piano. Parts 1 and 2* (Moscow: 1988)]

AL'ŠVANG, A. A. *Ljudvig van Bethoven. Očerk žizni i tvorčestva* (Moskva: Sovetskij Kompozitor, 1971)

АЛЬШВАНГ, А. А. *Людвиг ван Бетховен. Очерк жизни и творчества* (Москва: «Советский Композитор», 1971)

[ALSHWANG, ARNOLD. *Ludwig van Beethoven. An outline of his life and work* (Moscow: 1971)]

ARX, VICTORIA von. *Piano Lessons with Claudio Arrau. A Guide to His Philosophy and Techniques* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014)

АПЕТЯН, З. А. (sostavitel') *Vospominaniya o Rahmaninove. Tom 1* (Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe Muzykal'noe Izdatel'stvo, 1957)

АПЕТЯН, З. А. (составитель) *Воспоминания о Рахманинове. Том 1* (Москва: «Государственное Музыкальное Издательство», 1957)

[APETYAN, Z. (ed.) *Remembering Rachmaninov. Volume 1* (Moscow: 1957)]

АПЕТЯН, З. А. (sostavitel') *Vospominaniya o Rahmaninove. Tom 2* (Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe Muzykal'noe Izdatel'stvo, 1957)

АПЕТЯН, З. А. (составитель) *Воспоминания о Рахманинове. Том 2* (Москва: «Государственное Музыкальное Издательство», 1957)

[APETYAN, Z. (ed.) *Remembering Rachmaninov. Volume 2* (Moscow: 1957)]

АСАФ'ЕВ, В. В. (GLEBOV, I.) *Muzykal'naya forma kak process, 1930* (Leningrad: Muzika, 1971)

АСАФЬЕВ, Б. В. (ГЛЕБОВ, И.) *Музыкальная форма как процесс, 1930* (Ленинград: «Музыка», 1971)

[ASAFYEV, BORIS. (GLEBOV, IGOR) *Musical Form as a Process, 1930* (Leningrad: 1971)]

BARENBOIM, DANIEL. *Everything is Connected. The Power of Music* edited by Elena Cheah, 2008 (London: Phoenix – Orion Publishing Group, 2009)

BARENBOJM, L. A. *Anton Grigor'evič Rubinštejn 1867-1894. Tom 2* (Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoe Muzykal'noe Izdatel'stvo, 1962)

БАРЕНБОЙМ, Л. А. *Антон Григорьевич Рубинштейн 1867 – 1894. Том 2* (Ленинград: «Государственное Музыкальное Издательство», 1962)

[BARENBOIM, LEV. *Anton Grigoerevich Rubinstein 1867 – 1894. Volume 2* (Leningrad: 1962)]

BARENBOJM, L. A. (sostavitel') *Anton Grigor'evič Rubinštejn. Literayurnoe nasledie v treh tomah. Tom I* (Moskva: Muzyka, 1983)

БАРЕНБОЙМ, Л. А. (составитель) *А. Г. Рубинштейн. Литературное наследие в трех томах. Том I* (Москва: «Музыка», 1983)

[BARENBOIM, LEV. (ed.) *A. G. Rubinstein. Literary Legacy in Three Volumes. Volume I.* (Moscow: 1983)]

BARENBOJM, L. A. *Émil' Gilel's* (Moskva: Sovetskij Kompozitor, 1990)

БАРЕНБОЙМ, Л. А. *Эмиль Гилельс* (Москва: «Советский Композитор», 1990)

[BARENBOIM, LEV. *Emil Gilels.* (Moscow: 1990)]

BARENBOJM, L. A. 'Книга Г. Нейгауза и принципы его школы. (По поводу книги «Об искусстве фортеп'янной игры»)', *Sovetskaja muzyka*, 1959, № 5 pp. 116–122

БАРЕНБОЙМ, Л. А. 'Книга Г. Нейгауза и принципы его школы. (По поводу книги «Об искусстве фортепьянной игры»)', *Советская музыка*, 1959, № 5 pp. 116–122

[BARENBOIM, LEV. 'H. Neuhaus's Book and the Principles of his School. (In relation to his book "About the Art of Piano Playing")']

BARENBOJM, L. A. *Voprosy fortieniannoji pedagogiki i ispolnitel'stva* (Leningrad: Muzyka, 1966)

БАРЕНБОЙМ, Л. А. *Вопросы фортепианной педагогики и исполнительства* (Ленинград: «Музыка», 1966)

[BARENBOIM, LEV. *Questions of Piano Pedagogy and Interpretation* (Leningrad: 1966)]

BARKER, CLIVE. *Theatre Games: A New Approach to Drama Training* (London: Methuen Drama, 1977)

BARNES, CHRISTOPHER. *Boris Pasternak: A Literary Biography. 1980–1928* (Cambridge University Press, 1989)

BARNES, CHRISTOPHER. *Boris Pasternak: A Literary Biography. 1928–1969*, 1998 (Cambridge University Press, 2004)

BARNES, CHRISTOPHER. *The Russian Piano School. Russian Pianists and Moscow Conservatoire Professors on the Art of the Piano* translated and edited by Christopher Barnes, 2007 (London: Kahn & Averill, 2008)

BARRY, BARBARA. 'In Adorno's Broken Mirror: Towards a Theory of Musical Reproduction'. (*International Review of the Aesthetics and Sociology of Music*, Vol. 40, No. 1, June 2009, pp. 81–98)

- BAZZANA, KEVIN. *Glenn Gould. The Performer in the Work* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997)
- BEETHOVEN, LUDWIG VAN. *Beethoven's Letters* translated by J. S. Shedlock and edited by A. Eaglefield-Hull (New York: Dover Publications, 1972)
- BEJLINA, S. Z. (sostavitel') *Uroki Razumovskoj* (Moskva: Klassika-XXI, 2007)
- БЕЙЛИНА, С. З. (составитель) *Уроки Разумовской* (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2007)
- [BEILINA, S. (ed.) *Razumovskaya's Lessons* (Moscow: 2007)]
- BELLMAN, JONATHAN. *Chopin's Polish Ballade: Opus 38 as Narrative of National Martyrdom* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010)
- BENEDETTI, JEAN. *Stanislavski. An Introduction, 1982* (New York: Taylor and Francis, 2004)
- BERGER, KAROL. *A Theory of Art, 1947* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000)
- BERMAN, BORIS. *Notes from a Pianist's Bench, 2000* (Yale University Press, 2002)
- BERMAN, L. N. *Gody stranstvij. Razmyšlenija muzykanta* (Moskva: Klassika-XXI, 2006)
- БЕРМАН, Л. Н. *Годы странствий. Размышления музыканта* (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2006)
- [BERMAN, LAZAR. *Years of Pilgrimage. Thoughts of a Musician* (Moscow: 2006)]
- BLAGOJ D. D. A. B. *Gol'denvejzer. O muzykal'nom iskusstve* (Moskva: Muzyka, 1975)
- БЛАГОЙ Д. Д. А. Б. *Гольденвейзер. О музыкальном искусстве* (Москва: «Музыка», 1975)
- [BLAGOI D. D. A. B. *Goldenweiser. About Musical Art* (Moscow: 1975)]
- BLOOM, HAROLD. *A Map of Misreading* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975)
- BORISOV, Ju. A. *Po napravleniju k Rihteru* (Sankt-Peterburg: Azbuka-Attikus, 2011)
- БОРИСОВ, Ю. А. *По направлению к Рихтеру* (Санкт-Петербург: «Азбука-Аттикус», 2011)
- [BORISOV, YURI. *In the Direction Towards Richter* (St. Petersburg: 2011)]
- BORODIN, B. B. & LUK'YANOV, A. P. (sostavitel') *Mysli o Bethovene* (Moskva: Klassika-XXI, 2010)

БОРОДИН, Б. Б. & ЛУКЪЯНОВ, А. П. (составитель) *Мысли о Бетховене* (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2010)

[BORODIN, B. & LUKYANOV, A. (ed.) *Thoughts on Beethoven* (Moscow: 2010)]

BOWEN, CATHERINE DRINKER. *Free Artist. The Story of Anton and Nicholas Rubinstein* (New York: Random House, 1939)

BOWIE, ANDREW. *Aesthetics and subjectivity from Kant to Nietzsche*. Second edition, 2003 (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2006)

BRENDEL, ALFRED. *Musical Thoughts and Afterthoughts* (London: Robson Books Ltd., 1976)

BRENDEL, ALFRED. *Music Sounded Out* (London: Robson Books, 1990)

BRENDEL, ALFRED. *The Veil of Order. Conversations with Martin Meyer* (London: Faber and Faber, 2002)

BUDJAKOVSKIJ, A. E. *Ferenc List. Pianist. Pedagog*, (1938) 1986 (Sankt-Peterburg: Kompozitor, 2012)

БУДЯКОВСКИЙ, А. Е. *Ференц Лист. Пианист. Педагог*, (1938) 1986 (Санкт-Петербург: «Композитор», 2012)

[BUDYAKOVSKY, ANDREI. *Ferenc Liszt. Pianist. Pedagogue*, (1938) 1986 (St. Petersburg: 2012)]

BUSONI, FERRUCCIO. *The Essence of Music and Other Papers* translated from the German by Rosamond Ley (London: Salisbury Square, 1957). Originally: *Von der Einheit der Musik* and *Wessen und Einheit der Musik*, 1907.

COLLINGWOOD, ROBIN. *The Principles of Art*, 1938 (Oxford University Press, 1958)

CONE, EDWARD. 'The Authority of Music Criticism' (*Journal of the American Musicological Society*, Vol. 34, No. 1, Spring 1981, pp. 1–18)

CONE, EDWARD. *The Composer's Voice* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1974)

COOK, NICHOLAS. *A Guide to Musical Analysis* (Oxford University Press, 1987)

COOK, NICHOLAS. *Beyond the Score. Music as Performance*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013)

COOK, NICHOLAS. *Music, Performance and Meaning: Selected Essays* (London: Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2007)

COOKE, JAMES. *Great Pianists on Piano Playing. Godowsky, Lhevinne, Paderewski and 24 other Legendary Performers, 1917* (New York: Dover Publications, 1999)

CORTOT, ALFRED. *In Search of Chopin* translated by Cyril and Rena Clarke, 1952 (London: Dover Publications, 2013). Originally: *Aspects de Chopin*, 1949.

CROTHERS, GALINA. *Heinrich Neuhaus: Life, Philosophy and Pedagogy*. (PhD Thesis, Birmingham City University, 2010)

CYPIN, G. M. *Iсполнител' i tehnika* (Moskva: Academa, 1999)

ЦЫПИН, Г. М. *Исполнитель и техника* (Москва: «Academa», 1999)

[TSIPIN, GRIGORY. *Performer and Technique* (Moscow: 1999)]

DAHLHAUS, CARL. *Ludwig van Beethoven: Approaches to his Music* translated by Mary Whittall (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991). Originally: *Ludwig van Beethoven und seine Zeit*, 1987

DAHLHAUS, CARL. 'Neo-Romanticism' (*19<sup>th</sup>-Century Music*, Vol. 3, No. 2, November 1979, pp. 97–105)

DAHLHAUS, CARL. *Nineteenth-Century Music* translated by J. Bradford Robinson (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1987). Originally: *Die Musik des 19. Jahrhunderts*, 1980

DAHLHAUS, CARL. *Realism in Nineteenth Century Music* translated by Mary Whittall (Cambridge University Press, 1985). Originally: *Musikalischer Realismus: Zur Musikgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts*, 1982

DAWES, FRANK. 'Reviewing Heinrich Neuhaus's *About the Art of the Piano*' in *The Musical Times*, Vol. 114, No. 1567 (September 1973, p. 900)



DENNIS, DAVID. 'Beethoven at Large: Reception in Literature the Arts Philosophy and Politics' in STANLEY, GLENN. (ed.) *Cambridge Companion to Beethoven* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)

DELAKRUA, É. *Dnevnik Delakrua* perevod T.M. Pahomova (Moskva: Iskusstvo, 1950)

ДЕЛАКРУА, Э. *Дневник Делакруа* пер. Т. М. Пахомова (Москва: «Искусство», 1950)

[DELACROIX, EUGUENE. *The Diary of Delacroix* translated by T. Pahomova (Moscow: 1950)]

DEL'SON, V. Yu. *Genrih Nejgauz* (Moskva: Muzyka, 1966)

ДЕЛЬСОН, В. Ю. *Генрих Нейгауз* (Москва: «Музыка», 1966)

[DELSON, VIKTOR. *Heinrich Neuhaus* (Moscow: 1966)]

DOLINSKAJA, E. B. & JAKOVLEV, M. M. (sostavitel') *Jakov Flier . Stat'i. Vospominanija. Interv'ju* (Moskva: Sovetskij kompozitor, 1983)

ДОЛИНСКАЯ, Е. Б. & ЯКОВЛЕВ, М. М. (составитель) *Яков Флиер. Статьи. Воспоминания. Интервью* (Москва: «Советский композитор», 1983)

[DONLINSKAYA, E & YAKOVLEV, M. (ed.) *Yakov Flier. Articles. Reminiscences. Interviews* (Moscow: 1983)]

DUBAL, DAVID. *Evenings with Horowitz: A Personal Portrait*, 1991 (New York: Amadeus Press, 2004)

DUBAL, DAVID. *Reflections from the Keyboard: The World of the Concert Pianist* (New York: Summit Books, 1984)

DUBAL, DAVID. *The Art of the Piano. Its Performers, Literature, and Recordings*, 1989 (Cambridge: Amadeus Press, 2004)

DZIEDISZYCKA, MARIA MAGDALENA. 'Chapter III. From the Naïve vs. Sentimental to the Romantic Dialogue: Mickiewicz as Pushkin's Poetic Other.' in *The Romantic Other: Adam Mickiewicz in Russia 1824–1829* (PhD thesis, Columbia University, 2003)

EDWARDS, PAUL. (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (New York: Macmillan and Free Press, 1967)

