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Preface

The majority of previous musicological literature presents Tchaikovsky as a composer who finds difficulty in constructing and developing his works, although one must admit that these views have been substantially challenged by several commentators after the hundredth anniversary of the composer's death. The objective of this document has been to disclose texturally constructional features with Tchaikovsky, features which have been as good as left out in previous musicological literature.

What attracted my attention when I was getting acquainted with Tchaikovsky's music in my early teens was not primarily his melodic flair, but his multi-layered textures, a phenomenon I should later mainly associate with contrapuntal textures. Since then I have become increasingly aware of how important this feature is as a technical and developmental means in Tchaikovsky's music and have, as a consequence, wished to dig deeper into this field for quite some time. I have always felt highly uncomfortable about the fact that Tchaikovsky - the way he is described in the majority of musicological literature - did not correspond with my own views, and that having an admiration for the technical qualities of this music was not perceived as aesthetically correct within some circles, to say the least. Texturally speaking Tchaikovsky was in my opinion completely different from - even opposite of - the composer described in ditto musicological texts. Yet relatively recent biographical and analytical works on Tchaikovsky, together with recognition from highly esteemed composers like Stravinsky
and Shostakovich, have given me the inspiration as well as courage to contribute the way I can in an attempt to readjust the dubious view which previous musicological factions have expressed on this composer.

Even though this thesis reveals and pinpoints previously under-communicated aspects to counterpoint in Tchaikovsky’s symphonies - in addition to other textural features - it is my hope that it may spur theorists as well as musicians to a new or at least significantly broadened understanding and further research as concerns the technical aspects to Tchaikovsky’s music on a general level.

Abstract

Although some might be tempted to claim that Tchaikovsky’s symphonic movements may sometimes have reached their peak already before the development - and that his themes are so fulfilled that there is little more to be developed or added - this thesis reveals that Tchaikovsky’s developments do not primarily rely on linear monophonic growth or variation, a procedure which might hypothetically have implied a dismantling or deconstruction of something that was already “perfect”. Sooner on the contrary; in order to accelerate the thematic work Tchaikovsky’s thematically based counterpoint becomes his most important developmental procedure almost out of necessity, thus enabling the composer to justify the use of unabashedly soaring melodic material for symphonic purpose. Quite often he alternatively chooses to cultivate small melodic motives or cells in the polyphonic web, thus his technique is far from unequivocal.

Circumstances not necessarily relating directly to Tchaikovsky’s music as such might to some extent explain why analysts may have failed to see constructional aspects of it, or, alternatively, chosen to ignore them. Such circumstances, dealing above all with nationality, sexuality and mental illness, are discussed in this dissertation, since they constitute a highly crucial factor if one attempts to perceive the musicological climate leading to the kind of sedimenting negative attitudes toward Tchaikovsky we may encounter even today.

In order to examine a possible contrapuntal tendency in Tchaikovsky, several approaches from his vast and extremely varied output might have been possible. This thesis deals primarily with all the six numbered symphonies. A possible scrutiny of one single work might
have given the impression that Tchaikovsky’s contrapuntal procedures were confined to that work in particular – or at least that it might be the most representative or most successful work in respect of this quality. Since I have wanted to demonstrate a general, sustained characteristic with the composer, and since just a fraction from one single parameter (constructive textural aspects) is under examination, a somewhat wider selection of works felt appropriate, even inevitable. I have for some time been rather reluctant to support the view that Tchaikovsky should be left out among nineteenth century composers particularly concerned with counterpoint1, and the analyses carried out in this document reveal that thematically based counterpoint is a highly central characteristic of this composer, occurring regularly in all his symphonies.

Tchaikovsky's six symphonies were composed within fairly regular time intervals during his life, and are thus quite representative of the composer and his orchestral style: The first drafting of No.1 was begun already in 1866 and No.6 was written shortly before his death in 1893. Indirectly this document also comments on issues regarding orchestration; good orchestration is not only due to aspects of instrumentation and timbral materiality, but at least equally much to aspects in respect of relatively independent or complementing thematic or semi-thematic layers within each texture. In addition it deals with textural architecture on local as well as pan-textural level.

Depending on the structure of each movement, two slightly varied approaches have been used as regards presentation; the main procedure has been one of referring to the various textural techniques in the order of their appearances, alternatively - if it suits the movement in question - by segregating various sub-textural aspects in order to give each technique sufficient focus.

Where does Tchaikovsky stand in the poly-linear landscape of Nineteenth Century symphonic music? Brief references have been made in respect of thematic counterpoint in a symphonic context inside a historical as well as contemporary frame of reference. Although I am far from being an expert on the symphonies of Brahms and Bruckner, I felt it was nescessary to adress literature dealing with the symphonies of at least one of these composers in respect of counterpoint, since traditional and current musicology have mostly referred to them as contrapuntists, directly or indirectly referring to Tchaikovsky as their opposite. In much literature it is by far unusual to find that assertions concerning a composer’s style – or the

---

1 See, for example, Grove Music Online: Counterpoint; The Classical and Romantic era (access 2008-13).
quality of a specific work – are just assertions, without supportive technical descriptions or analyses. With this document it is sooner the other way round; it aims at giving a reasonable record of an extremely crucial aspect of Tchaikovsky’s textural style. Consequently the actual score examples, supplied with brief yet vital information, are at least equally important as the remaining text as such, and much effort has been invested in making these examples as self-explanatory as possible.

Thus the methodological centre of this dissertation lies with the written music, with a focus on textural and thematic analysis. Generally speaking the analyses as such make use of the same approach as central writings and analyses written by the onset of the twenty-first century, that is to say; in literature where contrapuntal aspects have in fact been described in some detail. In this document the textural analyses have been assisted by an extended system of concepts, as the author has felt the need of specifying some aspects regarding orchestral texturing and counterpoint. Finding and using these specified concepts have not been entirely unproblematic. Thus they should be read as introductory steps into this field, intending to increase our consciousness when it comes to describing counterpoint in nineteenth-century symphonic music; they are not in themselves crucial for the understanding of Tchaikovsky as textural architect. These extended specifications have challenged the author to be more specific than what is usually the case in similar analytical contexts, and on a general scale they have proved more helpful than problematic.

The thesis thus consists of two major parts:
1. Background material and definitions
2. Examination of contrapuntal work in the six symphonies

1.1 General reception in Anglophone musicography

1.1.1 Introduction

Can aspects dealing with Tchaikovsky’s reception history explain, at least to some extent, some possible reluctance or lack of interest in assessing the composer’s strengths as a composer? (We have to assume that the ability of the commentators has always been present…) Attacks on the composer as well as his music have been launched from various
angles, from the time his first works were premiered until today. When Tchaikovsky started his symphonic career, he had but few national predecessors, and he was one of the very first students at the St. Petersburg Conservatory to write a symphony. To be sure, Glinka had written orchestral music as well as operas which had been rapidly established in Russian musical life, but Rimsky-Korsakov, Balakirev, Borodin and Tchaikovsky were the pioneers of Russian symphonic music as such.

Before examining the central issue of this document, an introductory examination of some factors leading up to Tchaikovsky’s present musicological status seems appropriate.

1.1.2 The Russian

The pioneers of Russian symphonic music were met with scepticism by many influential Central European critics from the very start they entered the western European musical scene. Hanslick’s review after his first acquaintance with the finale in Tchaikovsky’s Violin Concerto, where he claimed that he could hear “music stink”, seems to have bestowed him a secure position in the history of music criticism\(^2\), together with his equally often quoted characterization of the finale of the Serenade for Strings as “Cossack Cheer”. But even though Hanslick in fact had a more detailed and varied view on Tchaikovsky\(^3\), the mainstream western twentieth century music theorists and writers were for a long time rather hostile to Russian music in general and Tchaikovsky in particular. In the middle 1890s Tchaikovsky’s music had won a tremendous following with the British audiences within an astounding short time. But this remarkable success had a first shot across the bows when Francis Tovey in 1905 became the principle contributor to the eleventh edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica. From that year he was extremely influential as a writer, and his many disciples stood in line to surpass their master in marginalizing Russian music. The leading figure of this generation was Gerald Abraham who wrote several books on Russian music.\(^4\) Abraham was to become one of the most influential writers in England for several decades. His standard

\(^2\) MODEST TCHAIKOVSKY: Tchaikovsky's Life, Vol.2, Zhizn, Moscow 1901, p.503

\(^3\) He realized immediately, for example, the legitimacy of the form of Tchaikovsky’s Sixth Symphony. Yet it should be noted that he found no ‘Russian’ element in that work, as opposed to the above-mentioned finale.\ldots

work *100 Years of Music* was published in 1938 and had its latest revision as late as 1974. Here is a rendering of Abraham’s view on Russian music (1974 edition):

> Another peculiarity of the Russian creative mind in general is its inability to conceive organic wholes. The Russian thinks most naturally in episodes and produces his general effects by the accumulation of episodes (...) Naturally the same disjointedness (and the same lack of dynamic 'drama' in the ordinary sense of the word) is very apparent in Russian opera. (...) The same peculiarity can be detected in Russian music in general. (...)\(^5\)

Later follows an attempt to describe the music per se:

> The interaction of melody and harmony so often apparent in the music of the great German masters is comparatively rare in Russian music ... the bulk of Russian music seems to have been conceived primarily in terms of line and timbre; the harmony is support, spice, sound-padding - but not living tissue.

> That is true of the contrapuntal element in Russian music. Genuine, spontaneous contrapuntal thought seems to be quite foreign to the Russian nature. (...) Tchaikovsky (...) was completely incapable of writing a true 'theme' and apparently never tried to write one till he reached the *Pathetique*\(^6\).

How exactly Abraham reached the conclusion that “genuine, spontaneous contrapuntal thought seems to be quite foreign to the Russian nature” is a mystery, though, as we shall see in our final chapter, this allegation seems to have been adopted and taken for granted by some later commentators. When David Brown some years later writes his large-scale biography on Tchaikovsky, he nails down that “my greatest debt has been to Gerald Abraham”,\(^7\) thus indicating there is little hope of finding views within these four volumes that depart significantly from Abraham’s dogmas.

Commenting on the reception of Russian music in general, Richard Taruskin accounts for how ‘the myth lives on’ in his preface to “Defining Russia Musically”.\(^8\) Taruskin’s broad examination on this subject leads to, for example, the following deduction:

> At the very least it will be evident that ideologies of promulgation and reception affecting Russian art music have been far more explicitly formulated and acknowledged, as a rule, than those of the "universal" repertories with which the Russian product has contended; and that, often enough, such formulations have been hollow excuses, founded on garish double standards,

\(^6\) Ibid, p.169.  
\(^8\) **Richard Taruskin**: *Defining Russia Musically: Historical and Hermeneutical Essays*, Princeton University Press, 1997 p. xiv
for tendentious value judgments. "A Russian symphony? A contradiction in terms!" my most distinguished professor in graduate school could still snort not so many years ago (...)"^9

Martin Cooper helps in underlining Taruskin’s, or, rather, his most distinguished professor’s point:

(…) Russian folk-song, on account of its repetitive character and its tendency to be itself a microscopic set of variations, is peculiarly unsuitable [for musical development].^10

There was also another side of Russianness, which has been discussed by Maes and Taruskin, namely that of Colonial Russia and orientalism. Maes draws attention to how Westerners perceived orientalism as inferior to Western ideas:

During the colonial period orientalism was (...) a means of expressing Western feelings of superiority, as the entire non-Western world was made to play the role of "the other." While the rule of reason prevailed in the West, irrationality and barbarism were seen to reign supreme in the East. (...) In the West, orientalism is among the best-known aspects of Russian music, so much so, in fact, that it is widely considered a feature of the Russian national character, a view that was firmly held by Stasov and has been one of the dogmas of traditional historiography ever since. ^11

Yet, as we all know, as compared to, for example, Borodin and Rimsky-Korsakov, Tchaikovsky's "oriental" contributions were rather microscopic, particularly taking into account his vast production.

1.1.3 The not-so-Russian

Taruskin reflects on some tendencies within public as well as musicological circles to dwell on the possible Russianness of Russian music, for example The Mighty Handful’s often debated position vis-à-vis Tchaikovsky, where Tchaikovsky was not regarded to be sufficiently "Russian", thus suddenly finding himself in a double bind, this time lacking in 'Russianness'. Taruskin refers to César Cui’s influence upon Western European musical life as regards Tchaikovsky’s positioning as a Russian composer:

---

^9 Ibid. p. xvii


Even before Diaghilev, French critical antipathy to Chaikovsky ran high. Its source probably lay in Cesar Cui's outrageously partisan survey *La Musique en Russie*, a reissue in book form of a series of articles originally published in 1878 in the *Revue et Gazette musicale*, which furnished a whole generation of French critics and writers on music with virtually their sole source of information on Russian music. Cui had dismissed Chaikovsky as "a musician of extraordinary talent, except that he abuses his technical facility," and, most unfairly, as being "far from a partisan of the New Russian school; he is more nearly its antagonist."

Though this last assertion was no truer than the notion of a monolithic "New Russian school" itself, it played into the Western prejudice about exotic group identities and formed French opinion irrevocably.  

As most readers will know, Cui was a member of "The Five", thus a competitor with Tchaikovsky on the Russian musical scene. He was at the same time a most influential music critic, thus being at once prosecutor, judge and executioner. Yet even though French antipathy towards Tchaikovsky arose a couple of decades before the British/American, we have already witnessed that the latter did not eventually evolve into a more matter-of-factly type of reception. The mighty handful, here represented by Cui, succeeded in defining Tchaikovsky as a “westernized” or “un-Russian” composer. Whether “Russianness” should be regarded as something fundamentally positive or negative has been an apparently never-ending issue for debate. Taruskin refers to *The New Grove* back to 1980 where the Second Symphony outranked number Four and Five on basis of being Tchaikovsky’s “most fully Russian work”.  

Just as Stravinsky is right in ascertaining that Tchaikovsky was “the most Russian of us all”, so is Taruskin correct in saying that Tchaikovsky views the “Russian” aspect of his music to be rather irrelevant. Taking both these considerations into account, Tchaikovsky’s work might thus be interpreted both within an extended hermeneutical socio-geographical context as well as within one more purely professional, subject to technical scrutiny. Most obviously this may, on the one hand, imply a departure from the classical German/Austrian tradition. Those who, well into the twenty-first century, claim that, for example, "The Little Russian" must be judged, or at least partly judged, on other premises than purely those of the Viennese school, are most probably granted such premises. As we all know, the *symphony* as such, as regards both form and content, has eventually developed into a multitude of directions, some of which can hardly be traced back only to the German-Austrian tradition. On the other hand, moving for a moment back to early twentieth century western musicology, the nineteenth century Russian

---


13 Ibid, p. xvii
symphonists were not automatically allowed to redefine the established formulas, regardless of the nature of this redefinition, regardless of the originality of their work. We may therefore observe, at least indirectly, that some western commentators are not always so interested in examining the possible originality or individuality of a specific work, but, at least indirectly, more concerned about whether or not it adheres to German/Austrian or at least Central European tradition.

1.1.4 The homosexual

Already during Tchaikovsky’s lifetime, musical circles in Russia were aware of his homosexual tendency, and this awareness was partly misused by critics like César Cui, not neglecting to make disparaging characteristics of T’s music as ‘feminine’;

“Tchaikovsky is primarily a lyric poet who is gentle, feminine, most often melancholy, though sincere and attractive, (...) his music has little passion, force or energy…”[14]

At this point of time only a few people outside Russia had any knowledge about Tchaikovsky’s sexual tendency, and one might just as well find characteristics about Tchaikovsky’s music which ran counter to Cui’s comments. In a "The Musical Times” review a critic referred to the outer movements of the Fourth Symphony as "... more an appeal to the judgment than to the emotions" [italics added]. [15]

George Bernard Shaw reflects thus after attending the same concert:

I need only say that [the Fourth Symphony] is highly characteristic of him. In the first movement, the only one with a distinct poetic basis, he is, as ever, "le Byron de nos jours"; and in the later (...) [movements], where he is confessedly the orchestral voluptuary, he is Byronic in that too. The notablest merit of the symphony is its freedom from the frightful effeminacy of most modern works of the romantic school [italics added]. [16]

But with the publishing of Rosa Newmarch’s translation (1905) of Modest Tchaikovsky’s biography on his brother[17], the first slight biographical allusions with regard to Tchaikovsky’s sexual leaning were made public[18]. The attitude towards Tchaikovsky changed dramatically, a
change which can be perfectly exemplified with this citation by the American critic James Huneker, dating from less than one year after the publication of the Newmarch biography:

I once wrote of Tchaikovsky that he said great things in a great manner. Now I sometimes feel that the manner often exceeds the matter.

Huneker’s further proclamations clearly show that there was gradually established a linkage between the composer’s sexual leaning (the “secret sorrow”) and his music:

(Tchaikovsky’s) … entire existence was clouded by some secret sorrow, the origin of which we can dimly surmise, but need not investigate. (…)
There is no need of further delving into the pathology of this case, (…) but it is well to keep the fact in view, because of its important bearing on his music, some of which is truly pathological.

Since then, examples of linking sexually oriented characteristics to his music have been practically endless. Comments have at times clearly surpassed the borders of humiliation and insult:

Tchaikovsky had little reticence in describing his feelings. Even in the letters of his middle age he would sometimes gush like a schoolgirl.

(...) The tragedy of Tchaikovsky was the denial, forced upon him, of normal love.¹⁹

To our knowledge, these kind of humiliating comments have never been directed towards other homosexual composers, like Benjamin Britten. With respect of Tchaikovsky’s contemporaries, Brahms and Bruckner, one may just as well assume that they too in a sense were “denied normal love” for the most part of their lives. But this fact has never – and should indeed never be - the object of any kind of speculations. In what way Brahms, Bruckner, Tchaikovsky or any other composer coped with their presumed sexual drives should barely interest us, and well into the twenty-first century most commentators will claim that this aspect is totally irrelevant when it comes to evaluate the music as such. But is it really so? The relatively constant focus directed towards Tchaikovsky’s homosexuality even in later years will hardly promote his music, sooner the contrary: It is a fact that as late as 1987, roughly two-thirds of Americans condemn homosexual behavior as morally wrong or a sin, a number

which until then had been relatively constant, though very slowly moving into a more tolerant attitude since 1970.\textsuperscript{20}

### 1.1.5 The neurotic

Roland John Wiley explains in an article on Tchaikovsky reception some tendencies caught up within parts of the musicological environment after the mid 1960’s:

… with the removal of taboos in public discussion of the 1960s and 70s, Tchaikovsky’s life was caught up in a discourse, exceptional for its tenacity, linking his music with his sexuality, an indignity that would have caused the composer unspeakable humiliation. When historical factors were brought into play – especially Freud’s pathologizing of homosexuality – specialist opinion of Tchaikovsky’s music changed accordingly, and dubiously slanted assessments of his music followed suit.\textsuperscript{21}

But it was not uncommon to link Tchaikovsky’s homosexuality to mental illness even long before the 1960’s, as demonstrated in the Huneker example from 1906. Antipathy toward homosexuality in Europe reached a climax already by the end of the 19th century. What had earlier been regarded as a vice, evolved as a perversion or psychological illness. Official reviews of homosexuality as both an illness and (for men) a crime led to discrimination, inhumane treatments and shame, guilt and fear for gay men and lesbians.\textsuperscript{22}

Martin Cooper’s comments in Gerald Abraham’s 1945 Tchaikovsky symposium, regarding Tchaikovsky’s “penchant for the piling of climax upon climax in the top register of the strings” concluded with the following outburst:

… Such passages (...) do more than tear the heart (as indeed they are meant to do) but also affect the nerves like an exhibition of hysteria (with which they are very possibly related). This tendency reaches its climax in the last movement of the Sixth Symphony, where the perpetually descending phrase with which the strings open the movement is raised to a hysterical pitch of emotion ... There is something quite unbalanced and, in the last resort, ugly, in this dropping of all restraint. This man is ill, we feel: must we be shown all his sores without exception? Will he insist on our not merely witnessing, but sharing, one of his nervous attacks?\textsuperscript{23}

Edward Lockspeiser made an assertion that

\textsuperscript{20}Polls conducted by ABC, 8/87; «Los Angeles Times», 8/87
\textsuperscript{21}ROLAND JOHN WILEY: Tchaikovsky, §7; Reception (Grove Online, 2008-2013)
\textsuperscript{22}«British Journal of Psychiatry» (ISSN 0007-1250), vol. 175, 1999, pp. 106-113
Tchaikovsky's mind, seen for a moment from a scientific viewpoint, constitutes a textbook illustration of the borderland between genius and insanity.

In Tchaikovsky's character (...) the neurotic elements are inseparable from his development as a composer. The man and his music are one - unsatisfied and inflamed.24

Those who search in Lockspeiser’s text for the ‘scientific viewpoint’ from which this borderland between genius and insanity can be observed, look in vain.

Beginning with the Fourth Symphony (...) Tchaikovsky’s music now reflects all the indulgent yearning and the garish exteriorization of a composer who can never refrain from wearing his heart on his sleeve.25

The introductory chapter of this extremely influential and frequently quoted book, “Tchaikovsky – A Symposium”, ends by referring to “a sense of guilt or sin” in Tchaikovsky’s music, conceived by a “warped neurotic, shy and tortured”26. These utterances lead to the inevitable verdict by the middle of the twentieth century claiming that there is “no cleverness in Tchaikovsky”.

The instigators of such innuendos should, though, bear in mind that their sarcasms indirectly also hit the vast majority of concert-goers who felt that the music in some way was addressing them. Since it is so often held that Tchaikovsky is one of the world’s best loved composers, this “inflamed music” with its “neurotic elements” might indirectly also characterize the majority of concert audiences throughout the world.27

Although society changes and new truths are being established, some firmly deep-rooted myths within segments of western musicology remain rather unchanged. “Of genuine polyphonic thought there is extraordinarily little”, Abraham proclaims about Tchaikovsky.28 But rather on the contrary, after close examination of Tchaikovsky’s scores, the present writer will claim that of genuine polyphonic thought, there is exceptionally much. Thematic and textural analysis of Tchaikovsky’s orchestral and chamber music will demonstrate clearly that thematically oriented counterpoint permeates Tchaikovsky’s scores to the extent of being severely under-communicated in preceding literature. Apparently, when contemporary

24 EDWARD LOCKSPEISER, Tchaikovsky the Man, pp. 12, 14
25 ibid. p. 20
26 Ibid. p. 23
commentators are facing unavoidable, striking examples of genuine counterpoint in Tchaikovsky’s scores, it looks as if they find it easier, or more “correct”, to comply with previous reception and thus reducing, even ridiculing the composer’s achievements, as we may observe later in this document.

1.1.6 Tchaikovsky’s musicological status at the onset of the Twenty-first Century

On a general basis it is quite astounding to witness the degree to which various musicologists and biographers have chosen to stick to the verdicts of but few critics only, avoiding taking into account the compositional insights of, for example, composers like Stravinsky and Shostakovich. These two men made their acclaim at a time when they were well established, belonging to the world’s leading composers, and thus had no concerns about musicological sanction or retaliation. Though in the name of justice, one can by the turn of the millennium observe a change in the overall tone by scholars. This progress has been made due to works by Richard Taruskin\(^29\), Frances Maes\(^30\), Roland J. Wiley\(^31\) and others\(^32\), not so much on a purely analytical, but possibly more on an extended hermeneutical level.

In respect of analysis, Peter A Brown’s volume on the symphonic repertoire also marks a decisive step forward, moving toward a broadened perspective on Tchaikovsky’s symphonic style,\(^33\) although he, as we shall return to later, cannot completely escape imperatives dictated by dogmas and previous reception. Only a couple of years earlier, the author on Tchaikovsky in "The Nineteenth Century Symphony" had based his views of Tchaikovsky's symphonies on the following thesis:


\(^{31}\) ROLAND JOHN WILEY: Tchaikovsky (Oxford University Press, New York, 2009)

\(^{32}\) Special note should be made of Alexander Poznansky & Brett Langston’s “The Tchaikovsky Handbooks” (Indiana University Press, 2002) and Poznansky’s: Tchaikovsky. The Quest for the Inner Man (English edition by Lime Tree, London, 1993)

"For Tchaikovsky, the concept of symphony as an abstract, impersonal genre was simply an impossibility."³⁴

It may be worth noting that once extremely influential persons like Francis Tovey and the majority among writers referred to in earlier paragraphs, are as good as excluded from, and never referred to, in large editorial volumes like The Cambridge History of Nineteenth Century Music (2002). But persistent heirs of the Tovey/Abraham tradition still lurk behind the scenes:

‘Tchaikowsky … composed a good deal of piano music, most of it, in this writer's experience, an indication of his capacity for unnerving miscalculation. This is evident in other genres too, especially the piano concerto, where following the First (1876), which may with justification be called the best-known piano concerto of all time, there followed two more, neither of which is much performed or deserves to be. The second, for example, was instantly disliked. George Bernard Shaw wrote after a London performance in 1890 that the work was ’impulsive, copious, difficult, and pretentious; but it has no distinction, no originality, no feeling for the solo instrument, nothing to rouse the attention or to occupy the memory’.³⁵

Not only may one become a little bewildered by the somewhat harsh and slightly bitter tone pervading these lines: A most urgent question arises; how can the best-known piano concerto of all time stand as an example of ‘unnerving miscalculation’? Rather on the contrary, it might possibly have made some sense to claim that ‘the best-known piano concerto of all time’ is a product of consistent, speculative, though successful calculation. By contrast, Francis Maes describes the work as

“The clearest example of the combination of lyrical spontaneity and structural planning (…)”[italics added].³⁶

The article-writer of the Cambridge volume’s notification that Tchaikovsky’s Second Concerto, was “instantly disliked”, must be based on a misunderstanding, since the work after its world premiere in New York more than seven years in advance of the Shaw review had been repeatedly performed, especially in Russia.

One might expectantly look forward to a closer explanation of Tchaikovsky’s “unnerving miscalculation” from the author of the lines quoted earlier. Furthermore, one might also look forward to an explanation why the Second Concerto does not deserve to be much played. Until then Stephen Hough’s opinion that the second concerto is “every bit as good as the first” might serve as an alternative view.

The previous quotations stem from the only chapter in the quite extensive Cambridge volume that contains about half a page dedicated to Tchaikovsky, and thus brings echoes of previous reception, preconceptions and prejudices into the Twenty-first Century.

Oceans of further research lie ahead of us if we really want to uncover every aspect of Tchaikovsky’s musical style. Shostakovich not only wanted to reveal aspects of this style, in some ways he even succeeded. He once wrote:

“When I myself encounter difficulty in the course of my work I invariably find the solution to my problems by studying Tchaikovsky’s technique”

1.2 General aspects to counterpoint
related to symphonic music of the Nineteenth Century

1.2.1 Occurrence of thematic counterpoint in symphonic literature before Tchaikovsky and his contemporaries

In order to possibly obtain fair and precise overview of substantial counterpoint within this vast span of symphonic literature, we must, obviously, call for a future equally close examination like the forthcoming. Thus the below brief overview must be read just as fairly rough sketch sooner than a complete picture.

At the time Tchaikovsky wrote his first symphony, we know that he particularly admired Mendelssohn’s Fourth Symphony and Schumann’s Third. Thematic counterpoint is not an

---

37 Quote from Stephen Hough's Blog in The Telegraph after his recordings of Tchaikovsky's complete works for piano and orchestra, for which he received the 2010 Royal Philharmonic Society Award.
38 DMITRI SHOSTAKOVICH: Thoughts about Tchaikovsky in “Russian Symphony”, Philosophical Library, New York, 1947, p.4
excessively predominant feature with any of these two works. On the other hand Mendelssohn’s Mozartean taste for contrasted and well-balanced timbre is a general textural feature being cultivated to a significant degree in the vast majority of orchestral works by Tchaikovsky. Substantial counterpoint particularly worthy of mention is found, for example, in Mendelssohn’s No.2 II and No.5 IV.

Neither is striking counterpoint an importunately predominant overall feature in the symphonies of Schumann, and it is an equally inconspicuous trait with the symphonies of Schubert. It is not at all unlikely, though, that, on a general basis, some of the chamber music of these composers inspired Tchaikovsky’s instrumental music on a general basis, even in his symphonies.\(^{39}\)

We find fugal strategies in the mature symphonic works of Mozart and Haydn; with Mozart we find an increasingly growing interest in the use of poly-linear techniques during his development as a composer.\(^{40}\) His two last symphonies are in a class of their own when it comes to contrapuntal craftsmanship, No.41 being by far the richest in that respect. With Haydn, we find – in general – the same increasing tendency towards applying related techniques.

The general impression in the case of Beethoven is that thematic counterpoint is quite predominant through his entire symphonic production. Notable examples of imitation-sections are found in Beethoven. For example, in his Third Symphony we find such episodes represented in the Scherzo, in the first movement of No.4, and in the scherzo and the Finale of No.5. Further we find imitation-sections represented in his Sixth Symphony (in the first and particularly in the second and fourth movements), in No.7 (notably the second and fourth movements), and to some degree in the scherzo of No.9.

Amongst Tchaikovsky’s contemporary German symphonists, Brahms and Bruckner,\(^{41}\) even though very different in respect of style, are in current and previous literature referred to as the leading contrapuntists of late Nineteenth Century symphonic music. None of these

\(^{39}\) See, for example, the chapter on the Finale of Tchaikovsky's Fourth Symphony.
\(^{40}\) ... though Mozart, taking into account various public or commercial considerations, did at a time moderate or even nearly neglect contrapuntal strategies in his chamber-music.
\(^{41}\) In the next chapter there is an account of how 'counterpoint' by Brahms (and to some degree Bruckner) is discussed in current literature on symphonic music.
composers had finished their first symphonies when Tchaikovsky started to write his first symphony, which, as it turns out, is highly contrapuntal, and so his attraction towards contrapuntal solutions could not be inspired by them.

Some notable, though not excessive, counterpoint is found in the first symphonies of Tchaikovsky’s fellow countrymen Rimsky-Korsakov, Balakirev and Borodin. These works, which all highly deserve regular performances, are written practically simultaneously, though some works (Tchaikovsky’s first two symphonies among them) were revised later. To the knowledge of the present author Tchaikovsky did not discuss orchestral counterpoint - or symphonic composition in general - with these composers while he was composing his First Symphony.

1.2.2 Possible direct influences

Very few accounts on Tchaikovsky’s practical use of counterpoint exist, a fact that should not come as a surprise since Tchaikovsky and counterpoint are not usually associated with each other. Tchaikovsky’s lifelong love of Mozart may to some extent explain his contrapuntal interest, though this is a feature particularly predominant with the earlier master’s last symphonies and part of his chamber music. The interest Tchaikovsky’s conservatory-teacher Zaremba took in late Beethoven and Haydn may to some extent have had an impact, though Tchaikovsky never admitted this, as his relation to his teacher was somewhat ambivalent. In 1862 Bellermann published his work on Palestrina style, yet this had an insignificant impact on the mainstream of composers in the Nineteenth Century, according to Carl Dahlhaus. Nonetheless Bellermann was held in high regard by Zaremba on the St. Petersburg Conservatory, since Tchaikovsky was driven through the disciplines of strict counterpoint successively in his first two student years.

Liszt is sometimes referred to as a composer belonging to the contrapuntal canon of the romantic era. To what extent Tchaikovsky knew Liszt’s first symphonic poems in detail by the time he wrote his first symphony is not perfectly clear, though we know from Laroche that

42 ROSA NEWMARCH: ‘The Life And Letters of Peter Ilich Tchaikovsky’ by Modest Tchaikovsky (John Lane, London) pp.46-48
43 CARL DAHLHAUS; Grove Music Online: Counterpoint; The Classical and Romantic eras, access 2008-12.
44 DAVID BROWN: Tchaikovsky. The Early Years, 1840-1874. (W. W. Norton & Co. Inc. 1978) p.60
“It is but fair to state that Liszt’s symphonic poems (…) only exercised an insignificant and ephemeral influence upon Tchaikovsky.”

The composer’s admiration of Glinka is well known, and though Tchaikovsky refers to Kamarinskaya as a source of inspiration – even with an eye to counterpoint – the latter feature is not very predominant in Glinka’s work in terms of thematic counterpoint. Yet we encounter some of the contrapuntal procedures we do find in Glinka already in Tchaikovsky's First Symphony.

1.3 Definitions of some selected concepts appearing in this document

1.3.1 Introduction

Hopefully the reader will find the below concepts to be self-explanatory. It is not this writer’s intention to try to build a hierarchy of contrapuntal classes or qualities. Rather, continuing work by several future contributors may gradually widen both a vocabulary and an increasing interest with regard to contrapuntal writing in the wake of the baroque era. Some terms used in this document are listed below, meant to represent a concise overview; a fuller understanding of each concept may only emerge more clearly during the forthcoming analyses. Although the forthcoming definitions relate to how aspects to counterpoint are treated in this particular document, they might hopefully contribute in widening a vocabulary even on a more general basis.

45 ROSA NEWMARCH: ‘The Life And Letters of Peter Ilich Tchaikovsky’ by Modest Tchaikovsky (John Lane, London) p.52
46 Ibid. p.377, pp.563-564
47 The chamber-musical, imitative sections in the overture of Ruslan and Ludmila at m.59 ff and m.153 ff may serve as examples of poly-linear episodes that may have been points of departure for Tchaikovsky in similar contrapuntal sections, notably in his First Symphony.
48 Some readers might possibly have wished to extend the limits of what might be regarded as contrapuntal textures in this text. Although sometimes problematic, limits might after all be helpful in science, even in musicology, when dealing with issues lying on a borderland between quality and quantity.
1.3.2 Poly-linearity ('Construction' is sometimes used synonymously)

Tchaikovsky’s orchestral style is constructional in sense of having originated from poly-linear architecture: His constructions are characterized, above all, by their dialectic textural approaches. This two- or multi-sidedness may be observed via its notable use of constructional multi-focus as regards

- Thematic and semi-thematic counterpoint (i.e. thematically based counterpoint)
- Timbral contrast, timbral dialectics
- Physical direction/contrary motion
- Textural counterpoint
- Local counterpoint

These and adjacent poly-linear techniques may be used separately or in combinations, and often two or more of these concepts may overlap or act together. Thus 'Poly-linearity' may work as a compressed term for 'Textural dialectics with a graphical/architectonic tendency'. The term 'Construction' is only used as an alternative when this architecture is dominated by thematic material.

For operational reasons only ascending or descending layers are basically reckoned to have potentials for contrapuntal activity from a pure technical point of view. Thus single-tone, flat signals, for example played by the horns or trumpets, are not regarded as contrapuntally significant, even when counterpointed to other substantial layers. An exception is made for symphonic motifs49, either when used in its entity or when one of its motives or cells is used in original or derived form. If the counterpoints to such a motto are triadic and non-thematic, or melodically inferior/insignificant in other respects, they are not regarded as interesting from a contrapuntal angle.

Terms like thematic counterpoint, local counterpoint, and so forth, may need clarification. Yet one should keep in mind that any thematic reference and its possible counterpoint are unique events50, while a classification is an attempted generalization.

---

49 Tchaikovsky only uses this solution to a very limited extent. It is found just sparingly in Symphonies Nos. 4 & 5.
50 The bassoon-counterpoint in the slow movement of the First Symphony is a typical borderline case: This idea is developed extensively, yet as a restricted bassoon-layer throughout. Still it is always subordinated the striking, highly melodious theme, and just dominates for brief intervals of time, like at mm. 88-9 and 97-8, with an additional local counterpoint written to it.
Consequently one should realize that attempts in classifying counterpoint sometimes just may be read as such, since they arise out of already existing music and not the other way round. They are operational steps taken with the intention of make quantitative and qualitative assertions possible. Yet in this writer's experience current theorists and composers find these definitions acceptable.

### 1.3.3 Thematic counterpoint

Thematic (motivic or substantial) counterpoint is the definition of a contrapuntal episode or situation involving at least two individual voices utilizing thematic/motivic elements or their derivatives. These voices may originate from the same theme or from different themes. In practice this will imply the use of two or more thematic ideas simultaneously, or the use of such elements in overlapping situations. A context where ideas only overlap by one note/chord - which is a quite common textural overlapping procedure in nineteenth century orchestral music - is not qualifying for the designation ‘thematic counterpoint’; the longer the overlap, the stronger the presence and impact of the thematic counterpoint.

Traditionally speaking, a common example of thematic counterpoint is the fugue or fugato and music labelled as polyphonic. In this document ‘counterpoint’ always refers to the craft or craftsmanship as such, while ‘polyphony’ is just one of several types of textures which may result from contrapuntal work; most often understood as imitative types of textures. Elements (motives or cells) taking part in a contrapuntal process, and which are derived or directly quoted from a theme, are characterized as ‘substantial’, ‘thematic’ or ‘motivic’ contrapuntal elements.

Thematic counterpoint may very well serve as an “intensification of motivic work” to quote Dahlhaus, thus standing out as a very commendable developmental procedure. Thematic counterpoint makes the music focused, yet the textural fabric as such may vary from quite open, laidback textures to multi-thematic excess. Hence this is not to say that thematically based counterpoint is automatically brilliant from a technical point of view or ditto interesting in a cognitive perspective, although this might often be the case.

In brief, substantial, thematic counterpoint is the realization of one thematically rooted event written as a counterpoint to another thematically rooted event.

Sprung out from an urge for linguistic variety, the wording ‘thematic (/motivic) counterpoint’ may be substituted with ‘substantial counterpoint’.

---

51 Though such incidents might possibly give the listener the impression of being contrapuntal
The majority of examples in this document, particularly in Symphonies 2 - 6, display thematic counterpoint. Yet there are also obvious examples in No.1; Exx. I I 12, I I 21-25, I IV 11-13 and I IV 17-20, although here we also encounter borderline examples like Ex.I I 19.

1.3.4 Local counterpoint

‘Local counterpoint’ describes a contrapuntal context where only one of the parts involved is - or is derived from - a thematic (substantial) element. This may be the type of counterpoint we may sometimes refer to as counter-melody or discantus. An extremely elegant bass-line can be contrapuntally significant. If there are no or inferior thematic qualities attached to it, it is a 'local' counterpoint. Yet if it might, even in theory, be associated with thematic material, it will be classified as 'semi-thematic' if no other thematic characteristics than the actual line is involved (See 1.3.5). One may with some justification claim that there is a contrapuntal aspect connected to almost everything that happens within an orchestral texture. But in order to deserve a contrapuntal label a layer should normally be architectonically significant compared to its surrounding layers, most often with a comparatively distinct contour. Some rigid rule or definition here would probably prove to be problematic in the long run; better then, probably, to operate with layers that are characterized as more or less contrapuntally striking, alternatively to operate with borderline cases.

Tchaikovsky's counterpoints are for the most part thematic or semi-thematic by nature. Instances of local counterpoint are shown in Ex. I II 1, I II 3, yet even here one is struck with hints of thematic relevance, although not dominance. A peculiar type of borderline case may hypothetically occur where a section containing local counterpoint recurs, but where the elements turn out to be rewritten/further developed. By definition it is still a local counterpoint, though it may become a question of definition whether or when the local counterpoint actually gains status as a new theme, an outcome that is not very much likely to happen.

When a local element counterpoints a thematic element during a substantial part of a movement, being it slightly varied or drastically reshaped, this non-thematic approach is most often referred to as ‘textural counterpoint’ (see 1.3.10).

---

52 If the theme as such should happen to be just a line - or just possess linear qualities - the mentioned counterpoint will, at least in theory, be 'thematic'.
1.3.5 Semi-thematic counterpoint (Stylized counterpoint)

Some themes may mainly or in part be constructed from arch-typed graphical lines in stepwise ascending or descending motion. If such a stereotyped line occurs as counterpoint to more characteristic thematic material, it is by definition thematic, but the overall universality characterizing such counterpoints reduces their melodic significance or distinctiveness, and they are thus most often labelled 'semi-thematic'. This is not to say that this type of counterpoint demands lesser degree of contrapuntal skill than other contrapuntal solutions, particularly if the line moves exclusively by stepwise motion, which is usually the case with Tchaikovsky's stylizations. None the less, contrapuntal lines, even chromatic lines in contrary motion, might with some justification be regarded as established procedures, even stereotypes, within segments of Nineteenth Century music. The reader will find that Tchaikovsky, in practically all of his symphonies, is particularly fond of writing this type of counterpoint to almost any theme, regardless of the properties belonging to the original thematic construction in question.

Semi-thematic registrations in this document are only made for counterpoints exceeding one measure, unless the thematic relevance, like simultaneous inversion, is obvious. Usually a copied measure involving this procedure will not be regarded as significant.

The denotations by which semi-thematic counterpoints are labelled are rooted in the themes, yet very often the stylizations are adapted to or fused with other materials, and thus might seem at least equally related to the latter.

Looking historically upon fugatos and fugues, linear motives may develop into semi-thematic lines or turn to other less thematically striking manifestations. In such cases the entire fugato, based on a defined theme/subject, is nonetheless labelled 'thematic counterpoint' throughout. In order to create stepwise lines to any given theme, the process quite often involves usage of chromaticism. The result of this approach stimulates or challenges at least two perceptual polarities in the listening process; the expectedness that a stepwise line will continue over more than just a few notes and the unexpected harmonies provoked by it.

Sometimes the term 'stylized counterpoint' is used. 'Linear counterpoint' might possibly have been a better alternative, were it not for the fact that this characterization is normally used for corresponding contrapuntal approaches appearing well into the twentieth century.

---

53 A minimum number of notes might have been an equally viable alternative.
54 An exemplification of this kind of copying is found in Symphony No.5 II, mm.39-41.
It is extremely important to stress out that counterpoints in some examples might theoretically speaking have been classified in alternative ways, and thus a term like 'semi-thematic stylization' is more accurate in most situations, and lies at the core of future use of the terms 'semi-thematic' and 'stylized'.

Two stylized layers moving in the same direction are not regarded as contrapuntally significant, even though the result might sometimes be effective\textsuperscript{55}. In the event of two non-thematic lines counterpointing each other, such textures will usually not qualify for labels like '(semi)thematic' or 'local' counterpoints. And, needless to say, neither will simultaneously layered broken chords, unless they are being blessed by a particularly original structure\textsuperscript{56}. A situation in which a layer consisting of broken chords is written in ideal technical counterpoint to a contrasting theme is a viable exception, the contrast indicating predominant linearity (as opposed to broken chords).

In the case of the Finale of the Second Symphony, the linear elongations of the thematic material are in most cases so obvious that the lines are classified as thematic.

One might possibly ask if we were better off without this term. Although no classification is completely unproblematic, the present author would clearly miss this concept if excluded. Semi-thematic counterpoint is demonstrated in Exx.1 IV 2-6 and 1 IV 8-9.

1.3.6 Textural field (‘texture’)

This expression defines a delimited, congruent scoring approach. A score page may depict this denotation quite well, though the length of a textural field may vary considerably. The term ‘texture’ is mainly used for short. It may be homophonic or highly contrapuntal. This document is above all concerned with the constructional, contrapuntal aspects related to textures - at the expense of timbre - although this specification, like most simplifications, may not be read too literally.\textsuperscript{57} The majority of textural fields accounted for in this document deserve the designation 'poly-linear' construction, or just 'construction' for short, since

\textsuperscript{55} Symphony No.4 IV, mm.260ff provides a telling example.

\textsuperscript{56} This Brahms'ian approach goes for triadically built thematic materials counterpointing each other, or triadic thematic material counterpointing other triadic material.

\textsuperscript{57} Tchaikovsky's use of timbral contrast is an extremely important device in the majority of his textures. Even though the timbral issue is far from central in this document, the majority of examples clearly demonstrate the importance of timbral cultivation in Tchaikovsky's constructions, and this approach is given special focus during the examination of Symphony o.1, movement III.
thematic and/or semi-thematic counterpoint dominates the respective textures. In the future one might possibly wish to make grades between monophony and extreme polyphony.

1.3.7 Textural layer ('layer'/segment)

A textural layer refers to a specific role attached to an instrument or group of instruments within a textural field.

A textural layer may or may not be of substantial, contrapuntal importance, and may or may not be thematically based. In this document the term is mostly replaced with 'layer' for short.

1.3.8 Textural element

A textural element is a term related to any definable, delimited unit acting within a textural field. This element may be found within one or more (all) layers. It may or may not appear as a thematic element, though this document is mainly concerned with thematic elements, in the shape of cells or motives, above all cells/motives used for contrapuntal purpose.

1.3.9 Textural Counterpoint: Textural Strategy or Textural Factor

The term 'Textural counterpoint' refers to an architectonically orientated procedure based on either a clearly definable gestalt or a definable, recurring principle, partly characterizing but not necessarily forming the movement. When carried out persistently by the composer, this principle may appear as a 'textural theme'.

'Textural Strategy' is a specification of the above term, referring to a contrapuntally based scoring procedure or scoring principle made possible by a non-thematic motive or cell which is traceable and recurring throughout the movement, for the most part counterpointing thematic material. One might alternatively perceive such a procedure as a “textural theme”, partly responsible for the construction of a movement. The march from the Pathetique Symphony is a representative example where large parts of one movement are designed from a clear textural strategy, where the textural counterpoint tends toward obtaining thematic importance (see Exx.6 29-37). With Tchaikovsky there is usually a thematically based contrapuntal approach associated with this procedure, although the borders between thematic and non-thematic material are sometimes blurred, as is the case with the zigzag triplets recurring in the Third Symphony.
Thus it is a rather relative term, and in cases where the term ‘Textural strategy’ feels exaggerated or too pretentious, one might in less conspicuous textures alternatively - or preferably - utilize the term ‘Textural tendency’.

An even less thematic or just vaguely thematic layer, constructed mostly on a 'textural graph' instead of a cell or motive, is labelled 'Textural factor'; in this document most clearly represented by the opening movement of the First Symphony. It is also present in some of the composer's remaining symphonic movements, yet above all in some of his orchestral pieces, like *Capriccio Italien* and *Marche Slave*. In an orchestral work the term 'Textural factor' is used synonymously with 'Orchestral factor'. From a contrapuntal view this approach may seem less interesting than thematically based strategies: The latter are favoured by Tchaikovsky, although he clearly demonstrates notable constructional possibilities of the former in the first symphony, see, for example, Exx.1 I 1-9. Yet in rare cases there are moments when a textural factor develops, and take on local, quasi-melodic proportions, like, for example, in Symphony No.2 II. Since such incidents are not rooted in a defined theme they cannot be classified as formally 'thematic' or 'semi-thematic', even though a textural counterpoint suggests a long-term involvement.

