The Chronicle of the Journal “Musical Contemporary” (1915-1917)

The Chronicle of the Journal “Musical Contemporary” [CMC] was published in Petrograd from September 1915 until May 1917 as a biweekly supplement to the quarterly Musical Contemporary. This quarterly featured studies on music history and theory, biographies of composers and other materials of a scholarly character; the supplement contained reports and reviews of concerts, operatic performances, and other musical events. Despite their short duration, the Musical Contemporary and the Chronicle played an important role in contemporary Russian musical journalism by treating a wide range of issues about national and Western music. Prominent musical critics—among them B. V. Asafyev, V. G. Karatygin, L. L. Sabaneyev, and J. Engel—discussed these issues and offered differing perspectives during a very important period in the history of Russian music. This period, sharply marked by social turmoil, the result of World War I and the February Democratic Revolution of 1917, witnessed a remarkable development in Russian musical life through the work of Prokofiev, Stravinsky, Rakhmaninov, Glazunov, N. Medtner, and many other outstanding composers and performers active at the time.

The Chronicle’s forty-three issues are organized in two series: no. 1 (September, 1915) through no. 22 (May, 1916); and no. 1 (September 20, 1916) through no. 21 (June, 1917). Several issues of 1917 are published as double issues. The number of pages in individual issues fluctuates from seventeen to fifty-four, with the later issues notably shorter than the earlier ones. The pagination is continuous in each issue. The text’s print size varies: smaller print is used in the miscellaneous sections and advertisements. Most articles appear in one column; the news sections in two columns. There are some graphic materials, among which are several musical examples and a caricature.

From fall 1915 until spring 1917, the publication of the Musical Contemporary and the Chronicle was financed by Pyotr Petrovich Suvchinsky (1892-1985), a prominent musical patron, “passionate music lover, serious expert in Russian poetry and literature, and a universally educated person.” He was also close friends with Stravinsky and Prokofiev, and promoted their music in Russia and abroad. Suvchinsky was born in St. Petersburg into a family of wealthy factory owners with Polish-Ukrainian roots. Upon graduating from the St. Petersburg University he studied music with the pianist,

1 A similar two-part format was typical in Russian periodicals of the period. See, for example, Diaghilev’s Mir Iskusstva [The World of Art] (St. Petersburg, 1899-1904), or Apollon [Apollo] (St. Petersburg/Petrograd, 1907-1917).
2 Izrail’ Vladimirovich Nest’yev says: “Though the journal did not last long, it gained the readers’ respect by the high level of its scholarly approach.” See I. V. Nestyev, “Chetyre druzhby” [Four friendships], Sovetskaya Muzyka [Soviet music] 3 (1987): 83.
3 Page numbers are missing on some pages containing advertisements and information for subscribers.
5 For more information about Suvchinsky’s life and works see Nestyev, op. cit.: 83-95.
composer and conductor Felix Mikhailovich Blumenfeld (1863-1931). In 1913 Suvchinsky was engaged in the publication of an almanac on church singing, the first of several periodicals about music that were published with his support. He also organized the musical salon where Prokofiev, Heinrich Neuhaus, Alexander Ziloti and Karl Szymanowski performed. After the February Revolution of 1917 Suvchinsky worked for the reform of Russian conservatories, and contributed to the publication of the prominent journal Melos.\(^6\) In 1918 Suvchinsky left his native city for the Ukraine, and then for other countries, finally settling in Paris. While living abroad Suvchinsky continued to work as a publisher and journalist, and founded the Eurasia Publishing House. Suvchinsky also helped Stravinsky in writing his Poetics of Music.\(^7\)

Suvchinsky’s role in the Musical Contemporary and the Chronicle was not limited solely to the financial side of the enterprise. He was an important member of the journal’s “think tank” and influenced its policies, trying to make it more supportive of modern music. This goal led Suvchinsky into conflict with those collaborators who held more conservative views, and, finally, to his resignation in March of 1917 in protest against the removal of an article by his friend Boris Asafyev, which was rejected for “excessive” praise of music by Prokofiev, Stravinsky and Myaskovsky.\(^8\) When Asafyev resigned, Suvchinsky withdrew his financial support, which led to the journal’s demise.

