



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS
JOURNALS + DIGITAL PUBLISHING

What Was “Shostakovich,” and What Came Next?

Author(s): PETER J. SCHMELZ

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *The Journal of Musicology*, Vol. 24, No. 3 (Summer 2007), pp. 297-338

Published by: [University of California Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/jm.2007.24.3.297>

Accessed: 10/09/2012 00:19

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



University of California Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Musicology*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

What Was “Shostakovich,” and What Came Next?

PETER J. SCHMELZ

After the Shostakovich centenary year of concerts, festivals, and conferences large and small as well as the many accompanying archival revelations and documentary publications, it seems opportune to pose at long last a fundamental historical question, namely: What was “Shostakovich” and what came next? This question is inspired by anthropologist Katherine Verdery’s 1996 study *What Was Socialism, and What Comes Next?* In her book Verdery surveyed the recent changes in Eastern Europe, and specifically Romania, from her vantage point in the uncertain period following the momentous events from 1989 to 1991 in the former Soviet bloc. Just as the collapse of the Soviet Union forced the world to reconsider both the meaning of socialism as well as the future course of global economic and political development, so too did the death of Shostakovich in 1975 come to encapsulate a variety of often divergent meanings for younger Soviet composers. Verdery saw her “overall theme as exploring how the operation

297

Earlier, shorter versions of this article were presented at the conference “Shostakovich and Weinberg: An Artistic Dialog” at the Eastman School of Music, the Shostakovich Centenary Conference at the University of Bristol, and the Washington University in St. Louis Department of Music Lecture Series. I am especially indebted to Gretchen Wheelock and Pauline Fairclough for inviting me to participate in the September 2006 Shostakovich events. I would also like to thank Elizabeth Crist, Elena Dubinets, Laurel Fay, Julian Lim, and the anonymous reviewers of this journal for their assistance and suggestions in preparing and revising this article.

THE JOURNAL OF MUSICOLOGY

of socialism influences what comes next.”¹ Similarly vital is an exploration of how Shostakovich, widely perceived in 1975 as the musical representative of socialism, influenced what came after him. The many forms of this influence are displayed most strikingly in the memorial compositions written in the decade after Shostakovich’s death by the leading members from the next generation of Soviet composers, including Alfred Schnittke (1934–98), Edison Denisov (1929–96), and Valentin Sil’vestrov (b. 1937). Also important are the commemorations by composers more beholden to Shostakovich and much more closely associated with him during his lifetime, among them the older Mieczysław Weinberg (1919–96) and the slightly younger Boris Tishchenko (b. 1939). In their Shostakovich memorials, all of these composers grappled in their own ways—and to varying degrees—with the shifting nature of the Soviet state, changing musical styles both foreign and domestic, and fundamental issues of aesthetic representation and identity associated with the move from modernism to postmodernism then affecting all composers in the Western art music tradition (and not only composers of art music). Individually the memorials to Shostakovich represent the diverse late Soviet perspectives on “Shostakovich,” ranging widely along a spectrum from imitation to critique. As a group they point to the significant transformations in Soviet music and society taking place amidst a period of seeming and assumed stability.

By 1975 Shostakovich had become a mixed blessing for younger Soviet composers, especially those of the Thaw generation, born in the 1930s and coming of age in the 1950s and early 1960s. His official status allowed him to intervene on their behalf on numerous occasions, and his stylistic language had become in many respects the *lingua franca* of the Soviet state. As Boris Schwarz wrote in 1981, “The entire edifice of Soviet music would collapse if Shostakovich’s contributions were removed.”² But this overwhelming musical influence threatened to overshadow younger Soviet composers. The danger had been clear for some time, as demonstrated by a 1974 *New York Times* article illustrated with photos of 45-year-old Soviet composer Edison Denisov and Shostakovich, then seen by many in both the United States and the USSR as representatives of its respective “unofficial” and “official” poles (i.e. those composers subsisting at the margins of the Soviet musical world, and those actively promoted by officialdom or holding positions

¹ Katherine Verdery, *What Was Socialism, and What Comes Next?* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1996).

² Boris Schwarz, *Music and Musical Life in Soviet Russia: Enlarged Edition, 1917–1981* (Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 1983), 641.

of authority).³ Critic Harold Schonberg, author of the article, asked “Is anybody composing music of any interest in the Soviet Union today?” He declared that Denisov “seems to have disappeared,” while Shostakovich “is the only Soviet who ‘gets any play.’” The year of this article was significant for several reasons. The previous May (1973) Andrey Volkonsky, the figurehead of “unofficial” Soviet music, had emigrated, thereby ending his two decades of influence on younger Soviet composers.⁴ In 1974 the departures of Soviet artistic luminaries continued: Alexander Solzhenitsyn was forcibly exiled from the USSR in February, and in May Mstislav Rostropovich and Galina Vishnevskaya left, ostensibly for a two-year period of touring that in 1978 turned into permanent exile. The artistic events of 1974 were equally noteworthy: In February Schnittke’s monumental, polystylistic First Symphony was premiered in the closed city of Gorky (now Nizhny Novgorod). And on September 15 an outdoor exhibition of “unofficial” art in southwest Moscow (near Belyaev) was literally crushed by the Soviet authorities in what came to be known as the “Bulldozer exhibition.”⁵ This exhibition—the impetus for Schonberg’s article—and the sense of artistic hopelessness that it instilled was emblematic of the sense of malaise beginning to grip Soviet life, at least externally. This was one of the reasons that the 1970s became known retrospectively during the Gorbachev 1980s as the period of “stagnation” (*zastoy*), originally an economic term that seemed to have broad relevance to Soviet life writ large.⁶

³ Harold C. Schonberg, “Is Anyone Writing Serious Music in Russia Today?” *New York Times*, September 29, 1974, D19. Astoundingly, in a recent *New York Times* review of performances by the Russian National Orchestra and the National Philharmonic of Russia Bernard Holland posed a similar question: “Is there no interesting Russian music written after Shostakovich? Are these musicians so lacking in curiosity about the rest of the world, or are powerful patriotic bearhugs all we are likely to get?” Bernard Holland, “In Two Concerts, a Russian Is a Russian Is a Russian,” *New York Times*, March 21, 2007. For more on “unofficial” Soviet music see Peter J. Schmelz, “Andrey Volkonsky and the Beginnings of Unofficial Soviet Music,” *Journal of American Musicological Society* 58 (2005): 139–207; and Peter J. Schmelz, *Such Freedom, If Only Musical: Unofficial Soviet Music during the Thaw* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, forthcoming).

⁴ Schmelz, *Such Freedom, If Only Musical*.

⁵ See Yevgeni Barabanov, “Art in the Delta of Alternative Culture,” in *Forbidden Art: The Postwar Russian Avant-Garde*, ed. Garrett White (Los Angeles: Curatorial Assistance, 1998), 24; Alexander Glezer, ed., *Iskusstvo pod bul’dozerom (sinyaya kniga)* (London: Overseas Publications Interchange, 1977), esp. 945; the chronicle of artistic events in Leonid Talochkin and Irina Alpatova, eds., “*Drugoye iskusstvo*”: *Moskva 1956–76, k khronike khudozhestvennoy zhizni*, 2 vols (Moscow: Moskovskaya kollektsiya, 1991); Renee Baigell and Matthew Baigell, eds., *Soviet Dissident Artists: Interviews After Perestroika* (New Brunswick: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1995), 5, 96–97; and Garrett White, ed., *Forbidden Art: The Postwar Russian Avant-Garde*, 114, 313, 300, and 303.

⁶ See Alexei Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever, Until It Was No More: The Last Soviet Generation* (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 2006), 7; and K. Rogov, ed., *Semidesyatiye kak predmet istorii Russkoy kul’tury, Rossiya/Russia* 1 (9) (Moscow and Venice: O.G.I., 1998), 7.

THE JOURNAL OF MUSICOLOGY

With the events of 1974, the promise of the Khrushchev years—the period that began with Stalin's death in 1953 and widely known as the Thaw (*otтеpel'*)—really did seem bankrupt (although many saw that promise as having been cut off dramatically by the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 1968). For most Soviet listeners, however, the signal musical moment of the 1970s was not Volkonsky's departure, nor the premiere of Schnittke's Symphony, but rather the death of Shostakovich in August 1975. Russian musicologist and cultural critic Tat'yana Cherednichenko in true postmodernist fashion highlights the 1970s as the “end of the nineteenth century” and the “end of the time of the composers” (borrowing the latter phrase from composer Vladimir Mart'nov [b. 1946]).⁷ In many senses the “end of Shostakovich” was just that for Soviet musicians: the end of their singular figurehead and dominant style, the end of one of their master narratives. Even *Sovetskaya muzika* admitted as much in the reflections published in the issue immediately after his death in September 1975: “The path of Soviet music will wend further along the mountain slopes to its new heights, but peering at the horizons of art we already no longer see on that path creative figures always moving forward. The current generation of Soviet musicians—composers, critics, performers—will not grow accustomed to this—as people, as citizens, as professionals.”⁸ Shostakovich's death was recognized on all levels as an anxious moment for Soviet music.

The 1970s came on the heels of a decade of remarkable change in Soviet music and society, but at the time of Shostakovich's death, change in Soviet life began to seem increasingly unlikely. Rather than stasis or stagnation, however, Shostakovich's legacy reveals the important shifts of the Soviet 1970s and early 1980s, both musical and other-

⁷ Cherednichenko sees the 1970s as lasting from 1974–1978. She writes that the 1970s was one moment when it was possible to hear the “non-modernity” of “modernity,” meaning the “non-contemporaneity” of “contemporaneity” (8–9). In other words, this was the time that avant-garde composers began to lose their audience by losing touch with contemporary social developments. See Tat'yana Cherednichenko, *Muzikal'nyi zapas: 70-ye. Problemy. Portrety. Sluchai* (Moscow: Novoye Literaturnoye Obozreniye, 2002), 8–9. See also Vladimir Mart'nov, *Konets vremeni kompozitorov* (Moscow: Russkiy put', 2002). Unless otherwise noted, all translations below from Russian, German, or French are by the author.

⁸ *Sovetskaya muzika* 9 (1975): 8. See also the official obituary in which he was declared a “loyal son of the Communist Party” (“Dmitriy Dmitriyevich Shostakovich,” *Pravda*, August 12, 1975, 3). For comparison see his front-page obituary in the *New York Times*: “Dmitri Shostakovich Dead at 68 After Hospitalization in Moscow,” *New York Times*, August 11, 1975, 1, 30. An accompanying article—“An Appraisal”—appeared in the same issue and began with the “riddle”: “What would it have been like if the composer had lived in a ‘free’ society rather than in the Soviet Union...?” See Raymond Ericson, “A Riddle in Music: Shostakovich, Under the Communists, Produced Both Good and Bad Works,” *New York Times*, August 11, 1975, 30.

wise. Anthropologist Alexei Yurchak's recent book *Everything Was Forever, Until It Was No More* provides a useful starting point for interpreting the larger sociocultural significance of "Shostakovich" reception at this time. Yurchak examines what he calls the "Last Soviet Generation," attempting to explain why the Soviet Union appeared to collapse so suddenly, taking everyone by surprise in 1991. He points to the simultaneous immutability and porousness of the post-Stalin period as the key. According to Yurchak, between 1953 and 1991 Soviet life became increasingly rigid, a series of endlessly repeated stereotyped rituals in speech and action that were performed by Soviet citizens even as they manipulated these rituals in various mundane, innocuous ways for their own ends, usually equally innocuous and mundane. This creative reinterpretation involved actions carried out by many Soviets—and especially the young Komsomol members Yurchak considers—like reading during official meetings or organizing rock concerts for official Communist gatherings. In Yurchak's account such reinterpreting of official dogma eventually weakened the Soviet system from within. Despite the long-term effects of their actions, the Soviets Yurchak discusses honestly believed in the larger promises of official ideology and were attempting only to personalize the system, even if in so doing they actually violated many of its central strictures.

301

Yurchak's paradigmatic example of the repetition permeating Soviet life is the classic 1975 comedy "Irony of Fate or 'Enjoy your bath'" (*Ironii sud'bi ili s lyogkim parom*), about a Muscovite who gets intoxicated at a bathhouse (*banya*) on New Year's Eve, is mistakenly placed on a plane to Leningrad by his drunken companions, finds his way "home" to an exact replica of his apartment building (the same number on an identically named street), to an exact replica of his apartment that his key predictably opens, revealing not his fiancée, but another equally attractive woman.⁹ Hilarity and sentimentality ensue. Of course the social and political realities that the film lightly mocked also had more insidious implications. Alexander Ivashkin points to a similar type of "standardization and predictability"¹⁰ (Yurchak's words) in Soviet music of the 1970s, writing:

Towards the end of his life almost the same thing happened to Shostakovich's music as happened to the Russian language during the era of totalitarian Communist rule: The idioms of his musical language seemed to be emasculated and drained of their content. Just as nobody believed in Communist slogans, there were very few at the beginning of the 1970s who believed in the possibility of anything new in

⁹ Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever, Until It Was No More*, 36–37.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 37.

THE JOURNAL OF MUSICOLOGY

Shostakovich's music—it seemed that he was simply repeating himself and the others [Mieczysław Weinberg, Yuriy Levitin (1912–93), German Galinin (1922–66), and Boris Tishchenko “the most talented among them”] were repeating him.¹¹

Ivashkin lends further support to the implicit parallel in my title between Shostakovich and socialist realism in the 1970s, even as he acknowledges the increasing vagueness of the latter concept. (Despite this vagueness, at the time socialist realism still held force as official doctrine, as even a quick perusal of articles in the official Union of Composers organ *Sovetskaya muzika* reveals.) Nonetheless, Ivashkin's generalizations need to be amended in several respects. Most important, as Yurchak's fieldwork has indicated, many Soviet citizens still “believed in” the Soviet state well into the 1980s. They followed its rituals and enriched them in their own ways, constantly maintaining the spirit though not the letter of Soviet law. They believed in what the Soviet Union represented in a fundamental sense—“equality, community, selflessness, . . . safety, education, work, creativity, and concern for the future”—even as their actions slowly, and, as Yurchak emphasizes, unintentionally “deterritorialized” the USSR from within. (Yurchak appropriates this term from Deleuze and Guattari to denote an act of “hollowing out” or enervating.)¹² But the moribund view of Shostakovich's music Ivashkin describes was common, despite the novelties that we focus on retrospectively: its elements of collage, quotation, and “twelve-toneness.”¹³

Yurchak emphasizes the “immutability” of Soviet language and customs even as he allows for a certain crucial flexibility through “deterritorialization,” and critics like Gerard McBurney see the 1970s as a time of “retrenchment” and “refinement,” a lull between the more notable “experiment[s] and discover[ies]” of the 1960s and 1980s.¹⁴ Yet in

¹¹ Alexander Ivashkin, “Shostakovich and Schnittke: The Erosion of Symphonic Syntax,” in *Shostakovich Studies*, ed. David Fanning (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995), 255. For more on the (inter-)relationship between Shostakovich and his students see David Fanning, “Shostakovich and His Pupils,” in *Shostakovich and His World*, ed. Laurel E. Fay (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 2004), 275–302.

