

THE MORPHOLOGY OF TEXTURE AND STYLE
IN THE MINUET MOVEMENTS OF
HAYDN'S KEYBOARD TRIOS

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Music,
in the Department of Music,
University of Natal.
Durban, 1991

by

ROSELINE SHAPIRO

DECLARATION

I declare that unless otherwise stated this is my own, original work.


-----signed

R. Shapiro

December 1991

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	v
PREFACE	vii
LIST OF TABLES	iv

PART ONE BACKGROUND

I. THE MINUET	1
Introduction	1
The Minuet before the Sonata	2
The Minuet and the Emerging Sonata	18
The Minuet and Trio	
Within the Sonata	25
Notes	29
II. THE KEYBOARD TRIO AND THE MINUET	30
Accompanied Keyboard Music	30
Textural Aspects of Haydn's	
Keyboard Trio	34
Haydn's Keyboard Instruments	37
The Minuet in Haydn's Keyboard Trio ...	39
Notes	43
III. HAYDN'S KEYBOARD TRIOS IN THE CONTEXT OF HIS	
ARTISTIC PERSONALITY	44
The Sociological Background	44
Haydn's Personality	50
The Place of the Keyboard Trio	
in Haydn's Creative Life	52
Some important Musical Influences	58
Notes	68

PART TWO
AN ANALYSIS OF THE MINUET MOVEMENTS
IN
HAYDN'S KEYBOARD TRIOS

INTRODUCTION	69
IV. THE EARLY TRIOS: NOS. 1-16	71
Notes	86
V. THE MIDDLE TRIOS: NOS. 17-30	87
The Minuet and trio of No. 17	87
The <i>Tempo di Menuetto</i> movements of:	
No. 19	90
No. 21	102
No. 24	114
No. 30	124
Notes	133
VI. THE LATE PERIOD	134
The <i>Tempo di Menuetto</i> of No. 40	134
The Absence of the Minuet movement	142
Notes	146
VII. CONCLUSION	147

LIST OF TABLES

1. The Minuet movements in Trios 1-16	72
2. The varied Reprise in the <i>Tempo di Menuetto</i> of Trio No. 19	99

LIST OF WORKS CITED	166
---------------------------	-----

ABSTRACT

Haydn wrote approximately forty-five keyboard Trios between 1760 and 1796. About fifteen of them date from his youth and the rest from the later part of his creative life. This study traces the changes in the Minuet-type movements in these Trios, commencing with the early Minuet and trio *da capo* works in which the Minuet and trio each conform to a binary structure; continuing with the sophisticated composite tri-partite structures of the *Tempo di Menuetto* movements of the middle-period works; and ending with the late period and the eventual demise of movements with Minuet indications in their titles.

As background to the above, the study traces the Minuet from its origins in the dance through to its place in the newly emerging Sonata plan. An investigation into the beginnings of the keyboard Trio assesses the position of the Minuet movement within the Trio genre. Background material also draws on Haydn's socio-musical environment, and the relation of his social and psychological circumstances to his composition of keyboard Trios and, more specifically, to the Minuet-type movement within the Trio.

The study raises a number of questions during the course of the investigation, the most important of which relate to the morphological changes in Minuet-type movements and to their gradually declining presence in the Trios.

In conclusion, the findings show that although the Minuet movement is generally considered to be the least complex of the movements of the Sonata plan, these movements reflect many aspects of the newly born Sonata form. Additionally, a number of style-characteristics occur with such regularity that they may well be regarded as reliable indications of Haydn's "Minuet style".

PREFACE

The Haydn keyboard Trios constitute a body of work which has been comparatively neglected by musicologists as well as by performers. Furthermore, musicologists have a tendency to concentrate their academic efforts on movements other than the Minuet. This would seem to be particularly unfortunate in the case of the Haydn Trios, for it is in the Minuet movements that the composer reveals many experimental and forward looking ideas.

The reader is referred to two comprehensive bibliographies of Haydn literature. The first is compiled by A. Peter Brown and James T. Berkenstock, *Joseph Haydn in Literature: A Bibliography*, in *Haydn-Studien*, III/3-4, 173-352, July 1974; and the second, which is a supplement to the earlier version, is compiled by Walter von Horst, *Haydn-Bibliographie 1973-1983*, in *Haydn-Studien*, V/4, 205-306, December 1985.

There tends to be confusion between the two usages of the word trio, one referring to a work for three players, and one referring to the section which traditionally follows a Minuet. In order to differentiate between the two, the term "Trio" in this study will refer to the keyboard Trio genre, and is here always written with an upper case "T", while the term "trio" referring to a section, as in Minuet and trio, is written with a lower-case "t", except when it is part of a title. The English spelling "Minuet" is retained throughout except in special instances when the French "Menuet", or German "Menuett" are part of a title; "Tempo di Menuetto" is used since this is the usage of the

term which is generally used in the Doblinger edition of the Haydn Trios.

The Urtext edition of *Joseph Haydn Klaviertrios* edited by H.C. Robbins Landon and published by Doblinger Vienna, has been used as the standard of reference throughout this study. The present writer has relied on the editor's opinion in all matters relating to the score, except when otherwise stated. When reference has been made to the solo Sonatas, the Wiener Urtext edition, *The complete Piano Sonatas*, edited by Christa Landon has been used.

The abbreviation DDT is used for *Denkmäler deutscher Tonkunst*, and DTÖ is used for the abbreviation of *Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich*.

I wish to acknowledge my thanks to the following. First and foremost to my supervisor Professor Beverly Parker who has assisted me with unstinting generosity and infinite patience. To Professor Christopher Ballantine for help with the sociological aspects of the thesis, to Father Philip Vietri who initiated me into some of the mysteries of the computer, and to Music Librarian, Rika Engelbrecht for whom no library task is either too trivial or too daunting. I also wish to thank Jilian Hurst of the Speech and Drama department for advice on the dance steps of the Minuet.

My sincere thanks go to Dr. Robin Walton of the Music Department of the University of the Witwatersrand, who guided me through the early stages of this thesis.

For providing the loving and supportive background to my endeavours, I thank my family.

A. Peter Brown has produced a chart which sets out and collates the main editions of the Haydn keyboard Trios (1981: xvii). It is reproduced below. The present writer has marked the Minuet movements for the purposes of this study.

Key	Hoboken Catalogue	Doblinger (H.C.R. Landon)	Haydn Werke (Stockmeier and Becker-Glauch)	Peters (Hermann)	Breitkopf & Härtel (David)
G	XIV:6, XVI:6	3 ●			
C	XIV:C1	16 ●			
g	XV:1	5 ●	I/9	19	16
F	XV:2, XIV:2	17 ●	I/11	26	25
G	XV:5	18	II/1	28	28
F	XV:6	19 ●	II/2	25	23
D	XV:7	20	II/3	10	21
B \flat	XV:8	21 ●	II/4	24	22
A	XV:9	22	II/5	15	9
E \flat	XV:10	23	II/6	20	17
E \flat	XV:11	24 ●	II/7	16	11
e	XV:12	25	II/8	7	10
C	XV:13	26	II/9	14	8
A \flat	XV:14	27	II/10	11	24
G	XV:15	29	II/12	31	31
D	XV:16	28	II/11	30	30
F	XV:17	30 ●	II/13	29	29
A	XV:18	32		13	7
g	XV:19	33		17	14
B \flat	XV:20	34		9	13
C	XV:21	35		21	18
E \flat	XV:22	36		23	20
d	XV:23	37		22	19
D	XV:24	38		6	6
G	XV:25	39		1	1
f	XV:26	40 ●		2	2
C	XV:27	43		3	3
E	XV:28	44		4	4
E \flat	XV:29	45		5	5
E \flat	XV:30	42		8	12
e \flat	XV:31	41		18	15
G	XV:32	31			
D	XV:33	8 (lost) ●	I/App.		
E	XV:34	11 ●			
A	XV:35	10 ●	I/10		
E \flat	XV:36	12	I/1		
F	XV:37	1 ●	I/3		
B \flat	XV:38	13 ●	I/4		
F	XV:39	4 ●			
F	XV:40	6 ●	I/8		
G	XV:41	7 ●	I/7		
C	XV:C1	2 ●	I/2		
D	XV:D1	9 (lost)	I/App.		
f	XV:f1	14 ●	I/6		
D		15			

- signifies that the work contains a Minuet and trio.
- _ signifies that the work contains a *Tempo di Menuetto*.