The difference between textural 'strategy' and 'factor' is not always striking, and thus it is neither necessary nor desirable to make a big issue out of how to distinguish between them. Both procedures are in rare cases seen "out on their own", not counterpointing thematic material. Yet contrapuntal aspects are in general clearly associated with both procedures, thus ‘Textural Counterpoint’ is used as a generic term.

### 1.3.10 Texture-confined counterpoint

This term relates to a textural field wherein non-thematic material (for example texturally strategic material) counterpoints other non-thematic material. Tchaikovsky normally avoids this type of texturing.

---

58 The rushing, arch-formed or ascending/descending lines in these works contrast the overall flat, tremolando or signal-like layers that so often accompany the thematic material of the First Symphony, movement I.

59 Since there is no final review as regards textural counterpoint in the thesis, the recurring, predominant textural lines counterpointing the theme regularly in Symphony No.1 III is registered as *local c.p.* From Symphony No.2 onwards textural counterpoint is mostly ignored for the benefit of thematic, semi-thematic and local counterpoint.
1.3.11 Motivic textural transfer (abbreviated to ‘Textural Transfer’)

This term describes a situation where a motive or cell moves from one register to another and most often is given a new role in the new textural field, forming a new textural layer. This approach can be observed particularly in the last three symphonies, see for example, Ex.4 I 5-6 and 4 I 11-12.

If the register-change is insignificant, but where the motive or cell, nonetheless, changes behaviour by shaping a renewed, distinct, separate textural layer, it is usually labelled 'imprint', meaning that a recently derived thematic element in one texture leaves a substantial imprint on the next (see 1.3.12).

1.3.12 Imprint

This term is used to describe that a thematic cell or motive used subordinately in one specific phrase or paragraph is used for developmental purpose and given a more central role in the ensuing phrase or paragraph. Sometimes the new role is so dramatically different from the preceding that one may suspect some commentators miss out on the connection between them - and thus fail to recognize an important developmental feature with Tchaikovsky, a procedure by which the composer may completely transform his material. If this procedure also implies change of register, it is referred to as 'textural transfer' (see 1.3.11).

1.3.13 Physical direction (‘direction’)

This term calls for an alertness with regard to the actual ascending or descending movement (direction) of a textural layer, thus distinguished from other types of “psychological” direction, the latter determined by, for example, seamless dynamic change, diminuendos, acceleration, etc.

---

60 M.361 ff of Symphony No.4, movement I, may serve as a good example: A Motto-motive culminates during a long, dramatic passage and is used in its augmented yet otherwise original gestalt in the calm pastorale that follows. A. Peter Brown labels the new passage as ”new material” (see the chapter dealing with the Fourth Symphony).
1.4 Some comments about the score examples

1.4.1 Presentation and intention

Assuming that "a (note)-picture speaks more than a thousand words" it has been this author's intention to write crucial analytical references directly into the written music and thus make Tchaikovsky's technique stand forth without the need of two extensive, additional texts. Hence much effort has been invested in an attempt to make the central objective of this document as easily accessible as possible by way of self-explanatory examples.

Most often the examples demonstrate just fractions of the construction in question. A more accurate record is rendered in the Appendix.

Some examples are complete, some are reduced and some characterized as 'score extracts', meaning that inferior parts or layers in the score are excluded. At the same time score examples provide verifiable, indisputable proof of the musicological findings in question, something which, unfortunately, has not always been the case when it comes to assessing Tchaikovsky's symphonic output in previous musicography.

In order to render a reasonable picture of Tchaikovsky's scores already from the outset, they are represented nearly in full in the first symphonies. Since music examples are crucial, serving both as demonstrations and, not the least: proofs of verifiability, they are, as a consequence, numerous. Thus, limitations of space lead to increased focus on contrapuntal aspects of the score as the examination proceeds, while peripheral textural layers are being left out.

1.4.2 Abbreviations used in the score reductions

The following abbreviations are used in the forthcoming examples

\textit{doubl.}: doubling(s) /doubled by…
\textit{nat.}: natura (sounding pitch)
\textit{not.}: as notated (transposed)
\textit{perm.}: permuted/permutation
\textit{supp.}: support / supported by… (I.e. some doubled notes are not in unison, but sound octave above or below the quoted instrument)

Ordinary (Arabic) digits in the woodwind parts refer to the respective player,

\footnote{These types of parts and layers are mainly of timbrally supportive nature, such as layer doublings or timpani or percussion layers.}
Roman digits in the brass or strings likewise. Thus "2." in the flute part refers to the second flute; "III" in the horns refers to the third horn.

1.5 Analysis

1.5.1 Thematic and motivic classification used in music examples

In order to gradually become acquainted with Tchaikovsky's thematically based counterpoint, Symphonies Nos.1-3, are more subjected to detailed motivic classification than the last three. Movements in sonata form have their themes and motives classified hierarchically. Thus, for example, 1A2b is equivalent with:

1: main area
1A: The first theme of the main area (sometimes referred to as 'the main theme')
1A2: The first theme's second significant melodic/thematic ingredient
1A2b: The second motive of the above thematic ingredient - and so forth

If an area has no subthemes or sub-thematic ingredient, the second cipher is skipped, and the letter can be small instead of capital.

A ' mark, for example 1A2b', refers to a permutation of the motive or theme in question, or can alternatively refer to a layer-construction stemming from the respective permutation. This mark is not necessarily utilized if the motivic permutation is insignificant or easily recognizable.

Several marks, usually made inside a layer (' , " , "' etc.), refer to different kinds of motivic permutations, for example in respect of contour, inside that specific layer. Normally the reference/classification alone will make the mark self-explanatory; in that case the permutation-marks are left out.

Usually only themes and motives which are put into use within notable contrapuntal contexts are classified. Indirectly this practice indicates, to some extent, why some motives are labelled the way they are, and why some are not labelled at all. Motivic divisions and subdivisions are only defined in order to become operational analytical elements; quite often alternative classifications might have been equally suitable as the actual chosen selections.

Deviations of the above descriptions may occur if they seem well suited for a particular theme or movement, as long as they, presumably, are easily perceived by the reader.
Previous commentators sometimes have different views on theme classification in Tchaikovsky’s works, particularly when it comes to defining a specific material as being of subsidiary, closing or transitory character. Such issues are seldom debated in this thesis. Music is art, and art should in some way give room for some personal interpretation. Yet although different views should sometimes be acceptable, they should represent the exception, not the rule. That said, not seldom Tchaikovsky's thematic usage is so versatile that alternative classifications - or focus - might have been possible. Although alternative shades of classification etc. are sometimes possible, the actual counterpoint is nonetheless central.

1.5.2 Analysis in context

During the analyses of No.1 I & IV and No.2 I textural, thematic and semi-thematic counterpoints are treated separately. Consequently the reader may hopefully benefit from this segregation in the process of becoming better acquainted with the respective concepts. On the other hand, such a division may lead to a poorer understanding of the continuous development of each movement. Thus the remaining movements are, by and large, treated and analyzed as the movement unfolds.

1.6 Extent of contrapuntal activity within each movement

Significant future research is needed when it comes to defining and classifying the contrapuntal aspects of a piece of music, but the present author nonetheless feels obliged to determine the extent of constructional dialectics within these scores, particularly as regards thematically based counterpoint. Such records, though, should be regarded as slightly approximate, since borderline cases are most likely to occur in almost any work of the symphonic repertoire. For example; if a semi-thematic or local counterpoint lasts for just about one measure or less, the measure is not registered in this record, while some might possibly have wished to include it, e.g. No.3 I; mm.202-3 and 204-5.

It has already been commented that the borderlines between semi-thematic and thematic counterpoints are sometimes blurred. Thus a term suggesting doubt or two-sidedness feels appropriate.

62 Mm.33-43 of No.3 I illustrate a problem at hand: do the two bassoons represent thematic, semi-thematic or local counterpoint, or is the contrapuntal aspect too insignificant to be worthy of mention? Exemplary part-writing may often coincide with stylized or thematic counterpoints. The harmonic, downward stepwise motion characterizing these measures are not read as sufficiently interesting from a contrapuntal viewpoint in the present examination; a ‘semi-local’ contrapuntal labeling might possibly have been viable in corresponding cases.

63 Most often, a borderline case is left unregistered when occurring in an otherwise homophonic paragraph.
Although one probably has to accept that problems related to defining definition-borders and handling borderline-cases at some stage may always exist, this issue is, fortunately, relatively seldom on the agenda during the actual textural analyzing. Thus it does not interfere particularly much with what finally stands as a fair record of the contrapuntal activity related to the respective works. Usually it is not particularly problematic to define Tchaikovsky's counterpoints. Parts of the second and third movements of No.3 are exceptions, mostly due to fluctuant or vaguely defined material of tertiary character.

Sometimes one might encounter textures containing three or four simultaneous thematic and/or semi-thematic layers. Such stretches are only registered as one contrapuntal event. There might also be doubt whether a measure at the end of a contrapuntal texture should be included in the total contrapuntal record if it contains only the last note of a phrase. Normally such a measure is not taken into consideration. If such a texture recurs, the measure in question might be registered once.

In the event of a thematic inversion counterpointing a theme/motive twice, this solution is usually only rendered once.\(^\text{64}\) Even though being a standard part-writing procedure, stepwise bass-lines over at least two measures, alternatively minimum one hexachord, are usually registered as semi-thematic or local counterpoints in this document.

Under most circumstances only the actual contrapuntal stretches are part of the contrapuntal record. In practice this means that in the event of a fugue, the first entry is not included in the overview.

If a contrapuntal stretch suiting a specific classification is interrupted by occasional single measures viable for other labels, the primary label is kept for the entire stretch.

### 1.7 Related problems for future discussion and research

The reason for including this chapter already at this stage and not at the end of the dissertation relates to methodological problems the present author faced already before embarking on his project. Until now there has not existed a sufficiently applicable theoretical fundament relating to all contrapuntal aspects to the symphonic output of the Nineteenth Century.

\(^{64}\) Symphony No.1 III, m.380ff may serve as an example.
1.7.1 Counterpoint, research and verifiability

Theoretically speaking, the actual contrapuntal length, i.e. the period within which two or more substantial ideas appear simultaneously, may indicate one quality credited to the contrapuntal work in question. For example, brief simultaneous thematic inversions, lasting up to just three or four pitches, are regarded contrapuntally inferior in this document, also when repeated or sequenced (i.e.; both layers having the same phrase-lengths). Yet other qualities are equally important, qualities which are not automatically subject to immediate evaluation, such as the melodic qualities of each layer, rhythmic and harmonic implications, even the total textural handling. Whether a system encompassing every aspect of a contrapuntal work is something we should wish to acquire or not, is yet an unanswered question. Possibly we may never wish to pursue such a goal, the pitfalls being obvious, envisaging just another rigid and imperfect system, incapable of capturing all human qualities constituting a piece of art. Even so; the central discussion of this document, pointing to vital aspects of Tchaikovsky’s work, indirectly indicates that the present-day comprehension and use of ‘contrapuntal music’ feels incomplete and unsatisfactory. When looking into previous writings on this subject, a search for more verifiable and precise discussion seems long overdue. On such grounds this document may hopefully be at least a minor contribution.

In the expectation of finding in the future a possible theoretical framework from which we may deduce qualities attached to any contrapuntal work, we must abstain from a much-needed tool by which we may determine or at least suspect the challenge or difficulty implied in the writing of specific types of counterpoints to specific themes. We should thus keep in mind during the forthcoming examination that the characteristics belonging to different themes do not only demand different possible solutions; they may represent a significant difference in respect of compositional challenge as regards contrapuntal writing, depending on the complexity and characteristics of the various themes. Today an analytical approach serving as a quality assurance in the attempt of referring to a contrapuntal canon is practically non-existent. If we in the future would wish to use descriptions like ‘contrapuntist’ or ‘contrapuntal’ with greater conviction, there is a vast amount of theoretic research waiting to be carried out. Yet despite of this, as we all know, some composers are pronounced “contrapuntists” with the utmost ease.

65 The analysis of Symphony No.6 contains an example of contrapuntally inferior thematic inversion at the statement of the subsidiary theme of movement I (Symphony No.6, Ex.6 I 8, trumpets at mm.243-45).
1.7.2 Triads in contrapuntal context

Sometimes, although rare, a non-triadic element develops into triadically built variants or as a variation being part of a triad. The present author feels it is more consistent to exclude all triadically based material counterpointing other triadically based material from being contrapuntally significant, without making exceptions. This view is in line with Brahms's comment concerning the First Symphony of Richard Strauss (see chapter 1.8.2), even though far from all aspects to this problem area seem sufficiently debated as concerns counterpoint in the Nineteenth Century.

1.7.3 Harmonic progression

Evaluating the harmonic surface in relation to thematic ingredients within a contrapuntal texture is but one of several challenges music theory and analysis might be faced with in future research. This document does not go any further in this respect than do related texts (see 1.8.2). If, in general literature, one often gets the impression that counterpoints usually, at least to some extent, seem adjusted to fit into a harmonic mould, the opposite is quite frequently the case in Tchaikovsky, who is often able to make stylized constructions apparently completely regardless of the qualities of the theme in question. In order to create such lines, chromaticism often comes into play; the re-harmonizations might appear refreshingly and at times astonishingly new and revitalized, mostly, though, by means of rather standard procedures. Consequently, in most cases raised bass notes are usually leading-tones, alternatively raised submediant thirds or augmented fifths, while flattened notes are usually dominant-sevenths or diminished fifths, appearing within brief harmonic excursions or modulatory paragraphs. Swift parallel mode changes occur regularly, in order to create sufficient harmonic and metric propulsion. On examination one will - on an overall basis - sense slightly varied harmonic approaches as regards contrapuntal paragraphs in Brahms (see Chapter 1.8.2) and Tchaikovsky (see Part 2), although harmony per se is not under examination in the present texturally and thematically oriented document. In the case of Tchaikovsky, thematic counterpoint is most often used within offensive modulatory passages.
1.8 Nineteenth century counterpoint, as expressed in current analytic literature on symphonic music

1.8.1 Introduction

General studies in poly-linear Nineteenth Century orchestral texture and orchestral counterpoint are surprisingly few. Some literature on the subject exists, though these writings do not focus to any notable extent on textural strategies. Particularly scarce are studies of thematically based counterpoint within a symphonic context, thus characteristics like ‘counterpoint’ or ‘contrapuntal’ are for the most part used en passent in the majority of analytical texts on symphonic literature. Carl Dahlhaus’ article on counterpoint in the classical and romantic eras may serve as a suitable point of departure before proceeding further into a more specific discussion on the subject.

The influence exerted by Bach on Chopin and Mendelssohn, Schumann and Brahms should not be sought solely in fugues and fughettas (…) it became logical to characterize the development section by an intensification of motivic work to the point of fugal technique and thus mark it out as distinct from the exposition and the recapitulation. In Beethoven's late quartets, in Brahms and even in Liszt, fugal technique was in effect displayed as a consequence of thematic working.

Dahlhaus's observation that fugal techniques were not solely found in fugues and fughettas is crucial, yet in spite of this, few commentators take into account the contrapuntal aspect in their analyzing to a notable degree. However, an examination of any symphony of Brahms, for example, reveals in fact no extensive fugal paragraphs at all. Referring to Schubert and subsidiary themes of Bruckner’s symphonies, the article writer moves on mentioning the idea of a cantabile counterpoint or a contrapuntal cantabile style, before continuing to stress the contrapuntal aspect of some of Brahms’s bass writing. Yet one may not automatically associate thematic development with extensive contrapuntal work. Dahlhaus’s article encompasses important aspects, yet several others call for substantial future research, which some of his paragraphs in Grove, at least indirectly, demonstrate. ‘Counterpoint’, in Dahlhaus's view, is thus confined to the more traditional conceptions covering the term,

---

66 Books on orchestration are for the most part concerned with timbral aspects, instrument range and playing techniques. They are in general more concerned with materiality than poly-linear construction.

67 See ANTONY HOPKINS: "Sounds of Music", J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd. (London 1982) and


69 Grove Music Online: Counterpoint; The Classical and Romantic eras (2008-13)

70 In the case of Liszt, the explanation is obviously applicable to some of his symphonic poems.
probably because they are those most easily detectable and also easiest to handle within analytical discourse.

1.8.2 The counterpoint of Johannes Brahms, as discussed in two anthologies

Very few commentators have made much notice of Tchaikovsky's counterpoint until just recently, but when such mention appears, his counterpoint is met with considerable skepticism, as seen later. This chapter attempts to explore in what way 'counterpoint', as a qualitative phenomenon, is discussed in recent analytical anthologies of late nineteenth century symphonic music. The number and frequency of references to counterpoint, together with the way actual references are described, are crucial factors if we want to put Tchaikovsky's contrapuntal work into perspective. This paragraph just deals with how 'counterpoint' and related wordings are applied in the actual analyzes, with no pretensions of discussing the quality of Brahms's work as such.

Among Tchaikovsky's contemporaries, Brahms and Bruckner are usually held in high esteem when 'counterpoint' is on the agenda. Consequently, one might expect to find extensive documentation and plenty of examples demonstrating this phenomenon in current musicography. Yet the fact is that such examples are far from numerous.

In The Nineteenth Century Symphony there is little mention of counterpoint even in the chapter on Brahms's First Symphony, which is in itself remarkable if we assume that counterpoint is such a pivotal phenomenon in Brahms's technique.

The author most correctly observes the "forceful fugato based on the rising motive from measures 6-7" in the development of No.2; a masterly poly-motivic/rhythmic explosion.\textsuperscript{71} The author's notion of a "complex discourse" corresponds well to this excerpt, while a similar characterization may seem too pretentious for m.224 ff:

"(...) the simultaneous return of the neighbor-note idea and the choir of trombones"

might possibly make us believe that there is some kind of textural complexity involved, yet in reality the truth is as simple as this: "The trombones play the neighbor-note idea". The fragment represents inferior contrapuntal challenge to the composer, possessing just complementing and barely overlapping elements. The commentator continues his praise of Brahms's development in the following way:

\textsuperscript{71} m. 204 ff
Tension is maintained as the music builds to a climax beginning in measure 246, where the horn theme (itself now briefly in 3/2) and neighbor-note figure (in 6/8) are soon set off against a new bass in 3/4.\textsuperscript{72}

The above comment is particularly flattering, taking into account that the fragment, later copied to the mediant, is but a stable G major chord, with absolutely no harmonic progression involved.\textsuperscript{73} Lack of harmonic propulsion is, by the way, a characteristic feature of the "real climax (…) at measure 282" with its "terrifying rising third".\textsuperscript{74} The author also makes an issue out of the "genuine cross-pollination (…) by combining the descending third-chain and ascending passacaglia subject".\textsuperscript{75} Yet this simultaneity is achieved via contrary motion on broken chords; see Brahms's comment on Strauss. This fact is, though, no discredit to Brahms; the combination produces nearly seamless harmonic propulsion. The author becomes even more ecstatic about an episode at mm. 169ff, which he describes as

"… particularly noteworthy on account of its "microscopic" detail; here Brahms not only combines a two-voice canon on a forceful variation of the first phrase (with the descending third filled in and the ascending sixth displaced by an expressive appoggiatura), a two-voice inversion canon based on the turning figure from measure 9, and a firmly articulated ascending scale, but then repeats the whole rich combination in triple counterpoint."

Brahms's unquestionable ability for maintaining motivic focus throughout his movements is one thing; the author's assumption that this particular passage represents a major contrapuntal achievement is another. Combining a three-note stepwise cell and a turning figure (in triple counterpoint) may work splendidly for developmental purpose, but represents only a limited contrapuntal challenge, particularly when kept within a one-measure long sequential pattern, based on the circle of fifths. In our dealing with Tchaikovsky's thematic counterpoint a variation like this is not given contrapuntal credit at all, but regarded as a complementary texture. The contrapuntal achievement is further reduced by the fact that two of the layers are linked together with just one note in octave(s), and all layers/motives are segregated by

\textsuperscript{72} BRODHECK, DAVID: Brahms in The Nineteenth Century Symphony, p.240
\textsuperscript{73} The problem at hand was even brought to the fore by Brahms himself: Commenting on Richard Strauss's Symphony in F he underlined that Strauss's simultaneity of triadic themes "was (still) not counterpoint", as Strauss seemed to believe (Brahms's opinion was further commented upon by Strauss's father in a letter to his son on 26.th October 1885). It is, though, highly important to distinguish between textures which involve only triadically based themes (with, for example, occasional passing-tones), thus representing inferior technical challenge, and textures which are constructed as a mixture of triadic and linear thematic layers.
\textsuperscript{74} BRODHECK, DAVID: Brahms in The Nineteenth Century Symphony, p.240
\textsuperscript{75} ibid., p.256
\textsuperscript{76} ibid., p.257
pauses. The "inversion" emerges from the fact that the three-note turning cell turns either up or down.

The enthusiastic author mentions the six-note long invertible counterpoint at the onset of the scherzo (mm. 1-2, 35-36, slightly varied at 3-4, 37-38) and correctly says about measures 33 ff. of the finale that

"(...) Brahms removes the subject to the bass and introduces a surging countermelody in the violins that includes two references to the third chain"

One might alternatively state that the countermelody is a measure-by-measure gestalt based on broken chords.

The last mention of counterpoint comes with the "thundering canon" in variations 39-40. This canon in close imitation is to be sure a powerful moment; the counterpoint as such is once again enabled via the successive melodic third-relations originating from the symphony's opening.

Thus, in general terms it must be fair to say that mention of contrapuntal activity demonstrated or rendered in the symphonic music of Brahms, is not overwhelming in this anthology. True, the article does not intend to demonstrate counterpoint in particular, but having in mind Brahms's reputation as contrapuntist one might expect this feature to be more dominating, even dominating to the extent of permeating the composer's scores.

Neither does A. Peter Brown reveal particularly numerous incidents of noted counterpoint in the symphonic music of Brahms in his extensive and impressive dealing with "The Symphonic Repertoire". Yet, when the author touches upon the subject, one may at times be struck with the way characterizations are dimensioned when correlated to the actual contrapuntal work:

Though there are no fugal expository sections in the entire symphony, the exposition and the development reveal the depth of Brahms's contrapuntal thinking in the seemingly effortless combinations of thematic material. The development itself commences with a quickly aborted canon on 1P followed by 1P in augmentation against something possibly related to 2S (m.197) or the latter part of 1P (...)

Since the author does not demonstrate or specify more clearly "the depth of Brahms's contrapuntal thinking" in Symphony No.1/1, one must presume that the associated "quickly aborted canon" stands as a noteworthy example. Yet, this particular spot possesses absolutely

77 ibid., p.260
78 ibid., p.262
no harmonic progression whatsoever. But equally worthy of notice is the fact that in contrast to the respective author's paragraphs on Tchaikovsky, he expresses no disappointment vis-à-vis the fact that Brahms's imitation does not "come into fruition", a possible regret which is groundless in either case: the author does not explain why some imitative passages should develop into fugatos and others not.

The commentator speaks positively of the horn when dealing with the opening measures of the third movement, which "provides a counterline moving in contrary motion". In our later examinations of Tchaikovsky's counterpoint, the above-mentioned four quarter-notes would be regarded to be rather insignificant taking into account Tchaikovsky's overall striking part-writing.

Later the Finale is praised, among other things, for its "latent contrapuntal potential of the material(s)". But despite this assumption, the realization of this contrapuntal potential is just demonstrated in a brief glimpse to the reader; by measures 2-3, written to standard invertible counterpoint at mm. 13-14.

The author also makes mention of "the contrapuntal orientation of a canon" at m.197, which is in reality the turn-motive in sequence, the imitation of which produces parallel sixths and/or thirds. It is difficult to imagine how thematic counterpoint could come into use in a more unsophisticated and plain fashion than this, and thus the present writer would have been much surprised if Brahms himself would have associated this passage with notable counterpoint.

True, the simultaneous return of two thematic elements at m.302 is noteworthy, yet Brahms once again turns to his predilection for triadic, broken chords.

This solution is also evident in the second movement at a celebrated moment from m.49 ff, but not to the same extent. On a general basis, the movement is lavishly supplied with counterpointing thematic materials. The contrapuntal fields, though, are usually shorter than what is the case with Tchaikovsky, as seen later. About the scherzo, the author once again refers on the one hand to "artifices of counterpoint", although on the other hand there are no specific references to such artifices.

There are but inferior accounts of contrapuntal activity in the Third and Fourth Symphonies, yet in advance of his dealings with the Finale of the Fourth, the author mentions not only "the

---

80 Ibid., p.60  
81 Ibid., p.64  
82 Ibid., p.71  
83 Ibid., p.72  
84 Ibid., p.77
contrapuntal fabrics" of the first and third movements, but even the "deft contrapuntal fabrics". The reader may with justification claim that Brown does not necessarily need to account for every presumption made. Yet why, instead, demonstrate to us the thematic materials and their respective keys, which have been explained to us time after time since the late Nineteenth Century? One might have wished that the notion of "deft contrapuntal fabrics" might have resulted in at least a few noteworthy examples.

Even though Bruckner is often acknowledged for his contrapuntal talent, the chapters from "The Nineteenth Century Symphony" dealing with him do not demonstrate the composer's counterpoint in much detail, despite the fact that he is regarded as "the continent's unrivaled master (of) virtuoso counterpoint".

'Counterpoint' is a term used more superficially than one might expect in A. Peter Brown's quite so extensive dealing with Bruckner. On pp. 173-4, 176, 192-3 and 208-9 contrapuntal activity is merely hinted at. Only after approx. fifty pages do we face more thorough information on the subject:

Bruckner's themes are often designed for the application of contrapuntal techniques. In the 1880 development we are made well aware of them: the components of \( P \) are treated to imitation and inversion; \( S \) is augmented and its counterpoint is inverted.

Since "Bruckner's themes are often designed for the application of contrapuntal techniques", some readers might possibly be disappointed to find that notable manifestations of such techniques are not demonstrated even once during the fifty introductory pages covering five different works.

Thus, the problem does not lie with Bruckner - or Brahms, for that matter - sooner with some of their commentators, who do not sufficiently demonstrate in what way the actual contrapuntal "depth" of these composers manifests itself. The above commentators often tell us that the two masters are contrapuntists in the front rank; they do not demonstrate convincingly why they are.

---

85 Ibid., p.110  
88 Ibid., p.221
2 Constructional texturing in Tchaikovsky's Six Symphonies

2.1.1.1 Symphony No.1 in g-minor, “Winter (Day)dreams”, opus 13, final version 1874 (original version composed 1866)

The creation process of this symphony is known as the most problematic of all Tchaikovsky’s works. He was so absorbed with this project that he was afraid he might die before having completed it. Working day and night he suffered from hallucinations and physical illness, his doctor warning him to be “one step from insanity”. 89

The reception of the symphony from the premiere until today has been varied, though the world premiere of the original version was on the whole negative 90. An anonymous critic in the St. Petersburg press is a noted exception. He was surprised at the symphony’s poor reception by the audience, saying the symphony had its undoubted merits, being “melodious and excellently scored” 91.

Several biographers on Tchaikovsky, like Strutte 92 and Holden 93, make rather insufficient mention of T’s three initial symphonies, while Warrack 94 has spotted a fugue in the Finale of No.1, though failing to reveal further aspects of Tchaikovsky’s orchestral style, even though some distinct characteristics are clearly exposed in this early work. Warrack directs most of his attention towards Mendelssohn’s possible influence on the symphony. From a textural point of view this assumption is highly plausible, and this document more than suggests that Tchaikovsky manages to take Mendelssohn's elegant scoring a step further.

An appropriate wording is found in Grove’s introductory characteristic of T’s complete symphonic output, mentioning one possible explanation of the somewhat troublesome birth of the three first:

90 Which version from the 1860s should be called the ‘original’ is not too obvious, since what is today called the ‘original’ does not contain the actual middle movements that the audience at the world premiere attended in St. Petersburg Feb. 1867, but which is a version partly consisting of elements forced upon Tchaikovsky by Zaremba and A. Rubinstein, Tchaikovsky’s former teachers in composition & theory at the St. Petersburg Conservatory. The version we today define as the ‘original’ is probably in accordance with the version before the Zaremba/Rubinstein-revision, premiered quite successfully in Moscow in February 1868. The revision made in 1874 is referred to as the ‘final’ version in this document.
92 Wilson Strutte: Tchaikovsky (Midas Books, Kent, 1979, ISBN 0 85936 113 6)
94 John Warrack: Tchaikovsky (Hamish Hamilton Ltd., London 1973) p.49
“Tchaikovsky's symphonies of any period are opulent, technically demanding essays in the relationship of language to form. Rich in musical substance; they also respond to Western expectations of integrated structure and coherence. These qualities mark their generic identity, as Tchaikovsky displays the rapprochement of Russian individuality with this proudest of Western genres. Aligning inspiration with genre explains the unusual features of the first three symphonies, his seeking critique from his former teachers, and the ease with which they discerned a tension between his music and their expectations of genre.”

David Brown’s large scale biography in four volumes is, obviously, the only one giving a detailed description of the symphony, and we might therefore occasionally return to some of his views when dealing with the respective movements. It is the largest biography in English language on Tchaikovsky until this day, and dealing with this first movement he proclaims that

‘Neither the title, Winter Daydreams, given to the whole symphony, nor the specific headings above the first two movements offer much insight into what follows. (…) Certainly the listener who doesn't know that the first movement is ’Daydreams of a winter journey' and the second 'Land of gloom, land of mists', is unlikely to be handicapped by his ignorance.’

In connection with this statement he bluntly puts forward the following bold assertion, an announcement which reveals a rather daring premise set for a large-scale biography:

‘… Tchaikovsky was just about incapable of producing a work which did not incorporate something of his own experience…’

Exactly how Brown arrived at this conclusion is yet unknown, which is most unfortunate, taking into account Tchaikovsky’s rather exceptionally wide-ranging production.

By and large, A. Peter Brown is rather positive as concerns the work as such as well as its programmatic allusions, and, like Warrack, suggests Mendelssohn as a possible inspirational source. Martin Cooper, on the other hand, underlines the attitudes of the Abraham tradition:

In the First Symphony his handling of sonata form in the first movement is rather weak and thin, but not positively irregular. He had not yet the skill or the individuality to break away from the academic forms and to create anything really original in its place.
Cooper does not support his allegation with analysis, descriptive examples or other manifestation. Depending on how the wind blows, Tchaikovsky might in one context be accused of being too academic, in another too little academic and/or too emotional.

Richard Taruskin, like Maes, refers in his essay “Tchaikovsky as symphonist” to the fact that - most correctly - the metric 3 x 2/4-grouping is a distinct Kamarinskaya feature\(^99\). One may keep in mind the question whether Glinka’s work may also have had other effects on Tchaikovsky’s First Symphony, above all texturally.

Taruskin holds that the opening movement is the most orthodox sonata-movement Tchaikovsky ever wrote.\(^100\) From a textural viewpoint, though, the movement is not necessarily an unoriginal piece of music.

2.1.1.1 Symphony No. 1, Movement I: Orchestral backdrop: Textural Counterpoint;
Architectonic coherence via orchestration; Textural/Orchestral Factor

Within the field of orchestration one may expect to find variation as regards textural layer-complexity, each layer conveying varying degree of focus or attention. In the opening movement of his First Symphony Tchaikovsky prepares the ground for his orchestral approach, which not only gives the movement character, but also adds to its unity. Even though Tchaikovsky's usage of textural counterpoint is not the core issue of this document, it is, by way of introduction, demonstrated in brief so as to give a fuller picture of his orchestration. It is used with consequence and inventory, fully in accordance with - and complementary to - the composer's remaining dialectical procedures. During the introductory part of the first theme Tchaikovsky displays his textural point of departure (Ex.1 I 1). The accompanying and inconspicuous pianissimo tremolandos, setting the Allegro tranquillo atmosphere, are not poly-linear in a melodic/motivic sense: Initially made up of sixteenth-notes, mostly moving in melodic thirds or seconds, they are just one manifestation of complementing ideas one may observe recur, even develop through the movement. Initially this technique is introduced in the first & second violins in the middle register (mm.1-17). Some passages may very well take their origin from Mendelssohn’s Fourth Symphony, but the departure from Mendelssohn’s bright, major-keyed Italy to Tchaikovsky’s Russian Winter in the minor is rather swift, and within short Tchaikovsky leaves his very personal orchestral imprints in the score. A connection between The Winter Daydream opening and the

\(^100\) Ibid. p.126
introductory atmosphere of Sibelius’ somewhat later Violin Concerto is not unlikely either, both are displaying the respective tranquil themes above soft, static tremolo strings. Tchaikovsky makes use of several varied horizontal scoring techniques during this first movement, and already in his First Symphony he is very conscious of the formally unifying possibilities adhered to clearly defined orchestrational approaches. In the first movement this phenomenon is materialized via a static ingredient, varying, for example, from \textit{ff} tutti displayed over a wide register, to, as is the case here, \textit{pp} within a highly limited ambitus. This static, anonym, yet well considered ingredient is complemented with one of the highly profiled, undulating themes:

Ex. I I Textural factor

In these opening measures we observe a striking sense of economy. The score is stripped for anything superfluous. The highly original melody - the first statement starting and ending with an interval which will recur frequently in the score; the ascending fourth, keeps unfolding in the flute and bassoon in optimal (for this type of instrumentation) double octave, with naked violin-tremolo in the middle register.\footnote{The woodwinds never touch the violin register in this introduction. Usage of segregated registers for complementing layers represents a scoring principle extremely characteristic of Tchaikovsky, although he also uses other methods for the same purpose. Transparent orchestration, though, comes not necessarily completely naturally with symphonists of the romantic period.} During mm.17-18 the violins move up one octave, affirming the already established procedure until m.58. This feature is in line with other orchestration strategies in the movement as concerns secondary material; they are mainly of horizontal, static nature as opposed to the relatively curving themes (except from the slightly more linearly profiled secondary thematic material of the first area). These
textural boundaries which Tchaikovsky inflicts upon himself contribute to the movement’s focused orchestration. On the one hand one might claim that these procedures are, if not commonplace, traditional, some with a Mendelsohnian touch. On the other hand they correspond well with later Tchaikovsky in the way that the approaches are used consistently throughout the movement. Example 1 I 2 renders a rather traditional thematic complementation where the flutes complement the violas. Thus there are three substantial (recurring) layers in this excerpt: two thematic and one textural/orchestrational. The procedure appears to be straightforward and self-evident, yet it is carried out with consequence during extensive parts of the first movement. Also note the elegant form of the layer, very characteristic of the composer, even of his thematic layers: in the beginning it is constructed as a relatively stable line at its top register, followed by a stepwise descent. This type of texture is not exceedingly used by Tchaikovsky in lyrical contexts. It is therefore worthy of notice that it brings textural unity to this particular work; one encounters similar textural solutions both in the second movement of this symphony and in the lyrical Trio-part of the third movement.

Ex.1 I 2 Textural counterpoint (+ thematic complementation)

Already at this stage we may in addition pay attention to the rather anonym tetrachords in the flutes at mm.31-5; this inconspicuous cell interacts in permuted forms in differently
constructed poly-linear textures later and participates in the unifying process of the outer movements in the grand fugato of the finale.

From m.68 the violins take over the thematic material, elegantly handing over the static tremolando to the flutes & clarinets at m.67, implicating a shifting of relative focus, tone colour, register and key (Ex.1 I 3). (The divisi violins, playing arco & pizzicato in unison, demonstrate an effect which Tchaikovsky reuses in this symphony, but one he shall utilize to just a limited extent in his later symphonic production.)

Ex.1 I 3 Textural factor / textural counterpoint

The constantly flowing effect produced by the technique briefly rendered above has also its counterpart in the harmonies produced in the eighth-note triplets of the woodwinds in the recapitulation between mm.430-52 (Ex.1 I 5). These static wind formulas are hybridizations between the tremolando and earlier brass signals, the latter carried out quite persistently particularly in the development. Here the static, textural factor is often made up by triplets, as contrast to the duplets of the motivic elements, thus having an impact upon the retransition (Ex.1 I 4, next page) and recapitulation (Ex.1 I 5).
The rushing, static triplets displayed in Ex.5 are let loose after having been built up during the transition as an increasingly smouldering tension in the French horns from m. 401, and the effect produced by the accompanying triplets of the rescored recapitulation may remind one of the opening of Mendelssohn's Fourth Symphony:

The triplets were introduced in the violins and violas in form of melodic octaves already as an accompaniment for the winds (at the start of the closing theme, m.220-5, Ex.1 I 6) and this specific textural feature is further cultivated in the development. This type of triplets, in various melodic octave combinations, gradually establishes itself as a constructional textural element in the strings. But more important; it may be traced back to the opening violin tremolando. The static designs of the texturally contrapuntal layers are significantly contributing to the tranquillity, or at least stabilizing factor, promised by Tchaikovsky’s introductory ambience, despite the fortissimo passages of the first movement.
From m.226 the triplets transform into duplets, searching for a way back to the original opening motive. The bass-line is built upon a Theme 2 cell, originating from m.163.

Ex.1 I 6 Textural factor (Closing Theme & semi-thematic counterpoint)

The string-figurations in the transition from mm. 226 are prolongations and transformations of the above accompanying string-triplets. They start as a stepwise minor second, thus carrying characteristics of the first three notes from the opening motive (Ex.1 I 10), in permuted retrograde / inverted forms.

Later these octaves recur in the violins (Ex.1 I 7, mm.271-312) together with a permutation of the first motive in the lower strings (mm.271-3), thereafter further developed by the woodwinds from m.293: The violin triplets are interwoven with stepwise triplets in the woodwinds – the latter standing as melodically diminished echoes of the closing theme. These octaves are definitely used as an organic orchestral variable during the movement, depending on the actual dynamic and textural climate. The woodwind triplets from m.271 might be interpreted as hybrids of the preceding violin triplet and the abrupt three-note quotation from the closing theme:
Ex.1 I 7 Textural factor and thematic counterpoint

Tchaikovsky thus makes use of these string triplets in melodic octaves with discipline throughout the movement; eighth-note triplets in the upper strings are in fact used strictly only in a rather static manner (mm.288-312 and 576-81) either in unison or octaves; the harmonic saturation (relatively speaking) in the first violins at m.276 being the exception from the rule. Separation of different ideas is further enhanced by the fact that the triplets are used for the most part simultaneously with duplet material (mm.293-312, 340-75), which, as an isolated phenomenon, is more of a common rhythmic device of the romantic period. The triplets are further reinforced in the woodwinds from m.296, finally creating an alternative accompaniment for the main theme in the recapitulation (m.430, Ex.1 I 5).

The ascending fourth, as demonstrated above in the violas at mm.267-71 and bassoon at m.276, is identical with the two opening notes of the opening theme. This is another demonstration of Tchaikovsky’s striving for economy and discipline, here creating a striking, suspenseful, rocking ostinato from m.250 in the lower strings (see. Ex.1 I 7). In brief, the first two, three and four notes respectively of the opening 1A1-theme recur in differentiated
constructions throughout the first movement\textsuperscript{102}, as is also the case with 1A2, although to a minor extent.

The recurrence of the main theme sets in after an ingeniously crafted retransition leading on to it, built on the initial three notes (mm.395-430). The already augmented opening interval keeps expanding to 5\textsuperscript{th} and augmented 6\textsuperscript{th}, until the “rush” of quaver triplets – the transforming, organic, textural factor – is set loose, preparing the ground for the opening theme (see also Ex.1 I 5). The motive, in its original or close to original statement, serves as building material for the equally noble transition (m.676-93) leading towards the fainted, out-dying version of the theme, forming a short, sophisticated and concentrated coda (m.745).

The above mentioned melodic octaves are kept strictly within the string section. Exx.1 I 4 & 5 demonstrate a static use of single-tone (unison) triplets in the winds. This is of course far from being a sensation. But with signals like those of Ex. 8, Tchaikovsky does never yield to vary or let go of their single-tone/single chord construction. They recur in a variety of haunting, fanfare-like wind shapes, expressed mainly through the brass section, sometimes supported by the woodwinds:

Ex.1 I 8 Textural counterpoint

An adjacent approach is found in combination with a transfiguration of 1A material and a cross-metric chromatic bass near the orchestral climax of the development section (Ex.1 I 9, mm.340-82; the upper woodwinds are omitted). The bassline disturbs the movements overall 3+3-measure construction with a 2+2-measure rhythm. The bass also represents a harmonic challenge vis-à-vis the otherwise relatively stable b-minor atmosphere, the latter being ensured above all by the brass signals:

\textsuperscript{102} One might even argue that there is a one-note reference from the closing theme, for example in mm.277-8; a notion which is confirmed in m.279, where the previously singled-out note appears on the same beat and pitch. The musical sentence is thereafter rounded off by singling out and repeating this note.
Ex.1 I 9 Textural and thematic counterpoint

The orchestral procedures above result in episodes we might have described as “poly-linear”; they occur (respectively) simultaneously with other substantial material in more than one local setting. Even though they are not quite as interesting as thematically contrapuntal procedures, they contribute in creating an extremely integrated, interwoven and focused orchestral output. In this movement Tchaikovsky demonstrates his capacity of creating soft yet clear orchestral refinement and subtle nuance, as well as extremely well-calculated orchestral outbursts originating, defined by a recurring textural factor.

There are some similarities with the (melodically) reappearing single-note fanfare statements in Tchaikovsky’s movement compared to the Beethovenian “fate” motive in Brahms’s First Symphony, but in the case of the latter, Brahms permits his motive to appear in various instrumental guises, where it is given a primary focus, usually without implementing any additional, complementing or challenging thematic layer, while Tchaikovsky keeps his signals strictly within the realms of the winds, mostly as secondary or tertiary material counterpointing the themes.

Summary: The composer makes use of easily detectable, reappearing orchestration procedures in this movement, although without falling into exaggeration. These approaches should not be confused with textures possessing less constructive importance, appearing only once or twice, having no, or vague, coordinates throughout the movement, and thus having no long-term developmental relevance.

During the succeeding chapter on thematic counterpoint in this movement, cross-references may be made to some of the previous examples. Developmental procedures other than thematic counterpoint are sometimes referred to when appearing in a suitable context.
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2.1.1.2 Thematic counterpoint

Taking a brief overview of the thematic material, we find that the Main Area consists of two thematic elements, 1A (Exx.1 I 1, 2, 3, 10) and 1B (Exx.1 I 2, 8, 11). 1A is sometimes being referred to as the "main theme", although only the opening phrase is mainly used developmentally, above all only the first four, three or first two notes.

Ex.1 I 10: 1A material

The rounding off of this first statement ends in a rather unusual manner (m.16), just the way it started, with an ascending perfect fourth.

The 1A2-phrase (see Ex.2) opens with an ascending tetrachord, 1A2a, and the importance of this cell is stressed as the composer singles it out in the flutes at m.31 ff (see Ex.1 I 2).

The secondary material of the main Area is a chromatically oriented gestalt. Although the 1A and 1B materials might appear as contrasted, they share some rhythmic characteristic:

Ex. 1 I 11: 1B material

The variants of this material are for the most part easily recognizable and determinable, despite the similarities mentioned above. Disclosing motivic material is essential in order to reveal, or determine, thematic counterpoint: For example, in the climax of the development section the first interval of 1A1a is permuted, forming a three-note synchronic gestalt (m.340: f#-g-f#, m.343: d-c#-d). The continuous transformation of this permuted cell may be traced until m.375; thereafter it is augmented from m.386 and still more so during the retransition until the recurrence of the main theme, now in its full statement at m.432. The three-note gestalt then returns to its initial form (now in e-minor) from m.676, culminating in a descending line in the strings until m.693, thereafter building up again towards the recurrence of its original g-minor opening in the coda.
The first typical example containing thematically based counterpoint occurs in mm. 90-101. Derivations of both capital motives of the main theme participate in an episode where 1B escalates, until a firm 1B statement dominates the texture at m.106. By keeping each idea within individual registers, the composer has complete acoustic balance between them, given the notated dynamics are respected, thereby ensuring a most desired separation of timbre – a characteristic valid for the majority of Tchaikovsky’s contoured, transparent orchestration of thematic counterpoints. This timbral segregation thoroughly enhances the experience of multi-focus in Tchaikovsky’s score. Even the sustained, octavated pedal in the horns is kept physically undistorted as long as possible (mm. 91-3), establishing a discreet yet important stabilizing role in this otherwise harmonically restless landscape:

Ex.1 I 12: Thematic counterpoint

Regardless of the complexity of Tchaikovsky's textures, the overall contrapuntal control is irreplaceable down to the smallest detail. In the above example we observe that the B-motive (in the strings) operates simultaneously with 1A in the woodwinds from m. 91. The first four notes of the A-motive occur both in the original form (mm.91-92,1), slightly permuted, then immediately linked to its inversion (mm.92-93). Another Tchaikovsky-speciality reveals itself in the above example: frequent shift of timbre in the woodwinds (mm.91-3) within one textural field, making the already intriguing symphonic moment still more challenging and rewarding.

From m.101 1B material accelerates to a new dialectic discourse between the strings and the winds (mm.106-17; see. Ex.1 I 8), culminating and resolving in a bold, re-harmonized restatement of the opening phrase over a descending bass line (mm.117-37). From the statement of the subsidiary theme and onward there might be closer thematic connections to
such lines than here, in such cases mostly indicating thematically oriented counterpoints. But in this example the falling line represents a local type of counterpoint.

The statement of the Subsidiary Theme (Ex.1 I 13) might also give the impression of being accompanied by *countermelodies* or other types of local counterpoints (Ex.1 I 14).

**Ex.1 I 13 Subsidiary Theme**

Yet on closer examination the counterpoints tend to be developed from the theme, and are thus of a more substantial kind. The 2B-counterpoint from m.149 (Ex.1 I 14), adopted from the first statement at m.138ff, renders a slight 1Aa impression, yet above all the theme's descending pitches 3-6 ("Y") are used contrapuntally from m.156: Augmented and inverted forms of this tetrachord counterpoint the (close to) original cell, added by a fourth substantial layer; an augmented chromatic bass in the transitory passage from m.159. The 'x' cell of 2B fulfils this elegant contrapuntal passage. This cell is also absorbed in the restatement of 2A.

**Ex.1 I 14 (Theme-continuation) Thematic and semi-thematic counterpoints**
The Second area continues developing by means of thematically based imitatively oriented counterpoint (Ex. I I 15). The countermovement by which the counterpointing layers move are particularly worthy of notice: Despite the dense texture, unavoidable dissonances resulting from intersection of two melodic layers, mostly moving by parallel fourths, are resolved in the most convincing and exemplary manner above pedals on c♯ and a.

