

Chaikovski and Mrs. Rosa Newmarch Revisited

A Contribution to the Composer's Centennial Commemoration*

Alfred Boynton Stevenson

HERBERT WEINSTOCK WROTE in 1943 that although Chaikovski had been dead fifty years

no full-length biography of him has been written in English. For the English-speaking world the chief, almost sole source of information about [his] life has been Rosa Newmarch's condensation (first published in 1906) of Paul Juon's German translation of Modest Tchaikovsky's official biography of his brother.¹

*In this article, transliteration of Russian directly into English obeys the rules described in "Rimski-Korsakov in the Eastern United States," *IAMR*, 1990/1, 117.

Rimski-Korsakov visited America during his salad days. Chaikovski arrived in New York April 26, 1891, at the height of his glory. Already sixteen years earlier the world premiere of his first concerto in Boston October 25, 1875, had given America a unique 19th-century honor. The present extended critique of the first large body of Chaikovski literature in English does not derogate from the similarly unique importance of Mrs. Rosa Newmarch's publications.

Readers forewarned that Newmarch worked primarily from German or English translations of German will not expect to assess Newmarch's translations of Chaikovski's letters to his patroness of 1876-1878 by comparing them with Galina von Meck's which are now available in a volume edited by Edward Garden and Nigel Gotteri entitled *To my best friend* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).

¹Weinstock, *Tchaikovsky* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1943), p. vii. Modest Ilich Chaikovski, *Zhizn Petra Ilich Chaikovskogo po dokumentam, khranyashchimsya v Arkhiv imeni pokojnogo kompozitora v Klinu. V trekh tomakh* (Life of Peter Ilich Chaikovski according to documents stored in the Archives named for the deceased composer in Klin. In three volumes);

Except for the fact that Juon's translation was itself somewhat condensed, this is an accurate statement of Newmarch's accomplishment. Nonetheless, its truth and particularly its limits have been persistently ignored. Even Weinstock himself went on to invalidate it, portraying Newmarch as busily selecting, translating, and herself editing Russian text first hand.² A near half-century later today's other

the first volume passed the censors in Moscow November 11, 1900; the third volume April 6, 1902; the first of twenty-five installments had begun to appear as early as 1899—all dates Old Style.

(Abbreviation: *MICH*)

German abridgement of *MICH: Das Leben Peter Iljitsch Tschaiowsky's aus dem Russischen übersetzt von Paul Juon. In 2. Bänden*; installments dated 1901-1903. (Abbreviation: *Juon.*) The Moscow-Leipzig publishing house of P. Yurgenson (Germanized as Jürgenson) was responsible for both *MICH* and *Juon*. English abridgement of *Juon: Newmarch, The Life & Letters of Peter Ilich Tchaikovsky* (London: John Lane, The Bodley Head, 1906). (Abbreviation: *LL 1906.*)

²Weinstock, p. ix. Eminently deserving of a book-length biography in her own right, Rosa Harriet Newmarch (née Jeaffreson) (*b* Leamington, Warwickshire, Dec. 18, 1857; *d* Worthing, Apr. 9, 1940) dominated Grove Dictionary coverage of Russian composers from the second through the fifth edition.

Daughter of a physician, she married in 1883 the son of a clergyman, Henry Charles Newmarch (*d* 1927), by whom she had one son and one daughter. Concerning her education, the A. & C. Black annual *Who's Who* volumes that carried her biography from 1916 through the year of her death, classed it as received "chiefly at home." Her mother was the daughter of the

biographers have followed suit, crediting her with more than she actually did. Thus, Alexander Poznansky omitted all mention of Juon when he wrote in 1991:

the three-volume *Life* [of Chaikovsky] composed at the turn of the century by his brother Modest (available in English only in an abridged edition by Rosa Newmarch,



Yours very sincerely,

Rosa Newmarch

playwright James Kenney (1780–1849) profiled in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, xi, 8–9.

In *The Feminist Companion to Literature in English; Women Writers from the Middle Ages to the Present* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), 791, her two volumes of poetry, *Horae Amoris* (1903) and *Songs to a Singer* (1906) are mentioned—but not her two children. Her poem “My Birthday” published in the same year as her Chaikovsky magnum opus “expresses a female speaker’s dejection, which is only relieved by the arrival of her woman friend.”

published in 1906) remains one of our major sources of information and still exercises strong influence.³

Likewise David Brown, in his Chaikovsky bibliography for *The New Grove*, described her 1906 volume as an “Eng[lish] trans[lation], abridged,” of Modest’s *Life*. In the *The New Grove* Newmarch bibliography her book is listed not even as an abridgement, but as a “trans[lation] of M. Tchaikovsky.” So it is in *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart* ix (1961), 1423. This latter-day misstatement of Newmarch’s accomplishment is precisely the outcome she sought.

Juon goes unmentioned on her title-page: *The Life & Letters of Peter Ilich Tchaikovsky edited from the Russian with an introduction by Rosa Newmarch*. However ambiguous the meaning of “edited from the Russian” might be, she quite obviously hoped that the public would view her as both translator and editor, directly and independently at work on Russian text. Her eager audience in England and America⁴ would have been disappointed to read more correctly:

abridged English translation by Rosa Newmarch of the abridged German translation of Paul Juon, with infrequent reference to the Russian text and occasional insertion of extraneous material.

When she did mention Juon in her preface, it was solely to cite his translation as a precedent justifying her own having dared to abbreviate the Russian text.⁵ She overstated, however, when she added that her further condensation resulted from her having judged for herself whether or not to retain various portions of Russian text omitted by Juon.

If at the outset she may indeed have intended to work independently,⁶ her reliance on Juon very soon

³ *Tchaikovsky; The Quest for the Inner Man* (New York: Schirmer Books, 1991), p. xiv. Continuing demand for Newmarch’s 1906 book justified reprinting as recently as 1973.

⁴ *LL 1906*, p. viii. She considered the two publics as one. “Both in England and America [as of November, 1901] the public interest in Tchaikovsky seemed to be steadily increasing.” She excused omitting a mass of information concerning Russian musical life because the persons and places “were quite unknown to the English and American publics” and would not interest them.

⁵ *LL 1906*, p. ix. Close to acknowledging the truth at one point, she veered suddenly and spoke rather of “following these abridgements,” without identifying what abridgement besides Juon’s she had in mind.

⁶ From text omitted by Juon, she restored in the opening para-

became so great that in her version scarcely a word of Modest's Russian remained that had not already been selected by Juon.⁷ Even less did she justify her claim to have made a selection increasing what the composer had to say himself in proportion to what others had said about him.⁸ Equally false was her claim to have lessened confusion for Western readers by meticulously inserting New Style alongside Old Style dates. While attending so much to dual dating she allowed errors to creep in, sometimes even rearranging letters out of the sequence in which she found them in order to complement her errors.⁹ All these negatives make questionable the assurance she gave that for her—if not for her publisher and audience—"the simplest—and in many ways most satisfactory—course seemed at first to be the translation of the Russian edition in its entirety."¹⁰

graphs the statements that the composer's father was a self-owner and that he was, tautologically, "left a widower" after the death of his wife.

