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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background and Significance

A Russian composer of French descent, Georgy L’vovich Catoire (also often spelled “Katuar”) (1861-1926) is one of the most neglected composers of the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. He lived during a period of Russian culture, called the *Silver Age*. Georgy Catoire’s oeuvre, which conveys some influences of Wagner, Tchaikovsky, Chopin, and Franck, and resembles early Scriabin’s style, is mainly in the realm of piano, voice and chamber music. Until very recent years, his music was only occasionally performed in his homeland and was rarely heard outside of Russia after his death. Catoire is generally remembered as one of the most influential music theorists of the early Soviet Era and the author of the two fundamental works, *The Theoretical Course of Harmony* and *Musical Form*. He taught composition at the Moscow Conservatory, training several important composers, most notably Dmitry Kabalevsky.

There are several reasons why Catoire’s music was almost forgotten: modest size of the output—a little over 30 opuses; the fact that in the last decade of his life, since becoming a professor of theory and composition at the Moscow Conservatory, he devoted his attention toward theoretical matters rather than composition; many compositions, composed much earlier were only published after the Russian Revolution in the mid-1920s when they could not be firmly established on the concert stage alongside the pieces of next-generation composers; unavailability of his music in the
West; aesthetical irrelevance of his music to the requirements of the political forces in
Soviet Russia; and certain technical difficulties of the works, which call for fairly
accomplished performers.

The Second Sonata for Violin and Piano exemplifies the composer’s mature style,
characterized by the refinement of the harmonic and rhythmical ideas, while
demonstrating melodic ingenuity and clear structural form. Outstanding Russian music
historian, Leonid Sabaneev, called the Poem “one of the most beautiful inspirations in
Russian violin music.” The work was composed in 1906 and dedicated to Alexander
Goldenweiser, Russian pianist and professor at the Moscow Conservatory from 1906 to
1961. Goldenweiser recorded it with David Oistrakh in 1948. For almost 60 years, it
was the only known recording of the piece. In 2007, the Amsterdam Chamber Music
Society included this work in the CD collection Treasures of Russian Chamber Music
along with pieces by Arensky, Taneyev, and Shostakovich.

State of Research

In recent years the interest towards the music of Georgy Catoire has been growing
increasingly. Besides the aforementioned Dutch recording, two outstanding albums were
released by the Hyperion label: Piano Music, played by Marc-André Hamelin in 1999;
and a 2005 CD entitled Chamber Music, which includes the Piano Trio in F minor, Op.
14 and the Piano Quartet in A minor, Op. 31, recorded by the ensemble Room Music.
However, there is not much information available about this composer, except for the
material, published in Russia in the 1920-s and very brief entries in music dictionaries. *The New Grove* article does not even list Catoire’s piano works.

**Purpose**

This study makes an attempt to fill this void. It thoroughly investigates Catoire’s life, as well as looks into his genealogy, since his family was influential in the commercial, political and cultural life of Russia for more than a hundred years. It discusses his works for piano, with particular emphasis on *Poem: Second Sonata for Violin and Piano, Op. 20*. To date, there is no known study on this subject of such scope both in Russian and English languages.

**Method**

This study is divided into three major sections. The first part is dedicated to Georgy Catoire’s life. Genealogy of his family, particularly its Russian branch is discussed for the first time in the English language to better understand the composer’s background and his uniqueness. Two non-English Website sources were used (the French and the Russian). The second part discusses his *oeuvre* for solo piano. It is divided into two sections, reviewing the early compositions and mature works, respectively. The third part focuses on Catoire’s large scale work, the *Poem: Second Sonata for Violin and Piano, Op. 20* with the intent to examine the composer’s mature style in depth.

Since in his treatises *Theoretical Course of Harmony* and *Musical Form*, Catoire
adopts ideas of functional harmony of the Belgian theorist François-Auguste Gevaert, it is appropriate to analyze his own works along the lines of Riemann’s theory, i.e. perceiving frequently used chromaticisms as natural extensions of diatonicism.
CHAPTER 2
LIFE OF GEORGY CATOIRE

Catoire’s Family

The known origin of the Catoire family goes back to the year 1250, when Jean Catoire owned a piece of land in Montigny in Northern France. This family, whose descendants still exist in France and Russia, was divided into two principal branches. The elder one resided more particularly at Verdun where it continues until the present day. The junior branch, known under the name of Catoire of Bioncourt, was settled in Metz from where it passed to Russia.

In 1817, Jean-Baptiste Catoire de Bioncourt, who was born in 1789 in Lorraine, immigrated to Russia and became a naturalized Russian in 1821. He started his business importing foreign goods to Russia and joined the First Guild of Merchants in 1825. His four sons carried the patronym “Ivanovitch.” After his death in 1831, his widow Anna Ivanovna Catoire (born Levé) (1789-1873) took over the family business. Born in Great Britain, daughter of an affluent Moscow wine merchant, Anna Catoire was also in charge of the banking operations. She was awarded a title of the hereditary Honorable Citizen in 1860. Together with her sons she owned a number of buildings in Moscow and was a stockholder of several sugar refineries. In 1869, she established a trading company Widow A. I. Catoire and Sons, specializing in wholesale retail of the imported wines, indigo, tea, oil, hardware, and silk. The company acquired a brickyard in the early seventies. Their bricks were used in construction of the Museum of Fine Arts and the
New Upper Trading Stalls, which in the Soviet time became a State Department Store (abbreviated GUM) on the Red Square facing the Kremlin.

In the 1870s the family affairs were directed by Konstantin (Jules-Constantin) Ivanovich Catoire (1823-1876), the second son of Jean-Baptist, (the oldest brother, Charles-Jean-Baptist Catoire, left Russia and settled in Paris). From 1870 to 1876 he chaired a committee for general inspection of the trade and industry, established by the Moscow Duma. He was also on board of the Moscow branch of the State Bank. After Konstantin’s death, his widow and children immigrated to France and settled in Lyon.

The youngest brother, Andrei (Henry-Auguste) Ivanovitch Catoire (1829-1887) was the most important landowner of the family.