Ex. I I 15 Subsidiary Theme, continued: Thematic counterpoints

In this section the lines in the violins, woodwinds and lower strings (except 2nd bassoon & double bass) thus consist of three measures from the theme plus three measures from the theme’s semi-thematic continuation. The Subsidiary Theme then dies out, first above a quite challenging dominant seventh\(^{103}\), finally left only with traces from the cross-directional lines in the upper and lower strings (mm.181-8) respectively:

---

\(^{103}\) One could possibly claim that some of the long notes in this movement, like this pedal-oriented seventh in the bass, to some extent can be associated with the overall static textural factor. For operational reasons we choose to ask for at least some sort of additional rhythmic ingredient in order to attract sufficient textural attention in this movement.
Ex.1 I 16: Subsidiary area (closing); semi-thematic inverted echoes (from m.180)

The organic development from the above section to the next (Ex.1 I 17, m.190) is as elegant as it is simple and effective; the descending, repeated tetrachord in the violins and the respective ascending version in the lower strings are appearing in diminutions of the thematic vestiges in advance of the GP (i.e. the original thematic note values), accompanied by static wind signals. In respect of orchestration, the fact that the strings never cross the vertical territory of the signals in the winds is also worthy of mention, ensuring acoustic transparency.

Ex.1 I 17 Textural factor & Semi-thematic counterpoint

The transformed material in the strings continues to move upward, while the upper woodwinds keep affirming the static signal until the closing theme at m.220.
The development of this material constitutes a brilliantly shaped seamless transition towards the concluding theme. The lyrical subsidiary theme has been transformed to a heroic closing theme (m.220, see Exx.1 I 16 & 18).

Having been presented to the thematic material, the themes seem to possess some constructional similarities; they start with upward leaps, succeeded by one stepwise fall, then succeeded by a falling melodic third.

Ex.1 I 18 Thematic connection

Though the three themes derive from the same source, each of them possesses individual expressive characteristics.

The development section starts with an immediate culmination, permutation and fragmentation of the closing theme. The latter is presented above the ascending fourth in the lower strings; an interval all the three themes have in common. This important and characteristic cell thus gives a touch of discreet, subtle thematic counterpoint:

Ex.1 I 19 Hint of thematic counterpoint

These two slurred notes in the lower strings are found as a steady rocking, isolated accompaniment under the dissimilation of the closing theme in the horns, repeated in the violas and clarinets respectively in the relative minor (m.261-9), transposed and rescored at m.276 (see Ex.1 I 7).

The rather anonym, ascending tetrachords displayed in the flutes at mm. 31-2 and 34-5 appear as being totally inconspicuous – serving as a complementation to the theme against the 1A2. Yet this thematic complement is developed further after the exposition and, above all, the
tetrachord as such gains in importance in the finale, counterpointing the material of that movement as well as participating in the unification process between the outer movements.

Ex.1 I 20 Tetrachord cell of Theme 1 - used in the outer movements

This thematic tetrachord can be observed in augmented form, first from m.296 (Ex.1 I 21), engaging in three successive, quite similar poly-linear textures in combination with a substantially permuted element from the core of the opening theme; Element 1: the permuted opening motive, played by the woodwinds (mm. 293-5), immediately picked up by the first violins (m.295); Element 2: a permutation of the Closing Theme presented in the lower strings (mm. 294-8); Element 3: the ascending tetrachord from m.296-8, which had been complementing/answering the theme already in the exposition (ref. also Ex.1 I 20). In other words; this thematic construction is further developed in 1 I 21, supplied with two additional substantial layers. An additional layer within this masterfully developed texture is built upon the texturally recurring fluctuant triplets (see also Ex.1 I 6&7) flying up and down in the second violins and violas. Notice also how this layer effects the development of the main theme (Vn.I), as it absorbs the legato - staccato phrasing, contrasting it in inverted form.

Ex.1 I 21 Thematic counterpoint
The closing theme strengthens its position further as it moves closer to the modulatory section between mm.312-26, where the composer uses four-part, sectional, imitative counterpoint:

Ex.1 I 22 Thematic counterpoint (woodwinds and horns are omitted)

A variation of the previous section takes over at m.328, this time based on a version of the closing theme which corresponds closer to its original. Worthy of note is the rather asymmetrical crafting of the second voice from m.335, partly breaking away from the presumed strict pattern vis-à-vis the upper voice:

Ex.1 I 23 Thematic counterpoint

This third variant of the closing theme (violins mm.329-30) bears strong similarity with the opening of the main theme of the Finale. In the latter, the first three notes are an inversion of the closing theme variation from the first movement, but the appearance in general is strikingly similar: a triad plus a falling second with an inserted pause:
Ex. I 24 Finale, m.66; thematic correlate

The orchestral climax and closing of the development at mm.562-92 is succeeded by a three-measure ostinato based on 1B material (mm.592-4). When established, it serves as a ground beneath the permuted Subsidiary Theme, the latter now being exposed in the upper strings in a totally new harmonic and – of course – poly-linear environment. In addition to the puzzling simultaneity of the two melodic factors, the harmonic ambiguity at the beginning of this coda may seem daring for its time:

Ex. I 25 Thematic counterpoint

Semi-ambiguous harmonies occur in some of the forthcoming poly-linear constellations, as when 1B continues running into reminiscences of former episodes, exemplified by the melodic ascending/descending fifth (Ex. I 27) which forcefully established itself during mm. 389-400 (Ex. I 26), at that point as a consequence of an orchestral explosion of the main theme, reminiscent by its three opening notes.

The continuous transformation of the three-note cell during the development is demonstrated in Ex. I 26.

Ex. I 26: Transformation of 1A1a
This cell recurs in a further transformed variant in the woodwinds in a new poly-linear construction between mm.619-21, in fashion of a statement in the horns at m.622:

Ex.1 I 27 Thematic counterpoint

The bass-ostinato then moves into an imitative constellation. This excerpt is the start of a long escalating retransition towards the recurrence of the main theme at m. 670, after a short dwelling on its sub-motive 1Ab at mm. 658-63. The way in which Tchaikovsky starts building up this brief fugato passage is also worth mentioning: From m. 607 the lower strings had been establishing the ostinato within the frame of the initial three-measure sub-division. But the violas (m.627), violin II (m.628) and violin I (m.630) enter in rather non-predictable ways above the chromatically modulating bass.

Ex.1 I 28 Thematic counterpoint

From m.676 the culmination of the climax starts with a permuted sub-motive of the opening motive in the strings, which has just been played in a varied form during the preceding measures; the first three notes\(^{104}\), bursting through the majestic, yet restrained single-tone/single chord static fanfare-motive.

The movement then ends the way it started (m.745 ff.); the 2\(^{nd}\) motive from the Main Theme is fragmented even more, resolving into thin air, and thus most elegantly creating a natural transition towards the next movement: “Land of Desolation, Land of Mists”.

\(^{104}\) During the movement various permutations of these 3 notes have occurred – the combination of one leap and stepwise motion – presented as original, invention, retrograde, retrograde inversion and their derivatives.
There might be several reasons for assigning thematic credit to the chromatically dominated bassline at mm. 117. It might be read as a stylization of 1B or prolongations of the transitory chromatic descents at m.80 before the return of 1A. This suggests that this texture contains thematic counterpoint, but since descending and ascending bass lines are rather standard solutions, they most often are labelled as 'semi-thematic' when there is a thematic association to it. Throughout this document, though, the reader will find a wealth of examples by which the composer utilizes this type of counterpoint.

Ex.1 I 29 Semi-thematic counterpoint

In his review of this movement, which covers approx. seven pages, David Brown has written about seven lines referring to Tchaikovsky’s contrapuntal achievements. This extreme confinement may thus easily be rendered in its entirety:

“Most of what follows (… in the development…) is made up by combining or contrapuntally working pieces of material extracted or derived from the exposition, and building these little syntheses into blocks of up to six bars long which are then sequentially repeated. In the middle, where contrapuntal imitation assumes control, it might look as though the movement will fall into that contrived bustle, which does service in so much of the finale, but the pitfall is swiftly avoided, and the lead back to the recapitulation is one of the most arresting moments in the whole symphony.”

"Contrived bustle" is a subjective assessment; 'complexity' is not. It is astonishing that Brown has found no closer examination of the actual episodes worthwhile, taking into account the abundance and the originality of the material. Yet equally remarkable is his failure in recognizing substantial contrapuntal work to be a predominant feature with the movement as such, a feature not just confined to the development section. Furthermore,

his three first lines, in which he tries to describe Tchaikovsky’s contrapuntal work, is a description very much in accordance with the procedure used by the earlier ‘classical’ masters and even correlates well to some episodes in the symphonies of Brahms.

Already in the composer's first symphonic movement there are at least three outstanding qualities characterizing the polyphonic web: 1: there is a considerable amount of simultaneous substantial thematic material. 2: The counterpoints, thematic as well as textural, stand out as clearly contoured in the score in a well balanced, clear-cut orchestral presentation, within which the composer makes use of few orchestral elements whose main function might have been to serve as a textural safeguard. 3: The contrapuntal work represents variety and inventiveness as a result of constant renewal of motive combinations.

Even so; one might with some justification claim that the textural strategies may to some extent resemble those of Mendelssohn, and that the counterpoints are not particularly more numerous than those of the symphonies of Rimsky-Korsakov and Borodin. Yet the sum of these factors makes even Tchaikovsky's first symphonic movement a highly noteworthy textural experience.

2.1.2 Symphony No.1, movement II (Land of Desolation, Land of Mists)

In this slow movement subsections which may appear as being local-contrapuntally angled are to some extent worked out and varied, even developed inside the borders of these subsections. They might be regarded as borderline cases, though they formally must be classified as textures partly constructed via local counterpoint\(^{106}\), presumed, naturally, that no further thematic connections exist. The forthcoming texture represents a chamber-musical example which contains three simultaneous melodic factors, presented in the obo, flute and bassoon respectively (Ex.1 II 1). Even though the movement's introductory measures\(^{107}\) are significant from a textural point of view as regards color – and there are signs of dialectic focus even here – we will move to the contrapuntally furnished melody at m.24. Attention should also be paid to Tchaikovsky’s transparent instrumentation, obtained by avoiding crossing the vertical territory of neighbouring voices. Whenever possible, Tchaikovsky also

---

\(^{106}\) Thematically based portions of such episodes might occur, and the composer hints at stylized counterpoints in the introduction and coda.

\(^{107}\) A. Peter Brown discusses problems related to the form of this movement in *The Symphonic Repertoire Volume III Part B* (Indiana University Press, Bloomington 2008) p.337
avoids crossing supporting voices, seen in the following example where the syncopated violins operate within a very limited ambitus. The oboe-melody is supplied with a sharply contoured local counterpoint in the flute. It is not only characterized by the stepwise thirty-second-notes leading on to the weightier notes; the ascending and descending, curved contour is equally characteristic. From m.27 the bassoon creeps in very discreetly in stepwise motion, until it starts transforming into an angular, highly profiled melodic contour possessing frequent major leaps, often combined with syncopations. Technically the stepwise descents also characterize the theme. The syncopated and un-syncopated leaps most probably resonate from the opening turn of the theme's second phrase, hinting at a thematic relevance. Thus the three melodic voices have their own very distinct contour, and the sum of the two lower voices preserve the relatively continuous eighth-note motion. The characteristic flute voice always enters after a 32-note pause, the stepwise 32-notes representing just passing notes sooner than the theme in diminutive inversion. The supplementary voices in the violins and violas never cross lines/blend with the three melodic voices. As was also the case with the transparent texture from the opening of the first movement, the chord material is placed within the one-line octave, the bass register only occupied by the melodic bassoon. The atmosphere is anything else than over-romantic or sentimental; a sensation ensured by the contrapuntal, intertwining procession of the three woodwinds, rooted in a confined, plain harmonization, suiting the noble theme, the latter evoking Russian folksong.

Ex.1 II 1Local and thematic counterpoints (viola part omitted)
Local and semi-thematic counterpoints, continued

The origin of the occasional leaps in the oboe and bassoon of the above example can be traced back to the melodic octaves in the flute in the brief transition after the introduction (m.21-2, Ex.1 II 2). These melodic leaps strengthen the thematic connection between the theme and the bassoon counterpoint, and might alternatively be read as a distinct thematic ingredient, to some extent coloring if not dominating the bassoon part:

Ex.1 II 2 Transition (second violins, violas and cellos omitted)

When one of the three simultaneous melodic elements falls out (e.g. the flute from m. 90), one of the two remaining layers is imitated, as when the oboe and clarinet imitate the violins from m.90. The continuous presence of the restless, bouncing bassoon-part assures a highly original three part counterpoint. The importance of this counterpoint continues to grow, to the extent of being a thematic counterpart almost on equal terms with the theme itself. But the peculiar opening intervals are far from accidental: They correspond with the symphony's opening theme:

108 Russian folksong elements, like the melodic octave and the descending fourth, are not discussed in this document.
We will return to a short summary of characteristic features with the above example after a discussion on a similarly built construction in the fourth movement.

A typical feature with Tchaikovsky’s orchestral style is represented in one of the re-instrumentations of the theme; the melody in the horns is supplied with a beautifully shaped, optimally complementing counterpoint in the upper strings. This counterpoint might be interpreted as semi-thematic on account of its obvious affiliation to linear portions of both thematic materials. The cello & bass part represents a third notable layer: In addition to being influenced by the thematic material, this layer also absorbs characteristics of the previous pizzicato bass accompanying the first theme between mm.64-84. In retrospect this new material-constellation draws an extended connection-line between the melodic materials and the leaping bassoon counterpoint, serving as a continuation of the latter.

**Ex.1 II 4 Thematic / Semi-thematic counterpoints**

The 2nd flute doubles the upper violin voice throughout (non tremolo), the 1st flute doubles in 8va.

Tchaikovsky's flair for imitative possibilities associated with any theme possible should be noted already in this work: The opening phrase of the original second theme is imitated unchanged at m.54:

**Ex.1 II 5 Thematic counterpoint (only thematic layers are rendered)**
There are also extremely thinned out contrapuntal textures in this movement, like in the measures right in advance of the reference to the work's opening theme (m.88): Both layers are thematically rooted, the thematic close in the first violins is reminiscent of the first theme's inversion, and the woodwind parts are stylizations of same:

Ex.1 II 6 Semi-thematic counterpoint

Once having been made aware of the I 1A reference (m.88), it might even be possible to accept that the contour of the second theme of the second movement might be associated with the first theme of the first. The tremolando figurations accompanying the first theme of the second movement between m.64-84 represents even a textural affiliation with the first.

2.1.3 Symphony No.1, movement III: Contrary motion and timbral contrast

Each of the initial three movements starts with light, transparent textures. The third movement is a brilliantly carved Scherzo, full of rhythmic invention, with a rhythmically intriguing, short introduction. The upper woodwinds seem to transcend into ordinary hemiola: 3/8+3/8+2/8x3. But the bassoons, in chromatically oriented parallel thirds, commencing with syncopations, muddle and challenge this preconception. Subsequently the four-part divisi violins alone present the opening of the first section of this scherzo. This author is not particularly fond of forcing imagery upon other listeners, but if one of several snowy allusions should be suggested in the Winter Daydream Symphony, this might be one such occasion. The Dance of the Snowflakes from “The Nutcracker” represents an adjacent moment where Tchaikovsky blends triple meter, frequent use of hemiola, transparent orchestral textures and extreme voice-leading into a white, whirling sensation. But the instrumentation is far more confined in this scherzo, so is the harmonization and range of expression. The introductory undulations in the woodwinds take root in the ensuing theme:

---


110 Since Tchaikovsky initially wrote this scherzo for his first Piano Sonata, an eventual “external” or programmatic source of inspiration remains unknown.
But instead of alluding to a ballet scene, this movement might alternatively be compared to a painter’s fascination with subtle variations of a dance routine: It is a movement of considerable discipline also when it comes to handling contrasting textural elements. This contrast is achieved by juxtaposing timbres, register and, not rarely, physical direction. The movement displays an artist at work who excels in combining strict elements with a constant renewed angling of these elements. The orchestral architecture of the A-part of the movement’s ternary form is made with an elegant, sophisticated touch: There is a constant two-sided aspect to the melodic material, from a rhythmical as well as a linear, melodic viewpoint.

Counter-directional layers come to the fore already after the theme's opening eight measures, measures which shall later dictate a constant call for thematic renewal. From m.13 thematically based descending woodwinds encounter an ascending pizzicato block (Ex.1 II 2). A slight difference as concerns rhythmical accentuations between the two groups underlines their respective contrapuntal impact. The construction executed at mm. 13-16 is immediately succeeded by a thinned-out, contrasting texture. By omitting the violas in measure 19, the composer gives the bassoons sufficient acoustic freedom between the remaining string instruments. Countermovement is the common denominator for the scherzo section. This strategy widens the definition of 'textural counterpoint' in this specific movement, thus not restricting the term to the textural linear factor as such. Measures 13-14 may serve as exemplification of the strategy, involving two instrument sections in countermovement, while
the continuation consists of the thematic element versus the textural linear factor in the cellos and basses:

Ex.1 III 2 Textural/local counterpoint / timbral contrast

During the composer’s search for new rhythmical subtlety between the two orchestral groups, there has gradually been formed an image of a 2+2+4 – measure pattern, making a contrast not only between the orchestral groups but between the first four measures and the next. When dealing with contrasting ideas like those of mm. 25-28 (Ex.1 III 3), Tchaikovsky would normally let them operate within separate registers. But because of their extremely contrasting timbral, constructional and directional properties, the composer allows their lines crossing each other. The pedal in the horns, though (harmonically representing the dominant root/tonic fifth), is unbroken, as is often the case in similar situations in Tchaikovsky's scores. The strategy involving counterbalancing the woodwinds against the strings is maintained. Simultaneously, though appearing to be rather insignificant at mm. 21-24 and 29-32, the pizzicato strings add discreet rhythmical contrast. Some might possibly wish to read the stylized counterpoints as thematic, derived from the thematic variation/continuation from m.25 ff.

Ex.1 III 3 Textural / local counterpoint & timbral contrast

(turn to the next page)
These modulatory yet unrestrained textures proceed from c minor to g# minor at m.37 (Ex.1 III 4). Here the layers form a new, ultra-thin texture, implying simultaneously a renewal of the hemiola approach. The timbral mixture consisting of arco and pizzicato in unison, which also could be observed in the first movement, is a delicacy which Tchaikovsky should use to a lesser extent in later works, presumably finding it somewhat inefficient. But not more so than when revising the work, he decided to keep this solution, - for all we know he may have done this in order to depict some frosty crispness with these passages.

In addition to the recurring principle involving contrary motion it could at this stage even make sense to define the contrasting timbres in this movement as a textural counterpoint, particularly in relation to the scherzo parts, and even to some extent with regard to the trio.

Ex.1 III 4 m.33-6: Textural/local counterpoint & timbral (and from 37ff) rhythmic contrast
From m.13 Tchaikovsky has followed something approximating a rhythmic 2+2+4 combination, but feels the time ripe to break down this formula. The last measure of the m.45-48 phrase (Ex.1 II 5) also serves as the first measure in the subsequent phrase toward the recurrence of the scherzo theme. The importance of the textural counterpoint is slightly reduced, as focus in respect of physical direction becomes the more emphasized.

Ex.1 III 5 Metric flexibility, textural/local counterpoint & timbral contrast

Juxtaposition in respect of timbral focus continues, together with renewed subtle rhythmical contrast (58ff); the hemiolas create an accelerating stretto-effect towards the recurrence of the scherzo's opening measures at m.62, now cautiously rescored with new rhythmic accentuations added in the woodwinds.

Ex.1 III 6 Timbral and rhythmical dialectics

The composer continues to explore new possible rhythmical nuances in this movement (note, for example, the bass off-beat, see Ex.1 II 7), while every formal contrapuntal aspect is handled with utmost care. It might be noted that the horn-line is part of a thematic statement
in slow motion (reminiscent of the theme's seven opening notes). The sectional focus between the orchestral groups is retained, executed with elegance, ease and clarity.

Ex. I III 7 Thematic counterpoint/Timbral/rhythmic contrast/Local counterpoint (from m.86)

From the movement’s Trio the below hemiola episode should definitely be rendered, which bears some resemblance to the already noted Waltz of the Snowflakes from one of the composer’s latest works; The Nutcracker. The ballet music is the more dramatic of the two, harmonically as well as melodically, with the last of the four slurred semiquavers in the upper strings are absent in the whirling waltz of the snowflakes. Yet we observe that the music of its symphonic counterpart is carried out with elegance at the expense of drama, preserving contrary motion between the melody in the woodwinds and the utterly well-organized contrapuntal string-block.

Ex. I III 8 Rhythmical (and timbral) dialectics
The trio is richly supplied with local counterpoints, particularly from m.174, with hints of semi-thematic references. The latter is also noticeable at the restatement of the trio. In a transitory passage leading to the timbrally contrasting codetta the rhythm of the scherzo is counterpointed against the lyrical trio theme in the timpani and strings respectively, thus resulting in thematic counterpoint. This textural field is as original as it is facile from a technical viewpoint; the timpani vary by starting their pedal phrases on c and g every second phrase.

Textural two-sidedness is to some degree also found with other composers of the Romantic era, but seldom to the same degree. This is a basic feature with Tchaikovsky's general compositional style, manifesting itself in various ways during his entire career. In this scherzo the multi-sidedness as regards textural and rhythmic subtlety is carried out with consequence and clarity. For a romantic piece the textural transparency of this movement is sober sooner than romantic. The actual scoring clarity shows affinity with the classical masters, but the pervasive dialectics characterizing the score represents steps ahead: These textures often depict contrary motion between orchestral groups and/or complementing rhythmic or melodic ideas between contrasting textural fields. The interplay between the woodwind- and the string-sections is at least equally important as are the remaining dialectic approaches of this movement.
2.1.4 Symphony No.1, movement IV

2.1.4.1 Semi-thematic counterpoint

In the Finale solutions representing complementary linear construction are apparent to the extent of partly constituting a notable complementary principle. We get a notion of this approach already with the introductory *Andante lugubre* (Ex.1 IV 1), where the bassoons hint at the ensuing statement of the actual melody. Absence of strings emphasizes the pronounced clarity in this highly elegant introduction, although smooth and refined linear part-writing is a feature characteristic of Tchaikovsky. This principle has already been easily observed in the preceding movements, but it will to a significant extent dominate the finale.

The reason for this might be found in the introductory theme, where six notes in the theme move in falling stepwise motion: This principal thus has a thematic argument, but since linearly formed counterpoints represent a rather common solution in a large number of works, they are for the most part labelled 'semi-thematic' even when having thematic relevance. Both the designation *Andante lugubre* and the fermata pauses indicate tension of some sort, a tension gradually being resolved as summer and the folk song "The Garden Bloomed" gains terrain later.

Before the actual introductory theme appears (a theme close of being a slow version of the subsidiary theme, see Ex. 1 IV 2), the focus on the introductory cell continues at m.9 in the upper woodwinds, counterpointed by a chromatically flavoured descending bass line in the bassoons, for the most part producing parallel harmonic relationships. This straightforward two-part semi-thematic counterpoint ensures a transparent and simple yet noble and elevated atmosphere.

---

111 Added thematic characteristics will normally border to or justify a 'thematic' classification.

112 In the event of having vague thematic relevance, as was the case in the preceding movement, such lines are labeled 'local' counterpoints.
This procedure is repeated in contrasting tone-colour by the strings, prolonging the conjunct, descending, partly chromatic bass; timbral contrast once again manifests itself as a striking textural hallmark in Tchaikovsky.\textsuperscript{113} What increases the listener’s attention towards this bass-line is the irregular rhythm and possibly slightly unpredictable harmonic implications\textsuperscript{114}. Just as we have had our attention focused on the bass and the melody, the bassoons creep in as a third layer attracts attention: After a smooth, stepwise onset, they incorporate more and more the type of odd leaps and turns which formed such characteristic bassoon-layers in similar textural constructions in the second movement (see also Ex. 1 II 3).

Although these voices are not in themselves exceptional, the continuous addition of new conjunct lines in the remaining woodwinds from m.25 creates an extremely elegant score, with up to four separate individual layers at mm.25-26 and 29-30. Nevertheless the music flows effortlessly, restrained and exalted, due to the composer's customary elegant part-writing. Except for the viola pedal, each voice has a melodic role in this semi-thematically rich texture.

\textsuperscript{113} Some may find remote relationship between this theme and the subsidiary theme of the 1.st movement.

\textsuperscript{114} The statement is characterized by a persistent interchange of minor and major dominants and sub-dominants. In this writer's view, as a rule too much uncritical emphasis has been placed on a presumably planned harmonic structure within a given work: During the reading of this document the reader will find that Tchaikovsky excels in counterpointing lines to almost any theme possible. Thus such lines become architectural goals in themselves, being at least equally important as the chords as such. Consequently the produced harmonic combinations come as the result of these lines, not necessarily the other way round, although, of course, harmonic functions as such are always inescapably valid.
The excerpt from m.25 (Ex.1 IV 4) bears strong textural resemblance with an excerpt from the second movement (see Ex.1 II 1), and consists of four separate melodic elements; - the violin theme, - the melodic, stepwise bass, - the melodic bassoons with their characteristic occasional abrupt leaps, and the additional descant counterpoints in the upper woodwinds (including the anonym “tetrachord” cell from the first movement).\textsuperscript{115} Not only are the contrapuntal combinations strikingly familiar, even the construction of the actual contrapuntal layers correlate to a high degree. Yet even though the themes themselves stand out as very individual, a closer look reveals some similar melodic elements.

Ex.1 IV 4 Semi-thematic counterpoints

Until m.31 the upper woodwinds had attracted increased attention, to such a degree that primary focus on this instrument section was to be expected. This happens at m.31, much due to the octave leaps in the flutes and clarinets, on top of simultaneous motivic and motivically inverted material. At m.33 three individual semi-thematic lines appear simultaneously:

Ex.1 IV 4 Semi-thematic counterpoint (the brass and strings are omitted)

\textsuperscript{115} Observe also the ‘folkloristic’ melodic octave in the flutes, bassoons and first clarinet.
The introductory theme then culminates with a restatement of the introductory motive at m.34, slightly re-orchestrated. The atmosphere is more withheld this time, with added fermata pauses and timpani rolls, before the motive accelerates until m.47; *Allegro moderato*. In this transition the composer makes use of complementing stepwise ascending lines building up towards the dominant preparation in advance of the Main Theme. The woodwinds on the whole double the strings, a procedure which in this example underscores the striking ascending lines, at the expense of timbral contrast (Ex.1 IV 5):

Ex.1 IV 5 Semi-thematic counterpoints

![Ex.1 IV 5 Semi-thematic counterpoints](image)

But before the actual *Allegro maestoso*-theme unfolds, the dominant preparation continues by a stylized version of elements from the introductory measures. The pervasive, stepwise procedure thus proceeds, highly unifying the introductory textural fields. The characteristic turn on the fifth and sixth scale degrees in the violin layer is a common feature with the main and subsidiary themes of the outer movements, particularly the Finale.

Ex.1 IV 6 Semi-thematic counterpoints / thematic inversion

![Ex.1 IV 6 Semi-thematic counterpoints / thematic inversion](image)

At m.180 a fugato on the subsidiary theme is transformed into a subtle cultivation of the movement’s linear, semi-thematic orientation at m.188-89 (Ex.1 IV 7). In addition the violins counterpoint the fugato by use of variations of the tetrachord and the theme's original introductory cell from the main theme of the first movement:
In advance of the above example a brief poly-linear construction (at m.157, Ex.1 IV 8) concludes with the following rhythmically complementing semi-thematic lines:

Ex.1 IV 8 Semi-thematic counterpoint (thematic inversion)

At m.370 this linear, cross-directional textural tendency comes to the fore again in the retransition in the strings (see Ex.1 IV 9), complemented by the horns, creating a passage having much in common with a corresponding textural field in the first movement’s mm.401-30. The syncopated descending chromatic line in the upper strings can be traced back to an inverted preparation of the main theme (motives from the theme are shown in Ex.1 IV 10) and to a counterpointing inversion earlier in the movement (see Ex.1 IV 12). These lines also correspond with the lower strings from the same part of the theme (Ex.1 IV 10), and also the introduction. In reality the whole episode is a dramatic reworking of the theme’s second motive, including its inverted counterpoint, and thus might alternatively easily have deserved being labelled as 'thematic counterpoint'. During the elaboration of the three linear layers, bold dissonances appear and resolve frequently (Ex. 1 IV 9).
The texturally static fanfare-shaped signals and horizontal tremolando signals of the first movement find their counterparts to the counter-directional layers of the finale; they are textural counterpoints, but the procedures of the finale are sometimes close of being thematic and are at any rate semi-thematic. Together with high degree of thematic counterpoint, the final result becomes the more imposing.

2.1.4.2 Thematic Counterpoint

In light of the contrapuntal work found in the first movement, one might expect to find a significant amount of substantial counterpoint also in the finale, since this is also a sonata form. Comparison of motivic elements from the opening movement and the main theme of the finale has been made earlier (Ex.1 I 23-24), but the main theme of the finale is significantly longer than its counterpart in the first movement. Together with the theme's characteristic opening motive 1A, the ascending stepwise, syncopated line, 1C, together with its stepwise bass leading toward the restatement of the theme’s opening motive, harmonize with the general linear texturing principle rendered in the previous paragraph.\textsuperscript{116}

Ex.1 IV 10 Main theme (Thematic counterpoint from 1C)

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Ex1IV10.png}
\caption{Main theme (Thematic counterpoint from 1C)}
\end{figure}

From m.89 the paragraph is prolonged by fugato-related passages, first only to a minor extent, by using the theme's 1A and 1C motives versus single and compound/scalar tetrachords. From

\textsuperscript{116} Particularly worthy of note is also the violin part as such, which demonstrates another constructionally significant feature of Tchaikovsky's poly-linear style: When the layer has, in practice, fulfilled its mission and handed over the remaining material to the bass register, the composer stretches the layer until the theme is closed, rounding it off with an arched descent. In later works this technique is at times even more elaborated.
m.103 (Ex.1 IV 11) the initial 1A is used imitatively in the upper strings, while the lower strings counterpoint via a bass figuration which might be regarded as a traditional Fortspinnung, though in the last resort it is constructed on the insignificant ‘tetrachord’ motive from the opening movement. The tetrachord of the first movement recurs in several contrapuntal contexts in this movement, as shown further on.\textsuperscript{117}

Ex.1 IV 11 Thematic counterpoint (score reduction)

This modulatory passage proceeds as a continuous build-up toward a permuted orchestral tutti statement of 1A at m.120, followed by a microscopic transition toward the subsidiary area.

The thematic development proceeds through the stepwise half notes / syncopated quarter notes stemming from the Main Theme's inverted 1C (Ex. 1 IV 12). The constant Fortspinnung of the tetrachord cell contributes in enhancing the contrapuntal effect. Noteworthy is also the structure of the layers as such, above all, as in this example, the elegant arch which forms the cello/bass layer: Its ascending part is built upon I:1A2a, its descent on 1C before it continues with 1A.

Ex. 1 IV 12 Thematic counterpoint (score excerpt)

\textsuperscript{117} Some commentators have had problems finding an argument for the tetrachords (I: 1A2a), and thus missed the inter-movement relationship in this respect. A. Peter Brown fails to see the thematic relevance and importance of this cell in \textit{A. Peter Brown: The Symphonic Repertoire Volume III Part B (Indiana University Press, Bloomington 2008)} p.339. See further comments at the close of this chapter.
The ascending tetrachord has a typically Tchaikovskyan textural consequence; its strenuous way up is rewarded as it gets the main role in the succeeding passage at mm.116-20. This type of textural transfer links textural fields together in an extremely purposeful way.

A restatement of the Subsidiary Theme in the tonic’s mediant leads up to a triumphant and architectonically elegant imitation at m.160:

Ex.1 IV 13 Thematic counterpoint (score excerpt)

The above restatement is prolonged by the equally refined semi-thematic texture rendered in Ex.1 IV 8.

This movement is full of exiting contrapuntal craftsmanship, for the most part being of thematic nature. The imitation built on the subsidiary theme in Ex. 1 IV 7 has been supplied by the tetrachord from the first movement. The individual parts which constitute the imitation are brilliantly shaped contours, each entering one step above the previous. (The fourth entry succeeding these voices is the 2\textsuperscript{nd} clarinet, at m.186). Immediately after this poly-linear episode, a succeeding contrapuntal construction emerges from a statement consisting of motives derived from the Main Theme at m.200 ff, this time in the minor key. From m.212 the final motive prepares the ground for the ensuing poly-linear constructions, wherein a mixture of subtle motivic derivations makes up the basic material together with the first movement's 1A2a. Before having a closer look at the fugatos as such, we need to give an eye to the materials.

Motive 1D repeats itself three times in descending direction (Ex.1 IV 14 B), the second is a permutation of the first and the third is a diminution of the second, the diminution carrying features from the opening of the symphony (Ex.1 IV 14 c). Above all it is a strait citation of the main Allegro Maestoso-theme (mm.85-6 in the bass instruments), in its parallel key. Worth noticing is also the relationships between the opening themes of the outer movements; five notes (Ex.1 IV 14 B) carry the raw material of the fugato from m.213, the initial four of these find interrelations with each other, as demonstrated briefly in Ex.1 IV 14. The inverted version of the first four notes from the finale’s main theme finds its equivalent in a motive from the finale’s subsidiary/introductory theme (Ex.1 IV 14 A/B).
Ex. 1 IV 14 Motivic relationships

When the motive from the subsidiary theme recurs in the shape of permuted inversions, the connection between the two outer movements becomes even more apparent:

Ex. 1 IV 15 Motivic permutations in the Finale, reminiscent of the work's opening theme

There are further examples demonstrating interconnections between the two outer movements; a derivation from the first movement’s main theme finds its analogue variant in the fourth movement:

Ex. 1 IV 16 Corresponding motivic development in the outer movements

The derivatives of the Main Theme's 1D interact in what might be regarded as an extraordinarily well crafted, versatile fugato:

Ex. 1 IV 17 Thematic counterpoint
The fugato passages grow in tension until m. 272, succeeded by a transition which adheres to the movement’s textural counter-linear strategy as it moves toward the recurrence of the Main Theme in its original key. These passages constitute a veritable fountain of poly-linear techniques. One particular incident worth mentioning is the close imitation of the rhythmically diminished 1D' motive at mm.245-50 (Ex.1 IV 19). From m.251 the original motive moves alongside the already intriguing counterpoint into this new simple yet ingenious three-part continuation of the modulatory process.

Ex.1 IV 19 Thematic counterpoint
(The score excerpt focuses on the main poly-linear constellations.)
This section continues to move seamlessly towards the restatement of the Main Theme. What is highly characteristic of this development section is its extreme focus on substantial counterpoint, executed by way of a constant variation of new motivic combinations within an incessantly restless tonality.

Ex.1 IV 20 Thematic counterpoint (Score excerpt)

When Tchaikovsky revised his first symphony, he left the finale rather unchanged as opposed to the first movement which underwent considerable revision. Tchaikovsky thus may have felt
very pleased with it, and it was one of the very few works he openly spoke warmly of for the rest of his life. Nevertheless, of this Finale, David Brown is on the whole negative. In his biography he refers to the “studied display of conservatoire contrapuntal skills”\(^{118}\) in the movement, without attempting to describe any such particular case in detail. On the contrary, his general approach to the symphony until now has been that of making comparisons to Glinka\(^{119}\), drawing a traditional harmonic overview of one of the movements\(^{120}\) or comparing sections from new and old versions\(^{121}\). These are all admirable doings, but a detailed study on how Tchaikovsky’s “trim little contrapuntal synthesises”, as he puts it, gives “an illusion of organic growth” at this point feels urgently welcome. When Dahlhaus, on the other hand, refers to such procedures, they are expressed to be “an intensification of motivic work”, a truly appropriate wording. Sometimes it looks as though Brown adheres to opinions of previous Tchaikovsky reception without being wholly comfortable with this situation, admitting that the “contrapuntal passages are expertly manufactured”.

A peculiar characteristic with the type of Tchaikovsky reception Brown represents, is the unwillingness or inaptitude to question whether the composer’s original approach in both this finale and the first movement represents something refreshingly new as concerns organic growth and focused development. On the contrary, he confines himself to ascertain that the polyphonic endeavors are “fundamental flaws”, yet failing in every respect to make a professional account in support of such an assertion.

David Brown sticks to Abraham’s dogma that “like most Russians [Tchaikovsky] had no aptitude for organic counterpoint”\(^{122}\) and that the modulatory sections

\[
(...) \text{ faced Tchaikovsky with some huge intractable lumps of music which he had no hope of digesting into an organic symphonic structure.}
\]

We might in addition include comments made by his successor A. Peter Brown, though the latter commentator, viewed in the light of the majority of previous reception, represents a considerable analytical step forward as compared to his predecessor. Even so, he copies D. Brown by finding the most extensive fugato to be one of the “miscalculations” in the finale:

---

\(^{118}\) David Brown: Tchaikovsky. The Early Years, 1840-1874. (W. W. Norton & Co. Inc. 1978) p. 108  
\(^{119}\) Ibid. p.104  
\(^{120}\) Ibid. p.106  
\(^{121}\) Ibid. p.114,115  
\(^{122}\) Ibid. p.108
In the case of T(P), the countersubjects seem more like something out of counterpoint exercises: scales, tetrachords, and suspensions with sequences.\textsuperscript{123}

The reader already knows that a melodist like Tchaikovsky did nothing like lapsing into arbitrary scale-exercises and tetrachords for no obvious reason, and that the tetrachord, in addition to the magical opening theme itself, is one of the most distinct motives in the first theme of the first area, its inconspicuousness notwithstanding, growing in importance throughout the finale.

Krauss's, D. Brown's and A. Peter Brown's receptions of Symphony No.1/4 become the more conspicuous taking into account the fact that the composer revised the symphony in 1874, but kept the finale as good as unchanged: This is the same composer who had by that time already composed “Romeo & Juliet” and the Second Symphony, with its much-praised finale. D. Brown characterized parts of the finale as “fundamental flaws”, while Tchaikovsky, for good reason, favored this symphony in particular for the rest of his life.

The reception concerning the counterpoints in this finale becomes even more spectacular viewed in light of comparable comments on works by Tchaikovsky's contemporaries. In “The Nineteenth Century Symphony” the author on Tchaikovsky even tries to surpass Brown, labeling mm.181-200 as a “heavy-handed and painfully regular fugato”.\textsuperscript{124} In line with his predecessor D. Brown, the author describes some of Tchaikovsky's contrapuntal creations as merely "decorative", presumably as opposed to "substantial". Yet both incidents, as seen previously (Symphonies No.1/1 m. 40 ff and No.2/3 m. 450 ff) contain nothing but strictly thematic material, and the author's description thus appears somewhat confusing to say the least. In “The Nineteenth Century Symphony” only the Tchaikovsky article contains rather extensive negative comments on the composer in question, and the author's dealings with the contrapuntal aspect are, at best, problematic.

Another heritage from D. Brown may also be detected in the writings of A. Peter Brown: speaking at least half-ironically of "Professor Tchaikovsky" one waits expectantly yet in vain for an explanation of why the fugatos of the finale of No.1 "seem static". The author might, for example, alternatively have compared Tchaikovsky's solutions with those of Bruckner's,

\textsuperscript{123} In Brahms Symphony No.1/I, m.321 ff an extremely straightforward, non-modulatory contrapuntal pattern is sequenced six times, even without suspensions. It looks as if this rather primitive solution is, by comparison, completely unproblematic to the same author.


\textsuperscript{125} Ibid., pp. 304, 309 etc.
Brahms's and even Beethoven's symphonic fugatos. Beethoven's fugatos, to be sure, differ from those of Tchaikovsky. But they are not necessarily less static, and, in line with habitual practice, these allegations are never being attempted accounted for.

In contrast to the rather negative reception of the fugato within some Anglophone circles, theorists and critics in Russia were mainly positive. Thus it is to A. P. Brown's credit that he quotes from a Russian review after a concert as late as 1886, in which the Russian critic is in complete disagreement with his Anglophone colleagues and finds the grand fugato to be the highlight of the Finale:

"The last, fourth movement of the symphony is mediocre in design, but superbly developed; in particular, a masterly constructed fugato (...) stands out."\textsuperscript{126}

\textbf{2.2 Symphony No.2, “The Little Russian” (Final version)}

\textbf{2.2.1 Introduction: A Russian Backdrop for “The Little Russian”}

The Second Symphony was composed in 1872 and had its final revisions during the years 1879-80, resulting in a total rewriting of the first movement. The work’s subtitle “The Little Russian” derives from the extensive use of themes based on Ukrainian folk songs. Among the first three symphonies, this work is the only one being performed with some degree of regularity, much due to the magnificently scored finale. Stravinsky may also have contributed to the work’s at least partial regularity on concert programs by including it together with his own works on concert tours.

In his four-volume biography D. Brown, instead of examining the actual craftsmanship exerted in the work, and in the first movement in particular, uses several pages in comparing the original and revised versions, as to which sections are moved whereto, which section has been totally removed etc.\textsuperscript{127} In light of the vast scale of his biography, it is surprising, to say the least, that Brown makes little effort to examine Tchaikovsky’s dialectically angled orchestral style, which is striking in this movement. Even Krauss spends most of his time

\textsuperscript{126} A. Peter Brown: \textit{The Symphonic Repertoire Volume III Part B} (Indiana University Press, Bloomington 2008) p.341

\textsuperscript{127} David Brown: \textit{Tchaikovsky. The Early Years, 1840-1874}. (W. W. Norton & Co. Inc. 1978) p. 259-64
comparing the two versions, making practically no attempt at revealing Tchaikovsky's technical approach.\textsuperscript{128}

\subsection*{2.2.1.1 Symphony No.2, movement I}

\textbf{Thematic material}

The symphony opens with an introductory French horn solo, a modified folktune consisting of motives which to some extent will have an impact on the ensuing first and second areas. The introductory area is clearly influenced by Glinka’s rescoring principle, although Tchaikovsky's solutions are – from a developmental point of view – far from mere inconsistent re-orchestration. The folksong's opening measure presents the most predominant material, together with the motive in the theme’s third measure (the score’s measure four). But as may be observed in Ex.2 I 1, some motives are highly dependent on others; and their interrelations are rather intricate, the simple melodic statement notwithstanding. Later this material is for the most part referred to as Intro material:

Ex.2 I 1 Introductory Theme; motives/cells of poly-linear significance

\begin{align*}
\text{Intro A1} & \quad \text{Intro A} & \quad \text{Intro B1} \\
\text{Intro A1a} & \quad \text{Intro A2} & \quad \text{Intro B1b} \\
\text{Intro B} & \quad \text{Intro C} & \quad \text{Intro A1 RETRO} \\
\end{align*}

The motive that opens this folkloric yet noble melody is the one being most drastically varied during the movement; this is particularly valid for the sub-motive after the first note (Intro A1a), as demonstrated in Ex.2 I 2. The Main Theme actually starts at \textit{Allegro Vivo}, but most of what follows throughout this movement originates from the introduction. Motive \textit{Intro A1z} (Ex.2 I 2c) might be regarded as a rather dramatic permutation of the Intro A and C figurations, consequently much more substantial than just the “scale passages that were already a fingerprint of his style”, as John Warrack puts it in his otherwise brief but well formulated paragraph on the symphony\textsuperscript{129}. If we look just hastily on the original motive and its derivative, the connection may perhaps appear a little speculative, but when we divide the Intro B-figuration into substantial cells (Ex.2 I 2b), the relation to the theme’s opening

\begin{footnotes}
\item \textsuperscript{129} John Warrack: \textit{Tchaikovsky} (Hamish Hamilton, London, 1973) p 70
\end{footnotes}
measure becomes the more apparent. Thus, technically speaking, it might possibly have been wiser to label just the delimited cell, but Tchaikovsky links together cells in ascending sequences throughout the movement and uses these connected cells as a recurring textural ingredient. A similar procedure is also applied to the construction of the subsidiary theme and is further utilized in a poly-linear construction at m.194 ff.

Categorization and exposure of motives, sub-motives and their derivatives are necessary for acquiring an adequate picture of the contrapuntal aspects to Tchaikovsky’s orchestral style: Despite the almost classical transparency of the score, one is struck with the variety by which the composer excels in using new motivic combinations in thematically based counterpoints.\(^{130}\) The Subsidiary Theme (mm.87ff.) is clearly directly interrelated with the above introductory theme: Some motives share distinct characteristics, as, for example, the interlinked ascending melodic cells, even though they at first sight may appear as quite different gestalts. Usually they ascend in a winding manner instead of following a rather straightforward linear upward procedure. Thus some inter-motivic relations can be read as an ascending graphical construction subdivided into several plateaus. A melodic, sequenced ascending fourth is also a predominant feature with some of these motives (notice for example the dotted slurs in Ex.2 I 2, see above all Ex.2 I 8).

**Ex.2 I 2 Motivic development and transformation**

The Main Theme’s five opening notes share characteristics with the second motive from the introduction; two identical notes plus two slurred stepwise descending notes plus one stepwise note:

**Ex.2 I 3 Motivic connection between the Introductory and Main Themes**

\(^{130}\) The motives in this and similar paragraphs are noted/registered only if the composer has used them in later contrapuntal passages. Possible motives that are not used in that manner – or used merely insignificantly – have been excluded from registration. Motivic variants that recur during the movement are also labelled only when used in a contrapuntal context.
The initial thematic material within the Main Area is a curved gestalt (Ex.2 I 4, m.54-60); at first there are approximately three ascending measures, then three descending. The metric ploy of 1A2 (m.57 ff. and 62 ff.) is later also applied to 1A1 (Ex.2 I 5) at m. 128 (Ex.2 I 14).

Ex.2 I 4 Basic material of the Main Area, mm.54ff.

The first five notes in this theme (1A1) form a widely used motive in the movement. The ensuing 1A2-material is just about as linked to the Introductory Theme’s first measure as is most of the remaining thematic fabric. Even though it is not predominant in contrapuntal contexts, 1A2 has, to some extent, a slight impact upon the B-part of the main theme (Ex.2 I 6, m.70ff). The motive initially appearing at the anacrusis of m.67; 1B (Ex.2 I 5), is a slight deviation of Intro A1a. This motive is immediately followed by its own permuted (retrograde) and rhythmically augmented variant. The rhythmical intricacies within the entire Main area are certainly interesting, but any closer examination of this parameter lies outside our focal interest.

