

Pavel Lamm – Boris Asafyev Edition of the Opera “Khovanshchina” by Modest Mussorgsky

Bringing Forward a Scholarly Problem on the Basis of Archival Materials

Vasilisa Aleksandrova

State Institute for Art Studies
Moscow, Russia
alexandrova.vasilisa@mail.ru

Abstract—The article describes the collaborative work of two outstanding musicologists of the 20th century, P. A. Lamm and B. V. Asafyev, on the scholarly edition of M. P. Mussorgsky’s opera *Khovanshchina* (the full score was completed in 1931 but did not appear in print). The present article’s task is to determine those vectors of enquiry that would result in filling an important gap in the history of the 20th century Russian musicology. Those vectors are: collection and systematization in chronological order the archival sources pertaining to their work on *Khovanshchina*; highlighting the similarities and differences between Lamm’s and Asafyev’s notions concerning editorial work; presenting of Asafyev’s score of *Khovanshchina* as an addendum to his legacy as a composer; describing the double autograph manuscript by Lamm and Asafyev kept at RGALI as an object of research and comparing P. Lamm’s – B. Asafyev’s version of *Khovanshchina* with other editions of the opera.

Keywords—*Russian opera; Modest Mussorgsky; Pavel Lamm; Boris Asafyev; Khovan shchina*

I. INTRODUCTION

Apart from the well-known scholarly editions and interpretative versions of M. P. Mussorgsky’s opera *Khovanshchina* – from its earliest 19th century performances based on N. A. Rimsky-Korsakov’s full score (1886, 1892, 1897) through its further key productions related to such names as I. F. Stravinsky and M. Ravel (1913), D. D. Shostakovich (1958–60), and C. Abbado (the sensational Viennese production of 1989) – there is one that still remains unperformed, unpublished, and unexplored by music scholars. The question is of the collaborative work of two professional musicians and outstanding musicologists of the 20th century, Pavel Lamm and Boris Asafyev (1931).

As is known, Mussorgsky worked on his opera for nine years, until the end of his life, and did not finish it. The music of the 2nd and 5th acts remained incomplete. The opera, for the most part, was notated in piano score; only two excerpts from the 3rd act, Marfa’s song *Iskhodila Mladēshen’k’* (‘A maiden wandered’) and the Chorus of *Strelz ĭ* (‘shooters’), were orchestrated by Mussorgsky himself.

Lamm began reconstructing the opera’s piano score after Mussorgsky’s autograph manuscripts in 1926. In 1930, Asafyev joined in. His task consisted in orchestrating the piano score and, perhaps more importantly, in completing the unfinished excerpts in a creatively convincing way. The work’s full score was ready by February 1931. Lamm’s piano score was published in the same year, while Asafyev’s full score did not appear in print. Fortunately, the manuscript has survived and is kept at the Russian State Archive of Literature and Arts (RGALI, fund 2658, inventory 1, storage units 105–109).

In the absence of serious research, the joint effort of Lamm and Asafyev acquired a rather poor reputation; there were speculations that their work was a failure. Hence, one of the present article’s tasks is to determine those vectors of enquiry that would result in filling an important gap in the history of the 20th century Russian musicology, irrespective of whether the existing preconceptions would eventually be confirmed or disproved.

II. BACKGROUND

In order to solve the problem stated above, this author took steps to collect and systematize in chronological order the archival sources pertaining to both scholars’ work on *Khovanshchina*. The people whose documents provided a rich factual material include relatives, friends and colleagues of both P. A. Lamm and B. V. Asafyev (in particular S. S. Popov, S. A. Lamm, O. P. Lamm, I. S. Asafyeva, N. Ya. Myaskovsky, K. S. Saradzhev, V. A. Kiselev, N. A. Malko) and employees of the Musical Section of the State Publishing House (in 1930 renamed State Music Publishers – Muzgiz); other relevant documents include those from the archive of Muzgiz, as well as the minutes of the sessions of the Commission for Russian Music Studies of the State Academy of Artistic Sciences, the manuscript of O. P. Lamm entitled ‘P. A. Lamm. A Biographical Essay’, etc.

