

November 2013

## On Not Inviting Difficulties in Haydn's Symphonies

Benjamin Korstvedt

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

---

### Recommended Citation

Korstvedt, Benjamin (2013) "On Not Inviting Difficulties in Haydn's Symphonies," *HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America*: Vol. 3 : No. 2 , Article 17.

Available at: <https://remix.berklee.edu/haydn-journal/vol3/iss2/17>

## **On Not Inviting Difficulties in Haydn's Symphonies**

by Benjamin Korstvedt

### *Abstract*

In his classic article "Sonata Form Problems" Jens Peter Larsen warned of analytic pitfalls that result from the reliance on anachronistic models of musical form. The modern tradition of taking "textbook sonata form as the starting point," as he put it with disarming simplicity, often "invites difficulties" in the analysis of Haydn's sonata forms. This article follows up Larsen's essay by reconsidering some perceived formal difficulties in Haydn's symphonies that arise from mismatches between Haydn's practice and modern expectations. Specifically, it explores ways in which Haydn's symphonies do things that according to the "textbook" are not supposed to happen in sonata form. The first of these involves appearances of the tonic during the development section, which have been termed "medial tonic returns." The second involves the clear statement of primary theme material in a non-tonic key before the decisive tonic return that initiates the recapitulation proper, which are here dubbed "medial thematic returns."

Both of these formal procedures are commonly discussed as part of the problematic of the so-called "false recapitulation." The advantages and disadvantages of this concept as a tool for musical analysis have been well-rehearsed by now. By separating the two components of this device—the seemingly preemptory recurrence of the tonic and of the main theme—this article clarifies the analytic problem and shows how a more historical sense of formal process reveals important yet overlooked aspects of Haydn's evolving

---

Much of the material in this article was first presented at "Haydn year" conferences in 2009 in Budapest, Toronto, and Boston. My participation in these conferences was made possible by research funds provided by Clark University under the auspices of the George N. and Selma U. Jeppson Professorship of Music. I would like to thank colleagues at those events for a number of useful suggestions and encouraging comments, including Mark Evan Bonds, Poundie Burstein, Stephen Fisher, Alex Ludwig, Elaine Sisman, Jessica Waldoff, James Webster, and David Wyn Jones. I am also grateful to Alan Karass of the College of the Holy Cross for help for some timely bibliographic assistance and to the anonymous reviewers of this journal for helping me to focus some of my ideas and observations.

---

approach to symphonic form during his two decades as Prince Esterhazy's resident symphonist.

### *I. Introduction*

The art historian Jas' Elsner recently wrote that the prime interpretive paradigms in art history have usually been designed to solve "the double impasse of generalizing from the specific empirical example and making the object speak."<sup>1</sup> Elsner's formulation applies as well to musicology, a discipline that often faces a similar interpretive challenge as it tries to address the aesthetic significance of a particular musical composition while situating it within a larger historical or contextual framework. With eighteenth-century music, this tension often is greatest when responding to the individual work, in part because the sheer number of compositions by most eighteenth-century composers can overshadow the appearance of each as an individual object. In these conditions, the impulse to generalize does at times overwhelm the possibility of letting the "object speak." Often then, the history of eighteenth-century music reads as a story told in generalizations, while that of later eras often veers in the other direction to become a tale of exaggerated singularities.

Balancing between generalizing and singularizing is especially acute with Haydn. He was a prolific eighteenth-century composer, and moreover one of the very few of this group whose works—albeit only a subset of them—have consistently been part of the mainstream repertory of chamber ensembles, choral groups, and orchestras. Haydn was also an extraordinarily resourceful and distinctive composer whose works were at the forefront of stylistic development over the course of a long career, a career that started in the now rather dimly perceived world of mid-century Habsburg musical

---

<sup>1</sup> Jas' Elsner, "From Empirical Evidence to the Big Picture: Some Reflections on Riegl's Concept of *Kunstwollen*," *Critical Inquiry* 32 (2006): 748-50

culture and ended in the full glow of early-nineteenth century public concert life. These factors collude to challenge us to balance the fascinating significance of his larger achievement and the articulate wonders of individual works.

The conventional model of sonata form is a durable, and in many ways worthwhile, interpretive tool used to bridge these gaps in modern Haydn studies. This formal paradigm is not without material connection to Haydn's works, and it is central to the current discourse about the symphony far beyond Haydn. Nevertheless the prevalent model of sonata form, with its tonal scheme and formal designs, is a nineteenth-century product that was thoroughly adapted and adopted by post-war scholars and critics. Haydn scholarship has long been conscious of the perils of anachronistic evaluation inherent in the use of such models. Indeed, Haydn and his contemporaries were hardly aware of what we call sonata form, at least in the way that we have come to learn and know it. Jens Peter Larsen encapsulated this concern when he warned that "the music of Haydn and Mozart, unlike Bach's or Handel's or Palestrina's, has commonly been put up not against the music of their forerunners but of their successors, or in any case of one great successor, Beethoven." Larsen identified this as one of the main reasons it has been "especially difficult to arrive at a fairly unbiased judgment" of this music.<sup>2</sup> In his "Sonata Form Problems" Larsen made the important argument that historically based, rather than "theoretical-pedagogical," models of form are best suited to the analysis of Haydn's sonata forms. He put it quite simply: the study of "the music of the Viennese Classical period invites difficulties when it takes textbook sonata form as the starting point."<sup>3</sup>

The "sonata form problems" that Larsen addressed emerge from the tension that exists between how we hear Haydn's forms in the present and how we imagine Haydn and his contemporaries may have done so, at least as far as we can reconstruct and deduce from

<sup>2</sup> Larsen, "Some Observations on the Development and Characteristics of Vienna Classical Instrumental Music," *Studia Musicologica* 9 (1967), 116 and 115.

<sup>3</sup> Larsen, "Sonata Form Problems," *Handel, Haydn, and the Viennese Classical Style* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1988), 269.

treatises, commentary, and musical works. Larsen's concern with the critical implications of "analytic tools," notably those based on sonata form, emphasizes an imperative that musical analysis as well as historical criticism must be leery of untimely assumptions and alert to the interpretive difficulties they spawn. To be sure, great progress has been made in this area in the fifty years since Larsen wrote. One of the signal developments in the analysis of late eighteenth-century music over the last several decades has been a wide-ranging and widely successful effort to incorporate perspectives derived from late eighteenth-century theorists (notably Koch, but also Riepel, Galeazzi, Kollman, and others) with modern analytic methods. Other scholars have recently elaborated extensive, often systematic approaches to sonata form that are less reliant on historical perspectives.<sup>4</sup> It is not merely coincidental that these approaches, which rely on defined formal conventions, find Haydn difficult to handle other than as an exception.<sup>5</sup>

These developments have highlighted the value of historicized approaches to analyzing Haydn, yet we cannot entirely escape modern-day ways of hearing symphonic form (nor should we wish to if we hope to speak to modern-day listeners!). Therefore present-day analysis of Haydn's symphonies must engage with current models of sonata form, which remain basic to modern-day musical culture even as they evolve. In practice, analyzing Haydn's symphonies in terms of sonata form involves a sort of back formation,

---

<sup>4</sup> Here the outstanding text is surely James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late-Eighteenth-Century Sonata* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), which was preceded by William E. Caplin's *Classical Form: A Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998) as well as by Charles Rosen's less systematic but often brilliant work in *The Classical Style: Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven* (New York: Norton, 1971) and *Sonata Forms*, revised ed. (New York: Norton, 1988).