¹² Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever, Until It Was No More*, 8.

¹³ See for example Peter J. Schmelz, “Shostakovich's ‘Twelve-tone’ Compositions and the Politics and Practice of Soviet Serialism,” in *Shostakovich and His World*, 303–54.

¹⁴ Gerard McBurney, “Soviet Music After the Death of Stalin: The Legacy of Shostakovich,” in *Russian Cultural Studies: An Introduction*, ed. Catriona Kelly and David Shepherd (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1998), 133. Musicologist Lyudmila Nikitina concurs, calling the 1970s an era of “meditativeness” (*meditatativnost'*) and “synthesis” (*sintez*) that followed the “contrast” of the 1960s. See Lyudmila D. Nikitina, *Sovetskaya muzika: istoriya i sovremennost'* (Moscow: Muzika, 1991), 188–90 (see also p. 193, where she apparently contradicts this earlier generalization). Mikhaíl Tarakanov also follows this line of

many important respects the 1970s witnessed a series of important social and cultural developments.¹⁵ The balance Yurchak describes was uneasy at best. Though “immutability” seemed to be the order of the day, in the cultural field vigorous motion often prevailed. Soviet language, rituals, and the external appearance of daily life may have become “standardized,” but many cultural products like those of “Sots art” and music (both high and low) were actively and overtly reinterpreting the present and the past.¹⁶ These significant shifts in Soviet life were separate from the complex, interdependent binary opposition that Yurchak has created between “Soviet life’s fixed, eternal and immutable nature” and “the system’s continuous internal shift and deterritorialization.” Moreover, many meaningful musical changes did not “[depend] for their very existence on the performative reproduction of immutable authoritative forms.”¹⁷ Instead the musically new and different—in this case changes in style, representation, and meaning—was spurred on by a creative reinterpretation of the past fundamentally rooted in generational change.

Many of Yurchak’s generalizations about “late Socialism” do not apply to the Soviet 1960s. Rather, the large-scale shift he discusses is a generational one provoked not by the Thaw generation who came of age in the 1950s and early 1960s (including Andrey Volkonsky, Alfred Schnittke, Edison Denisov, and Sofia Gubaidulina) but primarily by the generations who came of age in the late 1960s through the early 1980s

303

thought, pointing out the “initial mastering of the devices of the musical avant-garde,” while emphasizing the “later . . . stabilization of the earlier diametrically opposed styles [stabilizatsiya raneye polyarno protivostoyashchikh stiley] at the time of their mutual rapprochement [in the second half of the 1970s and the 1980s].” He discusses Shostakovich as a particular exemplar of this process in his integration of avant-garde devices like those of 12-tone composition into his own musical rhetoric. See Mikhail Tarakanov, “Sushchestvoval li avangard v poslevoynennoy Sovetskoy muziki?” in *Teoreticheskiy problemi sovetskoy muziki: sbornik nauchnykh trudov*, ed. M. E. Tarakanov (Moscow: Moskovskaya gosudarstvennaya konservatoriya, 1988), 17–18.

¹⁵ Svetlana Savenko [Svetlana Sawenko] suggested this in 1984, describing the “contemporary period of stylistic reflection and experiment” (die gegenwärtige Periode stilistischer Reflexionen und Experimente). Savenko, “Zum Weiterwirken der von Schostakowitsch ausgehenden Traditionen im Schaffen sowjetischer Gegenwartskomponisten,” in *Sowjetische Musik: Betrachtungen und Analysen*, ed. Hannelore Gerlach (Berlin: Akademie der Künste der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik), 60.

¹⁶ Yurchak’s subtle dialectic of stability and deterritorialization does not allow for such active change to occur, as he seems to equate visible change with “resistance,” a term and concept he strenuously avoids. The only music he examines is Soviet rock, and that without discussing the music. See Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever, Until It Was No More*, 28, 129–30, and 207–37. See also Peter J. Schmelz, “Soviet Crossovers and the Cultural Accreditation of Jazz and Rock in the 1970s,” paper presented at the University of Chicago, Workshop Conference on Popular Music in 20th-Century Russia and the Soviet Union, 26–27 January 2007; as well as Schmelz, *Such Freedom, If Only Musical*.

¹⁷ Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever, Until It Was No More*, 295.

THE JOURNAL OF MUSICOLOGY

(two generations, really: the Soviet equivalents of the American baby-boomers and Generation X, respectively).¹⁸ The 1970s was the moment that the “last Soviet generation” came into its own, “late Socialism” developed, and Soviet music began to enter its terminal phase of “late Socialist Realism.” In short, real change in the Soviet system seemed possible during the 1950s and 1960s; after 1968 this felt increasingly unlikely, and people adapted to the apparently unchanging, unalterable status quo. Change for the members of all three generations gradually occurred nonetheless, though most external observers focused solely on the USSR’s stationary, increasingly anachronistic aspects.¹⁹ Ivashkin notes that in the 1970s numerous Soviet composers “performatively reproduced” the tradition of “Shostakovich,” which had become a seemingly “immutable authoritative form” (borrowing Yurchak’s phrase). But at the same time many Soviet composers both young and old actively and overtly critiqued this tradition, pushing Soviet music in new and unexpected directions. Although the Thaw generation of composers was not the “last Soviet generation,” their compositions from the 1970s reflected and in turn affected the changing Soviet sociocultural circumstances instigated by the younger generation. More broadly, in their music from this decade they participated in an intergenerational discourse involving the older composers of the past, most notably “Shostakovich,” and the younger composers of the present like Vladimir Martınov and his confreres at the Scriabin Museum Electronic Music Studio in Moscow.²⁰

Historians of the Soviet period have recently begun advocating attention to generations as a means of coming to terms with the complex and often gradual developments in Soviet life from 1917 to 1991.²¹ In an essay published in 1976 (written in 1975) titled “Circles of Influ-

¹⁸ My generational critique also applies to Levon Hakobian’s periodization of what he calls the “Bronze Age” in Soviet music lasting from 1953 until Perestroika. For him 1982 is the period of “a real plurality of ideologies.” See Levon Hakobian, *Musical of the Soviet Age, 1917–1987* (Stockholm: Melos Music Literature, 1998), 216–24.

¹⁹ An oft-cited example of the contemporary cultural stagnation in the Soviet Union was the Bolshoy’s July 1975 New York production of Molchanov’s *The Dawns are Quiet Here*. See Richard Taruskin, “Current Chronicle: Molchanov’s *The Dawns Are Quiet Here*,” *Musical Quarterly* 62 (1976): 105–15; and Schwarz, *Musical and Musical Life*, 565–68.

²⁰ See Peter J. Schmelz, “From Scriabin to Pink Floyd: The ANS Synthesizer and the Politics of Soviet Music Between Thaw and Stagnation,” in *Otherwise Engaged: Avant-garde Music and the Sixties*, ed. Robert Adlington (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, forthcoming). See also Schmelz, “Soviet Crossovers and the Cultural Accreditation of Jazz and Rock in the 1970s.”

²¹ See for example Michael David-Fox, Peter Holquist, and Marshall Poe, eds., *The Resistance Debate in Russian and Soviet History*, Kritika Historical Studies 1 (Bloomington, IN: Slavica Publishers, 2003), especially the introduction, “Resistance Pro and Contra,” 5–11, and Michael David-Fox’s afterword, “Whither Resistance?” 230–37.

ence,” Alfred Schnittke himself pointed out the different ways in which each successive generation of Soviet composers had approached Shostakovich. Those in the 1930s aped the “biting sharpness and paradoxical naïveté of his early works”; those who “grew up in the 1940s and 1950s adopted the neoclassical austerity of expression characteristic of works such as Symphonies nos. 5 through 10, or the first five string quartets”; while the younger composers of the 1960s and 1970s—including presumably Schnittke himself—“further developed [his] unique ‘late’ philosophical lyricism.”²² The works written in response to the death of Shostakovich by Weinberg, Tishchenko, Schnittke, and Sil’vestrov reflected the many musical and generational shifts of the late 1960s and after, ranging from outright emulations of Shostakovich to critical reassessments of his legacy and the future of Soviet music. Their memorial compositions mark the developments of a society seemingly stuck on repeat but gradually changing and reconceiving itself all the while.

As is always the case with funeral rites, memorials, and eulogies, the pieces composed in memory of Shostakovich reveal as much about the composers writing them as about the person ostensibly being remembered, although they necessarily suggest something about that as well. Significantly, an examination of the contemporaneous Soviet responses to Shostakovich’s death—that is, the pre-*Testimony* responses—helps refine our understanding of Shostakovich’s complex position within Soviet society, abetting the dissolution of the tired binary of “dissident” or “loyalist” that continues to plague Western interpretations of his music.²³

305

Homage or Critique?

Shostakovich carried such an influence within Soviet musical life that he already inspired compositions while still alive, and especially near the end of his life. Not all of the compositions written in his honor were entirely celebratory. A case in point is Edison Denisov’s 1969 *DSCH* for a chamber ensemble of clarinet, trombone, cello, and piano, written at the behest of the ensemble “Atelier de musique” led by Polish composer Zygmunt Krauze (b. 1938). Denisov’s work, composed six years before Shostakovich’s passing, illustrates the tenuous relationship

²² Alfred Schnittke, “On Shostakovich: Circles of Influence (1975),” in *A Schnittke Reader*, ed. Alexander Ivashkin, trans. John Goodliffe (Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 2002), 59; originally as Al’fred Shnitke, “Krugi vliyaniya,” in *D. Shostakovich: stat’i i materialy*, ed. Grigoriy Shneerson (Moscow: Sovetskiy kompozitor, 1976), 225.

²³ See Allan Ho and Dmitry Feofanov, *Shostakovich Reconsidered* (London: Toccata Press, 1998) and Malcolm Hamrick Brown, ed., *A Shostakovich Casebook* (Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 2004) for a good introduction to the poles and parameters of the debate.

THE JOURNAL OF MUSICOLOGY

between Shostakovich and the next generation of “unofficial” composers, and thus reflects the tensions between “official” and “unofficial,” public and private, highlighted by Schonberg’s article. Early in his career, like most young Soviet conservatory students, Denisov had been greatly influenced by Shostakovich.²⁴ In fact, when his initial application to the Moscow Conservatory was denied, Denisov turned to Shostakovich for assistance and entered into an active correspondence with him that lasted through the 1950s.²⁵ By the end of his life—the late 1980s and early 1990s—Denisov had become more ambivalent about Shostakovich, saying: “Time passed, and my love and my respect for Shostakovich remained, but his language for me in many respects became foreign [*chuzhd*].”²⁶ In several interviews from his last decade

²⁴ Yuriy Kholopov and Valeriya Tsenova, *Edison Denisov* (Moscow: Kompozitor, 1993), 19–20. This has also been published twice in English: Yuri Kholopov and Valeria Tsenova, *Edison Denisov*, trans. Romela Kohanovskaya (Chur: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1995); and Yuri Kholopov and Valeria Tsenova, *Edison Denisov: The Russian Voice in European New Music*, trans. Romela Kohanovskaya, *Studia slavica musicologica* 28 (Berlin: Ernst Kuhn, 2002). All of my translations are from the original Russian text.

²⁵ Denisov’s correspondence with Shostakovich has been reprinted several times, first as “Dimitri Shostakowitsch: Briefe an Edison Denisow,” translated and with commentary by Detlef Gojowy, in *Musik des Ostens* 10 (Basel: Bärenreiter, 1986), 181–206. It appeared in Russian, with cuts, as an appendix to Kholopov and Tsenova, *Edison Denisov*, 172–83 (and also, therefore, in both English translations of this book). Excerpts were published in French in Edison Denisov and Jean-Pierre Armengaud, *Entretiens avec Denisov: Un compositeur sous le régime soviétique* (Paris: Editions Plume, 1993), 273–77; portions of this were translated into Russian as Edison Denisov, “Esli ti nastoyashchiy artist, ti vsegda nezavisim . . .,” *Muzikal’naya akademiya* 3 (1994): 72–76; and “‘Muzika ostalas’ zhiva v Rossii . . .’ Besedi E. Denisova s Zh.-P. Armango,” in *Muzika Edisona Denisova: materialy nauchnoy konferentsii, posvyashchyonnoy 65-letiyu kompozitora*, ed. Valeriya Tsenova (Moscow: Moskovskaya gosudarstvennaya konservatoriya, 1995), 112–20. Excerpts from Denisov’s diary relating his meetings with Shostakovich from 1952–58 were published as Edison Denisov, “Vstrechi s Shostakovichem,” *Muzikal’naya akademiya* 3 (1994): 90–92. See also Valeria Zenova, “Shostakowitsch und Denisow: Die Geschichte ihrer Beziehung in Tatsachen und Dokumenten,” in *Shostakowitsch und die Folgen: Russische Musik zwischen Anpassung und Protest/Shostakovich and the Consequences: Russian Music between Adaptation and Protest*, ed. Ernst Kuhn, Jascha Nemtsov, and Andreas Wehrmeyer, *Studia slavica musicologica* 32 (Berlin: Ernst Kuhn, 2003), 235–50.