At the end of the 1870s, the management of the company passed to the third brother, Lev (Aime-Leon) Ivanovitch Catoire (1827-1899). He was at the same time director of the commercial sugar refinery of Moscow, member of the Council of the Bank of the Accounts of Moscow, member of the Committees of the Accounts and the Loans and Mortgages of the Moscow branch of the State Bank (1877-1879); since 1881, member of the Moscow Division of the Commerce and Industry Council; from 1877 to 1885, adviser of the Moscow Municipal Council (Duma). Lev Catoire was named chevalier of the Légion d'honneur in 1881, Knight of Saint-Stanislaus of Russia in 1886, and accepted the title of adviser of trade in 1887. Under his direction, the family built a silk spinning mill (after the October Revolution it was nationalized under the name Red Rope Making Machinist, in 1995 became a Limited company Krounit).
He had twelve children including four heirs: George, Leon, Henri and Louis (without known filiations).

After Lev Catoire’s death, his third son Andrei (Henri) Lvovitch Catoire (1865-1929) took over the family business. He was also a director of the sugar refinery V. Hénert & Co, director of the joint-stock company Sugar Refinery of Moscow, director of the insurance company Anchor, member of the administration of the tea trading firm Vassili Perlov & Sons, vice president of the Moscow Commercial Court (from 1901 to 1908, and from 1912 to 1917), member of the Chamber Office of Moscow (1908-1916).

His older brother, Lev (Leon) Lvovitch, (1864-1922) was a member of the Council of the Bank of the Accounts of Moscow, director of company A. Arabaki & Co, chairman of the board of the commercial establishments Heirs of A.F. Dutfoy (starting from 1912). From 1901 to 1918, he was an adviser at the Municipal Duma of Moscow, member of many of the standing and temporary committees of the Duma. Lev Lvovitch contributed to the development of general primary education in Moscow. In 1913, he run for the post of Mayor of Moscow from the Constitutional Democratic Party and was elected. However, the Council of Ministers did not confirm this election because Catoire was Catholic and of French descent. After the October Revolution, Lev and his family returned to their historical motherland and settled in Paris, where he died in 1922.

Georgy Catoire’s cousin Alexandre Andreievitch Catoire (1863-1913), son of Andrei (Henri) Ivanovitch, had inherited his father’s fortune of 1.2 million rubles and gave up the commercial businesses. In order to marry Gilonne Henriette d’Harcourt (from a very ancient French noble family), he obtained the right to return to the name of
Catoire de Bioncourt and the accession to the Russian hereditary nobility by an *ukase* of the Tsar in 1891. Passionate hunter and weapons collector, Alexander Catoire gave his collection of 300 rifles and 200 guns as a gift to the Historical Museum together with funds necessary for the maintenance and conservation in 1909. This collection is currently in the Weapons Department of the State Historical Museum of Russia (on the Red Square), and Alexander’s name appears among the list of the founding members on a plate in the entry of the museum. From 1900 to 1910, he also was a member benefactor of the Moscow Society of Arts. He died in Baden-Baden in 1913.

Since the 1855 all male representatives of the older generation of the Catoire family were members of the Council of the Catholic Parish of Louis Saint of the French. Since 1859 they were regularly elected with the direction of the French charitable organizations of Moscow.

The Catoire family name also was reflected in some geographical names. There is a railroad station Katuar about 10 miles North of Moscow in the Savelov direction, where the property of Marie Catoire, wife of Leon Lvovich Catoire used to be. Lev Ivanovitch and Andrei Ivanovitch owned their respective properties, located near another small railroad station on the Kiev direction, which used to be called Katuar-Belavenets (now Lesnoi Gorodok). Until 1951 there was a street in Moscow called Katuarovskoe Shosse (now Nagornaya Street).

**Study of Music**

Georgy Catoire was born in Moscow on April 27, 1861. He was the oldest son of
Lev Ivanovitch Catoire. He did not prepare himself for the career in music, despite his musical talent that he showed in early age: he composed his first piece when he was six years old. At the age of fourteen he started taking piano lessons, while studying at the Kreymann’s gymnasium. His first teacher was the German pianist, conductor, and professor of the Moscow Conservatory Karl Klindworth (1830-1916), a pupil of Liszt and a personal friend of Richard Wagner. He was the author of some of the best piano reductions of Wagner’s *Ring* cycle.

Noticing Georgy’s exceptional abilities and interest in music, Professor Klindworth did not just teach him how to play piano, but tried to introduce his student to the wider music literature and the newest trends in music, particularly to the music of Wagner. It is important to know that during that time, Wagner was almost unknown in Russia to the public, and many leading musicians, such as Tchaikovsky, Rubinstein, and Taneyev, had a rather negative attitude toward his music. Famous Russian musicologist and composer Leonid Sabaneyev said about the conservative and provincial attitude in Moscow music circles: “Moscow was inveterately conservative in its tastes and tendencies; narrow in its horizons. Of the Russian National School, i.e. of Rimsky-Korsakov, Borodin and particularly Mussorgsky, even the musicians in Moscow had only a remote idea. Wagner was viewed as a sort of musical Antichrist.”

It did not stop Catoire from joining the Wagner Society. Described by Victor Belayev as “the first Russian Wagnerian,” in 1879, upon his graduation from the gymnasium he went to the Wagner Festival in Bayreuth, Germany.
Catoire continued his education at the Moscow University majoring in mathematics. Klindworth did not fit in the conservative musical society of Moscow. In 1882, after the death of his friend, Nikolai Rubinstein, Klindworth moved back to Berlin, where he became one of the conductors of the newly established Berlin Philharmonic.

Georgy graduated from the University with honors in 1884 and joined his father’s business, for which he did not have any disposition. His serious interest in music seemed odd and incomprehensible to his family. For a time Catoire continued his music studies with Klindworth’s pupil V. I. Villborg, who taught him some basic harmony. As a result of these short-lived studies, Catoire composed a piano sonata, which he never published, and several short pieces for piano. He also made several piano arrangements, among them a transcription of Liszt’s Sonata *Après une lecture de Dante* for piano four hands.

Two years later, when Peter Il’yich Tchaikovsky heard a piano version of his *Introduction* and *Fugue* from First Orchestral Suite made by Catoire, he was so impressed that he convinced his publisher Peter Ivanovich Jürgenson to publish the *Fugue*.

Lessons with Villborg did not any longer satisfy Georgy’s quench for musical knowledge, and in December 1885 he finally went to Berlin to continue his interrupted studies with Klindworth. By then his teacher was a director of a piano conservatory in Berlin which he founded in 1884.