PART ONE

BACKGROUND

CHAPTER I

THE MINUET

Introduction

The interdependence of dance and music is a fact so obvious that it need hardly be stressed. The precise ways in which the two arts influence each other are however often not so clear, their very closeness making the relationship a complex one.

The history of the minuet is a long and varied one, spanning many centuries. Indeed its longevity as an art form would appear to be out of all proportion to its weight as an artistic entity. It will be seen that during the course of its lengthy history, the Minuet embraces a variety of social, political, and aesthetic values. The extended tenacity and versatility of this seemingly slight form, as well as its ability to stimulate and penetrate deep into the fount of human creativity, merits investigation.

For the purpose of this study, the present investigation will stop at approximately 1760--that is at the time when

the Minuet was generally accepted as a movement in what came to be known as the Sonata plan. This does not of course imply that the history of the Minuet ended at this point. Friedrich Blume claims that the *da capo* Minuet was the forerunner of the nineteenth century character piece (1972: 56), and in various shapes and guises, the form has persisted well into our own century.

In tracing the path of the Minuet from its Terpsichorean roots through to its position in the Sonata plan, the approach in this study will not be so much to provide historical fact, for this has been done elsewhere.¹ Rather, the aim is to investigate some of the conditions responsible for the constantly changing shape of the Minuet before reaching what is to be the main thrust of this study--the morphology of the Minuet movements in Haydn's keyboard Trios. Why is it that the Minuet moved from dance to art-music? Why, of all dances, was it the Minuet that found its way into the Symphony/Sonata? Why did the Minuet gather the trio to itself? These are some of the perplexing questions that demand scrutiny, even if decisive answers are not always forthcoming. The discussion which follows is often speculative rather than factual, and the path traced is suggested rather than decisive.

The Minuet Before the Sonata

Origins

A polemic has grown in recent years, as to whether or not the Minuet originated as a folk dance of the French village of Poitou. An early reference to a peasant dance, the *Branle de Poitu*, is contained in Thoinot Arbeau's *Orchesography* (1589: 146,147). Here, this folk dance is described as one which is in triple time, and accompanied by the stamping of feet--a description which would, in

retrospect, suggest that the *Branle de Poitou* might well have been the early forebear of the more sophisticated Minuet.

Michael Praetorius (?-1621), a German composer and theorist of considerable standing, gave credence to the above suggestion by stating in his *Terpsichore Musarum* of 1612,² that the Minuet is descended from the *Branle de Poitou*. This theory was re-affirmed more than a century later, in 1725, by the French dance master Pierre Rameau in his authoritative work *Le Maître à danser* (Meredith Ellis Little 1980: 353).

Some studies however tend to disprove the link between the two dances. Frank Kidson claims that "there is virtually no point of similarity between the two dances" (1966: 786). Meredith Ellis Little infers that Praetorius was mistaken in his assumption (1980: 353), and David Tunley casts similar doubts on the possible link between the two dances (1982: 102). The situation is clouded further by a deficiency of printed dance music in France from about the time of Arbeau's *Orchesography* of 1589, until the Praetorius *Terpsichore* of 1612; and this despite the abundance of ballet productions at the French court at that particular time. James R. Anthony suggests a possible reason for this: it may have been due to a technique, says Anthony, which, not unlike contemporary jazz, allowed for artists to work from a memorized dance tune which would then be improvised upon in performance (1974: 290). The suggestion is pertinent, though unsubstantiated.

Despite the lack of clarity in theoretical opinion as to the origins of the Minuet as a dance, the music itself presents a somewhat more convincing picture. Ellis Little concedes that some early Minuets contained in the Philidor

Collection³ are constructed in three-bar phrases, and since the three-bar phrase is one of the hall-marks of the *Branle*, the association between the two cannot be entirely dismissed (1980: 353). The following extracts would strengthen this assumption. They are taken from works written between about 1612 and 1709. All have the three-bar phrase structure. This thread running through the four extracts ranging over almost a century is too strong to ignore. It provides a distinct pointer to a continuous line between the music of the *Branle de Poitou* (*Bransle* in Example 1) and that of the Minuet.

Example 1: From Michael Praetorius' *Terpsichore* of 1612 (Martens 1957: 5).

Bransle de Poictou



Example 2: Louis Couperin (1630-1665) (A. Davison and W. Apel 1950: II, 93)

Menuet de Poitou



Example 3: Jean Baptiste Lully from *Armide et Renaud* 1686
(Martens 1957: 6)

Menuett



Example 4: J.S. Bach Minuet from Suite BWV 820, ca 1709

While the origins of the Minuet as a dance are far from established, it is important for this study to take into cognisance the fact that, regardless of its actual origins, the Minuet was thought to have originated as a folk dance called *Branle de Poitou*. This belief held sway at least from the time that it was claimed to be so by Michael Praetorius in 1612, until well into the eighteenth century. The belief in itself would have had an effect on those composers and choreographers of Minuets who lived and worked during the time that the idea prevailed.

The same line of reasoning could well be applied to the origins of the word "minuet" since here too, no consensus of opinion exists. Whether the etymology of the word is from the French "pas menu" (small step), or not, the fact that it was thought to derive from a word meaning small or

dainty, would undoubtedly have had an effect on both the dance and its music.

More clear than its origins, and confirmed by all historical evidence, is the fact that the Minuet gained tremendous popularity at the court of Louis XIV, especially after 1664. The peasant dance was at that time transformed into a vehicle for a court-dance of aristocratic refinement and artistry. The leap is clearly an important one, both to artists and to historians, and yet the way in which it occurred is unclear. Between the years 1612 and 1664, the developmental narrative of the Minuet is interrupted through lack of information. The three eminent reference works, *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, and the *New Harvard Dictionary of Music*, supply no information under the word "minuet" or "menuett", for the fifty or so years preceding the appearance of the Minuet at the court of Louis XIV. The reason for this omission, one must assume, is that reliable records for the history of the Minuet during these intervening years simply do not exist.

In the absence of alternate evidence, this study will take the liberty of suggesting a likely path of development, and the premise here is that this path is through early Ballet and Opera. This premise is given credibility by the well established fact that Ballet/Opera at the court of Louis XIV provided a wonderfully fertile nurturing ground for the Minuet dance, during its most glorious period. This apogee of development would hardly have existed as an isolated incident, but rather in a continuum of gradual change in the performing arts at that time. Since it is the aim of this study to investigate conditions that are responsible for change in the Minuet, it would at this point not be inappropriate to take a backward look at the state of

ballet and opera before 1664, in an attempt to identify those conditions.

Ballet and Opera between 1530 and 1630

Three facts appear repeatedly in the literature. They are mentioned here at the outset since they form an important background to the entire discussion.

Firstly, the dividing line between Ballet and Opera was a highly fluid one. Dance was often part of the court spectacles, and continued to remain important to Opera until well into the seventeenth century. Secondly, there was constant political and cultural cross fertilization between Italy and France--the two most musically powerful countries of the time--each reciprocally affecting the other. Thirdly, music and dance played a vital role in the court life of Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries: the musical spectacles were used not only as entertainment, but often too as an important political tool. It is known for example that Ferdinando de' Medici planned highly extravagant *intermedi* in Florence in 1589 to celebrate his marriage, and at the same time to proclaim the power of the Medicis.

The present hypothesis is that the change from *Branle* to Minuet, that is from folk-dance to art-dance, took place between the late sixteenth and mid-seventeenth centuries, and that the change occurred within the medium of Ballet/Opera--an art-form which was itself going through important changes at that time. However, even if this assumption of a parallel metamorphosis is incorrect, it is quite certain that the Minuet found a place for itself at the French court precisely because circumstances within Ballet/Opera made this possible. The co-incidence of

events, both historical and artistic, will serve to illustrate the point.