Ex.2 I 5 - Further motivic connection between the Main (A) and Introductory Themes

The B-part of this ternary form is thus constructed entirely by means of 1B in a most convincingly transparent manner:

Ex.2 I 6 Main Theme B, m.66 ff.: motivic interconnection / motives for contrapuntal use

Thus, to some extent the initial motives have an impact upon the thematic material of the entire movement. The connection between the main and subsidiary themes is underlined by
the fact that the quavers in both are performed respectively staccato or legato in pairs. As the movement unfolds, some elements exchange certain characteristics: Motive 1B (Ex.2 I 5-6) has the same phrasing – staccato/legato – as 1A1. After the appearance of 2B (see Ex.2 I 7) phrased legato-staccato, 1B assumes some of 2B's phrasing features in the first transitory passage before the development (see Ex.2 I 7c), even though the strong and weak beats will normally be performed legato-staccato respectively.

Ex.2 7 Inter-motivic phrasing influence / development

The stepwise three-note cell, by which the Subsidiary Theme opens, is found in both the Main and Introductory Themes. But the ascending cell-sequence is, like is the case with Intro A1z (see Ex.2 I 2), its most predominant feature. Above all 2B (m.92) should be read as a diminished echo of two measures of 2A (e.g. mm.89-90):

Ex.2 8 Subsidiary Theme; essential motives

The clearness, by which the poly-linear procedures in this movement eventually are carried out, could hardly have been more architectonically clean-cut. As regards orchestration, the various motives and their derivates are exposed in extremely transparent textures, quite often with just a minimum of supportive, inferior material.
2.2.1.2 Thematically based counterpoint in the first movement

Already in his First Symphony Tchaikovsky had undertaken substantial motivic development during the exposition of the first movement. In mm. 23-24 of the Second Symphony (Ex.2 I 9) the original version of Intro B is utilized simultaneously with a derivative from Intro A1a; Intro A1z. There are at least two substantial layers in this texture, conducted in a manner that is typical of Tchaikovsky’s highly economical, razor-sharp textural planning: Firstly, there is a two-part (two-layer) thematic interaction, which is supported by syncopated harmonic material in the horns, organized as static measure-by-measure semiquaver-syncopations; notes which serve as harmonic common-tones in an otherwise chromatic environment. The syncopated layer was adopted from the woodwind layer of the previous texture. In addition there is a stepwise, descending bass. In Ex.9 the focus is only on the poly-linear aspect; the Intro B-motive from the opening theme’s third measure (the score’s fourth measure) in the first oboe and bassoon respectively, and Intro A1z it in the upper strings, counterpointing the theme.

The two measures in Ex.2 I 9 are subsequently repeated in mm.25-6, transposed up one semitone. Intro A1z is continuously yet discreetly varied and not just a copied blueprint. It is a highly flexible devise, though always keeping its characteristics recognisable and intact. The contrapuntal interplay between these two motives now continues over twelve measures.

Ex.2 I 9 Thematic counterpoint (only thematic layers are rendered)

It must be fair to say that this part of the Introductory Area contains some of the composer's most predictable contrapuntal passages. Sometimes only the second half of Intro B; Intro B1b
(Ex.2 I 1) is used, for instance at m.27 (oboe 1 and horns I & III) and in mm.42-5 (in the trumpets, trombones & violins) in a poly-linear construction (see Ex.2 I 11).  

From m.28 ff (Ex.2 I 10) the woodwinds present about the entire Introductory Theme, accompanied by variations of Intro A1z, which are played by the upper strings. The Intro A1z-procedure is applied measure by measure, regardless of the melody’s construction at any given moment. Subsequently the Intro A1z-motive is used as a counterpoint during a harmonic stretto, continuously retaining its main characteristics until the transitional figuration before the ensuing re-orchestration of the theme.

Ex.2 I 10 Thematic counterpoint (supportive material omitted)

Intro A1 is traduced in ascending sequence by the woodwinds and horns, complemented by tremolando sixteenth-note triplets in the strings; a technique favoured by the composer in

---

131 Mm.35-38 exemplify to some extent thematically based counterpoint, but it is rather a borderline case; each voice enters in form of a substantial motive, but at the next entrance the counterpoint is rather insignificant; a broken triad. It is by far typical of Tchaikovsky to submit to this type of solution.

132 Counterpointing an entire theme with a thematically based motive or cell is a procedure often found in Tchaikovsky. The respective motives may vary in length from the quite note-rich element in Example 2 I 10 down to the short, descending two-note cell which accompanies the love theme in Romeo and Juliet. A procedure similar to the latter is found in Francesca da Rimini, where the love theme is counterpointed by melodic octaves or upwardly surging semi-tones in triplets, versus the duplet melody. In these two works the counterpoints are forecasted during a procedure approximating 'textural transfer'.
parts of his orchestral program music. Intro B1b fulfils a thematic arch by proceeding in downward sequence towards a diminuendo, inheriting the Intro A1z counterpoint between mm.42-47 (Ex.2 I 11) before fading out:

**Ex.2 I 11** Thematic counterpoint

The utilization of a motive as dominating as Intro A1z over such a long stretch might possibly appear slightly over the edge. Tchaikovsky meets this challenge by using constantly shifting registers and changing instrumental color. Increasing harmonic tempo also helps avoiding textural convulsion and instead achieving textural durability. The motive is carefully weighed against the other elements in the texture; observe, for example, usage of separated registers for each textural layer. Drawing towards a close of the introductory area, the thematic counterpoint is further counterpointed by chromatically descending violins (mm.46-7). Here a touch of *stretto* is subsequently achieved via the insertion of an abbreviated form of Intro A1z for every quarter note, finally reaching a whispering diminuendo as the introductory theme closes (mm.48-53). The naked presentation of the introductory folk-tune highlights its shared motive-characteristics with the main theme, and strengthens the connection between them, consequently functioning as an elegant transition as such.

The Subsidiary Theme opens at measure 87 (the most vital elements are rendered in Ex.2 I 8). Motives 2A and B have inherited features from the introductory theme, while 2B is probably the closest link between the subsidiary theme and Intro A1 and Intro A1z. In addition to the association with the introductory theme, there is clearly also a link to parts of the main theme (motive 2A2, Ex.4). From m.102 the theme is complemented by a short, over-sweetened,

---

133 The latter reference is a consequence of the ascending terrace-like construction which is characteristic of both motives. Yet the cells of 2A and 2B are also interrelated: the latter is the rhythmically diminished version of the first, read most clearly at m.116 ff (see Ex.2 I 12).
chromatically carved countermelody with few striking thematic connections. The statement is subsequently ensued by the conjunct ascent at m.112 (Ex.2 I 12), which consists of an imitative cultivation of 2A. This motive is used in close imitation, leaving a rather restless, ambiguous harmonic impression, despite the opening violin pedal on g. Limited to just three vital layers, the harmonically ambiguous construction is characterized by clarity and economy. Special note should be made of the 2A-transformation with its expanding leap, above all in the low strings.

Ex.2 I 12 Thematic counterpoint

Tchaikovsky had already commenced exploring substantial counterpoint within the Main Area. At m.66 the woodwinds imitate each other and the violins respectively using motive 1B, while the latter subsequently continues the motive’s retrograde augmentation at m.67. An additional thematic layer based on 1B is also detectable in the lower strings, and even the viola part has its roots in 1B material:

Ex.2 I 13 Thematic counterpoint

While one may argue that melodic seconds like 1B2b are prominent in all tonal music, it is not the interval itself which is conspicuous here, but the deliberate, profiled and transparent
way by which it is embedded in the orchestral web. In any case, this cell serves as an extra bonus in the contrapuntal web.

The above procedure recurs in e₃-minor at m.128 (Ex.2 I 14) before leading towards a stretto. One could hardly ask for more sense of economy and transparency than this example demonstrates, surpassing even the previous in these respects: Within a context where there is absolutely no material other than the plain motives and their sub-motives in the texture, this economy contributes in shaping yet another episode of extreme objectivity or matter-of-factness for a romantic piece. The composer’s searching for clarity as regards recognizable construction material once again manifests itself in this movement, where he, as an alternative to motive transformation, renews the material by moving the motive by one crotchet from the anacrusis (see also Ex.2 I 13) to the downbeat (Ex.2 I 14). Yet the metric ploy is by far the most important quality in this episode: Every single note in this texture is traceable back to the theme, be it in groups of eight, four or two notes:

**Ex.2 I 14 Thematic counterpoint**

---

134 The symphony was mainly written during 1873, and substantially revised in 1879-80. This movement was drastically rewritten and abbreviated. Since then there has been an almost continuous debate concerning which version of the first movement should be preferred. The composer Taneyev, among others, favoured the original version. David Brown has given a comprehensive description in respect of differences between the two versions in *Tchaikovsky: The Early Years, 1840-1874*. (W. W. Norton & Co. Inc. 1978) pp.257-64
The ensuing stretto leads toward a transition constructed from the main theme’s opening measures, pollinated by an element of the Subsidiary Theme. The next example (Ex. 2 I 15) presents the opening of the development, displaying a modulatory first half of the introductory theme, concerting against 2B. After the two ensuing measures, at m.162, a third substantial element joins forces with the other two; motive 2A. This makes up a texture consisting of three different thematic layers without any additional textural or harmonic support. Special notice should be given the fact that an entire theme over approximately 12 measures is counterpointed by two different thematic layers which stand out extremely similar to their original statements. By now we have already noticed the architectonically deliberate textural physical direction Tchaikovsky often assigns to single motivic layers in the contrapuntal web, regardless of the counterpointing theme’s properties at any given moment. During this movement, single motives most often create an upward surge in the textures, although ostensibly not to the extent of becoming a prevalent, recurring principle. Yet in this opening of the development the upwardly, winding contrapuntal tendency is palpable, representing a significant contrapuntal leap forward as compared to the comparatively un-Tchaikovskyan, static, sequenced procedures of the exposition:

**Ex. 2 I 15 Thematic counterpoint**

This paragraph is subsequently transposed from $D^b$ to $E^b$, after which a new four-part thematic constellation takes place; the introductory theme engages in a three-part imitative variation, accompanied by 2B. The composer transforms the theme without for a moment
losing sight of the basic, original melodic material. Even this four-part contrapuntal texture involves two melodic elements, without any addition of thematically insignificant material:

**Ex.2 I 16 Thematic counterpoint**

The above strategy is succeeded by the introductory theme in its original form, accompanied by 2A (m.182-189, Ex.2 I 17). The usage of this motive has rather drastic and/or ambiguous harmonic consequences, an effect coming close to approximating the long *misterioso* transitory passages in the outer movements of the First Symphony\(^\text{135}\). The introductory theme’s four opening measures are played in their original form, counterpointed by two plus two measures of 2A, shaped as rather clean-cut, chromatic lines. Subsequently a chromatic ascension related to 2A evolves from the violin pedal. As commented upon earlier, even the introductory theme contains the 2A motive’s characteristic stepwise three-note ingredient. The composer further consolidates the thematic control over this episode by even retaining the quarter-note chord-progression, as the 3A-related elements in the theme, whenever optimal, counterpoints the half-notes of the 3A voices. The result; an ambiguous, chromatically flavored (passing-)chord progression combined with crystal clear thematic counterpoint, without extra harmonic support, may seem daring for its time.

---

\(^{135}\) Movement 1, m. 400 ff and mvm.4; m. 374 ff
Ex.2 I 17 Thematic counterpoint

As compared to previous poly-linear strategies in this movement, the following example is a somewhat more standard, imitative contrapuntal variant. As regards constructional strictness, the counterpoints to the thematic element are, almost without exception, in stepwise motion; in violin I formed as prolongations of the motive’s descent; the ascents might - at least hypothetically - be read as inverted or retrograde forms. This paragraph implements the otherwise rather underexposed main theme (Ex.2 I 18):

Ex.2 18 Thematic counterpoint (1A')

---

136 This type of stretto is also found in the first movement of the Third Symphony, mm. 229 ff and 251 ff. and in the Fugue of the First Suite, four measures before G.
In the ensuing somewhat triumphant statement in the trombones and trumpets in mm 194-201 (Ex.2 I 19), the plateau-formed Intro A1a and Intro C have developed, via IntroA1z and both fundamental elements of the subsidiary theme, into nearly an ascending line; 2x. It is not unlikely that this linear variation has also come about via - or is influenced by - the ending of the subsidiary theme’s counter-melody at mm.104-6.

**Ex.2 I 19 Thematic counterpoint**

As a consequence of the above passage, three succeeding textures involving 1A1 are presented in relatively close imitation before the recapitulation: mm.201-5, 205-11 and 213-15, with an inserted poly-linear fragment at mm.211-13, before the final re-transitory passage at mm.213-19. The concentrated *rallentando* before the augmented, solemn restatement of the main theme in mm 211-12 might be read as a dissimilation of the 2x variation: Both ascend in triple values via easily detectible plateaus. The ascent in the violins in this brief transitory passage is counterpointed by a descending, permuted cell from the Main Theme.

The high pretensions of this movement may at times seem to threaten its actual accomplishment; the music nearly constantly aims to put rather straightforward, clear-cut thematic elements into use via vertical thematic construction, keeping the original material easily recognizable. Thus this piece is rather unique in the romantic era, much due to its combination of noble folkloristic elements and easily detectable thematically based counterpoint. These rather formal procedures give the movement a somewhat cool, distant, even dry touch, despite the airy melodic material. This sense of architectural objectivity may baffle concert audiences, in particular those who value Tchaikovsky’s later, distinctly personal, at times emotionally charged melodies, like, for example, the subsidiary theme in the first movement of his sixth symphony. Clearly, there are climaxes in the opening

---

137 It is also possible to read this ascension as a direct triplet transformation of the introductory Intro A1z-element.
movement of the second symphony, but they are by far excessive and certainly not overemotional.

Thematic focus and thematic multi-focus by way of thematically based counterpoint are central compositional features, and the latter is a predominant textural parameter in the movement. It is quite remarkable, though, that D. Brown in his extensive biography fails to recognize these strikingly obvious technical qualities in this movement. He mentions in just one line the “constant contrapuntal interplay” in the original version’s second subject.138 Concerning the new version, counterpoint is not referred to with a single word, perhaps with the exception of the reference to the airy “countermelody” written above the subsidiary theme (m.102 ff). Not only may one find counterpoint in this movement, counterpoint characterizes it - and excessively so.

In the course of time, composers may have chosen alternative solutions as regards deviations from the sonata principle. There is no reason why this privilege should not also be granted to Tchaikovsky. The first movement of the Second Symphony is an extremely strict and architectonically consistent construction, securely built on its own premises.

If this movement should appear unromantic and unsentimental, possibly even matter-of-factly - more is yet to come in this symphony. The ensuing “slow” movement may hardly be considered a particularly slow movement at all, and the third movement is a solid, Beethovenian inspired specimen (held in much the same spirit as the scherzo of the Seventh Symphony of the latter). When thematic counterpoints are absent in the middle movements of Tchaikovsky's Second Symphony, one may at times observe some kind of substituting, dialectic textural strategy, as was also the case with No.1.

2.2.2 Second Symphony, movement II

Technically the second movement embodies textural features which are highly characteristic of Tchaikovsky’s orchestral style, though this movement can hardly be said to be particularly characteristic of his expressive style. It is a reworking of a wedding march from the earlier opera Undine. The movement is as unsentimental as the rest of this symphony, manifesting itself as a tribute to the metier more than to sheer romantic emotionalism. Not only is it rather unromantic for a romantic symphony; it is not even particularly slow for a slow movement (Andantino marziale, quasi moderato), in the relative major of the symphony's home key.

One may find textural similarities between this ‘slow’ movement and the scherzo from the First Symphony. In the scherzo Tchaikovsky made extensive use of just a couple of elements, while the procedure here is a little bit different. This rests partly on the fact that the main theme is effectively rescored during the movement, according to the Glinka’s re-orchestration principle – a procedure which, in the hands of Tchaikovsky, leads to continuous textural development.

D. Brown claims that the movement is an extensive ternary form sooner than a symmetrical rondo\(^{139}\), a deduction which is probably more plausible than the opposite. Yet the fact that his conclusion is reached after a quite extensive discussion indicates that there may be objections against it, since the A part is a quite compound section.\(^{140}\) In this essay the A-section is subdivided as follows: A1: mm.3-10 (repeated at 11-18), A2: mm.19-27 (see Ex.44), A3: mm.28-41 (see Ex.46). The transitory mm. 36-41 may be considered a hybrid of A1 and A3.

The movement opens with soft timpani, marching towards the theme's opening which is presented by two clarinets in the lower register together with the first bassoon (mm.3-10), creating an utterly dry and naked chamber-musical setting.

Ex. 2 II 1 Theme A1

\(^{139}\) David Brown: Tchaikovsky. The Early Years, 1840-1874. (W. W. Norton & Co. Inc. 1978) p.257
\(^{140}\) With the movement’s slightly ambivalent Ternary / Quasi Rondo impression in mind it feels more satisfying to utilize a thematic taxonomy different from the sonata-typed forms, thus referring to A – B – A material (and not 1- 2 -3 material).
These measures are subsequently rescoring for strings (mm.11-18), leading on to the A2-subsection. An immediate comparison with the previously mentioned scherzo from the first symphony can be made with a view to the combination of contrasting timbres and variation as regards physical direction. Already at this stage we also notice the $\frac{3}{4}$-figuration, which is used in various rhythmical combinations, often implying sectional imitation. Frequent discourse between timbres, registers, contrasting direction and contrast between elements come frequently to the fore in this movement, scored with Tchaikovsky’s extraordinary sense of refined economy. The opening cell of Ex.2 II 2 (m.18 ff) will subsequently form predominant layers in the forthcoming textures. Notice in particular the continuous renewal of timbrally segregated, fan-shaped (architectonically related) textures. From m.20 the 2a-cell is transported from the strings to the woodwinds.

The thematic counterpoints in these opening constructions are somewhat laid-back, bordering to complementation:

Ex.2 II 2 Element A2: Thematic counterpoint & timbral contrast / textural factor (see also subsequent examples in respect of textural construction)

One might argue that the violin parts of m.20, for example, represent rather commonplace figurations, hardly worthy of being viewed as motivically important. Regarded as an isolated phenomenon this argument would be fair enough, yet on examining the rest of the movement one finds that the figurations are far from accidental. This assumption is verified already during the ensuing phrase:
Ex.2 II 3 A2 continued; transition to A3: Thematic counterpoint & timbral contrast / textural factor, brief textural transfer at m.27

Observe also the extremely elegant part-writing, particularly striking in the above example, appearing as subtle shades of the 2a/2a’ in the strings and woodwinds respectively. These motivic elements interact vertically together with the (more) spun out horizontal thematic design. In sum the composer achieves a result which is extremely exemplary from a formal contrapuntal and general part-writing perspective, which contrasts the informality of the somewhat unpretentious melody. After a brief motivic textural transfer at m.27 the dotted A2-related motive is used consecutively with strict discipline (see 2 II 4), forming a new, clearly defined separate layer at m.28.

The technique which Tchaikovsky uses in the subsequent texture should later be employed in dramatic passages, though in this example it is used within a lyrical context: The motive forms a long, eloquent counterpoint to the new thematic A3-material which is first presented in the clarinets, very much influenced by the intervals from the first statements at m.18 ff. The flutes repeat this procedure with a slightly different interval preference, yet still arch-shaped, which was also the case with the clarinet-version. Normally this type of procedure will later in the composer's career imply constant ascension of a motive or a motivic idea (most often in the upper strings) until it reaches its goal or climax in high register, where it is used repeatedly simultaneously with motivic or thematic statements in other parts. It might even be fair to say that such a technique will stand out as one of the fingerprints of Tchaikovsky’s
later orchestral style, for example in the outer movements of *Symphonie Pathétique*, and may also be sensed, yet not exactly clearly demonstrated, in a forthcoming example (see m.103 ff).

Ex. 2 II 4 Thematic counterpoint

As may also be observed in the First Symphony and the first movement of No.2, some textures are constructed exclusively from thematic material\(^\text{141}\) without any supporting, non-thematic voices, as the rounding off of this A3-section demonstrates. Stylizations of the linear 2a-element (originally derived from three successive, ascending theme-notes) often counterpoint the more predominant original rhythmicized/dotted elements, either in their original, inverted or otherwise permuted form (see Ex.2 II 5).

One should also pay notice to the un-dotted up-beats of A3; the seemingly natural fleetness of the A3-area notwithstanding - read as un-dotted versions of A2a (see mm.34-5 of the above example): From m.41 (Ex.2 II 5) the rhythm of the A2-counterpoint move in direction of straight eighth-notes, which, not unexpectedly, will influence the counterpoint to the recurring A1 from m.41.

\(^\text{141}\) This assertion may even allude to examples like 2 II 4, although the pedal does not directly affect the contrapuntal work.
Thus the dotted rhythm of the last transitory measure (m.42) is smoothed into straight eights in order to transform to a light-footed walking bass from m.43. Hence one type of thematically rooted material is transformed to one being even further remote: an already developed cell leaves an imprint on the continued development, read as the walking bass in Ex.2 II 6. This type of counterpoint usually ends in the register it begins, while the ‘transfer’-technique rendered earlier - when utilized in more dramatic type of movements - usually is driven from one register to another. Although the counterpoint in Ex.2 II 6 possibly might appear to be unrelated to earlier significant thematic material, the transformation from dotted eighth/sixteenth figuration to straight eights becomes quite obvious during mm.41-2. Even though counterpoint is the major issue with this particular example, the fact that Tchaikovsky pursues his textural dialecticism by continuously renewing the textural approach in this most shamelessly natural and effortless manner, is quite typical and thus equally worthy of notice. When Tchaikovsky speaks of – and even demands – “beauty” in music, he may not just refer to the melodic aspect, but at least equally much the logical and architectonic beauty of textural disposition. During m.41 (Ex.2 II 5 ) A1a’ sets its direct imprint on the texture which starts at m.43 (Ex.2 II 6).

The folk song utilized for the middle section is a short 4 (2x2) + 4 (2x2)- measure design, using Glinka’s rescoring-principle four times, succeeded by a twenty-four- measure long
development. Thereafter follows a restatement of the folksong, succeeded by the re-transition. After the heavily contrapuntal first movement, only discreet hints of thematic simultaneity have been observed so far in this movement. In mm.57-8 Tchaikovsky creates an original textural solution by making the woodwinds catch up with – and even getting ahead of – the pizzicato melody:

Ex.2 II 7 Thematic counterpoint

The first rescoring of the new theme implements triplet-accompaniment (see Ex.2 II 8), transparently scored for clarinet in the lower register below a dominant pedal, played by two flutes. The triplet implementation will not be without consequences for the succeeding twenty-eight measures: It will confirm its position as a constant, vital complementing and transforming textural idea. At m.103 it recurs in more extensively elaborated form in a transitory passage, then accelerates into sextuplets in combination with a new statement of the folksong at m.111, subsequently transforming into semiquavers at m.113. Though not melodic, the procedure may be regarded to be a textural counterpoint, a side-idea whose main function is to complement and run alongside the thematic material. This textural complement starts discreetly with the two flutes (Ex.2 II 8 & 9), later it is handed over to the upper strings, growing in tension, thereafter culminating in the lower strings (Ex.2 II 12), before recurring with strengthened vitality (Ex.2 II 13). This sustained yet unstrained textural development makes this non-thematic idea a textural factor of notable importance.
The folk-song is restated in contrasting registers, and the register of the textural complement must adjust accordingly. During m.68 the flutes position themselves in high register in advance of the forthcoming, re-harmonized statement. Furthermore, discreet permuted motivic details are now added to the original theme, like the inverted motive in the lower violin I-part (m.69). The part-writing is strikingly disciplined in all voices, and it is quite unproblematic to attach thematic or at least semi-thematic relevance to the five string-parts involved, the influence may be traced above all to A2, A3 and B.

The folk song proceeds in the bass register from m.73. In order to achieve a credible and even telling result, Tchaikovsky keeps pushing Glinka’s principle of thematic re-orchestration, resulting in drastic textural reorganization: In the next example the composer utilizes textural counterpoint in addition to thematic counterpoints in two subsequent textures. The triplet layer in the violins splits at measure 77, and partly transforms into two segments; the

---

111

---

142 By this stage, one notices that sudden, synchronous shifts in respect of textural approach are to be expected when there is a renewal or change of elements used in the thematic contrapuntal work. In this respect Tchaikovsky’s two first symphonies in particular demonstrate ultra-clear, refined textural dialectics.
echoing of the permuted B1a element continues in the string-layer, yet this layer now changes dramatically into a hybrid between the previous triplet leaps, (only now the leaps are descending) and the horizontal brass signals. One also notices that when layers change roles, like at the m.77 junction, the new layers mainly start out from registers reached by the end of the previous texture, and subsequently at least one of these layers change direction.

Ex.2 II 10 Thematic counterpoints + textural counterpoint

At this point it seems appropriate to underline that Tchaikovsky’s textural counterpoints are usually characterized by an extremely well planned, geometric structure; most often they are presented as pure, linear creations.\(^{143}\) They are given a textural role, staged in the way that they move deliberately from one place to another, which is a supreme alternative to that of just being filled in where and whenever it suites a harmonic purpose.

Subsequently the counter-directional principle is pushed even further by way of one compound, purely thematic layer and one carrying the textural counterpoint, at first in the woodwinds and lower strings respectively, as rendered in the following score-excerpt. Not only are the textural principles involving contrary motion, register change and timbral/instrument change carried out most convincingly clear; notice in addition the dramatic transgression from textural to thematic counterpoint in the lower strings at mm.82-3 and vice versa in the high woodwinds:

\(^{143}\) Thus triplets in the shape of, for example, more or less static arpeggios – which above all are remnants from the classical period – would have had minimal textural, contrapuntal impact, unless there was a distinct quality attached to such a layer, like, for example, in way of direct or immanent physical direction.
Ex.2 II 11 Thematic and Textural counterpoint (The bassoons double the lower strings, horns 3&4 double the clarinets 8vb)

The above transformation of B2 (violins, mm.83-4) leads into a culminating passage at m.85 which starts as imitative counterpoint between the brass and the woodwinds:

Ex.2 II 12 Thematic counterpoint

(The horns I & II double the trumpets in 8vb and the 1st bassoon doubles the 1st obo in 8vb)

After a rescoring of B1, wherein the composer utilizes inverted thematic counterpoint, the triplet-factor is counterpointing a rather disguised B2 in a transitory passage from m.97 toward the restatement of A1. The previously mentioned deliberate use of ascending and descending layers is demonstrated convincingly by the composer even in this passage. There is a stretto effect associated with this passage, much due to a subdivision of the triplets (Ex.2 II 13), and one may with some justification claim that there is a developmental aspect also attached to the textural factor which counterpoints the thematic development. After ten measures the texture is transformed into still more sparkling effect in the flutes and clarinets (m.113 ff). The textural counterpoint is equally predominant as is the thematic material, and is given special attention in the following excerpt via deliberate use of shifting physical direction and rhythmic intensification. The textural factor has by now become an articulated counterpoint of, at least, temporary character:

144 Similar figurations are used in a corresponding textural plan and development in Marche Slave, commencing at approx. m.36. That work was written between the original and revised versions of Symphony No.2.
The broken chords between mm.113-16 are not excessively interesting as an isolated phenomenon, and must be viewed as a developmental textural consequence of the far more virile and constructionally interesting triplets and sextuplets, formed as ascents or descents.

Even during the ensuing apparently plain tutti re-orchestration of the A1 march-theme, Tchaikovsky enables to maintain dialectic focus, achieved via the syncopated in the trumpets, reminiscent of the previous eighth-note after-beat pedal in the cellos and basses.

Earlier in this paragraph on the second movement comparisons were drawn to the scherzo from the First Symphony regarding selected textural procedures. As was also the case with the scherzo, this extremely unbiased second movement dies out by means of faint timpani-beats – just the way it started – and with a simultaneous motivic fragmentation in the remaining orchestra.

Even though appearing as different orchestral procedures, interaction between the textural factor and the thematic material manages to create dramatic change of mood and color. Their mutual impact as they move up or down, into or away from focus, may lead to effective contrasts, yet these contrasts are the result of a pan-textural approach.
Second Symphony, movement III

Tchaikovsky’s symphonic scherzos may stand as noteworthy examples of high class refined architecture. The scherzo of the Second Symphony is above all a study of rhythmic invention, combined with much of the strict textural construction found in the scherzo of the First Symphony. In No.1 there was a recycling of phrases, implying and demanding a constant renewal of textural solutions. In the scherzo from No.2 the procedure is different, yet some textures seem similarly constructed. Stringent passages rhythmically knit together by a combined 1+2/2+1 formula, are particularly notable from m.14ff. Such constructions succeed each other throughout the movement, and the momentum of rhythmic and textural surprise is present throughout. The scherzo from the Second Symphony is even more something of a multi-focus construction than that of the No.1, and combinations of predictable as well as more restless, presumably less predictable events occur frequently. In the following excerpt the chromatic descent in the middle strings is contrasted by the bouncing double quavers in the winds and the remaining strings.

The movement’s outer sections are constructed by means of small, characteristic cells. Since the opening statement contains rhythmically complementing layers, thematic counterpoint is to some extent present throughout the movement. But in addition the constructions often possess extended textural multi-focal qualities, as demonstrated in the following example, where both layers stem from the opening theme. One layer; the violas and second violins, is constructed by extreme voice-leading, another by its unpredictability and bouncing contrast as regards sound-color and registers:

Ex.2 III 1 Textural counterpoint

(2+1 eighth-notes: linear / 1+2; nonlinear, contrasting colors, contrasting registers)

\[145\] In this respect the present scherzo bears some resemblance with the masterful scherzo of the Third Suite, particularly as a consequence of its triplet drive, even though textural sub-parameters between the two movements differ.
Combination of “stable” and “unstable” elements is also characteristic of the following excerpt. Both examples utilize fluctuant, shifting woodwind combinations by means of contrasting registers, contrasting the more thematically linear and stable strings. The present texture consists of (at least) three predominant layers: 1: the rushing, unstable sixteenth-note figurations of the woodwinds, 2: the thematically derived first violins with their stepwise upwardly syncopated striving, harmonically challenging the remaining layers, and 3: the stepwise descending and rhythmically contrasting lower strings, read as the opening theme's inversion (Ex.2 III 2). Some might perhaps even wish to include the relatively anonym middle strings as a fourth, easily perceptible layer. Both the first violin- and the woodwind-layers also owe much of their existence to the movement's introductory run in the cellos and basses, thus being highly thematic.

Ex.2 III 2 Thematic & textural counterpoints

This rhythmic ambiguity is one of the central issues of this movement; in Example 2 III 3 the hemiola aspect is renewed in combination with countermovement, ensuring three thematically derived layers above the pedal, in the violins and the violas respectively. Except for the first violins, these string-layers are doubled by woodwinds, thus highlighting the rhythm and thematic aspects (at the expense of timbral contrast). This textural procedure stretches from m.84 to 104:
The central trio is in most respects inferior to the main scherzo part as regards textural refinement, yet occurrence of sharply contoured individual layers is nevertheless detectable. The theme’s second statement has got a plain yet well crafted local counterpoint written to it, formed in a distinct Tchaikovskyan manner; formed as a long arch. The folk-tune has a metric 2+2+2 subdivision.\(^{146}\)

Ex.2 III 4 Local counterpoint

The above texture is immediately succeeded by contrasting timbre combinations, simultaneously rewarding the listener with subtle contrapuntal treatment via the parallel inversion and inverted augmentation of a Trio-cell, possibly giving the augmented version the impression of appearing in slow motion. (A variation of this technique was seen in Ex.2 II 7.) This episode is Tchaikovskyan to the core, combining textural economy with motivic concentration. In addition to these microscopic yet highly refined counterpoints, the cello & bass layer is not solely a trio-theme variation. At the same time the slow chromatic ascent simultaneously hints at a twisted permutation of the opening scherzo theme. As an extra bonus, the overall ascending chromaticism of this texture creates an extremely plastic harmonic ambiguity:

\(^{146}\) Connection lines might also be drawn between this theme and 1B-vatians of the Finale.
The immediate continuation adds a new edition of the trio's initial local counterpoint to the already established thematic counterpoint; now the thematic counterpoint of the first phrase is in contrary motion:

In the coda Tchaikovsky connects elements from the trio with the remaining scherzo, without involving elements from the two sections in contrapuntal display to any notable extent.

David Brown gives a fair, though general review of this short scherzo, starting his discussion by assuming that the ‘rhythmic verve’ of the scherzo in Borodin’s First Symphony served as a model for Tchaikovsky, but finally concluding that Tchaikovsky’s piece differs from Borodin’s in most respects. But for all we know, not only the rhythmic verve but even some textural ideas in Borodin’s movement, like, for example, his poly-directional passages may have inspired Tchaikovsky to further, more excessive cultivation in his own work. Though, as opposed to Borodin, Tchaikovsky does not choose to completely let go of neither the constant propulsion nor the dry wit in the middle trio.

---

2.2.4 Symphony No.2, Movement IV

The finale of the Second Symphony is the most frequently discussed of all the movements constituting the first three symphonies, much thanks to the orchestral. This movement, highly acclaimed by “The Mighty Handful”, is often, for example in D. Brown’s biography, said to owe much of its success to the Kamarinskaya-principle. But Glinka’s procedure is carried markedly further by Tchaikovsky in this finale, much due to the latter’s slightly more restless key-shift, and even more as a result of an effective sonata principle, implying active interplay between two contrasting themes.\(^{148}\) In addition of providing a sound textural disposition, Tchaikovsky was presumably well aware that he would have to make frequent use of brief excursions to new tonalities in order to avoid tonal monotony. Excessive theme-repetitions as such represented in fact a notable symphonic challenge, and might easily come into conflict with fundamental symphonic principles, especially on a developmental basis.

The stately introduction, based upon the folksong “The Crane”, which is the movement’s main theme, may very well have inspired Mussorgsky to the creation of “The Great Gate at Kiev”. The strings are lavishly provided with double-, triple- and quadruple-stops as the unveiling of the thematic material proceeds. In the following excerpt only two voices from the full orchestra are presented; during this massive, chorale-like introduction - a premature, modulatory variation of the still unveiled theme - the thematic material of the upper voices is counterpointed imitatively by the lower voices from measure 10:

Ex. 2 IV 1 Thematic counterpoint

\(^{148}\) Even so, the greatness of Kamarinskaya rests, above all, on Glinka’s varied technique per se, more than on the actual accomplishment of that peculiar work: Glinka’s disposition is not entirely unproblematic since there is an accumulation of compound texturing already in the introductory Wedding Song; “From the High Mountains” and also in the introductory statement of the main dance tune (Kamarinskaya), while later variations are, in general, harmonically, as well as texturally, surprisingly monotonous by comparison.
After three re-orchestrations of 1A in the tonic and one statement of 1B in the dominant, 1A is stated once more in C with a nimble wandering cello-pizzicato counterpointing it (Ex.2 IV 2). This statement is mentioned only since it is a regularly used Tchaikovskyan orchestral procedure, although not excessively. Wanting in thematic reference it is rather inferior from a contrapuntal point of view, the counterpoint not unexpectedly moving in contrary motion to the theme:

Ex. 2 IV 2 1A statement & Local counterpoint / background variation

In his biography Brown makes a comment regarding the originality of the folksong as it appears in Tchaikovsky’s work, which, for the record, ought to be rendered in this connection (this material forms the basis of what is labelled 1B material):

The second half of ‘The Crane’, as set out in the Mamontova collection of children's songs, which Tchaikovsky had just harmonized, differs from the version in the symphony. The discrepancy is obviously due, at least in part, to Tchaikovsky himself, but the butler at Kamenka, who was evidently exasperated by what he thought was a faulty delivery of the tune, also made a contribution which Tchaikovsky cheerfully acknowledged. ‘Credit for the success [of the finale with the audience at the first performance] I do not ascribe to myself, but to the real composer... Pyotr Gerasimovich who, while I was composing, and strumming through "The Crane", constantly came up and hummed: (1B)

a version which was presumably in Tchaikovsky's mind when he composed bars 113-16.¹⁵⁰

1B recurs at m.65, totally rescored and re-harmonized. The composer now employs a persistent, importunate and obstinate thematic cell, forming a counterpoint which attracts considerable attention in the first bassoon (Ex.2 IV 3). The contrast between the theme and its counterpoint is enhanced as the result of the former’s pentatonic construction (Obo I) versus the chromatic counterpoint of the latter, and variations of this passage are to some extent traceable in forthcoming variations. The immediate continuation (Ex.2 IV 4) of the

¹⁴⁹  M. A. Mamontova, A Collection of Children's Songs on Russian and Ukrainian Melodies, harmonized by Tchaikovsky, No. 18
derived chromatic two-note cell might be read as an imprint of the counterpoint from the variation rendered in Ex.2 IV 3.

**Ex. 2 IV 3 Thematic counterpoint (1B material)**

According to Brown, the succeeding texture is most probably transferred directly from Glinka:

> The pungent little appoggiatura figure that accompanies one statement of the theme is patently suggested by the obstinate ‘wrong note’ pedal of one *Kamarinskaya* variation, a model which is copied even more explicitly and at far greater length in the development…

Yet the ‘wrong note’ attracts so much attention at its first presentation as to become, eventually, just as important as the theme itself, and the two re-harmonized versions (Ex.2 IV 4 & 5) prepare for the whole-tone scale in the bass which will turn up later (see also Ex.2 IV 7 & 8). Hence the “wrong note” might be read as a phenomenon taking part in a developmental procedure; compare, for example, the following bass, deriving from 1B, with the bassoon-counterpoint of Ex.2 IV 3, in particular mm.65 & 69:

**Ex. 2 IV 4 Thematic counterpoint**

---

In the previous example, the ‘wrong’ note is, unlike the Kamarinskaya-reference, the flattened sixth, while Glinka’s (flattened) seventh is immediately introduced in Tchaikovsky's ensuing passage (Ex.2 IV 5). The flattened $b$ moving down a half step leaves the impression of suspension - resolution, which in turn might be felt like an unstable submediant as compared to the previous tonic. Yet the $c$ pedal and consequent use of the flattened seventh simultaneously leaves a mixolydian impression to this variation. Much more important, though, is the fact that the two note cell has come into use as an obvious thematically derived 1B-ingredient after a convincingly clear procedure.

Ex. 2 IV 5 Thematic counterpoint

The following dance-tune statements are created in a rather straightforward manner, yet thematic counterpoint, like the imitative variation in Ex.2 IV 6, occurs. Constant variation by means of new, additive orchestration appears, manufactured in accordance with the remaining transparent textures, together with imitative thematic layers. The afterbeat-effect, here produced by the pizzicato pedal, has been a constantly recurring yet texturally developing accompanimental factor to 1A from its first variation until now.

Ex.2 IV 6 Thematic counterpoint

152 The sevenths and sixths, though irreproachably resolved, might be felt like pedals, much in the same way as in Glinka’s harmonization of Kamarinskaya. Yet the sum of the thematic two-note combinations and the obsessive, focused syncopations constitute a result being far more dialectical than Glinka's static Kamarinskaya pedal. In addition, the syncopations might clearly be read as a rhythmic reinterpretation of the afterbeat-accompaniment of the introductory variations.
The composer’s threat - or promise - of turning the C-major scale into a whole-tone scale comes closer to being realized as the first four notes in the first violins obtain the characteristic of the major- (and whole-tone) scale’s first three notes, and the first four pitches in the bass substitute the remaining whole-tone scale; these four bass-notes constitute a permuted inversion of the first four notes of the theme (Ex.2 IV 7). The melodic and harmonic contexts still rest on the C-major-side (tonic / flattened submediant), but the progression succeeds in establishing a more ambivalent, two-sided tonal focus in addition to that purely thematic.

Ex.2 IV 7 Thematic counterpoint

It might be accidental or it might be a deliberate action taken by the composer to draw a faint connection line back to the opening movement by way of giving the opening of the main theme some shade or hint of the 2B figurations of the first movement:

Ex.2 IV 8 Hint of inter-movement connection/motivic transformation

This transition toward the subsidiary theme (starting at m.141) finally reaches the foretold whole-tone scale in the bass at mm.163-6, although the harmonization is not whole-tone-based. The phrases of the upper layers extend over four (2+2) measures; 161-4 & 165-8 respectively, while the whole-tone scale crosses this junction / continues its descent at 164-5. By adding the momentum of cross-directional layers Tchaikovsky securely maintains his ever so varied textural two-sidedness. There is a palpable, clean and unromantic sachlichkeit about the symphony, about this movement and this passage in particular, with its implicit melodic whole-tone combinations.
Melodic contrary motion is pursued also during the presentation of the relatively contrasting, calm subsidiary theme. The theme’s initial syncopated, descending fundamental line, played by the first violins, counterpoints elegantly the ascent in the violas, the latter – together with the second violins – accentuate on the succeeding downbeat and elements of the theme. The attention is drawn just as much towards this counterpoint as to the theme itself (Ex.2 IV 10). The counterpoint in the second violins has much in common with some of the bass counterpoints of the Main Area; a repeated, obstinate, rocking, chromatic two-note cell, yet here the syncopations come in the theme itself, not its counterpoint. Thus this layer is by no means without thematic relevance, and might alternatively have been labelled as such.

Ex.2 IV 10 Thematic counterpoint (from the opening of the subsidiary theme)

The subtle rhythmic nuance is investigated further in the second statement, this time by implementing the theme-syncopation for contrasting effect in the lower voice and at the same time by retaining the ascending stepwise motion in the counterpoint, elegantly rounded off on the top by a brief descent. Worthy of notice is even the construction of the third thematic layer, represented by the horns, which might be regarded as a stylized, re-rhythmification of the concurrent syncopated counterpoint:
The above excerpt provides a representative example of how the composer sometimes enables to create an architectonically well-formed construction within which each layer complements the remaining layers in respect of rhythm, contrary motion and harmonic completion, without having to incorporate supportive layers.

In the ensuing variation (m.234 ff) Tchaikovsky increases the textural tension by utilizing thematic counterpoint in a brief imitative passage:

Contrary motion, so widely used by Tchaikovsky, is also applied thematically from m.277, in a brief modulatory dominant chain, evolving as a natural consequence of some of the linear, thematically based counterpoints of this exposition. This contrapuntal construction could hardly have been executed more thematically purified, transparent and effective.
A characteristic feature associated with some of Tchaikovsky’s orchestral climaxes is his predilection for moving an ascending layer – often formed by motivic elements – to a, relatively, high register, and let it stay there as an accompaniment for a thematic statement, previously referred to as a ‘textural transfer’ procedure. Normally this kind of textural layer is favored the strings and the technique is very well depicted in this finale. From m.289 (Ex. 2 IV 14) the two consecutive and repeated quavers (the “Pyotr Gerasimovich” element, see, for example, m.51 ff) climb to a higher register and stay there while the trumpets perform a variation of 1A. The deviated measure of the theme (m.296) conforms in accordance with the cell constituting the counterpoint. Thus the persistent and consequent use of the appoggiatura cell makes it almost as predominant as the theme itself:

Ex.2 IV 14 Textural transfer/ thematic counterpoint (Extract from tutti)

In stark contradiction to the multifarious linear, stepwise procedures carried out during the main part of the exposition, the last transitory measures toward the development section is a succession of odd unisons. Brown finds these notes to be reminiscent of the previously commented “wrong” note\(^ {153} \), a deduction which is probably only partly correct, since the notes also attract special attention in their capacity of appearing as splashes of shifting tone-color. The latter quality, together with the huge downward leaps, is in fact thematically based, as an echo from the rounding off of the Main area (mm.191-8).

Ex.2 IV 15 1A element \( \underline{d}_{d}-\text{leap}-\underline{d}_{d} \) (Further connection; see also Exx.2 IV 16, (17), 18, 20-22)

This idea will continue to strengthen its position and frequently show up in capacity of an audacious, at times somewhat dissonant idea, refusing to resolve. From m.326 to 327, for example, the bass has the dominant’s seventh, moving down a minor tenth. In the first of these passages it acts together with a variation of the main theme (Ex.35).

**Ex.2 IV 16 Thematic counterpoint**

Yet mostly this tone’s capacity of standing out as a noteworthy, explicit phenomenon is achieved by appearing in constantly new dashes of timbre. In the below constellation together with the subsidiary theme, the cell is exposed only by the characteristic variation in tone–color, while the large melodic leaps are reduced or even absent. A third, distinctly contoured layer in this texture appears in the shape of a conjunct, ascending, fairly chromatic pizzicato in the second violins, which represents an additional side of Tchaikovsky’s sharply designed textural dialectics, a layer which is above all associated with previous linearly designed counterpoints derived from both themes.

**Ex.2 IV 17 Thematic counterpoints**

As the development proceeds the syncopated rhythm of the subsidiary theme is playing an increasingly important role. The majority of involvements made by this rhythmic element contain thematically derived stepwise lines, as in the above Vn.II-voice. In the next example the $[\ddash\text{-leap-}\ddash]$ cell is diminished to $[\ddash\text{-leap-}]$, thus speeding up the harmonic tempo. At the same time the intervals are expanded, an act being more in accordance with its motivic origin, and the subsidiary theme is being stylized into descending lines:
Ex.2 IV 18 Thematic counterpoint (The bassoons & lower strings play f throughout)

The fourth thematically based contrapuntal passage of the development consists of a permuted version of the subsidiary theme confronted with 1A in a new modulatory sequence, whereupon both textures are repeated in transposed versions.

Ex.2 IV 19 Thematic counterpoint (Extract/reduction from tutti)

As was the case with the previous examples, there is also a melting together of characteristics between the two themes during the succeeding variations. In the following example there is a motivic transformation of 1A's opening in the treble system, counterpointed by a continued elaboration of the subsidiary theme - much in line with the previous texture - in the bass. Already at this stage one might be tempted to argue that the successive chain of thematically highly stylized contrapuntal solutions explored by the composer in this finale is unrivalled for its time - alternatively one might ask which work that could possibly be.

Ex.2 IV 20 Thematic counterpoint

Alternatively, the composer makes combinations by amalgamating the subsidiary theme’s rhythmic characteristics with 1A's $\text{[} \frac{1}{4} \text{-} \frac{1}{2} \text{-} \frac{1}{4} \text{]}$ cell, juxtaposed with a closer variation of 1A proper, as from m.429:

---

154 There are several ways of associating these four notes with the opening of 1A; one is to regard them to be both rhythmic as well as melodic augmentations of the four opening notes; reading them as a plain, cadential ( plagal) manifestation is another.
Further thematic discourses related to the above example continue developing, leading into strettos, first between mm.445-54, then accelerating between 453-6 (Ex.2 IV 23). From m.445 the leaping “free note” cell in the lower voice is rhythmically diminished, while the main theme in the upper voice is rhythmically unchanged, a contrapuntal solution previously chosen also for the subsidiary theme.

