Sergei Istomin

The history of Tchaikovsky’s Variations on a Rococo theme and the collaboration with Fitzenhagen

1. Introduction.

Pyotr Ilyich Tchaikovsky’s Variations on a Rococo theme, Op. 33, were dedicated to the cellist Karl Friedrich Wilhelm Fitzenhagen, who premiered this masterpiece in Moscow in 1877.1 Fitzenhagen’s role in the compositional process has frequently been discussed by musicologists and performance practice specialists. In this article, we aim to re-assess Fitzenhagen’s involvement with the Variations with regard to ‘Texttreue’ – in other words, the performer’s fidelity to the text of a work – and re-evaluate Fitzenhagen’s own arrangement of the Variations with regard to the most recent musicological publications.2 In the field of today’s performance practice, our task is to shine a much-needed light on Fitzenhagen’s contribution to the Variations’ editorial and publishing processes.

In the first part of this article, the chronological history of the editorial and critical correspondence in the history of the Variations will be treated in detail. The two distinct versions of the Variations, which co-exist already in the original manuscripts, are of central significance to the subject matter. The conceptual clarification of historical, textological and editorial evidence includes several documents such as excerpts from the manuscript of the Variations’ Violoncello-Solo part3 (the initial eight-variations version), first editions, photographs, and Fitzenhagen’s letters that are presented here for the first time for the English reader. The confusion around the name of Fitzenhagen’s editor – Luckhardt in Berlin vs Leuckart in Leipzig – has been reviewed and clarified conclusively for the first time. Since nearly all contemporary publications on the Rococo Variations are based on mid-20th-century Soviet sources, our duty is to examine previous methods of analysis, review the existing musicological works, the musical texts and to revisit the period when Tchaikovsky’s Variations were composed, performed and published. It is important to note the positive side of the composer–performer collaboration between Tchaikovsky and Fitzenhagen; the composer was on professional as well as on friendly terms with the cellist, and on many occasions asked him to proofread and edit a number of his compositions for the cello.
In the second part, we shall take a closer look at the *Variations* in the context of their period and style. Fitzenhagen’s lineage of cello playing came through the Dresden cellist Friedrich Wilhelm Ludwig Grützmacher. We can see similarities in their approach of musical text treatment, as Grützmacher and Fitzenhagen give performance indications that are still relevant today and therefore useful for students, professional musicians and amateurs. The precision with which the manuscripts and the scores were edited is remarkable. Our main task consists of revising the existing materials and re-evaluating the current views.

Finally, we would like to highlight our own perspective as performers in the recording with Claire Chevallier (Passacaille Label №1047) in which we focus on all the performance details that are suggested by Tchaikovsky and Fitzenhagen in the *Variations*’ manuscripts. In this article, we have assigned letters ‘A’ to the set of eight variations by Tchaikovsky and letter ‘B’ to the version amended by Fitzenhagen that consists of seven variations. The two versions are presented in our recording below. It is important to note that the *Variations* were first composed for violoncello and fortepiano. Therefore, the usual term ‘piano reduction’ (*Klavierauszug* in German) does not strictly fit the original French indication ‘*pour violoncelle et piano*’ (for violoncello and piano) that we find on the title page of the first edition. To our knowledge this recording is the only CD publication available till now on period instruments and in keeping with this original first instrumentation. The instruments used for the recording are as follows:

a violoncello by Leopold Widhalm (Nurnberg, mid-18\textsuperscript{th} century). The cello was stringed with two open gut strings A and D, and overwound gut for the two lower strings G and C;

a fortепiano by Jakob Becker (Saint Petersburg, 1875).

The intricate editorial and publishing history of the Variations will be explained here with the help of tables and charts.\(^4\)

[WE WILL INSERT RECORDINGS ‘A’ and ‘B’ HERE!]

2. **Revisiting the Variations’ history:**

   **a chronology of the editorial and critical correspondence**

The first performance of the *Variations* in the orchestral version took place on 18 November 1877 in Moscow under the baton of Nikolay Rubinstein.\(^5\) ‘Today is a Symphonic Assembly and most importantly, Fitzenhagen is playing your Variations on a Rococo theme’ – wrote Nadezhda von Meck to Pyotr
Tchaikovsky.\textsuperscript{6} Two years later, during a Festival in Wiesbaden, Fitzenhagen gave the first performance of the \textit{Variations} outside of Russia. In July 1879, Tchaikovsky described this event in a letter to von Meck, ‘These days I have received letters from abroad with some very pleasant news about my compositions. Von Bulow played my Concerto during a Festival in Wiesbaden and in London. Fitzenhagen had great success with my Variations during Wiesbaden’s Festival.’\textsuperscript{7}

Fitzenhagen entered music history mostly as the first publishing supervisor, editor and performer of the \textit{Variations}. It is noteworthy that the cellist preferred to publicise Tchaikovsky’s works instead of his own compositions.\textsuperscript{8} His positive contribution has often been questioned by a number of authors including Viktor Kubatsky, Israel Yampolsky, Alexander Stogorsky, Boris Dobrokhотов, David Brown and Thomas Kohlhase. Negative statements about Fitzenhagen’s association with the \textit{Variations} by those 20\textsuperscript{th}-century authors (see Appendix I, Table 1) are in conflict with a number of primary sources and other documents that we examine in this article. In this way, relying upon musical textology, methodically narrowing down the factual historical context, we can undertake a more realistic approach to the problem of the Tchaikovsky–Fitzenhagen collaboration. The facts are gathered from the following sources: manuscripts, handwritten original copies of the fortepiano and violoncello parts, the first piano and cello version published by Pyotr Jurgenson, letters of Tchaikovsky, Jurgenson and others, contemporary publications and images together with materials extracted from instrumental method books describing techniques and style of playing as practiced in the leading European musical centres.

From the first published edition (see Appendix I, Table 2a and 2b) to the present day, Fitzenhagen’s version of the \textit{Variations} has continuously been performed by cellists. However, a number of musicians view Fitzenhagen’s edition as a misrepresentation of the composer’s initial intention. This notion is maintained by a ‘secondary’ source: a story told by Anatoly Brandukov\textsuperscript{9} to his student Viktor Kubatsky\textsuperscript{10} that appears to portray the composer’s ‘over-emotional’ reaction to Fitzenhagen’s editorial involvement:

During one of my visits of Pyotr Ilyich, I found him in a terribly irritated state. He had a look of a sick person. To my question ‘what is going on with you?’ – Pyotr Ilyich pointing his hand at the desk had pronounced, ‘\textit{Fitzenpupen} (Fitzenhagen) was here, look what he has done with my composition, he altered everything.’ To my questioning, what he is going to do with the piece, Pyotr Ilyich answered: ‘Hell with
it, let it be as it is!’. That evening I went home from Pyotr Ilyich with the manuscript of the Variations on a Rococo theme that I accepted from him as a gift.¹¹

Some of the authors that have discussed the topic of the Variations’ publication simply repeat the aforementioned story, the credibility of which, however, is questionable since it is based on hearsay. The authors of the most recent reference publications on Tchaikovsky ascribe Brandukov’s visit to the year 1889, presumably calculated in connection with the editorial preparation of the Variations’ orchestral score.¹² A number of authors refer to Dombayev’s publication whereas the year of Brandukov’s visit is in fact not indicated.¹³ It is curious, but possible, considering Tchaikovsky’s occasional absent-mindedness, that he would only then have noticed and thus reacted so strongly to Fitzenhagen’s ‘drastic reordering’ or ‘drastic modification’ of the Variations.¹⁴ Note, that details of the whereabouts of the original piano and cello part from 1876 to the year 1889 are not known.

We were not able to trace any mention of a date of Brandukov’s visit in the 19th century writings or in printed sources related to our research. We must clarify, though, that on 25 November¹⁵ 1889, Brandukov performed Tchaikovsky’s Pezzo Capriccioso, Op. 62.¹⁶ His recollections of the visit appeared for the first time in print in 1945 in Yampolsky’s article (see Appendix I, Table 1). In our opinion, this source cannot serve as a basis for evaluation of Fitzenhagen’s contribution. It is not without interest to mention that we have not managed to find any proof that Brandukov ever performed the Variations. The only contemporary printed source that associates Brandukov with this work is Yulian Poplavsky’s reminiscences.¹⁷ In October 1893, not long before Tchaikovsky’s death, Brandukov and Poplavsky were visiting the composer at his home in Klin.¹⁸ Poplavsky wrote:

At the dinner, Pyotr Ilyich was telling us about his last Symphony. We, noticing him in exceptionally good spirits, had started our usual plea – to compose a cello concerto. ‘Why don’t you play my Variations?’ – was one and the same answer. I pitched into an old song about the inconvenience of some of the variations for the cello and that there is too little singing at all. ‘Cannot play and badgering’ – was Pyotr Ilyich’s joke.¹⁹

Here is another document, a letter from Jurgenson to Tchaikovsky dated 3 February²⁰ 1878. This particular letter has been repeatedly brought up by musicologists:
Loathsome Fitzenhagen! He is most insistent on making changes to your cello piece, and he says that you have given him full authority to do so. Heavens! Tchaikovsky ‘revu et corrigé par Fitzenhagen!!’\textsuperscript{21}

It is important to note that there are four existing contemporary manuscripts: the very primary source, that is Tchaikovsky’s piano and cello part, the full orchestral score, the clean copies of the Piano part, and the Violoncelle-Solo part in two separate volumes. The latter manuscripts were very probably written out by Fitzenhagen (see Appendix I, Table 3).\textsuperscript{22} On the one hand, the composer’s preliminary drafts and sketches of the Variations are not extant. On the other hand, we could consider the first of the four manuscripts as a rough copy. Today, the documents are kept at the Russian National Museum of Music in Moscow.\textsuperscript{23}

The clean, ready-to-be engraved handwritten copy of the Piano part together with the Violoncelle-Solo part are very valuable performance practice documents. Their musical structure corresponds entirely to the manuscripts of the full orchestral score in which we find the handwriting of both Tchaikovsky and Fitzenhagen. The cello and piano parts consist of eight variations. Here we find ‘all sorts of indications and instructions of particular [i.e. to the violoncello and music performance in general] features’.\textsuperscript{24} These are violoncello fingerings, slurs, bowings, dynamic and agogic accents that correspond to ‘a refined style of musical expression’.\textsuperscript{25} For simplicity, we shall denote the eight-variations version as ‘A’.

