

**Tchaikovsky, Cui and Russian Chamber Music:
Commemorative Article on the 175th Anniversary of
Tchaikovsky's Birth**

By Henry Zajaczkowski

Published by Tchaikovsky Research
www.tchaikovsky-research.net

**Copyright © 2015 by Henry Zajaczkowski
All rights reserved**

Tchaikovsky, Cui and Russian Chamber Music: Commemorative Article on the 175th Anniversary of Tchaikovsky's Birth

By Henry Zajackowski

NB: All dates given in this article are "New Style" (N.S.) unless otherwise indicated

What are we to make of the following comments from a man Tchaikovsky considered to be no friend, the notoriously polemical critic César Cui?

In [Russian] chamber music, the accolade goes to Tchaikovsky. His melodic abundance, his beautiful manner in the handling of polyphony, preserving the independence of each voice, his skill in the use of instruments, have found a happy application in his quartets. The most remarkable of these works of great value is that which carries the number 2; it is also, probably, Tchaikovsky's masterpiece.¹

On the surface, this passage, from Cui's *La Musique en Russie* certainly seems honest praise. But in 1880, the date of the book's publication, any "accolade" in respect to a Russian composer of chamber music distinguished him from, frankly, few genuine rivals. Opera, orchestral compositions and solo song with piano accompaniment had been, far more than chamber works, the focus of Russian composers' creative development. Conversely, for example, Glinka's two string quartets, the First in D major and Second in F major, written respectively in 1824 and 1830, are early, derivative works and remain of academic interest only. They are far indeed from being the paradigms for later Russian chamber-music composers that Glinka's *A Life for the Tsar* (1834-36) and *Ruslan and Lyudmila* (1837-42) were for Russians writing in the operatic field, or that his orchestral masterwork *Kamarinskaya* (1848) proved to be for his successors who sought a model for the integration of Russian folk-based material into an extended orchestral structure. On this latter point Tchaikovsky himself famously observed that the whole Russian symphonic school was "in *Kamarinskaya*, just as all the oak is in *the acorn*."² Glinka was the fount also for later song-writers, in his masterly "The Night Review" (1836), "Where is Our Rose" (1837), his folk-influenced songs and romances.

Cui himself considered that, as regards the history of Russian chamber composition Glinka's output in this field was "very imperfect and ... in no way merits to hold [our] attention."³ At least – and quite rightly – Cui does mention it, but extends no such distinction to the substantial body of chamber works by Tchaikovsky's former teacher at the St. Petersburg Conservatoire, Anton Rubinstein. No reference to Rubinstein at all occurs in Cui's chapter on chamber music, although he is mentioned in regard to this sphere of composition elsewhere in the book, but only so as to dismiss him through his versatility in many genres: "He who embraces too much grasps

¹ César Cui, *La Musique en Russie* (Paris, 1880), section 2, *Musique instrumentale: Musique de chambre*, 135.

² Alexandra Orlova, trans. R. M. Davison, *Tchaikovsky: A Self-Portrait* (Oxford/New York, 1990), 335.

³ Cui, *ibid.*, 135.

little.”⁴ Perhaps indeed this “embracing of too much” helps explain why Cui does not accord Rubinstein the merit of a mention in the chamber-music chapter, albeit for reasons other than those he would have been happy to acknowledge. Rubinstein had, long since in 1855, committed a notorious *faux pas* in his article “Russische Komponisten” published in Vienna in the journal *Blätter für Musik, Theater und Kunst*. Here he had espoused a view of Russian folk influence as too restricted in its emotional range to be capable of constituting any opera that would have relevance on the international stage. The outrage that ensued in Russia meant that wherever Rubinstein had already used Russian folk style in his own music, and whenever he might intensify that exploration - as indeed he eventually did in the period from the late 1870s to the early 1880s - it was unlikely he would be taken seriously. His natural conservatism did not preclude a genuine artistic interest in the expressive properties of folksong, however ambivalently all-embracing that might seem, but his mismanaged representation of his views was a historic act of overreaching. In fact, in his string quartets, from the Third Quartet in F major, Op. 17 No. 3 (1853) onwards, folk style is an occasional, even a notable, feature.⁵ But to no avail, it seems, from Cui’s point of view.

It is of particular interest, therefore, that Cui notes no Russian folk style in a musical extract that he reproduces comprising the start of the scherzo of Tchaikovsky’s Second String Quartet - while at the same time praising it in these terms: “The scherzo is of incomparable originality and freshness; its rhythm in 7/4 is novel, bold and at the same time natural.”⁶ See Ex. 1.

Ex. 1. Tchaikovsky: String Quartet No. 2 in F major, 2nd movement, m. 1-3.
Reproduced from César Cui, *La Musique en Russie* (Paris, 1880), 136.



The use of septuple meter (in fact a repeated juxtaposition of two measures of 6/8 time and one of 9/8) is indeed striking,⁷ all the more as the medium of the string quartet in Europe in the late nineteenth century was usually conservative. Its roots clearly lie in Russian folk music, however. Indeed, as Cui himself states in his book’s opening chapter, in Russian folksong “one finds some measures in septuple time.”⁸ The scherzo’s originality is therefore not “incomparable,” but could and should have been placed in its folk context. Cui’s usually sedulous tendency to praise folk-like aspects thus fails him on this occasion, even though he describes the string quartet entitled “The Volga” (in A minor, c.1860) by the violinist and composer Nikolay Yakovlevich Afanasyev

⁴ Cui, *ibid.*, section 1, *Musique vocale*, chapitre 2, *L’opéra: Antoine Rubinstein, Tchaïkowsky*, 113.

⁵ The finale of Rubinstein’s Third String Quartet has a second theme in D minor (starting at m. 53) with a distinctively folk-like Russian fatalism, its phrases gravitating downwards towards the tonic. The scherzo (second movement) uses the pentatonic scale in its trio section, and while not conclusive (as that scalar system is ubiquitously spread across the world), a plausible root is in Russian folk music. The second theme in the finale of the Fourth String Quartet in E minor, Op. 47 No. 1 (1856) employs two Russian folk-like features: In the sixteen measures from m. 41 to m. 56 inclusive the entire course of the melody does not exceed a very narrow range of pitch (the perfect 4th: E to B) and, secondly, the sense of key is indeterminate between the minor (here C sharp minor for the first 8 measures) and the major (namely E major for the second 8 measures). The tune is neither “in” the one key nor the other, but balances them against each other, to bittersweet effect.