A pivotal point in Catoire’s life and the compositional career happened during his short visit to Moscow in summer 1886. Italian tenor and voice pedagogue Giacomo Galvani introduced the young composer to Tchaikovsky. Peter Il’yich approved Catoire’s
first compositional attempts (a set of piano variations) and said that “it would be a sin if he did not devote himself to composition.” Inspired by Tchaikovsky’s warm and encouraging reception, Catoire returned to Berlin. Besides lessons with Klindworth, he had briefly studied theory of composition with Otto Tirsch. After one month of unsatisfactory lessons, he switched to the Belgian professor Philippe Rüfer. Catoire later described him as a composer “deprived of originality.” Although he only studied with him for three months, Georgy composed a string quartet for Rüfer. Unfortunately, only a slow movement of that composition has survived as a manuscript, perhaps due to the marks in the score made by Tchaikovsky.

When the young composer returned to Russia in May, 1887, he was too shy to make his piano performing debut, despite Klindworth’s encouragement and confidence in Catoire’s aptitude for solo career. That summer Catoire met Tchaikovsky for the second time. It happened at the Jürgenson’s music store where Tchaikovsky was together with Sergei Taneyev and Nikolai Hubert, music critic and professor of theory at the Moscow Conservatory. Catoire showed them his quartet. Both Tchaikovsky and Taneyev commended the music, though found the texture of the composition to be rather weak.

Realizing that his compositional technique still was inadequate, Catoire went to St. Petersburg and, on Tchaikovsky’s recommendation, approached Nikolai Rimsky-Korsakov with a request for lessons in theory of composition. In his letter to the St. Petersburg colleague, Tchaikovsky described Catoire as “very talented... [but] in need of serious schooling.”

By then, Rimsky-Korsakov was not only a successful and prolific composer, but
also a famous professor at the St. Petersburg Conservatory, who had raised a generation of students. He had published his *Uchebnik Garmonii [Textbook of harmony]*, which eventually succeeded Tchaikovsky’s manual and became the foundation for harmony teaching in Russia.

For his only lesson with the celebrated composer Catoire wrote three piano pieces, later published as Op. 2. Rimsky-Korsakov handed him over to Anatoly Lyadov, the most gifted of his students (whom he, nevertheless, expelled from the Conservatory for laziness, then readmitted later). Catoire has completed a course of counterpoint with Lyadov and wrote several pieces for him. One of the compositions, *Caprice* Op. 3, was especially criticized and revised by the scrupulous teacher.

Neither the teacher nor the pupil was satisfied with these lessons and soon they were over, thus ending Catoire’s years of formal training.

Years before Breakdown

Upon his return to Moscow, Catoire became very close with Anton Arensky (1861-1906), who was a far more finished and successful composer than Catoire, even though they both were of the same age. Arensky was a student of Rimsky-Korsakov, and upon graduation from the St. Petersburg Conservatory with a Gold Medal in 1882, was hired by the Moscow Conservatory as a professor of harmony and counterpoint; Rachmaninoff, Scriabin and Glière were among his students. He knew Tchaikovsky as well, and received much practical encouragement from his older colleague.

During that period Catoire completed his second string quartet and a cantata
entitled *Rusalka [The Mermaid]*, Op. 5 for voice, women’s choir and orchestra. Both works had a rather peculiar destiny: the quartet remained unpublished and later the composer transformed it into a quintet; only a piano score of the cantata was published and it was never performed in the original instrumentation.

After several failures at the beginning of his artistic career, Catoire became disillusioned about his future as a musician. That, together with the lack of support and compassion both from his family and colleagues, led him to leaving Moscow and moving to the countryside around the year 1889. For about two years Georgy lived there as a recluse, cutting off all the contacts with his friends and planning to quit music. Yet his musical calling could not be subdued, and as a result of his seclusion the Symphony in C minor, Op. 7 came to life. Originally composed as a sextet, this symphony was not published and never been performed in its entirety.

Perhaps the first real, yet modest success came to Catoire with his Romances for Voice and Piano, Op. 9. Thanks to this set, the composer made several new acquaintances in the musical establishment, such as brothers Lev Eduardovich and Georgy Eduardovich Konyus, Arsenij Nikolaevitch Koreshschenko, and others. It was followed by a number of vocal and piano pieces, as well as several larger works: the symphonic poem *Mtsyri*, Op. 13, inspired by the poem of the famous Russian Romantic poet Mikhail Lermontov (1814-1841); Piano Trio, Op. 14; First Violin Sonata, Op. 15; and String Quintet, Op. 16. All these compositions were written between the years 1899 and 1902.

Unfortunately, working on the Quintet, particularly on its Finale, immensely
strained Georgy to the point of nervous exhaustion. As a result, the composer suffered a long and serious nervous illness, which explains an almost two-year long break in his creative activity. He returned to writing music in the late 1904. The complete recovery came in 1905, when Catoire lived in Tyrolean town of Brixen (then Austrian, now Italian).

Return to Life

Between 1904 and 1916, Georgy Catoire produced a dozen of new compositions. Among them there are some major works, such as Poem, Second Violin Sonata, Op.20, written in 1906; Piano Concerto, Op.21 from 1909; Piano Quintet, Op. 28 and Piano Quartet, Op.31, composed in 1914 and 1916 respectively.

In 1909, famous conductor and double bass virtuoso Sergey Koussevitzky (1874-1951) founded the publishing house Rossiiskoe Muzykal’noe Izdatel’stvo (known in the West as Editions Russes de Musique and Russischer Musikverlag). He became an avid advocate of the new music by Russian composers and eventually signed contracts with Scriabin, Stravinsky, Prokofiev, Rachmaninov, Medtner, and Catoire. Koussevitzky’s enterprise published a number of Catoire’s works.

Teaching at the Moscow Conservatory

In 1916, Georgy Catoire joined the faculty of the Moscow Conservatory as a professor of composition, the position he held for the last ten years of his life. During his tenure at the conservatory, Georgy composed a few works of a smaller scale, such as Six
Poems by Konstantin Balmont for Voice and Piano, Op. 32; Six poems by Vladimir Solov’yov for Voice and Piano, Op. 33; *Quatre morceaux pour piano*, Op. 34 (two pieces of the set were written many years earlier); and *Tempête pour piano*, Op. 35. The last compositions were published posthumously in 1928.

At the same time Catoire became interested in music theory. He based his research on the achievements of his predecessors: Riemann, Gevaert, Tchaikovsky, Rimsky-Korsakov, Taneyev, and Arensky. No one in Russia used Riemann’s method in pedagogy before Catoire. The primary subject of his research was works of composers of the later period: Scriabin, Medtner, and Prokofiev. This enabled him to expand the limits of theory and had an important impact on the further development of this musical science in Russia.