Andrey Nikolayevich Rimsky-Korsakov (1878-1940) was editor-in-chief of the Musical Contemporary and Chronicle throughout their publication. Rimsky-Korsakov was born in 1878. His father was the composer Nikolay Andreyevich Rimsky-Korsakov; his mother the singer Nina Purgold. Young Andrey studied the cello, music theory with his father and prominent composer M. O. Steinberg, and then philology and philosophy at the universities of St. Petersburg, Strasbourg and Heidelberg. Soon after he finished courses at the St. Petersburg University, Rimsky-Korsakov started to work as a journalist for several periodicals, and, during 1912-1914, edited the music sections in the journals Russkaya molva [Russian talk] and Severnye zapiski [Northern notes]. After the revolution of 1917 he headed the music department at the Leningrad Public Library (formerly the Imperial Public Library), and taught music theory at the Leningrad University. He also continued to write about music and musicians, published two books

---

\(^6\) Petrograd, 1917-18. The journal features high-level studies of basic issues on music and musical aesthetics.

\(^7\) Poétique musicale (Cambridge, Mass., 1942). Suvchinsky contributed to sections about problems of musical creativity and Russian music. See Nestyev, op. cit.: 90-91.

\(^8\) The unpublished review dealt with the fifth symphonic gathering of the Imperial Russian Music Society on January 14, 1917. The program’s features were Stravinsky’s Petrushka, Myaskovsky’s Second Symphony and Prokofiev’s First Piano Concerto. Readers can judge for themselves with regard to “excessiveness” of Asafyev’s evaluations from the following quotation from this review: “Now all three of them [Prokofiev, Stravinsky, Myaskovsky] are distinguished figures of our times […] One may like them, or not like them […], but one cannot disregard their works. Such a disregard would mean turning one’s face away from modern life, from the [artistic] forms in which it reveals itself […].” Quoted from Elena Mikhailovna Orlova, B. V. Asafyev (Moscow, 1964): 42. For more information about this article see Nestyev, op. cit.: 84-86, and Orlova, op.cit.: 41-44.
about his father and the catalogue of musical resources in the State Public Library in St. Petersburg. His other publications include editions of memoirs and letters by Glinka, Tchaikovsky, and his father, Nikolay Andreyevich Rimsky-Korsakov.

Rimsky-Korsakov did a great deal for the *Chronicle*, which under his guidance became one of the best musical periodicals created in Russia. Rimsky-Korsakov invited the best music critics and writers on music to contribute to the *Musical Contemporary* and to the *Chronicle*, and set the latter journal’s goals on the promotion of Russian music without neglecting foreign musical affairs. However, at times, he did not support a pluralism of opinion and obstructed the expression of views that he did not share. Asafyev gives an explicit example of the dictatorial manner in which Rimsky-Korsakov executed his functions:

> My article about Myaskovsky, Prokofiev and Stravinsky was mocked in a professor’s tone […] A great many of harsh words were said with regard to […] their insignificance as composers […] I do not know how I restrained myself and did not express myself with regard to their epigonus scholasticism.

Rimsky-Korsakov wrote occasionally for the *Chronicle*, and contributed satirical reviews in the section “Musical Affairs.” These articles criticized the absurd practices of musical theaters and producers, in particular, alterations (cuts) in operas by Glinka and others.

The first editorial of the *Chronicle* shed light on its program:

> The existence of the *Chronicle of the Journal “Musical Contemporary”* […] as an independent publication is justified by the events of musical life that demand the immediate response of a critic or chronicler. However, the *Chronicle* is, in fact, just a practical application of those views and ideas that will be influential for the journal’s main articles.

Thus, the *Chronicle* was created with two functions in mind: first, it had to be a prompt monitor of musical events, and second, a mouthpiece of distinctive “views and convictions” that were promoted by the journal. These represented, as one author

---


11 The quotation is taken from Asafyev’s letter to Myaskovsky dated February 15, 1917, and is found in ГЦММК [acronym for the State Museum for Music Culture], φ[φ]. 171. Asafyev discusses here the reaction of Rimsky-Korsakov to the article about the symphonic concert treated above.