⁶ Cui, *ibid.*, 136.

⁷ Tchaikovsky had indeed already employed irregular metrical structure in this quartet’s predecessor. The *Andante cantabile* of the First String Quartet in D major presents the folksong “Vanya was sitting” in fluctuating time-signatures as follows for the first 8-measure cycle: two measures of 2/4 time, one of 3/4, five of 2/4. (That list repeats exactly for the next 8-measure phrase.)

⁸ Cui, *ibid.*, section 1, *Musique vocale*, chapitre 1, *Chansons populaires russes*, 4.

(1821-98) as “impregnated with a pleasant national flavor.”⁹ Cui considers this composition (which, admittedly, was granted a prize from the Russian Musical Society in 1861, and was prominent in its day) the first Russian string quartet to be worthy of historical attention. But the lack of due assessment on Cui’s part regarding folk influence on Tchaikovsky is not surprising in view of his resentment concerning Rubinstein, which had existed long before Tchaikovsky came to public notice. It was, in all likelihood, a displacement onto the pupil of the opprobrium attaching to the teacher. Cui may, indeed, have engaged in an even more specific oversight, for there is a distinct possibility that Tchaikovsky’s use of folk-based style here was mediated by a comparable and remarkably striking usage of it in Rubinstein’s String Quartet No. 7 in G minor, Op. 90 No.1, which Cui of course does not mention. Tchaikovsky wrote of that work as follows, in a review printed on 2 February 1873 (O.S.) in *The Russian Gazette*: “[It] was written two years ago in St. Petersburg for the formation at that time, under [Rubinstein’s] influence and initiative, of The Russian Quartet, made up of four young local virtuosos.¹⁰ Perhaps that is why in [his] charming quartet there is so much of the Russian melodic element incorporated with great success into the entire work. A particularly felicitous feature is the Allegretto [sic] written in an extraordinarily piquant and original quintuple rhythm and charmingly scored. In the finale a broad melody in Russian style appears, brilliantly and richly developed.”¹¹

While Rubinstein’s use of 5/8 time for his scherzo is indeed adventurous, arguably even more daring is the material from the work’s first movement shown in Ex. 2.

Ex. 2. Rubinstein: String Quartet No. 7 in G minor, 1st movement, m. 20-27.

Moderato

⁹ Cui, *ibid.*, 135.

¹⁰ They were the violinists Panov and Leonov, the violist Yegorov and the cellist Kuznetsov.

¹¹ As reprinted in: P. I. Chaikovsky, ed. M. Ovchinnikov, *Muzyikal'no-kriticheskie stat'i* [Articles of music criticism], 4th edition (Leningrad, 1986), 102. The book's footnotes, compiled by V. Yakovlev and edited by Y. Vasilyev, contain an error as to the identity of the quartet by Rubinstein to which Tchaikovsky refers: See n. 2, p. 346 (regarding the review of "Two morning concerts of quartets"), which cites "The Eighth Quartet (G minor)." But Rubinstein's String Quartet No. 8, Op. 90 No. 2, is in E minor. Its companion item in this opus designation, his String Quartet No. 7, Op. 90 No. 1, is in G minor, and it is that work, beyond any question, that is the object of Tchaikovsky's remarks. There is no movement in quintuple time in Rubinstein's Eighth String Quartet, but his Seventh Quartet does have a scherzo (its second movement) in that meter. As Tchaikovsky calls it "the Allegretto" he only vaguely alludes to its tempo - Rubinstein actually marked it "Allegro non troppo" but that discrepancy is insubstantial (the Eighth Quartet's scherzo is an "Allegro vivace" i.e. a quicker tempo, and, more importantly, is simply in 2/4 time).

This forms part of the first subject section.¹² Its repeated alternation of 6/8 and 2/8 time is, on the one hand, inspired by the metrical irregularity that occurs in Russian folksong and, on the other, is subtly blended with the contrapuntal independence of each of the four players, in line with compositional principles that were laid down in the Classical period. It is an exemplary combination of the folk- and art-music ethos, showing how a successful melding of the two results in something exponentially greater than either. It may have put a seed so deep into Tchaikovsky's mind that he was actually unaware of it when writing his review as, indeed, he makes no mention of it. Perhaps it germinated when, roughly a year after the review, he composed his Second String Quartet.

An intriguingly cognate musical effect is displayed in Exs. 1 and 2 at the precise moment when the concert listener (as opposed to score reader) senses an irregularity of meter. In the Rubinstein extract, in the first occurrence of the 2/8 measure, that effect is of a truncated beat, namely a quarter note, whereas the two preceding beats (those that comprise the opening 6/8 measure) are *dotted* quarter notes. In other words, the expectation of ongoing full (dotted quarter note) beats is presently broken. It is then rebroken at the same juncture in each following phrase. These breaks are, so to speak, the bit of grit that causes the pearl to form. In the Tchaikovsky quartet, something similar is achieved, but more gently: The beat that breaks the continuity of meter, namely the third beat of the final measure of Ex. 1, is not truncated as such, but incorporates a brief silence at its end - the eighth-note rest that concludes the extract - and is preceded by another such silence (the eighth-note rest at the end of the preceding beat). One might say that the recalcitrant beat is rounded off rather than foreshortened.

The mediation of Tchaikovsky's inspiration here by that of Rubinstein might not lead straight back to Russian folksong. It could be that Rubinstein himself was inspired by another composer. If so, the line of influence might be a deeply ironic one as to Cui's serial blind spots where the recognition of anything outside his field of prejudice is concerned. Afanasyev's string quartet "The Volga," whose Russian flavor Cui admired so greatly, makes a grand display of septuple time in the Allegretto movement's coda. The gesture is made up of a reiterated pattern of: two measures of 2/4 time, marked *Allegro vivace*, followed by one measure of 3/4 time at the movement's original tempo.¹³ That is, a slower tempo marks the location at which the meter shifts into being an irregular one. Although it highlights the transition into irregularity in a simpler way, it foreshadows Rubinstein and, it seems, through him, Tchaikovsky. But whatever the specific line of transmission here, the underlying point is that, just as Rubinstein could not be recognized by Cui for having successfully captured a Russian style, neither could Tchaikovsky, as much as he pays lip service to them elsewhere in the book for having been influenced by Russian folksong.

