

SYMPHONIES NOS. 8 AND 10 BY DMITRI SHOSTAKOVICH:
A STUDY OF SKETCHES AND DRAFTS

by

Laura E. Kennedy

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Music: Musicology)
in The University of Michigan
2009

Dissertation Committee:

Professor Roland J. Wiley, Chair
Professor James M. Borders
Associate Professor Michael Makin
Associate Professor Steven M. Whiting

© Laura E. Kennedy
2009

To my mother and father,
for their love and encouragement at every step,
and to Dr. L. Jonathan Saylor,
in gratitude for his teaching.

Acknowledgements

My heartfelt thanks go to the staff and archivists at the Dmitri Shostakovich Archive, the Russian State Archive of Literature and Art (RGALI), and the Glinka Museum of Musical Culture. I also wish to thank the Fulbright Association for funding my research, as well as the Musicology Department and the Rackham Graduate School of the University of Michigan for support over several years.

I owe a debt of gratitude to Irina Antonovna Shostakovich, the composer's widow, for her kind permissions and assistance, and to Manashir Iakubov and Olga Digonskaya for their generosity and helpfulness. It is to Olga Dombrovskaya that I owe the deepest gratitude for her unfailing kindness, guidance, and friendship. Without her, this dissertation would not have been possible. Natalya Eliseyeva, chairman of the St. Petersburg Association for International Cooperation, also deserves special mention for her abundant encouragement and interest, which were a constant source of strength. My advisor, Roland John Wiley, gave hours to reading and discussing this dissertation. For his dedication, support, and keen critique, I thank him. I could not have had a better advisor.

I also want to thank my wonderful family with all my heart for their love and encouragement. Above all, I thank my mother, my dearest friend, who listened to me, laughed and cried with me, and never tired of Shostakovich.

Notes on Sources and Transliteration

The documents discussed in this dissertation are preserved in three archives in Moscow: the Russian State Archive of Literature and Art, which will be referred to as RGALI; the Glinka Museum of Musical Culture, which will be called the Glinka Museum; and the private Dmitri Shostakovich Archive, also known as the Family Archive, which is overseen by the composer's widow Irina Antonovna Shostakovich. RGALI and the Glinka Museum keep the original documents, while the Dmitri Shostakovich Archive keeps high quality scanned copies of most of the manuscripts. Both originals and copies were available for the present study. In bibliographic citation, initial references give the locations of both sets of documents since the information can be useful to a researcher and is not always easily accessible. In each archive, manuscripts are organized by *fond* (abbreviated *f.* and denoting an archive's collection), and then by one or two further categories, including *opis'* (*op.*, or "inventory"), *yedinita khraneniya* (*yed. khr.*, or "storage unit"), or *inventory number* (*no.*). At RGALI, Shostakovich files are in *fond* 2048 and are identified by *f.*, *op.*, *yed. khr.* At the Glinka Museum, the Shostakovich *fond* is *f.* 32; and files are labeled by *f.*, *yed. khr.*, and sometimes *no.* At the Dmitri Shostakovich Archive, files are identified by *f.*, *r.* (a designation similar to *opus*), and *yed. khr.*

Shostakovich's music is currently being published in the *New Collected Works* edition, a project that is anticipated to comprise 150 volumes. Series 1, on the symphonies, will include orchestral scores of Shostakovich's fifteen symphonies, four-

hand piano arrangements of each work, and facsimiles of compositional manuscripts, if known. To date, Symphonies Nos. 1–6 and 9 have been published in the *New Collected Works*, and compositional manuscripts reproduced for Symphonies Nos. 1–5 and 9. Symphonies Nos. 8 and 10 and corollary sketch materials have not been published, but it is hoped that they will soon be released.

Shostakovich’s sketch materials have, until recently, been unheralded and thus unexplored. Exposure of these documents is largely the work of two authors, Manashir Iakubov and Olga Digonskaya, whose access to and knowledge of the composer’s manuscripts are unprecedented. Given these authors’ prominence in the emerging field of Shostakovich sketch study, this dissertation includes many references to their work. Iakubov is the curator of the Dmitri Shostakovich Archive and the editor of the *New Collected Works*. In volumes that contain facsimiles of compositional manuscripts, Iakubov includes short articles, titled “Explanatory Notes,” which offer suggestions for “reading” the sketches—that is, following their musical content, discerning their order and sequence, and understanding the meaning of frequent non-notational markings, such as marginalia and instrumentation. These articles are an important resource for statements about Shostakovich’s sketches and compositional practices. Since Iakubov is cited frequently in this dissertation, footnotes after a first full citation will abbreviate the source as “NCW, vol.:p.n.” Thus, a quote from Iakubov found on p. 150 of Volume 20 in the *New Collected Works* would read “NCW, 20:150.” Given the authority Iakubov enjoys as an expositor of Shostakovich documents, his insights provide background and comparison for the observations made in this thesis. Olga Digonskaya, who works at both the Dmitri Shostakovich Archive and the Glinka Museum, has exposed a large and

varied collection of Shostakovich manuscripts, to which she applies careful description and deduction. Olga Dombrovskaya, Iakubov's wife and the chief archivist at the Dmitri Shostakovich Archive, also deserves mention for her knowledge of the Shostakovich *fondi* in Moscow. Although she has not written about sketch materials, her command of what sketches exist, which might offer useful comparisons, and where other relevant manuscripts can be found, provides critical guidance for sketch study.

The transliteration system used in this dissertation is based on the practice found in the *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians* and explained by Richard Taruskin in *Musorgsky: Eight Essays and an Epilogue* (1993). In adopting and occasionally modifying this system, I have sought to maintain consistency and readability and to ensure ease of reference for English and Russian sources. Hard and soft signs are retained and marked with an apostrophe. For the various forms of the Cyrillic *i*, I have rendered и as *i*, й as *y*, and ы as *ï*. The soft vowels ю and я are represented with *yu* and *ya*, respectively, while the Cyrillic *e* is typically rendered as *e*, but at the beginning of a word or after a soft sign or vowel, as *ye*.

While I have followed these rules as strictly as possible in bibliography and citations, a few exceptions occur. When the title of an article in English already includes transliteration of Russian, as does Malcolm Hamrick Brown's review of N.L. Fishman (1963), I have retained the author's transliteration. In the body of the text, moreover, familiar names, such as Dmitri and Olga, are rendered as commonly spelled in English, with the transliteration of the final й, or *y*, omitted in the former and the soft sign in the latter, although in citation literal transliteration is applied. Also, the common ending *-sky*

for surnames, such as Musorgsky and Stravinsky, is retained, rather than the more literal rendering *–skiy*.

The name *Iakubov* warrants special mention because it is found with an initial *I* or *Y* in English-language publications, hence as *Iakubov* and *Yakubov*. In bibliographic citation, I have retained the spelling that appears in a given publication; yet in every instance in this dissertation, the name in either spelling refers to the same person. Thus, *Iakubov* cited from the *New Collected Works* (2000–) is the same as *Yakubov* cited in articles in *Shostakovich in Context* (2000) and *Shostakovich Studies* (1995). Throughout the text of the dissertation, I have used the spelling *Iakubov*, since a majority of references are to his articles in the *New Collected Works*. Where other Russian authors are published in English, I have similarly retained the spelling of their names as found in publication. When citing their Russian-language publications, however, I have followed the transliteration guidelines given above. Thus, the name *Rosa Sadykhova* appears in this spelling for her article in *Shostakovich and His World* (2004), but is given as *Rosa Sadikhova* in the Russian-language bibliography for her article “Dmitriy Shostakovich: pis’ma k materi” (1986).

With few sources about Shostakovich’s sketches, ongoing yet still partial exposure of manuscripts, and limited access to documents, sketch study in Shostakovich faces many variables and unknowns. The interpretations, therefore, of this dissertation are necessarily tentative in this new field; but they are offered as a first step towards understanding Shostakovich’s sketches and creative process.

Table of Contents

Dedication	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Notes on Sources and Transliteration	iv
List of Appendices	ix
List of Abbreviations	x
Abstract	xi
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2 RECONSTRUCTING PROCESS: THE SKETCH STAGES OF SHOSTAKOVICH'S MANUSCRIPTS	39
CHAPTER 3 SYMPHONY NO. 10 IN SHOSTAKOVICH'S SKETCHES	58
CHAPTER 4 SYMPHONY NO. 8 IN SHOSTAKOVICH'S SKETCHES	79
CHAPTER 5 VERSIONS AND REVISIONS: COMPOSITIONAL PROCESS IN MOVEMENT II OF SYMPHONY NO. 8	99
CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSION	124
Appendices	135
Bibliography	164

List of Appendices

Appendix A.....	136
Chart I	136
Chart II.....	139
Chart III.....	141
Chart IV	143
Appendix B.....	144
Chart I	144
Chart II.....	145
Appendix C.....	146
Appendix D.....	160

List of Abbreviations

RGALI	Rossiyskiy gosudarstvenniy arkhiv literaturī i iskusstva [Russian State Archive of Literature and Art], Moscow
f.	<i>fond</i> [collection]
GTsMMK	Gosudarstvenniy tsentral'niy muzey muzikal'noy kul'turī imeni M.I. Glinka [Glinka Museum of Musical Culture], Moscow
NCW	Dmitri Shostakovich, <i>New Collected Works</i> , ed. Manashir Iakubov, 150 vols. [projected] (Moscow: DSCH, 2000–).
op.	<i>opis'</i> [inventory]
yed. khr.	<i>yedinitsa khraneniya</i> [storage unit]

Abstract

When asked about his compositional process at the outset and the end of his creative life, Shostakovich claimed that he conceived his pieces completely before writing them. Contemporaries who were in a position to know mostly affirmed this claim, suggesting or allowing the implication that Shostakovich never sketched his music. Presumably for this reason, in the nearly 35 years since the composer's death, scholars of his music have never taken up this most intuitive of compositional habits. Yet the curator of Shostakovich's private archive in Moscow affirms the existence of a vast body of compositional manuscripts pertinent to the composer's creative process. To the extent that they are gradually becoming known, these include sketches, drafts, discarded scores, abandoned autographs, thematic lists, proof-sheets, and still unidentified documents. Most numerous among these manuscripts, Shostakovich's sketches and drafts make possible the serious study of his creativity.

This dissertation is a study and interpretation of Shostakovich's sketch materials for Symphonies Nos. 8 and 10, which are preserved in private and state archives in Moscow. Sketches for the Tenth Symphony represent a mid-to-late stage of compositional process, while drafts for the Eighth reflect a final stage, prefiguring the entire symphony in piano score and serving perhaps as a private record of the work. These documents support Shostakovich's claim to thorough mental preparation but also occasionally point to changes between any such mental formulation and the symphonies' finished forms. In the Eighth Symphony drafts, two different variants of the second

movement allow a comparison of the composer's original ideas and his second thoughts, and illuminate how the actual writing of the movement led to its revision.

Shostakovich's manuscripts point to a basic hypothesis of creating, namely, that detailed mental preparation was followed by the act of writing, which could suggest further ideas, as well as allow the recording of diverse thoughts occurring to a constantly creative mind.

Intersecting with other areas of Shostakovich scholarship, this study also shows how sketch materials illuminate biographical and historical circumstances surrounding the composition of Symphonies Nos. 8 and 10, as well as questions of meaning in this music.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Sketches and drafts, along with a variety of other manuscripts, document the compositional history of Shostakovich's Eighth and Tenth Symphonies and offer insights into the composer's creative process. For the Eighth Symphony, twenty-six sketch sheets, identified as "D. Shostakovich–8th Symphony–1943," record a complete draft of the work in a late stage of composition, together with rejected versions of an inner movement. On 15 January 1945, Shostakovich began sketching a new symphony; but the music was not, as might be expected judging by the dates of the Eighth, the Ninth Symphony written later that year, nor any other completed work that we know. Yet ideas from the sketch can be found in the Tenth Symphony and in several smaller pieces written between 1945 and 1953. By late 1953, Shostakovich had sketched the Tenth Symphony in its entirety on 56 manuscript pages, which reveal a mid-to-late stage in his preparation of the work. Other manuscripts containing music from Symphonies Nos. 8 and 10 include excerpts from the autograph scores, proof sheets, a list of themes, partial orchestrations of rejected versions of movements from 1943 and 1945, and a file of unidentified documents that contain some music linked to the symphonies. Shostakovich's sketches, drafts, and miscellaneous documents reveal stages of his compositional process, as well as aspects of his life, habits, personal circumstances, and even character. This dissertation is a study and interpretation of these manuscripts, made

in the hope of illuminating the documentary legacy and understanding of Shostakovich's creativity.

Little is known about Shostakovich's compositional documents prior to his finished scores. While scholars have reported on the composer's life—biographies, reminiscences, overviews of music, the publication of letters and personal papers—and have pondered the interpretation of his music, only a handful of Russian scholars, in recent times, have begun to list and describe his sketches.¹ As this investigation continues, we can now examine the nature of the sketches, their extent, and how they shed light on the composer's creative process.

In 2002, Manashir Iakubov, curator of the Dmitri Shostakovich Archive in Moscow, wrote of an “enormous number” of compositional manuscripts that survive from the composer's creative life.² In short articles in the *New Collected Works* edition of Shostakovich's music, Iakubov refers to documents that he calls “sketches,” “outlines,” “drafts,” and “rough author's manuscripts.” Their value, he emphasizes, is their number, and the understanding they allow of Shostakovich's creative process.

[A] **vast body** of rough author's manuscripts [has] survived.³

¹ Dmitri Shostakovich, *New Collected Works*, ed. Manashir Iakubov [hereinafter: NCW], 150 vols. [projected] (Moscow: DSCH, 2000–), vols. 1–6, 9, 16–21, 24. Orchestral scores of Symphonies Nos. 1–6 and 9 are published in volumes 1–6 and 9 of the *New Collected Works*. Piano arrangements of these symphonies are in volumes 16–21 and 24. Some volumes also contain facsimile reproductions of Shostakovich's manuscripts, accompanied by explanatory articles by Iakubov. See also Olga Digonskaya, “Neizvestniye avtografi Shostakovicha v GTsMMK” [Unknown autographs of Shostakovich in GTsMMK], in *Shostakovich-Urtext*, ed. Marina P. Rakhmanova (Moscow: Glinka Museum of Musical Culture, 2006), 144–69, and “Simfonicheskiy fragment 1945 goda” [Symphonic fragment from 1945], *Muzikal'naya akademiya* 2 (2006): 97–107. Iakubov's and Digonskaya's work will be discussed later in this chapter.

² NCW, 3:211.

³ NCW, 16:166. Emphasis added.

Shostakovich's **numerous outlines and rough drafts** . . . are of immense value for studying his creative work.⁴

Acquaintance with the **enormous number of Shostakovich's rough drafts and outlines** shows [how] work on a new composition often began.⁵

Archives in Moscow began to receive Shostakovich's compositional documents during the composer's lifetime. Levon Atovm'yan, the composer's friend and music editor, collected papers and manuscripts from Shostakovich, and sometimes from his housekeeper, who saved discarded documents at Atovm'yan's request.⁶ The manuscripts in Atovm'yan's possession included sketches and drafts, which made their way into the Glinka Museum of Musical Culture in 1964.⁷ Around the same time, musicologist Grigoriy Shneyerson, with whom Shostakovich had corresponded for nearly twenty years, also gave the Museum a large collection of documents, which included "musical manuscripts."⁸ Pursuant to an interest in sketch studies, an affiliate at the Museum had published a three-volume work on Beethoven's sketches shortly before these donations were received. Natan Fishman had found the Vielgorsky sketchbook, probably acquired by Count Mikhail Vielgorsky in the mid- to late-1850s, but lost in Russia around 1900.

⁴ NCW, 1:10. Emphasis added.

⁵ NCW, 16:166. Emphasis added.

⁶ In reminiscences published in 1991, Atovm'yan recalled asking Shostakovich's housekeeper to give him papers and manuscripts from the composer's rubbish. Levon Atovm'yan, "Iz vospominaniy," publ. C. Merzhanovaya, *Muzikal'naya akademiya* 4 (1997): 250. The fact that Atovm'yan resorted to this method of collecting may indicate that Shostakovich resisted having some papers preserved, whether from a sense of privacy, a devaluation of pre-final manuscripts, or a desire to shape his own image.

⁷ Olga Digonskaya, "Neizvestniye avtografy," 152.

⁸ I.A. Bobikina, ed., *Dmitriy Shostakovich v pis'makh i dokumentakh* [Dmitri Shostakovich through his letters and documents] (Moscow: Glinka State Central Museum of Musical Culture, 2000), 5. From 1942 to 1948, Shneyerson was the musical consultant for VOKS (All-Union Society for Cultural Contact with Foreign Countries), and subsequently (1948–61) was in charge of the foreign department for the journal *Sovetskaya Muzika*. Shostakovich's letters to Shneyerson, as reproduced in Bobikina's edition, are professional in content. It is not clear what kind of "musical manuscripts" Shneyerson might have possessed.

After the Revolution, the sketchbook was rediscovered in a state archive in Moscow; in 1943, it was moved to the Glinka Museum; and in 1962, Fishman published a 174-page facsimile of the sketches, with a second volume containing his transcription and a third his analysis and commentary.⁹ Fishman's study is important because he was Shostakovich's contemporary, studying sketches as a window onto creative process in precisely the archive where many of Shostakovich's own compositional documents would soon be preserved. In 1963, reviewing Fishman's publication, Malcolm Hamrick Brown commented that

Fishman attempts to explicate the creative genesis and development of the works represented in the Vielgorsky sketchbook. This involves more than the mere mechanical comparison of sketches in various stages of evolution: he seeks to *explain* the creative process, rather than simply to describe it.¹⁰

Fishman's study, Brown judged, was "a musicological contribution of major importance"¹¹ because of its author's expertise in working with sketches and linking them to creative process. In the Soviet Union, too, the study garnered recognition; and, in 1968, Fishman was awarded a doctorate from the Moscow Conservatory for his work. After Fishman, it is reasonable to suppose that a collection of Shostakovich manuscripts,

⁹ The Vielgorsky (also "Wielhorsky") sketchbook dates from fall 1802 to May 1803 and includes sketches for the Piano Sonata in E-flat Major, Op. 31, no. 3; Variations for Piano, Opp. 34 and 35; a cadenza perhaps for a piano concerto in A; Bagatelles for Piano, Op. 33, no. 1 and Op. 119, no. 3; early ideas for the Third Symphony; Terzetto for Soprano, Tenor, and Bass with Orchestra, "Tremate, empi, temate," Op. 116; Duetto for Soprano, Tenor, and Orchestra, "Nei giorni tuoi felici," WoO 93; Duetto, "Languisco e moro," Hess 229; *Christus am Oelberge*, Op. 85; and the Violin Sonata in E Minor ("Kreutzer"), Op. 47. Douglas Johnson, Alan Tyson, Robert Winter, *The Beethoven Sketchbooks*, ed. Douglas Johnson (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985), 133–34.

¹⁰ Malcolm Hamrick Brown, "*Kniga eskizov Betkhovena za 1802–1803 gody. Issledovanie i rasshifrovka N.L. Fishmana. S dvumya prilozheniyami. (Gosudarstvennyĭ muzeĭ muzykalnoĭ kultury imeni M. I. Glinki.)*" *Notes* 20, no. 3 (Summer, 1963): 462.

¹¹ Brown, "*Kniga*," 463.

in the same archive, might have attracted similar attention. Yet Fishman dealt with a composer whose sketches and creative process were already established as an area of serious study, whereas Shostakovich was still alive, and to this day his documents are being catalogued. The extent, moreover, of Atovm'yan's and Shneyerson's donations is not clear, nor the number of manuscripts in their possession, the degree of randomness or cohesion among documents, or the conditions whereby they were received and preserved. The literature is silent about Shostakovich's sketches.

As scholars of Shostakovich have now begun to acknowledge his compositional manuscripts, we can begin to address questions of creative process. To date, the *New Collected Works* contains facsimiles of manuscripts for Symphonies Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 9, as well as for some non-symphonic, large-scale works¹² and a few unfinished works for orchestra.¹³ For each set of documents, short articles in the *New Collected Works* offer detailed physical descriptions, a summary of musical content, and a list of discrepancies with the autograph score. The explications highlight the variety of Shostakovich's documents, as well as great differences or disparity of appearance and methods of preparation. Shostakovich's manuscripts show that he sketched his way to final versions and that his method of sketching varied for different works. However, the nature, types, and value of his manuscripts are as yet unexplored. The question of how Shostakovich composed has not been asked, nor his sketches queried for the insight they can provide into the composer's creative thinking.

¹² Volume 98, for example, contains facsimiles of Shostakovich's sketches for the Piano Trio No. 2, Op. 67.

¹³ Volume 3, of the Third Symphony, also contains a facsimile of an unfinished work, which Iakubov designates "Unfinished Symphony of 1934 (Fragment *Adagio*)".

Lack of exposure and commentary limits an assessment of Shostakovich's manuscripts in relation to his overall process. Sketch study in Shostakovich is, moreover, hampered by an understanding of sketches and creative process that differs substantially from the one espoused by Fishman, by uncertainty as to what materials actually exist, and by difficulty of confirmation and archival access. This chapter will elaborate these issues. Examining the Russian usage of the terms *sketch* and *creative process* in reference to the Shostakovich literature shows that sketch study in Shostakovich follows a period in which descriptions of the composer's creativity were mainly laudatory tributes to his completed works, and sketches, if mentioned, were dismissed as unnecessary for his creative genius. As a rule, there is no commentary about sketches or compositional documents in the secondary literature; and even the recent exposition of manuscripts is limited to describing and coordinating these documents with events in Shostakovich's life. Moreover, terminology in the new discussion is confusing, because the Russian word *eskiz*, or "sketch," is sometimes applied to anything before a final score, sometimes exchanged for other terms, and sometimes explicitly defined as a near-final entity, a meaning opposite to that of its English-language equivalent. A review of the literature, organized by genre, locates sketch study as a new discipline, which most scholars have not explored, given the topics and emphases of their work, and for which the sources have been largely unavailable anyway. In closing, the present chapter offers a discussion of archival research, its challenges for sketch work in Shostakovich, and the new evidence of manuscripts that makes a study of the composer's creative process increasingly important.

A first challenge for sketch study in Shostakovich is the term *creative or compositional process*. It has been used in reference to Shostakovich; but in Russian it refers not to its simple denotation, as in English, but to a history or chronicle of a piece, or to Shostakovich's "creative genius" in composing it. Discourse on process is only now beginning to include sketches that document stages of composition, illuminate compositional decisions, or show substantial revisions of earlier ideas. Yet a Russian association of process with biography and of sketch with any manuscript antecedent to an autograph score means that nothing like Fishman's work on the Vielgorsky sketchbook has yet been attempted on Shostakovich's music, and the Russian connotation of *compositional process* is not clear to Western readers.

Statements about Shostakovich's creativity, made by his editors, the composer himself, and his contemporaries, have influenced the Russian understanding of his compositional process, which is one of total conception and command of a work before it is written down. Sketches, by implication, are neither a systematic nor systemic part of the creative process. The Soviet-era *Sobraniye sochineniy*, or *Collected Works*, mentions sketches for film, incidental music, and a few quartets, but says nothing more about them, while editorial prefaces chronicle the genesis of pieces by citing interviews with the composer, press articles, biographies, and diaries or comments from contemporaries. Scores are based "on autographs or copies endorsed by the composer . . . [the texts of which] are collated with Shostakovich's manuscripts, proof sheets, manuscript and printed copies containing his corrections, records carrying his performances and other available material."¹⁴ Only a passing reference acknowledges documents that pre-date

¹⁴ "Other available material" seems to include editions published during Shostakovich's lifetime and approved by the composer, hand-written copies of manuscript scores, or orchestral

autograph scores, and sometimes follow them too, and that these are relevant to Shostakovich's "creative process":

Dmitri Shostakovich's autographs, the chief source of this publication, are so illuminating as to deserve special discussion . . . [they] contain very few alterations (corrections, crossings-out, deletions, etc.), **while his rough copies (few in number) that have come to us are for the most part mere outlines of thematic material and sketches, and not complete works. This gives an idea of Shostakovich's creative process, of the clarity of his conceptions embracing the form as a whole down to the minutest details of texture and instrumentation.** It was usually while preparing a work for publication or in the process of proof-reading that the composer made corrections, not drastic, just a few finishing touches. This probably explains **the absence, with a few exceptions, of revised versions in Shostakovich's legacy.**¹⁵

The impression of such remarks is that Shostakovich wrote straight to score without preparing or revising his ideas. Indeed, the composer's own statements seemed to confirm this. As a twenty-year-old, fresh from the success of his First Symphony, Shostakovich completed a questionnaire on the psychology of the creative process, his responses emphasizing the totality, sophistication, and permanence of his compositional decisions:

I always feel the 'initial form.' It is always completely clear to me what should be the beginning, the middle, and the end of a composition, and where the moments of tension and release belong.

The external embodiment of a work occurs only after it has been completely conceived and worked out mentally.

The external embodiment always moves along more quickly than the process of mental formulation and often suggests new

parts from which a full score is reconstructed. Dmitriy Shostakovich, *Sobraniye sochineniy v soroka dvukh tomakh* [Collected works in forty-two volumes] (Moscow: Muzika, 1979–88), vol. 1, "Publisher's Note," (unpaginated).

¹⁵ Ibid. Emphasis added.

possibilities for treating the material. The reverse, i.e., the impossibility of embodying that which has been thought through in me, doesn't happen . . .

I never return to a composition once it has been written out (*this is always the case, so there's no point in giving an example*).

On completion of the external embodiment of a work, I experience complete satisfaction (*always*).¹⁶

As an old man, Shostakovich again answered questions about his creative process, his replies laconic but in line with his youthful remarks:

Q. In the first seconds of a new idea, how does it appear to you? Is the integrity of the future composition inherent in this instant?

A. Inherent.

Q. Does the process of composition begin with whatever details arise, by chance, or does “the vision” of the whole always dominate?

A. “The vision” of the whole always predominates . . .

Shostakovich expressed similar views in several different answers. To the question of how he wrote sketches, he replied, ‘My sketches are complete.’¹⁷

Soviet musicologist Ivan Martīnov was acquainted with Shostakovich. Before publishing a survey of the composer's life and works through 1946, Martīnov submitted his manuscript to Shostakovich for review. With justified confidence, he described the composer's work habits:

¹⁶ “Responses of Shostakovich to a Questionnaire on the Psychology of the Creative Process,” prep. Roman Ilich Gruber, in *Shostakovich and His World*, ed. Laurel E. Fay (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), 35–36. Original emphasis. Gruber conducted his survey in 1927–28 with teachers at the Leningrad Conservatory and graduates who had become members of the Leningrad Association of Contemporary Music (LASM). Shostakovich responded orally to Gruber's questions, then reviewed and added to the answers. Plain text indicates Shostakovich's words, transcribed by Gruber. Italicized text represents Shostakovich's handwritten additions.

¹⁷ Aranovsky wrote to Shostakovich in 1973 to ask the composer about his “creative process.” M. Aranovsky, “Zametki o tvorchestve” [Notes on creative work], *Sovetskaya muzika* 49, no. 9 (1981): 21–22.

Shostakovich always worked with extraordinary facility and speed . . . [It is a fact] that he sets his orchestration into the score at once, that he conceives of his compositions in all their detail and writes them down with phenomenal speed. There is something Mozartian in his complete mastery of musical material.¹⁸

Writing a biography of the composer, David Rabinovich included comments on Shostakovich's symphonies. Like Martīnov, he was emphatic that Shostakovich, a creative genius, did not need sketches:

[He] thinks in terms of the orchestra . . . The orchestral timbres come to him at the same time as the melody, harmony and rhythm, at the moment the idea is born. This makes it unnecessary for him to begin by writing the piano sketch of a future work—he never composes seated at the piano, but sits at his desk and writes the whole score straight off. He seldom makes “rough copies,” and the one and only version of a score rarely contains erasures or corrections . . .

Shostakovich does not belong to the category of composers who build up their works from a series of rough drafts, from some preliminary sketches.¹⁹

Such declarations aside, the absence of any material prior to a final score would be striking for any composer; and at a time when evidence of origin and process is highly valued across disciplines, the lack of such information for Shostakovich's music is odd. Yet a mythology thus established was bound to devalue, even disregard documentation, and contributed to silence about manuscripts. Given Shostakovich's own statements, plus little evidence or inquiry to the contrary, it appeared that his music was put to paper whole and complete. Such remarks forestalled scholarship and encouraged a connotation

¹⁸ Ivan Martīnov, *Shostakovich: The Man and His Work*, trans. T. Gural'sky (New York: Philosophical Library, 1947), 154–55.

¹⁹ David Abramovich Rabinovich, *Dmitry Shostakovich*, trans. George Hanna (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1959), 7.

of *compositional process* equated with Mozartian mastery or accounts of Shostakovich's life and whereabouts while composing. There was nothing else to report.

Manashir Iakubov, however, boldly states that the situation is quite different:

The idea encountered in the literature that the composer wrote his symphonies, quartets, and so on "straight to score" is refuted by the vast body of rough author's manuscripts that have survived.²⁰

This testimony to a "vast body" of documents, in fact preserved in archives (for decades), follows a period in which the myth of Shostakovich's Mozartian fluency was generally accepted, even perpetuated. We might presume that Martinov, Rabinovich, and the editors of the *Collected Works* did not know about or have access to Shostakovich's sketches. Yet evidence from other composers tends to disprove the idea of composer as mysterious creator. What Martinov, for example, could not have known in 1946 was that a parallel to Mozart could last only as long as the legends of Mozart's compositional facility, transformed in the 1980s and 1990s by sketch research.²¹ Moreover, when Russian musicologists studied Russian composers, sketches were assumed. At the turn of the twentieth century, Sergey Taneyev had used Tchaikovsky's sketches to reconstruct lost works. Pavel Lamm pioneered study of Musorgsky's music and, in preparing a collected works edition, studied hundreds of autographs showing various stages of

²⁰ NCW, 16:166.

²¹ See Alan Tyson, *Mozart: Studies of the Autograph Scores* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1987); Ulrich Konrad, *Mozarts Schaffensweise: Studien zu den Werkautographen, Skizzen und Entwüpfen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992); Lázsló Somfai, "Sketches during the Process of Composition: Studies of K.504 and K.414," in *Wolfgang Amadé Mozart: Essays on His Life and His Music*, ed. Stanley Sadie (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996): 53–65; and Sieghard Brandenburg, ed., *Haydn, Mozart, & Beethoven: Studies in the Music of the Classical Period: Essays in Honor of Alan Tyson* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1998).

composition.²² More recently, Polina Vaydman, chief archivist of the Tchaikovsky Museum in Klin, published *Tvorcheskiy arkhiv P.I. Chaykovskogo*, or *Tchaikovsky's Creative Archive*, a book that discussed the “creative legacy” of the composer—what Vaydman described as “drafts, sketches, autograph works, authoritative copies, proof-sheets, scene plans, that is, all the well-known types of documents preserved in the USSR and abroad.”²³

If these composers sketched and their sketches had value, on what basis would Shostakovich have been considered different? Why were Martinov and Rabinovich so emphatic that he was of a different “category of composers”? Iakubov suggests that a denial of sketches shows the inclination “to create a romantically mythologized aura of ‘the artist.’”²⁴ Perhaps in conjunction with this tendency, silence stemmed from a policy endorsed by Shostakovich to preserve his image as Soviet icon and artist genius. Even if Shostakovich’s contemporaries were idealizing, the composer did nothing to counter the impression. If his autobiographical accounts were anything like Stravinsky’s, who wrote for posterity and wanted to form a particular image of himself, Shostakovich might have been perpetuating an image, too, the esoteric composer-creator. Or did he attach no importance to compositional materials, only to scores that he “never returned to” because they were complete and, in his mind, had superseded the others? A devaluation of pre-final materials, in keeping with a natural tendency to privilege finished works, may partially explain the lack of information about sketches. Moreover, sensitivity about the image that Shostakovich cultivated in comments and self-descriptions over a lifetime

²² Modest Musorgsky, *Complete Works*, ed. Pavel Lamm, 8 vols. (New York: Kalmus, 1969).

²³ Polina Vaydman, *Tvorcheskiy arkhiv P.I. Chaykovskogo* [Tchaikovsky’s Creative Archive] (Moscow: Muzika, 1988), 3.

²⁴ NCW, 16:166, n. 1.

may also have contributed to reluctance in exposing or assessing his manuscripts. We now know, as we do of Mozart, Tchaikovsky, and Musorgsky, that Shostakovich left sketches and drafts, labeled meticulously in his own hand and preserved. His documents record the compositional history of major works; and in some cases, they permit us to examine creative process.

A review of the Shostakovich bibliography, organized by genre, reveals the place that sketch study can fill. While a lack of commentary on sketches is neither surprising nor improper, given the topics of Shostakovich scholarship, review shows that the recent exposition of manuscripts does not essentially change the situation created by lack of knowledge and exposure, but involves tentativeness in assessing sketches and their implications for Shostakovich's creativity.

Biography is an important genre of the Shostakovich literature, the composer's two principal biographers being the Russian Sof'ya Khentova²⁵ and the American Laurel Fay, whose book is the seminal study of Shostakovich's life.²⁶ Khentova writes prolifically, from biographical survey²⁷ to histories by locale (a popular Soviet genre following famous people in specific cities or locations)²⁸ to reports based on personal interviews with Shostakovich and his contemporaries.²⁹ Nevertheless, her work has been

²⁵ Sof'ya Khentova, *Shostakovich: zhizn' i tvorchestvo* [Shostakovich: life and works], 2 vols. (Leningrad: Sovetskiy kompozitor, 1985–86; 2nd ed., Moscow: Kompozitor, 1996).

²⁶ Laurel E. Fay, *Shostakovich: A Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

²⁷ Khentova, *Zhizn'*.

²⁸ Sof'ya Khentova, *Shostakovich i Sibir'* [Shostakovich and Siberia] (Novosibirsk: Novosibirskoye Knizhnoye Izdatel'stvo, 1990); *Shostakovich v Moskve* [Shostakovich in Moscow] (Moscow: Moskovskiy rabochiy, 1986); *Shostakovich v Petrograde-Leningrade* [Shostakovich in Petrograd-Leningrad] (Leningrad: Lenizdat, 1979).

²⁹ Sof'ya Khentova, *Udivitel'niy Shostakovich* [The surprising Shostakovich] (St. Petersburg: Variant, 1993); *V mire Shostakovicha: zapisi besed c D.D. Shostakovichem* [In Shostakovich's world: a record of conversations with D.D. Shostakovich] (Moscow: Kompozitor, 1996). Articles include "Shostakovich i Khachaturyan: ikh sblizil 48-y god" [Shostakovich and Khachaturian: 1948 brought them closer together], *Muzikal'naya zhizn'* 24 (1988): 10–11;

criticized for bias, faulty method, and insufficient documentation, and a revision of her two-volume biography also cited for unsubstantiated claims.³⁰ Fay described the work of her Soviet counterpart as “a minefield of misinformation and misrepresentation, incorrect dates and facts, errors of every stripe,” but acknowledged that some of these errors seemed inadvertently derived from earlier Soviet sources, while others were the effect of censorship.³¹ Offering a corrective, Fay suggested, her own book was an attempt to clarify the biographical record as much as possible and to trace the composer through other sources, including “period newspapers, concert programs and reviews, personnel files, transcripts, letters, and diaries.”³² Hers is the most comprehensive evaluation of biographical material held in the archives of Moscow and St. Petersburg. Other writers who chronicled Shostakovich’s life and music included Martīnov and Rabinovich, mentioned earlier, as well as Viktor Seroff and Christopher Norris.³³ Theirs were smaller works that traced biographical events and histories of individual pieces. Fay occasionally mentioned a sketch in documenting of the chronology of Shostakovich’s composition. Khentova, by contrast, boldly stated that “Shostakovich usually . . . wrote [the score] immediately, as he heard it,” her remark implicitly

“Shostakovich i Rostropovich” [Shostakovich and Rostropovich], *Muzikal’naya zhizn’* 16 (1990): 24–28; “Zhenshchinī v zhizni Shostakovicha” [The women in Shostakovich’s Life], *Vremya i mi* (1991): 217–78; “Na auktsione Sotbi—snova pis’ma o lyubvi” [At a Sotheby’s auction—more love letters], *Muzikal’naya zhizn’* 7 (1994): 26–28.

³⁰ Laurel Fay notes that 100 copies of this revised edition were published in Moscow in 1996 but that most mistakes from the original book were not corrected, nor was new information included, although much had been published in the ten years between Khentova’s editions. Fay, *A Life*, 288, n. 5.

³¹ Fay, *A Life*, 3

³² *Ibid.* Of course, primary sources also have their pitfalls and are never unflinchingly accurate.

³³ Martīnov, *Shostakovich*; Rabinovich, *Dmitry Shostakovich*; Victor Ilyitch Seroff, *Dmitri Shostakovich: The Life and Background of a Soviet Composer* (New York: Knopf, 1943); Christopher Norris, ed., *Shostakovich: The Man and His Music* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1982).

disregarding any stage of writing prior to a score.³⁴ Given Khentova's testimony, not to mention her presumed authority as Shostakovich's contemporary, biographer, and interviewer, it is hardly surprising if other writers overlooked the question of sketches in favor of examining other aspects of the composer's life and works.

