

November 2020

Joseph Haydn and the New Formenlehre: Teaching Sonata Form with His Solo Keyboard Works

James MacKay
Loyola University, New Orleans

Follow this and additional works at: <https://remix.berklee.edu/haydn-journal>

Recommended Citation

MacKay, James (2020) "Joseph Haydn and the New Formenlehre: Teaching Sonata Form with His Solo Keyboard Works," *HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America*: Vol. 10 : No. 2 , Article 4. Available at: <https://remix.berklee.edu/haydn-journal/vol10/iss2/4>

MacKay, James S. "Joseph Haydn and the New Formenlehre: Teaching Sonata Form with His Solo Keyboard Works."

HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America 10.2 (Fall 2020), <http://haydnjournal.org>.

© RIT Press and Haydn Society of North America, 2020. Duplication without the express permission of the author, RIT Press, and/or the Haydn Society of North America is prohibited.

Joseph Haydn and the New Formenlehre: Teaching Sonata Form with His Solo Keyboard Works¹

by James S. MacKay

Loyola University, New Orleans

Abstract

Haydn's keyboard works are endlessly fascinating, but they have seldom been the focus of any pedagogical approach to sonata form. This paper will demonstrate how these compositions, often neglected in the undergraduate curriculum, can serve as a springboard into a varied and nuanced understanding of sonata form. Using recent theories of form representative of the "New Formenlehre," such as William Caplin's theory of formal functions, Janet Schmalfeldt's process of "becoming," and James Hepokoski/Warren Darcy's Sonata Theory, I will show how Haydn's sonatas, if carefully selected, can provide students with a more flexible picture of how sonata form worked in the second half of the 18th century. Finally, through a close reading of a particularly challenging work (the slow movement of Haydn's Sonata in A-flat major, Hob. XVI: 46), I will show how these new theories of form can help students formulate criteria for making sense of the composer's often contradictory and complex musical decisions in sonata-form movements.

I. Introduction

Haydn's keyboard works are endlessly fascinating, but they have seldom been the focus of any pedagogical approach to sonata form. There are many reasons for this neglect. According to 19th- and early 20th-century opinion, Haydn's keyboard music compares poorly to the works of Beethoven and Mozart, both virtuosos who supposedly wrote more effectively for the instrument than Haydn. Moreover, few of Haydn's solo keyboard sonatas date from his full maturity: after 1784, Haydn wrote only five solo sonatas, focusing instead on the piano trio, of which he completed 27. Finally, many of

¹ This article is an expanded version of a paper presented at the HSNA mini-conference "New Perspectives on Haydn & C. P. E. Bach," Boston, MA, October 30-31, 2019. The author thanks the editor of this journal, and the anonymous reviewers, for the valuable suggestions that helped to shape the article into its current form.

MacKay, James S. "Joseph Haydn and the New Formenlehre: Teaching Sonata Form with His Solo Keyboard Works."

HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America 10.2 (Fall 2020), <http://haydnjournal.org>.

© RIT Press and Haydn Society of North America, 2020. Duplication without the express permission of the author, RIT Press, and/or the Haydn Society of North America is prohibited.

the sonatas, even the technically modest ones, are too unusual in structure to serve as exemplars of the form. Though unassailable in their musical logic, they fit the standard sonata-form model with difficulty, making them challenging as a first introduction to sonata form in an undergraduate setting.

This paper will demonstrate how Haydn's keyboard sonatas can serve as a springboard into a varied and nuanced understanding of sonata form. Using some recent theories of form, such as William Caplin's theory of formal functions, Janet Schmalfeldt's process of "becoming," and the insights of James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy's *Sonata Theory*, I will show how Haydn's sonatas, if carefully selected, can provide students with a more flexible picture of how sonata form worked in the second half of the 18th century. Finally, through a close reading of a particularly challenging work (the slow movement of Haydn's Sonata in A-flat major, Hob. XVI: 46), I will show how these new theories of form can help students formulate criteria for making sense of the composer's often contradictory and complex musical decisions in sonata-form movements.

II. Preliminaries: Caplin, Schmalfeldt, and Hepokoski/Darcy Summarized

A generation ago, William Caplin noted, "the time is ripe for a new theory of classical form."² Incorporating material from a 1987 article on the expanded cadential progression, and a 1994 article on hybrid themes, Caplin's 1998 book *Classical Form* introduced in full his new "theory of formal functions." Following the analytical thought of Arnold Schoenberg and Erwin Ratz, Caplin demonstrated that one can build a taxonomy of Classical form by tracing the interaction of phrases and phrase members, and their role in shaping the musical content (as beginning, middle, and ending gestures), both at the thematic level and at the level of the entire composition.

Caplin's theory of formal functions revitalized the study of form in the Austro-German Formenlehre tradition that goes back to Adolf Bernhard Marx (who codified sonata form in 1845), a tradition which had fallen into disrepute in the 20th century as being overly pedantic and inorganic. Caplin's example inspired other authors to revisit a form-based approach to Classical music, including Janet

² Caplin 1998, preface, 3.

MacKay, James S. "Joseph Haydn and the New Formenlehre: Teaching Sonata Form with His Solo Keyboard Works."

HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America 10.2 (Fall 2020), <http://haydnjournal.org>.

© RIT Press and Haydn Society of North America, 2020. Duplication without the express permission of the author, RIT Press, and/or the Haydn Society of North America is prohibited.

Schmalfeldt, James Hepokoski, and Warren Darcy. Often grouped together as exponents of the "New Formenlehre," these authors sought to reconcile traditional theories of form with the musical practice of the First Viennese School of composers (chiefly Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven).

Caplin and Schmalfeldt were colleagues for many years at McGill University in the 1980s, and Caplin's taxonomic approach to formal analysis benefited from Schmalfeldt's Hegelian view of "becoming"—of "form as process." A 1992 article titled "Cadential Processes: The Evaded Cadence and the One More Time Technique" was Schmalfeldt's first foray into the New Formenlehre corner of the field. Soon thereafter, a 1995 article on Beethoven's *Tempest* Sonata, Opus 31 no. 2, introduced the concept of "becoming" to the analytical community, in which a retrospective former analysis (denoted by an arrow) indicates a reinterpretation of a phrase or larger section's formal function. For instance, a continuation phrase—the middle phase of a sentence—may comprise an expanded cadential progression if its harmonic components proceed tonic-predominant-dominant-tonic. In such a case, Schmalfeldt would label this phrase, which begins like a continuation, but in retrospect forms a cadence, as continuation→cadential. Schmalfeldt's analytic approach would ultimately lead to the publication of *In the Process of Becoming* in 2011, a compilation of essays on form focusing primarily on early 19th century repertoire. These essays explore a variety of retrospective formal reinterpretations and demonstrate how they can play out at myriad formal levels and locations, especially in sonata form movements.³

Hepokoski and Darcy's theories post-date Caplin's and Schmalfeldt's by about a decade, at least in print. Their 1997 article on the medial caesura, a form of rhetorical punctuation that bisects a two-part exposition, summarized one of the crucial tenets of their Sonata Theory, which appeared in full in 2006, in their influential *Elements of Sonata Theory*. While Caplin focuses on differentiating between initiating, middle, and closing gestures as the building blocks of form, Hepokoski and Darcy focus on musical punctuation (the medial caesura, essential expositional closure, and essential structural closure) as markers of formal boundaries.⁴ Further, their comprehensive exploration of hundreds of

³ Schmalfeldt 2011 discusses many retrospective formal reinterpretations, including Introduction→Main Theme (39), Main Theme→Transition (40), and False Recapitulation→Retransition (79) among others.