In his chapter on opera, Cui observes of Rubinstein's stature as a world-famous musician that he is: "A universal, 'cosmopolitan' artist, his talent is only Russian from a topical angle, and even then only intermittently."¹⁴ In other words, when Rubinstein's operas utilize Russian subject-matter, as in the case of his opera set in the reign of Ivan the Terrible, *The Merchant Kalashnikov*, which Cui presently assesses,¹⁵ they never meet his criteria for a genuinely Russian use of musical style. Moreover, he relishes granting him a kind of imploding compliment for the impression made by Russian folk music upon his works: "Rubinstein's talent... is more varied [than that of Brahms and Raff, with which Cui considers it to be otherwise comparable] thanks above all to the use that it sometimes makes of oriental music and of Russian folk themes, so rich, so original."¹⁶ Cui's real focus of praise here is Russian folksong itself - he feels it is valuable as source material because it is *intrinsically* "rich" and "original" rather than because of the specific way in which Rubinstein has used it. Similarly, his commendation of oriental style is not really of its manifestation in Rubinstein's work, as much as he later expands his comments by referring to the

¹² Ex. 2, comprising m. 20-27 from the opening movement of Rubinstein's Seventh String Quartet in G minor, forms a developmental elaboration of the thematic material of the first subject. The preceding 19 measures are in 6/8 time (this movement's main meter), to which the music returns immediately after the end of the extract.

¹³ See the second movement, m. 122-30.

¹⁴ Cui, *ibid.*, 113.

¹⁵ See Cui, *ibid.*, 117.

¹⁶ Cui, *ibid.*, 114.

“vigorous coloring and...remarkable melodic and harmonic beauty”¹⁷ of the oriental dances in the opera *The Demon*. It is its origins in Glinka that he prizes.

The oriental stylizations that Glinka employed in *Ruslan and Lyudmila* were the model for pretty much all later Russian composers who evoked the Orient - whether inside the New Russian School, like Borodin or Rimsky-Korsakov, or outside it, like Tchaikovsky (whose song “The Canary” shows him making a rare obeisance to orientalism, a style that he generally showed little interest in) or indeed Rubinstein himself. Rubinstein is clearly paying homage to Glinka in *The Demon*’s dance interlude, and Cui’s comments in fact do the same, bypassing Rubinstein in the process, an insult so subtle that it would, again, almost certainly have evaded his book’s French readers, whom he keeps in the dark as to his personal, home-grown animosity. It may also be that he has, moreover, the subtext of anti-Semitism, a xenophobic reluctance to recognize Rubinstein’s salute to Russian music’s father-figure.

Concerning Tchaikovsky’s opera set in Ivan the Terrible’s day, *The Oprichnik*,¹⁸ Cui relates that it “sometimes presents the very unpleasant mix of Russian music [here he may mean not just folksong, which conspicuously flavors the score, but also Russian Orthodox liturgical chant which is simulated in the oprichniks’ chorus at the start of Act 2 scene 2] and Italianisms in Verdi’s manner.”¹⁹

And what of the opening movement in the string quartet Cui felt was “probably Tchaikovsky’s masterpiece”? Here is what he says of it: “It is true that the first movement is a little diffuse; one finds some harmonic and chromatic exaggerations there and too many syncopations. But the other movements are admirable.”²⁰ A strange way of making a case for a masterpiece, whose scherzo – he insinuates – is superior to its first movement. Cui’s arch assumption of a reluctance to be critical (“It is true that...”) would have been extremely difficult for the book’s main readership to see through, as they would have needed to know the historical perspective that shaped Cui’s prejudices – and Cui was hardly going to provide them with that. *La Musique en Russie* gave the West a book in an accessible Western language about musical life in a country that, for most of its readers, was inaccessible for reasons of language itself. It has skewed perceptions of Tchaikovsky’s, and indeed Rubinstein’s, compositions down to the present day. No musician was a greater advertisement abroad in favor of Russia than the internationally acclaimed Rubinstein, a pianist whose stature was surpassed only by Liszt, and there are arguably only two composers in the late nineteenth century who are more sensitive explorers of Russian folk style than Tchaikovsky: Aleksandr Borodin and Modest Musorgsky (who was also an associate of Cui’s in the New Russian School).

All three of Tchaikovsky’s string quartets had been composed by the time of the book’s publication (and also, indeed, of its original appearance in the form of a set of articles running from 1878 to 1880 in the *Revue et gazette musicale*): No. 1 in D major, Op.11 (1871), No. 2 in F major, Op.22 (1874) and No. 3 in E flat minor, Op. 30 (1876). They were the first consistently great achievement in the sphere of chamber music in Russia²¹ and created waves – Borodin, through fruitful rivalry with Tchaikovsky, produced his two string quartets: No. 1 in A major (1874 – 79) and No. 2 in D major (1881). Few could doubt that these five works are each of world

¹⁷ Cui, *ibid.*, 116.

¹⁸ The oprichniks were the special enforcers with whom Ivan the Terrible maintained his aims in his artificial division of Russia into territory for himself and territory for the nobility. Ivan had his oprichniks dress in monkish garb, compounding the destruction they wrought with religious hypocrisy - hence the ironic use of liturgical style in Tchaikovsky’s opera.

¹⁹ Cui, *ibid.*, 120.

²⁰ Cui, *ibid.*, 135.

²¹ Despite some longueurs in its finale, Rubinstein’s Third String Quartet, Op. 17 No. 3 (composed, as noted above, in 1853) has as strong a claim as Tchaikovsky’s Op. 11 quartet to being the first great Russian string quartet. Like his pupil’s composition it has outstanding lyrical qualities and a meticulously judged fluency in contrapuntal texture: its opening measures reveal that polyphonic skill, as does the canon between first and second violins in the slow movement’s coda. Its companion quartets in Op. 17, that is, No. 1 in G major and No. 2 in C minor (both of 1852) are mundane, however, and demonstrate their composer’s overriding flaw, his extreme inconsistency. That characteristic mars Rubinstein’s quartet output as a whole, but perhaps the time is ripe for the works of genuine inspiration, such as the Third String Quartet, to be given their due and salvaged from oblivion.

standing despite the regrettable phenomenon that they are still, even today, only really known by two separate movements, namely the slow movements of Tchaikovsky's First, and Borodin's Second, quartets. Here public acclaim attached to the admittedly intense highpoint of lyrical and melodic expression in the whole gamut of these works. It is notable that Tchaikovsky himself became exasperated by concert audiences' fascination with his D major quartet's *Andante cantabile*: "They have gone crazy about this 'andante'," he once remarked, "and want nothing else to be played."²²