In the handwritten Piano-violoncello score and Violoncelle-Solo part Fitzenhagen made pencilled annotations that indicate some cuts and a rearrangement of the specific variations into the new seven-variations sequence. This version was published for the first time in November 1878 in Moscow by Jurgenson (Appendix I, Table 2 a). Fitzenhagen’s seven-variations version we denote as ‘B’.

Note that the two versions (‘A’ and ‘B’) are simultaneously present in both handwritten Piano and Violoncelle-Solo parts, as well as in the manuscript of the full orchestral score by way of the written-out in ink version ‘A’ and the pencilled-in version ‘B’. In fact, we can logically presume that, for publishing, Jurgenson had a choice between the two versions of the Variations.

Structurally, Fitzenhagen moved the recitative episode together with the most developed Cadenza ‘a piacere’, which can be perceived as the ‘final’ one, to the end of the Variations. In this way, he linked them with another cadential episode at the end of Variation VI (Variation V in the ‘B’ version).\textsuperscript{26} The final Variation VII in the ‘B’ version consists of 32 measures – comprising the actual ‘Coda’ of
Variation VIII (version ‘A’) – to which the cellist added 44 measures from the Variation IV. (see Appendix, Chart 1).

If we compare the total amount of measures in both versions:

- version ‘A’ comprises 428 measures (counting the anacrusis to the whole composition) and excluding the ‘Cadenza a piacere’ identical to both versions,
- Version ‘B’ comprises 391 measures.

From the chart (see Appendix I, Chart 1) we see that Fitzenhagen’s version ‘B’ omits only 37 measures in all (the 2 final measures in Variation IV and the first 35 measures in Variation VIII that is actually the whole Variation VIII if we consider that the Coda starts on the 36th measure). Here it is appropriate to note that the 35 measures of Variation VIII (scale passages that sound nearly identical to the Variation II) were omitted by Fitzenhagen, presumably, because of redundancy and a lack of bravura at the very end of the Variations cycle (see Examples 1 and 2). It is important to mention that in all probability the Cadenza was composed with Fitzenhagen’s help.

Example 1
Variation II
(Violoncello – Solo part)
Russian National Museum of Music, Moscow, fund 88 № 97 b
Example 2
Variation VIII et Coda
(Violoncello – Solo part)
Russian National Museum of Music, Moscow, fund 88 № 97 b
Fitzenhagen participated directly in the *Variations*’ publication process during the years 1877 – 1878. The cellist convinced Tchaikovsky that if published abroad, his instrumental compositions were likely to benefit from better distribution. Following Fitzenhagen’s advice, the composer agreed on the publication of the *Variations on a Rococo theme, Op. 33* and the *Valse-Scherzo, Op. 34* with a publisher in Germany, in our opinion most likely with Friedrich Luckhardt in Berlin. The choice of Luckhardt’s publishing house can be explained by Fitzenhagen’s personal contact with the latter.

It is curious to see that another similar sounding name of a German publisher, viz. the name of Franz Ernst Christophe Leuckart in Leipzig, was mentioned in musicological sources. It seems that Tchaikovsky himself had started the confusion about the name: in his letters, as well as in all musicological and biographical works about the composer, we find different varieties of the German publisher’s name such as Leukhardt, Lukhardt, Leuckardt, Leückardt. For instance, in a monograph by Ronald John Wiley, *Tchaikovsky*, the name of the publisher in question appears simultaneously as Leuckhardt, Leuckardt and Leuckart. Tchaikovsky himself possibly did not know precisely with whom Fitzenhagen had been dealing: either it was Leuckart from Leipzig or Fitzenhagen’s Luckhardt from Berlin.

Note that the Hofmeister Monatsberichte for the year 1876 mentions Tchaikovsky’s early fortepiano opuses published by Leuckart in Leipzig. It is appropriate here to take note of the following lines from Franz Liszt’s letter, 15 November 1876 to Constantin Sander, music publisher in Leipzig, the grandson and successor of F.E.C. Leuckart publishing house:

> Very honoured Sir,  
> Best thanks for kindly sending me the ‘collected writings of Hector Berlioz’ and some novelties of your firm. The compositions of Tschaikowsky (*sic*) interest me. A few of my pupils here play his Concerto and several of his pieces really capitally. I have also recommended Riedel to include Tschaikowsky’s Symphony in the programme of the next Tonkünstler-Versammlung.

In March 1878 Tchaikovsky wrote to von Meck:

> Do you know that all my fortepiano works are published in counterfeit in Leipzig, that all my romances are also translated and published in Germany and moreover in an excellent way.

Tchaikovsky probably knew Leuckart’s name by that time. However, it looks as if he had heard about Fitzenhagen’s Luckhardt only ‘by hearsay’. On 14
February\textsuperscript{36} 1878 Tchaikovsky contacted Fitzenhagen with the help of Constantin (Karl) Albrecht\textsuperscript{37} who for reasons of clarity translated Tchaikovsky’s letter to Fitzenhagen into German:

Dear Friend!
You were so kind that you undertook to arrange with Luckhardt (Люкгардт) the printing of my violoncello piece and valse for the violin. At the same time, you told me that these pieces by being printed abroad would be better marketed rather than if I gave them to Jurgenson. I gave way then to your arguments and asked you to send my pieces to Mr. Luckhardt, from whom I did not even hope to receive an honorarium if only the pieces were printed soon and well. After a period of time, you told me that Mr. Luckhardt not only takes my pieces but also offers me 300 marks of honorarium. Since then a year has passed.\textsuperscript{38}

Earlier, in January 1878, Iosif Kotek who at that time lived in Berlin paid a visit to Mr. Luckhardt at the request of Tchaikovsky. Two months later, on 24 March\textsuperscript{39} 1878 Tchaikovsky wrote to von Meck about this visit:

It happened that my manuscript is resting peacefully on Leückardt’s (sic) shelf, – answering Kotek’s question, ‘When will these pieces be published?’ – Leückardt said, ‘Do not know, someday!’\textsuperscript{40}

The publisher’s attitude deeply offended Tchaikovsky; as a result, he refused to publish his works with the German. Tchaikovsky wrote with some irritation to Jurgenson:

Take the trouble to say to Fitzenhagen, that I want his sausage maker to immediately return my manuscripts. In no way do I want him to publish them under any conditions, even for hundred thousand rubles.\textsuperscript{41}

As aforementioned, in November 1878 in Moscow, after some twists and turns, Jurgenson finally published the so-called ‘piano reduction’ of the Variations.\textsuperscript{42} Fitzenhagen’s pencilled and inked remarks that indicate his version ‘B’ were implemented in the first edition of the violoncello and fortepiano parts. Among them: reprises of the first and second sentences of the Theme as well as the changes mentioned above (see Appendix I, Chart 1).\textsuperscript{43} Moreover, in the first edition we can find a number of misprints such as omission of dynamic, articulation, bowing and tempo marks (for instance at the beginning of Variation II the sign ‘Tempo della Thema’ is absent in the Piano-cello score).\textsuperscript{44} It is most likely that on 10 December\textsuperscript{45} 1878 Tchaikovsky wrote to Jurgenson precisely about these ‘editorial’ misprints:
I got the scores and I am awfully pleased… It is remarkable, that I have not found misprints either in the Concerto and Romances, or in the Children’s Album, – but in the composition dedicated to M. Guillaume who actually corrected it himself, – I have found! Hooray! We won over the Germans! … But, seriously, these are wonderful editions!  

Jurgenson’s printing plates № 3331 (Piano-cello score and Violoncelle-Solo part) were continually used in many subsequent Russian re-editions, for that reason the above-mentioned misprints were not corrected (see Appendix I, Table 2 a, and Appendix III, Discrepancies, Jurgenson editions 1878 and 1879).

In conclusion of these outlined facts, we should underline that with the composer’s consent, Fitzenhagen took part in the initial process of the Variations’ creation. Within this context, it is important to point out one of Fitzenhagen’s letters to Tchaikovsky. The cellist had just returned home after the final concert at Wiesbaden where he performed Tchaikovsky’s Variations on a Rococo theme with the Festival orchestra during the final concert of the Wiesbaden’s festival. On 13 June 1879, from Seesen am Harz, Fitzenhagen wrote:

My dear friend,
You must soon compose a cello concerto for me! I will again stand by your side with advice and help and would be very happy if you would satisfy my wish at last.

In all the handwritten documents related to the composition, we find Fitzenhagen’s remarks, corrections and inserted written out musical texts. Fitzenhagen prepared two fully edited arrangements of the Variations: version ‘A’ (Tchaikovsky – Fitzenhagen’s initial eight variations set) and version ‘B’ (Fitzenhagen’s personal arrangement). The ‘A’ version was available in three clean master manuscripts, but Jurgenson, disregarding his own ‘complaints’, nevertheless published the ‘B’ version. Note that during Tchaikovsky’s life the Variations were published and quite obviously performed in Fitzenhagen’s ‘B’ version.

Later, in the 20th century there was an ‘archaeological excavation’ of sorts into Tchaikovsky-Fitzenhagen’s working manuscript of the Piano-cello score; a defragmentation of the physical text materials by Kubatsky, who also involved forensic expert A. Purtov from the Ministry of Internal Affairs Research Institute of Criminology. Their work consisted of erasing the latter layers of the musical text and ungluing Fitzenhagen’s manuscript paper inserts (glued over the primary text).
Although there was no real necessity for Kubatsky’s painstaking editorial work, it has been a valuable asset rather from a textological point of view. Paradoxically Kubatsky’s Piano-cello score restoration highlights the musical text development together with creative cooperation between composer and performer.