commented, “the moderately conservative trend in Russian music of the period.” This “moderately conservative” platform explains the Chronicle’s original focus on classic values in national and European music, and its neglect of contemporary developments. As Asafyev remarked, the journal was a “shield of defense for the established authorities,” while the policy of wait and see was adopted with regard to innovative tendencies in composition and other actual problems. However, as time went by, the diversity of the musical environment and the progressive views of leading contributors (including Asafyev himself) expanded the publication’s scope. Eventually, the Chronicle became a well-informed source on various aspects and trends of contemporary musical life. Considerable attention was paid to the music of the New Russian School and French impressionism, Richard Strauss, Stravinsky and Prokofiev. Other topics treated include activities of music schools and associations, publishing houses, composers, ethnographers and music educators, church choirs, military and amateur orchestras, ensembles for the performance of early music, competitions for pianists and composers, and other issues concerning performance, creation, studies and publications.

With respect to musical events in specific locations, the journal’s interest was divided between Russia and foreign countries with a greater attention to Russian musical centers. While the majority of articles treat activities in Petrograd and Moscow, many consider Ekaterinodar, Kiev, Kharkov, Odessa, Tomsk and Tiflis. Owing to the pressure of WW I on the western parts of Russia, many of its eastern locations grew in significance as cultural centers with a rich musical life. Among those, Perm received particular attention from the journal, owing to diverse musical activities in this city. These, including concerts, lectures, and operatic performances, are reported upon in detail in a series of articles by Boris Popov.

With respect to Russia, a great deal of attention is given to the work of musical societies that played prominent roles in Russian musical life. The Imperial Russian Musical Society (RMS) promoted musical education and performance throughout the country by means of the organization and support of music schools and concerts. From the journal’s inception until the February Democratic Revolution of 1917, when the society was disbanded, information about the RMS—reviews of its regular symphonic gatherings in Petrograd and Moscow, accounts of the work of the society’s conservatories and music colleges, annual reports of the local branches and meetings at the society’s headquarters—appears in each issue. The Jewish Popular Music Society had promoted Jewish folk and art music since 1908, and its activities are reported upon in many articles covering, for example, the society’s concerts, its music publications and lectures.

13 Orlova, op. cit.: 36.
14 He continues: “[...] The criticism was also simplified: Bach is great, Mozart is great, Beethoven is great, Rimsky-Korsakov is great, and so forth, and so forth,—endless variations. Regarding the contemporary phenomena: caution, caution, caution. And as constant motto: let us wait!” The quotation from B. V. Asafyev, About Myself: 234-35, is found in Orlova, op. cit.: 42.
Skryabin societies, which were founded in Petrograd and Moscow, were the object of considerable interest due, in part, to the presence on the journal’s staff of writers (Karatygin, Sabaneyev) favorable to Skryabin. The Patronage Council for the Promotion of Music by Russian Composers (also known as Belyaev’s Fund) held regular competitions for composers and directed the associated publishing house M. P. Belyaev in Leipzig, which featured Russian music. These aspects of the Council’s work are treated in detail on a regular basis in the journal. Other frequently considered associations and institutions include the People’s Conservatories in Petrograd and Moscow, the Society for People’s Sobriety with branches in all prominent Russian cities, the House of Song in Moscow, and the Fine Arts, Friends of Music, Chamber Music and Philharmonic societies in Petrograd.

Productions at musical theaters were among the main events of Russian musical life and therefore the subject of many articles. Of particular interest are the activities at the Imperial Bolshoy and Mariinsky theaters, Zimin’s private opera in Moscow, the Music Drama Theater and the Opera Theater at the People’s House in Petrograd. During the time of the publication of the Musical Contemporary and the Chronicle, Russia experienced a significant development in the performance of orchestral music, with many symphonic and other types of orchestras making regular appearances in Petrograd, Moscow and other cities. These were the orchestras of the RMS, the Imperial Court, the Bolshoy Theater, Count A. D. Sheremetev and others. Among the conductors were Alexander Ziloti, Sergey Koussevitsky, Emil Cooper, and Alexander Fitel’berg. Many of their performances are covered in detail.