The lack of a meaningful paradigm in Glinka's music was compounded by a potentially engulfing one in the music of Beethoven as regards the composition of string quartets. It was the exact inverse kind of impediment, one which, moreover, was apt to affect every composer, not just those in Russia. Brahms once famously observed to the conductor Hermann Levi: "You don't know what it is like always to hear that giant [Beethoven] marching along behind me"²³ and, arguably, those awesome reverberations were even greater in the sphere of the string quartet than in the symphony. A case can be made that Beethoven achieved an even more remarkably great stylistic and emotional range in his quartets than in his symphonies. Furthermore, there was a structural shift in the whole area of the performance of orchestral music that had no relevance in the writing of string quartets. Advances in instrumental construction and increases in the size of orchestras meant that vistas of expression were open to Bruckner, Tchaikovsky, Borodin, Dvořák and Mahler (all, of course, facilitated by Wagner's use of the orchestra in his ground-breaking operas) that were not available to Beethoven. In particular, the move from "natural" trumpets and horns to ones that had a complete chromatic-scale capacity enabled the brass to function for the first time as a complete "choir" of instruments, thus substantially increasing the composer's orchestral palette and adding enormously to the capacity to build protracted orchestral climaxes. The fruit of that advance in the brass section was the expression of the monumental in late nineteenth-century symphonism as epitomized by Tchaikovsky's *Pathétique* Symphony, whose profoundly powerful creative expression of despair is the diametric opposite of Beethoven's exultant *Choral* Ninth – whose choir of human voices gave a textural and dynamic impact that the Beethovenian orchestra alone could not.

The string quartet, however, remained the string quartet. Just the two violins, viola and cello that Beethoven had used. An occasional exploration by later nineteenth-century composers into coloristic effects, such as Borodin's use of artificial harmonics in the trio of his First String Quartet's scherzo, or the prominent use of the viola's tone color in Brahms's String Quartet No. 3 in B flat major, Op.67 (1876), remained of peripheral significance only. Composers by and large stood on the same playing field, concerning quartet composition, as did the daunting figure of Beethoven. In which direction could they make a purposeful move? Beethoven's early output had embraced the classical foundations of Haydn and Mozart and proceeded, through the innovations of the middle-period quartets, to the transcendent originality and emotional depth of the late quartets. He had, so to speak, shown that he could cover any move. So, his successors tended to compose far fewer quartets: Like Tchaikovsky, Schumann and Brahms each wrote just three official quartets. Alone among major composers of the late 1800s Dvořák forged a large part of his creative personality through quartet composition – fourteen works in total (as part, indeed, of his intensive exploration of the chamber-music field in general, with some 40 works to his name). But for Dvořák the creative antecedent tended to be Schubertian lyricism, rather than Beethoven.

If Dvořák's line of approach sidestepped the more daunting explorations of quartet composition exemplified in the late opus numbers of Beethoven, the same may be said of Borodin. Indeed Borodin more or less implicitly acknowledges it, designating his First String Quartet as

²² Tchaikovsky's letter from Munich of 19 Nov. 1884 to his brother Anatoly, printed in: P. Chaikovsky, *Polnoe sobranie sochineny: literaturniye proizvedeniya i perezpiska* [Complete collected edition: literary works and correspondence], vol. 12 (Moscow, 1970), 477. On the same date he wrote also to his brother Modest, reiterating these comments - pertaining to his recent attendance as a concert-goer in Berlin - and indeed also to his publisher, Pyotr Jurgenson. His observations to the latter, however, show that his mood had changed, as he now specifically criticizes the Berlin concert impresario Benjamin Bilse: "He has become obsessed with this andante - the rogue performs nothing else." (*Ibid.*, 480.)

²³ Malcolm MacDonald, *Brahms* (London, 1990), 245.

having been “suggested by a theme of Beethoven,” the melody in question occurring as a subsidiary, lyrical component in the rather conventional movement that Beethoven devised as substitute finale for the String Quartet in B flat major, Op.130.²⁴ The movement it displaced was the single most revolutionary item the iconoclastic Beethoven ever composed, the “Grosse Fuge” which has been described as “a closed book to the 19th century [and which was] to Stravinsky... ‘this absolutely contemporary piece of music that will be contemporary for ever’.”²⁵ Of course it should be recalled that the cellist Borodin had a background in his youthful years in composing chamber pieces for fun, and performance by himself and his friends in a domestic setting, sometimes basing these for the pragmatic sake of having a starting-point on works by established composers. Examples are the (lost) String Trio in G major of 1847 adapted from themes in Meyerbeer’s opera *Robert le diable* and the Quartet in D major for flute, oboe, viola and cello of 1852-56, based on Haydn’s Piano Sonata in D major, Hoboken catalog No. XVI:51. A further qualifying matter to be borne in mind is what one might call the “safety net” factor. It is a profoundly regrettable one, yet understandable in view of Borodin’s main profession – which was in the field of science.²⁶ He felt apprehensive of becoming prominent beyond a certain extent as a composer in case his scientific colleagues no longer took him seriously.

That, as much as any other reasons, explains his non-completion of his life’s masterpiece, *Prince Igor*, which he had pored over, and intermittently worked upon, for eighteen years by the time of his abrupt death in 1887. A successful opera was the main vehicle through which a composer might reach fame and although chamber music reached smaller and more “refined” audiences, a composer’s “String Quartet No. 1” was still an important rite of passage. Borodin safeguarded his stature as a scientist by paying homage to a past master in the A major quartet. The homage provided a potential caveat about compositional ambitions to any would-be critical scientific colleagues, while in no way preventing Borodin from, in fact, achieving a *tour de force* in the quartet. It is as strikingly individual a first string quartet, albeit deriving from Beethoven and in broader terms of style, Mendelssohn,²⁷ as is Tchaikovsky’s Op.11, whose creative background (in a general sense, rather than with regard to any thematic quotation) is in Mozart and Beethoven.

With Tchaikovsky, however, the Beethovenian aspect would intensify in his Second String Quartet. Here, what Cui called the “harmonic and chromatic exaggerations” of the opening movement (they also appear briefly, but with even more strikingly inventive force in the finale) are far from being a flaw, but show Tchaikovsky furthering Beethoven’s love of broadening tonal boundaries. By a strange but perhaps meaningful coincidence, Tchaikovsky’s Second Quartet was composed in the same year as that which witnessed the birth of Schoenberg (1874). That pioneer’s own Second String Quartet in F sharp minor, Op.10 (1908) would open the door to other worlds in the quartets of Bartók, the first composer fully to embrace the line of motivic and tonal development in Beethoven’s late quartets.

