PETERIS VASKS. String Quartet No.3, version for string orchestra (première)—26 January/Kaustinen/Ostrobothnian Chamber Orchestra c. Juha Kangas.

JAMES WOOD. Children at a Funeral for prepared piano (première)—17 February/London, Wigmore Hall/Andrew Ball (pno).


DOUGLAS YOUNG. If on a winter’s night, Schubert ... (première)—May/Sheffield Schubert Festival/Bernard Gregor-Smith (vle), Yolande Wrigley (pno). A Youthful Symphony for strings (première)—28 June/London, St John’s Smith Square/Trinity College String Ensemble.

Books Received
(A listing in this column does not preclude a review in a future issue of Tempo.)


Ives: Concord Sonata by Geoffrey Block. Cambridge Music Handbooks, C.U.P., £25.00 (hardback), £8.95 (paperback).


Letters to the Editor

From Ian MacDonald

Edward McKeon’s erudite review of Shostakovich Studies (Tempo 199) is impressively informed in the necessary multiplicity of ways and it is encouraging to see a Western writer unafraid to take issue with the views of Richard Taruskin, even whilst deferentially referring to him as ‘the musicologist’s musicologist’ and ‘the most respected authority on Russian music (at least in the West)’. McKeon is correct to chide Taruskin for his remarks on dissidence, although describing these as ‘perhaps a little too direct’ takes academic deference to comical lengths. Taruskin’s assertions reveal a risible lack of acquaintance with the Soviet historical context. As for Laurel Fay, presented here as a judicious balancer of the revisionist and anti-revisionist agendas, her article on From Jewish Folk Poetry in The New York Times (14 April 1996) is a medley...
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of historical solecisms so preposterous that the leading specialist in the field, Dr Harold Shukman of the Russian and East European Centre at St Antony's College, Oxford, confessed himself 'barely able to believe' that a respectable newspaper would publish it. (See my article 'Fay versus Shostakovich: Whose stupidity?' published in East European Jewish Affairs, Volume 26 No.2 (Winter 1996), obtainable from The Institute for Jewish Policy Research, 79 Wimpole Street, London W1M 7DD.

Returning to Taruskin, what Edward McKeon misses is that his purported account of the reception of the Fifth Symphony is a distortion which ignores important information contradicting it. Taruskin's conclusions about the way the work was received by the Soviet authorities are approximately 180 degrees from the truth, although whether this error in navigation came about through accident, an inability to read the map, or something peculiarly similar to Nelson's 'blind-eye' at Copenhagen, is hard to decide, owing to the angry incoherence with which Taruskin sets his fulminatory course. It is unsurprising that McKeon postponed discussing this outburst until the end of his review in that it sits uneasily with the scholarly essays with which David Fanning has surrounded it. Far from a work of scholarship, Taruskin's piece is a polemic driven less by a wish to elucidate the context of Shostakovich's Fifth Symphony than by its author's obsession with rubbing revisionists such as Solomon Volkov and myself. (Again, those wishing to follow the argument at length are invited to read my article 'Thoughts on David Fanning's Shostakovich Studies' in DSCH No.5, Summer 1996.)

Far from the authority which Edward McKeon claims him to be, Richard Taruskin has long made a practice of travestying Shostakovich, from his interpretation of Lady Macbeth as a apologia for Stalin's genocide in the Ukraine to his guerilla way of insult and innuendo against Testimony, a book now endorsed by almost everyone who knew Shostakovich, including his son and daughter. In this connexion, readers may be interested to examine the case for Testimony as deployed in the introductory essay to Shostakovich Reconsidered, an anthology, edited by Allan Ho and Dmitry Feofanov, to be published by Toccata later this year. Suffice it to say that neither Taruskin nor Laurel Fay emerges from this close cross-examination with their feathers in place.

It is heartening to find, in Edward McKeon, a musicologist sufficiently conscientious to keep up with the latest findings in general Sovietology (or, at least, to read Stalinist Terror: New Perspectives, edited by J. Arch Getty and Robert T. Manning). What is ominous, however, is his excessively dispassionate approach to this subject, together with its concitant academic espousal of a notional 'centre ground' between otherwise upsetting extremes. His allusion to the 'mannered' style of my book The New Shostakovich – which I take to refer to its sustained attempt to communicate the psychological experience of life under Stalinism as expressed in Shostakovich's music – is symptomatic of the tendency among modern intellectuals to downgrade the subjective in a pseudo-scientific effort to objectify art, placing it in a state of emotional quarantine from which it is unable to disturb, let alone alter, the audience's feelings and thoughts. In this respect, I stand, not with Getty and Manning, but with their bugbears Solzhenitsyn and Robert Conquest, writers for whom the experiential truth comes first, the actuarial truth second. Please note that this is a rule of priority rather than of exclusion. 'Actuarial' books like Shostakovich Studies are obviously legitimate and warranted, if not, essay by essay, equally essential - but they are legitimate and warranted only after the experience has been absorbed first. (As Semyon Bychkov observes, 'the important question for us is: what is it that Shostakovich is trying to say in his music? Only after that can we look at how he is saying that.') Have the various authors of Shostakovich Studies absorbed the experience? One or two of them, to some small extent, here and there. The phrase 'scratching the surface' suggests itself.
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