

4-18-2019

## Shostakovich and the Memoirs

Hanna Bahorik  
*Cedarville University*, [hbahorik@cedarville.edu](mailto:hbahorik@cedarville.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.cedarville.edu/musicalofferings>



Part of the [Ethnomusicology Commons](#), [Fine Arts Commons](#), and the [Musicology Commons](#)

[DigitalCommons@Cedarville](#) provides a publication platform for fully open access journals, which means that all articles are available on the Internet to all users immediately upon publication. However, the opinions and sentiments expressed by the authors of articles published in our journals do not necessarily indicate the endorsement or reflect the views of [DigitalCommons@Cedarville](#), the Centennial Library, or Cedarville University and its employees. The authors are solely responsible for the content of their work. Please address questions to [dc@cedarville.edu](mailto:dc@cedarville.edu).

---

### Recommended Citation

Bahorik, Hanna (2019) "Shostakovich and the Memoirs," *Musical Offerings*: Vol. 10 : No. 1 , Article 1.

DOI: 10.15385/jmo.2019.10.1.1

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.cedarville.edu/musicalofferings/vol10/iss1/1>

---

## Shostakovich and the Memoirs

### Document Type

Article

### Abstract

The life, politics, and music of Dmitri Dmitriyevich Shostakovich have been subjects of extreme controversy. Despite the turmoil of his dealings with Stalin, many people thought of him as a loyal servant of Russia and a masterful composer. It was not until the publication in 1979 of a book called *Testimony: The Memoirs of Dmitri Shostakovich* surfaced that debates began to take form that would eventually charge into the realm of violent disputes from many sides. This book, written by Solomon Volkov, portrayed Shostakovich as a bitter dissident. One year later, an American researcher and specialist in Russian and Soviet music by the name of Laurel Fay responded to *Testimony* with an article in *The Russian Review* entitled "Shostakovich Versus Volkov: Whose Testimony?" in which she brought forth evidence of falsification. Presently, Shostakovich researchers are often split into two schools of thought: revisionist and anti-revisionist. The revisionists agree with Volkov's portrayal in *Testimony* that Shostakovich was indeed a secret dissenter. The anti-revisionist views cover a much broader spectrum, but many reject the authenticity of *Testimony* and are of the opinion that to think of the Russian composer as a dissenter is irrelevant or entirely false, some to more extent than others. *Testimony* seems to lie at the heart of these debates, and it is around these purported memoirs and the evidence for and against them that this paper will be focusing on. While the memoirs of *Testimony* and its claims of authenticity must be treated with caution, the *Testimony*-portrayal of Shostakovich corresponds with the views of his friends and family and therefore provides valuable insight into the composer's life and state of mind.

### Keywords

Shostakovich, memoirs

### Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

## Shostakovich and the Memoirs

Hanna R. Bahorik  
*Cedarville University*

Perhaps no other composer in history has been at the center of so much controversy as the Russian composer, Dmitri Dmitriyevich Shostakovich. Even though Stalin publicly reprimanded Shostakovich in 1936 for his opera, *Lady Macbeth of the Mtsensk District*, Shostakovich was hailed by his communist comrades as a great patriot; his symphonies were appreciated as nationalistic anthems. Few had any reason to question his persona as being anything other than that of a faithful Russian, considering his awards, high positions, and success within the communist regime. It was not until the 1979 publication of a book called *Testimony: The Memoirs of Dmitri Shostakovich* that debates began to take form that would eventually charge into the realm of violent disputes from many sides.<sup>1</sup> Solomon Volkov, the editor of the soon-controversial *Testimony* and a young music journalist from Leningrad, supposedly met with the composer and wrote down what he said.

One year after *Testimony* appeared, American researcher and specialist in Russian and Soviet music, Laurel Fay, responded to *Testimony* with an article in *The Russian Review* entitled, “Shostakovich versus Volkov: Whose Testimony?” in which she brought forth evidence of falsification and tampering.<sup>2</sup> Fay stated about Volkov’s *Testimony* that “the Shostakovich of these memoirs, at the time of his death and for many years before by far the most prominent, honored, and respected composer in the Soviet Union, reveals here with unparalleled scorn and bitterness the fear and oppression that plagued his life.”<sup>3</sup> Since then, other writers have come to the defense of Volkov such as Allan B. Ho and Dmitry Feofanov in their book, *Shostakovich Reconsidered*, which

---

<sup>1</sup> Dmitrii Dmitriyevich Shostakovich and Solomon Volkov, *Testimony: The Memoirs of Dmitri Shostakovich* (New York: Limelight Editions, 2004).