⁷ There are a few notable exceptions to this rule. See page 76.

⁸ *LL 1906*, p. ix. Newmarch misled her readers when she wrote: "the proportion of letters to the additional biographical matter is even greater in my version than in the German edition." An exact count is impossible to the extent that Newmarch combined letters similar in content, but the reduction she made of the number reproduced by Juon is approximately the same as the reduction she made of his entire text—about forty per cent. Juon had retained in whole or part all the approximately three thousand letters sampled by Modest, except for one or two (notably letter to P. Yurgenson [= Jürgensen], February 4, 1878, *MICH*, II, p. 105). The proportionate cuts Newmarch made outside the composer's letters and diaries were not limited to passages of third-person narrative. She also eliminated the lengthy résumés at the end of each season detailing the composer's professional undertakings, accomplishments, and critical ratings. They are autobiographical inasmuch as they were culled from his own records.

⁹ Examples: Letter to Modest concerning rehearsal of opera: September 13, 1868 (*MICH*, I, p. 298f; Juon, I, p. 171f); September 3/15, 1868 (*LL 1906* p. 94). Letter to Nadezhda Filaretovna from Venice: December 5, 1877 (*MICH*, II, p. 59; Juon, I, p. 416); December 3/15, 1877 (*LL 1906*, p. 242). Letter to Anatoli (Modest's twin) from Simaki: August 15, 1879 (*MICH*, II, p. 301; Juon, II, p. 55); August 18/30, 1879 (*LL 1906*, p. 350). Similarly, a performance of the Second Symphony is wrongly dated: January 16, 1873 (*MICH*, I, p. 402; Juon, I, p. 253); January 6/18, 1873 (*LL 1906*, p. 137).

¹⁰ *LL 1906*, p. viii. Newmarch said the only reason she did not choose the easy alternative of verbatim translation was that her English and American audiences would not be interested in local Russian particulars. This does not explain why she needed to suppress local American particulars. In New York the Knabe piano-makers tried by means of presents and extra services

Defects in her magnum opus (itemized in examples listed below) topple the widespread belief in her linguistic prowess prevalent at the time her book was ready to publish. What indeed were her Russian linguistic abilities? When Granville Bantock, then conductor of the Liverpool Orchestral Society went to meet Sibelius on his first arrival in England, December 1905, he found conversation impossible.

"Knowing that Rosa Newmarch was a fluent Russian linguist and an accomplished translator," he wrote, "I sought her aid, happily not in vain. How well I remember that eventful railway journey from Euston to Liverpool, during which we three were the sole occupants of the compartment . . . It was due to Rosa Newmarch's sympathetic understanding and tactful interest that this journey became the prelude to subsequent visits paid by Sibelius to England."¹¹

Her own account differed so essentially as to invalidate Bantock's testimony. She herself wrote:

the Bantocks invited me to meet [Sibelius] at their house at Mosely near Birmingham . . . I was put next to him at dinner with a vague idea that as nobody knew what language he spoke, a little Russian might come in handy. I had been long enough in Russia and over Finnish borders to know that the Finns were not too keen to speak the language of their big neighbor, but we soon effected a compromise: a sort of sandwich between French and German, to which looking over our correspondence which has lasted over thirty years, I found to my amusement we always adhered.¹²

Only a decade before Bantock's call upon her expertise, Newmarch knew so little Russian that it is doubtful that she knew even the alphabet. Witness a footnote appearing in the introduction to her

provided, through their representative, Ferdinand Mayer, to obligate Chaikovski to endorse their grand pianos as the best made in America. Chaikovski refused, saying he not only did not find them so, but found Steinway pianos indubitably better—despite the unpleasant treatment he had received from the Steinway representative. Newmarch had named Knabe, Mayer, and Steinway in other innocuous contexts, but here she substituted asterisks for the names of both companies, and Z for Mayer's. This she did on her own, ignoring Juon. She wanted no enemies. (*MICH*, III, p. 472f; Juon, II, p. 661f; *LL 1906*, p. 652f.)

¹¹ Newmarch, *Jean Sibelius* (Boston: C.C. Birchard, 1939), introduction by G. Bantock, p. 8.

¹² *Ibid.*, p. 16. She added that "Sibelius wrote chiefly in German, corresponding exclusively in French he found a little irksome" (p. 53). She received only one letter from him in English, January 3, 1919 (p. 54).

translation entitled *Borodin and Liszt*, published in London in 1895.¹³ The translation was of a French volume by Alfred Habets which bore the title: *Alexandre Borodine d'après la biographie et la correspondance publiées par M. Wladimir Stasoff* (Paris: Fischbacher, 1893).¹⁴ The footnote reads:

In writing the names of Korsakoff, Balakireff and Glazounoff, the Translator has adopted the termination most familiar to English readers; but on the authority of Monsieur Habets, Korsakow, Balakirew, etc., would be the correct orthography.¹⁵

Had she herself known the Russian alphabet at that time, she would at once have rejected Habets's Germanisms. Habets's own trip to Russia had taught him so little of the language that he had been forced to employ Russian students in Liège (including, he said, a former student of Borodin's) to translate the Russian for him.¹⁶

¹³Digby, Long & Co. issued the second edition in 1896. Other instances of the tendency to exaggerate Newmarch's accomplishments are the credits given her for having "produced" the Borodin and Liszt book (*The Times*, April 12, 1940), or having actually written it (*Entsiklopedicheski Muzykalny Slovar* [Encyclopedic Musical Dictionary], Moscow: 1966, Abbreviation: *EMS*); *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (Kassel, Abbreviation: *MGG*), 1961. *The Times*, London, April 12, 1940, erred additionally in dating the English publication 1889, as did still *The International Cyclopedia of Music and Musicians* (1985), p. 1505.

¹⁴See translator's and author's prefaces. Habets (1839-1908), Belgian mining engineer, was captivated by the Russian music he first heard performed at the 1878 Paris Exhibition. His enthusiasm was fed by a journey to Russia which he described in "Souvenir d'un Voyage en Russie: Impressions Musicales" (*Revue de Belgique*, 1885). When he learned through the Countess Mercy-Argenteau, arch-propagandist of Russian modern music, that Stasov had published biographical data concerning Borodin after his death in 1887, Habets wrote to Tsesar Kyui (Frenched as César Cui), presumably asking to publish Stasov's work in French. Kyui forwarded Habets's letter, urging Stasov to respond. The letter itself could not be found as of 1955. Stasov dated Kyui's envelope February 7, 1890 (Kyui, *Izbranye pisma* [Selected Letters], Compiling editor: N. L. Gusin, Leningrad: 1955, p. 584). In her preface to Habets, Newmarch acknowledged Kyui's *La Musique en Russie* (Paris: Fischbacher, 1880) as the source from which she drew the extended survey of Russian music which she provided there (pp. xxxvi and xxxix). Several years later she left a different impression with her interviewer from *The Musical Times* (London: April 1, 1911, p. 229), who did not mention Kyui in reporting that Newmarch's preface had "embodied the first general survey of Russian music," assigning 1896 instead of 1895 as date of publication.