Until now the composer has chosen modulations of the four-measure long thematic phrases to the submediant, subdominant or, as here, to the super-tonic.

Ex.2 IV 22 Thematic counterpoints

The leaping “free” note cell of the recent examples in the bass registers subsequently moves in direction of combining 1A's opening interval, presented by two paired, adjacent notes (vaguely associated with the highly substantial two-note cell of Ex.2 IV 3) together with the cell’s characteristic unorthodox and unpredictable leaping behaviour. From m.453 the ‘free' note, the chords’ seventh is, as a consequence, operating quite freely in the bass, leading diatonically up to the chords’ roots, instead of the expected downward resolution:
Before the recapitulation there is a variation containing three substantial layers; 1A is treated to imitative counterpoint, combined with the excessively used inverted, stylized scale element in the horns. This time the composer chooses to move his four-measure phrase to the sub-tonic:

**Ex.2 IV 24 Thematic counterpoints**

From mm.493 this procedure is applied together with a new harmonization above a dominant pedal in a tutti fortissimo.

Just the way various forms of textural dialectics are highly characteristic of Tchaikovsky, the counterpoint achieved by using the \( \text{[ } _4 \text{-leap } _3 \text{-leap} \text{]} \) cell is uncharacteristic. Yet this cell creates strikingly contrasted counterpoints against the remaining scale-dominated thematic material. Needless to say, counterpointing a "free" or "libero" note should not at all suggest a notable technical challenge to an experienced composer; sooner, it is the idea in itself which is extraordinary. Thus the approach completely contrasts the expertly executed fugato-passages in the finale of No.1. The pure, “unromantic” and clean-cut way by which the development in No.2 IV is carried out might very well be one of the reasons why Stravinsky chose to conduct the symphony on tour and even record it.\(^{155}\) The bare, unveiled procedure is most daring for a finale of a romantic symphony, and one may, on the whole, regret that Tchaikovsky did not pursue this path later in his symphonic career, as is also commented by D. Brown.\(^{156}\)

The question, though, remains whether a continued and constant highlighting and repetition of this quite rigid procedure, though encompassing enormous technical possibilities, looked particularly tempting for the creative mind. It is a great paradox, though, that Tchaikovsky’s pursuit of Glinka’s re-orchestration angle in many of his other movements – even when

---

\(^{155}\) Igor Stravinsky conducts the Los Angeles Philharmonic Orchestra in this work on PASC101.

carried out to a much lesser extent than here – is a procedure for which some commentators criticise him.

And still, this symphony represents much more than Russian lore, which was also Tchaikovsky’s intention: Richard Taruskin concretizes this issue with the following wording:

Owing to the use of this tune [“The Crane”] in the finale, Chaikovsky’s symphony is now widely known as the "Little Russian" symphony and has been touted, particularly by British writers, as evidence of the "High Nationalism" the feeble composer would soon traduce. But the great value of high nationalism in Russian music is something Westerners are more likely to preach than Russians to practice. For Westerners it was an exotic feature; only during the era of Soviet xenophobia was it preached from the Russian side. For nineteenthcentury Russians, especially Russians who, like Chaikovsky, saw themselves as Europeans, it was something that only marked them off as alien and inferior, denizens of a ghetto. The myth of Russian autochthonism was something Chaikovsky grew to detest and, as his life went on and his fame grew, more and more to resist.157

The constructional techniques used by Tchaikovsky in this finale not only surpass the borders of High Nationalism; they demonstrate technical brilliance and highly original approaches of transparent poly-linear construction, combining orchestral inventory and thematic focus with counterpointing thematic layers. In this work the composer exceeds the borders of sheer “re-orchestration” by a wide margin. The developments of the outer movements are almost exclusively constructed from thematically based counterpoint, and so are considerable parts of the expositions.

2.3 Symphony No. 3 in D, opus 29 (composed 1875)

The nickname “The Polish”, which has been stuck on The Third Symphony, apparently originates from the conductor Sir Alfred Manns, triggered by the finale’s *Tempo di Polacca*. But the symphony might just as well have been subtitled ‘The German’ because of the *Alla Tedesca* movement or even ‘The Academic’ because of the restrained, unsentimental *Tempo di marcia funebre* introduction with its succeeding *Allegro brillante*, the latter somewhat dry and subdued rather than brilliant, lively or sparkling. David Brown comments thus on the two outer movements:

The movement that opens the symphony is far more interesting […] than the finale…], though its development succumbs to that same rhythmic turgidity and contrapuntal pedantry that weighs so heavily on the finale.¹⁵⁸

Usually Tchaikovsky is accused of being sentimental and hyper-romantic, but here it seems opportune to charge him with being the complete opposite.

Most biographers and critics have proclaimed this symphony to be one of Tchaikovsky’s least successful as regards inter-movement connection, therefore it might be interesting to take a closer look at the work with this verdict in mind, in addition to the contrapuntal issue. Evans, in his biography, finds that “this Symphony is not of overwhelming interest”, though there are some mitigating factors:

“Both in contrapuntal resource and in instrumental coloring, however, considerable advance can be detected.”¹⁵⁹

Evans does not account for how or to what extent the “considerable advance” in contrapuntal resource manifests itself, nor does he put the contrapuntal issue into perspective in his overall dealing with the symphonies.

The Third Symphony was written shortly after the First Piano Concerto and completed at the time the composer started writing “Swan Lake”. Taking into account the success of its predecessor The “Little Russian” one might feel at least a bit surprised that the composer was not tempted to pursue this line, since the Third Symphony has only insignificant references to Russian lore. David Brown may be right in making the following assumption:

“There can be no doubt that Nikolay Rubinstein's strictures on his [Tchaikovsky’s] most recent symphonic work, the First Piano Concerto, still rang in his ears, and he was determined that this new piece should not be open to charges of technical or structural inelegance (…)”¹⁶⁰

If A. and N. Rubinstein, one way or another, convinced the composer that the Russian element was a dead end when it came to symphonic writing, their lack of comprehension, appreciation and acceptance of Tchaikovsky’s highly original output from his former period may in fact have resulted in a change of artistic direction, although the Russian folk song or dance rhythm did not completely vanish until the Sixth Symphony.

The Third Symphony was composed with considerable speed in the summer of 1875. But after its completion the composer must have felt that suppression – though not total elimination – of the Russian element in a cyclic work, was an overreaction: Even though the extrovert manifestation of such an element should never again become as predominant as in the Second Symphony, Russian presence is sensed in the majority of Tchaikovsky's works until the Sixth Symphony.

The somewhat formal stiffness of the opening movement and apparent lack of congruence between the five movements may, at least partly, explain the symphony’s low esteem among the majority of Tchaikovsky biographers. The opening movement may indeed be characterized as the most reserved and withheld of all Tchaikovsky’s main symphonic movements. Yet as a consequence of this suggestion it would be self-contradictory and totally unfair to blame Tchaikovsky for being an inescapable romantic on one occasion, only to accuse him of being the complete opposite on another, the former opinion usually being predominant with most commentators.

Tchaikovsky is, particularly in this symphony, much more than the archetype of the over-romantic composer, and the work is highly contrapuntal. Even more important: the composer’s predilection for poly-linearity reveals itself not only by the very presence of a few fugato-passages, but much more in the way he makes use of a variety of dialectical texturing on a wider scale, something which, at this point, should not surprise the reader. Motivic exploitation and development, though, is on an overall basis more obscure in this work than in his remaining six numbered symphonies.

2.3.1 Symphony No.3, movement I

In his third symphony the composer is not quite as eager to engage in contrapuntal activity in the exposition as he has proved to be in his earlier symphonies. D. Brown’s conception of symphonic writing appears to be somewhat rigid in this respect, proclaiming that thematic
developments must “be kept for their proper place, the development itself”\textsuperscript{161}, although he must probably have been aware that a corresponding approach is also found in Brahms.

The introduction, though held in the tempo of a funeral march, is not particularly tearful. The motives conceived in this introduction are later recognized slightly transformed during the exposition, the \textit{D} cell (Ex.3 1), is highly applicable in most situations, last but not least in dominant 7-, 9- and $b_9$-chords. Both the \textit{marcato} onset of this cell, the syncopation, the flattened super-tonic and the – via pauses – isolated demarcation single out this cell as something more than the almost unavoidable half-tone connection one may expect to find in the majority of musical themes. Motivic or possible motivic variations and derivatives seem more strained in this work than in the remaining six symphonies.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Ex3_1.jpg}
\caption{Ex.3 1 Introductory Theme}
\end{figure}

Tchaikovsky inserts something which looks like a local counterpoint in the subsequent restatement (m.9 ff, Ex.3 2), but which may equally valid be interpreted as a stylized variation of Intro B1's zigzag pattern (m.10 ff); the insertion of a distinct counterpoint which is conducted with utmost discipline within the texture. Even if we should choose not to attach thematic qualities to the layer, alternatively labeling it Intro F, it does not work as an incidental supplement to the thematic motives, but as an organic self-assumed unit within the texture. It adds a hazy complement to the more pedantic motives in this actual passage. Thus it functions very much in the same way as the descant tremolando fluctuations in the introduction of the First Suite, a piece which is also in d-minor, where the counterpoint complements the elements which later form the fugue theme. The counterpoint in both cases enters and exits in ascending and descending direction respectively, thus pursuing their own organic rise and fall. This approach, though, is being more thoroughly worked out in the Suite’s introduction (as part of the Introduction & Fugue) than is the case in this very short fragment in the Third Symphony. The melodic

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{161} David Brown: Tchaikovsky. The Crisis Years, 1874-1878. (W. W. Norton & Co. Inc. 1983) p.44
\end{footnotesize}
construction of these triplets by means of melodic seconds reappear in movements two, three and five (see for example Exx.3 29, 30, 33 and 45-47), but in the later movements some might possibly wish to read it as an extensively worked out textural ingredient and consequently label it as such. This triplet cell is predominant in the solo bassoon theme in the third movement\textsuperscript{162} and serves as textural counterpoint on several occasions.

Compare also the phrase-endings of the horn theme of the opening movement (mm. 9-12, Ex.3 2) with the bassoon theme in the middle movement's mm.10 - 12 (see footnote). The composer makes further explorations of these elements later, especially in the finale.

Ex.3 2 Thematic counterpoint (Score extract; without the cellos & basses and pedal.)

As compared with the first two symphonies there is a tendency toward a more withheld thematic renewal and development in this introduction. The introductory theme is restated over a dominant bass pedal via changing tone color, supported by rather straightforward local contrapuntal work, the latter by means of a Tchaikovskyan trademark: wandering pizzicato strings complementing the theme (mm.17-32), once again formed like an arch. This passage dissolves at \textit{Poco meno mosso}, leading to the transition toward the Main Theme. This transition amalgamates elements from the past as well as the future; the Introductory and the forthcoming Main Theme.\textsuperscript{163} The four notes of the thematic bass-counterpoint from in the modulatory passage from m.66ff, for example, represent the four opening pitches of the main theme.

The theme itself (Ex.3 3) owes parts of its origin to the introductory motives:

\textsuperscript{163} Although the upwardly striving 1A3 is a consequence of its two preceding measures as well as 1A2 and partly 1A1, it is at times more practical to handle it as a specific motive during the following poly-linear analysis.
Ex.3 3 Main Theme, opening:

In advance of the statement of the main theme, an extended dominant preparation (*Molto più mosso*) had created yet another halt in the propulsion. Nonetheless, the beginning of the transition was constructed as a hybrid by elements from the introductory theme (Ex.3 1) and the forthcoming main theme, particularly its phrasing (Ex.3 3) in close imitation. The ascending semi-sequential transition gradually becomes somewhat predictable, and one may even at this stage start to worry whether the thematic material, perhaps not characterized by the composer's customary originality, will cause him inescapable discomfort. But Tchaikovsky avoids such a pitfall, adding new motivic elements to the texture via an imitation of a transformed 1A3. The contrapuntal line in the bassoons (m.59) share obvious characteristics with later counterpoints to the Subsidiary Theme.\(^{164}\) In addition, the horn motives of m.62 ff (marked 'x' on the next page) share characteristics with 1A3 and Theme 2 (flute solo, mm.150-3).

Ex.3 4 Thematic counterpoint (beginning of transition to Theme 1)

---

\(^{164}\) The bassoon statement (particularly during mm.59-62:1) has inherited its linear traits from Motive 1A3 and the “hybrid” motive, yet above all the metric outline foretells characteristics of the subsidiary theme and some of its counterpoints, which we will return to later.
These measures lead into a stretto consisting of semi-thematic counterpoint in contrary motion (mm. 66-68, still over a dominant pedal), a passage which is reminiscent of a characteristic orchestral section right before the cadenza in the just recently finished First Piano Concerto. D. Brown points to another connection between the two works, referring to an ‘Artôt contour’ in the Introductory Theme and a ‘Tchaikovsky contour’ in the Subsidiary Theme, a connection we shall return to within short.

The main area is composed as a quite extensive ternary outline, with a modulatory middle section between mm. 95-126. This paragraph is constructed on reorganized characteristic elements from the A-section. The complementing semiquaver figuration (Ex. 3 5) is perhaps the most characteristic feature of this middle part. Later in the exposition these figurations also interact in the construction of the codetta.

Possibly the composer felt he had stayed contrapuntally restrained long enough, and that it was time to let thematic elements be worked out contrapuntally already at this early phase of the exposition. It has previously been observed that it is a highly characteristic feature with Tchaikovsky’s orchestral style that distinct, substantial motives interact in contrapuntal textures in the exposition, in which the melody itself is just taking part on equal terms with thematically derived layers. The horn-melody from m. 95 is constructed from 1A, which in turn is derived from the introduction. The falling fifth lies embedded in both themes: In fact; falling, singled-out intervals recur in this movement, as seen later, possibly stemming from the troubled, diminished fourth, which is the movement's opening interval.

---

The motive later to be associated with the closing theme (Ex.3 13); the Mozartean 1B (Symphony No.39:IV), appears in the upper strings, continue to accompany motives associated with the introduction. For a moment, the basses hold an f#-pedal, the tonic’s relative minor, below this three-layer thematic counterpoint, containing 1B, Intro D and a permuted Intro B:

Ex.3 6 Thematic counterpoint

Then follows a modulatory sequence (Ex.3 7), constructed from 1A2 in the treble instruments, this time displaying the motive close to its original form in ascending sequence. The contrapuntal bass-line might be read as Intro D in descending sequence, particularly viewed in light of how this material develops after m.119, alternatively the line might be read as an inverted 1A3. The four-crotchet motive may look just as much like a mathematical brain-game as music for the sake of art, but it nevertheless
demonstrates a sober and unromantic compositional attitude which is a familiar feature with the person we by now associate with Tchaikovsky of the early symphonies. From the anacrusis of m.119 the already mentioned falling leap; Intro A1/A2a, is counterpointed in augmented forms as major sixths, perfect fifths and diminished fifths against a descending Intro D. The repeated minor seconds in the bass at the end of this passage, together with the upbeat before m.215, points to Intro D as contrapuntal source equally much as a permutation of 1A2; in either case the counterpoint is thematic.

Ex.3 7 Thematic counterpoint (Tutti; harmonic material excluded)

This continuous motivic contraction might heighten a perilous sense of monotony (mm. 119-22). The continuously evolving short cells, involving quavers in renewed constellation, accelerates the transition toward the restatement of the theme. Thus the increasing danger of cunning pedantry draws still closer, while others might claim that this transition stands as a clear manifestation of a “neue sachlichkeit” and strict consequence. If not necessarily less romantic than his contemporary colleagues, Tchaikovsky is at least the complete opposite of the inescapable romantic he is sometimes accused of being.

Ex.3 8 Thematic counterpoint

The stretto leads to the restatement of the theme’s A-part, which ends with 1A1-signals in the trumpets, functioning as a new transition toward the Subsidiary Theme. Tchaikovsky chooses to keep this signal intact in the strings in the ritardando, instead of infusing it with the succeeding accompaniment-figuration appearing in the thematic statement (ref. Ex.3 10).
The Theme itself forms what Brown, in his constant search for anagrams, defines as the ‘Tchaikovsky contour’, a contour found also in the opening of the just recently finished First Piano Concerto. The pitches of this motive are repeated twice during different phrase lengths before the theme moves on. Since some sub-motives here are interrelated, marking them feels slightly out of place, and particularly derived 2A2 versions recur later only recognized by their motivic contour.

Ex.3 9 Subsidiary Theme; ‘2A’, the first theme of the Second Area, originating from Intro C

Tchaikovsky then immediately employs his habit of developing his new theme contrapuntally already at the theme’s restatement by means of continuously changing motivic combinations:

Ex.3 10 Thematic counterpoint

But now Tchaikovsky suddenly found himself developing his material “in its wrong place” again, and led the passage into contemplative dwelling on a motive from the main and the introductory themes (mm.158-61). Yet in doing so he could just as well let himself go by

167 N. Rubinstein’s first negative reaction to the concerto is well known. In spite of the work’s rapidly growing fame, much due to Hans von Bülow’s successful introduction of the work in America and Europe (together with Siloti), Rubinstein was just one of many who did not realize the thematic coherence within the work. When Tchaikovsky composed his Piano Trio in memoriam of Rubinstein’s death approximately seven years later, the composer makes a touching gesture by elegantly reinserting, as a transformation of the Trio’s main theme, this ‘Tchaikovsky contour’ from the Concerto (originally dedicated to Rubinstein) and work out the original motive in the Trio’s first movement, from eight measures after the return of L’istesso tempo.
reworking the Subsidiary theme (2A) drastically, in a way that transforms it into a new, short theme (2B; alternatively the B-section of a binary form, see Ex.3 11). The new theme is eventually at the height of blooming in the recapitulation. Both in the first and second statements the theme is presented within a poly-linear framework. In other words, the initial statement (2B1) has a transitory function when departing from 2A; the second (2B2) recurs in the recapitulation, where it is formed as a bold, self-sufficient fanfare-like utterance. This procedure may probably explain why 2B is practically absent in the actual development, although several threads may be tied from the latter back to the introduction. Spelling the first two measures of the first violins backward discloses a rather corresponding zigzag contour to Intro B. Although such an interpretation might seem somewhat contrived, the three tones ending the phrase, at least (mm.164-5), equals the opening of the symphony; the "Artôt contour", which is counterpointed in the bass register in m.165.

Ex.3 11 Thematic counterpoint, Second part of the Second Area (2B), initial statement (2B1)

A typical Tchaikovskyan textural transfer takes place from m.170; the staccato eighth-note figurations in the upper woodwinds drizzle downward, forming an eighth-note staccato bassoon pedal on e (m.174, preparing the new dance-like theme) beneath a further refreshingly new transitory shading of the first theme of the Second Area (Ex.3 12). The dance atmosphere is more withheld than for example a corresponding dance-like variant appearing in the opera Mazepa\(^{168}\), something that should be expected of a theme occurring in a sonata movement.

Ex.3 12 Thematic transformation from the Second to the Third Area

\(^{168}\)The opera was composed during 1881-83, and had its premiere in 1884.
The first measure of the transition is unmistakably familiar, yet combining elements from the second and the forthcoming closing theme makes the transformation complete; a Russian, Gopak-sounding transformation of the Second Theme breaks through (Ex.3 13). In this text the stretch before m.198 has been regarded as transitory, based on its motivic content. A. P. Brown views it as the first Closing theme, without transition, which is a viable alternative, particularly in respect of key 169. The melodic elements constituting 3A have already been thoroughly prepared in advance of its statement. They are represented by the theme's own A-elements suggested in the previous transition together with hints of 1B, presented already in the main theme, yet at the same time standing completely integrated in the new theme proper (see also Ex.3 5 & 6):

Ex.3 13 Closing Theme (3A)

The dance-rhythm in its pure form, initially established by the bassoon in the previous transition (m. 174ff), succeeds the above statement, fashioned as an orchestral gopak (mm.206-7, 210-11), possibly alluding to the effect of an accordion. From m.208 ff there is a brief textural decomposition of this harmonic and rhythmically static dance-rhythm, juxtaposing the dance rhythm and 3A cells in imitation.

A shading of the closing theme announces the opening the development most effectively at m.214, but surprisingly stops on the first chord, an effect later used in the Violin Concerto, where a single tutti chord is all the listener is left with as a substitute for a possible restatement of the haunting main theme. Thereafter the main theme's opening gestalt starts forming sectional imitations (Ex.3 14). The bass layer is particularly worthy of note, gliding seamlessly from 3A into an inverted 1A3 in a chromatically flavored descent. The rather fan-shaped imitative construction has, this far, often been observed as a highly Tchaikovsky characteristic: This type of thematically based abrupt fugal expositions are most probably found more often in his three early symphonies than in corresponding works by any other composer of the mid- or late-romantic period.

Another frequently used procedure in his earlier symphonies follows immediately after the transposed restatement of this modulatory passage; interplay between Theme 1 and 2 elements, forming a new modulatory passage. As seen on previous occasions the management of this procedure is clear-cut, making each thematic layer stand forth very distinctly in the polyphonic web. Yet unlike what has been the case with the majority of similar constructions of the composer's symphonic career, the contrapuntal layers are supported by rhythmic, less thematic material.
In this example the 2nd violin – in measure 228 particularly – carries traits from the first statement of the Second Group’s Second Theme (later transformed in the recapitulation). But elements from that theme’s first presentation are possibly lurking behind the scenes (see the string parts of Ex.3 11).

Except for the difference of tempo, the motivic utilization which follows brings into mind a thematic statement in the *Manfred Symphony* several years later; both incidents being in the minor mode, the home key of Manfred being the Third Symphony’s relative minor (this episode is in Manfred’s raised submediant). But the contextual implications are very different in this formal, almost impersonal poly-linear passage of the third symphony from that of the momentous thematic statement in Manfred.

The close imitation of elements belonging to the main theme, resulting melodically mostly in scale progressions, might well be one of the most formalistic passages of music Tchaikovsky ever wrote (Ex.3 16, see also comment on the First Suite/Ex.3 17). The section modulates from g# minor to f# minor, which is also the key of the corresponding Manfred example in the f# Dorian. Except for a short modulation to g-minor, the last passages spanning over twelve measures are now modulating seamlessly. Worthy of note is also the elegant, stylized bass, a feature we by now expect to find with this type of clean contrapuntal Tchaikovsky passages.

Ex.3 16 Thematic counterpoint (the woodwind doublings are omitted)

---

170 Tchaikovsky: *Manfred Symphony*, first movement, m.14 ff.
One cannot help but noticing the very strong common characteristics with these strettos and similar passages in the grand fugue of the First Suite. In the symphony there has been a continuing melodic augmentation of the opening interval of 1A2, from the fifth to the minor seventh. The opening motive of the suite’s fugue theme also continues expanding from its opening fifth during that movement. At mm. six and seven after E the interval is a minor seventh, and in the melodically and texturally strikingly equal stretto at mm. 4-1 before G it is a perfect octave.

Ex.3 17 Thematic stretto from the first movement of the First Suite (Compare with Ex.3 18)

The immanent 5/4-meter of the Suite contributes to a less conventional solution than that of the symphony. But with a total of seven entries the fugato of the symphony at least ousts the suite in that respect. The effect of Ex.3 16 may seem somewhat trivial and predictable, the opening falling seventh notwithstanding. Without bringing in new elements or in any substantial way changing the proportions of the previous passage, it leads directly into a stretto (Ex.3 18), followed by yet another re-texturization of this outline from m.255.

Ex.3 18 Thematic counterpoint (1A/Intro A elements)

In the ensuing paragraph the Main Theme’s second motive is substituted by a variant of the
opening motive of same, contrapuntally worked out together with its metrically augmented form, yet otherwise quite close to the original. These elements are connected by a reworked and prolonged introductory motive; 'Intro B', in the ensuing modulatory dominant chain:

Ex.3 19 Thematic counterpoint

Tchaikovsky manages to further intensify this construction by increasing the number of independent layers, starting with a three-part close imitation of an augmented, permuted main theme, accompanied by another variant of same, where the variation itself reveals the subtle connection between the introduction, above all Intro B, and the main theme:

Ex.3 20 Thematic counterpoint

This 1A2-variant might possibly bring into mind melodic elements of the introductory theme of the Second Symphony, a work written approximately two years earlier and substantially revised about four years after the premiere of the Third Symphony. We encounter a somewhat similar, intensified contrapuntal solution early in the development of No.2 I.

171 This 1A2-variant might possibly bring into mind melodic elements of the introductory theme of the Second Symphony, a work written approximately two years earlier and substantially revised about four years after the premiere of the Third Symphony. We encounter a somewhat similar, intensified contrapuntal solution early in the development of No.2 I.
Then follows a transposed version of the previous approximately fifteen measures and the further destiny of this variation – as with the former – is to end up as a stretto. The section preceding this stretto has been harmonically tied together over the local Tonic pedal on A, via expected as well as less expected progressions for every second measure: Dominant – Tonic – Subdominant – Supertonic and Relative Tonic, followed by a brusque modulation in m. 284 to its flattened supertonic in the minor (the flattened sub-mediant of the home key). Standard modulations on the circle of fifths continue, while the bass once again takes an active melodic role. In Ex.3 21 Tchaikovsky pushes his imitative 1A2-solution still further, now with the upper woodwinds and horns entering rhythmically diminished vis-à-vis the original note values in the strings:

Ex.3 21 Thematic counterpoint

This dominant-chain continues, but the stretto accelerates, both in respect of motivic development and harmonic tempo, something that calls for renewed instrumentation. In Ex.3 22 the 1A2-motive, by now rhythmically double diminished to sixteenth-notes, has become a self-evident springboard toward 3B. As the recapitulation draws near the movement takes more and more the form of a formal experiment: Except for the lowest horns, all elements are thematically straight motives or derived versions (mm.289-92):
The Main Theme in its original key is followed by the First Theme of the Second Area, now in the flattened supertonic. The reason for classifying 2B as a theme in its own right is on the basis of what now happens; 2B (Ex.3 23, see also Ex.3 11) reorganizes itself by bringing in elements from the main theme and simultaneously restructuring the Intro D-cells from its second measure. As was also the case with its first statement, this one is exposed polylinearly, both in its transitory and proper statements. The imitative aspect contributes in underscoring this modulatory version as Theme 2B2 proper, modulating toward its full-blown and triumphant statement at m.378. But it is also worth mentioning that 1A's four opening pitches are embedded in the new version of the theme.

Ex.3 23 Thematic counterpoint (Second Group's Second Theme 2B2; transitory phase)
The above transitory passage, first modulating, subsequently returning to B♭, moves toward the full-blown trumpet & trombone-version of the theme (Ex.3 24). The new thematic statement approximates a poly-linear construction in the finale of the Fourth Symphony, just before the final return of the motto in that work. The technique as such is strikingly similar: one brass layer imitates the other, and the strings build up to a vibrant, thematically inspired layer, the latter quality, though, more easily recognizable in the finale of the Fourth.

It is not totally unlikely that the frantic motivic texturing in the strings from m.378 (Ex.3 24), with its characteristic twist; the low note of the falling sixth in fact being the chord’s seventh, still resounds from the Finale of the Second Symphony. In No.2 this layer is usually traduced by the brass, bassoons or basses as a counterpoint to the theme played by the remaining orchestra (see Second Symphony, Finale, ex. m. 449 ff.). However, the melodic origin of the present layer in No.3 I is the opening melodic interval of the work; now in the guise of a diminished fourth. This falling interval has until now stood out in various augmented forms: from the start being notably emphasized on its way toward the main theme, where the falling perfect fifth was predominating. The interval keeps expanding – above all in the development – to become a minor seventh, and in the statement of the above theme the predominant interval is heard as a major sixth.

This attempted reading of the string-layer as an augmentation of the symphony's opening interval (also responsible for downward fifth of the main theme) may appear contrived - a suspicion not completely inappropriate. Yet the continuous repeat of this leap in the accompanying strings singles it out and adds weight to it, and the sixth has most probably been chosen out of the need of optimal formal counterpoint between the three most substantial layers in the texture; the string layer and the two wind layers. Equally notable is the behavior of the upper strings during the twenty measure long modulatory variation right in advance: there is a general ascent in these three upper voices, containing thematic gestures only, subsequently leading to their new role / new layer at m.378.

Ex.3 24 Thematic counterpoint (Score extract; without supporting parts & B♭ pedal)
Interaction between thematically based ascending and descending lines constitute the brilliant, stately and harmonically restless coda (Ex.3 25), where, at times, only glimpses of thematic material may be detected. It is always present, though, for example at the beginning of the coda, possibly associated with an augmented 1A3, where in fact the theme's opening melodic range is compressed in order to construct a fundamental stepwise line. Thus the original main theme's first - third - fourth degree-combination is leveled out linearly to first - second - third etc, yet revealing its origin by the upward leap to the second (ninth) scale degree on the fifth note.

Ex.3 25 Thematic counterpoint (Full orchestra, outer voices)

1A and 1B materials continue to level out their respective characteristics, ending up as linear, stylized gestalts, sacrificing their individual personalities for the common good, resulting in exemplary textural clarity (Ex.3 26). The upper strings transform into new fundamental roles via ascending textural transfer (mm. 457-9). The upward surge in m.456 and 458 ff closes as barely recognizable vestiges of Intro B - a variation which had begun in the bass-layer at the opening of this coda (see also Ex.3 25).

Ex.3 26 Semi-thematic counterpoint & textural transfer
Since the middle movements do not follow sonata-formulas, one might suspect that they are to a lesser degree treated to thematic counterpoint than the outer. In the case of the Third Symphony, one has to reconsider: although not all the thematic counterpoints are equally spectacular, they are so numerous that some are just mentioned without being exemplified.

2.3.2 Symphony No.3, movement II

The second movement, Alla tedesca, is a study in thin, easy-flowing textures. It is shaped as a ternary form with a central trio; this trio later affects the finale, and even serves as accompaniment of the recurring opening theme. Tchaikovsky at times masks his thematic connections, but if vague connections like the contours rendered in Ex.3 27a are intended - or just are consequences of the general organic, creative process - remains unknown.

Ex.3 27a Thematic inter-movement connection

The melody as such, which is in itself a ternary form, is played by the first flute and clarinet in unison, which, after eight measures, is counterpointed by the first bassoon (Ex.3 27b). Intro A might be camouflaged in the first stretch of this counterpoint, a view particularly justified by the falling diminished fourth. After about 8 ½ measures it presents a slight variation of the melody, played in close imitation to it:

Ex.3 27b Thematic counterpoint

The theme's B-part is counterpointed by 1A figurations. One of Tchaikovsky's trademarks is his ability of projecting each substantial layer effortlessly within the texture. This moment may possibly serve as an exception, though most conductors compensate for the dynamics
suggested by the composer. Yet one also suspects that Tchaikovsky wanted the counterpoint to be more sensed than projected.

Ex.3 27c Thematic counterpoint (only thematic layers are rendered)

```
\begin{music}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\pic (A) at (0,0) {
        instrument={fag},
        notes={\scalebox{0.8}{\textcolor{red}{$\text{mm.37}$}}\textcolor{blue}{$1B$}}
    };\node (A) at (0,0) {$1B$};
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{music}
```

The melody's continuation is then accompanied by an ascending, local counterpoint by way of changing sound-color (mm.47-58). In advance of 1A's return, the last melodic cell of the theme's middle section puts an imprint on the counterpoint to 1A from m.62ff.

It is almost impossible to avoid that the Intro D motive will recur in one way or another during the work, but in this movement there is at least one particular occasion where its appearance can hardly be seen as purely accidental (Ex.3 28). The quarter-note motive excels by way of a hemiola within a 3/2-signature (by a 2/4 subdivision) together with the remaining harmonically supportive accompaniment (excluded in the example), while the melody sticks to its ¾ rhythm, subsequently persuaded into 2/2.

Ex.3 28 Thematic counterpoint and inter-movement connection

```
\begin{music}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\pic (A) at (0,0) {
        instrument={fl,ob},
        notes={\scalebox{0.8}{\textcolor{red}{$\text{mm.70}$}}\textcolor{blue}{$1$: \textit{INTRO D'}}}
    };\node (A) at (0,0) {$1$: \textit{INTRO D'}};
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{music}
```

Neither do the flickering triplets that move around the orchestra during the entire Trio (mm. 83-153), moving poly-linearly alongside the movement’s main theme (mm. 154-61) appear to be just a random solution. This idea too was conceived in the introduction as a vital thematic germ (ref. Ex.3 2, mm.10-11). It may be seen as a combination of the figurations of the first movement's mm. 10 and 12 ff. and the staccato phrasing of m.11. In fact, the triplets

---

172 The second scherzo (i.e. main portions of the fourth movement) possesses much of that same thinned-out, transparent texture, yet it is more focused as regards number of constructive elements. Threads can later even be drawn from the finale's second episode back to the fluttering triplets in the middle section of the second movement.
– with their constantly moving melodic seconds – recur in various guises in all the movements, except for the fourth; the latter will produce light and telling motion by alternative means. The flying triplet-figurations contribute to the work’s light, easy-going impression, and mostly, though not constantly, reside in the treble registers.

These Intro 1B1-triplets may interact in poly-linear passages, as is the case from m. 107ff, together with a retrograde contour of another motive from the symphony’s introduction; Intro B (alternatively from the second note of its original contour).

Ex.3 29 Thematic/textural counterpoint and inter-movement connection (Horns omitted)

From the opening paragraph of the ternary-structured Trio (recurring at 137, Ex.3 30) a variation of another introductory motive (Intro E) in the violas is set against compounded woodwind triplets and duplets. As regards the wriggling behavior of the triplet cells combined with their exquisite sense of direction, this texture brings into mind the third movement of the Sixth Symphony.

Ex.3 30 Thematic/textural counterpoint and inter-movement connection (Cellos & basses omitted)

The triplets then continue to counterpoint the recurring Alla Tedesca from m.154.

Except for the movement's opening theme, the remaining material ranks among the least contoured among Tchaikovsky's thematic arsenal.
Another contrapuntal employment of the above technique will soon be reinforced by the introductory thematic flute- and bassoon-statements of the next movement.

### 2.3.3 Symphony No.3, Movement III

The opening of the third movement brings back that subdued atmosphere from the introduction of the first. This assertion is valid both with regard to the melodic elements and even more by the peculiar way pauses are used in order to segregate these elements, which are longer than just ordinary phrase delimitations. The concluding sixteenth note at the close of each phrase supports this assumption:

Ex.3 31a Inter-movement connections; phrasing

This soft woodwind coloring of the third movement’s opening, without oboes and with the flutes kept in their lower register, was also used effectively in the introduction to the finale of the first symphony, where the bassoons and second clarinet provided the constructional forward thrust. The textural/thematic linear 1C-factor from the opening of No.3 III (Ex.3 31b), characterized by its stepwise linear and turning quarter-note motives, serves as counterpoint also for major parts of the Second Theme, and, its inconspicuousness notwithstanding, later rounds off the movement's central section as a thematic force in its own right. It is read as a 2B permutation from m.46ff.

Ex.3 31b Thematic counterpoint

There are further similarities with the third symphony’s first and third movements, like the
first movement’s 2A-Theme’s possible influence upon the middle section of the slow movement, though this might be coincidental:

Ex.3 32 Thematic/motivic connections between the first and the third movements

A very subordinate connection may even be drawn to the finale’s 1B-motive (Ex.3 38), but by doing so one might run the risk of transgressing the borders of fruitful speculation.

After a bassoon solo at m.8ff (1B, constructed from elements of 1A), the movement's first measure makes service as a repeated signal, accompanied by a counterpoint built on the theme's opening; particularly mm.3-4, together with upwardly striving 1C material at m.17ff. Exemplarily shaped 1C-layers accompany the statement of the opening phrase of the Second Theme (2A) from 35 ff. It is probably correct to label this type of counterpoint as thematic, not only in respect of being further developed through the ensuing textures, but even more so because it plays the main role in a passage through which it counterpoints itself (m.68ff).

After 2A the theme proper continues by having even more elegant counterpoints written to it in the bass. The phrasing of the middle strings at mm.46-48 and 50-51 brings to mind an analogue hemiola passage in the second movement (ref. Ex.3 28), thus reminding one of the work's Intro D cell:

Ex.3 33a Thematic counterpoints

The climax of this movement is reached at m.60, at the end of an imitative thematic statement (Ex.3 33b). This imitation is further supplied with a new permutation of 2B; while the half-cadencing at m.58 underscores Intro D even more than in the corresponding mm.50-51, and even puts an imprint on the additional hemiola counterpoints from m.60 in the second violins and violas.
The ensuing manifestation of 1C (Ex.3 33c) might also be associated with thematic material from both former movements, particularly II 1B. The stylized 2B-element serves as the beginning of a calm retransition back to Theme 1, infused with frequent accentuated hemiolas above a pedal on b flat, underscoring an obvious connection with Intro D.

The triplets of Theme 1B serve as retransition toward a reshuffled recapitulation accompanied by 2B'/Intro C-influenced harmonization. The triplet elements, originally deriving from the introduction of the first movement, further cultivated in the second, thereafter partly responsible for the present movement's bassoon theme (1B) complement the Second Area's languishing violin theme over twenty-eight measures, growing into a haunting, passionate and powerful passage, involving also the stylized augmentation of the present movement's 2B. Thus all thematic material in this texture originates from previous movements. In advance of this texture (Ex.3 33d), Tchaikovsky had thoroughly prepared the triplet layer, emphasizing its clearly thematic 1B-relation.
2.3.4 Symphony No.3, movement IV

The fourth movement is above all a study in thinned orchestral texture, more so than exercise in melodic and contrapuntal art. The textures are created with consequence and concentration. Textural support is to some degree realized in the scherzo proper by involving the Intro D cell (from m.21). Yet even though this involvement is not carried out quite as convincingly as in earlier movements, there are some notable peculiarities concerning the string accompaniment below the rushing sixteenth-note figurations from m.21: The majority of melodic intervals come in the form of seconds; seconds via half-notes are not slurred and quarter-notes are slurred when they occur as seconds. An interval other than melodic second is tied together with a melodic second. This might altogether sound a bit contrived, but except for the pedal the melodic second is the most predominant interval of this quite extensive texture. Even so, as was the case with parts of the previous middle movements, the counterpoints are not striking, wanting in thematic as well as contoured melodic originality.

The flickering gestalts of this scherzo might perhaps distract the listener from not recognizing the fine threads spun between this and the first movement.

First coming into mind is the connection between the Introductory theme's Intro D and E motives and the trio of the fourth movement: they share the same motivic contour, and the trio relies probably more on the Intro D cell as a thematic force than what has been the case with any of the previous movements.

Ex.3 34 Thematic/motivic connection between the first and the fourth movements
This is the most typical Tchaikovsky scherzo of the two in this symphony, the former functioning as a partly lyrical intermezzo, with a central scherzo-like trio. The present leans much more in the direction of texturally founded dry wit. It is above all highly focused in most respects; melodically, texturally and rhythmically. Harmonically it is substantially more thinned out than the scherzo of, for example, the second symphony. The square, bombastic trombone tune (mm. 109-24) used as a local counterpoint to the movement’s semiquaver spinning-wheel theme above a pedal on e shows a sarcastic irony we should later expect to find with Shostakovich (Ex.3 35a). The heavy beats of the trombone-counterpoint (mm.109-14) are close to forming an inverted version of the Intro B - counterpoint of the previous scherzo (see Ex.3 29).

Ex.3 35a Local (hypothetically thematic) counterpoint (supporting voices are omitted)

From m. 37 the sixteenth-note figuration, presented as a contrasted string-woodwind combination, encounter the recurring fragmented introductory Intro A1-notes of the symphony:

Ex.3 35b Thematic counterpoint and inter-movement connection

1A also transforms to another contour between m.45-61, 69-88 etc., yet still keeping its spinning-wheel effect, serving as a counterpoint to a woodwind figuration, which might be derived from the work's stepwise falling Intro D cell, both in its augmented form in the strings and diminished form in the woodwinds. While the cell's phrasing characteristics are absent, thus impairing such an allusion, the combination of one joyously staccato, diminished
woodwind edition and a ditto augmented sinister cello-version makes a thematic connection plausible, although with considerable doubt.

Mm. 37-40 in the horn show immediate relationship with the first notes of the work’s Intro A, and above all, a cross-relation with Intro C seems plausible, particularly when keeping in mind that this kind of melodic zigzag pattern is far from characteristic of Tchaikovsky:

Ex.3 36 Thematic/motivic connection between the first and the fourth movements

In the recapitulation the counterpoint in the flutes can be read as deriving from the introductory octave leaps in the strings (easiest explained graphically; see Ex.3 37), or/and as to be absorbing the contour of the scherzo-theme’s introductory cell, amalgamated with a melodic elaboration of the First theme from the second movement (II; mm. 19-20). In sum IV: mm.164-67 thus is an augmented contour of the movement's scherzo-theme; 1A:

Ex.3 37 Thematic counterpoint and inter-movement connection

M. 398ff displays a half-complementary touch of thematic counterpoint.

This movement is said to be a favorite of Balakirev. It is remarkable for its forward drive and subtle orchestration. Discreet orchestral aloofness may thus have been partly responsible for the composer's inferior use of counterpoint, and some listeners might have wished for more contrapuntal projection into the somewhat repetitive Trio.

2.3.5 Symphony No.3, movement V

The Finale is a rondo with two separate and two integrated, thematically reworked episodes; each in a sense derived from the rondo theme itself, by their ascending fundamental lines and
by the descending, mainly chromatic complementing bass. The second episode is a variation of the first, the third is a fugue, whereas the fourth is a further adaptation and intensification of the first; an apotheosis before the concluding coda. The theme itself opens the movement without any preliminary ado:

Ex.3 38 Rondo Theme (opening) / (Semi-) thematic counterpoint, thematic from m.9

---

Not unexpectedly Tchaikovsky starts his contrapuntal preparation already at the theme’s initial statement. The chromatically oriented bass-line moving in contrary motion to this festive polonaise is at the time of its presentation "just" an elegant, local line. But it prepares at the same time the ground for the Episodic Material (E.M.); consisting of linear gestalts which are not derived directly from the surface of the rondo theme proper. Notice also the immanent hemiolas in mm.3-4 of this line, a tendency present earlier in the symphony. Later the 1B-motive usually comes into use in the shape of a descent made up by stepwise quarter-notes, alternatively seen as inversions. Obviously, this is a very standard and elementary turn, but it is used with such extreme consequence in this movement, that it feels appropriate to stress its constructional weight. The same argument goes for the three cells within 1A. They are the simplest of ingredients, yet utilized in an extraordinarily clean-cut way throughout the movement; a laudable attribute and in the spirit of the entire work (an exception made, though, for the slow, contrasted middle movement).

Some common architectonical principles recur in the main themes of the outer movements, not only in respect of their mutual ascending openings, but also as a result of the marked halts between the opening of the statements and their respective prolongations. The rhythmical poignant way by which these melodic phrases round off is also very distinct:

---

173 These episodic materials rely heavily on melodic stepwise ascents, opening by six to eight notes.
174 At least one of these common features is to be found in the opening of the middle movement, see Ex.3 31a.
Themes from the first, third and fifth movements share a mutual descending *motivic* characteristic:

The Rondo Theme continues as a semi-imitative construction between the outer registers, transforming into the linear gestalts, which are so characteristic of the Episodic materials:

The closing of this elaborate theme constitutes the following rhythmical sub-grouping of the polonaise; 3/4 - 2/4 (- 1/4) with an emphasized, condensed final close in 3/8. Excessive use of hemiola is later to be found particularly in the coda.

Tchaikovsky immediately starts a contrapuntal development based on this theme (Ex.3 43a). Obviously one might label the 2 E.M.-incidents as semi-thematic, yet the opening gestalts of the episodic materials are so linear that reducing the thematic importance of these lines seem
inappropriate. The viola part is formed by inverted episodic material and the horns signal the work's ever-present Intro 1A2 rhythm. The remaining layers open with the characteristic V:1A motive and continue into a turning E.M. - inspired x cell, a process that will continue into a later texture (see also Ex.3 43c). The development of this cell, as seen in mm.38-39 and 50ff brings immediately into mind the work's three opening notes. The bass-layer, though, moves directly into a 2(E.M.) inversion. Ex.3 43a is the first of three modulatory constructions in this extensive and elaborate transition toward the first episode:

Ex.3 43a Thematic counterpoint

After completing a transposed version of this construction, the composer reshuffles some of the above elements in the second, brief transitory passage (Ex.3 43b, m.m.46-49). In addition to the expanding, turning x-cell, the y-cell places more weight on the ensuing construction (m.50ff); although formally reasonable, the technical challenge per se is bearable:

Ex.3 43b Thematic counterpoint
Based mainly upon the y-cell the transition glides into a more relaxed state as it draws closer toward the first episode in the dominant.

The first episode has three notable layers, as demonstrated in the below example. Tchaikovsky had previously made revisions of his two earlier symphonies, but not of the Third, and one might possibly have wished for a revision of this somewhat naïve thematic variation. It opens as an ascent in accordance with the outline of the ascending Rondo Theme, stylized as Episodic material, hence standing out as distinctly independent. The descending conjunct bass brings immediately into mind the movement's opening construction. But there is more to it, which slightly strengthens the contrapuntal tendency: A third layer, the triplet accompaniment in the upper strings, associated with constructive elements from the first three movements, although the present plain arpeggiato usage reduces its thematic and contrapuntal weight. The impression of a "dreary tune" might have been reduced considerably had some performances paid more attention to the counterpoints, something which might give the thematic material needed resistance.

Ex.3 44 Opening of Episode I; Thematic counterpoint (score extract)

A subtle rhythmic restructuring of the opening measures of this first episode, combined with elements from the triplet figurations of its accompaniment, form the second episode (Ex.3 45). Thin threads may even possibly connect it with the bassoon statement of the third movement (third movement, m. 9 ff).

Ex.3 45 Episode II

The eighth-note triplets get the upper hand, and one gradually senses some resemblance with the trio of the second movement (mm. 120-53). Not only is the poly-linear connection between the primary thematic imitations strikingly similar, so, in part, is the pizzicato pedal in the lower strings (see also Ex.3 29):

Ex.3 46 Episode 2: Thematic counterpoint and inter-movement textural connection

This episode transforms gradually into a state similar to the trio of the second movement. One notices Tchaikovsky’s customary eye to effective, timbral contrast, while pizzicato duplets ensure the rhythmic verve (see also Ex.3 30). At m.139ff (Ex.3 47) the slight hemiola shading between the strings and woodwinds is overshadowed by the timbral contrast / contrary motion between these instrument groups. This is a kind of textural, chamber-orchestral dialectics reminiscent of Tchaikovsky's middle movements, not only in this symphony but also in No.2 and in particular No.1.