3. The Variations in the context of their title and style.

Considering performance practice matters, we should look at the Variations in the context of their title. Therefore, it is interesting to take note of Raaben’s remark that the title of Tchaikovsky’s composition is actually ‘Variations on a Rococo theme’ and not ‘Variations in the Rococo style’. Lev Ginsburg stipulates that the Rococo style was not typically associated with Russian culture. However, in contradiction with his statement, it is useful to clarify here that the architectural and decorative Rococo style was popular in Russia as well as in Europe at that time. The Brockhaus and Efron dictionary tells us:

The Rococo style originated in France during the regency period (1715-23), reached full development under Louis XV and spread to other European countries where it dominated until the 1780’s. The style was the continuation, or rather a modification of the Baroque style. Rococo architecture avoids strong symmetry. Regardless of its architectural irrationalities, the Rococo style left many monuments such as the Palace of Versailles in France, Zwinger in Dresden, Germany, the Winter Palace in Saint Petersburg together with many other Rococo buildings by the talented Count Rastrelli in Russia.

It is obvious that Mozart, whom Tchaikovsky greatly admired, and whose creative aura played an inspirational role in art, influenced Tchaikovsky’s choice of this particular variations’ genre.

Today, it is known that the interpretation of works that belong to previous epochs demands very specific knowledge. In our case, it is very useful to take into consideration the history and traditions of the leading European instrumental schools as well as relevant contemporary tastes and styles. This kind of ‘holistic historical approach’ encourages the most precise delivery of the composer’s textual indications and affects. As a result, the listener can fully experience the exact musical sense of the composer’s inspiration and ideas.

We should remember that logic as well as rhetoric were taught in Russian educational institutions from the beginning to the mid-19th century. Subsequently,
rhetoric as an educational discipline was regarded within a wider context, specifically as the theory of prose. The rhetorical rules applicable to the construction of musical language, together with the foundations and rules of versification, including the theory of affects, were obviously known to both Tchaikovsky, who graduated from the Imperial School of Jurisprudence and later from the Saint Petersburg Conservatory, and Fitzenhagen, who received his ‘humanistische Bildung’ [humanistic education] in Germany.

Precise musical grammar, rhetoric and versification, alongside general culture, aesthetics and performing concepts were intrinsic properties of previous generations of musicians. It is well known that musical phrases and sentences imply words and follow the same rules of word formation, phrasing and sentence construction that we find in versification and oratory. As an example, we can give Tchaikovsky’s use of the following diacritical signs, specifically, *macron* ‘¯’ and *breve* ‘˘’. These diacritical signs appear in a letter to Anton Arensky, Maidanovo, 25 September 1885:

Dear Anton Stepanovich,

Pardon me if I force my advice upon you. I have heard that 5/4 time appears twice in your new Suite. It seems to me that the mania for 5/4 time threatens to become a habit with you. I like it well enough if it is indispensable to the musical idea, that is to say if the time signature and rhythmic accent respectively form no hindrance. For example, Glinka, in the chorus of the fourth act of *A Life for the Tsar*, clearly could not have written in anything else but 5/4 time: here we find an actual 5/4 rhythm that is a continual and uniform change from 2/4 to 3/4:

![Example 3](Tchaikovsky's letter to Arensky)

**Example 3**

Tchaikovsky’s letter to Arensky

Tchaikovsky analysed Baron Rosen’s text, that we find in the women’s chorus *Rázgulyálasia, razliválasia (Lustig ergiessen frei von dem Eise)*, as follows: alteration of trochee, a foot consisting of one long or stressed syllable followed by one short or unstressed syllable ‘¯ ’ with dactyl ‘˘’, a metrical foot consisting of one stressed syllable followed by two unstressed syllables (see Examples 3, 4 and 5):
It is curious to note that in the German translation of ‘A Life for the Tsar’ published by Jurgenson the foot is shifted to a different syllabic alteration, therefore the foot structure does not fit perfectly in the 5/4 time signature as described by Tchaikovsky. An accent that falls on a ‘weak’ syllable creates a reverse alteration of dactyl ‘˘ ˘ ˘’ and trochee ‘˘ ˘’. The alteration accentuates a ‘wrong’ syllable compared to the original Russian text (see Example 5). For additional information on *The application of words to music and of music to words* we invite you to read through Mathis Lussy’s *Musical Expression, Accents, Nuances, and Tempo, in Vocal and Instrumental Music*, chapter IX on *Musical Prosody*.

The long syllables must coincide with the accented notes, and the short syllables with the unaccented ones; that is to say, the long syllables should fall on the accented notes (accented beats, or fractions of the beat) and the short syllables on the unaccented notes (unaccented beats or fraction of the beat). Each monosyllable which requires articulation should be long, the only exception being the article.

In addition, for a clearer understanding of the measure structure, musical phrases structure, natural accents, diatonic and enharmonic inclinations, we can use as a reference Alexander Villoing’s *Ecole pratique du Piano*. Besides other very valuable information, in his fortepiano Method we can find explanations of diacritical signs: ‘Measures consist of strong beats: *temps frappés*: ‘˘’ and weak beats: *temps levés*: ‘˘’ (see Example 6)
We also find a valuable information on poetical metre and musical measure in Adolph Friedrich Christiani’s book *The Principles of Expression in Pianoforte Playing* (see Example 7):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poetry</th>
<th>Music</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>is the rhythmical arrangement of articulated sounds (i.e., syllables), into regulated succession of groups called <strong>Metres</strong>.</td>
<td>is the rhythmical arrangement of unarticulated sounds (i.e., tones) into regulated succession of groups called <strong>Measures</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These depended,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the classic languages, upon the way in which long and short syllables were made to succeed each other, i.e., on <strong>Quantity</strong>.</td>
<td>in ancient music, upon the metres of poetry with which they were identical, i.e., on <strong>Quantity</strong>; the long and abort syllables being represented by long and short tones respectively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example 7**

Christiani’s comparative table of poetical metre and musical measure

Returning to our topic, for a more illustrative example we can put diacritical marks in the text of the *Variations’* Theme (see Example 8). Thus, we can easily see an obvious rhetorical link between the dynamic and performance indications
written out by Fitzenhagen in the aforementioned manuscripts. It is also of interest to note that the melody and its rhythm are structurally close to a poetical (sung) as well as an instrumental form of the French dance *Bourrée* that was reappearing occasionally in 19th-century compositions, particularly when they feature neoclassic tendencies.\(^70\)

Example 8
Manuscript copy of the violoncello part, fund 88 № 97 b

Hence, we invite performers to invent their own subtext that can facilitate a natural feeling for the metric movement and phrase constructions according to the rules of measure compositions and vocal accentuation. If we wish to refer to the original pastoral and graceful poetic genres, we can find a suitable example in Pyotr Karabanov’s *Verses*\(^71\) (below is our free translation, see also Example 9):
Под тенью густою
Близ тихого ручья
Сидела долго я,
Терзаема тоскою.
Вдруг миленький дружок,
Любезный пастушок,
О ком я воздыхала
И страсть открыть желала…

In the shade that dark and dense
Near quiet lovely stream
I was sitting for a while,
In tormenting, longing grief.
But suddenly my dear friend,
Precious little shepherd came,
About whom I dared to sigh
And dreamed to tell my desire.
Example 9
Interlude The sincerity of the shepherdess, duet Daphnis and Chloe (Act II, № 14 с)
from Tchaikovsky’s opera The Queen of Spades Op. 68
Note that Karabanov’s original text is in Tchaikovsky’s own adaptation
Contrary to the generally accepted tendency to criticise Fitzenhagen for ‘grossly bowdlerizing’ a primary state of the Piano-cello score, we propose to look differently at the motives, and therefore results of the cellist’s work with Tchaikovsky’s text. We should take into account that in the baroque, classic and even romantic traditions the ‘holy immunity’ of a composer’s score was not taken for granted as a mandatory requirement. The musical creation was a living matter that should be recreated as if anew in every performance. Performers did not regard the composer’s score as a dead artefact. Musicians used scores as a basis, a canvas or a plan, that could be realised in their own artistic performances. This approach to performance was not self-centred. It was based rather on a full understanding of the traditions as well as the style of execution of a certain era. In any case, a good musician within each epoch would cultivate and display such virtues as emotion, spirituality, intellectual agility and technique.

In our opinion the general character of version ‘A’ rather reflects Tchaikovsky’s unrestrained flight of imagination, possibly less conventional in terms of formal structure, as opposed to Fitzenhagen’s ‘academic’ sense of form and meticulous attention to detail. An interesting tongue-in-cheek observation in a letter from Mussorgsky to Rimsky-Korsakov comes to mind:

A German, when thinking, starts by analysing, and then proceeds to demonstrate. Our Russian brother begins by demonstrating, and afterwards may amuse himself with analysing.

Note that musicologists, as a rule, quote a fragment of Jurgens on’s letter to Tchaikovsky from 3 February: He [Fitzenhagen] certainly wants to remake your violoncello piece, make it more violoncellistic.

First of all we should note that this rather subjective statement comes from Jurgenson, in his capacity as a publisher i.e. not as a practicing musician. This quote can be interpreted as a kind of paralogism: is it a serious problem that a cellist would make the piece dedicated to him more suitable for his instrument? The French phrase from the same letter, specifically ‘revu et corrigé par Fitzenhagen!!’ is often (as by aforementioned Soviet-era musicologists) perceived in a negative sense. However, we should note that the phrase ‘revu et corrigé’ frequently appears in 19th-century music editions, also in some of Tchaikovsky’s compositions that were published in Russia. More likely, the French phrase refers to the formal type of statement that serves as a legal warrant,

1 Note that the French expression ‘revu et corrigé’ or especially ‘revu et corrigé par Fitzenhagen’ which is presumably written by the cellist himself is not found in any available primary source.
such as ‘lu et approuvé’. It is important to note that we were not able to find in the manuscripts any written out comment such as ‘revu et corrigé par Fitzenhagen!!’.