<sup>5</sup> Markus Neuwirth makes this point effectively in "Joseph Haydn's 'witty' play on Hepokoski and Darcy's *Elements of Sonata Theory*," *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Musiktheorie* 8/1 (2011), accessed 9 May 2013, [http://www.gmth.de/zeitschrift/artikel/586.aspx#fn\\_4](http://www.gmth.de/zeitschrift/artikel/586.aspx#fn_4). Also see Alexander Ludwig, "Hepokoski and Darcy's Haydn," *HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America*, Vol. 2.2 (Fall 2012) accessed 14 May 2013, <http://www.rit.edu/affiliate/haydn/hepokoski-and-darcy%E2%80%99s-haydn>. Some recent work by Poundie Burstein stands out for the historical sensitivity with which it brings sophisticated modern analytic methods to bear on distinctive aspects of Haydn's form; see for example "Mid-Section Cadences in Haydn's Sonata-Form Movements," *Studia Musicologica* 51 (2010): 91–107 and "True or False? Re-Assessing the Voice-Leading Role of Haydn's So-Called 'False Recapitulations,'" *Journal of Schenkerian Studies* 5 (2011): 1-37.

trimming a more recent concept to fit an earlier case and vice versa. This approach works well enough that it is far from impossible to make reasonably good sense of much of his music in this way.<sup>6</sup> It does, nevertheless, run into enough blind alleys to raise serious questions, some of which are worth exploring. Pursuing ways in which Haydn's symphonies do things that are not "supposed to happen" in sonata form can be telling, both about current interpretive paradigms and, more importantly, about Haydn's music. Some of these apparent irregularities are well-known topics in Haydn criticism; these include the presence or absence of a contrasting second theme—monothematicism, in other words—as well as Haydn's habit of continuing developmental processes in the recapitulation.

This essay follows up Larsen's warnings regarding misjudgments "invited" by the prevalent tendency to take "textbook sonata form as the starting point." It reconsiders two formal procedures often appearing in the development sections and recapitulations of Haydn's symphonies which are considered as dubious from the modern normative perspective, in order to suggest that such dubiousness is more perceived than real. The first of these procedures involves the appearance of the tonic during the development section, an occurrence that has been termed a "medial tonic return."<sup>7</sup> The second procedure involves the clear statement of primary theme material, or less often material from the second theme group, in a non-tonic key before the decisive tonic return that initiates the recapitulation proper. These may be dubbed "medial thematic returns." Both of these formal procedures relate to the problematic of the so-called "false reprise" or "false recapitulation." A "false recapitulation" is usually defined as a premature return of the main theme in the tonic that is intended to "disorient the listener" by deceptively inducing the impression "that the moment of recapitulation has arrived

---

<sup>6</sup> As Tovey warned about Symphony No. 99: "This Symphony conforms just closely enough to the orthodox scheme of sonata form to make that scheme a guide that can only divert our attention from its most important points." *Essays in Musical Analysis*, vol. 1 (Oxford: Oxford University, 1938), 156.

<sup>7</sup> To the best of my knowledge this term was coined by Peter Hoyt; see his *The "False Recapitulation" and the Conventions of Sonata Form* (Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Pennsylvania, 1999).

when in fact it has not.”<sup>8</sup> Some critics extend the concept to include clear restatements of the main theme in a related, non-tonic key. In any event, Haydn’s use of this device is commonly considered to reflect his penchant for manipulating formal conventions and wittily playing against the expectations of his listeners.<sup>9</sup>

The advantages and disadvantages of the concept of the “false recapitulation” as a tool for musical analysis have been well-rehearsed by now.<sup>10</sup> Despite the attractiveness of this notion for a listener-focused interpretive work, it is now clearly evident that holding to the model of the “false recapitulation” as an intentional, meaningful deviation from formal convention cannot be grounded in appeals to Haydn’s intentions. Yet separating the two components of the “false recapitulation,” the seemingly preemptory recurrence of the tonic and similar returns of the main theme, in order to consider them independently from each other, can offer a new perspective that helps to dissolve unnecessary difficulties many have found in them. This paper surveys the appearances of these procedures from the 1760s to the early 1780s and looks more closely at some examples that shed light on Haydn’s evolving approach to symphonic form during his two decades as Prince Esterhazy’s resident symphonist.

---

<sup>8</sup> Mark Evan Bonds, “Fausse reprise” in *Haydn*, Oxford Composer Companions, ed. David Wyn Jones (Oxford, 2002), 98-99. The term “false reprise” does not appear in the eighteenth-century, but was decisively introduced into Haydn studies by Oliver Strunk in his pioneering essay, “Haydn’s Trios for Baryton, Viola, and Bass,” *Musical Quarterly* 18 (1932), 216-251.

<sup>9</sup> A somewhat different approach, still essentially reliant on a conventional model of sonata form, is found in Ethan Haimo’s analysis of the “false reprise” in the first movement of Symphony No. 55 in *Haydn’s Symphonic Forms* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 100-13. Haimo does not read the two “false” returns of the main theme in the tonic primarily as “witty” or deceptive but rather argues that Haydn’s “succession of attempts to return to the tonic, only the last of which (appropriately) is properly executed” effectively raise “the level of tension and the desire for a proper resolution,” which is satisfied only with the arrival of the real recapitulation. Contrast this with Rosen’s discussion of this movement, which consider these returns as puns that humorously fool the listener (*Sonata Forms*, rev. ed., 276-80).

<sup>10</sup> The two most extensive treatments of the topic are Mark Evan Bonds *Haydn’s False Recapitulations and the Perception of Sonata Form in the Eighteenth Century* (Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1988) and Hoyt’s *The “False Recapitulation” and the Conventions of Sonata Form*, which is largely a critique of the concept. More recently, James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy discussed what they call the “false recapitulation effect” in their *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 221-28, recognizing its anachronistic limitations, but not quite willing to let it go.

## II. Haydn's medial tonic returns

The first movements of Haydn's twenty symphonies in the key of C provide a useful field in which to survey Haydn's treatment of medial tonic returns (see Table 1). Not only do these works originate from something of a sub-genre, the festive *Intrada* tradition, they span almost his entire symphonic career from the late 1750s through his second London season, and include a large number of works from the 1760s and 1770s, a period of particular interest in Haydn's symphonic development.<sup>11</sup> In addition, throughout the composer's career C major was one of two keys (the other being D major) that normally included trumpets and drums, instruments that in Haydn's day exhibited a special relationship to the tonic key as they were effectively limited to sounding only the central pitches of the home key. Thus, these instruments neatly and efficiently articulate the essential tonal framework of classical tonality—the tonic/dominant polarity—in an immediately present way, thereby serving nicely as structural markers—tonally fixed signposts signaling to the listener arrivals on or near the tonal center.<sup>12</sup> Modern accounts of sonata form generally assert that the tonic does not, and should not, appear in the development section.<sup>13</sup> Nevertheless, in the C-major symphonies composed before the late 1760s, the tonic appears quite regularly between the double bar and the clear onset of the reprise, but the “false recapitulation” model, with its implication of

<sup>11</sup> Larsen wrote about Haydn's early C major Symphonies as a special group arising from the *Intrada*. See “Concerning the Development of the Austrian Symphonic Tradition (circa 1760-1775),” *Handel, Haydn, and the Viennese Classical Style*, 323.

<sup>12</sup> “Listeners do not hear large-scale structure, but on a local level. A theory of long-range hearing must therefore be predicated on the negotiation of chains of structural markers, rather than a memory for tonal centre.” Spitzer, “Retransition as Sign: Listener-Orientated Approaches to Tonal Closure in Haydn's Sonata-Form Movements,” *Proceedings of Royal Musical Association* 121 (1996), 13.

<sup>13</sup> The entry on “Sonata Form,” written by Mark Evan Bonds, in *Haydn, Oxford Composer Companions*, ed. David Wyn Jones (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 362-5 reports that the “purpose” of the development section is “to take the music through various keys other than the tonic” (362) and later says that this section “avoids [the] tonic” (363).



---

witty or deceptive formal play, is hardly applicable, for here when the tonic appear it is not presented as puzzling or problematic. Only one C-major symphony, Symphony No. 41 of 1768, includes a fully articulated, harmonically prepared secure statement of the main theme in the tonic (i.e., a “false recapitulation” in the modern sense). Others present the tonic, but not in association with a clear thematic statement, or in any other apparently deceptive way. This all tends to confirm the suspicion that the construct of the “false recapitulation” in the strict sense says as much about modern presumptions about symphonic form as about how Haydn and his original audience might have perceived it.

