

UDC 780.647.2:083+78.071.1-05

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/facs-2021-2-1>

Natalia BASHMAKOVA

Candidate of Arts, Associate Professor, Head of the Department of Folk Instruments Mykhailo Hlinka Dnipropetrovsk Academy of Music, st. Liteynaya, 10, Dnipro, Ukraine, 49044

ORCID: 0000-0001-7728-6682

Yana ZLUNITSYNA

Master of the Department Folk Instruments, Mykhailo Hlinka Dnipropetrovsk Academy of Music, st. Liteynaya, 10, Dnipro, Ukraine, 49044

ORCID: 0000-0001-7728-6682

To cite this article: Bashmakova, N., Zlunitsyna, Y. (2021). “Russkaia y trepak” A. Rubinshteina v suchasnyy kontsertnyy praktytsi bayanistiv [“Russian and trepak” by A. Rubinstein in modern concert practice of bayanists]. *Fine Art and Culture Studies*, 2, 3-8, doi: <https://doi.org/10.32782/facs-2021-2-1>

**“RUSSIAN AND TREPAK” BY A. RUBINSTEIN
IN MODERN CONCERT PRACTICE OF BAYANISTS**

The article deals with the problems of bayan transfer, which for this type of performing art are relevant due to the fact that the number of translations is the largest part of the concert and educational repertoire of the bayanists. The manuals for translating instrumental works for the bayan of such authors as M. Davydov, F. Lips, B. Strandnolubsky from the position of the style range of the primary sources of this type of creativity are analyzed. The article reveals the problem areas and complexity of the translation of the works of the romanticism and impressionism for the bayan who, despite the warnings of famous methodologists of the bayan art, occupy a prominent place in the repertoire of modern concert performers and students of musical colleges of Ukraine, Russia and Belarus. The technology of creating piano music translations of Russian romanticism for the bayan understands the example of A. Rubinstein’s work “Russian and Trepek”. A detailed analysis of the composition from the standpoint of the specificity of the shaping, the dashed and dynamic palette of the work, the range used in the translation of the bayan techniques of the game is presented. A comparative analysis of the musical text of the original and the only printed bayan translation (author – F. Lips) is performed, which is not interesting and relevant for contemporary performers (due to the rapid increase of the general level of performing skills). It is stressed that these modern creative finds are transmitted only verbally. Today, only in the virtuoso version, that is, when the textual and technical complication of “Russian and Trepek” by A. Rubinstein “wins” the right to concert life. The comparative characteristics of the interpretations of the work of O. Nurlanov, A. Shkvorov, O. Bohatyryov, V. Romanko, Yu. Kononov and V. Kharchenko are presented, in which attention is paid to the peculiarities of the use of specific gameplay techniques (combined tremolo, ricolosheet, glissando), for with the help of which the primary source material is enriched and saturated. After analyzing the execution of the work by the above mentioned bayanists, we can distinguish two approaches to the sound implementation of the text: traditional (conservative), which is as close as possible to the original or printed translation, and innovative, which exists orally verbally and it is characterized by creative rethinking.

Key words: A. Rubinshtein, “Russian and Trepek”, bayan translation, interpretation version.

Наталія БАШМАКОВА

кандидат мистецтвознавства, доцент, завідувач кафедри народних інструментів, Дніпропетровська академія музики імені Михайла Глінки, вул. Ливарна, 10, м. Дніпро, 49044

ORCID: 0000-0001-7728-6682

Яна ЗЛУНІЦИНА

магістрант кафедри народних інструментів, Дніпропетровська академія музики імені Михайла Глінки, м. вул. Ливарна, 10, м. Дніпро, 49044

ORCID: 0000-0001-7728-6682

Бібліографічний опис статті: Башмакова, Н., Злуніцина, Я. (2021). «Русская и трепак» А. Рубінштейна в сучасній концертній практиці баяністів. *Fine Art and Culture Studies*, 2, 3-8, doi: <https://doi.org/10.32782/facs-2021-2-1>