- EIGELDINGER, JEAN-JACQUES. *Chopin: Pianist and Teacher as Seen by his Pupils* translated by Naomi Shohet, Krycia Osostowicz and Roy Howat, 1986 (Cambridge University Press, 2002). Originally: *Chopin, vu par ses élèves*, 1970
- EINSTEIN, ALFRED. *Music in the Romantic Era* (New York: W. W. Norton and Co. Inc., 1947)
- FANNING, DAVID & ASSAY, MICHELLE. 'From Russia with Love-Hate' (London: Rhinegold publishing, *International Piano No. 22. Nov–Dec. 2013*, pp. 38–41)
- FAY, AMY. *Music-Study in Germany: From the correspondence of Amy Fay*, 1886 (New York: Adamant Media Corporation, 2002)
- FEJNBERG, S. E. *Pianizm kak iskusstvo*, 1965 (Moskva: Klassika-XXI, 2001)  
 ФЕЙНБЕРГ, С. Е. *Пианизм как искусство*, 1965 (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2001)  
 [FEINBERG, SAMUIL. *Pianism as an Art*, 1965 (Moscow: 2001)]
- FIŠMAN, N. L. (sostavitel') *Iz istorii sovetskoj bethoveniany. Sbornik statej i fragmentov iz robot* (Moskva: Sovetskij Kompozitor, 1972)  
 ФИШМАН, Н. Л. (составитель) *Из истории советской бетховенианы. Сборник статей и фрагментов из работ* (Москва: «Советский Композитор», 1972)  
 [FISHMAN, N. (ed.) *From the History of Soviet Beethoveniana. A collection of articles and fragments of works* (Moscow: 1972)]
- FITE, DAVID. *Harold Bloom: The rhetoric of Romantic Vision* (University of Massachusetts Press, 1985)
- FRIEDHEIM, ARTHUR. *Life and Liszt. The Recollections of a Concert Pianist* (New York: Taplinger Publishing Company Inc., 1961)
- FROLOVA-WALKER, MARINA & WALKER, JOHNATHAN. *Music and Soviet Power 1917–1932* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2012)
- FROLOVA-WALKER, MARINA. *Russian Music and Nationalism from Glinka to Stalin* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007)
- GÁT, JÓSZEF. *The Technique of Piano Playing* (New York: Collet's Publishing House, 1968)

GENIKA, R. V. *Bethoven: Značenie ego tvorčestva v oblasti fortepiannoј kompozicii* (Sankt Peterburg: 1899)

ГЕНИКА, Р. В. *Бетховен: Значение его творчества в области фортепианной композиции* (Санкт Петербург: 1899)

[GENIKA, ROSTISLAV. *Beethoven: The Significance of his Creative Work in the Sphere of Piano Composition* (St. Petersburg: 1899)]

GERIG, REGINALD. *Famous Pianists and Their Technique*, 1974 (Indiana University Press, 2007)

GLAUERT, AMANDA. 'The Double Perspective in Beethoven's Opus 131' (*19<sup>th</sup>-Century Music*, Vol. 4, No. 2, Autumn 1980, pp. 113–120)

GILELS, Ė. G. 'Velikij sootečestvennik' (07/01/1959) in BLOK, V. M. (sostavitel') *In Memoriam. Ėmil Gilels* (Moskva: Kompozitor, 2009)

ГИЛЕЛЬС, Э. Г. 'Великий соотечественник' (07/01/1959) БЛОК, В. М. (составитель) *In Memoriam. Эмил Гилельс* (Москва: «Композитор», 2009)

[GILELS, EMIL. 'My Great Compatriot' (07/01/1959) in BLOK, VLADIMIR. (ed.) *In Memoriam. Emil Gilels* (Москва: 2009)]

GOEHR, LYDIA. *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works: An Essay in the Philosophy of Music*, 1991 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992)

GOETHE, JOHANN von. *Maxims and Reflections* translated by Elisabeth Stopp (London: Penguin Books, 1998). Originally: *Maximen und Reflexionen*, 1833

GOLDBERG, HALINA. 'Appropriating Poland: Glinka, Polish Dance, and Russian National Identity' in RANSEL, DAVID. & SHALLCROSS, BOZENA. *Polish Encounters, Russian Identity* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005)

GOLDBERG, HALINA. *Music in Chopin's Warsaw* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008)

GOL'DENVEJZER, A. B. *Dnevnik. Pervaja tetrad' (1889–1904)* (Moskva: Tortuga, 1995)

ГОЛЬДЕНВЕЙЗЕР, А. Б. *Дневник. Первая тетрадь (1889–1904)* (Москва: «Тортуга», 1995) [GOLDENWEISER, ALEXANDER. *Diary. Book One (1889–1904)* (Moscow: 1995)]

GOL'DENVEJZER, A. B. *Dnevnik. Tetradi vtoraĵa – ŝestaja (1905–1929)* (Moskva: Tortuga, 1997)

ГОЛЬДЕНВЕЙЗЕР, А. Б. *Дневник. Тетради вторая - шестая (1905–1929)* (Москва: «Тортуга», 1997)

[GOLDENWEISER, ALEXANDER. *Diary. Books Two – Six (1905–1929)* (Moscow: 1997)]

GOL'DENVEJZER, A. B. *Vospominanija, 1958* (Moskva: Deka, 2009)

ГОЛЬДЕНВЕЙЗЕР, А. Б. *Воспоминания, 1958* (Москва: «Дека», 2009)

[GOLDENWEISER, ALEXANDER. *Reminiscences, 1958* (Moscow: 2009)]

GROHOTOV, S. V. (sostavitel') *Uroki Gol'denjezera* (Moskva: Klassika-XXI, 2009)

ГРОХОТОВ, С. В. (составитель) *Уроки Гольденвейзера* (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2009)

[GROHOTOV, S. (ed.) *Goldenweiser's Lessons* (Moscow: 2009)]

GROŠEVA, E. A. (sostavitel') *Fedor Ivanovič Šaljapin. Literaturnoe nasledstvo. Pis'ma. N. Šaljapina Vospominanija ob otce. Tom I* (Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo Iskusstvo, 1957)

ГРОШЕВА, Е. А. (составитель) *Фёдор Иванович Шаляпин. Литературное наследство. Письма. Н. Шаляпина Воспоминания об отце. Том I* (Москва: «Государственное издательство Искусство», 1957)

[GROSHEVA, E. A. (ed.) *Feodor Ivanovich Chaliapin. Literary Legacy. Letters. N. Chaliapina's Remembrances of her Father. Volume I* (Moscow: 1957)]

GROŠEVA, E. A. (sostavitel') *Fedor Ivanovič Šaljapin. Stat'i, vyskazyvanija I vospominanija o F. I. Šaljapine. Tom II* (Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo Iskusstvo, 1958)

ГРОШЕВА, Е. А. (составитель) *Фёдор Иванович Шаляпин. Статьи, высказывания и воспоминания о Ф. И. Шаляпине. Том II* (Москва: «Государственное издательство Искусство», 1958)

[GROSHEVA, E. A. (ed.) *Feodor Ivanovich Chaliapin. Articles, Anecdotes and Recollections about F. I. Chaliapin. Volume II* (Moscow: 1958)]

HAMILTON, KENNETH. *After the Golden Age. Romantic Pianism and Modern Performance* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008)

HANSLICK, EDUARD. *On the Musically Beautiful* translated by Geoffrey Payzant (Indiana: Hackett Publishing Group, 1986). Originally: *Vom Musikalisch-Schönen*, 1854

HANSLICK, EDUARD. *Music Criticisms 1846-99* translated by Henry Pleasants (London: Penguin Books, 1963)

HAAS, DAVID. (ed). *Symphonic Etudes: Portraits of Russian Operas and Ballets by Boris Asafyev* translated by D. Haas (Scarecrow Press Inc., 2008)

HEIDEGGER, MARTIN. *The Essence of Human Freedom. An Introduction to Philosophy*, 2002 translated by Ted Sadler (London: Continuum Books Ltd., 2005)

HENTOVA, S. M. *Lev Oborin* (Leningrad: Muzyka, 1964)

ХЕНТОВА, С. М. Лев Оборин (Ленинград, «Музыка», 1964)

[HENTOVA, S. *Lev Oborin* (Leningrad: 1964)]

HENTOVA, S. M. (sostavitel') *Vydajušiesja pianisty-pedagogi o fortepiannom iskusstve* (Leningrad: Muzyka, 1966)

ХЕНТОВА, С. М. (составитель) *Выдающиеся пианисты-педагоги о фортепианном искусстве* (Ленинград, «Музыка», 1966)

[HENTOVA, S. (ed.) *Eminent Pianist-Pedagogues on the Art of the Piano* (Leningrad: 1966)]

List of articles (alphabetical):

HENTOVA, S. M. *Sovremennaja fortepiannaja pedagogika i ee mastera*

ХЕНТОВА, С. М. *Современная фортепианная педагогика и ее мастера*

[HENTOVA, S. *Contemporary Piano Pedagogy and its Masters*]

LEJMER, K. *Sovremennaja fortepiannaja igra*

ЛЕЙМЕР, К. *Современная фортепианная игра*

[LEIMAR, K. *Contemporary Piano Playing*]

LEVINA, R. *Zapiski*

ЛЕВИНА, Р. *Записки*

[LHEVINNE, R. *Notes*]

LONG, M. *Francuzskaja škola fortepiano*

ЛОНГ, М. *Французская школа фортепиано*

[LONG, M. *The French Piano School*]

MARTINSEN, K. *K metodike fortepiannogo obučenija*

МАРТИНСЕН, К. *К методике фортепианного обучения*

[MARTIENSSEN, C. *Towards a Method for Piano Teaching*]

NIKOLAEV, L. V. *Iz besed s učenicami*

НИКОЛАЕВ, Л. В. *Из бесед с учениками*

[NIKOLAEV, L. *From Conversations with Students*]

REINGBAL'D, B. M. *Kak ja obučala Ėmilja Gilel'sa*

РЕЙНГБАЛЬД, Б. М. *Как я обучала Эмиля Гилельса*

[REINGBALD, B. *How I Taught Emil Gilels*]

STOJANOV, A.V. *Nekotorye problemy muzykal'noj pedagogiki v svjazi s obučeniem igry na fortepiano.*

СТОЯНОВ, А. В. *Некоторые проблемы музыкальной педагогики в связи с обучением игры на фортепиано.*

[STOYANOV, A. *Some Problems of Musical Pedagogy in Relation to Teaching to Play the Piano.*]

HITRUK, A. F. (sostavitel') G. G. Neigauz. *Doklady i vystuplenija. Besedy i seminary. Otkrytye uroki. Vospominanija* (Moskva: Deka, 2008)

ХИТРУК, А. Ф. (составитель) Г. Г. Нейгауз. *Доклады и выступления. Беседы и семинары. Открытые уроки. Воспоминания.* (Москва: «Дэка», 2008)

[HITRUK, A. (ed.) H. G. Neuhaus. *Presentations and Appearances. Conversations and Seminars. Open Lessons. Reminiscences* (Moscow: 2008)]

List of articles and transcripts (alphabetical):

GUTMAN, N. G. *V ego klasse ja čuvstvovala sebja, slovno v kakoj-to ogromnoj družnoj sem'e*

ГУТМАН, Н. Г. *В его классе я чувствовала себя, словно в какой-то огромной дружной семье*

[GUTMAN, N. *In his Class I Felt as if I was in a Huge, Friendly Family*]

KREMENŠTEJN, B. & LOBANOV, P. *Zvučašćie uroki Neįgauza* (Sovetskaja muzyka, 1967 №2)

КРЕМЕНШТЕЙН, Б. & ЛОБАНОВ, П. *Звучащие уроки Нейгауза* (Советская музыка, 1967 №2)

[KREMENSTEIN, B. & LOBANOV, P. *The Sounded Lessons of Neuhaus* (1967)]

MURAVLEV, U. A. *Nezabyvaemye uroki*

МУРАВЛЁВ, Ю. А. *Незабываемые уроки*

[MURAVLEV, Y. *Unforgettable Lessons*]

NASEDKIN, A. A. *Vladetel' istiny*

НАСЕДКИН, А. А. *Владелец истины*

[NASEDKIN, A. *The Keeper of Truth*]

NAUMOV, L. N. *O Genrihe Gustavoviče ja mog by govorit' besconečno*

НАУМОВ, Л. Н. *О Генрихе Густавовиче я мог бы говорить бесконечно*

[NAUMOV, L. *About Heinrich Gustovovich I could Speak without End*]

NEJGAUZ, G. G. *Beseda s pedagogami muzykal'nyh učebnyh zavedenij* (09/12/1938.

Stenogramma, arhiv Moskovskoj konservatorii)

НЕЙГАУЗ, Г. Г. *Беседа с педагогами музыкальных учебных заведений* (09/12/1938.

Стенограмма, архив Московской консерватории)

[NEUHAUS, H. *A Conversation with Pedagogues of Musical Educational Institutions*

(09/12/1938. Stenograph, Moscow Conservatory Archive)]

NEJGAUZ, G. G. *Bethoven, 1936* (RIHTER, E. R. (sostavitel') *Genrih Neįgauz.*

*Vospominanija. Pis'ma. Materialy* (Moskva: 1992))

НЕЙГАУЗ, Г. Г. *Бетховен, 1936* (РИХТЕР, Е. Р. (составитель) *Генрих Нейгауз.*

*Воспоминания. Письма. Материалы* (Москва: 1992))

[NEUHAUS, H. *Beethoven, 1936* (RICHTER, E. (ed.) *Heinrich Neuhaus. Remembrances.*

*Letters. Materials* (Moscow: 1992))]

NEJGAUZ, G. G. *Dvadcat' pervaja sonata Bethovena* (24/10/1945)

НЕЙГАУЗ, Г. Г. *Двадцать первая соната Бетховена* (24/10/1945)

[NEUHAUS, H. *Twenty-First Sonata by Beethoven* (24/10/1945)]

NEJGAUZ, G. G. *Dvadcat' vos'maja sonata Bethovena* (11/1938. Uroki. TEPLOV, B. M. Stenogramma, arhiv Moskovskoy konservatorii)

НЕЙГАУЗ, Г. Г. *Двадцать восьмая соната Бетховена* (11/1938. Уроки. ТЕПЛОВ, Б. М. Стенограмма, архив Московской консерватории)

[NEUHAUS, H. *Twenty-Eighth Sonata by Beethoven* (11/1938. Stenograph by B. M. TEPLOV, Moscow Conservatory Archive)]

NEJGAUZ, G. G. *Dve besedy s B.M. Teplovym i A. V. Vicinskim* (06/12/1944)

НЕЙГАУЗ, Г. Г. *Две беседы с В. М. Тепловым и А. В. Вицинским* (06/12/1944)

[NEUHAUS, H. *Two Conversations with B. M. Teplov and A. V. Vitsinsky* (06/12/1944)]

NEJGAUZ, G. G. *Dvenadcataja sonata Bethovena* (c. 1937.)