Starting around 1770, thematic passages in the tonic effectively disappear from the first-movement development section of these C-major symphonies. The last two symphonies that Haydn composed in this key, which date from 1788 and 1792 respectively, make some subtle play with the tonic in the development section, but in ways that reflect a rather different conception of the structure and design of a symphonic first movement than in the 1760s. In the earlier symphonies the usual procedure is for the tonic to appear near the start of the development following a statement of primary theme material on the dominant, followed by an excursion to different tonal areas, commonly the submediant. A good example is found in Haydn's first symphony in this key, Symphony no. 33, which was composed in late 1761 or early 1762 (Example 1). Here the development opens with a clear 8-bar phrase on the dominant based on the movement's first theme, followed by an answering statement on the tonic, which moves off into unstable, sequential music before the second 8-bar period is complete, thus quickly minimizing any sense of full tonic arrival. In this movement, the dominant-to-tonic progression that starts the second half is followed—as the modern textbook would prescribe—by some 40 bars of development and by a reprise that restates the main material of the exposition, all in the tonic.

Table 1: Haydn's C-major Symphonies

Symphony	date	no. of movements	tpts & timp?	medial tonic return in first movement?
Symphony no. 37	1756/58	4	?	yes
Symphony no. 2	1757/59	3	no	yes
Symphony no. 20	1758/60	4	yes	yes
Symphony no. 25	1760/61	3 (+ intro)	no	yes
Symphony no. 32	1760/61	4	yes	yes
Symphony no. 7	June-Dec. 1761	4 (+intro & recit)	no	no
Symphony no. 33	1761-1762	4	yes	yes
Symphony no. 9	early 1762	3	no	no
Symphony no. 30	early 1765	3	no	no
Symphony no. 38	1767	4	yes	yes
Symphony no. 41	1768	4	yes	yes
Symphony no. 48	1769	4	yes	no
Symphony no. 50	1773/74	4 (+ intro)	yes	no
Symphony no. 56	1774	4	yes	no
Symphony no. 60	1774	4 (+ intro)	yes	no
Symphony no. 69	1774 (or 1779?)	4	yes	no
Symphony no. 63	1779	4	no	no
Symphony no. 82	1786	4	yes	no
Symphony no. 90	1788	4 (+ intro)	yes	♦
Symphony no. 97	1792	4 (+ intro)	yes	♦

♦ In these symphonies, the medial tonic return is problematized harmonically



The gambit of opening the second half of a movement with a statement of the main theme on the dominant followed by the tonic was identified by several eighteenth-century theorists as a prime option and was standard practice at the time.<sup>14</sup> It is indicative of a formal concept that plays by somewhat different rules than those now considered emblematic of sonata form. This eighteenth-century concept is a fundamentally binary design; it neither emphasizes the presence of a distinct middle section nor avoids the tonic in order to dramatize the “double return” to initiate the final, recapitulatory phase of the movement. Rather, it reflects the sensibility expressed by the theorist Joseph Riepel in the 1750s, when he wrote that the main key “often comes to the fore in the middle” of a work, “just as if [this key] wanted to give new orders.” Riepel enjoined that the home key “must never be let out of sight or hearing.”<sup>15</sup> A return of the tonic at a point early in the second half is thus understood as a means of orientation, not disorientation.<sup>16</sup>

In addition to serving to orient the listener by keeping the tonic within earshot, as Riepel suggested, a dominant-tonic progression early in the second half of a movement can also serve as a way of treating the tonic as a point from which to “push off,” to gather momentum for the passages to follow. In this scenario, the tonic does not appear as a

<sup>14</sup> Koch identified this as one of the most usual ways of organizing this section; see *Introductory Essay on Composition: The Mechanical Rules of Melody, Sections 3 and 4*, trans. Nancy Kovaleff Baker (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), 200-1. Laszlo Somfai has adapted Koch’s scheme under the rubric of the “counterexposition” as a tool to analyze sonata movements; see his *The Keyboard Sonatas of Joseph Haydn: Instruments and Performance Practice, Genres, and Styles*, trans. by the author in collaboration with Charlotte Greenspan (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 282-5.

<sup>15</sup> Joseph Riepel, *Grundregeln zur Tonordnung insgemein* (Frankfurt: [Christian Ulrich Wagner], 1755), 67; quoted and trans. in Scott L. Balthazar, “Tonal and Motivic Process in Mozart’s Expositions” in *The Journal of Musicology* 16 (1998), 430, fn 19. Riepel’s phrase is also quoted in Bonds, *Haydn’s False Recapitulations*, 305, and Hoyt, *The “False Recapitulation” and the Conventions of Sonata Form*, 49. Its imagery and significance is discussed in some detail by Balthazar in “Intellectual History and Concepts of the Concerto: Some Parallels from 1750 to 1850,” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 36 (1983), 50-2. Balthazar presents some similar ideas about the tonic’s function by Koch and Kirnberger in “Tonal and Motivic Process,” 429-30

<sup>16</sup> This sense of the role of the tonic seems to be confirmed by the fact that some of the most striking and prominent medial tonic returns, including those in Symphonies 41, 42, 43, and especially 55, occur in the midst of music that explores relatively remote harmonic regions.

---

static element, but is kinetic. In a common early form of this gesture, Haydn treats the tonic triad early in the second half of the movement as a secondary dominant, namely the dominant of the subdominant (as can be noted in the example from Symphony No. 33), which often leads nicely to the submediant region.

A remarkable early instance of the treatment of the tonic in a dynamic way occurs in the first movement of Symphony No. 20, a work often dated to 1758 or 1760, although there is some reason to believe it may be a few years later than that. Here the second half opens abruptly on the dominant of the supertonic ( $V^7/ii$ ) in a passage that uses the opening of the main theme in a dissonant setting. In the second four-bar clause, the harmony moves sequentially to the dominant and then glancingly through the tonic, marked by the timpani and trumpet, before moving off to the subdominant and beyond. So, instead of opening the second half on the home dominant, Haydn here backs up the tonal wheel a couple of turns, and then briskly continues on through the tonic (Example 2).

Something reminiscent of the ritornello principle is at work in musical designs that are organized around a main key that returns intermittently to assert its centrality. Furthermore, Riepel's comments and, more importantly, compositional practices in the mid-eighteenth century indicate that the appearance of the tonic was not so much a singularly significant event, as something regular. As Peter Hoyt put it, a ritornello has "very different formal properties from those attributed to 'recapitulation'. . . . The recapitulation is regarded as a unique structural moment which imparts information so specific that it cannot appear more than once. . . . A ritornello, on the other hand, communicates nothing that cannot be communicated again."<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Hoyt, *The "False Recapitulation" and the Conventions of Sonata Form*, 25.

Korstvedt, Benjamin. "On Not Inviting Difficulties in Haydn's Symphonies."

*HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America* 3.2 (Fall 2013), <http://haydnjournal.org>.

© RIT Press and Haydn Society of North America, 2013. Duplication without the express permission of the author, RIT Press, and/or the Haydn Society of North America is prohibited.

Example 2: Joseph Haydn, Symphony No. 20 in C, mvt. I, bars 66-86.

66

66

V<sup>7</sup>/ii      ii<sup>6</sup><sub>4</sub>      V<sup>7</sup>      I<sup>6</sup><sub>4</sub>

76

76

IV      ( I =V<sup>7</sup>/IV ) IV

© Copyright 1964 by Haydn-Mozart Presse, Salzburg. Used with permission.

Recognition of the influence of ritornello procedures on early sonata forms, including Haydn's, was well established in the first half of the twentieth century, and Larsen considered it evident as well.<sup>18</sup> More recently the suggestion that symphonic sonata forms exhibit "ritornello-like" influences has lost favor.<sup>19</sup> Yet a direct historical connection between various types of concerti, which make regular use of ritornello forms, and the early symphony surely exists, and this musical influence lingered well into the 1760s and 1770s in the Austrian symphony tradition.<sup>20</sup> The influence of the concerto on the early symphony appears in the *concertato* elements in numerous symphonies of this time, most famously the *Tagezeiten* trilogy, but several others as well. In Haydn's festive C-major symphonies of the 1760s the weight and color of timpani and drums quite naturally create something of a ritornello effect each time they enter the fray. Nor is it difficult to perceive something of the Baroque ritornello procedure hovering behind several other of Haydn's compositional tactics, notably his "monothematic" sonata form in which the main theme plays a recurring role at different key levels and the formative role he assigns to the juxtaposition of relatively stable periodic passages and against more dynamic transitional passages.

