

MIKLÓS MEZŐSI

Charting the Phenomenology of Music

Rhetoresis and Imagery in Opera (Musorgsky and Mozart)

Music is no guest here called in from outside, but an active participant in the debate, or to put it more precisely, the one who promotes discourse.

Osip Mandelstam

The present paper forms an essential part of a complex, interdisciplinary and intermedial, research project based on a closed-reading approach in the philological sense which I am conducting in opera semiotics and literary and philosophical anthropology with the aim to provide a series of interpretations of drama and opera of selected operas of Mozart and plays of Shakespeare, inviting Nietzsche and Kierkegaard as our guides.

The term I have coined as the ‘phenomenology of music’ refers to the methodology of outward or perceptible indications depicted (or the depictability of such indications) in form(ation)s and configurations related to and conditioned by the musical expression. The findings presented in this paper are intended to serve as a stepstone for close-reading based analyses of other operas.

In the first, larger, part of this paper I offer a close-reading analysis of a scene from a Musorgsky opera leading us to identify a ‘musical trope’—the *musical metaphor*—which I will term as the ‘musical synecdoche.’ As Hatten states, the musical metaphor ‘requires a more creative and integrative act on the part of the listener, one that leads to an *emergent* meaning—and probably a more complex meaning.’¹ Musical tropology, likewise metaphor in language, becomes a key tool in approaching the musical work. One of the characteristic elements in the poetic arsenal of Gogol, a technique termed by Boris Eikhenbaum as the ‘Gogolian mask,’ re-appears in Musorgsky’s last opera, *Khovanshchina*, having a musical genre adapt a literary legacy. The second part of the paper is somewhat more pragmatical, insofar it examines opera staging sets—the Figure of the Child from Andrei Tarkovsky’s production of Musorgsky’s *Boris Godunov*—intending to draw attention to the importance of selecting the right tools in designing the visuality of an opera performance.

¹ Hatten, R. S., *Musical Meaning in Beethoven: Markedness, Correlation, and Interpretation*. Bloomington, 1994.

PART I

An Opera Emerging from under Gogol's Cloak

Putting Gogol and Musorgsky side by side will probably make two opera titles enter one's mind: *The Marriage* (*Женитьба*) and *The Fair at Sorotchints* (*Сорочинская ярмарка*). From among the operatic *oeuvre* of Musorgsky I will hereby select a third work for discussion. This opera, which is bound to Gogol with strong, if unique, ties, is set forth by a certain 'musico-rhetorical trope' apparently stemming from and based upon one of the main rhetorical and poetical tools employed by Gogol in his prose. This musical trope may be regarded an offspring, or, perhaps, rather a sibling, of that Gogolian tool which is transformed and merged into music. The opera in question is *Khovanshchina* whose author was a devoted adherent of both Gogol and Pushkin. After the first scenes the opera will leave behind the technique borrowed from the 'Gogol heritage' as 'dead weight', only to set for itself a course wherein it can shape its own evolution on the basis of the 'legislative process' of its musical (opera) poetics. *Khovanshchina* will, then, keep going on its way under the control and responsibility of this 'musico-poetic legislation'.

It should be stressed beforehand that in terms of structure and composition the inner relationship between Musorgsky and Pushkin, however strange it may seem, lies not between the their *Boris Godunovs* (i.e. Pushkin's tragedy and Musorgsky's opera) but between the Pushkin play and Musorgsky's *Khovanshchina*, secured by the polyphonic musico-dramaturgic composition and the 'poetics of open closeness' of the opera.² In the present paper I intend to pull out the 'Gogolian thread' from the fabric of *Khovanshchina*, focusing on Gogol's 'verbal mask' and its adaptation for opera, where it is used as a technique for musical expression. Thus we start from Gogol's

² On this I have written extensively in my book: *Music, Word, Drama: Stagecraft and Transfigurations* [Zene, szó, dráma. Színjátékok és szín(e)változások], Budapest, 2006, *passim*, hereafter referred to as 'Mezősi 2006'.

clerk, the *чиновник*, and end up at the *подъячий*, the Scribe in *Khovanshchina*. Starting our way from Gogol's verbal mask, we will peep in Musorgsky's workshop, hoping to catch a glance at 'opera rhetoresis' in the making, and expect to be provided opportunity to watch how a 'musical metaphor' is being operated. In my attempt to describe what I call musical metaphor and musical synecdoche, I heavily rely on the interpretations of Gogol offered by Boris Eikhenbaum³ and Yuriy Tinyanov,⁴ respectively. In addition, on the ground that the concept of the Gogolian mask may be assumed to rest on the poetics of Dante's *Divine Comedy* as interpreted by Osip Mandelstam in his *Conversation with Dante*,⁵ in my discussion of Musorgsky's adaptation of Gogol's mask I will be supporting my argumentation also with Mandelstam's findings on Dante.

Musorgky's operatic *oeuvre* has had its roots in his literary predecessors, Pushkin and Gogol. As the youngest of the Gogol—Pushkin—Musorgsky triad, he has adapted several of his writer-predecessors' works for the opera stage.

There are a number of literary texts serving as *suzhet* for a Musorgsky opera—as Flaubert's *Salammbô*, Pushkin's *Boris Godunov*, and also several texts by Gogol. The best-known of these adaptations, *Boris Godunov*, which relatively soon conquered the opera stage, was composed after the text of Pushkin's 'romantic tragedy', with

3 Эйхенбаум, Б. М., 'Как сделана «Щинель» Гоголя,' Д. Кирай, А. Ковач (eds.), *Поэтика. Труды русских и советских поэтических школ*, Budapest 1982, pp. 409-21. First published in *Поэтика. Сборники по теории поэтического языка*, т. I-II, Петроград 1919, pp. 151-65. The page numbers of my citations from Eikhenbaum's study, referred to hereafter as 'Eikhenbaum: Кирай, Ковач', follow the Budapest edition of *Поэтика. Труды русских ...*. The English-language citations from 'How Gogol's Overcoat Was Made', likewise from Tinyanov's 'Dostoevsky and Gogol (the Theory of Parody)', are given in my translation. Similarly, in all other cases, unless otherwise stated, the English translations are mine.

4 Тынянов, Ю. Н., 'Достоевский и Гоголь (к теории пародии)' [Dostoevsky and Gogol (the Theory of Parody)], *Поэтика. История литературы. Кино*, Издательство «Наука». Москва, 1977, pp. 198-226. It was first published by ОРОJAZ [Society for the Study of Poetic Language] in Petrograd, 1921. I cite from this edition.

5 'Разговор о Данте' [Conversations about Dante], О. Э. Мандельштам, *Собрание сочинений в четырех томах*. Под ред. проф. Г. П. Струве и Б. А. Филиппова, Москва, 1991, Т. II: *Проза*, pp. 363-413.

significant alterations made by the composer in both the dramatic plot and the text of the source play. As for his two 'Gogol operas', *The Marriage* closely follows Act I of Gogol's play of the same title, whereas *The Fair at Sorotchyntsi*, an opera comique based on a cycle of short stories, *Evenings on a Farm near Dikanka*,⁶ was left unfinished in a fragmented state when the composer died. As for the resulting operas, they either bear but slight resemblance to the original pre-text (*The Fair at Sorotchyntsi*), or, as is the case with *Boris Godunov*, the main organizing force of the drama, polyphonic dramatic structure, is 'dissolved' in the music, that is, on (*inside?*) the *musical stage*.