P. A. Lamm’s work on the reconstruction of the piano score of *Khovanshchina* on the basis of Mussorgsky’s autograph manuscripts was first mentioned in the minutes of the session of the Commission for Russian Music Studies of

27 September 1926.¹ And in a letter of 16 June 1927 Lamm proposed to Asafyev to collaborate with him: '<...> I flatter myself with the hope that this autumn we shall say "The work is done entrusted to us by Russian music" and shall discuss Khovanshchina – I wish you to compose what is missing there and to orchestrate the whole <...>' [1].

Apart from doing the scholarly work, the collaborators were thinking over future productions. Of special interest is B. V. Asafyev's report of 3 July 1927 at an operatic session of the artistic council of the State Opera and Ballet Theatre (now the Mariinsky Theatre), discussing the five-year working plan for the theatre's repertoire commission. Asafyev proposed to include in the repertoire plan a 'radical staging' of Khovanshchina 'in [a new] musical and, hence, theatrical version <...> based on the composer's original text' [2]. Later Khovanshchina was regularly, albeit shortly, mentioned in Lamm's and Asafyev's correspondence.

Some important organizational decisions were taken in 1928 — the year when the Opera and Ballet Theatre staged Boris Godunov edited by Lamm with the participation of Asafyev. Their further collaboration depended on the production's outcomes, both artistic and financial. Though the production proved to be highly successful, it was severely criticized by the advocates of N. A. Rimsky-Korsakov's version, including A. K. Glazunov, A. N. Rimsky-Korsakov, and the administration of the Bolshoi Theatre in the person of N. S. Golovanov.

Be that as it may, in 1928 the Musical Section of the State Publishing House signed with P. A. Lamm a contract for further work on Mussorgsky (this fact was mentioned by O. P. Lamm in her manuscript mentioned above).² In his letter of 31 December 1928, the Musical Section's director A. N. Yurovsky asked Asafyev to come to Moscow 'in view of the necessity to clarify, in the shortest time possible, all the details related to the edition and orchestration of Musorgsky's opera Khovanshchina'.³ This confirms the fact that there was an agreement (even if unwritten) with the Musical Section concerning the publication of Khovanshchina.

The work continued to take its normal course, nothing augured problems, but in 1930 the publication of the full score of Khovanshchina suddenly became jeopardized.

First, the Musical Section of the State Publishing House was reorganized in Muzgiz, and this resulted in the dismissal of the Musical Section's employee, music scholar and P. A. Lamm's friend S. S. Popov.⁴

And if at the beginning there was some hope that the work on the publication would go on according to the

established plan, the subsequent events led to major troubles. In the beginning of 1931, A. N. Yurovsky was removed from his office of the director of the Musical Section, and 'a kaleidoscope of new directors broke out in the newly reorganized publishing house Muzgiz'.⁵ With every new director, the agreements with P. A. Lamm on the publication of Mussorgsky would be reconsidered.

Simultaneously with the changes of personnel, the long-standing collaboration between the Musical Section / Muzgiz and the Viennese publishing house Universal Edition found itself in peril. Both houses had concluded an agreement to cooperate fully and permanently, and the Viennese firm was greatly interested in the publication of Lamm's editions of Mussorgsky's works. However, the lawsuit against Bessel's publishing house (which claimed to own the copyright for all of Mussorgsky's works), the want of financial profit from the collaboration and, finally, the sudden death of the Universal Edition's director Emil Hertzka put an end to the teamwork.⁶ Though in the Soviet Union the publication continued, it encountered numerous obstacles (as result, only eight volumes of Mussorgsky's Collected Works were issued under Lamm's editorship).