НЕЙГАУЗ, Г. Г. *Двенадцатая соната Бетховена* (с. 1937)

[NEUHAUS, H. *Twelfth Sonata by Beethoven* (c. 1937)]

NEJGAUZ, G. G. *Ljubimyj učenik* (1963). Reč' v RIHTER, E. R. (sostavitel') *Genrih Nejgauz. Vospominanija. Pis'ma. Materialy* (Moskva: 1992)

НЕЙГАУЗ, Г. Г. *Любимый ученик* (1963). Речь в РИХТЕР, Е. Р. (составитель) *Генрих Нейгауз. Воспоминания. Письма. Материалы* (Москва: 1992)

[NEUHAUS, H. *A Favourite Pupil* (Speech in 1963)]

NEJGAUZ, G. G. *Masterstvo pianista* (SOKOLOV, M. G. (sostavitel') *Pianisty rasskazyvaut. Vypusk 2* (Moskva: 1984))

НЕЙГАУЗ, Г. Г. *Мастерство пианиста* (СОКОЛОВ, М. Г. (составитель) *Пианисты рассказывают. Выпуск 2* (Москва: 1984))

[NEUHAUS, H. *The Mastery of a Pianist*]

NEJGAUZ, G. G. *Odinnadcataya i tridcat' pervayja sonaty Bethovena* (03/12/1937.

ТЕПЛОВ, В. М. Stenogramma, arhiv Moskovskoj konservatorii)

НЕЙГАУЗ, Г. Г. *Одиннадцатая и тридцать первая сонаты Бетховена*

(03/12/1937. ТЕПЛОВ, В. М. Стенограмма, архив Московской консерватории)

[NEUHAUS, H. *Eleventh and Thirty-First Sonatas of Beethoven* (03/12/1937.

Stenograph by B. M. TEPLOV, Moscow Conservatory Archive)]

NEJGAUZ, G. G. *Preludija i fuga gis-moll iz pervogo toma Horošo temperirovannogo klavira I. S. Baha* (Stenogramma, Muzej muzykal'noj kul'tury imeni Glinki)



НЕЙГАУЗ, Г. Г. *Прелюдия и фуга gis-moll из первого тома Хорошо темперированного клавира И. С. Баха* (Стенограмма, Музей музыкальной культуры имени Глинки)

[NEUHAUS, H. *Prelude and Fugue in G sharp minor from Book 1 of the Well-Tempered Klavier by J. S. Bach* (Stenograph from a lesson in the Glinka Museum of Musical Culture)]

NEJGAUZ, G. G. *Problemy fortepiannoj pedagogiki* (SOKOLOV. M. G. (sostavitel') *Pianisty rasskazyvaut. Vypusk 2* (Moskva: 1984))

НЕЙГАУЗ, Г. Г. *Проблемы фортепианной педагогики* (СОКОЛОВ, М. Г. (составитель) *Пианисты рассказывают. Выпуск 2* (Москва: 1984))  
[NEUHAUS, H. *Problems of Piano Pedagogy*]

NEJGAUZ, G. G. *Semnadcataja sonata Bethovena* (28/01/1992. Stenogramma, Muzej muzykal'noj kul'tury imeny M. I. Glinki)

НЕЙГАУЗ, Г. Г. *Семнадцатая соната Бетховена* (28/01/1992. Стенограмма, Музей музыкальной культуры имени М.И. Глинки)

[NEUHAUS, H. *Seventeenth Sonata by Beethoven* (28/01/1992. Stenograph, Glinka Museum of Musical Culture)]

NEJGAUZ, G. G. *Vasilij Pavlovič Zubov – muzykant* (15/11/1963), ZUBOV, V. P. *Iz istorii mirovoj nauki. 1921–1963* (Sankt Peterburg: 2006)

НЕЙГАУЗ, Г. Г. *Василий Павлович Зубов – музыкант* (15/11/1963), ЗУБОВ, В. П. *Из истории мировой науки. 1921–1963* (Санкт Петербург: 2006)

[NEUHAUS, H. *Vasilij Pavlovich Zubov – A Musician* (15/11/1963) in ZUBOV, V. P. *From the History of International Academics. 1921–1963* (St. Petersburg: 2006)]

NEJGAUZ, G. G. *Velikij pol'skij muzykant* (Doklad 04/10/1941)

НЕЙГАУЗ, Г. Г. *Великий польский музыкант* ( Доклад 04/10/1941)

[NEUHAUS, H. *A Great Polish Musician* (Speech on 04/10/1941)]

NEJGAUZ, G. G. *Vystuplenie na zasedanii Nauchnogo studenčeskogo občestva Moskovskoj konservatorii* (с. 1957. Stenogramma, arhiv Moskovskoj konservatorii)

НЕЙГАУЗ, Г. Г. *Выступление на заседании Научного студенческого общества Московской консерватории* (с. 1957. Стенограмма, архив Московской консерватории)

[NEUHAUS, H. *A Performance During the Meeting of the Academic Student Union of the Moscow Conservatory* (c. 1957). Stenograph, Moscow Conservatory Archive]

NEJGAUZ, M. G. *Émil' Gilel's i sem'ja Genriha Gustavoviča Nejgauza*

НЕЙГАУЗ, М. Г. *Эмиль Гилельс и семья Генриха Густавовича Нейгауза*

[NEUHAUS, M. *Emil Gilels and the Family of Heinrich Gustavovich Neuhaus*]

PASTERNAK, Z. N. Otryvki iz knigi *Boris Pasternak. Vtoroe roždenie. Pis'ma k Z. N. Pasternak. Vospominaniya* (Moskva: 1993)

ПАСТЕРНАК, З. Н. Отрывки из книги *Борис Пастернак. Второе рождение. Письма к З.Н. Пастернак. Воспоминания* (Москва: 1993)

[PASTERNAK, Z. Fragments from the Book *Boris Pasternak. A Second Birth. Letters to Z. N. Pasternak. Remembrances* (Moscow: 1993)]

PROHOROVA, V.I. *V dome Nejgauza*

ПРОХОРОВА, В. И. *В доме Нейгауза*

[PROHOROVA, V. *In Neuhaus's Home*]

VIRSALADZE, Ė. K. *Ot Tbilisi do Moskvy*

ВИРСАЛАДЗЕ, Э. К. *От Тбилиси до Москвы*

[VIRSALADZE, E. *From Tbilisi to Moscow*]

VOSKOBONIKOV, V. M. *O samom lubimom i dorogom. O samyh lubimyh i dorogih*

ВОСКОБОЙНИКОВ, В. М. *О самом любимом и дорогом. О самых любимых и дорогих*

[VOSKBOINIKOV, V. *About the Most Loved and Dearest Things. About the Most Loved and Cherished Ones*]

HOFMANN, JOSEF. *Piano Playing with Piano Questions Answered, 1908 and 1909* (New York: Dover Publications, 1976)

HOLDEN, RAYMOND. *Richard Strauss. A Musical Life* (London: Yale University Press, 2011)

HOROWTIZ, JOSEPH. *Conversations with Arrau* (London: Collins, 1982)

HULLAH, ANNETTE. *Theodor Leschetizky, 1906* (Harvard University, 2008)

HUNEKER, JAMES. *Chopin. The Man and his Music* (New York: Dover Publications, 1966)

JARVIS, SIMON. *Adorno. A Critical Introduction* (New York: Polity Press, 1998)

JUSLIN, PATRIK & SLOBODA, JOHN. (eds.) *Music and Emotion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002)

KAMMERTÖTONS, CHRISTOPH & MAUSER, SIEGRFIED. *Lexikon des Klaviers. Baugeschichte, Spielpraxis, Komponisten und ihre Werke, Interpreten. Mit einem Geleitwort von Daniel Barenboim. [Encyclopaedia of the piano. Architectural history, performance practice, composers and their works, performers. With a foreword by Daniel Barenboim]* (Laaber: Laaber-Verlag, 2006)

КАС, В. А. (sostavitel') *Raskat improvizacij... Muzyka v tvorčestve, sud'be i v dome Borisa Pasternaka* (Leningrad: Sovetskij Kompozitor, 1991)

КАЦ, Б. А. (составитель) *Раскат импровизаций... Музыка в творчестве, судьбе и в доме Бориса Пастернака* (Ленинград: «Советский Композитор», 1991)

[KATZ, B. (ed.) *The Peal of Improvisation... Music in the Art, Fate and Home of Boris Pasternak* (Leningrad: 1991)]

KATC, A. I. (sostavitel') *G. G. Nejgauz. Pis'ma* (Moskva: Deka, 2009)

КАТЦ, А. И. (составитель) *Г. Г. Нейгауз. Письма* (Москва: «Дека», 2009)

[KATZ, A. (ed.) *H. G. Neuhaus. Letters* (Moscow: 2009)]

KEHLER, GEORGE. *The Piano in Concert. Volume I (A-L)* (London: The Scarecrow Press, 1982)

KEHLER, GEORGE. *The Piano in Concert. Volume II (M-Z)* (London: The Scarecrow Press, 1982)

KLINGER, ILYA. 'Dostoevsky and the Novel-Tragedy: Genre and Modernity in Ivanov, Pumpyansky and Bakhtin' in *The Journal of the Modern Language Association of America*, 2011 (pp. 77–87)

KNYT, ERINN. *Ferruccio Busoni and the Ontology of the Musical Work: Permutations and possibilities* (PhD thesis, Stanford University, 2010)

- KOGAN, G. M. *Ferruccio Busoni, 1964, 2 izdanie* (Moskva: Sovetskij Kompozitor, 1971)  
 КОГАН, Г. М. *Ферруччо Бузони, 1964, 2 изд.* (Москва: «Советский Композитор», 1971)  
 [KOGAN, GRIGORY. *Ferruccio Busoni, 1964, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition* (Moscow: 1971)]
- KOGAN, G. M. *Izbrannye stat'i. Vypusk 2* (Moskva: Sovetskij Kompozitor, 1972)  
 КОГАН, Г. М. *Избранные статьи. Выпуск 2* (Москва: «Советский Композитор», 1972)  
 [KOGAN, GRIGORY. *Selected articles. Issue 2* (Moscow: 1972)]
- KOGAN, G. M. *Rabota pianista* (Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe Muzykal'noe Izdatel'stvo, 1963)  
 КОГАН, Г. М. *Работа пианиста* (Москва: «Государственное Музыкальное Издательство», 1963)  
 [KOGAN, GRIGORY. *The Work of the Pianist* (Moscow: 1963)]
- KOGAN, G. M. *U vrat masterstva, 1958* (Moskva: Sovetskij Kompozitor, 1961)  
 КОГАН, Г. М. *У врат мастерства, 1958* (Москва: «Советский Композитор», 1961)  
 [KOGAN, GRIGORY. *At the Gates of Mastery, 1958* (Moscow: 1961)]
- KOMAROVA, V. D. (sostavitel') *Perepiska Balakireva i Stasova* (Moskva: Muzgiz, 1935)  
 КОМАРОВА, В. Д. (составитель) *Переписка Балакирева и Стасова* (Москва: «Музгиз», 1935)  
 [KOMAROVA, V. (ed.) *The Correspondence of Balakirev and Stasov* (Moscow: 1935)]
- KREMENŠTEJN, B. L. *G. G. Nejgauz – pedagog. Metodika zanjatij s učenicami i problemy muzykal'noj pedagogiki.* (Moskovskij Gosudarstvennyj Pedagogičeskij Institut im. V. I. Lenina, 1978)  
 КРЕМЕНШТЕЙН, Б. Л. *Г. Г. Нейгауз – педагог. Методика занятий с учениками и проблемы музыкальной педагогики.* (Московский Государственный Педагогический Институт им. В. И. Ленина, 1978)  
 [KREMENSTEIN, BERTA. *H. G. Neuhaus – pedagogue. A Method for Working with Students and Problems of Musical Pedagogy.* (Doctoratal Thesis, Moscow State University of Pedagogical Sciences, 1978)]
- LANDOWSKA, WANDA. *Landowska on Music* edited and translated by Denise Restout and Robert Hawkins (New York: Stein & Day, 1964)

LANGER, SUSANNE. *Feeling and Form. A Theory of Art Developed from Philosophy in a New Key* (Charles Scribner's Sons, New York: 1953)

LANGER, SUSANNE. *Philosophy in a New Key. A Study in the Symbolism of Reason, Rite, and Art* (Harvard University Press, 1996)

LAUER, QUENTIN. *Hegel's Concept of God* (Albany: State University Press of New York: 1982)

LEVINSKAYA, MARIA. *The Levinskaya System of Pianoforte Technique and Tone-Colour Through Mental & Muscular Control* (London: Dent and Sons Ltd., 1929)

LEVINSON, JERROLD. *The Pleasures of Aesthetics: Philosophical Essays* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1996)

LEVIT, S. Ja. (sostavitel') *Marija Yudina. Nereal'nost' zla. Perepiska 1964–1966 gg.* (Moskva: Rossijskaja političeskaja ènciklopedija, 2010)

ЛЕВИТ, С. Я. (составитель) *Мария Юдина. Нереальность зла. Переписка 1964–1966 гг.* (Москва: «Российская политическая энциклопедия», 2010)

[LEVIT, S. (ed.) *Maria Yudina. The non-reality of evil* (Moscow: 2010)]

ЛИНАЧЕВА, И. В. (sostavitel') *S. E. Fejnberg. Pianist, kompozitor, issledovatel'* (Moskva: Sovetskij Kompozitor, 1984)

ЛИХАЧЕВА, И. В. (составитель) *С. Е. Фейнберг. Пианист, композитор, исследователь* (Москва: «Советский Композитор» , 1984)

[ЛИХАЧЕВА, И. (ed.) *S. E. Feinberg. Pianist, Composer, Researcher* (Moscow: 1984)]

LINDSAY, KENNETH. *Kandinsky: Complete Writings on Art* (London: G. K. Hall & Co., 1982)

LONG, MARGUERITE. *At the Piano with Debussy* translated by O. Senior-Ellis (London: Dent Publishing House, 1972). Originally: *Au Piano avec Claude Debussy*, 1960