On the subject of making the Variations more violoncellistic, a quote from Tchaikovsky’s letter to Jurgenson may lead us to a better understanding of the composer’s attitude toward such actions:

Forgive me for making changes in some places. It’s not me who is to blame, but Taneyev, who was very careless about my request to make the piano reduction, that I arranged abroad and without an instrument, more suitable for the piano (‘оформтьниить’)\(^7\).

Throughout the mid-20\(^{th}\) century, Soviet performing arts historians, such as Yampolsky, Dobrokhotov, Stogorsky, argued that the 19\(^{th}\)-century German Violoncello School ‘excelled’ in cliché, conveyed the inertness of academic traditions, as well as heaviness and sentimentalism. It is not a surprise that Fitzenhagen’s contribution was perceived in a negative way by the aforementioned paragons of musical practice of the 1950’s. Ginsburg wrote about Fitzenhagen and the Variations:

but of course, we should not consider as mandatory Fitzenhagen’s performance indications (some of his dynamic markings as well as his antiquated fingering techniques).\(^7\)

In connection with this inference, one of the definitions of logic, or rather, a logical fallacy such as ‘argumentum ad novitatem’ comes to mind. Speaking of antiquated techniques, we can refer to the writings of Arnold Dolmetsch:

This last remark is amusing, in view of the fact that at all times people have been convinced of the superiority of their own taste over that of their predecessors.\(^8\)

Nowadays we should not forget that an interest in exploration of techniques, including ‘all sorts of indications and instructions of particular [i.e. to the violoncello and music performance in general], features\(^8\) as well as in the revival of the 19\(^{th}\)-century historically informed performance practice – is based on concerns that are more pragmatic rather than sensual. Therefore, the allusion to ‘outdated fingering technique’ allusion, which we can identify in the writings of the mainstream musicians, is not logically valid. Taking into account numerous historical materials, as well as modern works of the leading performance practice

\(^2\) Note that signature in contracts is usually preceded by the handwritten words ‘Lu et approuvé’ [‘Read and approved’].
specialists, we cannot agree with the description of the German Violoncello School quoted above. These materials point to a rather opposite conclusion. Bernhardt Romberg’s Violoncello School, to which we can add the cello methods of Jean-Louis Duport, Friedrich Dotzauer, Friedrich August Kummer and Sebastian Lee, define characteristics of lightness, grace, freedom and variety of instrumental techniques.

Among many of Romberg’s instructions, in the chapter *De la Manière de phraser* or *Of Execution* in one of the English translations of Romberg’s *Method* we find the following text:

Music may be considered in the light of declamatory language. The spirit and signification of a speech (sic) depends on the importance of the information it conveys, on the variety of tone used in the pronunciation of the words it contains, on the rising and falling inflexions, and on the strength or weakness of the voice. If a speech be pronounced monotonously, it must utterly fail in its desired effect, and can produce no other feelings in the hearers but those of languor and ennui. It is precisely the same case with Music, whenever it is played without a due admixture of light and shade, and a proper regard to feeling and expression. There is also a close analogy between the Rhythm of Music and the Rhythm of Verse; for in the former, the long and short syllables are regulated in the same manner as in the latter; for instance, the words ‘I love thee’ would be executed in Music thus:

\[ \begin{array}{c}
  \text{\textbf{p}} \\
  \text{\textbf{p}} \\
\end{array} \]

‘I love thee’, here the ‘D’ is a suspension to ‘C’

In the chapter ‘*Nuances in Music*’ we read:

The music has its nuances and contrasts as the painting has its shades and light. To be able to give the necessary instructions and directions to them who play an instrument, to be able to give to their play these nuances and the ensemble and detail perfection that constitutes the beauty, we use certain expressions and locutions borrowed from Italian language that is the most proper to the music. However, it is necessary to notice that this paragraph is missing in the English translation on *Light and Shade, &c.*

We can also refer to Duport’s Essay on the Fingering and Bowing of the Violoncello to obtain a more complete understanding of the aesthetics and
pedagogical foundations of the 19th-century European cello methods. Duport instructs cellists on equality of tone, nuances, expressions, variety of bow strokes and all the gradations of execution and expression:86

Variety in the manner of playing, gradations of sound, and consequently expression, depend on the bow, and are matters of taste and feeling. I shall not attempt to give examples of such taste and feeling, as that would be extremely ridiculous; but I will say that in order to be able to produce all those shades of sound which feeling inspires and taste regulates, we must begin by acquiring a perfect command of the bow.

Note that the August Lindner translation omits the following:

To produce equality in the tone, practice diligently the up and downstrokes in their full length, quite straight and with equal force throughout, on all the 4 strings. Therefore play the scales very slowly, and take care that the up and downstrokes be as equal as possible. Even on the best instrument, the tones on the four strings are not equal in power and quality; it is therefore the player’s task to equalise them. To acquire the different gradations of tone, you must apply the bow as gently as possible at its extremities, both in the up and downstroke, then swell the tone gradually but not in jerks, as far as the middle of the bow – where it reaches its greatest strength, – upon which you must diminish it in the same manner. This practice offers at the same time an opportunity of perfecting the intonation. If you have attained this object, and if you have succeeded in drawing out all the tones with equal force, and in swelling each single tone from the softest piano to the strongest forte, then you will have the bow in your power, and be able to produce with it all the gradations of execution and expression.87

We can discern that toward the end of the 19th century, in some editions of the Duport School, articles on nuances and expression appeared in abridged versions.88 By the beginning of the 20th century, such essential performing techniques as ‘messa di voce’89 (see Example 10), somehow disappear from the methodology of renowned violoncello teachers. For example, in Grützmacher’s Daily Exercises, Op. 67, published in 1891 and 1910 under the editorship of his prominent student Hugo Becker, as well as in the publication of William Willeke, the expressive effect ‘messa di voce’ is absent. (see Examples 11 and 12)
Example 10
Romberg, Paris (c.1840), p. 96

Slowly, with horizontal bowing.

Example 11
Grützmacher, *Daily Exercises for the Violoncello Op. 67*
New and revised Edition by Becker, p. 3

Example 12
Grützmacher, *Daily Exercises for the Violoncello Op. 67*
with explanatory notes
Revised and edited by Willeke, p. 2

Curiously, in the early Soviet-Russian facsimile reprint of Grützmacher’s Daily exercises published in 1924, the original indications of ‘messa di voce’ are present.

Example 13
Grützmacher, *Tägliche Übungen Op. 67*
Moskau: Muzsektor Gosizdat, 1924, p. 2
Example 14

Spohr, *Grand Violin School*, p. 111

The ‘*messa di voce*’ effect, that is singing or playing of a long note so that it begins quietly, swells to full volume, and then diminishes to the original quiet tone (*piano – cresc. – forte – dim. – piano*) can be successfully used as an expressive effect, for instance, on the long notes in the Andante variations (*Variations on a Rococo theme*: Variations III, V and VII, version ‘A’). Moreover this particular effect might be applied while the bow is changing direction (see Examples 14 and 15), for instance, in the 3rd and 4th measures, Variation VII, Andante sostenuto, Cantabile (version ‘A’): *mf – cresc. – forte – dim. – mf*.

Example 15

Variation VII (version ‘A’)

Manuscript copy of the violoncello part, fund 88 № 97 b

The ‘*messa di voce*’ effect undoubtedly brings about a better quality of sound production and formation of its timbre. The vibrato effect can be added to enliven the sound in a more singing, or melodic way. However, we must remember that not all long notes should be executed in such a manner. This effect should be left to the performer’s discretion and taste.

It is known that at the Moscow Conservatory Fitzenhagen and Jan Hřímalý, one of his colleagues and chamber music partners, demanded from their students ‘*the most serious attitude, especially to the execution of details*’. 

As mentioned above, we propose to consider the traditions of the leading European instrumental schools. Numerous indications by Fitzenhagen correspond to Louis Spohr’s ‘refined style’\(^\text{94}\) in which precision of performance, feeling and elegance converge. Spohr instructs the performer on how to complement the composer’s ideas by adding his own spirit. The listener is therefore given the opportunity to comprehend all of the composer’s intentions and, accordingly, acquire a better understanding of the composition. In Spohr’s *Grand Violin School*, Third Part, Chapter XXI, *On Delivery or Style in General* we read:

Style is the manner in which the Singer or Player performs that which is invented and noted down by the Composer. If it be confined to a faithful delivery of that written down by notes, signs, or words of art, it is called a *correct style* or *delivery*; if the performer however adds of his own, and if he be capable of intellectually animating the subject so that the hearer may discover and participate in the intentions of the composer, it is called a *fine style*, in which correctness, sentiment, and elegance are united.

Spohr continues:

Fine style is however confined within certain limits. The capability of discerning the character of the musical piece elevates the *correct* to the *fine* Style and enables the performer to participate in the sentiment displayed, and reproduce it; this is a gift of nature, which may be strengthened & improved, but cannot be taught.

A correct style or delivery requires; perfect intonation, exact division of the notes in a bar, according to their duration, a strict observance of time, of light and of shade, an also of the different kinds of bowing, slurs, double turns, shake &c.

A fine style or delivery requires besides the preceding the following technical expedients:

1\(^{\text{st}}\) The finer shades of the management of the bow, as regards the character of tone; viz.: strong, even, rough, soft, fluty, or, in the accentuation and separation of Musical phrases (see Examples 8, 15);

2\(^{\text{nd}}\) The artificial shifts which are not used merely on account of any easier mode of placing, but for expression and tone, to which belongs also the gliding from one note to another, and the changing of the finger on the same, tone;

3\(^{\text{rd}}\) The tremolo in its four degrees;
The increasing of time in furious, impetuous, and passionate passages, as well as the retarding of such as have a tender, doleful, or melancholy character.