All these difficulties, evidently, served as a pretext to postpone the publication of the full score of Khovanshchina, while the real reason lay in the controversies between the musicians.

B. V. Asafyev finished his work on Khovanshchina in February 1931. Having examined the score, Lamm rejected it: '...being unwilling to hurt Boris Vladimirovich and distrusting himself in this delicate affair, Pavel Aleksandrovich convoked a "council" of composers and musicians, including N. Ya. Myaskovsky, K. S. Saradzhev, V. Ya. Shebalin, and A. A. Shenshin. The general and unconditional sentence was that Asafyev's orchestration had serious shortcomings not only as regards his concept of Mussorgsky's style, but even with respect of the basic orchestral sound; there were no doubts that it could not contribute to the success of the opera's staging'.⁷

Though Lamm informed Asafyev about this in a tactful manner, this certainly had a negative impact on their friendly relations.

The fate of Asafyev's version of the opera's full score can be traced due to the memorandum of 15 December 1931, addressed by the secretary of Muzgiz to the house's Leningrad Office and intended personally for Asafyev: 'Find attached a registered parcel valued at 1000 roubles, Musorgsky's Khovanshchina, full score of acts I, II, III, IV and V ed. by P. A. Lamm (act I 204 p[ages], act II 154

¹ RGALI, fund 941, inventory 5, storage unit 30, folio 19 rev.

² Lamm O. P. P. A. Lamm. The biographical Essay. M. I. Glinka All-Russian Museum Association of Musical Culture, fund 192 (Lamm), storage unit 361, p. 357 (in Russian).

³ RGALI, fund 2658, inventory 1, storage unit 778, folio 10.

⁴ On S. S. Popov, see Komarov A. 'A born archivist'. A biography of S. S. Popov // Almanac of the Glinka All-Russian Museum Association of Musical Culture. Issue III / Edited and compiled by M. P. Rakhmanova. Moscow: Deca-VS, 2007, pp. 769–800 (in Russian).

⁵ Lamm O. P. P. A. Lamm. A Biographical Essay. M. I. Glinka All-Russian Museum Association of Musical Culture, fund 192 (Lamm), storage unit 361, p. 385.

⁶ Cf. Bobrik O. The Viennese Publishing House Universal Edition and the Musicians from Soviet Russia: a History of Collaboration in the 1920–30s. St Petersburg: N. I. Novikov publishers; Galina Scripsit publishing house, 2011 (in Russian).

⁷ Lamm O. P. P. A. Lamm. A Biographical Essay. M. I. Glinka All-Russian Museum Association of Musical Culture, fund 192 (Lamm), storage unit 361, p. 384-A (in Russian).

p[ages], act III 152 p[ages], act IV 135 p[ages], act V 53 p[ages]). In all 4 notebooks (acts IV and V in one notebook). Secretary Ye. Sheftel'.⁸ Thus, the full score was sent to Asafyev and, evidently, remained at his place until his archive was handed by his widow to the State Archive (now RGALI) after his death.

It is important to underline that though Lamm failed to understand Asafyev's orchestration of *Khovanshchina*, he did not consider himself competent enough to pass sentence on the outstanding musician's work and wanted to see it published. This is attested by the following documents:

- Lamm's petition to the Directorate of the Moscow State Conservatoire of 23 June 1938 proposing to pay homage to Mussorgsky in connection with the centenary of his birth; the document includes Lamm's recommendation to perform *Khovanshchina* in Asafyev's available version;⁹
- The plan of Mussorgsky's Complete Works compiled by Lamm and dated 25 June 1946; the list of volumes includes the full score of *Khovanshchina* in Asafyev's orchestration.¹⁰
- The controversies between the music scholars certainly arose from their different views on editorial work. Let us dwell on this in some detail.