In 1533 Catherine de Medici came from Florence to be the wife of Henri II of France, (at that time Duke of Orleans). Catherine would almost certainly have been exposed to some of the elaborate spectacles which took place at the Medici court.⁴ She brought to France not only her interest in Italian culture, but most importantly, her Florentine ballet-master, Balthasar de Beaujoyeulx who was sent to take up service with the Queen. It was the practice at this time in both Italy and France, to commemorate an occasion, or to honour an important guest with a masquerade-like ceremonial. When the marriage of Marguerite of Lorraine to the Duke of Joyeuse took place in 1581, it was Beaujoyeulx who directed the entertainment. The spectacle was performed on a grand scale, and bore the title "*Circé ou le Balet Comique de la Royne*".⁵ It represents a highly successful merging of poetry and dance, and is generally regarded as marking the birth of the Ballet de Cour, the art form which was destined to reach its greatest heights some sixty years later when another Italian-born artist, Lully, was to take charge of music and dance at the court of Louis XIV.

Dance was an integral part of the various media that preceded the rise of opera (that is a dramatic work without spoken dialogue). There existed for a long time before opera proper, a variety of what Donington aptly refers to as "nearly operatic forms" which included both music and dance (1981: 44). Among these were the *intermedio*, *mascerade*, *moresca* and many more. They functioned, as the occasion demanded, either as diversion from, or supplement to the larger dramatic or comic work within which they were placed.

Around the turn of the century, opera composer Caccini and librettist Rinuccini were invited to Paris. Their visits gave opera of both countries a tremendous boost, the Italian composer bringing new ideas to France, while Rinuccini returned to Italy with new and advanced French concepts of ballet, which Nettl claims, were revived in Monteverdi's ballet *Ballo delle Ingrate* of 1638 (1947: 160). The links between ballet and opera, (or dance and music) were thus further strengthened, and the close association between drama, dance, and music more securely forged. Opera continued to gain popularity throughout seventeenth century Europe, as did ballet. The two art-forms, together and individually, were to produce the ideal vehicle for the specialized entertainment which was to become so much a part of the French court.

The situation as it existed in France in about 1630 represents an example of that extraordinary phenomenon which occurs from time to time in periods of artistic gestation. A web of diverse circumstances which have developed at a different rate, in various countries and in different fields of endeavour all coincide, and a new art form is born. French Opera/Ballet was the outcome of precisely such a situation, and in a more specialised sense, it was the "new" Minuet which emerged--perhaps alongside, but certainly as part of a new period of intense creative activity.

Music and Dance at the Court of Louis XIV

Of all the factors which were destined to influence the Minuet, surely none was more propitious than the partnership between King Louis XIV and Lully.

Lully (1632-1687), born in Italy as Giambattista Lulli, was a highly gifted dancer, choreographer, composer and violinist. Not only was he an immensely talented artist, but he excelled as a co-ordinator. He totally monopolised music, ballet and drama at the French court for more than thirty years. Lully wrote his first Minuet for the *comédie-ballet*, *Le Mariage forcé* in 1664 in collaboration with Molière: by 1678 the Minuet had become the most frequently performed dance in his operas (Anthony 1974:101).

Little estimates that Lully composed ninety-two Minuets between 1664 and 1687,--some for ballet interludes, and some for opera (1980: 355). It is important to the history of instrumental music, and particularly to this study, that Lully frequently combined Minuets with other dances from his ballets, to form chains of dance tunes. Often, these would form the overture to the larger work, and were performed by various combinations of instruments. This clearly foreshadows the instrumental Dance Suite, and furthermore helps to explain why the Minuet was assured of a place in the Suite.

King Louis XIV (1638-1715) was six years younger than Lully, and was himself a skilled dancer with a sensitive understanding of music. Lully provided the perfect foil for the King. The Monarch and the Musician formed a partnership which is unique in the history of both music and dance. Lully's all-pervading influence as an artist, was matched by Louis' omnipotence as an absolute monarch. "L'Etat c'est moi" is the phrase which Louis is said to have coined and which epitomises the spirit of his rule. Political life radiated from the Sun King at the court of Versailles; Lully was in total control of courtly

entertainment, and the Minuet was danced by the King, and by the people in honour of the King.

Politics and the Musical Spectacle

The use of entertainment as a political tool by the Medici family in Florence has been mentioned above. Robert Isherwood's description of the sumptuous musical pageantry at the Valois court in the sixteenth century is one of many studies which describe the expedient use of music in the courts of France (1973: 55-67). It is well known, for example, that the Valois Queen, Catherine de Medici, and her son Charles IX, arranged spectacles of great grandeur in order to secure political gain for France. Cardinal Mazarin, who was in effect Louis XIV's immediate predecessor, turned to the Ballet de cour in the seventeenth century, as a means of tranquillizing the people, especially after his problems with the *Fronde* revolt (Wendy Hilton 1981: 7). Louis therefore stepped into an already existing pattern of royal behaviour, and soon became a master at the art of exploiting lavish musical spectacles, in order to prove to citizens and foreigners alike, that all was well with France. The King, especially in his younger years, was frequently cast in the title role, and the Minuet was given a position of great importance in the proceedings. The ceremonial associated with the Minuet was a vital part of life at court; and in politics, it served a statesmen well if he was skilled as a dancer of the Minuet.

The Cultural Ethos of the *Grand Siècle*

A social reaction to the vulgarities and coarseness of French cultural life began hesitantly in the late sixteenth century, and gathered momentum until the mid-seventeenth

century. The new ideals embodied a spirit of elegance, serenity, and delicacy of expression, which manifested itself particularly in the poetry of the *Préciosité*, but found its way into the Arts in general. The Minuet was nothing if not flexible. It thoroughly absorbed the spirit of the times and then reflected it. Indeed the manner in which the Minuet was executed became a barometer for measuring cultural status. Wendy Hilton suggests that a man's breeding, education, and character could be judged by the way in which he danced the Minuet (1981: 295). In *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme*, the work in which Lully collaborated so successfully with Molière, the Dancing-Master is given the following lines (1670: Act 1, Scene 2. Quoted also in Sachs 1937: 399-400).

There is nothing so necessary to men as dancing...Without dancing, a man cannot do anything...All the misfortunes of men, all the miserable reverses of which history is so full, the blunders of politicians, and the mistakes of great captains, all these solely arise through not knowing how to dance.

Though conceived ironically, the extravagant utterances of the Dancing-Master serve to reveal the contemporaneous attitudes to dancing, and since the Minuet was the most popular of dances, one may assume that these sentiments apply equally well to the Minuet.

It is not surprising that in such a society etiquette was valued as a highly important aspect of human behaviour. The Minuet moulded itself easily to the demands of etiquette and of protocol: which couple should begin the dance, who should follow on, how the bow should be taken, all these details and more, were often planned in advance, and then carefully executed, according to strict laws of social hierarchy. Especially important was the etiquette

of love, and since the seventeenth century Minuet was essentially a dance of subtle courtship, it was often the vehicle for delicately concealed wooing. Unlike the other *danses a deux* (couple dances), the couple dancing the Minuet dance face to face, holding virtually continuous eye contact. They are expected to perform the dance in accordance with the social expectations of the period; the tension is always controlled, disciplined, and without excess. As Curt Sachs puts it "the erotic is stylised to the last degree, everything is suggested, refined and generalised to the point of formalism" (1937: 398-399). Many cultural ethics of the period are faithfully reflected in the Minuet. One might even go so far as to say that the Minuet played a part in creating them.

The Dance Itself

Despite the historical uncertainty which surrounds the Minuet, one fact remains constant throughout: the Minuet's ability to absorb change, while at the same time keeping its essential character. This is as true for the dance as it is for its music. Steps varied with the passage of time, and according to the teachings of many different dance masters. The floor pattern too underwent changes, the movement of dancers in early Minuets conforming to a figure 8, changing to an S shape in the time of Louis (S being the symbol of the Sun King), and later still changing to a figure 2. The details of the steps are well documented, and will not be discussed here.⁶ However, some aspects of a distinctly musical nature, merit special mention.