Symphony No. 2, also in C major, is a remarkable case in this regard, for here Haydn works largely with what seems to us Baroque rhythms and textures in a formal design

---

<sup>18</sup> In "Sonata Form Problems" Larsen twice acknowledged the influence of Baroque concerto form on sonata form; see 271 and 276. The prompt recognition of the presence of ritornello procedures in Haydn's early symphonies is evident in the first modern scholarly article to discuss them, Hermann Kretzschmar, "Die Jugendsinfonien Joseph Haydns," *Jahrbuch der Musikbibliothek Peters* 15 (1908): 69-90; reprinted in *Gesammelte Aufsätze über Musik und Anderes* vol. 2 (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel), 401-27, esp. 409-10. Also see Fritz Tutenberg, "Die Durchführungsfrage in der vorneuklassischen Sinfonie," *Zeitschrift für Musikwissenschaft* 9 (126-7): 90-94. For a current discussion of this topic see Joel Galand, "Some Eighteenth-Century Ritornello Scripts and Their Nineteenth-Century Revivals," *Music Theory Spectrum* 30 (2008): 239-282.

<sup>19</sup> Hepokoski and Darcy are careful to warn that a "link between the two principles (sonata and ritornello). . . has been rigorously demonstrated" and that they remain "skeptical about any invocation of ritornello (or concerto) principles" when analyzing symphonic sonata forms, *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 268, fn 23.

<sup>20</sup> Eugene Wolf made this point plain in *Antecedents of the Symphony: The Ripieno Concerto. The Symphony 1720-1840*, Series A, Vol. 1 (New York: Garland, 1983), xv-xx and xxii-xxiv, and in "Ritornello Structure and the Early Symphony," a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Musicological Society, Oakland, California, 9 November 1990.

---

that integrates elements derived from Italian ritornello design along with characteristics of sonata form in ways that befuddle our style categories. This all may invite us to find difficulties in a work that taken on its own terms exhibits splendid draftsmanship. In the Baroque manner the movement has no repeat signs and is organized around a series of tonic arrivals (bars 19, 70, 94, 113, 134, 177) and one of the dominant (bar 70), each of which involves a restatement of the opening motif, often in varied form. Several of the variations (bars 94ff, 113ff, 178ff) involve traditional contrapuntal treatments that hearken back to an earlier generation. (It is noteworthy that these passages occur in precisely those sections of the movement that in sonata form tend to feature such music, namely the development section and the coda).

Other aspects of this movement are characteristic of sonata form. One of these tonic returns (bar 134) is clearly the most important moment of arrival—or as we feel it, the recapitulation—because it is prefaced by a strong dominant arrival and rhetorical pause, and because it literally restates the opening four bars. Likewise the statement of the main theme on the dominant (bar 70) surely signals the beginning of the second half of the movement, despite the absence of a double bar and repeat signs. Moreover, the movement presents a typical contrasting theme, in the minor mode (as quite often in the 1760s), that appears in the dominant key in the first part of the movement (bars 42-53) and is recapitulated in full along with the closing material that follows it in the tonic key near the end of the movement (bars 156ff).

During the 1770s and 1780s, Haydn became increasingly careful to control the absence and presence of the tonic in his symphonic first movements; as a rule, now the tonic is effectively absent during the middle portion of the movement. In his symphonies of the 1780s and in the London Symphonies, Haydn no longer offers clear medial returns of the tonic, but did find ways of introducing the tonic that withheld its harmonic fullness and thus thwarted its presence as anything like an actual key. Often these gestures make use of trumpets and timpani to neatly and efficiently articulate the presence of the tonic. We can observe this in Symphony No. 90 of 1788, Haydn's penultimate C-major symphony. In this work the development section opens with a quiet series of



---

suspensions and sequentially falling chords, but starting in the seventh bar, Haydn aggressively sounds the tonic with timpani and trumpets as part of a dissonant complex based on the dominant of the minor subdominant (bars 104-10). This is succeeded by a thematic period (bars 111ff) that restates the lyrical second theme in the subdominant with solo flute and later solo oboe (Example 3).

Here Haydn revamps his old practice of returning to the tonic shortly after the double bar to suit the fundamentally different structural design he favored for the larger ensemble and broader audience for which he was now writing. In the earlier symphonies he was inclined to open the second half of a symphonic allegro by presenting the tonic, following its own dominant. Now, in Symphony No. 90, many of the same elements appear at a similar place in the formal design, but transformed in form and manner. The tonic is presented in a manner that veils or mitigates the fullness of its tonal status by making it part of a chord that has a strongly articulated centrifugal harmonic impulse. Such gestures are enough to keep the tonic within range of "sight or hearing," as Riepel might have said, while sidestepping any feeling of palpably stabilizing tonal arrival.

Korstvedt, Benjamin. "On Not Inviting Difficulties in Haydn's Symphonies."

*HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America* 3.2 (Fall 2013), <http://haydnjournal.org>.

© RIT Press and Haydn Society of North America, 2013. Duplication without the express permission of the author, RIT Press, and/or the Haydn Society of North America is prohibited.

Example 3: Joseph Haydn, Symphony No. 90 in C, mvt. I, bars 98-112.

98

Solo

Tutti

98

106

(Solo)

106

V<sup>7</sup> I=V<sup>7</sup>/iv

V<sup>7</sup>/iv IV

© Copyright 1965 by Haydn-Mozart Presse, Salzburg. Used with permission.

### *III. Haydn's medial thematic returns*

During the course of Haydn's career as a symphonic composer he increasingly placed store on the creation of what might be called *events*, musical occurrences that are striking, noteworthy, clearly intended as significant, and dependent on careful preparation by the music that precedes them. Unlike ritornelli, these events are singular effects that are not repeatable. Haydn's proclivity for symphonic events culminates in the London Symphonies, many of which are marked by "surprises," events of the sort that could create a distinct impression on the audience of the Salomon concerts.<sup>21</sup> The most famous is the "surprise" in the Andante of No. 94, but the roster extends quite broadly.<sup>22</sup> Striking events were amongst the most important means of communication in symphonies designed for a larger, public audience.

Structurally, the symphonic event is formalized in the increasing importance, both musically and conceptually, of the "double return" at the moment of recapitulation. The "double return"—the simultaneous reprise of the tonic key and the primary theme—is the event *par excellence* in many nineteenth-century symphonies and is now widely considered to be essential to sonata form.<sup>23</sup> The double return depends on a tonal economy organized around the controlled absence and presence of the tonic. The tonic is naturally present at the start of the movement but then must be absent for some time in the middle portion of the movement in order to endow its return at the start of the recapitulation with decisive significance.

<sup>21</sup> Georg Feder, "Haydns Paukenschlag und andere Überraschungen," *Österreichische Musikzeitschrift* 21 (1966): 5-8.

<sup>22</sup> A short list would include the intrusion of the solo timpani before the coda in the first movement Symphony no. 103, the magnificent silence before the final trill in the Minuet of no. 104, the amazing A-flat fortissimo that starts the coda in Allegretto of the "Military" symphony, and the "bassoon joke" in the Andante of no. 93.

<sup>23</sup> The canonic account of this is James Webster's article "Sonata Form" in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 2d ed., ed. Stanley Sadie and John Tyrell (London: Macmillan, 2001), vol. 23: 687-701.

