

March 2017

Trimodular Block Strategies in Haydn's Sonata Movements

Samantha M. Inman

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

Recommended Citation

Inman, Samantha M. (2017) "Trimodular Block Strategies in Haydn's Sonata Movements," *HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America*: Vol. 7 : No. 1 , Article 2.
Available at: <https://remix.berklee.edu/haydn-journal/vol7/iss1/2>

Trimodular Block Strategies in Haydn's Sonata Movements

by Samantha M. Inman

Abstract

This study combines concepts from Hepokoski and Darcy, and Caplin, to examine Haydn's approaches to the trimodular block (TMB). The first part of the article proposes three categories of TMBs based on which modules of a given TMB lie within S and the stability of the opening of TM³. Subsequent parts use these three categories to identify patterns in Haydn's instrumental movements containing TMBs. Data regarding the fundamental features of forty-one movements are combined with in-depth analyses of three representative movements, one for each TMB category. While some traits remain consistent across all three categories, other traits typical of a single category in Haydn's output correlate with specific recapitulatory strategies.

I. Introduction

The Medial Caesura (MC) ranks among the most foundational concepts in James Hepokoski's and Warren Darcy's Sonata Theory. This break rhetorically reinforces the cadence that concludes the transition within a sonata exposition or recapitulation. Most often this arrival features a half cadence in tonic (I:HC) or in dominant (V:HC). A typical exposition (or recapitulation) features a single MC, which divides the primary zone (P) and transition (TR) in the first half from the secondary (S) and closing (C) zones in the second half. However, some expositions feature two MCs, thus expanding the exposition (or recapitulation) through what Hepokoski and Darcy call a trimodular block (TMB).¹

¹ James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy, "The Medial Caesura and its Role in the Eighteenth-Century Sonata Exposition," *Music Theory Spectrum* 19 (1997): 115-54 and *Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late-Eighteenth-Century Sonata* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2006): 23-50 and 170-77.

Some, but not all, TMBs correspond to what William E. Caplin calls a subordinate theme with an internal HC.²

The present study combines concepts from Hepokoski and Darcy as well as Caplin to examine Haydn's approaches to the TMB. The first part proposes three categories of TMBs based on which modules of a given TMB lie within S and the stability of the opening of TM³. Subsequent parts use these three categories to identify patterns in Haydn's works containing TMBs. The corpus for this study includes all movements containing a TMB that I have identified in Haydn's four major instrumental genres: keyboard sonata, keyboard trio, string quartet (from Op. 17 onward), and symphony. Data regarding the fundamental features of these forty-one movements are combined with in-depth analyses of three representative movements, one for each TMB category. While some traits remain consistent across all three categories, other traits typical of a single category in Haydn's output correlate with specific recapitulatory strategies.

II. Theoretical Background

As the name suggests, the trimodular block consists of three stages, which Hepokoski and Darcy summarize as follows: "Considered as a whole, the TMB situation conveys the impression of a flawed or unsatisfactory first S-idea, TM¹ . . . followed by some sort of TR-texture-based corrective action, TM², and a 'better' S idea, TM³."³ The expansion serves to delay the attainment of the two perfect authentic cadences crucial to Sonata Theory. These include the Essential Expositional Closure (EEC), which is responsible for confirming the secondary key in the exposition, and the Essential Structural Closure (ESC), which marks the tonal close of the movement by confirming tonic at the end of S in the recapitulation. In a trimodular block, TM¹ and TM³ typically possess clear beginnings given their placement immediately following a caesura. However, the boundary between the end of TM¹ and the start of TM² is often less clear, especially in

² William E. Caplin, *Classical Form: A Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 115-117.

³ Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 172.

Haydn. Even when rhetorical cues delineate the segments, TM¹ rarely concludes with a clear cadence. Instead, voice leading typically fuses TM¹ and TM² into a single process, suggesting that the trimodular block might be a bit of a misnomer. In any event, this particular layout raises the question of whether S really begins with TM¹ or TM³.

Although Hepokoski's and Darcy's description above spotlights one specific narrative in which TM¹ fails to successfully launch S-space, other passages in *Elements of Sonata Theory* take a more flexible view. In particular, they note that the relationship between individual modules of the TMB with a normative S-zone varies highly from one movement to another. Some TMBs fall into "a subcategory of medial caesura declined," particularly when TM¹ involves an unexpected tonal shift.⁴ Such expansions essentially fall between TR and S. More commonly, "The simplest TMB type occurs entirely within an unequivocal S-space, so that TM¹ is unproblematically equivalent to S^{1.1}."⁵ Here, the TMB acts to expand S, though the S-ness of TM¹ and TM³ may still vary from one movement to another.

Given the variable relationship between individual modules of the TMB with S-space, combining the symbols might best clarify this admittedly complicated design. Hepokoski and Darcy suggest this notational possibility: "Because on closer consideration the double-MC pattern can occur with differing S and/or TR implications, it can be desirable in some analytical situations either to replace the perhaps-expected S^{1.1}, S^{1.2}, S^{1.3} numbers with TM¹, TM², and TM³ or to use both in conjunction."⁶ However, they favor use of only the TMB symbols in practice.⁷ Nevertheless, including

⁴ Hepokoski and Darcy, "The Medial Caesura," 145-146. See also Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 172-175. For a discussion of the so-called "Three-Key Trimodular Block," see Graham G. Hunt, "The Three-Key Trimodular Block and Its Classical Precedents: Sonata Expositions of Schubert and Brahms," *Intégral* 23 (2009): 65-119 and "When Structure and Design Collide: The Three-Key Exposition Revisited," *Music Theory Spectrum* 36, no. 2 (2014): 247-269.

