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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Joseph Haydn was born in 1732 and died in 1809, a period spanning the lifetimes of the elder Bach and Beethoven. During his seventy-seven years he wrote at least fifty-two keyboard sonatas, eighty-three string quartets, one hundred-eight symphonies, many masses, divertimenti for instrumental ensembles, operas, cantatas, concerti, oratorios, songs, instrumental trios, and almost as many works in other categories.

It was only in 1957, after this present project had begun, that a complete catalogue of Haydn's works began to appear in print. At this writing the first of three volumes by Anthony van Hoboken has been published. Considering that Kochel's comparable work on Mozart has been available for ninety-seven years, it is apparent that research about Haydn's work has been impaired by the lack of such a reference.

Haydn's historic and artistic significance is still

---

continuing to come to light as old prejudices and half-truths about him and his work are discarded in favor of more scholarly and painstaking research. Although much has been known about Johann Sebastian Bach, Mozart, and Beethoven for many years, it has remained for middle twentieth century students to make the necessary studies to acquaint the world with Haydn. Considering the sheer quantity of material written during the last thirty years, it is evident that the tide of interest in this master has quickened during this period.

Although it is of interest to speculate on the reasons for this lack of scholarly concern for the work of Haydn, it is not within the scope of this study to do so. However, the fact that his work was neglected for such a long period draws one to the inevitable conclusion that much of the early scholarly interest was diverted from Haydn to the somewhat more accessible and colorful activities of both Mozart and Beethoven.

In determining the need for study of any composer, it is necessary to assess his significance in some stream of artistic development. Never does a composer truly stand alone in musical history, monumental though his advances may be. Somewhere through his composition runs a golden thread,
inexorably fusing him to both his predecessors and his followers. Though this thread sometimes may be stretched thin, and often follows a tortuous course, it nevertheless remains a firm nexus between past and future and provides the necessary perspective for any historical study.

Joseph Haydn assumes great stature in the development of Western music when one is confronted with all of the claims that have been made by his earlier admirers. The fact that some of these claims have proven to be exaggerations does not lessen his true position in the art. The following are examples of achievements formerly credited to Haydn:

1. The creation of the string quartet
2. The creation of the modern four-movement symphony
3. The establishment of the modern symphony orchestra
4. The creation of the sonata-allegro form, generally considered the apex of musical forms, a vital structural member of the symphony, the quartet, and the sonata

Subsequent research has blunted some of these statements. Further study is needed to clarify the others. One by one, these studies attempt to unravel fact from fiction in order to place this master properly in the continuum of the art. Considered in their entirety, these studies--a
number of which have already been completed and will be referred to in this text—are weaving a new fabric of knowledge about the genius of Haydn which may far outshine the fanciful embroidery to which students have previously been exposed.

This paper deals with some of the aspects of one of the major contributions ascribed to Haydn—the Sonata-allegro form. For reasons to be explained later, the analysis is concentrated on the so-called second or subordinate subject. A thorough survey of the literature was undertaken, and such materials as were pertinent are quoted at the appropriate points in the thesis. To the writer's knowledge, no other work exists which deals explicitly with the problem of the second subject in Haydn's sonata-allegro form. However, he has drawn upon the studies of scholars who have investigated related problems.

The sonata-allegro form is worthy of continuing investigation. The entire post-classical repertoire illustrates an overwhelming preference by composers for this form as the framework for their music. Apel states in the Harvard Dictionary:
It is probably correct to say that eighty percent of all the movements found in the sonatas, symphonies, quartets, concertos, trios, and the like from 1730 to the present day are written in sonata-form, strictly or freely applied.  

This statement is especially significant inasmuch as the year 1780 marks the approximate midpoint of the span of Haydn's keyboard sonatas, the genre described in this study. Thus, it appears that an investigation is likely to reveal evidences of the evolution of the sonata-allegro form from previous forms within Haydn's lifetime.

The introduction and treatment of the second subject itself is a fertile field for study, since it is the second subject which represents one of the leading elements of variety and contrast in music. Throughout the history of the art, its practitioners have striven to satisfy the demands of the principles of both unity and variety. The evolution of musical design has, accordingly, consisted essentially of a never-ending search for balance between these two opposing requirements. Goetschius defines this dichotomy in terms of

---

a basic human need for order:

Our nature demands the evidence of uniformity [italics in the original], as that emphasizes the impressions, making them easier to grasp and enjoy; but our nature also craves a certain degree of variety [italics in the original], to counteract the monotony which must result from too persistent uniformity. When the elements of Unity and Variety are sensibly matched, evenly balanced, the form is good.3

The main vehicle of musical thought for Haydn's immediate predecessors in the early eighteenth century was the binary form, in which the principle of variety was emphasized through modulation away from the primary key. Although the primary key eventually was regained, no complete restatement of the opening group occurred in it. Evolution during this period slowly transformed the binary form into a rudimentary ternary form, which later matured. This contained the balanced unity and variety "craved by our natures."

Hadow illustrates this evolution with these three diagrams:4

(a and b = musical clauses; 1 and 2 = keys)


Early type: \(a_1 - b_2\) \(a_2 - b_1\)

\((c_3 = \text{prolongation of the second part by further development of themes or new episodes})\)

Intermediate type: \(a_1 - b_2\) \(a_2 - c_3 - b_1\)

Mature ternary type:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPOSITION</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>Recapitulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a_1 - b_2)</td>
<td>(a_2 - c_3) (free modulation passage)</td>
<td>(a_1 - b_1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hadow points out that the third example actually represents the sonata-form as practiced by Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach, after having been taken "right to the verge" by J. S. Bach in the Polonaise of his Sixth French Suite. Corelli foreshadowed the form, using it approximately twelve times, but it remained for C. P. E. Bach to actually adopt this as his preferred pattern in his mature works. Hadow further cautions that, as yet, the "a" and "b" did not represent separate "subjects" or "themes", but simply contrasting tonal centers. The development is rudimentary and as he says, "The Recapitulation C. P. E. Bach never quite mastered."\(^5\)

That these principles of tonal contrast and unity practiced by Bach were known to Haydn is an established fact. It is known that during his formative years, while still

\(^5\)Ibid.
living in Vienna, he obtained copies of Bach's "Frederick" and "Wurtemburg" sonatas for study purposes and was greatly impressed by them. Landon phrases one of the statements which is often quoted as Haydn's, "Anyone can see how much I have learned from [C. P. E.] Bach." While most authorities agree that Haydn did study, admire, and try to imitate Bach, they are not in substantial agreement in finding evidence of Bach's influence in his music. Hadow believes that the influence was direct, Haydn writing his first divertimenti, cassations, and notturni [1755-56] as small orchestral adaptations of the principles he had learned from Bach. However, Alfred Einstein sees this lineage somewhat differently, "Only in the clavier sonata, in which Haydn is not altogether at his ease, is C. P. E. Bach's influence in some measure traceable; and even here it is more technical than in spiritual." Landon compromises these conflicting views with perhaps the more accurate appraisal:

6 Landon, op. cit., p. 275.
7 Hadow, op. cit., p. 200.
During the period 1761-1765—for before 1761 there is not a trace of Bach's serious, earnest style in Haydn's music—it is probably the church-sonata symphonies which approach the spirit of the "Wurttemberg" or "Prussian" sonatas most clearly; but it is not until this new, transitional period that C. P. E. Bach exerted anything but a very indirect and negligible influence on his Austrian admirer.9

In attempting to get at the heart of the matter, Landon adds, in direct contrast to Einstein:

It cannot, however, be said that C. P. E. Bach's style manifests itself directly in Haydn's music; rather it was the underlying spiritual beliefs [italics in the original] of the former that appear to have exerted such a profound influence on the young composer.10

Landon feels that C. P. E. Bach infused Haydn with his artistic code which spelled out a deeper meaning to his music than merely to entertain and delight.11

As we will note in more detail later, Haydn's pre-Esterhazy (1761) works show an artlessness which is suddenly dispelled, apparently as C. P. E. Bach's influence began to take hold upon him. Landon expresses this change:

During the middle 'sixties, Haydn's clavier sonatas underwent a far-reaching stylistic change which raised them from the category of light and pleasing divertimenti to the more serious level of the contemporary symphony.