MACH, ELYSE. *Great Pianists Speak for Themselves* (New York: Dodd & Mead, 1980)

MALINKOVSKAJA, A. V. (sostavitel') *Genrih Nejgauz i ego učeniki. Pianisty-Gnesincy rasskazyvaut* (Moskva: Klassika-XXI, 2007)

- МАЛИНКОВСКАЯ, А. В. (составитель) *Генрих Нейгауз и его ученики. Пианисты-Гнесинцы рассказывают* (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2007)
- [MALINKOVSKAYA, A. (ed.) *Heinrich Neuhaus and his Students. Gnessin-Pianists Speak* (Moscow: 2007)]
- MANN, THOMAS. 'Goethe and Tolstoy' (1925) in *Essays of Three Decades* translated by H.T. Lowe-Porter (London: Alfred A. Knopf, 1948)
- MARČENKO, I. P. *Pedagogičeskoe nasledie G. G. Nejgauza v professional'noy podgotovke učitelja muzyki* (Kandidat pedagogičeskikh nauk, Ural'skij gosudarstvennyj pedagogičeskij universitet, Ekaterinburg, 1999)
- МАРЧЕНКО, И. П. *Педагогическое наследие Г. Г. Нейгауза в профессиональной подготовке учителя музыки* (Кандидат педагогических наук, Уральский государственный педагогический университет, Екатеринбург, 1999)
- [MARCHENKO, IRINA. *The Pedagogical Legacy of H. G. Neuhaus in the Professional Preparation of the Piano Teacher* (Thesis for Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Ural State Pedagogical University, Ekaterinburg, 1999)]
- MARTINSEN, K. A. *Individual'naja fortieniannaja tehnika na osnove zvukotvorčeskoi voli* (Moskva: Muzyka, 1966)
- МАРТИНСЕН, К. А. *Индивидуальная фортепианная техника на основе звукотворческой воли* (Москва: «Музыка», 1966)
- [MARTIENSSEN, CARL. *Individual Piano Technique on the Basis of Creative Sound-Will* (Moscow: 1966)]
- MAZEL', L. A. *Issledovanija o Šopene* (Moskva: Sovetskij Kompozitor, 1971)
- МАЗЕЛЬ, Л. А. *Исследования о Шопене* (Москва: «Советский Композитор», 1971)
- [MAZEL, LEO. *Investigations about Chopin* (Moscow: 1971)]
- McCLARY, SUSAN. *Conventional Wisdom: The Content of Musical Form* (University of California Press, 2000)
- McCLARY, SUSAN & LEPPERT, RICHARD. (ed.) *Music and Society. The politics of composition, performance and reception*, 1987 (Cambridge University Press, 1996)
- MERKULOV, A. M. (sostavitel') *Uroki Zaka* (Moskva: Klassika-XXI, 2006)

МЕРКУЛОВ, А. М. (составитель) *Уроки Зака* (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2006)

[MERKULOV, A. (ed.) *The Lessons of Zak* (Moscow: 2006)]

METHUEN-CAMPBELL, JAMES. 'Neuhaus, Heinrich (Gustavovich)', 2001 in *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians, Second edition*. (London: Macmillan Press, Vol. 17. pp. 782–783)

MICZNIK, VERA. 'The Absolute Limitations of Programme Music: The Case of Liszt's *Die Ideale*' (*Music & Letters*, Vol. 80, No. 2, May 1999, pp. 207–240)

MILŠTEJN, Ja. I. (sostavitel') *G. G. Nejgauz. Razmyšlenija, vospominanija, dnevniki. Izbrannye stat'i. Pis'ma k roditeljam. 2 izdanie* (Moscow: Sovetskij Kompozitor, 1983)

МИЛЬШТЕЙН, Я. И. (составитель) *Г. Г. Нейгауз. Размышления, воспоминания, дневники. Избранные статьи. Письма к родителям. 2 изд.* (Москва: «Советский Композитор», 1983)

[MILSTEIN, YAKOV. (ed.) *H. G. Neuhaus. Thoughts, Reminiscences, Diaries. Selected Articles. Letters to his Parents. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition* (Moscow: 1983)]

List of articles (alphabetical and all authored by Heinrich Neuhaus):

*Avtobiografičeskie zapiski* (Pervonačal'nyj variant, 18/11/1959)

*Автобиографические записки* (Первоначальный вариант, 18/11/1959)

[*Autobiographical Notes* (First variant from the author's manuscript dated 18/11/1959)]

*Dirižiruet Igor' Markevič* (Sovetskaja kul'tura, 21/03/1963)

*Дирижирует Игорь Маркевич* (Советская культура, 21/03/1963)

[*Igor Marchevich Conducts*]

*Dmitriy Šostokovič* (Sovetskoe iskusstvo, 02/10/1941)

*Дмитрий Шостакович* (Советское искусство, 02/10/1941)

[*Dmitri Shostakovich*]

*Égon Petri* (Muzyka, 26/04/1937)

*Эгон Петри* (Музыка, 26/04/1937)

[*Egon Petri*]

*Émil' Gilel's* (Sovetskoe iskusstvo, 23/04/1936)

*Эмиль Гилельс* (Советское искусство, 23/04/1936)

[*Emil Gilels*]

*Émil' Gilel's* (Sovetskij muzykant, 10/06/1938)

*Эмиль Гилельс* (Советский музыкант, 10/06/1938)

[*Emil Gilels*]

*Ešče o Rihtere (Po povodu ispolnenie treh poslednih sonat Bethovena 10 i 12 dekabnja 1963)*

*Еще о Рихтере (По поводу исполнение трех последних сонат Бетховена 10 и 12 декабря 1963)*

[*More on Richter (On the Occasion of the Performance of the Last Three Beethoven Sonatas on the 10 and 12 December 1963)*]

*Evgenij Mravinskij* (Sovetskoe iskusstvo, 18/10/1938)

*Евгений Мравинский* (Советское искусство, 18/10/1938)

[*Evgeny Mravinsky*]

*Glen Gul'd* (Kultura i žizn', №7-8)

*Глен Гульд* (Культура и жизнь, №7-8)

[*Glenn Gould*]

*Individual'nost' i individualism* (Sovetskij muzykant, 19/12/1939)

*Индивидуальность и индивидуализм* (Советский музыкант, 19/12/1939)

[*Individuality and Individualism*]

*Iogann Sebast'jan Bah* (Literaturnaja gazeta, 27/07/1950)

*Иоганн Себастьян Бах* (Литературная газета, 27/07/1950)

[*Johann Sebastian Bach*]

*Iskusstvo Émilja Gilel'sa* (Literaturnaja žizn', 1961 №11)

*Искусство Эмиля Гилельса* (Литературная жизнь, 1961 №11)

[*The Art of Emil Gilels*]



*Istoria odnogo lebedja* (Iskustvo kino, 1961 №6)

*История одного лебедя* (Искусство кино, 1961 №6)

[*The Story of a Swan*]

*Iz vospominanij* (Sovetskaja muzyka, 1963 №4)

*Из воспоминаний* (Советская музыка, 1963 №4)

[*From Remembrances*]

*Jakov Zak* (Sovetskaja muzyka, 1959 №4)

*Яков Зак* (Советская музыка, 1959 №4)

[*Yakov Zak*]

*K čemu ja stremilsja kak muzykant* (*K stoletiju Moscovskoj konservatorii*)

*К чему я стремился как музыкант* (*К столетию Московской консерватории*)

[*My aims as a musician* (*For the centenary of the Moscow Conservatory*)]

*Kompozitor-ispolnitel'* (ŠLIFŠTEJN, S. I. (sostavitel') S. S. Prokof'ev. *Materialy, dokumenty, vospominanija* (Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe Muzykal'noe Izdatel'stvo, 1956))

*Композитор-исполнитель* (ШЛИФШТЕЙН, С. И. (сост.) С. С. Прокофьев. *Материалы, документы, воспоминания* (Москва: «Государственное Музыкальное Издательство», 1956))

[*Composer-Performer* (SHLIFSTEIN, S. (ed.) S. S. Prokofiev. *Materials, Documents, Remembrances* (Moscow: 1956))]

*Lučezarnyj talant* (Sovetskaja kul'tura, 09/03/1961)

*Лучезарный талант* (Советская культура, 09/03/1961)

[*A Radiant Talent*]

*Marija Grinberg* (Sovetskaja muzyka, 1957 №3)

*Мария Гринберг* (Советская музыка, 1957 №3)

[*Maria Grinberg*]

*Mejsteršule* (Sovetskoe iskusstvo, 17/05/1936)

*Мейстершуле* (Советское искусство, 17/05/1936)

[*Meisterschule*]

*Meždunarodnyj Šopenovskij konkurs pianistov v Varšave* (Sovetskaja muzyka, 1937 № 5)

*Международный Шопеновский конкурс пианистов в Вашаве* (Советская музыка, 1937 №5)

[*International Chopin Competition for Pianists in Warsaw*]

*Miron Poljakin* (Sovetskoe iskusstvo, 21/04/1939)

*Мирон Полякин* (Советское искусство, 21/04/1939)

[*Miron Polyakin*]

*Moi vpečatlenija* (Sovetskaja muzyka, 1958 №6)

*Мои впечатления* (Советская музыка, 1958 №6)

[*My Impressions*]

*Mysli o Mjaskovskom*

*Мысли о Мясковском*

[*Thoughts on Myaskovsky*]

*Neskol'ko slov o G. M. Kogane i ego knige «U vrat masterstva»* (Moskva: 1957)

*Несколько слов о Г.М.Когане и его книге «У врат мастерства»* (Москва:1957)

[*A Few Words About G. M. Kogan and his Book 'At the Gates of Mastery' (Moscow: 1957)*]

*Neskol'ko slov ob Aleksandre Fedoroviče Gedike* (A. F. Gedike. Sbornik statej i vospominanij (Moskva: 1959))

*Несколько слов об Александре Федоровиче Гедике* (А. Ф. Гедике. Сборник статей и воспоминаний (Москва: 1959))

[*A Few Words about Alexander Fedorovich Gedike*]

*Novyj fortepiannyj koncert* (Sovetskoe iskusstvo, 29/12/1937)

*Новый фортепианный концерт* (Советское искусство, 29/12/1937)

[*A New Piano Concerto*]

*O repertuare pianistov* (Sovetskoe iskusstvo, 14/06/1938)

*О репертуаре пианистов* (Советское искусство, 14/06/1938)

[*About the Pianist's Repertoire*]

*O velikom poëte* (Sovetskoe iskusstvo, 11/02/1937)

*О великом поэте* (Советское искусство, 11/02/1937)

[*About a Great Poet*]

*Ob opyte obmena opytom*

*Об опыте обмена опытом*

[*About the Sharing of Experience*]

*Oduhotvorennij hudožnik* (Muzyka, 06/10/1937)

*Одухотворенный художник* (Музыка, 06/10/1937)

[*An Inspired Artist*]

*O krugozore* (Sovetskaja muzyka, 1956 №6)

*О кругозоре* (Советская музыка, 1956 №6)

[*On Outlooks*]

*O Šopene* (Sovetskaja muzyka, 1960 №2)

*О Шопене* (Советская музыка, 1960 №2)

[*About Chopin*]

*Pamjati Leopold'a Godovskogo* (Sovetskaja muzyka, 1939 №3)

*Памяти Леопольда Годовского* (Советская музыка, 1939 №3)

[*In Memory of Leopold Godowsky*]

*Pervaja krupnaja удача* (Sovetskaja muzyka, 1940 №3)

*Первая крупная удача* (Советская музыка, 1940 №3)

[*The First Great Success*]

*Pianist-Hudožnik* (Sovetskoe iskusstvo, 25/01/1938)

*Пианист-Художник* (Советское искусство, 25/01/1938)

[*The Artist-Pianist*]

*Pjat' laureatov* (Izvestija, 17/10/1938)

*Пять лауреатов* (Известия, 17/10/1938)

[*Five Laureates*]

*Pamjati zamečatel'nogo artista* (Sovetskoe iskusstvo, 25/05/1941)

*Памяти замечательного артиста* (Советское искусство, 25/05/1941)

[*In Memory of a Wonderful Artist*]

*Pianist Arturo Benedetti Mikelandželi* (Izvestija, 30/05/1964)

*Пианист Артуро Бенедетти Микеланджели* (Известия, 30/05/1964)

[*The Pianist Arturo Benedetti Michelangeli*]

*Poët fortepiano* (Sovetskaja muzyka, 1949 №10)

*Поэт фортепиано* (Советская музыка, 1949 №10)

[*Poet of the Piano*]

*Posle konkursa* (Junost', 1958 №6)

*После конкурса* (Юность, 1958 №6)

[*After the Competition*]

*Povyšajte muzykal'nuju kul'turu detej* (Načal'naja škola, 1953 №3)

*Повышайте музыкальную культуру детей* (Начальная школа, 1953 №3)

[*Raise the Musical Culture of Children*]

*Predislovie k knige I. Gofmana «Fortepiannaja igra»* (Moskva: 1938. 3-e izdanie)

*Предисловие к книге И.Гофмана «Фортепианная игра»* (Москва: 1938. 3-е издание)

[*Preface to the book by J. Hofmann Piano Playing* (Moscow: 1938. 3<sup>rd</sup> edition)]

*Privet masteru!* (Sovetskoe iskusstvo, 29/05/1936)

*Привет мастеру!* (Советское искусство, 29/05/1936)

[*Hello to the Master!*]

*Razdum'ja o Šopene* (Kultura i žizn', 1960 №2)

*Раздумья о Шопене* (Культура и жизнь, 1960 №2)

[*Thoughts on Chopin*]

*Razmyslenija člana žjuri* (Žurnal RT, 1966, № 6.7)

*Размышления члена жюри* (Журнал РТ, 1966, № 6.7)

[*Thoughts of a Jury Member*]

*Самое высокое – самое доступное* (Izvestija, 15/12/1963)

*Самое высокое – самое доступное* (Известия, 15/12/1963)

[*The Highest – The Most Accessible*]

*Семнадцатая симфония Мясковского* (Sovetskoe iskusstvo, 01/01/1938)

*Семнадцатая симфония Мясковского* (Советское искусство, 01/01/1938)

[*Myaskovsky's Seventeenth Symphony*]