⁴ Hepokoski/Darcy 2006, 23ff, 117ff, and 232ff.

Classical sonata movements by Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, and their lesser-known contemporaries prompted them to establish a set of normative formal procedures for the Classical sonata. These norms comprise a range of default solutions to formal problems, based on their frequency of use in the repertoire. Their analytical approach, built around stylistic norms and common default options, works especially well for Mozart, but is decidedly problematic in dealing with Haydn's use of the form.

III. A Matched Pair: Hob. XVI: 31 and 32

Sonata form is traditionally the purview of sophomore-level courses, proceeding from a foundation of species counterpoint, diatonic part writing, harmonic analysis (including standard cadence types), and formal analysis at the level of the motive, phrase, and theme. All of these topics inform the analysis of short forms (chiefly binary form), in preparation for sonata form.

I begin by examining sonata expositions in isolation, before turning to a detailed consideration of complete movements. At this stage, I point out that sonata form traces the same tonal (and thematic) path as a modulating rounded binary work. Thus, a sonata-form movement illustrates many of the same techniques (modulation, development, thematic return) that students have already encountered in the context of short forms.

The first movements of Haydn's Sonata in E major, Hob. XVI: 31, and Sonata in b minor, Hob. XVI: 32, both hail from the *Anno 1776* sonatas. ([Score: Band 2, Nos. 31 and 32, pages 79-82 and 87-90.](#)) The beginning of Hob. XVI: 31 demonstrates the balance of the standard two-part exposition: its 24-bar exposition divides neatly into two 12-bar segments (Main Theme plus Transition, and Subordinate Theme plus Codetta). Here, one can introduce Hepokoski and Darcy's concept of *medial caesura* (MC) to describe the musical break at the exposition's midpoint. The eight-bar main theme unfolds in sentence design, and the ensuing four-bar transition (a model-sequence unit that concludes with a half cadence in the dominant), aptly illustrate common form-functional strategies in the Classical period.

In considering the exposition's second half, which likewise begins with a sentence-like unit, I introduce Caplin's rule that subordinate themes, (virtually) always end with a perfect authentic

MacKay, James S. “Joseph Haydn and the New Formenlehre: Teaching Sonata Form with His Solo Keyboard Works.”

HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America 10.2 (Fall 2020), <http://haydnjournal.org>.

© RIT Press and Haydn Society of North America, 2020. Duplication without the express permission of the author, RIT Press, and/or the Haydn Society of North America is prohibited.

cadence.⁵ This principle, paired with the concept of *essential expositional closure* (EEC) from Hepokoski and Darcy’s Sonata Theory, can stimulate discussion about the boundary between subordinate theme and codetta (closing) material. Haydn provides two possible candidates for the EEC: the beginning of bar 21 and the middle of bar 23 both feature a PAC, thus influencing how a performer might shape the final few bars.⁶

As a complement to the above discussion, the beginning of Haydn’s Sonata in b minor, Hob. XVI: 32 demonstrates a normative two-part exposition in minor mode, with the subordinate theme in the relative major.⁷ One major difference from Hob. XVI: 31: the transition begins with a main theme incipit, thus forming the statement-counterstatement design mentioned in 19th-century discussions of sonata form. This strategy provides an opportunity to discuss the difference between modulation (the point at which the material deviates from the home key) and transition as a formal construct (the beginning of the phrase that begins that process). Like Hob. XVI: 31, there are two potential candidates for Hepokoski and Darcy’s EEC, since the subordinate theme’s cadential segment appears twice. Once again, the change in musical content following the second PAC marks it as the more convincing EEC.

As a next step, we would then explore these works’ second halves, beginning with a discussion of development strategies. Caplin proposes a tripartite pre-core/core/retransition model for developments—the core being a central *Sturm und Drang* passage in model/sequence design—though he notes that this formal strategy is more common in Mozart and Beethoven than in Haydn.⁸

⁵ Caplin 1998, 97. Footnote 10 mentions two famous exceptional cases: the opening movement of Haydn’s opus 74 no. 3 and Beethoven’s Opus 106.

⁶ In some sonata expositions, one could point to the trill on the second degree at a cadence point—a technique borrowed from concerto form—to assist in this decision, but both cadence points in this work (and Hob. XVI: 32, discussed below) include an embellished second degree.

⁷ If the question arises, one can refer to the alternative possibility of the minor dominant as a “second level default”: cf. Hepokoski/Darcy 2006, 119.

⁸ Caplin 1998, 141-42.

MacKay, James S. "Joseph Haydn and the New Formenlehre: Teaching Sonata Form with His Solo Keyboard Works."

HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America 10.2 (Fall 2020), <http://haydnjournal.org>.

© RIT Press and Haydn Society of North America, 2020. Duplication without the express permission of the author, RIT Press, and/or the Haydn Society of North America is prohibited.

Notably, neither of these developments neatly illustrates Caplin's model, which can stimulate discussion of other formal strategies. Hob. XVI: 31 is closer to Caplin's tripartite design. Haydn begins with a double statement of main theme material, first in the subordinate key, then in the tonic key, a common early Classical strategy. He then segues into a *Sturm und Drang* passage in C-sharp minor, ending with a half cadence. A core-like passage follows, and a two-bar fleeting emphasis of the dominant serves as retransition.

The development of Hob. XVI: 32 is monothematic, focusing exclusively on main theme material. Haydn states the main theme incipit first in the subdominant and later in the minor dominant, leading to a four-bar dominant pedal as retransition. This dramatic emphasis of the dominant, punctuated by jagged dotted rhythms, is unusually long for Haydn, who, unlike Beethoven, generally preferred to downplay this formal juncture. This stylistic difference and its effect on our perception of the form can be a good stimulus for further discussion.⁹

These works also provide an opportunity to discuss recapitulation strategies. In Hob. XVI: 31, the differences between the exposition and recapitulation (barring the requisite transposition of the subordinate theme to the tonic key) are unusually slight. Haydn varies the restatement of the basic idea, introducing a chromatic version in parallel thirds that never recurs. A quick harmonic detour allows the transition to begin a fifth lower than in the exposition, following which the remainder of the recapitulation is fundamentally the same as the exposition, transposed to the home key.