What is in all certainty pressing for explanation is the term 'musical stage'. Musical stage should not be understood 'physically', i.e. as if it were a part or the whole of the 'physical' scene. In fact, it is to be conceived as the space or field generated, created and 'furnished' in the listener's mind by the sonic qualities and effects of music. It is entirely an imaginary 'space', laid out and designed by the structure made up of musical sound. It is the music that is to assure that this space and what happens in it should be made subject to our perception. In other words, it is the the music that is supposed to 'guarantee' for what takes place on the musical stage to actually appear in a 'consumable' form for the receptive audience's mind. Musical stage is designed to host operatic drama, regardless any non-immanent circumstances, say, the particular historical age or the identity of the composer: whether it be Gluck or Verdi, Mozart or Bartók, *Don Giovanni* or *Rigoletto*, opera *per definitionem* functions via musical figures, 'tropes' — meaning that it lives and breathes on and by the musical stage. Musorgsky's musical stage is unique in that it has special relations with the art of *word*.

6 *Вечера на хуторе близ Диканьки*. Musorgsky composed a fantasy for orchestra in 1867, based on the second piece of this cycle, *St. John's Eve* (*Вечер накануне Ивана Купала*), under the title *Ночь на лысой горе* (*St. John's Night on the Bald Mountain*, otherwise known as *A Night on the Bald Mountain*). Musorgsky later inserted this piece into his opera *The Fair at Sorotchintsy* as the 'Dream Vision of the Peasant Lad'. The two stories from the same cycle, ultimately finding their way into one and the same opera—what could more eloquently speak of Gogol's influence on Musorgsky?

The trope I term 'musico-dramatic synecdoche' occurs several times in the First Act of *Khovanshchina*. As I have indicated above, this trope is eliminated as the opera suzhet unfolds, just to pave the way for 'polyphonic dramaturgy'.⁷ As regards the question of polyphony and drama, it may be worthy of note to recall Mikhail Bakhtin's categorical rejection of genuine polyphonic structure in any of the dramatic genres whatsoever.⁸ However, there is in all probability at least one instance that provides an exception to this 'Bakhtinian rule', and that exception is Pushkin's *Boris Godunov*, a dramatic play which can be viewed as a typical example of the polyphonically composed drama.⁹ The interpretation I offered in a research article¹⁰ is essentially bound to genre poetics, with *Boris Godunov* representing a unique phase in literary history in that it embodies the process of quitting the genre of 'traditional drama', creating at the same time a new type of drama.¹¹

In this paper I focus on but one single appearance of what I call the musical synecdoche, the brief scene of the Scribe and the Streltsy from Scene 2 in Act I, and its source in Gogol's prose poetics, more specifically in *The Overcoat*. I will be discussing one of the basic and most characteristic elements of Gogol's poetics, termed by Boris Eikhenbaum as 'verbal mask',¹² which in my view is to re-emerge in the opening scene of *Khovanshchina*. Before pursuing a close inspection of the 'Gogolian mask'—a

7 For the 'polyphonic stage' in Musorgsky, see Mezősi 2006, pp. 135-222. For the polyphonic dramaturgy in Pushkin, see my 'Pushkin's "Virtual Scene". Some Aspects of Pushkin's Historiography. *Boris Godunov* as the Trivium on the Way to the Polyphonic Novel,' *Slavica* XXXII (2003), pp. 165-73.

8 Проблемы творчества Достоевского [Problems of Dostoevsky's Art] 1929; Киев, 1994., Часть II Слово у Достоевского (опыт стилистики), Глава I. A revised and extended edition with a new title was published: Проблемы поэтики Достоевского. [Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics] Москва, 1963; 1974; 1979 (4th ed.). The standard English version is Bakhtin, M. M., *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Ed. and trans. by Caryl Emerson, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

9 See Mezősi 2003

10 Ibid.

11 Id.: 2006., pp. 45-117

12 Eikhenbaum: Кирай, Ковач, pp. 409-21

technique (*прием*) originally designed and developed as the core element in prose poetics—with the intent to follow its way to become a ‘musical trope’, a brief excursus has to be made to support the concept, origin and functionality of the ‘musical metaphor’, whose subspecies, the ‘musical synecdoche’ is the actual subject-matter of this study.

On the first pages of Osip Mandelstam's magnificently sensitive essay, written on Dante¹³ with an enthralling eloquence, we read:

The mouth is working, the smile moves the verse; the lips are cleverly and merrily rubified, the tongue trustfully cleaves to the velum. The inner image of the verse is inseparable from the innumerable changes of expressions that flash through the enthusiastcally reciting man's face. The art of speech distorts the face, bursts its quietness, tears off its mask... [...] The work of Dante is first and foremost Italian speech of his age appearing on the world scene as a system.¹⁴

One of the numerous, both striking and appealing points Mandelstam makes in this essay is when he connects *Divina Commedia* with *music*. I cite but two examples:

Music is no guest here called in from outside, but an active participant in the debate, or to put it more precisely, the one who promotes discourse [...]¹⁵

To imagine Dante's poem as a narrative—or a voice—stretched along a single line is totally misleading. Well before Bach—in an age when there were no monumental organs built [...], when the main musical instrument was the zither that accompanied the singing voice—Alighieri in the domain of philology built an immensely huge organ and found pleasure in its every register of thought, blowing all its pipes with sweep, making them roar and coo.¹⁶

13 Mandelstam, op. cit.

14 ‘Уста работают, улыбка движет стих, умно и весело алеют губы, язык доверчиво прижимается к нёбу. Внутренний образ стиха неразлучим с бесчисленной сменой выражений, мелькающих на лице говорящего и волхующегося сказителя. Искусство речи именно искажает наше лицо, нарушает его маску [...]’ Ibid. I, pp. 365-6.

15 “Музыка здесь не извне приглашенный гость, но участница спора; а еще точнее – она способствует обмену мнений [...]” Ibid. VI, p. 394.

16 ‘Представлять себе дантовскую поэму вытянутым в одну линию рассказом или даже голосом – абсолютно неверно. Задолго до Баха и в то время, когда еще не строили больших монументальных органов [...], когда ведущим инструментом была еще цитра, аккомпанирующая голосу, Алигьери

References to music are conspicuous and abundant in *Conversation about Dante*. Wherever Mandelstam resorts to 'music' in his interpretation of the *Commedia*, he seems to inevitably touch the very core of what 'drives' this poem forward. Music and musicalness occupy in his concept a focal position in the poetics of the *Divine Comedy*. Dante's poetics is conceived by Mandelstam as a never-ending process of forms evolving and emerging one from the other. There are several instances when he demonstrates this unique characteristic of the *Commedia* by referring to, and providing a keen analysis of, passages as the Geryon episode (canto XVII)¹⁷ and what he calls the 'Heraclitan metaphor' (canto XXIV)¹⁸, both from the *Inferno*, just to mention a few.