*Сочиняйте, а не излагайте* (Iskusstvo kino, 1964 №4)

*Сочиняйте, а не излагайте* (Искусство кино, 1964 №4)

[*Compose, Don't State*]

*Sovremennik Skrjabina i Rahmaninova* (Sovetskaja muzyka, 1961 №11)

*Современник Скрябина и Рахманинова* (Советская музыка, 1961 №11)

[*A Contemporary of Skryabin and Rachmaninov*]

*Strast', intellekt, tehnika...* (Junost', 1962 №7)

*Страсть, интеллект, техника...* (Юность, 1962 №7)

[*Passion, Intellect, Technique...*]

*Svjatoslav Rihter* (Ogonek, 1941 №1)

*Святослав Рихтер* (Огонек, 1941 №1)

[*Sviatoslav Richter*]

*Svjatoslav Rihter* (Sovetskoe iskusstvo, 11/01/1946)

*Святослав Рихтер* (Советское искусство, 11/01/1946)

[*Sviatoslav Richter*]

*Svjatoslav Rihter* (Kul'tura i žizn', 1960 №2)

*Святослав Рихтер* (Культура и жизнь, 1960 №2)

[*Sviatoslav Richter*]

*Tri hudožnika* (Sovetskoe iskusstvo, 17/04/1936)

*Три художника* (Советское искусство, 17/04/1936)

[*Three Artists*]

*Van Klibern* (Sovetskaja kul'tura, 07/07/1960)

*Ван Клиберн* (Советская культура, 07/07/1960)

[*Van Cliburn*]

*Velikoe i prostoe* (Sovetskoe iskusstvo, 09/05/1940)

*Великое и простое* (Советское искусство, 09/05/1940)

[*The Great and Simple*]

*Vladimir Sofronickij* (Sovetskoe iskusstvo, 23/06/1937)

*Владимир Софроницкий* (Советское искусство, 23/06/1937)

[*Vladimir Sofronitsky*]

*Vladimir Sofronickij* (Sovetskaja kul'tura, 27/05/1961)

*Владимир Софроницкий* (Советская культура, 27/03/1961)

[*Vladimir Sofronitsky*]

*Vsesouznyj konkurs direžorov* (Izvestija, 10/09/1938)

*Всесоюзный конкурс дирижеров* (Известия, 10/09/1938)

[*The All-Union Competition of Conductors*]

*Vspominaja Mirona Poljakina* (Sovetskaja kul'tura, 1961 №6)

*Вспоминая Мирона Полякина* (Советская культура, 1961 №6)

[*Remembering Miron Polyakin*]

*Vydujščijsja pianist sovremennosti* (Ogonek, 1960 №48)

*Выдающийся пианист современности* (Огонек, 1960 №48)

[*An Exceptional Pianist of Our Time*]

*Zamečatel'nyj koncert* (Pravda, 14/06/1957)

*Замечательный концерт* (Правда, 14/06/1957)

[*A Wonderful Concert*]

*Zametki muzykal'nogo dejatelja* (Sovetskoe iskusstvo, 11/10/1936)

*Заметки музыкального деятеля* (Советское искусство, 11/10/1936)

[*Notes of a Musical Figure*]

*Zametki o Skrjabinе* (Sovetskaja muzyka, 1955 №4)

*Заметки о Скрябине* (Советская музыка, 1955 №4)

[*Notes on Skryabin*]

*Želaju udači!* (Sovetskaja muzyka, 1962 №2)

*Желаю удачи!* (Советская музыка, 1962 №2)

[*All the Best!*]

*Zrelost'* (Sovetskoe iskusstvo, 29/03/1945)

*Зрелость* (Советское искусство, 29/03/1945)

[*Maturity*]

MIL'ŠTEJN, Ja. I. *Konstantin Nikolaevič Igumnov* (Moskva: Muzyka, 1975)

МИЛЬШТЕЙН, Я. И. *Константин Николаевич Игумнов* (Москва: «Музыка», 1975)

[MILSTEIN, YAKOV. *Konstantin Nikolayevich Igumnov* (Moscow: 1975)]

MIL'ŠTEJN, Ja. I. *List. Tom 1* (Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe Muzykal'noe Izdatel'stvo, 1956)

МИЛЬШТЕЙН, Я. И. *Лист. Том 1* (Москва: «Государственное Музыкальное Издательство», 1956)

[MILSTEIN, YAKOV. *Liszt. Volume 1* (Moscow: 1956)]

MIL'ŠTEJN, Ja. I. *List. Tom 2* (Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe Muzykal'noe Izdatel'stvo, 1956)

МИЛЬШТЕЙН, Я. И. *Лист. Том 2* (Москва: «Государственное Музыкальное Издательство», 1956)

[MILSTEIN, YAKOV. *Liszt. Volume 2* (Moscow: 1956)]

MIL'ŠTEJN, Ja. I. *F. List. Izbrannye stat'i perevody A. Boboviča i N. Mamuna* (Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe Muzikal'noe Izdatel'stvo, 1959)

МИЛЬШТЕЙН, Я. И. *Ф. Лист. Избранные статьи* переводы А. Бобовича и Н. Мамуна (Москва: «Государственное Музыкальное Издательство», 1959)

[MILSTEIN, YAKOV. *F. Liszt. Selected Articles* translated by A. Bobovich and N. Mamun (Moscow: 1959)]

- MOCHULSKY, KONSTANTIN. *Dostoevsky: His Life and Work* (1947) translated by Michael Minihan (Princeton University Press, 1967)
- MOISEWITSCH, MAURICE. *Moiseiwitsch. Biography of a Concert Pianist* (London: Frederick Muller Ltd., 1965)
- MONSAINGEON, BRUNO. *Sviatoslav Richter. Notebooks and Conversations* translated by Stewart Spencer (London: Faber and Faber, 2001). Originally: *Sviatoslav Richter. Ecrits, conversations*, 1998.
- MÜHLENHOFF, BARBARA. *Die Pianofortefabrik W. Neuhaus Söhne Calcar: Briefe in die Heimat* [*The Piano Factory on W. Neuhaus & Sons: Letters to the Homeland*] (Norderstedt: Books on Demand, 2009)
- MUNDT, HANNELORE. *Understanding Thomas Mann* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2004)
- NATTIEZ, JEAN-JACQUES. *Musique and Discourse. Toward a Semiology of Music* translated by Carolyn Abbate (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1990). Originally: *Musicologie générale et sémiologie*, 1987
- NATTIEZ, JEAN-JACQUES. *Wagner Androgyne: A Study in Interpretation* translated by Stewart Spencer (New Jersey: Princeton Studies in Opera, 1993). Originally: *Wagner androgyne: essai sur l'interprétation*, 1990
- NAUMOV, L. N. *Pod znakom Neigauza* (Moskva: Antikva, 2002)
- НАУМОВ, Л. Н. *Под знаком Нейгауза* (Москва: «Антиква», 2002)
- [NAUMOV, LEV. *Under the Sign of Neuhaus* (Moscow: 2002)]
- NEJGAUZ, G. G. *Ob iskusstve fortepiannoj igry*, 1958 (Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe Muzykal'noe Izdatel'stvo, 1958)
- НЕЙГАУЗ, Г. Г. *Об искусстве фортепианной игры*, 1958 («Государственное Музыкальное Издательство», 1958)
- [NEUHAUS, HEINRICH. *About the Art of Piano Playing*, 1958 (Moscow: 1958)]



NEJGAUZ, G. G. *Ob iskusstve fortepiannoj igry*, 1958/61 (Moskva: Klassika-XXI, 1999)

НЕЙГАУЗ, Г. Г. *Об искусстве фортепианной игры*, 1958/61 (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 1999)

[NEUHAUS, HEINRICH. *About the Art of Piano Playing*, 1958/61 (Moscow: 1999)]

NEUHAUS, HEINRICH. *The Art of Piano Playing* translated by K. A. Leibovitch (London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1973).

NEWCORBE, ETHEL. *Leschetizky as I Knew Him* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1967)

NEWTON, MICHAEL. *The Path to Tyranny: A History of Free Society's Descent into Tyranny*, 2003. (Eleftheria Publishing, 2010)

NICHOLAS, JEREMY. *Godowsky: The Pianist's Pianist* (New York: Appian Publications & Recordings, 1989)

NIEMÖLLER, KLAUS. (ed.) *Heinrich Neuhaus (1888-1964) zum 110. Geburtsjahr: Aspekte interkultureller Beziehung in Pianistik und Musik-geschichte zwischen dem ostlichen Europa und Deutschland. Konferenzbericht Köln, 23 – 26. Oktober 1998.* (Sinzig Studio, 2000)  
 [Heinrich Neuhaus (1888-1964) 110 Years from his Birth: Aspects of Intercultural Relations in Piano Playing and Music History between Eastern Europe and Germany. Conference report Köln, 23–26 October 1998]

NIETZSCHE, FRIEDRICH. *Human, All Too Human* translated by Marion Faber and Stephen Lehman (London: Penguin Books, 2004). Originally: *Menschliches, Allzumenschliches*, 1878

NIETZSCHE, FRIEDRICH. *Human, All Too Human. Part II. The Wanderer and His Shadow* translated by Paul Cohn (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1913). Originally: *Der Wanderer und sein Schatten*, 1880

NIETZSCHE, FRIEDRICH. *The Birth of Tragedy and The Case of Wagner* translated by Walter Kaufmann (New York: Vintage Books, 1967). Originally *Die Geburt der Tragödie*, 1872 and *Der Fall Wagner*, 1888

NIKITIN, B.S. *Sergej Rahmaninov. Dve žizni* (Moskva: Klassika-XXI, 2009)

НИКИТИН, Б. С. *Сергей Рахманинов. Две жизни* (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2009)

[NIKITIN, BORIS. *Sergei Rachmaninov. Two Lives* (Moscow: 2009)]

NIKOLAEV, A. A. (*sostavitel'*) *Mastera sovetskoj pianističeskoj školy*. (Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe Muzykal'noe Izdatel'stvo, 1961 )

НИКОЛАЕВ, А. А. (составитель) *Мастера советской пианистической школы* (Москва: «Государственное Музыкальное Издательство», 1961)

[NIKOLAEV, A. (ed.) *Masters of the Soviet Piano School* (Moscow: 1961)]

List of articles:

ALEKSEEV, A. D. *O pianističeskih principah S. E. Fejnberga*

АЛЕКСЕЕВ, А. Д. *О пианистических принципах С. Е. Фейнберга*

[ALEXEEV, A. *About the Pianistic Principles of S. Feinberg*]

MIL'ŠTEJN, Ja. *Ispolnitel'skie i pedagogičeskie principy K. N. Igumnova*

МИЛЬШТЕЙН, Я. *Исполнительские и педагогические принципы К. Н. Изумнова*

[MILSTEIN, Y. *The Interpretative and Pedagogical Principles of K. Igumnov*]

NIKOLAEV, A. A. *Ispolnitel'skie i pedagogičeskie principy A. B. Gol'denvejzera*

НИКОЛАЕВ, А. А. *Исполнительские и педагогические принципы А. Б.*

*Гольденвейзера*

[NIKOLAEV, A. *The Interpretative and Pedagogical Principles of A. Goldenweiser*]

NIKOLAEV, A. A. *Osnovy sovetskoj pianističeskoj školy*

НИКОЛАЕВ, А. А. *Основы советской пианистической школы*

[NIKOLAEV, A. *The Foundations of the Soviet Piano School*]

NIKOLAEV, A. A. *Vzgljady G. G. Nejgauza na razvitie pianističeskogo masterstva*

НИКОЛАЕВ, А. А. *Взгляды Г. Г. Нейгауза на развитие пианистического мастерства*

[NIKOLAEV, A. *The Views of H. Neuhaus on the Development of Pianistic Mastery*]

NIKONOVICH, I. N & SKRJABIN, A. S. (*sostavitel'*) *Vspominaja Sofronickogo* (Moskva: Klassika-XXI, 2008)

НИКОНОВИЧ, И. Н. & СКРЯБИН А. С. (составитель) *Вспоминая Софроницкого* (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2008)

[NIKONOVICH, I & SKRYABIN, A. (ed.) *Remembering Sofronitsky* (Moscow: 2008)]

NOUDELMANN, FRANÇOIS. *The Philosopher's Touch: Sartre, Nietzsche, & Barthes at the Piano* translated by Brian J. Reilly (Columbia University Press, 2012). Originally: *Le Toucher des philosophes: Sartre, Nietzsche et Barthes au piano*, 2008

NOYLE, LINDA. *Pianists on Playing: Interviews with Twelve Concert Pianists* (London: The Scarecrow Press, Inc., 1987)

ORWIN, DONNA. *Tolstoy's Art and Thought, 1847–1880* (Princeton University Press, 1993)

OSNOVIN, V. V. (sostavitel') *L. N. Tolstoj. Čto takoe iskusstvo?* (Moskva: Sovremennik, 1985)

ОСНОВИН, В. В. (составитель) *Л. Н. Толстой. Что такое искусство?* (Москва: «Современник», 1985)

[OSNOVIN, V. (ed.) *Lev Tolstoy. What is Art?* [A selection of articles] (Moscow: 1985)]

List of articles and transcripts:

OSNOVIN, V. V. *Glavnoe značenie iskusstva – značenie ob'edinenija. (O vzgljadah L. Tolstogo na iskusstvo)*, 1985

ОСНОВИН, В. В. *Главное значение искусства – значение объединения. (O vzgljadah L. Tolstogo na iskusstvo)*, 1985

[OSNOVIN, V. *The Most Important Meaning of Art is the Meaning of Unity. (About the Views of L. Tolstoy on Art)*]

TOLSTOJ, L. N. *Dlja čego pišut ljudi*, 1851

ТОЛСТОЙ, Л. Н. *Для чего пишут люди*, 1851

[TOLSTOY, LEV. *What People Write For*]

TOLSTOJ, L. N. *Reč' v Občestve ljubitelej rossijskoj slovestnosti*, 1859

ТОЛСТОЙ, Л. Н. *Речь в Обществе любителей российской словестности*, 1859

[TOLSTOY, LEV. *A Speech in the Society of Appreciation for Russian Literature*]

TOLSTOJ, L. N. *O jazyke narodnyh knižek*, 1862

ТОЛСТОЙ, Л. Н. *О языке народных книжек*, 1862  
 [TOLSTOY, LEV. *About the Language of Popular Books*]