⁵ Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 171-172.

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ In an analysis of Beethoven's Piano Sonata Op. 2 no. 3/I, Darcy goes as far as discouraging the use of S in a TMB, flatly contradicting the passage from *Elements* cited above. See Warren Darcy, "Intersections between Two Analytical Perspectives on Sonata Form: The Sonata Theory Approach," in *Essays from the*

cross-mappings between symbols allows for greater nuance in discussing the similarities and differences between movements that contain a TMB. This practice also clarifies how expositions (and recapitulations) containing a TMB relate to expositions (and recapitulations) that do not, as Paul Wingfield advocates.⁸ Consequently, the analyses in Part II of the present article employ this double-labeling system.

The "MC declined" variety of TMB that delays the onset of S until TM³ does not have a specific name in Caplin's terminology due to his different analytical priorities. While Sonata Theory normally requires the articulation of an MC in order for S to exist, Caplin identifies the subordinate theme as arriving with the subordinate key, regardless of whether there is a cadence or rhetorical pause immediately prior.⁹ A typical theme possesses three stages: 1) an initiation featuring clear presentation of a characteristic melodic idea coupled with stable harmony, especially prolongations of the local tonic in root-position; 2) a continuation characterized by fragmentation, harmonic acceleration, faster surface rhythm, and sequence; and 3) a cadential function, which typically moves from I⁶ through a predominant to the articulation of the cadence proper.¹⁰ However, one or more of these three temporal functions may be omitted from the transition or the subordinate theme, potentially blurring the boundaries between the two. Caplin thus has no need of conceptualizing events as occurring between the transition and the secondary theme.¹¹

Fourth International Schenker Symposium, Volume 1, ed. Allen Cadwallader (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 2008), 105.

⁸ Paul Wingfield, "Beyond 'Norms and Deformations': Towards a Theory of Sonata Form as Reception History," *Music Analysis* 27, no. 1 (2008): 146. See also his discussion of Beethoven's Op. 2 no. 3/I on the same page.

⁹ Caplin, *Classical Form*, 97.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 10-11 and 253-55.

¹¹ The same theoretical differences underpin Caplin's alternative explanation of what Sonata Theory calls a "Continuous Exposition." Rather than choosing to create a new category of pieces, Caplin describes such movements as a result of TR missing its cadential function or ST lacking initiating function. See William E. Caplin and Nathan John Martin, "The 'Continuous Exposition' and the Concept of Subordinate Theme," *Music Analysis* 35, no. 1 (2016): 4-43. For the counter perspective, see James Hepokoski, "Sonata Theory, Secondary Themes and Continuous Expositions: Dialogues with Form-Functional Theory," *Music Analysis* 35, no. 1 (2016): 44-74.

In contrast, a TMB that occurs entirely within S-space maps directly onto Caplin's descriptions of a subordinate theme with an internal half cadence. Unlike Hepokoski and Darcy, Caplin provides a further subdivision based on the material after the internal half cadence, which is equivalent to TM³. In the first variety, the module begins with a strong initiating function, thus marking the arrival of what Caplin calls a second subordinate theme. In the second option, the material after the half cadence resumes continuation/cadential function, thus connecting back to the subordinate theme already begun.¹² Attending to these options facilitates understanding of the role of TM³ in particular.

Combining Sonata Theory with select concepts from Caplin thus yields three types of TMBs: Category 1, in which S opens with TM³; Category 2, in which S opens with TM¹ and TM³ begins with initiating function; and Category 3, in which S opens with TM¹ but TM³ begins with continuation function. All three of these basic layouts appear in Haydn's output. The remainder of this essay examines Haydn's approach to the TMB through the lens of these three categories. I will discuss each TMB-categorized group of works in turn, first identifying trends evident across Haydn's movements of a single type, and then illustrating details of compositional issues through close analysis of one representative per category.

[NB: Tables for the remainder of the essay are found in the Appendix.]

III. Analysis: Category 1 and Keyboard Trio Hob. XV:24/I

Table 1 (Appendix) lists information for the fifteen movements containing a TMB that delays the opening of S-space until TM³, accounting for roughly a third of the pieces in this study. All but three movements base at least one TMB module on motives from P. In each of the fifteen movements the ability of TM¹ to function as a suitable S is undermined by a harmonic event that either collapses to the minor dominant instead of the expected major or introduces another unexpected key. Interestingly, movements

¹² Caplin, *Classical Form*, 115-117.

featuring a TMB of this type in the exposition typically do not recapitulate TM¹⁻², instead articulating a single MC that highlights the role of TM³ as S. The opening movement of Keyboard Trio Hob. XV:24 embodies each of these characteristics.