Reminiscence is a beloved Russian genre, which has enjoyed a high profile in Shostakovich studies in the years since the composer died.³⁵ Like biography, reminiscence of Shostakovich emphasizes the story of the composer's life, but focuses on memory and anecdote. In 1979, Solomon Volkov published *Testimony*, a book he claimed was Shostakovich's own memoirs, recounted in secret meetings. Portraying the composer as a dissident who encoded angst and political critique in his works, *Testimony* suggested that Shostakovich's political views were the proper framework for interpreting his music. The book sparked debate, not just for this claim but also over the authenticity of the memoirs themselves. Yet Volkov, who claimed to have met with Shostakovich over four years and to have discussed intimately the details of the composer's writing of music, apparently never indicated curiosity about the process of composition or mentioned seeing musical manuscripts. However dubious his claim to first-hand knowledge of Shostakovich's creative impulses,³⁶ the lack of any mention of manuscripts

³⁴ Khentova, *Zhizn'*, 1:145. Khentova acknowledged that Shostakovich wrote a piano draft of the First Symphony before orchestrating it; but she stated that the draft "has not survived" and implied that after the First Symphony, Shostakovich typically did not sketch (1:132, 145). The piano draft has been found and is facsimiled in volume 16 of the *New Collected Works*.

³⁵ A glance through bibliographies on other famous Russians—Dostoyevsky, Tolstoy, Turgenyev, Mandelstam, Lenin, Asaf'yev, and Prokofiev—turns up hundreds of memoirs.

³⁶ Irina Shostakovich, the composer's widow, states that Volkov had only three interviews with Shostakovich, each of which lasted for approximately two hours and two of which took place in the presence of Shostakovich's former student and colleague, Boris Tishchenko. She categorically denies that Volkov had the four years of privileged access that he claims. Irina Shostakovich, "An Answer to Those Who Still Abuse Shostakovich" *New York Times*, 20 August 2000, late edition, sec. 2.

pertinent to his topic is striking. Nevertheless, because of Volkov's book, determining how politics related to meaning in Shostakovich's music became a crucial question in the field. The subject of the composer's creativity did not.

A by-product or implication of the Shostakovich debate was an interest in the humanity of the composer, and in memories and reminiscences that could shed light on the representation of Shostakovich as either loyal Soviet or dissident composer. The reflections of his contemporaries seemed to provide such a window onto this question of who Shostakovich really was and what his music meant. In the early 1990s, Elizabeth Wilson collected reminiscences for *Shostakovich: A Life Remembered*. Wilson's book is an oral history, valuable for the breadth and number of its interviews and the time frame when they were collected—just after the Soviet era had ended but less than twenty years after Shostakovich's death. Two years after Wilson, Khentova published a collection of interviews that she had conducted with over sixty of Shostakovich's friends and family members and with the composer himself.³⁷ Other memoirs were narrower in scope. Betty Schwarz published *Shostakovich—kakim zapomnilsya*, her own memories of Shostakovich.³⁸ Michael Ardov interviewed Shostakovich's children and also included some of his own memories.³⁹ Journals and commemorative publications regularly

³⁷ Khentova, *V mire*.

³⁸ Betty Schwarz, *Shostakovich—kakim zapomnilsya* [Shostakovich—with what remembered] (St. Petersburg: Kompozitor, 2006).

³⁹ Ardov describes himself as a friend of Shostakovich's children and a regular guest in the Shostakovich home, but states that he never knew the composer well. In his book, he also reproduces passages from Khentova's biography and other published sources. Mikhail Ardov, *Shostakovich v vospominaniyakh sina Maksima, docheri Galini i protoiyereya Mikhaila Ardova* [Shostakovich in the memories of his son Maxim, his daughter Galina, and the Reverend Michael Ardov] (Moscow: Zakharov, 2003), 7–8; trans. Rosanna Kelly and Michael Meylac in *Memories of Shostakovich: Interviews with the Composer's Children by the Revd Michael Ardov* (London: Short Books, 2004).

contained laudatory reflections, tributes, and articles in honor of the composer.⁴⁰ In a work that depended heavily on memoirs, Allen Ho and Dmitri Feofanov put *Testimony* “on trial” in *Shostakovich Reconsidered* and presented reminiscences to support their judgment that *Testimony* was true.⁴¹ In response, Malcolm Hamrick Brown’s *Shostakovich: A Casebook* also cited interviews and recollections, but highlighted *Testimony*’s fraudulent claims. Reminiscence is a varied genre in Shostakovich studies, and its scope is great; but it does not produce insights about sketches, documents of composition, or a creative process traceable beyond the time and place of a work’s composition.

The role of reminiscence in Shostakovich points to another issue, namely, the reliability of memory, not to mention the faultiness that can sometimes arise from particular motivations. When Fay cautioned that memoirs are “a treacherous resource to the historian,” she spoke of forces that can shape memory and of the need for verifiable fact to counter potential distortion:

⁴⁰ Retrospectives were collected after Shostakovich’s death— *Sovetskaya Muzika* contained multiple tributes—and on anniversaries of his birth, when he was honored as a teacher, composer, friend, and colleague. Now, each decade from Shostakovich’s birth is marked by tribute, whether in reminiscence, dedicatory publication, or both. While many retrospectives are highly ceremonial, some more recent dedicatory publications include articles on new research in Shostakovich and occasionally bring to light unpublished documents. Some of these will be mentioned in the genre of anthologies. See E.B. Dolinskaya, ed., *Shostakovichu posvyashchayetsya: sbornik statey k 90-letiyu kompozitora, 1906–1996* [Dedicated to Shostakovich: anthology of articles for the 90th anniversary of the composer, 1906–1996] (Moscow: Kompozitor, 1997); L.G. Kovnatskaya, ed., *D.D. Shostakovich: sbornik statey k 90-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya* [D.D. Shostakovich: anthology of articles for the 90th anniversary of his birth] (St. Petersburg: Kompozitor, 1996); V.N. Batsun and T.V. Kozhevnikova, *Nash Shostakovich: posvyashchayetsya k 100-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya D.D. Shostakovicha, sbornik nauchnikh rabot studentov muzikal’no-pedagogicheskogo otdeleniya* [Our Shostakovich: dedicated to the 100th anniversary of the birth of D.D. Shostakovich, an anthology of specialist work by the students of the musico-pedagogical department] (Samara: Samarskiy gosudarstvenniy pedagogicheskiy universitet, 2006).

⁴¹ They concluded that “*Testimony* is neither fiction nor an anomaly, but merely the last of many courageous attempts by Shostakovich to speak the truth.” Allen Ho and Dmitri Feofanov, *Shostakovich Reconsidered* (London: Toccata Press, 1998), 15.

Reminiscences can be self-serving, vengeful, and distorted by faulty memory, selective amnesia, wishful thinking, and exaggeration. They can be rife with gossip and rumor. The temptation to recast the past to suit the present—especially now, when the victims and survivors of the Soviet “experiment” are grappling with discomfiting issues of complicity and culpability with a shameful past—can be hard to resist. In any case, factual accuracy is not generally one of their most salient features. Memoirs need to be treated with extreme care, evaluated critically, and corroborated by reference to established fact.⁴²

Fay’s comments illustrate an impetus in Shostakovich studies to verify—and, where necessary, correct—the historical and biographical record. As we now know, the composer’s sketches are part of that record; and whatever the motivations, conscious or inadvertent, that led to silence about them, their recent exposure makes dealing with them a historiographical imperative.

In addition to biography and reminiscence, documentation of the composer’s life comes in personal papers and public documents that Shostakovich wrote. “Letters to” and “Shostakovich about” are frequent phrases in the bibliography and refer to collections of the composer’s correspondence with family, friends, or colleagues or to his public statements about famous people. Khentova in the 1990s published excerpts from Shostakovich’s letters to his lover Yelena Konstantinovskaya,⁴³ while the composer’s

⁴² Fay, *A Life*, 2–3. Psychologist Elizabeth Loftus states that human memory is basically unreliable, with or without motivation. Busyness of life, interest (or lack of it) in a subject, confusion or conflation of events and experiences, trauma, familiarity with an object, person, or event, lack of concentration, or simply failure to commit to memory are a few of the many reasons she cites for the capriciousness of recall. “Memory is imperfect,” she comments, “because we often do not see things accurately in the first place. But even if we take in a reasonably accurate picture of some experience, it does not necessarily stay perfectly intact in memory . . . [but can] undergo distortion . . . Even in the most intelligent among us is memory thus malleable.” Elizabeth Loftus, *Memory: Surprising New Insights into How We Remember and Why We Forget* (Reading, Mass.: Addison–Wesley, 1980), 37.

⁴³ Shostakovich’s letters to Yelena Konstantinovskaya in Khentova, *Udivitel’niy Shostakovich*, 116–30. Konstantinovskaya received forty-two letters and three telegrams from

letters to his mother, spanning over thirty years, are reproduced in a variety of sources.⁴⁴

The most complete collections of correspondence to particular addressees are the letters to Isaak Glikman and to Boris Tishchenko, published in the 1990s and in English translation in 2001.⁴⁵ In 2000, the Glinka Museum of Musical Culture published the 570-page *Dmitri Shostakovich through His Letters and Documents*, which conveyed the Museum's holdings of Shostakovich's letters to more than one hundred correspondents over fifty years. The most recent addition to the published letters are those to Ivan Ivanovich Sollertinsky, written between 1927 and 1944, and published in 2006.⁴⁶ Yet many letters, in archives and private hands, remain unpublished. When available for study, this correspondence, from professional communications to love letters, will add texture and color to the composer's biography, though probably not to an understanding of his creative life.⁴⁷ Apart from occasional references to the contemplation or

Shostakovich. In *Udivitel'niy Shostakovich* and *V mire*, Khentova reproduced excerpts from the same twenty-six letters. *Udivitel'niy Shostakovich* contains the more complete versions.

⁴⁴ Rosa Sadykhova comments that some of these letters, written when Shostakovich was embarking on his professional career, "are so sincere and contain so much direct perception of life that they give us a sufficiently full picture of the character of the young composer." "Shostakovich: Letters to His Mother, 1923–1927," selected by Dmitrii Frederiks and Rosa Sadykhova, in *Shostakovich and His World*, 1–26. See also Kovnatskaya, ed., *Shostakovich: sbornik*.

⁴⁵ Isaak Glikman, *Pis'ma k drugu: Dmitriy Shostakovich Isaaku Glikmanu* [Letters to a friend: Dmitri Shostakovich to Isaac Glikman] (Moscow: DSCH, 1993); trans. Anthony Philips in *Story of a Friendship: The Letters of Dmitry Shostakovich to Isaak Glikman, 1941–1975* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001); and Boris Tishchenko, *Pis'ma Dmitriya Dmitriyevicha Shostakovicha Borisu Tishchenko: s kommentariyami i vospominaniyami adresata* (St. Petersburg: Kompozitor, 1997); trans. Asy Ardova in *Letters of Dmitri Shostakovich to Boris Tishchenko* (Sankt-Peterburg: Kompozitor, 2001). Glikman was Shostakovich's secretary from 1936. Boris Tishchenko studied with Shostakovich at the Leningrad Conservatory in the 1960s, and they maintained a friendship until the composer's death in 1975.

⁴⁶ Dmitriy Shostakovich, *Pis'ma I.I. Sollertinskomu* [Letters to Sollertinsky] (St. Petersburg: Kompozitor, 2006).

⁴⁷ According to archivists at the Dmitri Shostakovich Archive, there are "thousands" of unpublished letters related to Shostakovich's professional life, especially from his later years when he held important positions in the Soviet music world. These have to do almost entirely with business, official petitions, thanks or tributes, and the like, and shed little, if any, light on the

composition of particular works, his published letters do not mention compositional process or documents. In contrast with this publishing of documents that illuminate the composer's life, comparable interest and exposition have not similarly exposed his musical manuscripts—a lapse, even imbalance if a “vast body” exists,⁴⁸ that has supported the impression of lack of documents, of knowledge about them, or possibly of little value in them.

In another genre of the literature, chronological and cultural survey, scholars who study Shostakovich's social, historical, or political milieu, as well as his musical and artistic influences, draw on history books, biography, letters, diaries, musical and literary studies, and records of Shostakovich's professional activities in Soviet society. Representative are Eric Roseberry's *Shostakovich: His Life and Times*, which traces the composer's life and whereabouts during major events in Soviet Russia, and Volkov's *Shostakovich and Stalin*, described by its author as a cultural history.⁴⁹ Volkov claims personal knowledge of his subject,⁵⁰ while Roseberry relies on secondary sources, including histories, biographies, and published articles. None of these studies sets out to deal with compositional process, which reasonably seems a different topic from broad survey of the composer's life and times. Scholars who examine artistic influences on

composer's music or creativity. Most of this correspondence is preserved in the Russian State Archive of Literature and Art (RGALI). Unpublished personal letters, like those to Lidiya Vasil'yevna Amanovaya, his nurse in hospital in 1947, are not available for research at present. The composer's affair with Lidiya Vasil'yevna probably lasted only a few months, his eleven letters dating from 19 January through 8 May 1947 (RGALI, f. 2048, op. 4, yed. khr. 6). Olga Digonskaya, conversation with author, Dmitri Shostakovich Archive, Moscow, Russia, 27 February 2007.

⁴⁸ NCW, 16:166. See also n. 3.

⁴⁹ Volkov, *Shostakovich and Stalin: The Extraordinary Relationship between the Great Composer and the Brutal Dictator*, trans. Antonina W. Bouis (New York: Knopf, 2004), xiii.

⁵⁰ Volkov declares: “I've kept quotes from *Testimony* and from my personal conversations with Shostakovich to a minimum. But of course, everything in the present work is informed by these conversations and by the insight they afforded me into the composer's psyche, his worldview, and his way of being.” Volkov, *Shostakovich and Stalin*, xii.

Shostakovich come closer to considering compositional process, as they discuss literary,⁵¹ professional,⁵² or musical⁵³ stimuli behind his music. In one instance, sketches are mentioned in an article on the musical and literary sources of Shostakovich's *Anti-formalist Rayok*.⁵⁴

In musical analyses, sketches are occasionally mentioned; but there is no evidence that any authors had access to manuscripts. Based on final scores, the studies involve stylistic examinations or broad overviews of genres.⁵⁵ While a lack of sketches does not undermine these authors' purposes, the absence of information about manuscripts may suggest that protectiveness, restriction, or lack of interest made those who knew silent, and those who might have found sketches useful, unaware of their existence. As a result, in musical analyses, compositional process in terms of materials that would chronicle the creation of a work could not be raised. In 1978, when Laurel Fay wrote her dissertation,

⁵¹ Caryl Emerson, "Shostakovich, Tsvetaeva, Pushkin, Musorgsky: Songs and Dances of Death and Survival," and Rosamund Bartlett, "Shostakovich and Chekhov," both in *Shostakovich in Context*, ed. Rosamund Bartlett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 191–218. See also Emerson, "Shostakovich and the Russian literary tradition," in *Shostakovich and His World*, 183–226.

⁵² Laurel Fay, "Shostakovich, LASM, and Asafiev," in *Shostakovich in Context*, 51–66; and David Fanning, "Shostakovich and His Students," in *Shostakovich and His World*, 275–302.

⁵³ Lyudmila Kovnatskaya, "Shostakovich and Britten: Some Parallels" in *Shostakovich in Context*, 175–90. See also Eric Roseberry, "A Debt Repaid? Some Observations on Shostakovich and His Late-period Recognition of Britten," and Alexander Ivashkin, "Shostakovich and Schnittke: The Erosion of Symphonic Syntax," in *Shostakovich Studies*, ed. David Fanning (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 229–71.

⁵⁴ Manashir Yakubov, "Shostakovich's *Anti-formalist Rayok*: A History of the Work's Composition and Its Musical and Literary Sources," in *Shostakovich in Context*, 135–58.

⁵⁵ Laurel Fay, "The Last Quartets of Dmitri Shostakovich: A Stylistic Investigation" (Ph.D. diss., Cornell University, 1978); Pauline Fairclough, *A Soviet Credo: Shostakovich's Fourth Symphony* (Aldershot, Eng.: Ashgate, 2006); Eric Roseberry, *Ideology, Style, Content and Thematic Process in the Symphonies, Cello Concertos, and String Quartets of Shostakovich* (New York: Garland, 1989); Genrikh Orlov, *Dmitriy Dmitriyevich Shostakovich: kratkiy ocherk zhizni i tvorchestva* [Dmitri Dmitriyevich Shostakovich: a short study of life and works] (Moscow: Muzika, 1966); and Marina Sabinina, *Shostakovich—simfonist: dramaturgiya, estetika, stil'* [Shostakovich as symphonist: dramaturgy, aesthetics, style] (Moscow: Muzika, 1976).

a stylistic investigation of Shostakovich's late quartets, she commented on a lack of resources for studying Shostakovich's music:

“It is to be hoped that in the near future his . . . **autographs, sketches and other sources, if they exist**, will come to the public light.”⁵⁶

Almost thirty years later, Pauline Fairclough observed a similar lack of manuscripts and, therefore, limited her analysis of the Fourth Symphony to published scores.⁵⁷ Her work, based on her dissertation of 2002, overlapped with the *New Collected Works*' publication of some sketches for the Fourth Symphony in 2002–3.⁵⁸ Acknowledging these sketches, available by the time she published her book, Fairclough comments on their potential for a study of the composer's creativity:

A complete source study of the Fourth Symphony would have to include discussion of the **various sketch materials** that preceded work on the symphony as we know it . . . [these] provide a fascinating insight into Shostakovich's creative processes.⁵⁹

Broad summaries of Shostakovich's music, like the overviews that Genrikh Orlov and Marina Sabinina made of the symphonies,⁶⁰ might have been a place to discuss source material or compositional process in the Western sense. That neither Orlov nor Sabinina did so may point to lack of knowledge, to restrictions on Shostakovich's

⁵⁶ Fay, “Quartets,” 3. Emphasis added.

⁵⁷ Fairclough, *A Soviet Credo*, xi–xii.

⁵⁸ Volumes 3 and 4 of the *New Collected Works*. Volume 3 contains facsimiles of the unfinished symphony of 1934 (see n. 13), which Iakubov identifies as a preliminary manuscript for the Fourth Symphony (NCW, 4:269). Volume 4 contains facsimiles of detailed piano drafts that prefigure approximately half of the symphony.

⁵⁹ Fairclough, *A Soviet Credo*, x. Emphasis added.

⁶⁰ Genrikh Orlov, *Simfonii Shostakovicha* [The symphonies of Shostakovich] (Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoye muzikal'noye izdatel'stvo, 1961); and Sabinina, *Shostakovich—simfonist*. Sabinina's work is from 1976.

documents (whether imposed by the composer or some other authority), or possibly to a devaluation of such documents and their relevance. Whatever the case, Orlov took final texts, the symphonies as published, and made it his goal “to help the reader ‘to hear’ the symphonies of Shostakovich, to penetrate their rich and complex internal world as shown through formal exposition.”⁶¹ He did not trace process; he explained its result. Sabinina set out to “trace the evolution of style and dramaturgical principles in Shostakovich’s symphonies, their connections with different genres, different arts, and the most important tendencies of the epoch,”⁶² and in doing so, did not need sketches. If Russians in Russia did not know about and were not studying Shostakovich’s sketches, Westerners could hardly be expected to take up the topic. When Roy Blokker and Robert Dearing wrote *The Music of Dmitri Shostakovich: The Symphonies* in 1979, they offered a listening guide that progressed movement by movement and pointed out themes, structure, instrumentation, and harmony. Theirs was a biographical-musical manual combining elements of formal analysis with information about the time and place when each symphony was composed. Until recently, the only questions about Shostakovich’s compositional manuscripts have been hypothetical, in asking whether manuscripts exist and, if so, to what extent they might be valuable.

The relative paucity of information about Shostakovich’s sketches begs the question of why a “vast body” of manuscripts from a major composer, who has generated so much interest, has remained unknown until now, or if known, unexplored. Did Shostakovich or some other authority suppress his sketches or deem them unimportant? Is the extent of documents in fact less than recently stated; or is there something daunting

⁶¹ Orlov, *Shostakovich: kratkiy*, 4–5.

⁶² Sabinina, *Shostakovich—simfonist*, 17.

or impenetrable about them, which defies categorization or assessment? Perhaps a false judgment prevailed that nothing could be gained from these sources because any study would be inherently subjective or might challenge the composer's iconic creativity, yet at least Atovm'yan seems to have guessed the manuscripts' potential and conspired with the housekeeper to obtain them. For whatever reason, a lack of information about Shostakovich's sketches seems rooted in sensitivity over them.

In addition to the *New Collected Works*, information about sketches occasionally appears in anthologies comprising collections of articles presented at conferences, symposia, or anniversaries of Shostakovich's birth.⁶³ Important titles in English include *Shostakovich in Context*, *Shostakovich Studies*, and *Shostakovich and His World*.⁶⁴ In Russian, two major works are Lyudmila Kovnatskaya's anthology for the ninetieth anniversary of Shostakovich's birth, and her 900-page collection, *Shostakovich: Between Moments and Eternity*.⁶⁵ The latter is compiled chronologically, tracing events in Shostakovich's life, then directions in scholarship after his death. While its primary contribution is the exposition of letters, minutes of meetings, and records from Shostakovich's professional work, Kovnatskaya states that "the most important parts of

⁶³ There is overlap here with broad studies of Shostakovich's social, historical, or political milieu. See nn. 51–54.

⁶⁴ Bartlett, Fanning, and Fay, respectively. Bartlett's book was compiled from papers presented at a conference at the University of Michigan in 1994. Fay's followed the Bard Music Festival of 2004, and Fanning's *Shostakovich Studies* is part of the scholarly series of Cambridge's *Studies*.

⁶⁵ L.G. Kovnatskaya, ed., *Shostakovich: mezhdu mgnoveniye i vechnost'yu* [Shostakovich: between moments and eternity] (St. Petersburg: Kompozitor, 2000). A few articles in the ninetieth anniversary edition (Kovnatskaya, ed., *Shostakovich: sbornik*) are also in Bartlett and Fanning, while some in *Shostakovich: mezhdu mgnoveniye* are translations of earlier, English-language publications.

the collection are the documents written in Shostakovich's hand."⁶⁶ These include compositional manuscripts, which are discussed in two articles in the book.⁶⁷

In an article on the *Suite for Jazz Orchestra*, Manashir Iakubov discusses a *chernovik*, or draft, kept in Shostakovich's personal archives in Moscow. The manuscript is a piano score of the Suite, largely complete, but not identical with the work's "final version." The draft is a stage of composition, Iakubov suggests, that could be the basis for reconstructing a lost work.⁶⁸ In *Shostakovich in Context*, Iakubov offers another article, already mentioned, on Shostakovich's *Anti-formalist Rayok* and discusses compositional history on the basis of surviving sketches. Iakubov identifies stages of composition for *Rayok*, including a "first rough sketch" dating from 1948, "the first draft of a parodic preface" from the end of the 1950s, a "preliminary draft of the second version," bars that the composer "jotted down" as a sketch "for further development," a "Preliminary Version," and the autograph score, which Iakubov dates no later than 1968. The successive stages that music and text went through over a twenty-year period are reflected in Shostakovich's manuscripts,⁶⁹ and Iakubov's work traces how materials antecedent to the final score record the process of composition. Perhaps due to the limitations of an article, however, and interest in the finished work, Iakubov reproduces very little music from these drafts and does not say to what extent surviving sources might yield to similar scrutiny. The value of Iakubov's discussions of the *Jazz Suite* and

⁶⁶ L.G. Kovnatskaya, "Ot redaktora-sostavitelya" [From the editor-compiler], in *Shostakovich: mezhdru mgnoveniyem*, 4.

⁶⁷ Arkadiy Klimovitskiy, "Syuita na finskiye temi—neizvestnoye sochineniye Shostakovicha" [Suite on Finnish themes—an unknown composition of Shostakovich], and Manashir Yakubov, "Syuita dlya estradnogo orkestra ili Syuita dlya dzhaz-orkestra No. 2?" [Suite for Stage Orchestra or Suite for Jazz Orchestra, No. 2?], in *Shostakovich: mezhdru mgnoveniyem*, 308–45.

⁶⁸ Iakubov, "Syuita," 345.

⁶⁹ Iakubov, "Syuita," 139–40.

Anti-formalist Rayok is to alert the reader to the role of sketches and drafts in Shostakovich's compositional process, to identify some of these manuscripts, and to raise interest in where others can be found.

In 2006, Olga Digonskaya published an article about “unknown autographs” of Shostakovich in the Glinka Museum of Musical Culture.⁷⁰ Her work describes approximately 250 manuscript pages of sketches and drafts found in a file marked “длительное хранение,” or “long-term preservation,” an instruction mentioned but not explained in the article. The fragments in this file date from the 1920s to the 1950s and represent at least part of Atovm'yan's donation to the Museum in the 1964. Digonskaya uses the terms эскизы (sketches), наброски (drafts), чистовые автографы или их фрагменты (clean scores or their fragments), and рукописиные материалы (manuscript materials) to describe them. Although she does not define these terms, the impression is one of great variety. Digonskaya identifies two types of manuscripts in the file: (1) compositional materials related to some of Shostakovich's well-known works and (2) manuscripts for unknown pieces. Among the first group are sketches for symphonies, a concerto, quartets, sonatas, a prelude and fugue, vocal music, works for stage dramas, and film music. For some of the pieces, only one or two documents are preserved; for others, sketches and drafts represent entire works. From the group relating to unknown works, Digonskaya describes the prologue of an unfinished opera *Orango*, which she dates from the mid-1930s and identifies as the second opera in the rumored tetralogy that

⁷⁰ Digonskaya, “Neizvestniye avtografi.” *Shostakovich—Urtext*, which contains Digonskaya's articles, also includes some Shostakovich letters and the stenographic record from the meeting in 1936 of the Leningrad Composer's Union, when Shostakovich's opera *Lady Macbeth* was discussed.

Shostakovich announced when he was writing *Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk*.⁷¹ For Digonskaya, the materials “supplement, clarify, and, through comparison with other sources, even essentially change our understanding of particular moments in Shostakovich’s creative life.”⁷² Her work shows that sketches contribute to biographical information about the composer, his working methods, and his pieces. That is, the manuscripts for *Orango* provide firm evidence of a piece otherwise only rumored to exist; and Digonskaya’s deductions that this opera is from the 1930s and a sequel to *Lady Macbeth* help to establish its place in the sequence of Shostakovich’s compositions. When the musical content and sequence of such sketches can also be assessed, especially in relation to Shostakovich’s known or finished works, the manuscripts will begin to illuminate compositional process.

Digonskaya’s article is the first list of compositional manuscripts for many different pieces in Shostakovich, and her classification of “types” of documents is a step towards organizing and identifying these materials. Her comment, moreover, about the comparative completeness or incompleteness of these sketches merits attention because it raises the question of what the term *sketch* means and how much a sketch might say about the genesis and development of a given piece, not to mention a method for determining completeness. As Digonskaya uses it, *eskiz*, or *sketch*, covers anything before the final score. A sketch may be in piano score or orchestral score; it may be partially composed or almost complete; it may have changes and crossings-out, or it may be clean. A hallmark of these 250 unidentified pages is their disparate nature, characterized by different methods of preparation and scoring, differing degrees of

⁷¹ She concludes that Shostakovich could have written the fragment no earlier than 25 July 1934 and no later than the spring of 1936. Digonskaya, “Neizvestniye avtografi,” 166.

⁷² Digonskaya, “Neizvestniye avtografi,” 169.

coherence and continuation, and a wide range of sophistication. These manuscripts pave the way for understanding Shostakovich's music from a perspective much further back than the final score; but from Digonskaya's article, it is not yet clear what these materials say about the process of composition or how they are relevant to any given work's finished form.

Digonskaya cites Atovm'yan's story of acquiring documents from Shostakovich's housekeeper and identifies this file at the Glinka Museum as part of Atovm'yan's donation.⁷³ If Atovm'yan asked the housekeeper to salvage Shostakovich's rubbish—as he recalls in his reminiscences—the disparity and variety of the file at the Glinka Museum are at least partially understandable and may speak to what Shostakovich chose to discard or keep from curious eyes. According to Iakubov, however, in the *New Collected Works*, the extent of Shostakovich's surviving manuscripts refutes the idea that the composer did not keep his drafts, or even that he deliberately destroyed them.⁷⁴ While this is true to some extent, we have no idea how much Shostakovich actually wrote, nor, therefore, to what degree surviving manuscripts are representative, nor how they speak to his possible motivations for preserving or discarding documents. Whether Shostakovich meant to dispose of certain manuscripts separates them categorically from sketches that he preserved and considered worthwhile remains. If the manuscripts he preserved supported an image of the artistic genius and composer-creator, is it possible that manuscripts for “long-term preservation” (or others possibly destroyed) might challenge it? The image of Shostakovich, as controlled by Shostakovich, seems in some way to explain the long silence about his sketches. Now, as the sketches are being

⁷³ Digonskaya, “Neizvestniye avtografy,” 152.

⁷⁴ NCW, 16:166.

exposed, they need to be pressed for their implications about the composer's creativity; yet a certain caution continues to govern inquiry.

The *New Collected Works* of Shostakovich's music includes, in addition to scores, facsimiles of sketches and brief editorial commentaries that list the manuscripts, where they are preserved, and how they can be interpreted. Given the current pressures of publication and urgency to bring formerly unknown documents to press, assessment lags behind this description. Yet in these early stages of acknowledging and exposing the sketches, the question of how they fit into the composer's creative thinking or relate to an assessment of his compositional process is increasingly relevant.

At the end of Volume 20 of the *New Collected Works*, which reproduces a piano arrangement of the Fifth Symphony, are facsimiles of Shostakovich's "*chernoviye eskizi*," or rough drafts for the symphony. These "extensive drafts" and "thematic sketches," as Iakubov calls them, are in piano score; and they "make it possible to follow in detail how the symphony was composed and specify the dates on which work on the composition was carried out."⁷⁵ Iakubov describes the drafts in detail—the size and format of the manuscript paper, the number of sheets, their condition, the handwriting on them, and their printed trademarks. Comparing information from biographical sources, Iakubov points out where the musical documents corroborate or challenge earlier reports, an approach that points to a concern for clarifying the chronological and biographical record. Most significantly, Iakubov notes differences between the drafts and the autograph score. Tracing the evolution of the Fifth Symphony through changes, crossings-out, incomplete measures, restarts, and rejected ideas, he provides facsimiles of

⁷⁵ NCW, 20:149. These manuscripts seem to represent those known, to date, for the Fifth Symphony. Iakubov makes no definite statement, however, whether the manuscripts represent all those for the Fifth Symphony, or whether there might be more.

the thirteen pages covered in Shostakovich's dense handwriting and describes them as a stage in the life of the Fifth Symphony:

The interpretations of Shostakovich's rough drafts are not meant to bring them into harmony with the final text of the score (it is obvious that this would be easy). Rather, on the contrary, it appears important to show the outlines and drafts in their original and initial form in order to observe how the composer worked on his composition by comparing these initial notations with the end result.⁷⁶

Iakubov's descriptions are meticulous, even as he eschews speculation as to meaning. As a result, the *New Collected Works* allows some insights into the value of Shostakovich's sketches; but now that the existence of sketches is not a question, how to discuss them is, and substitutes for the earlier difficulty of ignorance. A fundamental caution in dealing with Shostakovich's sketches manifests itself in a tendency to marshal the manuscripts only for issues of bibliography and dating.

A final and corollary challenge to the lack of commentary on Shostakovich's sketches involves accessing and confirming sources. Russian archives have never been easy to navigate⁷⁷; but obtaining information on Shostakovich has the added challenge that his *fondi* in Moscow are closed and documents can only be seen if written permission is granted by Irina Antonovna Shostakovich, the composer's widow. Given concerns for the rights of immediate family and scholarly interests in Russia, Shostakovich's unpublished documents, including his sketches, are subject to vigilant protection. With the composer's fame established, the caution over his documents is curious, albeit

⁷⁶ NCW, 20:152.

⁷⁷ On a practical level, visa regulations and registration laws changed multiple times in 2007 alone, affecting foreign entries and stays in Russia, including the length of scholars' in-country research. Although bureaucratic problems can often be overcome, they raise practical barriers to Russian studies.

explained to some extent by the scholarly and commercial opportunities of publication, as well as sensitivity over the way Shostakovich has been written about since his purported memoirs. Like the long silence about sketches, however, and the cautious description that still does not query them, protection of manuscripts may in some measure flow from the composer's own sense of privacy, or perhaps instructions regarding his legacy. The image of Shostakovich still seems to be handled with care.

Shostakovich's *fondi* are large, growing, and not yet fully organized, a fact that makes them difficult to navigate. A brief account of how Shostakovich's *fond* at the Glinka Museum grew describes an intense collecting process through the year 2000 and mentions large collections of the composer's manuscripts:

In preparing this book [*Shostakovich through His Letters and Documents*], the Museum's scholars and archivists have gone through more than fifty other *fonds*, holding letters, telegrams, postcards, notes, memos, reviews and articles by [Shostakovich], as well as reminiscences about him.

Shostakovich's *fond* was opened during the war years, when the composer, fearing the fate of his manuscripts if left in the besieged city of Leningrad, decided to give them and the autograph score of the Seventh Symphony to the Rubinstein Museum of Musical Culture. In the 1960s, the Museum acquired from G.M. Shneyerson and L.T. Atovm'yan two large collections of Shostakovich's musical manuscripts, letters, and documents. In 1977, E.A. Kershon donated a collection of letters and documents, as well as programs, photographs, and other materials from his own archive. At another time, the composer's autographs found their way into his *fond* . . . At the present time, Shostakovich's *fond* comprises 2,135 items; and it is constantly growing, in many cases through gifts.⁷⁸

While resources are obviously plentiful, finding and interpreting them are difficult. At the same time that Irina Bobikina was describing the resources at the Glinka Museum, Laurel Fay was highlighting challenges for archival research:

⁷⁸ Bobikina, ed., *Dmitriy Shostakovich*, 5.

Shostakovich scholarship is in its infancy. Much of the composer's personal legacy remains in private hands. His own archival repositories contain but a small fraction of the evidence that will eventually contribute to a fully nuanced assessment of the man and his career. Most of the letters he wrote were retained by their recipients. In the public arena, Shostakovich cut a wide swath across Soviet artistic and political life over a span of fifty years. Traces will be discovered in the archives of virtually every Soviet cultural and political institution. The process of uncovering them has barely begun.⁷⁹

A significant challenge for research on Shostakovich's compositional manuscripts is their variety, together with misfiling or inaccuracies in filing, which affect confirmation and interpretation of sources. Some files have generic labels—"odd sheets," "excerpts," "drafts," "assorted compositions"—and contents are occasionally mixed up. A folder of "sketches" may contain not only sketch sheets for one work but also fragments of autograph scores for others. "Assorted compositions" might be unidentified manuscripts, and "excerpts" can mean fragments of unknown works or discarded sheets from known scores. Abundance yet disorder encumbers the research process, but stimulates the thrill of discovery.

Practicalities of daily life also complicate archival research. *Remont*, which means remodeling but invariably involves rebuilding, is almost a byword in Russia because so many buildings are engulfed for years in the chaos of this activity (or lack of it). Many famous archives are in historical buildings, centuries old, which have already been retrofitted for plumbing and electricity, and exist in conditions that necessitate near-continuous repair. Harsh climate, the building of stations and tunnels for the Metro, rumored underground structures for defense, not to mention moisture, damp, and other

⁷⁹ Fay, *A Life*, 4–5.

factors, have threatened buildings and subject them to constant maintenance. When an archive closes for *remont*, its holdings are packed into storage for unspecified lengths of time. During research for the present project, part of the Glinka Museum was under *remont*, its 2,135 files on Shostakovich reportedly in boxes. Although a few of these items were kindly extracted from storage by the archivists, it is impossible for a visitor to know what else is there. The same is true of other archives—“the process of uncovering [their material] has barely begun”⁸⁰—and the extent of the Shostakovich *fondi* in Moscow will only be known as greater accessibility and more publication bring materials to light.

Given recent discoveries in the archives, it seems safe to presume that Shostakovich’s sketches will continue to be found and that any assessment of his creative process will be provisional, subject sometimes to significant revision. When the Fourth Symphony and accompanying compositional manuscripts were published in 2003, for example, the known sketches accounted for approximately half of the work. For the Sixth Symphony, no manuscripts were known, not even the autograph score.⁸¹ Subsequent to the publication of these symphonies in the *New Collected Works*, Digonskaya identified compositional documents for both pieces among the “unknown autographs” in the Glinka Museum.⁸² The sketches for the Fourth Symphony are more extensive than was previously believed. Sketches for the Sixth Symphony are reportedly complete.⁸³ While current assessment of Shostakovich’s manuscripts is hampered by difficulty of access and uncertainty about what actually exists, recent discoveries and

⁸⁰ Fay, *A Life*, 5.

⁸¹ The orchestral score was published in volume 6 (2001) of the *New Collected Works*. An arrangement for piano four hands came out in volume 21 (2004).

⁸² Digonskaya, “Neizvestniye avtoografi,” 145.

⁸³ Ol’ga Digonskaya, conversation with author, Dmitri Shostakovich Archive, Moscow, Russia, 27 February 2007.

confirmation of long-known holdings make a study of sketches and creative process increasingly relevant and require that sources be queried beyond straightforward description.