Patterns related to this new tonal economy begin to become evident in the 1770s. The role of harmonic preparation of important formal events becomes greater and more rhetorical, a tendency allied to the increasingly expansive, wide-ranging yet often locally quite stable tonal schemes he favored in these years. Haydn also more and more consistently avoids clear statements of the tonic in the medial portions of sonata-form movements; as a result, clear-cut examples of the “false recapitulation” effectively ceased to appear in his symphonies.<sup>24</sup>

Nevertheless, during this decade, related procedures did continue to play a role. The desire to avoid the tonic in the medial portion of a movement encouraged Haydn, it would seem, to come up with a procedure that allowed him to introduce thematic passages into this section without returning to the tonic key. In the 1770s and early 1780s Haydn tended to substitute medial *thematic* returns—relatively stable passages that restate thematic material in a related key—for medial *tonic* returns. In Symphonies Nos. 50, 56, and 63, for example, the first half of the development section is organized around clear statements of identifiable elements of the primary theme on the supertonic and subdominant.

Medial thematic returns appear with great clarity in Symphony No. 63. In the first movement of this symphony the main theme appears three times in the exposition, each in the tonic but each orchestrated differently: first in a simple two-part setting (bars 1-8), then scored for wind band (bars 9-16), and later in full tutti (bars 29-36). The fairly short recapitulation contents itself with only the tutti form, which begins the section (bar 146) following a rather formal period of dominant preparation. In the development section, however, the primary theme appears twice in different guises, both off the tonic:

---

<sup>24</sup> The last tonic-key “false recapitulation”—and the most elaborate of them—occurs in the first movement of Symphony No. 55 in E-flat major, which was composed in 1774. Symphony no. 71 in B-flat major (1778/79) features what is sometimes categorized as a “false recapitulation.” Haydn does restate a considerable portion of the main theme on the tonic (starting in bar 122), but it is not immediately deceptive, since the first two bars of the theme are fundamentally changed in pitch contour, scoring and dynamics. By bar 126, however, this passage literally restates material from the exposition. Such literal restatement is quite exceptional, for during this period Haydn was inclined to vary almost every appearance of a theme, if only subtly.

Korstvedt, Benjamin. "On Not Inviting Difficulties in Haydn's Symphonies."

*HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America* 3.2 (Fall 2013), <http://haydnjournal.org>.

© RIT Press and Haydn Society of North America, 2013. Duplication without the express permission of the author, RIT Press, and/or the Haydn Society of North America is prohibited.

a wind presentation in the supertonic (bars 88-95) and a more intense subdominant tutti version dominated by the strings, which devolves sequentially as it moves to the submediant (bars 105ff) (Examples 4a and b).

Example 4a: Joseph Haydn, Symphony No. 63 in C, mvt. I, bars 87-95.

Example 4b: Joseph Haydn, Symphony No. 63 in C, mvt. I, bars 105-113.

© Copyright 1967 by Haydn-Mozart Presse, Salzburg. Used with permission.

Haydn's cultivation of these seemingly irregular gestures of thematic reprise was especially intense in the symphonies composed between 1776 and 1884. (Table 2 lists these works.) The symphonies of this period are now not generally among the most esteemed of Haydn's compositions; in fact, despite some efforts to reappraise these works modern-day critics have tended to overlook the significance and artistic worth of most of these works.<sup>25</sup> It is quite true that as a group these works do not exhibit the intensity of the "Sturm und Drang" symphonies that preceded them, nor do they achieve the consummate synthesis of melodic expression, structural design, and rhetorical effect of those that followed, above all the final dozen written for London in the 1790s. Nevertheless, when judged on their own merits, these works are fascinating musical compositions that can shed considerable light on Haydn's evolving approach to symphonic form as he made the transition from court *Kapellmeister* to an international artist composing for a large, cosmopolitan public.

These symphonies arose during a crucial juncture in Haydn's symphonic career. With them he began to shift his attention as a symphonist away his immediate audience in Eisenstadt and Esterháza, towards a larger European public reached through the publication of scores in Paris, London, Vienna, and Germany. Leading stylistic traits of these works—notable clarity of design, preference for melodic thematic material that is subject to pervasive yet subtle variation, and defined yet controlled patterns of contrast—seem to have been inspired by the desire to reach this large, yet anonymous audience. In so doing, they prepared the ground for Haydn's even finer achievements in his last sets of symphonies. During these years Haydn was also increasingly involved with *opera buffa*, as director, arranger, and composer. His experience with this genre, which often capitalized on surprise, comic effects, moments of tuneful melody, and the

---

<sup>25</sup> An emblematic exception is James Webster's "Haydn's Symphonies between *Sturm und Drang* and 'Classical style': Art and Entertainment," in *Haydn Studies*, ed. W. Dean Sutcliffe (Cambridge, 1998): 218-45, which contests the tradition of diminishing the merits of these works. W. Dean Sutcliffe has recently discussed several of these symphonies in "Expressive Ambivalence in Haydn's Symphonic Slow Movements of the 1770s," *Journal of Musicology* 27 (2010): 84-133, but addresses only slow movements, in which sonata form is not at issue.

recombination of themes, must have enriched the musical vocabulary he brought to these symphonies.

Table 2: Haydn's symphonies composed between 1773 and 1784

Symphony No. 51 in B-flat major (1773)  
 Symphony No. 64 in A major, *Tempora mutantur* (1773)  
 Symphony No. 50 in C major (1773/74)  
 Symphony No. 54 in G major (1774)  
 Symphony No. 55 in E-flat major, *The Schoolmaster* (1774)  
 Symphony No. 60 in C major, *Il distratto* (1774)  
 Symphony No. 56 in C major (1774)  
 Symphony No. 57 in D major (1774)  
 Symphony No. 68 in B-flat major (ca. 1774/75)  
 Symphony No. 66 in B-flat major (ca. 1775/76)  
 Symphony No. 67 in F major (ca. 1775/76)  
 Symphony No. 69 in C major, *Laudon* (ca. 1775/76)  
 Symphony No. 61 in D major (1776)  
 Symphony No. 70 in D major (1778/79)  
 Symphony No. 71 in B-flat major (1778/79)  
 Symphony No. 53 in D major, *L'impériale* (1778/79)  
 Symphony No. 75 in D major (1779)  
 Symphony No. 63 in C major, *La Roxelane* (1779)  
 Symphony No. 62 in D major (1779/80)  
 Symphony No. 74 in E-flat major (1780)  
 Symphony No. 73 in D major, *La chasse* (ca. 1781)  
 Symphony No. 76 in E-flat major (1782)  
 Symphony No. 77 in B-flat major (1782)  
 Symphony No. 78 in C minor (1782)  
 Symphony No. 79 in F major (1784)  
 Symphony No. 80 in D minor (1784)  
 Symphony No. 81 in G major (1784)

Dates are based on Sonja Gerlach, "Die chronologische Ordnung von Haydns Sinfonien zwischen 1774 und 1782," *Haydn-Studien* 2 (1969): 34-66 and idem, "Joseph Haydns Sinfonien bis 1774: Studien zur Chronologie," *Haydn-Studien* 7 (1996): 1-287.

Structurally the symphonies composed at this time are quite distinct. They seem most interested in lucidity of formal design, even at the cost of expressive and motivic intensity leading to what William Newman once described as an "almost paradoxical" tendency to ally an increasingly obvious use of sonata form with an "organization of tonality and structural rhythm [that] grows broader and simpler."<sup>26</sup> This impulse supported a tendency to organize the form around statements of important thematic materials. The ways in which these returns are prepared, or not prepared, also bears significance in these designs.

In each of three symphonies in D major composed in 1779 and 1780 (Nos. 62, 53, and 75) the opening thematic gesture appears in the development section in a diatonic minor key. In the first movement of Symphony No. 75, for example, Haydn boldly reintroduces the opening theme of the Presto early in the development section, in the supertonic minor, tutti, *forte* and with the strongly moving bass line that first accompanied it in the counterstatement in the exposition (bars 88ff). The effect of this passage is all the more startling because it bursts in brusquely upon a *piano* staccato passage—almost comic in tone—based on a diminished seventh chord.