Ex.3 47 Inter-movement connection & timbral contrast
The triplet - duplet layer-combinations recur in all the movements, except for the fourth, mostly forming architectonically well-shaped, extensive, spun-out passages. Constructed chiefly by means of staccato neighboring tones they create a shimmering texturization, starting already in the opening Marcia funebre, where the slurred (yet melodically familiar) triplets, played *moderato*, made a somewhat dimmer impression (ref. Ex.3 2).

The recurrence of the rondo theme prepares the ground for a grand fugue, which, if not viewed as an episode might be viewed as a variation of the rondo theme, particular on the basis of appearing in the tonic. The previous episodes have been in the dominant key and the tonic’s relative minor. The fugue theme is constructed mainly from elements of the rondo theme, spun out over four measures; the first counterpoint impatiently starts out by reworking cells from the theme, implementing linear gestalts reminiscent of the episodes.

Ex.3 48 Fugue (Thematic counterpoint from m.181)

The proportion of this fugue is remarkable. It is more than just a pastiche, and so it justifies its position in the movement just as much as a fugue in a symphony from the classical period or one from the twentieth century. By varying textures and flexibility of phrasing Tchaikovsky enables the episode to grow from a baroque embryo to a romantic symphonic expression; a transition towards the re-entry of the first episode, which in this case becomes a more elevated and majestic *meno mosso* statement in the façon of an anthem (Ex.3 49). This is a context where that somewhat naïve, whistling tune at mm. 66-101 is transformed to a pompous yet noble interlude between the fugue and the coda. The bass-layer is rewritten, yet easily recognizable - moving for the most part in contrary motion to the episode-theme - and the insistent triplets/sixteenth-notes in the strings is an effect Tchaikovsky keeps in reserve for the big occasions. The recurring and varied triplet-usage through this symphony may justify such usage here:
Parts of this symphony might be read as an experiment in de-romanticizing the romantic symphony. Tchaikovsky keeps us at a distance of at least an arm's length in this work. It may be coincidental or it might have been planned that what might be perceived as a ‘Tchaikovskyan core’ is ultimately found in the middle section of the middle movement. But the Tchaikovsky of utter elegance and wit found in these scherzos is an equally characteristic trait observable in all his symphonic scherzos, and yet they are all highly individual, differentiated movements.\textsuperscript{176}

One finds a recurring tendency in Tchaikovsky reception of criticizing him of sometimes being overtaken by emotions and to forgo discipline. Since this conception does not fit in very well with this particular work, he is, accordingly, accused of being quite the opposite:

\begin{quote}
Discipline of expression, thematic concentration, and a good measure of musical intellect are admirable qualities in a development, but Tchaikovsky's dogged pursuit of what he fondly imagined was proper developmental technique turns discipline into repression, concentration into constriction, and lively intellect into arid pedantry.\textsuperscript{177}
\end{quote}

In his comprehensive biography David Brown mentions no palpable connection between the movements in the Third Symphony, describing the work as “inconsistent”, even a "patchwork".\textsuperscript{178} This, among other things, raises the question whether there is a possible limit to the speed by which thematic material should be developed or transformed, and above all, if there should be a possible limit to which thematic material should be renewed or radicalized. A closer look at Tchaikovsky's next symphony reveals that commentators have taken this

\textsuperscript{176} One might possibly exclude the waltz of No.5 from such a hypothetical list, of which ‘refined elegance’ might be a slightly better characterization.

\textsuperscript{177} David Brown: Tchaikovsky. The Crisis Years, 1874-1878. (W. W. Norton & Co. Inc. 1983) p.44

\textsuperscript{178} Ibid. p.50
problem far too lightly, even though the fourth symphony is an extremely much played and scrutinized work.

The composer’s brother Modest refers to two quite contrasting reviews of Cui and Laroche after the world premiere of the Third, first Cui:

"The public remained cool during the performance of the work, and applauded very moderately after each movement. At the end, however, the composer was enthusiastically recalled. This symphony must be taken seriously. The first three movements are the best; the only charm of the fourth being its sonority, for the musical contents are poor. The fifth movement, a polonaise, is the weakest. On the whole the new symphony shows talent, but we have a right to expect more from Tchaikovsky."

Cui failed to give fair credit to innovations of orchestral writing, since the scherzo can hardly be characterized otherwise than being remarkable for its sonoric and textural qualities. Whether this kind of negative attitudes had a direct impact on Tchaikovsky’s development as a symphonist, is not yet known for certain. What we do know, is that he did not approach experimental orchestration later in his numbered symphonies (the *sempre pizzicato*-movement of the Fourth Symphony was not as such a completely new invention), yet he tried out new possible solutions in the Waterfall music of *Manfred* and also in the suites, especially *Jeu de Sons* of the Second Suite. Cui seems to miss the point that Tchaikovsky’s *sonority* is immensely more than just plain vertical instrumentation; it is most often – also with a view to the scherzo in question – just as much interplay between constructional polarities.

Laroche’s conception of the work differs somewhat from Cui:

"The importance and power of the music, the beauty and variety of form, the nobility of style, originality and rare perfection of technique, all contribute to make this symphony one of the most remarkable musical works produced during the last ten years. Were it to be played in any musical centre in Germany, it would raise the name of the Russian musician to a level with those of the most famous symphonic composers of the day."

Among those representing a refreshingly new view on Tchaikovsky’s Third Symphony is Francis Maes. He is not merely critical to earlier general reception of the work, but even

---

179 Rosa Newmarch: ‘The Life And Letters of Peter Ilich Tchaikovsky’ by Modest Tchaikovsky (John Lane, London) p.179
points at “the high degree of motivic and polyphonic intricacies in the Third Symphony”.  

Tchaikovsky’s symphonic style – particularly in this work – demonstrates that a symphony may encompass diametrical opposites, an attitude for which Mahler should be praised as well as criticized. A closer study of Tchaikovsky’s score reveals that these diverging aspects are guises stemming from a mutual source, yet in this work he covers up his tracks even more carefully than usual. The motivic and textural cross-references in this work are remarkable, as is the high degree of substantial counterpoint.

---

2.4 Symphony No.4 in f-minor, op.36
(Composed May 1877- January 1878, first performed February 1878)

Reception at the turn of the millennium

During his respectful study of the first movement of this symphony, Francis Maes notes that

The dramaturgy of the first movement of the Fourth Symphony is not based on the transformations of themes in the German sense. The crux is the rhythmic opposition between the motto and the first theme. ¹⁸¹

However, this is just half the truth; what characterizes Tchaikovsky’s Fourth Symphony, including this movement, is that this rhythmical contrast is for the most part rooted in melodic material, ensuring substantial passages of thematically based counterpoint, truly an “intensification of motivic work” (Dahlhaus). The view held by Maes and Taruskin that there is a waltz–polonaise dialectic in the movement¹⁸², supports the forthcoming findings, but in this writer's view it does not sufficiently give credit to Tchaikovsky’s notable contrapuntal achievement. Yet above all the Fourth Symphony turns out to be a further elaboration, stylization and clarification of the contrapuntal techniques Tchaikovsky already had used extensively in his three previous symphonies.

2.4.1  Fourth Symphony, movement I

The main thematic material is found in the introductory motto (Ex.4 I 1). Cells $a$ and $b$ are particularly much used throughout the movement, above all in the main theme, which is the dominating theme in the development. As regards $c$, this element refers just as much to a general linear principle, and it is also re-found as a culmination of the first statement of the main theme (mm.48-52) besides of being the embryo of the closing 3b theme. The half-step d-factor (m.4) is, of course, found in almost any musical composition in existence, for example in the important, inverted a-cell in the main theme, yet in this case we shall later re-find a quite similar way of deliberately utilizing this cell on the second and third beats in the horns. Thus we may classify these four (and closely related) elements as substantial or motivic/thematic.

Evidently, and as we might expect, most of the cells in the forthcoming main theme (Ex.4 I 2) are derived from the introduction, directly or in form of inversions or other permutations.

In accordance with Tchaikovsky’s usual procedures in his earlier symphonies, he starts immediately to develop the main theme (Ex.4 I 3), whereby thematic counterpoint is immediately brought into play: Elements from the main theme are counterpointed in the woodwinds and the strings respectively. The ascending half-step in the horns – reminiscent of the introduction – recurs in this passage from measure 53 (sensed in the upper strings from 52) to 65 and constitutes the third substantial textural layer in this variation.

In addition to the utilization of thematic counterpoint, stylized, contrary motion is, as so often before, a powerful textural force. The majority of motives used in the contrapuntal work are interrelated in these three contrapuntal layers. In all the forthcoming excerpts, the composer does not yield to repetitive sequential standard types of formulas, like what may, for example, occasionally be found in his earlier symphonies and quite often in Bruckner’s and even in Brahms’s symphonic production. Most often the counterpoint – even when the music flows most effortlessly – is characterized by a nearly note-per-note relationship, offering variety as regards motives selected for contrapuntal construction:
The elements taking part in the poly-linear work are varied continuously via new combinations of simultaneous motives, yet perpetual motivic imprints make the music proceed effortlessly. In addition to the contrapuntal work, the composer ensures a longitudinal structuring and planning of specific voices (See Exs. 4 I 12, 15 and 25). Special attention should also be drawn toward the thematic elements: they do not occur in strict sequential order, their lengths (phrase structures) and types of construction vary. Sometimes they appear as gestalts closely related to the actual theme-construction. The combining of varying quotation lengths within a thematically based contrapuntal passage is exemplified in Ex. 4 I 4.

During this part of the exposition, further aspects to Tchaikovsky’s style become evident: Sometimes the variation of a cell is given a new role in a forthcoming texture, for example as shown in measure 67 (Ex. 4 I 5); the cell has an impact upon – or puts a direct imprint on – a new textural layer. Tchaikovsky usually, as is also seen in Ex. 4 I 5, aims at using this type of approach with convincing clarity: First the cell, derived from a cell in the main theme, is played by the woodwinds, thereafter it is caught up by the strings where it reasserts itself, gaining improved status. Thus having been absorbed in the thematic development, the cell strengthens its position as a chromatic, inverted stature in the woodwinds again from measure 70. The transfer from one section to another most often, like here, results in an utterly clean architecutonic construction; the woodwind-layer is much more than just a run (a fact
underlined also by the withheld *Moderato* tempo); it is the transformation of a thematic cell, utilized in a new textural construction. Two measures of the Main Theme now counterpoint the descending chromatic cell-transformation. An “imprint” from the theme has produced a new layer, even continuously new layers, which take part in a constantly developing and transforming thematic counterpoint.

This cell is traceable directly back to the introductory motto. Typical, though, is the gradual, organic transformation of such a small element from one textural field to another. The rather anonymous brass layers in measures 70-3 (Ex.4 I 5) and 82-6 (Ex.4 I 7) are rendered in order to demonstrate the utmost clean-cut dissonance treatment: Even though focus in this document is being put on selected aspects of dialectic textural construction, Tchaikovsky’s supreme ability in solving potential conflicts between separate layers, ensuring optimal orchestral clarity and transparency, represents another typical feature of his style.

Worthy of notice is also the contrasting constructional relationship between the two substantial layers rendered in mm.70-1; the theme in the strings is kept rather unchanged (before being absorbed by the derived cell from m.72 ff), while the woodwind-counterpoint is built upon the (more remote) cell-permutation: A stylized element is counterpointed by an original, melodic element. Similar substantial thematically motivated layers continue to ensure thematically based counterpoints to fragments of the main theme; observe, for example, the \( x \)-diminutions in measures 72-3 (Ex.4 I 5) which occur in permuted form at measures 79 and 81 (Ex.4 I 6).
Ex.4 I 6 Thematic counterpoint / continued formation of new layers via motivic development

The transformation of motivic layers continues seamlessly, resulting in continually new textural fields containing thematic counterpoint. Contrary motion between the thematic elements is gradually enforced, having direct impact on the forming and permutation of substantial, contrapuntal elements; in other words, the majority of typical/original melodic cells are permuted in order to form stylized ascending or descending lines. Notice also the perfect layer-segregation; the scale-movements of the remaining layers do not transgress the brass-lines.

Ex.4 I 7 Thematic counterpoint (Theme 1)

The subsidiary theme (Ex.4 I 8) is a compound stature consisting of a melodic element in the first clarinet (2a), supported with motivic echoes in the flutes and first bassoon (2b). Two complementary ideas in the violas and cellos counterpoint 2b, which contain the most important material for the forthcoming closing section. The cello-cell in measure 118 displays 3a material which grows in importance until the four statements from m. 121/22 ff (see also Ex.4 I 9), and the modest triadic gesture in the violas faintly suggests the concluding 3b statement at m.161. 3a and 3b are used in poly-linear constructions during the exposition, but the latter makes the greatest contrapuntal impact on the development, mostly counterpointing Theme I. Although one may with justification claim that the broken 3b triad represents a
rather common thematic gesture in symphonic works of the nineteenth century, it is comparatively rare with Tchaikovsky.\textsuperscript{183}

Ex.4 I 8 Subsidiary and closing material / Thematic counterpoint

In Exx.8 & 9 the counter-directional principle is highly present, yet more important: The simultaneous statements of two substantial elements are taking place (2 and 3a; 3b is barely being hinted). The 3b-element is the less characteristic, but the most utilized as a contrapuntal ingredient in the movement. 3a is isolated from the thematic counterpoint and stylized in its new key from m.134. But there is absolutely nothing which is thematically new when this occurs; in measures 122, 125, 128 and 135 this thematic element has been counterpointed to the Theme 2 elements, and it was, as mentioned previously, even introduced already from m.118 (cellos) and 120 (violas). When the 3a-element stands forth as an isolated stature at mm.133-34, the episode is strikingly similar to a texture from the second movement (waltz) of the Serenade for Strings\textsuperscript{184}, m.21ff: both the textural fabric as such – which merely consists of naked, parallel thirds in the violins – and the fundamental melodic interval-connection are quite identical. Even the ascending up-beat is present in both examples; in the symphony the up-beat takes its origin from the start of the 2a-element. The concurrent statement of two simultaneous thematic units is unusual.\textsuperscript{185}

\textsuperscript{183} Usually Tchaikovsky contrasts Brahms in this respect; the latter builds much of his thematic material in his second, third and fourth symphonies on broken triads.

\textsuperscript{184} The String Serenade in C was written in 1880, only approximately two years after the Fourth Symphony.

\textsuperscript{185} Not all commentators take a definite stand as to which theme area the 3a and b themes belong, a fact being more than understandable viewed in light of the extreme interplay between the thematic components in this movement, and if they do, they may come up with various possible solutions. An agreeable alternative is suggested in ERIC BLOM, \textit{Tchaikovsky, Orchestral Works}, Oxford University Press, London, 1948, pp.29-30.
The 2b woodwind-figurations are found later in the recapitulation of the second movement, counterpointing that movement’s main theme. That statement is only constructed as thematic counterpoint if we choose to accept that the woodwind-figurations are not just isolated within the second movement, but are imported from thematic material from the first. Not only are the figurations quite identical; compound texturing via changing woodwind instrumentation, periodical leaps between them and irregular, shifting physical direction immediately makes an impression of being highly thematic.\textsuperscript{186, 187} (See Ex.4 I 10)

\textsuperscript{186} There is also another direct thematic link between movements I and II: The second theme of the slow movement is constructed out of the opening of the first movement’s main theme.

\textsuperscript{187} Further there is a palpable resemblance with the first two measures of the main theme from the second movement of the Fourth Symphony and a substantial element from the first movement of the Second Symphony; see, for example, Symphony No.2, first movement, mm.92 and 99-100): Even though they occur in very different episodes from both a structural and textural point of view, they are constructed quite similarly, even in respect of phrasing. (The Fourth Symphony was composed between the first and the second version of the Second Symphony.)
Besides being related both to the Main Theme and the 3a-element, the closing 3b-statement, beginning at measure 161 (Ex.4 I 11), most of all originates directly from the opening motto. It is introduced in the strings, while the trumpets and trombones first counterpoint it with a rhythmic cell associated with the Main Theme between mm. 161-4. This counterpoint in the brass echoes the thematic cell in the strings which dominates the transition (mm.159-60) leading on to the m.161 statement, communicating the spirit of the opening motto.

One may by now observe that the Motto represents a miniature form of the exposition. The previous areas find their most characteristic material in mm.3-4 while 3B takes its material mainly from mm.5-6; first focusing on the characteristic downward triadic cell (“Closing cell”) derived from the main beats in m.5, starting on the scale’s fifth degree (mm.161-64 and 169-72). The latter statement is followed by a combination of the descent in m.6 and echoes of the syncopated close of the restatement at mm.11-12 (mm.173-76). This syncopated element is reinforced in the permuted variation of the triadic Closing cell in the winds between mm.165-68, divided into two successive pairs of harmonic thirds, counterpointing the rhythmic reminiscences of Theme 1 in the descending strings.

**Ex.4 I 11 (Thematic) transition/textural transfer + Thematic counterpoints**

(Turn to the next page)

---

188Although all thematic material is derived from the opening motto, the cell, or Motto a and b cells, are so closely associated with the main theme that they are most often referred to as Theme I – cells, even when they recur as part of 3b. In 3a, the opening motive of Theme 1 (in the woodwinds from m.135) succeeds the more characteristic 3a material (in the strings from m.133). But then again the main theme’s opening quarter-note / eighth-note - combinations may have had an impact upon the mm 134-35 statement in the violins.
The ensuing thematic restatement in the horns is counterpointed by the woodwinds and violins from m.169 (Ex.4 I 12); a counterpoint which is even more closely related to the main theme, both as a result of its instrumentation and because of the conjunct cell-combinations, permuted as to give contrary motion to the descending thematic triad. (This Closing-cell later reinvents itself in a permuted form from m.284 ff in the trombones, and in the Coda at mm.399-402, just before the augmented, concluding restatement of the main theme.) Although Theme 3b is not reworked to any notable extent during the development, it is treated and reworked quite substantially during its presentation.

Taking a glance at the linear voice-structure, the string-part from measure 155 ff. demonstrates Tchaikovsky’s long-term planning of a single, predominant orchestral layer (Ex.4 I 12); the first violin-part is rendered from its transitory function from m.155 to the return of the motto at 193, formed mainly like a long arch. Firstly, the Theme 1-cell is carried sequentially upward toward the statement of Theme 3b, subsequently continuing gradually downward again to m.169, where it counterpoints the restatement of the new theme in the horns in an upward surge, thereafter continuing still further upwards to a tutti reunion at m.176. There it engages in a Theme 1 variation from m.177 which has similarities with some thematic references in the Finale (for example from the finale’s m. 50). The violin part, in an extremely exemplary outline, then continues exploring the possibilities of the main theme above a rhythmically changing orchestral background until the motto returns in the brass.
Since similar voice-structures might also be found with other composers of the romantic era, the quotation in Ex.4 I 13 is not as unique and characteristic for Tchaikovsky as is the composer's use of thematic counterpoints. But the smooth transfer between registers, the equally smooth change of roles (the example encompasses e.g. the thematic counterpoint to the horns from m.169) are, nonetheless, quite descriptive characteristics of this type of Tchaikovskyan voice structure. It has thus a constructional side which most sophistically carries a dialectic focus; not only is the listener directly confronted with the poly-linear passages when they actually occur; the persistent voice-continuation might also be regarded as a goal in itself.

At this point it might be appropriate to stress that the principle of thematic counterpoint must not be confused with more standard type of dialectic orchestral texturing, where motives are

---

189 See, for example, also mm. 231-294 in this movement
being complemented\textsuperscript{190} in different orchestral parts. (The “question-response” method, utilizing, for example, contrasting instrumentation, is perhaps the most common and ordinary type of such complementary textures.) The type of procedure which is rendered in the next example is a borderline case; a rather common type of complementing texture bordering to thematically based counterpoint. A discourse concerning an episode’s possible poly-linear qualities may time and again lead to the question whether continuing existing layers turn into standard, non-thematic voice-leading, as soon as a new thematic entrance takes place. Although such procedures may be expertly executed, they may be of insignificant thematic importance. The question concerning the originality of a given thematically rooted counterpoint seems to be a demanding yet extremely interesting subject for future research. In Ex.4 I 13 each voice, as the result of most elegant part-writing, carries traces of the concluding descent-motive from the motto, a motive which is found regularly throughout the movement (see for example mm.5-6, 48-49, 50-52). The reason for including this example in our discussion is to emphasize that the quality and originality of this type of textures leans toward a “quasi” counterpoint, a procedure which Tchaikovsky usually finds insufficiently interesting. Even so the complementing structure within which the thematic elements relieve each other brings a more relaxed momentum to the opening of the development section after the concluding intensity of the closing 3b-theme. Here the more anonymous subsidiary layers are just vaguely rooted in thematic material in the form of short stylizations in contrary motion.

Ex.4 I 13 Motivic complementation, bordering to semi-thematic counterpoint (Theme 1)

In Ex. 4 I 14, the presence of thematic counterpoint is far more significant. As in examples 4 I 3-12 Tchaikovsky’s thematic counterpoints usually create a forward drive. But in these early examples his thematic counterpoints usually create a forward drive. But in these early

\textsuperscript{190} ‘Complementation’ is a term suggesting that two or more thematically founded parts relieve each other by no overlap or just a minimum of overlap. Accordingly, this approach represents only inferior contrapuntal importance. The larger the thematic overlap, the more profound the contrapuntal impact.
passages of the development section this propulsive effect is reduced by means of periodic
halts in the counterpoints and a general withheld aloofness, moving for the most part in
contrary motion to the thematic development in the woodwinds.

Ex. 14 Thematic counterpoint (Theme 1)

In our next example, once again the linear structure of the first violin part is worthy of
comment: During its arch-shaped “rise and fall” in the development from m.236 to m.294 the
violin-part conveys foregrounds and backgrounds; the thematic material is at times directly
quoted from the main theme, at other occasions developing organically from it. The violin
part is formed as an extremely consistent organism, where much of the accompanying
sections have their roots in thematic material. The outline of this type of layers implies
elegantly connected textures obtained via extremely well planned use of motives and/or
registers. Tchaikovsky rarely falls into excessive use of primitive solutions like arpeggio-
layers. Even when the violins are supporting the fate-motto in the trumpets (m.253 ff., 263 ff.,
transposed one semi-tone, 278 ff.), the violin-part is purely thematic.

There are similar examples of linear voice-planning for the first violins in, for example, mm.
334-55 and mm. 373-422 and in the Finale from m.47ff.

Ex. 15 First violin-part, measures 236-294; seamless role-changes between textures
There is always the danger that thematic counterpoint may become “mechanical”, but Tchaikovsky’s thematic counterpoint is extremely versatile. Even at the rather simple manifestation from m.236 (Ex.4 I 16), he avoids mechanical sequencing, even though the counterpoint is, to be sure, a modulatory, repetitive creation. The episode grows organically out of the previous strings-woodwinds dialectic which had put its mark on the episode proper at mm. 234-6 by forwarding it and leaving its clear imprints on it. This texture owes much of its existence to the main theme's two-note, stepwise, thematic, falling “horn” cell:
Ex. 4 I 16 Thematic counterpoint (Theme 1)

The above modulation leads to a climax at measure 253, containing three thematically stylized layers. Layer 1: the introductory motto in the trumpets, layers 2 & 3: descending and ascending (inverted) Theme 1- layers in the upper and lower registers respectively. There is practically nothing in the score which is not rooted in thematic material (except for the timpani, which are omitted in the rendering of the score).

In measure 254 the additional trombone-layer leads to a construction with four thematic layers, adding a thrilling rhythmic counterweight.

Ex. 4 I 17 Semi-thematic counterpoints (Theme 1 & Motto)
The powerful effect of the climax at m.253 is more due to the clean-cut simultaneous three-part thematic treatment than mere tone-coloristic effects. Rather on the contrary; the coloristic aspect is almost erased as a result of the temporary doublings of the woodwind and brass-layers.

In order to make a clear argument for the thematic counterpoint in Example 4 I 20, a look back to, for example, measures 224-6 (Ex.4 I 18) feels appropriate: In mm.225-6 the violin-figuration, established as a transformation of the syncopated accompaniment in mm.224-5, is a discreet, subtle foreboding of what is going to happen in m.258, absorbing the thematic development in the cellos and the first bassoon.

Ex.4 I 18 Motivic coherence/development & thematic counterpoint

From measure 259 there is a change of scoring approach as regards instrumentation; contrary motion between thematic layers are no longer limited to the upper and lower parts respectively, but is also found between the high and middle strings and woodwinds. The bass instruments (of both sections) turn towards a markedly more aggressive, bouncing and contrasting bass-line as the composer pushes the climax even further:

Ex.4 I 19 Thematic counterpoint (see also Ex.4 I 18), inversions from m.259
The violin figuration in Ex.4 I 20, which has already been stated in the violins at the return of the “Fate” motto, contains parts of the folk song and the main theme of the Finale (notes 3-6). Thus the exact quotation of the string cell in this example is re-found in a poly-linear episode from that movement's m.146 ff. With Tchaikovsky, such whirling layers in tutti passages are often created from more than mere haphazard solutions; they tend to be thematically orientated, here emphasized by hemiolas. At the same time the violin cell contains a permuted quotation from the main theme's notes 2-5 of the first movement (i.e.: both layers utilize the same scale degrees).

Ex.4 I 20 Thematic counterpoint

The sixteenth-note figuration in the lower strings at mm.282-83, circling around the opening pitches of the main theme, concludes the retransition and prepares the ground for the simultaneous restatement of the main theme, and a permutation of the closing Theme 3b. The permutation is made by inverting the direction of the theme's initial broken chords and adding the falling "tale", reminiscent of the original theme as well as the motto.

Ex.4 I 21 Thematic counterpoint

As one is about to renew one's acquaintance with Theme 3b, it should be stressed that the start of its original statement might be regarded as an expanded form of the string-motive from Theme 3a, just the way that motive is a stylization of an excerpt from the opening motto’s measures three and four. Driven to its logical conclusion, nearly everything that happens in

191 The Finale's theme 1B.
192 The Transfer from the development of Symphony No.6 I represents another telling, quite similarly constructed example (Symphony No.6 I, m.188ff).
the movement derives from the opening motto, yet the motto’s measures 5 & 6 contain the closest link to Theme 3a.

Ex.4 I 22 Thematic coherence

A restatement of the Motto ends with a lingering over one of its motives (see Ex.4 I 23, mm.363-4), a motive that shall later make up the basis of the festive main march-theme of the Finale. This motto-fragment is subsequently augmented in the flutes and clarinets, counterpointed by a variation of the Main theme in the strings, the latter having much in common with earlier variations as regards contour and rhythm. This episode serves as an intermezzo - or rather a calm prelude - to the coda:

Ex.4 I 23 Thematic counterpoint

The same motive is then further developed in the strings: While being transferred between mm.381-89 from the middle to the upper registers, it establishes itself as a hemiola counterpoint against fragments from the opening motto (in the trumpets and horns) from m.389 (See Ex.4 I 24). From m.392 the texture is supplied with yet another substantial layer; a chromatically rising bass.
Even though there is a marked focus on thematic counterpoint in this document, one more suitable example of Tchaikovsky’s well-considered layer construction ought to be rendered:

After the above episode has been repeated, the concluding measures from 393 develop toward a permuted statement of the “Closing” cell - or 2b melodic third-cell - at m.399. The thematic cells in the strings climb to the high register of the texture, and “hang” at mm.399-401 while the brass play the 3b-permutation, after which the strings continue with a culminating variation of the main theme (m. 402 ff), rounding off the episode’s arched contour.

Ex.4 I 25 (from m.393, second time) Voice structure / layer design (violins)
2.4.2 Symphony No.4, movement II

The slow movement of Tchaikovsky's Fourth is more characteristic of its utterly Tchaikovskyan stylized counterpoints, notably from m.134 ff, than for those genuinely thematically based. As such it is kept emotionally on a relatively tight rein as compared to the slow movements of Nos. 5 and 6; by reducing thematic counterpoint the composer at the same time reduces intensity or "intensification".

As with earlier examples of this type of movements, Glinka's re-orchestration principle is once more taken to a level far beyond that of its originator. Each variation is developed texturally; consequently one episode or variation has an impact upon the ensuing.

The restatement of the opening theme brings along a linear, slightly curved counterpoint, at this point just hinting at the procedures which follow later. This far it should be but fair to say that Tchaikovsky manages to create architectonically clean-cut counterpoints to almost any kind of thematic material. The stylization (1B2') might be derived from the thematic, stepwise octave-descents at mm.44-45 and 47-48.

Ex.4 II 1 Semi-thematic counterpoint

![Ex.4 II 1 Semi-thematic counterpoint](image)

In the middle section of this ternary formed movement, the theme, played by the violins, is clearly infused with elements from the first movement's main theme (see Ex.4 II 2, m.134), getting a linearly designed woodwind counterpoint written to it which may be read as a reinterpretation of the same ideas, and above all as a further elaboration of 1B2:

Ex.4 II 2 Semi-thematic counterpoint

![Ex.4 II 2 Semi-thematic counterpoint](image)

In the next example the seemingly less interesting horn part is included: This layer, from m.143, might be read as an augmented variant of the already established string-counterpoint
(m.142ff) to the second theme, played by the upper woodwinds. There are also other, less suspect ways by which to interpret this generally ascending horn-part, counterpointing the melody together with the established string-counterpoint; above all the stepwise "horn-cell" of the first movement comes automatically into mind.

Ex.4 2 3 Semi-thematic counterpoint (woodwinds / strings)

An increasingly agitated atmosphere is brought in via the chromatically infused triplets. The rather ordinary melodic second-turns are reminiscent of the first melodic turn (horn cell) of the main theme. Both clarinet-parts are semi-thematic, although, alternatively, it feels unproblematic to read the semi-thematic layers of both the previous as well as the present example as thematically derived inversions. As often, possibly one of the most impressive features with this and similar examples is the extreme clarity and ease by which each contrapuntal layer, the extreme chromaticism notwithstanding, is projected.

Ex.4 II 4 Semi-thematic counterpoints

The recapitulation evokes the previously mentioned thematic counterpoint rendered in Ex.4 I 10, where the counterpoint incorporates similarities with elements from both movements.
2.4.3 Symphony No. 4, movement III

This famous movement is above all a study of striking motion and sonority, taking into account that it is a nineteenth century creation. The pizzicato part is characterized by its two layers, each competing of achieving the listener's attention from m.25 ff; one constructed by winding and wriggling conjunct eighth notes, the other by bouncing notes on the afterbeat. The composer refers to the movement on behalf of the sonic qualities, stressing contrasts of timbre among its merits. Even so; the most striking moment is possibly where the brass theme meets the woodwind theme, and the latter is played by the clarinet above the brass section at m.185 ff. Yet from m.17 the dialectic texturing is quite obvious; a rising arch in the upper strings with an unusual harmonic ambience produced by rapid A major/minor, B flat major/minor and C major/minor shifts moves above a falling melodic arch in the bass, the latter introducing the afterbeats which are so important for the movement's restless drive. These afterbeat-arches may owe their existence to the cross-directional arches of the movement's two opening measures.

2.4.4 Symphony No. 4, movement IV

Textural coherence, a textural theme - and a fate motto and its consequence

In his four-volume biography on Tchaikovsky – the most extensive until date – the author does not abstain from passing harsh verdicts on even the composer’s most celebrated works. Here is an excerpt from the belitteling comments about the finale of the Fourth Symphony, one of the most frequently performed works from the nineteenth century symphonic repertoire:

(…) Nor does the sudden intrusion of the fate theme carry much conviction, for none of the other music seems in any way to relate to the emotional world this theme represents (…).193

In advance of the above citation, the author launches multiple attacks on the movement, but we start with the present, because this assertion has such a dramatic impact upon his overall verdict: The biographer totally misses the main clue of this finale; the central march part of the first theme, not fully stated until m.30ff, is constructed on a retrograde motive from the symphony’s opening motto (Ex.4 IV 1). Thus the Finale theme, built on a retrograde idea from the motto, purposefully winds its way back to the motto’s inescapable and original

---

triumphant statement at the end of the work, simultaneously leaving us with several possible interpretations as regards the composer's - or mankind's - fighting against or, alternatively, surrendering to fate.

Ex.4 IV 1 The opening "Fate" motto and the Finale's Main Theme; retrograde relationship

The main problem with Brown’s analysis and reception is not that he completely misses one of the most vital aspects of the finale; none of us is infallible, least of all the present author. It is far more problematic that the biographer puts forward his misjudgments in an ironic and condescending tone, an approach tending to pervade his biography, sometimes leading to the most disastrous assessments on many of the composer’s most central works. Confident of his own analytical infallibility, the biographer concludes with the following words:

It is a rather sad end [italics added] to a symphony which had begun so magnificently. Not until his very last completed work, the Sixth Symphony of 1893, was Tchaikovsky to find a solution of the finale problem that was as successful as it was original.

More than ten years later we find a similar verdict concerning the finale in the anthology “The Nineteenth Century Symphony”, where the commentator, possibly influenced by Brown, keeps the myth alive, claiming that

“(…) the last movement is bound to disappoint listeners (…) There seems to be little musical motivation for the intrusion of the Fate motto (…) suggesting that this move indeed depends on a program for its justification” 194,195

In respect of the two commentators, it would be unfair to judge the remaining parts of their articles in light of the recently disclosed connection between the motto and the finale’s main theme. But the authors continue their criticism of this well-known finale, the latter probably inspired by the former, by claiming there is no relation between the first and second themes. Yet Tchaikovsky had chosen his folk-song with care: The chief motives of both themes

195 As regards the often commented-upon re-rhythmization of the movement’s second theme, it is not completely unlikely that this reworking came about after Tchaikovsky first had constructed the main theme from the opening motto, thereafter to proceed with the second theme, where he possibly might look for a folksong that could share some affinities with the main theme. The folk-song should accordingly be in 4/4 meter, or it could alternatively be reworked into 4/4 meter, as eventually became the fate of the selected folksong “In the Meadow there stood a Birch Tree”.

190
conclude in a rather identical way, by two repeated and two descending notes (the march theme's notes 3-6; Ex.4 IV 2):

Ex.4 IV 2 Thematic cell relation

But Brown continues to criticize the movement by asserting that “It lacks even the scope and ambition of the last movement of the Second Symphony”, which Krauss copies thus: “the variations also lack the textural and harmonic range of those based on "The Crane"”. The latter quality should not come as a big surprise, since the form of the finale of the Fourth approximates more that of a rondo, as opposed to the more sonata-orientated finale from the “Little Russian”. No doubt the finale of the Second Symphony is a superb movement, but even so; is it possible that the above commentators have lost even additional aspects concerning Tchaikovsky’s architecture? The present author would like to underline one specific feature with Tchaikovsky's musical style; his striving for magnificently transparent and dialectical textural construction, for the most part achieved as a result of thematically based counterpoint.196 These types of textures do not necessarily have to be realized via overtly clear thematic elements, they may alternatively be graphically designed stylizations, though Tchaikovsky’s graphical approach most often tends to be securely thematically rooted. In the present finale, the composer reveals this tendency already at the introductory statements of the folksong. Thus, Brown diminishes Tchaikovsky’s achievement when he reduces the folksong “to be treated to a series of changing backgrounds”. On the contrary, during its restatements the importance of the folksong becomes gradually reduced, while the listener’s awareness is directed towards what is eventually being counterpointed to it (see Exx.4 IV 4-10). But even more important: There are architectonic similarities between these "changing backgrounds", a phenomenon also characterizing textures of the finale of "The Little Russian"; the "backgrounds" are distinct textural ideas developing into "foregrounds", acting on equal terms with remaining thematic materials. To some extent, this type of textural planning distanced Tchaikovsky from "The Mighty Handful" as well as Glinka. The finale’s opening measures (Ex.4 IV 3), including the four initial notes which open the main themes of each movement

---

196 For more details, see SVEIN HUNDSNES, *Tchaikovsky’s Orchestral Style«* Studi Musicali, No2, 10» Rome, 2011
(corresponding also to the descending gestalt of the first part of the forthcoming second theme) have a profound impact upon the orchestration of this finale.\footnote{This part of the first theme might possibly represent an elaboration of the opening of the finale in Schumann’s op.47 (with even the concluding eighth-note combination intact), a thematic statement which, in turn, was possibly a reworking of Beethoven’s introduction to Symphony No.3/IV and above all the Finale of Jupiter.}

Ex.4 IV 3 Theme IA, introductory measures

The theme’s rushing sixteenth-note combinations are included in some of the ensuing figurations used for counterpointing (alternatively complementing) the folk-song, mostly in the form of inverted variations. Accordingly, there is an aspect of thematic counterpoint associated with the overall orchestral strategy, which, on the grounds of being so purely cultivated in the score, might possibly be classified as a “textural theme”. In either case there is a thorough constructional/architectonic angle associated with the sixteenth-note figurations, which is in itself a truly Tchaikovskyan approach, one he had already demonstrated in several earlier orchestral pieces. In this respect Tchaikovsky is ahead of his time; in much twentieth century music the textural layout has a pan-thematic function, and Tchaikovsky manages to imbue some of his movements with this type of extremely committed, architectonic orchestration. The x-cell (Ex.4 IV 3) – found in almost any musical piece in existence, yet rarely cultivated as deliberately and purposefully as here – forms the accompanying string figuration complementing the first statement of the folk-song from m.10 (Ex.4 IV 4). This thematic connection is affirmed by the gradual transition toward the opening theme (m.30).\footnote{In some later, related episodes, the sixteenth-note ascensions begin on the second semiquaver, a construction reminiscent of the first ascending sixteenth-note figuration in the introductory part of the main theme.}

Ex.4 IV 4 Textural strategy

The composer utilizes this clear, stylized orchestral strategy in the ensuing variations, as he continuously explores the motive’s technical possibilities (Exx.4 IV 5&7): In the m.68 variation (Ex.4 IV 5) the ascending x-variants are hybridized with the inverted, long descent
reminiscent of the main theme's mm. 2-3, played by the strings, counterpointing the Second Theme stated by the woodwinds:

Ex.4 IV 5 Textural strategy / Thematic counterpoint

Thus the textural theme continues developing organically from one variation to the next (Ex.4 IV 6): At mm.76-79 the phrasing is at first elongated vis-à-vis that of the folk-song. The textural strategy stemming from Theme 1A is realized by an augmented version of the arched string layer of the m.10-passage, and the ensuing measures might be read as condensations of the m.76 arch. Despite differences in respect of phrase-lengths between layers at mm.76-79 the composer maintains contrary motion between the respective layers.

Ex.4 IV 6 Textural strategy / Thematic counterpoint

Also worthy of note is the \(c\)-cell (the "Tchaikovsky contour", m.81) taken directly from the symphony's opening motto, which subsequently leaves an imprint on the ensuing organically transformed texture from m.84. With all due respect of the Kuchka; by now Tchaikovsky has, by way of architectonically planning and continuously developing his textures, outdistanced
them on their own ground, and he has most convincingly transferred Glinka’s re-orchestration principle to the symphonic territory for developmental purpose. In the ensuing variant from m.84 Tchaikovsky constructs the fundamental eight-measure long arch via x - and c - related cells, this time lengthened from the original (m.10) one measure to eight measures, paired in to each other in contrary motion in the first and second violins respectively. This stylized, compound yet transparent textural layer counterpoints the folk-song.

Ex.4 IV 7 Textural strategy / Thematic counterpoint

The textural theme continues forming new hybrids, i.e. new thematic variations, cultivated on renewed textural fields while building new counterpoints from new shadings of the introductory part of the main theme. The composer demonstrates this also from m.157, where the phrasing of the flute emphasizes and breathes new life into already existing, original aspects of 1A. This counterpoint is instantly interpreted as inverted permutations of the rushing, sequential sixteenth-notes of measure three:

Ex.4 IV 8 Textural strategy / Thematic counterpoint

The developing textural theme, observed also in the lower strings at m.103, leads into an episode formed by clean thematically based counterpoint, where three variants of the folk song collide in a textural explosion at m.104 (see Ex.4 IV 9). Although the explosion as such
is, like most explosions, short, one observes that the composer lengthens the majority of contrapuntal layers in form of stylized thematic and/or linear gestalts, exemplified by the horn and bass-voices of mm.105-6. This is another feature characterizing Tchaikovsky's thematic counterpoints: They are constructed from symmetrically or in other respects architectonically well-carved textural layers. The graphical shape as such is one thing, registral locations another; the textures most often contain just insignificant voice-crossing, and when it appears, its execution is extremely discreet.

Comparatively fast harmonic tempo is a third general feature characterizing this type of counterpoint: In this example the harmonic changes come in eighth-note or quarter-note rhythm, as a hypothetical alternative to simpler solutions, like frequent use of passing-notes or other non-harmonic notes over a stable chord.

Ex.4 IV 9 (Textural strategy) / Thematic counterpoint

Finally, the previously mentioned four-note cell (see also Ex.4 IV 2) interacts in the intriguing three part contrapuntal episode which leads to the closing, inevitable statement of the work’s opening motto (Ex.4 IV 10). The trumpets and trombones counterpoint each other using original note values while the strings move from one register to another (textural transfer) carrying the central, characteristic four-note cell in diminished note-values, modulating toward and past the stretto at m.195. This third layer gradually breaks away from its thematic origin, even more so as the brass layers turn toward closer imitation and modulation.

Ex.4 IV 10 Textural transfer (in the strings) & Thematic counterpoint
Prior to the Fourth Symphony Tchaikovsky had utilized the re-orchestration principle in many of his orchestral works, a procedure clearly inherited from Glinka. But Tchaikovsky’s solutions definitely move beyond those of the elder master: Tchaikovsky uses a highly defined, traceable dialectic double-thematic scoring strategy in this movement. Besides utilizing differentiated thematic counterpoint, the composer makes use of a textural strategy running through the movement like a “textural theme”; an architectonic finesse for which the composer has won too little musicological acclaim.

One may at this juncture conclude by saying that there is a recurring interplay between the two themes throughout the piece, a finding completely contrary to D. Brown’s, who, most surprisingly, proclaims that “There is no significant interaction between the various materials”.

As the finale is nearing its close, one senses a change as regards texturization. Yet dialectics is clearly detectable, it moves in direction of timbral contrast and thematic complementation at the expense of counterpoint. Looking at the symphony as a whole, one might already have sensed this tendency, which comes most clearly to the fore in the third movement. Although varied use of counterpoint is highly present in this symphony as a whole, Tchaikovsky's textural dispositions have moved slightly in direction of powerful, complementary contrasts. The last three numbered symphonies of Tchaikovsky are his most frequently performed, and at this point one might wonder whether the noted tendency represents a new approach in his symphonic production.

199 The “retrograde Motto-theme”, though, is singled out as an un-counterpointed event.
2.5 Symphony No.5 in e minor, opus 64

On reviewing his Fourth Symphony in advance of the printing of the orchestral material, Tchaikovsky is said to have become so "heartened to discover how good" it looked, that he told his brother Modest he had begun work upon its successor. Composed mainly in 1888, approximately three years after the voluminous “Manfred” Symphony opus 58, the Fifth Symphony represents, by comparison, a return toward the clarified style of the Fourth. It was, possibly, even more clarified than the latter, according to Brown. Obviously, the style of Manfred had been a natural consequence of the typically romantic drama lying at the core of Byron’s poem, while A. Peter Brown concludes thus about the opening movement of the Fifth:

“The shape of this first movement has strong Classical proportions that, if maintained, allow the music to speak for itself.”

No wonder, then, if the fleetness of the music, achieved by melodious themes and the (by now) expected smooth, elegant voice-leading might trick some of us into believing that even the opening sonata movement lacks in contrapuntal activity, at least compared to the earlier symphonies.

Tchaikovsky sketched hints of programmatic content during the creation process, and Fate is suggested to be the recurring motto in all the four movements. As was also the case with the Fourth Symphony, the significance of this kind of suggestions was later reduced, even minimized. As the composing on the symphony proceeded, Tchaikovsky became increasingly satisfied with the new work, and conducted its first performance in Moscow. Although he sometimes expressed uncertainty about the quality of the finale, the work was never published in revised version.

201 Ibid., p.150
203 Maes discusses the relevance of programmatic content in Tchaikovsky's last three symphonies in Francis Maes, Geshiedenis van de Russische muziek: Van Kamarinskaja tot Babi Jar (1996), English translation 2002, UCLA, pp 159-60
204 Wiley, Roland John: Tchaikovsky, Oxford University Press 2009, p 331
2.5.1 Symphony No.5, movement I

Timbral contrast and cultivation of sound-color has always been Tchaikovskyan stamps, even in symphonic contexts. The introductory Motto is stated by the clarinet in its *chalumeau* register, accompanied by dark, soft strings. This setting worked so well that the composer used a corresponding solution for the bassoon-introduction of the Sixth Symphony.

Maes concludes thus on the first movement:

> The entire first movement relies on the tension between the descending, darkening tendency of the themes and expansion by accumulation and contrast.205

The present author agrees completely, yet would humbly like to add "extraordinarily frequent, propulsive and offensive counterpoint" to the movement's many advantages. A.P. Brown mentions in particular the rhythmic duality of the movement:

> "(...) there are a number of passages that incorporate cross-rhythms. At the beginning, P (m.42), from its articulations, could be easily inferred as 3/4 rather than 6/8 (...) though its accompaniment is a straight duple meter. As the exposition unfolds, Tchaikovsky juxtaposes P in its implied triple meter with passages strongly duple (mm.80-86)."206

Although differences in respect of time signature occur, there are connections between the opening motto and the first movement's main theme (m.41 ff.). In addition to the general thematic and rhythmic characteristics of the two subjects, even apparently insignificant details of the main theme are used later in the movement as self-assumed units; above all the motivic element of m.52 and even the inconspicuous and traditional upward run in the flute at m.49.

Ex.5 I 1 Symphony 5/I; Main Theme

When the upper strings restate the main theme at m.57, the ascent at m.49 is used in both ascending and descending/inverted forms as a separate layer adding to the otherwise steady march-rhythm (Ex.5 I 2). Later this apparently unimportant run is given a predominant role

---

throughout the movement, particularly as a phenomenon originating from the main theme (see also Ex.5 I 3). The conventionalism associated with this figuration, though, only leans toward semi-thematic significance.