This assessment can be aided by a study of Shostakovich's sketches and drafts for Symphonies Nos. 8 and 10. These documents are extremely disparate, the contrasts between them often stark. The drafts for the Eighth Symphony are coherent and detailed; those for the Tenth are more fragmentary and disjunct. Other kinds of documents record corrections and changes made to the symphonies during (and possibly after) the writing of the final scores. Still other manuscripts contain fragments from different works altogether, sketches that are mixed up with those for the symphonies and that suggest links to other pieces. There is no neat, step-by-step sequence of materials. The question provoked by Digonskaya's article comes to mind: what is a *sketch*, and how much does it say about process? Joseph Kerman's observations about sketch studies are helpful here. "We are faced with some terminological imprecision," he writes.

Not all work on composers' sketches and drafts is directed to an understanding of creation, creativity, or compositional process; nor is all work on compositional process restricted to sketches—even if the term "sketch" is stretched hard (perhaps inadmissibly hard) to include all kinds of composers' working documents. The important thing is to define or conceive the field broadly enough so that nothing is shut out in a way that is arbitrary to the material or inimical to a comprehensive view of it. A broad definition would cover all kinds of research, then, on a broad range of documents: sketches, drafts, working autographs, reject sheets, *colletes* (or paste-overs). This includes everything, in fact, that fulfills two conditions: (1) it has survived, and (2) it was in the composer's mind superseded.⁸⁴

Moreover, Kerman remarks,

⁸⁴ Joseph Kerman, "Sketch Studies," in *Musicology in the 1980s*, ed. D. Kern Holoman and Claude Palisca (New York: Da Capo, 1982), 54.

[Compositional process] is a somewhat loaded term, carrying the suggestion of a seamless development in time almost akin to the unfolding we attributed to certain kinds of music . . . what sketches and drafts reveal is more accurately described as a series of “compositional stages,” and tentative compositional stages, at that.⁸⁵

It is the goal of this dissertation to contribute to the research that has just begun on Shostakovich’s sketches. To this end, we will elaborate Shostakovich’s creative process through a discussion of his compositional manuscripts for Symphonies Nos. 8 and 10. These documents permit expositional and interpretive questions, including what kinds of materials are available, what information they contain, and how they illuminate the composer’s creativity. Sketches and drafts comprise the majority of Shostakovich’s known manuscripts for these symphonies and are the most revelatory of process. Other documents include abandoned scores, discarded excerpts from finished scores, a thematic catalog, the composer’s instructions to his editor, and “assorted pages” from other files. All are in Shostakovich’s *fondi* in Moscow.

A word about terminology as it will be used in the following chapters is in order, given the variety of these manuscripts. The word *sketch* or *eskiz* is confusing when it refers to almost any document antecedent to an autograph score, and thus allows no differentiation of manuscripts. It is especially misleading for sophisticated documents that show all major decisions about the shape, content, and details of a piece. Confusion also results with English false cognates of Russian terms. *A rough draft*, Iakubov explains, denotes preliminary notation of some small part of a piece, such as a

⁸⁵ Kerman, “Sketch Studies,” 58.

fragmentary theme or short passage.⁸⁶ *Sketch* in his usage denotes an entire composition or movement.⁸⁷ In English, the terms have the opposite meanings; and even in Russian, Iakubov does not use them consistently. *Sketch*, in English, typically denotes something unfinished, sometimes schematic, while *rough draft* suggests an approximation of an entire final entity, or some stretch of the same.

The terms *eskizi* (“sketches”) and *sketch materials* will be used in this thesis as a label, an equivalent in a sense, to the phrase “Beethoven sketchbooks,” which indicates a body of compositional material but not the number, kind, or variety of manuscripts. This definition brings *sketch* somewhat into line with Russian-language designations in Shostakovich—labels on archival files, as well as discussions in the *New Collected Works*—and with the broadest English-language classification, in which *sketch* “may also represent a more fully worked-out musical idea . . . sufficiently extensive and fully notated as to be performable.”⁸⁸ *Draft* in this thesis will refer to long, unbroken sections of music in piano score. The term *continuous draft* will be used in reference to Shostakovich’s comprehensive but jumbled *eskizi* for the Tenth Symphony, and *piano score draft* in reference to *eskizi* that prefigure the sequence and detail of a final score. Shostakovich’s sketch materials are preparatory to his final scores; but they are not

⁸⁶ “We are calling a rough draft the preliminary notation of some small [part] of the future composition: of a fragmentary theme, passage, and so on.” Iakubov, NCW, 2:108, n.1.

⁸⁷ “A sketch . . . designates the composition or its separate finished movement as a whole.” Ibid. Iakubov does not define *thematic outline*; but from the way he uses the term, it seems to mean a short, notated melody that may or may not have any relation to other notation on a sketch sheet. He also applies the term to the multiple short versions in the 4th Symphony manuscripts. Iakubov, NCW, 4:269.

⁸⁸ Nicholas Marston, “Sketch,” in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, ed. Stanley Sadie, (London: Macmillan, 2001), 23:472. Barry Cooper also states, in reference to Beethoven, that “sketches in the broadest sense . . . [show] works in the actual course of being created.” Barry Cooper, *Beethoven and the Creative Process* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1990), 1.

limited to, nor are they for the most part preliminary jottings through which initial musical ideas are set down or worked out.

Given the sheer variety of Shostakovich's manuscripts, it is helpful to offer a hypothetical reconstruction of the composer's process and to identify stages within a range of his compositional activity. This is the subject of the following chapter. A discussion of the *eskizi* for the Eighth and Tenth Symphonies will take up the rest of the thesis. These manuscripts are coherent in that their ideas seem largely to be 'in place'; and apart from a notable exception in the Eighth Symphony, discussed in Chapter 5, there are few versions or substantial revisions. Broadly speaking, the *eskizi* for Symphonies Nos. 8 and 10 reveal neither the genesis of ideas nor several series of formulations, but rather, the entire musical content of the symphonies. These manuscripts are comprehensive and coherent, though in very different ways.

Symphonies Nos. 8 and 10 represent relatively late stages in Shostakovich's creative process. In Chapter 3, the *eskizi* for the Tenth Symphony are discussed as a mid-to-late stage, a possible precursor to the kind of sophistication and order found in *eskizi* for the Eighth Symphony. The latter are the topic of Chapter 4, where they are shown to be a near-final stage of refinement that directly anticipates the autograph score. Chapter 5 presents three compositional stages in Shostakovich's preparation of Movement II of Symphony No. 8.

In light of Shostakovich's sketch materials, there is a need to engage the dialectic of his creativity: his claims to "complete conception," or total command and grasp of the future composition *before* it is put to paper, and the body of manuscripts from his compositional process. Based on the *eskizi* for Symphonies Nos. 8 and 10, the question

of this dissertation is, How did Shostakovich compose? In light of the composer's own statements plus the evidence of his documents, the framework for addressing this question is that his sketches attest to the comprehensive formulation of the piece in the mind, but also to a compositional process that lies between complete formulation and finished form.

Shostakovich's manuscripts corroborate his own description of his creative process, in which thorough mental preparation preceded writing, but in which writing also sparked new ideas and sometimes complete alteration of music. The effect of comprehensive conception, the actual writing of a piece appears to have been a particular cognitive and compositional process for Shostakovich and, along with seemingly restless creativity of mind, to account for variety, changes, new ideas, and occasional anomalies in his sketches. These manuscripts show that there is some merit in the composer's claims and self-descriptions, which in the absence of elaboration, appear grandiose and unlikely. This fact also has ramifications for other sweeping statements attributed to Shostakovich, in interviews, the press, and the like, and thus for the veracity of his words as a point of departure in illuminating his life and music.

CHAPTER 2

RECONSTRUCTING PROCESS: THE SKETCH STAGES OF SHOSTAKOVICH'S MANUSCRIPTS

Shostakovich's sketch materials for different symphonies illustrate a spectrum of his compositional process, but no sketches for a particular symphony trace that process completely. Rather than early, middle, and late sketches, his symphonic *eskizi*, to appearances, typically comprise one stage of his thinking per work and differ considerably, manuscripts for some symphonies being coherent and detailed, but for others, partial and fragmentary. Taking *eskizi* for one symphony, then those for another, and another, we can speculate about the stages through which Shostakovich's symphonies passed and thus create a hypothetical composite of his process. In doing so, we acknowledge the likelihood that Shostakovich did not methodically work through stages with every project and that some projects may have given him more trouble than others or presented different kinds of challenges. This chapter offers a hypothetical reconstruction of his process, based on published sketch materials for five symphonies, and shows what compositional issues these materials raise. In subsequent chapters, this model will serve as a framework for locating the sketch stages of Symphonies Nos. 8 and 10 in relation to the composer's overall process.

As published in the *New Collected Works*, Shostakovich's sketch materials for Symphonies Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, and 9 show stark differences in compositional method, stage,

and degree of coherence.¹ Some manuscripts are written in piano score, others in orchestral score. Some show almost all the notational details of the autograph score, though rarely particulars of dynamics, articulation, tempi, or scoring. Others merely outline ideas, break off abruptly, and appear to lack continuity. Some sketch materials contain large, unbroken sections of music; others, just two or three bars. Some manuscripts may even postdate autograph scores; yet they are preserved with sketches, facsimiled and transcribed in the *New Collected Works*, and discussed in articles on preparatory manuscripts.

For the Second Symphony, fragmentary sketch materials account for about half of the piece and are written in short, disconnected, often non-sequential fragments. An incomplete, piano score draft also survives, making the materials for the Second Symphony the only known group to comprise both fragmentary sketches and a (partial) piano score draft for the same work. Moreover, the piano draft seems to post-date a score, to which it refers several times with “see score,” but to pre-date the final autograph, from which the draft differs in some places. For the Fourth Symphony, the sketch materials prefigure about half of the piece and contain several discrepancies with the autograph score, as well as multiple variants, mainly for the opening of movements and mainly discarded. The *eskizi* for the Third, Fifth, and Ninth Symphonies are piano score drafts that represent almost the entire works in varying detail. The most

¹ Manuscripts for Symphony No. 1, also published in the *New Collected Works*, are not discussed in this chapter because some of them look like they were written for Shostakovich’s teachers, who also critiqued them. They seem, therefore, to be in a different category from Shostakovich’s sketches for other symphonies and are a mixture of miscellaneous drafts—some for an orchestral autograph, some for piano transcriptions, some (presumably) for assigned, pedagogical exercises.

sophisticated of the manuscripts under discussion, the Ninth Symphony drafts, match the final score with few discrepancies and almost no “extra” music, versions, or revisions.

A diagram is helpful for laying out Shostakovich’s known sketch materials for the symphonies and their relative position in a hypothetical process:

Known Sketch Materials for Shostakovich’s Symphonies

Symphonies ²	Early	Middle	Late	Final ³
Symphony No. 1 ⁴				
Symphony No. 2	Half of symphony on twenty-five pages ⁵ ; two beginnings of a symphony (1925) ⁶			Manuscript Z (partial piano score draft)
Symphony No. 3				Piano score drafts
Unfinished symphony (Adagio) of 1934		Piano score draft (346 bars); Score 1934 (137 bars) ⁷		
Symphony No. 4			Piano score drafts of approximately two-thirds of the work; several short variants of openings of mvts.	

² Square brackets indicate unpublished manuscripts.

³ A final compositional stage, piano score drafts essentially represent the notational detail and sequence of the autograph score. In a few instances, passages in the score are missing in the drafts.

⁴ See Chapter 2, note 1.

⁵ Of the symphony’s 402 bars, the sketch materials prefigure approximately mm. 2–25, 55–106, 108–53, 262–300, 311–25, 334–43, 354–57, 390–92. Some passages are sketched more than once.

⁶ These beginnings are thirty and fifty bars. A good deal of the 50-bar sketch is present at the beginning of Symphony No. 2.

⁷ There are significant differences between draft and score, but the latter is still clearly based on the former.

Symphonies	Early	Middle	Late	Final
Symphony No. 5				Piano score drafts
[Symphony No. 6]				[Said to be “complete”] ⁸
[Symphony No. 8]				Piano score drafts
[Unfinished symphony of 1945]		[Manuscript A ⁹ Piano score draft of an unfinished movement; six pages sequentially written in varying detail [Score A] 322 bars		
Symphony No. 9				Piano score drafts
[Symphony No. 10]			Almost entire symphony in continuous drafts and elaborative sketches (mixed up, less detailed than piano score drafts, often showing only primary voices) ¹⁰	

Of the sketch materials examined in this chapter, the earliest in conception are the fragmentary manuscripts (also “*eskizi*”) for the Second Symphony, followed by the sketch materials for the Fourth in a later stage, and those for the Third, Fifth, and Ninth in a final stage immediately antecedent to the autograph score. The *eskizi* for Symphony

⁸ Ol’ga Digonskaya, conversation with author, Dmitri Shostakovich Archive, Moscow, Russia, 27 February 2007.

⁹ See Chapter 3.

¹⁰ See Chapter 3.

No. 10 illustrate a mid-to-late stage, and those for Symphony No. 8 a final stage, similar to but even more sophisticated than Shostakovich's other known *eskizi*. Assigning sketch stages to Manuscript Z (the incomplete piano score of Symphony No. 2) and to manuscripts for unfinished works is difficult. Manuscript Z seems to be different from Shostakovich's other piano score drafts because it post-dates an existing pre-final score, yet suggesting a near-final compositional stage seems permissible because the manuscript prefigures much of the final autograph without matching it exactly. The diagram lists manuscripts for unfinished symphonies to show where they come in the chronology of Shostakovich's sketch materials and designates them as a middle stage of writing, given their sequence and detail, yet lack of continuation. Rather than revealing sketch stages, per se, these materials raise different questions about Shostakovich's creativity, namely, the place of unfinished works in his claimed conceptions and his reuse of ideas in subsequent pieces.

Shostakovich's claim to thorough mental conception of a work before writing is one measure for understanding his sketch materials, in light of which we pose two questions: why Shostakovich wrote them, and how they can be understood as part of the composer's creative process. *Eskizi* for different symphonies respond differently to these questions. At an early stage of writing, Shostakovich appears to set down ideas, incompletely and unsystematically, in anticipation of linking them together in a subsequent draft. Middle and mid-to-late stages are not discussed in detail in this chapter; but it is possible to suggest that they show some incompleteness and lack of sequence, like early stages, but significant coherence across long passages, like later stages. At a late stage, Shostakovich's drafts are long and coherent, but also indicate

some ongoing clarification of ideas through modifying and testing alternatives of short passages. At a final stage, his manuscripts are essentially copies of his symphonies in piano score and may point to a desire to preserve private records of his works, perhaps to play informally or to protect against loss. Without applying this sequence of stages to every symphony, we can speculate that Shostakovich wrote down fragmentary ideas, combined these into drafts, and wrote piano score copies immediately before, or even while, he orchestrated his autograph scores. His motivations appear to have been mixed, but two predominate: the impetus to write down ideas in order to clarify them and the desire to preserve his works. Given these issues, the present chapter shows how the early, late, and final sketch stages of Symphonies Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5, and 9, as well as unfinished works, offer comment on Shostakovich's description of his creative process, and how current Russian-language discussion of sketches can be expanded from chronicling the historical record to discussing the composer's creativity.

The *eskizī* for the Second Symphony look like early sketches, characterized by fragmentary, disordered, and non-sequential arrangement, a disjunction that is highlighted by their physical appearance and lack of relation to each other. Iakubov describes a motley collection:

The extensive body of rough drafts of the Second Symphony consists of numerous, separate, author's manuscripts done on different sheets, and at times on cut-off pieces or scraps of music paper . . . There are often completely unrelated drafts on the same sheet, and sometimes on the same side of the sheet[:] their mutual arrangement does not correspond to their place in the final score.¹¹

¹¹ NCW, 17:108. We recall that Iakubov defines the term *rough draft* or *draft* as "the preliminary notation of some small movement of the future composition: of a fragmentary theme, passage, and so on." NCW, 2:108, n.1.

These sketches leave the impression that Shostakovich wrote the symphony down unsystematically—in fragments and short passages, at different times,¹² on different manuscripts,¹³ and in different methods of scoring.¹⁴ While it is possible that more sketches may be found and the entire symphony accounted for (as distinct from about half of it), the piecemeal work and scattered fragments of what has been published do not necessarily suggest that the Second Symphony was comprehensively written down or that a full sequence of ideas will be accounted for. This state of manuscripts leaves the impression of early-stage sketching, in which coherence, continuation, and sequence are relatively uncertain, at least to the onlooker.

The preparation, fragmentation, and non-sequential ordering of these sketches point, on the surface, to non-continuous and non-sequential composition.¹⁵ And yet, the sketches clearly prefigure large sections of the autograph. The longest coherent passage is nearly 100 bars, sketched over several pages, jumbled in the file but correctly arranged

¹² Since the sketches are undated, it is impossible to know the order in which they were written; but it seems that Shostakovich worked on them between March and August 1927. NCW, 17:108.

¹³ Iakubov gives each manuscript an alphabetical letter and arranges the pages in the order of the final work. Thus, Manuscript A is a sketch of the opening of the symphony (mm. 2–25), Manuscript B of mm. 12–25, and so on until Manuscript Y, which corresponds to mm. 390–92 of the autograph, the latest part of the score (which is 402 bars) prefigured in the sketches. Iakubov also lists Manuscript Z, a draft, he suggests, that post-dates an unpolished score of Symphony No. 2, and Manuscripts AA and BB, which are initial attempts at a Second Symphony dating from 1925. Most manuscripts for the Second Symphony are in the Dmitri Shostakovich Archive; a few are in RGALI. NCW, 17:109.

¹⁴ Many sketches are in piano score, but a few are in open score. For example, mm. 71–85 are sketched twice, once in Manuscript C, where the passage is in piano score, and again in Manuscript D, which is a detailed version in semi-open score (five-, six-, or seven-line scores without instrumentation). According to Iakubov, this open-score version “correlates precisely” with the autograph. *Ibid.*

¹⁵ Manuscript G in Iakubov’s labeling is a sketch of mm. 126–41, and Manuscript H of mm. 141–49. Iakubov comments that passages written “at one sitting” rarely show interruption or overlapping material. The repetition of m. 141 leads him to suggest that Manuscript H was written some time later than G. NCW, 17:110.

by Iakubov to account for mm. 55–153 of the finished autograph. This passage comprises several fragments, the shortest on a single page being four bars. Some such fragments show only one layer of the score, such as a bass or woodwind part. In these instances, more than one sketch fragment can exist for the same measures; and different fragments can represent different layers of the same measures. An example is a sketch of mm. 2–25, which prefigures the bass instruments of the score in that passage. Another sketch sheet shows mm. 12–25, written again, this time with music for Violins I and II. The two sketches look like they were written at different times, as though the composer thought of them, or perhaps recalled the different layers of the music, separately. From what Iakubov has published, it appears that Shostakovich did indeed write the sketch fragments for the Second Symphony out of order compared with the finished work.

There is a tension between the primitive, early-stage appearance of the Second Symphony *eskizi* and the sophisticated conception they seem to reveal. Fragmentary, non-sequential sketches suggest, at first glance, a hectic process of writing down ideas; yet disordered preparation also attests to a complex mental command, by which Shostakovich was able to sketch discrete passages and fragments, at any time and in any arrangement, and still prepare large sections of the final work. Due to this kind of compositional facility, his *eskizi* reveal a paradox between continuity of musical content, presumably guided by his comprehensive mental composition before writing, and the fragmentation and disorder of the compositional record. Thus even an early stage of sketching, as proposed in the present chapter, reflects Shostakovich's sophisticated mental preparation. Moreover, his *eskizi* for Symphony No. 2 appear to be a place for setting down ideas in anticipation of linking them together in a subsequent manuscript.

From the manuscripts known to date for the Second Symphony, it seems that a pre-final score and piano score draft, perhaps written nearly simultaneously, followed the *eskizi* for the Second Symphony. Nine pages long, Manuscript Z is an incomplete draft, which prefigures in piano score R6–R29 (mm. 25–107), R53–87 (mm. 199–357), and R90–R93 (mm. 369–85) of the final autograph (402 bars). Iakubov calls the manuscript “something between” a piano transcription, a sketch, and a score—because, he explains, part of it looks like an arrangement for piano, part of it lacks detail, and some of it looks like a miniature score with up to five staves and with textures and notation that would be unplayable at the piano. Manuscript Z refers to a score at each gap between drafted sections; yet since the manuscript does not match the final autograph, we can suppose that an incomplete or pre-final score existed at that time and that the two documents were written in close chronological proximity.¹⁶ This possibility seems to corroborate both that Shostakovich’s fragmentary sketches were a precursor to subsequent, more coherent drafting, and that drafting and scoring proceeded in tandem at a late compositional stage.

The sketch materials for the Fourth Symphony, facsimiled and transcribed in the *New Collected Works*, include drafts of long, unbroken passages in piano score, multiple short variants of beginnings of movements, and some discrepancies with the finished autograph. On a spectrum of Shostakovich’s process, these *eskizi* represent a late stage, in which the overall shape, continuity, and detail of the work are largely in place, yet still

¹⁶ The phrase “see score” occurs at the un-drafted sections: “*ot nachala do 6 sm. partituru*” (“from the beginning to R6 see score”), “*ot tsifri 30 do 53 sm. partituru*” (“from figure 30 to 53 see score”), and “*sm. partituru ot 87 do 90*” (“see score from 87 to 90”). Iakubov suggests that Manuscript Z was a “conspectus,” prepared for informal performance—a surprising comment following his statement that the draft is unplayable at the piano. But Iakubov is probably right, since the scoring of the draft, or even its gaps, would hardly have prohibited an accomplished pianist like Shostakovich from performing it. Iakubov also speculates that Shostakovich may have played or shown Manuscript Z to his publisher, with whom he met in August 1927; but there is no firm evidence for this suggestion. NCW, 17:112.

subject to modification.¹⁷ The designation “late” speaks to the length, sequence, and detail of the drafts, as well as the fact that variants of beginnings suggest indecision not about overall conception and detail, but about which alternative best sets up the finished music. That Shostakovich had complete command over the concept of a piece, yet still wrote drafts or variants, may speak to the act of writing as essential to the amplification or resolution of ideas in the mind. In his *eskizi* for the Fourth Symphony, the juxtaposition of variants and long drafts, abandoned and continued music, discarded and preserved passages shows that some sophisticated ideas are still being worked out.

The Fourth Symphony drafts progress uninterruptedly for hundreds of bars and prefigure large sections in the finished autograph. Dense notation in piano score fills several score sheets from top to bottom. The second movement is almost complete, “an extremely detailed and precise draft,” comments Iakubov, “from its first bar to bar 394 [of 403].”¹⁸ From the finale, 939 bars out of 1,385 are written consecutively on two large, double-sided manuscript sheets.¹⁹ The first movement is the least represented in the sketch sheets. Approximately 140 bars in two continuous sections prefigure mm. 1–98 of the autograph on one sketch sheet and mm. 1008–44 on another. In addition to these long drafts, the sketch materials contain eight discarded beginnings of Movement I,

¹⁷ The designation of this stage is provisional and refers only to what can be discerned from what has been published. If the entire symphony is actually represented in Shostakovich’s manuscripts, and if these, when fully published, show the shape, continuity, and detail of the whole work, the Fourth Symphony *eskizi* may fit into a final stage, comprising piano score drafts immediately antecedent to the score. Clearly, this is one methodological risk in speculating about sketch stages when we have a limited number of sketch materials.

¹⁸ NCW, 4:271. Iakubov’s use of the term *draft* here runs counter to his definition in NCW, 2:108, n.1 (see also Chapter 2, n. 3), but is in line with English-language terminology (Chapter 1, p. 35).

¹⁹ The sheets are closely written on the front and back of 30-line score paper from Yurgenson printers in Moscow. NCW, 4:272.

two beginnings of Movement II, and several beginnings of the finale.²⁰ Most of these variants are short, ranging from two to twenty bars. Some foreshadow the final score, but others bear little relation to it. Suggesting a hypothetical chronological order for these variants, Iakubov proposes that revision gradually modified some early ideas into final forms and sometimes wholly replaced the original music. His comments report fact, an in-depth analysis, he states, being beyond the scope of explanatory notes.²¹ Presumably, such analysis would involve weighing the creative possibilities of each variant as it relates to the rest of the piece.

It is striking to observe that in the sketch materials for the Fourth, Shostakovich wrote alternate beginnings, as distinct from reconsidered interior passages. Since beginnings state premises that, analytically and acoustically, are often played out in the rest of the movement, the variants seem to suggest some unsettledness about setting up derivational origins for music already conceived. To what extent did the physical act of writing clarify the composer's ideas? In some cases, variants may represent uncertainty and reconsideration; in others, simply different options, in which indecision involved no more than testing ideas (in writing) and identifying a preference. In order to explore reasons for Shostakovich's modifications and alternatives, it would be necessary to examine the variants' differing relationships to the movements, perhaps the symphony as a whole, and to propose a compositional reason for retaining one alternative over the others. This kind of examination will take place when we discuss the *eskizi* for the Eighth Symphony, where two versions of the second movement have different relationships internally as a movement and externally to the entire work. Variants and

²⁰ NCW, 4:270, 272.

²¹ NCW, 4:269–70.

changing ideas in Shostakovich's sketch materials point to sketching as a particular part of the compositional process that followed detailed conception and contributed, in some measure, to the clarification and articulation of that conception.

In 2004, shortly after the Fourth Symphony had been published in the *New Collected Works*, Olga Digonskaya found more manuscripts in the Glinka Museum for the Fourth and other works.²² Since these documents have not yet been listed or described in any detail, the extent of sketch materials for the Fourth Symphony is still unknown. In publication, they represent about half of the piece; in reality, according to Iakubov and Digonskaya, they prefigure much more. The Fourth Symphony is a huge work of 2,829 bars. According to Iakubov, the “preliminary manuscripts contain a total of 2,419 bars”²³; and from his identification of the drafts, they appear to prefigure 1,468 bars of the final autograph. If Iakubov's calculations are correct, Shostakovich's known sketch materials do not account for approximately 2,400 bars: almost 1,400 bars of the Fourth Symphony are not prepared in sketch materials,²⁴ and nearly 1,000 “extra” bars are present. While sketch materials for some of the music unaccounted for by Iakubov may be in Digonskaya's discovery at the Glinka Museum, the “extra” music is puzzling. Facsimiles in the *New Collected Works* contain approximately 180 “extra” bars of versions and revisions; but it is not clear how Iakubov arrives at calculations that imply an extra thousand bars, nor how these relate to any part of the symphony. Is the calculation an error? Or was Iakubov, even in 2003, referring to more sketch materials

²² Digonskaya, “Neizvestniye avtografi,” 145. Ol'ga Grigoryevna Digonskaya, conversation with author, Dmitri Shostakovich Archive, Moscow, Russia, 27 February 2007.

²³ NCW, 4:269.

²⁴ Passages that are “missing” in the published sketches include most of the first movement (about 900 out of a total 1,045 bars) and part of the finale (approximately 450 out of 1,385 bars). See also pp. 10–11 of this chapter.

than he was able to give in facsimile? The answer is not clear. Are the other sketch materials for the Fourth Symphony comparable to those for the Second, or do they show a different stage of composition? If they “complete” the known drafts and thus, with them, represent the entire work, they might alter our perception not only of the overall shape and continuity of these drafts, but also of how variants and alternatives fit into this stage of Shostakovich’s writing, as well as how some tentative ideas may have been resolved. Iakubov’s summary of the Fourth Symphony draws attention to the difficulty of identifying and confirming the extent of Shostakovich’s manuscripts, not to mention methodological challenges of trying to interpret them. Nevertheless, more sketch materials will enhance our understanding of Shostakovich’s compositional process.

In discussing the Fourth Symphony, Iakubov identifies a relationship between that work and an unfinished symphony of 1934, which he publishes in volume 3 of the *New Collected Works* and considers part of the “preliminary manuscripts” for the Fourth.²⁵ A draft of 346 bars and an unfinished score of 137 bars survive for this incomplete work. Iakubov’s association provokes a question, namely, what place unfinished works had in Shostakovich’s conceptions. Noting that Shostakovich titled the partial score, though not the draft, of the *Adagio* from 1934 as “Symphony No. 4,” Iakubov also identifies fourteen bars in the work with mm. 356–69 of the Fourth Symphony’s finale, as known from the autograph score.²⁶ He concludes without explanation that in addition to its connections to the Fourth Symphony, the unfinished symphony from 1934 also shows “various connections with Shostakovich’s subsequent compositions from the Fifth Symphony, Op.

²⁵ NCW, 3:211–12; 4:269. The draft of the unfinished symphony is 346 bars and a partial score of it 137 bars.

²⁶ NCW, 3:211.

47, to the Sonata for Alto [Viola] and Piano, Op. 147.”²⁷ This comment is extraordinary. According to Iakubov’s description, the score of the unfinished symphony prefigures the Fourth Symphony in its title and in fourteen interior bars. It would seem, therefore, to bear as much, or perhaps as little, musical relation to the Fourth as it does to several other works that the composer finished over the next forty years. It seems that Shostakovich had thought through this unfinished work sufficiently not only to begin drafting, but also to start scoring. We can suggest, therefore, that the work was a single, coherent composition in his mind, but that the act of writing it out in a score led him to change his mind and abandon his project. Perhaps the actual writing clarified either that the composition in his mind would not succeed on paper or that it would be better in other forms, pieces, and genres.

A similar situation occurs with an early document linked to the Tenth Symphony, “Score A,” which is listed in the chart of Shostakovich’s known sketch materials and will be discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3. According to Digonskaya, this manuscript is an unfinished score of a symphony that Shostakovich began in January of 1945 but did not finish. Ideas from the work can be found in the Tenth Symphony, as well as in a number of other pieces completed between 1945 and 1953. The significance of the manuscripts identified by Iakubov and Digonskaya seems to lie not so much in any causal, or necessarily compositional, relationship to subsequent works but in implications for the composer’s creative process, in that unfinished pieces call into question Shostakovich’s claim to complete conception, raise the question of how he reused or distributed ideas from originally integrated works, and show how the act of writing could lead to changes and abandonment of composing projects.

²⁷ NCW, 3:212.

The existence of two “unfinished symphonies” among the symphonic *eskizi* published to date—not half of Shostakovich’s fifteen symphonies or corollary sketch materials, if known, have yet been published—and the small-scale re-use of ideas in a variety of works seem at odds with the composer’s description of how he composed: that he thought through a piece completely before writing it and that it was never impossible for him to write out his fully prepared ideas. Did unfinished works represent ideas that Shostakovich wrote down before pieces were completely clear in his mind; or did the actual writing of a work illuminate compositional challenges, indeterminate decisions, or better application for his ideas? Shostakovich occasionally remarked on compositional problems. Certainly while he wrote the Fourth Symphony, he mentioned difficulties and more than one restart, his statements implying new ideas much more radical than the few variants in the published manuscripts.²⁸ Perhaps he abandoned some works because of compositional difficulties, which were not resolved in a mental think-through but discerned in the process of writing, yet preserved the works as repositories of ideas to be reused and integrated into later pieces.

The sketch materials for Symphonies Nos. 3, 5, and 9 illustrate a final stage of writing just before the autograph score. These *eskizi* are piano score drafts of assured conception that represent all (or almost all) of the respective symphonies. The drafts for the Fifth Symphony prefigure each movement in detail, from start to finish, on different manuscript papers, and in different inks. They are neat and clean, with thick textures and

²⁸ In 1934, he stated, “My earlier drafts and outlines do not satisfy me” and, in 1935, “I am discarding all my previous material . . . [and] writing the symphony anew.” Dmitri Shostakovich, “Budem trubachami velikoy epokhi” [We Will Be the Trumpeters of a Great Era], *Leningradskaya Pravda* (28 December 1934): 4, and “Balet i muzika” [Ballet and music], *Vechernyaya Moskva* (5 April 1935): 3, quoted in NCW, 4:269. With the Ninth Symphony, Shostakovich also confessed misgivings (Shostakovich, *Pis'ma k drugu*, 70), of which Score A seems to have been one (Digonskaya, “Simfonicheskiy fragment”).

extensive marginalia about instrumentation, and look like they were the basis for an orchestration of the work. Some “extra” sketches on the manuscripts include two discarded openings of the third movement²⁹ and a few short, seemingly unrelated melodies,³⁰ which may represent other compositional ideas distinct from the focus of the moment. These drafts, like those for Symphonies Nos. 3 and 9, look like a record of the work, in which compositional process is essentially complete and by which Shostakovich may have preserved his symphony for his own use once the score was out of his hands.

The Third Symphony *eskizi* contain “the entire text of the symphony from the first to the last bar,” as well as some variants or rejected versions of a few passages.³¹ In our hypothetical model of sketch stages, these *eskizi* have some characteristics of both late and final stages of composition. In their detail and refinement, they are like the drafts for the Fifth (and Ninth) Symphonies; but in their variants or alternatives, they are reminiscent of the Fourth Symphony. Iakubov highlights six versions of the opening of the choral episode and speculates that these may have resulted from some difficulty in setting the text—verses that Shostakovich encountered late in his work on Symphony No. 3.³² The piano score draft, with its multiple variants of the choral episode, supports the suggestion that for Shostakovich the act of writing offered a means of testing or examining ideas. The irregularities or anomalies in this manuscript, including unsettledness about some ideas, can thus be tied to writing—a particular cognitive and compositional act that elaborated what was in the mind. Nevertheless, most of this draft

²⁹ One opening is 66 bars and the other 8 bars. Despite these alternate beginnings, the designation of a final compositional stage for these drafts seems reasonable because of their complete, detailed prefiguration of the symphony. See also Chapter 2, n. 20.

³⁰ Iakubov calls them “thematic sketches.” NCW, 20:149. See Chapter 1, note 87.

³¹ NCW, 18:119.

³² Subtitled “The First of May,” the symphony is in one movement and sets verses by Semyen Kirsanov. The episode that Shostakovich sketched six times begins at R98.

is detailed, sequential, and clean. For that reason, it fits into a final stage of writing, in which Shostakovich recorded his symphonies in detail immediately before orchestrating them.

Like the Third and Fifth Symphony *eskizi*, the Ninth Symphony manuscripts are piano score drafts that anticipate the autograph score.³³ They are sophisticated in appearance because they are largely uninterrupted by variants, alternatives, or “other” music. While they are sometimes less detailed than Shostakovich’s other piano score drafts and show only one or two voices at a time, this difference seems to arise at least partially from the symphony’s relatively simple textures. The drafts appear to be a stage of thought and preparation so final as to exclude either indecision, as in drafts for the Third and Fourth Symphonies, or unrelated music, which intrudes to some degree on the drafts for the Fifth Symphony. Iakubov concludes that the drafts for the Ninth Symphony were written out movement by movement and that all evidence points to them as the final draft of the symphony, written in alternation with the autograph score.³⁴ His deduction comes from dates, different inks, and lists of instrumentation, and thereby underscores an interest in aligning the manuscripts with the biographical record. By identifying a “final draft,” Iakubov also implies that Shostakovich wrote earlier drafts and, for evidence, cites testimony about the composer’s attempts at a symphony after the Eighth and before the Ninth.³⁵ Iakubov thus links earlier versions to the report that Shostakovich started a

³³ Measures 142–393 of the finale are missing from the drafts. It is not clear whether a final page was lost or never written.

³⁴ He calls them manuscripts of “the final version of the symphony we know today.” Citing an article from 1996 in which these drafts were wrongly identified as early manuscripts, he also asserts that the evidence “refutes the opinion that we are dealing with ‘one of the first drafts of the symphony.’” NCW, 24:119, 121.

³⁵ In volume 9 of the *New Collected Works*, Iakubov refers to his article in volume 24 for “a detailed description of how the early versions of this symphony were conceived and how work

symphony in January of 1945, then another shortly thereafter, and finally wrote the Ninth Symphony, as we know it, in the summer of 1945. In this, he deals with the composer's biography.³⁶

Written nearly simultaneously with the score, these drafts are comparable to those for the Eighth Symphony, discussed in Chapter 4, and therefore raise similar questions about why Shostakovich wrote out such drafts so late in the compositional process. Having excluded the First Symphony from our review, we have five, perhaps seven, sets of piano score drafts for eight symphonies—a proportion that makes such drafts look routine for Shostakovich.³⁷ These records of his works seem to have been aids in scoring since they were written in close proximity to the final autograph and contain many notes about instrumentation. Did they serve any compositional purpose? Were they written on the basis of earlier sketch materials, such as those for the Second Symphony or for the Tenth, discussed in the next chapter? Given examples of stages earlier than final drafts, it seems possible that Shostakovich may indeed have sketched other symphonies at earlier stages before writing final, comprehensive drafts. Yet given the example of two unfinished symphonies, it also seems that drafting, in whatever detail, and scoring, even if he did not complete a piece, were essential to his compositional method, and

on the final version of the score progressed” (NCW, 9:119, n. 4). In volume 24, he quotes David Rabinovich, Levon Danilevich, and Daniel’ Zhitomirsky for testimony to Shostakovich’s two abandoned projects (NCW, 24:106). Volume 9 of the *New Collected Works* includes the orchestral score of the Ninth Symphony, as well as facsimiles and transcriptions of Shostakovich’s piano score drafts. Volume 24 is a four-hand piano arrangement of the symphony and contains no compositional manuscripts. Both volumes were published in 2000.