¹⁵*Borodin and Liszt*, p. xxviii.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, p. lii: "A. Foniakoff . . . had been a pupil of Borodin's at St. Petersburg."

The Borodin project did bring Newmarch and Stasov together. It was Stasov who suggested that she learn Russian if she truly wished to explore the culture of his country. Having acquired "some knowledge" of the language, during the tedium of an illness—as she told an interviewer much later—she made a first visit to Russia in 1897, and worked "for a time" under the direction of Stasov at the Imperial Public Library in St. Petersburg.¹⁷ No person to be busied with teaching basic or intermediate Russian to a novice already in her fortieth year, Stasov, a world-renowned art, music, and literature savant, had already twice refused the directorship of the Library for fear of being drawn away from his own wide-ranging inquiries and championings.¹⁸ English, French, and German were therefore the languages they at first had in common.¹⁹

In 1896, the year before her arrival, Nikolai Dmitrievich Kashkin, who had been a fellow professor with Chaikovski at the Moscow Conservatory

¹⁷*The Musical Times* (London, April 1, 1911, p. 226); *The Times* (London, April 12, 1940). Even before Rosa Jeaffreson Newmarch was born a link with Stasov had been forged by her maternal uncle, Charles Lamb Kenney. In a publication of 1853 Kenney had appeared as co-translator from the French of an account of travels through Southern Russia by Anatoli Demidov, Prince of San Donato, who was Stasov's host during his stay in Florence where Mikhail Glinka addressed him in December of the same year—1853. (M.I. Glinka, *Pisma i dokumenty* [Letters and Documents], ed. V. Bogdanov-Berezovski, Moscow: State Music Publishers, 1953, pp. 468-470; *Dictionary of National Biography*, xi, p. 7. See also British Library Catalogue entries under "Demidov, Anatoly Nikolaevich, Prince di San Donato.")

¹⁸Gerald Abraham, Introduction to Florence Jonas's translation of *Selected Essays on Music* by Vladimir Vasilevich Stasov (London: Barrie & Rockliff, 1968), p. 8.

¹⁹Before the translation from the French already mentioned, Newmarch had translated the German biographical sketch, *Johannes Brahms*, by Hermann Deiters (English translation, with additions, London: T. F. Unwin, 1888). Stasov had studied foreign languages in childhood. He traveled to England in 1851 and thence to Italy where he catalogued Santini's magnificently diverse library in Rome. In 1854 at his own expense he published his catalogue at Florence under the title *L'Abbé Santini et sa collection musicale*, returning to Russia in the same year. In 1870 he donated his approximately 400 copies of Santini treasures to the St. Petersburg public library. Stasov's enthusiasm for things English and western European (witness his searching out foreign treasures for the Public Library and his urging of Shakespearean and Byronic subjects upon Russian composers) seems at odds with his fierce insistence that Russian art and music never stray from what he conceived to be "national." According to Newmarch, *The Russian Arts* (London: H.

and his long-time acquaintance, if not close personal friend, published what was heralded as the first book designed to supply the demand for a full-length biography of the composer.²⁰ (A large number of Kashkin's personal reminiscences were incorporated into the much larger compilation that Modest put together a few years later.) In 1897, crowded into the same year as her first arrival in Russia, Newmarch "published in *The Musician* a series of papers upon Tchaikovsky based upon" this little volume of Kashkin's.²¹ She began her biography of the composer published in 1900 (a book to be discussed extensively below) with these same "papers based on Kashkin," but now "almost completely written"—so she averred. Who helped her with the translation in 1897 and again in 1900 remains uncertain, but it is unlikely that the same person translated all quotations from Kashkin in view of the unevenness of workmanship which persisted in the second version of these papers published in 1900.²²

In *The Musical Standard* (London) during January and February of 1899 Newmarch presented Chaikovski as musical critic.²³ Her articles were based, she said, on "The Collected Writings of Peter Ilich Tchaikovsky, edited by G. A. Laroche, Moscow, 1898."²⁴ The Russian title is more descriptive: *Muzykalnye feletony i zametki Petra Iliche Chaikovskogo (1868–1876) s prilozheniem portreta, avtobiograficheskogo opisaniya puteshestviya zagranitsu v 1888 godu i predisloviya G. A. Larosha* ("Music articles and notes by Peter Ilich Chaikovski [1868–1876] with the addition of a portrait, an

Jenkins, 1916), p. 261, Stasov on one occasion remarked: "If you strip a Russian of his nationality you leave a man several degrees inferior to other Europeans."

²⁰ *Vospominaniya o P. I. Chaikovskom* (Reminiscences relating to P. I. Chaikovski) (Moscow: 1896) (Abbreviation: VOS). The date Newmarch assigns to VOS is 1897 (*Tchaikovsky. His Life and Works, with extracts from his writings, and the diary of his tour abroad in 1888*, London: Grant Richards, 1900 [Abbreviation: TLW], p. vii).

²¹ TLW, p. viii. *The Musician*, A Registered Newspaper, lasted only 28 weekly issues according to *The New Grove*, xiv, 486, item 174.

²² The unevenness persists in Newmarch's publications through 1906. If she had helpers, they probably would have been others than her only daughter, Miss Elsie Newmarch, whom *The Times* (Apr. 12, 1940) described as having been her mother's "skilful helper in all her more recent undertakings."

²³ Jan. 14, p. 22f; Jan. 21, p. 36f; Jan. 28, p. 50f; Feb. 4, p. 66.

²⁴ *The Musical Standard*, Jan. 14, p. 22.

autobiographical description of his travel abroad in 1888, and a preface by G. A. Larosh").²⁵ An index of names appearing in the 390 pages of Russian text facilitates extracting all references to individual composers. The fruits of such extraction were being published in a very similar German abridged translation by Heinrich Stümcke at almost the same time as Newmarch's English abridgement.²⁶ Her inability to understand both the Russian text and the subject matter comes to light in such a crucial passage as the following Beethoven allusion.

In translating Larosh's quotation of Chaikovski, Newmarch wrote: "I am not disposed to proclaim the infallibility of *Beethoven's principles*, and without in any way denying his historic importance, I protest against the *insincerity* of an equal and indiscriminate laudation of his works [italics supplied]." The Russian says nothing about *Beethoven's principles*. Chaikovski objected to the *principle that Beethoven is infallible (ya ne raspolozhen provozglashat printsip Betkhovenskoi nepreshimosti)*. Moreover, he did not consider it *insincere* but *unjustifiable (protivnym pravde)* that every work of his elicit the same unconditional and uniform adulation.²⁷

²⁵ Abbreviation: MF.

²⁶ The imprint date is lacking in the volume: *Musikalische Erinnerungen und Feuilletons von Peter Tschaikowsky*. Im deutscher Übersetzung herausgegeben von Heinrich Stümcke (Berlin: Harmonie, Verlagsgesellschaft für Literatur und Kunst). The date of publication usually supplied is 1899, based on the foreword which reads: Berlin, January, 1899. Stümcke reversed Larosh's order, placing the diary of the 1887–88 tour ahead of the music articles. The German and English abridgements are of equal length, but the selection of musical opinion differs in emphasis. Newmarch's later translation of the diary shows some dependence on Stümcke's. See note 60, below.