Despite the perfectly normal P and TR that open this exposition, few listeners would confuse the onset of TM¹ with S. Example 1a shows the *forte* D-major triad that perfunctorily announces the tonic key of the movement along with the antecedent (ant) phrase of P. The consequent (cons) briefly tonicizes ii⁶ before confirming tonic with a PAC. As indicated in Table 2a (Appendix), TR refuses to modulate, but the idiomatic "hammer blows" at its end clearly articulate bar 29 as a I:HC MC as indicated in Example 1b. TM¹ arrives in bar 30, borrowing material from P as the boxes in Examples 1a and 1b indicate. Despite this shared head motive, the inability of TM¹ to function as S is immediately apparent. Although the pitch a arrives in the bass as expected, the beginning of this passage replaces the expected A-major triad with an inverted F-major chord, which is prolonged for two measures. After a pause, the P-based figure repeats up a step, providing a similarly fleeting tonicization in g minor, as if searching for a way out of this tonal conundrum. The collapse to tonic minor in bar 35 declines the apparent MC of bar 29 and necessitates a second and stronger attempt to escape the clutches of the home key.¹³ A German augmented sixth chord successfully introduces TM² in bar 39. Returning to TR material, this TM² locks on the dominant of A in bar 39 and generates the stronger V:HC MC in bar 43 (see Table 3a below). The stage is finally set for S to enter.

¹³ Graham Hunt identifies this movement as containing a "three-key exposition," naming bIII (F major) as the second key. (See Ex. 6 in Hunt, "The Three-Key Trimodular Block," 80.) However, F major only lasts four measures, inviting interpretations of this passage as a brief tonicization dependent on the surrounding keys as presented here.

Example 1: Motivic Links in Keyboard Trio Hob. XV:24/I

a) P

Allegro *p*

f *p* *fz* *fz* *fz*

Head Motive

IHC

b) TM¹⁻³

28 TR (end) MC¹ TM¹

p *p* *f* *f*

Motive in FM (pIII) Motive in gm (iv) TM²

IHC

36

cresc. *cresc.* *cresc.*

41 MC^2

46 TM^3 p Motive (shortened) Motive (shortened) VHC

52

55 $EEC C^1$ mf $V:PAC$

While TM³ clearly opens S-space, it retains two features from TM¹. TM³ brings yet another iteration of the head motive, as shown in Example 1b. The passage definitively opens in A major, finally reaching the secondary zone in the expected key. However, as in TM¹, modal mixture soon clouds the happy diatonicism. Even the EEC in bar 57 seems understated, marking the cadential arrival with only an open octave that emphasizes the bleakness of this arrival. The blustering C¹ quickly reasserts A major, trying to dispel the doubt of the preceding passage by cadencing clearly in the correct mode in bar 61. However, the modified immediate repetition of this phrase leads to a prominent reassertion of C-natural as part of vii^{o7}/V in bar 64, providing one last moment of doubt before conclusively cadencing in A major in bar 66. C² further confirms the secondary key through codetta rhetoric. Nevertheless, TM¹ and TM³ remain linked via motive and modal mixture.

As comparison of Table 2a and 2b (Appendix) reveals, the recapitulation cuts both TM¹ and TM², yet the compensatory expansions elsewhere actually make it four measures longer than the exposition. Skipping the heraldic chord from bar 1, P quietly begins in

bar 122. The cadence concluding this period in bar 133 marks the beginning of the first interpolation, delaying the arrival of TR. This passage again tonicizes the supertonic, exaggerating the harmonic properties of the consequent in P. Despite its belated appearance, TR returns with minimal alteration in bar 142. It concludes with a slightly modified version of the first MC from the exposition, smoothing the path towards the entrance of TM³ in bar 158.

The excision of TM¹⁻² from the recapitulation not only removes the most turbulent tonal aspect of the exposition, but also reveals the suitability of TM³ to act alone as S. Even the revisions to TM³ seem designed to reinforce its ability to achieve the ESC. The first portion of S tracks mostly along with the exposition and introduces mixture in bar 167, but the TR-based expansion opening in bar 171 neutralizes the brief borrowing, firmly switching the mode back to major. The articulation of the ESC in bar 178 includes the root and the third rather than merely the open octaves heard in the exposition, again clearly affirming major tonality. The first phrase of C¹ returns unaltered, but the varied repeat is expanded by a few measures. The vii⁰⁷/V returns in bar 188, yet the addition of a cadential ♯ in the subsequent measure corrects F-natural back to F-sharp before the cadence marking the boundary with C² in bar 191. The changes to the harmony, coupled with the recapitulatory cuts, highlight the differences between TM¹ and TM³, the two monothematic TMB modules. Separated from TM¹ and TM² and purged of some of its chromaticism, TM³ clarifies its role as S in this recapitulation.

This movement illustrates all three elements common in Haydn's version of the "MC declined" type of TMB. The connections between P and the TMB are particularly strong in this case study, with both TM¹ and TM³ citing the same head motive. The brief tonicizations followed by a collapse to tonic minor in the exposition signify the role of TM¹⁻² as an expansion between TR and S. The omission of TM¹⁻² from the recapitulation further asserts the status of TM³ as S.