9Landon, loc. cit. 10Landon, loc. cit. 11Landon, loc. cit.
This change was wrought primarily as a result of the influence which the theories of C. P. E. Bach were beginning to exert on Haydn; but whereas it is difficult to observe a trace of the "Hamburg" Bach in Haydn's instrumental and choral pieces, the way to the clavier sonata was direct and the elder master's style is discernible in some of the interim works produced during the 'sixties. In Sonata No. 19, (1766-68), the influence becomes much more than discernible, and the slow movement of that work, with its predominantly languid, two-part construction, is very obviously the result of C. P. E. Bach's clavier writing.12

Moving to yet another element of the form herein undertaken for analysis, the second subject itself, other sources, apparently, than C. P. E. Bach must be sought, if we are content with Hadow's conclusion that Bach did not truly employ thematic members for his sonata-allegro movements. Thematic contrast has long been considered one of the contributions of the Mannheim school, especially its most famous representative, Johann Stamitz (1717-1757). Stamitz, as a composer, contributed to the first movement sonata in a way which surely influenced Haydn, although Haydn later went on to an entirely unsuspected resolution of the contrasting theme problem. Georg Matthias Monn (1717-1750), leader of the Viennese school of composition is another contributor to the young ternary sonata-allegro form. However, Smith, in a careful investigation of the Mannheim and Viennese symphonists, concludes:

12 Landon, op. cit., p. 312
In the use of the secondary theme, Stamitz greatly surpassed Monn. The former understood the principle of contrast perfectly; whereas in Monn's works, subordinate material was too often fragmentary, in most of Stamitz' first movements the secondary passage is recognizable as a thematic unit.\(^{13}\)

If Haydn undertook thematic contrast as a cardinal principle of his sonata-allegro form, surely Stamitz, Richter, and Cannabich qualify as his precursors. However, there is evidence both within Haydn's own compositions and in the writings of eighteenth century musicologists that the presence of a secondary contrasting subject was not necessarily a requisite of the classical sonata-allegro form, as conceived by the masters responsible for its development. Ratner offers substantial evidence in support of a harmonic rather than thematic basis for the classic sonata-allegro form.\(^{14}\)

During the course of this study, it soon became evident that Haydn's sonata-allegro was involved in a process of active evolution throughout his lifetime. At some stages the form exhibited binary rather than the more


characteristic mature ternary form. Although the contrast­
ing ingredients were occasionally true themes, more often 
they were simply the spun-out motivic elements, of the type 
associated with many of Haydn's predecessors and contem­
poraries. As it has been the primary concern of this study 
to investigate the role played by the material within the 
second key area as it makes its successive appearances 
throughout the movement, it has been necessary to establish 
a workable terminology for this material. The usual con­
notation of the term "theme" as a recognizable tune or 
melody was considered too narrow a definition. Thus, the 
term "subject" was chosen as more descriptive of the mater­
ial under consideration. Blom defines the term "subject" 
in a manner broad enough to suit the purposes of this in­
vestigation:

Subject. A theme used as a principal feature in a 
musical composition... In sonata form first and second 
subjects are the main structural features, but there they 
are thematic groups more often than single themes.15

The sonata-allegro form is best located in the first 
movements of Haydn's symphonies, string quartets, and sona­
tas (both for keyboard and other solo instruments). As

15Eric Blom (ed.), Everyman's Dictionary of Music 
Table II, page 26, indicates, in this study nine movements other than first movements were analyzed as sonata-allegro movements. It was necessary to select either one of the above categories for study or a chronological period of Haydn's life, from which all representative works would be studied. The lure of following a single genre through Haydn's long and productive life prevailed, and the keyboard sonatas were selected. Landon, while belittling the piano sonatas in favor of the symphonies for his study, inadvertently justifies their merit for a study of these dimensions. After pointing out the inadequacy of the quartets and the masses for a study of Haydn's stylistic growth due to the many gaps during which nothing in these forms was composed, he goes on to say that:

Neither the operas nor the clavier sonatas contain the wide range of emotional expression found in the symphonies. . . . It is perhaps the sonatas which most closely approach the symphonies in number and regularity of composition; but one would hardly choose this smaller form instead of the larger.16

Thus, in spite of certain inherent artistic limitations, Landon acknowledges--and rightly so--the validity of the clavier sonatas for a study of stylistic growth.

16Landon, op. cit., p. 172.
The edition used was from the C. F. Peters collection, volumes number 444, 713a, 713b, 713c and 713d.17 Editor of the series, Carl Adolf Martinenssen, states in his preface that these five volumes embrace the complete piano sonatas given in the "Gesamtausgabe" of Haydn's work and are based on the original text edited by Karl Pasler (editor of the Gesamtausgabe). While this information is not questioned, Chapter II on chronology will discuss several difficulties which required resolution before an orderly treatment of all the clavier sonatas could begin. Karl Geiringer, eminent Haydn scholar, expresses the frustration facing all Haydn students when he comments:

The student who undertakes the compilation of a work dealing with the music of Joseph Haydn is faced with difficulties that it would be hard to overestimate. No collected edition exists for the creator of the Clock and Surprise symphonies. It is true that a definitive Collected Edition of Haydn's works was begun in 1907, when it was estimated that it would comprise some 80 volumes. So far [as of 1936] ten of them have appeared and if the edition continues to be produced at this rate, we may look forward to its conclusion in a little less than three hundred years.20


19Ibid., preface.

Geiringer adds that only twelve Pianoforte sonatas exist in autograph manuscripts. The remaining forty, thus, are based from the outset upon secondary sources.

21 Ibid., p. 183.
CHAPTER II

CHRONOLOGY

Notwithstanding the remarks of Geiringer\(^1\) in Chapter I, regarding the difficulties in assigning exact dates to much of Haydn's work, it was not a primary concern of this thesis to attempt to fix such dates. However, because of the nature of the treatment of data, it was important to utilize the best possible chronology from whatever sources it might be obtained. This proved to be a difficult and unsatisfying task, due to the rather substantial areas of disagreement represented by many writers in the field.

Lacking access to such primary sources as exist, the student of Haydn has two types of secondary sources available upon which to base a chronology of works. The first type comprises the listings of works and catalogues which are a part of a number of standard reference volumes. Whereas, such sources normally might be considered sufficiently accurate and complete to establish chronology, with Haydn, unfortunately this is not the case.

Had Haydn but followed a systematic numbering plan for his compositions, had many of the original manuscripts not

\(^1\) Cf. ante, pp. 14-15.
been lost, had a number of publishers and copyists not printed works of minor composers under his name (for their own gain—not Haydn's), had Haydn's memory not been so poor in 1805 when he prepared his Haydn-Verzeichnis (Haydn Catalogue), and had perhaps a dozen other annoying circumstances not been as they were, the problem of chronology would not be nearly as difficult as it is.

Landon, in his treatise on the symphonies, devotes the first three chapters to this problem, especially as it bears upon the symphonies. He exhaustively reviews the worth and contributions of the eight or more existing imperfect catalogues which must be carefully compared and weighed for validity when the task of undertaking a chronology is begun. As Landon states in his preface:

The definitive biography of Joseph Haydn cannot be written until three Haydn monumentae [italics in the original] are published: (1) the Complete Edition of his music; (2) a complete catalogue of all his works, on which Antony van Hoboken has been working for many years, and which is to be expected in the near future [Vol. 1 published in 1957]; and (3) the complete documents of his life. . . . The fact that none of these three projects has been completed explains in part the slow progress of Haydn research in the last fifty years; it is difficult, if not impossible, to write comprehensive books on a composer whose exact œuvre [italics in the original] is not even known.2

The Hoboken Catalogue provided a number of interesting changes in chronology. Hoboken's dates have been given a great deal of weight in this thesis because of his careful and recent research in the field. However, sometimes he differs from certain other scholars with cogent internal evidence in their favor. In the cases where this occurs, a choice had to be made, based in part upon the evidence presented by the authorities, and in part upon the conclusions reached by the writer.