III. COINCIDENCES AND DIFFERENCES IN LAMM'S AND ASAFYEV'S NOTIONS CONCERNING EDITORIAL WORK

Both Asafyev and Lamm expressed their views on the principles of editing Mussorgsky's music with regard to Boris Godunov, on which they worked earlier than on *Khovanshchina*. In the editor's preface to the piano score of *Khovanshchina* Lamm directly referred to his preface to the piano score of Boris Godunov, in which he had already expounded his editorial principles.

As regards Asafyev, he planned to preface the opera's full score with an extended text about his work on *Khovanshchina* (cf. his article 'Working on *Khovanshchina*'¹¹), but either he did not write it, or its manuscript is lost.

Therefore, we can judge about Asafyev's editorial principles mainly on the basis of his opinions expressed with reference to Boris Godunov and to Mussorgsky's oeuvre in general. This, indeed, is possible, though with some reservations.

First of all, let us point out that the main work on the reconstruction of the music text of *Khovanshchina* after

Mussorgsky's manuscripts was done by Lamm. Asafyev's task consisted in the orchestration of the piano score, completion of the ending of the 2nd act (unfinished by Mussorgsky), harmonization and orchestration of a large excerpt from the 5th act (scene of Marfa and Andrey Khovansky, figs. 22–32), in which 'the whole melodic material is Mussorgsky's, while the harmonization was done by B. V. Asafyev on the basis of similar passages in the opera'.¹²

One of the most conspicuous features of Asafyev's full score is the presence of different transposing instruments in the families of clarinets, horns, and trumpets. Here is the list of instruments used in the full score: Fl. piccolo, 2 Flauti, 2 Oboi, 2 Clarinetti (in A, in B flat), 2 Fagotti, 4 Corni (in E, in F), 2 Trombe (in D, in A, in B flat), 3 Tromboni, Timpani, Tamburino, Tamburo militare, Piatti, Campana, Violini I, Violini II, Violenze, Celli, Bassi. Besides, the instruments involved in the performance (onstage and from behind the stage) include 3 Trombe (in C) and a wind band (Banda).

Such a choice of instruments was conditioned by some peculiarities of the materials orchestrated by Mussorgsky himself. The materials in question are:

A. *Marfa's Song 'Iskhodila mladëshen'ka' ('A Maiden Wandered') in Two Sources:*

- Lamm's publication in the Complete Works, vol. 7, issue 2;
- Lamm's copy of Mussorgsky's autograph manuscript done in Leningrad, in the Manuscript Department of the State Public Library (now kept at the M. I. Glinka All-Russian Museum Association of Musical Culture)¹³.

B. *'Chorus of Streltzi' ('shooters'), Which still Remains Unpublished. Two Manuscripts by Lamm Are Extant, Containing This Excerpt*

- Lamm's copy of Mussorgsky's autograph manuscript, kept at the Manuscript Department of the Russian National Library (formerly State Public Library);¹⁴
- Lamm's autograph manuscript of the chorus in the version edited by Lamm and Asafyev, obviously intended for publication as a part of the whole opera.¹⁵

Our comparative analysis of Mussorgsky's original score and Lamm's edition shows that Lamm used only those

¹² RGALI, fund 2658, inventory 1, storage unit 109, folio 31. Manuscript note by P. Lamm.

¹³ M. I. Glinka All-Russian Museum Association of Musical Culture, fund 192, storage unit 147, folios 73–80; Mussorgsky's original: Manuscript Department of the Russian National Library, fund 502, storage unit 50.

¹⁴ M. I. Glinka All-Russian Museum Association of Musical Culture, storage unit 147, folios 59–72; Mussorgsky's original: Manuscript Department of the Russian National Library, fund 502, storage unit 52.

¹⁵ M. I. Glinka All-Russian Museum Association of Musical Culture, fund 192, storage unit 276.

⁸ RGALI, fund 2658, inventory 1, storage unit 778, folio 22.

⁹ Lamm O. P. P. A. Lamm. A Biographical Essay. M. I. Glinka All-Russian Museum Association of Musical Culture, fund 192 (Lamm), storage unit 361, p. 426 (in Russian).