But all these means of expression lead to fine style or delivery only when good taste watches over their application, and when the soul of the performer guides the bow and animates the finger. When, therefore, the scholar is so far advanced, as in some measure to command the mechanism of playing, it will then be time to cultivate his taste and to awaken his sensibility. The best way probably is to let him often hear good music and distinguished singers and performers, pointing out to him the beauty of the composition as well as the method used by the singer or performer to heighten the expression and give effect to the piece.95

We should remember that Fitzenhagen, like all his contemporary string players, used nothing but gut strings. On his violoncello we can clearly see that there were no fine tuners (see Photo 1, 2 and 3). It is obvious that the cellist had two metal overwound low gut strings and the two top open gut strings. It should also be mentioned that in the 19th to early 20th century, as in previous times, the use of an endpin was not standardised. During his training years, the young Fitzenhagen had been using a small wooden stick that was customary for young students who practised on large instruments (see Photo 1). In 1900, Louis Abbiate writes in his Method:

Nowadays, the manner of holding the cello has not changed, except for the function of an endpin that is made for the instrument support, therefore has a double advantage of facilitating the instrument retention and giving bigger sonority. Nevertheless, we recommend to the student, when he or she will have a good hold of the instrument with endpin, to get used to do so without it, which will give him the classic hold rectification.96 (see Photo 4)

At the beginning of his professorship at the Moscow Conservatory in 1870, Fitzenhagen played on a cello without an endpin, as we can see from a photo taken shortly after his arrival in Moscow (see Photo 2). Later he returned to the use the endpin, rather for convenience, but possibly in connection with the established performing traditions, as evidenced by another photograph dated 1888 (see Photo 3).
Photo 1
Wilhelm Fitzenhagen with his mother
c. 1855 – 1858
courtesy of A. Polyak
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo 2</th>
<th>Photo 3</th>
<th>Photo 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| K.F.W. Fitzenhagen, c. 1870  
Photo from the family archive  
(courtesy of A. Polyak) | K.F.W. Fitzenhagen, 1888  
Photo from the Russian National Museum of Music, Moscow, Russia | Abbiate, Louis (1866-1933).  
Tenue générale du violoncelliste  
1900 |
The title page of the *Piano-cello* score manuscript stipulates that the *Variations* can be accompanied by an orchestra or by a fortepiano (see Appendix I, Facsimile of the title pages). This implies the Haydn-Mozart type of orchestration (2 flutes, 2 oboes, 2 clarinets, 2 bassoons, 2 horns and strings). Concerning the fortepiano, we should point out that ‘*Tchaikovsky and his teacher and mentor, Anton Rubinstein, both praised the singing tone and powerful sound of Jacob Becker’s [fortepianos].’

In February 1877, Tchaikovsky wrote from Moscow to his sister, Alexandra Davydova:

*Last week I received a wonderful present from Becker, the well-known piano manufacturer, viz. a new excellent piano. [На прошлой неделе я получил от Беккера, известного фортепьянного фабриканта, великолепный подарок, т. е. новый превосходный рояль.]*

Tchaikovsky received at least two fortepianos from Jacob Becker’s firm. The second piano was given to him in 1885. We can admire this parlour grand piano in Tchaikovsky’s living room at his house in Klin.
4. Conclusion

The main purpose of this study is to highlight the positive aspects of the collaboration between Tchaikovsky and Fitzenhagen, especially against the background of the mid-20th-century mainstream Soviet musicological criticism on which, to our knowledge, all previous research is based.

We concluded that, with the composer’s consent, Fitzenhagen took part in the initial process of the Variations’ creation as well as its editing and publication. Fitzenhagen proposed to help Tchaikovsky with the publication of the Variations abroad with Friedrich Luckhardt in Berlin, and not with Franz Ernest Christophe Leuckart in Leipzig as it erroneously mentioned in all modern musicological sources.

There are four existing contemporary manuscripts of the Variations: the very primary source that is Tchaikovsky’s Piano-cello score with Fitzenhagen’s remarks inked and pencilled directly into the score, the full orchestral score and the manuscript copy of the aforementioned Piano-cello score to which a separately written out violoncello – solo part was added.

It is of importance to state that Fitzenhagen participated in the preparation of two fully edited versions of the Variations: Version ‘A’ (Tchaikovsky-Fitzenhagen initial eight variations set) and Version ‘B’ (Fitzenhagen’s personal arrangement). Additionally, we should keep in mind that the ‘A’ version was always present in ink as basis of the text in three clean master manuscripts. Nevertheless Jurgenson, disregarding his own ‘complaints’, published the ‘B’ version that was pencilled in by Fitzenhagen.

Fitzenhagen was one of the founders of the Russian violoncello school in Moscow. His lineage of cello playing came through the Dresden cellist Friedrich Wilhelm Ludwig Grützmacher. We can see similarities in their approach of musical text treatment. Grützmacher and Fitzenhagen give various performance indications that are still relevant today and therefore useful for students, professional musicians and amateurs. The precision with which the manuscripts and the scores were edited is remarkable.103

Recent approaches to performance practice brought back the interest in exercising techniques employed by cellists throughout the 19th century. This revival of cello playing methods and instructions that emphasise refined style and freedom of
expression is nowadays shared by many leading performance practice specialists. We embrace this approach, and further agree with musicologists such as Polina Vaidman, Tatyana Gaidamovich and Lev Ginsburg with regard to inviting performers to decide for themselves on their preference for one version of the Variations or another by acknowledging, as we concluded in this study, that both versions are legitimate.

In turn we would like to recommend using the manuscripts and publications from Tchaikovsky’s lifetime, i.e. the full orchestral score and Jurgenson’s first edition, in addition to the manuscript copies of the Piano-cello score and cello-solo part (Fund 88 № 97 a & b). These essential and significant reference documents are published here for the first time. Ideally, the facsimile versions of all of Tchaikovsky’s and Fitzenhagen’s manuscripts, especially the hand-written copies of the aforementioned documents, should be included in a much-needed new critical edition of the Variations on the Rococo theme, Op. 33. Taking into consideration that the facsimile of the Piano-violoncello score is perfectly legible and clearly written in modern notation, we believe that there is no real necessity to re-notate the score in modern typeset. From our point of view the modern editions that contain numerous subjective changes to Fitzenhagen’s original fingerings, articulation and dynamics are not conducive to a clear perception of the original musical project.

Finally, we would like to highlight our own perspective as performers in the recording with Claire Chevallier (Passacaille Label №1047) in which we focus on all the performance details that are suggested by Tchaikovsky and Fitzenhagen in the Variations’ manuscripts.
### APPENDIX I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kubatsky, V.</th>
<th>Yampolsky, I.</th>
<th>Stogorsky, A.</th>
<th>Dobrokhotov, B.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>22 February 1950:</strong> presentation at the Gnessin Institute, mentioned in Alexandr Stogorsky (ed.): ‘Variations on a Rococo theme Op. 33,’ violoncello and fortepiano version (Moscow: Muzgiz, 1954), p. 3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | | **1973:** Stogorsky (ed.): ‘Variations on a Rococo theme,’ prefaces to ‘Authorized’ cello and piano version and to ‘Composer’s
version’ of the Orchestral Score (Moscow: Muzyka, 1973).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Four mid-20th-century key sources of negative critiques on Fitzenhagen’s contribution</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Tchaikovsky’s *Variations on a Rococo theme Op. 33*  
for the Violoncello – Solo with accompaniment of orchestra or piano  
*Articles, presentations, prefaces*  
(Note that most of the 20th-century research is based on these sources) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurgenson’s first edition of the Variations’ and Piano-cello score (1878)</th>
<th>Jurgenson’s second edition of the Variations’ Piano-cello score (1879)</th>
<th>Jurgenson’s third edition of the Variations’ Piano-cello score (c. 1898)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Table 2 a.**  
19th-century P. Jurgenson’s Editions
Table 2 b.
Jurgenson’s editions of the orchestral parts, plates № 3330 (ca. 1889-1891)
and
the full orchestral score, plates № 13791 (ca. 1905-1911)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund 88 № 342</th>
<th>Fund 88 № 96</th>
<th>Fund 88 № 97 a</th>
<th>Fund 88 № 97 b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tchaikovsky’s and Fitzenhagen’s handwriting</td>
<td>Tchaikovsky’s and Fitzenhagen’s handwriting</td>
<td>Clean manuscript copy</td>
<td>Clean manuscript copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘rough copy’ of cello and piano part or ‘working’ manuscript</td>
<td>clean</td>
<td>Piano part (<em>Piano-cello score</em>) created from the manuscripts funds 88 № 342 and № 96</td>
<td>‘Violoncelle-Solo’ part created from the manuscripts funds 88 № 342 and № 96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title page</strong></td>
<td><strong>Title page</strong></td>
<td><strong>Title page</strong></td>
<td><strong>Title page</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Mr. Guillaume Fitzenhagen</td>
<td>A Mr. Guillaume Fitzenhagen</td>
<td>note that handwriting differs from fund 88 № 97 b</td>
<td>note that handwriting differs from fund 88 № 97 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variations sur un thème rococo pour le Violoncelle avec <em>accompagnement d’orchestre</em></td>
<td>Variations sur un thème rococo pour le Violoncelle avec <em>accompagnement d’orchestre ou de piano</em></td>
<td>A Mr. Guillaume Fitzenhagen <em>Professeur au Conservatoire de musique à Moscou</em></td>
<td>A Mr. Guillaume Fitzenhagen <em>Professeur au Conservatoire de musique à Moscou</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>par P. Tchaikovsky (<em>Op. 33</em>)</td>
<td>par P. Tchaikovsky (<em>Op. 33</em>)</td>
<td>Variations sur un thème rococo pour le Violoncelle avec accompagnement d’orchestre <em>ou de Piano</em></td>
<td>Variations sur un thème rococo pour le Violoncelle avec accompagnement d’orchestre <em>ou de Piano</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>par P. Tchaikovsky <em>Op. 33</em></td>
<td>par P. Tchaikovsky Op. 33 <em>Piano</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Violoncelle – Solo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version ‘B’ indications N/A</td>
<td>inked and pencilled in nuances;</td>
<td>with pencilled in indications for Version ‘B’</td>
<td>Version B indications N/A (see the Piano-cello score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tchaikovsky’s inked-in nuances</td>
<td>Fitzenhagen’s pencilled-in nuances, cuts; inked-in corrections, wax sealed inserts written out on manuscript paper</td>
<td></td>
<td>Variation VIII – 32 measures from the beginning are crossed out (pencil)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Available electronic resource:**