Typically, the greater part of these contrasting opinions on the dating of sonatas came not from authors of catalogues or chronologies of the entire series of sonatas, but from writers who were discussing significant musical aspects of the sonatas and other compositions. In the course of these discussions the authors have suggested dates which seem indicated by their investigations of the sonatas, either independently or relative to the symphonies and quartets.

This method of comparing authorities, then, comprises the second type of secondary source available to the student who seeks a sequential dating for Haydn's works. This activity, when used to supplement the chronology indicated in catalogues, most of which were also available to the authorities who amended them, provides what is probably the best chronological order that will be available until such time as scholars
shall be able to obtain the lacking evidence directly from manuscript sources. Due to the apparent paucity of such materials, this task is not likely ever to be wholly completed.

Table I, page 20, represents the chronological order of the piano sonatas which has been established for use in the balance of this study. In order to retain an easily identified reference, the Breitkopf and Hartel Collected Edition numbering system, compiled by Karl Pasler in 1914 for the "Gesamtausgabe" of Haydn's works, has been used. In spite of several inaccuracies in the dating of works in this listing, the numbers themselves have attained, through use, a universality of meaning which justifies their retention. Following each entry the datings preferred by a number of authorities are cited, the one selected to justify the sequence of a particular entry being the first listed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B &amp; H number</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Dates and Authorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.           | C maj. | a. before 1760  
b. "among earliest works"  
c. before or about 1760? |
|              |       | Hoboken\textsuperscript{a}  
Scott\textsuperscript{c} |
| 2.           | Bb maj. | a. before 1760?  
b. "among earliest works"  
c. before or about 1760? |
|              |       | Hoboken  
Geiringer |
| 3.           | C maj. | a. after Nos. 1, 2, and 4  
b. before 1760?  
c. before 1765? |
|              |       | Geiringer  
Hoboken  
Scott |
| 4.           | D maj. | a. before 1760?  
b. "among earliest works"  
c. before or about 1765? |
|              |       | Hoboken  
Geiringer  
Scott |
| 5.           | A maj. | before 1763  
before 1766 |
|              |       | Scott and Hoboken |
| 6.           | E maj. | a. about 1765?  
b. before 1767 |
|              |       | Scott  
Hoboken |
| 7.           | C maj. | a. before 1760?  
b. before 1766 |
|              |       | Scott  
Hoboken |
| 8.           | G maj. | a. before 1760?  
b. before 1766 |
|              |       | Scott  
Hoboken |
| 9.           | F maj. | a. before 1760?  
b. before 1766 |
|              |       | Scott  
Hoboken |
| 10.          | C maj. | a. 1760-65?  
b. before 1767 |
|              |       | Scott  
Hoboken |
| 11.          | G maj. | a. 1760-65  
b. before 1767 |
|              |       | Scott  
Hoboken |
| 12.          | A maj. | a. about 1765?  
b. before 1767 |
|              |       | Scott  
Hoboken |
| 13.          | E maj. | a. about 1765?  
b. before 1767 |
|              |       | Scott  
Hoboken |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B &amp; H number</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Dates and Authorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>D maj.</td>
<td>a. about 1765?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. before 1767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>G maj.</td>
<td>before 1766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Eb maj.</td>
<td>a. 1765-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. 1766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. 1766-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>G min.</td>
<td>a. 1765-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. 1766-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. 1785-86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Ab maj.</td>
<td>a. 1765-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. 1766-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. 1785?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>F maj.</td>
<td>a. 1765-67?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. 1787-88?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>C maj.</td>
<td>a. 1767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Eb maj.</td>
<td>a. probably not authentic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. authenticity not estab-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Bb maj.</td>
<td>a. probably not authentic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. authenticity not estab-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>lished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Bb maj.</td>
<td>a. 1766-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. 1767?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>D maj.</td>
<td>a. 1767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. 1766-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B &amp; H number</td>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Dates and Authorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>C min.</td>
<td>a. 1771, Geiringer and Scott (Hoboken)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. 1771?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>C maj.</td>
<td>1773, Geiringer, Scott and Hoboken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>E maj.</td>
<td>1773, Geiringer, Scott and Hoboken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>F maj.</td>
<td>1773, Geiringer, Scott and Hoboken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>D maj.</td>
<td>1773, Geiringer, Scott and Hoboken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Eb maj.</td>
<td>1773, Geiringer, Scott and Hoboken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>A maj.</td>
<td>1773, Geiringer, Scott and Hoboken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>G maj.</td>
<td>a. 1774-76, Scott (Hoboken)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. 1774-76?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Eb maj.</td>
<td>1774-76?, Scott and Hoboken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>F maj.</td>
<td>a. 1774-76?, Hoboken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. 1774, Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>A maj.</td>
<td>a. 1774-76?, Hoboken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. before 1776, Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>E maj.</td>
<td>a. 1774-76?, Hoboken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. before 1776, Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>B min.</td>
<td>a. 1774-76?, Hoboken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. before 1776, Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. 1774, Landon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>D maj.</td>
<td>a. 1777-78, Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. 1777, Hoboken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>E min.</td>
<td>a. 1777-78, Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. before 1778, Hoboken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>C maj.</td>
<td>a. 1779-80, Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. before 1780, Hoboken</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE I (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B &amp; H number</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Dates and Authorities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>C# min.</td>
<td>a. 1779-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. before 1780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>D maj.</td>
<td>a. 1779-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. before 1780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Eb maj.</td>
<td>a. 1779-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. before 1780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>G maj.</td>
<td>a. 1779-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. before 1780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>G maj.</td>
<td>pub. 1784; date of comp. unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Bb maj.</td>
<td>pub. 1784; date of comp. unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>D maj.</td>
<td>pub. 1784; date of comp. unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Ab maj.</td>
<td>a. before 1783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. 1785?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>C maj.</td>
<td>1789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Eb maj.</td>
<td>1789-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Eb maj.</td>
<td>a. 1794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>D maj.</td>
<td>a. 1794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. before 1794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>C maj.</td>
<td>a. third of final three sonatas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. 1794-95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. during second London journey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d. before 1794</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Anthony van Hoboken; Joseph Haydn Thematisch-bibliographisches Werkverzeichnis, Book I (Mainz: B. Schott's Sohne, 1957), pp. 5 et seqq.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table I (continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(footnotes continued)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sonata No. 15 is a violin sonata in the Peters Edition and is not included in this analysis.*

*Sonatas Nos. 16 and 17, because of their doubtful authenticity, are not included in the Peters Edition or in this analysis.*

*Oliver W. Strunk's research indicated that the order for the final three sonatas inferred by Karl Pasler (C, D, Eb) was incorrect, and that it was properly 52-Eb, 51-D, 50-C. This finding of Strunk's has the support of both Landon and Hoboken, and has been incorporated into this chronology.*
CHAPTER III

HORIZONTAL ANALYSIS OF SONATAS

The investigation of the fifty-one sonata-allegro form movements as reported in Table II permits analysis in two dimensions—horizontal and vertical. Horizontal analysis allows the comparison of any one factor in one movement with the same factor in any other movement or group of movements. It also provides the basis for a study of stylistic growth of the form through Haydn’s lifetime. Vertical analysis provides a purposive dissection of each movement to gain an understanding of the treatment of subordinate key and thematic materials as they move through the exposition, development, and recapitulation sections.

The former objective—that of tracing the evolution of a form—while perhaps the most fascinating aspect of such a study as this, is at once the most frustrating. This is due to the utter inability to fix wholly reliable dates for all of Haydn’s sonatas. However, to the extent that the broader divisions of his work permit such analysis, and with foreknowledge of the degree of risk involved in making such conclusions upon faulty or incomplete evidence, it still may be done.