With respect to solo performers, Sergey Rakhmaninov was at the height of his career as a pianist and composer and received considerable attention side by side with the bass Chaliapin; the pianists Anatoly Nikolayevich Drozdov, Maria Nikolayevna Barinova, Alexander Borisovich Goldenveizer; cellists Mikhail Preys and Yury van Oren; sopranos Nina Pavlovna Koshetz and Zoya Petrovna Lody; and many other prominent musicians of the period. While showing regular interest in the works of Russian composers, particular attention was given to Skryabin’s compositions, and later to those of Prokofiev, giving ground for Cesar Cui’s sarcastic remark “Skryabin is their god equal to Beethoven, with Prokofiev as his Prophet.”

In the treatment of foreign affairs, the focus was placed on Western and Central Europe. Great Britain, Italy and France received much attention as they were prominent musical centers and Russia’s military allies during WW I. Russia’s adversaries, Germany and Austria, were also monitored extensively due to their traditionally strong influence on Russian music. Treated are prominent composers (among them Richard Strauss, Ravel, Schoenberg and Erich Korngold), musical theaters, concerts and publications. Regular

reports followed the progress of Russian music abroad, treating the concerts, lectures and publications featuring works of Russian composers.17

The February Democratic Revolution brought dramatic changes to the organization and management of Russian musical life. Many imperial musical establishments, guided by appointed officials, were disbanded, and musicians of Petrograd and other cities discussed new types of musical associations based on the principles of self-government, and the reforms of the old institutions such as conservatories in Petrograd and Moscow, the State (former Court) orchestra and others. The outcome of the discussions was reported in the *Chronicle*.18

During most of its publication run, the *Chronicle* maintained a uniform structure for individual issues. Each issue also contains a core group of articles appearing in the following order: a review of musical activities in Petrograd, news sections, and correspondence from Moscow and other Russian and European cities. In 1917 the news and correspondence sections changed places showing an apparent increase of interest in musical development and activities beyond Petrograd. Several additional features are placed before, after, or in-between the items of the core group. These include a lead article, reviews of publications about music and other periodicals, obituaries, bibliographies of published music, and satirical comments on aspects of musical life in Petrograd. Each issue opens or closes with from one to four pages of advertisements, followed or preceded by a table of contents, a list of collaborators, and information for subscribers.19

A lead article, of two to nine pages, appears regularly but not in every issue, treating significant events in Petrograd and Moscow, including operatic productions, premières, and concerts. Others discuss general problems of national musical life, or review the activities of major institutions such as the Mariinsky Theater and Belyaev’s Fund.

A review either follows the lead article or opens issues with titles such as “Petrograd’s Theaters and Concerts,” “Petrograd Concerts,” and “Petrograd’s Concerts and Lectures.” The reviews are extensive, approximately twenty pages each, and divided into sections.20 The reviews treat operatic productions, concerts of orchestral and chamber music, recitals

17 See below concerning the regular rubrics about foreign music in “News” sections.
19 During the period (autumn 1915 - 1916) the first few pages in each issue include: a table of contents; a blank page with the trade mark of the printing house Sirius; a title page with a list of collaborators and dates of the publication (added in the later issues). This pattern changed in the spring of 1916 when the table of contents was moved closer to the end of the issues; extensive prospects for the potential subscribers were included in many issues; one of the last pages informed about the date of the next issue’s publication.
20 In spring 1916 an attempt was made to reduce the section’s size; however, it soon returned to its former size.
and lectures. Concert series and important institutions and performers (such as the Mariinsky and the Music Drama theaters, the concert series of the RMS, Ziloti’s and the Court’s orchestras) are reported upon on a regular basis. One article published every year in September contains a retrospective report on the summer’s activities in the vicinity of Petrograd, including the Pavlovsk Vauxhall and the Sestroretsk Resort.

The “News” sections occupy from five to eight pages with rare exceptions. Similar to the musical reviews, “News” sections are divided into distinct parts, most of which are titled. This portion of the Chronicle offers reports on musical life in Russia and abroad, and contains references to concert programs, operatic productions and recitals in Petrograd, Moscow and other locations, summaries of annual reports of the RMS (including its regional branches), the Petrograd Conservatory and other major institutions, and information on publications, composers and performers. Major musical institutions, including the RMS, the Petrograd and Moscow conservatories, the Jewish Music Society and several others, are also dealt with in separate sections. Reports on musical activities abroad appear on a regular basis, and often focus on performances of Russian music and musicians in Europe, particularly in England, Italy and France. The following “News” section announces forthcoming musical events that are later discussed in lead articles and reviews.