**Currently available manuscript source:**

**Electronic resource:**
currently N/A

**Electronic resource:**
Currently available manuscript source:

See Appendix II
(see the Piano-cello score)

**104**

**Variation VIII – 32 measures from the beginning are crossed out (pencil)**

**Available electronic resource:**

**Currently available manuscript source:**

**Electronic resource:**
currently N/A

**Electronic resource:**
Currently available manuscript source:

See Appendix II
(see the Piano-cello score)

**105**

**Copied mostly from manuscript fund 88 № 342, except for Variation IV and V. Variations IV and V copied from the fund 88 № 96 (violoncello-solo stave)**

**Tchaikovsky’s and Fitzenhagen’s handwriting**

**Tchaikovsky’s and Fitzenhagen’s handwriting**

**Copied mostly from manuscript fund 88 № 96 (violoncello-solo stave)**

**Copied mostly from manuscript fund 88 № 96 (violoncello-solo stave)**

**Page 1**
Solo with piano accompaniment manuscript paper (9 staves)

**Page 1**
Solo with piano accompaniment manuscript paper (12 staves)

**Page 1**
Solo manuscript paper (12 staves)

**Page 1**
Solo manuscript paper (12 staves)
### Table 3

**Four available manuscripts of the *Variations on a Rococo theme Op. 33***

Russian National Museum of Music, Fund 88 №№ 96, 97 a and b, 342
Two Versions of the ‘Variations on a Rococo theme,’ Op. 33
Version ‘A’ – Tchaikovsky and Fitzenhagen collaboration
Version ‘B’ with Fitzenhagen’s amendments
Arrows indicate rearrangement of the Variation’s particular movements and fragments

Facsimile of the title pages
Variations sur un thème rococo pour le Violoncelle avec accompagnement d’orchestre ou de Piano par P. Tchaikovsky Op. 33
Piano-cello score and Violoncelle-Solo part
Russian National Museum of Music, Fund 88 № 97 a and b
APPENDIX II

The full text of Fitzenhagen’s letter to Tchaikovsky appear here in print for the first time.
The letter is preserved in the Tchaikovsky’s Memorial House – Museum in Klin, Russia.  

Facsimile of Fitzenhagen’s letter manuscript (excerpt) 
Preserved in the Tchaikovsky’s Memorial House – Museum in Klin, Russia.
My dear Friend!

Just back from the Wiesbaden Musikfest, I have the great joy of informing you that I made a great impression with your Cello Variations. I pleased the public so much that I was called back three times and even received stormy applause during the piece, after the andante in D minor. Liszt said to me ‘I admire you, you played superbly’, and of your composition he said, ‘at last some real music again’, surely the greatest compliment Liszt could make to you. I can foresee that I will have the greatest possible success with this piece everywhere and will therefore keep it always in my repertoire as a bravura piece. I have surpassed all cellists with it. Everyone says that nobody else can play it like me. Fr. Grützmacher, B. Cossmann and J. de Swert all attended my performance. I’m delighted, dear friend, to be able to tell you this and my only regret was that you were not in Wiesbaden. H. v. Bülow played your piano concerto in the first concert. Here the second and third movements were appreciated more than in Moscow. Bülow played very well, yet not as beautifully as our friend Nicolai Rubinstein. Bülow got lost twice in the first movement and at the end was only recalled for one bow. As you can imagine you were spoken about frequently during the festival and it goes without saying that I recommended all your works to all virtuosi, violinists as well as pianists. You are generally held in high esteem in Germany. I gave Liszt the piano reduction of Eugene Onegin and he will arrange some paraphrases or fantasies for solo piano from the opera.¹¹⁰

My dear friend, you must soon compose a cello concerto for me! I will again stand by your side with advice and help and would be very happy if you would satisfy my wish at last. Raff has also finished a second cello concerto but I have not yet seen it. Think of me from time to time, and when you find time and the Muse inspires you, write a few more pages.

Your sincerely devoted friend,

W. Fitzenhagen

My address is: Seesen am Harz.

(translated from the German by Charles Zebley)
Facsimile of Fitzenhagen’s compositions manuscript (first page)\textsuperscript{111}

Russian National Museum of Music, Fitzenhagen’s Personal Fund 549-5
Written on Moscow’s Musical Circle stationery paper
Printing house & lithography N.I. Kumanin
Handwriting comparison

**Facsimile of the title page (excerpt)**
Variations sur un thème rococo pour le Violoncelle avec accompagnement d’orchestre ou de Piano
par P. Tchaikovsky Op. 33, *Piano-cello score*
Manuscript Fund 88 № 97 a, preserved in the Russian National Museum of Music

**Facsimile of Fitzenhagen’s compositions manuscript (first page excerpt)**
Russian National Museum of Music, Moscow, Fitzenhagen’s Personal Fund 549-5
Facsimile of Fitzenhagen’s Cadenza for
K. Eckert Violoncello Concerto Op. 26 in D minor
Vladimir Nabokov,  
‘Lolita’

| ‘On the *opposite* bank, at least a thousand paces away (if one cold walk across water), I could make out the tiny figures of two men working like beavers on their stretch of shore.’ | ‘На противном берегу, по крайней мере в тысяче шагах от нас (если бы можно было шагать по воде), я различал крошеные силуэты двух человек, усердно работавших на своем куске берега.’ |

---

**Vladimir Nabokov**

One of the interpretations of the Russian word ‘противный’, meaning ‘*opposite*’.
APPENDIX III

   Violoncelle – Solo part
   First edition, plates № 3331

   Piano-cello score – Discrepancies
   First edition, plates № 3331

   Piano-cello score – Discrepancies
   Second edition, plates № 3331
A.-Maurice Guillaume Fitzerhagen.

VARIATIONS SUR UN THEME ROCOCO


THÉMA

Tempo della Théma.

VAR I

Propriété de l'éditeur pour tous les pays 3331

P. Jurgenson à Moscou
Allegro moderato

VAR V

[Cadenza]

a tempo

p a piacere
Variations on a Rococo theme, Op. 33 (Version ‘B’)
Violoncelle – Solo part
First edition, plates № 3331
AUGUSTE GUILLAUME FITZENHAGEN

Professeur au Conservatoire de musique
a MOSCOU.

VARIATIONS

SUR UN THÈME ROCOCO

POUR LE

VIO LonCelle

avec accompagnement d’orchestre
OU DE

PIANO

par

P. TSCHAIKOVSKI

Op. 33.

Préparé par l’auteur.

MOSCOU chez P. JURGENSON
St.-Pétersbourg chez J. JURGENSON.
Voronein chez C. Donnewald.

N° 9931
Variations on a Rococo theme, Op. 33
First Edition, P. Jurgenson 1878
Plates № 3331
Discrepancies
A. M. Guillaume Fitzenhagen
Professeur au Conservatoire de musique
à MOSCOU.

VARIATIONS
sur un thème rococo
pour le
VIOLONCELLE
avec accompagnement d’orchestre
ou de
PIANO
par
P. TCHAIKOVSKY

Op. 33. 1 R. 80 c.

Propriété de l’éditeur
MOSCOU CHEZ P. JURGENSON

DÉPÔTS
SPETERBORG, VARSOVIE
Chez Jurgenson, C. Sennewald

IMPR. P. JURGENSON
N° 3931.
Variations on a Rococo theme, Op. 33
Second edition, P. Jurgenson 1879
Plates № 3331
Discrepancies
Fitzenhagen, Karl Friedrich Wilhelm (1848–1890) was a prominent German violoncello player. He was one of the founders of the Russian violoncello school in Moscow together with Davydov, Karl in Saint Petersburg. He was engaged by the Imperial Russian Musical Society as a soloist, chamber music player and professor at the Moscow conservatory (1870 – 1890). Fitzenhagen was also known as a composer, music director and editor, and he was the musical director of the Moscow Music Circle from February 1885.


2 Note that, instead of terms ‘piano reduction or arrangement’ (Klavierauszug in German), we use here more precise definitions such as ‘fortepiano-violoncello score,’ ‘Piano-cello score,’ ‘violoncello-solo’ part as well as indications such as ‘Piano’ and ‘Violoncello-Solo,’ the latter are present on the title pages of the manuscript Fund 88 № 97 a and b (for further explanation see the Conclusion chapter below).

Becker, J., Saint Petersburg, 1875, serial № 8333, length 212cm, 2 pedals: una corda and sustaining pedal, 7 octaves A-A, Claire Chevallier’s piano collection: www.clairechevallier.com.

3 30 November in the Julian calendar that was in use in Russia until 14 February 1918, the Julian calendar dates are indicated further as ‘Old Style’ [O.S.], http://en.tchaikovsky-research.net/pages/Project:Old_Style_and_New_Style_Dates


6 Fitzenhagen’s own list of compositions comprises 64 opuses and 40 transcriptions, including four violoncello concertos, solos, pieces, studies, etc. See also Appendix II: Facsimile of Fitzenhagen’s compositions; Fitzenhagen’s personal list of compositions online (reviewed 07.03.2019).

Anatoly Brandukov (1859–1930). Russian and Soviet cellist, teacher and composer, Tchaikovsky’s close friend. Studied at the Moscow Conservatory in the cello class of Fitzenhagen and in Tchaikovsky’s harmony and instrumentation classes.