¹⁰ M. I. Glinka All-Russian Museum Association of Musical Culture, fund 382 (Abramsky), storage units 698–700.

¹¹ M. P. Mussorgsky: on the Occasion of the 50th Anniversary of His Death. 1881–1931: Articles and Materials. Ed. by Yury Keldin and Vasily Yakovlev. Moscow: State Music Publishers, 1932 (in Russian).

transposing instruments that had become firmly established in the orchestral practice.¹⁶ Thus, in the original version of the 'Chorus of Streltzi' there are clarinets in C, horns and trumpets in D, while in Lamm's version the clarinets are in A and in B flat, and the horns are in F. In the original version of Marfa's song, the horns are in C, the trumpets are in D, while in Lamm's version they are in F and in B flat, respectively. Obviously, the choice of transposing wind instruments was one of the issues on which the opinions of Lamm and Asafyev differed radically.

No doubt, they disagreed also about the choice among the author's versions: which of them had to be considered as the principal one. Lamm believed that 'any edition must be based on the author's last version, which must be supplemented by all the variants and extras', while Asafyev considered Lamm's attitude irrelevant to Mussorgsky's oeuvre [3]. His article 'An essay in substantiation of the nature and character of Mussorgsky's oeuvre' reads: 'While reproducing his works, one must not content oneself with a formal attitude taking the last version as the principal one, approved by the composer, since all the variants are authentic and valuable, for no one of Mussorgsky's works was and could be finished once and for all. In this respect, musical creation was for him an entirely existential process. All accusations that Mussorgsky all too easily modified separate passages and considerable portions in his music under the influence of others or on his own initiative lose their basis if we pay attention to his nature as a composer and cease to apply to him the criteria that are valid for others' [4]. It is important to mention here that one of the most serious (and, in fact, well-founded) criticisms of Lamm's and Asafyev's version of Boris Godunov was related just to the mixture of the music texts from the opera's first and second versions; such a 'hybrid' was considered undesirable. With Khovanshchina, the situation was different, since the opera formally exists in one single version. In reality, though, the very amount of music composed by Mussorgsky made it necessary to select the material.

IV. ASAFYEV'S SCORE OF KHOVANSCHINA AS AN ADDENDUM TO HIS LEGACY AS A COMPOSER

Pupil of N. A. Rimsky-Korsakov and A. K. Lyadov, Asafyev graduated from the composition class of the St Petersburg Conservatoire in 1910, and in the same year was employed as an accompanist for the ballet of the Mariinsky Theatre. His numerous works composed between 1906 and 1922 include two children's operas, seven ballets, incidental scores for theatre performances, works for piano, and romances. After that, however, he ceased to compose for around a decade.

In the early 1930s Asafyev, dispirited by the censorial restrictions that did not allow him to express himself frankly

in musicological writings, found an outlet in composition. The work on the orchestration of Khovanshchina influenced his tastes and inspired him. In a letter to Myaskovsky written on 16 February 1931 (ten days after he had completed the orchestration) he confessed that '...nowadays my personal taste is focused on scores with a small number of instruments, and this is so not only because the number is small, but also because this small number suggests the absence of anything superfluous and the simplicity of utterance'.¹⁷

The influence of working on Mussorgsky's opera on Asafyev's creative activities was noticed also by O. P. Lamm: 'The work on the full score of Khovanshchina, though criticized by Myaskovsky, Lamm, and other Muscovites, gave a new life to Asafyev's creativity, and he decided to turn to composition'.¹⁸

In the wake of the orchestration of Khovanshchina Asafyev wrote his most important ballets, which have remained in the repertoire up to our days: *The Flames of Paris* (1932) and *The Fountain of Bakhchisaray* (1934). His later output includes operas, ballets, symphonies, concertos, romances, piano and chamber works, but in contrast to both ballets, they were unsuccessful.