³⁶ In 2000, Iakubov probably did not know of any manuscripts for the abandoned symphonies. Digonskaya described one such manuscript in her article “Simfonicheskiy fragment” (2006).

³⁷ The sketch materials now known for the Fourth and Sixth Symphonies have not yet been fully listed or published. Once they are, we will know whether they represent those works completely in piano score drafts.

sometimes allowed him to clarify ideas and discern how to apply them—steps that we might more typically associate with relatively early sketching. Shostakovich's sketch materials represent a variety of types and stages, of which piano score drafts are predominant. This fact may speak not only to his conceptions and processes, but also to his motivations in preserving his works.

Shostakovich's *eskizi* corroborate his own statements about his creative process. They appear to have come after a first coherent, finished think-through of a piece, yet at a point when some first thoughts were not altogether secure. We can suggest stages of composition for these *eskizi* and, at the same time, recognize that some sketch materials reflect practical, instead of compositional, purposes. Shostakovich's sketch materials point to a basic hypothesis of creating, namely, that a composition came to him and he worked it out in detail in his mind before the act of writing. This last was a particular cognitive and compositional process that could suggest further ideas, sometimes lead to the abandonment of projects, and occasionally allow the recording of miscellanies and intrusions occurring to a restlessly creative mind. Shostakovich's *eskizi* preserve records of his symphonies in ways that speak to compositional, practical, and personal concerns. Taking the composer's statements as a basis for interpretation, we turn now to his *eskizi* for Symphonies Nos. 8 and 10, and ask how these manuscripts illuminate his creativity and motivations for sketching.

CHAPTER 3
SYMPHONY NO. 10 IN SHOSTAKOVICH'S SKETCHES

“The vision” of the whole always predominates.¹

The external embodiment of a work occurs only after it has been completely conceived and worked out mentally.²

The external embodiment . . . often suggests new possibilities for treating the material. The reverse, i.e., the impossibility of embodying that which has been thought through in me, doesn't happen [sic].³

Shostakovich's sketch materials for the Tenth Symphony are in the Russian State Archive of Literature and Art (RGALI), in a file marked *Klavir, eskizi*.⁴ Hereinafter called *eskizi* or *the sketches*, they comprise fifty-six pages and prefigure almost the entire Tenth Symphony. The Glinka Museum preserves another manuscript, unidentified except for a date, 15 January 1945. It is a six-page draft in piano score, hereinafter *Manuscript A*, of an unfinished work, perhaps an early attempt at a Ninth Symphony, from which Shostakovich reused some ideas in an unfinished violin sonata (1945), the D Minor Fugue, Op. 87 (1951), and the Tenth Symphony (1953). Manuscript A shows much less detail than do Shostakovich's piano score drafts of finished works; yet it was the basis of an unfinished score, hereinafter *Score A*, which Digonskaya discusses in her

¹ Shostakovich, quoted in Aranovsky, “Zametki,” 21–22.

² “Responses of Shostakovich,” in *Shostakovich and His World*, 35–36.

³ Ibid.

⁴ *Simfoniya No. 10. Klavir, eskizi* [Symphony No. 10. Piano score, sketches], RGALI, f. 2048, op. 1, yed. khr. 14; copies in the Dmitri Shostakovich Archive, f. 2, r. 1, yed. khr. 52.

article “Symphonic Fragment of 1945.”⁵ Digonskaya had published her article before she discovered Manuscript A; but in conversation, she was able to indicate that Manuscript A and Score A are the same piece.⁶ While the *eskizi* reveal Shostakovich’s composition of the Tenth Symphony, Manuscript A indicates that he conceived and partially drafted an integrated work, of which he scored 322 bars before abandoning his project, and subsequently reusing a few ideas. The purpose of this chapter is to present the *eskizi* for the Tenth Symphony as a mid-to-late stage in Shostakovich’s compositional process and to deal with their content and sequence in relation to the final work. Turning then turn to Manuscript A, we will raise the question of how this work fits into Shostakovich’s claim to complete mental conception, not to mention the ability to “embody,” or write out his ideas. Moreover, the fact that motifs from Manuscript A recur in the Tenth Symphony (and other works) may indicate that Shostakovich wrote down some ideas before thinking them through, or that writing led him to reconsider, even abandon them, as it clarified how they might fit into other works. Lastly, we will consider to what extent Shostakovich’s manuscripts shed light not only on his creativity, but also on biography and long-standing questions of meaning in the Tenth Symphony.

The *eskizi* of Symphony No. 10 are written entirely in Shostakovich’s hand, although an archivist has penciled pagination in the upper corners of the sheets and a Roman numeral “III?” on one page.⁷ Shostakovich wrote “10th Symphony” in violet ink

⁵ Digonskaya, “Simfonicheskiy fragment.”

⁶ Ol’ga Digonskaya, conversation with author, Glinka Museum of Musical Culture, Moscow, Russia, 1 June 2007. The present author perused Manuscript A at the Glinka Museum but was not able to record the document’s unit or catalog number, nor had other bibliographic description been made at the time of this research. Unfortunately, Score A was unavailable, making direct comparison with Manuscript A unfeasible.

⁷ The numeral appears at the top right of p. 45, as if to suggest that the page is a sketch for the third movement, which it is. See Appendix A, Chart I.

on eighteen pages, and paginated five pages of the fourth movement as 1–5, but gave no other labels or organization.⁸ The first impression is one of little, if any, coherence or order.

The *eskizi* can be divided into three categories: (1) sketches that prefigure passages in the final autograph, (2) sketches that were probably prepared for the Tenth Symphony but are not in the final autograph, and (3) sketches of other music altogether, some of which may have been mixed up inadvertently with the *eskizi* and some of which Shostakovich probably wrote down while he worked on the symphony proper. In a few cases, passages in the autograph score have no precursor in the sketches. Appendix A contains four charts of the music in the *eskizi* and shows where that music occurs in the file's arrangement. Disorder is evident. The sketch sheets are not only mixed up in the file in the archive, but they also appear to have been mixed up in Shostakovich's own preparation. Nevertheless, once the jumbled pages are arranged in order according to musical content almost the entire symphony is present; and all but three of the fifty-six pages contain music that Shostakovich included in the work.

The *eskizi* comprise two sketch types, which we will call *continuous drafts* and *elaborative sketches*. The former are drafts in piano score of large sections of the symphony; but they are not sequential and detailed like the piano score drafts described in the previous chapter, and hence require a different term. The continuous drafts for the Tenth are mixed up, occasionally interrupted, and frequently written on non-sequential pages of folded quartos. While some drafts prefigure significant detail of melody,

⁸ He wrote this designation once per quarto, which is folded and thus comprises four pages. These labels may have been added after the sketches were finished, as “10th Symphony” is written in the same violet ink throughout, although the principal content of the sketches is written in different inks.

harmony, and counterpoint and are relatively easy to follow, others show one or two voices; and still others comprise series of empty bars, punctuated by the occasional rhythm or chord, as though Shostakovich outlined these sections by a few, primary musical events. *Elaborative sketches* show short passages, no more than a few bars, which usually elaborate a less detailed part of a continuous draft. They can be found anywhere on the sketch sheets, even up to fifty pages away from the passages they elaborate. The impression from the combination of continuous drafts and elaborative sketches is that Shostakovich composed the Tenth Symphony by a “top-down” approach, drafting on the large scale first and sometimes adding details later.⁹

The non-sequential layout of the *eskizi* for the Tenth in no way discloses the presence of the complete work. Illustrating this complexity, the *eskizi* for the fourth movement show how continuous drafts and elaborative sketches appear in the file.¹⁰

Three continuous drafts comprise the fourth movement—approximately, drafts of R157–

⁹ It is helpful to look to Beethoven sketch studies in order to compare our terminology. Eight types of sketches have been identified in Beethoven’s sketchbooks: concept sketches, continuity drafts, variants, synopsis sketches, score sketches, brouillons, piano exercises, and random notations (Barry Cooper, *Beethoven and the Creative Process* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1990], 104–8.). Three of these—continuity drafts, variants or elaborations, and something similar to “brouillons—are pertinent in discussing Shostakovich’s *eskizi* for the Tenth Symphony and explaining why we use different terminology. Coherent preparatory drafts, comparable to Cooper’s “continuity drafts” of an extended portion of a composition, comprise a majority of the *eskizi*. We call these *continuous drafts* because Shostakovich’s approach involved composition in large sections, followed by elaboration of a few parts, whereas Beethoven’s continuity drafts involved “fitting together the more fragmentary ideas made earlier into a coherent whole” (105). “Variants,” in reference to Beethoven, are alternative or modified readings of short passages already present in a longer continuous draft. For Shostakovich, we use the term “elaborative sketches” because it seems more accurate for what he was doing: that is, elaborating some part of a draft, rather than modifying or writing alternatives of it. Cooper’s designation of “brouillon,” as “something between a sketch and a final score” that functions as an early draft for an autograph score, seems to apply to Shostakovich’s piano score drafts, such as those for Symphonies Nos. 3, 5, and 9, reviewed in the last chapter, and for Symphony No. 8, to be discussed in Chapter 4. There are, apparently, no *brouillons* for the Tenth Symphony, an absence that draws attention to a major difference between the *eskizi* for the Eighth and Tenth Symphonies.

¹⁰ See Appendix A, Chart I.

161, R164–182, and R184 through the end of the piece. The draft of R157–161 takes up part of pp. 1–2 of the *eskizi*; the draft of R164–182 covers pp. 48–50, 47, 51 (in that order); and the draft from R184 comprises pp. 53–54, 7, 10, 8–9 (also in that order). Page 11 shows roughly R160–164, the passage connecting the first and second continuous drafts; and elaborative sketches of R173–R173+9, R175+4–7, R176–R176+9, and R177+3–R179—passages also within the continuous drafts—are on pp. 6, 4, 55, and 56, respectively. Although no sketches clearly prefigure the movement’s opening *Andante* or the *Allegro* before R157, a matter of ninety measures, the fourth movement is present from R157 to the end, almost without interruption, across a jumble of pages, and despite intervening music from other movements and drafts.

Taking the second draft, R164–R182 on pp. 47–51, we can illustrate how the draft and two elaborations, R175+4–7 and R176–R176+9 (pp. 4 and 56), fit together.¹¹ Parts of the continuous draft show the same detail of counterpoint and notation that is in the autograph score. Other parts are barely outlined, with a harmonic summary, a melody, or a specified number of bars that are left empty. This kind of minimal detail is evident when the draft prefigures R175+4–7 and R176–R176+9, which in the draft do not quite match the autograph score. In the elaborative sketches on pp. 4 and 56, however, the same passages match the score exactly, prefiguring most of its melody, counterpoint, and accompaniment and allowing us to suppose that Shostakovich wrote the elaborative sketches after the draft. The continuous drafts and elaborative sketches thus corroborate the impression that Shostakovich wrote out large, coherent sections—in this example,

¹¹ Page 4 also contains an elaboration of R163+3–R164.

part of the exposition and development of Movement IV—before elaborating parts of them.¹²

There is a tension between continuity and disorder in the *eskizī* when they are placed in the sequence of the finished work. Although they show the symphony nearly in its entirety, they look disjunct. Again, the *eskizī* for the fourth movement provide an example. Pages 7–10, part of the third continuous draft for that movement, comprise a single folded sheet, or quarto, which prefigures R193+12 through the end of the movement.¹³ While the music is largely continuous, the way it appears on these pages is not. The passage starts on the front page of the folded sheet (p. 7), continues on the back (p. 10), and finishes on the inside pages (pp. 8–9).¹⁴ The arrangement of the second continuous draft is similarly unusual in the way it is written on pp. 47–51, of which pp. 47–50 comprise a folded quarto and prefigure R164–R177+5, and p. 51, on a separate quarto, prefigures R179–R182. The beginning of the draft (from R164) starts on the inside verso of the folded sheet (p. 48), continues consecutively on the recto (p. 49) and back page (p. 50), moves to the front page (p. 47), and finishes on p. 51, the front of the quarto comprising pp. 51–54. The disorder here is not an archivist’s faulty pagination, added long after Shostakovich wrote these *eskizī*. It is the way Shostakovich wrote down the music, that is, continuously as to musical content but out of sequence as to pages.

¹² It could be interesting to explore whether Shostakovich’s “top-down” approach made his works less susceptible to inter-movement unity or motivic integration than the works of other composers, such as Beethoven, who started with small ideas and fit them together to form larger structures.

¹³ The continuous draft starts on pp. 53–54, which prefigure R184–R193+11.

¹⁴ If typical of Shostakovich’s method, this arrangement would be expected to occur elsewhere. It does once in the *eskizī* for the Eighth Symphony, although there the disjunction occurs with music not in the final score. We would have to see originals of other sketch materials before we could say how often Shostakovich wrote out of order on single, folded quartos.

In at least one instance, Shostakovich seems to have been aware of this disarray. On the second continuous draft (R164–R182), he wrote page numbers, marking what is now p. 48 (in archival pagination) as p. 1, 49 as 2, 50 as 3, 47 as 4, and 51 as 5—a numbering that follows the sequence of musical content. This is the only instance in the *eskizī* for the Tenth Symphony where Shostakovich paginated.¹⁵ Was he simply organizing one draft, and no others? Or does the numbering suggest that this draft, of the middle of the fourth movement, was his first?¹⁶ If the latter, it would seem that mental conception and control over the music allowed him to write down any part, at any time, and in any order.

Since most of Shostakovich’s known *eskizī* for other symphonies replicate the sequence of the finished scores, we must ask why he wrote so differently in the Tenth Symphony.¹⁷ One explanation might be that the *eskizī* for the Tenth represent an earlier stage of composition than the piano score drafts for other works. While the *eskizī* are mature in that they comprehensively anticipate the score, they lack the detail and finesse found in the composer’s piano score drafts. The *eskizī* for Symphony No. 8, for example, are in stark contrast, because they are meticulously detailed, in the correct sequence of the finished work, and organized by the composer, who numbered their pages, labeled movements, and crossed out all extra music. For lack of detail and polish, therefore, we

¹⁵ By contrast, in the *eskizī* for the Eighth Symphony, he wrote page and movement numbers throughout the document and clearly organized it.

¹⁶ Elizabeth Wilson states that Shostakovich’s correspondence from the summer of 1953 refers “unequivocally to the creation of his Tenth Symphony, movement by movement” (Elizabeth Wilson, *Shostakovich: A Life Remembered* [Princeton: Princeton University Press], 301). Shostakovich’s *eskizī* do not necessarily challenge this description, but they would if his pagination in the fourth movement indicates where he started drafting.

¹⁷ Even the *eskizī* for the Second Symphony, which offer some parallels to those for the Tenth, are not entirely analogous. Like the Tenth, the *eskizī* for the Second are jumbled and can be ordered to approximate music in the finished score; but unlike the Tenth, the Second comprise many separate fragments, not long drafts.

place the *eskizi* for the Tenth Symphony earlier than those for the Third, Fifth, Eighth, and Ninth Symphonies, but later than those for the Second Symphony because of length of drafts and near-complete representation of the work. The *eskizi* for the Tenth point to a mid-to-late stage in Shostakovich's process, perhaps a pre-stage to the final writing of piano score drafts.¹⁸

Yet the *eskizi*'s complex arrangement may partly be an appearance, an intentional deception. Perhaps they were a ruse, whereby only Shostakovich could interpret them and write the final work. The fact that no other known *eskizi* are comparable to those for the Tenth supports this suggestion to some degree, as do the symphony's layers of meaning and personal reference, including the encoding of initials and echoes of Mahler.¹⁹ If the *eskizi* are a kind of code, their lack of sequence has the look of hectic sketching; yet the fact that nearly every sketch prefigures a part of the final autograph suggests not chaotic activity, but supreme control over the music. Whatever the explanation for their appearance, the *eskizi* for the Tenth Symphony reflect an unusual mode of presentation.

An extraordinary continuity exists in these sketches despite jumbled pages, not to mention intervening music from other movements, drafts, and occasionally unrelated

¹⁸ Some lists of instruments appear in the margins of the *eskizi* for the Tenth and may indicate that Shostakovich used these drafts for orchestrating. As Iakubov writes in reference to Shostakovich's drafts for the Ninth Symphony, instrumentation marks in drafts suggest "that the score was written directly on the basis of these drafts with no intermediary texts between them and the final version" (NCW, 9:121). Admittedly, his inference is broadly generalized; but he seems to be the only person who has seen a majority of Shostakovich's manuscripts and who would have the authority to make such a statement. Yet the lists in the *eskizi* for the Tenth are few, especially by comparison with examples in piano score drafts, and are mainly in drafts for the fourth movement, rather than throughout the document. Like much in the rest of the document, they seem to be unusual illustrations of how Shostakovich wrote these sketches.

¹⁹ The horn call in the third movement has been identified as the musical monogram of "Elmira" Nazirova and is also reminiscent of the opening theme of Mahler's *Das Lied von der Erde*. See Chapter 3, note 42.

works. No matter how dispersed the pages of a continuous draft may be in the file, the music is unbroken and the color of ink is the same. The continuity is like a clue linking different sketch pages and allowing an outside observer, who has a final score, to piece together their disjunction. The continuity in music and ink suggests that each continuous draft in the *eskizi* was written at one time, allowing uninterrupted sketching whatever its external appearance. When we group sketch pages for each movement, as in Chart I, it is evident that each movement is sketched on one or two types of paper.²⁰ Movement I is mostly written on paper types B and D; Movement II on A and B; Movement III on A; and Movement IV mainly on B. Of the violet, blue, black, and purple-black inks involved, one may be used in a large section and more than one continuous draft.²¹ Charts II and III of Appendix A arrange the sketches by color to show how different sections of the symphony can be grouped. Some of the perplexing elements that make the sketches difficult to follow—lack of sequence, mixing of continuous drafts and elaborative sketches, interruptions, a range from fairly complete to empty measures, and the like—become easier to navigate when we follow the cues of continuity.

One especially curious example that illuminates Shostakovich's writing of these *eskizi* includes four fragmentary outlines of melodies from Movements I, II, and IV, which appear on sketch pages 52–53, in violet ink—the color, incidentally, of continuous drafts based on the melodies and found elsewhere in the file. At first glance, it looks like

²⁰ The *eskizi* are written on four types of manuscripts, whose measurements are given in Appendix A, note 1.

²¹ The second movement is written in blue ink from R71–R85+18 and in violet from R85 almost to the end of the movement. These passages correspond, respectively, to the movement's scherzo and trio (R71–R86) and to the reprise of the scherzo (R86) and the coda (R94). Violet ink is used for all but a few bars of the sketches for Movement IV. Blue and black inks are used for most of the first movement, except for the passage R5–R12, which is written in violet and black; and Movement III is sketched almost entirely in a purple-black ink that otherwise occurs only for a nine-bar elaborative sketch on p. 56 (R176–R176+9 of Movement IV).

Shostakovich notated the melodic ideas almost consecutively, as though in a single sketch. When we look more closely, however, we see that he left one narrow, empty bar between each melody, perhaps to separate them. This is a unique instance in the *eskizi* where music from more than one movement appears together on the same sketch page.

The melodic outlines on pp. 52–53 represent a schematic idea for the clarinet solo at R5, the scherzo tune of Movement II (written at the pitch level of R86ff), and two renderings of the oboe’s *Andante* theme at the beginning of Movement IV.²² These ideas appear between the second and third continuous drafts for the fourth movement—that is, after the draft of R164–182 and before the draft of R184 to the end of piece—and are written in the same ink as the second continuous draft. Moreover, two of the melodies reappear within continuous drafts of Movements I and II,²³ where they match the score and show details of rhythm, counterpoint, and accompaniment. It is possible, therefore, to suggest that the schematic outlines on pp. 52–53 were written earlier than the continuous drafts, which incorporate them in much greater detail, but later than Shostakovich’s draft of R164–R182. We recall, too, that Shostakovich’s only pagination in the *eskizi* appears on the draft of R164–R182, and that his numbering (1–5) could indicate the start of his drafting of the symphony. Were the outlines of the melodies from Movements I, II, and IV preliminary not only to drafts for R5ff and R86ff, but also to the main body of *eskizi*? Did Shostakovich jot down these ideas in order to retain them before deciding where and how he would use them? Or did some extra-musical

²² This part of the fourth movement is not represented in a continuous draft. The first schematic outline of the *Andante* tune is shown in the key of E-flat and is written a major third above the notation of the score. The second outline is written a half step higher than in the score. Immediately after these sketches is an imperfect rendering of the woodwind sixteenth notes at R173+8–11.

²³ Pages 29–30, which show R5–R12, and p. 40, which shows R86ff.

significance link them in his mind? We cannot be sure of the answers to these questions; but since the outlines suggest preliminary ideas, they nuance the picture of Shostakovich writing down an already complete conception, and suggest that at times he wrote ideas in order to clarify and record them before incorporating them elsewhere.

Shostakovich also went over his drafts after writing them and sometimes added new details, in different ink, as if to supplement his initial writing. This practice is similar to the elaborative sketches, which expand some part of a continuous draft, but different in scale when applied to long sections. The draft of R5–R10 offers an example. The soprano line is in violet ink and represents the clarinet solo at R5, then Violin I at R6; the countermelody and accompaniment are in black, as though Shostakovich wrote the melody first and the counterpoint later. Similarly, for R17–R29, the second-theme area of Movement I, the melody line is in a very faded black ink, with counterpoint and accompaniment in bold black. From the equivalent of R17+6 to R18+7, the sketch contains chromatic sixteenth notes in the bass, which do not fit the rhythm or fit within the barlines of the sketch. Shostakovich added, then subsequently rejected the counterpoint and excluded it from the autograph score. A transcription of R17–R19 from the *eskizi* and a comparison with the score are given in **Examples 3.1a** and **3.1b**.²⁴

Shostakovich's *eskizi* also include music that is related to the Tenth Symphony but not in the final autograph, and music that has no association with the symphony at all. The former may represent early ideas, while the latter may attest to the composer's constant creativity, which allowed the intrusion and notation of seemingly random ideas, discrete from the main compositional focus. We recall, too, Manuscript A, a piece that Shostakovich abandoned but from which he later reused ideas in the Tenth Symphony

²⁴ See Appendix C for musical examples.

and other works. Both the “alien” music in the *eskizi* proper and Manuscript A show that, for Shostakovich, the act of writing was a decisive part of the cognitive and compositional process, which sometimes led the composer to change his ideas, and sometimes abandon them altogether.

Music in the *eskizi* that does not prefigure the Tenth Symphony but is in some way linked to it includes sketches prepared for the symphony, but discarded or changed before the autograph score. Two examples are on pp. 31, 27, and 13. The music on p. 31 looks like early ideas for R12–R17, but it is difficult to match sketch and score for the entire passage because parts of the sketch’s melody line are in the score, parts are not, and parts of the score are not in the sketch. **Example 3.2a** shows the latter part of this sketch, from R15-1 to R16+10. In the score, the passage is a long clarinet solo, which starts with a six-bar upbeat to the melody at R15 and is 30 bars long (**Example 3.2b**). In the sketch, the solo is half that length.

On p. 27 of the *eskizi*, Shostakovich’s music vaguely resembles part of the first movement; but the detail is minimal and difficult to link to the autograph score. Written in the same ink as p. 26, which prefigures R32–R37, p. 27 may be a continuation of that music. Passages on p. 13 are related to the second movement of the Tenth Symphony but are not in the autograph score, at least in the same form. Written in common meter, the key of B-flat minor, and blue ink, p. 13 contains several alternatives of a melody, which relate to the key and initial motif of Movement II and are written in the same ink as Shostakovich’s draft of the opening of the movement, which begins overleaf on p. 14.

Other passages in the *eskizi* are not music from the Tenth Symphony at all. Examples are on pp. 20–22, as well as parts of pp. 3, 11, 28, and 29. Pages 21–22

comprise a neat copy of the alto part from the D minor Fugue, Op. 87, a piece that Shostakovich originally wrote in 1951, two years before finishing the Tenth Symphony.²⁵ The transcription starts from m. 111 of the fugue, not from the beginning, and goes through the end of the piece. It is written on a single staff in violet ink and contains key signature, dynamics, articulation, and rehearsal numbers, but no title or identification. The fugal passage is on the inside verso and recto of a folded quarto, whose back page (p. 23) contains a draft of R65 to the end of the first movement of the Tenth Symphony, and whose front (p. 20) is a sketch of otherwise unknown music, written in piano score in black ink and comprising a melody in 4/4 time in F# minor.

The fugal transcription may be among the *eskizi* for the Tenth merely because Shostakovich planned to arrange the fugue for quartet or four-hand piano, and was doing so around the time he was writing the Tenth Symphony.²⁶ If so, presumably he reused the same quarto to write the closing draft of Movement I (p. 23), which he then preserved with the rest of the *eskizi*. But the fugue's presence may be more than accidental, especially considering that the transcription does not look like a sketch that might inadvertently get mixed up with other sketches. On the contrary, the transcription looks like part of a score: it is neat, clean, and contains rehearsal numbers. Perhaps it is among the *eskizi* for the Tenth because it contains similar music. There is a striking connection between the second subject of the fugue (**Figure 3.3a**), where the alto transcription begins, and the second theme of Movement I of the Tenth Symphony (**Figures 3.3b**).

Two other echoes of the Op. 87 fugue also come up in other manuscripts, which are not

²⁵ Collectively, the Twenty-four Preludes and Fugues, Op. 87 date from 1950–51.

²⁶ According to Ol'ga Dombrovskaya, it is believed that Shostakovich meant to prepare the fugue for four-hand performance on two pianos. Ol'ga Dombrovskaya, conversation with author, Dmitri Shostakovich Archive, Moscow, Russia, 31 May 2007. If this is true, it seems curious that the alto and soprano voices were written as single-line parts, not in piano score.

part of the *eskizi* for the Tenth: once in Manuscript A, discussed below, and again in a file of unidentified documents labeled simply *razronenniye listi* (“assorted pages”), which seems to be a cache of miscellaneous manuscripts for several different works.²⁷ The file of *razronenniye listi* includes a folded quarto that seems to be the counterpart of pp. 20–23 in the *eskizi*, because on the inside verso and recto of this quarto is a neat, clean copy of the soprano part from the D minor Fugue, starting at m. 105.²⁸ No music from the Tenth Symphony music is present on this quarto, which may be why this manuscript is not among the *eskizi* but in a file of miscellaneous documents. Was Shostakovich sometimes uncertain about what music went where, and could this be the reason for some of the mixture of ideas (and pieces) in his manuscripts? When we turn to Manuscript A, we will see an example of an originally integrated work, from which he eventually distributed ideas into different works.

On several pages of the *eskizi* proper, sketches of “other” music appear to be mixed up with sketches for the Tenth Symphony and may indicate that new ideas, not related to the project at hand, came to Shostakovich while he was drafting. Page 3 prefigures R95+8–R98+4 of the autograph score and is the concluding part of a continuous draft that starts from R90.²⁹ On the last two lines of the page, and written in

²⁷ *Razroznenniye listi iz razlichnikh proizvedeniy* [Assorted pages from different works], RGALI, f. 2048, op. 1, yed. khr. 63; copies in the Dmitri Shostakovich Archive, f. 2, r. 1, yed. khr. 205. This is a separate file, not catalogued with the *eskizi* for the Tenth Symphony or any other work. It comprises thirty-two pages of miscellaneous manuscripts for many different pieces. Most of the manuscripts have not yet been formally identified, although Digonskaya has been able to recognize some of the contents. Ol’ga Digonskaya, conversation with author, Dmitri Shostakovich Archive, Moscow, Russia, 30 May 2007. It does not seem possible to speculate how many such files might exist or what they might contain. See also Appendix D.

²⁸ The front of the sheet contains another sketch of the unidentified passage on p. 20 of the Tenth Symphony *eskizi*.

²⁹ See Appendix A, Chart I, Movement II.

the same ink, is a melody from the song “*Ptitsa mira.*”³⁰ On p. 28, the last two staves prefigure R30–R32 of the Tenth Symphony; but the rest of the page contains sketches for an E-minor passage that is not in the symphony. Overleaf, the last line of p. 29 prefigures the Tenth Symphony at R5; but above this, the rest of the page comprises more fragmentary sketches for the E-minor music. Page 11 roughly anticipates R160–R164 of the autograph score but skips several sections of this passage (R161–R161+5 and R162–R163+5). At the equivalent of R164+2, where the score shows the key of B-flat, Shostakovich’s sketch shows the key change, but then goes into triple meter and a completely different continuation from that in the score. Overleaf, p. 12 contains only a few notes that look like a continuation of the B-flat music. In each of these instances, the sketch sheets contain a mix of alien and Tenth Symphony music, which sometimes seem wholly unrelated, but could also have been part of some disguise, perhaps a pattern of concord and divergence that allowed Shostakovich to link his drafts but would have confused anyone else.

We turn finally to Manuscript A, a draft for a piece that Shostakovich apparently did not complete but thought through sufficiently to score part of it, and from which he later reused some ideas. Manuscript A comprises six pages,³¹ four-and-a-half of which contain music in piano score, the detail of which is often limited.³² The draft appears to

³⁰ Digonskaya identifies this melody as “a song on words by Dzh. Skitta Melodiya.” “Simfonicheskiy fragment,” 103.

³¹ One folded sheet of four pages and one loose sheet of two. Archival pagination is *1, 1 ob.*, *2, 2 ob.*, etc., where *ob.* means “reverse” or “overleaf.” This numbering is given in parentheses in the text.

³² All handwriting is Shostakovich’s, except for lightly penciled page numbers, which archivists have added in upper right- and left-hand corners. Notation, barlines, clefs and key signatures when given, and occasional words in the margins are in black ink. Blue is used for a few small crossings-out, corrections, or altered notes, most of which seem to be a kind of editing;

be the opening movement of an orchestral work. In one instance, it refers to a score, probably Score A, which Olga Digonskaya found at the Glinka Museum and described in her article “Symphonic Fragment of 1945.” Digonskaya discusses 322 bars of a symphony in E-flat, which she identifies as a “first, unfinished version of the Ninth Symphony,” not for compositional relationship to the Ninth Symphony as we know it, but because chronologically the work followed the Eighth Symphony and was known by Shostakovich’s contemporaries as his first (but abandoned) attempt at a Ninth.³³

Digonskaya shows that a motif from the development of this abandoned symphony appeared in an unfinished violin sonata of 1945 and again, eight years later, in the Tenth Symphony. To date, Manuscript A is the only draft that has been found for this work.

Shostakovich seems to have used Manuscript A in preparing Score A, which is somewhat surprising since he had drafted so minimally, not just in detail but in scope, relative to an entire symphony. The draft looks something like drafts in the *eskizī* for the Tenth Symphony, where detail also varies; but it is nothing like the piano score drafts for Symphonies Nos. 3, 5, and 8. Yet its margins contain lists of instruments; and at the top of the second page (*1 ob.*) are nearly illegible words, possibly *str[anitsi]* 8, 9 and *str[anitsa]* 10,³⁴ and references to clarinet or piccolo clarinet and trumpet or trombone, all of which are written in black ink. These words appear to indicate a score, as though Shostakovich was orchestrating Manuscript A. The possibility that a draft, lacking continuation and detail, formed the basis of a score may support the suggestion that the

and lists of instruments in the margins are in pencil. Measurements were not permitted; but the pages are large, with 18 staves on each.

³³ Digonskaya, “Simfonicheskiy fragment,” 97. Digonskaya cites Glikman’s diary, as well as a report that, on 16 January 1945, Shostakovich told his students that he had started a new Ninth Symphony the day before.

³⁴ “Pages 8, 9” and “page 10.”

details of the piece were in the composer's mind. Or do Manuscript A and Score A indicate that Shostakovich sometimes wrote down ideas without knowing how, or sometimes if, they would bear fruit? Shostakovich occasionally mentioned difficulty in writing works, including the Fourth and Ninth Symphonies, and sometimes spoke of discarding ideas and starting afresh,³⁵ though he did not explain such circumstances in connection with his pronouncements on compositional process. That Manuscript A and Score A remained unfinished may suggest some difficulty or dissatisfaction with the work, but may also indicate that the process of writing out ideas—in a score no less—led Shostakovich to reconsider them. A parallel situation occurred with the second movement of the Eighth Symphony, discussed in Chapter 5, though on that occasion, Shostakovich revised his ideas rather than discarding and dispersing them elsewhere.

Manuscript A has only a slight connection to the Tenth Symphony, and an equally slight one to other works, including the D minor Fugue of Op. 87, written in 1951.³⁶ It is also interesting to note that a motivic similarity between the second subject of the D minor fugue and that of the Tenth Symphony seem to have their source here (**Example 3.3**). The example of Manuscript A and Shostakovich's reuse of ideas recall the "Unfinished Symphony of 1934 (Adagio)," cited in the Chapter 2, from which the composer recycled ideas in different compositions over forty years.³⁷ It seems that

³⁵ See Chapter 2, note 32.

³⁶ Near the end of the third page (page 2 in archival numbering), a fugue starts in alternating 3/2 and 2/2 meter. The statement of the subject opens with several bars of repeated G's in half-notes, with eighth notes above—a texture and meter that bring to mind mm.111ff of Op. 87's D minor Fugue. Following this, a third voice enters near the bottom of the page (2); and the texture and complexity of the sketch seem about to increase when, overleaf (2 *ob.*), the continuation is suddenly more primitive and less detailed. Many passages are crossed out; the counterpoint stops; and only the fugue subject and fragments of it can be traced. Unfortunately, it was not feasible to make a transcription of this passage.

³⁷ NCW, 3:212.

Shostakovich used these unfinished works, each of which he originally began as single pieces, as repositories of ideas for later works.

Manuscript A (and Score A) are also important because they contribute to biographical information about Shostakovich and the chronology of his works. As Digonskaya shows, Score A confirms rumors that the composer started and abandoned an orchestral work before he wrote the Ninth Symphony as we know it.³⁸ Moreover, rumors had also circulated that he wrote the Tenth Symphony as early as 1951. In an interview in the late 1980s, Tatyana Nikolayeva, a close friend of Shostakovich and the pianist for whom he wrote his Twenty-Four Preludes and Fugues, Op. 87, stated emphatically that Shostakovich played the first movement of the Tenth for her in 1951 and finished the rest of the symphony within the year.³⁹ Digonskaya suggests that the symphonic fragment of 1945 may have been the work that Shostakovich played for Nikolayeva:

The thematic connections between the first version of the Ninth Symphony and the Tenth Symphony—and they are significant and numerous—allow us to treat with confidence the testimony of T.P. Nikolayeva, who maintained that Shostakovich composed the Tenth Symphony not in 1953, but in 1951, and at that time played fragments for her from the score of the first movement . . . It is not surprising, then, that in 1953, when the

³⁸ Digonskaya, “Simfonicheskiy fragment,” 97. Digonskaya found Manuscript A after her article on the “Symphonic Fragment of 1945” was published. Ol’ga Digonskaya, conversation with author, Glinka Museum of Musical Culture, Moscow, Russia, 1 June 2007.

³⁹ Wilson, *Shostakovich*, 301. Wilson does not dismiss Nikolayeva’s testimony but comments that Shostakovich’s correspondence from the summer of 1953 clearly refers to his composition of the Tenth Symphony then. “It would seem far-fetched,” she adds, “for the composer consciously to wish to create the fiction of writing a work two years after its actual completion” (302). Still, on the basis of sketches rumored to be in Shostakovich’s archive, she suggests that the composer may have been “mulling over this musical material for many years before it eventually got written down in finished form as the Tenth Symphony” and that he may have played some of his ideas for Nikolayeva (302). On the title page of the autograph score, Shostakovich recorded the dates on which he completed each movement, which admittedly does not indicate the timeframe of their composition: Movement I on 5 August, Movement II on 27 August, Movement III on 8 September, and Movement IV on 25 October 1953.

Tenth Symphony had its premiere, [Nikolayevna] “remembered” the familiar fragments.⁴⁰

Digonskaya uses the implication of evidence from 1945 to account for Nikolayeva’s testimony; yet if we credit Shostakovich with the creativity he attributed to himself, and to which his sketch materials attest, he could have accomplished a great deal in his head between 1945 and 1951, on an unfinished work or some other. Digonskaya is rightly cautious. Apart from Nikolayeva’s claim, we do not know of what Shostakovich played for her; but according to Shostakovich’s letters, he composed the Tenth Symphony, as we know it, in the summer of 1953. Digonskaya’s work shows the biographical relevance of Shostakovich’s compositional manuscripts, but also that the study of biography and of process can sometimes be blurred. Shostakovich’s manuscripts attest to the creativity that allowed mental composition, sparked new ideas, and sometimes led him to abandon works and reuse ideas later. This framework seems to account for Manuscript A.

Digonskaya raises a question about the dating of the Tenth Symphony and, in turn, about how compositional manuscripts contribute to a study of Shostakovich’s life and works. The timeframe in which Shostakovich composed the Tenth, and to some degree its interpretation and historical significance, have been linked to Stalin’s death in 1953.⁴¹ Completed a few months after that event, the Tenth was Shostakovich’s first major work after his official condemnation in 1948, when his Eighth and Ninth

⁴⁰ Digonskaya, “Simfonicheskiy fragment,” 100.

⁴¹ Solomon Volkov maintains that the symphony is Shostakovich’s commentary on the Stalinist regime (Volkov, *Testimony*, 107). David Fanning discusses historical significance and calls the symphony “a release from some of the more crass constrictions of the Stalin era” (David Fanning, *The Breath of the Symphonist* [London: Royal Music Association, 1988], 3.) Elizabeth Wilson remarks on the “stifling atmosphere of the post-1948 climate” and considers the Tenth an opportune return to “large symphonic form” (Wilson, *Shostakovich*, 302).