Note that in Poznansky and Langston, *The Tchaikovsky Handbook*, on p. X – Abbreviations and p. 203, there are discrepancies between two of Tchaikovsky’s works compendiums published in the year 1958. For instance, the undated visit was mentioned in Dombayev, *Creative work*, p. 472, and not in the ‘MNC’, viz. Tchaikovsky’s Musical Heritage: From the history of his compositions (Moscow: the Academy of Science USSR, 1958), pp. 320-322. [Музыкальное наследие Чайковского: Из истории его произведений (Москва: АН СССР, 1958), сс. 320-322.]; Note also that if we compare the so-called Urtext edition (Brown, Wallfisch and York (as editors), *Variations on a Rococo theme*) with the analysed above manuscripts it becomes clear that the edition does not fully correspond to the ‘Urtext ’definition.


14 Brown, Wallfisch and York, *Variations on a Rococo theme*, p. V;

See also:
http://en.tchaikovsky-research.net/pages/Variations_on_a_Rococo_Theme

15 7 December [O.S.].

16 The first performance in Moscow.

17 Poplavsky, Yulian (1871 - 1958) studied the cello at the Moscow Conservatory with Fitzenhagen and Alfred von Glenn (graduated in 1894). After 1917 lived in France; Poplavsky’s reminiscences, Tchaikovsky’s last days at Klin appeared for the first time in print in Moscow (October 1894) in the Artist magazine; see also: Yulian Poplavsky, Tchaikovsky’s Last Day at Klin, reminiscences about Tchaikovsky, 3rd edition (Moscow: Muzyka, 1979), p. 380. [Поплавский, Ю., Последний день Чайковского в Клину, воспоминания о Чайковском, 3-е изд., Москва: Музыка, 1979, с. 380.]

18 Today, Tchaikovsky’s Memorial House – Museum in Klin, Russia.

19 In connection with requests for composition of a cello concerto, it is interesting to read Fitzenhagen’s letter to Tchaikovsky (see Appendix II, Fitzenhagen’s letter to Tchaikovsky from Seesen am Harz, 13 June 1879); Dombayev, *Creative work*, p. 472; Poplavsky, *Last Day at Klin*, p. 380.

In Brown’s preface (Brown, Wallfisch and York, Variations on a Rococo theme, p. V.), the Russian word ‘противный’ translated as ‘wretched’); note that the word ‘противный’ can be interpreted differently, as ‘contradicting, disagree[able], resisting, opposite’, see https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/headwind; http://sbiblio.com/biblio/dict.aspx; See also Appendix II, Nabokov’s text example; Poznansky and Langston, The Tchaikovsky Handbook, p. 203; Kohlhase, Preface, Variations on a Rococo theme (2007), p. IV; Kohlhase (2010), p. 2; http://en.tchaikovsky-research.net/pages/Variations_on_a_Rococo_Theme ['Противный Фитценхаген! Он непременно желает твою виолончельную пьесу переделать, обвиолончелить и говорит, что ты ему дал полную мочь. Господи! Чайковский revu et corrigé par Fitzenhagen!!']

Handwritings of the ‘Piano’ and the ‘Violoncelle-Solo’ parts will be analysed in our future publications; see also Appendix II, Handwriting comparison.

The foundation date of the Russian National Museum of Music (formerly the Glinka Central State Museum of Musical Culture is 11 March 1912 [O.S.]. On that day, the Museum named after Nikolay Rubinstein, who was an eminent musician and one of the founders of the Moscow Conservatory, opened its doors next to the Conservatory library.

(see http://glinka.museum/en/)

(tthe italics are ours); Tchaikovsky’s correspondence with Pyotr Jurgenson in 2 volumes, Vol. II: 1886 – 1893 (Moscow: P. Jurgenson, 2013), p. 85. [Чайковский П. И., Юргенсон П. И., Переписка: в 2 т., Т. 2: 1886 – 1893 (Москва: П. Юргенсон, 2013), с. 85.]; see also the endnote 91 that accompanied this remark.


It is interesting to note that Fitzenhagen’s Concerto № 2 (Fantastique) Op. 4 in A minor begins with a Cadenza. Accordingly, we can see that the practice of featuring a Cadenza at the beginning of a piece was familiar to him.

The Valse-Scherzo Op. 34 in C major, version for violin and piano; Note that ‘The whereabouts of Tchaikovsky’s full orchestral score and piano arrangement manuscripts are unknown. A manuscript copy of the full orchestral score possibly written out by Iosif Kotek, and with tempo, dynamic and expressive markings added by Tchaikovsky, was sold at auction in Marburg, Germany, in 1979, and is now in a private collection. If Kotek had been solely responsible for the orchestration, then it follows that the full score of Tchaikovsky’s manuscript may never have existed.’, see: http://en.tchaikovsky-research.net/pages/Valse-Scherzo_Op_34#cite_note-note11-11. It is important to note that Friedrich
Luckhardt’s Edition House has never been mentioned in the current musicological works in connection with Tchaikovsky’s *Variations on a Rococo theme* Op. 33 and *Valse-Scherzo* Op. 34.

28 A number of Fitzenhagen’s opuses were published by Luckhardt in Cassel and in Berlin, see: Musikalisch-literarischer Monatsbericht, Verlag von Friedrich Hofmeister, Leipzig, 1876; http://www.hofmeister.rhul.ac.uk; Appendix II, Facsimile of Fitzenhagen’s compositions manuscript (first page).


33 Musikalisch-literarischer Monatsbericht, Verlag von Friedrich Hofmeister, Leipzig (http://www.hofmeister.rhul.ac.uk), September 1876, p. 218; January 1877, p.10; November 1877, p. 326.


36 26 February [O.S.]


38 Opuses 33 and 23 (see above); Note that in this letter the German publisher’s name is written in Russian, for the first time, in its closest phonetic equivalent for ‘Luckhardt’;

find the letter, which is translated and published with some common in our case discrepancies, here: http://en.tchaikovsky-research.net/pages/Letter 760.

39 5 April [O.S.]


41 ‘Leukhardt either Luckhardt or something?’ was Tchaikovsky’s remark (the italics are ours); *Tchaikovsky - Jurgenson*, Vol. I, p. 37 – 38.

42 Jurgenson’s plates № 3331, ‘Pour Violoncelle et Piano’ score and ‘Violoncello principale’ part (Note the way of naming these particular parts as they appear on Jurgenson’s printed title pages from the years 1889 - 1891 together with indications such as ‘Partition d’orchestre’ and ‘Parties d’orchestre’); the
Variations’ publication date is indicated in Jurgenson’s letter to Tchaikovsky, see: *Tchaikovsky – Jurgenson*, Vol. I, p. 70.

43 Version ‘B’ that was pencilled in the ‘Piano’ score and ‘Violoncelle-Solo’ part, Fund 88 № 97 a and b.

44 The first edition copies of the ‘Piano’ score and ‘Violoncelle-Solo’ part are kept at the Tchaikovsky’s Memorial House – Museum in Klin, Russia, library № 538.

45 22 December [O.S.]

46 Underlined by Tchaikovsky; Wilhelm (fr. Guillaume) Fitzenhagen; *Tchaikovsky - Jurgenson*, Vol. I, p. 80; Raaben, *Tchaikovsky’s works*, p. 58; see also:

http://en.tchaikovsky-research.net/pages/Letter_1014

47 The letter № 580 is kept at the Tchaikovsky’s Memorial House – Museum in Klin, Russia.

48 Seesen is a town and municipality in the district of Goslar, in Lower Saxony, Germany, Fitzenhagen’s birthplace; see also: http://www.stadtverwaltung-seesen.de/Tourismus/Sehenswertes/Seesens-ber%C3%BChmte-S%C3%B6hne/Louis-Spohr; https://www.stadtverwaltung-seesen.de/Tourismus/Sehenswertes/Seesens-ber%C3%BChmte-S%C3%B6hne/Heinrich-Steinweg

49 Translated by Charles Zebley.

50 Seven variations version.

51 Fund 88 №№ 96, 97 a and b.

52 However, it is very probable that in Moscow Fitzenhagen premiered the eight-variations version ‘A’. Note, that the handwritten orchestral parts are lost or still not discovered.


55 Tchaikovsky, *Complete Collected Works, Volume 30 Б and 55 Б*, edited by Kubatsky (1956); See also:


56 It is interesting to mention here that ‘the cellist Boris Dobrokhotov recounted that Kubatsky, the first performer of the sonata [by Shostakovich], after receiving the manuscript from Shostakovich introduced considerable changes into the cello part, including octave passages. Not everything went smoothly at the first rehearsals with the composer, and the cello part was further edited (evidently some of Kubatsky’s suggestions were eliminated)’, see Elizabeth Wilson,
The title of the four existing manuscripts is written in French. Note that in Poznansky and Langston’s *The Tchaikovsky Handbook*, p. 202, the title in French ‘Variations sur un thème rococo pour le violoncelle avec accompagnement d’orchestre ou de Piano par P. Tchaikovsky Op. 33’ is absent.

Raaben, Tchaikovsky’s works, p. 50 (see the footnote).


see also: http://www.vehi.net/brokgauz/

From Greek *makrón* (μακρόν) – ‘long or heavy’. A written or printed mark ‘¯’ used to indicate a long vowel in some languages, a stressed vowel in verse, or a strong beat in music; From Latin *breve* — ‘brief or short’. A written or printed mark ‘˘’ used to indicate a short or unstressed vowels or syllables as well as a weak beat in music. Note that Tchaikovsky in his library had M. Brodovsky’s, *Guide to versification*, [Бродовский, М., Руководство к стихосложению, Санкт-Петербург: Книгоиздательство Герман Гоппе, 1887], see also: Ada Aïnbinde, *Tchaikovsky’s personal library as the source of study of his creative biography*, Doctoral thesis, Gnessin Russian Music Academy, Music history department (Moscow, 2010) [Айнбиндер, А., Личная библиотека П.И. Чайковского как источник изучения его творческой биографии, Диссертация, Российская Академия Музыки им. Гнесиных, Кафедра истории музыки, Москва, 2010].


Here, we find inaccuracy in Tchaikovsky’s writing. In Jurgenson’s 1880 score of the Opera, the women’s chorus *Razgulyâlasia, razlivâlasia* (*Lustig ergiessen frei von dem Eise*) published under № 13 in the Third Act of the Opera, see: Glinka, *A Life for the Tsar* (1880), p. 226.