Landon must have had moments of this sort in mind when he identified a "surprise technique" that replaced the "false recapitulation" in Haydn's symphonies of these years. Landon described this technique as the unexpected statement of a leading theme during "the course of the development in a remote key, usually after a pause or even a hold."<sup>27</sup> Many of Haydn's later symphonies do just this by presenting the primary theme, or less often material from the second theme group, in a non-tonic key (the

<sup>26</sup> Newman, *Sonata in the Classic Era* (New York: Norton, 1963), 149.

<sup>27</sup> "The *fausse reprise* is almost entirely discarded [in the symphonies of 1774-1784] and the surprise technique of No. 54/I, in which the main subject is introduced during the course of the development in a remote key, usually after a pause or even a hold, is preferred. . . . In the development section, the second subject is often used as a surprise element. Beginning with an extension of the first subject, or part of it, and proceeding through remote keys, Haydn will—very often at the end of a long tutti—end in a fermata; the second subject is then innocently introduced in the remote key in which the section has landed, after which the lead-back to the recapitulation occurs." H.C. Robbins Landon, *The Symphonies of Joseph Haydn* (London: Barrie & Rockliff, 1955), 373-74.



---

subdominant, the supertonic, or the submediant, but now rarely the dominant) some time before a decisive tonic return initiates the recapitulation proper. The procedure occurs as early as Symphonies Nos. 51 and 54, which date from 1772 and 1774 respectively, these do not seem designed to surprise. Haydn was a great master at using timing, gesture and syntax to achieve surprise, and several classic late examples of this technique, as in first movements of Symphonies Nos. 85, 96, and 102, do partake some of the surprise quality Landon described. Yet more often any feeling of surprise depends on the expectation modern listeners bring to symphonic form. In fact, as with “medial tonal returns,” these “medial thematic returns” serve to orient and organize the music, more than disrupt its course.

Consider how Symphony No. 69 “Laudon” makes use of medial thematic returns. This is among the least admired of Haydn's works for modern critics: “one of Haydn's weakest works in the genre,” which makes what Simon McVeigh recently heard as, “uncharacteristically straightforward use of sonata form in the first movement.”<sup>28</sup> In fact, the form and style of the movement may seem uncharacteristically plain for Haydn, yet its evident clarity of design contains a tonal subtlety or two in the movement's second half. This movement is laid out with a lengthy development section, which is just about as long as the exposition and quite a bit longer than the recapitulation. The second half of the movement begins with a jolt on the dominant of the submediant. This is typical of these works; while in Haydn's early symphonies it is exceptional for the second half of the movement to begin on anything other than the dominant, in the symphonies after the mid-1770s, it is almost equally rare for the dominant to be used at this juncture. Starting farther away from the tonic region helps to establish what might be called the tonal otherness of the development section that is important to the tonal economy of these works. Perhaps in compensation for this the section ends with a long, almost exaggeratedly long, dominant preparation (bars 118-35) that presages the reprise of the opening theme.

---

<sup>28</sup> Simon McVeigh in “Symphony” in *Haydn, Oxford Composer Companions*, 394.

The development section is largely controlled by the prolonged secondary dominant chord (V/vi) that opens it (bars 70-77), which is eventually fulfilled by a statement of the secondary theme in the submediant (bars 106-13). Between these, we experience a fortissimo episode that emphatically presents a thematic element from the exposition with full orchestration, starting solidly on the subdominant (bars 84ff). This passage almost inevitably introduces the tonic momentarily as a subsidiary local dominant (bars 84 and 86). More striking, though, is the way that Haydn emphasizes the tonic pitch itself so strongly with the timpani, horns and trumpets at the start of this episode. In this passage, the tonic pitch resounds through the air very palpably, but as the fifth degree of F major, not the root of a tonic triad (see Example 5). Within the context of the music that precedes it, as well as that which is to follow, this provides a sort of harmonic orientation, albeit of a slightly unorthodox sort.

In the symphonies of the early 1780s, Haydn returned as well to the device of the medial tonic return that plays out in ways that recall the older form of "false recapitulation," but always with some means of mitigation. One well-known example of a return to the tonic key in the midst of the development section occurs in the first movement of Symphony No. 77 in B-flat (see Figure 1).<sup>29</sup> In this movement, the development section opens with a fairly intense, sequential, harmonically roving development of the head motive of the main theme, treated in close imitation between the first violins and the oboes. Without any break in the sequential pattern the music arrives on the home dominant (bar 88), which then progresses to the tonic. At this point, the head motive of the main theme is again introduced, now by the full orchestra, in *stretto* in many instruments, moving harmonically within the key of B-flat. This marvelously intricate passage, which is far too intense to feel recapitulatory, leads to a pause and then a decorous statement of the second theme group in the submediant major before devolving in a developmental manner and leading with tactful, non-emphatic harmonic preparation to a conventional

---

<sup>29</sup> This passage was discussed quite prominently in Karl Geiringer's early book *Joseph Haydn, Die Grossen Meister der Musik* (Potsdam: Athenaion, 1932), 76, and in the subsequent English versions of the book; see for example, *Joseph Haydn: A Creative Life in Music*, third revised and enlarged edition (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1982), 286-7.

Korstvedt, Benjamin. "On Not Inviting Difficulties in Haydn's Symphonies."

*HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America* 3.2 (Fall 2013), <http://haydnjournal.org>.

© RIT Press and Haydn Society of North America, 2013. Duplication without the express permission of the author, RIT Press, and/or the Haydn Society of North America is prohibited.

Example 5: Joseph Haydn, Symphony No. 69 in C, mvt. I, bars 83-93.

83

83

Vic. e B. Tutti

IV  $\frac{6}{4}$       V  $\frac{4}{IV}$       IV  $\frac{6}{4}$       V  $\frac{4}{IV}$

89

89

recapitulation of the main theme. It is noteworthy that the tonic reprise of the secondary theme that follows in due course (in bar 160), which is preceded by a firm arrival on the dominant, gives rise to a passage of renewed developmental activity before the conclusion of the movement.

Figure 1: Haydn, Symphony No. 77 in B-flat, mvt. 1.

					*Reprise																
[	P	P	T	S	K	]	[	P	sequential dev.	P	stretto	S	P	T	S	secondary dev.	K	]			
mm.	1	12	23	41	56		74	88	90	98	106	126	137	160		205	217				
	I	I	I	V	V		V <sup>2</sup>	V/vi	IV	V <sup>6</sup> <sub>5</sub>	V <sup>2</sup> /IV	V7	I	vi	IV	ii	V/vi	VI	I	I	I

Seen as a whole, the pattern of thematic statement and developmental activity in this movement, and indeed many movements in these symphonies, does not fall neatly into the frames we now associate with sonata form, which tend to place special emphasis on an almost architectural equilibrium, in which the recapitulation neatly balances the exposition and resolves the tension created by a development section that avoids the tonic key and thematic statements alike. Instead, this movement, like so many by Haydn, is more lucidly explained with reference to eighteenth-century concepts of musical form. These encourage us to regard musical form primarily as a matter of a logical, persuasive sequence of events, rather than an overall structural form of almost three-dimensional solidity. In Symphony No. 77, within the framework of a larger binary design, musical contrasts function locally, working against what has immediately gone before, rather than balancing a corresponding section elsewhere in the form. One of the most characteristic of these patterns of contrast is that between alternating periods of thematic statement and more active transitional music, or as Koch put, the exchange of “singing phrases” and “rushing and sonorous” passages.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>30</sup> Koch, *Introductory Essay on Composition*, 199. Larsen was one of the first modern scholars to draw attentions to this; see “Sonata Form Problems,” 376. The increasing role played by the structural duality of stable and unstable passages in Haydn’s symphonic forms in the 1780s and 1790s was considered at more length by Peter Hauschild, “Liedthema und Entwicklung in den Expositionen von Haydns 'Londoner' Sinfonien” in *Joseph Haydn: Bericht über den Internationalen Joseph-Haydn-Kongreß, Wien 1982* (Munich: Henle, 1986): 175-183, as well as by Diethard Riehm, “Zur Anlage der Exposition in Joseph Haydns letzten Sinfonien,” *Osterreichische Musikzeitschrift* 21 (1966): 255-260; and, with special reference to his keyboard works, by A. Peter Brown, “Critical Years for Haydn's Instrumental Music: 1787-1790,” *The Musical Quarterly* 62 (1976): 374-394.