The *Grosse Fuge*’s opening measures, which look on the page like G major, but actually sound nothing like it,²⁸ prefigure such adventurous works as Tchaikovsky’s Second Quartet. Much

²⁴ Compare the melody beginning in the viola in the second beat of m. 109 in the finale of Beethoven’s Op. 130 with Borodin’s adaptation of it commencing at m. 69 in the first violin in the opening movement of his First String Quartet.

²⁵ From the entry on Ludwig van Beethoven by Joseph Kerman and Alan Tyson (with Scott G. Burnham) in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 2nd edition (London/New York, 2001), eds. Stanley Sadie and John Tyrrell, vol. 3, 106.

²⁶ Borodin was an eminent research chemist. Indeed, that seems to be how he primarily viewed himself, a matter that, if one admires his music, it is all too easy to overlook.

²⁷ Periodically Tchaikovsky too was influenced by Mendelssohn. A common influence of general Mendelssohnian style is displayed in the opening measures of the scherzo in Borodin’s First String Quartet and the material beginning at the second beat of m. 8 in Tchaikovsky’s piano piece *La Sorcière (Baba Yaga)* from *Album pour enfants*, Op. 39 No. 20. Also, the passages starting at m. 52 in Borodin’s scherzo and the second beat of m. 12 in Tchaikovsky’s piano piece seem to spring from a root in Mendelssohn.

²⁸ Indeed, the balance between the establishing of the tonic (m. 1-4 of the *Overture*, which consist entirely of the pitch G in octaves, slightly extended through a fermata on the first beat of m. 2) and its circumvention (m. 5-10, all of the instruments still moving in, as it were, primal octaves, without harmony, and incorporating the extreme disruption of a G sharp in m. 5 and again - crucially in terms of the expected tonal periodicity of quadratic phrasing - in m. 8) seems

though Tchaikovsky deplored that piece (he observed in a diary entry concerning his views on Beethoven: “I *hate* the last period, particularly the late quartets. There are *flashes* there, but no more. The rest is *chaos*, over which there broods the spirit of this musical Lord of *Sabaoth*, swathed in impenetrable mists”)²⁹ he was quite capable of being influenced by music for which he had little sympathy. His celebrated comments to Taneyev concerning the mark left by Wagner’s *Der Ring* on the symphonic fantasia *Francesca da Rimini* (“Isn’t it odd that I should have submitted to the influence of a work of art that in general is extremely antipathetic to me?”)³⁰ show that he could be influenced by music that he actually loathed.

As regards more general issues of influence and precedent, Tchaikovsky and Borodin’s establishing of a new momentum for the composition of string quartets in Russia provided the impetus for the next generation of Russians, namely Aleksandr Glazunov (the pupil of Borodin’s colleague Rimsky-Korsakov) and Sergey Taneyev (the pupil of Tchaikovsky himself) to build upon. This they did with determination and quite remarkable technical skill. Taneyev’s quartets, in keeping with his works in general, display a markedly cosmopolitan approach, and a honing of contrapuntal technique, but not to the exclusion of musical humor or raciness of style in his scherzos to secure an overall creative balance in the composition.

Taneyev himself acknowledges a debt to the impetus granted him by Tchaikovsky’s corpus of string quartets by dedicating his String Quartet No. 1 in B flat minor, Op. 4 (1890): “To my Master Mr. Tchaikovsky.” But as Taneyev’s spiritual and creative outlook was usually highly conservative, it is not surprising that Rubinstein’s quartets, not Tchaikovsky’s, provided the greater source of influence. Even so, in this First String Quartet one notes the homage paid to Tchaikovsky’s Third String Quartet in E flat minor, as regards an extremely remote and emotionally intense shift of key. In the opening movement of both quartets the key a tritone away from the tonic asserts itself: in Tchaikovsky’s, to encompass the occurrence in the reprise section, of an entirely new theme, in A major; in Taneyev’s, to mark the development section, in E minor. Fascinatingly, even in this instance one cannot discount an evolution from the work of Rubinstein, in the finale of whose String Quartet No. 3 in F major (written 23 years before Tchaikovsky’s Third Quartet) there is a structurally less prominent use of a tritonal relationship. There, A flat major emerges for a purely decorative restatement of the main theme,³¹ within the first subject section (whose overall tonic is, as one would expect, the same as that of the quartet), contrasting in due course with the second theme, set in D minor.³² While the relative minor is, of course, merely a routine key for a subsidiary subject, its coloration is imbued with an extra tint through being placed in near juxtaposition with the earlier use, as a tonal byway, of the flat mediant key during the course of the first subject.

Contrariwise: For a Romantic period composer to evoke a dance genre from the Baroque suite is an extreme touch of conservatism, and Rubinstein’s inclusion of a slow movement comprising a sarabande and variations in his Fifth String Quartet in B flat major, Op. 47 No. 2, is startling for 1856. Even more so - at first sight - is Taneyev’s use of a gigue in his Sixth String Quartet, also in B flat major, Op. 19. This forms the work’s scherzo, and is a remarkable illustration of the biologist’s dictum: “Ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny.” Taneyev composed the quartet in 1905, and revolutionary fervor was not just “in the air” in socio-political terms but in artistic terms also, as the musical avant-garde was gaining pace. For the personal creative development of so conservative a figure as Taneyev to continue to be meaningful he had to make a response to the shifting artistic ground of the times. In his Sixth String Quartet’s scherzo he starts with a regressive journey (influenced by Rubinstein’s sarabande precedent of 1856) back to the eighteenth century. But this is far from being watery pastiche. Taneyev’s gigue progresses

absolute. It is an artistic entropy achieved with such skill that when Beethoven supplies a G natural again, two measures too late, so to speak (m. 10), and even spuriously crowns it with a trill, one senses it is a deposed monarch.

²⁹ Orlova, *ibid.*, 334.

³⁰ David Brown, *Tchaikovsky: A Biographical and Critical Study*, vol. 2, *The Crisis Years (1874-1878)* (London, 1982), 108.

³¹ The A flat major restatement of the theme starts in m. 21.

³² From m. 53 (and cf. footnote 5 above).

through its recapitulation of phylogeny by capturing an aftershock of the most seismic musical event in the closing years of the nineteenth century: Tchaikovsky's *Pathétique* Symphony.