Ex.5 I 2 Semi-thematic counterpoint (excerpt)

Even if one feels reluctant to label this texture as ‘thematic counterpoint’, as a consequence of the inconspicuousness detached to the ascending cell, the textural dialectics, though, is still striking. Not only is it carried out with consistency; it develops thematic/melodically, for example in the ensuing passage, first in form of syncopated upward runs from m.66 ff, when they reaffirm and strengthen their thematic value, moving from having an accompanying role to a thematic/melodic.

In the midst of this fluent and apparently effortless progress, Tchaikovsky’s eye for overwhelmingly clear stylizations reveals itself, when the sixteenth-note figurations transform to a metrically diminished version / counterpoint of the main theme in the flutes and clarinets versus the original eighths in the upper strings (Ex.5 I 3). A similar procedure was detected in the finale of No.2. In addition there is a third contrapuntal layer in form of inversions in the low strings of the original segment in the upper strings.

Ex.5 I 3 Thematic and semi-thematic counterpoints (the brass hits/markings are omitted)
These sixteenth-note combinations, implying change of tone color and varied rhythmic accentuations, keep exploring new constellations as the first area grows in intensity from m.84, and the theme’s opening motive is used in traditional imitation from m.88, added by disjointed thematic cells:

Ex.5 I 4 Thematic counterpoint (excerpt)

The above imitative procedures keep developing as the main area reaches its peak at m.100 in a modulatory sequence that leads to the re-harmonized restatement of the theme at m.108:

Ex.5 I 5 Thematic counterpoint (excerpt)

The restatement is realized via a typically Tchaikovskyan falling bass directed towards the dominant of the next theme (see Ex.5 I 6). The composer does not immediately let go of this local counterpoint, but reuses it later in the re-orchestration of the ensuing subsidiary theme from m.132, then as running eighth-note pizzicato.
Ex. 5 I 6 Semi-thematic counterpoint, germ for textural counterpoint of all three themes

The downwardly, drizzling woodwind octaves at m.119 (later appearing string *pizzicato* in the restatement at 135) that complement the subsidiary theme (starting at 116), may possibly be read as alterations of the thematic falling fifth of the Closing Theme at 154 ff (Ex.5 I 7). Yet above all it has been brought into existence via a motive from the main theme at m. 52 (Ex.5 I 1). The subsidiary and closing themes are related not only by key, but also by their melodic outline (refer mm.116 and 156ff respectively):

Ex. 5 I 7 Thematic material, Themes 2 & 3: semi-thematic / textural counterpoints

The continuation of the Closing area, the onset of 3B, consists of two counterpointing elements, which might be interpreted as being derived from the start and close of 3A2: the rising woodwind and descending string motives respectively. The violins provide the theme proper, while the high woodwinds counterpoint by inverting or echoing the theme:
Ex.5 I 8 Third Area / Second Theme (3B); Thematic counterpoint (omitted: horns and bassoons)

Theme 3B proceeds into a modulatory paragraph, and the contrary motion in the bass increasingly establishes itself as a semi-thematic counterpoint, a principle applied to all three themes. Given the design of the linear parts of the subsidiary and closing themes, it might not be completely out of place to view these counter-lines as thematic inversions. This tendency is being strengthened during the ensuing transitory passage:

Ex.5 I 9 Semi-thematic counterpoint (excerpt) and textural transfer (to m.194, Ex.5 I 10)

After a textural transfer of 3B in the upper strings the main and closing themes (3B’) meet at the return of the closing theme’s dominant (Ex.5 I 10, m.194), before one gets a glimpse of that theme’s falling fifth-cell at 198, accompanied by the rhythm of the main theme. Consequently the transition toward the development section revolves around a persistent 3B cell.
The contrary motion of 3A2 is subsequently exploited still further, until 3A leads to the development (Ex.5 I 11, m.226). Again, after a rather short separation, the first and third themes reunite. The counterpoint as such does not put the composer to any insurmountable test, sooner on the contrary, yet it is effective as a result of the extreme thematic clarity of both layers. In addition the composer handles his textural contrapuntal line with care; everything is combined effortlessly without any need of artificial, desperately necessary adjustments, sometimes labeled “motivic development”. At 231 the Theme 1 layer absorbs the stylization-principle by elongating the concluding descent of its opening phrase. As regards thematic interconnections: Previously a possible link between the falling octave of Theme 2 and the falling fifth of Theme 3 was being mentioned, a connection which is affirmed and strengthened during this excerpt from m.231.
The composer combines the themes with an even more subtle nuance by uniting the (measure-by-measure) string-crescendo, which was originally associated with the descending octaves of the Second Theme, with a link to the falling fifths of the Third from m.244; the latter as a natural consequence of the above m.231 ff counterpoint. Texturally, much of what happens in the development has been tested out in the exposition, although some harmonic turns obviously are more dramatic. After a reworking of the main theme from m. 255, which is inspired by a thematic preparation from the exposition’s m.84 ff, there is an exemplarily transparently constructed contrapuntal passage combining elements from all three themes from m.269. In this passage, the opening phrase of the subsidiary theme is being imitated, added by a touch of the closing theme’s falling fifth, everything supported harmonically by a wind layer carrying the rhythm of the main theme.

Ex.5 I 12 Thematic counterpoint
As concerns the opening of this development one observes that the composer recomposes or repeatedly develops the construction that incorporates imitation, i.e. two imitative layers, and one other thematic or texturally contrapuntal layer. The preceding texture leads directly into a new, related constructional procedure; in the next variation, the main theme rises from an accompanying to a predominantly imitative, thematic role, added by the recurring descending bass. (Yet the latter barely qualifies for the designation ‘textural counterpoint’ in this excerpt.)

Ex.5 I 13 Thematic counterpoint

However, there is no reason to complain about the semi-thematic bass hemiolas at the climax of this movement, counterpointing the opening motive of the main theme, given an added touch of suspense by the syncopated trumpets and horns:

Ex.5 I 14 Semi-thematic counterpoint (excerpt)

The transition toward the coda bears some resemblance with that of the opening movement of the Violin Concerto: it builds up toward a climax, only to be abruptly relieved by a subito piano leading to another type of climax. The coda opens with yet another imitation that involves the main theme, this time combined with a standard bass descent:
Ex. 5 I 14 Thematic and semi-thematic counterpoints (excerpt)

After having repeated the above descent, the bass (lower strings and brass) first continues in stepwise contrary motion, then wanders down again to the root of a four-measure dominant preparation before ending as a culminating ostinato. All in all this movement is remarkable for the composer’s stylized thematic development and textural disposition, in addition to its rhythmical dialectics.

2.5.2 Symphony No. 5, movement II

Just as was the case with the main theme of the first movement, the opening horn solo of the slow movement also brings to mind the opening contour of the motto, after having subtracted the motto’s three repeated, introductory notes.

Ex. 5 II 1 Thematic origin of the first theme of movement II

This extremely melodious movement carries Tchaikovsky’s usual dialectic stamp, which comes to the fore already in the middle of introductory horn melody as the deep clarinet comments upon or answers the horn melody:

Ex. 5 II 2 Thematic counterpoint, bordering to complementation (extract)
At the closing of the first theme, the horn proceeds by counterpointing the second theme, played by the oboe. The horn’s role-transition could hardly have been smoother and more elegantly written, and the two falling melodic sevenths of mm.20-21 forecast the two opening sixths of forthcoming obo theme:

Ex.5 II 3 Thematic counterpoints

Then follows a brief modulatory passage during which the importance of a two-note cell from the second theme is being affirmed; notes three and four (from m.33). This cell counterpoints the ensuing restatement of the first theme and is used in combination with elaborations of Theme 1-cells in the first oboe (from m.34), including a reworking of the ascent of measure 20 at 35, which in turn transforms from its linear design into ascending broken triads (m.36). Simultaneously the duplets from the second theme are being absorbed by the first theme at m.36, played by the cellos, and in the ensuing measure they are picked up by the ascending broken triad-layer in the upper woodwinds (which had started as triplets in the previous measure):
After tarrying over a segment of the first theme (mm.39-45) a soaring imitative statement of the Second Theme emerges between the strings and woodwinds from m.45. In addition to the imitative layers, the texture is being supplied with a stylized, descending bass. The triplet / duplet dialectics comes as an extra poly-linear bonus:

Ex.5 II 5 Semi-thematic and thematic counterpoints (the latter bordering to complementation)

It would not seem too far-fetched to regard the linear bass as a general textural tendency in this movement. As the intensity increases, the basses continue downward as contrast to the ascending thematic development in the upper voices, until the latter reach the climax of this paragraph (m.56) by executing a falling mediantic sequence of the second theme’s opening motive. From here the basses counterpoint the theme in ascending stepwise motion,
rhythmically answering/imitating it before turning downward again at 59, handing over the
descent to the flute and horn (m.59).

Ex.5 II 6 Semi-thematic counterpoint (voice examples)

The falling second is an emphasized interval of both the first and second themes, on the first
plus seventh and forth plus third scale-degrees respectively. Even the weight assigned to the
themes’ positioning within their respective measures is quite similar (see, for example, mm.9-
10 and 61-62), in the first theme they appear at the start of the theme, in the second they come
at the end.\textsuperscript{207} These stepwise, descending, quite withheld notes which appear immediately
after the barlines are also a noteworthy feature with the third theme at m.68 (starting at m.67,
see also m.72 in the following example). The sixteenth-note layer which opens with the
violins at m.91, can definitely be read as originating from the thematic trill of m.72, an
assumption which is being reinforced immediately afterwards by strings at 93-4.
The second statement of the opening phrase is played by the first bassoon, immediately
imitated by the low strings and second bassoon.

Ex.5 II 7 Theme 3 / Hints of thematic counterpoint (not registered in the overview)

\textsuperscript{207} The closing of this theme (mm.59-60) is, deliberately or not, re-written by Sibelius in his \textit{Valse Triste}, at the
close of the waltz’s first thematic statement. The same composer is also close to plagiarism of a fragment from
the first theme (mm.11-12) of this Tchaikovsky movement in his Seventh Symphony, first movement.
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The ensuing modulatory paragraph is constructed on an imitation of the theme’s opening motive, combined with the by now well established, lavishly chromatically furnished bass line. The first motive of the new theme (m.71) is followed by a reworking of the second (m.72, but without the trill) at m.76, incorporated in the stylized cello-part. More than with previous passages, the composer lets his counterpoint adjust more and more to the descending two-note combination so characteristic of the first two themes.

Ex.5 II 8 Thematic & Semi-thematic counterpoint

The third thematic area is for the most part a continuous display of thematic counterpoint. Although imitative by nature, the entries sometimes appear rather unpredictably. The three-part imitation between mm.82-86, starting on the fifth, fourth and first scale degrees respectively, is stabilized by a pedal in the low strings (the pedal is excluded in the example):

Ex.5 II 9 Thematic counterpoint

Between the above hectic texture and the even more animate development from m.91 (Ex.5 II 10) the composer inserts a laidback variation of the texture between mm.75-78 (Ex.5 II 8), without utilizing the thematic nonuplets and sixteenth-notes. The elegant bass line is still there, but it is transformed into a sustained half-note-descent, yet adheres to the initial progression:
Ex.5 II 10 Thematic and textural counterpoints

The thematic nonuplet (m.68), with its repeated melodic seconds, instigates the creation of the string layer, which counterpoints the first four measures of the theme from m.91, the first two measures working as textural, motivic transfer to the continuation (Ex.5 II 11). This intensification of the movement leads to a transitory stretto before the motto climax at m99 (see also Ex.5 II 12):

Ex.5 II 11 Thematic counterpoint

The ensuing *stretto* between m.95-98 is primarily constructed on the third theme's stepwise note 3-6-cell, counterpointed by its own inversions. The dramatic lines and partially chromatic counter-lines in the woodwinds and strings are balanced harmonically by the trumpets and horns, and together with the tuba, kettledrum and double basses the listener is left with a cadential 6/4-suspension, leading to the Motto climax on the sixth degree's third inversion (m.99); the dominant, leading to the recapitulation.

Ex.5 II 12 Hint of thematic counterpoint
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Pizzicato strings and an oboe-counterpoint accompany the first theme, the latter played by the first violins. The counterpoint is at first inspired by the actual theme, then gradually influenced by both the second and third themes: From m.116 the first theme is being imitated by the first horn. From here the thematic wavering sixteenth's originating from the m.91-94 passage return in the first clarinet, but above all these figurations are clearly derived directly from the third theme. At m.118 the peak of this clarinet counterpoint is represented by the previously mentioned accentuated falling second in a brief, emotionally charged falling sequence, finally rounding off the phrase at 119, echoing the theme of the violins.

The oboe and clarinet counterpoints of this passage thus contain a distillate of the main thematic ingredients of this movement. In addition, they once again demonstrate that there are several very characteristic aspects to Tchaikovsky's counterpoints: Besides of being technically superior, they possess strong architectonic qualities, and more often than not they are driven in one direction or another; they lead somewhere.

Ex.5 II 13 Thematic counterpoints

The clarinet counterpoint, stressing the quadruple element of the previous texture, continues in the high woodwinds, as the first theme proceeds at m.120 in the bassoons and first violins. The combining of slurred versus tenuto phrasing enhance thematic relationships already established. The counterpoint, now closer associated with the second than the third theme, is realized via an arched contour, which was also the case with the last half of the previous passage:
In addition to developmental qualities already associated with Tchaikovsky's counterpoints, like textural transfer, it is high time to mention development on a general level: The three-note turn, adapted from the nonuplet cell, attracts gradually more attention. This layer grows in importance, even steeling focus from the layers representing the first theme: Between m.128-137 the quadruple layer of the high and mid strings represent a forceful realization and fulfillment of the potentials hidden inside this seemingly ornamental trill. The noble bass-lines and the overall well balanced textural architecture with its directionally controlled layers come as extra bonuses in addition to the developmental aspects:

From m.134 the quadruplet-counterpoint transforms from static syncopation to un-syncopated downward motion, indicating the beginning of a transition toward the elevated and noble Andante mosso return of the second theme. An ascending line counterpoints this descent:
The second theme draws on the same dramaturgy as in the expository m.45 - statement, yet utilizing an expanded instrumentation. The expected climax is postponed, thus challenging the composer to stretch his bass-line even longer than he did in the initial statement:

Ex.5 II 17 Semi-thematic counterpoint (the thematic, imitative counterpoint is not rendered)

This extremely singable tune then seems to die out, when the Motto all of a sudden interferes in $fff$ from m.158-165. From m.171, the second theme finally dies out, closing the movement. Once more the theme is presented within a renewed imitative framework:

Ex.5 II 18 31 Thematic counterpoint (triplet accompaniment in the woodwinds and horns)

2.5.3 Symphony No.5, movement III

As was also the case with the first theme of the second movement, the main theme of this waltz is closely related to the contour of the opening motto. Tchaikovsky first heard the theme's main material sung in a street in Florence, extending it with a retrospective b-part. Thus there is a link between the various movements which is not just dependant on the motto insertions into each movement, but which is, in addition, thematical (Ex.5 III 1), not only as regards the obvious connection with the Theme's opening, but which corresponds even more closely to five notes of the Motto from m.20ff (see also Ex.5 III 2):

Ex.5 III 1 Motivic connections between movements
Even in the finale, the introductory motto-statements lead to the withheld falling second, first at m. 20, camouflaging a turn that foreshadows the opening of that movement's main theme.

Even in his less pretentious type of movements like this ternary form, Tchaikovsky displays his customary dialectical approach. As the opening phrase is restated, it is counterpointed by thematic inversions and variations: Besides the more conventional contrary motion between the violins and violas/cellos at mm.12-13, the transitory thematic variation between the two statements (mm. 8-11) is used in the viola/cello counterpoint at 14 (-15) together with the counterpoint's inversion in the obo and flute at m.16 (-17).

Ex.5 III 2 Thematic counterpoint (score excerpt)

The composer manages to retain a light, airy style while adding sporadic counter-lines and thematic counterpoints. An elegant, chromatically designed line counterpoints the concluding statement of the theme. Because of the waltz-theme's introductory stepwise six-note descent one might regard the counterpoint from m.45 as thematical, but since there are but inferior thematic characteristics, it is labeled semi-thematic, its striking effect notwithstanding.

Ex.5 III 3 Semi-thematic counterpoint

A more than fifty measure long middle section (from m.73), containing a fluttering thematic sixteenth-note layer and contrasting staccato or legato eighth- or quarter-note cells, constitute what may with justification be labeled as 'textural counterpoint': The sixteenth-note layer also

---

208 The ending of the motto's opening phrase is also a stepwise six-note descent.
makes service as transition and thereafter as a counterpoint to the returning waltz theme. It is not unlikely that the onset of this figuration is part of a development which had started in the second movement at m.68, a suspicion strengthened by the figuration's trill-like onset, transformed at 91 ff. Thus there is a tangible sense of continued development in the third movement from movement II, m.91 ff.

Ex.5 III 4 Thematic counterpoint (score excerpt)

Theoretically speaking one might even regard parts of the textural dialectics from m.73 as thematic: The two-note cell, with an accentuation on the first note, grows in importance until m.89, reminiscent of the endings of the concluding phrase of the motto and the first themes of the middle movements, both in respect of phrasing and stepwise motion. In spite of these facts, the composer does not seem very concerned about underlining further thematic connections in this vivid central part of the movement. The textural dialects are further enhanced via frequent use of hemiolas, a phenomenon occurring in the majority of Tchaikovsky waltzes and last but not the least via the composer's usual sense of timbral contrast: The flowing sixteenth-note figurations are kept in either the woodwinds or the strings, with ditto complementary figuration from m.72 until 152.

2.5.4 Symphony No.5, movement IV

Having added one sharp for the home key with each new movement, the composer opens the Finale with the Motto, this time maestoso in the major mode, as contrast to the first movement's subdued introduction in the minor. The first statement leads to a thematic fragment, keeping the motto's rhythmic characteristics as signals in the trumpets and horns, combined with an inverted motivic contour from m.15 in the strings and bassoons:

---

209 The movement begins and closes in E major, but its central part is in e minor.
From here the string layer is intensified as it moves from duplets to triplets. The constantly repeated turning triplets from m.23 might be read as inversions of the main theme's opening cell\textsuperscript{210}, which were also molded into the mm.20-23 phrase. This connection is finally gradually confirmed in the withheld transition before the main theme itself, between mm.43 - 58, just the way the link between the motto and the main theme is made obvious later on; in the trumpets from m.199.

In addition to the triplet layer of the strings, the motto in the high woodwinds is counterpointed by its own "tail"-fragment, attached to the motto's second measure in the horns and bassoons. Even though the turning-cell as such looks and is trivial, Tchaikovsky compensates by constructing a consistent architectonic layer from it.

This textural field stretches over fifteen measures until m.39, where it becomes more intensified, not only as a result of the crescendo from 32: The triplet-notes convert from eights to sixteenths in the strings and their linear contour becomes more agitated, partly moving by contrary motion. Thus gaining in attention vis-à-vis the horizontal, stylized trumpet calls until m.43, the thematic orientation toward the main area (m.58) begins in earnest. Once stated, connections between the motto and the main theme\textsuperscript{211} are palpable.\textsuperscript{212}

\textsuperscript{210} The "probability test" (implying the question "Is this connection more likely here than in another symphony by T.?") supports this assumption, the cell's inconspicuousness notwithstanding: Here Tchaikovsky uses such a cell in order to form a layer by thematic argument, like in Symphony No3 and, above all, in No.6 III.

\textsuperscript{211} The connection is affirmed most convincingly at mm.199-204
Ex. 5 IV 3 Thematic connections between the motto and the main theme

Tchaikovsky utilizes the tension between the three-note turning-cell of the theme (m. 58) and the opening motive in accentuated counterpoint. This dialectic is implemented from the fifth measure (m. 70) of the restatement by the horns (beginning at m. 66), counterpointing 1A2 in the woodwinds in contrary motion. The triplet layer in the high strings is about to be phased out:

Ex. 5 IV 4 Thematic counterpoint (primarily in the winds)

The closing of the first theme of the main area does not just display Tchaikovsky's customary eye for magnificent counter-lines, one also senses the "two-plus-two" afterbeat constellations of the previous example from m. 78ff, still dominated by the brass section.

Ex. 5 IV 5 Semi-thematic counterpoint

(continued on the next page)

212 Some might even want to read the Subsidiary Theme's notes 3-7 as a contour descending from the Motto.
213 For further cross-thematic references, see also David Brown: Tchaikovsky, The Final Years, 1885-1893 (W. W. Norton & Co. Inc. 1991) p.155
214 Once again it should be noted that these lines may be read as local as well as purely thematic counterpoints, since both the motto and the main theme contain stepwise descents.
The two-plus-two phrasing of the cell in Example 5 IV 4 (and 5 IV 5) is changed into three-
plus-three combinations during the second thematic segment of the main area, counterpointing the new material. As with the previous example, contrary motion between the most predominant layers contributes in strengthening their respective independence and individuality.

Ex.5 IV 6 Thematic counterpoint (mm.82-83, 86-87 etc.)

The ensuing variation above a pedal on e combines 1A- and 1 B - elements linearly in long, imitative phrases. This passage is shaped as a long, curved, singable, contrapuntally intriguing phrase, particularly from m.98. Rightfully satisfied with it, the composer repeats this idea in transposed version on his modulatory way toward the final transitory passages before the subsidiary theme.

Ex.5 IV 7 Thematic counterpoint

(continued on the next page)
These imitations stretch from m.98 to 114, where the contrapuntally semi-local stepwise line is set in contrary motion against a hybrid of this line and the 1B rhythm. The pedal on a continues into this modulatory phase, within which the ties between the present and the previous paragraphs are being reinforced, and the thematic material is further developed. Tchaikovsky's solution is, not to our surprise, a stylized clarification. The following score excerpt only displays two thematic layers of this escalating tutti passage.

Ex.5 IV 8 Thematic and Semi-thematic (from m.114) counterpoints

The most predominant layer in the final transitory passage before the subsidiary theme (Ex.5 IV 9) grows out of the climax at mm.118-19; the two-note, persistent bass idea played by the timpani, deep strings and bassoons. This layer eventually forms the bass beneath the subsidiary theme, and grows in importance in the ensuing textures. The origin of this ostensibly trivial perpetuum mobile stems from the first notes of the main theme, which became more markedly expressed by the two-note, slurred sf - mf counterpoints from m.70ff (see also Ex. 5 IV 4).

This easy-flowing theme is accompanied by slurred off-beat triplets in the violins and violas. In addition, the seemingly inconspicuous fourth layer of this texture is formed as a completely symmetric arch by the horns: It enters by a simple rising triad, stays on a pronounced dominant pedal and exits the way it entered; by way of a descending dominant triad.

215 This stylization, together with the line-stylizations, might equally well have been labeled as 'semi thematic'; they are clearly thematic per se yet at the same time their roles in the texture differ from the more clearly thematic layers like, for example, the thematic layers from m.98. This movement represents but one of comparatively few examples in which some of Tchaikovsky's thematic counterpoints stem from microscopic cells.
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The second area modulates to the submediant, where one observes that the rather anonymous bass layer increases in importance as it is adopted by four horns at m.148, and the composer underlines its importance by adding a clear lead-in to it (Ex.5 IV 10). Worthy of note is, as usual, the sonic clarity: Each layer is given its individual, distinct timbral quality. Unresolved register-conflicts are avoided.

Ex.5 IV 10 Thematic counterpoint (Theme 2)

As shown in Ex.5 IV 11, these thematic elements continue their contrapuntal interaction with the syncopated continuation of the theme toward the modulatory, transitory sequenzations leading to the Motto statement at m.172. Worthy of note is also the impact the upwardly eighth-note run before m.160 has on both the actual transition and the ensuing motto textures: After having led in to the first modulatory passage, the ascent is being expanded and made
linear from m.164. Thereafter it is being further developed and expanded from m.168 where each idea goes through a stylization which is extremely efficient in the modulatory stretto at mm.168-171. Reminiscences of the earlier mentioned accentuated falling second are possibly accidental, but, whether deliberately pan-thematic or not, the textural clarity and consistency is nonetheless convincing: This two-note cell acts in different note values in three different layers from m.168. Observe also how gradually the eighth-note layer has been established.

Ex.5 IV 11 Thematic development/transition & Thematic counterpoint (notably from m.168)

The way the eighth-note layer keeps developing is equally notable as are the neighbor-note combinations as such: its transformation and enhanced significance from m.163-64 to 168 leads on to a dramatically more predominant role as it complements the Motto from m.174 by its own inversions and in the shape of an extended gestalt of the m.168-171-figuration:

Ex.5 IV 12 Semi-thematic counterpoint
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The seamless switch between the Motto and the main theme from m.199 is primarily a consequence of purely thematic similarities.\textsuperscript{216} Thematic inversions between the outer brass-layers contribute in reinforcing the thematic splicing and the entire textural architecture:

Ex.5 IV 13 Material connection & Thematic counterpoint

This part of the Main theme (1A2) continues with a counterpointing viola and bassoon line, or rather; two paired tetrachords, instigated by the above bass ascents (m.205-8):

Ex.5 IV 14 Semi-thematic counterpoint

One may wonder if the triadically designed, long brass notes that counterpoint the main theme in the transition between mm.210-30 is a textural idea that has emerged gradually, from, at least, the horns' arch construction at m.128. Probably they are reborn from the transitory whole-notes concluding the Motto at its first statement, which reappear in this movement at mm.20-21. The dramatic power of these textures is above all due to thematic treatment and not the counterpoints between mm.210-32 as such; the turmoil caused by thematic activity in the woodwinds and strings is no doubt effective, as projected against the solid, stately brass. Yet the feeling of being exposed to a Tchaikovskyan texture comes equally much from the long arch-formed layers of the upper strings between mm.220-49.

By contrast, thematic counterpoint is more predominant in the development from m.234, with two imitatively projected Theme 2 layers versus hint of a Theme 1 layer, the latter focusing

\textsuperscript{216} Commentators differ on how they should define these stretches. A. Peter Brown labels the first half of the Motto (m.172ff.) and the Main Theme (m.202 ff.) as two Closing Themes. See A. Peter Brown: \textit{The Symphonic Repertoire Volume III Part B} (Indiana University Press; Bloomington 2008) p.408
on its opening motive. The opening cell of the main theme is used as accompaniment to the imitative layers derived from the subsidiary theme:

Ex.5 IV 15 Thematic counterpoints

The development continues with a slightly varied textural approach: the first violins change material from Theme 1 to permuted Theme 2 cells (Ex.5 IV 16, see also Ex.5 IV 11). However, the dialectic span between the Theme 2-layer in the woodwinds versus the pounding Theme 1-figurations of the middle strings attracts most attention as a result of their immediately recognizable thematic origins.

Ex.5 IV 16 Thematic counterpoints

The subdued retransition (m.266ff.) is very much in line with the transition between the introduction and the Main Theme. However, there are notable dialectics present even here; the
half-notes of the woodwinds echo their previous association with the subsidiary theme, complementing the strings, who carry the main theme's opening cell.

The main theme in the low strings and woodwinds is challenged by an offensive counterpoint (see Ex.5 IV 17). In reality the original theme is being overpowered, since the latter is being stated by the trumpets, horns, high strings and woodwinds. First the counterpoint is a tonal and metric augmentation of the introductory cell (mm.296-97); then the falling fourth is inverted, still with the use of augmented tone-lengths (mm.296-97). After that the next five notes are inverted (mm.297-98), the opening cell is highly present in mm.299-300, while a compressed version of the themes introductory phrase is felt in mm.299-301.

Ex.5 IV 17 Thematic counterpoint (from the recapitulation, represented by the high and low woodwinds and strings respectively):

From m.304 it is presented in invertible counterpoint, which is in itself a comparatively simple continuation, yet fully forgivable in light of the previous exertion.

The less striking contrapuntal passage between mm.168-71 of the exposition is extended in the recapitulation (between mm.421-25), thus prolonging the modulation to the expectant e-minor return of the motto, this time stated *Poco meno mosso* (m.426). In this the eighth-note layer acts mostly as pure diminutions of the descending, thematic quarter-note cell. Even though the descending thematic layer of the highest voices appears to be sequential, the counterpoints, as such, are not:

Ex.5 IV 18 Thematic counterpoints
The culmination of the subsidiary theme leads into a sustained paragraph heralded by the introductory notes of the Motto. The elegance by which this is carried out is worthy of note: The preceding transitory passage transfers the quarter-note cell of the subsidiary theme seamlessly into counterpointing the Motto. An extra, though significantly less impressive counterpoint is represented in the texture by the main theme's introductory three-note cell, expanded to fourths and sixths in the high woodwinds and horn respectively, before both layers adopt the motto cell. The motive of the subsidiary theme continues on its way downward from m.420 to 433 (until m.435 in the double-basses).

Ex.5 IV 19 Thematic counterpoint

At m.434-5 the Motto and the Main theme is linked together in the trumpet parts (Ex.5 IV 20), while the theme's opening cell (1A1A) is scattered between the basses (m.433), trumpets and violins plus flutes (m.435). Joined together by these thematic details, the bass instruments lead downward to the ensuing Molto vivace, where the low strings and woodwinds form a new contrapuntal layer against the Motto rhythm in the trumpets and horns.

Ex.5 IV 20 Thematic and semi-thematic counterpoints

The molto maestoso motto statements between mm.472-503 draw on both previous and new contrapuntal materials. The layers are divided by instrument groups: The woodwinds play the
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undulating eight-triplet layer, which was also a notable layer early in the movement. Yet between mm.472-88 it is crafted more offensively, moving up and down as often as the motto permits: Even though the three melodic layers are not segregated by registers, the composer allows all three to project well within the texture. The second melodic layer consists of references both to the motto and the main theme, and is played by the trumpets and horns in the first half of this textural field, the second is played by the horns only. The violins, violas and cellos play the motto in its original (major) form. In the restatement from 490 to 496 the trumpets and oboes play the motto, and the high strings and flutes counterpoint with a sixteenth-note layer (divided to thirty-two-notes in the strings), adapted and developed as an intensification of the previous eighth-note triplet layer.217

In the concluding Presto the composer lives up to our contrapuntal expectations by letting the instruments belonging to the treble register perform a variation of the main area's second theme while the bass registers take care of the first theme:

Ex.5 IV 21 Thematic counterpoint

From m.518 (Ex.5 IV 22) the perpetuum mobile that previously accompanied the Subsidiary theme, does exactly the same in this concluding variation, where its origin from the Main theme once again is becomes obvious in the low strings and bassoons. Worthy of note is also the stepwise transfer in the high and low thematic layers from the previous to the ensuing textural field. The high strings and woodwinds transcend from 1B to a compressed fusion of 2A and the syncopated 2B. In addition, two trumpets, two horns and the first trombone perform a variant of the perpetuum layer, which is the inversion of 1A:

217 In this writer's view, this passage is probably the most critical moment within Tchaikovsky's entire symphonic output as regards concluding with success or failure: The result depends particularly much on the conductor. The purpose of this moment is triumph and victory, yet if the counterpoints are underplayed, which they sometimes are, the textures completely lose their dialectic span, substituting heroism with bombast. An unqualified guess would be that Tchaikovsky experienced this problem several times, instigating cuts in the score; changes that have, unfortunately, been lost.
In the modulatory passage from m.526, the syncopations and ensuing half-notes of 2B are augmented, constructed as a counterline to the ascending runs in the violins and flutes. Although admittedly contrived, the lines not only represent cells of the Motto and both the Finale themes, they are even more reminiscent of the main theme of the first movement, which is restated at m.546, towards which they serve as transition:

Finally, the main theme of the first movement ends the symphony, more often than not played considerably slower than what is indicated by the composer.

After a poly-linear analysis of Tchaikovsky's Fifth Symphony one is struck by the considerable amount of contrapuntal weight that is laid upon the work, its melodiousness notwithstanding. This particularly goes with the second movement, which is so packed with memorable melodies that from a non-analytical perspective the movement may seem unfocused and disjointed. Yet in accordance with our previous findings, Tchaikovsky may sometimes be compared to a gardener who manages to breed incredibly new and differentiated hybrids from one single plant. This plantation is welded together by a wealth of
thematically based counterpoint, and the overall majority of textures within the movement are contrapuntal. Yet all this considered; on examining the textures of the finale, their thematic use range from incredibly focused and sustained, like the Exx.5 IV 7-8, to less powerful solutions, like counterpoints consisting of shorter, repeated cells - for the most part represented by the main theme's three opening notes - in addition to less thematically significant stylized forms.
2.6 Symphony No.6 in b-minor (Pathétique"), op.74

The Sixth Symphony was composed in 1893, and Tchaikovsky completed the orchestration just a couple of months before his death in November that year. The composer conducted the first performance only a few weeks before he died, and much effort and speculation has been invested around the circumstances of the composer's death: Did he catch cholera out of bad luck, did he drink contaminated water deliberately or did he commit suicide by poisoning himself after having been sentenced to death by "court of honor"? Or, did he die of other reasons, reasons which have been concealed from the public eye? Above all: did the composer compose the Sixth Symphony with the intention of creating his own requiem? In any case Tchaikovsky's Sixth is a work full of drama and contrast and we may have in mind if it is possible to detect any palpable technical change in the work as regards textural disposition and construction compared to his previous symphonies. As concerns the possibility that Tchaikovsky with this work deliberately wrote his own Requiem, it might already at this stage be but fair to say that it is highly exceptional for any composer who does not suffer from a physical disease to plan and compose an extensive symphonic work; a piece which today belongs to the symphonic canon, with the intention of taking his own life after the work's completion. One should also take into consideration the fact that the composer concurrently made substantial sketches for future works in his sketchbook. During this period he also planned tours as conductor of his own works, thus a possible suicide becomes even less plausible.

2.6.1 Symphony No.6, movement I

The musical material of the introductory bassoon solo (mm.1-6) is strongly reminiscent of the first measures of Beethoven's Pathétique sonata, even the opening phrase-structures of both works share obvious similarities. The Main Theme (Ex.6 1) opens with the introductory motive 1Aa at mm.19-20, followed by an ornamented variant (1Ab) at 20-21, which, in turn, is transformed to 1Ac at 21-22. Each motive will later tear loose from their thematic origin and operate on its own in separate layers during the movement. In the development the

---

introductory motive is predominant, and in the exposition it evolves continuously, leading to segregated paragraphs which in this document are labeled as separate thematic variations, mostly for operational reasons. As has already been observed being the case with Tchaikovsky, the thematic development is restless, drastic and challenging. The composer has several times in his career managed to transform and renew his material to the extent of making it seem brand new, rather than developed. The stepwise, falling, slurred two-note cell of the opening motive is the weightiest cell of this theme. Even as Tchaikovsky exposes his main theme (Ex.6 1) the use of this cell demonstrates Tchaikovsky's *imprint* technique; a cell of one phrase or sub-phrase is given a central role in the ensuing phrase.

Ex.6 1 Thematic elements (Theme 1A)

The rescored restatement of this phrase (m.23, Ex.6 2) leads into thematic counterpoint in which the two first motives (1Aa, 1Ab) counterpoint a variation of the third (1Ac) from m.30 ff. As the listener is being guided toward the latter variation, the third motive, not unexpectedly, is brought to its new register via textural transfer:

Ex.6 2 Restatement, transitory passage and hint of thematic counterpoint (from m.30)

A brief modulatory passage (mm.34-37) leads to a descent in the violins, wherein the thematic motives from the first theme transcend in direction of what shall become elements for the second theme of the first area\(^{219}\). In m.37 the notes of 1Ac are articulated *staccato*, changing

---

\(^{219}\) In his structural overview of this movement A. Peter Brown operates with only one ten-measure theme in the Main Area (mm.10-19) and five transitory paragraphs or themes ("Transition Materials") from m.20 to 90 in A. Peter Brown: *The Symphonic Repertoire Volume III Part B* (Indiana University Press, Bloomington 2008) p.420. This is a very reasonable alternative, particularly since the introductory motive, which is also used in the first
to paired legato at the top of the ascent of m.38, a slurring which in turn is prolonged over eight notes in the ensuing, related theme (m.42ff, see also Ex.6 4). Later, these inconspicuous notes are completely reinvented in an intense dramatic texture in the development. Even the staccato horn signals, which operate between m.39 to 41, are related to 1Ac, but, above all, they represent and announce a thematic motive which opens the next thematic paragraph, 1B. These actions take place above an augmented version of the permuted opening motive, 1A', in the low strings (observe also the slur between notes 3-4):

Ex.6 3 Motivic / thematic development & hint of thematic counterpoint (from m.39)

Among the three main ideas making up the ensuing theme, two; 1B1 and 1B2, counterpoint each other already at the initial statement (Ex.6 4). Both ideas lead to the rather trivial 1B3, and are used in inverted registers, as in mm. 42-44 and 44-46. In the forthcoming analyses, stepwise ascents or descents are mainly referred to as 1B2 material unless performed staccato (1Ac). As for the rhythm of 1B1, this will in turn accompany the second paragraph of the Subsidiary theme.

---

theme, rules the development section more than any other thematic idea in the exposition. Furthermore, some materials from the Main Area are later made use of in the Subsidiary. Yet there are some notable exceptions, as the present examination will later demonstrate. Relationships between themes and even between the main and subsidiary areas are far from foreign to the symphonic repertoire as such, and certainly not to Tchaikovsky, and as long as the material is continuously developed, this author, in general, finds no good reason for not keeping labeling it as Main Theme material.

220 We encountered a similar, seemingly uninteresting idea once before in a Tchaikovsky symphony; in the slow movement of No.5. In that movement, it was adapted very convincingly for a vivid paragraph, during which the idea's status was raised dramatically. In the Subsidiary Area's Moderato Mosso paragraph of No.6/1 there is a strikingly similar construction to that of No.5/II; both share counterpointing triplet versus duplet layers, and in addition, the "inconspicuous" motive is used in various forms of trills: In No.6/1 1B3 is later read as sextuplets and septuplets in the low strings.
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Ex.6.4 Paragraph two of the Main Area / Thematic Counterpoint

In the third paragraph of the main Area Tchaikovsky returns to a closer variant of 1Ac at m.50. The composer inserts an ascending woodwind idea in contrary motion to this particular statement, 1C1, which foreshadows the final transitory stage before the Subsidiary Theme (at mm.86-88), while it is in other respects thematically insignificant. In addition the composer supplies the texture with another rather inferior element, the dotted horn signal at m.51ff; 1C2, adapting some of the descending contour and textural role of 1B2, whose main function is to give harmonic support to the dominating string-layer. Although some textural elements cross registers, the composer remains true to his preference for keeping separate ideas within separate instrument groups.

Ex.6.5 Paragraph three of the Main Area, Thematic counterpoint (from m.51)
The 1C paragraph contains two texturally related constructions. The second (see Ex.6 I 6), which is developed from the previous, consists of an imitative version of a permuted, developed 1C3a (based on gradually reshuffled 1Ac elements, see also m.51:4/cellos), resulting in the inverted and augmented motive 1C3b at m. 54 ff. Although there seems to be no obvious reason for this new labeling at this stage (or, one might alternatively labeled this phrase differently already from m.50) the closing cell of the developed phrase, 1C3b, puts a particular imprint upon this paragraph's concluding fanfare outburst later on.

Ex.6 6 Thematic counterpoint

This paragraph concludes with the already foretold fanfare, by which the composer makes a direct amalgamation of the symphony's opening motive and the one that closes 1C3b (see Ex.6 7). In this passage 1C3a counterpoints itself (at mm.66-7 and 68-9) in the woodwinds and strings respectively, 1C3b counterpoints itself in the trumpets/trumpets and horns in mm.68, immediately followed by 1C3b in the horn and bassoon, counterpointing 1C3a in the woodwinds. As is usually the case with Tchaikovsky, separate contrapuntal layers are presented within separate registers, presented by contrasting instrument groups (see Ex.6 7). It may be noted that the melodic close of 1C3b (1C3b2) is far from being a commonplace procedure, being constructed by a falling (for the most part diminished) third and a concluding rising second. Because of its rather unusual construction it is probably not just a coincidence that the opening phrase of the forthcoming movement also closes in an almost identical way, although after a melodic ascent:
Ex.6 7 Thematic counterpoint

This climax of the main area instigates the retardation and culmination of an incessantly repeated 1C3a. There are two features of the transition toward the subsidiary area that are worthy of note: The ascent leading to the onset note of the introductory descent of the subsidiary theme and above all the importance placed on 1C3a. There are, possibly, features of this nine-note motive (ref. 66-67 and 68-69 in the woodwinds) resonating vaguely in the opening phrase of the ensuing second area's first theme (mm.90-91). Yet the new theme's opening is, above all, even more reminiscent of 1B2 (see also Ex.6 4). The reason for singling out 2A1a' will be revealed later; the present variant concludes the exposition.

Ex.6 8 Theme 2A (2A1 & 2A2)

As the above example indicates, there is only insignificant contrapuntal activity during the statement of the subsidiary theme (m.102 ff). This, however, is rectified in the ensuing

---

221 About this transition, see also David Brown: Tchaikovsky. *The Final Years, 1885-1893* (W. W. Norton & Co. Inc. 1991) pp 447-8

222 The + symbol refers to incidents where also the first of the repeated notes is represented in the thematic work, like some of the tone repetitions / syncopations of the development, wherein different lengths/stretches of 2A2 are quoted. Two repeated notes, beginning on the anacrusis, are also present in the ensuing theme (2B2). In the forthcoming analysis, the origin of this note-combination is so vague that the material is labeled as belonging to the Second Area and not 2A or 2B specifically. As for 2A2b, this accentuated, slurred two-note cell is at times used separately in some textures, but it is also associated with notes 3-4 of the main theme.
The thematic material (2B1) is presented imitatively, and the imitative layers are accompanied by a rhythmization of 1B1 (Ex.6 9, see also Exx.6 3&4).

Ex.6 9 Thematic statement (2B1) & thematic counterpoint

Tchaikovsky then increases the number of thematic ingredients as the theme continues (Ex.6 10) by inserting a stylized 2B1(a), which had initially been utilized in an imitative type of texture (see also Ex.6 9). Here it counterpoints the theme's prolongation; 2B2; a melodic phrase strongly related to 2A2. This texture has much in common with some of the textures presented in the slow movement of the Fifth Symphony; even the trill-element, 1B3, is present, together with the harmonic background presented via the rhythm of 1B1. Despite their variety as regards phrase lengths and physical direction each thematically based layer is projected convincingly clear, due to the composer's customary separation of timbres and registers, the contrary motion of B1 and B2 notwithstanding:

Ex.6 10 Thematic statement (2B2) & Thematic counterpoints
A broad restatement of 2A culminates with *Moderato assai* (Ex.6 11), wherein cells deriving from 2A1 (for the most part 2C) and 2A2b (see also Ex.6 I 8) are used over a pedal on d in the transitory *rallentando* toward *Adagio mosso* rounding off the exposition. The latter simply represents a continuation of the previous phrase, and both elements are inversions of their original cells, in original or permuted forms, and relative note lengths as well as slurs confirm their origins. 2C is a spin-off from the concluding 2A1c at m.142. In addition to these central melodic ingredients there is even an echo of 1C3b (see also Ex.6 7, m.68). As was the case with that example, this motive is performed by the trumpets and horns. The woodwind and string layers represent two different thematic ingredients evolving parallel to each other.

**Ex.6 11 Thematic counterpoints**

The work's introductory "Pathetique" motive (1Aa) is as inconspicuous as it is highly applicable. After a ferocious opening of the development (m.162), in which the motive is prolonged and chromatically permuted, the first motives of the main theme are counterpointed against two of its variants: In the viola part of mm.172-73 the motive is observed as the four high notes of the melodic curves, which may above all be interpreted as expanded contours of the same motive, and in the two ensuing measures the motive is used in ascending sequence:

**Ex.6 12 Thematic counterpoint**

Textures constructed from these elements continue over approximately nineteen measures, during which 1Ab is transported to the high registers of the violins, flutes and clarinets. From m.191 it counterpoints a descent in the trumpets, oboes and bassoons which is mainly associated with the descending phrase of the Subsidiary Theme:
As seen before with similar Tchaikovskyan symphonic climactic passages, the textural counterpoint is arch-shaped. But there are more qualities to the texture than what has already been noted: When 1Ab returns to the low register (see Ex.6 14), there is an echo of it counterpointing a new segment: the phrase of a traditional chant from the Russian requiem. The centre of this phrase contains the augmentation of a contracted 1Ab variant heard right in advance (m.201). But the clarinet transition to the development, constructed on 2A material, had already forecasted and stressed the quotation twice (mm. 158-160), then in the major mode. Here both the gradual motivic diminishment, as well as the descent which had already started from m.197, contribute in underlining the requiem atmosphere. The question remains: Did Tchaikovsky plan this development from the very start, or did he 'discover' the requiem-reference at the bottom of the 1Ab-descent?
Above all, as observed in earlier symphonies, Tchaikovsky takes on the challenge of placing his materials in completely new surroundings, integrating them so well that their origin is at times obscured. Technically speaking the counterpoint to the requiem quotation is of inferior significance, but the span of the textural 1Ab counterpoint from m.185 to 230 is the far more important - from measure 202 for the most part in the form of motivic repercussions. Speaking of the bass-line, its structure is remarkable: except for the pauses at 230, it continues seamlessly until m.244 where a melodic third interrupts the ensuing stepwise motion.

A possible connection between the tied/syncopated opening version of the requiem quotation and the non-tied notes of 2A2b might look far-fetched, but the composer strengthens a possible connection by putting the two versions side by side in a new contrapuntal constellation, as shown in Ex.6 15. The brass instruments, which had initially quoted the orthodox phrase, resound its opening motive in an un-syncopated, signal-like variant which may be read as a +2A2b prolongation or 2A2a retrograde inversion. The violins and violas use the syncopated requiem variant: syncopation and tone repetition initially opened the 2B2 phrases of theme 2B (see also Ex.6 10). Scale movement combined with tone-repetition is, though, a common feature with both themes of the second area, and thus other motivic interpretations than those suggested in Ex.6 15 are highly possible.