Symphonies were denounced and withdrawn from performance. Like its historical circumstances, the symphony's personal references are striking. The insistent repetition of the composer's initials, DSCH, is well known, as is the third movement's horn motif, reported to be the musical monogram of Elmira Nazirova, the Azerbaijani pianist with whom Shostakovich was in love.⁴² The question has arisen whether the symphony was in some sense a personal reflection on or response to a political era of such ignominy, an interpretation fueled by Shostakovich's purported memoirs, in which the second movement is called "a musical portrait of Stalin."⁴³ Shostakovich's *eskizi*, however, suggest a different idea. In the second movement, Shostakovich notated the "Elmira" theme once alone,⁴⁴ then again in the passage prefiguring the movement's climactic arrival at the coda (R94).⁴⁵ "Elmira" is not in the autograph of Movement II, but its presence in the sketches seems to offer some alternative to the interpretation of Stalinist portraiture.

Shostakovich's *eskizi* offer a window onto his creativity and occasionally contribute to questions about his life. The mythology, encouraged by the composer, that nothing was written down until complete in his head is nuanced in light of these documents that record his composition, exploration of alternatives, and even abandonment of pieces. To one degree or another, Shostakovich's documents illustrate

⁴² According to Nelly Kravetz, Shostakovich explained this motif in a letter to Elmira, where he described the combination of letters and solfège used to create a musical monogram of her name. Nelly Kravetz, "A New Insight into the Tenth Symphony of Dmitri Shostakovich," in *Shostakovich in Context*, ed. Rosamund Bartlett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 159–74. Before Kravetz's discovery, David Fanning explored the motifs connections to Mahler's *Das Lied von der Erde* but presciently suggested that the call might also be "a musical signature complementing DSCH." Fanning, *The Breath*, 52.

⁴³ Volkov, *Testimony*, 107.

⁴⁴ It is written on p. 16, which is part of a continuous draft of R71–R85+18.

⁴⁵ The motif, in the notes E—A—E—D—A, is written in black ink, whereas the rest of the music on the page, which is extensive, is in violet.

that what he claimed is true, even as they also attest to the occasional intrusion of unrelated ideas and the act of writing as, in some sense, both cognitive and compositional process. The Eighth Symphony manuscripts, strikingly different from those for the Tenth, further illuminate these issues and are the subject of the next chapters.

CHAPTER 4

SYMPHONY NO. 8 IN SHOSTAKOVICH'S SKETCHES

I completed work on my new, Eighth Symphony, a few days ago. I wrote it very quickly, in a little over two months.¹

To the question of how he wrote sketches, [Shostakovich] replied, 'My sketches are complete.'²

The *eskizi* of Symphony No. 8 present a very different picture from those of Symphony No. 10.³ Whereas the latter appear jumbled and irregular, the former are organized, systematic, and coherent, presenting a complete, clean copy of the symphony, with numbered sketch pages and labeled movements. Whereas the latter comprise a series of continuous drafts and elaborative sketches, the former are piano score drafts. Whereas some manuscripts suggest the lengthy genesis of a few ideas for the Tenth Symphony, the earliest sketch material for the Eighth dates from 2 July 1943, little more than two months before the completion of the autograph score.⁴ Other manuscripts

¹ Dmitriy Shostakovich, "Vos'maya simfoniya. Beseda s kompozitorom D. Shostakovichem" [Eighth Symphony. Conversation with the composer D. Shostakovich], *Literatura i iskusstvo* (18 September 1943): 1.

² Shostakovich, quoted in Aranovsky, "Zametki," 22.

³ *Simfoniya No. 8. Klavir, eskizi* [Symphony No. 8. Piano score, sketches], RGALI, f. 2048, op. 1, yed. khr. 11; copies in the Dmitri Shostakovich Archive, f. 2, r. 1, yed. khr. 41.

⁴ We do not know if Shostakovich wrote something earlier than these materials, but the only dates in the known *eskizi* are from July 1943. The score was completed on 9 September of that year. *Simfoniya No. 8. Partitura* [Symphony No. 8. Autograph score], RGALI, f. 2048, op. 1, yed. khr. 9; copies in the Dmitri Shostakovich Archives, f. 2, r. 1, yed. khr. 9.

relevant to Symphony No. 8 include *otrivki* (“excerpts” from the autograph score),⁵ *nabroski* (“drafts”),⁶ the beginning of an eight-hand piano transcription of the symphony,⁷ and proof-sheets for publication.⁸ The *eskizi*, *otrivki*, fragment of transcription, and autograph score are in RGALI; the proof-sheets and *nabroski*, in the Glinka Museum. These documents trace the Eighth Symphony’s formulation in a late compositional stage to its completion in final score, the *eskizi* shedding light on a sophisticated, final drafting of the work, and the other documents appearing to post-date the *eskizi* and occasionally helping to interpret them.⁹ The subject of this chapter is the *eskizi*, which corroborate Shostakovich’s claim to quick and facile composition of the Eighth Symphony, and allow insights into his methods and possible motivations for writing these drafts.

The *eskizi* for the Eighth Symphony comprise twenty-seven pages of music: twenty-six pages of drafts in piano score, plus an additional page containing the beginning of Parts III and IV of an eight-hand *perelozheniye*, or piano transcription of the

⁵ *Simfoniya No. 8. Partitura, otrivki 1, 2, 3, ch.* [Symphony No. 8. Autograph score, excerpts from movements 1, 2, 3], RGALI, f. 2048, op. 1, yed. khr. 10; copies in the Dmitri Shostakovich Archives, f. 2, r. 1, yed. khr. 42.

⁶ *Simfoniya No. 8. Nabroski* [Symphony No. 8. Drafts], GTsMMK [Glinka Museum of Musical Culture], f. 32, yed. khr. 125; copies in the Dmitri Shostakovich Archive, f. 2, r. 1, yed. khr. 124. Despite its label, this manuscript is not a draft but a two-page list of twelve principal themes from the Eighth Symphony. It has no date but probably post-dates the score since it contains metronomic, dynamic, and tempo markings, which never appear in the *eskizi*, only in the final autograph. See also Appendix D.

⁷ This transcription is in two fragments, one of which shows the first eleven bars of Parts I and II, and the other of which shows eleven bars of Parts III and IV. The fragment of Parts III and IV is filed with the *eskizi* for the Eighth Symphony (see note 10), while the fragment of Parts I and II is in *razroznenniye listi*, that is, in the same file as the soprano-voice transcription of the D minor Fugue, Op. 87, mentioned in Chapter 3 (*Razroznenniye listi iz razlichnikh proizvedeniy* [Assorted pages from different works], RGALI, f. 2048, op. 1, yed. khr. 63; see also Chapter 3, note 27).

⁸ *Simfoniya No. 8. Korrektura s notnim prilozheniyem* [Symphony No. 8. Proof-sheets with musical supplements], GTsMMK f. 32, inv. no. 2147.

⁹ See Appendix D for a brief description of these and other miscellaneous archival sources that contain some manuscripts relevant to Symphonies Nos. 8 and 10.

work.¹⁰ In this thesis, all references to the *eskizi* will mean the twenty-six pages in piano score and will exclude the fragment of transcription. The *eskizi* are written entirely in Shostakovich's hand on three types of manuscript paper.¹¹ Closely composed from top to bottom with rarely a skipped line or empty space, the sketch pages are written in black ink and have numerous, accessory markings in red, green, blue, or black pencils.¹² The notation is clean and coherent, with occasional marginalia showing shorthand notes about the music and some information unrelated to the music. The entire Eighth Symphony is present, along with some additional music, some of which is related to the Eighth and some of which is not.

Given the detail and comprehensiveness of these manuscripts, the disjunction between the Russian word *eskiz* and the English-language implication of *sketch* is especially acute in reference to them, and leads us to recall the terminology set out in Chapter 1, in order to clarify its application here. The term *eskizi*, in reference to the Eighth Symphony, designates the piano score drafts in the file at RGALI but does not

¹⁰ The fragment filed with the *eskizi* shows the first eleven bars of Parts III and IV, which are written on the first page of a folded quarto, whose other three pages are blank. The first eleven bars of Parts I and II are in the file of *razroznennīye listi*. See note 7.

¹¹ The first sixteen pages are on 24-stave paper, approximately 34.8 x 21.5 centimeters. At the bottom of pp. 2, 6, 7, and 13 is the printed trademark «*1-ya Obr. tip. Zak. . . .*», an abbreviation for «*1-ya Obraztsovaya tipografiya Zakaz . . .*», or “First Model Press Order [number].” The rest of the marking has faded, but the legible text indicates that the paper was printed and probably purchased in Moscow. The next six pages are written on 14-stave paper, about 29.9 x 20.7 centimeters, in the lower left-hand corner of which a different trademark «*Po zakazu Mosk. k-rī Glavumsbīta*», or “By order of Moscow k-rī [possibly kulturī] Glavumsbīta,” appears once, on p. 21. Four more pages come from the same press, but they are slightly smaller with twelve staves on paper approximately 28.1 x 22.6 centimeters. «*Po zakazu Mosk. k-rī Glavumsbīta*» appears on pages 22 and 26. The beginning of the piano transcription is a folded sheet that has been cut off at the bottom and right-hand margins, leaving eleven staves and paper measuring about 33.6 x 24.1 centimeters.

¹² There are very few markings in blue or green pencil. A thin blue line faintly zigzags through several systems on pp. 16 and 19 [18 and 21] (see Appendix B, Chart I for pagination); and on p. 1, a reverse green solidus (\\) appears under the second system. Lead-colored and red pencils are used regularly.

suggest sketch type. The *eskizi*, which we can also call *piano score drafts*, show the shape, content, and most of the detail of the piece, and represent a stage of composition in which refinement is almost complete, very nearly duplicating (for piano) the autograph score. This chapter will present the content and sequence of the *eskizi* and examine possible reasons why Shostakovich wrote them. Following that, we will discuss the organization of the drafts and, lastly, elaborate several anomalies and ambiguous references in them.

The *eskizi* of Symphony No. 8 contain six complete movements—drafts of the symphony’s five movements, hereinafter designated Drafts I, IIB, III, IV, and V, plus an early version, hereinafter Draft IIA, of what became Movement II in the completed work. Also included are two revisions of parts of the early second movement, hereinafter Revisions A and B, and a copy of Shostakovich’s proposal for a new national anthem, written for a competition in the summer of 1943.¹³ The latter is the only extraneous music in the document and, like interruptions in the sketch materials for Symphonies Nos. 5 and 10, may illustrate the creativity that allowed Shostakovich to write out different, sometimes unrelated ideas in one place and intrude upon a primary composing project. It could also speak to external stimuli, including prosaic matters like a shortage of manuscript paper during the war, or a premeditated one to preserve the patriotic song and the Eighth Symphony together.

The following chart lays out the content and sequence of the *eskizi*, which are paginated in two ways, once by Shostakovich, who passed over Draft IIA in his

¹³ Fay, *A Life*, 139. Shostakovich wrote several anthems for this competition and collaborated on one with Aram Khachaturyan. Their joint and individual entries reached the third and final round of the competition, but did not win. After a text substitution, their joint anthem became the “Song of the Red Army.”

numbering,¹⁴ and once by an archivist, who numbered every page, except the first. Shostakovich's pagination is given in plain text and, where applicable, archival numbering in square brackets¹⁵:

The *Eskiz* of Symphony No. 8

Drafts	Pages	Paper Type
Title page (I) [Third page of Draft IIA]	[no page number]	Type A ¹⁶
Draft I	1–5 ¹⁷	Type A
Revision A	5	Type A
Draft IIA [First two pages of Draft IIA]	[6–7] and I	Type A
Draft IIB	6–8 [8–10]	Type A
Draft III	8–11 [10–13]	Type A
Revision B	11 [13]	Type A
Draft IV	11–13 [13–15]	Type A
Anthem	13 [15]	Type A
Draft V	14–23 [16–25]	Type B ¹⁸ [16–21] Type C ¹⁹ [22–25]
8-hand transcription	[26]	Type D ²⁰

¹⁴ He originally paginated Draft IIA, but then crossed out his numbering, skipped over the draft, and continued numbering with Draft IIB. See pp. 91–92.

¹⁵ See also the charts in Appendix B, which explain the two systems of pagination and the physical layout of the manuscripts on folded and loose pages.

¹⁶ 24-stave paper, approximately 34.8 x 21.5 centimeters.

¹⁷ Only the last two bars of the first movement are on p. 5.

¹⁸ 14-stave paper, approximately 29.9 x 20.7 centimeters.

¹⁹ 12-stave paper, approximately 28.1 x 22.6 centimeters.

²⁰ 11-stave paper, approximately 33.6 x 24.1 centimeters.

From dates in the manuscripts and the autograph score, we can judge that Shostakovich wrote the *eskiži* between July and September 1943. Drafts I and IIA are dated, as are all movements in the autograph score. Written in the top right-hand corner of the sketch sheets, the dates in the two drafts are start dates, while those in the autograph score appear at the end of each movement, under the double bar, and mark time and place of completion. The dates outline the chronology of Shostakovich's composition during the summer of 1943:

2 VII 1943	[Draft I]
29 VII 1943	[Draft IIA]
3 VIII 1943 Moscow	[Movement I in the score]
17 VIII 1943 Ivanovo	[Movement II, an orchestration of Draft IIB]
22 VIII 1943 Ivanovo	[Movement III]
25 VIII 1943 Ivanovo	[Movement IV]
D Shostakovich 9 IX 1943 Moscow	[Movement V]

From their arrangement, content, and dates, we can suggest that the drafts were written in the finished order of movements: Draft I, Draft IIA, Revisions A and B (of Draft IIA), Draft IIB, Draft III, Draft IV, the national anthem, and Draft V. The layout of the *eskiži* seconds this ordering, especially for Drafts IIB, III, and IV, which follow each

other without interruption.²¹ In short, everything about the *eskizi* corroborates the composer's description of his work on this symphony. For the rest of his life, Shostakovich pointed to the Eighth as the large-scale work that he had composed with exceptional speed and facility.²²

Meticulously detailed, the *eskizi* show not only almost every note, but also some instrumentation, time signatures, and meter changes, even intricacies of counterpoint and rhythm in the Eighth Symphony. Draft I, of Movement I, is representative. Its first two pages prefigure R1–R24 of the final autograph almost note for note. Page 3 corresponds to R24–R33+10. Page 4 continues from R33+11 to R45+4; and the last two bars of Draft I, which are the last two bars of Movement I (R45+5–6), finish at the top of p. 5. Every bar, every part, and extraordinary detail are present, the meticulousness of the draft indicating a command of its minutest elements, not to mention the composer's fastidiousness in writing it and its near duplication, or direct anticipation, of the score.

Occasionally, a few passages are minimally outlined in a kind of shorthand, which shows primary musical events, such as melody and harmonic changes, but not specifics of texture or rhythm. With a score, it is relatively easy to understand this shorthand, as at the end of Draft III, where Shostakovich sparsely rendered the last seventy bars with occasional chords and many empty measures. The outline of the passage, approximately R106 to the end of the movement, appears to have been laid out in anticipation of fuller expansion in the autograph score, a suggestion that underscores the chronological proximity of draft and score.

²¹ Draft IIB ends on Stave 16 of p.8 [10]; Draft III begins on Stave 17; and Draft IV begins immediately after Draft III on p. 13 [15].

²² Aranovsky, "Zametki," 22.

The dates in Shostakovich's manuscripts indicate that he wrote the *eskizi* in close alternation with the final autograph. That is, he drafted one movement and orchestrated it immediately, even as he began to draft the next movement. We see the proximity of this work particularly in the dates for Draft IIA and Movements I and II. Six days before he finished orchestrating Movement I, Shostakovich began to write Draft IIA, the first version of Movement II, which he revised and fully redrafted into Draft IIB in the three weeks between 29 July and 17 August. With the *eskizi* being nearly simultaneous with the score, it is easy to understand why they are detailed, polished drafts, which represent a final compositional stage. What is much harder to understand is why Shostakovich wrote them.

Given the dates in his manuscripts, as well as his claim of having written the Eighth Symphony in two months, Shostakovich's *eskizi* seem to be his only manuscripts for the work. This circumstance is more than a little surprising—no prior sketches, quick composition, advanced conception in every detail, and yet a symphony written out twice. To be sure, Shostakovich wrote piano score drafts for other works, though never in such a short time. Was the writing of piano score drafts simply a habit, which provided him with a personal record of his works and served as an aid in scoring? Did Shostakovich also wish to preserve an *aide-memoire*, in case something happened to him or his music? As we will see below, it is likely that the *eskizi* did indeed aid orchestration, though given the composer's command of the work, which his drafts clearly demonstrate, such an aid seems more an indulgence than a necessity. The *eskizi* may also have prefigured a future piano reduction or provided the composer with his own piano score of the symphony,

which he could play or show to friends and colleagues.²³ Whatever his reasons for drafting, these *eskizi* are a copy of the Eighth Symphony in piano score and, to appearance, a private record of the work.

Judging from Shostakovich's similar drafts for several other symphonies, the *eskizi* for the Eighth seem to fit into a recurrent stage in the sequence of his writing.²⁴ Perhaps piano score drafts were a kind of backup source, from which the composer could reproduce an autograph score if it were lost, a practical concern in uncertain times. We know, for instance, that his scores for the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Symphonies indeed went missing or remained in the possession of others.²⁵ If insecurities in his life were a motivation for his complexly annotated piano versions, that fact would help to explain why we have the meticulously prepared *eskizi* for the Eighth, not to mention several parallel sources, all from such a late stage in his compositional process.

The *eskizi* for the Eighth Symphony appear to have been the manuscripts that Shostakovich used when he orchestrated the score. This observation is based on not only on their dates and sophisticated representation, but also on extensive marginalia, some of which indicate instrumentation. As Iakubov comments, in reference to the Ninth Symphony, instrumentation in the margins of a draft suggest that Shostakovich wrote the

²³ Shostakovich showed the Eighth Symphony to colleagues while he worked on it but did not mention it publically until he had finished (Fay, *A Life*, 136). If he used these drafts at the piano, their instances of minimal notation, shorthand, or ambiguous markings would have been clear to him, though not to another performer without access to a full score. Sometimes the notation on the piano staff is so thick that it appears unplayable for two hands; but it seems that “problem,” too, would have been negligible for a pianist of Shostakovich’s caliber.

²⁴ See Chapter 2, pp. 41–42.

²⁵ NCW, 4:242; 5:173; 6:156. The publishers of the Soviet-era *Collected Works* also noted that “the whereabouts of some of [Shostakovich’s] MSS are not known.” “Publisher’s Note,” in *Sobraniye sochineniy*, vol. 1 (unpaginated). See also Chapter 1, note 14.

score directly on the basis of that draft.²⁶ In the *eskizi* for the Eighth, lists of instruments appear several times per page and seem to be precursors to, or reminders about, scoring.²⁷ Extremely detailed, the lists often give the number of instruments on a part and appear at the beginning or end of a system that prefigures music in which there is a change of instrumentation.²⁸ The marginalia look like supplemental markings, which allowed Shostakovich to see all the details of a piece in one place and write them out.

Yet there is something curious about this marginalia. For unfinished works, or those not fully orchestrated, Shostakovich's manuscripts give the impression that he wrote some instrumentation in the margins of drafts while orchestrating them, as if to preserve in them a record of what he put in the final autograph. In two unfinished composing projects, Shostakovich's lists of instruments stop precisely where his unfinished scores break off. A partial orchestration of Draft IIA, which we will discuss in the next chapter, stops at m. 124; the last instrumentation markings in Draft IIA itself are next to m. 129. The Unfinished Symphony of 1934, mentioned in Chapter 2, breaks off at m. 137; instrumentation marks in the draft end seven bars earlier, at the equivalent of m. 130.²⁹ These examples, one of which is in the *eskizi* for the Eighth Symphony, nuance the idea that piano score drafts formed the basis of an autograph score. They also

²⁶ NCW, 9:121.

²⁷ Some pages have none, like Draft IIB, which is the only draft without markings for instrumentation. It is a revised, rewritten draft, incorporating parts of Draft IIA as well as Revisions A and B, which contain several lists of instrumentation, presumably what Shostakovich would have needed to re-orchestrate IIB. The unique traits of Draft IIB are discussed in Chapter 5.

²⁸ Such as "cor. 2," "fag. 2," or "3 стр.," where стр. is an abbreviation for струнные инструменты, or "stringed instruments." When the directive «3 стр.» is given, comparison with the score suggests that the abbreviation probably indicates three string sections, violins I and II and violas.

²⁹ The first 137 measures of the draft and score are not identical; and m. 186 in the draft, where the last instrumentation is marked, corresponds to m. 130 in the score.

seem to be personal, private records, written to aid the composer while he was writing them out, but perhaps also against the event that he might have to do so again.

At the top of p. 5 in the *eskizi*, immediately after the double bar of Draft I, a list of words and phrases refers directly to scoring. All but three of its items are crossed through with a single line³⁰:

div. unis.	con sord. senza sord.
цифра	
лига и [effaced] со страницы на страницу	
лига	a 2 solo
arco и pizz	a 2 в начале страницы ³¹
	θ = θ

The list appears to be a memorandum indicating details to be added to the score—slurs, *divisi* and unison, *arco* and *pizzicato*, mutes, and so on—and all but three of its items are crossed through with a single line, as though to mark an item as a completed, or entered in the score.³² The references remind us of Manuscript Z for the Second Symphony, the partial piano score draft in which Shostakovich directly cited an existing, though perhaps unpolished score. Whereas Manuscript Z probably post-dated a score, the piano score drafts of the Eighth Symphony were written immediately before, even in alternation with, the final autograph. It seems that the creation of a draft and corollary score was a nearly simultaneous, almost inseparable activity for Shostakovich at a final stage of writing.

³⁰ The three items not crossed through are “a 2 solo,” “a 2 в начале страницы,” and θ = θ.

³¹ The Russian words are *tsifra* [number], *liga i [effaced] so stranitsi na stranitsu* [slur and . . . from one page to another], *liga* [slur], *arco i pizz*, and *a 2 v nachale stranitsi* [a 2 at the beginning of the page].

³² The three items not crossed through are “a 2 solo,” “a 2 в начале страницы,” and θ = θ.

The *eskizi* for the Eighth Symphony bespeak a special pride, as though Shostakovich placed some value on creating a systematic piano score copy of this work. From the chart on p. 84, we see that Drafts I, IIB, III, IV, and V, the drafts of the movements in the autograph score, are not consecutive in the *eskizi*, but interrupted by Revision A, Draft IIA, Revision B, and the Anthem. Despite this, the *eskizi* are actually easy to follow because various organizational elements help to systematize their appearance and seem to indicate that Shostakovich arranged his drafts after finishing them and with the purpose of preserving them. Labeling only drafts that prefigure the autograph score, he wrote page and movement numbers on them and created a kind of title-page, which identifies composer, piece, and date. Moreover, in drafts this highly organized and properly labeled, it seems significant that Draft IIA has no movement number or pagination,³³ and that Draft IIA, Revisions A and B, and the national anthem are each crossed through with a large red X. Shostakovich's organization of the *eskizi* suggests a conscious ordering of their content in a manner that highlights what music is in the autograph score and what is not. The impression is that he took pains to make these drafts a coherent copy of the symphony.³⁴

Shostakovich wrote page numbers in red pencil and in Arabic numerals and placed them at the upper right, left, or center of the pages. His pagination skips Draft IIA, which is three pages long; but it is interesting to note that he originally numbered the first two pages of Draft IIA as pp. 6 and 7 and Draft IIB, which follows them, as pp. 8–

³³ Draft V, which starts on p. 14 [16], does not have a movement number, perhaps because there is no room for one since the page's top margin contains a penciled sketch of the movement's opening bassoon solo. See Chapter 4, pp. 96–97.

³⁴ As the chart on p. 5 shows, Revision A, Draft IIA, Revision B, and the anthem interrupt the orderly sequence of Drafts I, IIB, III, IV, and V; but the interruptions actually intrude relatively little on the flow of the *eskizi*—unlike the disruptions in the *eskizi* for the Tenth Symphony—because of Shostakovich's organization.

10. Later, however, scribbling out these five pages numbers, 6–10, he skipped Draft IIA and renumbered IIB as pp. 6–8. Draft IIA is probably among the *eskizi* because it is an early version of the second movement, although certain anomalies in an incomplete score might also be explained if the movement had originally been written as the beginning of another work.³⁵ Ultimately, the draft seems to have been excluded from pagination because it was not part of the Eighth Symphony, as we know it from the autograph score.³⁶

The bold, red X's in the *eskizi* that cross through music not in the autograph score also warrant mention because they seem to be part of the composer's conscious ordering and purpose to create a piano score record of the work. Admittedly, what has so far been described of Shostakovich's compositional habits challenges this possibility. According to Olga Dombrovskaya and Manashir Iakubov, large X's are not marks of deletion or exclusion, but of completion: they indicate that a crossed-out passage has been rewritten in fair copy or orchestrated. Iakubov states that

Shostakovich crossed out [large sections of a page or entire pages] after making a fair copy (or orchestrating).³⁷

In Dombrovskaya's words,

[Shostakovich] had the habit of drawing an X through parts of his sketches that he had rewritten in fair copy or orchestrated. In

³⁵ See Chapter 5, pp. 119–20.

³⁶ An archivist's numbering is written in pencil in the upper corners of each page and includes pages [6–7] of Draft IIA, which Shostakovich originally paginated, then skipped over. Neither numbering includes the first page of the *eskizi*, which serves as a title-page. In both Shostakovich's and the archivist's paginations, Draft I begins on p. 1 and ends on p. 5, from which point, as Chart I in Appendix B shows, the numberings are off by two pages.

³⁷ NCW, 9:138.

this way, he marked [in the sketches] which sections of the autograph were worked through.³⁸

Some of Shostakovich's manuscripts illustrate this pattern, such as parts of the Tenth Symphony sketches, where many (but not all) pages prefiguring a part of the autograph score are crossed out. The file of *otrivki*, or "excerpts" from the Eighth Symphony, contains another example, a folded quarto, which Shostakovich extracted from the fourth movement of the score, recopied, then crossed through and gave to his neighbor as a gift.³⁹ With the *eskizi* for the Eighth Symphony, however, there is a clear departure from the presumed norm.

A final organizational marking in the *eskizi* is the title-page. It too is crossed through from corner to corner with a red X, and the words "D. Shostakovich – Eighth Symphony – 1943" are written in red pencil and centered underneath each other down the page.⁴⁰ Nine systems of notation are written in black ink on the page, along with a six-bar fragment near the bottom.⁴¹ This music is the third page of Draft IIA, a fact deflected

³⁸ Ol'ga Dombrovskaya, "Dve stranitsi iz yezhednevnika Shostakovicha" *DSCH* (2005): 69.

³⁹ In two places, the extracted pages show an incomplete ground bass in the fourth movement; and at each occurrence, Shostakovich noted that an extra measure needed to be added. The excerpt corresponds to pp. 49–50 and 63–64 in the autograph score, where, in the recopied version, the additional bars are present and the ground bass complete. Shostakovich signed the crossed-through excerpt: "To Alexey Kruchenikh from Dmitri Shostakovich, from the 8th Symphony, 1943, 17 X." See also Appendix D, p. 163.

⁴⁰ A penciled Roman numeral *I* in the upper right-hand corner is probably a movement number. It may not be in Shostakovich's hand and, in any case, does not look like his other movement numbers, which in rest of the document are written in red pencil and centered over the beginning of drafts.

⁴¹ The fragment prefigures the treble line of Movement I from R23+2 to R24. See Chapter 4, p. 97.

by its more prominent identification of the Eighth Symphony. Overleaf, Draft I begins and is the first complete draft seen in the *eskizī*.⁴²

In addition to their sophisticated organization and presentation of the Eighth Symphony, the *eskizī* also appear to be a working document, which not only aided Shostakovich in writing out the autograph score, but which also contain many incidental, sometimes ambiguous markings, including phone numbers, lists of numerals, elaborations of already sophisticated sketches, and occasional, isolated musical fragments next to fully written drafts. The extraneous seems at odds with the sophistication and orderliness of the main body. Some markings, such as the elaboration of a draft, are germane to the Eighth Symphony, but suggest fastidiousness, even fussiness on the composer's part. They seem incidental, if not a little gratuitous, especially when writing the autograph score came on the heels of writing the *eskizī*. It is not possible to know what many of the anomalies mean, or their motivation. Nevertheless, we will describe them here in order to avoid either homogenizing or simplifying a discussion of the drafts.

Several kinds of marginalia are present in the *eskizī*. The first, having to do with instrumentation, has already been discussed. Other marginalia include cryptic lists of numbers. In Draft I, on p. 3, the numbers *11, 6, 5* and *2, 2, 3, 2* are written in the left margin, near music that prefigures R28ff and that was crossed out and rewritten. On p. 4, the numbers *60, АНС. 61, 62, 63, 64* are written in the lower right-hand margin, where the drafted music corresponds to the end of the first movement; there is no obvious relationship to the music. In Draft IIA, along the right-hand margin of p. [6], the numbers *9, 5, 3* and *9, 3* appear in a vertical list to the right of music corresponding to

⁴² On this draft, p. 1 is marked in the upper left-hand corner and a Roman numeral *I* in the center top margin. A small 8 in black ink, also at top center, signifies “8th Symphony”; and the date 2 VII 1943 is written at top right.

R47ff. The numbers may have something to do with instrumentation or bars of a score; but again, their meaning is unclear. They appear incidental and irrelevant (or interpretable only to the composer) because what they signify is unknown.

Phone numbers also appear in the margins of the drafts, as at the top of p. 4⁴³:

Г6465 [effaced] Adagio Г646552 K59675⁴⁴

The numbers look like they were jotted down quickly on an available sheet of paper and have no apparent relevance to the Eighth Symphony. Similarly, some marginalia about music seem to comprise incidental, unrelated memoranda. On the *eskizi*'s title-page are a list of keys in the right-hand margin and a list of songs at the bottom of the page.⁴⁵ The list of keys, written in pencil, starts at *C* and goes chromatically through the 24 keys to end with *h* (B minor). All but seven of the keys are neatly crossed out with a single line. Of the remaining keys, Shostakovich circled *es*, *e*, *F*, and *fis*, and left *as*, *A*, and *b* unmarked. To the right of the 24-key list, he wrote a shorter list—*es*, *e*, *F*, *fis*, *as*, and *b*—and circled it. No other markings on the page explain what these lists are or if they have any relation to the Eighth Symphony. Near the bottom of the page, Shostakovich penciled the titles of the songs in his *Six Romances on Verses by Raleigh, Burns and*

⁴³ The phone numbers are written in black pencil and *Adagio* in ink. The top of p. 4 is a sketch of R33+11ff, and *Adagio* almost certainly refers to the tempo change at R34. Incidentally, it is the only tempo marking in the entire document.

⁴⁴ A Cyrillic letter followed by five or six numbers indicates a phone number in Moscow, the first letter and numeral, Г6 or K5, specifying a region of the city and its telephone station. If one knows where Shostakovich's friends or colleagues lived, it is sometimes possible to work out whose number he wrote down. K5 was Shostakovich's own telephone station; and therefore, the number K59675 indicates someone who lived near him, perhaps his neighbor, Alexey Kruchenikh. Olga Dombrovskaya, conversation with author, Dmitri Shostakovich's Archive, Moscow, Russia, 2 July 2007. When Shostakovich moved to Kirov Street in Moscow in 1943, his phone number, as given to Isaak Glikman, was K 5-98-72. Glikman, *Story of a Friendship*, 20.

⁴⁵ Other marginalia on the page includes the phone number "K34187" written in pencil; the Roman numeral *I*, mentioned earlier; and below it, the word *tsifri*, or "numbers."

Shakespeare—Sinu, Dzhenni, 12 with an *x* below it, *Makferson, Korol'*, and *Sonet*.⁴⁶

Like other marginalia, the list has no clear relevance to the Eighth Symphony; and its literal information is ambiguous. Perhaps this is what Shostakovich intended, or perhaps he simply jotted these things down randomly. The markings do, however, seem at odds with his fastidious care and organization of the *eskizī*, which, on the one hand, look like a piano score copy of the Eighth Symphony and, on the other, contain these various informalities that seem completely irrelevant.

Another category of peculiar markings includes details and elaborations that Shostakovich added to already polished drafts. These additions are written in pencil within or next to drafts already finished (in ink), as though Shostakovich inserted the notes sometime later, perhaps to ensure that he would remember them if he needed to recall them. From a compositional standpoint, the additions seem unnecessary, sometimes excessively detailed—a few chords, a little counterpoint, or a short melodic figure. They are not elaborations of schematic passages, as we saw in some *eskizī* for the Tenth Symphony. On the contrary, the passages in each case are coherent without the additions, but match the autograph score exactly with them.⁴⁷ The extraordinary specificity of these markings contributes to the impression of sophisticated drafting,

⁴⁶ “To a Son,” “Jenny,” “12 x,” “Makferson,” “The King,” and “Sonnet.” The title not included, or perhaps represented with *12 x*, is “V polyakh pod snegom i dozhdem” (“In the Fields under Snow and Rain”), the second romance dedicated to Nina Shostakovich. This romance is also untitled in the autograph score, which was completed on 18 March 1943 in Arkhangelskoye. *6 romansov na stikhi angliksikh poetov* [6 romances on texts by English poets], GTsMMK, f. 32, yed. khr. 87.

⁴⁷ On p. 21 [23], at the equivalent of mm. 482–84 in the fifth movement, the strings’ chords are shown in pencil in Draft V, as if added after the rest of the draft, which is written in ink. Similarly, at mm. 496–500, the rests and lower bassoon notes are written in pencil, indicating later notation. On p. 23 [25], at the equivalent of R171, or mm. 550–54, Shostakovich penciled in the half- and quarter-note harmonies as inner voices and, at m. 555, added the violin solo on ledger lines above the staff.

which prefigured (and duplicated) the score and produced an *aide-mémoire*, or copy, of it.

A few isolated fragments of ideas, which are all part of the music of the Eighth Symphony, comprise a final miscellany within the context of the detailed, sequential drafts. On p. 5, two staves below Revision A, Shostakovich penciled an eleven-bar melody in G# minor and in alto clef. The line on first consideration looks like a fragment from nowhere; but it is the ground bass for Movement IV, notated in triple meter on p. 5, and later in common time in Draft IV⁴⁸:



The melody looks incongruous among the complete, detailed drafts of the *eskizi*. Is it a lone survivor of early, fragmentary ideas that Shostakovich wrote down but destroyed? Or was it a sudden thought, perhaps an intrusion of sorts at this point in the document, and thus comparable to other enigmatic and seemingly haphazard markings?

Another melodic fragment appears at the beginning of Draft V on p. 14 [16], where Shostakovich drew an extra staff in the top margin and wrote out mm. 11–18 of the fifth movement. Although there is no clef sign, the notation shows the bassoons in tenor clef⁴⁹:



⁴⁸ Transcription by the present author from *Simfoniya No. 8. Klavir, eskizi*, 5.

⁴⁹ Transcription by the present author from *Simfoniya No. 8. Klavir, eskizi*, 14 [16].

Immediately below, Draft V starts on the manuscript's printed staves. The draft is written in black ink, in piano score, in treble clef, and at concert pitch⁵⁰:



Different clefs and four extra eighth notes (C#-D#-E-G#), discretely scribbled through, in m. 12 of Draft V are the only discrepancies between the two passages. The repetition of mm. 11–18 in the margin above Draft V is odd and serves no obvious purpose.

A six-bar passage at the bottom of the title-page, which, we recall, is also the third page of Draft IIA, is a final isolated fragment. It prefigures six before R24 in Movement I, a passage that is also in Draft I. In both Draft I and the fragment, the passage is coherent, although in the fragment it does not correspond perfectly with the autograph score; and in both instances, the six bars are numbered,⁵¹ a technique that Shostakovich seems to have used to indicate two sketches of the same passage. The fragment on the title page is the treble part before R24, written out with rhythmic and notational detail and probably numbered to identify where the music fits with Draft I⁵²:



Given the comprehensive preparation illustrated in Draft I, it is certainly surprising to find a single, separate fragment, which shows slight rhythmic variations of a

⁵⁰ Ibid. Only the treble line is reproduced here.

⁵¹ The numbering is 1–6 in Draft I and 1–5 in the fragment, where the sixth bar is shown with a repeat sign (·/·).

⁵² Transcription by the present author from *Simfoniya No. 8. Klavir, eskizi, I*.

six-bar idea. Why Shostakovich wrote any of these passages seems inexplicable. Nevertheless, the overall impression is that the *eskizi* represent a final, polished draft of the Eighth Symphony, in which interruptions and certain informalities of a working document are observable. The drafts show little compositional process but reflect a significant anterior process, written or not, in which the shape, structure, and detail of the symphony had been fully refined. In one instance only, some thoughts were apparently not altogether secure, even at this final stage of writing, as the next chapter will elaborate.