This perspective helps in approaching the next example, which involves a stretch of developmental activity after the reprise of the main theme—the sort of thing that Charles Rosen labeled a “secondary development.”<sup>31</sup> In the first movement of Symphony No. 79, Haydn starts the second half with a quick move to the subdominant for a clear off-tonic statement of the main theme (see Figure 2). This is followed by what we might call a “normal” development section and clear double return of the main theme and the tonic key (bar 102). But instead of a full, regular recapitulation of the movement’s thematic groups in the tonic key, we are treated to two outbursts of new developmental activity: the first grows from the second phrase of the primary theme and touches on the mediant of the tonic minor; the second, a few bars later, takes transitional material to the mediant of the dominant minor. As a result, the recapitulation sounds almost as “developmental” as the development section *per se*.

Figure 2: Haydn, Symphony No. 79 in F, mvt. 1.

										†																
										*Reprise																
[ Pa	b Pa		?	T		S (=Pb var.)	K	]; [										P	Pb	T	S var	P (sec. dev.)	T (sec. dev.)	S	K	]
mm. 1	9	13		29	31	43	52	61	65	73	82	87	96	102	106	113	117	123	140	147	155					
I	I		V/V	V	V	V	V	V/vi	V/IV	IV	ii	bIV <sup>6</sup>	V <sup>7</sup>	I	i	V	I	V/V	I	I						

† a clear medial thematic return of the main theme in the subdominant (mm. 65-72)

Many of Haydn’s later symphonies are famous for the freedom of their recapitulations, in which as Tovey memorably wrote, “the prevailing impression is one of perpetual expansion as regards themes and phrases and developments, while the perfect balance of keys and harmonies provides that sense of underlying symmetry which makes the expansion so exhilarating.”<sup>32</sup> His marvelous, dynamic manner of treating the recapitulation comes into its own in the London symphonies; the roots of this achievement are found in works from 1780, as we can see in Symphonies 77 and 79.<sup>33</sup>

<sup>31</sup> Rosen, *Sonata Forms*, rev. ed., 289.

<sup>32</sup> Tovey on Haydn’s Symphony No. 92 in *Essays in Musical Analysis*, 145.

<sup>33</sup> See Eugene K. Wolf, “The Recapitulations in Haydn’s London Symphonies,” *The Musical Quarterly* 52 (1966): 71-89.

By way of conclusion, I will turn to a particularly subtle and telling instance, the opening movement of Symphony No. 76 in E-flat major, which was published in 1783 together with Symphonies 77 and 78. This composition works out some of the compositional possibilities attendant to the new devices that Haydn began to capitalize upon in his later symphonies; these include a monothematic design in which the secondary theme group commences with a variant of the primary theme, a medial thematic reprise along with passages of “secondary development,” not to mention Haydn’s impulse continually to vary his thematic material (see Figure 3). The exposition of this movement includes a clear, distinctly contrasting second theme, which appears in bar 56 in the dominant (Example 6a). It is noteworthy that the opening clause of this theme is directly derived from an element of the primary theme group (bars 26ff) (Example 6b). This is a kind of back-door monothematic design, making use not of the obvious opening gesture, but rather a distinct if subsidiary element. Therefore, when the development section promptly introduces a clearly framed medial thematic return of the second theme on the supertonic major (m. 85) it is, in effect, also recalling an element of the primary theme. This theme returns almost as clearly few bars later (m. 106), now on the home dominant, before the transitional material returns to set-up a classic double-return recapitulation. As in Symphony no. 79, the return of the main theme is followed by a passage of renewed harmonic roving; this replaces the clause of the main theme group that was appropriated for the second theme group, which is made redundant by the restatement of that material as part of the second theme in the tonic key that follows.

Figure 3: Haydn, Symphony No. 76 in E-flat, mvt. 1.

																		†																		
[Pa b Pa 2P T 2T Sa(=2p var.) b K ]																		:	[K Sa(=2p) Sb Sa T P (sec. dev.) T Sa(=2p var.) b K ]																	
mm. 1	8	19	26	31	35	42	48	56	63	66	81	85	92	106	114	122	127	152	164	171	174	189														
I	I	I	I	V/vi	vi	V/V	V	V	V	V	vi	VI	VI	V	ii	V <sup>7</sup>	I	V <sup>7</sup>	I	V <sup>7</sup>	I	V <sup>7</sup>	I													

The first clause of the secondary theme (Sa) is clearly derived from a thematic element in the primary theme group (2P).

2P does not return in the reprise.

† S is presented as medial thematic return, a closed, stable thematic statement in the submediant major in the development section (mm. 85-91).

## Example 6a: Haydn, Symphony No. 76 in C, mvt. 1, bars 26-30.

## Example 6b: Haydn, Symphony No. 76 in C, mvt. 1, bars 56-62.

## IV. Conclusion

Larsen's essay on the problems of sonata form does not primarily ask us to solve problems we may identify in the works of Haydn, but rather suggests that often these problems are more ours than Haydn's. The subtle mismatch between Haydn's actual music and modern analytic paradigms has indeed caused problems for many analysts and has both colored and limited modern judgments of his work, sometimes positively—as in the many appreciations of what seem to be his witty play with formal convention—but also negatively, as with the all-too-often underestimated symphonies composed around 1780. The careful critique of the reception of Haydn's form by music theorists and musicologists has shed important light on the successes and limits of established

Korstvedt, Benjamin. "On Not Inviting Difficulties in Haydn's Symphonies."

*HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America* 3.2 (Fall 2013), <http://haydnjournal.org>.

© RIT Press and Haydn Society of North America, 2013. Duplication without the express permission of the author, RIT Press, and/or the Haydn Society of North America is prohibited.

---

approaches.<sup>34</sup> The complementary task of learning to hear and evaluate Haydn's symphonies in ways that refuse to get hung up on "sonata form problems," an effort aided by recourse to eighteenth-century concepts of musical form, also benefits our understanding and appraisal of these works, especially if it encourages us *not* to invite problems where none properly exist.

---

<sup>34</sup> See James Webster, *Haydn's "Farewell" Symphony and the Idea of Classical Style: Through-Composition and Cyclic Integration in His Instrumental Music* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), esp. 335-73; Peter Hoyt, "Haydn's New Incoherence," *Music Theory Spectrum* 19 (1997), 115-54; and Lawrence Kramer, "The Kitten and the Tiger: Tovey's Haydn" in *The Cambridge Companion to Haydn*, ed. Caryl Clark (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005): 239-248. Helpful recent discussion may also be found in Ludwig, "Hepokoski and Darcy's Haydn" and Neuwirth, "Joseph Haydn's 'witty' play on Hepokoski and Darcy's *Elements of Sonata Theory*."



## V. Works Cited

- Balthazar, Scott L. "Intellectual History and Concepts of the Concerto: Some Parallels from 1750 to 1850." *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 36 (1983): 39-72.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Tonal and Motivic Process in Mozart's Expositions." *The Journal of Musicology* 16 (1998): 421-60.
- Bonds, Mark Evan. "Fausse reprise." In *Haydn*. Oxford Composer Companions, ed. David Wyn Jones, 98-99. Oxford: Oxford University, 2002.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Haydn's False Recapitulations and the Perception of Sonata Form in the Eighteenth Century*. Ph.D. dissertation. Harvard University, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Sonata Form." In *Haydn*. Oxford Composer Companions, ed. David Wyn Jones, 362-5. Oxford: Oxford University, 2002.
- Brown, A. Peter. "Critical Years for Haydn's Instrumental Music: 1787-1790." *The Musical Quarterly* 62 (1976): 374-394.
- Burstein, Poundie. "Mid-Section Cadences in Haydn's Sonata-Form Movements." *Studia Musicologica* 51 (2010): 91-107.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "True or False? Re-Assessing the Voice-Leading Role of Haydn's So-Called 'False Recapitulations.'" *Journal of Schenkerian Studies* 5 (2011): 1-37.
- Caplin, William E. *Classical Form: A Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Elsner, Jas'. "From Empirical Evidence to the Big Picture: Some Reflections on Riegl's Concept of *Kunstwollen*." *Critical Inquiry* 32 (2006): 741-66.
- Feder, Georg. "Haydn's Paukenschlag und andere Überraschungen." *Österreichische Musikzeitschrift* 21 (1966): 5-8.
- Galand, Joel. "Some Eighteenth-Century Ritornello Scripts and Their Nineteenth-Century Revivals." *Music Theory Spectrum* 30 (2008): 239-282.
- Geiringer, Karl. *Joseph Haydn*. Die Grossen Meister der Musik. Edited by Ernst Bücken. Potsdam: Athenaion, 1932.