IV. Analysis: Category 2 and String Quartet in C Major, Op. 50 no. 2/I

Table 3 (Appendix) lists the twenty-two movements belonging to the second type of TMB, which accounts for just over half of the corpus. In each of these movements, TM¹ successfully launches in the expected secondary key, but TM² clearly reinvigorates transition rhetoric leading to the second MC. TM³ has a definite beginning in the secondary key as well, embracing attributes typical of Caplin's initiating function. As in the previous category, the majority of these works base at least one part of the TMB on P. However, comparison of Table 1 and Table 3 reveals a reversal in recapitulatory preferences. Two-thirds of expositions featuring a TMB that lies entirely in S and a strong relaunch at TM³ lead to a recapitulation that preserves the entire TMB. The opening movement of String Quartet Op. 50 no. 2 exemplifies this strategy, confining substantial recapitulatory re-writes to TR as a counterbalance to some of the more unusual aspects of phrase structure, rhetoric, and voice leading of this movement.

Table 4a (Appendix) summarizes the form of the exposition, which is riddled with rests. The piece begins with an awkward extended period encompassing P and TR. As shown in Example 2a, the first violin laboriously creeps upward over a tonic pedal, and then quickly collapses for the PAC in bar 9. Flanked by rests on both sides, the descending third G-E in octaves in bars 10-11 seems to question the finality of this PAC. The function of the subsequent eight-measure dominant lock is not immediately clear. Bar 18 could have served as the MC of an extremely short transition of a very small-scale movement. However, TR's return to the opening material in bar 21 forces a retrospective reinterpretation of bars 1-20 as an antecedent, notwithstanding the pauses it contains. Although omitting the cello for the first four bars, this consequent closely tracks the antecedent, this time locking on the dominant of G major in bar 35. As Table 4a indicates, the V:HC MC arrives in bar 42, opening the door for the expected S.

Example 2: Motivic Links in String Quartet in C Major, Op. 50 no. 2/I

a) P

1 *Vivace* P Head Melody

sotto voce *fz* *fz* *fz*

sotto voce *fz*

sotto voce *fz*

sotto voce *fz* I:PAC

b) TM¹⁻³

41 TR (end) MC¹ TM¹

p

p

p

p

V:HC

mf *fz*

mf *fz*

mf *fz*

mf *fz*

55 TM²

fz *p* *mf*

fz *p* *mf*

fz *p* *mf*

fz *p* *mf*

cadence evaded

cadence evaded

65

76

85

94

MC²

TM³

Head Melody

EEC

V:HC

V:PAC

All three stages of the subsequent TMB seem to fall in S-space, immediately establishing the secondary key. As shown in Ex. 2b, TM¹ successfully launches in G major with a cheerfully diatonic melody in the first violin supported by a conventional accompaniment in the lower strings. All seems well until bar 58, where an evaded cadence marks the start of TM². At first, this seems to be only the briefest of delays leading to a second

attempt at reaching closure only five measures later. However, the evaded cadence in bar 63 initiates a much longer detour, briefly tonicizing A-flat major and f minor before locking onto the dominant of g minor in bar 77. A second MC arrives in bar 83. Returning to G major, TM³ borrows the beginning of P as the boxes in Example 2 indicate. This return to a familiar head motive clearly serves Caplin's initiating function, marking an important restart in the search for confirmation of the secondary key. EEC finally arrives complete with cadential trill in bar 100, an achievement celebrated with a brief codetta. Thus, the exposition's main tonal turbulence occurs within a longer stretch in the expected secondary key rather than *en route* to that secondary key.

The recapitulation refuses to smooth over the rhetorical and tonal oddities inherited from the exposition. As indicated in Table 4b, P returns without alteration in bar 176. TR still functions more or less as a consequent, albeit with substantial revision in texture. A version of the creeping stepwise melody appears in canon at the fifth, with pairs of entries alternating between *rectus* and *inversus* forms. The zone halts on a dominant seventh chord in bar 224. Ironically, these revisions further emphasize the stability of TM¹. All three TMB modules return. In fact, the only change to material after the transition is a two-measure expansion in TM³; the second violin returns to the expected ascending scalar flourish in bar 275, which passes to the lower instrument in bar 276 and finally to the first violin in bar 277. Cutting TM¹ and TM² in this movement would have cut most of the material not derived from the first nine measures of the piece. Thus, the three units of the TMB function as a segmented yet cohesive secondary theme.

V. Analysis: Category 3 and Symphony No. 79/I

Table 5 (Appendix) lists movements falling into the third and smallest category, in which the entire TMB lies within S and TM³ skips directly to continuation function. The identification of this type of TMB relies heavily on the transitional nature of TM² and the clarity of the second MC. The expositions of these movements resemble the second category by opening S with TM¹ in the expected secondary key. However, the recapitulatory strategy more closely aligns with the practices of the first category, eliminating the TMB. Specifically, each of the movements in Table 5 omits only TM¹ from the recapitulation, thus retaining both portions of the TMB that emphasize continuation function. The opening movement of Symphony No. 79 differs from the others by lacking motivic connections between P and the TMB, yet the piece provides a clear case study in which TM¹ opens S-space in the exposition while TM² takes on this role in the recapitulation.