In Dante there is no one form but a multitude of forms. These are being pressed out of each other [...] for him form is like grape pomace, not a husk in itself. Therefore, however strange it is, the form is squeezed out of the conception, the content, which envelopes it. This is succinct Dantean thought. [...] ... in poetry, creation of a form in all cases assumes the lines, periods and cycles of resonances of forms [...] A scholarly description of Dantean Comedy taken as a process, as a current would inevitably take the form of a treatise on metamorphosis, and would take pains to penetrate into the wide-ranging states of poetic matter [...]¹⁹

Imagery thinking in Dante, just as in all kinds of genuine poetry, is realized through that quality of poetic matter which I suggest being called transformability or transformation.²⁰

построил в словесном творчестве бесконечно могучий орган и уже наслаждался всеми его мыслимыми регистрами и раздувал мехи, и ревел, и ворковал во все трубы.' Ibid. II, p. 373.

17 Ibid. IV, pp. 380-3

18 Ibid. V, pp. 386-7

19 'У Данта не одна форма, но множество форм. Они выжимаются одна из другой [...] ...форма ему представляется выжимкой, а не оболочкой. Таким образом, как это ни странно, форма выжимается и содержания-концепции, которое ее как бы облекает. Такова четкая дантовская мысль. [...] ...всякое формообразование в поэзии предполагает ряды, периоды или циклы формозвучаний [...] Научное описание дантовской Комедии, взятое как течение, как поток, неизбежно приняло бы вид трактата о метаморфозах и стремилось бы проникать в множественные состояния поэтической материи [...]' Ibid. II, pp. 375-6.

20 'Образное мышление у Данта, так же как во всякой истинной поэзии, осуществляется при помощи свойства поэтической материи, которое я предлагаю назвать обрацаемоцтью или обратимостью.' Ibid. IV, p. 382

Mandelstam's understanding of the *Divine Comedy* has a touch of a 'physiology-based approach'—aimed not only at Dante but also at poetry as a whole. 'The mouth moves the verse', smile and other 'distortions of the face' emerge when one speaks etc. As the reciting person produces all those myriads of feelings that 'flash through the face of the reciting man' in the act of recital, poetical substance is 'distorted', with the artistic forms 'squeezed out' one from the other like grape juice crushed out from pomace with the ultimate goal of winning wine in a never-ending process... In Mandelstam's interpretation of Dante this process starts with the physiologic events the reciting person is going through and ends up at 'Bach-like' organ and orchestral music, which turns out to be the perhaps most genuine perceptible form of *Divina Commedia*. It should not escape our attention that one of the modes of existence of the world of *Paradise*, as presented by Dante, is *music*. In fact, Dante's *Paradiso* can hardly be conceived without music. Another point which should be made here is that although we shall never know what the burned portion of Gogol's *Dead Souls* would be like if it had survived, we should not forget it either that Gogol intended the extant part of his novel to be an *Inferno* in a modern *Divina Commedia*...

To support my analysis of the *début* of Musorgsky's *Scribe*, I will now focus on one of the decisive elements in the poetics of Gogol's prose. The unique status Gogol enjoys in literary canon is in close connection with his peculiar style and diction, analysed in Boris Eikhenbaum's article, *How Gogol's Overcoat Was Made*, noted for the originality and ingeniousness of its approach.²¹ Not unlike Frigyes Karinthy, for example, the Hungarian satirical writer who viewed the world in kind of a 'curved mirror' (actually the title of one of his books²²) and used comicality created and reflected in this 'mirror' as the cement in his writings, Gogol never halts at 'pure' comicalness. In Gogol, comic elements and humor in most cases add up to something unexpectedly incompilant with our perception of 'the comic'.²³ 'Gogol viewed things in a peculiar way', Yuriy Tinyanov says. Evidently this peculiar way of looking at things makes him capable to 'grasp the comicality of things'

21 Eikhenbaum: Кирай, Ковач

22 *Görbe tükör* [Curved Mirror] was first published in 1912 and in several editions after the writer's death in 1938.

23 Cf. Árpád Kovács, *A gogoli szövegmű (A köpönyeg – írva és olvasva)*. [The Gogolian Textual Opus (The Overcoat – written and read)] = Á. Kovács, I. Nagy (eds.), Helikon 1999/1-2 XLV, pp. 259-70.

which he 'attains by listing objects in a tone unchanged, objects that are incongruous with each other.'²⁴ Tinyanov regards *mask* as Gogol's main technique used to represent human figures. He mentions a certain Prince Dmitry Obolensky who relates a story about Gogol creating a mask and making it 'work'.²⁵ Remarkably, the same story can also be found in Eikhenbaum when he is discussing the process of the construction of Gogol's text.²⁶ According to this account, Gogol extemporaneously acts out the figure of a plaintiff on the spot, based on a single written complaint: 'Right away he set to describe the gentleman's outward appearance in the most amusing and original way, his career in the civil service and even episodes from his life, visualizing some additional characters as well. I remember I was roaring with laughter as a madman, while Gogol was performing the skit with a serious face.'²⁷ Now let us see the characterization given by Eikhenbaum about this basic feature of the Gogol text:

[...] Gogol's texts are based on сказ, "narration in the first person". This means that the text is composed of live speech images and speech images. Furthermore, this сказ tends to not simply relate what happened, not simply speak, but, through mimesis and articulation, it embodies the words used, and the sentences are selected and connected one after the other not merely by logical speech but rather by expressive speech in which articulation, mimics, vocal gestures etc. are given particular emphasis. Hence the phenomenon of sonic semantics in Gogol's diction: the sonic shell, its acoustic character, apart from the logical or material meaning, becomes meaningful. Articulation and its acoustic effect come to the forefront as a technique of expression [выразительный прием].²⁸

24 „[Гоголь] необычайно видел вещи.” „[Гоголь] улавливает комизм вещи.” „[...] комизм] достигнут перечислением подряд, с одинаковой интонацией, предметов, не вяжущихся друг с другом.” Tinyanov, op. cit., p. 202.

25 Ibid., p. 204

26 Eikhenbaum, op. cit., p. 410

27 „«[...] И тут же начал самым смешным и оригинальным образом описывать мне сперва наружность этого господина, потом рассказал мне всю его служебную карьеру, представляя даже в лицах некоторые эпизоды его жизни. Помню, что я хохотал, как сумасшедший, а он все это выделял совершенно серьезно»” Tinyanov, op. cit., p. 203 (italics in the original).