²⁷ *The Musical Standard* (hereafter MS), Jan. 21, 1899, p. 57, reprinted without change in TLW, p. 124. MF, p. 11. In another Beethoven passage Newmarch makes the point that she is adhering strictly to the Russian text in the translation of one word she considers to be a misprint: "The rhythm of this theme [of the second movement of the Seventh Symphony], with its original [in the sense of unique] accent on the third beat of the bar, is maintained with wonderful skill throughout the entire movement." (MS, *idem*; TLW, pp. 129–134.) (*Ritm etoi temy, s originalnym aktsentom na tretei dole takta, vyderzhan c udivitelnyim masterstvom v techenie vsej pervoi chasti*. [MF, pp. 217–219]) This observation by Chaikovski made no sense to Newmarch. She appended a footnote: "I have printed this sentence as it appears in Russian, but I consider *third* evidently a misprint for *first*." Fortunately she did not simply make a silent correction.

Chaikovski combined Beethoven's two-beat measures into

Newmarch left off her series in *The Musical Standard*, hoping soon to complete her study with a supplementary paper on Chaikovsky's attitude toward the "New School of Russian Music."²⁸ Without lingering at this project, she began immediately to assemble for separate publication her *Tchaikovsky, his Life and Works; with extracts from his writings and the diary of his tour abroad in 1888*, which appeared in 1900 almost simultaneously with Iwan Knorr's German biography and the first volume of Modest's *Zhizn*.²⁹

Her book was in three parts. The first part was a rewrite of the biography she had published in *The Musician* based mainly on Kashkin's *Vospominaniya* with the addition of some quotations from "other and more recent sources." V. V. Berezovsky was the only one named, but Modest, himself, was also one.³⁰ The second part was a reprint from *The Musical Standard* of her presentation of Chaikovsky as a music critic—expanded a few pages by his comments of Russian composers in particular. All was drawn from the writings that Larosh had assembled in *Muzikalnye Feletony*. The Russian text of the third part—the diary, "now published for the first time in English"—was what she would have found as the concluding section of Larosh's collection.³¹ It was

larger two-measure groupings. To him, the *tenuto* on a first beat followed by two eighths on a second beat placed a natural accent on the next beat, even without the help of a bar-line. Similarly, the fact that he consistently referred to the movement as an Andante despite Beethoven's Allegretto marking seemed to her mere inadvertence—revealing nothing about Chaikovsky's perception. She substituted Allegretto in the text of her translation.

²⁸ Feb. 4, 1899, p. 68.

²⁹ In his review of Knorr's *Peter Iljitsch Tschaikowsky* (Berlin) Larosh observed that 1900 had been a fortunate year for Chaikovsky, so far as biographers were concerned—mentioning Newmarch among them. Knorr, a professor at Dr. Hoch's Conservatory in Frankfurt-am-Main (becoming its director in 1903), was born in West Prussia, lived many years in Russia, and knew the language well. (*Rossiia*, Dec. 12, 1900, Nr. 578, reprinted in Larosh, *Izbrannye stati* [Selected Articles], Vol. II [Leningrad: 1975], p. 331f).

³⁰ Newmarch referred to the critical opinion of Chaikovsky's music expressed in a single article, unnamed, by Berezovsky, author of *Russkaya Muzyka* (St. Petersburg: 1898). She also inserted a letter from the composer to his sister in advance of its appearance in the first bound volume of Modest's *Zhizn*. Before the approval of that volume by the censors, Modest had made at least six such letters available to Iwan Knorr to quote in his German biography (Knorr, pp. 26–30). Kashkin's volume does not contain any of these letters.

³¹ Larosh's heading: *Avtobiograficheskoe opisaniye puteshest-*

Modest she thanked for permission to republish the diary, but she spoke of the text as if it were a find that owed nothing to Larosh. She maintained this position in all future references to the diary.³²

When summarizing her effort in the assembly of the whole work she made great claims to independent research that her modesty did little to veil:

No one can be more conscious than myself of its shortcomings, and of the patchy nature of its construction. If it has not been altogether a case of making bricks without straw, at least the straw has been scattered on the four winds of journalism and has had to be gathered up in the by-ways of Russian musical literature.³³

She continued to build this image when she wrote in the preface to her 1906 volume:

In 1900 I published a volume . . . which was I believe the first attempt to embody in book form all the literature—scattered through the byways of Russian journalism—concerning the composer of the Pathetic Symphony.³⁴

Stasov, writing to Balakirev in the last year of his life, accepted wholeheartedly Newmarch's claim to have searched out by herself all that she had put together, but his confusion as to what publications he was talking about and what they actually contained make his acceptance very inconsequential.³⁵

Linguistic shortcomings of Newmarch's 1900 version of Kashkin (already alluded to above) appear in such passages as the following [italics supplied]:

viya zagrantsu v 1888 godu (An autobiographical description of travel abroad in 1888). The description actually begins in 1887. It had been published before in *Russki Vestnik* (Russian Herald), Moscow, 1894, No. 2, pp. 165–203, but Newmarch did not cite that publication as source for the Russian text here or elsewhere. In her article of Feb. 4, 1899, p. 66, in the *MS* series, Newmarch inserted Chaikovsky's sketch of Brahms, saying "I am now quoting from his journal abroad."

³² Modest printed extracts of the diary, citing Larosh, in his third volume of *Zhizn* published in 1902. In her 1906 version Newmarch suppressed all mention of *MF* where Modest cited *MF* by page number (*MICH*, III, p. 202; *MF*, p. 367; *LL 1906*, p. 541; *MICH*, III, p. 211; *MF*, p. 386; *LL 1906*, p. 546).

³³ *TLW*, p. viiif.

³⁴ *LL 1906*, p. vii.

³⁵ Stasov wrote to Balakirev Jan. 25, 1906, the same day he had received from London an advance copy of Newmarch's 1906 volume. He reported that he had already read and examined it. As he was doing so, he was unaware that the book was supposed to be a version of Modest's *Zhizn*. He thought that the diverse research claims which Newmarch had reiterated in describing her previous 1900 volume applied instead to her 1906

In 1867 Balakirev had succeeded Anton Rubinstein as conductor of the St. Petersburg Musical Society and *head of the Conservatoire*. He took advantage of the position to forward the interests of *the rising school of Russian composers*, and among them he included Tchaikovsky.³⁶

Kashkin's text is more accurately translated:

After A. G. Rubinstein left the Petersburg Musical Society and the Conservatory in 1867, M. A. Balakirev, in accordance with his instructions, was made the *conductor of the concerts* of the Society and led it for two seasons with great success, promoting especially the compositions of *young Russian composers*, including Chaikovski.³⁷

Apparently Newmarch, or her possible helper, read *dirizher kontsertov* as *direktor konservatorii*. Her "rising school" is a fabrication substituted for the single adjective *molodye* (young). Balakirev included Chaikovski in his programming as a "young" composer, but not as a member of the "rising school" that made up Balakirev's own special following.³⁸

The new material that Newmarch interwove with Kashkin presented like problems. These are exemplified by a letter written December 4, 1861, by the composer to his sister Aleksandra that Modest had made available to fellow biographers. The letter documents an important advance in Chaikovski's

decision to make music his single pursuit in life. The translation shows the problems caused by Newmarch's intuitive approach to Russian:

. . . I am only afraid of a want of purpose; perhaps idleness may take possession of me and I may not persevere. You know that I have powers and capacity, but I am ailing with *your* malady, which is called 'fragmentariness,' and if I do not *become enthusiastic over a thing*, I am easily done for.³⁹

Newmarch's misapprehensions (italicized words) include these:

your is a misreading of *toyu* (meaning *that*) as *troyu*. 'fragmentariness' is a misreading of *oblomovshchina* (meaning *sluggishness* or *laziness*, derived from the name of Goncharov's character, Oblomov) as a non-existent derivative of *oblomok* (meaning *fragment*).

become enthusiastic over a thing, is a misreading of *vostorzhestvuyu nad neyu* (meaning *triumph over it*) as *vostorgayus chom-nibud*.