This exposition uses subtle rhetorical features rather than overt harmonic interruptions to dramatize its drive to the EEC. Table 6a (Appendix) summarizes the form. The pre-MC material of this movement seems intent on establishing tonic as firmly as possible, concluding both P¹ and P² with PACs. TR modulates without protest, articulating the V:HC MC in bar 28. The TMB contains surprisingly little chromaticism amidst its peculiar rhetoric. As shown in Example 3, TM¹ unassumingly announces the dominant key area through a unison descending C-major triad. Having arrived on the chord I⁶ as early as the second measure of the section, the passage seems intent on cadencing in short order. However, TM² forestalls the expected cadence by returning to I⁶. The steady stream of eighth notes across this juncture between TM¹ and TM² softens the impact of the evaded cadence in bar 34 and seamlessly returns to continuation function. Like TM¹, TM² remains firmly entrenched in C major. However, TM² does fail to achieve a PAC, leading instead to a dominant lock that concludes with the prototypical three hammer blows for the stronger V:HC MC in bar 42. Note also in Example 3 how TM³⁻¹ resumes the continuation/cadential function that has dominated the S-zone with a sequence, beginning once again on I⁶ and continuing with a stream of parallel first-inversion

triads. The passage manages only to reach IACs in bar 46 and 52, as shown in Table 6a. TM^{3:2} continues the protracted cadential attempts. Only the fourth try produces a PAC, finally achieving EEC in the very last measure of the exposition.

Example 3: Symphony No. 79/I, bars 26-48

TR (end) MC¹ S/TM¹ Continuation Function →

VHC I⁶

31 tr Continuation Function →

V $\frac{8}{4}$ $\frac{7}{3}$ I⁶

36 Continuation Function →

VHC

41 MC² TM^{3.1} Continuation Function →

VHC 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6

45 TM^{3.1'} Continuation Function →

V:IAC

Substantial revision of material from the first half of the exposition draws greater attention to the recapitulation's sole MC shown in Table 6b. While the exposition's P-zone featured diatonicism and frequent cadences, the corresponding passage in the recapitulation undermines this tonal stability. Only the antecedent of P¹ returns without alteration. The rewriting of the consequent of P¹ and the excision of P² removes both of the PACs from the early portion of the exposition. Furthermore, the rewritten passage of bars 106-16 features extensive modal mixture and tonicization. Interestingly, the articulation of the I:HC in bar 116 revisits material not from the end of the original TR, but rather from the conclusion of TM². This substitution thus adapts the more emphatic of the two MCs.

This early use of the stronger of the two MCs from the exposition necessitates other alterations in the recapitulation. Skipping TM¹, the beginning of TM² opens S in bar 117. Unwilling to simply duplicate the earlier MC, TM² derails with a return to motives from TR in bar 123. A brief pause in bar 136 references the idea of a MC despite the lack of a HC, but the subsequent insertion of a new module in bars 137-9 further undermines this moment's resemblance to the exposition. This section new to S-space restarts the concerted attempts at achieving tonal closure. Modified versions of TM^{3.1} and TM^{3.2} continue this game. TM^{3.1} alters the expected IAC to a PAC in bar 143, but weak articulation combined with the immediate repetition of the thematic material make this arrival all but conclusive. TM^{3.2} once again contains several unsuccessful attempts at achieving a PAC, delaying ESC until the last measure of the movement.

The recapitulatory alterations of this movement flow out of the shared features of the three modules of the exposition's TMB. Unlike most TMBs, the three sections here all share roughly the same balance of stability and instability, each quickly moving toward a cadential function. The segments collectively constitute the S-zone without any single module seeming more "S-like" than the other two. Consequently, the excision of TM¹ does not drastically alter the narrative of the recapitulation, which remains focused on achieving the elusive I:PAC.

VI. Conclusion

These three case studies illustrate the link between rhetoric, tonal stability, and form in Haydn's varied approaches to the trimodular block. In Keyboard Trio Hob. XV:24/I, TM^{1-2} function as an interpolation between P and S in the exposition, which allows for easy excision in the recapitulation. The expositions of String Quartet Op. 50 no. 2/I and Symphony No. 79/I both treat the entire TMB as a multi-part S zone, but the differences in the content of TM^{1-2} and the rhetoric at the start of TM^3 lead to different recapitulatory strategies. The TMB of String Quartet Op. 50 no. 2/I contained sufficient contrast to enable recapitulation of the entire complex, with the P-based TM^3 clearly articulating initiating function via a clear reference to material from P. In contrast, all three stages of the TMB in Symphony No. 79/I downplay their beginnings in favor of emphasizing repeated attempts at achieving a convincing PAC, shifting attention from the start of S, with or without TM^1 , to the eventual achievement of this expected PAC at the very end of the TMB material. Emphasizing continuation function at the opening of each portion of the TMB enables excision of TM^1 while preserving the larger game of cadential evasion in this symphony.