<sup>2</sup> Laurel E. Fay, “Shostakovich versus Volkov: Whose Testimony?” *The Russian Review* 39, no. 4 (1980): 484-93.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, 484.

the authors referred to as a “reply against unjust criticism,” voicing their support of Volkov.<sup>4</sup>

Presently, Shostakovich researchers are mainly split into two schools of thought: revisionist and anti-revisionist.<sup>5</sup> The revisionists agree with Volkov’s portrayal in *Testimony* that Shostakovich was indeed a secret dissenter. The anti-revisionist views, such as those of Fay, cover a much broader spectrum. Many anti-revisionists utterly reject the authenticity of *Testimony* and believe that it is either irrelevant or entirely false to think of the Russian composer as a dissenter. Debates between scholars have resulted in many conflicting opinions in the books and articles dedicated to the memory of Shostakovich, and *Testimony* seems to lie at the heart of these debates. This article examines the contrasting views and opinions of Volkov, Fay, family members, friends, and others with the intent of discovering if *Testimony* provides any reliable insight into the life of Shostakovich. While the authenticity of *Testimony* is still very much a current debate among scholars and must be treated with caution given the evidence against it, the *Testimony*-portrayal of Shostakovich corresponds with the views of many of his friends and family and therefore provides valuable, if not authentic, insight into the composer’s life and state of mind.

Before evaluating the accuracy of the revisionist picture Volkov portrayed of Shostakovich, first consider the authenticity of the document. Volkov’s claim is that *Testimony* contains the actual memoirs, information, and opinions of Shostakovich, dictated to Volkov and personally authorized for publication by the composer himself.<sup>6</sup> In her article, Fay wrote that essentially, *Testimony*’s authenticity rests on two different types of evidence. The first kind of evidence is the honesty and integrity of Solomon Volkov and his methods, and the second is Shostakovich’s signature at the head of each of the eight sections.<sup>7</sup>

Consider Volkov’s methods: Volkov claims that he and the composer sat down over a series of meetings, with Volkov taking notes and Shostakovich answering his questions. Afterward, Volkov organized

---

<sup>4</sup> Allan B. Ho and Dmitry Feofanov, *Shostakovich Reconsidered* (London: Toccata Press, 1998), 14.

<sup>5</sup> Ian MacDonald, “The Shostakovich Debate,” in “Shostakovichiana,” *Music under Soviet Rule*, 3.

<sup>6</sup> Fay, “Shostakovich versus Volkov,” 486.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, 487.

these “penciled scribbles,” as he called them, in *Testimony*.<sup>8</sup> He described the process in *Testimony* as such: “I divided up the collected material into sustained sections. . . then I showed these sections to Shostakovich, who approved my work.”<sup>9</sup> Malcom Hamrick Brown, in his work entitled *A Shostakovich Casebook*, reveals the opinion of the composer’s widow, Irina Shostakovich, who cast further doubt on *Testimony*’s authenticity and Volkov’s methods in a 1979 interview.<sup>10</sup> She stated, as quoted by Brown, that “Volkov saw Dmitrich three or maybe four times. . . . I don’t see how he could have gathered enough material from Dmitrich for such a thick book.”<sup>11</sup> Though it is possible that Irina was not aware of subsequent meetings, Brown reminded his readers that at the time of the interviews in question (1971-74), Shostakovich was not well and depended on his wife for every need, and she never left his side.<sup>12</sup> In speaking of Volkov’s experiences with Shostakovich and the method he used to obtain his information, Fay calls it “a complicated process which, at crucial points, remains essentially unverifiable.”<sup>13</sup> David Fanning, a supporter of Fay and her research, in his review of *Shostakovich Reconsidered*, pointed out that “unfortunately, the one piece of decisive evidence, Volkov’s shorthand notes of his conversations with Shostakovich, is, according to Volkov, now lost,” those notes having been sold to a private collector.<sup>14</sup>