Errors in *The Musical Standard* translation of Larosh extracts went still uncorrected in the 1900 version. Apart from the Beethoven passage already mentioned, Chaikovski's description of Brahms (in the new third section—the diary) also confused her: Chaikovski was struck by Brahms's very impressive bulk (*Brams—chelovek . . . ochen vnushitel'noi polnoty*). But for her this meant that Brahms "suggests a sort of amplitude."⁴⁰

Balakirev's Fifth Waltz
dedicated to Rosa Newmarch

This copy is reproduced from the Russian complete edition (by K. S. Sorokin) of Balakirev's piano works (*Polnoe sobranie sochineni dlya fortepiano*, vol. II, pp. 197–211. [Moscow–Leningrad: State Music Publishers, 1952]). Based on the first edition of 1903, it agrees fully with the autograph (p. [251]). The title-page of the first edition is in French: "A Madame Rosa Newmarch, *Sème Valse pour le piano par Mili Balakirev*, Jul. Heinr. Zimmermann, Leipzig–St. Petersburg–Moskau–London."

volume. He praised the new book, calling it the result of Newmarch's long years of labor and preparation which had now brought together for the benefit of all Europeans everything she could search out in Russian or any language concerning Chaikovski, whom, he said, "she especially deifies." At the same time that he praised the book for its comprehensiveness, he complained that he could not find in it or in the work of anyone else a description of the beautiful and close relations that had once existed between Balakirev and Chaikovski. In particular, he missed any reference to Balakirev's recommendation to Chaikovski of "Manfred," Balakirev's program for it, his letter, etc. There was no such omission, he had simply not read carefully what was there (Balakirev and Stasov, *Perepiska* [Correspondence], Compiling editor: A. A. Lyapunova; Indexing: I. A. Konopleva [Moscow: 1970], II, p. 240f). Balakirev replied that he had been told that Modest's book had reported all the things that Stasov had been looking for, and even more than Stasov had mentioned. It is noteworthy that neither of the correspondents had read Modest's book.

³⁶ *TLW*, p. 22.

³⁷ *VOS*, p. 62.

³⁸ Sundry peculiarities in transcribing proper names may be typographical errors: *Taistov* for *Testov* (*VOS*, pp. 107 and 109; *TLW*, p. 59) and *Zoeriev* for *Zver(i)ev* (*VOS*, p. 157; *TLW*, p. 109).

³⁹ *TLW*, p. 7; *MICH*, I, p. 147, Newmarch improved her translation of the second sentence in 1906 by omitting it, following Juon's good example. In rewriting, however, she botched the first sentence by leaving out the modal *may*. (*LL 1906*, p. 40; *Juon*, I, p. 73.)

⁴⁰ *TLW*, p. 185; *MF*, p. 367; *MICH*, III, p. 202n; *Juon*, II, p. 434n; *LL 1906*, p. 541n. When Newmarch first attempted this

ПЯТЫЙ ВАЛЬС

Vivo agitato [Живо, возбуждённо] (14/II 1903 г.)

p

poco riten.
pp

Tempo di valse (Poco meno mosso) [Темп вальса, немного медленнее]

p

poco ritenuto
pp

a tempo

p

pp

poco ritenuto

a tempo

pp

Cadenza
 L'istesso tempo [Tor me remu] animato
 mf Quasi recitato

a tempo animato

a tempo poco meno poco riten.

mf espressivo

animato

p leggiero

a tempo

pp

Allegretto scherzando [Довольно скоро, шуточно]

p

poco a poco agitato

p

più tranquillo

p

a tempo

p

poco riten.

a tempo poco meno
p sempre

più tranquillo

pp

ppp

Tempo I (Vivo agitato) [Темп I. Живо, возбужденно]

p

f

p

f

poco riten.
pp

Tempo di valze (come sopra) [Темп вальса (как выше)]

p

poco ritenuto
pp

a tempo

First system of musical notation on the left page, featuring a treble and bass clef with various notes and rests.

Second system of musical notation on the left page, continuing the piece with similar notation.

Third system of musical notation on the left page, showing melodic lines in both hands.

Fourth system of musical notation on the left page, with dynamic markings and phrasing slurs.

Fifth system of musical notation on the left page, featuring a steady rhythmic pattern.

Sixth system of musical notation on the left page, with a mix of eighth and sixteenth notes.

Seventh system of musical notation on the left page, showing a more active melodic line.

Eighth system of musical notation on the left page, with a consistent rhythmic accompaniment.

Ninth system of musical notation on the left page, featuring a dense texture of notes.

Tenth system of musical notation on the left page, concluding the section with a final cadence.

First system of musical notation on the right page, continuing from the left page.

Second system of musical notation on the right page, with a melodic flourish.

Third system of musical notation on the right page, marked *ff con fuoco*.

Fourth system of musical notation on the right page, showing a complex harmonic structure.

Fifth system of musical notation on the right page, with a driving rhythmic motif.

Sixth system of musical notation on the right page, featuring a series of chords.

Seventh system of musical notation on the right page, marked *Presto (очень быстро)*.

Eighth system of musical notation on the right page, with a rapid melodic line.

Ninth system of musical notation on the right page, showing a dense texture of notes.

Tenth system of musical notation on the right page, concluding the piece with a final chord.

In 1901 Newmarch revisited Russia. Those who greeted her had reason to thank her for what she had done during the previous year to promote Russian music not only by her publishing but also by her lecturing. Thus on April 20/May 3, 1900 Stasov had written to Balakirev that he had just received news from London of a *Russian* [his italics] concert where two of Balakirev's songs had met with huge success.⁴¹ He was referring to a concert-lecture—"The Art Songs of Balakirev"—which Newmarch supposedly had staged at Steinway Hall on April 14/26 [sic].⁴²

Therefore it was not an unappreciative Balakirev who responded to the invitation to come to an evening gathering at the Stasovs' May 11/24, 1901,⁴³ partly to honor the presence "of an English enthusiast for Russian music," as Newmarch described herself on that occasion. This was their first meeting. She was not yet speaking fluent Russian. There was no need to in Stasov's circle. Balakirev, dispensing with preliminaries, went to the piano, announced

sentence in *MS* (Feb. 4, 1899), she had the good sense to omit the phrase she did not understand. She was also correct when she wrote in her first version: "He certainly has not the features of a good-looking *German*." Mistakenly she wrote in her second version: "His features are certainly not characteristic of *Russian* good looks."