«РУССКАЯ И ТРЕПАК» А. РУБИНШТЕЙНА В СУЧАСНІЙ КОНЦЕРТНІЙ ПРАКТИЦІ БАЯНІСТІВ

Мета статті – визначення специфіки перекладів та інтерпретацій твору А. Рубінштейна «Русская и трепак» на сучасному етапі еволюції баянного мистецтва. Методологія дослідження полягає в застосуванні історико-стильового та компаративного методів аналізу. Наукова новизна роботи визначається тим, що вперше характеризується різноманіття баянних версій твору в інтерпретаціях О. Нурланова, А. Шкворова, О. Богатирьова, В. Романько, Ю. Кононова, В. Харченка, а також виявляється комплекс специфічних баянних прийомів гри, завдяки яким матеріал періоджерела збагачується й набуває нових тембрових барв. Аналіз сучасних баянних версій «Русской и трепака» А. Рубінштейна дає змогу виділити два підходи до звукової реалізації нотного тексту – традиційний, або консервативний (максимально приближений до оригіналу чи надрукованого перекладу), та інноваційний, який існує в усній формі та характеризується творчим переосмисленням.

Ключові слова: А. Рубінштейн, «Русская и трепак», баянний переклад, інтерпретаційна версія.

Formulation of the problem. The problem of transposition in the bayan art has a great significance, since the number of translations represents the greater part of the concert and educational repertoire. This type of development has evolved throughout the twentieth century and continues to evolve today. Among the influential factors of development are the evolution of the musical thinking of the bayanists (translators) and the general level of performing skill. Consideration of the technique of creating piano music translations of Russian romanticism (in particular, A. Rubinstein's work) seems to be an actual direction of research, which is conditioned by the requirements of contemporary concert practice and the lack of scientific and methodological developments on this topic.

Analysis of recent research and publications. An analysis of existing benefits for the translation of instrumental works for bayan, which are in high demand in professional circles (Davydov, 1982; Lips, 2007; Strannolyubsky, 1960), allows us to determine that most authors are skeptical to the transposition of piano's works of the Romantic and Impressionist era. So F. Lips points out that doing them is rather risky due to the specifics of the original and piano sound proofing, because of the frequent use of the pedal and the typical of them play of the timbre (although the last factor is rather controversial, as the modern design of the accordion allows you to change the sound timbre thanks to the registers). Nevertheless, in the repertoire of contemporary performers and students of musical colleges of Ukraine, Russia, Belarus, piano works of Russian romanticism are widely represented. One of the most significant in this aspect is "Russian and Trepak" by Rubinstein's. The scientific novelty is to show the variety of bayan versions of the work, which, in

turn, are transmitted only by verbal method. There is only one translation of the original, but today it is not sufficiently virtuous and textured to be full of modern bayanists. Therefore, in the interpretations of the leading bayanists of the post-Soviet space, the main variants of the above-mentioned work are presented, and presented specific bayan receptions of the playsng, which enrich, source of the material with new timbral colors.

The aim is to determine the specifics of the translations and interpretations of A. Rubinstein's work "Russian and Trepak" at the present stage of the evolution of bayan art.

Main material presentation. There are more than 200 works by A. Rubinstein in the composer's arsenal. He was the founder of new (at that time for Russia) musical genres: symphonies, piano concertos, concert for violin and orchestra. His piano miniatures and romances, which are laced with lyrics and melodicism, were also widely known. The composer left his mark in all musical directions. But most of all A. Rubinstein prefers instrumental music. Since the composer was closely associated with the culture of Germany (studying in Berlin at Z. Den, close communication with F. Mendelssohn and Meyerber, correspondence with mother, who lived in Germany), these certainly influenced A. Rubinstein's composer's writing. However, Russian culture did not get around the composer too (the influence of M. Glinka's creativity, folk singing, emotionality, lyrics, dancing, imagering of the common people). One example of the inheritance of the Glinka's handwriting is "Russian and repak". This piece is devoted to the Russian composer of French origin, the author of differert romances Alexander Dubuque and entered to the cycle "Collection of national dances" op. 82 (1868), which consists of seven dances of different nationalities (Russian