The second and strongest piece of evidence for *Testimony*’s authenticity is that Shostakovich’s signature appears only on the first page of each chapter, where he wrote “*Chital D. Shostakovich*” (“*Chital*” being translated as “read”).<sup>15</sup> Shostakovich signed the first page of each section, thereby giving his stamp of approval and declaring the young journalist’s work to be factual. However, Fay pointed out that a staggering total of seven out of the eight chapters contain passages which “are verbatim or near-verbatim reproductions of memoirs previously

---

<sup>8</sup> Shostakovich and Volkov, *Testimony*, xvii.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> Malcom Hamrick Brown, ed., *A Shostakovich Casebook* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004), 3.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid.

<sup>12</sup> Ibid., 4.

<sup>13</sup> Fay, “Shostakovich versus Volkov,” 487.

<sup>14</sup> David Fanning, “Review of *Shostakovich Reconsidered*, by Allan B. Ho Dmitry Feofanov,” *Music & Letters* 80, no. 3 (1999): 489. doi:[10.1093/ml/80.3.489](https://doi.org/10.1093/ml/80.3.489).

<sup>15</sup> Fay, “Shostakovich versus Volkov,” 487.

published by Shostakovich.”<sup>16</sup> There are only two explanations: either Shostakovich memorized them word-for-word and then perfectly recited them in his question-and-answer type of interviews with Volkov, or Volkov obtained them from other sources. This raises questions because Volkov claims he never used previously published material in *Testimony*.<sup>17</sup> Even more alarmingly, Fay also stated that “what is most disturbing about these borrowed reminiscences, however, is the fact that all seven occur at the beginning of chapters.”<sup>18</sup> Fay and other anti-revisionists find it difficult to believe that Volkov somehow fleshed out his penciled scribbles in a way that led to an accidental, word-for-word quotation of previously published material (down to the exact literary layout and punctuation).<sup>19</sup> Though Volkov never answered Fay’s article, he still maintains that he never used previously published material and was not even aware of the existence of these recycled passages until Fay brought it to light.<sup>20</sup> Incidentally, one of the articles which *Testimony* borrowed from first appeared in a Russian journal with an introduction signed by “S. Volkov.”<sup>21</sup>

Evidence of tampering can be seen in the Moscow typescript where there appear to be odd gaps and horizontal shadow lines, suggesting that correction tape was used to cover up missing text.<sup>22</sup> Further examination by Fay revealed that “comparison with the Moscow typescript confirms that the two passages are identical in all respects, except for the deleted sentence,” (speaking of a passage first published in a Russian journal, and then seen in *Testimony*) and that “in each instance the deleted sentence makes a temporal reference that would allow a reader to infer the date when the reminiscences were originally produced.”<sup>23</sup> These duplicated passages printed on the signed pages of *Testimony* exist only to the extent of a single page of the original typescript.<sup>24</sup> Brown quotes Fay’s statement that “in every case, the direct quotation ceases abruptly, even breaking off in mid-sentence, the moment one turns to the next page.”<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Fay, “Shostakovich versus Volkov,” 488.

<sup>17</sup> Brown, *A Shostakovich Casebook*, 22.

<sup>18</sup> Fay, “Shostakovich versus Volkov,” 490.

<sup>19</sup> Brown, *A Shostakovich Casebook*, 23.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 22.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, 23.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 30.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, 30.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 40.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*

Regarding the authenticity of Shostakovich's autographs, the composer's family members offered their opinions. Shostakovich's son, Maxim Shostakovich, said this of *Testimony* in 1981 after he defected: "They are not my father's memoirs. It is a book by Solomon Volkov. . . . Volkov probably slotted numerous pages between the unnumbered pages of the interview. It's easily done."<sup>26</sup> However, it is important to note that ten years later, Maxim elaborated a bit on his opinion of *Testimony*: "I would still say it's a book about my father, not by him. . . . It's a collection of different things—real documentary, fact, and rumor. But what's more important is that when we take this book in our hands, we can imagine what this composer's life was like in this particular political situation—how difficult, how awful it was under the Stalin regime."<sup>27</sup>