Catoire’s research resulted in two works: *Teoreticheskiy kurs garmonii* [*Theoretical course of harmony*], and *Muzykal’naia forma* [*Musical form*]. In his first book he surveys tonality and chord structure focusing on late nineteenth-century compositions. The latter book was not finished, but published posthumously in a completed and edited form by Catoire’s students Dmitry Kabalevsky, Leo Mazel, and Lev Polovonkin almost ten years after the author’s death. In this book Georgy Catoire researched characteristics of Riemann’s theories on rhythm, justifying mixed, transitional, and new forms as its basis.

Both publications became the cornerstones of the music theory development in the USSR, and are still in use as the required textbooks at the conservatories in Russia.

Among Catoire’s students, besides the aforementioned Kabalevsky, Mazel, and
Polovinkin, were composers Viktor Bely, Mikhail Starokadomsky, Vasily Shirinsky, and Vladimir Fere. The latter wrote that in his teacher’s class the students received “the strictest logic and a systematic character of thinking, while gaining solid professional skills.”

Nikolai Myaskovsky thought very highly of the preparation students received under Georgy Catoire’s tutelage and considered him an excellent pedagogue.

Catoire dwelled in the annex of the estate, built in 1786 and owned by his family since early 1850s. He died there in his sleep less than a month after his sixty-fifth birthday on May 21, 1926. Death came to Georgy L’vovich unexpectedly, since he was not ill or even indisposed.

Descendants of Georgy Catoire still live in Moscow. His daughter, T. G. Katuar, taught piano at the Children’s Music School, associated with the Moscow Conservatory since the mid 1930s for more than three decades. Catoire’s great-granddaughter Ekaterina Messner is on the piano faculty of the Moscow Conservatory and very active as a chamber musician.
CHAPTER 3
CATOIRE’S STYLISTIC CHARACTERISTICS IN THE PIANO SOLO
AND CHAMBER MUSIC

Texture

The musical texture and sonority of Catoire’s piano works are characterized by thick, often multi-layered sound, contrapuntal interest added to a basically homophonic texture, and idiomatic instrumental writing. Thick vertical sound is produced by extremely full chords: 7ths, 9ths, 11ths, ranging up to ten tones (see Example 1).

Example 1: Poem, Sonata for violin and piano, op.20, m. 264.

Contrapuntal enlivenment of homophonic texture by imitation in inner voices is also common (Example 2). Grandiose virtuoso exploitation of piano technique encompasses octave passages and progressions of thick consecutive arpeggiated and broken chords (Example 3). Although Catoire’s counterpoint is harmonically conceived, it is often spare and linear in a way that suggests the truly independent counterpoint of the Russian neo-classical composers – Stravinsky, Shostakovich, and Prokofiev.
Many of Catoire’s works are characterized by metrically irregular rapid figurations (Example 4). This perpetual motion dominates in many early character pieces: *Legend*, op.10 No. 5, *Tempest*, op.35, *Etude fantastique* from *Quatre Morceaux*, op.12.
Example 4: *Etude No.4* (1924-26), mm.1-4.

In compositions where the perpetual motion figure is the prevailing texture, Catoire often uses tempo markings or changes in range for contrast (*Legend*, op.10 No. 5).

The pianistic style of Catoire is distinguished by idiomatic, difficult technical demands: chromatic and diatonic scale passages, extensive arpeggiation, octave passages, frequent use of multiple sharp/flat keys. In the Sonata, op.20, mm.231-2 there is a brief appearance of the main motive in a key of D sharp major/minor (Example 5).

Catoire has a broad dynamic vocabulary and employs a wide range of dynamic markings extending from *ppp* to *fff* -- a common feature of the late XIXth century composers in general, and Russian romantic composers, such as Anton Rubinstein, Balakirev, Mussorgsky, Tchaikovsky, Taneev, and Glazunov in particular. The sheer number of dynamic markings and tempo and mood suggestions in his scores is impressive, again reflecting the agitated and impassioned sound ideal of the late Romantics. Sixty four dynamic and mood indications occur in the first thirty-three measures of the Second Sonata for Violin and Piano, op.20, on average about two markings per measure. Juxtaposed extremes of sound occasionally occur (Examples 6a and 6b).
Example 5: Sonata, op.20, mm.231-2.

Example 6a: Sonata, op.20, mm.13-14.
Although chromaticism is often considered a feature of melody, Catoire achieves a conglomeration of sound by layers of chromaticism (Example 7).

Example 7: Poem No.1, op.34, mm. 30-32.

While following the traits of the late romanticism, Catoire embraces the new stylistic trends of the modernist composers of the turn of the XXth century, particularly favoring Alexander Scriabin’s middle-period works. However, Catoire disapproved of Scriabin’s last works which he described as having “an absence of harmonic movement and a tiresome stasis.” Some characteristics of the harmonic language of Catoire’s works are Scriabinesque chromatic “yearnings,” complex altered sonorities, progressions of seventh and ninth chords, and frequent enharmonic deviations and modulations which
delay the arrival of the main key. In Example 8, the arrival to tonic is avoided by addition of the seventh in the bass line.

Example 8 Sonata, op.20, mm. 111-116.
While Catoire’s mature period works exemplify meticulous attention to detail, their form becomes freer and more flexible. Thus in the Sonata, op.20, the appearance of seemingly independent sections in the development (mm.175-182 and mm.288-303), juxtaposition of themes in remote keys, frequent tempo fluctuations, avoidance of clearly set cadential resolutions, substituted by a series of tonally unstable seventh chords (Example 8), as well as reversed order of the thematic appearance in the recapitulation, all create an impression of freely improvised form.

Catoire’s harmonic language is enriched by impressionistic features as well. Occasional use of augmented chords perhaps inspired by Debussy is displayed in the introduction of the Sonata, op.20 and its coda (mm. 1-3 and 361-363 respectively). (The Scriabin’s influence could also be seen in the capriciously whimsical rhythmic design of some Catoire’s themes.)

There is an apparent interest in Russian folk melodies that is especially prevalent in Catoire’s shorter works of the early period: Trois morceaux, op.2, Paysage and Contraste, op.6 and others, and in cantabile movements of the large scale works of the mature period. For example, the main theme of the middle section of the second movement scherzo of the Trio in F minor, op.14 closely resembles Russian folksong, and continues ideas of the Russian Nationalist composers: Balakirev, Rimsky-Korsakov, Liapunov, and Arensky.