TOLSTOJ, L. N. *Ob iskusstve*, 1889  
 ТОЛСТОЙ, Л. Н. *Об искусстве*, 1889  
 [TOLSTOY, LEV. *About Art*]

TOLSTOJ, L. N. *Čto takoe iskusstvo?*, 1897  
 ТОЛСТОЙ, Л. Н. *Что такое искусство?*, 1897  
 [TOLSTOY, LEV. *What is Art?*]

TOLSTOJ, L. N. *O Šekspire i o drame (kritičeskij očerk)*, 1906  
 ТОЛСТОЙ, Л. Н. *О Шекспире и о драме (критический очерк)*, 1906  
 [TOLSTOY, LEV. *About Shakespeare and Drama (A Critical Survey)*]

OVERY, RICHARD. *The Dictators: Hitler's Germany and Stalin's Russia*, 2004 (London: Penguin Books, 2005)

PADDISON, MAX. *Adorno's Aesthetics of Music*, 1993 (Cambridge University Press, 1997)

PAPERNO, DMITRI. *Notes of a Moscow Pianist* (Oregon: Amadeus Press, 1998)

PAPERNO, D. A. *Zapiski moskovskogo pianista* (Moskva: Klassika XXI, 2008)

ПАПЕРНО, Д. А. *Записки московского пианиста* (Москва: «Классика XXI», 2008)

PAPERNO, DMITRI. *Notes of a Moscow Pianist* (Moscow, 2008)

PASTERNAK, E. V. & PASTERNAK, E. B. (sostaviteli) *Boris Pasternak. Pis'ma k poditeljam i sestram 1907–1960* (Moskva: Novoe Literaturnoe Obozrenie, 2004)

ПАСТЕРНАК, Е. В. & ПАСТЕРНАК, Е. Б. (составители) *Борис Пастернак. Письма к родителям и сестрам 1907–1960* (Москва: «Новое Литературное Обозрение», 2004)

[PASTERNAK, E. V. & PASTERNAK, E. B. (eds.) *Boris Pasternak. Letters to his Parents and his Sisters 1907–1960* (Moscow: 2004)]

PERES DA COSTA, NEAL. *Off the Record. Performing Practices in Romantic Piano Playing* (Oxford University Press, 2012)

PHILIP, ROBERT. *Early Recordings and Musical Style: Changing Tastes in Instrumental Performance, 1990–1950* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992)

PLASKIN, GLENN. *Horowitz: A Biography of Vladimir Horowitz* (University of Michigan, 1983)

POZNANSKIJ, A. N. *Petr Čajkovskij. Biografija* (Sankt-Peterburg: Vita Nova, 2009)  
 ПОЗНАНСКИЙ, А. Н. *Пётр Чайковский. Биография* (Санкт-Петербург: «Вита Нова», 2009)  
 [POZNANSKY, ALEXANDER. *Piotr Tchaikovsky* (St. Petersburg: 2009)]

RABINOVIČ, D. A. *Ispolnitel' i stil'*, 1981 (Moskva: Klassika-XXI, 2008)  
 РАБИНОВИЧ, Д. А. *Исполнитель и стиль*, 1981 (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2008)  
 [RABINOVICH, DAVID. *Interpreter and Style*, 1981 (Moscow: 2008)]

RABINOVIČ, D. A. *Portrety pianistov* (Moskva: Sovetskij Kompozitor, 1962)  
 РАБИНОВИЧ, Д. А. *Портреты пианистов* (Москва: «Советский Композитор», 1962)  
 [RABINOVICH, DAVID. *Portraits of Pianists* (Moscow: 1962)]

RAMANN, LINA. *Franz Liszt. Artist and Man* (London: W. H. Allen and Co., 1882)

RANCOUR-LAFERRIERE, DANIEL. *The Slave Soul of Russia* (New York: New York University Press, 1995)

RIHTER, E. R. (sostavitel') *Vspominaja Nejgauza*, 1992 (Moskva: Klassika-XXI, 2007)  
 РИХТЕР, Е. Р. (составитель) *Вспоминая Нейгауза*, 1992 (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2007)  
 [RICHTER, ELENA. (ed.) *Remembering Neuhaus*, 1992 (Moscow: 2007)]

RIZEMAN, O. *Sergej Rahmaninov. Vospominanija*, 1934, perevod V. N. Čemberdži (Moskva: Klassika-XXI, 2008)  
 РИЗЕМАН, О. *Сергей Рахманинов. Воспоминания*, 1934, перевод В. Н. Чемберджи (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2008)  
 [RIESEMANN, OSKAR von. *Sergei Rachmaninov. Reminiscences*, 1934, translated by V. Chemberg (Moscow: 2008)]

RINK, JOHN. (ed.) *Musical Performance. A Guide to Understanding* (Cambridge University Press, 2002)

RINK, JOHN. (ed.) *The Practice of Performance. Studies in Musical Interpretation*, 1995, (Cambridge University Press, 2005)

ROLLAND, ROMAIN. *Beethoven the Creator: From the Eroica to the Appassionata* translated by Ernest Newman (London: Victor Gollancz Ltd., 1929). Originally: *Beethoven le Créateur: Les Grandes Epoques Creatices*, 1928.

ROSEN, CHARLES. *The Romantic Generation*, 1995 (Harvard University Press, 1998)

RUBINŠTEJN, A. G. *Lekcii po istorii fortepiannoј literatury*, 1889 (Moskva: Muzyka, 1974)

РУБИНШТЕЙН, А. Г. *Лекции по истории фортепианной литературы*, 1889 (Москва: «Музыка», 1974)

[RUBINSTEIN, ANTON. *Lectures in the History of Piano Literature*, 1889 (Moscow: 1974)]

RUBINŠTEJN, A. G. *Muzyka i ee predstaviteli*, 1891 (Sankt-Peterburg: Sojuz Hudožnikov, 2005)

РУБИНШТЕЙН, А. Г. *Музыка и её представители*, 1891 (Санкт-Петербург: «Союз Художников», 2005)

[RUBINSTEIN, ANTON. *Music and Those Who Represent It*, 1891 (St. Petersburg: 2005)]<sup>1</sup>

RUBINSTEIN, ARTHUR. *My Younger Years* (London: Random House, 1973)

RUBINSTEIN, ARTHUR. *My Many Years* (London: Random House, 1980)

SACHS, HARVEY. *Virtuoso* (New York: Thames and Hudson, 1982)

SAID, EDWARD & BARENBOIM, DANIEL. *Parallels and Paradoxes. Explorations in Music and Society* edited by Ara Guzelimian (Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group, 2004)

SAID, EDWARD. *Musical Elaborations* (Columbia University Press, 1991)

SAID, EDWARD. *Music at the Limits with a foreword by Daniel Barenboim* (Columbia University Press, 2008)

SAMSON, JIM. *The Music of Chopin*, 1985 (Oxford University Press, 1994)

---

<sup>1</sup> The published English translations of this book are titled *Music and its Masters*.

SAMSON, JIM. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Chopin*, 1992 (Cambridge University Press, 1998)

SÁNDOR, GYÖRGY. *On Piano Playing: Motion, Sound and Expression* (New York: Schirmer Books, 1981)

SAVŠINSKIJ, S. I. *Rabota pianista nad muzykal'nym proizvedeniem* (Leningrad: Muzyka, 1964)

САВШИНСКИЙ, С. И. *Работа пианиста над музыкальным произведением* (Ленинград, «Музыка», 1964)

[SAVSHINSKY, SAMARII. *The Work of the Pianist on a Musical Work* (Leningrad: 1964)]

SCHMALFELDT, JANET. *In the Process of Becoming: Analytic and Philosophical Perspectives on Form in Early Nineteenth-Century Music* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)

SCHNABEL, ARTUR. *Music and the Line of Most Resistance* (New York: Da Capo Press, 1942)

SCHNABEL, ARTUR. *Reflections on Music* translated by Cesar Saerchinger (London: Simon & Schuster, 1934)

SCHOENBERG, ARNOLD. *Style and Idea* translated by Dika Newlin (New York: Philosophical Library, 1950). Originally: *Stil und Gedank*.

SCHONBERG, HAROLD. *Horowitz. His Life and Music* (London: Simon & Schuster, 1992)

SCHONBERG, HAROLD. *The Great Pianists from Mozart to the Present* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1987)

SCHOPENHAUER, ARTHUR. *The World as Will and Representation* translated by E. F. J. Payne (Keystone Series, Falcon's Wing Press, 1958)

SCHRIFT, ALAN. *Nietzsche and the Question of Interpretation: Between Hermeneutics and Deconstruction* (London: Routledge Inc., 1990)

SCHUMANN, ROBERT. *On Music and Musicians* translated by Paul Rosenfeld and edited by Konrad Wolff, 1946 (University of California Press, 1983)

- SCHUTTE, OFELIA. *Beyond Nihilism: Nietzsche without masks*, 1984 (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1986)
- SCHWARZ, BORIS. *Music and Musical Life in Soviet Russia 1917–1970* (London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1972)
- SEROV, A. N. *Stat'i o muzyke (1859) Tom 4* (Moskva: Muzyka, 1988)  
 СЕРОВ, А. Н. *Статьи о музыке (1859) Том 4* (Москва: «Музыка», 1988)  
 [SEROV, ALEXANDER. *Articles about Music (1859) Vol. 4* (Moscow: 1988)]
- SILOTI, ALEXANDER. *My Memories of Liszt* (London: Breitkopf & Haertel, c. 1911)
- SITWELL, SACHEVERELL. *Liszt* (London: Faber and Faber, 1934)
- SKROWRONECK, TILMAN. *Beethoven the Pianist* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010)
- ŠLIFŠTEJN, S. I. (sostavitel') *S. S. Prokof'ev. Materialy, dokumenty, vospominanija* (Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe Muzykal'noe Izdatel'stvo, 1956)  
 ШЛИФШТЕЙН, С. И. (составитель) *С. С. Прокофьев. Материалы, документы, воспоминания*. (Москва: «Государственное Музыкальное Издательство», 1956)  
 [SHLIFSTEIN, SEMIEN (ed.) *S. S. Prokofiev. Materials, Documents, Remembrances* (Moscow: 1956)]
- ŠNABEL', A. *Moja žizn' i muzyka, (1945) 1961. Muzyka i linija naibol'shego soprotivlenija, 1942. Razmyšlenija o muzyke, 1933* (Moskva: Klassika-XXI, 1999)  
 ШНАБЕЛЬ, А *Моя жизнь и музыка, (1945) 1961. Музыка и линия наибольшего сопротивления, 1942. Размышления о музыке, 1933* (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 1999)  
 [SCHNABEL, ARTUR. *My Life and Music, (1945) 1961. Music and the Line of Most Resistance, 1942. Thoughts on Music, 1933* (Moscow: 1999)]
- SOKOLOV, M. G. (sostavitel') *Voprosy fortepiannogo ispolnitel'stva. Vypusk pervyj* (Moskva: Muzyka, 1965)  
 СОКОЛОВ, М. Г. (составитель) *Вопросы фортепианного исполнительства. Выпуск первый* (Москва: «Музыка», 1965)  
 [SOKOLOV, M. (ed.) *Questions of Piano Interpretation. Issue 1* (Moscow: 1965)]



List of articles:

BARENBOJM, L. A. *Na urokah F. M. Blumenfel'da*

БАРЕНБОЙМ, Л. А. *На уроках Ф. М. Блюменфельда*

[BARENBOIM, L. *In the Lessons of F. Blumenfeld*]

FEJNBERG, S. E. *Put' k masterstvu*

ФЕЙНБЕРГ, С. Е. *Путь к мастерству*

[FEINBERG, S. *The Path to Mastery*]

FEJNBERG, S. E. *Sonaty Bethovena*

ФЕЙНБЕРГ, С. Е. *Сонаты Бетховена*

[FEINBERG, S. *Beethoven's Sonatas*]

GOL'DENVEJZER, A. B. *O redaktirovanii*

ГОЛЬДЕНВЕЙЗЕР, А. Б. *О редактировании*

[GOLDENWEISER, A. *About Editing*]

GOL'DENVEJZER, A. B. *Ob ispolnitel'stve*

ГОЛЬДЕНВЕЙЗЕР, А. Б. *Об исполнительстве*

[GOLDENWEISER, A. *About Interpretation*]

HLUDOVA, T. A. *O pedagogičeskikh principah G. Nejgauza*

ХЛУДОВА, Т. А. *О педагогических принципах Г. Нейгауза*

[HULDOVA, T. *About the Pedagogical Principles of H. Neuhaus*]

MIL'ŠTEJN, JA. I. *K.N. Igumnov i voprosy fortepiannoj pedagogiki*

МИЛЬШТЕЙН, Я. И. *К.Н. Игумнов и вопросы фортепианной педагогики*

[MILSTEIN, Y. *K.N. Igumnov and Questions about Piano Pedagogy*]

NIKOLAEV, A. A. *Moskovskaja fortepiannaja škola i ee vydajučšeesja predstaviteli*

НИКОЛАЕВ, А. А. *Московская фортепианная школа и ее выдающиеся представители*

[NIKOLAEV, A. *The Moscow Piano School and Those who Eminently Represent It*]

SOKOLOV, M. G. (sostavitel') *Pianisty rasskazyvajut. Vypusk vtoroj* (Moskva: Muzyka, 1984)

СОКОЛОВ, М. Г. (составитель) *Пианисты рассказывают. Выпуск второй* (Москва: «Музыка», 1984)

[SOKOLOV, M. (ed.) *Pianists Speak. Issue 2* (Moscow: 1984)]

List of articles:

FEINBERG, S. E. *O fortepiannoj muzyke Mocarta i Bethovena. Stenogramma besedy.*

ФЕЙНБЕРГ, С. Е. *О фортепианной музыке Моцарта и Бетховена. Стенограмма беседы*

[FEINBERG, S. *About the Piano Music of Mozart and Beethoven. A Stenograph of a Conversation*]

FEINBERG, S. E. *Ob interpretacii proizvedenij I. S. Baha. Stenogramma besedy*

ФЕЙНБЕРГ, С. Е. *Об интерпритации произведений И. С. Баха. Стенограмма беседы*

[FEINBERG, S. *About the Interpretation of Works by J. S. Bach. A Stenograph of a Conversation*]