In *A Shostakovich Casebook*, Brown printed a very illuminating article written by Irina Shostakovich in 2000 entitled, "An Answer to Those Who Still Abuse Shostakovich." Irina stated that sometime after those few meetings, "Mr. Volkov brought Shostakovich a typed version of their conversations and asked him to sign every page at the bottom. It was a thin sheaf of papers, and Shostakovich . . . did not read them."<sup>28</sup> When his wife asked why he had signed every page, Shostakovich replied that Volkov had told him about "some new censorship rules according to which the publishers would not accept his material without a signature."<sup>29</sup> The verbatim passages themselves are more or less of a neutral nature and do not contain any controversial sentiments.<sup>30</sup> As to the pages supposedly added by Volkov, Brown provides us with Fay's second article that she wrote in response to *Shostakovich Reconsidered* entitled, "Volkov's *Testimony* Reconsidered." In this article, Fay uncovers evidence supporting the idea that Volkov rearranged and inserted both pages and text after Shostakovich put his signature to the pages with verbatim passages.<sup>31</sup> Two pages containing inflammatory remarks were slotted in before the page with Shostakovich's signature, and they were inserted *after* Shostakovich's signature had already been obtained.<sup>32</sup> If Fay was indeed examining a true copy of the original

---

<sup>26</sup> Brown, *A Shostakovich Casebook*, 47.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, 48.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 131.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>30</sup> Fay, "Shostakovich versus Volkov," 490, 16.

<sup>31</sup> Brown, *A Shostakovich Casebook*, 37.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, 39.

typescript, then these two pages were unauthorized because they are the first of the chapter and do not bear Shostakovich's signature.

Though the anti-revisionist position questions Volkov's honesty concerning how he obtained the material for his book and his claims to its total authenticity, other scholars and friends and family of Shostakovich believe that *Testimony* reflects many of the thoughts, opinions, and sentiments of Shostakovich and contains valuable insights into his life under the communist regime. The revisionists believe that *Testimony* is accurate and factual, and that Fay and other skeptics of *Testimony* have not given readers the full picture of all the evidence supporting the book and its view of Shostakovich. MacDonald stated that "the 'new' Shostakovich portrayed in *Testimony* has been confirmed beyond a doubt."<sup>33</sup>

Except for the opinion of Irina Shostakovich, the picture painted in *Testimony* of how much Shostakovich detested Stalin and Communism matches the picture painted by his family members. Even Maxim Shostakovich, who voiced skepticism about Volkov's methods and as of 1991 still maintained that "it is a book about my father, not by him," stated that "the political tendency, the political opinions of my father are represented correctly."<sup>34</sup> Brown stated that over the years, Maxim has granted that "the book is broadly accurate in its description of the political circumstances of Shostakovich's life and the spiritual torment he endured."<sup>35</sup> Maxim Shostakovich disagreed with those who would say Shostakovich was a loyal Communist when he recalled, "I shall never forget Father asking Galya and me to come into his study in summer 1960, and saying: 'They have forced me to become a Party member.' And then he started weeping. I saw him weeping only twice in my life and the other time was when my mother died."<sup>36</sup> In 1986, Maxim even endorsed *Testimony*, saying, as quoted by MacDonald, "It's true. It's accurate. . . . The basis of the book is correct."<sup>37</sup>

Allan B. Ho and Dmitry Feofanov are two of *Testimony*'s staunchest defenders, and in their book, *The Shostakovich Wars*, they interviewed the people closest to Shostakovich, including his daughter, Galina.

---

<sup>33</sup> MacDonald and Clarke, *The New Shostakovich*, 9.

<sup>34</sup> Brown, *A Shostakovich Casebook*, 47-48.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid.

<sup>36</sup> Allan B. Ho and Dmitry Feofanov, *The Shostakovich Wars*.

<http://www.siue.edu/~aho/ShostakovichWars/SW.pdf>, 37.

<sup>37</sup> MacDonald and Clarke, *The New Shostakovich*, 9.