The unusual relationship of dance-steps to music in the execution of the Minuet, is mentioned by most dance theoreticians, and among them is Meredith Ellis Little (1980: 354). Little's approach is largely from the

musician's view-point, and it is therefore particularly valuable in the present context. Little stresses the fact that the basic unit of the Minuet is two bars long: in two bars of music, that is six crotchets, the natural strong beat of the music will fall on beats one and four while for the dancers, depending on the patterns which they are using, steps will fall on beats one three four and five, or one three four and six. That is to say, there are four dance steps to six crotchet beats. The result of this is a metric disturbance, which, though rather gentle, causes a strong underlying tension between dance and music.

Wendy Hilton, in her discussion on the steps of the Minuet, elaborates on the hemiola effect which arises from the cross-rhythm between step-units and music (1981: 240). In the following example Hilton shows how the metric accent of the music falls on beats one and four, while the dance accent falls on one and three. This cross-rhythm in itself suggests a hemiola.

Example 5:

Music	
Dance	

The cross rhythms become even more complex when a hemiola occurs in the music. In the following example (Hilton 1981: 241), the strong accent on the seventh crotchet (beat one of the second unit), is weakened by the hemiola in the music. This impedes the co-incidence of dance step and metric accent on the strong first beat.

Example 6:

Example 6 shows two staves: Music and Dance. The Music staff contains a melody in 3/4 time, consisting of three measures. The first measure has three quarter notes. The second measure has a quarter note followed by a half note with a slur over it. The third measure has three quarter notes. The Dance staff shows a 3/2 hemiola pattern over the same three measures. The first measure has three quarter notes. The second measure has a quarter note followed by a half note with a slur over it. The third measure has a quarter note followed by a half note with a slur over it, and then a quarter note. The Dance staff is divided into three measures by vertical bar lines.

Curt Sachs too discusses the way in which the 3/4 melody is countered by the 3/2 hemiola of the dance, a feature which, he says, became part of the Minuet soon after the middle of the seventeenth century (1953: 286). His illustration below shows the long bending step of the right foot extending over two beats, and another long bending step with the left foot extending over the bar-line (also two beats), followed by two straight short steps of one beat each.

Example 7:

Example 7 illustrates step patterns for the right and left feet. The right foot pattern is 'r. bending step forward straightening' over two beats. The left foot pattern is 'l. bending step gliding straightening' over two beats. The right foot pattern is 'r. straight forward' over one beat. The left foot pattern is 'l. straight forward' over one beat.

Lyn Oxenford (1958: 232-233) gives more explicit instructions as regards the basic steps. Oxenford explains that the lifted look which the dance elicits is a result of the no heel-drop on beats three and four, that is to say the beat is held across the bar-line.

It will be seen in Part II of this thesis that the hemiola, which is inherent in the relationship of dance and music in the seventeenth-century Minuet, is used with great

sophistication in the art-music Minuet of the eighteenth century.

From Dance to Instrumental Music

As the historical narrative of the Minuet moves from the dance into art music, it is the lutenists who play a leading role. The lute was the seventeenth century instrument which was most closely associated with the every-day life of the people of France, whether in worship, socially, or domestically. Since the spirit of the dance permeated all French music, it is not surprising that it entered deeply into the domain of this most intimate of instruments. It is the lutenists who formed the vital link between the dance music of the court, and the instrumental music which forms the nucleus of this study.

Headed by the Gaultier family, the seventeenth century lutenists produced a rich treasury of music. The essential refinement of the instrument lends itself admirably to the sentiments of the *précieux*. At its best the music was of great delicacy and often of deep intensity. Wilfrid Mellers writes of the lute as a "musical-maid-of-all-work" (1968: 188): widely used as an accompanying instrument, it was also the favoured instrument for transcriptions of vocal music, and most importantly, the most popular solo instrument for dance compositions. Denis Gaultier's 1669 collection bears testimony to the lutenists' great interest in the dance (Prunières 1943: 258 N).

The French Clavecinists.

After the death of Denis Gaultier in 1672, the number of compositions for lute began to decline, but despite this, lute music was kept alive in a most unusual way. Manfred Bukofzer comments, on the "astonishing and unique transfer

of idioms" (1948: 169) which took place when the clavecinists emulated, in their harpsichord compositions, both the idiom and style of the lute--and of course with this transference, the Clavecinists took over their predecessors' profound interest in the dance.

Jacques Chambonnières (d.1672) who is considered to be the father of the clavecinists, was in the service of both Louis XIII and Louis XIV, thus maintaining the tradition of serving Music to the honour of the French court. He had a devoted following, foremost among them being Louis Couperin (d.1661), Nicolas le Bègue (d.1630) and Jean Henri d'Anglebert (d.1691). Dance pieces in binary form abound in all their works and each of these composers wrote Minuets.

Generally regarded as being the greatest of all the French clavecinists, is Francois Couperin le Grand (1668-1733). The possessor of an unusually rich musical heritage through a long line of family musicians (he was Louis' nephew), Couperin inherited also the tradition of love of the dance. Mellers makes the interesting suggestion that Couperin's *ordres* (a series of suites for harpsichord) should be regarded as miniature ballets expressed in absolute music, through a single instrument (1968: 79).

Couperin, following a well-established French tradition, arranged the *clavecin ordres* as an anthology of small pieces with fanciful titles, but among them, are a large number simply entitled "Minuet". Nor is the presence of the Minuet confined to his works for harpsichord; several chamber ensemble works such as *Concert Royaux* (1722) *Les Nations* (1724) and *Les Goûts Réünis*, also contain Minuets.

French Baroque music, in the words of Anthony, "speaks of

the dance in all its guises as does no other music" (1974: 1). In this milieu the Minuet flourished and matured. There is not a shadow of doubt that by 1730, at the very latest, the Minuet occupied a firm position in French instrumental music. The question now is how the music of the Minuet spread to the rest of Europe, and how it ultimately arrived at what is to be the heart of this investigation--the Sonata in Austria of the 1760s.

The Minuet and the Emerging Sonata

In order to discuss the absorption of the Minuet into the Sonata it will be necessary to digress briefly, so as to examine the state of the embryonic Sonata in Europe around the mid-eighteenth century.

The middle of the century marks an important watershed period for music in Europe. J.S. Bach at about that time in Leipzig, was nearing completion of *Die Kunst der Fuge*, the work which perhaps best symbolises the pinnacle, and at the same time the end, or near-end of counterpoint as a prominent force in composition. By 1750 the Baroque Dance Suite was virtually moribund with only the Minuet remaining as a relic of the old and a precursor to the new. Despite much vehement discussion between musicologists of this century, who each claim their own country to be the birth place of the Sonata, it is as yet still difficult to pinpoint a single country for this honour. Indeed the final change from Suite to Sonata probably took place, via a trend which was "in the air", and which was picked up by several creative thinkers independently though concurrently, resulting in what history has designated as pre-classicism.

France and Italy before 1760

French life under the early Bourbons was characterised by strong national unity, a strictly autocratic rule, and an immense national self-confidence. These, no doubt, are some of the reasons why French cultural life was so well able to sustain itself within its own boundaries, with little direct recourse to the rest of Europe. As far as music was concerned, creativity, especially during the reign of Louis XIV, was so deeply entrenched in the court, that it was hardly necessary to look beyond Versailles for fresh stimulus.

The situation in Italy was quite the opposite. The repartition of Italy after 1748 had the result that the Italian States, (with the exception of Piedmont, which remained Italian) were divided among several non-Italian monarchs. The cultural cross-fertilization which resulted from the foreign occupation, and the volatile political situation, had their effect on the economy, and on the creative arts. The political fragmentation was accompanied by a parallel emotional restlessness, and a dissatisfaction with what was seen as the rigidity of the old ways. Moreover the new, or newly-improved instruments which were being produced in Italy, provided the ideal vehicles for the new genre which were in turn shaped to suit the new instruments. In the absence of an autonomous political body, musicians in need of work, not only created music centres in various parts of the country, but moved out in a steady flow to various centres of Europe, taking with them their new compositional ideas, as well as their expertise as teachers; both commodities turning out to be highly exportable, and in great demand. Italy apparently held her influential position in the world of music until

the end of the eighteenth century, although Giorgio Pestelli points out that in retrospect Italy was beginning to lose her supremacy in all except opera, by the second half of the century (1984 : 1). But until then the dissemination of the new sonata concept by Italian musicians continued unabated. With it, went the Minuet.