28 Eikhenbaum, op. cit., p. 411: '[...] основа Гоголевского текста — сказ, что текст его складывается из живых речевых представлений и речевых эмоций. Более того: сказ этот имеет тенденцию не просто повествовать, не просто говорить, но мимически и артикуляционно

Eikhenbaum then goes on:

The real dynamics and hereby the composition of Gogol's works are inherent in the structure of the narration ["сказ"], and in the play with the language. His characters are, in fact, petrified postures, and above them, as the stage director and the actual hero, reigns the artist's merry-making and playful spirit.²⁹

Karinthy and Gogol apparently share a feature in their diction to secure for them the reputation they both hold which makes them kins within the literary canon. This 'curved mirror' and poignant diction, enabling both writers to 'dispose of' such figures as the Important Personage (*The Overcoat*) or the ill-famed versemonger (*This Is How You Write*³⁰), lie at the bottom of what may be called the 'poetics of freak', described by Eikhenbaum thus:

The technique of advancing absurdity or illogical compounds often occurs in Gogol, at the same time, as a rule, masked by strictly logical syntax which, consequently, gives the impression of spontaneousness. Take, for example, the description of 'Petrovich, the tailor, who lived somewhere on the fourth floor up a dark staircase, and who, in spite of his having but one eye, and pock- marks all over his face, busied himself with considerable success in repairing the trousers and coats of officials and others; that is to say, when he was sober, and not nursing some other scheme in his head.' Here the logical absurdity is concealed behind the abundance of the details that divert attention; instead of showing off the paronomasia, the writer, on the contrary, hides it with every effort, which only increases its power. Purely etymological puns occur even more often:

воспроизводить слова, и предложения выбираются и сцепляются не по принципу только логической речи, а больше по принципу речи выразительной, в которой особенная роль принадлежит артикуляции, мимике, звуковым жестам и т. д. Отсюда — явление звуковой семантики в его языке: звуковая оболочка слова, его акустическая характеристика становится в речи Гоголя *значимой* независимо от логического или вещественного значения. Артикуляция и ее акустический эффект выдвигаются на первый план, как выразительный прием.'

29 'Настоящая динамика, а тем самым и композиция его вещей — в построении сказа, в игре языка. Его действующие лица — окаменевшие позы. Над ними, в виде режиссера и настоящего героя, царит веселящийся и играющий дух самого художника.' Ibid., p. 412

30 Így írtok ti, Karinthy's well-known collection of literary parodies which the author himself called 'literary caricatures' was first published in 1912, and was followed by several posthumous editions of which the latest came out with Akkord Publishing House in Budapest in 2007.

“...were it not that there are various ills strewn along the path of life for titular councillors as well as for private, actual, court, and every other species of councillor, even to those who never give any advice or take any themselves.³¹

‘The basic technique that Gogol uses to portray people is mask’—indicates Tinyanov the main characteristic of Gogol’s poetics,³² listing and analysing half a dozen ‘masks’, including ‘geometrical’, ‘bodily’, ‘material’ and ‘verbal’ masks.³³ This tool, the core of the ‘poetics of freak’, is to turn up in Musorgsky, who regarded Gogol’s art as an *étalon*—which also meant that for him, the musician, Gogol’s *oeuvre* is a pre-text of especial importance.³⁴

31 Eikhenbaum, *op. cit.*, p. 413: ‘Прием доведения до абсурда или противологического сочетания слов часто встречается у Гоголя, при чем он обычно замаскирован строго-логическим синтаксисом и потому производит впечатление произвольности; так, в словах о Петровиче, который ‘несмотря на свой кривой глаз и рябизну по всему лицу, занимался довольно удачно починкой чиновничьих и всяких других панталон и фраков’. Тут логическая абсурдность замаскирована еще обилием подробностей, отвлекающих внимание в сторону; каламбур не выставлен на показ, а наоборот — всячески скрыт, и потому комическая сила его возрастает. Чистый этимологический каламбур встречается еще не раз: ‘бедствий, рассыпанных на жизненной дороге не только титулярным, но даже тайным, действительным, надворным и всяким советникам, даже и тем, которые не дают никому советов, ни от кого не берут их сами’.

The English citations from *The Overcoat* are taken from The Project Gutenberg EBook of Best Russian Short Stories. Release Date: September 11, 2004 [EBook #13437]. Produced by David Starner, Keith M. Eckrich, and the Project Gutenberg Online Distributed Proofreaders Team. Compiled and Edited by Thomas Seltzer. (Note that this edition has *The Cloak* as title.)

32 ‘Основной прием Гоголя в живописании людей — прием маски.’ Tinyanov, *op. cit.*, p. 202

33 *Ibid.*

34 Among Musorgsky’s extant personal documents there are two pieces of evidence that expressedly indicate his devotedness to Gogol: 1. a letter he wrote to his friend, Golenishchev-Kutuzov on August 15, 1877; 2. a letter written to Vladimir Stasov on October 18, 1872. The standard editions of Musorgsky’s correspondence are: Модест Петрович Мусоргский. Литературное наследие. Составители А. А. Орлова и М. С. Пекелис. Москва, 1971 and М. П. Мусоргский. Письма. Москва, 1981 (no editor indicated). All Musorgsky’s letters that have survived, along with all the extant documents connected with the composer, can be found (in Hungarian translation) in this excellent edition: Bojti, J., Papp, M. (eds.), *Musorgsky. Letters, Documents, Recollections*. Budapest 1997 [Muszorgszkij. Levelek, Dokumentumok, Emlékezések], pp. 481-2.; p. 261. A comprehensive collection of all documents relating to Musorgky, along with detailed biographic references, is Орлова, А., *Труды и дни Мусоргского. Летопись жизни и творчества*, Москва 1963. It has an English version: Orlova,

'Material metaphor is transformed into verbal mask', Tinyanov continues (Korobochka in *Dead Souls*), or 'the verbal mask is associated with phonics and has become a sounding and phonetical metaphor' (Akaky Akakievich³⁵ in *The Overcoat*, for example). It can be seen that, according to Tinyanov, these *masks* are always set in motion by some *metaphor*. If we 'read' *Khovanshchina's* Scribe—the *Подъячий*—entering the stage in the beginning of Act I alongside with the best-known of all Gogolian masks, Akaky Akakievich, we find a far-reaching kinship and similarity between the two chinovniks. It must be stressed here that it is not their *personal* character, destiny or other personal particulars that link these two characters; it is, rather, the *poesis* of their build and appearance that makes them close kins. 'All Gogol's "characters", "types", are masks, as they are all determined once and for all; no "cracks" can be spotted on them and they do not go through "development"— i.e. they are unchangeable, Tinyanov says. Eikhnenbaum, it should be noted, as he is discussing Gogol's way of building his text, offers a full analysis of the musico-poetical 'toolbar' that produces *Khovanshchina's* Scribe—at the same time casting light on a rare if not exceptional instance in scholarship that an approach, originally invented and applied for interpreting a literary work, seems fit to be adaptable to adequately describe the 'poetics' of a musical piece from the same cultural context. A thorough examination of this close relationship may bring us nearer to a more distinct understanding of a deeper layer in Musorgsky's music: how music becomes separated from words; how musical form comes to life; and, what perhaps is most important, dealing with this problem may take us close to find out more about the nature of the *relation between music and words* in Musorgsky.

A., Musorgsky's Days. UMI Research Press 1983. On Gogol's influence and the way it has left its mark on Musorgsky the opera composer, see fn. 5 above. In the context of Musorgsky's operatic oeuvre, "The Gogol case" definitely speaks of remarkably much more than the mere choice of subject, as I hope to show in this paper.