Several general patterns in Haydn's approach emerge from the comparison of Tables 1, 3, and 5. First, the vast majority of Haydn's TMBs feature at least one P-based unit, which holds true across all three categories. This is most commonly TM^1 , though TM^3 remains a viable option as well. Second, the P-based passage is often but not always cut from the recapitulation. This finding supports Markus Neuwirth's assertion "Haydn himself by no means regarded multiple thematic returns in the tonic key as problematic or redundant."¹⁴ In this case, the inclusion of a monothematic element in the trimodular block does not in and of itself demand a particular handling of the recapitulation. Third,

¹⁴ Markus Neuwirth, "Does a 'Monothematic' Expositional Design have Tautological Implications for the Recapitulation? An Alternative Approach to 'Altered Recapitulations' in Haydn," *Studia Musicologica* 51, no. 3-4 (2010): 369-85. Neuwirth's article responds to the "redundancy principle" proposed in Ethan Haimo, *Haydn's Symphonic Forms: Essays in Compositional Logic* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 5. For further illustration of monothematic recapitulations in the Paris symphonies (including No. 84/I and No. 86/I included in Table 6), see Pieter Bergé, "Transcending Mono(tono)thematicism: A Reinvestigation of Compositional Logic in Haydn's Paris Symphonies Nos. 84-86," *Dutch Journal of Music Theory* 8, no. 3 (2003): 199-205.

the three categories differ not only in the nature of the TMB in the exposition, but also in preferred recapitulatory strategies. The harmonic deviations in TM¹⁻² defining the first category are typically omitted in the recapitulation. The double beginnings in the second key in the second category most often recur in the recapitulation. The emphasis on continuation function already present in the exposition's TM³ in the third category becomes even more pronounced in the recapitulation through the omission of TM¹ and the retention of TM²⁻³.

Further studies are needed to determine which of these trends are idiomatic to Haydn and which also appear in contemporary music by other composers. For example, Beethoven tends to retain the TMB in the recap and deal with residual compositional issues in extensive codas or coda-rhetoric interpolations (CRIs).¹⁵ In any event, the present article has combined Sonata Theory with select concepts from Caplin to define three basic patterns available within the trimodular block and has illustrated the issues inherent in their application in Haydn's sonata movements. Haydn's decision to use one, two, or all three modules of an exposition's trimodular block in its recapitulation thus depends on both tonal stability and rhetorical emphasis of individual units, exemplifying his masterful derivation of form from content.

¹⁵ Representative examples include Beethoven's Piano Sonata Op. 2, No. 3/I, Piano Sonata Op. 10, No. 3/I, and Symphony No. 2/IV. For information on CRIs, see Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 288-92.

Appendix: Tables

Table 1: Category 1. S = TM³

<i>Recap TMB?</i>	<i>Haydn Movement</i>	<i>Expo MCs</i>	<i>Recap MCs</i>	<i>P-based unit</i>	<i>Recap cuts</i>	<i>Expo TM¹</i>
Yes	String Quartet Op. 17, No. 6/I	V:HC bar 43; v:HC bar 56	I:HC bar 170; i:HC bar 183	TM ³	none	begins in bVII
Yes	Symphony No. 65/I	I:HC bar 18; V:HC bar 36	I:HC bar 96; I:HC bar 114	TM ¹	none	V collapses to v
Yes	Symphony No. 71/I	I:HC bar 44; V:"HC" bar 58	I:HC bar 180; I:"HC" bar 185	none	none	begins in ii
No	Keyboard Trio Hob. XV:16/I	I:HC bar 30; V:HC bar 45	I:HC bar 151	TM ¹	TM ¹⁻²	begins in v
No	Keyboard Trio Hob. XV:24/I	I:HC bar 29; V:HC bar 43	I:HC bar 157	TM¹, TM³	TM¹⁻²	bIII collapses to i
No	Keyboard Trio Hob. XV:28/I	V:HC bar 20; V:eIAC bar 29	n/a	TM ¹	TM ¹⁻²	excursion in bIII
No	String Quartet Op. 50, No. 6/IV	I:HC bar 22; V:HC7 bar 36	I:HC bar 165	TM ¹	TM ¹⁻²	begins in v
No	String Quartet Op. 64, No. 3/I	V:HC bar 32; V:HC bar 47	I:HC bar 152	none	TM ¹⁻²	V collapses to v
No	Symphony No. 16/III	I:HC bar 9; V:HC bar 19	I:HC bar 57	none	TM ¹⁻²	Chromatic sequence returns to I
No	Symphony No. 46/IV	I:HC bar 28; V:HC bar 43	I:HC bar 123	TM ³	TM ¹	begins in v
No	Symphony No. 61/I	I:HC bar 30; V:HC bar 40	I:"HC" bar 159	TM ¹	TM ¹⁻²	chromatic sequence collapses to v
No	Symphony No. 94/I	V:HC bar 54; V:PAC bar 67	I:HC bar 95	TM ¹	reordered	begins in v
No	Keyboard Trio Hob. XV:13/II	V:HC bar 43; V:HC bar 58	I:HC bar 198	TM ¹	Parts of TM ¹⁻²	V collapses to v
No	Keyboard Trio Hob. XV:30/I	I:HC bar 32; V:HC bar 41	I:HC bar 168	TM ³	TM ¹	chromatic sequence collapses to v
No	Symphony No. 85/I	V:HC bar 61; V:HC bar 76	I:HC bar 76	TM ³	TM ¹	begins in v