The fact that Shostakovich wrote out his annotated piano drafts so late—indeed, in alternation with the autograph score—explains why it is so difficult to justify them as a stage of composition, presumably preceded by other stages. Given the number of similar drafts for other symphonies, at least from what we can tell to date, it would be interesting to know how he wrote later symphonies, not to mention works in other media, the compositional record of which may have been preserved in other ways. We do know that he wrote the Tenth Symphony quite differently. Until we understand far more about Shostakovich's sketch materials, we must consider the possibility that his piano score drafts reflect not only a final stage of composition, or writing out of a piece, but also a means of preserving a record of his works, which would have allowed him to recompose them if necessary.

CHAPTER 5

VERSIONS AND REVISIONS: COMPOSITIONAL PROCESS IN MOVEMENT II OF SYMPHONY NO. 8

The external embodiment . . . often suggests new possibilities for treating the material.¹

Sometimes it happens that I begin writing, and then have second thoughts. It doesn't always turn out as I intended.²

On 29 July 1943, while still orchestrating the first movement of Symphony No. 8, Shostakovich began a piano score draft of the second movement. In the next three weeks, he completed the second movement and orchestrated almost half of it, but then revised two large sections, wrote a new piano score draft incorporating his revisions, and orchestrated the new draft as Movement II of the Eighth Symphony. Shostakovich's two drafts of the second movement, hereinafter *Drafts IIA* and *IIB*, are in the file of *eskizī* for Symphony No. 8 and are variants of the same movement: both are in tripartite reprise form; 168 bars (of 308 in the earlier version) are the same; the differences are all in the B section and music based on B in development, reprise, and coda.³ Also in the file of *eskizī* are two revisions of large sections of Draft IIA, hereinafter *Revisions A* and *B*,

¹ Shostakovich, quoted in Gruber, "Responses," in *Shostakovich and His World*, 36. Original emphasis.

² Dmitriy Shostakovich, "Kak rozhdayetsa muzīka" [How Music Is Born], *Literaturnaya gazeta* (21 December 1965): 3.

³ *Simfoniya No. 8. Klavir, eskizī* [Symphony No. 8. Piano score, sketches], RGALI, f. 2048, op. 1, yed. khr. 11. In the order of its musical content, Draft IIA occupies pp. [6–7] and the title page of the *eskizī*; Draft IIB is on pp. 6–8 [8–10]. See Chapter 4, p. 83.

which comprise, respectively, revisions of the B section and its reprise.⁴ An unfinished orchestration of Draft IIA is hereinafter *Score IIA*, which is preserved in the *otrivki*, or “excerpts,”⁵ while Movement II of the autograph score of the Eighth Symphony is an orchestration of Draft IIB.⁶ Examining the content and chronology of these six manuscripts, this chapter presents three stages of composition for the second movement—a complete and partially orchestrated first version (Draft IIA and Score IIA), two revisions to produce a second version (Revisions A and B), and a final draft and score of the complete second version (Draft IIB and Movement II). In the course of writing out the movement, Shostakovich changed musical content and instrumentation, which altered the movement’s expression and relation to the symphony as a whole. Tracing this compositional process, Shostakovich’s manuscripts illuminate his claim that his conception of a work was complete before writing, yet subject to change during writing.

Like the other drafts in the *eskizi*, the manuscripts for the second movement come from a near-final stage of composition, in the sense that even the earliest manuscript (Draft IIA) is a polished piano score draft showing all the details of the movement and predating a corollary score by a matter of days. Shostakovich does not seem to have written Draft IIA in anticipation of reworking it, but as part of a long-meditated conception. The draft was already complete when he decided to change it; and, to appearances, the act of writing it out led him to revise his ideas. Thus, even at a near-final stage, Shostakovich reconsidered some decisions, abandoned sophisticated ideas,

⁴ Revision A is on p. 5 in the *eskizi*, and Revision B on p. 11 [13].

⁵ *Simfoniya No. 8. Partitura* [Symphony No. 8. Autograph score], RGALI, f. 2048, op. 1, yed. khr. 9. See also Appendix D.

⁶ *Simfoniya No. 8. Partitura, otrivki 1, 2, 3 ch.* [Symphony No. 8. Autograph score, excerpts from movements 1, 2, 3], RGALI, f. 2048, op. 1, yed. khr. 10.

and reworked the music's function and expression as a movement of the Eighth Symphony.

Drafts IIA and IIB are the only examples in Shostakovich's symphonic sketch materials available to date in which we find two complete variants of the same piece. These drafts respond differently to the Eighth Symphony in terms of style. Draft IIA fit into the symphony's lyrical expression—a mode that David Haas identifies in Movements I and V and considers a tradition of “symphonic lyricism” rooted in Tchaikovsky.⁷ The product of rethinking, Draft IIB, revealed new ideas about expression and sonority in Movement II and contributed differently to the integrity of the entire symphony than did the rejected version. Draft IIB reflected the symphony's broad preoccupation with solo woodwind sonorities and better fit into the scherzo idiom not only within Movement II, but also of other Shostakovich symphonies. This chapter offers a discussion of compositional process and stages—Draft IIA and Score IIA, then Revisions A and B, and lastly Draft IIB and Movement II—elaborates the different relations of Drafts IIA and IIB both internally as movements and externally to the entire work, and closes with some suggestions of how the two variants illuminate meaning in the Eighth Symphony.

Shostakovich's revisions of the second movement have to do with the B section, beginning at m. 67 in the score, elaborated briefly in development (mm. 127–41), and reprised at m. 187. In Draft IIA, the B section is 80 bars, and the reprise of B is 51 bars—considerably longer than this section in the final version, where B is 35 bars and its reprise is 30 bars. From Draft IIA to the movement's final form in the autograph score,

⁷ David Haas, “Shostakovich's Eighth: C Minor Symphony against the Grain,” in *Shostakovich in Context*, ed. Rosamund Bartlett (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 125.

Shostakovich modified or wholly rewrote the B section in each of its appearances—statement, development, and reprise—by shortening it and altering its melodic content and instrumentation. We can trace these changes by describing his manuscripts in relation to the autograph score.

Movement II in the autograph score is a scherzo of 250 bars and is graphed below. Bar numbers in the graph refer to the autograph score, but it may be noted that the structure and harmonic areas are the same in Drafts IIA and IIB:

A	B	Development	A¹ (A & B reprised)		Coda
			[A]	[B]	
(1)	(67)	(102)	(156)	(187)	(217)
D-flat I	Am #v	A-flat V	D-flat I	Dm #i	D-flat I
R46	R53	R57	R64	R67	R70

In Draft IIA (and its partial orchestration in Score IIA), the most striking differences with the autograph score are the length, melody, and instrumentation of the B section, which Shostakovich wholly altered in subsequent stages, by halving the length of B, replacing its musical content, and changing its instrumentation. The changes that document his decision to rewrite parts of Draft IIA are evident in Revisions A and B, which point early and clearly to the movement as we know it. In Revision A, we see a (partially) reworked B section, whose melody and length (though not accompaniment) prefigure the final score. In Revision B, we have a revised reprise, which matches the final autograph. In Draft IIB and Movement II, Shostakovich slightly modified Revision A—that is, the B section as already revised—and altered part of the development of Draft IIA, which he had not dealt with in either revision. The following chart compares his

manuscripts. Since Draft IIB and Movement II are essentially identical, they are grouped together.

Movement II/Draft IIB (250 bars)	Draft IIA (308 bars)	Revisions
A (1–66)	Same	
B (67–101)	Different (80 bars, 45 bars longer)	Revision A (prefigures score imprecisely for 67–101)
Development , opening (102–7) Continuation (107–155)	Slightly different (8 bars) Same (some differences at 127–41)	Revision A (prefigures score exactly for 102–7)
Reprise of A (156–86)	Same	
Reprise of B (187–216)	Different (51 bars, 21 bars longer)	Revision B (prefigures score exactly for mm. 187–216)
Coda for ten bars (217–27)	Not in Draft IIA	Revision B (prefigures score exactly for mm. 217–34)
Remainder of Coda (227–50)	Same	

As shown in the chart, two large passages in the autograph score—mm. 67–101 and 187–227, which represent the B section—have no precursor in Draft IIA. Score IIA, the unfinished orchestration of Draft IIA, is 124 bars long and reflects Draft IIA exactly until the middle of the B section, where the score ends abruptly. This looks like the point at which Shostakovich decided to make changes, that is, in the act of writing out the B section.

Revisions A and B show the reconception of the B section, in which Shostakovich wrote a new melody, shortened statement and reprise, and indications of new instrumentation. Forty-one bars long, Revision A imprecisely prefigures mm. 67–107 of the final autograph—that is, the B section (mm. 67–101) and the first six bars of the development (mm.102–7).⁸ The Revision appears to be the turning point in the composer’s rethinking of Movement II, because the changes he made here—in length, melody, harmony, and instrumentation—necessitated the rewriting of the B section wherever its music reappeared in development, reprise, and coda. The rewriting of these later occurrences is evident in Revision B and in Draft IIB and the final score. Whatever its significance as a turning point, Revision A does not reflect a total rewriting of the B section, but retains the accompaniment from Draft IIA. Revision B, the other manuscript in Shostakovich’s second compositional stage, is a revision of the reprise of the B section and the first half of the coda. It is 46 bars long, matches mm. 187–234 of the autograph score exactly,⁹ and is the consequence compositionally of the new ideas introduced in Revision A.

Draft IIB and Movement II represent Shostakovich’s final compositional stage, which brings the movement down to 250 bars and shows a few minor alterations of ideas set down in Revisions A and B. Draft IIB prefigures the autograph score in every detail, which means that we can use the terms *Draft IIB* and *Movement II* interchangeably in referring to essential musical content. The transformation of the B section of Movement II, not yet complete in Revision A, is here complete; and every revisiting of music based

⁸ The opening of the development in Draft IIA is eight bars and differs somewhat from the autograph score, although a correspondence is evident. See Chapter 5, p. 17–18.

⁹ At the equivalent of m. 227, Draft IIA, Revision B, and Movement II are essentially the same. In Draft IIA, the measure does not contain the rhythmic detail of the other manuscripts; but an outline of the melodic idea is clear.

on B anticipates exactly the score. At m. 67ff, Draft IIB incorporates Revision A's new melody but also shows a new accompaniment that completes the transformation of musical content in this section. In the development, Draft IIB contains a different elaboration for the passage prefiguring mm. 127–41 of the score, which in Draft IIA was similar to, but not identical with, the final autograph. In the reprise and coda, Draft IIB incorporates Revision B exactly. The draft is a clean, polished copy of Movement II, putting the draft at the same level of completion and integration as the piano score drafts of the other movements. Including all the information already in earlier stages of composition, it is an orderly presentation of the movement, in which only two small changes are evident since earlier stages. This last stage seems to be more about the organized, sequential arrangement of the revised movement than about the setting down of new ideas.

Having shown the chronology of Shostakovich's manuscripts, we can now most easily trace his process by examining how the B section, its development, and reprise change at each compositional stage; and we can also propose reasons for the changes in compositional terms. The statement of B at m. 67 undergoes three stages in Draft IIA, Revision A, and Movement II. Its elaboration in development has two stages, Draft IIA and Movement II; and the reprise and beginning of the coda also have two stages, Draft IIA and Revision B. Some changes made in Revision B are further clarified in Draft IIB and the autograph score, though these clarifications are more cosmetic than compositional.

The B section in Draft IIA prefigures nothing of the final score except texture, namely, a solo instrument over reduced strings. In Draft IIA, the solo part is for

pianoforte¹⁰; in Movement II, the soloist is the piccolo flute. A piano is not included in the instrumentation of the Eighth Symphony as we know it, so its inclusion in the first version of Movement II creates some disjunction with the rest of the symphony. Yet there is precedent in Shostakovich's symphonies for piano as a solo instrument. We recall the First and Fifth Symphonies, noting, too, that the piano in those works appears in more than one movement. What is unusual in the Eighth Symphony is the style of the piano music, which is long, lyrical, and wandering, and found in the B section of Movement II, which is a scherzo. This music creates stark contrast both within the movement and by comparison with piano solos—indeed, the use of piano—in other Shostakovich symphonies, where solo moments are brief, and piano music is found in scherzo idiom (Symphony No. 1/II), in frenetic runs or bright coloration (Symphonies Nos. 1/IV or 5/III), and in percussive roles (Symphony Nos. 1/II, 5/I, and 5/IV). None of these examples is lyrical. After Draft IIA for the Eighth Symphony, Shostakovich revised the piano for a more scherzo-like alternative featuring the piccolos.

The B section of Draft IIA opens with the piano in A minor (**Example 5.1**).¹¹ Over broken-chord accompaniment in the left hand and sustained string chords, the piano solo starts with an octave leap down from a high E, which is followed by high repeated notes and a turn, a leap to mid-register, and an ascending scale to B-flat. The repeated notes and turn are heard again over a (minor) subdominant chord before the music moves

¹⁰ Score IIA shows this instrumentation. In the following discussion of Draft IIA, all references to instrumentation are based on the partial orchestration in Score IIA.

¹¹ See Appendix C. All examples from Shostakovich's manuscripts are based on the author's transcriptions. Bar numbers have been inserted for ease of orientation and refer only to selected passages; they do not occur in the original manuscripts. Thus, the B section in Draft IIA is shown as mm. 1–80 in transcription; but the numbering does not correspond to the section's actual bars in Draft IIA. Instrumental and dynamic markings have been inserted by the author on the basis of Score IIA.

back to A minor. A motif of descending thirds enters in the flutes (m. 14), after which the piano picks up its scalar figure and moves to G minor for a restatement of mm. 6–14, now a minor third lower and followed by wandering elaboration. Nearly forty bars into the second-theme area, the piano solo ends. Other instruments take up the melody; and the piano joins the accompaniment, which is not fully notated in Draft IIA (**Example 5.2**) but is written out in Score IIA. The melodic octave, turn, and scale figures of the melody are played by different instruments; descending thirds are interspersed again between phrases; and the piano's broken chords, now played by the low strings, continue throughout the rest of the section. After eighty bars, the B section closes with a pickup to the development, where the draft begins to prefigure mm. 102–7 of the autograph score, albeit imprecisely (**Example 5.3**).

In Score IIA, the piano is scored from the beginning of the movement, where it doubles strings and woodwinds in the A section, and takes up its solo in the B section in a manner reminiscent of a classical piano concerto, albeit without repetition of opening music. A question of genre is raised when the piano solo begins, almost concerto-like, even if that impression fades as the instrument recedes into accompaniment. The effect of the piano, with its extraordinary material, simple lyricism, and *concertante* element, is almost bizarre for the choice of instrument, the length of its solo, and the contrast with the A section. Shostakovich's articulation, given in Score IIA, underscores the piano's expression. The left-hand of the piano part is shown with one long phrase mark over nearly 35 measures, below which the strings sustain tied chords. The right-hand part has long, lyrical phrases, as illustrated in **Example 5.4**. Signaling a striking change of mood and style, the lyrical music creates strong contrasts with the A section. *Fortissimo*

unisons and contrapuntal textures in the A section give way to expressive solo work in the B section; D-flat major moves to A minor; and a forceful 4/4 meter slips seamlessly into a waltz-like 3/4. Melody, style, and idiom, as well as texture, key, and rhythm, change completely.

Arresting as its appearance and expression are, however, the piano solo in Draft IIA seems related to lyrical interludes found in every other movement of the Eighth Symphony except the third. Movement I contains three important lyrical themes—the first theme of the exposition proper at m. 10, the second theme, and the recitative for English horn in the recapitulation. Movement IV is a slow passacaglia with obligato passages for flute piccolo and clarinet. Movement V contains the gentle themes of a “rondo pastorale,” as well as lyrical solos in the coda.¹² Moreover, the piano’s solo in Draft IIA may be specifically related to the long, poignant English horn obligato in Movement I (R35), which leads into the reprise of the second theme by the same instrument (R38). **Example 5.5** shows the piano and English horn melodies. Both themes open with sustained note values and a falling interval. Both contain a long, ascending scalar figure in the middle of the phrase, then a chromatic descent through the interval of a fourth at the end. Both come at important structural points in their respective movements, produce stark contrasts with preceding music, and arrest that music’s forward momentum; and both are lyrical obligatos over sustained string chords. It seems possible that the piano solo of Draft IIA is, in some sense, a transformation, even a faint echo of the English horn in Movement I. In that relationship, Draft IIA highlights some inter-movement connection within the Eighth Symphony and sustains the emphasis

¹² Haas, “Shostakovich’s Eighth,” 131. Haas discusses the themes in Movements I and V, suggesting that the Eighth Symphony’s lyrical emphasis is “consistent with late nineteenth-century lyrical dramatic symphonies” (128).

on lyrical interlude found throughout the work. We note, however, that most of the lyrical solos in the Eighth are for woodwinds, and that the interludes in Movements I, IV, and V are in keeping with the overall expression of those movements. Contrasting starkly with the scherzo that it interrupts, the piano solo in Draft IIA produces an entirely different sonority and effect.

Revision A eliminates the piano solo and prefigures much of the final score (**Example 5.6**). In it, the statement of B is reduced by more than half, and the piano solo replaced by a spiky, angular tune that essentially matches the autograph score, given a few enharmonic pitches. While Revision A foreshadows the score, however, its anticipation is not exact. A gentle broken-chord accompaniment in the bass clef is retained from Draft IIA, and the old accompaniment underlying the new melody in a new character makes the B section an odd juxtaposition of the gently lyrical with the energetic and asymmetrical. Nevertheless, while Revision A retains ideas from Draft IIA, it is close to the autograph score and is a major step in revising the music for Movement II.

In a second significant change, Revision A indicates a change of instrumentation, eliminating the piano and replacing it with piccolo instruments. We may infer this change from Shostakovich's marginalia, which in Revision A do not include piano, but rather piccolo flute and piccolo clarinet. In Revision A, two lists give the same set of instruments in different orders and contain an abbreviation for piccolo flute or piccolo clarinet at the top of each grouping¹³:

fl. *picc.*
fag. 2
3 *str.* [strings]
cor. 2

¹³ The abbreviations and capitalization are Shostakovich's.

Cl. picc.
Trbe 2

Cl. picc.
Trbe 2
cor. 2
fag. 2
fl. picc.
3 *str.*

The scoring of the B section in Movement II reflects this instrumentation,¹⁴ a correlation that supports the suggestion that a change of instrumentation was primary in Shostakovich's rethinking of Movement II. Two details in Revision A's marginalia seem to draw attention to the new, primary role of the high woodwinds. The first is the order of instruments in Shostakovich's groupings, where one piccolo instrument is placed at the top of each list and the other is near the bottom. While it is true that any list of instruments would begin with the high woodwinds, Shostakovich's lists do not follow a typical ordering. In the first list, where the piccolo flute is at the top, the piccolo clarinet is written below the bassoons, strings, and horns—instruments that would also be out of order in a typical grouping in an orchestral score. In the second list, the piccolo clarinet is at the top but the piccolo flute near bottom, below trumpets, horns, and bassoons. A second detail that draws attention to these instruments is an extra abbreviation of "fl. picc." and "cl. picc." written separately, in pencil, below Revision A. Like the lists, the marking seems to highlight these instruments, which contribute to new sonority in the movement.

¹⁴ There are only a few minor differences between Revision A's lists and the orchestration of the autograph score. The latter, for example, includes tuba in mm. 81–85, which is not listed in Revision A, as well as three trumpets and four horns instead of two of each.

This new sonority is comparable to sonority and idioms in Shostakovich's second movements in general. We note particularly the role of piccolo instruments in other second movements, including the piccolo clarinet in Movement II of the Fifth Symphony and the E-flat piccolo clarinet in the second movement of the Sixth Symphony. Moreover, given the prominence of woodwind solos throughout the Eighth Symphony, exchanging piano for piccolos in Movement II seems appropriate to timbres and sonority throughout that work, if not to their lyrical expression. The change also seems appropriate to the style and mood of the A section and makes the movement more internally consistent.

It is helpful here to anticipate a discussion of Revision B, the revised reprise of the B section, where marginalia contain lists of instruments showing increased woodwind and percussion, including xylophone, tamburo, bass clarinet, and contrabassoon. These low woodwinds and percussion are not in Score IIA, Shostakovich's first orchestration; but one or more of them are present in all movements of Symphony No. 8. Like the instrumentation in Revision A, the instrumentation of Revision B points to new expression and sonority, through instrumentation, as primary in Shostakovich's rethinking and significant to the integrity of the entire symphony. Revision B's lists, given below, reflect the instrumentation of mm. 187–234 in the autograph score¹⁵:

fl.
cl.
5
xyl.
T-ro [Tamburo]
cor. 2
c. fag.

¹⁵ Bars 187–234 of the score are orchestrated for these instruments, and more that are not listed.

fl.
cl.
c. fag.
ob. 2
cl. basso
5
cor.
Tamburo¹⁶

In Draft IIB, the final stage of composition, the B section incorporates most of the changes already made in Revision A—length and melodic content—but also shows one further modification. The accompaniment of the B section is no longer the broken chords of Revision A, but static, staccato repetitions. In notation, the change is slight, altering only the style of accompaniment, not its chords or harmonies; but the expression of the passage is wholly altered, as all lyrical elements are excised at this stage. As orchestrated in the score, the B section opens with the melody in piccolo flute over *pianissimo* accompaniment from the strings (**Example 5.7**).¹⁷ With its new, dry accompaniment for its fast, angular melody, the B section in its final form is more homogeneous than it was in Revision A, because it eliminates the juxtaposition of lyrical and angular, and more consistent stylistically with the rest of the movement. Moreover, the B section maintains the energy of the A section, where the mood is forceful, even percussive at times; and passages of mixed meters, syncopations, and asymmetrical motifs give a driving energy. In this final stage of composition, the effect and expression of the movement as a whole are fully transformed. Shostakovich's revision of the B section thus made its statement

¹⁶ Iakubov considers single numbers in a list of instrumentation to be shorthand for instrumental ensembles. Thus, 5 can mean *quintet*, or as Iakubov identifies it in drafts for the Ninth Symphony, *string quintet* (NCW, 9:121). In Revision B, the numbers might refer to the five string sections at mm. 187–88 and after m. 217 of the score.

¹⁷ Since Draft IIB essentially matches the score, the latter is used for musical examples.

more orchestral and less soloistic, not to mention more in keeping with the rest of the movement and his own scherzo idiom.

Shostakovich's change of melody and instrumentation in the B section, first signaled in Revision A, had implications for subsequent parts of the movement. In his manuscripts after Revision A, Shostakovich altered every recurrence of the B section (or music from it) on the basis of the ideas he had introduced in Revision A. These changes are seen in the development and in the reprise and coda.

The elaboration of the B section in the development has two stages, shown in Drafts IIA and IIB. Draft IIA prefigures some elements of the autograph score at mm. 127–41; Draft IIB's prefigures the score exactly.¹⁸ **Examples 5.8** and **5.9** compare the relevant passages in Draft IIA and the autograph score.¹⁹ In Draft IIA, the fifteen-bar passage elaborates motifs of the B melody stated earlier in the draft—the scale, repeated notes, turn, and octave leap of the piano (**Example 5.8**).²⁰ These figures mainly occur in the bass, except for the scale in the alto voice (mm. 5–6), and differ from the final score. The upper voices shown in Draft IIA prefigure the score—that is, the score's flute-piccino line and its wind and string chords. Thus, while the elaborations of Draft IIA differ from those in the score, the counterpoint and accompaniment are the same.²¹ In the

¹⁸ See the chart on p. 5.

¹⁹ **Example 5.9** is a piano transcription of mm. 127–41 in the score, where the figuration is orchestrated for bass clarinet, bassoons and contrabassoon, cellos and basses. The present author's transcription from Dmitri Shostakovich, *Symphony No. 8, Op. 65* (Hamburg: Musikverlag Hans Sikorski, 1946).

²⁰ The bars of **Example 5.8** are numbered from 1 to 15 to make comparison with the **Example 5.9** easier.

²¹ For the sake of clarity, we can refer again to the chart on p. 6, which shows that, in Draft IIA, this fifteen-bar passage is part of a longer section essentially prefiguring mm. 107–86 of the final score. Within this large section, Draft IIA differs only somewhat from the final score for the bars that elaborate the B section. No part of the development is present in Revisions A and B.

score, the figurations of the development are based on the melody first given in Revision A; yet it is interesting to note that the melodic outline and low register of the passage are the same as they were in Draft IIA. In **Example 5.9**, the melodic notes that correspond to those in Draft IIA are circled. It is also evident from the example that the figuration of the score is much more extensive than was Draft IIA's.²² Although derived from different melodies, the first and final versions of the B section in development clearly have much in common. It seems that Shostakovich used his first ideas (in this passage) as the basis for his final elaboration.

The reprise of the B section undergoes two compositional stages, as reflected in the differences between Draft IIA and Revision B.²³ In Draft IIA, the reprise opens with a scale, perhaps recalling the expansive upbeat of the piano before the first statement of B; and thematic restatement begins in m. 7 with the repeated F's and turn in the bass (**Example 5.10**). The melody is in low register, with broken-chord accompaniment in the treble—the reverse of the textures in the first statement (cf. **Example 5.1**). Although no key signature appears in Draft IIA, the key is likely D minor, as in the autograph score. Once the melody starts in the seventh measure, it is reprised almost exactly for twenty bars, after which the B section turns long and wandering, as it had in its first statement. By m. 28, the broken-chord accompaniment and thirds moving in half-steps are still present (mm. 38–40); but the B theme is gone (**Example 5.11**). In the score, this passage is the beginning of the coda (m. 217), in D-flat major. In Draft IIA, however, it is still the reprise, which is 51 bars long—nearly as long as the score's reprise of both A and B,

²² Incidentally, the turn figure from Draft IIA, which starts on the upper neighbor, seems to be retained but slightly altered in this elaboration, where the turn starts on the main note (see **Example 5.9**)

²³ Draft IIB and Movement II also clarify some of the changes shown in Revision B but do not make further changes to the reprise.

which is 61 bars. The coda in Draft IIA arrives with the D chord in m. 52 of the transcription, the last bar of **Example 5.11**. Although a key change is not shown in the draft, the bar matches m. 227 of the score, which is in D-flat and is ten bars into the coda.

Revision B, the second compositional stage of the reprise, essentially matches the autograph score for mm. 187–234,²⁴ which includes a 30-bar reprise of the B section and a new beginning of the coda, which is expanded by ten bars. Revision B is the compositional consequence of Revision A. The melody of Revision B is the new melody introduced in Revision A; the length of the B section in Revision B is shortened, as was the B section in Revision A; and the instrumentation of Revision B, as implied in marginalia, indicates expanded instrumentation, a change prepared by Revision A's elimination of the piano, increased emphasis on the woodwinds, and implication of new character and sonority for the entire movement.

In each stage of revising Draft IIA, Shostakovich changed some ideas outright—such as the musical content and instrumentation of the B section, as discussed—and elaborated others differently. Examples of the latter occur in a few, short passages in Draft IIA, Revision A, and Revision B. In Draft IIA, the first eight bars of the development prefigure mm. 102–7 of the score in outline but not in detail. Revision A condenses this passage into six bars, and matches the autograph score. Comparison shows that the passages in Draft IIA and Revision A are very similar. Measures 85–88 of Draft IIA are essentially the same as mm. 39–40 of Revision A, because the notes are the same, though the rhythmic values in Revision A are twice as fast. The connection is not as close for mm. 81–83 of Draft IIA, where the draft's quarter notes in no way

²⁴ Given its near-exact correspondence with Revision B, the score may be consulted for illustration.

correspond with the eighth-note motif in mm. 36–37 of Revision A (**Examples 5.12** and **5.13**). A second example of new elaboration comes at the end of the B section of Revision A. At mm. 29–35, Revision A prefigures mm. 95–101 of the autograph score; but the revision’s melody is a straightforward dotted rhythm and does not contain the figuration added to the final version (**Examples 5.14** and **5.15**). Incidentally, at this point, Revision A drops the broken-chord accompaniment from Draft IIA and shows counterpoint that prefigures the score. The expansion of the coda in Revision B is our third example of new elaboration. Draft IIA and Revision B are the same at the equivalent of m. 227 of the score, but the ten bars before that measure differ. In Draft IIA, those bars are part of the reprise and contain a chordal, quarter-note motif probably derived from the Draft’s broken-chord accompaniment. In Revision B, the passage is the first part of the coda and features eighth-note motifs derived from the B theme of Revision A. While the music in these bars differs, each passage contains ideas from a version of the B section (**Example 5.16**).²⁵

Before considering the implications of Shostakovich’s revision of Movement II, it is worth pausing briefly to look at two curiosities in his manuscripts: Draft IIB and Score IIA. Draft IIB is a unique and remarkable document, even in the *eskiži*. It is the neatest, most refined manuscript in the file, a polished copy of Movement II in piano score. Judging by the *eskiži*’s other drafts, which seem to be immediate precursors to scoring, we might think that, similarly, Shostakovich wrote Draft IIB before orchestrating Movement II. Yet Draft IIB is not like the *eskiži*’s other near-final drafts and shows a degree of sophistication beyond them. We can compare it with Revision B. For mm.

²⁵ **Example 5.16** shows only the passage in Draft IIA, which is based on the B section in that draft (cf. **Example 5.1**). Compare also mm. 217–27 and mm. 67ff of the score.

187–234, Draft IIB and the Revision are essentially identical and match the autograph score; but Draft IIB is much neater and clearer. From m. 205 to m. 216, it is written on three staves, whereas Revision B is crowded onto two. Instead of the Revision’s dense notation, Draft IIB gives clarity to the contrapuntal passage, separates the textures, and makes the draft more readable. The draft appears to be a means of clearing the thoughts, or at least the notation of this section. Yet the scoring of an identical passage twice, with the only difference being the way the notation appears on the page, highlights what seems to be almost excessive fastidiousness. Draft IIB seems unnecessary, even redundant.

Other details, too, contribute to this impression. Draft IIB is clean and coherent, despite a few bars that are scribbled out and have a correction written next to them. It shows most of Movement II’s key and meter changes, although other drafts in the *eskizi* only occasionally include such information. Despite its sophistication and near-exact anticipation of the score, there is no evidence that Draft IIB was used in the scoring of Movement II. While the other drafts in the *eskizi* have lists of instrumentation and random marginalia like phone numbers, the margins of Draft IIB are completely clean. This absence of instrumentation is striking, partly because it is Draft IIA and Revisions A and B that contain his instrumentation, not his final manuscript, and partly because, as Iakubov comments, lists of instruments can almost always be found in Shostakovich’s drafts for orchestral works.²⁶ Perhaps Shostakovich had already made all decisions about orchestration before he wrote Draft IIB, as he had about the movement and his changes to it. While this suggestion would explain the draft’s absence of markings, it does not explain why Shostakovich wrote Draft IIB, nor if he even did so before he scored

²⁶ Iakubov states: “Instrumentation marks in the manuscript margins . . . are extremely characteristic of and almost mandatory for the drafts of Shostakovich’s orchestral compositions.” NCW, 18:119.

Movement II. The draft seems to have had some other purpose than as a document for orchestration, namely, as a document that preserves a systematic record of the movement. Draft IIB discloses nothing of compositional process because it is a report of process completed. Preserving in one place a piano score copy of Movement II, it fits into the possibility that, with the rest of the *eskizi*, it was an *aide-memoire*.²⁷

Draft IIB may also indicate some routine habit by which Shostakovich organized his compositional ideas into sequential piano score drafts. Without it, Draft IIA and Revision A and B essentially prefigure Movement II; but these manuscripts appear disjunct in the file, Draft IIA covering pp. [6–7] and the title page, Revision A occupying part of p. 5, and Revision B appearing on p. 11 [13].²⁸ Draft IIB systematizes this disjunction of the manuscripts and presents a sequential, coherent draft of Movement II. As discussed in Chapter 4, Shostakovich seems to have placed some value on making the *eskizi* for his Eighth Symphony sequential and ordered, and to have taken painstaking care over their detail and meticulous organization. Indicative of his fastidiousness, Draft IIB is not so much a place for setting down ideas, which have already been written, but of organizing their appearance.

Score IIA is a second curiosity that provides insights into Shostakovich's compositional thinking and writing. By looking at Draft IIA, Score IIA, and Revision A, we can judge that the scoring of the B section (in Score IIA) led directly to a revision of the movement. Score IIA breaks off at m. 124, two thirds of the way into the B section.²⁹

²⁷ See Chapter 4, p. 84.

²⁸ Draft IIA prefigures mm. 1–66, 107–86, 227–50 of the score; and Revisions A and B prefigure mm. 67–107 and mm. 187–227. Revision A's correspondence with the score is not exact, but the differences are hardly significant enough to warrant a new draft of the entire movement.

²⁹ That is, 61 bars into Draft IIA's 80-bar B section (**Example 5.1**).

At precisely this point in Draft IIA, on p. [7] of the *eskizi*, Shostakovich's marginalia about instrumentation stop, as though he was orchestrating and noting instrumentation in the draft when he stopped both activities, turned one page back in the *eskizi*, and began to write Revision A in the largely empty space of p. 5. While this sequence of events may disclose some fallibility in Shostakovich's (self-promoted) image of Mozartian fluency, it also leads us to recall his statement that writing down the music could lead to "new possibilities for treating the material."³⁰ More than once, he described his creative process as a combination of lengthy premeditation and the act of writing:

Shostakovich said several times that writing down the music goes very quickly, since this is preceded by lengthy reflection on the composition. Nevertheless, he also said more than once that the original idea already formed in his mind may change as he writes the music down on paper: "Sometimes it happens that I begin writing, and then have second thoughts. It doesn't always turn out as I intended."³¹

The revision of Draft IIA into Movement II illustrates this compositional timeframe in which fully prepared ideas changed as they were written down. With Draft IIA, the new ideas affected the character and content not only of Movement II, but also of the Eighth Symphony, into which the music was incorporated in a new form.

Score IIA is also unusual because it is paginated as if from the beginning of a work. Only six pages survive, although the sixth is composed right to the end without a pause, perhaps implying a continuation that does not survive.³² Shostakovich numbered

³⁰ Shostakovich, quoted in Aranovsky, "Zametki," 22.

³¹ NCW, 3:211.

³² Shostakovich probably did not finish scoring this manuscript. Many kinds of markings found in his completed scores are absent here. While the unfinished score includes notation, dynamics, articulation, instrumentation for each system, and the tempo marking *Moderato con moto* at the beginning, it has no title, movement number, rehearsal numbers, system breaks in red

these pages 1–6, writing in black ink in the upper right- and left-hand corners. His pagination is odd because his scoring of Movement I of the Eighth Symphony ends on p. 25 in the autograph score and Movement II starts on p. 26. Dated 3 August, six days after he started Draft IIA, Movement I would have been finished in the final autograph (or very nearly so) by the time Draft IIA was ready for scoring. When Shostakovich started Score IIA, then, he must have known that Movement II of the Eighth Symphony would not reasonably start from p. 1. His pagination leaves open the possibility that he was considering this the beginning of a work; or at least, the numbering might be explained if Draft IIA had at some point been considered as another work.³³ Yet the musical evidence of the movement, as both Draft IIA and Draft IIB, makes this suggestion doubtful, because only one thematic area changes, and because Draft IIA seems to have expressive and melodic links to other movements in the Eighth Symphony.

Judging from Shostakovich's changes, we can speculate that the composer revised Draft IIA because he questioned the relevance of its solo and lyrical expression within the Eighth Symphony. The example of Mahler's "Blumine" comes to mind, the brief second-movement *Andante* for Symphony No. 1 that made a five-movement work, until Mahler cast it off, apparently declaring the movement "insufficiently symphonic"

pencil, or rests in empty bars—all of which seem to be practical matters to be added at a later stage.

³³ If Movement II was not originally part of the Eighth Symphony, its revision is far more significant than the premise that some ideas changed as they were written down. Presumably, Shostakovich's reworking would indicate a re-conception of the Eighth from a traditional, four-movement work, albeit with exceptionally large outer movements that were hardly balanced by two short inner movements, to a five-movement symphony. Yet we have no indication that Shostakovich thought about his intensely serious works so casually as to add movements at the last minute. On the contrary, his manuscripts bespeak painstaking thought and detail.

because of a long solo.³⁴ It appears impossible that Shostakovich could have known “Blumine,” which Mahler had withdrawn from Symphony No. 1 by 1896 at least, and which was not rediscovered until 1966; yet the situation with Shostakovich’s two versions of the second movement may have been motivated, in some degree, by similar questions of symphonic appropriateness. Perhaps the replacement of lyrical solo and *concertante* element with new sonority and more orchestral, less soloistic music was one means of addressing these matters.

We may also ask whether the Eighth Symphony might have had a program. It is true that Shostakovich denied one, stating that “there aren’t any concrete events described in [the Eighth]”, then adding in rather unhelpful socialist-realist terms, that the work represented his “philosophical conception” that “life is beautiful.”³⁵ Yet many of his symphonies have extramusical and textual references; and many leave strong implications of meaning in the connotations of their sounds, regardless of what Shostakovich may have claimed for them. The Second, Third, Thirteenth, and Fourteenth Symphonies have texts; the Fifth has an apologia; the Seventh and Eleventh have subtitles; and the Seventh, Tenth, and Fifteenth have at least programmatic elements, as well as strongly evocative allusions. Moreover, the Eighth Symphony has long been linked to the war experience, particularly in its inner movements. Hugh Ottaway described the second movement as “an aggressive march-cum-scherzo” and the third as the “embodiment of all that is meant by a war machine.”³⁶ Haas comments that

³⁴ Bruno Walter quoting Mahler, as cited in Donald Mitchell, *The Wunderhorn Years* (London: Faber & Faber, 1975), 221.