Exposition

What is the source of the second subject? In Table II
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>D6</td>
<td>D3</td>
<td>D2</td>
<td>D5</td>
<td>D6</td>
<td>D3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>before bef.</td>
<td>bef.</td>
<td>bef.</td>
<td>bef.</td>
<td>bef.</td>
<td>bef.</td>
<td>bef.</td>
<td>bef.</td>
<td>bef.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60?</td>
<td>60?</td>
<td>60?</td>
<td>60?</td>
<td>60?</td>
<td>60?</td>
<td>60?</td>
<td>60?</td>
<td>60?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPOSITION**

- Is the second subject related to (R) or contrastiing with (C) the first subject?
- Is there strong (S) or weak (W) contrast between the subjects?
- Is there a third subject? (Y-yes, N-no)
- Which subject is of greater length? (1-first, T-transition, 2-second, 3-third, or E-equal)
- Is there development of the second subject in the exposition? (Y-yes, N-no)

**DEVELOPMENT**

- Does an episode replace the development? (Ep-episode, D-development)
- Which subject opens the development? (1-first, T-transition, 2-second, 3-third, C-codette)
- Does the second subject appear? (Y-yes, N-no)
- Which subject provides the most material for the development? (1-first, T-transition, 2-second, 3-third, E-equal, New-new material)
- Is the development a real "working out"? (Y-yes, N-no)

**RECAPITULATION**

- Does the second subject appear? (Y-yes, N-no)
- Is the second subject literal or altered? (L-literal, A-altered)
- Is there new development material from the second subject? (Y-yes, N-no)
- Is the second subject of greater (G), lesser (L), or the same (S) length, relative to the first subject as in the exposition section?

---

**Notes:**
- Sonatas number 40, 42, and 48 possess no movements in sonata-allegro form, therefore are not included in this table.
- Accompaniment and greatly altered melody.
- Subject is identified only by its rhythm.
- Published 1731; date of composition unknown.
- Supplementary text:
Breitkopf and Hartel Catalogue numbering system; cf. ante Chap. II. Numbers used in C. F. Peters Corporation edition; cf. post Bibliography.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Second subject is actually a "development" of the first subject.
the first appearance of the second theme or key area material in a movement is indicated by the question, "Is the second subject related to or contrasting with the first subject?" Fully twenty-eight of the movements utilize subordinate material which has a recognizable source in the principal key area or subject. This indicates that in approximately fifty-five per cent of the movements Haydn did not feel the necessity for original or contrasting thematic members in the second subject. Yet, it was also found that the literal transposition of the principal theme or themes to the subordinate key was rejected by Haydn. Truly monothematic sonata-allegro movements are not found in the piano sonatas.

Is there strong or weak contrast between the subjects?

In all cases where the second subject was related to the first the contrast between subjects was relatively weak. In seven additional movements where the subordinate material qualified as substantially original, the contrast was still of a low order, leading to a tabulation of sixty-nine per cent of the movements as possessing weak contrast. The remaining movements were not all composed of equally highly contrasted members, but because they lacked direct melodic, harmonic, and thematic identity with the principal area, they were considered to be of relatively higher contrast
than the others, at least by Haydn standards.

Is there a third subject? In only one movement was the second key area distinctly subdivided into two thematic entities which might properly be defined as second and third subjects. In this movement, number 52/I, the third subject remains decidedly within the key area of the second subject (Bb major, the dominant) which it follows after a perfect cadence. The second subject, in number 52/I, is closely related to and in weak contrast with the first subject, a situation which made logical a third and contrasting theme. However, there are twenty-seven other movements in which the latter conditions exist without the presence of a true third subject. Thus, Haydn by no means inevitably created a third subject to provide contrast which is lacking between the previously stated subjects.

In a majority of the remaining movements in which contrast between the first and second subjects was of a low order or lacking, the second subject was divided into two or more sections, the latter of which generally provided the desired contrast. These examples fail to qualify as third subjects, due to the absence of a clearly enunciated perfect cadence separating the sections, but are otherwise quite
Which subject is of greater length? It is here that the near-third subjects commented on above evidence their importance by often spinning out the duration of the second key area far beyond that of the first. In only five expositions is the first subject given greater duration, while the second subject is longer in thirty-seven cases. The transition passage is favored in one sonata and the first and second subjects are approximately equal in eight movements.

Is there development of the second subject in the exposition? This is a characteristic which was noted only infrequently. It does not occur at all until sonata number 21/I of 1773, the near midpoint of Haydn's piano-sonata chronology. Then it occurs but four more times, with its final appearance in the last sonata, number 50/I. This seems to be a technique with which Haydn was not at ease. His preference in most cases was for a second key area which began in a manner reminiscent of the principal subject, then continued on into a second section consisting of loosely jointed elements of a motivic character, almost never repeating in any sense, even developmental.

1 Sonata number 52/I is discussed at greater length and illustrated with examples in Chap. IV; Cf. post. pp 57-66.
Development

Does an episode replace the development section?

Goetschius defines an episode as a middle section in which the new material predominates over the old. However, because this study is centered upon the second subject, a somewhat more restricted definition has been assigned. The middle section was not considered episodic unless there was no recognizable appearance of principal or subordinate material. In this sense there were but three episodes, although in the broader sense of Goetschius there were three more movements whose middle sections consisted predominately of new material. These latter sections were subjected to the same questioning as given the true developments in order to trace the thematic treatments. Only one of the three which were adjudged episodes was so studied. This curious movement, number 5/1, will be discussed more fully in the next chapter.

Which subject opens the development? Forty of the developments began with first subject material. Only five started with the second subject, while the codetta provided opening material for two. The transition and third subject

---

each are found at the opening of one development section. Thus, fully four-fifths of the developments commenced effectively with a restatement of the principal subject. That this restatement is always in the subordinate key and subsequently disintegrates into development does not lessen its cohesive force. In the main, these movements are the stronger for this regularity.

**Does the second subject appear?** In eight of the forty-eight developments (in addition to the three episodes) the second subject did not appear. With the second subject represented in forty developments its absence is the exception to the rule. Nevertheless, these eight movements are especially interesting. In five of the eight the second subject, although absent in the development section, was given the more lengthy treatment in the exposition. In one case the second subject was considered to have had duration in the exposition section at least equal to that of the first. It is curious that four of the developments lacking a second subject occurred in chronological sequence. Of further interest it was noted that three of these are movements in which the second subject was given the more lengthy treatment in the exposition. These four movements are numbers 32/I of 1774–76(?), 33/I of 1777–78, 34/I of 1777–78, and 35/I of 1779–80.
Which subject provides the most material for the development? Although the development is the section in which thematic and new materials ordinarily are given extensive treatment and undergo transformations, it is not difficult to determine the parentage of the bulk of Haydn's developmental components. Not surprisingly, the first and second subjects were the preponderant source of material in nearly eighty per cent of the developments. The first subject dominated in twelve developments, shared this role with the transition in two developments and with the second subject in six others. The second subject received the more lengthy treatment in twenty-two movements and was equal, as stated above, in six movements with the first subject. The transition was the source of the bulk of developmental material in three movements in addition to the two previously mentioned with the first subject. The three episodes replacing developments, by definition consisted almost entirely of new material and an additional three movements which were broadly defined as developments for this study nevertheless were most heavily weighted with new material.

Is the development a real "working out"? Most definitions of the development section include the term "working out" of previously stated thematic material as the central aspect of the section. The degree to which this is
accomplished is in large measure a standard for the maturity of the sonata-allegro form. However, as expected, in the youth of the form this characteristic was still immature. Of the forty-eight developments, only fifteen could be termed truly "worked out". Certainly, if these fifteen developments are compared with works which were to follow Haydn, even they in most cases do not illustrate anything approaching a "working out" in the late classic or romantic sense of the word. Again, it was not unexpected that developments evidencing the more mature treatment would appear with increasing frequency in the later works. This proved to be the case, with the "worked out" developments occurring after number 19/I of 1767. Even taking into account the subjectivity of this question, it is evident that the development section of early Haydn was perfunctory, exhibiting little of the potential for creativity which Mozart, Beethoven and even Haydn himself were to manifest within only a few years.

Recapitulation

Does the second subject appear? In this characteristic, Haydn exhibited the greatest consistency of all those measured. In all fifty-one movements the second subject made its reappearance in the recapitulation section. Notwithstanding the responses to the next question, there was a persistent adherence to the formal sonata-allegro pattern
which always brought back the two subjects in their original positions.