Galina Shostakovich stated in a 1995 interview, “I am an admirer of Volkov. There is nothing false there [in *Testimony*]. Definitely the style of speech is Shostakovich’s—not only the choice of words, but also the way they are put together.”<sup>38</sup> Vladimir Ashkenazy, a student who periodically met with the composer stated, “when I read *Testimony*, there was no question in my mind that the real Shostakovich was here in this book. All that we knew about him was now confirmed in print.”<sup>39</sup>

Concerning Irina Shostakovich (the only member of Shostakovich’s immediate family who openly rejects Volkov and *Testimony*) and her critical remarks about Volkov and *Testimony*, Ho and Feofanov have uncovered evidence of a KGB connection.<sup>40</sup> Apparently, it was the KGB who met with Irina concerning the memoirs and advised her to ask Volkov to let her see a copy before publication. Volkov declined, and a week later, he emigrated to the United States.<sup>41</sup> Contrary to Irina’s statements about Volkov only having met with Shostakovich three or four times, Volkov stated that he and the composer had a fifteen-year relationship.<sup>42</sup> Ho and Feofanov wrote of Shostakovich’s long-time friend, Flora Litvinova, who remembers “the composer himself telling her that he had been meeting ‘constantly’ with a young Leningrad musicologist to ‘tell him everything I remember about my works and myself.’”<sup>43</sup> As for Irina’s statements about Volkov only showing Shostakovich a handful of papers, Ann Haris of Harper and Row stated that after Volkov had already shown the composer some smaller sections, “Volkov began to organize the material into longer chapters. As soon as he had finished each chapter, he gave it to Shostakovich, who read it and as proof of his reading and approval, wrote at the head of each chapter the word ‘Read,’ followed by his signature.”<sup>44</sup> These statements support Volkov’s honesty and the idea that Shostakovich was indeed able to read the finished chapters. Shostakovich wrote both his cello concertos for the Russian cellist Mstislav Rostropovich who said of *Testimony*, “one can very clearly hear Shostakovich’s own voice in the memoirs.”<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> Ho and Feofanov, *The Shostakovich Wars*, 1.

<sup>39</sup> Vladimir Ashkenazy, Overture to *The New Shostakovich*, by Ian MacDonald and Raymond Clarke (London: Pimlico, 2006), 10.

<sup>40</sup> Ho and Feofanov, *The New Shostakovich*, 49, 80.

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, 79.

<sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, 80.

<sup>44</sup> Ho and Feofanov, *The Shostakovich Wars*, 26.

<sup>45</sup> *Ibid.*, 14.

Ho and Feofanov's earlier book, *Shostakovich Reconsidered*, dealt extensively with Fay's accusations concerning Volkov's dishonesty in copying articles. Speaking of the extended passages of previously published material, Ho and Feofanov stated that "it is entirely conceivable that he (Shostakovich) might sometimes work with the same type of precision with which he composed music, committing his thoughts to paper in finished form."<sup>46</sup> In other words, it is entirely possible that Shostakovich would have dictated his opinions and life story to Volkov in a carefully planned manner, even quoting himself. Ho and Feofanov believe Fay is wrong in assuming the meetings were conducted in a choppy, question-and-answer form, as Volkov referred to Shostakovich's responses as "highly stylized" and as if they had "been polished over many years."<sup>47</sup>

Supporting Ho and Feofanov's position, many of Shostakovich's friends and family have testified to his amazing photographic and musical memory. Flora Litvinova said that "it was enough for him to look at a score or to listen to a work once for him to remember it."<sup>48</sup> Maxim Shostakovich said of his father, "I know of no other composer who could sit down at the piano and play and sing the entire *Ring Cycle* from beginning to end from memory."<sup>49</sup> Shostakovich also had incredible literary memory and was able to recite long passages out of books and entire letters word-for-word.<sup>50</sup> Ho and Feofanov stated that, "once a phrase or story became formulated in his mind, it could (and often would) reappear in later conversations, verbatim or near-verbatim."<sup>51</sup> These lengthy self-quotations are attributed to "superior memory" in that Shostakovich easily could have "mapped out his memoirs in his mind."<sup>52</sup> In addition to his superior memory, two of the verbatim passages came from articles written at the same time as the Volkov-Shostakovich meetings, so it would have been easy for Shostakovich to quote that material.<sup>53</sup>

Concerning Fay's accusations of tampering in the Moscow typescript, Ho and Feofanov contend that Fay never once had access to Volkov's

---

<sup>46</sup> Ho and Feofanov, *Shostakovich Reconsidered*, 190.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, 192.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, 193.