Table 2: Form of Keyboard Trio Hob. XV:24/I

a) Exposition

						S					
P		TR	MC ¹	TM ¹ (P-based)	TM ²	MC ²	TM ³ (P-based)	EEC/C ¹		C ²	
1	7	13		30	39	43	46	57	61	66	69
	HC	PAC	HC			HC		PAC	PAC	PAC	PAC
DM			FM-gm-dm		am		AM				
I			bIII - iv- i		v		V				

b) Recapitulation

						S					
P		exp		TR	MC	TM ³ (P-based)	ESC/C ¹		C ²		
122	127	133	136	142	157	158	177	182	191	169	
	HC	PAC	PAC	IAC	HC		PAC	PAC	PAC	PAC	
DM			em		DM						
I			ii		I						

Table 3: Category 2. S = TM¹⁻³ ; TM³ opens with Initiating Function

<i>Recap TMB?</i>	<i>Haydn Movement</i>	<i>Expo MCs</i>	<i>Recap MCs</i>	<i>P-based unit</i>	<i>Recap cuts</i>
Yes	Keyboard Sonata Hob. XVI:25/I	V:HC bar 14; V:HC bar 21	I:HC bar 58; I:HC bar 65	none	none
Yes	Keyboard Sonata Hob. XVI:50/I	I:HC bar 19; V:HC7 bar 28	I:HC bar 119; I:HC7 bar 129	TM ¹ , TM ³	beginning of TM ³
Yes	Keyboard Trio Hob. XV:19/III	I:HC bar 8; V:HC bar 14	I:HC bar 35; I:ePAC bar 41	none	none
Yes	Keyboard Trio Hob. XV:20/I	I:HC bar 12; V:HC bar 27	I:HC bar 83; I:ePAC bar 92	TM ¹	Part of TM ³
Yes	Keyboard Trio Hob. XV:21/I	V:HC bar 27; V:PAC bar 38	I:HC bar 117; I:PAC bar 127	TM ¹	none
Yes	String Quartet Op. 17, No. 2/IV	I:HC bar 26; V:HC7 bar 39	I:HC7 bar 117; I:HC7 bar 130	none	none
Yes	String Quartet Op. 50, No. 2/I	V:HC bar 41; V:HC bar 83	I:HC7 bar 224; I:HC bar 265	TM³	none
Yes	Symphony No. 30/I	V:HC bar 20; V:HC bar 29	I:HC bar 64; I:HC bar 73	none	none
Yes	Symphony No. 47/IV	V:HC m. 43; V:HC m. 68	I:HC bar 204; I:HC bar 229	TM ³	none
Yes	Symphony No. 48/I	I:HC m. 29; V:HC m. 44	I:HC bar 145; I:HC bar 160	none	none
Yes	Symphony No. 52/I	III:HC bar 32; III:HC bar 46	i:HC bar 126; i:HC bar 140	none	none
Yes	Symphony No. 57/I	I:HC bar 63; V:HC bar 90	I:HC bar 192; I:HC bar 206	none	Parts of TM ¹⁻²
Yes	Symphony No. 68/III	V:HC bar 24; V:HC bar 30	I:HC bar 102; I:HC bar 108	none	none
Yes	Symphony No. 84/I	V:HC bar 57; VPAC bar 73	I:ePAC bar 219; I:PAC bar 236	TM ³	new TM ²
Yes	Symphony No. 86/I	V:HC bar 53; V:PAC bar 64	V:PAC bar 176; V:PAC bar 190	TM ¹	new TM ²
No	Keyboard Sonata Hob. XVI:38/I	I:HC bar 12; V:HC bar 18	I:HC bar 65	TM ¹	V overwrites TM ¹⁻²
No	Keyboard Trio Hob. XV:5/II	I:HC bar 14; V:HC bar 28	I:HC bar 118	none	TM ¹⁻²
No	String Quartet Op. 20, No. 5/I	III:HC7 bar 18; III:HC bar 27	i:HC bar 105	TM ¹	TM ¹
No	String Quartet Op. 54, No. 3/I	I:HC bar 22; V:HC bar 30	I:eIAC bar 135	TM ¹	TM ¹⁻²
No	Symphony No. 69/I	I:HC bar 26; V:"HC7" bar 44	I:HC bar 151	TM ¹	TM ¹⁻²
No	Symphony No. 99/I	V:HC bar 44; V:HC bar 70	I:HC bar 156	TM ¹	TM ¹⁻²
No	Symphony No. 100/I	V:HC7 bar 73; V:IAC bar 93	I:HC7 bar 94	TM ¹	TM ² ; TM ¹ = part of P

Table 4: Form of String Quartet in C Major, Op. 50 no. 2/I

a) Exposition

S													
P (ant)			TR (cons)		MC ¹	TM ¹	TM ²		MC ²	TM ³ (P-based)		EEC/C	
1	9	18	21	29	41	43	58	63	83	85		100	106
	PAC	HC		PAC	HC		ev	ev	HC			PAC	PAC
CM					GM			Ab-fm	gm	GM			
I					V			bVI-iv	v	V			

b) Recapitulation

S												
P		TR'	MC ¹	TM ¹	TM ²		MC ²	TM ³ (P-based)			ESC/C	
176	193	196	224	225	240	245	265	267		275	284	290
	HC		HC ⁷		ev	ev	HC			(PAC)	PAC	PAC
CM						Db-bb	cm	CM				
I						bII-bvii	i	I				