²⁶ This comment echoes Vissarion Shebalin’s earlier conservatory declaration that Shostakovich was “foreign” to Denisov’s language: “Time will pass, Edik, and you will understand that you don’t need to imitate Shostakovich, you need to find your own language.” Edison Denisov, “Ne lyublyu formal’noye iskusstvo . . .,” *Sovetskaya muzika* 12 (1989): 12. Denisov also summarized his relationship with Shostakovich for Elizabeth Wilson: “It is true that our ways drifted apart and I became increasingly indifferent to his music. But Shostakovich is very dear to me, and I continue to love the man and admire his music, despite the passage of time.” Elizabeth Wilson, *Shostakovich: A Life Remembered*, 2nd ed. (Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 2006), 490 (all quotations below are from the second edition). Or as Denisov told French pianist Jean-Pierre Armengaud, “Shostakovich is full of contradictions.” Denisov and Armengaud, *Entretiens avec Denisov*, 46, 69, and 42–45. He used almost the same wording in his interview with Wilson. See *Shostakovich: A Life Remembered*, 342 (“all the oblique contradictions which in fact make up the true essence of his nature and evolution. Shostakovich was full of paradox”).

Denisov pointed to what he perceived as Shostakovich's moral failings, singling out a moment when Shostakovich admitted to Denisov that he had been a coward his entire life: "When I think about my life, I realize that I have been a coward. Unfortunately I have been a coward."²⁷ Denisov also noted Shostakovich's signing of open letters supporting the expulsion of Solzhenitsyn from the USSR and denouncing Sakharov, the fact that he joined the Communist Party, and the fact that he often signed articles he had neither written nor read, mentioning most frequently the one in *Pravda* in which "Shostakovich" declared that he "cannot distinguish between the music of Boulez, Henze and Stuckenschmidt," though of course Stuckenschmidt was not a composer.²⁸ (Sofia Gubaidulina was also crushed when Shostakovich joined the Communist Party. She told Elizabeth Wilson, "When Shostakovich joined the Party in 1960, our disappointment knew no bounds. That such a man could be broken, that our system was capable of crushing a genius, was something I could not get over. We were left wondering why, just at the time when the political situation had relaxed somewhat, when at last it seemed possible to preserve one's integrity, Shostakovich fell victim to official flattery."²⁹) Denisov also resented Shostakovich for not coming to his assistance during a roundtable discussion of his chamber cantata *Sun of the Incas* in 1964.³⁰ By the time of a 1989 *Sovetskaya muzika* interview, Denisov's indifference to Shostakovich's music had grown to the point that he declared astonishingly: "Perhaps in the world today there are even more people who love the music of Webern than those who love the music of Shostakovich."³¹

²⁷ Wilson, *Shostakovich: A Life Remembered*, 345. See also Edison Denisov and Dmitriy Shul'gin, *Priznaniye Edisona Denisova: po materialam besed* (Moscow: Kompozitor, 1998), 192–93 (there is also a second corrected edition: Moscow: Kompozitor, 2004); and Denisov and Armengaud, *Entretiens avec Denisov*, 46.

²⁸ Denisov and Shul'gin, *Priznaniye Edisona Denisova*, 192–93 (Solzhenitsyn and Stuckenschmidt; in his discussion of the latter article Denisov omits Boulez, and says that musicologist Aleksandr Medvedev actually wrote it); Denisov and Armengaud, *Entretiens avec Denisov*, 45–46 (Solzhenitsyn and Stuckenschmidt; Denisov again omits Boulez here); "Pozorit zvaniye grazhdanina," *Pravda*, September 3, 1973, 2 (this is the letter denouncing Sakharov; see Laurel E. Fay, *Shostakovich: A Life* [Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2000], 344n60 and 277–78); and Wilson, *Shostakovich: A Life Remembered*, 489, 492 (Sakharov) and 487–88, 488–89 (Stuckenschmidt).

²⁹ Wilson, *Shostakovich: A Life Remembered*, 348.

³⁰ See *ibid.*, 431; and [Anonymous], "Kogda sobirayetsya Sekretariat . . .," *Sovetskaya muzika* 1 (1966): 29–32. See also Schmelz, *Such Freedom, If Only Musical*.

³¹ Edison Denisov and G. Pantyev, "Ne lyublyu formal'noye iskusstvo," *Sovetskaya muzika* 12 (1989): 16. Denisov also made many negative comments about Shostakovich in his posthumously published diary, Edison Denisov, *Neizvestniy Denisov: Iz Zapisnikh knizhek (1980/81–1986, 1995)*, ed. Valeriya Tsenova (Moscow: Kompozitor, 1997), 16–20.

THE JOURNAL OF MUSICOLOGY

EXAMPLE 1. Edison Denisov, *DSCH*, opening measures

Clarinetto (in C)

Poco rubato

f *p* *ff*

2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

5:4 7:6

Trombone

con sord. *f* *p* *sf* *p* *ff*

gliss. 5:4

Violoncello

pp *f* *fp* *ff*

1 *gva* *p* *sf* *gliss.* *6:4*

sul G 5:4

Piano

ff

Red.

3

p *fp* *f* *pp*

5:4 7:6 5:4

fr. *gliss.*

pp *mp* *f* *ff*

f *mf* *ff*

5:4 5:6

gva *ff*

Red.

DSCH is typical of Denisov's late 1960s output: It is serial and it was first heard abroad—at the Warsaw Autumn festival in 1969 (26 September 1969, to be precise).³² In the composition Shostakovich's musical monogram becomes a tool for serial manipulation. As Example 1 shows, the basic series is constructed from two permutations of the DSCH (D–E♭–C–B♯) motive, with a four-note tag at the end featuring minor thirds and a tritone absent from the remainder of the row. The culmination of the work (mm. 45–55) is a quotation from the opening of Shostakovich's Eighth String Quartet. (This homage to Shostakovich had been preceded by an homage to Schoenberg: In mm. 110–15 of Denisov's String Trio [also 1969], he quoted mm. 116–21 of Schoenberg's op. 45 String Trio, though Denisov's trio is not explicitly dedicated to Schoenberg.) Denisov saw this moment in *DSCH* as a collage: The music of Shostakovich was “deformed” and combined with Denisov's own earlier music, the “shadow of my compositions” as he put it.³³ The predominant style is undoubtedly Denisov's, however, and it is more than a passing shadow.

Denisov recalled playing a tape of the work's premiere performance for Shostakovich, and although Shostakovich asked to hear the tape twice and requested a copy of the score and recording, the silence with which he greeted the audition suggests that he may have harbored more mixed feelings. Denisov defensively declared to musicologist Dmitriy Shul'gin that Shostakovich was obviously not “indifferent” to it as he had asked to hear it twice.³⁴ Yet Shostakovich's silence might have been a reaction to the use of his personal monogram by someone younger and in a radically different stylistic environment. After all, the “deformation” of Shostakovich's music—and especially his motto—by Denisov's own serial language implicitly turned the “homage” into a stylistic and generational critique. It is not difficult to read this in Oedipal terms. With *DSCH* Shostakovich's declaration to Isaak Glikman from 1960 that “It's hardly likely that someone will write a quartet dedicated to my memory” was proved false.³⁵ Though not a true memorial—Shostakovich after all was still alive—Denisov's composition may have reinforced Shostakovich's mounting sense of his own impermanence, as his personal motto was subsumed by a stylistically foreign “shadow”

³² Kholopov and Tsenova, *Edison Denisov*, 215.

³³ Denisov and Shul'gin, *Priznaniye Edisona Denisova*, 194. For another interpretation of this piece, “in which Denisov suppressed his twelve-tone experiments,” see Zenowa, “Schostakowitsch und Denissow: Die Geschichte ihrer Beziehung in Tatsachen und Dokumenten,” 242. Here Tsenova (Zenowa) also points out that Denisov's Saxophone Sonata (1970) uses a row that begins with the DSCH motive.

³⁴ Denisov and Shul'gin, *Priznaniye Edisona Denisova*, 194.

³⁵ Wilson, *Shostakovich: A Life Remembered*, 380.

THE JOURNAL OF MUSICOLOGY

and transformed into a shade itself, into a ghostly apparition: a musical cipher alone.³⁶

Denisov boasted to Shul'gin that he had been the first composer other than Shostakovich to use the monogram, and he scorned those who did it later, especially those composers he claimed had acted against Shostakovich during his lifetime but had rushed to compose DSCH pieces after his death.³⁷ (In this he was mistaken, for Scottish composer Ronald Stevenson had written his lengthy *Passacaglia on DSCH* for piano between 1960 and 1962; Denisov may have been the first Soviet to write such a piece.) Denisov's disdain was most likely directed at the compositions included as the appendix to journalist Grigoriy Shneerson's volume of essays and documents relating to Shostakovich that had been in the planning stages before the composer's death, but after was quickly recast as a memorial volume and published in 1976.³⁸ It included works by former students and colleagues, both Soviet and foreign (see Table 1).³⁹

Listening through these miniatures one is overwhelmed by the pervasiveness of the DSCH motive as a means of remembering Shostakovich. All use his musical monogram to some extent, and one is especially overwhelmed by the sheer banality of many treatments, especially Andrey Eshpay's left hand ostinato (see Exs. 2a–c).⁴⁰

310

³⁶ Despite Fay's description of Shostakovich in an upbeat mood about the chances of his recovery while composing the Fourteenth Symphony at the beginning of 1969, by October 26 he was again experiencing pain, and in November he received the diagnosis of the disease that would ultimately contribute to his death six years later (at the time thought to be poliomyelitis, it was later identified as amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, known more widely as Lou Gehrig Disease). The ultimate cause of his death was lung cancer. See Fay, *Shostakovich: A Life*, 263–64; and Wilson, *Shostakovich: A Life Remembered*, 441, 527–28.

³⁷ Denisov and Shul'gin, *Priznaniye Edisona Denisova*, 193.

³⁸ Grigoriy Shneerson, ed., *D. Shostakovich: stat'i i materiali*.

³⁹ Significantly, neither Denisov nor Schnittke were included, though they had penned brief pieces in memory of Stravinsky for *Tempo* magazine's collection of Stravinsky memorial pieces, confirming their status as Western-oriented young Soviets worth watching (see *Tempo* 97 [1971]; a second set of memorial compositions appeared in the next number as well: *Tempo* 98 [1971]). Denisov and Schnittke also contributed theoretical essays on Shostakovich's orchestration and voice-leading practice respectively to a 1967 collection devoted to the composer. See Edison Denisov, "Ob orkestrovke D. Shostakovicha," and Alfred Shnitke, "Nekotoriye osobennosti orkestrovogo golosovedeniya v simfonicheskikh proizvedeniyakh D.D. Shostakovicha," in *Dmitriy Shostakovich*, ed. G. Sh. Ordzhonikidze (Moscow: Sovetskiy kompozitor, 1967): 439–98 (Denisov) and 499–532 (Schnittke).

⁴⁰ Tishchenko's is one of the more restrained: Although saturating the music with half-steps and some transposed statements of the motive (e.g. mm. 5–7 in the tenor), he avoids an outright DSCH reference until the final three bars. See Sawenko, "Zum Weiterwirken der von Shostakowitsch ausgehenden Traditionen im Schaffen sowjetischer Gegenwartskomponisten," 56.

TABLE 1
Pieces Dedicated to Shostakovich (in the order they appear in the text)

(NB: This is a selective list of Shostakovich memorial pieces and is not intended to be exhaustive or comprehensive.)

Edison Denisov (1929–1996)	DSCH for Clarinet, Trombone, Cello, and Piano (1969)	First Performance: 26 September 1969, Warsaw (Warsaw Autumn) by the Ensemble “Atelier de musique.”
Kara Karaev, Miroslav Skorik, Sergey Slonimsky, Boris Tishchenko, Andrey Eshpay, Alan Bush (Great Britain), Günther Kochan (GDR), Daniel-Lesur (France), Ernst Hermann Meyer (GDR), Siegfried Matthus (GDR), Carlos Palacio (Spain), Nicolas Slonimsky (USA), and Ronald Stevenson (Great Britain)	Compositions written as an appendix to <i>G. Shneerson, D. Shostakovich: stat'i i material'i</i> (Sovetskiy kompozitor, 1976)	
Arno Babadjanian (1921–1983)	String Quartet no. 3, “In memory of Shostakovich” (1976)	
Tigran Mansuryan (b. 1939)	Cello Concerto no. 1 (1976)	
Mieczyslaw Weinberg (1919–1996)	Symphony no. 12, op. 114, “In memory of Dmitri Shostakovich” (1975–76)	
Boris Tishchenko (b. 1939)	Symphony no. 5, op.67 (1976)	
Alfred Schnittke (1934–1998)	Prelude in Memoriam Shostakovich for two violins or one violin and tape (1975)	First performance: 5 December 1975, Moscow (M. Lubotsky and V. Lubotsky)
	Dedication to Igor Stravinsky, Sergei Prokofiev and Dmitri Shostakovich, piano 6 hands (1979)	First performance: 28 December 1979, Moscow, Central House of Workers in Art (Tsentral'nyi dom rabotnikov iskusstv), V. Postnikova, G. Rozhdestvenskiy, A. Bakhchiev
	String Quartet no. 3 (1983)	First performance: 8 January 1984, Moscow, Beethoven Quartet
Valentin Sil'vestrov (b. 1937)	Postludium “DSCH” for soprano, violin, cello and piano (1981)	

THE JOURNAL OF MUSICOLOGY

EXAMPLE 2a. Kara Karaev, "DSCH," mm. 1-7

$\text{♩} = 63$
p
poco rit.
mf
p

312

EXAMPLE 2b. Sergey Slonimsky, "DSCH," mm. 1-4

Andantino a piacere
f
sub. pp non legato
sempre

EXAMPLE 2c. Andrey Eshpay, "DSCH," mm. 1–10

These are musical analogues to Shostakovich's tombstone, which also prominently displays the motive. Such banality was to be expected however, for these pieces fulfilled a ceremonial function, the "boring" ceremonial function that musicologist Marina Frolova-Walker provocatively proposes as central to Socialist Realist music and art.⁴¹

313

Homage as Continuity, Homage as "Full Understanding"

Several other more substantial musical memorials were completed the same year that Shneerson's volume was published, including two symphonies, a concerto, and a string quartet. Tigran Mansuryan's Cello Concerto no. 1 and Arno Babadjanian's String Quartet no. 3 continued the approach exhibited by the Shneerson volume compositions albeit at greater length. In his quartet Babadjanian extensively and obsessively explored all of the intervals—and especially the half-steps—within the DSCH monogram, though only rarely did he include the motive at pitch. Mansuryan integrated the monogram into his concerto and his post-tonal language in a more general sense; the work contains only general allusions to the motivic content of the monogram, and like Babadjanian's, only a rare, and buried, iteration of the monogram itself. By contrast, the two very public memorial symphonies by Mieczysław Weinberg and Boris Tishchenko from 1976 presented more weighty

⁴¹ Marina Frolova-Walker, "Stalin and the Art of Boredom," *twentieth-century music* 1 (2004): 101–24.