⁴¹ Balakirev and Stasov, *op. cit.*, I, p. 194. According to A. A. Lyapunova there were at least three songs: "*Slyshu li tvoi golos* (Do I hear your voice)," "*Vvedi menya o noch* (Bring me by night)," and "*Pridi ko mne* (Come to me)."

⁴² *Ibid.*, II, p. 342n. The dual date given in the Russian editorial note is impossible. There should be a difference of *thirteen* instead of *twelve* days in April 1900. Assuming that at least one of the dates is correct, the dual dating should read either 13/26 or 14/27. No such concert during April was mentioned in *The Musical Standard*, *The Musical World*, or *The Times*. On Wednesday afternoon, April 25, Mr. Theodore Field, baritone, and Miss Jessie Field, pianist, gave a joint recital under the direction of Mr. N. Vert at Steinway Hall. Three Hungarian Folk Songs arranged by Korbay were sung (*MS*, May 5, p. 280; *MW*, June 1, p. 399; and *The Times*, April 27, p. 12). In concurrent dual dates that Lyapunova supplied elsewhere, she correctly indicated a thirteen-day separation (Balakirev and Stasov, *op. cit.*, II, p. 332n 1). If the particulars from London were relayed solely through Stasov, error could well have extended beyond misdating (see note 35, above). Newmarch did not refer to such a concert-lecture in any of her publications relating to Balakirev.

⁴³ The date is recorded in Balakirev and Stasov, *op. cit.*, I, p. 23f and Newmarch, "Some Unpublished Letters of Balakirev," *The Chesterian*, London, New Series, No. 35, Dec. 1923 (abbreviation *SULB*), p. 75.

the three sonatas⁴⁴ he would play and proceeded without interruption. After that, "an inspiration on my part," wrote Newmarch, "to address him some remarks in *extremely ungrammatical Russian* [italics supplied] on the subject of his songs . . . sent him back to the piano, where he continued to converse with me, illustrating his words with examples."⁴⁵

When Balakirev departed, he believed the English lady to be an illiterate in Russian with whom he would only be able to correspond in formal French.⁴⁶ Just six months later, in November 1901, Petr Ivanovich Yurgenson = Jürgenson (1836-1904) invited Newmarch to undertake an English version of Modest's *Zhizn*, a year before the last volume was passed by the censors. Modest had not been Yurgenson's first choice to compile the documents stored at Klin. He accepted only after Kashkin had refused the mammoth job.⁴⁷ While Modest was yet at

⁴⁴ Besides Beethoven's "Appassionata" and Schumann's G Minor, which are not in dispute, Newmarch said Balakirev played Chopin's Sonata in B Minor (*The Russian Opera*, London: H. Jenkins, 1914, p. 200). Lyapunova has said more recently (1970) that the Chopin Sonata was in B Flat Minor, but her differing identification is doubtful because she also called this sonata Chopin's first (sic)—"*pervuyu [si-bemol minor]*" (Balakirev and Stasov, *op. cit.*, I, p. 23f).

⁴⁵ Newmarch, *The Russian Opera*, p. 199f. Newmarch printed at least four accounts of this event, each differing in minor detail. Besides the one just cited, see *Sammelbände der Internationalen Musik-Gesellschaft* (abbreviation *SIMG*), Leipzig, Vol. 4, Oct.-Dec., 1902, pp. 157-163, in French; "Mily Balakirev," *Musical World*, Feb. 1, 1903, pp. 22-25, English translation, in part, of the French; *SULB*, *loc. cit.* Where the 1914 version reads *extremely ungrammatical Russian*, the earlier French and English read *very bad Russian*. The version in *The Chesterian* does not comment on her skill.

⁴⁶ Balakirev wrote to Newmarch [Nov. 21/] Dec. 4, 1902, in French (obviously at dictation, she said) "before [he] found that he could write to [her] in Russian." He was thanking her for her article about him in *SIMG*. He hoped for a correction in her intended translation into English. "The first subject of the Overture [on a Spanish March-theme] is *my own*," he said. (*SULB*, p. 74f.) Stasov wrote to him Jan. 7/[20], 1903 to provide in his polyglot fashion Newmarch's "exactly and accurately written address: Madame Rose [sic] Newmarch, Londres, Campden Hill Square No. 52." Balakirev began to compose a waltz in her honor Jan. 9/[22], and finished it Feb. 14/[27]. (Balakirev and Stasov, *op. cit.*, pp. 217 and 332n.) His Leipzig publisher, Zimmermann, had it engraved and printed in the favored French manner while reverting to a German spelling of the composer's name: À Madame Rosa Newmarch 5ème Valse pour le Piano par Mili Balakirew.

⁴⁷ Kashkin's co-memorialist (*Na pamyat o P. I. Chaikovskom* [To the memory of P. I. Chaikovskii] of 1894, G. A. Larosh,

work, Yurgenson recruited Pavel Fedorovich Yuan (Paul Juon in German) to make a concurrent German translation, which he completed—very slightly abridged—in 1903.⁴⁸

Juon was eminently qualified. Born in Moscow March 8, 1872 (*d* Vevey, Switzerland August 21, 1940) of a transplanted Swiss family, he had studied violin under Johann Hřimaly and composition under A. S. Arenski and S. I. Taneev (both advisees of Chaikovski) at the Imperial Moscow Conservatory, beginning in 1889. In the winter of 1893–94 he had furthered his studies in Berlin, winning the Mendelssohn Prize there in 1894–95. He had returned to Russia in 1896 where he assumed his first post, teaching violin and theory at the Baku Municipal Conservatory. In 1897 he had decided to reside permanently in Berlin where he won great distinction as composer, teacher of composition, and author of textbooks on harmony and counterpoint. Despite his long career in Germany, Soviets still claimed him as a Russian composer in 1966.⁴⁹

Newmarch's qualifications were as nothing in comparison, but knowing German well enough to have translated Hermann Deiters's *Johannes Brahms*,⁵⁰ she could count on Juon to guide her through the vast Russian thickets of Modest's *Zhizn*. When Yurgenson approached Newmarch, his negotiations with an American publisher had fallen through, and he hoped she might find an English substitute. Born at Reval (July 17, 1836), he died January 2, 1904, before the Englishing was completed.

By late 1905 Newmarch had finished what was in essence her version of Juon's Urtext—not of Modest's Russian. She failed to hold strictly to Juon on only these few occasions—when the text (1) dealt with a relationship that particularly intrigued her, (2) concerned some individual who was personally important to her, (3) derived from a source that she had quoted in another publication, or (4) for some other reason drew her random attention. The next section illustrates each of these categories.