³⁵ Shostakovich, “Vos’maya simfoniya,” 1.

³⁶ Hugh Ottaway, *Shostakovich Symphonies* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1978), 39–40. See also Sabinina, *Shostakovich—simfonist*, 222–25.

the nearly unanimous critical interpretation of the Scherzo and Toccata as evocations of the war experience is based on the evidence of brisk tempi, mechanized motion, and extreme ranges and dynamics. Significant, too, is the lack of lyrical writing; neither lyrical themes nor arioso connecting passage-work appear in movements II and III.³⁷

It is precisely this lyrical element that was present in Shostakovich's original conception of Movement II. What could be more appropriate, in a war composition, than lyrical reflection? Or was there something Mahler-esque about this lyricism—perhaps sentimental expression as a platform for nostalgia—which was inconsistent with the expressive stance of a symphony in which the lyrical connotation is often sober and tragic? We do not know what the implications of Draft IIA might have been for the rest of the Eighth Symphony, or how subsequent movements might have been affected by the presence of a piano and the mode of its expression. Perhaps Draft IIA as Movement II might have seemed like a march-cum-waltz (to borrow Ottaway's terms) of less martial evocation, and the symphony as a whole, a lyrical drama, as Haas's interpretation of Movements I and V already implies:

Shostakovich's Eighth, with its quiet close and preponderance of lyrical interludes . . . [can be read] as the final manifestation of a symphonic lyricism . . . [marked by] successive incursions of a lyrical element—and a lyrical persona.³⁸

Draft IIA fit into this symphonic lyricism in the Eighth Symphony. In that link, the draft may shed light on the significance of the Eighth, which seems to lie, as Haas suggests, in its "lyrical persona." Shostakovich's changes to Movement II came late in his compositional process, when he had scored almost half a score. Draft IIA apparently

³⁷ Haas, "Shostakovich's Eighth," 131.

³⁸ Haas, "Shostakovich's Eighth," 125.

represents his first (written) thoughts that were, for a time at least, also his last. Revisions A and B appear to represent the new ideas that came to him through the process of writing out Draft IIA in Score IIA, or possibly the ideas that he was already considering and that he then decided to pursue. Draft IIB was a copy of the final version of Movement II. These documents illustrate Shostakovich's own statements that the process of writing often led to new ideas and new elaborations; and the unusual aspects of these documents can be tied to the act of writing, and thus to the cognitive and compositional process that involved embodying the thoughts of the mind in sketches and drafts. In the Eighth Symphony, perhaps the repercussions of those thoughts, both initial and revised, applied beyond Movement II to the expression and interpretation of the entire work.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

The premise of this dissertation is that the term *compositional process*, in the western sense, has meaning for Shostakovich and can be demonstrated to some degree by surviving documents. This premise, in turn, has taken as its point of departure that Shostakovich's sketch materials illustrate his claim to extensive mental conception before writing a work and reveal the writing process as a means of testing, clarifying, or elaborating some new ideas. To study Shostakovich's sketch materials for insights into his creative process, however, is but one perspective on these manuscripts. We may also ask to what extent his manuscripts, now coming to light, can be read in different biographical and social contexts, and can enter into other issues taken up in current scholarship on the composer. As reviewed in Chapter 1, prominent genres of the secondary literature reveal scholarly and popular interest in Shostakovich's life, humanity, and how his contemporaries remembered him, in studies of his historical, social, and political milieus, in musical analyses, and in the relation of politics to meaning in his works. As Shostakovich's sketch materials become known and a more comprehensive understanding of his composing is gained, it will be increasingly possible to include sketch study as it intersects with these other areas of scholarship. As a preliminary step to this end, we can speculate about how the *eskizi* for Symphonies Nos. 8 and 10 may speak to biographical and historical circumstances surrounding the works and to questions of meaning in this music.

The Eighth and Tenth Symphonies are among Shostakovich's largest, most complex pieces. Both appeared at decisive moments in Soviet history; and both were subject to intense scrutiny in the Soviet Union, not to mention colorful interpretation at times in the West. The Eighth Symphony was written in the summer of 1943 and is the second work in the trilogy of Shostakovich's war symphonies (Nos. 7, 8, and 9). By the end of April 1943, Shostakovich and his wife Nina had left evacuation in Kuybishev (present-day Samara) and moved into an apartment in Moscow. Although the war had turned in Russia's favor by mid-1943, wartime privation continued to mark daily life. Initially, the Shostakovichs lived with "just bare walls," the composer wrote to Glikman, though he added a few weeks later that "life is more interesting here than in Kuybishev: there is the world of music to think about and take one beyond the sheer business of getting enough to eat."¹ Within a few months, Shostakovich had started his Eighth Symphony.

After the enormous success of the Seventh Symphony, the Eighth was much anticipated; but from its premiere, its reception was mixed. Its language was more difficult and less accessible than the most popular of Shostakovich's earlier symphonies. Instead of celebrating the heroism of the Soviet people, as had the Seventh, or reflecting optimism in light of anticipated Soviet triumph over the German army, the Eighth was tragic and austere. Some critics praised its musical quality, but others decried its individualism and pessimism.² As musicologist Ivan Sollertinsky presciently observed,

¹ Glikman, *Story of a Friendship*, 19–20.

² Ivan Sollertinsky and the composer Nikolay Myaskovsky were among the symphony's admirers; but Sergey Prokofiev and Yuriy Shaporin, as well as members of the Committees for the Stalin Prize and for Artistic Affairs, criticized it with varying sharpness.

[The Eighth] makes an enormous impression, but the music is significantly tougher and more astringent than the Fifth or the Seventh and for that reason it is unlikely to become popular . . . And it has some fierce enemies.³

In 1948, Shostakovich, with several other composers, was condemned for “formalistic distortions and antidemocratic tendencies in music.”⁴ His Eighth and Ninth Symphonies were singled out for censure and banned from performance.⁵

To what extent are Shostakovich’s *eskizī* for the Eighth Symphony relevant to these biographical and historical circumstances? From a practical standpoint, the physical appearance of the *eskizī*—which are written on different manuscript papers, cover almost every page from top to bottom, and include a copy of a proposed national anthem—may have had something to do with wartime privation, which likely included some shortage of manuscript paper.

The Eighth Symphony, moreover, held special importance for Shostakovich. A photograph from the summer of 1943 leaves the impression that he could not be parted from the work and shows him carrying a large manuscript—almost certainly the symphony—even while strolling with his children through Ivanovo, the composers’ retreat near Moscow where he spent much of August that year.⁶ In his diary, Glikman

³ Ivan Sollertinsky, quoted in Lyudmila Mikheyeva, *Zhizn’ Dmitriya Shostakovicha* (Moscow: Terra, 1997), 166.

⁴ The Resolution of the Central Committee of the Communist Party, “On V. Muradeli’s Opera *The Great Friendship*,” quoted in Fay, *A Life*, 158. Sergey Prokofiev, Aram Khachaturyan, Vissarion Shebalin, Gavriil Popov, Nikolay Myaskosky were also condemned in the Resolution.

⁵ The Sixth Symphony (1939), the First Piano Concerto (1933), *Two Pieces* for string octet (1924–25), the Second Piano Sonata (1943), *Six Romances on Texts by W. Raleigh, R. Burns, and W. Shakespeare* (1943), and *Aphorisms* (1927) were also banned.

⁶ Ol’ga Dombrovskaya, *Dmitriy Shostakovich: stranitsi zhizni v fotografiyakh* [Dmitri Shostakovich: pages of his life in photographs] (Moscow: DSCH, 2006). Shostakovich was writing the Eighth Symphony at the time and completed movements II, III, and IV of the

also remarked on Shostakovich's love for the Eighth Symphony and, more than once, the composer's high estimation of its merits.⁷ Shostakovich, too, discussed the work, its meaning, and associations several times, as well as the speed with which he wrote it.⁸ In their detail, orderliness, and sophistication, the *eskizi* for the Eighth Symphony attest to this special pride in and care of the work. We recall that they look more like a piano score copy of the Eighth Symphony than compositional manuscripts for it, and were it not for the revised and rewritten second movement, there would be no essential difference (except scoring) between the *eskizi* and the autograph score. While these detailed drafts are similar to the kinds of drafts that Shostakovich wrote for several other symphonies, the *eskizi* for the Eighth appear to be more sophisticated and meticulous than the composer's other manuscripts. Informalities, such as phone numbers, random lists, even the somewhat surprising appearance of a national anthem, speak to the *eskizi* as a private, working document written for the composer's own purposes; but the detail and sequence of the music speak to a sophistication that belies compositional necessity. These manuscripts, like Shostakovich's drafts for other symphonies, look like they were written to be preserved.

Shostakovich's attachment to the Eighth Symphony would have been a powerful reason for careful preparation and preservation of it. The war and possible loss of personal effects, including manuscripts, may have been one practical concern, brought home to the composer by his itinerant life from 1941 to 1943, in Leningrad, Kuybishev, and Moscow. We recall too that several of Shostakovich's autograph scores were lost,

autograph score in Ivanovo. Given a cultural climate of official intrusion into private lives, there was reason to protect personal documents.

⁷ Diary entries "Leningrad, 5 XII 1944," "18 XII 1959," and "10 yanvarya 1962," in Isaak Glikman, *Journal I–X*, Dmitri Shostakovich Archive f. 4, r. 2, yed. khr. 1–10.

⁸ Aranovksy, "Zametki," 22.

sometimes in unknown circumstances. Did Shostakovich write a piano score copy of the Eighth Symphony against the risk that something might happen to his score, or the possibility he might one day need (or wish) to re-create it? If so, his action could speak to perils arising from wartime, as well as to more sinister ones inherent in Soviet society, including censorship, suppression, even possible confiscation or exile. The piano score drafts, which he wrote for the Eighth and several other symphonies, would have enabled him to recompose his works easily, if necessary.

These drafts may have served another purpose. Many reports survive of Shostakovich playing works-in-progress for individuals or groups of friends, critics, conductors, and students who gathered in his home. In the late spring of 1936, he presented parts of his Fourth Symphony for a coterie of Russian and foreign musicians, including Otto Klemperer, Fritz Stiedry, Ivan Sollertinsky, Alexander Gauk, and others.⁹ While writing the Fifth Symphony in 1937, he played movements for the composer Tikhon Khrennikov, and separately for the composers Aram Khachaturyan and Vissarion Shebalin.¹⁰ In August 1939, presenting the Sixth Symphony to a gathering of colleagues in Leningrad, he performed excerpts from two completed movements and predicted a third movement within a month.¹¹ In 1941, he played the Seventh Symphony in its entirety for friends.¹² Glikman heard part of the “new Ninth Symphony” begun on 15 January 1945 but never finished,¹³ and Nikolayeva claimed that Shostakovich played part of the Tenth Symphony for her in 1951.¹⁴ The testimonies to Shostakovich’s

⁹ Fay, *A Life*, 94.

¹⁰ Fay, *A Life*, 98.

¹¹ Fay, *A Life*, 115.

¹² Fay, *A Life*, 128.

¹³ Diary entry “16 V 1945,” in Glikman, *Journal I–X*.

¹⁴ Wilson, *Shostakovich*, 301.

performance at the piano of symphonies-in-progress bespeak a habitual practice. In his last apartment in Moscow, his two pianos—his instrument from Leningrad and a Steinway, which was a birthday present from Rostropovich—are preserved in their original location in his study. For Shostakovich, a highly proficient pianist, the piano was the natural and primary medium for which to prepare and preserve his symphonies and on which to perform them.

As Sollertinsky anticipated, the Eighth never became as prominent or popular as other Shostakovich symphonies. Perhaps partly for that reason, its meaning has not been seriously examined, as has meaning in other works; yet Shostakovich spoke about meaning in the Eighth several times, his descriptions ranging from the philosophical to the historical to the deeply personal. Taken together, his explanations appear to contradict each other. In an interview in 1943, a few days after finishing the Eighth Symphony, Shostakovich summed up the work's mood and philosophy in clearly socialist realist terms:

It expresses my thoughts and experiences, my elevated creative state, which could not help but be influenced by the joyful news connected with the victories of the Red Army . . . [the Eighth] is an optimistic, life-affirming work . . . I can sum up the philosophical conception of my new work in three words: life is beautiful.¹⁵

In 1956, he described the symphony very differently, as an echo of terrible tragedy and the reflection of an era:

In this work there was an attempt to express the emotional experience of the people, to reflect the terrible tragedy of the

¹⁵ Shostakovich, "Vos'maya simfoniya," 1.

war. Composed in the summer of 1943, the Eighth Symphony is an echo of that difficult time.¹⁶

This latter explanation has some corroboration in the reminiscences of Atovm'yan, who recalled that while writing the Eighth, Shostakovich went every day to see a newsreel about the atrocities of war and fascism.¹⁷ Yet in 1959, in a private conversation recorded by Glikman, Shostakovich made a different association when he acknowledged a close relationship between his Fifth and Eighth Symphonies. The former, in 1937, was connected not with war but with his rehabilitation after the debacle of *Lady Macbeth*. “I commented,” writes Glikman,

that the Eighth is a close relative of the Fifth Symphony, even the closest. [Shostakovich] agreed: “Yes, yes! The first movement of the Eighth is like a rewritten first movement of the Fifth; but in the years separating the two symphonies, I have gained much life experience. Yet the Fifth Symphony has become the so-called ‘repertoire’ piece [he spoke the word ‘repertoire’ with an ironic smile], and the Eighth is played very, very rarely.”¹⁸

In his purported memoirs, the composer ostensibly called the Eighth Symphony his “requiem.”¹⁹ Was this association an echo of Mahler, not simply in suggesting a death-wish, but also in maintaining contact with the grand tradition in what was, for Shostakovich, a closed society? We might note that Mahler’s Eighth, with its quotations from obscure passages of Goethe’s *Faust*, was the most explicitly philosophical of his works. Moreover, the sadness and angst, expressed so typically in Shostakovich’s music,

¹⁶ Dmitriy Shostakovich, “Dumī o proydyonnom puti” [Thoughts about the path traversed], *Sovetskaya Muzika* (1956), 9: 9–15.

¹⁷ Levon Atovm'yan, “Iz vospominaniy,” *Muzikal'naya akademiya* 4 (1997): 75, cited in Fay, *A Life*, Chapter 8, note 53.

¹⁸ Diary entry 18 XII 1959, in Glikman, *Journal I–X*.

¹⁹ Volkov, *Testimony*, 103.

seem to echo Mahler's world-weariness, and the "folkish" idiom²⁰ to resonate with Mahler's mockery of artificially generated happiness.²¹ Were Shostakovich's symphonies a lifeline to a musical past, and the Eighth a reflection or elegy to that connection?

Meaning in Shostakovich is an issue that elicits strong reaction; and although the Eighth Symphony has largely escaped such controversy, the composer's explanations of the work illustrate the kind of dislocation that complicates an effort to understand his music. Not only is there a clash between his first description of the Eighth and the music's expression, but there is also dissonance among his own interpretations. A perennial issue in Shostakovich studies is to acknowledge, if not wrestle with these complexities. The question arises, therefore, to what extent Shostakovich's sketch materials shed light on what his music means.

The *eskizi* for the Eighth Symphony do not speak directly to the different meanings assigned to that work; but it is possible that as more Shostakovich manuscripts become known, sketch study will indeed intersect with questions of meaning and motivation. For this to be possible, we would want to know, for example, how Shostakovich wrote his later symphonies, when the Soviet Union was comparatively at peace and the composer's personal circumstances (from possible purges, war, suppression, or censorship) did not threaten the existence of his works. If he continued to write detailed piano score drafts, that fact might undermine the suggestion that his *eskizi* served as *aide-memoires* in case something happened to him or his music. On the other

²⁰ As in the last two movements of the Sixth and the circus-like elements in the Ninth.

²¹ Such as the minor-mode rendition of "Frere Jacques" in Symphony No. 1, the parody of "St. Antony's Sermon to the Fishes" in Symphony No. 2, and Mahler's gradual extension of the symphony into realms of chorus, solo singing, and poetry.

hand, if piano score drafts are not routine in the later symphonies, we would also have to recognize that increasingly sophisticated technology for copying and recording works may have obviated the necessity of more primitive means of preservation. It is possible that meaning in Shostakovich's music and motivations for his sketching may be related.

The Tenth Symphony is usually dated from the summer of 1953, a few months after Stalin's death on 5 March of that year. It was Shostakovich's first symphony after the condemnation of 1948, as well as the first work in which he made obvious personal reference. In light of its historical and biographical circumstances, the interpretation of the Tenth has been controversial. As Fay notes, a contemporary, who sought to enumerate the symphony's flaws, inadvertently offered an explanation for its impact:

The music of the Tenth Symphony, with its psychological depression and imbalance, is a true document of the era.²²

In *Testimony*, Volkov reported Shostakovich as saying that the Tenth is “about Stalin and the Stalin years” and as calling the second movement a “musical portrait of Stalin.”²³ More identifiable (and credible) than Volkov's hidden program, though not necessarily more explicable, is the symphony's strong personal and extra-musical reference—the monogram of Elmira Nazirova in the third movement and the composer's initials in the third and fourth movements. As noted in Chapter 3, “Elmira” also appears in sketches for the second movement, though its removal in the final version of the movement is at least as noteworthy as its earlier presence.

The *eskizī* for the Tenth Symphony, as discussed in Chapter 3, are unique among Shostakovich's known symphonic *eskizī* because of their jumbled appearance, varying

²² Yuliy Kremlyov, quoted in Fay, *A Life*, 192.

²³ Volkov, *Testimony*, 107.

detail, mode of preparation in continuous drafts that do not disclose the sequence of the score, yet their comprehensive representation of the work. The unusual appearance of these manuscripts has led us to ask whether Shostakovich had an ulterior motive for writing sketch materials that only he could reconstruct. Is it possible that he was uncertain about the fate of the Tenth Symphony or whether he would finish it? Did his unusual method of writing—that is, out of order on the four pages of a folded sheet—represent a mystification to anybody who might learn about the piece, yet a ruse so simple to Shostakovich that he could easily reconstruct the work, if necessary? Or do his sketch materials for the Tenth simply offer a rare glimpse into a stage of composition earlier than piano score drafts, like the *eskizi* for the Eighth and other symphonies? Perhaps they even presage a change in his writing of symphonies. Again, knowing what Shostakovich did in later symphonies would shed light on his *eskizi* for the Tenth and, more widely, on his motivation for sketching and drafting at all.

We need to know much more about Shostakovich's pre-final documents as a whole before we can speak with more confidence to his motivations for writing and preserving them. The frequency with which he wrote out complexly annotated piano score drafts, like those for the Eighth Symphony, seems to explain why several such parallel sources exist from his late compositional process, and why it may be reasonable to see these documents as practical means of preserving works. Whether the manuscripts are also a stage of composition, perhaps preceded by earlier stages that may have been written and destroyed or never written at all, is another question that can be considered. For the *eskizi* of Symphony No. 10, the situation is exceptional. We are faced with what is to date an unusual mode of presentation, as well as a murky realm of potential

meanings, involving allusion, personal reference, even possible code or hidden motive.

Until we know more about Shostakovich's manuscripts, the possibility remains that his sketch materials may speak not only to his creativity and conceptual abilities, but also to the darker side of a troubled and uncertain life.

Appendices

Appendix A

Chart I

Chart I shows how the Tenth Symphony *eskizi* prefigure the final autograph. Although completely disordered in the file, the sketches are organized in the chart to account sequentially for the four movements of the symphony. Pages inset in the chart contain one or more elaborative sketches of a passage already in a continuous draft. In order to avoid homogenizing or simplifying the complexity of the *eskizi*'s appearance, “extraneous” music is indicated in gray in **Sans Serif font** and identified where possible. In several cases, this other music does not appear to have been written for the Tenth Symphony. In other instances, passages in the sketches are recognizably related to the Tenth in idea or motif but cannot be identified with any part of the autograph score. They appear to have been discarded or changed before the score was written, though changes are not necessarily traceable in the sketches.

Page of <i>eskizi</i>	Sketch	Movement	Type ¹
p. 29	Fragments of music in E minor		D
pp. 29 (last line)–30	R5–R12	I	D
p. 31	R12–R17 ²		D
p. 24	R17–R24+6		D
p. 25	R25–R30		D
p. 28	Fragments of music in E minor		D
p. 28	R30–32 ³		D
p. 26	R32–R37		D
p. 27	c.R37–R44 ⁴		D
p. 5	R36+5ff (similar)		B
p. 38	R37+1–R41		B
p. 32	R40–R41		B
	R43–R45+3		
	R50–R50+6 (last line)		
p. 37	R44–R50		B
pp. 32 (last line)–34	R50–R65		B
pp. 35–6	R59+8–R64		B
p. 20	Unidentified sketch in the key of A		C
p. 21-22	D minor Fugue, Op. 87 (Alto part)		C

¹ The sketches are written on four types of manuscript paper, labeled here as A, B, C, and D. Paper Type A measures approximately 33.6 x 25.1 centimeters and comprises fourteen pages. Type B is the most common, with forty pages measuring 32.8 x 24.2 centimeters. Type C is approximately 30.8 x 23.6 centimeters and comprises four pages; and Type D, for eight sheets, measures 30.5 x 23.1 centimeters. Of the 66 pages in the file, 56 contain notation and 10 are blank.

² The music on p. 31 contains ideas similar to R12–R17, but it does not match the score.

³ The passage R30–R32 is on the last two staves of p. 28.

⁴ Page 27 is schematic, with empty bars, occasional rhythmic indications, and a few melodic fragments. The passage is written out much more coherently on p. 38.

Page of <i>eskizi</i>	Sketch	Movement	Type
p. 23	R65–R68+5 R69–R70+15		C
p. 13	Alternatives of melodies in B-flat minor		B
pp. 14–16	R71–R85+18	II	B
p. 41	R85–R85+18		B
p. 40	R86–R90+3		B
p. 42	R90+4–R94		B
p. 39	R90–R94		A
	R94+9–R95+7		
p. 3	R95+8–R98+4		A
pp. 45–6	R100–R113	III	A
p. 18	R105+2–R107		A
	R108–R110		
pp. 43–4	R114-12–R127-3		A
p. 19	R129–R135		A
p. 17	R134–R139		A
p. 1	Ideas similar to opening of <i>Allegro</i> (IV)		B
pp. 1(last 8 bars)–2	R157–R161 ⁵	IV	B
p. 11	R160–R164 ⁶		B
p. 12	Schematic continuation from p. 11		B
p. 4	R163+3–R164		A
pp. 48–50, 47, 51	R164–R182		B
p. 6	R173–R173+9		B
p. 4	R175+4–7		A
p. 56	R176–R176+9		A
p. 55	R177+3–R179		B
	R203–203+6 [see also p. 9]		
p. 52	Melodic fragments from Mvts. I, II, IV ⁷		B
p. 53	R184–R188+1		B
p. 54	R188+2–R193+11		B
p. 7	R193+12–R196+3/4		B

⁵ The passage in the sketch discernibly prefigures R157–R160. A few bars from R161 are also present. Before and after R157–R160, the sketch shows music similar to that of the autograph score but does not match it.

⁶ The draft on p. 11 does not match the final autograph continuously for this passage. R161–R161+5 and R162–R163+5 are not prefigured; and the continuation after R164+2, which carries on overleaf to p. 12, is completely different in the sketch.

⁷ Page 52, the verso of p. 53, appears to contain schematic fragments of the clarinet solo at R5, the scherzo theme at R86 (Movement II), and the Andante melody at R144 (Movement IV).

Page of <i>eskizi</i>	Sketch	Movement	Type
p. 10	R196+5–R198		B
p. 8	R198–R202		B
p. 9	R202–end		B

Chart II

Colors of the *eskizî* for Symphony No. 10⁸

Page of <i>eskizî</i>	Sketch	Mvt.	Ink	Type
pp. 29 (last line)–30	R5–R12	I	Violet & Bl.	D
p. 31	R12–R17		Black ⁹	D
p. 24	R17–R24+6		Black	D
p. 25	R25–R30		Black	D
p. 28	R30–R32		Black	D
p. 26	R32–R37		Black	D
p. 27	c.R37–R44		Black	D
p. 5	R36+5ff (similar)		Blue	B
p. 38	R37+1–R41		Blue	B
p. 32	R40–R41		Blue	B
	R43–R45+3		Blue	
	R50–R50+6 (last line)		Blue	
p. 37	R44–R50		Blue	B
pp. 32 (last line)–34	R50–R65		Blue	B
pp. 35–6	R59+8–R64		Blue	B
p. 23	R65–R68+5		Black	C
	R69–R70+15		Black	
pp. 14–16 ¹⁰	R71–R85+18	II	Blue	B
p. 41	R85–R85+18		Violet	B
p. 40	R86–R90+3		Violet	B
p. 42	R90+4–R94		Violet	B
p. 39	R90–R94 ¹¹		Violet	A
	R94+9–R95+7		Violet	
p. 3	R95+8–R98+4		Violet	A
pp. 45–6	R100–R113	III	Purple-black	A
p. 18	R106–R110		Purple-black	A
	R111–R114		Black	
pp. 43–4	R114-12–R127-3		Purple-black	A
p. 19	R129–R135		Purple-black	A

⁸ The chart gives only the Tenth Symphony sketches without the extra music shown in Chart I.

⁹ Pages 31 and 24 are written in two black inks, a faded ink for most of the music and a much bolder ink for some counterpoint and accompaniment that seem to have been added sometime after the melody had already been sketched.

¹⁰ The B-flat minor melodies on p. 13 are also in blue ink.

¹¹ The motif E—A—E—D—A, of “Elmira,” is in black ink at the equivalent of R94.

Page of <i>eskizî</i>	Sketch	Mvt.	Color	Type
p. 17	R134–R139		Purple-black	A
pp. 1(last 8 bars)–2	c. R157–R161	IV	Violet	B
p. 11	c. R160–R164		Violet	B
p. 4	R163+3–R164		Violet	A
pp. 48–50, 47, 51	R164–R182		Violet	B
p. 6	R173–R173+9		Violet	B
p. 4	R175+4–7		Violet	A
p. 56	R176–R176+9		Purple-black	A
p. 55	R177+3–R179		Violet	B
	[R203–203+6]			
p. 53	R184–R186		Black	B
	R186–R188+1		Violet	
p. 54	R188+2–R193+11		Violet	B
p. 7 [7–10 = a folded sheet]	R193+12–R196+3/4		Violet	B
p. 10	R196+5–R198		Violet	B
p. 8	R198–R202		Violet	B
p. 9	R202–end		Violet	B
p. 55	R203–203+6		Violet	B

Chart III

Passages by color

Page of <i>eskizî</i>	Sketch	Mvt.	Color	Type
pp. 29 (last line)–30	R5–R12	I	Violet & Bl.	D
p. 41	R85–R85+18	II	Violet	B
p. 40	R86–R90+3		Violet	B
p. 42	R90+4–R94		Violet	B
p. 39	R90–R94		Violet	A
	R94+9–R95+7		Violet	
p. 3	R95+8–R98+4		Violet	A
pp. 1(last 8 bars)–2	R157–R161 [?]	IV	Violet	B
p. 11	R160–R164		Violet	B
p. 4	R163+3–R164		Violet	A
pp. 48–50, 47, 51	R164–R182		Violet	B
p. 6	R173–R173+9		Violet	B
p. 4	R175+4–7		Violet	A
p. 55	R177+3–R179		Violet	B
p. 53	R186–R188+1		Violet	B
p. 54	R188+2–R193+11		Violet	B
p. 7	R193+12–R196+3/4		Violet	B
p. 10	R196+5–R198		Violet	B
p. 8	R198–R202		Violet	B
p. 9	R202–end		Violet	B
p. 55	R203–203+6		Violet	B
p. 5	R36+5ff (similar)	I	Blue	B
p. 38	R37+1–R41		Blue	B
p. 32	R40–R41		Blue	B
	R43–R45+3		Blue	
	R50–R50+6 (last line)		Blue	
p. 37	R44–R50		Blue	B
pp. 32 (last line)–34	R50–R65		Blue	B
pp. 35–6	R59+8–R64		Blue	B
pp. 14–16	R71–R85+18	II	Blue	B
p. 31	R12–R17	I	Black	D
p. 24	R17–R24+6		Black	D
p. 25	R25–R30		Black	D
p. 28	R30–R32		Black	D
p. 26	R32–R37		Black	D
p. 23	R65–R68+5		Black	C
	R69–R70+15		Black	
p. 18	R111–R114	III	Black	A
p. 53	R184–R186	IV	Black	B

Page of <i>eskizi</i>	Sketch	Mvt.	Color	Type
pp. 45–6	R100–R113	III	Purple-black	A
p. 18	R106–R110		Purple-black	A
pp. 43–4	R114-12–R127-3		Purple-black	A
p. 19	R129–R135		Purple-black	A
p. 17	R134–R139		Purple-black	A
p. 56	R176–R176+9	IV	Purple-black	A

Chart IV

Folded Pages & Loose Sheets

Chart IV shows which sheets of the *eskizi* are loose and which are folded. It can be compared with Charts I and II to see what sketches are on each page and where those sketches come within the movements. Comparison will show that several continuous drafts or parts of them, like those on pp. 7–10 and pp. 47–50, are written on the same folded sketch sheet, but not on sequential pages. “Other” in this list refers to extraneous music, as shown in Chart I.

Folded	Loose	Movement
	1/2	IV
	3/4	I and IV
	5/6	I and IV
7–10		IV
	11/12	IV
13–16		“Other” & II
17–19		III
20–23		“Other” & I
24–27		I
28–31		“Other” & I
32–34 [the reverse of 34 is blank]		I
35–36 [followed by 2 blank pages]		I
	37/38	I
	39/reverse [blank]	I
40–42		I
	43/44	III
	45/46	III
47–50		IV
51–54		IV (also some I & II)
55 [followed by 3 blanks]		IV
	56/reverse [blank]	IV

Appendix B

Chart I

Pagination of the *Eskizi* for Symphony No. 8

Shostakovich's pagination ¹	Archival ²
I [?] ³	I [?]
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6 (crossed out)	6
7 (crossed out)	7
8 (crossed out; renumbered 6)	8
9 (crossed out; renumbered 7)	9
10 (crossed out; renumbered 8)	10
9	11
10	12
11	13
12	14
13	15
14	16
15	17
16	18
17	19
18	20
19	21
20	22
21	23
22	24
23	25
	26 ⁴

¹ Shostakovich's pagination is written in red pencil.

² When the archivist's pagination starts on p. 6, the numbers are written in lead-colored pencil and appear at the top right- or left-hand corners of the manuscript paper.

³ The Roman numeral is written in pencil in the upper right-hand margin. It is not clear whether the handwriting is Shostakovich's. Although the number is probably not a page number but a movement number, it is given here to make identifying the page easier.

⁴ This page is the beginning of the eight-hand transcription.

Chart II
Folded Pages & Loose Sheets

Folded	Sketch	Loose
I/1 and [6/7] I = 3 rd page of IIA 1 = 1 st page of Mvt. I [6] = 1 st page of IIA [7] = 2 nd page of IIA	IIA & 1 st page of I	
2/3–4/5	I & Rev. A ⁵	
6/7–8/9 [8/9–10/11]	IIB & part of III	
	III, Rev. B, beg. of IV	10/11 [12/13]
	IV & Hymn	12/13 [14/15]
	V	14/15 [16/17]
16/17–18/19 [18/19–20/21]	V	
20/21–22/23 [22/23–24/25]	V	

⁵ In their current arrangement, pp. 2–5 lie inside the fold of I/1 and 6/7. See Chapter 4, p. 14.

Appendix C
Musical Examples

Chapter 3

Example 3.1. R17–R19, comparison of *eskizi* and score.
a. *Eskizi*, prefiguring R17–R19.

The image displays a musical score for Example 3.1a, consisting of two systems of staves. The first system features two staves: the upper staff is labeled "[Written in violet ink]" and contains a melodic line with a key signature of one flat and a common time signature. The lower staff is labeled "[Counterpoint added in black ink]" and contains a counterpoint line. The second system also consists of two staves, continuing the melodic and counterpoint lines. In the upper staff of the second system, several notes are crossed out with a diagonal slash, indicating they were not part of the original *eskizi* but were added in the score. The lower staff continues the counterpoint line.

b. Symphony No. 10, Mvt. I, R17-R19

17 $\text{♩} = 120$
I solo
p

Fl. I

V-ni I *pizz.*
p

V-ni II
p

V-le
p

18

Fl. I

V-ni I

V-ni II

V-le

19

Fl. I

V-ni I

V-ni II

V-le

Example 3.2. Approximately R15-6 through R16+10, comparison of *eskizî* and score.

- a. *Eskizî*, prefiguring approximately R15-1 through R16+10.**
(The sketch is at concert pitch.)

Two staves of musical notation. The top staff is a single melodic line in a key with one flat (B-flat major or D minor) and a 2/4 time signature. The bottom staff is a piano accompaniment with chords and moving lines in the right and left hands.

- b. Symphony No. 10, Mvt. I, R15-6 through R16+10**

Score for Clarinet I (Cl. I) and Arches (Archi). The Cl. I part is marked "a tempo" and "I solo". It begins with a *mf* dynamic, followed by a *dim.* section, and ends with a *p* dynamic. A box containing the number "15" is placed above the staff. The Archi part consists of four staves (Violins I, Violins II, Violas, and Cellos/Double Basses). The Violins I and II parts have a *pp* dynamic marking. The Cellos/Double Basses part has a *pp* dynamic marking and includes fingering indications (5' and 5').

Cl. I

Arch. I

Arch. II

Arch. III

Arch. IV

Arch. V

Arch. VI

cresc. *mf*

non cresc.

non cresc.

non cresc.

16

Cl. I

Arch. I

Arch. II

Arch. III

Arch. IV

Arch. V

Arch. VI

dim. *p* *cresc.*

Cl. I

Archi

mf

pp

pp

Example 3.3.

a. Fugue in D Minor, Op. 87, mm. 111–17

accelerando poco a poco

pp

b. Symphony No. 10, Mvt. I, R17

SOLO

p

Chapter 5

Example 5.1. Sketch IIA, B section (mm. 1–41).

Musical score for Example 5.1, Sketch IIA, B section (mm. 1–41). The score is written in G major and 4/4 time. It consists of three systems of staves. The first system (mm. 1–13) features a piano accompaniment with a dynamic marking of *p*. The second system (mm. 14–26) includes a flute part (fl. I & II) with a dynamic marking of *pp* and a piano accompaniment with a dynamic marking of *p*. The third system (mm. 27–41) features a violin part (vlns I & II) with a dynamic marking of *p* and a cello/bass part (vc c-bassi) with a dynamic marking of *p*.

Example 5.2. Sketch IIA, B section (mm. 42–80).

Musical score for Example 5.2, Sketch IIA, B section (mm. 42–80). The score is written in G major and 4/4 time. It consists of three systems of staves. The first system (mm. 42–55) features a piano accompaniment with a dynamic marking of *p* and a cello/bass part (vc c-bassi) with a dynamic marking of *p*. The second system (mm. 56–66) includes a flute part (fl. I) with a dynamic marking of *p*, a piccolo part (fl. picc.) with a dynamic marking of *p*, and a trumpet, trombone, and tuba part (trp. trombones & tuba) with a dynamic marking of *pp*. The cello/bass part (vc c-bassi) has a dynamic marking of *p*. The third system (mm. 67–80) features a piano accompaniment with a dynamic marking of *p* and a cello/bass part (vc c-bassi) with a dynamic marking of *p*.

Example 5.3. Sketch IIA, Development (mm. 81–9), prefiguring mm. 102–7 of the autograph.

Musical score for Example 5.3, Sketch IIA, Development (mm. 81–9). The score is written for piano and consists of two staves. The key signature has two flats (B-flat and E-flat), and the time signature is 4/4. The music begins at measure 81. The right hand features a melodic line with eighth and sixteenth notes, while the left hand provides a harmonic accompaniment with chords and moving lines. The piece concludes at measure 89.

Example 5.4. Autograph IIA, B theme (piano).

Musical score for Example 5.4, Autograph IIA, B theme (piano). The score is written for piano and consists of four staves. The key signature has two flats (B-flat and E-flat), and the time signature is 4/4. The music begins at measure 102. The right hand features a melodic line with eighth and sixteenth notes, while the left hand provides a harmonic accompaniment with chords and moving lines. The piece concludes at measure 107.

Example 5.5.

a. Piano melody, Sketch IIA (mm. 1–14)

Musical score for Example 5.5a, Piano melody, Sketch IIA (mm. 1–14). The score is written for piano and consists of a single staff. The key signature has two flats (B-flat and E-flat), and the time signature is 4/4. The music begins at measure 1. The melody is characterized by eighth and sixteenth notes, with a dynamic marking of *p* (piano).

b. English horn, Symphony No. 8, Mvt. I, R35

Musical score for Example 5.5b, English horn, Symphony No. 8, Mvt. I, R35. The score is written for English horn and consists of a single staff. The key signature has two flats (B-flat and E-flat), and the time signature is 4/4. The music begins at measure 35. The melody is characterized by eighth and sixteenth notes, with a dynamic marking of *p espress.* (piano, expressive). The score includes a *trio* marking and a *rit.* (ritardando) marking. The piece concludes at measure 36.

Example 5.6. Revision A.