That symphony, whose finale, Hans Keller once observed, "cast an illuminating shadow over the whole future history of the [symphonic] form"³³ serves, in its preceding movement, the maniacal scherzo that runs away with itself into being a mad march, as a means for Taneyev's self-assertion. Taneyev's creative adaptation of this is to pass into a kind of high Romantic grotesquerie: Great, arching dissonant leaps of melodic sevenths appear³⁴ and a rather manic chromatic episode with a winding, ostinato-like pattern on viola.³⁵ In effect, the music has marched towards a late Romantic decadence - an embodiment of its conservative creator's fears for the future. By the early years of the twentieth century, however, such a gesture was too late. The tipping-point into the atonality of the Second Viennese School was imminent, and Taneyev, for all his gifts and technique, came to seem like a back number. That fate also befell his (arguably even greater) contemporary, Glazunov.

Whereas Taneyev showed only a slight interest in folk material, Glazunov's quartets, on the other hand, are frequently in the Russian manner, and grow from the soil of Borodin and Tchaikovsky's achievement (with general reminiscences of the musical style of Rimsky-Korsakov). Furthermore, Glazunov absorbed the remarkable fluency of motivic texture in, for example, Tchaikovsky's Second String Quartet and Borodin's First. This enabled him, even in his String Quartet No. 1 in D major, Op.1 (1882) and No. 2 in F major, Op.10 (1884), both composed while he was still a teenager, to speak with the established voice of a master. The former work (which proclaims its nationality through its being dedicated to Glinka's sister, Lyudmila Shestakova) drew the following, albeit begrudgingly admiring comment from Tchaikovsky, in a letter to his brother Modest, whom he advised should buy it in a four-handed piano arrangement to get to know it: "The form is so smooth that I am surprised, and suspect that the teacher [i.e. Rimsky-Korsakov] helped." But form was the last thing that Rimsky-Korsakov, by nature no builder of gradually evolving musical structures, could bequeath his student. The more mosaic patterning of that composer's music was spotted by Tchaikovsky in his nevertheless rhetorically exaggerated criticism of Glazunov's "imitation of Korsakov, the innumerable repetitions of ideas in a thousand keys instead of developing them." Flaws apart, Tchaikovsky felt that a "significant talent is revealed."³⁶ Perhaps the fruits of that giftedness and astuteness may one day gain their deserved recognition, and Glazunov's quartets take their place in the international performing repertoire. Perhaps we can forgive him for being in the wrong place at the wrong time?

Significant talent is often vested in striking personalities (much though, in Glazunov's case, it was housed in a man of some modesty). It is to the entirely exceptional character of Nikolay Rubinstein, dictatorial Director of the Moscow Conservatoire, younger brother of Anton and not much less remarkable performing musician (though Tchaikovsky at first did not perceive this), *bon vivant*, gambler and socialite, that we owe the really unlikely item in Tchaikovsky's chamber works. The path to it was unwittingly opened in 1880 by the composer's patroness, Nadezhda von Meck. She was at that time in the midst of a daily succession of musical treats: the performance by her house musicians of an array of piano trios. She wrote Tchaikovsky a mild reprimand for having composed nothing himself in that category. As we shall presently see, he responded by stating a deep revulsion to the very sound made by the combination of instruments in a piano trio.

He rose to the challenge of overcoming that antipathy when Nikolay Rubinstein died in 1881. They had had both warm and stressful relations over the years. It was Rubinstein who had lambasted Tchaikovsky over what he felt were the gross failings of the latter's First Piano Concerto, on Christmas Eve 1874, O.S., at a private playing-through by the composer. That caused

³³ Hans Keller, "Tchaikovsky" in *The Symphony*, ed. Robert Simpson, vol. 1, *Haydn to Dvořák* (Harmondsworth, 1966), 353.

³⁴ Starting at m. 54.

³⁵ Starting at m. 66.

³⁶ This quotation and the two preceding ones, Gerald Abraham, *Slavonic and Romantic Music* (London, 1968), chapter 15, "Glazunov and The String Quartet," 220.

Tchaikovsky deep and long-lasting offense, as much as anything because he felt he had been addressed as though he were an idiot. Yet this was the same Rubinstein who, having offered Tchaikovsky his first professional post as a musician, namely that of professor of musical theory at the fledgling conservatoire, took the new employee under his wing upon his arrival in Moscow in 1866 – so securely that Tchaikovsky felt “nannied” by him. He had the generosity to provide lodgings in his own home to the composer, went so far as to buy six shirts as a gift to help ensure that the penniless professor be properly attired, introduced him into the Moscow club circuit where he became acquainted with such eminent figures as the playwright Ostrovsky, and generally devoted every energy to installing him as an important new figure in the city. This was most notably achieved by Rubinstein’s conducting, on 16 March 1866, the first of Tchaikovsky’s compositions to be performed in Moscow: the revised version of the Overture in F major (whose original version, for a smaller orchestra, had been premiered with Tchaikovsky himself as conductor in St. Petersburg the previous year). Rubinstein would go on to premiere many of Tchaikovsky’s works, including the first four of his symphonies, and the greatest of his operas, *Eugene Onegin*. At his death, Tchaikovsky was “utterly crushed by sorrow.”³⁷ To rebuild himself from a position of such inward destruction, Tchaikovsky set about writing the Piano Trio, “In Memory of a Great Artist,” but had to surmount his deep-rooted resistance to the sound of a violin, a cello and a piano in combination. He had declared to von Meck that “the singing tones of the violin and cello, with their marvelously warm timbre, have a quality all their own when set alongside the *king* of instruments, which latter vainly tries to show that it too can *sing* like its rivals.” More specifically, he felt the piano’s sound “has an elastic quality”³⁸ that, rather than blending with any other instrument, rebounds from it. He went so far as to assert: “Even thinking about the sound of a trio is a source of actual physical discomfort to me.”³⁹

Life’s task of reconciling opposites within oneself finds empathy in the like task undertaken by our friends and loved ones, the death of one of whom leaves one more alone with the carrying-out of it. Nikolay Rubinstein could hardly have been a more irresolvable combination of opposites: the despot and the devoted friend. It seems that the psychological healing process granted by creativity was what gave Tchaikovsky the motivation to overcome his disdain for the timbral and acoustical discrepancies of the piano trio medium. By composing a piano trio he was enabled to address, and resolve as fully as he could in his own perceptions, his deceased friend’s discrepancies, and the actual loss of the man. The immensity of the task resulted in the first great Russian piano trio.