An important question arises regarding Asafyev's decision to score Khovanshchina for such a modest orchestra: did he intend to follow Mussorgsky's principles reflected in both excerpts orchestrated by Mussorgsky himself, or this style is characteristic of Asafyev's own oeuvre of the early 1930?

V. THE DOUBLE AUTOGRAPH MANUSCRIPT BY LAMM AND ASAFYEV KEPT AT RGALI AS AN OBJECT OF RESEARCH

The manuscript, entitled 'M. Mussorgsky. Khovanshchina. Full score. Orchestrated by B. V. Asafyev. Under the general editorship by P. Lamm', is full and fair. The vocal and choral parts, stage directions, Russian text and its German translation, page markings and page numbers are written in Lamm's hand, while Asafyev wrote down all the instrumental parts, the names of instruments, and the tempos. The date and the signature at the end of the 5th act, 'D[etskoye] S[elo] 5–6 February 1931, B. Asafyev', are also written in Asafyev's hand. The folios are filled entirely, with the exception of two blank spaces in the 3rd act, reserved for two excerpts (Marfa's song and the 'Chorus of Streltzi') existing in Mussorgsky's own orchestration.

It is obvious that the areas of competence of Lamm and Asafyev were different, and each of them was responsible for his own part of the work (in other versions there was but one decision maker: Rimsky-Korsakov, Diaghilev, Shostakovich). The working process could be influenced by the fact that Lamm lived in Moscow, while Asafyev's residence was at Detskoye Selo near Leningrad. Lamm

¹⁶ On the same topic (with reference to Lamm's memorandum kept at RGALI, fund 2743, inventory 1, storage unit 260, folios 24–27 rev.), cf: Komarov A. Documents pertaining to the history of Russian music in the activities of Moscow scholars of the 1910–30s // *Problems of Music Text Studies: Articles and Materials* / Edited and compiled by D. R. Petrov. Moscow Conservatoire, 2003. P. 122 (in Russian).

¹⁷ Asafyev's letter to Myaskovsky of 16 February 1931 (M. I. Glinka All-Russian Museum Association of Musical Culture, fund 33 [Prokofiev], storage units 522–546).

¹⁸ Lamm O. P. P. A. Lamm. A Biographical Essay. M. I. Glinka All-Russian Museum Association of Musical Culture, fund 192 (Lamm), storage unit 361, p. 400 (in Russian).

mailed to Asafyev printed excerpts of the piano score as soon as they were ready. While Asafyev was working on the orchestration of *Khovanshchina* (presumably from September 1930 to 6 February 1931), he and Lamm did not meet personally.

VI. LAMM – ASAFYEV VERSION OF KHOVANSCHINA AS COMPARED WITH OTHER EDITIONS OF THE OPERA

It is important to compare the version of P. Lamm and B. Asafyev with other editions of *Khovanshchina*. The basic points for comparison are especially the two excerpts that were not completed by Musorgsky, namely the end of the 2nd act (on Shaklovitiy's words 'obozval Khovanshchinoy i velel siskat' ['called it Khovanshchina and ordered to find out']) and the big excerpt from the 5th act.

What was special in the decisions of Lamm and Asafyev?

As is known from the autograph manuscript of the opera's piano score, Mussorgsky intended to close the 2nd act with the scene of bewilderment and stupefaction of the plotters (Vasiliy Golitsin, Ivan Khovansky and Dosifey), who were thunderstruck by the news about the order of Peter I to carry out an immediate investigation implying all the brutalities of that cruel epoch. To achieve a desired result, the composer had to create an operatic equivalent of the so-called silent scene in dramatic theatre. The last line, however, remained unfinished.