(1) In Chaikovski's letter to Nadezhda Filaretovna written from Kamenka August 12, 1877, Newmarch

commendably retained part of the opening 31 lines of Russian (reduced to 18 in English) in which the composer reviewed and agreed with the advice of his patroness at this crucial point in his life. Attacking the Russian unaided, Newmarch twice went astray, translating *makhnut rukoi* by its opposite—as “to set to” instead of “to wave goodbye to,” and *chtonibud odno* as “here is a case in point” instead of something more like “there's only one thing to do.”⁵¹

(2) In Stasov's letter to the composer of January 21, 1873, Newmarch paid particular attention to the Russian wording because of her personal association with the author and her plan to send him an advance copy of her work.⁵² Accordingly she did not simply translate Juon's German word *Seitenstück* (which would have been her normal practice), but reproduced instead the French *pendant* which Stasov had italicized to describe the relationship Chaikovski's *The Tempest* would bear to his *Romeo and Juliet*. Similarly, she restored Stasov's reference to the last movement of the Second Symphony by the title of its folk-song theme, “The Crane,” a translation of the Russian *Zhuravel*. Juon had omitted the folk-song reference, simply calling the movement *das Finale*. In commenting on the same letter, however, she mistakenly dated the performance of the Symphony “January 6th (18th), 1873,” whereas both Modest and Juon dated it January 16, 1873.⁵³

(3) Tolstoi was not personally as important to Newmarch as Stasov was, but she knew the wide interest he attracted. She had already published the report that Chaikovski gave his diary of 1888 of a disheartening encounter with the author. When Newmarch came upon family correspondence contained in the first volumes of Juon and Modest that described Chaikovski's first encounter with Tolstoi in 1876, Newmarch hastened to compose an article that would tie the two encounters together. She published it in *The Contemporary Review*, in January, 1903.⁵⁴ She had gained permission to do so from Modest and Yurgenson even though *Zhizn* was still in the process of publication. Her translation of the diary was carried over to the article and the translation of letters and diary were carried over to her

became Modest's main helper in compiling the first volume of *Zhizn* (I, preface).

⁴⁸ See note 1, above.

⁴⁹ *EMS, MGG* (1958).

⁵⁰ English translation, with additions, London: 1888.

⁵¹ *MICH*, II, p. 25; *Juon*, I, p. 386, omission; *LL 1906*, p. 221f.

⁵² See note 35.

⁵³ *MICH*, I, p. 400ff; *Juon*, I, p. 251ff; *LL 1906*, p. 137.

⁵⁴ London, pp. 112–118.

1906 publication. Consequently they are largely independent of Juon and in one particular more accurate. Where she translated *polu-bog* as *demigod*, Juon had been less exact and written *Gott*.⁵⁵

(4) Rare examples of Newmarch's selecting directly from Russian rather than German include her restoration of "so-called" in naming the Gūsenich Concerts in Cologne,⁵⁶ her listing by name each of the twelve conductors who were engaged to direct the Moscow Russian Music Society during the 1889–90 season,⁵⁷ and her inclusion of a description of N. G. Rubinstein, which she treated as a quotation from Kashkin—contrary to the Russian text of Modest. Uncomprehending, she concluded that it was Nikolai's *temperament* rather than his *face* that expressed an unflagging energy (*litsom vyrazhavshim nekolebimuyu energiyu*) in contrast to the rest of his body.⁵⁸

When she came to the account of the first performance of the Second Quartet in F Major in Nikolai's apartment, she resurrected her 1897–1900 rendition of Kashkin's eyewitness report, using the occasion to change—but not always to correct—some of the proper names she had attempted earlier. While changing her *Laut* to *Laub* and *Herber* to *Gerber*, she preferred her *Grijimal* to Juon's *Hrimaly* (properly *Hřimalý*).⁵⁹ Later when she came to Chaikovsky's interview with Avé-Lallemant (Theodor Avé-Lallemant, 1806–90), the octogenarian pillar of the Hamburg Philharmonic Society, which was related in the diary of the 1887–88 European tour, she added to Juon's and Modest's texts extraneous material drawn from her own 1900 publication. In doing so she cited only the diary without mentioning Larosh, whose work Modest had noted as his source. Her reason may have been the fact that she would have had to credit Heinrich Stümcke as well. Only she and Stümcke, who had published his translation of the diary a year before hers, wrote the last part of Avé-Lallemant's name as *Lallemant*. (For the correct Avé-Lallemant spelling see *MGG*, v,

1403; xvi, 582.) The Russian rendition by the composer, Larosh, and Modest was *Lalleman*—with Modest adding a final *d* when writing independently of the other two. None of the Russians transcribed *an* as *en*. Once again Newmarch is shown to be dependent upon a German intermediary—but one more foolhardy than Juon, who chose to edit out the name entirely.⁶⁰

None of the textual manipulation instanced above gives evidence of her having worked independently with Modest's three volumes of Russian text. The most obvious indications that Newmarch was for the most part merely translating German rather than Russian are of the following three types.

I. The copying of an error or substitution made in the German. Examples:

When the composer told his brother Modest of his decision to get married, he wrote "this is inescapable (*eto neizbezhno*)." Juon's translation was "Das ist unwiderrüfflich." Newmarch copied Juon: "This is irrevocable."⁶¹

After Chaikovsky outlined his plan to propose Taneev to head the Moscow Conservatory, he told his patroness: "If they don't listen to me, I have decided to withdraw from the Society (*Obshchestva*)." The Imperial Russian Musical Society was the super-authority over both the St. Petersburg and Moscow Conservatories. Juon translated the sentence: "Sollte es mir nicht gelingen, dann werde ich aus dem Direktorium ausscheiden." The Society was represented by directorate members in both cities. Juon, however, misled the reader in his use of the word *Direktorium*. Newmarch followed the German rather than the Russian turn of phrase at the

⁵⁵ *MICH*, I, pp. 518f and 524f; *Juon*, I, pp. 353 and 358; *LL 1906*, pp. 194f and 200.

⁵⁶ *MICH*, III, p. 291; *Juon*, II, p. 514, omission; *LL 1906*, p. 574.

⁵⁷ *MICH*, III, p. 321; *Juon*, II, p. 544, omission; *LL 1906*, p. 587.

⁵⁸ *MICH*, I, p. 209; *Juon*, I, p. 111f, omission; *LL 1906*, p. 64.

⁵⁹ *VOS*, p. 84; *TLW*, p. 34; *MICH*, I, p. 424f; *Juon*, I, p. 273; *LL 1906*, p. 148.

⁶⁰ *MF*, pp. 382 and 386f; *TLW*, p. 218f; *LL 1906*, p. 546n; *MICH*, III, pp. 211 and 301; Stümcke, *op. cit.*, p. 64. See note 26, above. Theodor Avé-Lallemant, author of *Rückerinnerungen eines alten Musikanten* (Hamburg: 1878), referenced in "Hamburg," *MGG*, v, 1956, 1414, became the dedicatee of Chaikovsky's Fifth Symphony, premiered at St. Petersburg November 17, 1888 [Chaikovsky, *Polnoe Sobranie Sochineni* (Complete Collection of Works), Vol. 17a, (Moscow: State Music Publisher, 1963)].