THE JOURNAL OF MUSICOLOGY

and more personal explorations of Shostakovich's legacy, for these two composers were identified more closely with Shostakovich both stylistically and personally. As Ivashkin asserted, they were two composers already "repeating Shostakovich."

Unlike the other 1976 Shostakovich memorials, Weinberg's Symphony no. 12 makes no direct references either to the DSCH motive or to specific moments from Shostakovich's output. Certain sections in Weinberg's symphony undeniably conjure up and allude to Shostakovich: The scherzo second movement strongly recalls similar movements from Shostakovich's symphonies; the marimba opening to the moving (if occasionally overwrought) final, fourth movement makes reference to the clockwork endings of several of Shostakovich's works (e.g. Fourth Symphony movement 2, Second Cello Concerto, and Symphony no. 15); and the final coda resembles the Fourth Symphony's own muted conclusion. Weinberg's Twelfth Symphony is a more generalized homage to Shostakovich; it is in many ways a typically Shostakovich-inspired late Soviet (if not late Socialist Realist) symphony.⁴² The Twelfth Symphony arguably only continued Weinberg's long string of Shostakovich-influenced works, though its overt dedication (like that of any memorial composition) particularly colored its creation, performance, and reception.

Unlike Weinberg, Tishchenko uses the DSCH motive in his Symphony no. 5 from the very outset, tying it together with prominent quotations from Shostakovich's symphonies as well as from his own works (including his Third Symphony, Piano Concerto, Concerto for Flute and Piano, and Fifth Piano Sonata).⁴³ In the words of a Soviet critic, Tishchenko made more direct use of Shostakovich's music to "reconstruct an image of the great master as though with the means of his own musical language."⁴⁴ The opening English horn melody sets the tone with its prominent early use of the DSCH motive (Ex. 3). Also rep-

⁴² My thanks to Matthew Gelbart for providing me a copy of the score to Weinberg's Symphony no. 12.

⁴³ The Third Symphony quotation occurs in the finale of Tishchenko's Symphony at rehearsal 109, mm. 5–8; the Piano Concerto at rehearsal 113 in the finale; the Concerto for Flute and Piano at rehearsal 44 of movement III; and the Fifth Piano Sonata in movement I at rehearsal 16. Tishchenko's Third Symphony had also been dedicated to Shostakovich and was reportedly one of his favorite compositions by his pupil. See Boris Kats, *O muzike Borisa Tishchenko: opit kriticheskogo issledovaniya* (Leningrad: Sovetskiy kompozitor, 1986), 151; and Solomon Volkov, *Molodiye kompozitori Leningrada* (Leningrad: Sovetskiy kompozitor, 1971), 18, cited in Mikhail Grigor'yevich Byalik, "Tishchenko, Boris Ivanovich," in *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 2nd ed. (New York: Grove's Dictionaries, 2000). (Hereafter *NG II*.)

⁴⁴ "Vossozdat' obraz velikogo мастера sredstvami kak bi ego sobstvennogo muzikal'nogo yazika." N. Z., "Pamyati Shostakovicha posvyashchayetsya," *Sovetskaya muzika* 7 (1978): 72; quoted in Kats, *O muzike Borisa Tishchenko*, 150. The symphony was premiered in Leningrad on 6 April 1978, conducted by Kiril Kondrashin (it had been

EXAMPLE 3. Boris Tishchenko, Symphony no. 5, opening English Horn solo (in F)



representative are the third and fifth movements. Movement 3 begins with the DSCH motive and then launches into a lengthy passage based on the fugato from Shostakovich's Eighth Symphony; near its end it quotes the scherzo from Shostakovich's Tenth Symphony. Shostakovich's Eighth Symphony also reappears at the end of the work: The second movement theme from that composition serves as the basis for the recurring theme in Tishchenko's final Rondo. Musicologist Boris Kats claims that the "deepest layer" of the symphony is its "dialogue between the music of Tishchenko and the music of Shostakovich."⁴⁵ Yet overall, in Tishchenko's Fifth Symphony the string of more familiar Shostakovich quotations, near-quotations, and allusions threatens to overwhelm its creator. In his review of the premiere the same Soviet critic cited above identified Tishchenko's "wide [use] of themes from Shostakovich's compositions" without identifying the many self-quotations Tishchenko also employed.⁴⁶ If Denisov overshadowed Shostakovich in *DSCH*, here Shostakovich begins to overshadow Tishchenko, turning the memorial into a pastiche of Shostakovich's greatest hits. But, Kats countered, this was not Tishchenko boasting of his connection to Shostakovich. Rather, the Fifth Symphony's pastiche—or read more positively, its "dialogue"—reflected the shift in musical thinking characteristic of the 1970s: "As is well known the spirit of searching for new paths [pafos poiska novikh putey] characteristic of our art from the 1960s gradually gave way in the mid 1970s to a spirit of continuity [pafos preymstvennosti]."⁴⁷ By emulating Shostakovich, Tishchenko demonstrated the continuity and stability of Soviet composition instead of the confrontational novelty offered by Denisov's

315

heard a few days earlier on the radio in a performance conducted by Maxim Shostakovich). Tishchenko received the Glinka Prize of the RSFSR (Gosudarstvennaya premiya RSFSR im. M. I. Glinki) for this symphony (as well as for his Concerto for Flute, Piano, and String Orchestra and *Sinfonia robusta*). He was also named an Honored Artist of the RSFSR (Zasluzhenniy deyatel' iskusstv RSFSR) (Kats, *O muzike Borisa Tishchenko*, 164).

⁴⁵ Kats also suggests that in his Fifth Symphony Tishchenko only made explicit the links that had always existed between certain of his themes (like those from the Third Symphony) and Shostakovich's compositions. Kats, *O muzike Borisa Tishchenko*, 151 and 153.

⁴⁶ N. Z., "Pamyati Shostakovicha posvyashchayetsya."

⁴⁷ Kats, *O muzike Borisa Tishchenko*, 155.

THE JOURNAL OF MUSICOLOGY

late-1960s *DSCH*. Of course it was just this continuity that would later be so vociferously critiqued by writers like Ivashkin.

In the Shneerson volume Schnittke described Shostakovich's own collages, his "reprises, . . . self-quotations, [and] returns to the thematic imagery and material of his earlier works." Schnittke also noted that "All his life Shostakovich has been under the influence of Shostakovich." He continued in an oft-quoted passage that outlines his own artistic credo as much as Shostakovich's, comparable in many respects to his earlier polystylism essay.

[Shostakovich's] String Quartets nos. 8 and 14 and Symphony no. 15 are, in their way, the most distinctive crossroads in time, where the past enters into new relationships with the present, and, like the ghost of Hamlet's father, intrudes into the reality of the music and actually forms it. In Shostakovich's music, when thematic material from his earlier personal musical career intermingles in collages with thematic material borrowed from the earlier history of music, a striking effect is created: One of objectivization, of an assimilation of what is individual with what is universal. And it is precisely this that determines the purpose of an artist's life—to influence the world by merging with it.⁴⁸

316

At least in its third movement something different is happening in Tishchenko's composition: Hamlet's father intrudes, but he dominates the stage. The past is too much here, and rather than objectivization, the effect is one of striking subjectivization: The individual is assimilated by another subject that in death was fast becoming universal. Tishchenko subsumes his own musical personality to that of the stronger albeit deceased, absent and yet omnipresent "Father."⁴⁹

⁴⁸ Schnittke, "On Shostakovich: Circles of Influence (1975)," 60; and Shnitke, "Krugī vliyaniya," 226. Compare the above excerpt with the following statements in Schnittke's 1971 "Polystylistic Tendencies in Modern Music": "[In polystylistic composition] the question of authorship becomes more complicated both legally and in the sense of whether the composer is able to preserve his individual and national identity. . . . Furthermore, the elements of an alien style usually serve merely as a modulated space, a kind of periphery that throws the composer's own style into relief"; and "it is doubtful whether one could find another musical approach that expresses as convincingly as the polystylistic method the philosophical idea of 'the links between the ages.'" Alfred Schnittke, "Polystylistic Tendencies in Modern Music," in *A Schnittke Reader*, ed. Alexander Ivashkin, trans. John Goodliffe (Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 2002), 89–90; and A. Shnitke, "Polistilisticheskiye tendentsii sovremennoy muziki," in Al'fred Shnitke and Aleksandr Ivashkin, *Besedi s Al'fredom Shnitke* (Moscow: "Kul'tura," 1994), 145–46. See also the presumably earlier version of this essay in V. Kholopova and E. Chigaryova, *Al'fred Shnitke: ocherk zhizni i tvorchestva* (Moscow: Sovetskiy kompozitor, 1990), 330–31.

⁴⁹ Schnittke among others also acknowledged Tishchenko's influence on Shostakovich in the last years of his life: "It was a mutual influence [*vzaimovliyaniye*]." See Nelli Shakhnazarova and Grigoriy Golvinskiy, eds., *Novaya zhizn' traditsiy v sovetskoy muzike: stat'i, interv'yū* (Moscow: Sovetskiy kompozitor, 1989), 347. Tishchenko's eulogy for Shostakovich also appeared in the 1976 Shneerson volume: Boris Tishchenko, "Etyud k portretu," in *D. Shostakovich: stat'i i materialy*, 98–104.

The prominent quotations from Shostakovich's Eighth Symphony in Tishchenko's Fifth Symphony may also be read as symptoms of a larger reappraisal of Shostakovich's career and social significance beginning to take place after his death. In an essay published as an ad hoc memorial to Shostakovich in the September 1975 *Sovetskaya muzika* and titled "Thoughts on the Historical Place of Shostakovich's Music" (*Razdum'ya ob istoricheskom meste tvorchestva Shostakovicha*) theorist Lev Mazel' began by declaring:

Much of that which seemed controversial in the past now proves its highest artistic justification. The complaints about the lack of a joyful, celebratory conclusion to the Eighth Symphony have been forgotten. They have been replaced by the full understanding [*polnoye ponimaniye*] that in the context of the entire composition such a conclusion would be "impossible and even insulting after what one has gone through [*perezhitomu*]." ⁵⁰

The Eighth Symphony, of course, had not been greeted warmly upon its first performance in November 1943. It was not the victorious work anticipated and expected, and its somber mood rang especially hollow in comparison with the worldwide triumph of Shostakovich's Seventh Symphony. In 1944 the work was denied a Stalin Prize. As Laurel Fay summarizes, Committee for Artistic Affairs chairman Mikhaíl Khrapchenko judged the Eighth Symphony "recidivous and too individualistic, its language intentionally complicated and inaccessible, its mood exceptionally pessimistic."⁵¹ Although the work was "rehabilitated" in October 1956 (performed by Samosud with the Moscow Philharmonic Orchestra),⁵² it remained absent from Shostakovich's official obituary; the Seventh was highlighted instead (along with the Fifth, Sixth, Eleventh, and Fifteenth Symphonies).⁵³ The focus on the Eighth

⁵⁰ In the last sentence of the above excerpt Mazel' is quoting Sergey Pavchinskiy on Beethoven and Shostakovich (Sergey Pavchinskiy, *Nekotoriye novatorskiye cherti stilya Betkhovena* [Moscow, 1967], 13). Lev Mazel', "Razdum'ya ob istoricheskom meste tvorchestva Shostakovicha," *Sovetskaya muzika* 9 (1975): 8. This essay subsequently appeared in slightly revised form in the Shneerson memorial volume: Lev Mazel', "Razdum'ya ob istoricheskom meste tvorchestva Shostakovicha," in *D. Shostakovich: stat'i i material'i*, 58. Mazel' also acknowledged that "Soviet music study, which—so far as it concerns the study of contemporary music—in fact also developed to a significant extent through the analysis of Shostakovich's compositions, and remains in debt to his work" (8).

⁵¹ Fay, *Shostakovich: A Life*, 138–39.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 205. Wilson describes the work as "unofficially but effectively banned from further performance" after Mravinsky's 1944 performances in Novosibirsk and Leningrad. Wilson, *Shostakovich: A Life Remembered*, 203. Of course, as always, this "ban" was slippery, for Mravinsky and the Leningrad Philharmonic recorded the work in Leningrad on 2 June 1947 after touring with it in Czechoslovakia. Shostakovich, *Symphony no. 8*, Melodiya/BMG 74321 29406 2 (Mravinsky Edition vol. 17).

⁵³ "Dmitriy Dmitriyevich Shostakovich." This obituary was reprinted in the September 1975 number of *Sovetskaya muzika* (accompanied by a strikingly different photograph).

THE JOURNAL OF MUSICOLOGY

Symphony by Mazel' and Tishchenko thus can be read as a counternarrative to the official focus on the "heroic," approved Shostakovich of the war years; rather than concentrating on the Seventh they attempted to draw attention to the more complicated Eighth, not out of opposition or dissent, but as a "full understanding," in Mazel's words. Musicologist Lev Danilevich took a similar tack in the September 1976 issue of *Muzikal'naya zhizn'* dedicated to the 70th anniversary of Shostakovich's birth. There Danilevich cited Boris Asafiev on the tragedy of the Eighth (from Asafiev's 1945 essay "Shostakovich's Eighth Symphony"⁵⁴) and wrote: "Is it really surprising that Shostakovich with his rare sensitivity to the grief of others (for him it was not other, but his own!) was unable to pass by the suffering of many people. This is why tragedy occupied a large place in his music."⁵⁵ Whereas the Eighth Symphony's reflection of tragedy was suspicious in 1945 (despite Asafiev's initial pleading to the contrary), by 1975 it was more acceptable to be tragic, or rather to reveal life in all of its complexities.