Table 5: Category 3. S = TM¹⁻³ ; TM³ opens with Continuation Function

Recap TMB?	Haydn Movement	Expo MCs	Recap MCs	P-based unit	Recap cuts
No	Keyboard Trio Hob. XV:6/I	V:HC bar 25; V:HC bar 40	I:HC bar 130	TM ¹	TM ¹
No	String Quartet Op. 20, No. 2/I	I:HC bar 21; V:HC bar 33	I:HC bar 92	TM ¹	TM ¹
No	String Quartet Op. 20, No. 3/IV	III:HC bar 17; III:HC bar 25	i:HC bar 88	TM ¹	TM ¹
No	Symphony No. 79/I	V:HC bar 28; V:HC bar 42	I:HC bar 116	none	TM ¹

Table 6: Form of Symphony No. 79/I

a) Exposition

S																
P ¹			P ²	TR	MC ¹	TM ¹	TM ²	MC ²	TM ^{3.1}		TM ^{3.1'}	TM ^{3.2}			EEC	
1	4	8	9	19	28		34	42	43	46	47	52	55	58	59	60
	HC	PAC		PAC	HC		ev	HC		IAC		(IAC)	(IAC)	ev	ev	PAC
FM					CM											
I					V											

b) Recapitulation

S														
P ¹		>TR'	MC	TM ²	exp (TR-based)	N	TM ^{3.1}	TM ^{3.1'}	TM ^{3.2'}	TM ^{3.2'}			ESC	
102	105	106	116	117	123	137	140	143	147	150	153	154	155	
	HC		HC				ev	(PAC)	(IAC)	(IAC)	ev	ev	PAC	
FM		fm	FM											
I		i	I											

Works Cited

- Bergé, Pieter. "Transcending Mono(tono)thematicism: A Reinvestigation of Compositional Logic in Haydn's Paris Symphonies Nos. 84-86." *Dutch Journal of Music Theory* 8/3 (2003): 199-205.
- Bergé, Pieter, ed. *Musical Form, Forms, and Formenlehre: Three Methodological Reflections*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2009.
- Cadwallader, Allen. "Intersections between Two Analytical Perspectives on Sonata Form: the Schenkerian Approach." In *Essays from the Fourth International Schenker Symposium, Volume 1*, edited by Allen Cadwallader, 85-102. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 2008.
- Caplin, William E. *Classical Form: A Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Caplin, William and Nathan John Martin. "The 'Continuous Exposition' and the Concept of Subordinate Theme." *Music Analysis* 35/1 (2016): 4-43.
- Cortens, Evan. "The Expositions of Haydn's String Quartets: A Corpus Analysis." *HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America* 4.1 (Spring 2014). <http://haydnjournal.org>.
- Darcy, Warren. "Intersections between Two Analytical Perspectives on Sonata Form: The Sonata Theory Approach." In *Essays from the Fourth International Schenker Symposium, Volume 1*, edited by Allen Cadwallader, 103-109. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 2008.
- Haimo, Ethan. "Haydn's Altered Reprise." *Journal of Music Theory* 32/2 (1988): 335-351.
- _____. *Haydn's Symphonic Forms: Essays in Compositional Logic*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Hepokoski, James. "Beyond the Sonata Principle." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 55 (2002): 91-154.
- _____. "Sonata Theory, Secondary Themes and Continuous Expositions: Dialogues with Form-Functional Theory." *Music Analysis* 35/1 (2016): 44-74.

- Hepokoski, James, and Warren Darcy. "The Medial Caesura and its Role in the Eighteenth-Century Sonata Exposition." *Music Theory Spectrum* 19 (1997): 115-54.
- _____. *Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late-Eighteenth-Century Sonata*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Hunt, Graham G. "The Three-Key Trimodular Block and Its Classical Precedents: Sonata Expositions of Schubert and Brahms." *Intégral* 23 (2009): 65-119.
- _____. "When Structure and Design Collide: The Three-Key Exposition Revisited." *Music Theory Spectrum* 36/2 (2014): 247-269.
- Mastic, Timothy R. "Normative Wit: Haydn's Recomposed Recapitulations." *Music Theory Online* 21, no. 2 (2015).
- Monahan, Seth. "Sonata Theory in the Undergraduate Classroom." *Journal of Music Theory Pedagogy* 25 (2011): 63-127.
- Neuwirth, Markus. "Does a 'Monothematic' Expositional Design have Tautological Implications for the Recapitulation? An Alternative Approach to 'Altered Recapitulations' in Haydn." *Studia Musicologica* 51/3-4 (2011): 369-85.
- _____. "Joseph Haydn's 'witty' play on Hepokoski and Darcy's *Elements of Sonata Theory*." *Zeitschrift Der Gesellschaft für Musiktheorie* 8/1 (2011): <http://www.gmth.de/zeitschrift/artikel/586.aspx>.
- Wingfield, Paul. "Beyond 'Norms and Deformations': Towards a Theory of Sonata Form as Reception History." *Music Analysis* 27/1 (2008): 137-77.

Inman, Samantha M. "Trimodular Block Strategies in Haydn's Sonata Movements."
HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America 7.1 (Spring 2017), <http://haydnjournal.org>.
© RIT Press and Haydn Society of North America, 2017. Duplication without the express permission of the
author, RIT Press, and/or the Haydn Society of North America is prohibited.