Idem.

Idem. (for German translation)


Idem., p. 19.


The bourrée was rather lively in manner and in duple meter, calling for lightness in performance (Rousseau, Türk) While the term bourrée does not appear in classic music as a title for a movement, the style was frequently used. The bourrée has a short upbeat and an articulation after the third beat of the measure, Ratner (1980), p. 13; *Bourrée* – old French dance from Auvergne, of merry but not very quick character. Its time signatures and rhythms are: 2/4, 4/4, 2/2. This dance underwent artistic treatment especially among composers of the 18th century (*Brockhaus and Efron*); See also *The Bourrée* chapter, Meredith Little and Natalie Jenne, *Dance and the Music of J.S. Bach* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1991), p. 35. We should note, however, that examples of ‘fast’ bourrées also exist (Dr. G. Kennaway’s remark).


15 February [O.S.]

Russian – ‘обвиолончелить’ that phonetically sounds as ‘obviolonchelit’ (i.e. make it more suitable for the violoncello); *Tchaikovsky - Jurgenson*, Vol. I (2011), p. 45.


Dolmetsch, (Eugène) Arnold (1858 - 1940). English instrument maker and pioneer in the revival of performances of early music on original instruments; Arnold Dolmetsch, *The interpretation of the music of the XVII and XVIII centuries revealed by contemporary evidence* (London: Novello, 1916), p. 22; Dolmetsch talks about François Couperin’s remark:

> Take great care not to alter the time of set pieces, and not to hold notes longer than their proper value. *Finally, form your playing on the good taste of to-day, which is without comparison purer than formerly, ‘L’art de toucher le Clavecin’ (1717), the italics are ours.*

Tchaikovsky - Jurgenson, Vol. II, p. 85, Letter № 679, Tchaikovsky to Jurgenson:

Maidanovo, 30 August / 11 September [O.S.] 1887

I am sending to you today a violoncello piece (‘Pezzo capriccioso’ for cello and orchestra Op. 62, S.I.), dedicated to Brandukov. Be so kind, send it to Fitzenhagen (i.e. not the full score, but with the piano) and ask him for me to look through the violoncello part and put in all sorts of indications and instructions of particular features (bold text and italics are ours). I have written the full score just in case, but I will not bother you whether you publish it or the parts; but with the piano, I will be very glad if you print it. This piece is the only fruit of my creative spirit from the whole summer.

Your,

P. Tchaikovsky

[Я высылаю тебе сегодня виолончельную пьесу, посвящённую Брандукову. Будь так добр, пошли её к Фитценхагену (т. е. не партитуру, а с фортепьяно) и попроси его от меня просмотреть виолончельную партию и выставить всяческие знаки и указания специального свойства. Партитуру я написал на всякий случай, но вовсе не буду приставать, что ты её или голоса издавал; а с фортепьяно очень буду рад, чтобы ты напечатал. Эта пьеса есть единственный плод моего творческого духа за все лето.

Твой,

П. Чайковский]
For an alternative translation of the letter see: http://en.tchaikovsky-
research.net/pages/Letter_3333

82 Clive Brown, Classical and Romantic Performing Practice 1750-1900 (Oxford
University Press, 1999); George Kennaway, Playing the Cello, 1780–1930,
(Ashgate Publishing Ltd., 2014); Valerie Walden, Bernhard Romberg: A Survey
of His Life, Work, and Contribution to the Art of Violoncello Performance, a
thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master
of Arts in Music University of Auckland, 1989; Walden, One Hundred Years of
Violoncello: A History of Technique and Performance Practice, 1740-1840
(Cambridge University Press, 2004).

125.

84 Romberg, A Complete Theoretical and Practical School for the Violoncello
(Boston: Oliver Ditson, c. 1880), p. 118.

85 Romberg, Méthode, p. 94 ; Romberg, School, p. 90.

86 Jean-Louis Duport, Essay on Fingering the Violoncello and on the Conduct of
the Bow, translated from the Original by Bishop (London: Messrs. R. Cocks &

87 Duport, Essai sur le doigté du violoncelle [Instruction of the Fingering and
Bowing of the Violoncello], Nouvelle Edition revue et corrigée par Lindner, A.,
Texte Français, Allemand et Anglais (Offenbach sur le Mein: chez Jean André,
1864), p. 141.

88 Idem.

89 ‘Messa di Voce’ (It.). Placing of the voice. Practice in bel canto of singing a
crescendo then a diminuendo on a held note. Not to be confused with ‘mezza
voce’. We should note that the ‘Mezza di voce’ effect remained a vocal ornament
well into the 20th century, see: The Oxford Dictionary of Music, Kennedy, M.,

90 Under stave indication is ‘G.B.’ – ‘mit ganzem Bogen’ or else ‘W. B.’– ‘with
the whole bow’.

91 Facsimile reprint of one of the earliest German editions, probably Kahnt,
Leipzig 1845 or 1891.

92 Czech violinist (1844 - 1915); known in Russia as Ivan Woyzeckhovich
Hřímalý (Grzhimali) [Иван Войцехович Гржимали]. In 1869 he was appointed
violin teacher at the Moscow Conservatory, where in 1874 he succeeded his
father-in-law Ferdinand Laub as professor of violin studies.
See: Tchaikovsky-research: Jan Hřímalý.

93 Ostrovskaya, From the Memories about the Moscow Conservatory (Moscow,

94 Spohr, Louis (1784 – 1859), lived in Seesen (Fitzenhagen’s birthplace) from
1786 to 1796, studied violin with the leader of the Brunswick orchestra and in
1802 with Franz Eck, who took him on a tour of Russia. A copy of the first edition of Spohr’s *Violinschule*, Originalausgabe, Haslinger, Wien (c.1832-1833) is preserved at the Russian State Library, Moscow; see also: Saponov, *Die russischen Tagebücher und Erinnerungen Richard Wagners, Ludwig Spohrs und Robert Schumanns* (Moscow, 2004).

95 Spohr, *Grand Violin School*, p. 179 – 180; Note that the orthography of the original English edition has been retained.

96 Louis Abbiate, *Nouvelle méthode de violoncelle*, théorique et pratique, en trois parties, contenant de nombreuses photographies explicatives, des extraits et des cadences des concertos les plus connus, et suivie d’une étude Symphonique par l’auteur (Paris : Enoch & Cie; London: Enoch & Sons, 1900): ‘Actuellement, la tenue n’a pas changé, sauf l’adjonction d’une pique faite pour soutenir l’instrument, qui a le double avantage de faciliter le maintien et de donner une sonorité plus grande. Néanmoins, nous recommandons à l’élève, quand il possédera bien la tenue de l’instrument avec pique, de s’habituer à s’en passer, ce qui lui donnera la correction de la tenue Classique’ (Voir la figure en tête de la *Méthode*), p. 12.

97 Fitzenhagen’s family member.

98 The Haydn-Mozart type of orchestra (2 flutes, 2 oboes, 2 clarinets, 2 bassoons, 2 horns and strings). However, it is not a wind instrument combination that is very usual for the classic music. Note that a combination that is more usual includes the trumpets and timpani. In Poznansky – Langston, *The Tchaikovsky Handbook*, p. 202, the fortepiano indication ‘pour le violoncelle avec accompagnement d’orchestre ou de Piano’ is absent. The title stipulates *Variations on a Rococo Theme for cello with small orchestra, Op. 33* (1876 –77). Tchaikovsky, however, does not mention the [forte]piano on the title page of the manuscript 88 № 342 (see Table 3) and there is no indication of a ‘small orchestra’ on any of the four manuscripts; in the *Thematic and Bibliographical Catalogue* (Jurgenson – Schott), p. 418, the piano accompaniment is also not mentioned. Indication of a ‘small orchestra’ mentioned in Brown’s book that was published in 2006, 2007, and reprinted in 2010, see: Brown, *Tchaikovsky* (2010), p. 128.

99 It is interesting to observe that we find the same orchestration as in Tchaikovsky’s Variations, also in Saint-Saëns’ Allegro appassionato in B minor, Op. 43 for cello solo and orchestra, 1873 (1875).

100 Russian firm of piano makers: Jakob Becker (1811 – 1879) founded a workshop in Saint Petersburg in 1841, 20 years later the firm was taken over by his brother Franz Davidovich, see: *Brockhaus and Efron* (1899); Anne Swartz, *Piano Makers in Russia in the Nineteenth Century* (Bethlehem: Lehigh University Press, 2014), p. 91;

See also:

Grützmacher, Friedrich Wilhelm Ludwig (1832 – 1903). German cellist and composer. In 1860, Rietz brought Grützmacher to the Dresden Hofkapelle. In 1864 he replaced Kummer as solo cellist. Later he was appointed as Kammervirtuos to the King of Saxony. He remained at Dresden for over 40 years, making frequent tours through Europe and Russia as a soloist and chamber music player, and becoming an esteemed and influential teacher. Alexanian, Becker, Fitzenhagen, Gérardy and Hegar were among his most notable pupils. In the most recent and complete work on Grützmacher, Kate Bennett Wadsworth wrote: ‘The broad outlines of Grützmacher’s career also place him at the heart of a 19th-century German musical tradition, referred to at the time as ‘classical,’ that included the musical circles of Mendelssohn, Schumann, and Brahms; see also: MacGregor, Grützmacher.


The first Soviet edition that represents Stogorsky’s contemporary editorial approach appeared in 1954.

The first Russian Fitzenhagen’s edition, Jurgenson, 1878.

For the rest of Fitzenhagen’s letters to Tchaikovsky see: Istomin, PhD thesis, 2019.

Liszt, Franz, Polonaise aus der Oper: Jewgeny Onegin, v. Tschaïkowsky, Hamburg, Rahter, Marz 1880; see http://www.hofmeister.rhul.ac.uk/2008/content/database/browse.html

See all the pages here: http://89.175.96.254:5556/entity/OBJECT/121711 (reference 06.03.2019)