FEINBERG, S. E. *Zametki pianista*

ФЕЙНБЕРГ, С. Е. *Заметки пианиста*

[FEINBERG, S. *Notes of a Pianist*]

GOL'DENVEJZER, A. B. *O fortepiannoj pedagogike. Stenogramma doklada*

ГОЛЬДЕНВЕЙЗЕР, А. Б. *О фортепианной педагогике. Стенограмма доклада*

[GOLDENWEISER, A. *About Piano Pedagogy. A Stenograph of a Speech*]

GOL'DENVEIZER, A. B. *Ob ispolnenii proizvedenij kompozitorov klassikov.*

*Stenogramma otkrytogo uroka*

ГОЛЬДЕНВЕЙЗЕР, А. Б. *Об исполнении произведений композиторов классиков.*

*Стенограмма открытого урока*

[GOLDENWEISER, A. *About the Interpretation of Works by Classical composers. A Stenograph of an Open Lesson*]

GOL'DENVEIZER, A. B. *Rabota nad proizvedenijami krupnoj formy. Stenogramma otkrytogo uroka*

ГОЛЬДЕНВЕЙЗЕР, А. Б. *Работа над произведениями крупной формы.*

*Стенограмма открытого урока*

[GOLDENWEISER, A. *Working on a Musical Work with Extended Form. A Stenograph of an Open Lesson*]

GOL'DENVEJZER, A. B. *Sovety molodym muzykantam. Stenogramma besedy*

ГОЛЬДЕНВЕЙЗЕР, А. Б. *Советы молодым музыкантам. Стенограмма беседы*

[GOLDENWEISER, A. *Advice to Young Musicians. A Stenograph of a Conversation*]

IGUMNOV, K. N. *Moi ispolnitel'skie i pedagogičeskie principy*

ИГУМНОВ, К. Н. *Мои исполнительские и педагогические принципы*

[IGUMNOV, K. *My Interpretative and Pedagogical Principles*]

IGUMNOV, K. N. *O tvorčeskom puti i ispolnitel'skom iskusstve pianista. Iz besed s psihologami. Redakcija i komentarii M. Smirnova*

ИГУМНОВ, К. Н. *О творческом пути и исполнительском искусстве пианиста. Из бесед с психологами. Редакция и комментарии М. Смирнова*

[IGUMNOV, K. *About the Artistic Path and Art of the Pianist's Interpretation. From Conversations with Psychologists. Edited with commentaries by M. Smirnov*]

NEJGAUZ, G. G. *Masterstvo pianista. Stenogramma besedy*

НЕЙГАУЗ, Г. Г. *Мастерство пианиста. Стенограмма беседы*

[NEUHAUS, H. *The Mastery of a Pianist. A Stenograph of a Conversation*]

NEJGAUZ, G. G. *Problemy fortepiannoj pedagogiki. Stenogramma seminar*

НЕЙГАУЗ, Г. Г. *Проблемы фортепианной педагогики. Стенограмма семинара*

[NEUHAUS, H. *Problems in Piano Pedagogy. A Stenograph of a Seminar*]

SOKOLOV, M. G. (sostavitel') *Voprosy fortepiannogo ispolnitel'stva. Vypusk vtoroj* (Moskva: Muzyka, 1968)

СОКОЛОВ, М. Г. (составитель) *Вопросы фортепианного исполнительства. Выпуск второй* (Москва: «Музыка», 1968)

[SOKOLOV, M. (ed.) *Questions of Piano Interpretation. Issue 2* (Moscow: 1968)]

List of articles:

FEINBERG, S. E. *Bethoven. Sonata Op. 106 (ispolnitel'skij kommentarij)*  
 ФЕЙНБЕРГ, С. Е. *Бетховен. Соната Op. 106 (исполнительский комментарий)*  
 [FEINBERG, S. *Beethoven. Sonata Op. 106 (A Performance Commentary)*]

NEJGAUZ, G. G. *O Poslednih sonatah Bethovena*  
 НЕЙГАУЗ, Г. Г. *О Последних сонатах Бетховена*  
 [NEUHAUS, H. *About Beethoven's Last Sonatas*]

SOFRONICKIJ, V. V. *O Šopene (fragment)*  
 СОФРОНИЦКИЙ, В. В. *О Шопене (фрагмент)*  
 [SOFRONITSKY, V. *About Chopin (A Fragment)*]

ZAK, Ja. I. *O nekotoryh voprosah vospitanija molodyh pianistov*  
 ЗАК, Я. И. *О некоторых вопросах воспитания молодых пианистов*  
 [ZAK, Y. *About a Few Issues in the Training of Young Pianists*]

SOLOMON, ROBERT. *From Rationalism to Existentialism. The Existentialists and their Nineteenth-Century Backgrounds* (Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2001)

SONTAG, SUSAN. *Against Interpretation and other essays*, 1966 (London: Penguin Books, 2013)

STASOV, V. V. *Stat'i o muzyke v pjati bypuskah, vyp. tretiji 1880–1886* (Moskva: Muzyka, 1977)  
 СТАСОВ, В. В. *Статьи о музыке в пяти выпусках, вып. третий 1880–1886* (Москва: «Музыка», 1977)  
 [STASOV, VLADIMIR. *Articles on Music in Five Volumes, Volume Three 1880–1886* (Moscow: 1977)]

STANISLAVSKIJ, K. S. *Rabota aktera nad soboj v tvorčeskom processe perežibanija. Dnevnik učenika*, 1938 (Sankt-Peterburg: Azbuka-Klassika, 2010)  
 СТАНИСЛАВСКИЙ, К. С. *Работа актера над собой в творческом процессе переживания. Дневник ученика*, 1938 (Санкт-Петербург: «Азбука-Классика», 2010)  
 [STANISLAVSKY, KONSTANTIN. *The Work of an Actor on Himself in the Creative Process of Experiencing. The Diary of a Student, 1938* (St. Petersburg: 2010)]

STANISLAVSKIJ, K. S. *Rabota aktera nad soboj v tvorčeskom processe voploščeniija*, 1938

(Sankt-Peterburg: Azbuka-Klassika, 2011)

СТАНИСЛАВСКИЙ, К. С. *Работа актера над собой в творческом процессе воплощения*,

1938 (Санкт-Петербург: «Азбука-Классика», 2011)

[STANISLAVSKY, KONSTANTIN. *The Work of an Actor on Himself in the Creative Process of Incarnation*, 1938 (St. Petersburg: 2011)]

STANISLAVSKIJ, K. S. *Stat'i. Reči. Besedy. Pis'ma* (Moskva: Iskusstvo, 1953)

СТАНИСЛАВСКИЙ, К. С. *Статьи. Речи. Беседы. Письма* (Москва: «Искусство», 1953)

[STANISLAVSKY, KONSTANTIN. *Articles. Speeches. Conversations. Letters* (Moscow: 1953)]

STARR, S. *Bamboula – The Life and Times of Louis Moreau Gottschalk* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995)

STASOV, VLADIMIR. *Selected Essays on Music* translated by Florence Jonas (London: Barrie and Rockliff, 1968)

STEPHENSON, ROGER. *Goethe's Conception of Knowledge and Science* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1995)

SUBOTNIK, ROSE. 'Adorno's Diagnosis of Beethoven's Late Style. Early Symptom of a Fatal Condition' (*Journal of the American Musicological Society*, Vol. 29, No. 2, Summer 1976, pp. 242–275)

STRAVINSKY, IGOR. *Poetics of Music in the Form of Six Lessons*, 1942, translated by Arthur Knodel and Ingolf Dahl (New York: Vintage Books, 1960)

TALBOT, MICHAEL. (ed.) *The Musical Work: Reality or Invention?* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000)

TARUSKIN, RICHARD. *Defining Russia Musically: Historical and Hermeneutical Essays* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997)

TARUSKIN, RICHARD. *On Russian Music* (California: California University Press, 2009)

- TARUSKIN, RICHARD. *Text and Act: Essays on Music and Performance* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995)
- THAYERS, ALEXANDER. *Life of Beethoven. Volume 2, 1921*. Revised and edited by Elliott Forbes (Princeton University Press, 1991)
- THIEFFRY, JEANNE. *Alfred Cortot's Studies in Musical Interpretation* (London: George G. Harrap & Co. Ltd., 1937)
- TROCHIMCZYK, MAJA. *A Romantic Century in Polish Music* (Los Angeles: Moonrise Press, 2009)
- UMBERTO, ECO. *The Limits of Interpretation* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1990)
- VICINSKIJ, A. V. *Besedy s pianistami, 1944/9* (Moskva: Klassika-XXI, 2007)
- ВИЦИНСКИЙ, А. В. *Беседы с пианистами, 1944/9* (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2007)
- [VITSINSKY, ALEXANDER. *Conversations with Pianists, 1944/9* (Moscow: 2007)]
- VICINSKIJ, A. V. *Process raboty pianista-ispolnitelja nad muzykal'nym proizvedeniem, 1950* (Moskva: Klassika-XXI, 2008)
- ВИЦИНСКИЙ, А. В. *Процесс работы пианиста-исполнителя над музыкальным произведением, 1950* (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2008)
- [VITSINSKY, ALEXANDER. *The Process of Work by the Pianist-Interpreter on a Musical Work, 1950* (Moscow: 2008)]
- WALKER, ALAN. *Hans von Bülow. A Life and Times* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010)
- WALKER, ALAN. *Franz Liszt. The Virtuoso Years: 1811–1847, 1983* (New York: Cornell University Press, 2003)
- WALKER, ALAN. *Franz Liszt. The Weimar Years: 1847–1861, 1988* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1993)
- WALKER, ALAN. *Franz Liszt. The Final Years: 1861–1886* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1997)

WALKER, ALAN. 'Liszt the Writer' in *Reflections on Liszt* (New York: Cornell University Press, 2005)

WEBSTER, JAMES. 'Between Enlightenment and Romanticism in Music History: "First Viennese Modernism" and the Delayed Nineteenth Century' (*19<sup>th</sup>-Century Music*, Vol. 25, No. 2–3, Fall, Spring 2001–2002, pp. 108–126)

WILLIAMON, AARON. (ed.) *Musical Excellence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004)

WINTLE, CHRISTOPHER. 'Issues in Dahlhaus' (*Musical Analysis*, Vol. 1, No. 3, October 1982, pp. 341–355)

WOLFF, KONRAD. *Schnabel's Interpretation of Piano Music, 1972, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1979)

ZIMJANINA, N. M. (sostavitel') *Stanislav Nejgauz. Vospominanija. Pis'ma. Materialy* (Moskva: Sovetskij Kompozitor, 1988)

ЗИМЯНИНА, Н. М. (составитель) *Станислав Нейгауз. Воспоминания. Письма. Материалы* (Москва: «Советский Композитор», 1988)

[ZIMYANINA, N. (ed.) *Stanislav Neuhaus. Reminiscences. Letters. Materials* (Moscow: 1988)]

ZASIMOVA, A.V. (sostavitel') *Kak ispolnjat' Šopena* (Moskva: Klassika-XXI, 2005)

ЗАСИМОВА, А. В. (составитель) *Как исполнять Шопена* (Москва: «Классика-XXI», 2005)

[ZASIMOVA, A. (ed.) *How to Perform Chopin* (Moscow: 2005)]

List of articles:

АСАФ'ЕВ, В. В. *Šopen v vosproizvedenii rusских kompozitorov*

АСАФЬЕВ, Б. В. *Шопен в воспроизведении русских композиторов*

[АСАФЬЕВ, В. *Chopin in the Works of Russian Composers*]

ГОЛУБОВСКАЯ, Н. И. *Ob ispolnenii Šopena*

ГОЛУБОВСКАЯ, Н. И. *Об исполнении Шопена*

[ГОЛУБОВСКАЯ, Н. *About the Interpretation of Chopin*]

ИГУМНОВ, К. Н. *О Šopene*

ИГУМНОВ, К. Н. *О Шопене*

[IGUMNOV, K. *About Chopin*]

КОГАН, Г. М. *Zametki ob ispolnenii Šopena*

КОГАН, Г. М. *Заметки об исполнении Шопена*

[KOGAN, G. *Notes on the Interpretation of Chopin*]

LANDOVSKA, V. *Šopen i francuzskaja starinnaja muzyka*

ЛАНДОВСКА, В. *Шопен и французская старинная музыка*

[LANDOWSKA, W. *Chopin and Ancient French Music*]

LENC, fon V. *Vospominanija o Šopene*

ЛЕНЦ, фон В. *Воспоминания о Шопене*

[LENZ, W von. *Remembering Chopin*]

LIST, F. *Šopen*

ЛИСТ, Ф. *Шопен*

[LISZT, F. *Chopin*]

МИHALOVSKIJ, A. *Kak igral Frederik Šopen?*

МИХАЛОВСКИЙ, А. *Как играл Фредерик Шопен?*

[MIKHALOWSKI, A. *How did Fryderyk Chopin Play?*]

NIKOLAEV, V. N. *Šopen-pedagog*

НИКОЛАЕВ, В. Н. *Шопен-педагог*

[NIKOLAEV, V. *Chopin-Pedagogue*]

OBORIN, L. N. *O Šopene. Vyderžki iz besed s S. Hentovoj*

ОБОРИН, Л. Н. *О Шопене. Выдержки из бесед с С. Хентовой*

[OBORIN, L. *About Chopin. Extracts from a Conversation with S. Hentova*]

ROULAND, D. *Šopenovskoe tempo rubato v hudožestvenno-istoričeskom kontekste*

РОУЛЭНД, Д. *Шопеновское tempo rubato в художественно-историческом контексте*

[ROLLAND, D. *Chopin's Tempo Rubato in the Historical-Artistic Context*]



RUBINŠTEJN, A. *O Šopene*  
 РУБИНШТЕЙН, А. *О Шопене*  
 [RUBINSTEIN, A. *About Chopin*]

ŽID, A. *Moj vzgljad na tvorčestvo Šopena*  
 ЖИД, А. *Мой взгляд на творчество Шопена*  
 [ŽID, A. *My Views on the Artistry of Chopin*]

ZENKIN, KONSTANTIN. 'The Liszt at the Moscow Conservatoire' (*Studia Musicologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*, T. 42, 2001, pp. 93–108)

ZILBERQUIT, MARK. *Russia's Great Modern Pianists* (New York: Paganiniana Publications, 1983)