Is the second subject literal or altered? Altered second subjects predominate over literal repetitions in the ratio of twenty-eight to twenty-three in the fifty-one movements. Again, this treatment seems to provide a guide to Haydn's maturation. Merely seven of the twenty-five recapitulations in the second half of Haydn's output (from sonata number 21/I of 1773 to number 50/I of 1794-95) evidence a literal return of the second subject. Those which were recorded as altered accomplished this in several ways. Often the material was shortened by the elimination of the first part of the second subject, as in number 36/I or, more often, by an extension or further development of the second part as in number 33/I. The following two questions also pertain to this same general area of investigation.

Is there new development material from the second subject? Only eleven recapitulations show anything which could be termed as new development material springing from the second subject. In the main, these examples follow the trend outlined in the previous question, but develop into more substantial alterations, warranting designation as new development. The criteria for such designation must be
rather arbitrary; however, an examination of number 50/I reveals this characteristic treatment in its most mature form.

In number 50/I the second subject consists of two parts. The first part, in the exposition, is itself a developmental outgrowth of the first subject. It appears in the customary key, the dominant. The second part of this subject offers contrast to the previous material. In the development section the first and second subjects are virtually indistinguishable, except at the beginning of the section where the opening material is clearly from the second subject, first part. In the recapitulation, again the effect is virtually monothematic, except that here, in the position assigned the appearance of the second subject, it has undergone a transformation of character. Now, instead of arriving as a strident forte eighth note-eighth rest return to the first subject, it appears as a pianissimo, gently syncopated passage of quarter notes, sustained by the pedal. Thus, only here does the second subject (first part) play a truly contrasting role. The second part of the subject returns in its normal position and the movement closes regularly.

Were it not for the second part of the second subject, movement 50/I almost would seem to be in variation
form. This is probably the most significant aspect of Haydn's sonata-allegro form—his frequent treatment of the principal thematic material in a closely related key area as though it were the second subject. Subsequently, the two related subjects become integrated in the development. Finally, in the recapitulation, the first part of the second subject either becomes totally absorbed into the principal subject and the second part is all that remains of it or, as in number 50/I, it at last plays a contrasting role which has been hitherto unrevealed. (Musical examples illustrating sonata 50/I will be found in figures 21-28, Chapter IV.)

Is the second subject of greater, lesser, or the same length, relative to the first subject as in the exposition? This measurement was made in an attempt to determine whether the second subject tended to increase or decrease in duration in the recapitulation section, in comparison with the first subject. As with many of the other questions, it was suspected that over Haydn's long creative life this characteristic, too, would evidence an evolutionary aspect. In the majority of movements, as expected, the two subjects retained in the recapitulation the same durational ratio as they possessed in the exposition. It was the closer examination of the remaining twenty-two movements which showed an
appreciable change in ratio which produced the sought-after information. In sixteen movements the second subject had a greater durational ratio (when compared with the principal subject) in the recapitulation than in the exposition. In only seven movements was this ratio reversed. However, again taking the sonatas of 1773 as an approximate midpoint in the chronology, it may be noted that six of the seven movements in which the second subject was of lesser relative length in the recapitulation occurred after this date. Conversely, but six of the sixteen with greater relative length occurred during the same period. Thus, it may be said that although Haydn preferred to keep his subjects in their original durational proportions, he lengthened the second subject in a substantial number of recapitulations (relative to the principal subject). In the second half of his chronology, he also experimented with shortening the second subject, something attempted but once before.
CHAPTER IV

VERTICAL ANALYSIS OF SELECTED MOVEMENTS

Six movements were selected for individual analysis as representative of some of the more important phases in Haydn's chronology. These include number 1/I, believed to be the earliest existing sonata and number 50/I, regarded as Haydn's last. The other four are numbers 5/I, 19/I, 27/I and 52/I.

I. SONATA NUMBER 1/I, C MAJOR, BEFORE 1760

This movement is of interest because it is certainly one of the earliest, if not the very first, of Haydn's known piano sonatas. No exact date is known for it, but it is classified by all of the standard references as preceding 1760. In this sonata the lineage from binary form is quite clear. The movement is structured unmistakably as belonging to Hadow's intermediate type, as described more fully in Chapter I.²

¹Cf. ante, p. 20.

The only variation from this pattern in movement 1/1 is the shifting of tonality in the development from the expected dominant major to the dominant minor.

The first subject is a study in simplicity, consisting merely of a four measure phrase, extended one measure by repetition. The melody suits the artless mood of the phrase with a triadic broken chord over an Alberti bass (Figure 1).

A two measure transition and a decisive cadence in the dominant lead to the second subject, which is of a more lilting character, and again is of regular construction. The exposition ends with a two and one-half measure codetta firmly in the key of G major. Figure 2 illustrates the transition, second subject, and codetta.

The development, commencing abruptly in the minor dominant key, uses material from the first subject for six measures. Next, material traceable to the consequent phrase of the second subject appears over a rhythmic eighth-note bassline for five measures, followed by a one-measure glimpse of an altered fragment of the second subject's antecedent phrase. At this point (measure 30, first subject
material reappears forte in a sequential passage leading to the original transition and thence to the recapitulation on the second subject. The second subject and codetta are identical with their statements in the exposition, except that the codetta is lengthened by repetition. The entire development and recapitulation sections of this brief movement are illustrated in Figure 3, pages 42-44.

FIGURE I

Figure 1. 1/1, measures 1-5.
Figure 2. 1/I, measures 6-17.
Figure 3. 1/I, measures 18-50.
Although, formally, the recapitulation is made at the point of re-entry of the second subject (measure 39), further evidence of Haydn's experimentation with his evolving sonata-allegro is exhibited from measures 34 to 38. Were there but two measures of first subject preceding measure 34, this would be an entirely regular "mature" sonata-allegro movement, as diagrammed by Hadow. As it is, it lacks the symmetry of either of the earlier semi-binary forms and thus is somewhat irregular.

EXPOSITION  DEVELOPMENT  RECAPITULATION
\[ a_1 - b_2 \quad a_2 - c_3 \quad a_1 - b_1 \]

However, the fact that these two measures have been omitted—or better, replaced by the four measures of sequential first subject developmental material leading up to measure 34 (measures 30 to 33)—decidedly places this movement into the period preceding Haydn's acceptance of C. F. E. Bach's form.

II. SONATA NUMBER 5/I, A MAJOR, BEFORE 1763

Movement 5/I contains a number of intriguing elements, some of which are highly significant to the evolving sonata-allegro form.

\[ ^3\text{Ibid.} \]
In two important respects this movement is in non-conformity with strict sonata-allegro form. Notwithstanding this hybridism, the movement was considered as an experiment within the form, so was included in the study.

The movement opens, quite typically, with a four-measure phrase, extended by repetition of the final two measures. This is the first subject; it represents an absolute minimum of thematic material, but enough to clearly establish the mood of the sonata (Figure 4).

![FIGURE 4](image)

Figure 4. 5/I, measures 1-6.

Following a nine-measure transition, concluding with an E major cadence, the second subject begins on the
dominant of C# minor, the relative minor of the expected E major (Figure 5).

Figure 5. 5/I, measures 16-19.

Progressing by fifths through a six-measure phrase, the second subject continues into four additional four-measure phrases (including the codetta) and concludes with a perfect cadence on unison E in measure 37.

The first anomaly of the movement is found at this point in a curiously defined section, enclosed by double bars and changes of signature. This section, which fails to qualify as a third subject because of its accompanimental rhythmic relationship to the second subject as well as its lack of a final perfect cadence, is an eight-measure period with a three-measure extension. This passage concludes with a half-cadence on the dominant of E.

The key again changes back to three sharps, with the tonality reverting to E major. While the thematic material
is new, it is again akin to the second subject. It is constructed of an eight-measure period with a four-measure extension. The exposition concludes with a two-measure codetta and a perfect cadence in E major.