The reappraisal of the Eighth Symphony extended beyond the musical sphere when director Alexander Sokurov highlighted the composition in his 1981 Shostakovich documentary (and memorial), "Viola Sonata" (*Al'tovaya Sonata*). In the film Sokurov emphasizes the tragic aspects of the symphony, pitting its fourth movement against images of bombed-out buildings, women carting debris, and most significantly against speeches from the 1948 musical debates, among them selected remarks of Asafiev (here criticizing the work), composer Viktor Beliy (1904–83), Isaak Dunayevsky (1900–55), Vladimir Zakharov (1901–56), and others denouncing Shostakovich's music and his formalistic tendencies in general, and his Eighth and Ninth Symphonies in particular.⁵⁶ Earlier in the film Sokurov had accentuated the tensions be-

"Dmitriy Dmitriyevich Shostakovich," *Sovetskaya muzika* 9 (1975): 6–7. Significantly, the memorial section of the November 1975 *Sovetskaya muzika* featured an address given by Shostakovich at a plenum of Soviet composers held from March to April of 1944 and focused on the works composed during that year (though he also addressed insufficiencies of the Soviet performance, teaching, theater, and publishing infrastructure). But what remained unmentioned in the *Sovetskaya muzika* reprinting of his comments was that this was the same plenum at which critical remarks were made about the Eighth Symphony. See D. Shostakovich, "Sovetskaya muzika v dni voyni," *Sovetskaya muzika* 11 (1975): 64–77; and Fay, *Shostakovich: A Life*, 138.

⁵⁴ B. Asaf'yev, "Vos'maya Simfoniya Shostakovicha," in *Izbrannyye trudy*, vol. 5 (Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR, 1957), 132–35 (Danilevich's quotation is from the first paragraph).

⁵⁵ L. Danilevich, "Dmitriy Shostakovich," *Muzikal'naya zhizn'* 17 (451) (September 1976): 3.

⁵⁶ For Beliy's statements see Alexander Werth, *Musical Uproar in Moscow* (London: Turnstile Press, 1949), 71. See also Wilson, *Shostakovich: A Life Remembered*, 242, for Levitin's account of Zakharov's and Nestyev's negative comments about the Eighth Symphony.

tween the war's lofty ideals and cruel realities through the equivocal tone of the Eighth Symphony's third movement, but the sustained grief of the fourth movement enabled him to go further by amplifying the many levels of tragedy that followed the war, and especially the tragedy of the 1948 Resolution. Through this succession of sounds and images Sokurov took advantage of the complexities of the Eighth Symphony to provide his own "full understanding" of Shostakovich's Soviet reception. From the perspective of the early 1980s, Sokurov's pessimistic and naturalistic conception of Shostakovich's Eighth Symphony seemed an accurate—for some too accurate—portrayal of both Soviet past and present. Like Tishchenko and Mazel', Sokurov placed Shostakovich's music front and center in broader cultural debates over the recent past and prospects for the future. For these and other Soviets, Shostakovich's Eighth Symphony became a focal point for rethinking his legacy and its continued meaning for Soviet artists against the changes and continuities of the 1970s and early 1980s.⁵⁷

BACH-DSCH: Schnittke as Heir Apparent

Schnittke's approach to Shostakovich's legacy further exemplifies the uneasy stasis of the time in his own overt negotiations between change and continuity, critique and homage. In an interview from the late 1980s Schnittke declared:

319

[The influence of Shostakovich] gained new strength with his passing. In the last years of Shostakovich's life I was almost completely uninterested [*pochti ne interesoval'sya*] in his new compositions, cultivating a certain kind of disillusionment [*nekotoroye razocharovaniye*]. But when I heard the Fifteenth Quartet already after his passing, I . . . beg[an] to understand that before us is a significantly higher level of creative activity.⁵⁸

⁵⁷ For Levon Hakobian (Akopyan), the Eighth is the most representative of Shostakovich's symphonies: It falls right in the middle of his symphonic output, and its five movements represent the "five facets of Shostakovich's creative character" (*pyat' grani tvorcheskogo oblika Shostakovicha*)—"classical" (*klassicheskiy*), "innovative" (*novatorskiy*), "toccata-like" (*tokkatnyi*), "lyrical" (*liricheskiy*), and "scherzo-grotesque" (*Skertsozno-grotesknii*). In his words, the Eighth Symphony is "undeniably, that work, in which the phenomenology (*fonomonologiya*) of his creativity found its most concentrated, many-sided, and intensive expression." Levon Akopyan, *Dmitriy Shostakovich: opit fenomenologii tvorchestva* (St. Petersburg: Dmitriy Bulanin, 2004), 233, 236–37.

⁵⁸ Shakhnazarova and Golvinskiy, eds., *Novaya zhizn' traditsiy v sovetskoy muzike*, 346–47. Schnittke also added, "Thankfully, the imitative influence that affected a number of composers when Shostakovich was alive has ceased" (347). Schnittke told Shul'gin: "There was a time when I truly loved Shostakovich, and followed [him] so that [in my music] much was done exactly as he did. Then it began to seem to me that there was nothing to learn from Shostakovich, nothing to take away. But what remained was the dramaturgical principles of his conception, with [its] culmination and growth, with

THE JOURNAL OF MUSICOLOGY

Schnittke's musical expressions of this reappraisal included his 1975 *Prelude In Memoriam Dmitri Shostakovich* for two violins, or violin and tape (1975, first performed by Mark Lubotsky)⁵⁹ and his 1983 Third String Quartet. (Schnittke's 1979 *Hommage à Igor Stravinsky, Sergey Prokofiev and Dmitry Shostakovich* is a more general and lighter collection of music by three figures important to Schnittke's music, including the "Chinese March" from Stravinsky's *Nightingale*, Prokofiev's *Humoristic Scherzo for Four Bassoons*, and the Polka from Shostakovich's ballet *Golden Age*.⁶⁰) The most significant moment in Schnittke's memorial *Prelude* is its conclusion, where shortly after the second violin (or tape) enters at rehearsal 7, the DSCH motive is closely followed at one measure before rehearsal 8 by BACH (B \flat -A-C-B \sharp), that is, by Bach's musical motto. Subsequently the two mottos share material and gradually intertwine until by one measure before rehearsal 10 they are superimposed (sharing the final C-B in violin 1). From rehearsal 11 on this superimposed version is repeated as it gradually fades away, the ebb and flow of the two mottos like fading breaths. At the end of Schnittke's composition, BACH and DSCH are linked eternally in the pantheon, as musicologist Svetlana Savenko has written (Ex. 4).⁶¹

320

Many commentators have noted the musical and symbolic similarities of the two mottos: The fact that the BACH motive appears prominently near the end of Bach's last (and unfinished) composition, *Art of Fugue*, and that therefore the DSCH and BACH mottos raise similar questions of "identity, origin, and death," to quote Lawrence Kramer.⁶² But the ties between BACH and DSCH are greater than their connota-

thematic contrasts, dynamic reprises. And perhaps in my Symphony [no. 1] there is something of the formal character of Shostakovich's symphonies, not from his language, but from the very character." See Alfred Shnitke and Dmitriy Shul'gin, *Godi neizvestnosti Al'freda Shnitke: besedi s kompozitorom* (Moscow: Delovaya liga, 1993), 27; there is also a second corrected edition of this volume (Moscow: Kompozitor, 2004). See also Alfred Shnitke and Aleksandr Ivashkin, *Besedi s Al'fredom Shnitke* (Moscow: "Kul'tura," 1994), 81-83.

⁵⁹ Shnitke and Shul'gin, *Godi neizvestnosti Al'freda Shnitke*, 72-73.

⁶⁰ See liner notes by Sigrid Neef to the *Alfred Schnittke* volume of the *Musica non Grata* series of recordings (Melodiya/BMG 74321 562642).

⁶¹ "Dem Genius der Gegenwartsmusik antwortet die Kunst der Vergangenheit, antwortet die Weigheit; Einzug ins Pantheon, Teilhaftigwerden der Unsterblichkeit." Sawenko, "Zum Weiterwirken der von Schostakowitsch ausgehenden Traditionen im Schaffen sowjetischer Gegenwartskomponisten," 56. She also strangely sees the motivic technique in the *Prelude* as being akin to "rudimentary serial techniques." And it is impossible to agree with her that in the work "the quotation [of the DSCH motive] is employed intonationally as if the composer had forgotten that he is handling a quotation" (Das Zitat wird intonatorisch so verarbeitet, als hätte der Komponist 'vergessen,' daß er mit einem Zitat umgeht). I am indebted to Melina Esse for pointing out the breathlike quality of this passage.

⁶² Lawrence Kramer, *Musical Meaning: Toward a Critical History* (Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 2002), 233; see also David Fanning, *Shostakovich: String Quartet no. 8*,

EXAMPLE 4. Alfred Schnittke, *Prelude in Memoriam Dmitri Shostakovich*, final page

10

11

D S Es (Eb) C H(Bb)

B(Bb) A C H(Bb)

pp

12

poco a poco più sul pont. rit.

ppp

poco sul pont. rit.

ppp

tions of impending demise. Schnittke's superimposition of the two motos, though similar to the musical memorials that appeared in the 1976 Shneerson volume (and especially American lexicographer Nicholas Slonimsky's), also had a precursor in his own late-1960s compositions, and specifically his Violin Sonata no. 2, "Quasi una Sonata." This is one of Schnittke's first polystylistic compositions, and it ends with a final

Landmarks in Music Since 1950 (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 34. For a rather gushing late-Soviet consideration of the influence of Bach's polyphony (and Bach in general) on Shostakovich, see Nina Gerasimova-Persidskaya, "Polifonicheskoye mishleniye Shostakovicha v kul'turno-istoricheskoy aspekt/Schostakowitschs polyphones denken in kultur-geschichtlicher hinsicht," in *Bericht über das Internationale Dmitri-Schostakowitsch-Symposium Köln 1985*, ed. Klaus Wolfgang Niemöller, *Kölner Beiträge zur Musikforschung*, vol. 150 (Regensburg: Gustav Bosse, 1986), 262–70 (Russian language version).

THE JOURNAL OF MUSICOLOGY

concluding statement of BACH harmonized with prominent grinding major sevenths.⁶³ Bach and tonality suggested salvation both musically and spiritually to many Soviet composers in the late 1960s, but especially to Schnittke and Arvo Pärt (who turned to Bach in his 1964 *Collage on the Theme BACH* and his 1968 *Credo*). Schnittke told Shul'gin in the mid 1970s that in his *Prelude* the "BACH theme appears more as an objective voice, larger than all that has gone before, which absorbs everything and therefore engulfs the DSCH theme too. This is a sort of return to origins."⁶⁴ (This effect is extremely difficult to achieve in performance because inevitably one of the voices predominates: In Gidon Kremer's recording the DSCH in the live part is countered though not "engulfed" by a ghostly BACH on the tape; Vladimir Spivakov's rendition achieves more of the balance and "absorption" that Schnittke may have been seeking.)⁶⁵ Schnittke compared the effect of the *Prelude*'s conclusion to a 1962 staging of the "Prodigal Son" by George Balanchine in which the son creeps behind the father and is obscured by his cloak, so that the "illusion is created that the son has crawled back into the Father." Shostakovich thus becomes the "Prodigal Son" reunited with Bach the Father (an image also reminiscent of Schnittke's comments about Shostakovich's use of quotation and the "ghost of Hamlet's father" mentioned above).⁶⁶ But Schnittke's next work to make prominent use of the DSCH motive, his Third Quartet, takes this blending of Bach and Shostakovich even further, placing Shostakovich in an intricately woven amalgam of quotations and references spanning the history of Western music from the 16th century to the present.

Schnittke's Third Quartet is a dense collage based, at least overtly, on quotations from Orlando di Lasso's *Stabat Mater* and Beethoven's *Grosse Fuge* together with the DSCH motto. From the outset DSCH is the least audible of the three, recalled more by the highly chromatic passages in the work that follow that are equally indebted motivically and intervallically to the Beethoven quotation (Ex. 5a).

⁶³ Schnittke noted the similarities between the endings of the two works (Sonata no. 2 and the *Prelude*) in his conversation with Shul'gin. Schnittke and Shul'gin, *Godi neizvestnosti Al'freda Shnitke*, 73.

⁶⁴ Ibid. Quoted in liner notes by Sigrid Neef to the *Musica non Grata* recording.

⁶⁵ Vladimir Spivakov's performance is on the CD *Schnittke: Orchestral Works & Chamber Music*, Col Legno Collage 10, 20510; Gidon Kremer's appears on the *Musica non Grata* recording.

⁶⁶ In a 1989 interview Schnittke declared that "in all of my works I bow before this name, the center of music. Everything that occurred before Bach and after Bach is a further development of what was already there in his work. It is the center that I cannot lose." Quoted in Hartmut Schick, "Musikalische Konstruktion als musikhistorische Reflexion in der Postmoderne: Zum 3. Streichquartett von Alfred Schnittke," *Archiv für Musikwissenschaft* 59 (2002): 251 (originally in "Verschiedene Einflüsse und Richtungen: Alfred Schnittke im Gespräch mit Tatjana Porwoll," *MusikTexte* 30 [July/August 1989]: 28).