Korstvedt, Benjamin. "On Not Inviting Difficulties in Haydn's Symphonies."

*HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America* 3.2 (Fall 2013), <http://haydnjournal.org>.

© RIT Press and Haydn Society of North America, 2013. Duplication without the express permission of the author, RIT Press, and/or the Haydn Society of North America is prohibited.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Joseph Haydn: A Creative Life in Music*. Third revised and enlarged edition. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1982.
- Gerlach, Sonja. "Die chronologische Ordnung von Haydns Sinfonien zwischen 1774 and 1782." *Haydn-Studien* 2 (1969): 34-66.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Joseph Haydns Sinfonien bis 1774: Studien zur Chronologie." *Haydn-Studien* 7 (1996): 1-287.
- Haimo, Ethan. *Haydn's Symphonic Forms*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Hauschild, Peter. "Liedthema und Entwicklung in den Expositionen von Haydns 'Londoner' Sinfonien." In *Joseph Haydn: Bericht über den Internationalen Joseph-Haydn-Kongreß, Wien 1982*, ed. Eva Badura-Skoda, 175-183. Munich: Henle, 1986.
- Hepokoski, James and Warren Darcy. *Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late-Eighteenth-Century Sonata*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Hoyt, Peter. *The "False Recapitulation" and the Conventions of Sonata Form*. Ph.D. dissertation. The University of Pennsylvania, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Haydn's New Incoherence." *Music Theory Spectrum* 19 (1997): 115-54.
- Jones, David Wyn, ed. *Haydn. Oxford Composer Companions*. Oxford: Oxford University, 2002.
- Koch, Heinrich Christoph. *Introductory Essay on Composition: The Mechanical Rules of Melody, Sections 3 and 4*. Translated by Nancy Kovaleff Baker. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.
- Kramer, Lawrence. "The Kitten and the Tiger: Tovey's Haydn." In *The Cambridge Companion to Haydn*, ed. Caryl Clark, 239-248. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Kretzschmar, Hermann. "Die Jugendsinfonien Joseph Haydns." *Jahrbuch der Musikbibliothek Peters* 15 (1908): 69-90. Reprinted in *Gesammelte Aufsätze über Musik und Anderes*, vol. 2, 401-27. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1911.
- Landon, H.C. Robbins. *The Symphonies of Joseph Haydn*. London: Barrie & Rockliff,, 1955.

Korstvedt, Benjamin. "On Not Inviting Difficulties in Haydn's Symphonies."  
*HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America* 3.2 (Fall 2013), <http://haydnjournal.org>.  
 © RIT Press and Haydn Society of North America, 2013. Duplication without the express permission of the author, RIT  
 Press, and/or the Haydn Society of North America is prohibited.

---

- Larsen, Jen Peter. "Concerning the Development of the Austrian Symphonic Tradition (circa 1760-1775)." In *Handel, Haydn, and the Viennese Classical Style*, trans. by Ulrich Krämer, 315-25. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Some Observations on the Development and Characteristics of Vienna Classical Instrumental Music," *Studia Musicologica* 9 (1967): 115-139.  
 Reprinted in *Handel, Haydn, and the Viennese Classical Style*, trans. by Ulrich Krämer, 227-50. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Sonata Form Problems." In *Handel, Haydn, and the Viennese Classical Style*, trans. by Ulrich Krämer, 269-80. Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1988.
- Ludwig, Alexander. "Hepokoski and Darcy's Haydn." *HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America*, Vol. 2.2 (Fall 2012). Accessed 14 May 2013.  
<http://www.rit.edu/affiliate/haydn/hepokoski-and-darcy%E2%80%99s-haydn>.
- McVeigh, Simon. "Symphony." In *Haydn*. Oxford Composer Companions, ed. David Wyn Jones, 381-414. Oxford: Oxford University, 2002.
- Neuwirth, Markus. "Joseph Haydn's 'witty' play on Hepokoski and Darcy's *Elements of Sonata Theory*." *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Musiktheorie* 8/1 (2011).  
 Accessed 9 May 2013. [http://www.gmth.de/zeitschrift/artikel/586.aspx#fn\\_4](http://www.gmth.de/zeitschrift/artikel/586.aspx#fn_4).
- Newman, William S. *Sonata in the Classic Era*. New York: Norton, 1963.
- Riehm, Diethard. "Zur Anlage der Exposition in Joseph Haydns letzten Sinfonien." *Osterreichische Musikzeitschrift* 21 (1966): 255-260.
- Riepel, Joseph. *Grundregeln zur Tonordnung insgesamt*. Frankfurt: [Christian Ulrich Wagner], 1755.
- Rosen, Charles. *The Classical Style: Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven*. New York: Norton, 1971.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Sonata Forms*, revised edition. New York: Norton, 1988.
- Somfai, Laszlo. *The Keyboard Sonatas of Joseph Haydn: Instruments and Performance Practice, Genres, and Styles*, translated by the author in collaboration with Charlotte Greenspan. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Korstvedt, Benjamin. "On Not Inviting Difficulties in Haydn's Symphonies."

*HAYDN: Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America* 3.2 (Fall 2013), <http://haydnjournal.org>.

© RIT Press and Haydn Society of North America, 2013. Duplication without the express permission of the author, RIT Press, and/or the Haydn Society of North America is prohibited.

- Spitzer, Michael. "Retransition as Sign: Listener-Orientated Approaches to Tonal Closure in Haydn's Sonata-Form Movements." *Proceedings of Royal Musical Association* 121 (1996): 11-45.
- Strunk, Oliver. "Haydn's Trios for Baryton, Viola, and Bass." *Musical Quarterly* 18 (1932): 216-251.
- Sutcliffe, W. Dean. "Expressive Ambivalence in Haydn's Symphonic Slow Movements of the 1770s." *Journal of Musicology* 27 (2010): 84-133.
- Tovey, Donald Francis. "Haydn. Symphony in E Flat (Salomon no. 10; Chronological List, no. 99)." In *Essays in Musical Analysis*, Vol. 1, 156-9. Oxford: Oxford University, 1938.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Haydn. Symphony in G ('Oxford'). Chronological List, no. 92." In *Essays in Musical Analysis*, vol. 1, 143-7. Oxford: Oxford University, 1938.
- Tutenberg, Fritz. "Die Durchführungsfrage in der vorneuklassischen Sinfonie." *Zeitschrift für Musikwissenschaft* 9 (126-7): 90-94.
- Webster, James. *Haydn's "Farewell" Symphony and the Idea of Classical Style: Through-Composition and Cyclic Integration in His Instrumental Music*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Haydn's Symphonies between *Sturm und Drang* and 'Classical style': Art and Entertainment." In *Haydn Studies*, ed. W. Dean Sutcliffe, 218-45. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Sonata Form" in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., ed. Stanley Sadie and John Tyrell, vol. 23, 687-701. London: Macmillan, 2001.
- Wolf, Eugene K. *Antecedents of the Symphony: The Ripieno Concerto*. The Symphony 1720-1840, Series A, Vol. 1. New York: Garland, 1983.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Recapitulations in Haydn's London Symphonies." *Musical Quarterly* 52 (1966): 71-89.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ritornello Structure and the Early Symphony." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Musicological Society, Oakland, California, 9 November 1990.