and Trepak, Lezginka, Mazurka, Chardash, Tarantella, Waltz, Polka). It is important that A. Rubinstein was the first to combine the pieces into cycles. “Russian and trepak”, like “Kamarinsky” by M. Glinka is also with an extended theme and dance. The feature of A. Rubinstein is that he was able to embody the Glinka’s idea in an instrumental work, not in an orchestra. Since this dance opens the cycle, from the first major chords we hear the solemnity and open Russian morality. A. Rubinstein has diversified a fairly simple topic of variation and technicality, which shows dance lifting for the common people to the academic level. And most importantly – the composer was able to convey the images believably, not theatrical. This proves the sincerity of A. Rubinstein to the audience not only in the performing arena, but also in the composer’s. The performance begins with a brilliant introduction (1–8 b.) Thanks to the bright and cheerful tone of G dur and the pace of Moderato assai, the confident, decisive and enthusiastic mood of the whole work is transmitted. The energetic nature of the original is emphasized by such a catchy technique as a combined tremolo (squeezing – squeezing, squeezing – squatting). The square structure of the musical thought of the introductory material (which is retained in subsequent themes) is shaded by the tonal contrast (1–4 b. – G dur; 5–8 b. – e moll) and dynamic (comparison *f* and *p*). With this contrast, perseverance and playfulness are achieved. The exposition theme (9–24 b.) is also rich in contrasts, since the first cycles there are noticeable sharp changes in the strokes of legato-staccato and tonality (G dur – a moll – C dur). The development of material occurs with constant rhythmic repetition of the motive and tonal inconsistency. In this way the theme gets new persistent intonations. In the second C dur theme (26–32 b.) draws attention to itself the textual decision. In the right keyboard, instead of a simple rhythmic-austenitic motif, there are descending gamma passages, which in the first holding (25–28 b.) pass through the entire keyboard of the bayan in one voice, and then the same figure sounds in the tertsiya (29–33 b.). The left keypad has a chord accompaniment based on the rhythm of the original theme. Third, the final holding of the theme of the initial section (33–40 b.) is characterized by greater certainty, because the theme is executed in chord texture, with ascending chromatic basses in the party of the left

hand. Thanks to the addition of the melody to the combine tremolo, which was used in the introduction, the latest holding of “Russian” sounds quite powerful. Thus, the colorful bayan technique of tremolo in this section of translation performs a framing function – its use emphasizes the integrity of the initial conducting of the thematic material. Instead of a decisive and playful theme appears an expressive melody of the new g moll section (41–73 b.) conveying the image of a fragile Slavic woman, doomed to a miserable fate with a wealth of emotional experiences. It is written in a simple two-part form. The first topic of the second section (41–56 b.) has a narrative character, its structure consists of two sentences of rebuilding, tone openly. Each of them is divided into two phrases, where the first phrase is lengthy and based on the following harmonic sequence: t-s-d-t. The second phrase consists of descending lamentoses on a dominant basis. The transmission of uncertainty also occurs at the expense of the eighth and sixteenth notes. The second theme is of a questionable nature, which is reproduced by austenitic two-tact and trills on an unstable IV# stage. This topic ends with a descending tetrahedron, which is solved in a tonic. However, the descending tetrachords do not end after that – they are short, they are executed in different octaves of the right keypad and reproduce the insertion function (transition to reprise). With a reprise returns the original bright, decisive image-mood. However, the reprise includes not only the theme, but also the introductory part in the original tone. The pace is gradually accelerating – so the composer trains the listener to the dance Trepak. The phrases of the theme are interleaved by tremolo chords, which gives more enthusiasm and courage. There are fanfare intonations in the final holding of the theme “Russian” (122–139 b.). The downward octave passage in the four octave range brings to the bright enchanting tonic, which is confirmed by short full-length chords with eight lengths and the final octave unison of the main tone. The theme of “Trepak” is prepared by intriguing introduction (140–155 b.). In the party of the left hand is an ascending chromatic move, which is duplicated in the middle voice of the right keyboard. The upper voice holds the main tone (*gl*). Also, with the use of one reception – tremolo, the integrity of the structure is achieved. The intrigue is formed by the dynamics (*p* – *cresc.* Poco a poco – *f*)