SCHMELZ

EXAMPLE 5a. Alfred Schnittke, String Quartet no. 3, beginning

Andante

Violino I

Violino II

Viola

Violoncello

pp *p* *pp* *p*

Orlando di Lasso – Stabat mater

5

p *mp* *mf* *f* *p* *pp sub.*

pizz. arco

rall. a tempo

Ludwig v. Beethoven – Quartett N. 16

D S C H

11

mf *f* *mf* *f*

pizz. arco

THE JOURNAL OF MUSICOLOGY

In fact, according to musicologist Hartmut Schick, the Beethoven and Shostakovich quotations are linked together insofar as the appearance of the DSCH motive at the opening of Shostakovich's Eighth String Quartet resembles the opening of Beethoven's String Quartet op.132, which in turn resembles the *Grosse Fuge* theme. In this respect, Beethoven in Schnittke's Third Quartet could be said to take the role of Bach in the *Prelude*, absorbing DSCH into its web of signifiers and the traditions they represent, in this case the quartet tradition from Beethoven to Shostakovich that continues with Schnittke's Third.⁶⁷ Yet Bach may also be found in the opening to the Third Quartet, for Schick identifies a "latent," retrograde statement of the BACH motive in measures 6–7 in the last four pitches of the *Grosse Fuge* quotation in the first violin. As these pitches continue to sound under the statement of the DSCH motive as well, Schick sees this moment as "Bach and Shostakovich . . . together entangled or coalesced in tones."⁶⁸ According to this interpretation Schnittke is expanding the composers to whom Shostakovich—and therefore he himself—is indebted. (In these opening measures Schnittke has also encoded the initials of Lasso and Beethoven into the musical fabric, "Orlando di Lasso" [A–D–D–A–E♭–A♭—Schick interprets the final A♭ as an additional representation of the "as" sound in "Lasso" as well as a representation of Schnittke's initials]—in the violins in m. 11, and "Ludwig van Beethoven" [D–G–A–B♭–E–B (h)] in mm. 15–16 in all four strings.)⁶⁹

The three movements in the Quartet loosely follow the Lasso (I), Beethoven (II), Shostakovich (III) progression outlined at the opening of the quartet, and the final summarizing bars of the entire work present one of the few linear appearances of the DSCH motive at its original pitch (see rehearsal 16—end, Ex. 5b; the motive had also sounded at

⁶⁷ "Beethoven" is also blended with "Shostakovich" in the viola in mm. 19–20 of the second movement, where a transposed version of the main "Beethoven" motive of that movement (D–G–A–B♭)—originally heard in m. 15 of the first movement—contains the DSCH motive. See Schick, "Musikalische Konstruktion als musikhistorische Reflexion in der Postmoderne," 249, 261.

⁶⁸ "Werden klanglich miteinander verschränkt oder verschmolzen." Ibid., 251. Schick also identifies the *Prelude* as a precursor for this mixture (p. 252), and also finds a transposed version of the BACH motive in the first four measures of the first violin (F♯–G–E–F=B–C–A–B♭) in the quartet (253).

⁶⁹ Schick was the first to point this out. Ibid., 250–51. He also identifies references to Webern in a 12-tone row (made up of only nine different pitches) that he finds in the *Grosse Fuge* measures 5–8, thereby finding in the complex of quotations in those measures a connection of Beethoven, Webern, and Shostakovich, all united by their reverence for Bach (257).

SCHMELZ

EXAMPLE 5b. Alfred Schnittke, String Quartet no. 3, final measures

84 16 *rall.* *a tempo* *pizz.*

pp *p* *pizz.* *p* *arco*

pp sub. *p* *pp sub.* *p* *pp sub.*

90 17 *accel.* *a tempo*

arco *mp* *f* *mf* *f* *arco* *mp*

mp *f* *mp* *f* *mp*

pizz. *mp* *f* *arco* *f* *mp*

96 *pizz.* *p* *pp* *morendo*

p *pp* *morendo*

p *pp* *morendo*

THE JOURNAL OF MUSICOLOGY

pitch in the pizzicato viola of mm. 65–69).⁷⁰ Schick demonstrates that the final movement, and especially its last page, “fuses” together all of the quartet’s previous material, including the Lasso monogram (violin 1, m. 95, as well as the viola in mm. 87 and 91, and violin 2 in m. 89), the Beethoven monogram (violin 1, m. 86 and m. 93), and the initial Lasso cadence in the final violin 1 chords (mm. 97–99). This final cadence also contains the Beethoven monogram (the top pitches of the violin 1 chords), the DSCH motive in the second voice of the same chords (sharing the initial D with the Beethoven motto), and the BACH motive in the final two violin 1 chords. Despite this wealth of allusions, “Shostakovich” arguably rises to the foreground in the concluding measures, with the repeated iterations of the monogram in the viola and second violin drawing more attention than the other buried, coded, or less familiar material.

Schick’s interpretation of the quartet as a multi-leveled meditation on music history is suggestive. For Schick the Third Quartet may be read

326

As an autobiographical essay of Schnittke’s musical formation and the important stages of his work (with reference to key works like the Piano Quintet and the Second Violin Sonata); as an essay on the genre of the string quartet, namely on the tradition of the genre from Beethoven through Webern and Bartók up to Shostakovich . . . and finally as an essay on the history of Western polyphony from the 16th century through Beethoven’s highly chromatic counterpoint up to twelve-tone techniques and quartertone music, with Bach as the secret center of everything, and the leit-sonority of the discant clausula as the root for the progressive dissolution of diatonicism and tonality.⁷¹

⁷⁰ Schick reads the progression somewhat differently: As a movement from a history of counterpoint centered on the Lasso motive in movement I, to the second movement’s “thematization of both music history and the history of counterpoint, however put much later chronologically and oriented to the history of the [quartet] as a genre” (thematisiert ebenfalls Musikgeschichte und Geschichte des Kontrapunkts, aber chronologisch viel später ansetzend und auf die Gattungsgeschichte bezogen). *Ibid.*, 258.

⁷¹ “Als autobiographischer Essay über die musikalische Prägung des Komponisten Schnittke und wichtige Stationen seines Schaffens (mit Verweisen auf Schlüsselwerke wie das Klavierquintett und die 2. Violinsonate), als Essay über die Gattung Streichquartett, nämlich über gattungsimmanente Traditionslinien von Beethoven über Webern und Bartók bis hin zu Schostakowitsch . . . und schließlich als Essay über die Geschichte der abendländischen Polyphonie vom 16. Jahrhundert über Beethovens hochchromatischen Kontrapunkt bis zur Zwölftontechnik und Vierteltonmusik, mit Bach als dem geheimen Zentrum von allem und der leittonigen Diskantklausel als Wurzel für die fortschreitende Auflösung von Diatonik und Tonalität.” *Ibid.*, 266. Schick’s entire argument counters the view of postmodernism as linked with style or construction and especially the idea of poly-stylism as a “simple” juxtaposing of “foreign” elements, positing that the opposite is true in Schnittke’s Third Quartet. Instead, it is based on a “multilayered and complex . . . reflection on music [history]” (vielschichtig und komplex . . . Reflexivität der Musik) (245–46).

As Schnittke's own account of his *Prelude* indicated, Bach represented a return to the "origins" of tonality after Schnittke's Thaw-era dalliances with serialism and aleatory devices. Now, as Schick's reading of the Third Quartet suggests, Schnittke's 1970s development entailed a further definition and exploration of the traditions to which he belonged. The final pages of the Third Quartet demonstrate that Shostakovich continued to play a prominent role in his musical consciousness. Schnittke honed his tonal allegiances, making it clear that as he told Shul'gin in the mid 1970s he was indeed "dependen[t] on that type of emotional thought (climaxes, dynamic reprises, in general a dynamic type of form), which is characteristic of the tradition called 'Shostakovich.'" ⁷² Such statements helped lay the foundation for the oft-repeated assertion from the 1980s and early 1990s that Schnittke was the "obvious torchbearer after Shostakovich," a designation that had its explicit roots in the *Prelude* and the Third Quartet (one of his first pieces to gain wide Western exposure thanks to the Kronos Quartet's 1988 disc *Winter Was Hard*). ⁷³ Of course, as the coded references to Bach and Beethoven in this quartet and the ciphered initials of German composers that saturate the musical fabric of his 1980 Third Symphony show, the Austro-Germanic heritage was never far from Schnittke's musical consciousness. ⁷⁴

327

The ties between Shostakovich and Bach in Schnittke's *Prelude*, continued "latently" in the Third Quartet, also had larger implications fueled by the growing defensiveness many Soviets felt about their greatest musical representative at the time of his death. In their memorial articles, many writers, theorist Lev Mazel' and Weinberg among them,

⁷² Shnitke and Shul'gin, *Godī neizvestnosti Al'freda Shnitke*, 28. See also Shnitke and Ivashkin, *Besedī s Al'fredom Shnitke*, 81.

⁷³ "Despite Schnittke's insistence that his music lacks an explicit agenda, it's precisely this musical, metaphorical struggle that makes him the obvious torchbearer after Shostakovich. As Schnittke said in his press conference [at Carnegie Hall], 'I would like to say right away that I would not want to be thought of as an imitator, but as a composer who works parallel to Shostakovich's music.'" Philip Kennicott, "The Strong, Silent Type," *Pulse!* (August 1991): 64. Mark Aranovsky's 1979 history of the Soviet symphony over the period 1960–1975 also took this tack, comparing Schnittke's dramaturgy to Shostakovich's: "[In the First Symphony] Schnittke becomes a follower of the tradition of Shostakovich, for whom music was always a representation of one or another level of culture," both high and low. Mark Aranovskiy, *Simfonicheskiye iskaniya: problema zhanra simfonii v sovetskoy muzike 1960–1975 godov* (Leningrad: Sovetskii kompozitor, 1979), 161. See also Kronos Quartet, *Winter Was Hard*, Elektra/Nonesuch 9 79181.

⁷⁴ Schick idiosyncratically perceives Shostakovich as "German," declaring his Eighth Quartet to be rooted "unmistakably in the tradition of the Germano-Austrian String Quartet" because it was composed in Dresden and because its opening resembles that of Beethoven's Op. 132 quartet, in the process ignoring other obvious non-Germano-Austrian precursors like Smetana or Janáček. See Schick, "Musikalische Konstruktion als musikhistorische Reflexion in der Postmoderne: Zum 3. Streichquartett von Alfred Schnittke," 249.

THE JOURNAL OF MUSICOLOGY

connected Bach and Shostakovich, because as Mazel' admitted, Shostakovich

Was not an initiator of a great renewal in 20th century music. And he did not try at all costs to go farther than others in the area of musical-technical innovation. . . . In the West they sometimes claim that [Shostakovich] was conservative and old-fashioned. But this is the conservatism and old-fashionedness of Bach, creating polyphonic music in an age of the domination of harmonic thinking.⁷⁵

In 1968 Bach equaled a renewed and revitalized sense of tradition (and tonality) for younger Soviet composers. In 1975 Bach and Shostakovich together offered a typically conservative course for Soviet music: not too innovative but not lagging too far behind either.⁷⁶ Or as Union of Composers head Tikhon Khrennikov declared in his introductory comments to the essays published in the September 1976 *Sovetskaya muzika*, on the occasion of what would have been Shostakovich's 70th birthday: "The tradition of Shostakovich is a tradition of a deeply restricted uniting of the fundamentals of the musical classics with the audacious innovations of the creative type." At the same time Khrennikov also emphasized that the "tradition of Shostakovich is a tradition of uncompromising service to his affairs, to his calling as an artist of the socialist epoch."⁷⁷ In this respect, Schnittke actually followed official dictate by adhering to a similar "middle path," an interpretation supported by Schnittke's growing official respectability in the late 1970s and into the 1980s.

⁷⁵ Mazel' also compared Shostakovich to Beethoven in his "combination of civic spirit [*grazhdanstvennost'*] and the publicistic nature [*publitsistichnost'*] of his creative work with the deepest penetration into the internal world of man." Mazel', "Razdum'ya ob istoricheskom meste tvorchestva Shostakovicha," 15. These statements also appeared, slightly amended and with a new final concluding paragraph, in the Shneerson volume, *D. Shostakovich: stat'i i materialy*; the quotation above is from pages 71–72. Perhaps sensing the incipient lack of interest in Shostakovich, Mazel' added the following in the Shneerson volume: "As is well known, there was a falling off of interest in [Bach]. Such a period cannot be ruled out in relation to the music of Shostakovich. But in such a case its magnificent renaissance is inevitable" (Mazel', "Rasdum'ya ob istoricheskom meste tvorchestva Shostakovicha," 72). Weinberg also underscored Shostakovich's similarity to Bach in his contribution to Shneerson's volume, "Like Bach in his time, [Shostakovich] placed his creative expression under the command of all his artistic experience of the classics, and also all of the new that seemed to him worthy of attention" (M. Vaynberg, "Velichiye muziki Dmitriya Shostakovicha," in *D. Shostakovich: stat'i i materialy*, 48).

⁷⁶ Pianist Tatyana Nikolayeva similarly connected Shostakovich to Bach in an interview with Elizabeth Wilson: "Shostakovich conceived his works in an enormous span from beginning to end; they are born of an amazingly intense creative process. In this he is comparable to Bach." Wilson, *Shostakovich: A Life Remembered*, 291.

⁷⁷ Tikhon Khrennikov, "Nash Shostakovich," *Sovetskaya muzika* 9 (1976): 6. See also Tarakanov, "Sushchestvoval li avangard v poslevoyennoy Sovetskoy muziki?" 17–18.

The Ending of DSCH

Denisov critiqued Shostakovich stylistically and morally, though not personally, in his *DSCH*. Weinberg and Tishchenko assimilated, reassessed, and continued Shostakovich's style in their memorial symphonies, and Schnittke embraced the "tradition of Shostakovich" in his works from the late 1970s and early 1980s as the model for a mimetic musical dramaturgy of a specifically Soviet sort, based on a reinvigorated expression of the tonal tradition—both self-consciously Russian and Austro-Germanic.⁷⁸ Alternatively, in his 1981 *Postludium DSCH* for soprano, violin, cello, and piano, Ukrainian composer Valentin Sil'vestrov expressed a fundamental anxiety about the possibility of really new artistic creation, the "fewer and fewer possible texts beginning, figuratively speaking, from the start." Instead, he "wanted to write something, not so much beginning, as answering something already uttered."⁷⁹ As had been the case since the early 1970s, Sil'vestrov believed that by repeating the old, he could renew it, like Jorge Luis Borges's "Pierre Menard, Author of the *Quixote*."⁸⁰ Sil'vestrov's anxiety over artistic creation coincided with his reported increasing disillusionment with Shostakovich both as man and musician over the course of the 1970s.⁸¹ Thus in the *Postludium DSCH* he bid farewell to Shostakovich and his tradition even as he renewed his engagement with both.⁸² He did this by extending Shostakovich's (and Mahler's) rhetoric of conclusion,

329

⁷⁸ My use of the term "mimesis" is from Karol Berger's opposition of "mimetic" and "abstract" musical modes. See Karol Berger, *A Theory of Art* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2000), esp. 120–61; as well as Schmelz, *Such Freedom, If Only Musical*.