Melody

The late Romantic composers treat their melodies with greater breadth and
plasticity. As described by William Newman, the unyielding four-measure phrases of the early Romantic era were extended into more irregular groupings. Two melodic types which often appear are a short dramatic, at times motivic idea, and a very broad lyrical cantabile tune.

Catoire uses two dramatically contrasting melodies: a short, bold, disjunct melodic idea, motivic, and easily fragmented (theme A); and another, a broad lyrical melody with a smooth, rather seamless flow (see Example 10b). Initial melodic range in most of his melodies is an octave or less, and melodic continuation is achieved most often by sequential repetition, usually with chromatic inflection (Example 9).

Example 9: Prelude, op.17 No.2.

In Poem, Sonata No.2, op.20, Catoire demonstrates his ability to use the most economical germ cell as a unifying theme motive for both themes A and B. From the motive, a descending third with a leading note back to it, he creates most of the other
themes and accompanying texture (compare Examples 10a, 10b, 10c, and 10d). He easily combines the two themes, one motivic and one lyrical, by incorporating the descending third cell into the opening of the cantabile second theme, further developing it by inverting it into a leap to a sixth (Example 10b). This motive continues to evolve by means of rhythmical alteration and fragmentation throughout the development (Example 10d).

Example 10a: Sonata, op. 20, mm. 8-11.
Example 10b: Sonata, op. 20, mm. 34-35.

Example 10c: Sonata, op. 20, mm. 73-74.

Example 10d: Sonata, op. 20, mm. 129-130.
Some of Catoire’s melodies are tonally ambiguous; the tonic note may not appear
toward the beginning of the melody, giving it a vague, rootless quality (Example 11).
Supporting harmony in many of these melodies makes the tonality clear. Victor Belaiev,
in an article on Russian folk-music, points to this rootless sound at the beginning of a
melody as a peculiarity of Russian folk-song.

Example 11: Prelude, op.17 No.1.

Harmony

Catoire adopts trends of late XIXth century harmony, generally characterized by
increased chromaticism and greater divergence from standard harmonic progression,
including the use of altered chords, freer dissonance and voice-leading, and movement to
and from more distant keys. Frequent modulation to remote keys and coloristic
chromaticism, often through the common addition of 2nds, 6ths, 7ths, 9ths, and 11ths to
chromatic and diatonic chords obscures the use of close tonal relationships as structural
landmarks. In order to balance chromatic movement in the upper parts, Catoire
incorporates long stretches of dominant pedal point in a bass line to make his eventual goal clear (Example 12). Color shifts from major to minor are frequent in Catoire’s works.

Example 12: Sonata, op. 20, mm.169-171.

Catoire frequently uses common chords outside their traditional context. For example, German sixth chords do not prepare cadential resolutions, but act independently inside the phrase or serve as a pivotal point for an enharmonic modulation, as in Example 10c.
Catoire’s harmonic rhythm varies with the type of melody he writes. In broad lyrical melodies, harmonic progression freely follows melodic contour. In pieces with rapidly moving perpetual motion figurations, the harmonic rhythm tends to be slow, often one harmony per measure (Example 13), increasing to two per measure toward points of articulation. The shorter dramatic themes exploit faster and more driving harmonic progressions with prevailing diminished 7th and double augmented chords (see Example 11c).

Example 13: *Caprice*, op. 3.

Catoire typically uses stretches of rapid harmonic rhythm at climactic points, as in the development of the *Poem*, Sonata, op.20 (Example 14a), or as contrast between two sections of slower harmonic rhythm as in the transition from the A to B section, (Example 14b).
Example 14a: mm.189-193.

Example 14b: mm.28-33.
Catoire particularly favors long stretches of busy moving passages over the descending chromatic bass line movement, which frequently appears in many works of Catoire: Prelude No. 3, op. posth., Etude No.4 (1924-26), Paysage, op. 6, Trio, op.14 first movement, Sonata, op.20 to name a few.

Catoire’s tonality represents the expanded tonality prevalent in late Romantic music. He favors the key relationships of the major or minor mediant and submediant, and often oscillates around the tonic by use of the leading tone key the Neapolitan key. Modulation by half-step is as common in Russian music as dominant or subdominant modulation, due to the importance of the second degree in some scales of Russian folk music.

Table 1 shows tonalities in major sections of the Poem, Sonata for violin and piano, op. 20.

TABLE I

Tonal/Modulatory Plan of Poem, Sonata for Violin and Piano, op. 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Tonal Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>A major (mm. 1-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme A</td>
<td>D major (mm. 8-13), A major (mm. 14-21) b minor (mm. 22-33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme B</td>
<td>d minor (mm.34-53)/E flat major (54-58)/d minor (mm. 59-72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme A1</td>
<td>G flat major (mm. 73-83)/e sharp minor (mm. 84-103)/F sharp major (mm. 104-120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme C</td>
<td>F sharp major (mm. 121-134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme B1</td>
<td>d sharp minor (mm. 135-150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme B2</td>
<td>d minor/e minor (mm. 151-174)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme B3</td>
<td>f minor (mm. 175-182)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Table 1 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development (con’t.)</th>
<th>Theme B4</th>
<th>b flat minor (mm. 183-194)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theme B</td>
<td>d minor (mm. 195-208)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme A1</td>
<td>G major/d minor/A flat major (mm. 209-231)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B major (mm. 232-242)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f sharp minor/B major (mm. 243-265)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B major (mm. 266-273)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme C</td>
<td>B major (mm. 274-281)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme B1</td>
<td>E major (mm. 282-287)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c sharp minor (allegro moderato, mm. 288-307)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation</td>
<td>Theme B</td>
<td>G major/D major (mm. 308-332)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theme A</td>
<td>B flat major (mm. 333-343)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D major (mm. 344-353)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>mm. 354-363</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In some of the earlier character pieces in ternary form, the tonal plan may emphasize more closely related keys inside each section, but move to distantly related keys between sections. Table 2 shows tonality in the Caprice, op. 3.

TABLE II

Tonal Plan of Caprice, op. 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exposition</td>
<td>I-(V)-i-ii-b-I-III(enharmonic substitution)-iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>i-#i-iii-vib-i-IV-i-III-VI-iii-VIb-VI-VII-vii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recapitulation</td>
<td>IV-I-VIIb-I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A section</th>
<th>G flat major/e flat minor/A flat major/B flat major/G flat major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B section</td>
<td>b minor/F major/A major/dominant to G flat major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A section</td>
<td>G flat major/e flat minor/A flat major/B flat major/G flat major</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transition from section A to section B is prepared through descending stepwise movement in the bass line from D flat to b. In this instance, the dominant of G flat major is acting as II# in the new key of b minor.