and the agogy that is not specified in this text. Traditionally, the bayanists play these sixteen cycles “with a roll”, while the composer sought to temporal contrast (in the note text noted Allegro). The dance section of the contrast-component cycle of A. Rubinstein is written in a variational form. The main theme of Trepak (156–163 b.) is typical, embodies all the characteristics of this zealous dance. It is characterized by the simplicity of short motifs and the allocation of the weak 2nd tone (twotone dance), which set up the listener to gradually accelerate the pace, resulting in the impression of the infinity of the dance. The melodic theme covers the range of three degrees (II – IV) in the tonality C dur. Thanks to the laced every second destiny followed by the first, as well as the constant abduction of the third degree between the second and fourth creates a flirtatious image of the simple composition of the melody. In the second sentence, the topic is presented in two voices (164–171 t): the first voice sounds on the dominant side, with the octave jump due to the promotion; the second voice fills down with the variations of the above-mentioned batch. Further outships of an intrusive character with appear on every weak fate and with the help of crescendo lead to G dur’s solemn variation theme (180–187 b.). Solemnities are given to it: an ascending full of four notes for a strong (!) tone, a change in the dynamics of p on f and chord support on the strong lobe in the left keypad. In place of a harmonic texture, the polyphonic (188–209 b.) the theme unfolds in the form of a canon, introducing an element of development, in which the two-stroke variation motif in the batch of left hand repeats the quintet below. This rhythmic pattern sounds three times more each second in a row, thus creating drama, but after that, the upright sequences are similarly resolved in descending order. Following on the foreground the second fourthact of the main theme comes out, and also takes on development. The first 4 steps are a show of the theme in the key H dur, and in the following – the forlugh on the weak fates, against which the rising chromatic counterpoint in the party of the left hand (212–219 b.). The next 8 cycles play the role of a mini-development of the previous theme, which translates the above topic into the tone of E dur and accurately reproduces it without changes in the new tone. Later, exactly the same rhythmic pattern is used in the A dur’s

tonality, but such a long sound in the themes of major tonality is offset by a minor tremolous episode (260–275 b.). In place of the previous stormy episode after glissando, through the entire keyboard, the final sound of the original theme sounds in a variational form in the original tone of C dur, with strong and solid chords on the background of the strong lobe in the left keypad. Subsequently, after a violent superstition, a solemn theme with the addition of a tremolo for the approval of the finale sounds. The final episode of the play is the arpegged rising passage, which is performed on a tremolo and comes to a sure tonic chord, which is repeated in five octaves. As for the performing variety, then the interpretative versions at the moment are numerous. And this is again confirms the fact that this work is popular among young musicians. Another reason why there are quite a lot of versions of A. Rubinstein’s work is the lack of musical translation of the play. Today only one translation is known, which is fixed in the collection (Kashkadamova, 2006), which is far from all teachers and students. And so the extreme case is to play the work from the original musical notes. However, since we can not completely transfer the invoice of the work to the accordion, the piano version undergoes some textual changes and enriches the masterpieces of the work (each performer – in its opinion). The comparative characteristic of interpretation versions is made on the basis of videos of laureates of international competitions Olzhas Nurlanov, Arkady Shkvorov, Yuriy Kononov, Valentin Kharchenko, Oleksandr Bohatyryov, as well as the audio recording of Victor Romanko. Comparing the records and the existing versions of the musical publications, it should be noted that the versions of O. Bogatyryov and O. Nurlanov are closest to the bayan translation that is in the above-mentioned collection. And in the video recording by V. Romanko, on the contrary, passages in the party of the left hand, which are only in the original musical note, sound. Other performances partially combine the original and the translation of the work. The Bayanists use a ready-made keyboards differently. For example, Yu. Kononov combines a ready-made and elective keyboard in the “Russian”, that is, if the chords are written in a musical text in the left-hand party, in this case, the singer switches the elective keyboard to the ready-made to facilitate the technical side of the execution (instead of three keys to press