The correspondence sections include from one to three letters. Many offer accounts of activities in Moscow (a regular feature entitled “Letters from Moscow” or “Musical Life in Moscow”), and other Russian and European locations. Some of these articles are given in series format. Moscow reports often concern the concerts of Koussevitsky’s orchestra, Rakhmaninov’s piano recitals, productions at the Bolshoy Theater and Zimin’s private opera theater. Other correspondence includes open letters about publications in the Musical Contemporary and deals with other issues. Most notable among these is a letter by Sergey Prokofiev denouncing Leonid Sabaneyev’s “review” of a cancelled performance of the composer’s Scythian Suite.21

Reviews of publications about music in other periodicals are regular features until the autumn of 1916. These occupy from two to six pages and often have a sectional structure. The reviews deal with many periodicals, but pay particular attention to the writings by Alexander Benois, Karatygin and other authors in the journals of Petrograd (Russian Musical Gazette, Apollon) and Moscow (Muzyka).

The rubric “A Chronicle of Musical Vandalism” appears in several 1915 issues. This unique one-page feature lists alterations imposed upon the operas of Russian composers by the producers of the Mariinsky and other theaters.

The ambitious plans of the publishers of the Musical Contemporary to create a periodical about both music studies and criticism attracted many writers. The journal’s impressive

list of collaborators includes more than seventy authors from Russia and abroad, among them A. M. Avramov, V. I. Belsky, V. M. Belyaev, S. A. Bugoslavsky, A. N. Drozdov, N. D. Kashkin, A. Ya. Levinson, N. P. Malkov, S. B. Rozovsky, B. M. Popov (correspondent from Perm), B. K. Yanovsky (correspondent from Odessa) and N. L. Zil’bershteyn (correspondent from Kharkov). The most prolific contributors are Karatygin, Asafyev, Joel Engel, Sabaneyev and V. V. Paskhalov.

Karatygin (1875-1925), one of the leading writers on music of the time, was also a composer and pedagogue. Through his literary and other activities Karatygin promoted contemporary music, and, in particular, works by Prokofiev, Stravinsky, Debussy, Ravel and Schoenberg. Karatygin’s literary output features more than 1,000 articles in some forty periodicals, including the *Musical Contemporary*, *Muzyka*, *Apollon* and *De Musica*. He also wrote biographical sketches on Skryabin, and other Russian composers, and several essays on music criticism and aesthetics.

Karatygin made major contributions to the *Chronicle*. His twenty-seven articles include musical reviews, historical sketches and obituaries. In most of these he wrote about music in Petrograd, and regularly on the concerts of Ziloti, Koussevitsky, and Lody, and, on the productions at the Music Drama Theater. He also, on several occasions, reviewed performances of Skryabin’s music, offering interesting comments on its style and interpretation. Other composers Karatygin frequently dealt with are S. I. Taneyev, Borodin and Rakhmaninov. The latter was treated with notable, though not always benevolent interest. Karatygin’s writings feature remarkable consistency in his points of view concerning music. Also noteworthy is the “iron logic” of his music analyses in which he moves from general characteristics to details. Among Karatygin’s important articles are “Pelléas and Mélisande, the Lyric Drama by Debussy ... and its Production on the Stage of the Music Drama Theatre,” “Prince Igor by Borodin (To the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Opera’s First Production),” “The Cantata At the Reading from the Psalm by S. I. Taneyev (Regarding the First Concert of S. Koussevitsky),” “In memoriam A. P. Borodin” and an obituary of Max Reger.

---

22 Among the *Musical Contemporary*’s contributors are Asafyev, Karatygin, Nikolay Sergeyevich Zhilyaev, Nikolay Dmitriyevich Kashkin, M. D. Calvocoressi, Rosa Newmarch, and Jean-Baptiste Thibaut.
24 For a list of Karatygin’s articles in CMC see Rimsky-Korsakov, op. cit.: 248-51.
26 CMC 6 (1915): 3-7. The article contains interesting commentaries concerning the influence of Borodin’s work on the music of French composers associated with the style of impressionism.
27 CMC 8 (1915): [3]-6. Note Karatygin’s evaluation of Taneyev’s work as the polyphonic stage of Russian music.
28 CMC 17 (1917): [1]-3.
29 CMC 22 (1916): 52-57.
The musicologist and composer Sabaneyev (1881-1968) is better known today for his monograph *Modern Russian Composers.* Sabaneyev was an “ardent follower of contemporary trends,” and for a while presided over the well-known Association for Modern Music, active in the Soviet Union during the 1920s. Sabaneyev’s literary output features several monographs about Skryabin, biographical sketches of Debussy and Ravel, and publications on music history and theory.