The development of number 5/1 begins with the first subject, stated in the key of the dominant. From this point on, the middle section consists entirely of new material, and is thus episodic. Finally, at measure 101, an abrupt recapitulation is effected. However, it is an incomplete return, entering as though at measure 22, in the midst of the second subject. This is the second important anomaly of movement 5/1. Another abbreviated recapitulation in movement number 1/1 was discussed previously in this chapter. From this point to the end of the movement the material is identical to that of the exposition, excepting that the original tonic keys of A major and minor are retained throughout.

It is apparent that sonata number 5/1 illustrates some rather atypical characteristics when considered with the bulk of the piano sonata movements. Particularly unusual is the strange eleven-measure passage in minor which has been inserted between what must properly be considered two parts of the second subject in the exposition and recapitulation. Whether termed a third subject or another part
of the second subject its appearance is irregular and represents a treatment never again attempted by Haydn in the piano sonatas.

III. SONATA NUMBER 19/1, D MAJOR, 1767

As quoted more fully on page 10, Chapter I, Landon says that C. P. E. Bach's style is discernible in some of the interim clavier sonatas of the seventeen-sixties. He adds: "In Sonata No. 19, (1766-68), the influence becomes much more than discernible . . ." Sonata 19/1 is also the first movement recorded as possessing a "worked out" development. A more detailed examination of this movement reveals something new in Haydn's style.

Following the first subject in D major (measures 1-18), the second subject enters in the left hand, beneath a strongly rhythmic treble accompaniment. While it bears a distinct rhythmic resemblance to the first subject, and is thus not highly contrasted with it, the second subject nevertheless asserts itself as the firm occupant of the dominant key area (Figure 6).

The second subject is cast in double period form and concludes on a perfect cadence on the third beat of measure 33. An eight measure coda elides into a two measure codetta to end the exposition section on measure 42.

![Figure 6](image)

**FIGURE 6**

Figure 6. 19/I, measures 19-21.

The development provides a rich interplay between thematic members, following this scheme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURE NUMBERS</th>
<th>LENGTH</th>
<th>THEMATIC SOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43-47</td>
<td>5 meas.</td>
<td>First subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47-56</td>
<td>8½ meas.</td>
<td>Second subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-57</td>
<td>1 meas.</td>
<td>Coda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57-66</td>
<td>9½ meas.</td>
<td>Second subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-68</td>
<td>2½ meas.</td>
<td>Retransition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the second subject dominates as developmental material, there is still a well balanced treatment of all the expositional elements and, most important, for the first time these elements are handled as raw material for a true "working out" section. This may best be illustrated by the appearance of the second subject accompaniment figure in measure 57. While the original figure has moved into the left hand
in an abbreviated form, a new counter melody comes to prominence in the right hand (Figure 7).

![Musical notation](image)

**FIGURE 7**

Figure 7. 19/I, measures 57-60

This new concept of the role of the development is that which Landon has indicated can be traced to C. P. E. Bach, beginning with this sonata. Thus, this must be considered a milestone movement, representing a significant new compositional maturity for Haydn.

It is interesting to note in the recapitulation that again (as in sonata 1/I) Haydn shortens his first subject. However, in this case it is the entire first period which

---

is deleted, leaving intact the second period, transition, second subject, coda, and codetta.

IV. SONATA NUMBER 27/I, G MAJOR, 1774-76

This movement, like the others discussed in this chapter, illustrates a noteworthy deviation from its predecessors. Here, the developmental fabric is woven entirely of second subject material, to the exclusion of all other themes. Immediately following the sonatas of this period, Haydn's sonata-allegro movements show a tendency toward an extreme de-emphasis of the contrasting second subject, particularly within the development. Thus, movement 27/I signals an interesting turning point.

A highly tuneful first subject opens this sonata (Figure 8).

![Figure 8](image)

**Figure 8.** 27/I, measures 1-5.
It is customary for Haydn to open his transitional passages with a phrase which is a virtual repeat of the principal subject. This technique is illustrated in this movement. Immediately following this preliminary phrase the transition begins to modulate to the key of D major. The repetitive portion of this passage and the beginning of the modulation are illustrated in Figure 9.

FIGURE 9

Figure 9. 27/I, measures 13-20.
The second subject, over a monotonous Alberti bass line, recalls the spirit of the first subject. However, it avoids its forthrightness through the employment of an appoggiatura in measure 26 and an acciaccatura in measure 28 of the first phase (Figure 10).

![Figure 10](image)

**FIGURE 10**

Figure 10. 27/I, measures 25-31.

At this point the subject launches into a series of overlapping phrases and periods, which continue to the brief codetta ending the exposition. A diagram of the complete second subject illustrates its form. It is not set in song-form; few of Haydn's subjects or themes are songs:
Figure 11 compares the opening measures of the development (measures 58-61) with the passage from the second subject in the exposition from which it has been drawn (measures 32-35). This theme has been changed in a number of respects:

(1) The rhythmic emphasis within the phrase has been shifted.

(2) The tonality has been altered from major to minor.

(3) The upward leap of melody now spans an octave rather than a fifth.

(4) The accompanimental figure has changed from octave leaps to the familiar Alberti broken chord which characterized the bulk of the second subject in the exposition.
The balance of the development continues to utilize this same thematic fragment, subjecting it to chromatic and sequential treatment.

FIGURE 11

Figure 11. 27/I, measures 32-35 and 58-61. A comparison of second subject material as it appears in the exposition and development sections.

No other thematic material is used, so the development of 27/I emerges as a monothematic treatment—virtually the only sonata movement in which this occurs with the second subject. Sonata number 49/I of 1789-90 comes closer to duplicating this treatment than any other; however, in number 49/I the second subject is such a close relative of the first that when it appears in the development it must
be considered as an appearance of both themes simultaneously.

In the recapitulation of sonata number 27/1 the second subject is further emphasized, both by making an appearance in the transition passage and by enlargement through repetition of its first phrase. This movement, thus, stands out as an anachronism—a thoroughgoing study in depth of the second subject. Unfortunately, it did not result in an especially good movement, which Haydn must have realized, for he never repeated this technique. In fact, as previously noted, after the completion of the next three sonatas of the same years (numbers 28, 29 and 30), he commenced a growing inclination toward monothematicism. This, then, was to be the next step in the resolution of Haydn's lifelong search for the role of the second subject. The discussion which follows on sonatas number 52/1 and 50/1 amplifies upon this point.

V. SONATA NUMBER 52/1, Eb MAJOR, 1794.

This movement belongs to the first of the three final and best known of Haydn's solo piano sonatas. Oliver Strunk states that Haydn wrote no piano music at all during the first London tour. Strunk's research indicates that the correct chronological order for the three final sonatas is just the reverse of that implied by Karl Pasler in the Breitkopf and Hartel catalogue. That is, number 52 in Eb
was written first, followed by number 51 in D, and finally by number 50 in C.  

This movement is the only one possessing a distinct third subject. This is not as unique as it may at first seem. As was pointed out in Chapter III on pages 28 and 29, this movement actually differs but little in form from a substantial number of others.  

The determination of the presence or absence of a third subject is made primarily upon the relative strength of the cadence concluding the full second subject or the first part of the second subject, as the case may be. Goetschius' definition of a subject (or more precisely, in his terminology, a "theme") includes these characteristics:  

(1) It is a musical sentence, illustrating melodic, harmonic, and particularly rhythmic consistency.  

(2) It is of sufficient length to establish this individuality.  

7 Cf. ante, pp. 28-29.  
It must be added that before a new "theme" or subject can begin the previous one must have ended—hence, an obvious requirement is that it be preceded not only by a complete and structurally correct prior subject, but also by a strong cadence.

In many cases, one or more of these requirements was met, but either the material itself failed to stand alone as a true subject, or the material preceding it demanded the remaining material as its logical continuation. More often, however, the sole impediment to the designation of a third subject lay in the weakness of the cadence concluding the preceding material. Some of these cadences were delivered on an unaccented beat; others were deceptive—ending a major passage on an unexpected minor vi chord, often immediately denied in the following passage. Others, again, were constructed on weaker inversions or hollow and incomplete tonics. In but one case did Haydn so prepare and execute his second key-area material as to permit a division into both second and third subjects, and that was in the sonata under discussion.