one). V. Kharchenko plays exclusively on the elective, and the finished basses and chords are used only in “Trepak”, as indicated in the translation. An interesting moment is present in the version of V. Romanko. Polyphonic variation “Trepak” is executed as written in the original, which requires the high tech of the left hand (movement of the sixteenth notes). In the same variant V. Kharchenko performed this section, replacing the sixteenth and eighth notes. Other variations of this variation are played on the note recording of the translation: in the party of the right hand is the variation of the theme of Trepak, and on the background of the theme – the display of tonality by the terrible moves of the fourth bass. Separately it is necessary to discuss the use of bayan techniques in the work of A. Rubinstein, because after listening to several interpretive versions, there is no such that they play solely according to the instructions of the translation. In the first stages of the entry, the playing is combined with a tremolo (squatting – squeezing, squeezing – squatting). The textual features of the original are transmitted to him (repeated repetition of the chord alternately with the right and left hand). However, Valentin Kharchenko’s interpretation of the usual tremolo is presented at a slow pace, which is less spectacular in the sound and visual aspects. Unlike its version, other bayanists play more lively, and the combination of a rolling pace with a combined tremolo sounds interesting. Functionally, bayan tremolo is sometimes used to enhance drama, the approval of the celebration, even the usual chamomile, arpeded passages performed on tremolo, sound like complicated technical elements. So in the translation in the culmination section of “Trepak” playing on tremolo is indicated, however, V. Kharchenko and V. Romanko, as well as A. Shkvorov play differently, which again confirms the attraction of performers to the original version. Also, they all are ambiguously played by the final descending arpeggiated passage, which is also indicated on the tremolo, but the aforementioned bayanists refused the instructions of the authors, and V. Kharchenko, on the contrary, added his

color to this play: instead of the exact ascending passage on the sounds of the arpeggio, he carries out this passage with the arranged short arpeggios. Valentin Kharchenko most creatively approaches the interpretation of the work. So, for example, in the final solemn holding of the theme instead of a short tremolo, he uses a new for this play, a flamboyant reception – ricolshchet. Among the bayan techniques of the play is also used glissando, which replaces the gamma passage and helps to perform it quickly, but V. Kharchenko uses the above method only in upper case, and V. Romanko generally renounces glissando and follows the piano version of the original.

Conclusions. In summary, we note that from the work of A. Rubinstein, the bayanists often play only “Russian and trepak”. For the bayan repertoire, this piece is a true discovery due to folklore themes. It can be heard in the performance of such leading bayanists as Olzhas Nurlanov, Arkady Shkvorov, Alexander Bohatyryov, Victor Romanko. He is also in repertoire luggage by Yuri Kononov and Valentin Kharchenko. In the bayan version composition is enriched with such specific techniques of the playing as a combine tremolo, ricolshchet, glissando, which enhance folklore color. However, each performer has its own interpretation of this work. This is due to the fact that the only printed version of the bayan translation, in the context of the modern high level of performing arts bayanists, is no longer attractive, that is, it has lost its relevance. Today, only in the virtuos version, that is, in the textual and technical complication of “Russian and Trepak” A. Rubinstein “wins” the right to concert life. After analyzing the execution of the work of the aforementioned bayanists, one can distinguish and outline two approaches of the performers to the sound implementation of the text, each of which the first is divided into two subspecies: traditional, or conservative, which is as close as possible to the original or printed translation, and innovative, which exists orally and characterized by creative rethinking of existing texts and purely bayan coloring.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. Давыдов Н. Методика переложений инструментальных произведений для баяна. Москва : Музыка, 1982. 173 с.
2. Кашкадамова Н. История фортепианно-виконавського мистецтва. Тернопіль : Астон, 2006. 608 с.
3. Липс Ф. Об искусстве баянной транскрипции: теория и практика. Москва : Музыка, 2007. 136 с.
4. Страннолюбский Б. Пособие по переложению музыкальных произведений для баяна. Москва : Музгиз, 1960. 88 с.

REFERENCES:

1. Davydov, N. (1982). Technique of transcriptions of instrumental works for bayan. Moskow: Musik [in Russian].
2. Kashkadamova, N. (2006). The history of piano and performing arts. Temopil: Aston [in Ukrainian].
3. Lips, F. (2007). About the art of bayan transcription: Theory and Practice. Moskow: Musik [in Russian].
4. Strannolyubsky, B. (1960). Handbook on the transposition of musical products for the bayan. Moskow: Muzgiz [in Russian].