There is no trio for piano, violin and cello by Glinka, but he wrote a highly dramatic and introspective *Trio pathétique* in D minor (1832) scored for piano, clarinet and bassoon, such that one regrets that he did not also essay a work in the standard combination of instruments. Anton Rubinstein composed an inconsistent series of piano trios: No. 1 in F major, No. 2 in G minor (bracketed together under a single opus number, Op.15, composed 1851), No. 3 in B flat major, Op.52 (1857), No. 4 in A major, Op.85 (1870) and, in the year after Tchaikovsky completed his own Piano Trio, comes No. 5 in C minor, Op.108 (1883). None of Rubinstein’s works in this medium has the thoroughgoing and high level of inspiration shown in, for instance, his Fourth Piano Concerto in D minor, Op.70 (1864), or his Fifth Symphony in G minor, Op.107 (1880).

Borodin’s output in the sphere of the piano trio is, disappointingly, restricted to a single, early and unfinished work (in D major, comprising only the first three movements, namely a sonata-form *Allegro*, a *Romanze* and a minuet-style *Intermezzo*) derivative of Mendelssohn, and composed from 1860 to 1861. This was just before reaching the significant juncture of his first meeting with Balakirev (in 1862) and the subsequent evolution of his mature style as part of the New Russian School.

An intriguing mention is made in the chamber music chapter of *La Musique en Russie* of Eduard Nápravník. Though mainly remembered now as a conductor, he was also a substantial composer (a meaningfully comparable figure of later times in this respect is Wilhelm Furtwängler)

³⁷ Orlova, *ibid.*, 218.

³⁸ This quotation and the preceding one, Orlova, *ibid.*, 210.

³⁹ Orlova, *ibid.*, 211.

so, in itself the reference is not surprising. Nor, in view of its having been awarded a prize by the Russian Musical Society in 1876 is Cui's mention of "a piano trio [in G minor, Op.24], which has gained a merited success"⁴⁰ (though his distaste for the conservative RMS results in his saying nothing whatsoever of this). However, Nápravník was, of course, not Russian, but a Czech who worked in Russia. Although Cui is fully within his remit here (the book's title actually specifies music within Russia's borders, rather than, specifically, music written by Russians), a distinguished composition by a Czech seems to underline the paucity of piano trios by indigenous composers.

Whereas the world of ballet was changed irrevocably by Tchaikovsky's radically innovative scores in that field, his Piano Trio in A minor, Op.50 (1881-82) also issued a challenge, but arguably an even deeper one: How could later composers encompass a similar evocation of a whole lifetime's experience – a melding of that of the dedicatee and its reciprocation by the composer himself – within the confines of a chamber medium that had originally evolved for amateur, home music-making in the mid-eighteenth century, with a concomitantly gentle and delicate framework of style? Just as Beethoven's *Grosse Fuge* was a "bridge too far" for nineteenth-century composers in the realm of string-quartet composition, so too composers of the twentieth century fought shy of trying to surpass the monolithic quality of Tchaikovsky's Piano Trio. Indeed, the writing of fewer works in that medium during the period is comparable to the decline in quartet composition post-Beethoven. Even Tchaikovsky was only to exceed the emotional depth of his piano trio's coda when he came to write the finale of the Sixth Symphony. Moreover, the Piano Trio is a decisive step in the direction of that most overwhelming of finales.

Prior to the Piano Trio came a small-scale, but highly interesting addition to Tchaikovsky's output of chamber works. In view of his aforementioned discomfort at the combined sound of piano with solo strings, it is not surprising that a discarded movement from his Violin Concerto Op.35 in D major (1878) did not form the nucleus for any attempt to write a violin sonata. Instead, the concerto's original slow movement, about which the violinist Iosif Kotek (who acted as adviser during the composition of Op.35), the composer's brother Modest, and Tchaikovsky himself each had misgivings, was shortly published as part of a set of three pieces for solo violin and piano. Newly entitled *Méditation*, its affecting melancholy was contrasted with an engagingly spiky *Scherzo* and a strikingly lyrical *Mélodie*, the whole collection being cast as *Souvenir d'un lieu cher*, Op.42 (the "beloved place" in question was his patroness's estate at Brailov), printed in 1879. In view of the high level of inspiration that characterizes Tchaikovsky's writing for solo violin in general (that in the concerto itself being complemented by, for example, the *Sérénade mélancolique*, Op.26, for violin and orchestra, or the violin *obbligato* in the fourth movement of the Third Suite in G major, Op.55), it is lamentable that no sonata ensued from this. His acoustical unease over the piano *in lieu* of the orchestra as accompaniment to the violin must explain why the idea of a full-scale work for violin and piano did not occur to him. So, the *Souvenir d'un lieu cher* – a work of immense charm despite the rather haphazard circumstances of its provenance – is as improbable an item in the canon of Tchaikovsky's chamber music (albeit for the diametrically opposite reason of not realizing a challenge instead of courageously grasping one) as his Piano Trio. We are fortunate indeed to have both.

The final chamber composition Tchaikovsky was to write stemmed from his gratitude to the St. Petersburg Chamber Music Society for making him a life member in 1886. The city's German community comprised the greater part of the membership, and it was with the knowledge that the society was well versed in the great teutonic chamber music heritage that Tchaikovsky embarked on the String Sextet in D minor, Op.70, *Souvenir de Florence*, which he dedicated to them. He did some initial work on this in 1887 and returned to complete the piece in 1890, revising it from 1891 to 1892. The general, European repertoire of string sextets has a sporadic history in complete contrast to that of the impressive succession of string quartets, though both genres share a root in the eighteenth-century divertimento, cassation, serenade and nocturno (those for a mixed combination of six solo instruments comprising winds and strings prefigure the string sextet). There are no string sextets by Mozart or Beethoven, and although Haydn composed two (early)

⁴⁰ Cui, *ibid.*, 136.

works for the combination of string quartet plus two horns, he wrote no sextet exclusively for strings.⁴¹ Such Classical-period examples as the string sextets of Boccherini would almost certainly have been an academically remote and inaccessible paradigm. Of important possible Russian precursors, Glinka wrote nothing in the medium, but Anton Rubinstein did compose a single example, the String Sextet in D major, Op.97 (1876). Though that work, so to speak, helped break the ice as a fairly recent precedent, it appears otherwise to have had no meaningful influence on Tchaikovsky's sextet (a common tonic of D is of course not surprising where a composition for strings is concerned).⁴²