The movement opens with the powerful first theme (Figure 12).
The second key-area, beginning on measure 17, is thematically a virtual image of the first subject, although it quickly moves into a scale-wise passage, continuing for a total of eleven measures (Figure 13).

![FIGURE 12](image)

**Figure 12.** 52/1, measures 1 and 2.

![FIGURE 13](image)

**Figure 13.** 52/1, measures 17 and 18.

The second subject's final cadence in measures 26 and 27 is perfect, by every test (Figure 14).
The cadence complete, the third subject (still in the dominant key-area) enters in a distinctive new mood (Figure 15).

FIGURE 14

Figure 14. 52/I, measures 26 and 27.

FIGURE 15

Figure 15. 51/I, measures 27-29.
Counting measure 27, this third subject is eight measures long. It concludes by eliding into an eight measure restatement of the first subject (Figure 16).

A dramatic piano to forte sweep leads to the four-measure codetta, concluding the exposition (Figure 17).

The development opens with Haydn's most uncommon modulation in the sonatas—a two-measure link passage from Bb major to C major. This is accomplished by means of a pure Italian Sixth chord, of the key of C. Following this striking modulation, the third subject immediately asserts itself in the key of C major, representing a departure from
Haydn's norm of beginning the developments in the key of the dominant (Figure 18).

All thematic members make their appearance in what is truly a sparkling development, except the original two-measure motive which identified both the first and second subjects in the exposition. In the development, Haydn explores keys which are more remote than those found in any previous sonata-allegro movement. Following a decisive cadence in G major (measure 67), a sudden change is made
to E major for further development of the third subject (Figure 19).

Finally, Haydn accedes to the fact that the second subject is but a pale echo of the first and serves only as a transition to the third subject. In the recapitulation he halves the second subject to but five measures and shifts it to the less accented position of the third beat (Figure 20).
Sonata 52/I stands alone as a movement illustrating a third subject, but in reality, as seen by the examples cited, the second subject is virtually a transposition of the first subject to a new key; thus it lacks identity as an original theme. However, because of its occupancy of the expected secondary key-area, it must be considered to fulfill the requirement of a second subject, albeit non-contrasting. The third subject, as a separate and contrasting entity within the secondary key-area, does ultimately provide the desired contrast. In the majority of other sonata-allegro movements, this same role is played by the second part of the second subject. The distinction between the two forms is not especially great, in a functional sense.

In the development, the composer has avoided this theme, held in common by the first and second subjects, preferring to "save" its predominant motive for the recapitulation. Here it is finally brought into nearly perfect balance with the contrasting element—the third subject—while the second subject is virtually brushed aside as useless.

This movement and the next one under discussion, number 50/I, represent the zenith of Haydn's piano composition. Thus, their disposition of the problem of the second subject must be considered as Haydn's "solution" within this medium, although as it will be seen, the symphonies apparently took
VI. SONATA NUMBER 50/I, C MAJOR, 1794-95

This movement, in addition to belonging to Haydn’s final piano sonata, is illustrative of two of the major characteristics noted on Table II, page 26, and referred to in Chapter III.

This movement possesses two of the most identical subjects found in all of the sonatas. Only the accompaniments distinguish the themes (Figures 21 and 22).

![Figure 21](image)

Figure 21. 50/I, first subject opening, measures 1-4.

The third appearance of this opening phrase occurs in measures 30 to 34 (Figure 23). Because it is still in the second key-area and its accompanimental figure is again different from that of the first and second subjects, it must be considered as development of the second subject, which is
itself essentially a development of the first, except for the key.

**FIGURE 22**

Figure 22. 50/I, second subject opening, measures 20-22.

**FIGURE 23**

Figure 23. 50/I, measures 30-34.
A second part of the second subject later appears in a contrasting mood (Figure 2b). This part continues until relieved by the codetta in measure 47.

![FIGURE 2b](image)

Figure 2b. 50/I, measures 37 and 38.

Here, then, is the final result (in the piano-sonatas) of Haydn's experimentation with the second subject and its role in the exposition section. The first and second subjects are virtual identities—but not quite. This theme of the second subject is given added emphasis by yet another appearance in the exposition. Finally, almost as an afterthought, the contrasting material is introduced as a second part of the second subject, to fulfill what by now is an insistent demand for variety.

In the development, this primary theme is submitted to richly varied treatment. The theme shows through the developmental fabric in three distinct places (Figures 25, 26 and 27).
Figure 25. 50/I, measures 54-56.

Figure 26. 50/I, measures 60-63.
The second part of the second subject, too, makes a brief seven measure appearance before the retransition.

FIGURE 27

Figure 27. 50/I, measures 73-76.

The recapitulation of this important movement was described in detail in Chapter III, page 35. The utter transformation in character of the second subject provides one of the most beautiful passages in all of the sonatas (Figure 28).

In Chapter V this movement with its strange but effective solution to the problems of the second subject will be compared with Haydn's earlier efforts as well as his resolution of the problem in his other media of composition.
Figure 28. 50/I, measures 120-123.
It has been illustrated, in the foregoing chapters, that the sonata-allegro form was significantly shaped during its early years by Joseph Haydn. Although he was not the originator of the form, his lifetime of composition supplied a nearly ideal testing ground for this relatively new musical expression.

The baroque sonata, dance suites, and the French and Italian overtures (Sinfonia) provided the raw material from which Haydn and his contemporaries fashioned the modern sonata-allegro. The characteristic binary formal structure of this music became ternary as the middle section grew in importance, eventually asserting itself as an equal if not the dominant member of the movement. Guido Adler comments on the evolutionary nature of Haydn's sonata-allegro:

It [the sonata-allegro form] is actually a ternary form, despite its outward appearance of binary division (first section: exposition; second section: development and partially modified repetition, or reprise, of the first, with coda). In its proportions it conforms to the mathematician's "golden section": The first section is to the second as the second is to the whole. Yet the
working out of the scheme is never twice the same, but varies according to the content that is to be expressed.  

This element of freedom is the genius of the form. The song-forms, theme and variation, and rondos are all more confining forms than the sonata-allegro. Yet, we have grown accustomed, through the works of more recent composers, to expect a regularity of contrast through the interplay of differing themes. It has been observed that Haydn did not regard thematic contrast as an indispensable ingredient of his sonata movements. Adler continues:

Not even the contrast of two groups of thematic material in the first section is obligatory, and it is sometimes said that the execution of those movements in which Haydn uses no second subject is the more skillful.

Haydn's technique in coping with the demand for contrast—without always fulfilling it, yet never entirely thwarting it—was unique. Harmonically, his composition was regular; almost without exception he modulated to the expected secondary key during or immediately following a transitional passage from the principal subject. Once there, however, more often than not, instead of a contrasting subject he offered a close imitation of the first subject, only

2 Ibid.
later, in a second part of the subject, did he provide any real contrast. Georges de Saint-Foix observes that Haydn approved when he saw this same device employed by another composer:

Having been sent copies of Clementi's [Muzio Clementi, 1752-1832] latest piano sonatas in 1793 (probably Op. 7, 9 and 10), Haydn expressed delight with them, declaring them very beautiful. Here, in fact, for the first time Clementi—perhaps following in Haydn's footsteps—built his first movements on what was really but one theme; instead of the expected second and contrasting theme, there emerges a sort of pseudo second theme which in reality is nothing but a modification in key or expression, of the first theme. This is almost invariable with Haydn, and doubtless pleased him in Clementi.3

Rosemary Hughes suggests some of the underlying reasons for this unique thematic parallelism:

The fact that some of his [Haydn's] finest sonata-form movements are mono-thematic—that their so-called "second subject" in the complementary key is merely a modification of the first—is the strongest evidence of his ability to see the full range of possibilities latent in a single theme and having begun to "develop", he could not stop; his recapitulations begin to take on irregular contours, sometimes sharply condensed, sometimes surprisingly expanded, losing their first tame symmetry to regain a balance of a far higher and more satisfying order.4

Miss Hughes' philosophy is interesting when compared with that of another student of the form, Robert Sondheimer,

whose study was based upon the string quartets:

The content of the [sonata-allegro] movement is not to be disjointed by contrasting themes in the exposition. The first subject, therefore, does not immediately make way for intermediary episodes; it is retained as long as possible by repetitions and expanded with supplementary material. Thus, the roots combine into a strong growth which gives the exposition solidity from the first. Eventually, however, the main stem of the music has to spread out into a number of branches, and thereby ebbs away like a great river in a delta. . . . That is why in his quartets, time after time, Haydn tends to form the second subject from ingredients of the first. . . . The place assigned to the second subject is like a blind alley from which it has to run back into the main avenue.7

Although each of the two foregoing comments is frankly speculative as to the motivations behind Haydn's treatment of the second subject, they do represent careful observation of the facts of the matter.