Newman (1972:75) points out that as early 1685, G.B.Vitali had included a Minuet movement in his Sonatas, while Alessandro Scarlatti wrote Minuets as finales for several ensemble Sonatas at about the same time. Of course it is to be understood that these compositions, though they bear the title "Sonata", do not yet conform to the pattern which the term has come to denote. The very presence of a Minuet in a work entitled "Sonata", does however, with our retrospective vision, signify that an important process had been set in motion, and through it one is able to speculate on the early beginnings of the relationship between Minuet and Sonata.

A comprehensive list of Italian composers who included Minuet movements in their Sonata-type works in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century, is too lengthy to mention here: the line passes through such important masters as Arcangelo Corelli (1653-1713), Benedetto Marcello (1686-1739), Giovanni Batista Sammartini (ca 1700-1775), and Marco Rutini (1723-1797).⁷ Suffice it to say that by 1740 it was a most usual practice in Italy, to couch one movement, usually the last, of a Sonata-type work, in the form of a Minuet.

Austria and Germany before 1760

Like France, Germany was slow to take up the new Sonata idea. However, whereas French composers did not ever become deeply involved in the Sonata genre, composers in Austria and Germany, followed the opposite trend: once interest in the new form had been kindled, there was no stopping its progress.

The repertoire of Minuets which was produced in Austria-Germany before 1760, exhibit a marked duality. Its two streams correspond almost exactly to the influence of the two countries, France and Italy. Johann Jacob Froberger (1616-1667) occupies an important place at the forefront of those who succumbed to the influence of French music. He visited Paris in about 1652, and was familiar with the music of Gaultier, Chambonnière and Louis Couperin. Although he is not known for his composition of Minuets, he merits inclusion in this survey, since he stands at the head of those responsible for the absorption of elements of the French style into the German Baroque Dance Suite.

A second generation of German composers who were influenced by the French composers comprises three main protagonists:

Georg Muffat (1653-1704), Johann Sigismund Kusser (1661-1727) and Johann Casper Fischer (c1670-1746). All wrote Dance Suites in the French style, and these Suites contain Minuets. It was these three composers who were mainly responsible for disseminating the Minuet in the style of Lully into Germany. The French influence is marked, Kusser and Muffat actually having worked with Lully. Kusser's orchestral suite *Composition de Musique*

(1632), and Georg Muffat's *Florilegia* (1695-1698) in the same genre, are important in the history of the Minuet in the orchestral suite.⁸ Fischer's *Musicalisches Blumen-Buschlein* for keyboard is of significance since it contains a Minuet with a trio. It is now generally recognized that J.S.Bach was familiar with the work of Fischer.⁹ Whether Bach was influenced by Fischer in writing Minuets is not known, but certainly he wrote many including Minuet and Trio in the last movement of his first Brandenburg concerto, as well as in the keyboard Suites (for example see Ex.4 above)

The second stream of Minuet composers were active immediately before Haydn, and their influence on him is discussed in Chapter III, below. By the time that this second group was active, the Sonata was well past the embryonic stage, and these composers, showing the Italian influence, regularly wrote Minuets in their Sonata-type works. Matthias Georg Monn (1717-1750) is thought to have been the first to include a Minuet in a symphony in 1740.¹⁰ J.C.Wagenseil (1633-1708), J.A.Hasse (1699-1783) and I.Holzbauer (1711-1783) are among the important pre-classical composers who made the Minuet part of their works in Sonata plan.

The Tempo of the Minuet

The precise tempo of the Minuet, and the change in tempo according to different style periods, is a parameter well-nigh impossible to assess. Mellers suggests that the tempo slowed down to "*une élégante et noble simplicité*" in the time of Couperin (1968 : 241).¹¹ Anthony quotes several theorists' views on the tempo of the Minuet (1974 : 103). All are arbitrary, and their assertions impossible to prove. The discussion on this topic will

therefore be confined to indications within the Haydn Minuets themselves in Part II of this study.

The Trio of the Minuet

It was the practice in France, even before the time of Lully, to alternate sections scored for full orchestra, with those scored for smaller groups of instruments (Nettl 1947: 167). James Anthony describes in some detail, and with excellent references, not only the structure of the "King's music" at the court of Louis XIV (1974: 8-14), but also the tradition of the division of labour by musicians at the French court as far back as Henri III, Henri IV and Louis XIII (1974: Chapter 19).

There were at the court of Louis XIV, three large groups of players: these were the ensembles for the king's chamber, stable and chapel respectively. The most important group was under the administration of the king's chamber, and was known as the *Musiciens du Roi*: this consisted of the 24 *Violons du Roi* as well as a smaller group the *Petits Violons du Roi*. This latter group was created and led by Lully.

Another important and highly expert group of players was to be found in the *Ecurie* (stable) category of musicians. This was made up of the finest wind players, and was known as the *12 Grands Hautbois*. It was this group who, in addition to its other duties, augmented the string groups for performances at court ballets, operas, and *divertissements*. The scoring for the winds was often reduced to a three part texture, for two oboes and bassoon, thus contrasting with the typical "a 5" texture of the strings. It is this practice in the opinion of Blume (1972: 56) and others, which foreshadows the practice of

alternating the Minuet with a trio. There are many examples of this type of textural contrast in Lully's compositions: his prologue to *Armide* (1686) for example, contains two Minuets; the first is for five-part strings, and the second, a trio for two oboes and bassoon.

The practice of varying the texture was obviously continued after Lully, for Georg Muffat in his foreword to *Auserlesene Instrumental-Music* of 1701¹² offers the following suggestion:

Should there be among your musicians some who can play and modulate the French oboe or shawm agreeably, you may with the best effect use two of these instead of two violins, and a good bassoon player instead of the two French bass, to form the concertino or little trio in some of these concertos (Muffat translated in Strunk 1950: 451).

Erich Schwandt points out that from the seventeenth century onwards, the second of two alternating dances was called a trio whether it was scored for three instruments or not. He goes on to say that from the seventeenth century onwards, the main purpose of the trio which came after the Minuet was to provide sufficient music for the step pattern to be completed (1980: 151).

The tendency to alternate a dance with a second dance of contrasting texture was applied to a variety of dance-forms, and was by no means confined to the Minuet and its trio: Bach, in his orchestral Suite No. I BWV 1066, includes Gavotte I and II, Bourree I and II, Passepied I and II, as well as Minuet I and II. The second dance in each case functions as a trio. Later in the eighteenth century however it became, and remained the usual practice to couple only the Minuet (and later the Scherzo) with trio *da capo*.

The Minuet and Trio Within the Sonata

The Historical View

No doubt the powerful philosophical, social, and political influences which were at work when the Sonata itself was produced, also influenced the incorporation of the Minuet into the Sonata. The importance of these influences cannot be overemphasised, but although there is an underlying awareness of their presence, this discussion will concentrate more on the formal aspects.

The ancestral roots of the Sonata in the Dance Suite are well documented, and widely accepted. It would seem to be a valid expectation that a dance form from the past, should have survived and flourished in a newly emerging ambience. The Italian Overture is a more immediate forebear of the Sonata. This three movement form usually ends with a fast movement of a dance type (very often a Minuet), and since the Italian overture is an accepted model for the Sonata, it is not at all surprising that the Sonata should have incorporated a dance as one of its movements.

Seen from the eighteenth century contemporary view-point, it is not difficult to understand why a binary form dance movement turned out to be one of the members in the new Sonata pattern.¹³

Tonally, the binary form, like the Sonata form itself, usually establishes a tonic-dominant polarity (or at least an allusion to the dominant) towards the end of its first section. This, and the final return to the tonic, are crucial to the very existence of the sonata principle, as well as to the binary form. The period construction of the binary form, since it stems from the dance, is mostly

regular and strong, and matches the demands of composers of the Sonata form. Structurally, the dance form, frequently ends with a return, or at least an allusion to its opening.