35 '«Коробочка», где вещная метафора стала словесной маской; «Акакий Акакиевич», где словесная маска потеряла уже связь с семантикой, закрепились на звуке, стала звуковой, фонетической.'

Tinyanov's examples for the verbal mask and metaphor effectuating language parody and his supporting arguments can still be considered valid, even after Árpád Kovács's discovery of layers in *The Overcoat's* main character's naming deeper than the "verbal mask". Cf. Kovács: 1999. See fn. 21

Let us now have a glance at Gogol's description of Akaky Akakievich's appearance in *The Overcoat*:

'So, in a certain department serves a certain official— not a very prominent official, it must be allowed—short of stature, somewhat pockmarked, rather red-haired, rather blind, judging from appearances, with a small bald spot on his forehead, with wrinkles on his cheeks, with a complexion of the sort called haemorrhoidal.'³⁶

The relevance of Eikhenbaum's comment on this description to the way Musorgsky introduces the *Подъячий* into *Khovanshchina* is anything but unnoticeable:

'... this sentence [Gogol's description of Akaky A. – M.M.] is not so much a description of the main character, as a mimico-articulative depiction of him: the words are selected and placed in a certain order not to mark the typical traits, but, rather, on the basis of phonic semantics. [...] The sentence gives the impression of an accomplished whole, a system of sound gestures to be realized by the selection of the words. Consequently, these words, as logical units, as signs of concept, are hardly perceptible, and are re-arranged and -grouped along the principle of sonic speech. This is one of the remarkable effects of Gogolian language. Some of its sentences operate as though they were sonic inscriptions— so much do articulation and acoustics come to the forefront.'³⁷

Eikhenbaum epitomizes “sonic semantics” thus:

The personal tone, with all the techniques of the Gogolian сказ, definitely penetrates into the long-short story, taking on the character of grotesque scowl or grimace. [...] Then [sc. after the genesis of the name Akaky Akakievich] follows the torrent of “mockery”, with the

36 'Итак, в одном департаменте служил один чиновник; чиновник нельзя сказать чтобы очень замечательный, низенького роста, несколько рябоват, несколько рыжеват, несколько даже на вид подслеповат, с небольшой лысиной на лбу, с морщинами по обеим сторонам щек и цветом лица что называется геморроидальным...'

I have replaced “sanguine” in The Project Gutenberg Ebook's text for “haemorrhoidal”.

37 '[...] фраза эта — не столько описание наружности, сколько мимико-артикуляционное воспроизведение: слова подобраны и поставлены в известном порядке не по принципу обозначения характерные черт, а по принципу звуковой семантики. [...] Вся фраза имеет вид законченного целого — какой-то системы звуковых жестов, для осуществления которой подобраны слова. Поэтому слова эти как логические единицы, как значки понятий, почти не ощущаются — они разложены и собраны заново по принципу звукоречи. Это — один из замечательных эффектов Гоголевского языка. Иные его фразы действуют как звуковые надписи — настолько выдвигается на первый план артикуляция и акустика.' Eikhenbaum, op. cit., p. 415 (italics mine–M.M.)

narration reaching the sentence “But Akaky Akakievich answered not a word”, when the comical narration is suddenly interrupted by a melodramatic excursus with the typical techniques of the sentimental style. This way [...] *The Overcoat* is raised from a simple anecdote to grotesque.³⁸

The accord between the two *chinovniks*, Akaky Akakievich and the *Подъячий* being introduced into the poetical/musical world of *The Overcoat* and *Khovanshchina* is more than apparent. In his *début* the *Подъячий* not only seems to follow closely Akaky Akakievich in his mask-like appearance but, what is even more striking, the two figures, as they make their ways into the texture of the *syuzhet*, are accompanied by the very same artistic techniques: 1) *then* [after the Scribe enters the stage = 'the genesis of the name Akaky Akakievich'] *follows the torrent of 'mockery'* [on behalf of the *streltsy*]; 2) after the *streltsy* leaving the scene and heading for the Kremlin, a turning-point is brought about by the *melodramatic excursus*, whereby *the scene of the Scribe's début is raised to the grotesque*. This evidently speaks of Gogol's strong and decisive impact on Musorgsky. Gogol's ways of building the narration, analysed by Eikhenbaum ('mimic-articulative depiction', 'principle of sonic speech', 'articulation and acoustics', 'live speech images, speech emotions', 'sonic gestures', 'sonic semantics', 'the sonic shell of a word' etc.), become part of the technique to be used by an opera composer—true, not most important one employed in *Khovanshchina*, but in the course of *syuzhet* development certainly the one that paves the way for polyphonic opera dramaturgy.

Eikhenbaum's account of Prince Obolensky's anecdote with Gogol at the postal station immediately follows the elucidation of the 'basis of the Gogolian text', which perceptibly bears an ultimately close resemblance to the way Musorgsky utilizes the musical techniques he is using to represent the *chinovnik* entering the stage. The unique situation that a literary terminology proves adequate for explaining a musical phenomenon sheds

38 'Личный тон, со всеми приемами Гоголевского сказа, определенно внедряется в повесть и принимает характер гротескной ужимки или гримасы. [...] Идет поток „издевательств“ — в таком роде продолжается сказ вплоть до фразы: „но ни одного слова не отвечал...“, когда комический сказ внезапно прерывается сентиментально-мелодраматическим отступлением, с характерными приемами чувствительного стиля. Этим приемом достигнуто возведение „Шинели“ из простого анекдота в гротеск.' Ibid. p. 417 (italics mine—M.M.)

extra light on the ‘poetics’ of *Khovanshchina*. Obolensky's report is in fact a ‘historification’ of the Pygmalion myth from the age of modernity, in which the artist—Gogol—creates the *contradictio in adiecto* of ‘live work of art’. Comes another artist—Musorgsky—to create the figure of the *Подъячий* in the beginning of his opera; this figure steps forth from behind the mask and comes to life right away. Tropologically speaking, the ‘rhetorical figure’ applied by Musorgsky in the scene of the Scribe and the streltsy is the *musical synecdoche*. Belonging to the family of the ‘musical metaphor’, it generates the *musical mask* responsible for operating the ‘musical or opera rhetorhesis’ in that scene. This is probably the most characteristic and most conspicuous example of the musical synecdoche in *Khovanshchina*. Kuzka and two other Streltsy recognize and scornfully comment on the approaching Scribe. For the reader's convenience I cite the ‘lyrics’ of this scene—the musical score can be found at the end.

First &

second strel'yets: [...] (*The Chancellery Scribe enters, sharpening his quill.*)

Look: old scribbler is pen-pushing already!

First strel'yets: He's sharpening his quill.

Kuzka: That big ink-horn! My God!

Second strel'yets: What a scraping and scratching! (*They approach the Scribe.*)

First &

second strel'yets: Please, your Grace from the Chancellery... (*They bow.*)

Kuzka: Quick, up here on this column! Ha, ha, ha...