Rhythm

Common rhythmic elements in Catoire’s music include freedom from the regularity of pulse by syncopation in one or sometimes in all voices (Prelude op.17 No.3), cross-accents (Scherzo from Six Morceaux op.6, p.13), cross-rhythms, such as duplets against triplets (Prelude op.17 No.4), septuplets against quadruplets (Etude No.4 (1924-26) etc., dynamic accents on weak beats, syncopated harmonic rhythms, irregular and complex meters (Poem op. 34). Contrapuntal movement in inner voices often contributes to generating a rhythmically busy texture (Example 15).

Example 15: Sonata, op.20, mm. 91-92.

Example 16 from Capriccioso, op.10 No.3 shows hemiola rhythmic figures in the bass line against a continuous sixteenth-note pulse in 6/8 at an extremely rapid tempo, creating the effect of a superimposed meter. Catoire occasionally employs syncopated harmonic rhythm to create the effect of misplaced bar lines (Example 17).
In his early works in rapid tempo, Catoire seems to prefer busy surface rhythms in many of his character pieces (Caprice, op. 3, Prelude, op. 6, Vision, op. 8, Cinq Morceaux, op. 10, Quatre Morceaux, op. 12, and others). Often perpetual motion surface rhythm carries on through B sections of these ternary pieces, leaving an unsatisfactory amount of rhythmic contrast with the listener. The slower lyrical pieces of the same period exploit irregular bar lengths. Five beats meter is especially frequent and reflects traditions of Russian folk music. In his later period, rhythmic patterns become more flexible and tend to follow melodic contours (see Example 7: Poem, op. 34).
Although Catoire provided tempo directions for most of his compositions, he seldom included metronome markings. In fact, there is only one set of piano solo pieces which has a metronomic suggestion, the *Quatre Chants du Crepuscule*, op. 24.

While his early pieces are marked with more standard tempo directions – *Allegro, Andante, Moderato* and others, his later works include more descriptive character suggestions, such as *capricciosamente, con molto sentimento, andante dramatico, poco allegro, misterioso, sempre molto rubato* etc. Catoire adds numerous other tempo changes – *agitato, accelerando, ritardando, tempo rubato*, and others – which give an illusion of the improvisational nature of his pieces.

Form

Many of Catoire’s early piano works are typical nineteenth-century character pieces in ternary form. Sections are usually clearly articulated, with tempo changes frequently distinguishing a new section. Themes in B sections are not always highly contrasted with A themes, and they often seem to be derived from them. In several of his character pieces Catoire uses part of an A theme in a B section. A fairly typical ternary form of Catoire is shown in the structural analysis of *Intermezzo*, op. 36

Structural Analysis of *Intermezzo*, op. 36

Section A (mm. 1 – 62) B flat major. *Allegro capriccioso*. Melody is based on two elements: mm.1-4 – an octave wide ascending stepwise motion and mm. 5-9 descending broken chord sequential pattern; repeated in modified form in mm.10-23; 24-44; 45-56(climactic statement); and mm. 59-62.
Section B (mm. 63 – 99)  F sharp major. *Moderato non troppo*. The theme B resembles the second element of the main melody (mm. 5-8); contrapuntal writing is introduced in mm. 67-72; mm. 78-82 – theme is restated in octaves; mm. 84-88 – motivic imitation in the bass line voice; transition back to B flat major is harmonically achieved through enharmonic substitution of the fully diminished 7th chord in m. 97.

Section A (mm.100 – 129)  B flat major. *Tempo I*. Truncated. The entire section is a direct repetition of mm. 1-29.

Coda (mm. 130 – 152)  B flat major. Culmination of the piece in mm. 138-152 is prepared by tempo increase (accelerando to *Presto* is marked from mm. 130 to 142); motivically, it exploits the ascending element of the theme A, supported by series of chromatically “climbing” fully diminished chords over the dominant organ point.

In the ternary form shown above sections are unified through the motivic resemblance of theme B and second element of theme A.

In many of the ternary forms Catoire extends the forms by introductions, long transitions from A to B sections, and codas.

Other forms in his early works are strophic and short set of variations on a theme.

Catoire’s larger works: Trio, op. 14, Quartet, op.31, Piano Concerto, op. 21, and the First Violin Sonata, op.15 are three movement works. Some are cyclic, i.e. themes or material presented in the first movement appear in one or both of the other movements.

For example, in the Quartet, op.31, the opening motive, the ascending second in inverted dotted rhythm of the first movement, is quoted directly in the second movement (Example 18). The characteristic rhythmic figure in the piano part resembles a similar one in the last movement *Molto Allegro* (compare figures a and c in Example 18).
The outer movements of Violin Sonata No.1, Piano Quartet, op.31, Trio, op.14, and the first movement of the Piano Concerto are in sonata form. His Second Sonata for Violin and Piano is the only single movement large scale work with an extensive development, truncated recapitulation and coda.

Catoire is careful to juxtapose contrasting textures between movements. The outer movements of Violin Sonata No.1 are both rapidly moving, almost rhapsodic, and
each is characterized by a perpetually moving fluid rhythmic figure. The middle movement is a slow and lyrical *Barcarolle* in $ABA^1 B^1$ design.
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF *POEM*, SECOND SONATA FOR VIOLIN AND PIANO, OP. 20

This sonata fully represents Catoire’s mature style of composition. Its texture is highly contrapuntal and multi-layered, yet well-balanced between the parts. Example 15 shows a typical imitative treatment of the thematic material between the two instruments, in which two motives of the opening theme: one – based on interchanging major-minor thirds and the other – a long descent from the third octave c sharp down to the first octave e, through a progression of two wide downward leaps, where the perfect fifth and the major seventh (see Example 10a: mm. 8-11) are superimposed.

Both instruments are treated equally, with rhythmically independent rhapsodic figures, which tightly intertwine together, creating a complex yet well structured texture. To build up the intensity towards climactic moments Catoire overlays more rapidly moving metrically irregular rhythmic figurations (quintuplets against septuplets, etc.) to achieve a sense of spontaneous excitement and energy (Example 19).

Example 19: Sonata, op. 20, m.343.
The sonata opens with a brief piano interlude (mm.1-3), in which harmonic “tension” between E-F-E over tonic and low submediant (VI♭) is introduced. The appearance of F natural in the opening has a motivic function. It corresponds to the semitonal outline of the opening theme (c#-b#-c#-d-d#-e of mm. 4 and 5) and also forecasts the d minor tonality of the secondary theme that arrives in m. 34 (Example 20).