This recall creates a situation closely resembling the recapitulation of the Sonata form. In a nutshell, the binary dance form is a perfect reflection, in miniature, of the principles of the Sonata form. Or, viewed historically, it would be more accurate to put it the other way around: the Sonata form is a grand elaboration of the essence of the binary dance form. Add to this, the elements of contrast and psychological release which the dance form provides between itself and the more serious movements, and its place in the Sonata appears to be a perfectly natural outcome of a strong evolutionary tide.

Why the Minuet?

From the above, it is patently clear that a movement in a bi-partite dance form was eminently suited to a place in the Sonata scheme. But there is a deeply puzzling question which hovers over the picture, and blurs its outlines. Why the Minuet? Why was that dance form and not the Bourrée or the Allemande? Or if it was the appeal of a triple meter which was the attraction, why not the Courante or the Passepied? And if it was the Minuet in conjunction with its trio that fitted the niche so well, why was it not for instance the Bourree and trio that survived? The answers to these questions are not easily found. An attempt to come closer to their solution will be made on examination of the movements themselves.

The Minuet in Central Europe in about 1760

For the purposes of this investigation, the Minuet has almost reached its destination, and though its outer morphology has changed radically, its essential qualities have remained. By the middle of the century, the Minuet was to be found in many countries of Europe, in diverse genres, and often in surprising contexts.

In composition, the Minuet had a place in virtually all the genres that were in use at the time, and in addition it was cast in a wide variety of unconventional roles. In Germany for instance, Georg Telemann wrote two sets of keyboard suites with the unusual titles, *Sept fois sept et un menuet* (1728) and *Zweytes seben mal seben und ein Menuet* (1730); in France Andre-Joseph Exaudet's, Minuet finale from his Op.2 No.1 of 1751, scored tremendous popularity, apparently reaching the status of what can best be described as "a hit tune" of the 1760's. Leonard Ratner describes a Minuet-related game devised by Johann Kirnberger and published in Berlin in 1757 (1970: 343-344). Entitled *Der allezeit fertige Menuetten--und Polonoisenkomponist*, the players using two six-sided dice, can come up with a seemingly infinite number of compositional possibilities.

The influential intellectual Baron F.W. von Grimm wrote a parable entitled *Le petit prophète de Boehmisch-Broda* as an indictment against the artificiality of certain artistic practices in France at the time (about 1740). The hero of the story is a writer of Minuets, the Minuet being the symbol of the natural and spontaneous expression of the people, as opposed to the contrived atmosphere of the Parisian Opera (reproduced in Strunk 1950: 619-635).

In instrumental pedagogy the Minuet became a most important vehicle for instruction: Leopold Mozart's notebook for Nannerl for example, contains a large proportion of Minuets.

The German theorist Mattheson (1681-1764) was one of the early pedagogues to use the Minuet in order to teach the rudiments of composition, a trend which was to continue throughout the century.

In short, by 1760, the Minuet or at least an allusion to the Minuet, was to be found in a remarkably wide variety of musical situations in Europe.

NOTES TO CHAPTER I

1. A concise history of the Minuet is given by Meredith Ellis Little 1980: 351-359.

Tilden A. Russel gives a broad resumé of the literature of the Minuet in 1983: 2-14.
2. The *Terpsichore* consists of 312 dances and airs, composed and arranged by Praetorius in collaboration with Pierre-Françisque Caroubel. The dances are arranged according to category, and the collection is a valuable source of information on dances which were popular in about 1600.
3. The Philidor collection contains ballet music from the time of Henri III to about 1700. The collection is divided between the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris and the Bibliothèque Municipale, Versailles.
4. An idea of the grandeur of the spectacles may be gained from David Nutter 1980: 263-269.
5. *Circé* is reproduced in *Chefs-d'oeuvre classique de l'opéra français, Vol I*.
6. Claudie Marcel Dubois 1949-1951: 106-107; Wendy Hilton 1981: 239-295; Meredith Ellis Little 1980: 353-358; and K.H. Taubert 1968: 167 among others, give details of Minuet dance-steps and floor-patterns.
7. A comprehensive summary is to be found in Newman 1972: 128-200.
8. *Florilegium Primum* is to be found in DTÖ I, (Vienna 1894), and *Florilegium Secundum* in DTÖ II, (Vienna 1895).
9. It is now generally accepted that Fischer's work *Ariadne* was a forerunner to Bach's *Das Wohltemperierte Clavier* (Susan Wollenberg 1980: 608).
10. Monn's Symphony in D major with Minuet, is to be found in DTÖ XV-2.
11. W. Mellers discusses the tempo of eighteenth century dance movements in some detail (1968: 347-349).
12. *Auserlesene Instrumental-Music* is a collection of instrumental Concerti. It is to be found in DTÖe XI-2 (Vienna 1904).
13. The eighteenth-century theorists have a contribution to make in this regard. For an account of theorists' views on the Minuet see Wolfram Steinbeck 1973: 8-9.

CHAPTER II

THE KEYBOARD TRIO AND THE MINUET

Accompanied Keyboard Music

The Doblinger edition of the Haydn Trios begins with a set of six, published by Hummel of Amsterdam in 1776, entitled *Six sonates pour le clavecin avec l'accompagnement d'un violon & violoncelle*. The implication of the title is clear: these are works written for a keyboard (almost certainly the harpsichord) as main instrument, with violin and cello accompaniments. Moreover, such was the situation at the time, that it was necessary to specify these particulars in the title so as to avoid misunderstanding: that is to say that the parts for the accompanying instruments, the violin and cello, are written out, or *obbligato*, while the harpsichord which traditionally provided the basso-continuo accompaniment, is, in these works, to be the dominating instrument. Also inherent in the title is the acknowledgement of a genus which embraces accompanied clavier music, and which is written according to the principles of the Sonata, as they were understood at the time. The genus was not the invention of Haydn. Indeed it was so popular, that Newman states that of all the Sonatas published in the important catalogues of eighteenth century instrumental music, it was the Accompanied Sonata that was the most frequently represented (1983: 99). The set of "accompanied sonatas" with which the Doblinger edition begins, is clearly the forerunner of

the subsequent keyboard Trios "proper"; their presence in this edition confirms the generally accepted view that accompanied clavier music is the forerunner of the keyboard Trio. It is worth noting that even the three last Trios, Nos. 43-45 were published in London in 1797 under the title "Three Sonatas for the Piano-Forte with an Accompaniment for the Violin & Violoncello dedicated to Mrs. Bartolozzi". It would thus be well to examine the roots of accompanied keyboard music more closely.

Documented examples of accompanied keyboard music go back, according to David Fuller, as far as 1614 (1974: 231). Of interest, since it bears reference to our previous discussion of the lutenists at the court of Louis XIV, is Fuller's mention of a harpsichordist Hardel, of the 1670s. Hardel was a pupil of Chambonnières; it is reported that he gave a weekly harpsichord performance for King Louis XIV, and performing with him, was an accompanist who played the lute.

Closer to the Classical keyboard setting, are J.S. Bach's *Sei Suonata a cembalo certato e violino solo, col basso per viola da gamba accompagnato se piace* (BWV. 1014-1019a), and the *Sonata a 1 Traversa e Cembalo obligato* (BWV 1030). These works are strongly forward-looking: not only do they contain predominantly written out *obligato* harpsichord parts, but in addition, all the parts show a remarkable degree of equality. Both these attributes were most unusual at the time (about 1720).

Naturally, changes did not come all at once, and the practice of the *basso-continuo* was to continue until the end of the century. In the transition period, performers were often allowed a variety of options, not only with regard to accompaniments, which could be *obligato* (written out) or *ad libitum* (left to the choice of the performer), but also as far as choice of instrument was concerned.

Georg Telemann for example, in about 1734 wrote works to which he gave the title *Six concerts*. These works could be played by flute and *obligato* harpsichord. In addition however Telemann made provision for four additional options. The full title of the work contains this prodigious inscription: "*Six concerts et six suites à clavessin et flûte traversière; ou à clavessin traversiere et violoncello; ou à violon, traversière et violoncello ou fondement; ou à clavessin, violon, traversière et violoncello, faits par Teleman*".¹ Haydn himself, in the keyboard Trios Nos. 28, 29, and 30 of about 1790 allows the option of either flute or violin.