Sabaneyev was second after Karatygin in the amount he wrote for the *Chronicle* (eighteen articles). However, Sabaneyev wrote for the journal from only autumn 1915 until spring 1916 when he resigned after a scandal related to his “review” of Prokofiev’s Scythian Suite. As the major Moscow correspondent for CMC, Sabaneyev wrote extensively for the “Music in Moscow” and the “Letters from Moscow” columns. His preferred topics include piano recitals, orchestral concerts, and productions at the Zimin Opera and Bolshoy Theater. Being a major proponent of Skryabin, Sabaneyev paid close attention to the performances of the composer’s music by Koussevitsky’s orchestra, and also by the pianists Alexander Borovsky, Alexander Goldenweiser and others. Several times Sabaneyev discussed Rakhmaninov’s music (which he characterized in a more favorable way than did Karatygin), Koshetz and Lody. While many of Sabaneyev’s writings offer interesting musical analyses and characteristics of the music and composers, some contain rather unreasonable observations. Sabaneyev’s contributions feature noteworthy articles on Skryabin and Rakhmaninov, and a review of Alexander Kastalsky’s oratorio *Brotherly Commemoration of Fallen Warriors*.

Musicologist, composer and pedagogue Joel Engel (1868-1927) promoted Jewish music in Russia and other countries. Among his achievements are the first Russian edition of Hugo Riemann’s *Musiklexikon,* and many articles written for Russian, and German periodicals. Engel began to contribute to the *Chronicle* in the autumn of 1915, and continued to do so for a full year. His nine articles feature music reviews and historical studies. Similar to Sabaneyev, Engel wrote on Moscow’s musical life, and also treated the activities of the Zimin Opera and the Bolshoy Theater. Other areas of his interest include Russian classic music and the activities of the Jewish Music Society. Engel was a writer with a more conservative outlook on music than that of Karatygin or Sabaneyev,

---

32 Ibid., 363.
33 See footnote 21.
34 See, for example, Sabaneyev’s review of the production of Musorgsky’s *Boris Godunov* at Zimin’s Opera with Chaliapin in the title role in CMC 18 (1916): 32.
35 See, for example, the group of articles “Music in Moscow” in CMC 19 (1916): 44-47 [about Skryabin]; 7: 13-15; 11/12: 23-26 [about Rakhmaninov].
37 For more information about his life and work see *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians,* 1st ed., s.v. “Engel, Joel.”
38 Engel supplied this edition with many new articles about Russian composers and musicians.
and often expressed moderate opposition to modernism in music.\textsuperscript{39} Engel’s writings, featuring interesting characteristics of music and musicians, include, for example, the article “Theater of Zimin,”\textsuperscript{40} concerning Chaliapin’s personality and performing art. The critic’s sketch “Tchaikovsky’s manuscripts” discusses the contents of P. I. Tchaikovsky’s archive in the Moscow Conservatory.\textsuperscript{41} Engel’s review of “The Revival of Tale of the City of Kitezh by Rimsky-Korsakov (The Bolshoy Theater)” focuses on dramatic and musical peculiarities of the work.\textsuperscript{42}

Music researcher, publicist and composer Boris Vladimirovich Asafyev (1884-1949) brought outstanding contributions to twentieth-century musicology.\textsuperscript{43} Asafyev wrote fundamental studies in music theory and history, including the first Russian-language monograph on Stravinsky.\textsuperscript{44} Asafyev also wrote for other musical periodicals, including Muzyka, Melos and later Sovetskaya muzyka.