Hob. XVI: 32 is equally efficient. Haydn alters the main theme's continuation phrase to end with a half cadence, after which the subordinate theme follows, transposed to the home key but otherwise unaltered. Since there is no modulation, Haydn omits the transition altogether, a common formal strategy. This musical decision could also open up avenues for discussion. If the transition is truly absent, how does Haydn compensate for this omission by how he alters the main theme's conclusion (HC as opposed to PAC)? More profoundly, how meaningful is the transition label in the recapitulation (and in many expositions, for that matter) when there is no modulation, as was the case

⁹ The two-bar dominant pedal in Hob. XVI: 31 is more typical in scope for Haydn's practice, as is the single bar in Hob. XVI: 20. In Hob. XVI: 18, first movement, the dominant pedal is absent altogether.

MacKay, James S. "Joseph Haydn and the New Formenlehre: Teaching Sonata Form with His Solo Keyboard Works."

HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America 10.2 (Fall 2020), <http://haydnjournal.org>.

© RIT Press and Haydn Society of North America, 2020. Duplication without the express permission of the author, RIT Press, and/or the Haydn Society of North America is prohibited.

in Hob. XVI: 31? These questions could open up discussion of other rationales for restating musical material—for maintaining the rotation of material initially presented in the exposition (per Hepokoski and Darcy's Sonata Theory¹⁰), or to maintain the movement's formal or motivic balance.

Haydn's unusually modest revision of his material in both movements makes the identification of formal units relatively straightforward. As such, these works are a good introduction to Haydn's use of sonata form, serving as a jumping-off point for his more challenging uses of the form.

IV. Haydn and the Monothematic Exposition

After the student has learned the norms of Classical sonata form, the next step would be to turn to variants of the form that are associated primarily with Haydn. One feature of Haydn's sonata form that is virtually unique to him is the monothematic exposition, in which the subordinate theme group begins with the main theme incipit transposed to the subordinate key, a strategy that begins to appear in his keyboard sonatas in the 1770s.¹¹ If students have learned to view tonal, and not thematic, contrast as the driving force in a Classical sonata exposition, this variant of sonata form should pose few problems. In fact, the presence of the main theme incipit can greatly assist the student in identifying the subordinate theme's location.

This motivic re-use is particularly striking when it includes a change of mode, as is found in most minor-mode sonata form expositions. As a result, a good first example of this technique would be the Sonata in C-sharp minor, Hob. XVI: 36, one of the Auenbrugger set published in 1780. ([Score: Band 2, No. 36, pages 127-28.](#)) This sonata exposition demonstrates a subtler reuse of material: the opening motto is part of a longer, expansive gesture at its initial appearance, but becomes truncated to a single

¹⁰ Hepokoski/Darcy 2006, 16-18, uses this term to refer to the expected sequence of thematic events in the exposition and recapitulation.

¹¹ Rosen 1988, 5, and Larsen 1963/2013, 11-12, remark upon this unique aspect of Haydn's sonata-form practice. The first movement of Mozart's Sonata in B-flat major, K. 570 provides a rare non-Haydn example.

MacKay, James S. "Joseph Haydn and the New Formenlehre: Teaching Sonata Form with His Solo Keyboard Works."

HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America 10.2 (Fall 2020), <http://haydnjournal.org>.

© RIT Press and Haydn Society of North America, 2020. Duplication without the express permission of the author, RIT Press, and/or the Haydn Society of North America is prohibited.

bar (followed by its varied repetition on the dominant) when it reappears in bar 12 to begin the subordinate theme.¹²

The varied re-presentation of opening material is typical of Haydn's monothematic sonata-form movements in his late period: three of his final four piano sonatas (Hob. XVI: 49, 50, and 52) begin with such a movement. Any of these works, in conjunction with the c-sharp minor sonata discussed above, would provide the student with an adequate introduction to this composer-specific formal procedure. In Hob. XVI: 49 and 52, Haydn recalls the opening material as a motivic device, before continuing with a full subordinate theme that focuses on entirely new material. In Hob. XVI: 50, Haydn restates opening material nearly in full, and adds a new sixteenth note countermelody. All of these movements confirm that during Haydn's active period as a composer, it was *tonal* contrast, and not *thematic* contrast, that was the more crucial component of a sonata exposition. We can recall Larsen's remarks in this regard:

The agents of form construction and of form perception are not primarily the themes, but rather the underlying tonal progression and the changing formal function of the successive periods [sections]. The import of the themes can indeed be truly significant, but the formal function is basically the carrier of the themes, not the other way around.¹³

Recognizing the monothematic exposition as a common feature in Haydn's works can assist the student in locating the subordinate theme in problematic cases, such as his Sonata in E-flat major, Hob. XVI: 38. ([Score: Band 2, No. 38, pages 143-44.](#)) Like its companion from the Auenbrugger Sonatas (Hob. XVI: 36 in C-sharp minor), the opening movement features two statements of main theme material, once in the home key, and once in the subordinate key. Unlike the earlier movement, this exposition has two possible medial caesuras: an early HC in the home key (bar 12) and a later one in the subordinate key (bar 18). As such, it has two plausible points for the subordinate theme's onset: bar 13 or 19. The earlier potential theme, located near the exposition's exact midpoint, begins with a

¹² Moreover, this material also initiates the transition: per Rosen 1988, 2, this repetition of main theme material creates the traditional statement-counterstatement design.

¹³ Larsen 1963/2013, 13.

MacKay, James S. "Joseph Haydn and the New Formenlehre: Teaching Sonata Form with His Solo Keyboard Works."

HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America 10.2 (Fall 2020), <http://haydnjournal.org>.

© RIT Press and Haydn Society of North America, 2020. Duplication without the express permission of the author, RIT Press, and/or the Haydn Society of North America is prohibited.