Example 20: Sonata, op. 20, mm. 1-8
The composer widens the downward motion from a fifth to a major seventh in the second statement, and from the second octave \( a \) down to a thirteenth, to the first octave \( d \) in the third climactic reiteration of the theme in mm. 10 and 11. The fourth conclusive thematic appearance ends with a calmer and thus smaller descent to a ninth in the violin part in m.27 (Example 21).

Example 21: Sonata, op. 20, mm. 26-27

Harmonic alterations help to intensify each statement. Chord by chord analysis in table below illustrates this point.

**TABLE III**

Chord by Chord Analysis of the Theme A of Sonata, Op. 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>m. 1</th>
<th>m. 2</th>
<th>m. 3</th>
<th>m. 4</th>
<th>m. 5</th>
<th>m. 6</th>
<th>m. 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>First statement in A major in the piano part</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( 1^{6/4} - b\text{vi}^+ )</td>
<td>( 1^{6/4} - b\text{vi}^+ )</td>
<td>( b\text{vi}^+ )</td>
<td>( 6/4 - \text{Ger}^{6/5} )</td>
<td>( 1^{6/4} - b\text{vii}^7/\text{ii}^7 ) in F</td>
<td>( \text{vii}^6/\text{ii}^6/\text{vi}^4/2 )</td>
<td>( \text{vi}^6 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>m. 8</th>
<th>m. 9</th>
<th>m. 10</th>
<th>m. 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Second statement in D major in the violin part</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \text{Ger}^{6/5} ) ( \text{vii}^6/2/\text{f}# )</td>
<td>( \text{Ger}^{6/5} ) ( 1^{6/4}/\text{c}# )</td>
<td>( \text{vii}^6/2/\text{v} ) ( \text{ii}^+ )</td>
<td>( \text{vii}^6/2/\text{ii} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c) Third climactic statement in A major in the violin part

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>m. 14</th>
<th>m. 15</th>
<th>m. 16</th>
<th>m. 17</th>
<th>m. 18</th>
<th>m. 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

d) Fourth statement in A major begins in the piano part continues by the violin (recess)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>m. 21</th>
<th>m. 22</th>
<th>m. 23</th>
<th>m. 24</th>
<th>m. 25</th>
<th>m. 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

over b organ point

As seen from Table IIIa, Catoire incorporates by now familiar chords in new ways. Frequently used augmented chords do not play the traditional role of preparing the dominant, but instead act as brief deviations from the tonic (see mm. 4, 8, and 9 in Example 20), which help to destabilize it and create an indefinite, indecisive, longing musical character, which perhaps recalls Alexander Scriabin’s transitional middle period tonal works.

Motivically, this work demonstrates the composer’s ability to create a large scale work based on a single motive undergoing a series of rhythmic, harmonic, and dramatic transformations. The first motive of the opening theme in m. 8 (Example 10a) is transformed into the initial descending third motive of the secondary theme in m. 34 (Example 10b), thus creating motivic coherence between otherwise contrasting themes: the first, highly chromatic, based on semitonal interplay of f sharp and e sharp,
harmonically and tonally unstable, and the diatonic, folk-like second theme in parallel sixths, first occurring in the piano part, accompanied by metrically “placid,” Brahmsian triplet figures (see Example 10a).

The composer constructs the melodic development of the opening theme, based on the contrast between close chromatic intervals and large dramatic leaps. Melodic outline of the first thematic statement in the piano part is constructed largely of semitones and ends with a contrasting leap down to a perfect fifth.

He then widens the downward motion from a fifth to a major seventh in the second statement, and from the second octave “a” down to a thirteenth to the first octave d in the third, climactic reiteration of the theme in mm. 10 and 11. The fourth, conclusive thematic appearance ends with a calmer and thus smaller descent to a ninth in the violin part m. 27.

The secondary theme in many ways corresponds to the opening theme: motivically, it also involves series of large descending leaps to a sixth and a ninth (mm. 37-39); tonic – subdominant key relationship between the piano and the violin statements remain the same: In the opening theme, it is A major-D major, while in the secondary, it is d minor-g minor.

Rhythmically, the Second Sonata is based on the juxtaposition of the two themes: the rhythmically tense syncopated pattern occurring in the theme in mm. 9, 12, 13, accompanied by metrically “unsettled” quintuplets in the piano part; and the lyrical second theme with its relatively stable movement in eighth-note triplets and lower level rhythmic activity.
After introducing the second theme, Catoire restates the first theme in various ways. Each statement appears in a new key and tempo: the first, in mm. 73-76 (Example 22a), in G flat major, marked *Allegro Moderato*. *Tempo Rubato* is more rhapsodic, with “impatient” ascending runs overlapping between the piano and the violin; the next in c sharp minor/d sharp minor/ a sharp minor *piano espressivo* is in languid character – the theme appears in the piano part, with “sobbing” chromatically descending passages in the violin; prepared by a build up *poco agitato* in mm. 93-96 (Example 22b) (violin and piano imitating each other), then comes the third climactic statement *Allegro risoluto. Animato*, mm.103-105 in F sharp major, in which both parts play the theme in octaves in unison; the following theme appearance, still in a key of F sharp major *poco meno mosso* presents the last preparation before the dramatic entrance of the closing theme.

Example 22a: Sonata, op. 20, mm. 73-76.
Example 22b: Sonata, op. 20, mm. 93-96

Example 22c: Sonata, op. 20, mm. 103-105
In the development, the second theme undergoes series of dramatic transformations: the initial eighth-note pick up transforms into a short grace note-like reaping figure; the smooth and continuous melodic line is broken up into short disjointed motivic cells; harmonically stable tonic chord that supported the first measure of the theme B is now is replaced with half diminished 7th chord (compare Examples 10b and 10d). Restless character is also insured by Catoire’s masterful use of irregular bar lengths.