First &

second strel'yets: Ha. Ha, ha... (*They all move off towards the Kremlin. The Scribe steps into his booth.*)

Scribe: Sodom and Gomorrah! What times these are... (*rubs his hands*) Dreadful times!... All the same, I'll manage to make some profit... oh yes!³⁹

³⁹ '1-й стрелец и 2-й стрелец.

[...] Гляди-кось: сам строчило прёт.

[*Входит Подъячий, очинивая перо.*]

1-й стрелец. Гуся точит.

Кузька. Чернилище-то, господи!

2-й стрелец. Вот заскряпит-то!

1-й стрелец. (*подходит к Подъячему*) Вашему приказному степенству... Ха, ха, ха, ха...

Кузька. Скорей на этот столбик угодить. Ха, ха, ха, ха... (*Все трое хохочут.*)

In the vocal parts we first hear of the ‘scribbler’, then a ‘goose’ (standing for ‘goose-quill’ and indicating, of course, the scribe) being ‘pointed’ (i.e. sharpened). Then a new metaphor turns up (a synecdoche again): ‘That big ink-horn’. Finally, a verbal metaphor rounds off the image: ‘What a scraping and scratching!’ Now that the scene—the image—is complete, with the figures sketched and the colours applied onto the canvas, the two *streltsy* start directly (in the second person) to mock the scribe, with Kuzka suggesting putting him ‘up here on this column’. (What ‘this column’ really stands for is left to be revealed in the scene with the ‘Muscovites’, the *пришлые люди*, right after the denunciation scene of the Scribe and Shaklovity. On this column a list is suspended of those recently killed and beaten up by the *streltsy*. The exact reference of ‘[getting] up here on the column’ is yet vague; still, neither we nor the scribe should have particular doubts about the sinister implications enveloped in Kuzka’s suggestion.) In the orchestral parts a goose’s cackle and the sharpening of a goose-quill is imitated. As an additional effect, ‘the goose’ can be felt swaying its head—as implied by the peculiarly designed sound of the cackle. Presumably, the actual action is that the scribe has just arrived at the spot and is busy setting up his booth and making the rest of his habitual preparations for his daily work, such as arranging and sharpening his quills (note that it is early in the morning and we are right after the ‘Dawn over the Moscow river’). This brief scene, a fine snapshot from the Red Square, displays the compactness—and for that matter, the would-be power and potential—of this music, its ability to authentically represent an everyday situation by aptly responding to the sudden-arisen demands of the—musical—stage. We get information about four people in about half a minute’s music, with the scribe in the focus, and we have the figures of these people before us—in our mind’s eye. What we are facing here is a live instance of ‘musical metaphor’, a multiple, or multi-layered, musical metaphor, consisting mainly of synecdoches: the scribe, sharpening—‘scraping and scratching’—his quills, resembles a goose in that he sways his neck, cackling, that is, ‘becoming a goose’: he is identified with his working tools (even with his ink-horn) in our perception. *The final result is a mask* through which we can peep into the figure itself. Remarkably, the *streltsy*—apart from their remark ‘the scribbler is pen-pushing’ (which

[Уходят к Кремлю.]

Подъячий. (Садится в будку). Содома и Гомора! Вот времечко!.. Тяжкое!.. А все ж
прибыток справим... Да!..’ Мусоргский 1972., p. 125.

does not disturb or break the fine implicity of the situation, as it stands half-way outside of the metaphorical structure)—never speak about ‘the scribe’ in an explicit way; the words they use are: *goose, scraping and scratching, ink-horn*. The situation is unambiguous, even at the level of words. It is important to note the otherwise obvious fact that, despite the adequately arranged *lexis* of this scene (the work of Musorgsky's hand), the *mere/very artistic effect is conveyed not by the *literary* metaphors (synecdoches) but the *musical* ones. That the scribe is ‘scraping and scratching’ his quills, and his stature bears resemblance to a goose, is perceived not so much via the words as in and by the music. (Remember Gogol's ‘sonic speech’ in Eikhenbaum.) The scribe's movements, gestures and his appearance are genuinely accessible—palpable—for aesthetic perception. A process of musical association takes place, at the end of which we have before us the stature and countenance of the ‘scribbler’ clearly and distinctly. This association process is conveyed by the ‘sonic’ layer, i.e. the music—for the most part in the orchestral parts.

The plasticity of the scene is mainly ensured by the *sonic* element—the ‘cackling’ sound accompanying the scribe's action on the stage commented on by the *streltsy* on the one hand, and the mockery by the *streltsy* of the scribe on the other. The ‘cackling sound’ forms the skeleton of what I here call *musical synecdoche*, for it is this very element that powerfully leaves its stamp on the musical stage, thus producing the aesthetically relevant (i.e. perceptible and adequately decodable) information for the listener of the opera.

The witty way of representing the scribe, marked with remarkable ingenuity in terms of musicalness and operatic stagecraft, is secured by the strict observation of proportions: the composer adds *just/but the required minimum of ‘gooseness’ to the music, taking utmost care to avoid the over-emphasizing of the identification of the ‘scribe’ with ‘goose’, lest to lose the gist of the scene. The aesthetic value of this ‘snapshot scene’ is created by the sonic metaphoricality—the rhythmical cackles in the oboes.

What is manifested by the ‘peculiar arrangement’ of words as a result of the evolvement of literary genres, in Musorgsky re-appears as though flesh enveloping the skeleton—i.e. in the fabric of the music. One instance of it is the *musical synecdoche* and the *musical mask*. In terms of aesthetic effect as well as the mode of operation, it bears strong resemblance to the structural component responsible for the effectiveness of Gogol's comicality. It is remarkable that in the whole grand tableaux of *Khovanshchina* the

application of this musical trope is but confined to the scenes of the scribe.⁴⁰ Just as in *The Overcoat*, the artistic technique that makes the figure of the *Подъячий* as it appears for us, has essentially been designed for grasping and representing an entity of typically a small calibre—chronotopically, of course, which *de natura* sets the limitations for its applicability—and as a tool for producing or catalysing aesthetic process can effectively function in smaller rather than larger dimensions. To summarize, a musical mask built from musico-dramatic synecdoche(s) can presumably only work—i.e. is capable to bring about aesthetically perceptible effect—in the short run and on a smaller scale, which evidently proves insufficient for a grand-scale musical drama. Because the musical mask seems by nature to have much in common with the *zeugma*, a rhetorical figure that often links ideas and actions in an absurd way, thus producing humorous and comical effect, it necessarily follows that this technique is inappropriate to cope with larger-scale artistic representations.⁴¹ There are rhetorical figures, however, which, for example the hyperbaton, are able to switch over to carry a larger semantical unit.⁴²

Though unable to keep the musical dramaturgy of the whole opera under control, the musical metaphor (synecdoche) and musical mask have both proved to be excellent techniques to launch *Khovanshchina* and set it in its proper orbit, so that from this point the opera can develop the artistic concept that best fits it. Typically, during Musorgsky's mature period, the technique termed here as 'musical synecdoche' appears exclusively in comic—and in some part also grotesque—situations and figures, as, thanks to its expressively *parodistic* character, it is suitable for the representation of a small-scale entity. By this tension, based upon zeugmatic correlation, everyday normality is shattered to pieces; yet at the same time—in the given musico-dramatical moment—it does not generate a new, larger-scale, configuration that would constitutively re-arrange the outlines of the figure and the situation and enhance the *sjuzhet* as, for example, Marfa's figure does versus the old Khovansky who is gradually pushed into regression.