Main Theme incipit, making it a convincing location for this formal boundary based on Haydn's typical thematic practice. One can make a convincing argument in favor of bar 19, however: although a notably later onset for the subordinate theme than is typical, it is nonetheless the first thematic material that is incontrovertibly in the subordinate key, following as it does the first cadence in that key. Here, one could introduce Hepokoski/Darcy's concept of the trimodular block, in which the composer presents a potential subordinate theme, only to reject it in favor of a more suitable one, according to the norms of the Classical era.¹⁴

The underlying question about the subordinate theme's beginning would be framed thus in the scholarly literature: does the exposition have a two-part transition (bars 9-18) or a two-part subordinate theme (beginning in bar 13ff.)?¹⁵ To be certain, the specific terminology is of greatest interest to researchers who employ a New Formenlehre analytical approach. In generic terms, one can pose this question more simply—what material groups with what? Knowing the thematic and tonal strategies that are typical of Haydn can help the student to make this determination, as well as to quantify in what fundamental ways Haydn's practice differs from that of his contemporaries—an assertion often implicit in the field, but seldom explained with any specifics beyond the most superficial.

Haydn's music requires an audience that recognizes the conventional aspects of form and style. His clever avoidance of convention contributes to the wit in his music, no doubt to the delight of a knowing listener. The variety, intricacy, and deliberate ambiguity of his formal strategies engages and challenges the listener in following the logic of a composition as it unfolds. The insights provided by the New Formenlehre can assist the student in quantifying how Haydn's logic shapes his musical content.

¹⁴ Hepokoski/Darcy 2006, 170-77 discusses the trimodular block. Monahan 2011, 99, FN 49, notes that this concept provides challenges in terminology for the beginning student, and recommends a casual, ad hoc approach to labeling, tied closely to the specifics of the movement under consideration.

¹⁵ Caplin 1998, 117 and 135-38; see also Wiens 2010, 46-49.

MacKay, James S. "Joseph Haydn and the New Formenlehre: Teaching Sonata Form with His Solo Keyboard Works."

HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America 10.2 (Fall 2020), <http://haydnjournal.org>.

© RIT Press and Haydn Society of North America, 2020. Duplication without the express permission of the author, RIT Press, and/or the Haydn Society of North America is prohibited.

V. Sonata-Form Problems: Haydn and the Three-Part Exposition

As Jens Peter Larsen noted in his 1963 article, "Sonata Form Problems," one common feature of Haydn's sonata-form movements that is virtually unique to him is the three-part exposition.¹⁶ Derived from mid-18th century formal practice (especially that of C. P. E. Bach), such an exposition features a developmental *expansion section* that mediates the main theme in the home key, and closing (codetta) material in the subordinate key.¹⁷ This dynamic curve, which focuses on tonal process rather than thematic succession, results in a gradual establishment of the secondary key over the course of the exposition. Hepokoski and Darcy's assertion that the lack of a medial caesura automatically signifies a three-part exposition is a possible litmus test.¹⁸ Such expositions also permit reintroducing Schmalfeldt's process of "becoming," which aptly explains the formal nuance of the three-part exposition. An expansion section serves as Transition→Subordinate Theme, combining the features of both formal functions.¹⁹

Along with opening movements from a pair of late symphonies (Nos. 82 and 97), Larsen singles out the opening movement of Haydn's Sonata in C minor, Hob. XVI: 20, as a particularly elegant example of the three-part exposition. ([Score: Band 1, No. 20, pages 120-21.](#)) This movement provides a challenge for any student expecting to find a subordinate theme in every sonata form movement. Approaching this work with that particular preconception might tempt the student to identify bar 15, with its double statement of new material in the subordinate key, as the best location for this theme's onset. However, an examination of the prior material confirms that this is a forced reading. The B-flat major chord with doubled third in bar 13 *could* be misconstrued as a dominant of E-flat major, and thus the exposition's medial caesura. However, its context as the goal of a sequential passage, the

¹⁶ This term has some overlap with James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy's *continuous exposition*: cf. Hepokoski/Darcy 2006, 51-64.

¹⁷ The term derives from Fillion 1976. Larsen's term (*Entwicklungspartie*) appears as "elaboration section" in Larsen 1963/2013, 9. More recently, Ludwig 2010, Ludwig 2013, and Martin 2014 have revisited and expanded Larsen's concept.

¹⁸ Hepokoski/Darcy 2006, 52. They do acknowledge that there is room for analytical nuance, especially in expositions wherein the two-part and three-part exposition models are in dialogue with each other.

¹⁹ Compare Caplin 1998, 203, which uses the term Transition/Subordinate Theme to describe this formal design, as noted in Martin 2014, 1.

MacKay, James S. "Joseph Haydn and the New Formenlehre: Teaching Sonata Form with His Solo Keyboard Works."

HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America 10.2 (Fall 2020), <http://haydnjournal.org>.

© RIT Press and Haydn Society of North America, 2020. Duplication without the express permission of the author, RIT Press, and/or the Haydn Society of North America is prohibited.

persistent dominant pedal F that precedes it, as well as its unusual doubling, mark it as a local tonic rather than a dominant. Subsequent dominant arrivals in bars 26 and 31 are equally problematic as medial caesuras, since Haydn adds a chordal seventh to both dominant chords (and a chordal ninth, amazingly, to the earlier one), compromising their role as points of rest.

Larsen's designation of this exposition as being tripartite effectively solves the analytical impasse. His analysis breaks down the exposition as follows: Main Theme: bars 1-8, Expansion Section: bars 9-26, Closing Section: bars 26-37.²⁰ If students are proficient at recognizing the standard rhetorical markers that typically conclude a transition, this movement's understated (or thwarted) dominant arrivals will not lead them to infer a medial caesura. Moreover, in applying the lessons learned from this movement to other, later repertoire, they may see how vestiges of the three-part exposition influence sonata-form practices in composers such as Beethoven and Schubert.²¹

VI: For Advanced Study—Hob. XVI: 46, Second Movement

Though it is easy to select movements from Haydn's voluminous keyboard output that conform to the formal principles outlined above, it is equally instructive to apply these principles to his problematic examples of sonata form. Specifically, his pre-1775 use of the form is endlessly varied and often resistant to analytical tools of the New Formenlehre. (This is not surprising, since these tools were designed primarily to explain the procedures of the High Classical Period, of ca. 1775-1800.) This caveat notwithstanding, it is instructive to apply some of these principles to certain of Haydn's early essays in the form, despite the challenge this endeavor entails. For instance, as many authors have

²⁰ As proposed in Larsen 1963/2013, 9. Following Martin 2004, 6, I would begin the closing section in bar 32, with the onset of the new accompaniment texture (Alberti bass) and the higher register in both hands. Granted, either reading will challenge the students to consider what criteria they may use to determine such formal boundaries, and to weigh the merits of alternate readings.

²¹ Rosen 1997, 488ff. notes the tripartite structure of the exposition from the first movement of Beethoven's Sonata in A-flat major, Opus 110. Thus, though primarily associated with Haydn, this expositional strategy continued to influence composers well into the 19th century.

MacKay, James S. "Joseph Haydn and the New Formenlehre: Teaching Sonata Form with His Solo Keyboard Works."

HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America 10.2 (Fall 2020), <http://haydnjournal.org>.

© RIT Press and Haydn Society of North America, 2020. Duplication without the express permission of the author, RIT Press, and/or the Haydn Society of North America is prohibited.

noted, the string quartets Opus 9 and 17, composed ca. 1768-71, are wonderfully problematic when viewed through the lens of High Classical sonata-form practice.²²

Since the focus of this essay is on Haydn's keyboard music, we will conclude by examining one of Haydn's formally elusive sonata-form movements from his keyboard output: the slow movement of his Sonata in A-flat major, Hob. XVI: 46, of ca. 1767-68.²³ Employing Caplin's theory of formal functions, and Hepokoski/Darcy's Sonata Theory, we can identify many of the standard features of sonata form in this movement, yet note that their use differs somewhat from the norm. In works such as this, which provide the listener with conflicting formal signals, it is profitable to add Schmalfeldt's concept of "becoming" to the analytical mix. By allowing the possibility of blended formal functions, we can better examine and quantify the work's formal elusiveness. The following discussion, by combining these analytic approaches, will seek to provide an exhaustive analysis of the movement's oft-elusive formal content.

Table 1: Hob. XVI: 46, II: Cadential goals in exposition

Measure	Cadence Type (Key)	Comments
4	PAC (D-flat major)	Two-voice texture, tonic prolongation
8	IAC (D-flat major)	Repeats Phrase 1, countermelody added
12	HC (A-flat major)	Rather brief and weakly defined
18	HC (A-flat major)	Extended by dominant pedal to measure 20
24	IAC (A-flat major)	Cadential phrase
28	PAC (A-flat major)	Repeats preceding phrase

Let us begin with the exposition. Contrary to the normative form that features a medial caesura at the exposition's midpoint, this work features a sequence of cadences, suggesting a gradual drift to the dominant rather than the tonic-dominant polarity that a traditional two-part exposition would provide

²² Cf. Landon 1978, Webster 2005, MacKay 2014, Birson 2014 and 2015, all of which discuss formal aspects of the Opus 9 and 17 quartets in detail.

²³ This proposed composition date follows Brown 1986, 119.

MacKay, James S. "Joseph Haydn and the New Formenlehre: Teaching Sonata Form with His Solo Keyboard Works."

HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America 10.2 (Fall 2020), <http://haydnjournal.org>.

© RIT Press and Haydn Society of North America, 2020. Duplication without the express permission of the author, RIT Press, and/or the Haydn Society of North America is prohibited.

(see Table 1). Though the large-scale form of this movement is problematic, the exposition's moment-by-moment design is unusually straightforward for Haydn: but for the eight-bar model-sequence passage of bars 13-20, the exposition breaks neatly into four-bar phrases, as shown in Example 1.

Based on their parallel phrase beginnings, the phrase pair in bars 1-8 form a unit, as does the phrase pair of bars 21-28. However, neither of these passages is a *complete* musical unit. Bars 5-8 duplicate bars 1-4, the only difference being a countermelody added above the original two-voice pair: thus, both phrases are beginning gestures, rather than a beginning gesture followed by a closing gesture as would be required for a complete theme. Similarly, bars 21-24, and its repetition in bars 25-28, are both expanded cadential progressions:²⁴ thus, both passages are closing gestures. Due to the lack of an interruption on V, neither bars 1-8 or 21-28 truly express a periodic structure. Though Caplin permits an imperfect authentic cadence (IAC) to conclude an antecedent phrase, which would allow bars 24-31 to comprise an anomalous period, I suggest that an opening phrase-type that returns to a tonic chord suggests a tonic prolongation rather than a cadential arrival (thus resembling a presentation phrase, or an expanded basic idea).²⁵

Where do the middle phrases fall in this design, formally speaking? Bars 9-12 effect a modulation to the dominant key, and bar 13ff. establishes this new key with a model-sequence span. Traditionally, analysts have labeled bars 9-12 as a brief transition, and bar 13 as the onset of the subordinate theme, but if bars 1-8 comprise an incomplete formal unit, then one or more of these segments would have to accrue to it to complete the opening span. If Phrase 3 completes the first formal unit, this passage begins with a 12-bar span (basic idea/basic idea repeated/modulating continuation), forming a main theme→transition blended formal unit.²⁶ Bars 13-28 would follow as a compound basic idea in bars 13-20 (model-sequence, plus cadence and dominant pedal), followed by continuation→cadential, stated twice.

²⁴ Caplin defines the expanded cadential progression (ECP, for short as a cadential progression (initial tonic-predominant-dominant-tonic) that spans an entire phrase: see Caplin 1998, 254. As a theme's closing gesture, such a phrase, as a nod to Schmalfeldt, serves as continuation→cadential (Caplin 1998, 45-47).

²⁵ Cf. Caplin 1998, 51, and example 4.2, 50.

²⁶ Schmalfeldt 2011, 40 (regarding Beethoven's "Tempest" Sonata in d minor, Opus 31 no. 2), and 119 (regarding Schubert's Sonata in a minor, D. 845), broach this formal possibility.

Example 1: Haydn, Sonata in A-flat major, Hob. XVI:46, second movement (after *Oeuvres Complètes* version): Formal analysis of exposition (bars 1–28)

The musical score is presented in a grand staff format (treble and bass clefs). It is divided into five main sections with descriptive labels above the staves:

- OPENING GESTURE (bars 1-6):** Labeled "basic idea (tonic prolongation)" and "(basic idea repeated)". It features a piano (*p*) dynamic and a PAC (Phrase Accent) in D-flat major.
- MIDDLE GESTURE (continuation) (bars 7-12):** Labeled "IAC, D-flat major" and "HC, A-flat major". It includes a triplet of eighth notes in the right hand.
- (model-sequence) (bars 13-16):** Labeled "(a)" and marked *mf*. It features sixteenth-note runs with trills.
- (dominant affirmation) (bars 17-22):** Labeled "HC, A-flat major". It includes a *f* dynamic and a triplet of eighth notes.
- CLOSING GESTURE (bars 23-28):** Labeled "IAC, A-flat major" and "PAC (A-flat major)". It includes a *f* dynamic, a *p* dynamic, and a triplet of eighth notes.

Additional annotations include "basic idea (tonic prolongation)", "PAC, D-flat major", "IAC, D-flat major", "HC, A-flat major", "HC, A-flat major", "IAC, A-flat major", and "PAC (A-flat major)".

(a) D-flat in modern editions (b) parallel to measure 21 in modern editions

MacKay, James S. "Joseph Haydn and the New Formenlehre: Teaching Sonata Form with His Solo Keyboard Works."

HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America 10.2 (Fall 2020), <http://haydnjournal.org>.

© RIT Press and Haydn Society of North America, 2020. Duplication without the express permission of the author, RIT Press, and/or the Haydn Society of North America is prohibited.

The deliberate ambiguity of the exposition's musical signals permits other interpretations. For instance, the exposition could be construed as a three-part structure—eight bars of presentation, plus a 16-bar expansion section, ending with eight bars of closing material—based on the transitional character of bars 13-20.²⁷ Viewed thus, bars 1-12 would be main theme→expansion section (part 1), and bars 13-28 follow as an expansion section (part 2)→closing section. As a final possibility, the emphatic dominant emphasis of bars 18-20 could suggest a medial caesura.²⁸ This analysis divides the exposition into two formal segments of decidedly unequal length: main theme→expansion section (bars 1-20) followed by closing section (bars 21-28). However formally imbalanced that reading appears to be, it would still be a syntactical possibility.²⁹

I present these multiple readings primarily to stimulate discussion. In the final analysis, the exact points of division in this exposition are not necessary for an understanding of Haydn's formal procedures. There is no incontrovertible medial caesura in the exposition: Haydn instead drifts gradually to the subordinate key with ever-more-final cadences confirming it; thus, Schmalfeldt's "becoming," with its blending of formal functions, seems to be the best option for mapping the formal trajectory of this exposition onto its rhetorical shape. It is a good exercise for students with sufficient keyboard skills to perform the exposition according to each of the readings suggested above: how might a performer use dynamics, tempo, and brief caesuras to project the desired formal design?

Perhaps the best solution would be to label bars 1-28 as a tripartite blended formal unit (main theme→expansion section→closing section), encompassing the entire exposition. Within this unit, we can still identify Caplin's formal functions: two opening phrases, two intermediate phrases (the second being the extended model-sequence plus cadence of bars 13-20), and two closing phrases. Schmalfeldt's process of "becoming" describes *what* Haydn does, while Caplin's formal functions elucidate precisely *how* he accomplishes it, phrase by phrase.

²⁷ The developmental character of model-sequence suggests continuation function, per Caplin 1998, 42.

²⁸ Cf. Hepokoski/Darcy 2006, 24-25.

²⁹ Hepokoski/Darcy 2006, 39, states that such a medial caesura typically occurs between the 25% and 50% (rarely 60%) point of the exposition. A late medial caesura (at the 71% mark) creating a 5:2 ratio of first half to second half, would be highly irregular. (The prior analysis of a 12 bar/16 bar division, suggested above, would result in a more normative 3:4 ratio of first half to second half).

This strategy of formal blending continues in the movement's second half as well, as if Haydn's formal elusiveness in the exposition set the tone for the movement as a whole. Nevertheless, the development poses few problems for the beginning analyst. Per early Classical convention, Haydn begins the development with the main theme in the subordinate key, as shown in Example 2. Diligent students may note the resemblance to the "head-rounding" strategy of many binary compositions, wherein the two halves begin with similar motivic material.

Example 2: Haydn, Sonata in A-flat major, Hob XVI:46, second movement (per *Oeuvres Complètes*): Beginning of development, leading to main theme incipit (bars 29–46)

(= main theme, phrase 1)

(a) G-flat in Henle edition

HC, D-flat major

MacKay, James S. "Joseph Haydn and the New Formenlehre: Teaching Sonata Form with His Solo Keyboard Works."

HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America 10.2 (Fall 2020), <http://haydnjournal.org>.

© RIT Press and Haydn Society of North America, 2020. Duplication without the express permission of the author, RIT Press, and/or the Haydn Society of North America is prohibited.

This phrase then spins off sequentially by ascending fifths (touching upon E-flat, B-flat and F minor) creating a model-sequence design that is typical of the development's core, invoking Caplin's terminology. It is worthwhile to note, however, that a core that is not set up rhetorically with a pre-core section—as this movement seems to do—is uncommon.³⁰ This core is also atypical in character: it does not explore a *Sturm und Drang* mood, instead unfolding sedately and ruminatively in three-part counterpoint, before arriving surreptitiously upon a HC in the home key in bar 44.

At first, one might accept this elusive HC as the tonal goal of a concise, intense 16-bar development. (Haydn, unlike Mozart or Beethoven, often downplays the dominant arrival at development's end, so the understated nature of this cadence would not necessarily disqualify it from serving a concluding role.) However, what Haydn does in the following bars puts this reading into serious question (Example 3). Bar 45, confirming our first impression, seems initially to be the onset of the recapitulation, reprising the main theme's two-voice incipit from bar 1, with a third voice adding harmonic clarity. However, the theme breaks off quickly, midway through its second bar: a triplet figure and upward registral shift highlights this abandonment.

Haydn repeats this material by sequence in the following bars, a strategy suggestive of a development section. The two bars of dominant arrival that conclude the final sequential repetition—bars 50-51, ending with a fermata on a first inversion dominant seventh—overtly mark this arrival as the true goal of the development. Nonetheless, the nebulous passage that mediates the HC of bar 44 and the dominant arrival of bars 50-51 gives conflicting musical signals: harmonically, this segment still suggests the development, while thematically (or at least motivically), it recalls the main theme, beginning the movement's second rotation through the thematic events initially presented in the exposition. To be certain, this juncture occurs approximately where one might expect the main theme to return, based on Hepokoski and Darcy's concept of rotation. However, Haydn's immediate resumption of developmental techniques (the main theme incipit initiates a model-sequence passage) gives us pause. Following Schmalfeldt's process of "becoming," one could see this passage as a

³⁰ Caplin 1998, 147. Footnote 32 cites a few high-profile examples of core without pre-core, including Haydn's *Sinfonia Concertante* in B-flat, Hob. I: 105, and Beethoven's *Kreutzer* sonata, Opus 47.)

retransition→recapitulation unit, whose gradual move from elaboration to restatement evinces a blending of development and recapitulation at the deepest structural level.³¹

Example 3: Haydn, Hob. XVI: 46, second movement, bars 42–59 (per *Oeuvres Complètes*):
Development blending with recapitulation (Retransition==>Recapitulation module)

RETRANSITION

HC, D-flat major

V⁷ arrival

==>RECAPITULATION (= measure 13ff, in home key)

HC V pedal...

³¹ Schmalfeldt 2011, 67 (and Footnote 28) suggests this formal possibility for the opening movement of Haydn's String Quartet in C major, Opus 33 no. 3 ("The Bird").