Even though this sonata gives an illusion of a freely improvised through-composed form, it falls under the sonata form category with some features of sonata-rondo, The grounds for the latter gives an appearance of the modified version of theme A after the secondary theme in both exposition and recapitulation. Its form could be outlined as following:

**TABLE IV**
Formal Plan of *Poem*, Sonata, op. 20

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Introduction</strong></td>
<td>A major (mm. 1-7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme A</strong></td>
<td>D major (mm. 8-13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A major (mm. 14-21), b minor (mm. 22-33)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme B</strong></td>
<td>d minor (mm.34-53)/E flat major (mm. 54-58)/d minor (mm. 59-72)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme A1</strong></td>
<td>G flat major (mm. 73-83)/c sharp minor (mm. 84-103)/F sharp major (mm. 104-120)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme C</strong></td>
<td>F sharp major (mm. 121-134)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exposition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme B1</strong></td>
<td>d sharp minor (mm. 135-150)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme B2</strong></td>
<td>D minor/e minor (mm. 151-174)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme B3</strong></td>
<td>f minor (mm. 175-182)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme B4</strong></td>
<td>b flat minor (mm. 183-194)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme B</strong></td>
<td>d minor (mm. 195 - 208)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme A1</strong></td>
<td>G major/d minor/A flat major (mm. 209-231)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B major (mm. 232-242)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f sharp minor/B major (mm. 243-265), B major (mm. 266-273)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Appearance of the theme B in m. 195 creates an impression of the beginning of recapitulation. In reality it opens the second wave of development, in which themes B A1 C B (mm. 34-134) are reiterated in a new key. As seen from the formal plan above, true recapitulation does not occur until m. 308 with the triumphantly stated theme B in a tonic key: D major. It is followed by the theme A: *Maestoso Trionfante*. The reversed order of the thematic appearance in the recapitulation brings the piece symmetry and helps to unify its structure.

Catoire’s style characteristics firmly reflect style practices of the German late Romantics. His use of harmonic and tonal color and occasional use of Russian folk-song reflect the Russian style characteristics of Rimsky-Korsakov, Arensky, Scriabin, and the Russian nationalist composers. Many of his early works – the waltzes, preludes, and other character pieces – have a naive sentimentality of parlor-music style. The two violin and piano sonatas, piano trio, and piano quartet have much more depth and originality. They display composer’s masterful use of counterpoint, theme manipulation, demonstrating Catoire’s ability to write in variety of textures and tonal colors.
CHAPTER 5
CATOIRE: MUSICAL SIGNIFICANCE

Catoire was the influential figure in Russian musical life for the first quarter of the twentieth century. Teaching theory at the Moscow Conservatory, he pioneered and developed theoretical systems of Riemann, Prout, and Gevaert, establishing a foundation for Soviet music theory. Having similar views with Taneev, he promoted ideas of functional harmony, opposing the modern tendencies of the loss of tonal structure. At the same time, he experimented with chromatically altered harmonies, creating many “fresh” tonal colors. Outstanding Russian music historian Leonid Sabaneev praised Catoire for “the refinement and taste which permeate his compositions” and “his tendency towards exquisiteness and harmony, and in the masterly elaboration of details.” He also acknowledged Catoire as one of the first Moscow musicians to “recognize” Wagner and bow before his genius. In regard to his compositional style he thought that Katuar combined “the mastery and fundamentality of German music with the elegance of the French and the profound lyricism of the Russian.” Sabaneev compares Catoire with Caesar Franck, the “French Brahms.”

Catoire composed a number of piano pieces, most of which are chamber and solo works. These pieces are rarely studied or performed in the West. A few reasons for such neglect are unavailability of his music scores and the more conservative characteristics of his style, i.e. adherence to the tonal system, and the more gentle sentimental nature of his solo piano works. Thus, his compositions fell out of fashion before they gained wider
recognition. Unavailability of his music scores contributed to his obscurity for the Western audiences. The first attempt to fill in the void was made by Scribes Press in Philadelphia in 1999: pre-revolutionary Russian editions of Catoire’s works for solo piano, published by Jurgenson were reprinted.

The discography of Catoire’s music is extremely limited. The only recordings done during the Soviet times were of two violin and piano sonatas and an elegy, performed by David Oistrach and Alexander Goldenweiser in late 40s, and a piano trio recorded by Mstislav Rastropovich, Leonid Kogan, and Alexander Goldenweiser.

Catoire’s music is slowly starting to get attention in the West: in 1999, Marc-André Hamelin initiated a recording of selected piano solo music by Catoire.

While Catoire can be relegated to secondary stature as a composer, his best solo and chamber works for piano deserve to be rediscovered and reintroduced into the standard repertory.
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Sonata dla skripki i fortepiano, soch. 15; Sonate pour violon et piano, op. 15. Moscow: Muzykal’nyi sektor Gosizdat, 1926.


Три стихотворения Тютчева для женского хора и ф. п., соч 18. [Three poems by Tyutchev for Women’s Choir and Piano, Op 18] [German & Russian]. Berlin: Russischer Musikverlag, 1909

Poème: 2me. sonate pour piano et violon, op. 2. Berlin: Russischer Musikverlag; Brüssel, New York: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1910.


G. Orentlikher, ed. Romansy: dlya golosa s fortepiano [Songs for voice and piano : Op. 1, no. 4; op. 9, no. 1 & 4; op. 11, no. 1 & 4; op. 19, no. 1 & 2; op. 29, no. 3 & 6; op. 32, no. 4. Moscow: State Publishers Music, 1972.

The complete piano music of Georgi Catoire: Trois morceaux, op. 2. Chant intime; Loin du foyer; Soirée d’hiver -- Caprice, op. 3 -- Six morceaux, op. 6. Réverie; Prélude; Scherzo; Paysage; Intermezzo; Contraste – Vision, op. 8 -- Cinq morceaux, op. 10. Prélude; Prélude; Capriccioso; Rêverie; Légende – Quatre morceaux, op. 12. Chant du soir; Méditation; Nocturne; Étude fantastique – Quatre préludes, op. 17 -- Chants du crépuscule; 4 morceaux, op. 24 -- Valse, op. 30 -- Quatre morceaux, op. 34. Poème; Poème; Prélude; Étude – Tempête, op. 35 -- Valse, op. 36 -- Concert transcription of Bach’s Passacaglia for organ BWV 582. Philadelphia, PA: PRO/Scribes Press, 1999.


Recordings


Oistrakh, David, Alexander Goldenweiser. *Katuar, Georgii: Elegy for violin and piano; Sonata for violin and piano no. 1 in B minor, op. 15.; Sonata for violin and piano no. 2 in D major, op. 20: Poema*, in *David Oistrakh collection, Vol.5*. DHR-7720; Doremi; D 1408; Melodiya; Series: Legendary treasures 1999.


List of Works for Solo Piano


*Caprice pour le piano, Op. 3*, Moscow: P. Jurgenson, 1897.