⁷⁹ Valentin Sil'vestrov and Tat'yana Frumkis, "Sokhranyat' dostoinstvo . . .," *Sovetskaya muzika* 4 (1990): 16 (see also 14). Significantly, as Tat'yana Frumkis notes, this composition was not dedicated to Shostakovich, but rather to the first soprano soloist to sing the work, Lidiya Stovbun. The composition was written for a Shostakovich program in Kiev that also featured works by Leonid Hrabovsky, Valentin Bibik, and Volodymyr Huba. Tat'yana Frumkis, "K istorii odnoy (ne)Lyubvi," *Muzikal'naya akademiya* 3 (2006): 88; this essay originally appeared in German: Tat'yana Frumkis, "Silwestrow und Schostakowitsch: Zur Geschichte einer (Nicht)Liebe" (trans. Sigrid Neef), in *Schostakowitsch und die Folgen: Russische Musik zwischen Anpassung und Protest/Schostakovich and the Consequences: Russian Music between Adaptation and Protest*, ed. Ernst Kuhn, Jascha Nemtsov, and Andreas Wehrmeyer, *Studia slavica musicologica* 32 (Berlin: Ernst Kuhn, 2003), 220.

⁸⁰ Sil'vestrov and Frumkis, "Sokhranyat' dostoinstvo . . .," 14. Jorge Luis Borges, "Pierre Menard, Author of the *Quixote*," in *Labyrinths: Selected Stories & Other Writings* (New York: New Directions Publishing, 1964), 36–44.

⁸¹ Frumkis, "K istorii odnoy (ne)Lyubvi," 87–88; Frumkis, "Silwestrow und Schostakowitsch: Zur Geschichte einer (Nicht)Liebe," 218–21.

⁸² Frumkis has a somewhat different reading of this composition: "In this unusual . . . composition Sil'vestrov confronts not only the typical for and after-Shostakovich productions, but also Shostakovich himself." She explores Sil'vestrov's changing relationship with Shostakovich over the course of his career, including his own moment of rejecting the elder composer, in: "K istorii odnoy (ne)Lyubvi," 85–91 (the quotation above appears on page 86); and Frumkis, "Silwestrow und Schostakowitsch: Zur Geschichte einer (Nicht)Liebe," 211–27 (the quotation above appears on pages 212–13).

THE JOURNAL OF MUSICOLOGY

expanding the idea of the coda as the end of a musical composition to represent an “end time” in a more encompassing sense. (This had long been one of Sil’vestrov’s preoccupations; it is no coincidence that his earlier Symphony no. 3 from 1966 carried the subtitle “Eschatophony” [*Eskhatofoniya*].) Sil’vestrov described the postlude in a generic sense as a “fundamental condition of culture,” a “commentary on life and music” that opposed the traditional view of life as a prelude.⁸³ As a genre the “postlude” was for him a “collecting of echoes, a form opening not to the end, as is more usual, but to the beginning.” Sil’vestrov’s *Postludium DSCH* thus acts as a counterweight to Schnittke’s *Prelude*, emphasizing not Shostakovich as a precursor, as the beginning of something new, but rather Shostakovich as the beginning of the end. Or as Virko Baley has evocatively if paradoxically said of Sil’vestrov’s music “[o]ne is, in effect, experiencing the future of an event long gone.”⁸⁴

In Sil’vestrov’s *Postludium DSCH* a dramatic opposition is created between the chromatic DSCH motive and the stark, self-conscious diatonicism that had increasingly begun to occupy Sil’vestrov’s music over the course of the 1970s in pieces like his String Quartet no. 1 (1974) and *Silent Songs* (1974–84)—he called this his “weak style.”⁸⁵ The DSCH motive appears at the very opening of the *Postludium* even if it is not immediately audible as such (Ex. 6; DSCH is heard in the harmony and melody in mm. 1–2; it also appears in mm. 28–29, in the bass in mm. 33–36, and in the violin in mm. 43–44). Ultimately the chromaticism implicit in the DSCH motive is rejected, subsumed by the triads and tonality of Sil’vestrov’s austere, spartan, repetitive, always ending music.⁸⁶ More suggestively, in the end DSCH also gives way to the soprano’s final “Amen” (the culmination of the “A-” vocalise that opens the work). The master narrative that was “Shostakovich” prevented Sil’vestrov from saying anything “new”; it only permitted him to look back, endlessly spinning out and repeating its lingering traces. As a result, Sil’vestrov’s music became ineluctably if self-consciously “new,” especially in relation to the music of those Soviet composers who were uncritically repeating “Shostakovich,” oblivious to the ending of his tradition.⁸⁷

⁸³ Sil’vestrov and Frumkis, “Sokhranyat’ dostoinstvo . . .,” 16.

⁸⁴ Virko Baley, “Sil’vestrov, Valentyn Vasil’yovych,” *NG II*; see also Hakobian, *Music of the Soviet Age*, 310–11.

⁸⁵ Sil’vestrov and Frumkis, “Sokhranyat’ dostoinstvo . . .,” 14.

⁸⁶ Paul Griffiths writes that Sil’vestrov’s Fifth Symphony “seems to begin where a slow movement by Bruckner, Tchaikovsky or Mahler might have ended, and then to go on ending.” Paul Griffiths, *A Concise History of Western Music* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2006), 312.

⁸⁷ Sil’vestrov declared, “For that which is alive up to now can be pronounced like it is contemporary, a current word. And this means that a new language may arise.” Sil’vestrov and Frumkis, “Sokhranyat’ dostoinstvo . . .,” 14.

EXAMPLE 6. Valentin Sil'vestrov, *Postludium DSCH*, opening measures

Adagio (♩ = 52), rubato

Soprano: *mf* *p* *mf* *p* rit. -----

Violino: *f* *ppp* (s.p.) *mf* *ppp* rit. -----

Violoncello: *fp* *f* *pp* *ppp* rit. -----

Pianoforte: *ff* *f* *f* rit. -----

The continued presence of “Shostakovich” as both man and tradition was reflected in the comments by musicologist Israil’ Nest’yev (1911–93) in the *Sovetskaya muzika* volumes from 1981 dedicated to what would have been the composer’s 75th birthday. Nest’yev begins his reflections by pondering what would have happened were Shostakovich still alive, hardly believing that he is not. Nest’yev imagines that “On 25 September 1981 Dmitri Dmitrievich Shostakovich would have turned 75 years old. On one of the evenings of this autumn he without fail would have gone to the Union of Composers in order to show his new quartet or new symphony, composed with his usual obsessiveness in a single breath during the meager weeks of his summer break.”⁸⁸ As both man and musical tradition Shostakovich still haunted Soviet musical life in the early 1980s (in 1976 Henry Orlov already described the Eighth Quartet and “other later works” as expressing “the numbness of a lonely soul troubled by ghosts,” suggesting that to some Shostakovich was haunted, if not haunting, before his actual death).⁸⁹

⁸⁸ Israil’ Nest’yev, “Iskusstvo besstrashnoy dobroti,” *Sovetskaya muzika* 9 (1981): 6.

⁸⁹ Henry Orlov, “A Link in the Chain: Reflections on Shostakovich and His Times (1976),” in *A Shostakovich Casebook*, ed. Malcolm Hamrick Brown (Bloomington: Indiana Univ. Press, 2004), 211.

THE JOURNAL OF MUSICOLOGY

In fact, as the 1981 and 1986 memorial issues of *Sovetskaya muzika* demonstrated, the strength of his presence and his tradition only increased with each passing year. In 1986 the editors of *Sovetskaya muzika* noted that “it is as if a great many have not bid him farewell,”⁹⁰ even as more and more younger composers became skeptical of his value.⁹¹

One might read loose parallels between the Soviet musical world that wanted to escape the past but could not let go and the dilemma facing the political leadership of the Soviet Union at the beginning of the 1980s, and especially near the end of Leonid Brezhnev’s rule. Soviet leaders insisted on maintaining the status quo even as they gradually realized that (in historian Ronald Suny’s words) “pressure for greater social autonomy and less interference from the state was building up.”⁹² Brezhnev’s immediate successors—especially Yuri Andropov and Konstantin Chernenko—were torn between order and reform. As historian Robert Service has summarized, Andropov “wanted change, but insisted that it should be undertaken at no risk to the existing state order.”⁹³ (The decisive reforms, of course, were initiated by Mikhaíl Gorbachev [b. 1931], himself a member of the Thaw generation who had no intention of ending the Soviet Union but instead hoped to “bridge the gap between socialism’s ideals and its disappointing realities.”)⁹⁴

Similarly, Sil’vestrov and Schnittke as well as Weinberg and Tishchenko could not entirely bid farewell to “Shostakovich” even while simultaneously expanding and supplanting his language. This reading is at odds with Yurchak’s account of late socialism as visibly “im-

⁹⁰ “I ochen’ mnogo kak budto bi s nim i ne proshchalis’.” “Obzhigayushcheye plamy muziki,” *Sovetskaya muzika* 9 (1986): 14.

⁹¹ Some older composers had been skeptical long before. The reminiscences by Leo Mazel’, Yuri Fedosyuk, and the late Viktor Bobrovskiy (1906–79) published in the section of the September 1991 number of *Sovetskaya muzika* dedicated to what would have been Shostakovich’s 85th birthday were generally positive and predictable (these had been prepared for print before the monumental events in August occurred). Yet a shift was apparent in the late Bobrovskiy’s reading of Shostakovich (drawn from notes he had begun making in late 1975). Like many younger composers Bobrovskiy—born the same year as Shostakovich—underscored the “paradoxical bifurcation [*razdvoyennost’*] of Shostakovich,” the split between the man himself and his music that became increasingly evident in his last decade: “The highest steadfastness in the music and such sad weakness in the life visible to us.” Viktor Bobrovskiy, “Shostakovich v moye zhizni. Lichnye zametki,” *Sovetskaya muzika* 9 (1991): 24 (see also 28 and 29).

⁹² Ronald Suny, *The Soviet Experiment: Russia, The USSR, and the Successor States* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1998), 442.

⁹³ Robert Service, *A History of Twentieth-Century Russia* (Cambridge: Harvard Univ. Press, 1997), 431. See also Peter Kenz, *A History of the Soviet Union From the Beginning to the End* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1999), 243–44.

⁹⁴ For an examination of the connections between Gorbachev’s Thaw-schooled ideology and the reforms of the late 1980s, see Stephen Kotkin, *Armageddon Averted: The Soviet Collapse, 1970–2000* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2001), esp. 54–57 (the quotation above is on p. 59).

mutable” because it underscores the loaded nature of the binary opposition that Yurchak has created. In some areas of late Soviet existence, including music composition, the pressures of “deterritorialization”—in this case often a very overt angling for change—overwhelmed the apparent stability of the status quo. Tat’yana Frumkis’s description of Sil’vestrov’s recent music (including presumably his post-1980 works like the Fifth Symphony from 1980–82) appears to match Yurchak’s strained balance of stasis and change: “Woven from brief motives and their innumerable echoes, the musical fabric, despite its seeming staticness, is full of internal movement.”⁹⁵ Yet more important, as their Shostakovich memorials suggest, in Schnittke’s and especially Sil’vestrov’s music the “new”—the increasingly external “movement”—often overshadowed the elements of continuity—the “seeming staticness.” This despite the fact that the “new” was often paradoxically predicated upon the “old”: The sometimes exaggerated and always self-conscious invocation of the past represented by DSCH and the Germano-Russian tonal tradition. Most fundamentally, in the 1970s and into the 1980s the nature of this interaction between past and present in their music was always “new” and constantly changing. It was an audible, dynamic process of renewal and development, emulation and critique.

333

What Comes Next?

The ambivalence of Sil’vestrov’s music recalls the posthumous Soviet debates concerning Shostakovich’s role as traditionalist or innovator and also reflects the general anxieties of contemporary Soviet society. Much of the tension between new and old, change and continuity at the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s resulted from generational conflict in Soviet music and politics. Initially, anxiety fueled the musical advances of the Thaw, as Soviet composers felt left behind and attempted to catch up with composers in Europe and the United States. In the 1970s the sense of being left behind technically was heightened by a new generation of Soviet composers younger than Denisov, Schnittke, and Sil’vestrov. For these composers, including Viktor Yekimovsky (b. 1947), Vladimir Martınov (b. 1946), and Eduard Artem’ev (b. 1937, born somewhat earlier but still associated with the younger composers), neither Shostakovich nor Bach was the dominant tradition. Nor were Schnittke or Denisov “advanced” enough. The younger composers were inspired more by rock music, John Cage, and Steve Reich. Violinist Tat’yana Grindenko (b. 1946) told me:

⁹⁵ Frumkis, “K istorii odnoy (ne)lyubvi,” 89; Frumkis, “Silwestrow und Schostakowitsch: Zur Geschichte einer (Nicht)Liebe,” 222.

THE JOURNAL OF MUSICOLOGY

"[Denisov] considered all of the minimalists to be only speculators, [saying] that 'I can also write two notes and say that it is a composition, just like that.' [He displayed] an absolute lack of understanding."⁹⁶ As might be expected, and as Gubaidulina told Elizabeth Wilson, "The next generation of musicians had a different attitude to Shostakovich's music and personality. They had different landmarks, and found their own answers. What was pain to us was history to them."⁹⁷

After 1991 "Shostakovich" as history could be more openly criticized, especially by those Russian composers living abroad who could voice more provocative opinions without fear of direct reprisals.⁹⁸ The heatedness of some responses to the "tradition of Shostakovich" reveals how threatening it remained for many younger composers whether within Russia or not. Composer Viktor Suslin (b. 1942), then living in Germany where he had emigrated in 1981, wrote an especially vitriolic letter to the sympathetic Galina Ustvol'skaya dated 4 August 1994 in which he expressed his contempt for Shostakovich and all that he represented.⁹⁹ Suslin took issue with the "false" dialectic that Shostakovich had created that "allowed him to compose a huge quantity of very mediocre music and as a result to seem a genius not only to others but to himself" (47). Suslin condemned Shostakovich's official actions, including the denunciation of Sakharov decried by Denisov and other Soviet composers. According to Suslin, quoting his teacher Nikolay Peyko, "Shostakovich truly was the musical conscience of his period, a

⁹⁶ Tat'yana Grindenko, interview by author, tape recording, Moscow, 12 January 2001.

⁹⁷ Wilson, *Shostakovich: A Life Remembered*, 348.