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, 194.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, 213-14.

<sup>53</sup> *Ibid.*, 213.

original manuscript, as that was kept in a Swiss bank for years before being sold to a private collector. Harper and Row gave three individuals access to the Russian typescript to be translated; their agreement was that these three translators were not to share these copies with anyone.<sup>54</sup> However, one of the translators admitted to “not only showing but loaning copies of the Russian text to some fifty Soviets, ex-Soviets, and others, even before any of published editions had been released.”<sup>55</sup> It is very possible that the Finnish translator, Dr. Seppo Heikinheimo, made some unauthorized alterations and then let those copies get out into circulation. The Russian texts handled by the other two translators had no such alterations, with no blacked-out sections and no cut-and-paste work. Additionally, the original transcript was free of any alterations, excepting Shostakovich’s own authentic signature.<sup>56</sup> Fay’s “Moscow typescript” appears to be an exact copy of the Heikinheimo typescript, and “both have all the editorial emendations mentioned by Fay and even duplicate non-textual markings such as random specks on the page and borders resulting from photocopying.”<sup>57</sup> Evidence shows that Fay’s typescript was not an original, but merely one of the many unauthorized, altered copies floating around. Those who did handle the original Russian typescript (such as Henry Orlov) maintain that it looked nothing like the heavily marked-up version Fay used for her research.<sup>58</sup>

Current scholarship remains divided on the question of *Testimony*’s validity. *Testimony* is either a valuable representation of the composer’s life and beliefs, or just a “political sensation,” as called so by Pauline Fairclough in her article entitled, “Facts, Fantasies, and Fictions: Recent Shostakovich Studies.”<sup>59</sup> Noted musicologist Richard Taruskin said this of *Testimony*: “Mr. Volkov’s book (despite the seductive, still widely believed stories it promulgates) has been exposed as a mixture of recycled material that Shostakovich had approved for republication and fabrications that were inserted after his death.”<sup>60</sup> Taruskin disagreed with the sentiments in *Testimony* portraying Shostakovich as “opposed to and

---

<sup>54</sup> Ho and Feofanov, *The Shostakovich Wars*, 58.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, 68.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, 62.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, 67.

<sup>59</sup> Pauline Fairclough, “Facts, Fantasies, and Fictions: Recent Shostakovich Studies,” *Music & Letters* 86, no. 3 (2005): 452-60.

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3526611>.

<sup>60</sup> Richard Taruskin, “Was Shostakovich a Martyr? Or is that just Fiction?” *The New York Times*, Aug. 26, 2016.

victimized by the Soviet government.”<sup>61</sup> David Fanning followed up with a review of *Shostakovich Reconsidered* in 1999 in which he expressed disdain for the manner in which the composer’s politics and music were discussed in the book and referred to Fay’s research as “conclusive.”<sup>62</sup>

The revisionists staunchly defend Volkov and *Testimony*’s portrayal of Shostakovich, and the anti-revisionists question almost everything about the supposed memoirs and the scope of the Solomon Volkov’s involvement in them. To this day, Volkov affirms three propositions: (1) that in writing *Testimony* he used no previously published material, (2) that *Testimony* only contains that which Shostakovich communicated to him in conversation, and (3) that he was not acquainted with the previously published article duplicated in *Testimony*.<sup>63</sup> Fay’s research is not without merit and raises important questions about these propositions and others made by Volkov. Unfortunately, until Volkov makes available his original manuscripts for further research, questions will persist. Most of Shostakovich’s closest friends and immediate family members believe that *Testimony* rings true and claim that the voice in *Testimony* is indeed that of the Shostakovich they knew. Though Volkov may or may not have paraphrased, added to, or embellished the composer’s sentiments, Ho and Feofanov’s evidence makes a strong case for his defense.