Example 4: Haydn, Sonata in A-flat major, Hob. XVI: 46, second movement (per *Oeuvres Complètes*): Concluding measures of recapitulation (bars 60–80)

Continuation=>cadential progression (NB. MT incipit near beginning) "One more time"

Dissolves into: Cadenza-like passage

(IAC)

crescendo

tr (b)

(a) PAC

(a) B-flat in all other editions (b) Upper A-flat added in later editions (by inference with the following measure)

MacKay, James S. "Joseph Haydn and the New Formenlehre: Teaching Sonata Form with His Solo Keyboard Works."

HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America 10.2 (Fall 2020), <http://haydnjournal.org>.

© RIT Press and Haydn Society of North America, 2020. Duplication without the express permission of the author, RIT Press, and/or the Haydn Society of North America is prohibited.

Perhaps surprisingly, Haydn does not reprise the main theme after this grand pause: this theme's premature statement in bar 45 would make a return of this material redundant so soon afterward. Rather, as shown in Example 4, Haydn follows this dominant arrival with the thematic material of bar 13-20, transposed to the tonic, thus joining the recapitulation *in media res*.³²

Once again, as in the exposition, these ambiguities can provide an opportunity for discussion. How might a performer downplay (or highlight) the seeming return of the main theme in bars 45-46, to project this passage as either a false recapitulation or a genuine one? (Certainly, the interjections in the upper register give this thematic return—however the performer and listener interpret it—a somewhat wistful quality, especially if one sets these moments in relief with a change in dynamics and a slight rubato.) Also, how does the withholding of main theme material following the extended dominant pedal of bars 50-51 impact the listening experience? When Haydn thwarts this formal expectation, do we as listeners feel surprised, or cheated? On the contrary, do we understand in retrospect that Haydn compensates for the absent main theme with its fleeting appearance in the home key in bar 45, as well as its prevalence throughout the development? Furthermore, if multiple interpretations of this passage are possible, might this provide an impetus for the performer to observe the repeat of the development and recapitulation? This wholesale repetition would provide the performer with space to explore a different formal reading the second time around.

After an emphatic HC in bar 57 (followed by an extended V pedal, as in the exposition), Haydn begins the closing phrases in bar 60, corresponding to the material of bar 21ff. from the exposition. However, in a clever twist, he tweaks the phrase's beginning gesture to resemble the previously suppressed main theme incipit. As before, the opening phrase ends on an open-ended IAC. This time, however, the parallel phrase that follows is even more elusive, resolving slyly to the submediant (forming a deceptive cadence). A cadenza-like passage follows, touching upon the tonic minor, followed by its lowered submediant, B double flat major, which, despite the reading challenge for the performer, Haydn declines to spell in the more convenient enharmonic key of A major. This remote excursion includes a G-flat minor chord in first inversion, cleverly recalling the harmony of bar 49 that prepared

³² As Caplin 1998, 173 notes (citing Rosen 1988, 144-45), this formal strategy is "normative in midcentury works." Hepokoski/Darcy 2006, 353ff. describes this strategy as the "Type 2" Sonata.

MacKay, James S. “Joseph Haydn and the New Formenlehre: Teaching Sonata Form with His Solo Keyboard Works.”

HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America 10.2 (Fall 2020), <http://haydnjournal.org>.

© RIT Press and Haydn Society of North America, 2020. Duplication without the express permission of the author, RIT Press, and/or the Haydn Society of North America is prohibited.

the way for the recapitulation. These highly improvisatory bars, a challenging musical span replete with accidentals, are a fascinating tonal excursion comparable to Chopin’s most chromatic moments!

Yet this tonal digression is certainly of its time, despite its seeming adventurousness: Johann Georg Sulzer, in his *Allgemeine Theorie der schönen Künste* (1771–74), champions the use of “sudden modulations and digressions from one key to another that are all the more striking the more distant their relation.³³” It is beyond question that in the late 1760s, an emphasis of the lowered submediant region, further highlighted by its dominant seventh harmony, as Haydn presents over a three-bar span, counts as a “striking, distant digression.”

Finally, the easy availability of older editions online permits us to engage in a bit of minutiae for the interested observer, drawing students’ attention to potential textual issues that may arise as to various editions’ musical content and accuracy. When this chromatic excursion concludes, the bass note changes from B double flat to B flat in bar 53, supporting a secondary vii⁰⁶ chord, prior to the cadential six-four chord that ushers in the final PAC. Though this alteration in the bass is seen in virtually all editions, it seems *a propos* to retain the B-double flat as the bass of an Italian augmented sixth chord (per the *Oeuvres complètes* of 1799), which creates a more seamless musical link to the cadential six-four chord and subsequent cadenza, *ad libitum*.³⁴ Moreover, it recalls the B double flat from bar 49 that provided a chromatic approach to the dominant just before the recapitulation. Ultimately, this issue speaks to one of the most important roles of music theory training: to provide criteria for making decisions about what notes to play when the available editions differ as to musical content.

³³ Summarized in Baker-Christensen 1995, 106.

³⁴ The editions of the late 19th and early 20th century (Peters, Schirmer, Breitkopf and Stuttgart) generally follow the *Oeuvres complètes*, but all ignore the clearly signed B double flat in bar 76, for unknown reasons! (The more recent Wiener Urtext and Henle editions, basing their reading on earlier manuscript copies of the work, have B-flat here as well.)

MacKay, James S. "Joseph Haydn and the New Formenlehre: Teaching Sonata Form with His Solo Keyboard Works."

HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America 10.2 (Fall 2020), <http://haydnjournal.org>.

© RIT Press and Haydn Society of North America, 2020. Duplication without the express permission of the author, RIT Press, and/or the Haydn Society of North America is prohibited.

VII. Conclusion

Though Haydn's use of sonata form can seem idiosyncratic, it does not confront the analyst with insoluble formal problems. Many of the tenets of Caplin's theory of formal functions, attenuated by Schmalfeldt's process of "becoming," permits the student to make sense of Haydn's musical decisions within a sonata-form movement. Moreover, the musical punctuation (MC, EEC, and ESC) described in Hepokoski and Darcy's *Sonata Theory* assists in the recognition of large-scale formal boundaries, as well as permitting differentiation between the typical two-part exposition and the rarer three-part exposition.

Granted there are certain impediments to highlighting Haydn's use of sonata form as opposed to focusing on Mozart and Beethoven in the context of the undergraduate music curriculum. One minor complication, at this writing in the early 2020s, is the absence of a reliable scholarly edition that is readily available at minimal cost. The Wiener Urtext edition of the mid-1960s has just entered the public domain in Canada (though not yet in the United States or Europe), and the Henle Edition is many years away from this availability. (In comparison, the *Neue-Mozart Ausgabe* is freely available on the internet, while Schenker's edition of the Beethoven sonatas, though not beyond reproach, is both relatively reliable and in the public domain.) Furthermore, issues of chronology, still problematic when Anthony von Hoboken produced his scholarly catalogue of Haydn's works in 1957, and not fully resolved in the current day, make it difficult for students to get a clear chronological picture of the composer's stylistic development.