The image displays a musical score for piano, consisting of five systems of music. Each system contains a grand staff with a treble clef on the upper staff and a bass clef on the lower staff. The key signature is three flats (B-flat, E-flat, A-flat), and the time signature is 3/4. The score is written in a style typical of a piano accompaniment for a vocal line, with various rhythmic patterns and melodic lines. The first system shows a melodic line in the treble clef and a bass line in the bass clef. The second system continues the melodic line with some chromaticism. The third system features a more active bass line with eighth notes. The fourth system includes a measure with an 'X' above the treble clef staff, indicating a specific performance instruction. The fifth system concludes the piece with a final cadence in both staves.

Example 5.7. Movement II, B section (mm. 67–77).

53 ♩ = 144
[I solo]
Piccolo *p* *sf* *sf* 70
Violin I *pp*
Violin II *pp*
Viola *pp*

1
Picc. *sf* *sf* *sf* *sf* *sf* 75
Vln. I
Vln. II
Vla.

Example 5.8. Sketch IIA, Development of B

Musical score for Example 5.8, Sketch IIA, Development of B. The score is written for piano and consists of two systems of music, each with a treble and bass staff. The first system contains measures 1 through 8, and the second system contains measures 9 through 15. The music is in a key with one flat and a 3/4 time signature. The notation includes various rhythmic values, accidentals, and dynamic markings.

Example 5.9. Movement II, Development of B (mm. 127–41).

Musical score for Example 5.9, Movement II, Development of B (mm. 127–41). The score is written for piano and consists of four systems of music, each with a treble and bass staff. The first system contains measures 1 through 4, the second system contains measures 5 through 8, the third system contains measures 9 through 11, and the fourth system contains measures 12 through 15. The music is in a key with one flat and a 3/4 time signature. The notation includes various rhythmic values, accidentals, and dynamic markings.

Example 5.10. Sketch IIA, Reprise of B (mm. 1–25).

8

16

21

Example 5.11. Sketch IIA, Reprise of B (mm. 26–52).

The musical score is presented in four systems, each with a treble and bass clef. The first system begins at measure 26, showing a complex chordal texture in the treble and a more active bass line. A dynamic marking of *p?* is present. The second system starts at measure 34, featuring a series of chords in the treble and a bass line with some rests. The third system begins at measure 42, with a more melodic treble line and a bass line with some rests. The fourth system starts at measure 48, showing a simpler chordal texture in the treble and a bass line with some rests. The score concludes with a double bar line and repeat signs.

Example 5.12. Sketch IIA (Development, mm. 81–9).

Musical score for Example 5.12, Sketch IIA (Development, mm. 81–9). The score is written in treble and bass clefs. The treble clef staff contains a melodic line with various accidentals (flats and naturals) and slurs. The bass clef staff contains a bass line with some rests and chordal accompaniment. The piece begins at measure 81.

Example 5.13. Revision A (mm. 36–41).

Musical score for Example 5.13, Revision A (mm. 36–41). The score is written in treble and bass clefs. The treble clef staff contains a melodic line with various accidentals and slurs. The bass clef staff contains a bass line with rests and chordal accompaniment.

Example 5.14. Revision A (mm. 29–35).

Musical score for Example 5.14, Revision A (mm. 29–35). The score is written in treble and bass clefs. The treble clef staff contains a melodic line with various accidentals and slurs. The bass clef staff contains a bass line with rests and chordal accompaniment.

Example 5.15. Movement II (mm. 95–102, woodwinds only).³⁰⁰

Musical score for woodwinds in Example 5.15, Movement II (mm. 95–102). The score is arranged in two systems. The first system (measures 95-102) includes parts for Piccolo (Picco.), Clarinet in C (Cl. picco.), Bassoon (Fag.), and Contrabassoon (C-fag.). The second system (measures 103-110) includes parts for Piccolo (Picco.) and Bassoon (Fag.), with the Contrabassoon part continuing from the first system. Dynamics include piano (p) and fortissimo (ff). The key signature has one flat (B-flat major or D minor).

Example 5.16. Sketch IIA, Reprise of B (mm. 42–52).

Musical score for Example 5.16, Sketch IIA, Reprise of B (mm. 42–52). The score is arranged in two systems. The first system (measures 42-52) includes parts for Treble and Bass clefs. The second system (measures 53-62) includes parts for Treble and Bass clefs. The key signature has one flat (B-flat major or D minor).

³⁰⁰ Dmitri Shostakovich, *Op. 65, Symphony No. 8* (Hamburg: Musikverlag Hans Sikorski, 1946).

Appendix D

Miscellaneous Sources for Symphonies Nos. 8 and 10

Neustanovlennīye proizvedenniya [Unspecified works]. RGALI, f. 2048, op. 2, yed. khr. 52.

A collection of miscellaneous fragments relating to many different works. Some of the documents have been identified; others have not. Some appear to be fragments excerpted from autograph scores and recopied; others look like sketches, drafts, and proof-sheets. Two manuscripts relating to the Tenth Symphony are on pp. 22–27 and pp. 29–31 of the file. The first document is a folded quarto, excerpted from the autograph score and recopied. On the first two pages of the quarto is the passage corresponding to R45+4–R47+4 of the Tenth Symphony; on the third and fourth pages is the passage corresponding to R75+4–R76+8. While the music in excerpt and autograph score is identical, the way it appears on the excerpted quarto differs. On the third page of the excerpt, which shows R75+4–R75+9, the timpani part appears below the strings in a different ink, as though it was added after the page had been written. In the recopied portion of the score, the timpani line appears in its proper place. Other differences between the excerpt and the final autograph are slight and pertain mainly to dynamics and performance directives. Pages 29–31 of the file comprise proof-sheets for the finale of the Tenth Symphony. Other manuscripts that archivists have identified in the file include fragments relating to Quartets Nos. 4, 5, and 6, Trio No. 1, Preludes Nos. 2 and 17, the Preludes and Fugues, Op. 87, and Symphony No. 7.

***Razroznennīye listī iz razlichnikh proizvedeniy* [Assorted pages from different works].** RGALI, f. 2048, op. 1, yed. khr. 63. Copies in the Dmitri Shostakovich Archive, f. 2, r. 1, yed. khr. 205.

Similar to *neustanovlennīe proizvedenniya*, or “unspecified works,” above. The file contains thirty-two pages of unidentified fragments relating, sometimes recognizably, to different works. Page 18 contains the beginning of an eight-hand *perelozheniye*, or piano transcription, of the Eighth Symphony (see Chapter 4, pp. 1–2). Near the beginning of the file is a transcription of the soprano voice of the D Minor Fugue, Op. 87 (see Chapter 3, note 34).

***Simfoniya No. 8. Korrektura s notnim prilozheniyem* [Symphony No. 8. Proof-sheets with musical supplements].** GTsMMK f. 32, inv. no. 2147.

Shostakovich’s proof-sheets for the Eighth Symphony. They comprise six pages and indicate small corrections, modifications, or additions to be made to a score of the work. Each correction gives a location in the symphony (by rehearsal number and the number of bars beyond), usually identifies an instrumental part, and includes a directive either notated or written in words. Many instructions are about minute details of dynamics, notation, accidentals, and articulation.

***Simfoniya No. 8. Nabroski* [Symphony No. 8. Drafts].** GTsMMK, f. 32, yed. khr. 125. Copies in the Dmitri Shostakovich Archive, f. 2, r. 1, yed. khr. 124.

A list of themes from the Eighth Symphony. The manuscript is a folded sheet comprising four pages. On the front page are the words “D.D. Shostakovich – 8th Symphony,” which are not in Shostakovich’s handwriting. The back page is blank; and

the inside verso and recto contain twelve melodies, written by Shostakovich and comprising, in order, the main themes from each movement of the Eighth Symphony:

- From Mvt. I
 - the first two bars of the symphony
 - four bars at R8
 - two-and-a-half bars at R13+5
- From Mvt. II
 - four bars at R46
 - four at R53
- From Mvt. III
 - eight bars at R75
 - eight at R97+5
- From Mvt. IV
 - nine-bar ground bass (R112+3)
- From Mvt. V
 - ten bars at R124+4
 - seven at R126
 - twelve at R129+4
 - six at R136

The document does not actually comprise *nabroski*, or “drafts,” but a thematic catalog of the Eighth Symphony, probably written after the piece was finished. It is worth noting that the second theme shown from Movement II is the revised, piccolo theme of the B section, which is only in Shostakovich’s second version of the movement (see Chapter 5).

***Simfoniya No. 8. Partitura, otrivki 1, 2, 3, ch.* [Symphony No. 8. Autograph score, excerpts from movements 1, 2, 3].** RGALI, f. 2048, op. 1, yed. khr. 10. Copies in the Dmitri Shostakovich Archives, f. 2, r. 1, yed. khr. 42.

Two excerpts from the autograph score of the Eighth Symphony and an unfinished score of the first version of Movement II. The first excerpt is a folded quarto corresponding to pp. 5–6 and 15–16 of the score, or the passages R16+7–R19+6 and

R25+7–R28+3. The pages appear to have been excerpted and recopied, like those from the autograph score of the Tenth Symphony in *neustanovlennïe proizvedenniya*. The second document in the file is Autograph IIA, a six-page, unfinished orchestration of Sketch IIA (see Chapter 5). A seventh page is misfiled with the partial score. Rather than being a continuation, as the filing seems to imply, it is an unfinished “p. 7” from Movement I and contains four bars of music at R20. The third excerpt in the file, like the first, is a folded quarto, extracted and recopied. The pages correspond to pp. 49–50 and 63–64 of the autograph score, and their music matches R83+7–R88+5 from Movement III but differs slightly from R113+3–R120+9 of Movement IV. The excerpt omits two bars of Movement IV, mm. 24 and 64, without which the ground bass in those repetitions is not complete. Shostakovich drew two carets in lead-colored pencil where the missing bars needed to be inserted and wrote “*ostavit’ odin pustoy takt,*” or “leave one empty bar.” He gave this excerpt to his neighbor, signing its first page, “To Alexey Kruchenikh from Dmitri Shostakovich, from the 8th Symphony, 1943, 17 X” (see Chapter 4, note 39).

Bibliography

Bibliography

Titles in English

- Abraham, Gerald. *Eight Soviet Composers*. London: Oxford University Press, 1943.
- Ashkenazy, Vladimir. "Making Music in the Shadow of Stalin." *New York Times*, 16 February 2003, late edition, sec. 2.
- Bartlett, Rosamund. "Shostakovich and Chekhov." In *Shostakovich in Context*, edited by Rosamund Bartlett, 199–218. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- , ed. *Shostakovich in Context*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Blokker, Roy, and Robert Dearling. *The Music of Dmitri Shostakovich: The Symphonies*. London: Tantivy Press, 1979.
- Botstein, Leon. "Listening to Shostakovich." In *Shostakovich and His World*, edited by Laurel E. Fay, 355–86. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.
- Bowl, John E., ed. and trans. "Contributions to the First All-Union Congress of Soviet Writers [Extracts], 1934." In *Russian Art of the Avant-Garde: Theory and Criticism, 1902-1934*. Revised edition. New York: Thames & Hudson, 1988.
- Brown, Malcolm Hamrick. "Kniga eskizov Betkhovena za 1802–1803 gody. Issledovanie i rasshifrovka N.L. Fishmana. S dvumya prilozheniyami. (Gosudarstvennyĭ muzeĭ muzykalnoĭ kultury imeni M.I. Glinki.)" [Beethoven's sketchbook of 1802–1803. Research and transcription of N.L. Fishman. With two prefaces. (Glinka Museum of Musical Culture.)]. *Notes* 20, no. 3 (Summer, 1963): 460–63.
- , ed. *A Shostakovich Casebook*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004.
- Cooper, Barry. *Beethoven and the Creative Process*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1990.
- Darby, Joseph Eugene. "Shostakovich's Second, Third, and Fourth Symphonies: Problems of Context, Analysis, and Interpretation." Ph.D. diss., CUNY, 1999.
- Emerson, Caryl. "Back to the Future: Shostakovich's Revision of Leskov's 'Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk District.'" *Cambridge Opera Journal* 1 (1989): 59–78.
- . "Shostakovich and the Russian literary tradition." In *Shostakovich and His World*, edited by Laurel E. Fay, 183–226. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.

- . “Shostakovich, Tsvetaeva, Pushkin, Musorgsky: Songs and Dances of Death and Survival.” In *Shostakovich in Context*, edited by Rosamund Bartlett, 191–98. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Fairclough, Pauline. *A Soviet Credo: Shostakovich's Fourth Symphony*. Aldershot, Eng.: Ashgate, 2006.
- Fanning, David. *The Breath of the Symphonist: Shostakovich's Tenth*. London: Royal Music Association, 1988.
- . “Shostakovich and His Students.” In *Shostakovich and His World*, edited by Laurel E. Fay, 275–302. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.
- , ed. *Shostakovich Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Fay, Laurel E. “The Composer Was Courageous But Not as Much as in Myth.” *New York Times*, 14 April 1996, sec. 2.
- . “The Last Quartets of Dmitri Shostakovich: A Stylistic Investigation.” Ph.D. diss., Cornell University, 1978.
- . *Shostakovich: A Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . “Shostakovich, LASM, and Asafiev.” In *Shostakovich in Context*, edited by Rosamund Bartlett, 51–66. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . “Shostakovich versus Volkov: Whose *Testimony*?” *Russian Review* 39 (1980): 484–93.
- , ed. *Shostakovich and His World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.
- Haas, David Edwin. “Form and Line in the Music and Musical Thought of Leningrad: 1917–1932 (Soviet Union).” Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 1989.
- . “Shostakovich's Eighth: C Minor Symphony against the Grain.” In *Shostakovich in Context*, edited by Rosamund Bartlett, 123–34. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Hakobian, Levon. *Music of the Soviet Age: 1917-1987*. Stockholm: Melos Music Literature, 1998.
- Ho, Allen, and Dmitri Feofanov. *Shostakovich Reconsidered*. London: Toccata Press, 1998.
- Huband, Joseph D. “The First Five Symphonies of Dmitri Shostakovich.” D.A. diss., Ball State University, 1984.

- Hulme, Derek C. *Dmitri Shostakovich: Catalogue, Bibliography, and Discography*. 3rd ed. Lanham, Md.: Scarecrow Press, 2002.
- Ivashkin, Alexander. "Shostakovich and Schnittke: The Erosion of Symphonic Syntax." In *Shostakovich Studies*, edited by David Fanning, 254–71. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Johnson, Douglas. "Beethoven Scholars and Beethoven's Sketches." *19th-Century Music* 2, no. 1 (1978): 3–17.
- Johnson, Douglas, Alan Tyson, and Robert Winter, ed. *The Beethoven Sketchbooks*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.
- Kay, Norman. *Shostakovich*. London: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Kerman, J. "Sketch Studies." In *Musicology in the 1980s: Methods, Goals, and Opportunities*, edited by D. Kern Holoman and Claude V. Palisca, 53–65. New York: Da Capo, 1982.
- Kovnatskaya, Lyudmila. "Shostakovich and Britten: Some Parallels." In *Shostakovich in Context*, edited by Rosamund Bartlett, 175–90. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Kravetz, Nelly. "A New Insight into the Tenth Symphony of Dmitri Shostakovich." In *Shostakovich in Context*, edited by Rosamund Bartlett. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Loftus, Elizabeth. *Memory: Surprising New Insights into How We Remember and Why We Forget*. Reading, Mass.: Addison–Wesley, 1980.
- MacDonald, Ian. *The New Shostakovich*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1990.
- . "Fay versus Shostakovich: Whose Stupidity?" *East European Jewish Affairs* 26.2 (winter 1996): 5–26.
- . "Witnesses for the Defence: Testimonies Concerning Shostakovich's Attitudes to the Soviet Regime." *Music under Soviet Rule*. March 1998. www.siue.edu/~aho/musov/witness.wit.html (accessed 9 June 2003).
- , ed. "The Shostakovich Debate: A Manual for Beginners." *Music under Soviet Rule*. <http://www.siue.edu/~aho/musov/deb/begin.html> (accessed 9 June 2003).
- MacDonald, Ian, and Dmitri Feofanov. "Do Not Judge Me Harshly! Anti-Communism in Shostakovich's letters to Isaak Glikman." *DSCH Journal* 8 (winter 1997).

- MacDonald, Malcolm. *Dmitri Shostakovich: A Complete Catalogue*. 2nd ed. London: Boosey & Hawkes, 1985.
- Maes, Francis. *A History of Russian Music: From Kamarinskaya to Babi Yar*. Translated by Arnold J. and Erica Pomerans. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- Marston, Nicholas. "Sketch." In *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, edited by Stanley Sadie. Vol. 23. London: Macmillan, 2001.
- Martínov, Ivan. *Shostakovich: The Man and His Work*. Translated by T. Guralsky. New York: Philosophical Library, 1947.
- Mikheeva, Lyudmilla V. *Dmitri Shostakovich*. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1980.
- Mitchell, Donald. *The Wunderhorn Years*. London: Faber & Faber, 1975.
- Montefiore, Simon Sebag. *Stalin: The Court of the Red Tsar*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2003.
- Norris, Christopher, ed. *Shostakovich: The Man and His Music*. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1982.
- Ottaway, Hugh. *Shostakovich Symphonies*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1978.
- Orlov, Genrikh. "A Link in the Chain: Reflections on Shostakovich's Biography." *Music in the USSR* 1990: 36–47.
- Rabinovich, David Abramovich. *Dmitry Shostakovich*. Translated by George Hanna. London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1959.
- "Responses of Shostakovich to a Questionnaire on the Psychology of the Creative Process." Prepared by Roman Ilich Gruber. Edited and annotated by staff researchers of the Glinka Museum of Musical Culture, Moscow. Translated by Malcolm Hamrick Brown. In *Shostakovich and His World*, edited by Laurel E. Fay, 27–42. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.
- Roseberry, Eric. "A Debt Repaid? Some Observations on Shostakovich and His Late-period Recognition of Britten." In *Shostakovich Studies*, edited by David Fanning, 229–53. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- . *Ideology, Style, Content and Thematic Process in the Symphonies, Cello Concertos, and String Quartets of Shostakovich*. New York: Garland, 1989.
- . *Shostakovich*. London: Omnibus, 1986.

- . *Shostakovich: His Life and Times*. Tunbridge Wells, Kent: Midas Books, 1982.
- Schwarz, Boris. *Music and Musical Life in Soviet Russia, 1917-1970*. New York: Norton, 1972.
- Seroff, Victor Ilyitch. *Dmitri Shostakovich: The Life and Background of a Soviet Composer*. New York: Knopf, 1943.
- Shaginyan, Marietta. "Fifty Letters from Dmitri Shostakovich." *Soviet Literature* 1 (1984): 68–99.
- Sheinberg, Esti. *Irony, Satire, Parody and the Grotesque in the Music of Shostakovich: A Theory of Musical Incongruities*. Aldershot, Eng.: Ashgate, 2000.
- Shostakovich, Irina. "An Answer to Those Who Still Abuse Shostakovich." *New York Times*, 20 Aug. 2000, late edition, sec. 2.
- "Shostakovich: Letters to His Mother." Selected by Dmitrii Frederiks and Rosa Sadykhova. In *Shostakovich and His World*, edited by Laurel E. Fay, 1–26. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.
- Slonimsky, Nicholas. "Dmitri Dmitrievitch Shostakovich." *Musical Quarterly* 28 (1942): 415–444.
- Sollertinsky, Dmitri, and Lyudmilla Sollertinsky. *Pages from the Life of Dmitri Shostakovich*. Translated by Graham Hobbs and Charles Midgley. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1980.
- Taruskin, Richard. *Defining Russia Musically: Historical and Hermeneutical Essays*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.
- . *Musorgsky: Eight Essays and an Epilogue*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.
- . "The Opera and the Dictator: The Peculiar Martyrdom of Dmitri Shostakovich." *New Republic* 200, no. 12 (1989): 34-40.
- . "When Serious Music Mattered: Double Trouble." *New Republic Online*. 13 Dec. 2001. www.tnr.com/docprint.mhtml?i=20011224&s=taruskin122401 (accessed 22 March 2002).
- . "Who Was Shostakovich?" *Atlantic Monthly* 275, no. 2 (1995): 62-72.
- . "Writing about Shostakovich." Publication of the 2000 Cramb Lecture. *DSCH Journal* 14 (2001): 25-43.

- Volkov, Solomon. *Testimony: The Memoirs of Dmitri Shostakovich*. Translated by Antonina W. Bouis. New York: Limelight Editions, 1979.
- . *Shostakovich and Stalin: The Extraordinary Relationship between the Great Composer and the Brutal Dictator*. Translated by Antonina W. Bouis. New York: Knopf, 2004.
- Weiss, Piero. “Shostakovich and the *Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk* Debacle.” In *Opera: A History of Documents*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Wilson, Elizabeth. *Shostakovich: A Life Remembered*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Yakubov, Manashir. “Shostakovich’s *Anti-Formalist Rayok*: A History of the Work’s Composition and its Musical and Literary Sources.” In *Shostakovich in Context*, edited by Rosamund Barlett, 135–58. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Scores

- Shostakovich, Dmitri. *New Collected Works*. Edited by Manashir Iakubov. Vol. 1, *Symphony No. 1, Op. 10*. Moscow: DSCH, 2002.
- . *New Collected Works*. Edited by Manashir Iakubov. Vol. 2, *Symphony No. 2, Op. 14*. Moscow: DSCH, 2001.
- . *New Collected Works*. Edited by Manashir Iakubov. Vol. 3, *Symphony No. 3, Op. 20; Unfinished Symphony of 1934 (Fragment Adagio), Sans op.* Moscow: DSCH, 2002.
- . *New Collected Works*. Edited by Manashir Iakubov. Vol. 4, *Symphony No. 4, Op. 43*. Moscow: DSCH, 2003.
- . *New Collected Works*. Edited by Manashir Iakubov. Vol. 5, *Symphony No. 5, Op. 47*. Moscow: DSCH, 2004.
- . *New Collected Works*. Edited by Manashir Iakubov. Vol. 6, *Symphony No. 6, Op. 54*. Moscow: DSCH, 2001.
- . *New Collected Works*. Edited by Manashir Iakubov. Vol. 9, *Symphony No. 9, Op. 70*. Moscow: DSCH, 2000.
- . *New Collected Works*. Edited by Manashir Iakubov. Vol. 16, *Symphony No. 1, Op. 10*. Moscow: DSCH, 2004.
- . *New Collected Works*. Edited by Manashir Iakubov. Vol. 17, *Symphony No. 2, Op. 14*. Moscow: DSCH, 2004.

- . *New Collected Works*. Edited by Manashir Iakubov. Vol. 18, *Symphony No. 3, Op. 20*. Moscow: DSCH, 2003.
- . *New Collected Works*. Edited by Manashir Iakubov. Vol. 19, *Symphony No. 4, Op. 43*. Moscow: DSCH, 2000.
- . *New Collected Works*. Edited by Manashir Iakubov. Vol. 20, *Symphony No. 5, Op. 47*. Moscow: DSCH, 2003.
- . *New Collected Works*. Edited by Manashir Iakubov. Vol. 21, *Symphony No. 6, Op. 54*. Moscow: DSCH, 2004.
- . *New Collected Works*. Edited by Manashir Iakubov. Vol. 24, *Symphony No. 9, Op. 70*. Moscow: DSCH, 2000.
- . *Symphony No. 8, Op. 65*. Hamburg: Musikverlag Hans Sikorski, 1946.
- . *Symphonies Nos. 9 and 10 in Full Score*. New York: Dover, 1995.
- Shostakovich, Dmitriy. *Sobraniye sochineniy v soroka dvukh tomakh* [Collected works in forty-two volumes]. Moscow: Muzika, 1979–88.

Bibliography

Titles in Russian

- Akopyan, Levon Ogonesovich. *Dmitriy Shostakovich: opit fenomenologii tvorchestva* [Dmitri Shostakovich: an essay in the phenomenology of his work]. St. Petersburg: Dmitri Bulanin, 2004.
- Aranovsky, M. “Zametki o tvorchestve” [Notes on creative work]. *Sovetskaya muzika* 49, no. 9 (1981):16–22.
- Ardov, Mikhail. *Shostakovich v vospominaniyakh sina Maksima, docheri Galini i protoiyereya Mikhaila Ardova* [Shostakovich in the memories of his son Maxim, his daughter and the Reverend Michael Ardov]. Moscow: Zakharov, 2003. Translated by Rosanna Kelly and Michael Meylac under the title *Memories of Shostakovich: Interviews with the Composer’s Children by the Revd Michael Ardov* (London: Short Books, 2004).
- Atovm’yan, Levon. “Iz vospominaniy.” *Muzikal’naya akademiya* 4 (1997): 67–77.
- Batsun, V.N., and T.V. Kozhevnikova. *Nash Shostakovich: posvyashchayetsya k 100-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya D.D. Shostakovicha, sbornik nauchnikh rabot studentov muzikal’no-pedagogicheskogo otdeleniya* [Our Shostakovich: dedicated to the 100th anniversary of the birth of D.D. Shostakovich, an anthology of specialist work by the students of the musico-pedagogical department]. Samara: Samarskiy gosudarstvenniy pedagogicheskii universitet, 2006.
- Bobikina, I.A., ed. *Dmitriy Shostakovich v pis’makh i dokumentakh* [Dmitri Shostakovich through his letters and documents]. Moscow: Glinka Museum of Musical Culture, 2000.
- Digonskaya, Ol’ga. “Neizvestniye avtografi Shostakovicha v GTsMMK” [Unknown autographs of Shostakovich in GTsMMK]. In *Shostakovich-Urtext*, edited by Marina P. Rakhmanova, 144–69. Moscow: Glinka Museum of Musical Culture, 2006.
- . “Simfonicheskiy fragment 1945 goda” [Symphonic fragment from 1945]. *Muzikal’naya akademiya* 2 (2006): 97–107.
- Dolinskaya, E.B., ed. *Shostakovichu posvyashchayetsya: sbornik statey k 90-letiyu kompozitora, 1906–1996* [Dedicated to Shostakovich: anthology of articles for the 90th anniversary of the composer, 1906–1996]. Moscow: Kompozitor, 1997.
- Dombrovskaya, Ol’ga. *Dmitriy Shostakovich: stranitsi zhizni v fotografiyakh* [Dmitri Shostakovich: pages of his life in photographs]. Moscow: DSCH, 2006.

- . “Dve stranitsi iz yezhednevnik Shostakovicha” [Two pages from Shostakovich’s daily dairy]. *DSCH* (2005): 66–89.
- Dzhafarova, S.G., ed. *Posvyashcheniye Shostakovichu: sbornik statey k 90-letiyu kompozitora, 2 dekabrya 1996–12 yanvarya 1997* [Dedicated to Shostakovich: anthology of articles for the 90th anniversary of the composer, 2 December 1996–12 January 1997]. Moscow: ART MIF, 1996.
- Fishman, Natan. *Kniga eskizov Betkhovena za 1802–3 godi: issledovaniye i rasshifrovka* [Beethoven’s sketchbook of 1802–3: research and transcription]. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoye muzikal’noye izdatel’stvo, 1962.
- Glikman, Isaak. *Pis’ma k drugu: Dmitriy Shostakovich Isaaku Glikmanu* [Letters to a friend: Dmitri Shostakovich to Isaac Glikman]. Moscow: DSCH, 1993. Translated by Anthony Philips under the title *Story of a Friendship: The Letters of Dmitry Shostakovich to Isaak Glikman, 1941-1975* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001).
- Gryaznovaya, Nina, ed. “Stenogramma zasedaniya Leningradskogo otdeleniya Soyuz Sovetskikh Kompozitorov v fevrale 1936 goda” [Notes from the meeting of the Leningrad division of the Union of Soviet Composers, February 1936.]. In *Shostakovich-Urtext*, edited by M.P. Rakhmanova. Moscow: Glinka Museum of Musical Culture, 2006.
- Khentova, Sof’ya. *Molodiye godi* [Early years]. Leningrad; Moscow: Sovetskiy kompozitor, 1975.
- . “Na auktsione Sotbi—snova pis’ma o lyubvi” [At a Sotheby’s Auction—More Love Letters]. *Muzikal’naya zhizn’* 7 (1994): 26–28.
- . *Shostakovich i Sibir’* [Shostakovich and Siberia]. Novosibirsk: Novosibirskoye Knizhnoe Izdatel’stvo, 1990.
- . *Shostakovich v Moskve* [Shostakovich in Moscow]. Moscow: Moskovskiy rabochiy, 1986.
- . *Shostakovich v Petrograde-Leningrade* [Shostakovich in Petrograd-Leningrad]. Leningrad: Lenizdat, 1979.
- . *Shostakovich: zhizn’ i tvorchestvo* [Shostakovich: life and works]. 2 vols. Leningrad: Sovetskiy kompozitor, 1985–86; 2nd ed. Moscow: Kompozitor, 1996.
- . *Udivitel’niy Shostakovich* [The surprising Shostakovich]. St. Petersburg: Variant, 1993.

- . *V mire Shostakovicha: zapis' besed c D.D. Shostakovichem* [In Shostakovich's world: a record of conversations with D.D. Shostakovich]. Moscow: Kompozitor, 1996.
- . “Zhenshchiny v zhizni Shostakovicha” [The women in Shostakovich's life]. *Vremya i mi* 112 (1991).
- Klimovitskiy, Arkadiy. “Syuita na finskiye temi—neizvestnoye sochineniye Shostakovicha” [Suite on Finnish themes—unknown compositions of Shostakovich]. In *D.D. Shostakovich: sbornik statey k 90-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya* [D.D. Shostakovich: anthology of articles for the 90th anniversary of his birth], edited by L.G. Kovnatskaya, 308–27. St. Petersburg: Kompozitor, 1996.
- Kovnatskaya, L.G. “Ot redaktora-sostavitelya” [From the editor-compiler]. In *Shostakovich: mezhdru mgnoveniyem i vechnost'yu* [Shostakovich: between moments and eternity], edited by L.G. Kovnatskaya, 3–8. St. Petersburg: Kompozitor, 2000.
- , ed. *D.D. Shostakovich: sbornik statey k 90-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya* [D.D. Shostakovich: anthology of articles for the 90th anniversary of his birth]. St. Petersburg: Kompozitor, 1996.
- . *Shostakovich: mezhdru mgnoveniyem i vechnost'yu* [Shostakovich: between moments and eternity]. St. Petersburg: Kompozitor, 2000.
- Orlov, Genrikh. *Dmitriy Dmitriyevich Shostakovich: kratkiy ocherk zhizni i tvorchestva* [Dmitri Dmitriyevich Shostakovich: a short essay of his life and works]. Moscow: Muzika, 1966.
- . *Simfonii Shostakovicha* [The symphonies of Shostakovich]. Leningrad: Gosudarstvennoye muzikal'noye izdatel'stvo, 1961.
- “Publisher's Note.” In *Sobraniye sochineniy v soroka dvukh tomakh* [Collected works in forty-two volumes], by Dmitriy Shostakovich. Vol. 1. Moscow: Muzika, 1979–88.
- Rakhmanova, Marina P., ed. *Shostakovich—Urtext*. Moscow: Glinka Museum of Musical Culture, 2006.
- Sabinina, Marina. *Shostakovich—simfonist: dramaturgiya, estetika, stil'* [Shostakovich as symphonist: dramaturgy, aesthetics, style]. Moscow: Muzika, 1976.
- Sadovnikov, E.L. *D.D. Shostakovich: notograficheskiy i bibliograficheskiy spravochnik* [D.D. Shostakovich: notographic and bibliographic reference guide]. 2nd ed. Moscow: Muzika, 1965.
- . *D.D. Shostakovich: notograficheskiy spravochnik* [D.D. Shostakovich: notographic reference guide]. Moscow: Sovetskiy kompozitor, 1961.

- Sadikhova, Rosa, and Dmitriy Frederiks, comp. "Dmitriy Shostakovich: pis'ma k materi" [Dmitri Shostakovich: letters to his mother]. *Niva* 9 (1986): 166–75.
- Schwarz, Betty. *Shostakovich—kakim zapomnilsya* [Shostakovich—with what remembered]. St. Petersburg: Kompozitor, 2006.
- Shostakovich, Dmitriy. "Balet i muzika" [Ballet and music]. *Vechernyaya Moskva* (5 April 1935): 3.
- . "Budem trubachami velikoy epokhi" [We Will Be the Trumpeters of a Great Era]. *Leningradskaya Pravda* (28 December 1934): 4.
- . "Kak rozhdayetsa muzika" [How Music Is Born]. *Literaturnaya gazeta* (21 December 1965): 3.
- . *Pis'ma I.I. Sollertinskomu* [Letters to Sollertinsky]. St. Petersburg: Kompozitor, 2006.
- . "Vos'maya simfoniya. Beseda s kompozitorom D. Shostakovichem," *Literatura i iskusstvo* (18 September 1943): 1.
- "Sumbur vmesto muziki: ob opere 'Ledi Makbet Mtsenskogo Uyezda' D. Shostakovicha" [Muddle instead of music: on Shostakovich's opera *Lady Macbeth of Mtsensk District*]. *Pravda*, 28 January 1936, 3. Also published in *Sovetskaya Muzika* 2 (1936):4–5.
- Tartakovskaya, Natalia, ed. "Neizvestniye pis'ma" [Unknown letters]. In *Shostakovich-Urtext*, edited by M.P. Rakhmanova, 8–39. Moscow: Glinka Museum of Musical Culture, 2006.
- Tishchenko, Boris. *Pis'ma Dmitriya Dmitriyevicha Shostakovicha Borisu Tishchenko: s kommentariyami i vospominaniyami adresata*. St. Petersburg: Kompozitor, 1997. Translated by Asy Ardova under the title *Letters of Dmitri Shostakovich to Boris Tishchenko: With the Addressee's Commentary and Reminiscences* (St. Petersburg: Kompozitor, 2001).
- Vaydman, Polina. *Tvorcheskiy arkhiv P.I. Chaykovskogo* [Tchaikovsky's Creative Archive]. Moscow: Muzika, 1988.
- Yakovlev, Mikhail, comp. *D. Shostakovich o vremeni i o sebe: 1926–1975* [Shostakovich about his times and himself]. Moscow: Sovetskiy kompozitor, 1980. Translated by Angus and Neilian Roxburgh under the title *Dmitry Shostakovich: About Himself and His Times*, compiled by L.G. Grigor'yev and Y.M. Platek (Moscow: Progress, 1980).

Yakubov, M.A. “Syuita dlya estradnogo orkestra ili Syuita dlya dzhaz-orkestra No. 2?” [Suite for stage orchestra or Suite for jazz orchestra No. 2?]. In *D.D. Shostakovich: sbornik statey k 90-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya* [D.D. Shostakovich: anthology of articles for the 90th anniversary of his birth], edited by L.G. Kovnatskaya, 328–45. St. Petersburg: Kompozitor, 1996.

Zhitomirsky, Daniel’. *Izbranniye stat’i* [Selected articles]. Moscow: Sovetskiy Kompozitor, 1981.

Archival Sources

Glikman, Isaak. *Journal I–X*. Dmitri Shostakovich Archive, f. 4, r. 2, yed. khr. 1–10.

Shostakovich, Dmitriy. *Neustanovlenniye proizvedeniya* [Unspecified works]. RGALI, f. 2048, op. 2, yed. khr. 52.

———. *Razroznenniye listi iz razlichnikh proizvedeniy* [Assorted pages from different works]. RGALI, f. 2048, op. 1, yed. khr. 63. Copies in the Dmitri Shostakovich Archive, f. 2, r. 1, yed. khr. 205.

———. *Simfoniya No. 8. Klavir, eskizi* [Symphony No. 8. Piano score, sketches]. RGALI, f. 2048, op. 1, yed. khr. 11. Copies in the Dmitri Shostakovich Archive, f. 2, r. 1, yed. khr. 41.

———. *Simfoniya No. 8. Korrektura s notnim prilozheniyem* [Symphony No. 8. Proof-sheets with musical supplements]. GTsMMK f. 32, inv. no. 2147.

———. *Simfoniya No. 8. Nabroski* [Symphony No. 8. Drafts]. GTsMMK, f. 32, yed. khr. 125. Copies in the Dmitri Shostakovich Archive, f. 2, r. 1, yed. khr. 124.

———. *Simfoniya No. 8. Partitura* [Symphony No. 8. Autograph score]. RGALI, f. 2048, op. 1, yed. khr. 9. Copies in the Dmitri Shostakovich Archives, f. 2, r. 1, yed. khr. 9.

———. *Simfoniya No. 8. Partitura, otrivki 1, 2, 3, ch.* [Symphony No. 8. Autograph score, excerpts from movements 1, 2, 3]. RGALI, f. 2048, op. 1, yed. khr. 10. Copies in the Dmitri Shostakovich Archives, f. 2, r. 1, yed. khr. 42.

———. *Simfoniya No. 10. Klavir, eskizi* [Symphony No. 10. Piano score, sketches]. RGALI, f. 2048, op. 1, yed. khr. 14. Copies in the Dmitri Shostakovich Archive, f. 2, r. 1, yed. khr. 52.

———. *Simfoniya No. 10. Dlya fortep’yano v 4 ruki* [Symphony No. 10. For piano 4 hands]. GTsMMK, f. 32, yed. khr. 69.

———. *6 romansov na stikhi angliskikh poetov* [6 romances on texts by English poets].
GTsMMK, f. 32, yed. khr. 87