It is entirely possible that those who dispute *Testimony*, such as Irina Shostakovich, were coerced into doing so by the Russian authorities. Apart from his music, Shostakovich himself is now silent, which is why solving this mystery is so important. A factual and informed impression of Shostakovich’s life will contribute to a better understanding and perception of his music, which is still widely listened to today. The research in this article serves to increase understanding and awareness of the controversy. Additionally, it explains why the mystery is unsolved and will remain unsolved until the original documents become available for research. As time goes on, the evidence will become buried even deeper, and it will be more difficult for the public to have a true picture of Shostakovich. While it cannot be concluded that *Testimony* is the actual, factual memoirs straight from the mouth of Shostakovich, many other scholars, friends, and family have affirmed that *Testimony* contains

---

<sup>61</sup> Taruskin, “Was Shostakovich a Martyr? Or is that just Fiction?”

<sup>62</sup> Fanning, “Review of *Shostakovich Reconsidered*,” 489.

<sup>63</sup> Brown, *A Shostakovich Casebook*, 22.

valuable insights about his opinions, memories, and state of mind, not to mention a rare picture of Soviet life under Stalin. The bitterness, sadness, fear, and the immense pressures under which Shostakovich was forced to work are all evident in *Testimony* and are echoed in the statements of many of his friends and family.

## Bibliography

- Brown, Malcolm Hamrick, ed. *A Shostakovich Casebook*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004.
- Fairclough, Pauline. "Facts, Fantasies, and Fictions: Recent Shostakovich Studies." *Music & Letters* 86, no. 3 (2005): 452-60. doi:[10.1093/ml/gci070](https://doi.org/10.1093/ml/gci070).
- Fanning, David. "Review of *Shostakovich Reconsidered*, by Allan B. Ho Dmitry Feofanov." *Music & Letters* 80, no. 3 (1999): 489. doi:[10.1093/ml/80.3.489](https://doi.org/10.1093/ml/80.3.489).
- Fay, Laurel E. *Shostakovich: A Life*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- . "Shostakovich versus Volkov: Whose Testimony?" *The Russian Review* 39, no. 4 (1980): 484-93. doi:[10.2307/128813](https://doi.org/10.2307/128813).
- Fay, Laurel E., and Dmitrii Dmitrievich Shostakovich. *Shostakovich and His World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.
- Ho, Allan B., and Dmitry Feofanov. *The Shostakovich Wars*. <http://www.siue.edu/~aho/ShostakovichWars/SW.pdf>.
- . *Shostakovich Reconsidered*. London: Toccata Press, 1998.
- MacDonald, Ian. "Shostakovichiana." *Music under Soviet Rule*. Accessed February 13, 2018. <http://www.siue.edu/~aho/musov/dmitri.html>.
- MacDonald, Ian, and Raymond Clarke. *The New Shostakovich*. London: Pimlico, 2006.
- Puolakka, Kalle. "Musical Quotations and Shostakovich's Secret: A Response to Kivy." *British Journal of Aesthetics* 57, no. 1 (2017): 37-50. doi:[10.1093/aesthj/ayw085](https://doi.org/10.1093/aesthj/ayw085).
- Rabinowitz, Peter J. "'Squandered on Communism:' Shostakovich during the Cold War." *Canadian Review of American Studies* 28, no. 3 (1998): 69. doi:[10.3138/cras-028-03-05](https://doi.org/10.3138/cras-028-03-05).
- Shostakovich, Dmitrii Dmitrievich, and Solomon Volkov. *Testimony: The Memoirs of Dmitri Shostakovich*. New York: Limelight Editions, 2004.

- Taruskin, Richard. "Was Shostakovich a Martyr? Or is that just a Fiction?" *The New York Times*, August 26, 2016, <https://www.nytimes.com/2016/08/28/arts/music/julian-barnes-the-noise-of-time-shostakovich.html>.
- Volkov, Solomon, and Antonina W. Bouis. *Shostakovich and Stalin: The Extraordinary Relationship between the Great Composer and the Brutal Dictator*. New York: Knopf, 2004.
- Wilson, Elizabeth. *Shostakovich: A Life Remembered*. London: Faber and Faber, 2006.