At the end of the 2nd act, Lamm added one bar and a half, resolving an interrupted harmonic progression to the tonic. Asafyev's instrumentation is both psychologically powerful and dramaturgically appropriate: for the ending of the scene, he uses a disquieting kettledrum tremolo on d, beginning with a powerful forte blow and continuing through sforzando to piano. In the 5th act, Asafyev has harmonized the scene of Marfa with Andrey Khovansky (beginning with Marfa's words 'Podviglis'. Gospodi, ne utayu skorbi moyey' ['We've dared. Lord, I'll not conceal my grief'], until the appearance of Dosifey announcing 'Truba Predvechnogo!' ['The trumpet of the Eternal!']), of which Musorgsky's autograph manuscript contains only the notation of vocal parts. The opera ends with the 'Chorus of Schismatics'.

A comparison with the versions of other composers-editors shows that Lamm and Asafyev chose the method of minimum interference in the author's music text and at the same time succeeded in achieving the most satisfactory result in terms of artistic realization and emotional impact. To make things somewhat clearer, let us briefly describe these basic episodes in the versions by other editors.

At the end of the 2nd act Rimsky-Korsakov introduces the theme of dawn, while in the 5th act he completes the scene of conflagration. In the production of S. P. Diaghilev's company, the 2nd act was entirely cut, while the final chorus for the 5th act was composed by I. F. Stravinsky on themes by Musorgsky. In D. D. Shostakovich's edition, the 2nd act closes with the March of Tsar Peter's men played offstage, while for the 5th act the composer provides a polyphonic triple climax, adding the theme of 'strangers' ('prishliye lyudi') and the theme of dawn. Finally, in the Viennese

production of 1989 C. Abbado used Shostakovich's version with the final chorus composed by Stravinsky. For the production of the K. S. Stanislavsky and V. I. Nemirovich-Danchenko Academic Musical Theatre, Moscow, based on Shostakovich's version, a new ending was proposed by the composer V. A. Kobekin.

VII. CONCLUSION

In connection with the opera *Khovanshchina* edited by Lamm and Asafyev, a fundamental question arises: does their work have a real artistic value? Was the 'council' right considering Asafyev's orchestration a failure? We cannot answer this question with certainty, but it is not improbable that in those times all the experts were still under a powerful influence of Rimsky-Korsakov's splendid orchestra. The present study's goal is to prepare a basis for well-founded conclusions. In order to achieve this goal, we have to:

- Restore Asafyev's full score;
- Elucidate Asafyev's attitude towards the problem of reconstruction of Mussorgsky's orchestral sound and orchestral style (with due attention to the cases when he remained loyal to Mussorgsky is original or had to deviate from it).

Besides, we have to find out, to what extent Asafyev was influenced by the prevailing European trend towards a more concise orchestration.

In all probability, we will be able to demonstrate in what respects Asafyev was right or wrong (or, paradoxically, both right and wrong) from the viewpoint of both the 20th and the early 21st century. In any case, it is necessary to prepare Asafyev's full score for publication (for its scholarly value is out of question) and to consider the perspectives of its theatrical realization.

REFERENCES

- [1] V. Asafyev's correspondence with P. A. Lamm / Published by O. Lamm // *From the Historical Past of the Soviet Musical Culture. Collection of articles* / Compiled and edited by T. N. Livanova. Moscow: Sovetskiy Kompozitor, 1975, p. 123.
- [2] *Materials for a Biography of B. Asafyev* / Compiled by A. Kryukov. Leningrad: Muzika, 1982, pp. 184–185.
- [3] Mussorgsky, Modest Petrovich (1839–1881). *Complete Works*, in 8 volumes, under the general editorship of A. Aleksandrov, P. Lamm and N. Myaskovsky, vol. 2. *Khovanshchina* / Compiled and edited after the composer's autograph manuscript by Pavel Lamm. Moscow: Muzgiz; Wien: Universal Edition, 1932.
- [4] An essay in substantiation of the nature and character of Mussorgsky's oeuvre // Glebov Igor (Asafyev B. V.). *On the Reconstruction of Musorgsky's Boris Godunov*. Collection of articles. Moscow, 1928.