The French composer, Jean-Joseph Cassanea de Mondonville (1711-1772), contributed something new with his *Pieces de clavecin en sonates avec accompagnement de violon*, Opus 3 of 1734. Though written for harpsichord and accompanied by violin, and though Mondonville places much of the emphasis on the harpsichord, he allows both violin and harpsichord to express themselves in the idiom best suited to each instrument. Barry Brook quotes Marc Pincherle in this regard: "*C'est bien la première fois que les deux instruments associes ici s'expriment, avec un egal interet, dans deux langues differentes*" (1962: I, 60). In so doing Mondonville was to set the trend for the future. Even when, as Newman points out (1983: 617-620), the violin doubles the keyboard as in the excerpt below of Opus 3 No.6, this does not last long: the violin soon becomes part of the imitative texture of the work (the excerpt is from Brook 1962: 61).

Concerto

Violon

Allegro [tutti]

Clav. [Tutti]

14

Solo

Jean Philippe Rameau (1683-1764), continued the French contribution to the genre of accompanied keyboard works with compositions such as his *Pièces de clavecin en Concerts avec un violon ou une flûte et une viole ou un 2^e violon*, of 1741.

Giardini (1716-1796) is considered by some, to be a composer who has been overlooked in the history of accompanied clavier music (Kidd 1972: 124-125). Born in Italy, Giardini published a set of six accompanied Sonatas in London. This work, his Opus 3 of 1751, was scored for harpsichord, and violin or flute (Christopher Hogwood 1980: 351). Karl Geiringer draws attention to the fact that in this work the violin is most often accompanied by the figured bass only. However, when the right-hand keyboard part is occupied with an independent melody, there are no figures to be found in the bass (1973: 531). In other words, the harpsichord is used both as a continuo instrument and as a melodic instrument in the same work. From the investigations of this study into Haydn's early Trios, it has been seen that for example in his Trio No. 1 the harpsichord has a similar dual function. In this early work there are indications that the harpsichord-player is required to realise a figured bass, but the harpsichord

functions as a solo instrument. Despite this transitional role of the harpsichord in the Giardini works there is an unusual degree of equality between the instruments, and his work is of particular interest to this study since the predominantly two-movement works usually end with a Minuet.

Johann Schobert (1735-1767) who spent a great part of his life in Paris made a significant contribution to the genre, and included a great number of Minuets in his works. Of his nine ensemble works in DDT XXXIX-¹, all but one contain Minuet movements; two of which are entitled *Tempo di Menuet*. His style is worthy of comment in that, in the opinion of such an authority as H. Riemann, it reflects the influence of orchestral textures reminiscent of the Mannheim school (1958: XXXIX¹-1, i-vi). Schobert's work had great success in Paris around 1760, and in London a few years later.

"The origins of accompanied keyboard music in the Viennese milieu remains a mystery"--so says A. Peter Brown (1986: 195). He refers largely to the dubious claim for the ancestry of the accompanied keyboard Sonata in the Viennese Lauthenconcert.² It is however known without doubt that Georg Cristoph Wagenseil wrote accompanied keyboard works which were published in 1760-1761, though possibly written, according to Fuller, even earlier (1974: 235), and it is highly probable that Haydn was familiar with Wagenseil's works.

Textural Aspects of Haydn's Keyboard Trios

Few would disagree that the single most important parameter in determining genre in music of the Classical period is that of instrumental scoring. The difference after all between Symphony, Concerto, Quartet, Trio, Sonata, is essentially in the instruments for which each are scored, and the texture which is the outcome of this scoring. The

purpose of the brief historical outline above, is that it sharply exposes the shift in texture which took place in the scoring of ensemble works from the Baroque, with its Trio Sonata influences, to early Classical music: changes which had a great bearing on the Haydn keyboard Trios. A number of facts emerge.

The Changing Role of the Instruments

With the abandonment of the basso continuo, the position of the clavier changed from a subordinate role to one of equality and even of superiority. Of course, this was the contemporary trend in music composition generally, and applies not only to ensemble music. Newman puts it well (1983: 80):

Much as the stringed instruments, especially the newly cultivated violin, had been central to the scoring of the Baroque sonata, so the keyboard instruments, especially the newly cultivated "fortepiano", were central to the Classic sonata.

The violin, which traditionally had been the "singing" instrument is, in Haydn's Trios, often cast in the opposite role of supporting instrument. It is in addition, frequently given the task of doubling the upper keyboard voice, either at the octave or unison, or in thirds or sixths. However the ability of the violin, unlike the keyboard, to sustain sound, is well exploited, and its traditional role of melody instrument, is usually retained in the trio sections of the Minuet movements, as will be seen in Part II below.

Of the three instruments in the Haydn Trios, it is the cello which remains closest to its Baroque past in that it retains its traditional role of re-inforcing the keyboard bass, and is rarely given a chance to do otherwise.

Changes in Style of Composition.

The Haydn Trios so often open with a prominent keyboard passage that Brown regards this procedure to be one of Haydn's special characteristics (1986: 82). The present investigation does not find that this holds true for the Minuet movements, which frequently do not open with a keyboard passage. Despite the fact that this is therefore not a reliable "fingerprint" Brown's perception draws attention to the general impression of keyboard dominance in the opening movements of these works. In this Haydn was apparently different from his contemporaries.

Resulting from the emancipation of the keyboard from the *basso continuo*, a new keyboard idiom began to evolve. Newman considers the Alberti bass to be seminal to the Classical style (1983: 3): this device figures prominently in the Trios. The melody line and passage work, previously the domain of the violin, is now often taken over by the keyboard. Occasionally all the instruments, but particularly the keyboard and violin, are employed in imitative dialogue. The later Trios particularly, make considerable demands on the technical ability of the pianist, requiring the execution of rapid scale-passages and octave runs. The enhanced dynamic capabilities of the piano are also well exploited. (This will be discussed in greater detail in the analyses of the Trios in Part II, below.)

The Balance of Sound in the Haydn Trios

It would seem clear from all accounts, that the tone of the *clavier*, and this applied even to the *fortepiano*, needed re-inforcement. Newman quotes the composer Louis-Gabriel Guillemain who says of his own *Pièces de clavecin en sonates avec accompagnement de violon*, Op. 13 of 1745, that he noticed "that the violin covered a bit too much, which

prevented one from distinguishing the true melody" (1947: 340). Clearly, there was a tendency for the accompanying instruments to drown the tone of the keyboard. As the keyboard gained in importance, so the string instruments were relegated to the role of re-inforcing the tone of the keyboard. This, no doubt helps to explain the subsidiary role of the strings in these works. Nevertheless, the fact remains that string players generally find their "re-inforcing" roles in the Haydn Trios to be unrewarding, and too undemanding to justify performance. Charles Rosen, on discussing this aspect of the Haydn Trios declares, in a tone of uncharacteristic despondency (1976: 354):

"It is odd to have to defend some of the greatest music ever written. In any case the Haydn trios are doomed. Only pianists will ever want to play them, and the modern recital is no place for them."

There is however a positive aspect to this. The simplicity of the parts gives amateurs the opportunity to perform these works, and this was undoubtedly an important consideration at the time of their composition.

Haydn's Keyboard Instruments

The earliest of Haydn's Trios, that is Nos. 1-16, were almost certainly written for the harpsichord. Horst Walter reports that the documents concerning the maintenance and repairs of instruments at Esterháza show that only harpsichords were available in the 1770s (1981: 215). This assumption would be supported by the fact that the first movement, as well as the Minuet of Trio No.1, contain sections in which a figured bass occurs. Landon suggests that the instrument was probably of the Italian type with two eight-foot registers and a single manual (1970: 16). The range of Haydn's harpsichord for these early works was probably from F' to d''', with perhaps a second instrument which had a top e''''³ (Landon 1976-1980: I, 260).