ZIMDARS, RICHARD LOUIS. *The Piano Master Classes of Franz Liszt 1884–1886. Diary Notes of August Göllerich* (Indiana University Press, 1996)

Selected Scores Mentioned in the Thesis:

Ludvig van Bethoven. *32 Sonaty dlja fortepiano*. Redakcija Artura Šnabelja (Moskva: Muzyka, 1983)

Людвиг ван Бетховен. *32 Сонаты для фортепиано*. Редакция Артура Шнабеля (Москва: «Музыка», 1983)

[Ludwig van Beethoven. *32 Sonatas for Piano*. Edited by Artur Schnabel (Moscow: 1983)]

Ludvig van Bethoven. *32 Sonaty dlja fortepiano*. Redakcija A.B. Gol'denveizera (Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe muzykal'noe izdatel'stvo, 1957)

Людвиг ван Бетховен. *32 Сонаты для фортепиано*. Редакция А. Б. Гольденвейзера (Москва: «Государственное музыкальное издательство», 1957)

[Ludwig van Beethoven. *32 Sonatas for Piano*. Edited by Alexander Goldenweiser (Moscow: 1957)]

Ludwig van Beethoven. *Sonatas for the Piano*. Revised and fingered by Dr Hans von Bülow and Dr Sigmund Lebert, translated by Dr Theodore Baker (New York: G. Schirmer Inc., 1923)

Ludwig van Beethoven. *Klaviersonaten. Urtext* (Munich: G. Henle Verlag, 1980)

[Ludwig van Beethoven. *Piano Sonatas. Urtext* (Munich: 1980)]

Frederik Šopen. *Ballady dlja fortepiano*. Redakcija G. G. Nejgauza i Ja. I. Mil'štejna (Moskva: Muzyka, 1951)

Фридерик Шопен. *Баллады для фортепиано*. Редакция Г. Г. Нейгауза и Я. И. Мильштейна (Москва: «Музыка», 1951)

[Frederyk Chopin. *Ballades for Piano*. Edited by Heinrich Neuhaus and Yakov Milstein (Moscow: 1951)]

### Select Videography

Dokumental'nyj fil'm *Master Genrih* 39min, 2008.

režisser: Nikita Tihonov, avtor fil'ma: Yulija Tihonova

(Telecompanija *Gamajun* 2008 dlja Telekanala 'Kul'tura': Genrih Nejgauz – 120 let so dnja roždenija)

Učastvujut: Vera Gornastaeva, Milica Nejgauz, Marina Nejgauz, Ludmila Krenkel', Elena Rihter, Ėliso Virsaladze, Aleksej Nasedkin, Pavel Lobanov.

Документальный фильм «Мастер Генрих» 39 мин, 2008г.

Режиссер: Никита Тихонов, автор фильма: Юлия Тихонова

(Телекомпания «Гамаюн» 2008 для Телеканала «Культура»: Генрих Нейгауз – 120 лет со дня рождения)

Участвуют: Вера Горностаева, Милица Нейгауз, Марина Нейгауз, Людмила Кренкель, Елена Рихтер, Элисо Вирсаладзе, Алексей Наседкин, Павел Лобанов.

[Documentary *Master Heinrich*. 39 minutes, 2008.

Producer: Nikita Tihonov, author: Yulia Tihonova

(Produced by *Gamajun* for Television Channel *Kul'tura* for the 120<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of Heinrich Neuhaus)

Featuring: Vera Gornostaeva, Militzia Neuhaus, Marina Neuhaus, Ludmila Krenkel, Elena Richter, Eliso Virsaladze, Aleksei Nasedkin, Pavel Lobanov.]

BURTON, HUMPHREY. *Conversations with Glenn Gould [Series of Four Television Programmes]*

(BBC, 1966: i. *Bach and Recording* (15 March); ii. *Beethoven* (22 March); iii. *Strauss* (5 April); iv. *Schoenberg* (19 April))

DUBAL, DAVID. *The Art of the Piano. Great Pianists of the Twentieth Century.* (NVC Arts, 1999)

ANDRÁS SCHIFF. *Late Beethoven Piano Sonatas* (The Masterclass Media Foundation MMF 003, Royal Academy of Music, 2007)

*Alfred Brendel: What Makes Music Beautiful?*

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Hc9mhaCBZBU> (accessed 07/04/2013)

*Dmitri Alexeev Interview on Chopin, Poland 2012*

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Pos3hQa3CvA> (accessed 08/09/2014)

*Garrick Ohlsson: "Why Chopin? and Other Questions" at UC Berkeley*

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zI1XWrPNaAM> (accessed 31/03/2013)

*Glenn Gould: Dialogue with Menuhin about Beethoven aired on CBC on 18<sup>th</sup> May 1966*

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VBX7Z1OFR9s> (accessed 01/04/2013)

*Glenn Gould Talks to Children about Interpreting Music*

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VbLw2Mfa2NA> (accessed 01/04/2013)

*Perfect Pitch* (Series of Russian Television Programmes). *Emil Gilels and Heinrich Neuhaus.*

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Jko-KaKl40g> (accessed 02/02/2013)

*Susan McClary: Interpreting Music as a Performer*

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gU9GzI9hKIU> (accessed 23/03/2013)

*Susan McClary: On Why Cultural Context Matters to Understanding the Music You Play*

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-b64cWimElo> (accessed 23/03/2013)

*Richard Taruskin: Shall We Change the Subject? A Music Historian Reflects*

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4uxlZgVHjdk> (accessed 02/03/2013)

Websites

*Website dedicated to Heinrich Neuhaus by Valery Vosokoboinikov*

<http://www.neuhaus.it/english/> (accessed 08/08/2011)

*Website of the Heinrich Neuhaus museum in Kirovograd (formerly Elisavetgrad)*

[http://www.neuhausmuseum.region.in.ua/muz\\_neig\\_r.html](http://www.neuhausmuseum.region.in.ua/muz_neig_r.html) (accessed 08/08/2011)

*Website set-up and maintained by the current generation of the Neuhaus-family*

<http://www.neuhausklavier.com/> (accessed 05/03/2104)

Articles on Philosophy

<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/> (accessed 19/12/2013)

*Adam Mickiewicz's Sonnets in the vernacular and in English translations*

[www.sonnets.org/mickiewicz.htm](http://www.sonnets.org/mickiewicz.htm) (accessed 08/02/2014)

HOPKINS, CHARLES. *Biography of Leopold Godowsky*

[http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/11344?q=leopold+godowsky&search=quick&pos=1&\\_start=1#firsthit](http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/11344?q=leopold+godowsky&search=quick&pos=1&_start=1#firsthit) (accessed 01/05/2014)

METHEUN-CAMPBELL, JAMES. *Biography of Karl Heinrich Barth*

[http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/41241?q=Karl+barth&search=quick&pos=1&\\_start=1#firsthit](http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/41241?q=Karl+barth&search=quick&pos=1&_start=1#firsthit) (accessed 01/05/2014)

METHEUN-CAMPBELL, JAMES. *Biography of Heinrich Neuhaus*

[http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/19771?q=heinrich+neuhaus&search=quick&pos=1&\\_start=1#firsthit](http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/19771?q=heinrich+neuhaus&search=quick&pos=1&_start=1#firsthit) (accessed 17/04/2014)

SAMSON, JIM. *Biography of Karol Szymanowski*

[http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/27328?q=szymanowski&search=quick&pos=1&\\_start=1#firsthit](http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/27328?q=szymanowski&search=quick&pos=1&_start=1#firsthit) (accessed 01/05/2014)

MINAKOWSKI, M. J. *Genealogia potomków Sejmu Wielkiego [Genealogy of Descendants of Famous Families]*

<http://www.sejmwielki.pl/s/?lang=;em=R&ei=465344&m=NG&select=input&t=PN&et=S&image=on&spouse=on&n=sw.1799> (accessed 19/04/2014)

*Winners and Laureates of the Chopin International Piano Competitions*

<http://en.chopin.nifc.pl/chopin/persons/detail/name> (accessed 14/01/2014)

*Liszt and Beethoven. Document by the Beethoven Haus, Bonn*

[http://www.beethoven-haus-bonn.de/sixcms/media.php/75/kf\\_beeth\\_liszt\\_engl.pdf](http://www.beethoven-haus-bonn.de/sixcms/media.php/75/kf_beeth_liszt_engl.pdf)  
(accessed 08/04/2012]

*The Guardian, cultural reviews*

<http://www.guardian.com/music>

*AHRC Research Centre for the History and Analysis of Recorded Music*

<http://www.charm.rhul.ac.uk/index.html> (accessed 08/09/2013)

Select Discography

Recordings of Heinrich Neuhaus:

*Uroki Professora G. G. Nejgauza / Уроки Профессора Г. Г. Нейгауза [The Lessons of Professor H. G. Neuhaus]* (Мелодия [Melodiya], 1962, 33Д-022885, 33Д - 022886, 33Д - 022887, 33Д - 022888. 33Д - 019959. 33Д- 019960)

*Heinrich Neuhaus: Collected Recordings* (Denon, 1998, COCO-80271-281)

*The Art of Henry Neuhaus. Skryabin* (Classical Records, 2005, CD-060)

*The Art of Henry Neuhaus. Chopin: Nocturnes, Mazurkas, Berceuse, Etudes, Valse* (Classical Records, 2006, CD-083)

*The Art of Henry Neuhaus. Chopin: Fantasy, Polonaise-Fantasy, Sonatas No. 2 & 3* (Classical Records, 2006, CD-084)

*The Art of Henry Neuhaus. Beethoven: Sonatas No. 14 'Moonlight', 17, 24, 30 & 31* (Classical Records, 2008, CD-099)

*The Art of Henry Neuhaus. Schumann, Brahms, Rachmaninov* (Classical Records, 2008, CD-106)

*The Russian Piano School. Heinrich Neuhaus. Mozart, Prokofiev, Debussy* (Melodiya, CD MEL 10 00746)

*The Russian Piano Tradition: The Neuhaus School. Heinrich Neuhaus* (Appian Publications & Recordings, 2007, APR 5660)

Recordings of selected contemporaries:

*Alfred Cortot. Preludes, Barcarolle & Berceuse* (EMI Classics, 2006, B000I2ISLI)

*Arthur Rubinstein. The Chopin Collection* (RCA Victor, 1991, B000026OW3)

*Emil Gilels. 29 Beethoven Sonatas & Eroica Variations* (Deutsche Grammophon Gesellschaft, 2006, DDG2532061)

*Emil Gilels. The Russian Historical Archives Set 1* (Brilliant Classics, 2006, BRIL92434)

*Emil Gilels. The Russian Historical Archives Set 2* (Brilliant Classics, 2006, BRIL92615)

*Glenn Gould. Beethoven Sonatas Nos. 8, 14 & 23* (Sony Classical, 2002, SMK87858)

*Maria Grinberg. Ludwig van Beethoven Sonatas* (Melodiya, 2013, MEL CD1002025)

*Rachmaninoff plays Chopin* (RCA Vicotr. Gold Seal, 1994, B000003FOO)

*Samuel Feinberg. The First Recordings 1929–1948* (Arbiter Records, 1999, AR 188)

*Shura Cherkassky & Leopold Godowsky. Masters of the Piano Roll* (Dal Segno Records, 2007, B003FVSQUW)

*Stanislav Neuhaus. A 1971 Chopin Recital* (Denon, 2006, COCQ-84252)

*Stanislav Neuhaus. A 1974 Recital. Chopin & Scriabin* (Denon, 1999, COCQ-80644)

*Stanislav Neuhaus. A 1979 Recital* (Denon, 2006, COCQ-84253)

*Stanislav Neuhaus. Live 1979 Recital* (Denon, 2005, COCQ-83982)

*Stanislav Neuhaus. The Last Recital & excerpts from 1976* (Denon, 1999, COCQ-80639-40)

*Stanislav Neuhaus. The Studio Recordings* (Denon, 2005, COCQ-83981)

*Sviatoslav Richter. Icon* (EMI Classics, 2008, B001B1R1HC)

*The Complete Beethoven Sonatas. Artur Schnabel* (Classica d'Oro, 2001, 2270766)

*The Great Pianists Volume 3. Ferruccio Busoni* (Dal Segno, 2007, DSPRCD019)

*The Russian Piano Tradition: The Goldenweiser School. Alexander Goldenweiser* (Appian Publications & Recordings, 2008, APR 5661)

*The Russian Piano Tradition: The Igumnov School. Konstantin Igumnov* (Appian Publications & Recordings, 2007, APR 5662)

*The Russian Piano Tradition: Emil Gilels. The Early Recordings* (Appian Publications & Recordings, 2007, APR 5663)

*The Russian Piano Tradition: Music for Two Pianos. Emil Gilels and Yakov Zak* (Appian Publications & Recordings, 2007, APR 5664)

*The Russian Piano Tradition: The Igumnov School. Yakov Flier* (Appian Publications & Recordings, 2007, APR 5665)

*The Russian Piano Tradition: The Goldenweiser School. Tatiana Nikolayeva* (Appian Publications & Recordings, 2008, APR 5666)

*The Russian Piano Tradition: Grigory Ginzburg. His Early Recordings Volume 1* (Appian Publications & Recordings, 2008, APR 5667)

*The Russian Piano Tradition: The Igumnov School. Lev Oborin* (Appian Publications & Recordings, 2009, APR 5668)

*The Russian Piano Tradition: The Neuhaus School. Sviatoslav Richter plays Schubert* (Appian Publications & Recordings, 2009, APR 5669)

*The Russian Piano Tradition: Maria Yudina. The Beethoven Sonatas* (Appian Publications & Recordings, 2009, APR 5670)

*The Russian Piano Tradition: The Goldenweiser School. Victor Merzhanov* (Appian Publications & Recordings, 2009, APR 5671)

*The Russian Piano Tradition: Grigory Ginzburg. His Early Recordings Volume 2* (Appian Publications & Recordings, 2010, APR 5672)



*The Russian Piano Tradition: Rachmaninov Piano Concertos. Sviatoslav Richter, Yakov Zak & Lev Oborin* (Appian Publications & Recordings, 2007, APR 5673)

*Vladimir Sofronitsky. Scriabin chez Scriabin* (Arbiter Records, 1999, AR 157)

*Vladimir Sofronitsky. Live Recordings 1946–1960* (Brilliant Classics, 2008, BRIL8975)