A number of writers suggest that this "pseudo" second theme device makes possible a spaciousness otherwise impossible within Haydn's relatively small movements. Tovey calls this technique "Haydn's amazing invention."6 Geiringer, in


commenting on the frequent similarity of themes, not only within compositions, but even between each other, says, "He wanted to show that the main problem in a composition was how to deal with a theme, not how to invent it." He adds that this is the concept that Beethoven brought to fullness in his work.7

Although the above theories are unquestionably helpful in reaching an understanding of the second subject phenomenon, it is doubtful whether the question can ever be resolved on a solely intellectual basis. It is probably more valid to record the observed facts, then attempt to find an artistic basis for these findings. Landon observes, regarding the second subject in the symphonies of 1771-74, "Haydn had long struggled with the problem of the second subject; and during this period he is still uncertain how this unwelcome child should be treated."8 Landon illustrates with examples from the symphonies the existence of much the same situation of oscillation between clear-cut themes and variants of one theme as have been ascribed to


It is probably more than coincidental that four sonatas, presumably in sequence and written during the period 1774–80, avoid the employment of second subject material in the development sections of their first movements. Three of these movements have previously given the second subjects the lengthier statements in the expositions, yet in three of the four the second subject is closely related to and in weak contrast with the principal subject. After these four sonatas (Nos. 32/I, 33/I, 34/I and 35/I), the eleven remaining sonata-allegro form movements illustrate a consistent employment of second subject material in their developments. Evidently, some artistic answer was found about 1780 which enabled Haydn to reassert the second subject at least in his development sections. As though to partially balance this concession, however, he shortened the relative duration of the second subject in the recapitulations of five of these same last eleven movements!

If Haydn's former uncertainty about the role of the second subject had finally become resolved during the period 1780–95, some philosophical factor beyond—yet inclusive of—the first movement must have been responsible. Landon indicates that the answer lies in the solution of the problem of the last movement! Although he refers to the symphonies,
there is good reason to believe that the piano sonatas may offer a partially parallel conclusion:

The older Haydn grew, the more monothematic became his finales: the last movements of symphonies numbers 83-88 and 90 are based on one subject; in such a sonata finale as number 83/IV, Haydn simply introduces the main theme in the dominant key as a substitute for the second subject, while in numbers 84/IV, 86/IV and 87/IV the second subjects are derived from the first.°

Landon adds that although symphonies number 91/IV and 92/IV technically possess second subjects, they are either ignored or covered by the principal subjects so that the effect is virtually monothematic.10

Landon's final statement on the second subject question avers that ultimately Haydn achieved both an intellectual and an artistic reconciliation to the presence of the second subject in his first movements. According to Landon, this occurred in the Salomon Symphonies of 1790-95:

Haydn, who had fought the second subject throughout his whole career, now became reconciled to its presence in the first movements of the symphonies, as a necessary contrast, structurally and dramatically. This reconciliation, however, came about only after the problem of the finale was solved. In the 'eighties, he had evolved for the last movements a scheme which combined the monothematic unity of the rondo with the dramatic and dynamic possibilities of the sonata, and only after perfecting this hybrid finale was he willing to allow a dualistic thematic construction in the first movement.11

9 Ibid., p. 424. 10 Ibid. 11 Ibid., p. 576.
The parallel between the symphonies and the piano sonatas is not perfect. Haydn was never quite so bold with his sonatas as with his larger forms, and to some extent at least, this specific resolution of the problem of the second subject is not clear in the smaller works. Although the finales to the piano sonatas, as a group, were not investigated in this study, those which were deemed to be sonata-allegro in form were included. Two third-movement sonata-allegros appear in the last eleven movements; one of these is number 52/III, belonging to his final group of three sonatas composed for Therese Jansen in 1794-95. Thus, it is apparent that Haydn had not made quite the same firm decision regarding the finales in the piano sonatas as Landon has attributed to the symphony finales.

Additionally, only three of the last eleven movements recorded in Table II, page 26, show contrasting second subjects, while two have second subjects verging on imitations or developments of the first subjects (numbers 36/I and 50/I). Thus, lacking clear indications that Haydn intended to reassert the second subject as an element of conspicuous

contrast in his mature sonata first movements, no such inference may be made as Landon has done for the symphonies. Nevertheless, as reported on page 77, there was at least a tendency to restore the second subjects to the developments from which they had been so abruptly excised in the four movements beginning with number 32/I of 1774–76(?). In conclusion, this investigation has established that the role of Haydn's second subject was in process of active experimentation and change throughout his career. Beginning as a contrasting element, it became by the middle seventeen-sixties a predominantly complementary appendage of the first subject. In spite of this seeming unimportance, the second subject consistently retained its role as the occupant of the secondary key-area (usually the dominant or related major key), and as such was given a greater duration than the principal subject in a majority of the expositions. Even if the transitional passages had been included as part of the first subjects, the second subjects still would have approximately equaled the combined first subjects-transitions in expositive duration.

True third themes or subjects were nearly non-existent, but many second subjects were subdivided into two
parts--usually periods or longer--the second of which typically played a contrasting role denied the first part. There was occasional development of the second subject within the exposition, which served to strengthen its position in the exposition, but had little effect on subsequent sections.

Of the six episodes which replaced development sections, four were analyzed, because they contained material traceable to their expositions.

Nearly eighty per cent of the developments began with material from the first subject, typically a nearly literal restatement of the first phrase. The second subject provided recognizable material for seventy-nine per cent of the developments and was the leading source of material in forty per cent of them--more than the principal subject. Only a third of the developments could be termed a real "working out" of themes, motives, and other previously stated and new materials. Recognizing the easily debatable nature of these appraisals, the more factual statement may be made that the degree to which developments were "worked out" tended to increase--although not in a sharply rising curve--after the year 1767. As this date nearly coincides with the beginning of Haydn's "Sturm und Drang" period, it may be considered
as the starting point of his mature works, as contrasted with those representing his youth.

In all cases, Haydn composed regular recapitulation sections. His subjects returned in their expected order and showed few important changes from their original statements in the exposition section. The second subject was altered in slightly more than half of the cases but this alteration was not of great significance, as a rule. Usually, the alteration took the form either of further development or extension. In a number of cases, the second subject was shortened by the elimination of its first part.

Although most of the recapitulations retained a static ratio between subjects (in comparison with their ratio in the expositions), the second subject was lengthened in a majority of the remaining cases. However, there was a trend of at least minor significance for Haydn to shorten second subjects in the recapitulations of his later movements, representing another innovation.

Landon, in his summary of Haydn's contributions to the sonata-allegro form, says that during the late 'sixties Haydn began to realize the spiritual values which were
inherent in the beautiful symmetry of the sonata-allegro form. He adds:

... this realization had driven him to new heights of inspiration which ... had been suddenly and mysteriously checked in the year 1774. Now, drawing near the end of his career, he again shows his awareness of the symbolic significance of the three sections of the sonata-form.

All of this grew out of his gradual insight into the meaning of the "development" section ... It had constantly grown in significance, beginning as a "varied exposition" and gradually being enhanced by contrapuntal and more complex motif work.\(^\text{13}\)

The present study, suggested by Dr. Lucas Underwood, Professor of Musicology, College of the Pacific, offers support to Landon's position that a "spiritual" or philosophical maturation was taking place through Haydn's work within the sonata-allegro. Certainly, no lesser inspiration could have sustained this master's music so long within the hearts of men the world over.

\(^{13}\) Landon, op. cit., p. 577