⁶¹ *MICH*, I, p. 497; *Juon*, I, p. 337; *LL 1906*, p. 185. Weinstock, who relied on others to translate for him since he did not know Russian, also printed: "This is irrevocable." (*Op. cit.*, pp. x and 217f.) David Brown correctly paraphrased: "I cannot avoid this." (*Tchaikovsky*, II, [London: 1983], p. 99.) The Russian adjective may of course be translated correctly as *inescapable*, *inevitable*, or *unavoidable*, but not as *irrevocable* or *immutable*.

beginning of the sentence and translated *Direktorium* as *committee*: "If I don't succeed in this, I shall retire from the committee." *Committee* was the equivalent she regularly used wherever she found *Direktorium*.⁶² On the other hand, when Juon correctly translated *Musical Society* (*Muzykalnoe Obshchestvo*) as *Musickalische Gesellschaft*, Newmarch followed along with *Musical Society*.⁶³

At an early stage in the composition of the Suite Nr. 1 for orchestra, Chaikovski wrote strongly contrasting fourth and fifth movements. The fourth movement written for high-register instruments—none below the clarinet and violin—he called "March of the Lilliputians (*Marsh Liliputov*)." The fifth, written for full orchestra, he called "Dance of the Giants (*Plyaska velikanov*)." Juon translated *Marsh Liliputov*, the name given it in Chaikovski's letter of November 13, 1878, as *Marche miniature*, Newmarch copied Juon, calling the movement *March Miniature*, the name only later chosen when the composition was published.⁶⁴

Long after Newmarch had discarded German spellings in the majority of her ancillary writings, she—or some assistant—reverted to those spellings in transliterating phrases in Chaikovski's diary of his visit to the United States in 1891. The Russian used by Mr. Hyde in his effort to amuse Chaikovski was transcribed by Juon using standard German equivalents. In her reproduction Newmarch copied the German instead of making a direct transfer from Russian to English letters. Thus, she used the German *s* to transcribe the Russian *z*-sound, the German *sch* to transcribe the Russian *sh*-sound, and the German *ju* to transcribe the Russian *yu*-sound. To clinch the matter, she copied Juon's inconsistent use of *sch* where he normally used *sh* to transcribe the Russian *zh*-sound.⁶⁵

II. The copying of the same paraphrasing found in the German. Example:

The "anonymous" critique of Rimski-Korsakov's "Serbian Fantasy"—to which Chaikovski strongly objected—is quoted in *Zhizn*. There the composition is described by its critic as *colorless, characterless, and lifeless* (*beztsvetna, bezlichna, bezzhiznenna*),

Juon condensed the three predicate adjectives into a German compound "farb-und-leblos," which he enclosed within quotation marks that are not in the Russian original. "Colourless and inanimate" repeated Newmarch, retaining the quotation marks Juon had inserted.⁶⁶

III. The errors caused by the hazardous use of English words to translate German words that are cognate in form but not in meaning. Example:

In his diary of his trip to the United States in 1891 Chaikovski reported that his hosts in New York showed him the vaults of the Treasury building where, he said, "I was allowed to hold in my hand 10,000,000 dollars worth of *new bills* (*novykh biletov*)." Juon's translation was perfectly correct: "Es wurde mir erlaubt, ein Paket *neuer Scheine* im Werte von 10 Millionen Dollaren ein wenig in der Hand zu halten."⁶⁷ The translation in Newmarch's publication of 1906 reads: "I was allowed to hold in my hand a packet of *new shining coins* worth about 10,000,000 dollars." (All italics are supplied.) Realizing something was wrong, Newmarch appended a note: "This would have been an impossible athletic feat, probably the equivalent in notes is intended.—R.N."⁶⁸ By this Olympian comment, Newmarch showed her clay feet. First, she did correctly translate *Scheine*. Secondly, but more importantly, she ignored the Russian, where the word was *bilet*, a loan word synonymous with the French *billet*, far indeed from any thought of "shining coins."

It would be unfair, however, to conclude so long a list of objections to the sham in some of Newmarch's claims without underscoring the epochal importance of her Chaikovski publications. She brought to the English-speaking world more documentary information about Chaikovski than had ever been given to the public about any other composer so soon after death. In contrast, during the past half-century Chaikovsky biographers have tended to narrow rather than broaden their scope. Despite its length, the most recent study of the composer by David Brown concentrates so much on personal analysis that pure supposition is mixed inextricably with verbatim quotation and legitimate

⁶² *MICH*, II, 45f; *Juon*, II, p. 331; *LL 1906*, p. 483.

⁶³ *MICH*, II, pp. 103 and 189; *Juon*, II, pp. 369 and 424; *LL 1906*, pp. 528 and 537.

⁶⁴ *MICH*, II, 217f; *Juon*, II, p. 12; *LL 1906*, p. 324.

⁶⁵ *MICH*, III, p. 473; *Juon*, II, p. 162; *LL 1906*, p. 653.

⁶⁶ *MF*, 2; *MICH*, I, p. 287; *Juon*, I, p. 162; *LL 1906*, p. 90.

⁶⁷ *MICH*, III, p. 453.

⁶⁸ *Juon*, II, p. 647.

⁶⁹ *LL 1906*, p. 461.

paraphrase. As a result, the identity of the correspondence itself is often lost, gaining nothing from the meticulous tabulation of file numbers in the footnotes.⁷⁰

It is no longer to be expected that any single

⁷⁰The surrealism of A. A. Orlova's *Tchaikovsky/A Self-Portrait* (translated by R. M. Davison, New York: 1990) is achieved by stringing together quotations from letters and diaries removed from their original contexts and identified only by page references to Russian-language sources. The third-person narrative of conspiracy with which she concludes in no way qualifies as *self-portrayal*. Under her hypnotic influence Brown's readiness to believe in conspiracies of silence has sometimes clouded his perception of fact, as it did when he was led to assert that "Modest had been less than honest" when he reported that Nadezhda Filaretovna had only eleven children who survived infancy. Brown implied that Modest was trying to hide the existence of her youngest daughter, "Lyudmila (Milochka)." As a matter of fact Modest not only included the mention of Milochka in Chaikovski's letter to her mother of August 11, 1879, but further identified her in a footnote and in the index as Lyudmila Karlovna von Mekk, subsequently Princess Shirinskaya-Skakhmatova, youngest daughter of the com-

English-language publication will attempt to provide as proportionately large and representative a sampling of the documentation that has accumulated during the past century as Rosa Newmarch did of the documentation available to her near the beginning of the century from Modest Chaikovski⁷¹—even though mediated mostly through Paul Juon.

poser's patroness (*MICH*, II, p. 300; III, index; *Juon*, II, p. 53; Brown, *op. cit.*, II, p. 224f).

⁷¹The three volumes of *Zhizn* bound in green vellum at the Library of Congress were presented to the Grand Duke Konstantin Konstantinovich by Modest, who inscribed his offering on the flyleaf of the first volume in 1901. Konstantin read the three volumes to his wife and daughter Tatiana beginning November 10, 1909 and ending December 4, 1911. On occasion Tatiana read to her parents. The pencil notations in the margins record the day, the place, and the persons to whom each passage was read. The choice of this book to occupy for more than two years the hours of domestic intimacy within Konstantin Romanov's branch of the imperial family is a remarkable testimony to the respect accorded not only the music but also the character and personality of the composer.