Ex.6 15 Semi-thematic (and hint of thematic) counterpoint

In the ensuing texture, the 1Ab segment is subsequently repressed for the benefit of a bass counter-line to the development of the upper 2B2 (/2A2) segment in the trumpets and tenor trombones (Ex.6 16). Together with a syncopated 2B2" in the upper strings they interact in three-part thematic counterpoint leading to a fortissimo statement, in which the syncopated version plays the central role. The continued, seamless bassline-junction between preceding and new textures underlines the textural elegance of this contrasting development.
The low strings now resume their focus on 1Ab in the shape of an unstable c# pedal (Ex.6 17), which serves as counterpoint to the syncopated 2B2" activity of the upper strings. Together with these string layers one also senses the paired, 2B-material in the low and middle winds - whose stepwise ascent continues from the previous texture before forming an arch from m.216. The upper trombone counterpoint of mm. 214-15 (starting with the bass trombone in m.214) bears strong resemblance to the contour of the sequenced counterpoint written to the recurring Subsidiary Theme's 2A2 at m.309 ff. The materials turn in direction of the triumphant 1C3b2 'brass-turn' of m.67ff (see Ex.6 7), yet this time used in a culminating diminuendo.

This contrapuntal culmination of the development extends over approximately fifteen measures whereupon the retransition commences with the work's opening 1Aa motive (m.231), projected above static, syncopated horn signals which are preserved from the preceding texture's measures 224-30. During a hectic retransition 1Aa and 1Ab compete in attracting our attention alongside a semi-thematic, chromatically flavored 2B bass counterpoint at mm.237-46 (not included in Ex.6 18). In the final transitory passage 1Ac takes control as the recapitulation sets in at m.245, utterly elegant, the symphonic drama notwithstanding: Textural transfer brings 1Ac up to the rendezvous with 1Aa, then, after just one-and-a-half measures it returns to the middle register as the dominating motive, thus concluding the first thematic restatement of 1A:
Ex.6 18 Textural transfer of 1Ac (The semi-thematic bass counterpoint is not rendered).

The ensuing passages (mm.249-59) demonstrate timbral dialectics between the strings on the one hand and woodwinds plus horns on the other, both groups handling Theme 1 material. In the brief modulatory passage at 259-63 the slurred two-note motive characterizing both theme areas are counterpointed to a permuted 1Aa motive, but this motive does not survive the entire passage. Since the chromatic, ascending bassline has thematic references it serves at least as a semi-thematic counterpoint, and special mention should be made of the elegant way by which this bass-line finally reaches its thematic 1Aa-inversion:

Ex.6 19 Thematic and semi-thematic counterpoints

After two dramatic outbursts of 1Aa (m.263ff) the rather trivial and laid-back 1B3 is thoroughly revitalized in the even more dramatic passage from m.267 (Ex.6 I 20) where its inversion counterpoints one descending and two ascending lines. These sharply projected lines may tend to lean even more towards the thematic side than that of the previous example; either one may choose to read the occasionally dotted line of Ex.20 as a 2A1c or 2B reference, yet the juxtaposition between 1B2 and 1B3 (see also Ex.6 I 4) may lend credibility to a 1B2
interpretation. At any rate both the dynamic, textural and harmonic\textsuperscript{223} radicalization and renewal of the original thematic material may possibly make this episode appear as constructed from brand new material, even though thematic characteristics already presented are obviously present\textsuperscript{224}.

Ex.6 20 Semi-thematic counterpoint

As this episode culminates, augmented 2B2 material in the strings counterpoints vestiges of same in the trombone-descent (Ex.6 21). These thematic elements exchange instrument groups in the ensuing transition above an $f^\#$ pedal, each layer containing only faint thematic hints\textsuperscript{225}.

Ex.6 21 Dissolving semi-thematic counterpoint

2A returns accompanied by two revitalizing, elegant counterpoints. The theme, once harmonized in a harmonic half-note rhythm, now comes with a partly chromatic ascending eighth note progression in the violas and cellos. This linearly shaped counterpoint continues over two phrase openings (mm.305 and 307). The second counterpoint opens in parallel

\textsuperscript{223} The harmonic tempo in this passage is tripled, at times quadrupled compared to the original thematic statement.

\textsuperscript{224} See, for example, David Brown: Tchaikovsky. The Final Years, 1885-1893 (W. W. Norton & Co. Inc. 1991) p.446: Brown characterizes the material as "new".

\textsuperscript{225} From m.285 the opening descent in the strings and flutes, combined with the answer in the trombones, may possibly even give the listener the impression of a compressed 2A, a rather speculative notion that, admittedly, corresponds with this paragraph's transitory function toward 2A/the first theme of the Subsidiary Area.
motion to the first, thereafter it turns into a rounded arch before given less interesting textural challenges.

Ex.6 22 Semi-thematic counterpoints

In the ensuing 2A2 paragraph (Ex.6 23) the new dotted eighth-note - sixteenth-note version has already been introduced, at least hinted at, in the slightly permuted, inverted reed-instrument counterpoint at m.307. The peak of this counterpoint, associated with the work's opening motive, is now incorporated into the viola/cello counterpoint (mm.310-12). The entire stretch of this counterpoint, connecting 2A1 and 2A2 between mm.305-310, is seamlessly conjunct when counterpointing phrase-divisions in the theme.

Ex.6 23 Thematic (semi-thematic) counterpoint

The composer takes the three-note anacrusis of the concluding 2A Theme, augments it and counterpoints the prolonged 1B2 reference in the strings to something reminding vaguely of the contour of the work's opening 1Aa motive. Yet the distilled version of this motive, portrayed at mm.242-43 in the woodwinds, is at the same time a retrograde version of the four opening pitches of the pivotal and melodiously strong 2A theme; both interpretations seem equally legitimate. After the stormy contrasts of this movement, the gloom, which had been characterizing the introduction, is replaced with a solemn, dignified close, due to the march-like pizzicato strings and the discreet, choral-like wind sections in the major mode:

---

226 Fl. 1&2, Ob.1, Fag.1
This type of textural as well as thematic stylizations (Exx. 6 21-24) possibly makes the contrapuntal work of this first movement appear rather modest compared to the composer's preceding opening movements. High drama, even for a Tchaikovsky symphony, together with the soaring melodiousness of the first Subsidiary Theme, may possibly overshadow other compositional qualities. Yet, the contrapuntal activity is about as extensive as in his earlier sonata movements, although wanting in extensive fugatos and striking double-thematic simultaneity.

2.6.2 Symphony No.6, movement II

The second movement is above all notable for its smooth handling of 5/4 time. Odd time signatures may sometimes tend to appear rigid or static, but flexible accompaniment contributes in avoiding this effectively, already from the start. After the first theme statement, the cellos counterpoint the restatement in the woodwinds by a variation of its inversion:

In the ensuing texturally transparent melodic variation, the composer utilizes accompanying octave shifts consistently, mostly on the fifth degree: First, the horns accompany the strings in this way (mm.18-24), whereupon the strings accompany the woodwinds by way of a renewal of the horn variant (25-32). The texturization of the latter reminds one above all of a graphically corresponding texture in the scherzo of the First Symphony. After these rather facile textural counterpoints the music moves lightheartedly on as the high strings counterpoint the thematic restatement in the woodwinds. Although extensive portions of the
theme move in stepwise motion, the counterpoint does not possess any of the most notable characteristic motives, hence the semi-thematic classification.

Ex.6 26 Semi-thematic counterpoint

As with the previous movement, melodic originality seems to prevail over striking counterpoint. In the ensuing passage (Ex.6 27) the horn-part vaguely foreshadows the violin and viola counterpoint from m.50ff. The violin and viola curve from 42 to 56 pictures yet another smooth Tchaikovskyan textural transfer: The thematic variation, ascending in a modulatory passage from 42 to 45, adopts the syncopated woodwind line (46-49), while the woodwinds and horns play a thematic variation. At the end of this passage, the violin/viola layer climbs even higher, reaching a variation which may in brief be described as a thematic permutation, counterpointing thematic references in the trumpets and bass-trombone/tuba respectively. Finally, the layer rounds off this comprehensive arch with a brief thematic passage, falling down at m.56 on its starting-tone ($f^2$ in the first violins, $f^1$ in the second violins and $f$ in violas respectively).

Ex.6 27 Voice structure/textural transfer (violins) & thematic counterpoint (m.50ff)

(continued on the next page)
From a contrapuntal viewpoint, the ensuing middle section is less interesting; the four-note combinations from m.58 may possibly be associated with the work's opening motive, a sensation being reinforced by the melodic eight-note arch-shapes from m.66. Textural dialectics are predominant again from m.82 in the form of two complementary, transitory paragraphs (82-89 and 90-96). Particularly elegant is the actual junction with the theme, which occurs in the middle of a long ascending thematic line in the first violins and cellos at mm.96-7.

As the closing of the movement draws near, the 5/4 time signature makes possible effortless counterpoint between regular and augmented thematic lines over a d pedal:

Ex.6 28 (Semi-) thematic counterpoint

The four-note motive from the middle section rounds off this rather subdued Tchaikovsky movement, wandering between the woodwind instruments, until it is complemented by the opening of the actual theme in the closing measures.

The counterpoints of the first two movements come frequently in stylized form, and although this tendency continues also into the third movement, the composer highlights another type of solution in this vibrant march; textural counterpoint.
2.6.3 Symphony No.6, movement III

In his biography D. Brown is not quite certain what to make out of the moto perpetuo triplet quavers, describing them as functioning

"sometimes with a thematic life on their own, but also acting as background to a succession of ideas."^{227}

In fact, it is impossible to imagine the effect of the "ordinary" thematic scherzo material without the triplets. It is not unthinkable that Tchaikovsky have taken Joachim Raff's idea of polarizing triplet figurations against the sort of thematic statement found at m.71^{228}. If one should feel reluctant towards characterizing these figurations as 'thematic', they are no doubt texturally thematic (see Ex.6 29). Most of the time they appear in divisi strings, but the rhythmically as well as melodically detailed construction encountered in mm.1-4 and 5-8 recurs several times in the movement, and is thus a thematic construction as good as any, particularly taking into consideration the abundance of variations. The opening four-measure formula consists of one measure of divisi, non-synchronic, staccato violins and ditto thinned-out violas, the violins thereafter move in parallel motion upward to the more stable woodwind layer (m.3) constructed as triplets versus duplets. Although the first three measures are extremely closely related, to the extent of, for the most part, having benefited from being labeled as one unit, Tchaikovsky often succeeds in finding separate textural use for them. The first (Intro A), with its restless, unstable character, is most of the time moving from one part of the register to another. Most of the time its structure is not quite as resilient as in this textural theme, but formed as a less spectacular, linear stature, made up by equally formed cells, like in m.19 ff. The second (Intro B) has a much more straightforward metric subdivision, and is above all associated with the significant whole-tone tetrachord that sometimes occurs after an Intro A ascent (see, for example, mm.31-36).

It is not at all necessary to single out the third measure (Intro C), which is rhythmically and melodically closely related to Intro A, though supplied with a duplet sub-layer. Yet despite its horizontal, inconspicuous gestalt, its repetitiveness gives it increased focus. It may serve as the goal of the preceding Intro A and B ascent, or the fulfillment of a descent, as in mm. 17-19. Alternatively at the end of an ascent, like mm.61-68, it can move but slowly upwards: This element never acts with occasional leaps, as does an Intro A ascent or descent.

---

^{227} David Brown: Tchaikovsky. The Final Years, 1885-1893 (W. W. Norton & Co. Inc. 1991) p.452

The first half of the fourth measure contains an accentuated legato descent in the violins; Intro D1 (Violins I a) versus a legato motivic arch in the cellos; Intro D2. The latter construction is copied by the clarinets and first bassoon one octave below, and is, like the Intro B opening, also used as a thematic ingredient later in the movement (integrated in Theme 1c). Thus, this four-measure construction is formed as an arched unit: a two measure, slow ascent in the strings up to the woodwinds followed by a one measure long, quick retreat. These ingredients prepare and provide an extremely offensive textural backdrop. They are at least as significant as the thematic material proper in the opening "scherzo" area of this quasi sonata movement.

Ex.6 29 Introductory material

From m.9 the first obo hints at the forthcoming clarinet theme (m.71). Fragments of this theme permeate the majority of the movement, and thus serve as an additional textural layer, in addition of being purely thematic. Intro A, on the other hand, begins forming an eight measure sub-sectional arc-structure accompanied by an additional introductory idea; a sporadic, falling, leaping pizzicato; Intro E, at m.10, not to be confused with less texturally significant pizzicati. Yet, the pizzicati in octave leaps from m.19 show another side of the same coin. Later this pizzicato idea is augmented rhythmically (mm.17-18) and at m. 37 it becomes further developed and prolonged, constituting a thematic idea. There are several fragmentary thematic references in this movement; first there are three thematic fragments, labeled Themes 1a, 1b and 1c respectively, and from m.71 the main march theme, labeled as the second theme.
The above example demonstrates the main textural principle of this movement; where important keywords are *direction*, *(contrary)* *motion* and *thematic presence*. The first introductory texture-idea forms a stable Intro C variant at m.17, counterpointed by an augmentation of the leapwise, falling Intro E pizzicato, which in turn gives birth to a ditto melodically octavated b pedal. Then it starts an ascent simultaneously with the statement of Theme 1a:

Ex.6 31 Textural and (from m.19) thematic counterpoint

---

229 *Divisi* is notated on just one stave for reasons of space in the forthcoming examples. This may result in some lack of detail, details being of minor importance as regards the actual textural analysis. For example, when a divisi stave occasionally just renders single (non-harmonic) notes, this indicates that only one voice perform them.
The ascending Intro A fragment leads seamlessly to Intro B (Ex.6 32). At m.31 a variant of Theme's 1a is moved to the bass-register, and ends up counterpointing the four opening notes of Intro B.

Ex.6 32 Textural counterpoints

The ambiguity of measures 31-36 is not caused solely by the discourse between the motives of Theme 1a and Intro B, but results perhaps even more from the mixing of major and whole-tone Intro B-tetrachords in rapid succession. From m.36 (Ex.6 33 ) a new thematic fragment is stated; 1b, growing out of the Intro E pizzicato idea. This new thematic idea counterpoints a rewriting of the introductory texture:
In the ensuing rescoring of 37-41 the thematic 1b fragment is handed over to the trombones and violas, partly in invertible counterpoint; the Intro A layer operates both above and below 1b, but only in the first half of the restatement. The latter is immediately followed by a new thematic fragment: 1c (Ex.6 34), in the violins, flutes and clarinets, yet the statement consists of an additional layer; the triplet anacrusis in the accompanying horns and trumpets respectively. As was the case with the previous thematic fragments, also 1c sets off counterpointed by Intro A. In the preceding texture only D1 had counterpointed the thematic fragment, without any additive D material, as opposed to what happened in the introduction m.4. Introduced by the brand new triplet signal D2 takes on a similar prominent role. Thus there emerges an increasing flexibility between melodically thematic and texturally thematic material, and D2 might alternatively be read as part of 1c. As regards thematic similarity, central parts of both 1a and 1c make up a falling hexachord.

After a rescoring of the above texture, two transitory texturally related passages emerge: First a repeated four-measure crescendo-phrase with a fragment of the forecasted march theme (Theme 2) counterpointing still another ascending Intro A layer over an f# pedal:
The next crescendo reaches the stable, fluttering Intro C at m.61; the latter counterpointing a slightly longer, slightly less permuted portion of the march-theme (Ex.6 36). Even though there are two Theme 2' layers, they act complementary sooner than contrapuntally vis-à-vis each other. Although the effect of this transition toward the march theme proper is telling, the actual contrapuntal challenge is rather modest, particularly when taking into consideration the rather flat, brief Theme 2 fragment:

Not unexpectedly, the respective thematic clarinet & textural string layers maneuver elegantly into position during the last two transitory measures before the second theme (Ex.6 37;
opening statement: mm.71-80) via duplets and triplets. After this effortless, local counterpoint the Intro A string-layer proceeds downwards after an exemplary, hardly noticeable junction between the transition and the actual theme area (70/71):

Ex.6 37 Textural counterpoint/Theme 2a, opening statement (from m.71)

At the onset of the theme, rhythmic tension arises between the hitherto dominating triplet layer in the strings and the eighth-/sixteenth-note horn layer. But after well over seventy measures of migration between different registers the constantly mobile triplet layer loosens its grip on textures of the second area. For example at mm.77-80, at the rounding-off of the first 2a statement (2a2), it disappears for a while at the expense of the already foretold linear (eighth-note) duplet counterpoint to the actual theme. Then, after a re-scoring of the theme's opening measures, 2A1, its prolongation, 2A2, is counterpointed by a new line in a modulatory passage (Ex.6 38). From now on one encounters a successive chain of contrapuntal lines that finally leads to the theme's middle section. Thus it may be about time to attach at least a semi-thematic label to textures like these.

Ex.6 38 Semi-thematic counterpoint

The clarinet ascent, though, suggests an overall strengthened melodically linear tendency, which is often observed in the forthcoming area, particularly characterizing the new theme's middle part.

---

230 The clarinet ascent, though, suggests an overall strengthened melodically linear tendency, which is often observed in the forthcoming area, particularly characterizing the new theme's middle part.
The fanfare-like triplet signals from m.93ff, stated for the most part as complementary signals between the winds and strings, lead to the remaining, compound materials of the second area (Ex.6 39): First 2b1 is stated in the strings, with inversion between the violins and cellos. There is an immediate 2b2-response in the clarinet and flute, counterpointing a partly chromatic semi-thematic 2b1 ascent and descent over a pedal on b.

Ex.6 39 Semi-thematic counterpoint

A rescoring of the above phrases leads to a repetition of the first, concluding with a prolongation of the first phrase; a ten-note chromatic ascent (Ex.6 40). Having in mind Tchaikovsky's previous textural counterparts to ascending melodic lines, one could hardly imagine another contrapuntal solution than a bass line in contrary motion. In order to ensure a smooth reconnection with 2A, Tchaikovsky starts the contrapuntal Intro A-descent two beats before the actual theme (m.112½).

Ex.6 40 Semi-thematic counterpoint (thematic inversion)

At the return of 2A2, Tchaikovsky varies the initial counterpoint by enabling double counterpoint via a highly elegant role change between the thematic and semi-thematic layers respectively: the linear ascent to a permuted 2A2 stands forth as an unbroken line as the former changes register at m.130:
Four repeated measures then lead to a brief retransition, built on material associated with both Intro B and the legato-phrased Intro D2, announcing the recurrence of the restless introductory material.

After the reprise of the first area the composer now inserts a longer and more elaborate transition between the two groups. As was the case in the exposition, the composer makes use of 2A1 material as the most prominent element in this long crescendo, together with semi-thematic linearity (Ex.6 42), made possible by continuous modulation until an efficient, yet technically facile thematic counterpoint at m.214 (Ex.6 43).

The m.214 climax leads through a stretto (217-20) into a rather plain, texture-confined counterpoint, at best on the gestalt of Intro D2; the motive prolongation makes possible the
motivic overlap. There are two factors suggesting the textural D2 and not the linear, thematic 2B1 element; lack of harmonic progression and above all the typical slurred ascent + descent-arch, used without supportive or additional layers.

Ex.6 44 Insignificant, texture-confined counterpoint

The restatement and rescoring of the march-area is mostly held on an $\text{fff}$ level. As the conclusion draws nearer, Tchaikovsky once again finds use for a stylized, semi-thematic bass counterpoint beneath perpetual 2A2 cells, exemplary designed as regards physical direction vis-à-vis the latter, and with its chromatic descent prolonged into the ensuing passage:

Ex.6 45 Semi-thematic counterpoint

In the ensuing coda, the composer uses a corresponding yet harmonically simpler, less chromatic procedure in the final build-up toward the concluding variation on the march-theme. There are two semi-thematic 2B1 layers counterpointing the march-element; one ascending and one descending. The permuted 2A1 ingredient acts as a kind of thematic organ-point taking liberties with possible harmonic obstacles, like the d natural - d sharp collisions (mm. 318, 320 etc.). It should by now be but fair to describe the long, stepwise ascent of the upper string-layer as highly Tchaikovskyan:
The very last spasms of march-theme take place above a recurring Intro B layer; the linear design of the latter giving it a semi-thematic touch:

Ex.6 47 Textural/semi-thematic counterpoint

Symphony No.6, movement IV; Finale

The opening of this movement brings back, possibly in an unexpected way, one of our introductory questions concerning which layers or ideas that deserve being characterized as 'contrapuntal': Are the string parts of the opening measure individual, equally important voices, wherefrom the highest pitches make up the theme? Since the effect of these calculated voice crossings is a thick, homophonic string-texture, the answer must be negative. This famous opening is possibly textured this way in order to add, at least, a sense of resistance or suspense to an otherwise straight, falling line - suspension is also a keyword as regards the exposition, as seen later. It is rewritten as such at the recapitulation, where falling suspensions in the horns reflect the descents of the theme's first and third measures (m.91), eventually
picking up the theme's dotted quaver-semiquaver combination in the third beats (m.99-102). This horn layer is part of a re-arrangement of the bassoon counterpoint of the exposition. In both cases the counterpoints take over and elongate the theme.

Ex.6 48 Main theme - hinting at semi-thematic counterpoint

The subsidiary theme (Ex.6 49) is related to the main theme by its descending opening, although it sometimes seeks an upwardly, soaring orientation during this short-lived finale. Its introductory tone-repetitions from the weak to the strong beat possess a quality it shares with portions of the subsidiary theme of the first movement.

The counterpoint to the main theme was characteristic for its suspensions, a feature brought into the opening of the subsidiary theme by the partly imitative, partly inverted cello- & double-bass counterpoint. The syncopated triplet quavers of the horn pedal add to this suspense.

Ex.6 49 Subsidiary theme - thematic counterpoint
At the ensuing rescoring, the composer makes use of the contrapuntal inversions of mm.43-4 as a device by which to modulate upward toward yet another expanded rescoring (Ex.6.50). In these modulatory transitions the inverted motive and the linear theme-reflections interact in three part semi-thematic counterpoint, while the horizontal syncopated triplet quavers, now in the woodwinds, move from being a pedal toward making up a fourth, linearly, ascending layer:

Ex.6.50 Thematic counterpoints

In the reprise the composer modulates and develops the main theme after its restatement at m.105. In this writer's view this thematic extension represents some of the problems connected with a layer's possible contrapuntal status (Ex.51, mm.107-12). There are at least two significant details concerning the rather anonym woodwind layer. Firstly, the composer underscores its importance on basis of its unison/octave line and ditto pure woodwind color. Secondly, its half-note / quarter-note structure is also found counterpointing the subsidiary theme at its first restatement at m. 54 ff, as a purely melodic unison/octave woodwind phenomenon. In spite of this, one feels reluctant towards adding contrapuntal significance to any of these examples, above all because of their middle-registered layers and thus not very profiled appearance acoustically. Nonetheless, the layers are formed with considerable consistency, and as regards this particular incident (mm.109-12) it is constructed as a fundamental ascent with half-note/quarter-note falls. Possibly starting as local counterpoints, semi-thematic quality is achieved from m.113.

Ascension is also the keyword concerning the horn layer, yet here the suspensions on the first beat give the layer a much more profiled role than the woodwind segment, and the dissonance-resolutions mirror a weighty thematic cell (i.e. the violin part of mm.107-08). In
addition, the upward leap to the second beat gives it articulatory weight; initially the characteristic, long decrescendo answering the thematic phrase had also been placed on the second beat (see mm.106 and 108). The bottom line behind the resolved tones is a stepwise ascent.

The cello + bass layer opens in parallel motion to the thematic layer of the upper strings before orienting itself in direction of a semi-thematic layer moving in contrary motion.

Ex.6 51 Thematic & Semi-thematic counterpoints

At this climactic moment, the composer counterpoints one of his longest stepwise lines against sequenced thematic material, ranging from E in the lowest wind instruments up to g in the trumpets (Ex.6 52). The procedure as such is strikingly similar to a fragment of the subsidiary area of the first movement (see Ex.6 10), in which an offensive brass-line also counterpoints a soft, sequentially descending motive. This motive is a variation on the main theme's notes 8-13 in falling sequence.

Ex.6 52 Semi-thematic counterpoint

260
Taking into account the gestalts of the original themes of this movement and their stylized appearances, the majority of contrapuntal activity takes place in the ambiguous border-zone between thematic and semi-thematic spheres. In the Andante at m.127 some of the dialectic features once associated with the opening theme and respective horn-complementation are kept, yet here the horns come first, inciting the theme fragment to action. An even smaller element of this fragment is used for the quiet brass chorale at m.138, in which the upper voice brings in a melodic reference to the concluding subsidiary theme, thus serving as a transition towards it. This time the obligatory thematically based counterpoint to the subsidiary theme is harmonically altered, yet without losing its original characteristics.

From the time of Tchaikovsky's death until this day, his Sixth Symphony has been met with more musicological acclaim than his previous works within the genre. This is his only symphony being without overt Russian or East-European folkloristic elements, and even though speculations are not always fruitful, one may wonder if this comparatively generous reception may be due to the work's un-Russianness, and that the composer consequently did no longer represent a threat to, or adverse influence upon established Central- or Western-European musical culture.²³¹ Even D. Brown, who cannot refrain from criticizing the majority of Tchaikovsky's works, is unreservedly positive, even when he encounters "new" material in the first movement. Although the explanation lies in the fact that No.6 is a better symphony than his previous works in the genre, Gustav Mahler, who had conducted some of Tchaikovsky's earlier works, like the Fifth Symphony, Manfred and Eugene Onegin, was disappointed after his first acquaintance with the "Pathetique". We do not know for certain if this opinion changed during the years. The greatest paradox, though, is due to the fact that other qualities, like "the piling for climaxes" are more predominant in No.5 and in particular No.6 - especially the last movement - than in his remaining symphonies. It is not the present author's intention to dethrone the Sixth from the rostrum, but it might have been far from unfair if its predecessors - not only No.4 and 5 - might join it on the podium.

²³¹ See chapter on Reception
Conclusion

In sum Tchaikovsky's six symphonies contain an extremely high degree of easily identifiable and audible counterpoint; between 40 - 50%. While it is highly problematic to make textural analyses of Tchaikovsky's symphonies without bringing contrapuntal aspects to the surface, this urge seems less pressing in respect of the symphonies of Brahms and Bruckner, whose counterpoint is also definitely substantial. The majority of this counterpoint is by nature thematic, while the amount of local, less thematic counterpoint is comparatively insignificant:

Fig.1 Total amount of contrapuntal activity in Tchaikovsky's six symphonies (%)

![The Six Symphonies](image)

The contrapuntal ingredient is relatively constant through the composer's entire symphonic production, varying from 34% (Symphony No.4) to 58% (Symphony No.3). This lasting tendency is notable in the majority of composer's remaining oeuvre, identifiable from the very early quartet-sketches from his student days to his last chamber work; the sextet *Souvenirs de Florenze*, dating from 1890–92\(^\text{232}\). Local counterpoint is as good as nonexistent in the last two symphonies, and there is a decreasing amount of local counterpoint from the First to the Sixth Symphony. The content of stylized lines in No.5 and No.6 has increased as compared to the previous works at the expense of locally based counterpoint:

Fig.2 Overview of contrapuntal activity in each of the six symphonies (%)
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\(^{232}\) Sketches are dating back to 1887.
Notable counterpoint is not primarily restricted to the outer movements or sonata movements, but distributed quite evenly between all types of movements. This indicates that counterpoint is an almost inescapable technical procedure with the composer. Contrapuntal and other dialectically based approaches were his preferred developmental choices, whatever the material, although the amount of thematic counterpoint was slightly higher in the sonata movements than, for example, ternary-formed movements and rondo forms.

Fig.3 Overview of contrapuntal activity in the respective movements (%)\textsuperscript{233}

The previous examination shows that Tchaikovsky, beyond doubt, is a notable orchestral contrapuntist, a finding standing in sharp contrast to the majority of previous literature. Only closer contrapuntal analyses of the symphonies of Brahms and Bruckner may more closely determine exactly how notable this feature is in Tchaikovsky, although already existing analyses far from give proof of any contrapuntal supremacy with the two B's vis-à-vis Tchaikovsky. During the previous analyses, contrapuntal qualities as well as quantities have come under scrutiny; not only are Tchaikovsky's counterpoints extensive, but the quality is equally striking. Passages like the opening of the development of Symphony No.2 I, in which multiple contrasting motives without additional harmonic support come into contrapuntal use, are particularly noteworthy.

In connection with previously rendered Tchaikovsky reception, it should probably be stressed that historicity may never come in the way of le métier as such. Sometimes one might suspect that the expressive (or subjective) and technical qualities of a given work - or composer - are confused with one another, leading to disastrous and misleading musicological assessment.

\textsuperscript{233} This graph might have looked slightly different were it not for the Third Symphony, which has remarkably high amount of counterpoint in all its five movements. In contrast to No.3, Symphony No.4 possesses a relatively low degree of notable counterpoint in its middle movements. This goes particularly for the scherzo, which relies on timbral dialectics at the expense of counterpoint.
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Appendix

Overview of contrapuntal activity in the six symphonies

Turning a piece of art into numbers, commas and percentages is something one does with considerable - even extreme - reluctance. It might possibly help to read the below figures only in light of the previous analyses and least of all as something defined by the composer. On the other hand it would tend toward the absurd to call for reliability and verifiability without at least trying to live up to such verifiability. The figures are the result of definitions made by the author in Chapter 1.3. During the process of evaluating a piece of art, recipients might - perhaps even should - perceive and value some details differently, though be able to agree on an overall basis.

2.1.5 Particularly noticeable contrapuntal activity in the First Symphony

Total amount of thematic counterpoint in Symphony No.1 ≈ 15 %
Total amount of semi-thematic counterpoint in Symphony No.1 ≈ 14,55 %
Total amount of local counterpoint in Symphony No.1 ≈ 16,36 %

Total amount of thematic, semi-thematic and local counterpoint in Symphony No.1 ≈ 46 %

In addition, the work contains a considerable amount of textural counterpoint, particularly in the first movement.

2.1.5.1 Significant contrapuntal activity in No.1 I:

Total number of measures: 724

Thematic counterpoint, ref. by measure numbers; from - until/including:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91-94</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-100</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138-49</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150-73</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205-10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212-13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215-19</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220-25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253-57</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265-69</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271-72</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280-84</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.1.5.2 Significant contrapuntal activity in No.1 II:

Total number of measures: 168

Thematic counterpoint:
Semi-thematic and local counterpoint:
25-43  19
88-93  6
97-103  7
TOTAL:  32 ≈ 19,05 %

Local counterpoint:
126-48  23 ≈ 13,69 %

Semi-thematic counterpoint:
84-87  4
94-96  3
TOTAL:  7 ≈ 4,17 %

Total amount of thematic, semi-thematic and local counterpoint in No.1 II ≈ 41,67 %

2.1.5.3 Significant contrapuntal activity in No.1 III:

Total number of measures: 442

Thematic counterpoint:
78-85  8
90-101  12
311-14  4
368-75  8
TOTAL:  32 ≈ 7,24 %

Semi-thematic counterpoint:
0

Local counterpoint:
1-4  4
16-19  4
25-28  4
33-36  4
41-53  13
86-89  4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>135-50</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167-202</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209-15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225-34</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251-66</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291-93</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307-09</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315-18</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323-26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331-43</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376-79</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total amount of thematic, semi-thematic and local counterpoint in No.1 III ≈ 41%

### 2.1.5.4 Significant contrapuntal activity in No.1 IV:

Total number of measures: 600 (G.P. not included)

Comment: Very little counterpoint is being registered in the Coda: These well over a hundred measures are notated *Alla breve*, thus tying up a disproportionate number of measures.

Thematic counterpoint:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90-115</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162-66</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181-200</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218-70</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306-34</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Semi-thematic counterpoint:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-28</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-36</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-54</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57-60</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78-80</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153-59</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169-70</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271-78</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.5. Particularly noticeable contrapuntal activity in the Second Symphony

Total amount of thematic counterpoint in Symphony No.2 \( \approx 34,22 \% \)
Total amount of semi-thematic counterpoint in Symphony No.2 \( \approx 6,49 \% \)
Total amount of local counterpoint in Symphony No.2 \( \approx 8,08 \% \)

Total amount of thematic, semi-thematic and local counterpoint in Symphony No.2 \( \approx 48,79 \% \)

2.2.5.1 Significant contrapuntal activity in No.2 I:

Total number of measures: 368

Thematic counterpoint:
23-33 11
42-47 6
60-62 3
64-70 7
112-33 22
160-65 6
168-201 34
226-28 3
Semi-thematic counterpoint:

82-85     4
16-21     6
35-38     4
87-91     5
134-37     4
229-301     3
241-44     4
246-50     5
287-90     4
TOTAL: 39 ≈ 10,60%

Local counterpoint:

9-14     5
102-06     5
211-13     3
255-59     5
356-61     6
TOTAL: 24 ≈ 6,52%

Total amount of thematic, semi-thematic and local counterpoint in No.2 I ≈ 55,16 %

2.2.5.2 Significant contrapuntal activity in No.2 II:

Total number of measures: 179

Thematic counterpoint:

19-26     8
28-40     23
57-60     4
69-72     4
75-78     4
83-84     2
86-89     4
97-100     4
125-46     22
TOTAL: 75 ≈ 41.9 %

Semi-thematic counterpoint:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>101-06</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121-24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>10 ≈ 5.57 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local counterpoint:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43-50</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79-82</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107-12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149-59</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>29 ≈ 16.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total amount of thematic, semi-thematic and local counterpoint in No.2 II ≈ 63.67%  

**Significant contrapuntal activity in No.2 III:**

Total number of measures (including repeats): 613

Thematic counterpoint:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62-73</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-101</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108-25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183-93</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212-22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341-45</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347-51</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452-62</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481-91</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>95 ≈ 15.5 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Semi-thematic counterpoint:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>229-46</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498-515</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519-30</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>567-72</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>579-84</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>60 ≈ 9.79 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local counterpoint:
### Total amount of thematic, semi-thematic and local counterpoint in No.2 III ≈ 33.94 %

#### 2.2.5.4 Significant contrapuntal activity in No.2 IV:

Total number of measures: 847

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic counterpoint:</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-88</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107-12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141-68</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187-90</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203-08</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211-16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219-41</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277-84</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293-300</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325-468</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477-508</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>514-19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522-27</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530-44</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>546-52</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>587-95</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603-13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>628-33</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>653-58</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>661-66</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>673-78</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>681-86</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>693-95</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>698-703</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706-16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>725-29</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>733-35</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>738-43</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Semi-thematic counterpoint: 0%
Comment: All stylized lines are given thematic classification

Local counterpoint:
57-64
8 ≈ 0.94%

Total amount of thematic, semi-thematic and local counterpoint in No.2 IV ≈ 42.38 %

2.3.6 Particularly noticeable contrapuntal activity in the Third Symphony

Total amount of thematic counterpoint in Symphony No.3 ≈ 49.64 %
Total amount of semi-thematic counterpoint in Symphony No.3 ≈ 5.58 %
Total amount of local counterpoint in Symphony No.3 ≈ 3.26 %

Total amount of thematic, semi-thematic and local counterpoint in Symphony No.3 ≈ 58.48%

2.3.6.1 Significant contrapuntal activity in No.3 I:

Total number of measures: 472
Thematic counterpoint:
10-14 5
59-65 7
66-71 6
89-90 2
95-125 11
152-157 6
162-170 9
208-09 2
212-13 2
215-18 4
221-23 3
225-36 12
239-58 20
260-73 14
275-306 32
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>317-18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320-39</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341-49</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351-57</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358-83</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421-28</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435-42</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455-60</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \approx 47.03 \% \]

**Semi-thematic counterpoint**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17-20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-32</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-71</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93-94</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146-51</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180-82</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188-91</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393-95</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>401-04</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \approx 7.63 \% \]

**Local counterpoint \approx 0\%**

*Total amount of thematic and semi-thematic counterpoint in No.3 I: 54.66 %*

### 2.3.6.2 Significant contrapuntal activity in No.3 II:

**Total number of measures: 289**

**Thematic counterpoint:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11-16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-46</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62-69</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-83</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-90</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93-98</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127-35</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137-48</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154-69</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171-97</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
213-33  21  
234-49  16  
255-61  7   
TOTAL   198 ≈ 68,51%  

Semi-thematic counterpoint ≈ 0%  

Local counterpoint  
47-58   12  
197-210  14  
TOTAL:  26 ≈ 9%  

Total amount of thematic and local counterpoint in No.3 II: 77,51%  

Comment: What distinguishes the triplets of this symphony from those of No.6/III is above all their expository highlighting already at the introduction of the former. Alternatively one might reduce the thematic importance and view the triplets as an architectonically striking textural strategy, in line with that of No.6/III.  

2.3.6.3 Significant contrapuntal activity in No.3 III:  

Total number of measures: 183  

Thematic counterpoint:  
1-8      8  
17-21    5  
35-38    4  
41-42    2  
45-62   18  
68-76    9  
80-88    9  
90-101   12  
104-33   30  
137-47   11  
149-56   8  
TOTAL    116 ≈ 63,39 %  

Local & Semi-thematic counterpoint ≈ 0  

Total amount of thematic and local counterpoint in No.3 III ≈ 63,39%
2.3.6.4 Significant contrapuntal activity in No.3 IV:

Total number of measures: 439

Thematic counterpoint:
- 21-28: 8
- 37-45: 9
- 47-68: 22
- 71-88: 18
- 264-77: 14
- 280-87: 8
- 296-303: 8
- 306-26: 21
- 330-47: 18

TOTAL: 126 ≈ 28.70%

Semi-thematic counterpoint: ≈ 0%

Local counterpoint:
- 109-124: 16
- 368-83: 16

TOTAL: 32 ≈ 7.29%

Total amount of thematic and local counterpoint in No.3 IV: 35.99%

2.3.6.5 Significant contrapuntal activity in No.3 V:

Total number of measures: 350

Thematic counterpoint:
- 9-19: 11
- 35-39: 5
- 41-49: 9
- 50-57: 8
- 66-80: 15
- 82-88: 7
- 90-99: 10
- 131-38: 8
- 165-73: 9
- 181-240: 60

TOTAL: 142 ≈ 40.57%
Semi-thematic counterpoint

1-6    6
28-33  6
106-08 3
111-16 6
158-64 7
174-76 3
241-42 2
258-72 15
278-84 7
290-99 10
310-12 3
314-16 3
TOTAL  71 ≈ 20.29%

Local counterpoint ≈ 0%

Total amount of thematic, semi-thematic and local counterpoint in No.3 V: 60.86 %

2.4.5 Particularly noticeable contrapuntal activity in the Fourth Symphony

2.4.5.1 Significant contrapuntal activity in No.4 I:

Total number of measures: 422

Thematic counterpoint:

53-71    19
74-75    2
78-85    8
117-18   2
120-33   14
161-75   15
179-80   2
217-21   5
230-34   5
237-46   10
248-49   2
253-56   4
257-71   15
278-81   4
284-90   7
296-97   2
299-312  14  
342-44   3  
TOTAL:  133 ≈ 31,52%

Semi-thematic counterpoint:
30-35    6  
39-42    4  
202-05   4  
207-10   4  
TOTAL:   18 ≈ 4,27%

Local counterpoint:
0

Total amount of thematic, semi-thematic and local counterpoint in No.4 I ≈ 35,79%

Significant contrapuntal activity in No.4 II:

Total number of measures: 304

Thematic counterpoint:
34-40    7 ≈ 2,30%

Semi-thematic counterpoint:
22-24    3  
30-32    3  
134-55   22  
TOTAL:   28 ≈ 9,21%

Local counterpoint:
77-96    20  
156-65   10  
200-17   18  
TOTAL:   48 ≈ 15,79%

Total amount of thematic, semi-thematic and local counterpoint in No.4 II ≈ 27,30%

Significant contrapuntal activity in No.4 III:

Total number of measures: 414

Thematic counterpoint:
186-96   11 ≈ 2,66%
Semi-thematic counterpoint:
0
Local counterpoint:
0
Total amount of thematic, semi-thematic and local counterpoint in No.4 III ≈ 2.66%

**Significant contrapuntal activity in No.4 IV:**

Total number of measures: 293

Thematic counterpoint:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68-91</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103-10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159-73</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175-81</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188-99</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22.53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Semi-thematic counterpoint:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47-49</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-02</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136-38</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281-84</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL:</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local counterpoint:

0

Total amount of thematic, semi-thematic and local counterpoint in No.4 IV ≈ 26.97%

**2.5.5 Particularly noticeable contrapuntal activity in the Fifth Symphony**

Total amount of thematic counterpoint in Symphony No.4 ≈ 14.75%
Total amount of semi-thematic counterpoint in Symphony No.4 ≈ 4.48%
Total amount of local counterpoint in Symphony No.4 ≈ 3.95%

Total amount of thematic, semi-thematic and local counterpoint in Symphony No.4 ≈ 23.18%

**2.5.5.1 Significant contrapuntal activity in No.5 I:**
Total number of measures: 542

Thematic counterpoint:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68-73</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-77</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-83</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88-89</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94-95</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-07</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156-57</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160-61</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164-65</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168-85</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194-97</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227-34</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236-43</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271-76</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278-80</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282-84</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347-48</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351-52</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355-56</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413-14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417-18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421-22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425-42</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451-54</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>114 ≈ 21,03%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Semi-thematic counterpoint:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure Range</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57-65</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108-18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132-33</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136-37</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186-93</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-01</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204-05</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297-300</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337-44</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363-72</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389-90</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393-94</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Local counterpoint: 0%

Total amount of thematic, semi-thematic and local counterpoint in No.5 I \(\approx 41,69\%\)

**Significant contrapuntal activity in No.5 II:**

Total number of measures: 184

Thematic counterpoint:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32-38</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44-59</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-86</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-98</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116-34</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143-48</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153-55</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171-78</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>80 (\approx 43,48%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Semi-thematic counterpoint:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75-82</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87-90</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142 (-156)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149-52</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL:</strong></td>
<td><strong>17 (\approx 9,24%)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local counterpoint: 0%

Total amount of thematic, semi-thematic and local counterpoint in No.5 II \(\approx 52,72\%\)

**Significant contrapuntal activity in No.5 III:**

Total number of measures: 266
Thematic counterpoint:
12-18    7
145-59   15
TOTAL:   22 ≈ 8.27%

Semi-thematic counterpoint:
45-56    12
186-97   12
TOTAL:   24 ≈ 9.02%

Local counterpoint: 0%

Total amount of thematic, semi-thematic and local counterpoint in No.5 III ≈ 17.29%

**Significant contrapuntal activity in No.5 IV:**

Total number of measures: 565

Thematic counterpoint:
16-18    3
70-73    4
82-83    2
86-87    2
90-91    2
94-97    4
99-113   15
128-39   12
148-55   8
168-71   4
202-05   4
234-59   26
296-315  20
324-25   2
328-29   2
332-33   2
336-39   4
341-67   27
399-401  3
403-05   3
414-51   38
504-17   14
TOTAL: $201 \approx 35.58\%$

Semi-thematic counterpoint:

- 4-7: 4
- 13-15: 3
- 24-37: 4
- 39-42: 4
- 74-77: 4
- 114-18: 5
- 140-47: 8
- 164-67: 4
- 174-75: 2
- 178-87: 10
- 190-91: 2
- 194-201: 8
- 206-09: 4
- 220-30: 11
- 260-66: 7
- 316-19: 4
- 378-97: 20
- 474-81: 8
- 486-88: 3
- 531-37: 7

TOTAL: $122 \approx 21.59\%$

Local counterpoint:

- 490-99: 1.77%

Total amount of thematic, semi-thematic and local counterpoint in No.5 IV $\approx 55.19\%$

Total amount of thematic counterpoint in Symphony No.5 $\approx 27.09\%$

Total amount of semi-thematic counterpoint in Symphony No.5 $\approx 15.13\%$

Total amount of local counterpoint in Symphony No.5 $\approx 0.44\%$

Total amount of thematic, semi-thematic and local counterpoint in Symphony No.5 $\approx 41.72\%$

2.6.5 Particularly noticeable contrapuntal activity in the Sixth Symphony
Total amount of thematic counterpoint in Symphony No.6  ≈ 17.93%
Total amount of semi-thematic counterpoint in Symphony No.6  ≈ 27.69%
Total amount of textural counterpoint in Symphony No.6  ≈ 9.46%
Total amount of local counterpoint in Symphony No.6  ≈ 0%

Thematic, semi-thematic and textural counterpoint in Symphony No.6  ≈ 55.08%

### 2.6.5.1 Significant contrapuntal activity in No.6 I:
Total number of measures: 354

**Thematic counterpoint:**
- 31-36: 6
- 39-74: 36
- 102-09: 8
- 111-17: 7
- 119-25: 7
- 143-50: 8
- 172-98: 27
- 203-06: 4

**TOTAL:** 103 ≈ 29.10%

**Semi-thematic counterpoint:**
- 207-22: 16
- 239-46: 8
- 259-63: 5
- 268-75: 8
- 286-98: 13
- 305-16: 12
- 336-43: 8

**TOTAL:** 70 ≈ 19.77%

**Local counterpoint:** 0%

**Total amount of thematic, semi-thematic and local counterpoint in No.6 I ≈ 48.87%**

### 2.6.5.2 Significant contrapuntal activity in No.6 II:
Total number of measures: 187

**Thematic counterpoint:**
- 9-15: 7
- 42-45: 4
- 50-53: 4
- 58-60: 3
Semi-thematic counterpoint:
25-27 3
33-41 9
113-16 4
136-44 9
151-55 4
161-68 8
TOTAL: 37 ≈ 19,79%

Local counterpoint: 0%

Total amount of thematic, semi-thematic and local counterpoint in No.6 II ≈ 34,23%

2.6.5.3 Significant contrapuntal activity in No.6 III:
Total number of measures: 349

Thematic counterpoint:
214-18 5 ≈ 1,43%

Semi-thematic counterpoint:
69-70 2
93-112 20
197-213 17
229-54 26
256-75 20
283-315 43
318-26 9
332-39 8
TOTAL: 145 ≈ 41,55%

Textural counterpoint:
9-16 8
19-34 16
37-47 11
49-50 2
53-68 16
71-79 9
81-92 12
113-36 24
147-54 8
157-68 12
175-84  10
187-88  2
191-92  2
TOTAL:  132 ≈ 37,82%

Local counterpoint ≈ 0%

Total amount of thematic, semi-thematic and textural counterpoint in No.6 III ≈ 80,80%

2.6.5.4 Significant contrapuntal activity in No.6 IV:
Total number of measures: 172

Thematic counterpoint:
39-43     4
47-59     13
63-70     8
109-11    3
149-55    7
157-63    7
TOTAL:    46 ≈ 26,74%

Semi-thematic counterpoint:
11-15     5
23-29     7
84-102    19
112-25    14
139-44    6
TOTAL:    51 ≈ 29,65%

Local counterpoint ≈ 0%

Total amount of thematic, semi-thematic and local counterpoint in No.6 IV ≈ 56,39%