40 The figure of Shaklovity can be taken as a musical form constituted and operated by musical metaphor—exclusively in his scene with the Scribe, but nowhere else in *Khovanshchina*.

41 Cf. Tinyanov above on Gogol's techniques applied for attaining comicalness. Cf. "...by listing objects [...] that are incongruous with each other." See fn. 22

42 Pushkin's *Boris Godunov* can be interpreted as a huge hyperbaton. See the chapter *Hyperbaton and Irony. From the Disciple to the Pretender* [*Hiperbaton és irónia. A tanítványtól a trónkövetelőig*] in Mezősi: 2006, pp. 63-75

The piano score of the scene of the Scribe
and the streltsy from Act I of *Khovanshchina*

21 Moderato (P)

1-й С. прет. Гу - ся то - чит.

2-й С. прет.

Moderato (P)

КУЗЬКА (P) (подходят к Подьячему)

Чер - ни - ли - це - то, го - спо - ди!

1-й С.

2-й С. Вот за - скры - шит - то.

14

PART 2

Do We See Music the Right Way? The Figure of the Child in Ingmar Bergman's *Trollflöjten* and Andrei Tarkovsky's *Boris Godunov*

The remainder of this paper reflects on the question 'What is happening on the stage of the opera theater?', or, to put it more precisely, 'What *ought to* happen on the opera stage?'. I compare Ingmar Bergman's film adaptation of Mozart's *The Magic Flute* (the *Trollflöjten*) with Andrei Tarkovsky's production of Musorgsky's *Boris Godunov* with regard to how a particular craft, a technique used by the staging director, configures and triggers both adaptations and is being shared by both directors is applied in each of the two adaptations. I am going to discuss here the Figure of the Child, which is a particular child, that appears in both productions. Tarkovsky's adaptation is built upon the very exposing the child who is one of the characters in the play, thus its entering the performance follows from the dramaturgic logic of the play. Bergman, on the other hand, makes someone from the audience—that is, from the receptive side, from 'outside',—become part of the performance by showing from time to time the facial expressions and gestures of the little girl sitting in the auditorium as she is following the spectacle.

To investigate into the nature of co-operation of sound and image on the opera stage, one has to think of the 'musical stage' as outlined above, in the beginning of the first part of this study. The success of an opera performance—apart from the musical quality demonstrated by the performers from soloists to the dirigent—heavily depends on these momentums: is the imagery of the particular performance is in 'harmony' with the music? on what level of proficiency can the imagery speak the performed opera's music language? Is the visual layer of the performance capable to sustain its subordinateness to the opera's stage constructed of sounds in order not to 'overblab' its music (as it, sadly enough, often happens), yet at the same time grow into a competent and authentic interpretation of the particular opera?

The Figure of the Child in both adaptations becomes a key element in the course of the performance. That said, our 'reading' of the visual representation of the sacral layers of these two opera performances relies on the interrelation between the child figure and the opera. A well-known and characteristic example of the stage effect being made sacral is the 'counsel of priests' in *The Magic Flute* designed after Leonardo da Vinci's fresco, the *Last Supper*, whereas in *Boris Godunov* some of the choir scenes (for example, the one set

at the Vasily Blazhenny Cathedral) acquire sacral semantics.

It is important to explore the co-operation between imagery and music in these two opera adaptations as these adaptations are set up, 'configured', by this very co-operation. Tarkovsky exposes a mute child figure on the stage who, despite that he is not an innate part of the authorial text (the opera), his entering the performance is in accordance with the structure and the logic of the play. The basic setup of this opera—Boris Godunov's becoming tsar due to his alleged murder of the twelve-year-old tsarevich Dimitry—thus adds a deeper meaning to the Boris—Child relation; the child-motif haunts with its emphasized presence.

The scene before the cathedral underlines the peculiar interdependence and affinity developing between the Simpleton and the children: the children gather around him, robbing him of his only belonging, the copeck, whose value he puts so high that he asks the tsar to have them murdered, 'just as [he] had murdered the small tsarevich'. The link between the Simpleton and the children is further underlined and is granted a more profound character by the Biblical allusion connecting the Simpleton with Christ, emphasizing his, the Simpleton's, sanctity. Albeit the detailed analysis of this scene lies outside the scope of the present study, I nevertheless refer to the threads of the 'child motif' intertwined by Pushkin: his drama *Boris Godunov* offers, retrospectively, a paraphrase of the famous saying traditionally attributed to Dostoevsky indicating the family tree of 19th century ('classical') Russian writers: 'We all came forth from Gogol's cloak'. For this famous statement, a telling *topos* in Russian literary history, seems to forget, in its original form, about Pushkin's murdered children, to whom Dostoevsky and his fellow-writers owed at least as much as they owed to Gogol's cloak.

It can be *seen* that a performance of the *Boris* opera extended with the figure of the child speaks the same language as a close-reading based analysis of the same play. The figure of the child, being made the tool for inducing the drama of conscience, thus becomes the psychological and dramaturgical counterpoise for the protagonist.

Before focusing on one of the imageries applied by Tarkovsky in his *Boris* adaptation, the Figure of the Child, let us examine a different way of handling imagery in opera stage direction. The opening scene of Alfred Kirchner's *Khovanshcina* production at Wien Staatsoper in 1989:



This stage set is based on a painting by Vereschagin, *The Apotheosis of War*. No doubt, the pyramid formed of human skulls to 'illustrate' Musorgsky's *Khovanshchina* is an appealing idea, yet it is nothing more than a mere emblem—even though it emerges before every act on the stage, reminding the perhaps oblivious spectator of 'what this opera really is about'. The application of the painting as an 'explanatory *décor/scenery' does not follow from the dramatic structure and logic of the emblemized play, and does not add to our discourse with the opera. The basic premiss the staging director may have had in his mind is erroneous: the spectator is not likely to forget after every act what this opera is about... Provided, of course, the performance is good enough.

Now let us have a close look at a frozen picture of the 'Kromy scene' (the closing scene) from *Boris Godunov* (Mariinskii Theater, St. Petersburg, staging director: Andrei Tarkovsky):



In this picture a mass of humans can be seen *sleeping*. However, due to the onstage hanging and lynching just preceding this image, the border that separates sleep from death is made dim, which seems to gain further support from the Simpleton's closing song. The Kromy scene in *Boris Godunov* is an excessively dynamic, robust scene, bursting with carnivalesque energy, which with the hangings and the song of the Simpleton vanishes into nothing, that is, 'goes to sleep'. This visual representation of the closing scene of the opera—this image of 'half sleep, half death'—organically develops from the preceding events; in fact, it would be more precise to say that it dissolves in the air. Thus the imagery used by the staging director can enter in a highly productive dialogue with the 'events' that take place on the musical stage. The Simpleton's song is about some 'impenetrable, unfathomably thick darkness' (the Russian text has a threefold *figura etymologica*, adding to the apocalyptic character of the song: 'темень темная, непроглядная', 'dark darkness, impenetrable'). In the context of European culture, this inevitably evokes Dante, Aeneas and Ulysses descending in the Nether World, so the Simpleton's song may warn of the approaching Hell. There is consent among Russian historiographers, old and new, in that they call the period in Russian history that follows the fall of the Godunovs as the *смута*, the 'troubled times'. *Night* is coming, then...