What seems significant, rather, is the sense of exploration that Tchaikovsky grasped by spreading his wings in this medium, in which there were so few existing models. In this, there is both a most paradoxical point of contact with, and fundamental divergence from, Brahms. Arguably Tchaikovsky's deepest detestation for the work of any composer was for Brahms (more so than for the late string quartets of Beethoven and more so even than for the music dramas of Wagner). The differences between them are transparent, Tchaikovsky the epicurean melodist, Brahms the serious contrapuntist, Tchaikovsky the sensual and deeply subtle orchestrator, Brahms the ingenious architect of structures in media whose more neutral coloring – the many chamber works he composed and the music for solo piano and piano *à quatre mains* – emphasized structure itself. Tchaikovsky could never have composed the Clarinet Quintet⁴³ and Brahms could never have composed *The Nutcracker* (masterworks of the nineteenth century as both are).

Brahms was on the long path towards the writing of his first official string quartet when he composed, as a young man, his two string sextets (whose antecedent seems to have been Spohr's String Sextet in C major, Op.140 (1848)). Tchaikovsky, in middle age (indeed, as it turns out, in the last few years of his life), having over a decade previously made as complete a statement as he seems to have wished in the sphere of string quartet composition, turned to begin his only string sextet. The medium of the sextet, with its expanded range of sonority, verges on the orchestral, and for Brahms in his First String Sextet in B flat major, Op.18 (1860), this facilitated the writing of an exceptionally warm and lyrical work, redolent indeed of his symphonies. The Second String Sextet in G major, Op.36 (1865), though more introspective as a whole, shares the quasi-orchestral richness of its predecessor's sound-world, and both pieces may be seen as embodying the principle of *reculer pour mieux sauter*. That is, as Brahms found through them the release of some characteristic self-expression in a less strict chamber genre, it may have reempowered him to assail once again the ascetic task of writing a worthy string quartet (to succeed the apparently many abortive attempts that came before). Without his string sextets, Brahms would perhaps have had an even longer journey in reaching his Op.51 string quartets (completed in 1873), the first of which, in C minor, may have begun to be sketched at about the time that he completed the Second String Sextet.

When Tchaikovsky got down in earnest to drafting his String Sextet in 1890 (having three years previously sketched the work's opening) he gave a characteristically self-deprecatory account of his progress. He wrote to the pianist Aleksandr Ziloti: “[It] is not going at all well so far [...] this new form for expressing myself is causing dreadful difficulties [...] I constantly feel as though I have not got six real parts but that I am in fact writing for the orchestra and just rearranging it for six string instruments. But perhaps it will go better when I get the hang of things.”⁴⁴ He did. One should recall that he was also capable of making the astonishing remark about *The Nutcracker* that it was “infinitely worse”⁴⁵ than *The Sleeping Beauty*. No great master

⁴¹ I am grateful to Professor David Wyn Jones for confirming the information regarding Haydn's chamber works (in a personal communication).

⁴² The natural sonority of stringed instruments and their ease in performance are facilitated by a composition having the tonic of D. The violin, viola and cello (also the double bass, though of course it only occasionally features in chamber works and neither the Rubinstein nor Tchaikovsky sextets employ it) each have a D string, an A string (D's dominant) and a G string (D's subdominant).

⁴³ With regard to more neutral coloring it is notable that Brahms sanctioned the performing of this work with a viola in place of the clarinet (resulting in an entirely homogeneous string ensemble).

⁴⁴ Orlova, *ibid.*, 371.

⁴⁵ Roland John Wiley, *Tchaikovsky* (Oxford/New York, 2009), 359.

has more consistently given ammunition to his detractors than Tchaikovsky, with resonances that have lasted to our own times. Standing in line behind Tchaikovsky himself as attackers of his music are Cui, the Viennese critic Eduard Hanslick (who, unlike the tergiversatory Cui at least had the good grace to show an openly aggressive tone in his reviews of the composer's work) and, in a later period, the scholar Donald Tovey. Furthermore, the phrase "as Tchaikovsky himself acknowledged" is one that has chimed with indiscriminating frequency throughout the often execrable mass of critical commentary on the composer. To try to stand between Tchaikovsky and his low self-esteem is a necessary task, otherwise we will never gain any chance of analyzing the depth of his genius.

The discipline of taking a starting-point in orchestral style and of proceeding from there to a chamber-music one resulted in what is perhaps an ideal balance in this string sextet, standing foursquare as it does in the ambiguous semi-orchestral sextet medium. That ambiguity was turned, in other words, to advantage - and also benefitted Brahms, albeit, as we saw, in a far more general way. The textural lucidity and vivacity of the writing, harnessing Tchaikovsky's full expertise as an orchestrator in allaying potential sluggishness in a large sustained body of sound gives an intense rhythmic dynamism to the work. Counterbalancing this is the composer's well-judged integration into the music of polyphonic material, culminating in a fugue subject in the finale's fugato that is both as sensually and as subtly designed for three pairs of stringed instruments as could be. The sense of creative release in the successful interweaving of these diverse elements lends the work a special aura, for arguably no other composition of Tchaikovsky's in any field has quite the stunning degree of lyricism as this. It was characteristically the case that the writing of the first composition in a particular category stimulated in Tchaikovsky his warmest expressiveness.⁴⁶ In his quartets, it was the *Andante cantabile* of the First String Quartet, as noted previously, that more fully displayed this quality than any other movement in the entire series. As chance would have it, Tchaikovsky's String Sextet is both his first and last essay in that format, but its status as its composer's initial exploration in a genre partly explains its remarkable depth of lyricism. The remaining part of that explanation surely resides in the fulfillment that comes from completing the exceptionally difficult technical task of melding orchestral and chamber style. The *Souvenir de Florence* is a life-affirming piece, as far from the painful spiritual rigors of the *Pathétique* Symphony's *Adagio lamentoso* as the anguish in the Piano Trio's finale is a sure step towards it.

Tchaikovsky's multifacetedness was too great, it would appear, for him to be able to see it for himself. It invests his chamber output at every turn.

⁴⁶ Cf. my earlier assessment of this point, in relation to the opera *The Voevoda*: Henry Zajackowski, *An Introduction to Tchaikovsky's Operas* (Westport, Connecticut/London, 2005), 8.