Another impediment is the continued perception of Haydn as a childlike, surprising composer, a Romantic era view of the composer that has not yet fully disappeared from the literature. One still encounters the dismissive attitude toward Haydn as *merely* a humorist, even in major scholarly publications (Hepokoski/Darcy's *Elements of Sonata Theory*, for instance).³⁵ However, even a cursory glance at Haydn's use of sonata form in the small sample of works considered above demonstrates that his musical decisions have little to do with humorous intent, or a desire to be

³⁵ Hepokoski/Darcy 2006, 11, 39, 49, 55, and 67, among others. Reviews by Neuwirth 2011 and Ludwig 2012 note this tendency as a blind spot in their *Sonata Theory*.

MacKay, James S. "Joseph Haydn and the New Formenlehre: Teaching Sonata Form with His Solo Keyboard Works."

HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America 10.2 (Fall 2020), <http://haydnjournal.org>.

© RIT Press and Haydn Society of North America, 2020. Duplication without the express permission of the author, RIT Press, and/or the Haydn Society of North America is prohibited.

willfully idiosyncratic. Nor is Haydn the “familiar friend” from whom one can learn little, as Robert Schumann opined in 1841.³⁶ Haydn synthesized influences ranging from Galant style and C. P. E. Bach’s *Empfindsamer Stil* to his own Baroque heritage as a Viennese choirboy, formulating from these various musical strands his own characteristic approach to sonata form.

These objections notwithstanding, Haydn’s solo keyboard works provide an endlessly varied chronicle of how sonata form developed and changed in the second half of the 18th century. His imaginative approach to the form, in works ranging from the modest examples for beginning keyboard students that he composed in the 1750s, to the ambitious and technically challenging virtuoso sonatas of the mid-1790s, provide a compendium of sonata-form possibilities. These possibilities range from relatively conventional works that are appropriate for an introduction to the form, to idiosyncratic works that broach graduate-level musical problems. Furthermore, this flexible use of sonata principles no doubt made an impression of Beethoven, whose creative use of the form became a model for future generations of composers.

³⁶ Cited in Proksch 2015, 22.

MacKay, James S. "Joseph Haydn and the New Formenlehre: Teaching Sonata Form with His Solo Keyboard Works."

HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America 10.2 (Fall 2020), <http://haydnjournal.org>.

© RIT Press and Haydn Society of North America, 2020. Duplication without the express permission of the author, RIT Press, and/or the Haydn Society of North America is prohibited.

Works Cited

Baker, Nancy, and Thomas Christensen, editors. *Aesthetics and the Art of Musical Composition in the German Enlightenment: Selected Writings of Johann Georg Sulzer and Heinrich Christoph Koch*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Birson, Adem Merter. "[The Use of Minor Mode and Playing with Sonority in Haydn's String Quartets, Opp. 9 and 17.](#)" *HAYDN: The Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America* 4.1 (Spring 2014).

_____. "Haydn's dramatic dissonances: Chromaticism and formal process in his string quartets, Opp. 9 and 17." Ph.D. Dissertation. Cornell University, 2015.

Brown, A. Peter. *Joseph Haydn's Keyboard Music: Sources and Style*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986.

Caplin, William. *Classical Form: A Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Fillion, Michelle. "Sonata-Exposition Procedures in Haydn's Keyboard Sonatas." In *Haydn Studies: Proceedings of the International Haydn Conference, Washington, D.C. 1975*. Edited by Jens Peter Larsen, Howard Serwer and James Webster (New York: Norton, 1981), 475-81.

Haydn, Joseph. *Oeuvres complètes*, Vol. 1, no. 6. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1799.

Hepokoski, James, and Warren Darcy. *Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late-Eighteenth-Century Sonata*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Landon, H. C. R. *Haydn: Chronicle and Works. Volume 2: Haydn at Eszterháza*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1978.

Larsen, Jens Peter. "[Sonata-Form Problems \(1963\), as translated by Jerald C. Graue \(1978\).](#)" *HAYDN: The Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America* 3.2 (Fall 2013).

Ludwig, Alexander. "Three-part Expositions in Joseph Haydn's String Quartets." Ph. D. dissertation, Brandeis University, 2010.

_____. "[Hepokoski and Darcy's Haydn.](#)" *HAYDN: The Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America* 2.2 (Fall 2012).

_____. "Expecting the Unexpected: Haydn's Three-Part Expositions." *Lumen* 32 (2013): 31-40.

MacKay, James S. "Joseph Haydn and the New Formenlehre: Teaching Sonata Form with His Solo Keyboard Works."

HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America 10.2 (Fall 2020), <http://haydnjournal.org>.

© RIT Press and Haydn Society of North America, 2020. Duplication without the express permission of the author, RIT Press, and/or the Haydn Society of North America is prohibited.

MacKay, James S. "[Sonata Form Experimentation in Joseph Haydn's String Quartets, Opus 17.](#)"

HAYDN: The Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America 4.1 (Spring 2014).

Martin, Nathan John. "[Larsen's Legacy: The Three-Part Exposition and the New Formenlehre.](#)"

HAYDN: The Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America 4.2 (Fall 2014).

Monahan, Seth. "Sonata Theory in the Undergraduate Classroom." *Music Theory Pedagogy* 25 (2011): 63-127.

Neuwirth, Markus. "Joseph Haydn's 'witty' play on Hepokoski and Darcy's *Elements of Sonata Theory*." *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Musiktheorie* 8/1 (2011), 199-220.

Proksch, Bryan. *Reviving Haydn: New Appreciations in the Twentieth Century*. Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2015.

Rosen, Charles. *Sonata Forms*. Revised edition. New York: Norton, 1988.

_____. *The Classical Style*. Expanded edition. New York: Norton, 1997.

Schmalfeldt, Janet. *In the Process of Becoming: Analytic and Philosophical Perspectives on Form in Early Nineteenth-Century Music*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

_____. "Cadential Processes: The Evaded Cadence and the 'One More Time' Technique." *Journal of Musicological Research* 12/1-2 (1992): 1-52.

Webster, James. "Haydn's Op. 9: A Critique of the Ideology of the 'Classical' String Quartet." In *Essays in honor of László Somfai on his 70th birthday: studies in the sources and the interpretation of music*. Edited by László Vikárius and Vera Lampert. Lanham, MD, Scarecrow Press (2005): 139-58.

Wiens, Carl. "Two-Part Transition or Two-Part Subordinate Theme?" *Intersections* 31/1 (2010): 46-65.