Asafyev joined the Chronicle in March 1916 and resigned in January 1917. His contributions include nine articles,\textsuperscript{45} among them the lead article “Mariinsky Theater (Facts and Gossip),”\textsuperscript{46} and several reviews of music activities in Petrograd. More than half of these focus on Russian music with emphasis on works by Rimsky-Korsakov, Stravinsky, Prokofiev and Kastalsky. Asafyev reported on activities at the Mariinsky and at the Music Drama theaters and wrote extensive reviews on their productions of operas by Bizet (Carmen),\textsuperscript{47} Rimsky-Korsakov (Tale of Tsar Saltan and The Golden Cockerel),\textsuperscript{48} and Alexander Gretchaninov (Dobrynya Nikitich).\textsuperscript{49} In Asafyev’s concert reviews he often wrote about performances by Ziloti and Rakhmaninov.\textsuperscript{50} In his articles

\textsuperscript{39} Ira Fyodorovna Petrovskaya, Istochnikovedeniye istorii russkoy muzykalnoy kul’tury XVIII - nachala XX veka [Sources on the history of Russian musical culture of the 18th - beginning of the 20th century] (Moscow, 1983): 211.
\textsuperscript{40} CMC 21 (1916): 31-34.
\textsuperscript{41} CMC 20 (1916): [3]-5. The article contains the description of several musical manuscripts, including Pique Dame.
\textsuperscript{42} CMC 13/14 (1917): 12-15.
\textsuperscript{43} For more information about his life and works see Orlova, op. cit. Also The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians, 1st ed., s.v. “Asaf’yev, Boris Vladimirovich.”
\textsuperscript{44} Kniga o Stravinskom [Book about Stravinsky] (Leningrad, 1929).
\textsuperscript{45} Asafyev’s contributions (including his unsigned articles) to the Chronicle are listed and analyzed in Orlova, op. cit.: 36-41.
\textsuperscript{46} CMC 16 (1917): [1]-7.
\textsuperscript{47} The unsigned article “Carmen at the Mariinsky Theater” in CMC 17 (1916): 10-13.
\textsuperscript{49} The unsigned article “Dobrynya Nikitich” by Gretchaninov in the People’s House” in CMC 2 (1916): [1]-3.
\textsuperscript{50} The article “The Second Extra-abonnement Concert of A. Ziloti” in CMC 5/6 (1916): 8-10 contains interesting comments on Prokofiev’s style with references to his Ala and Lolly suite. The review “The Concerts by A. Ziloti” in CMC 9/10 (1916): [1]-7 treats the works by Debussy, Ravel and Prokofiev, and also the première of Myaskovsky’s Third Symphony. Both articles are signed “Igor Glebov.” The unsigned review “The evening of S. V. Rakhmaninov’s Songs Performed by N. P. Koshetz” in CMC 9/10 (1916):
Asafyev acts as a consistent defender of both innovative trends in modern composition and classical values of Russian music. The critic’s bold literary style employs complexly structured texts, a rich vocabulary, metaphors and much comparative analysis.

Composer and musicologist Vyacheslav Viktorovich Paskhalov (1873-1951) wrote for the Chronicle between autumn of 1915 and spring of 1917. He contributed eight letters and portions of reviews concerning concerts in Moscow, popular music and folk music. Among his noteworthy writings are three letters containing a detailed report on the all-Russian congress devoted to the problems of theaters for the masses, in which he gave rare insight into lesser-known aspects of provincial musical life in early twentieth-century Russia, and the review of a concert by the folk singer Maria Dmitriyevna Krivopolenova held in September 1915 at the Moscow Museum of Polytechnology.

Many articles in the Chronicle are unsigned or signed with pseudonyms or initials, several of which have been identified:

- B. V. Asafyev
- A. M. Avraamov
- S. A. Bugoslavsky
- V. G. Karatygin
- A. Ya. Levinson
- N. P. Malkov
- A. N. Rimsky-Korsakov
- S. B. Rozovsky
- O. Ya. Shtrimer

Абонент [Abonent], Игорь Глебов [Igor Glebov]
Ars
Серг. Б. [Serg. B.], Сергей Б-ий [Sergey B-iy].
В.К. [V.K]., К.
А.Л. [A.L.], А. Л-нь [A. L-n].
Зух
Гулливер [Gulliver]
С. О-ий [S. R-iy].
О. Ш-ръ [O. Sh-r].

14-15 considers dramatic qualities of Russian art songs as reflected by Rakhmaninov’s works performed by Koshetz.