⁹⁸ For more on the tensions and issues of identity surrounding the many Russian composers who emigrated in the 1980s and 1990s see Elena Dubinets, "Music in Exile: Russian Émigré Composers and Their Search for National Identity," *Slavonica* 13, no. 1 (April 2007): 57–67.

⁹⁹ This letter is reprinted in Ol'ga Gladkova, *Galina Ustvol'skaya—Muzika kak navazhdeniye* (St. Petersburg: Muzika, 1999), 47–52 (all citations in this paragraph are to this source); this also has been translated into German: Olga Gladkova, *Galina Ustvol'skaya: Musik als magische Kraft*, trans. Jürgen Köchel and Dorothea Redepenning, *Studia slavica musicologica* 19 (Berlin: Verlag Ernst Kuhn, 2001). Throughout her book Gladkova is intent on distancing Ustvol'skaya from Shostakovich, see for example her third chapter, "Ustvol'skaya and Shostakovich: A Dialogue Real and Imaginary" (*Ustvol'skaya i Shostakovich: dialog real'nyy i mnimyy*), 40–58. The original of Suslin's letter is in the archives of Hans Sikorski Musikverlag, Hamburg and a photocopy is in the Galina Ustvol'skaya Collection of the Paul Sacher Foundation, Basel. See David Fanning, "Dmitri Shostakovich; String Quartet no. 5/Galina Ustvol'skaya: Trio for Clarinet, Violin, and Piano" in *Settling New Scores: Music Manuscripts from the Paul Sacher Foundation*, ed. Felix Meyer (Mainz: Schott Musik International, 1998), 238n14. For more on Ustvol'skaya's negative view of Shostakovich see Simon Bokman, *Variations on the Theme Galina Ustvol'skaya*, trans. Irina Behrendt, *Studia slavica musicologica* 40 (Berlin: Verlag Ernst Kuhn, 2007), 41–50. Shostakovich's pupil Georgiy Sviridov also criticized his former teacher and his music in his diaries: Georgiy Sviridov, *Muzika kak sud'ba*, ed. Aleksandr Belonenko (Moscow: Molodaya gvardiya, 2002), see for example 216, 397, 501–2, 573–74, 576, and 622–23.

period devoid of any conscience. As the time, so is the conscience [*Kakovo vremya, takova i sovest'*]” (48).¹⁰⁰ At the same time, if Shostakovich the citizen was suspect, so too was his music. Suslin asked: “The music was well done, but the question remains: What was it?” (50). And for Suslin, Shostakovich the composer was, citing a well known bon mot of composer Filipp Gershegovich, “someone who turns out pot-boilers in a trance” (*Khalturshchik v transe*) (50–51). Shostakovich’s representative genre—the genre in which he was truly “progressive”—was film music. The accessibility of his film music also carried over into his symphonies, which as a result were “‘light reading’ [*obshchedostupnoye chtivo*] on a very high professional level, . . . fairly entertaining, fairly boring, fairly thoughtful” (52). In general Suslin averred that the social and political had overwhelmed the musical in evaluations of Shostakovich’s work. When you took away the politically grounded interpretations of the Fifth Symphony finale, once all of the “social-hysterical (not historical) feathers” had been “plucked,” Suslin asked, “What remained?” He concluded: “What remained was rather gray and not particularly good music,” to which Ustvol’skaya “completely and fully” concurred, even allowing publication of the letter in her “authorized” biography (47).

Musicologist Marina Rakhmanova made a similar anti-political, though not anti-Shostakovich, argument in 1994, declaring that “if the political syndrome in relation to Shostakovich does not weaken, we will soon stop listening to his music in general.”¹⁰¹ This post-Soviet depoliticized critique of Shostakovich reached its climax over a decade later in 2005, when composer Boris Filanovsky (b.1968)—truly a member of Yurchak’s “Last Soviet Generation” (or “Generation ‘P[epsi],’” as author Viktor Pelevin memorably called them)¹⁰²—commanded his readers to “Kill DSCH in yourself” (*Ubey v sebe DSCH*) in an essay titled “Without Shostakovich” (*Bez Shostakovicha*), itself clearly indebted to Pierre Boulez’s 1952 “Schoenberg est mort.”

335

¹⁰⁰ Suslin adds, “Besides which the ‘civic-courageous’ opuses of Shostakovich are such that from them it is possible to draw only one conclusion: In Stalin’s Russia, besides the ‘Jewish question,’ there were no kinds of serious problems, which seems to me something of an exaggeration.” Gladkova, *Galina Ustvol’skaya—Muzika kak navazhdeniye*, 48.

¹⁰¹ Frumkis concurred. Cited in Frumkis, “K istorii odnoy (ne)Lyubvi,” 88 (originally in M.R., “Pora nachat’ slushat’ muziku: retsenziya na spetsial’no posvyashchyonnoye Shostakovichu izdaniye zhurnala ‘Melos,’” *Muzikal’naya akademiya* 1 [1994]: 50); Frumkis, “Silvestrow und Shostakowitsch: Zur Geschichte einer (Nicht)Liebe,” 220–21. See also Ye. Durandina’s consideration of “What Does Shostakovich Mean For Us?” (“Chto dlya nas Shostakovich?”) (originally written to coincide with the 90th anniversary of Shostakovich’s birth): Ye. Durandina, “Dmitriy Shostakovich: portret khudozhnika na fone ukhodyashchego veka,” in *Shostakovichu posvyashchayetsya: sbornik statey k 90-letiyu kompozitora (1906–1996)*, ed. Ye. Dolinskaya (Moscow: Kompozitor, 1997), 9–16, esp. 15.

¹⁰² Viktor Pelevin, *Generation ‘P’* (Moscow: Vagrius, 2000), 11–13.

THE JOURNAL OF MUSICOLOGY

Shostakovich is the sacred cow who is worshipped during the instruction of composers. Why aren't new names heard? Because throughout the country the pupils of Shostakovich—both internal and external [*ochniye i zaochniye*—sit in the conservatories. They are now between 70 and 80 years old, and their whole heads are overgrown with DSCH. How many young and tender [*rannikh*] [composers] have they ruined in their 30 years of teaching!¹⁰³

The angry, very personal response from the older critic Iosif Raiskin only confirmed Filanovsky's statements, but also showed how vexed the terrain of "DSCH" and the anxieties "he" elicited still remain (in his own response to his critics, Filanovsky was careful to note that he "didn't write 'Kill Shostakovich in yourself.' I am not talking about Shostakovich as a person at all. I wrote 'Kill DSCH in yourself.' I guess the difference is clear. . . . But the confusion is symptomatic").¹⁰⁴

From their side Western critics were not as concerned with issues of succession and tradition and quickly hailed Schnittke during the late 1980s and early 1990s as the "obvious torchbearer after Shostakovich."¹⁰⁵ (And not only Western critics, for Russian musicologist Lyudmilla Nikitina also wrote of Schnittke as the "heir of the tradition of D. Shostakovich.")¹⁰⁶ Yet the musical responses to Schnittke's death in more recent post-Soviet works like Dmitri Smirnov's 1998 *Postlude in Memory of Alfred Schnittke*, Op. 112 (1998), and *Gratias* for four cellos,

336

¹⁰³ Boris Filanovskiy, "Bez Shostakovicha," *Sankt-Peterburgskiy muzikal'niy vestnik* 10 (October 2005): 5 (this first appeared in the St. Petersburg *Khronika*, June 24, 2005, 15, and was subsequently published in *Muzikal'naya akademiya* 3 [2006]: 96). Iosif Raiskin's response, titled predictably, "With Shostakovich" (S Shostakovichem) also appears in *Sankt-Peterburgskiy muzikal'niy vestnik* 10 (October 2005): 5; as well as *Muzikal'naya akademiya* 3 [2006]: 95–98. I am indebted to Elena Dubinets for bringing these essays to my attention and for graciously providing me copies. Boulez's essay, "Schoenberg is Dead," was originally published in English in *The Score* 6 (February 1952), 18–22.

¹⁰⁴ Filanovsky continued, "And nevertheless, until Russian music buries Shostakovich, it will still be making no headway . . . I only mean that esthetically Shostakovich is still alive . . . But he is a composer of the same scale as Brahms, Mahler and so on. Nobody even thinks of guarding the legacy of Mahler or Brahms. Why? More time has passed? Or is it our national self-identification?" (Trans. Elena Dubinets). Boris Filanovsky, "Bez Shostakovicha. Shkola i vzhivaniye," *Tribuna sovremennoy muziki*, 4 (2006) (<http://tribunacm.ru/tribune/reviews/rev2006-01-01.php>). The Filanovsky quotation is from Elena Dubinets, "The Art of Being Russian: Shostakovich Through the Eyes of Emigré Composers," paper presented at the Shostakovich 100 Festival-Symposium, Centre for Russian Music, Goldsmiths College, University of London, 24–27 September 2006; my deepest thanks to Elena Dubinets for allowing me to see this paper. For another recent reaction to Russian listeners' apparently increasing lack of interest in the music of Shostakovich see Ella Fradkina, "Shostakovich v menyayushchemsya vremeni," *Muzikal'naya akademiya* 3 (2006): 49–51.

¹⁰⁵ Kennicott, "The Strong, Silent Type."

¹⁰⁶ "A. Shnitke okazivayetsya naslednikom traditsiy D. Shostakovicha." Nikitina, *Sovetskaya muzika: istoriya i sovremennost'*, 173.

Op. 123 (2000), or Giya Kancheli's *Slyx* for viola, mixed choir, and orchestra (1999), have been as suggestive as those to Shostakovich's death 23 years earlier.¹⁰⁷ Some are eager to move on. Composer Alexander Zhurbin (b. 1945) for one wrote in a 2005 essay called "Crossover" (original title in English), "The time of polystylistics and collage has ended: Schnittke has grown old, and Arvo Pärt has shot forward [*virvalsya vperyod*]."¹⁰⁸ But already contemporary anxieties—outgrowths of the anxieties all too apparent by the end of the 1970s, musically, economically, and otherwise—have had deleterious effects, one of the most pronounced of which is that within Russia thus far no "obvious torchbearer after Schnittke" has emerged, and presumably never will. Indeed, as Filanovsky lamented, too many Russian composers still have no obvious torchbearer after "DSCH." Like Verdery in 1996, they are still trying to determine what comes next in the current period of all too frequent change and instability.

Washington University in St. Louis

ABSTRACT

The title of this article is borrowed from anthropologist Katherine Verdery's 1996 study *What Was Socialism, and What Comes Next?* In her book Verdery surveyed the recent changes in Eastern Europe, and specifically Romania, from her vantage point in the uncertain period following the momentous events from 1989 to 1991 in the former Soviet bloc. Similarly, this article explores how Shostakovich, widely perceived in 1975 as the musical representative of socialism, influenced

337

¹⁰⁷ Smirnov's *Postlude* includes the monograms of the composers he thought most influential for Schnittke, beginning of course with DSCH and BACH (*An Introduction to Dmitri Smirnov*, Megadisc MDC 1818 [2002]). Other compositions written to Schnittke's memory included: Sergey Slonimsky, *Odin den' zhizn'* (Cantata based on the ancient Indian *Dkhammapada*), and his Six Romances to words of Lermontov and Derzhavin; Roman Ledenyov, *Tishinu* for Violin solo; Efrem Podgayts, Fantasia in memory of Alfred Schnittke for Bayan solo. John Neumeyer choreographed a ballet, *Sounds of Empty Pages* (*Zvuki pustikh stranits*), to the music of Schnittke's Viola Concerto. See Valentina Kholopova, *Kompozitor Al'fred Shnitke* (Chelyabinsk: Arkaim, 2003), 238–40. In addition to the five pieces in memory of Shostakovich Smirnov composed between 1999 and 2005 (including *DSCH* for two violins, Op. 118a [1999], and String Quartet no. 7, *In Memory of Shostakovich*, Op. 146 [2005]), he also wrote an Elegy in Memory of Edison Denisov in 1997, Op. 97a; also on the Megadisc recording mentioned above). In 2006 Smirnov's daughter (with his wife composer Elena Firsova), Alissa Firsova (b. 1986), had her composition *Celebration* (2006) in memory of Dmitri Shostakovich and based on the Coda of the Eighth Symphony premiered in Seattle (9 April 2006). Elena Dubinets, program notes to concert.

¹⁰⁸ Aleksandr Zhurbin, "Crossover" in *Kompozitor, pishushchiy slova* (Moscow: Kompozitor, 2005), 212. See also Zhurbin's intriguing ruminations on the "marketing" of Schnittke both at home and abroad: Aleksandr Zhurbin, "Al'fred Shnitke ili ukhmilka Mefistofelya," in *Aleksandr Zhurbin: kompozitor* (Moscow: Khroniker, 2002), 141–52.

THE JOURNAL OF MUSICOLOGY

what came after him. It details how Soviet composers from the younger generations, including Edison Denisov, Mieczysław Weinberg, Boris Tishchenko, Alfred Schnittke, and Valentin Sil'vestrov, dealt with Shostakovich's legacy in their compositions written in his memory, including Denisov's *DSCH*, Weinberg's Symphony no.12, Tishchenko's Symphony no. 5, Schnittke's *Prelude In Memoriam Dmitri Shostakovich* and Third String Quartet, and Sil'vestrov's *Postludium DSCH*.

In their memorial works, as they wrestled with the legacy of Shostakovich and his overwhelming influence, these composers also grappled with the shifting nature of the Soviet state, changing musical styles both foreign and domestic, and fundamental issues of aesthetic representation and identity associated with the move from modernism to postmodernism then affecting all composers in the Western art music tradition. The 1970s came at the heels of a decade of remarkable change in Soviet music and society, but at the time of Shostakovich's death, change in Soviet life began to seem increasingly unlikely. Despite recent interpretations by scholars such as anthropologist Alexei Yurchak that emphasize the fundamental immutability of the 1970s, however, these memorial compositions show that audible and significant developments were indeed occurring in the musical styles of the 1970s and early 1980s. Examining Shostakovich's legacy therefore also reveals the larger changes of the Soviet 1970s and early 1980s, both musical and otherwise.

Keywords:

Edison Denisov

Alfred Schnittke

Dmitri Shostakovich

Valentin Silvestrov

Alexei Yurchak