Likewise *Boris Godunov*, *Khovanshchina* too ends with mass death; however, contrary to Kirchner's stage scenery based on Vereshchagin's painting which even offers historical

authenticity by indicating the disastrous outcome for the greater part of the dramatis personae of *Khovanshchina*, Tarkovsky's tableaux of the sleeping mass in the closing scene of *Boris*, offering a view of a heap of freshly massacred corpses, constitutes a fine example of what makes good opera staging, demonstrating how staging sets must organically follow the logic of the dramatic structure to provide the audience with authentic commentary that is an equal-ranking companion to music provided it is intended to go any further than a mere illustrative décor taking the burden of thinking and judgment off the spectator.

The tremendous success of Tarkovsky's 'play' with the Figure of the Child as inserted in the performance is provided by its anticipating and *enhancing visually the drama of conscience being exposed by the play and culminating in the scene before the Vasiliy Blazhenniy Cathedral. The biblical connotation of Herod*es and the executed infants is well underlined by the Figure of the Child, aptly supporting the music. The Figure of the Child, placed on the stage by the staging director, has a key role in how the stage scenery unfolds—either into a coherent and consistent image as the iconlike closing image in Act I, or, the other way round, the carnevalesque cavalcade dissolving into an apocalyptic vision in the Kromy scene.

Every time the phantom-figure of the child emerges in In Tarkovsky's production of *Boris Godunov* it but emphasizes the close relation between the child and the tsar; thus these 'inner epiphanies' are in fact images 'pulled forth' by the staging director from Boris' conscience. There is no space left here for a detailed analysis of the 'imagerial orchestration' of the Overture in *Trollflöjten*, yet it can be stated that, with the Figure of the Child, an organically born interpretation has entered in a highly productive dialogue with the music itself. (The possibility of Tarkovsky's production being influenced by Bergman's adaptation of *The Magic Flute* can hardly be ruled out.) The Figures of the Child applied by Tarkovsky and Bergman in their opera productions have set the framework for the plays, outlining feasible paths of further research into and interpretative work on opera.

Works cited

БАХТИН, М. М., *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Ed. and trans. by Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press 1984.

БАХТИН, М. М., Проблемы творчества Достоевского [Problems of Dostoevsky's Art] 1929; Киев, 1994., Часть II Слово у Достоевского (опыт стилистики), Глава I.

Bojti, J., Papp, M. (eds.), Muszorgszkij. Levelek, Dokumentumok, Emlékezések [Musorgsky. Letters, Documents, Recollections], Budapest, 1997.

HATTEN, R. S., *Musical Meaning in Beethoven: Markedness, Correlation, and Interpretation*. Bloomington, 1994.

КИРАЙ, Д., КОВАЧ, А. (eds.), *Поэтика. Труды русских и советских поэтических школ*, Budapest 1982, pp. 409-21.

KOVÁCS, Á., 'A gogoli szövegmű (A köpönyeg – írva és olvasva)' [The Gogolian Textual Opus (The Overcoat – written and read)], Kovács, Á, Nagy, I. (eds.), *Helikon* 1999/1-2 XLV, pp. 259-70.

МАНДЕЛЬШТАМ, О. Э., 'Разговор о Данте', *Собрание сочинений в четырех томах*. Под ред. проф. Г. П. Струве, Б. А. Филиппова, Москва, 1991, Т. II: *Проза*, pp. 363-413.

MEZŐSI, M., 'Pushkin's "Virtual Scene". Some Aspects of Pushkin's Historiography. Boris Godunov as the Trivium on the Way to the Polyphonic Novel,' *Slavica* XXXII, 2003, pp. 165-73.

MEZŐSI, M., *Zene, szó, dráma. Színhátékok és szín(e)változások [Music, Word, Drama: Stagecraft and Transfigurations]*, Budapest, 2006.

МУСОРГСКИЙ, М. П., Литературное наследие. Eds. Орлова, А. А. и Пекелис, М. С. Москва, 1972. МУСОРГСКИЙ, М. П., *Письма. Москва*, 1981 (no ed[s]. ind.).

ОРЛОВА, А., *Труды и дни Мусоргского. Летопись жизни и творчества*, Москва, 1963.

ОРЛОВА, А., *Musorgsky's Days*. UMI Research Press 1983.

ТЫНЯНОВ, Ю. Н., 'Достоевский и Гоголь (к теории пародии),' *Поэтика. История литературы. Кино*, Издательство «Наука». Москва, 1977, pp. 198-226.

ЭЙХЕНБАУМ, Б. М., 'Как сделана «Щинель» Гоголя,' *Поэтика. Сборники по теории поэтического языка*, т. I-II, Петроград 1919, pp. 151-65.

Excerpts from Gogol's *The Cloak* were cited from *The Project Gutenberg EBook of Best Russian Short Stories*, 2004 [EBook #13437], produced by David Starner, Keith M. Eckrich, and the Project Gutenberg Online Distributed Proofreaders Team. Compiled and Edited by Thomas Seltzer.

Disco- and Cinematography

BERGMAN, MOZART 2000 = I. BERGMAN. *The Magic Flute [Trollflöjten]*. cond. by E. ERICSON. Sveriges Radio AB 1975. 2000 The Criterion Collection. Cat. No. Mag100. ISBN 0-78002-308-0. 2nd printing 2000

MUSORGSKY 1989 = MUSORGSKY. *Khovanshchina*, stage dir. A. KIRCHNER, orch. by D. D. SHOSTAKOVICH and I. STRAVINSKY, cond. by C. ABBADO, from the Vienna State Opera 1989. 2 DVDs

MUSORGSKY 1993vhs = MUSORGSKY. *Boris Godunov*. The Royal Opera House, Covent Garden production by A. TARKOVSKY. Kirov Opera cond. by V. GERGIEV. Filmed at the Mariinsky Theatre in 1990. DECCA, 071 409-3 (2 VHS)

MUSORGSKY 1993dvd = MUSORGSKY. *Boris Godunov*. The Royal Opera House, Covent Garden production by A. TARKOVSKY. Kirov Opera cond. by V. GERGIEV. Filmed at the Mariinsky Theatre in 1990. PHILIPS (Set 075 089-9) 075 090-9, 075-091-9 (2 DVD)

MUSORGSKY 1990cd₁ Deutsche Grammophon, 429758-2. Co-production with Vienna State Opera. Conducted by Claudio Abbado. The English version is that of the Decca Record Company, Ltd. London, 1955, revised and with additional material by Dr. Victor Borovsky and Adele Poindexter. 3 CDs