In the solo Sonata No. 33 of 1771 Haydn uses a *crescendo* mark which indicates that the work was not conceived for the harpsichord. More important, according to Edwin M. Ripin (1981: 304), are the *forte* and *piano* marks on individual notes in the autograph copy: all these indications, as well as the fact that this Sonata was published by Artaria under the title "*per il clavicembalo, o Forte Piano*", would confirm that by 1771 Haydn, was familiar with the *fortepiano*. Despite this however, it would appear from the Keyboard Trios that he continued composing for the harpsichord and clavichord after this date, and it is not until Trios Nos 18 and 19 of 1784 that a change is obvious.

In 1788 Haydn wrote a letter to the publishers Artaria, in connection with his Trios Nos. 24-26 (Landon 1959: 79).

In order to compose your 3 Sonatas particularly well, I had to buy a new fortepiano. Now since no doubt you have long since realised that scholars are sometimes short of money--and that is my situation at present--I should like to ask you, Sir if you would be kind enough to pay 31 gold ducats to the organ and instrument-maker Wenzl Schanz...

Two years later, in 1790, Haydn wrote to his dear friend Marianne von Genzinger, urging her, in two separate letters, to exchange her harpsichord for a Schantz *fortepiano*.⁴ This would undoubtedly suggest his personal satisfaction with the instrument (1959: 106 and 107).

When Haydn visited England he became acquainted with the English Broadwood pianos and, Ripin suggests that the Trios 43-45 were composed with these pianos in mind. Ripin bases his assumption on the specific technical demands made on the keyboard performer in these works, two of which were dedicated to the accomplished pianist Theresa Jansen (1981: 307-308). Interestingly, Ripin points out that the set of Nos. 32-37 which were written at about the same time (the second London visit) for Princesses of the Esterhazy

family, were in his opinion not written with the English instruments in mind. The reason, Ripin suggests, is that they were to be performed and circulated in Vienna. Haydn, ever practical, and mindful of sales possibilities, chose to forego the advantages of the English instrument in favour of the Viennese variety, so as to be more sure of the wide marketability of the works. Although there is no written indication of a Minuet movement in either of these sets of Trios, No. 34 nevertheless contains a movement which conforms to the Minuet both in meter and style.

The Minuet in Haydn's Keyboard Trios.

The early Trios (those from about 1755 to 1760), almost routinely contain a Minuet and trio. The only exceptions, (apart from No. 9 which is almost entirely lost), are No. 12 which contains a Polonaise in place of the Minuet and trio, and No. 15, a two movement work, the finale of which is a theme and variations. The position of the Minuet is not fixed in the works in which it occurs, but in most instances it is the second movement in a three movement work.⁵

In the middle period of Trios, that is the fourteen works up to about the first London visit of 1791, there are only five Minuet movements and four of these are *tempo di menuetto* movements. (No. 17 is not taken into account since it is an arrangement of a much earlier work).

In the fifteen works from about 1792 until about 1796 there is only one movement with a Minuet title, and that is the *Tempo di Menuetto* of No. 40. It should however be noted that some of the later Trios, and in particular Nos. 34, 38, and 44 contain triple meter movements which are cast in the form of the minuet-type movements (see Part II below for a more detailed discussion of these movements). There is a tendency in these later works for the Minuet-type

movement to occupy the final movement of either a two-movement or a three-movement work.

The solo keyboard Sonatas follow a similar pattern: the early works almost all contain a Minuet and trio; there are fewer Minuet movements in the middle period, and when they do occur, they are in the "*Tempo di Menuetto*" style. In the last period there is only one movement with a Minuet indication, and that is the "*Tempo di Minuet*" of Sonata No. 59.

This is in sharp contrast to Haydn's other instrumental works using the Sonata plan. The earliest such works in the Sonata form are the String Trios. Of the twenty one authenticated works in the Hoboken catalogue three are marked "*verschollen*" (lost), and of the remaining eighteen, fifteen contain Minuet and trio movements.

The same pattern is true for the Baryton Trios. It is well known that Haydn's employer from 1762-1790, Prince Nicolaus Esterhazy, was passionately fond of the baryton. Haydn wrote a great many Baryton Trios to please his Prince, and almost all of these three movement works contain a Minuet and Trio as the third movement.

It is perhaps not surprising that these early compositions contain Minuet and trio movements. Haydn stopped writing string Trios after about 1767, and Baryton Trios after 1778; one might well conclude that after 1780 he no longer felt that a Minuet movement was appropriate in his Sonata plan, especially bearing in mind the gradually diminishing appearance of Minuet movements in the keyboard Trios and solo Sonatas as discussed above. However, on investigation of his other non-keyboard instrumental works, this is found to be not at all the case. The string Quartets, and the Symphonies almost all contain a Minuet movement, and what is more these are all of the "Minuet and Trio" type, rather

than the *Tempo di Menuetto*. Even the Quartets of the late set, Opus 77, written after 1797, and the last Symphony, No.104 of 1795, all contain Minuet and Trio movements; in these four-movement works, the Minuet and trio generally occupy third place.

Why did Haydn change from the routine Minuet and trio, to the occasional *Tempo di Menuetto* in the trios and solo Sonatas, and why did he then seem to lose interest in the style altogether in these keyboard works while continuing to write them in the other instrumental works? The reasons have as far as I am aware, remained unexplored by researchers. Indeed, the present writer has not in these investigations, come across writings which ask, let alone answer the question. Certainly, any doubts as to the common roots of the keyboard Trio and the keyboard Sonata should be dispelled in the light of these facts, for the keyboard works, both accompanied and solo, clearly behave in a similar way as far as the Minuet movements are concerned. In this regard they are treated as a single category, while the other instrumental works are placed in another.

In summary this cursory examination of Haydn's keyboard Trios reveals several important paths of development. Basil Smallman postulates that since Haydn did not succeed in liberating the string instruments in his keyboard Trios, he denied himself the honour of being the originator of the piano Trio: an honour which rightfully falls to Mozart (1990: 2). One cannot deny the truth of Smallmans reasoning. The accusation is particularly valid for the the cello which, in the Haydn Trios, has on the whole progressed but a short distance from its older function of *basso continuo*. Nevertheless, several important evolutionary paths are clearly documented in these works. The changing role of the keyboard from *basso continuo* to the emancipated keyboard. The transitional phase from

accompanied clavier music to Classical Trio. The compositional manifestations of the technical changes in the keyboard as an instrument. The changing position of the Minuet, and its virtual disappearance in these Trios. All these are highlighted, and provide a rich source of study of a genre in transition. Despite Charles Rosen's gloomy predictions for the fate of the Haydn Trios, as quoted above, it would seem that they bring to light a number of paths which are, as yet, not fully explored.

NOTES TO CHAPTER II

1. The Telemann work is to be found in *Musikalische Werke XI*, Kassel 1957.
2. For a discussion of the *Lauthenconcert* see Fuller 1974: 232-233.
3. The pitch names are those used in D. Randel, ed. 1986: "Pitch names", Scheme 1.
4. The spellings Schantz as well as Schanz are used.
5. Table 1 in Chapter IV indicates the presence and position of the Minuet movements in the early Haydn Trios.

CHAPTER III

HAYDN'S KEYBOARD TRIOS IN THE CONTEXT OF HIS ARTISTIC PERSONALITY

Haydn's artistic life was, in a most obvious way, governed by the social forces operating at the time in which he was composing. Furthermore, the employers who dictated his life-style were, in turn, though less obviously, governed by "the system" of which they were an integral part. Theodor Adorno draws attention to the fact that no true art work exists in isolation, or as he puts it "no authentic work of art...has ever exhausted itself in itself alone, in its being-in-itself" (1967: 23); it stands, says Adorno, always in relation to the life process of the society from which it emanates. The circumstances of Haydn's creative life would strongly support this observation.

The Sociological Background

The importance of music as a political tool in the Courts of Italy and France in the seventeenth century and earlier has been mentioned in Chapter I above. Music continued to be an important element of aristocratic life throughout the eighteenth century, especially in Germany and Austria. Many of the Hapsburg rulers were passionately fond of music, and a few among them were competent composers. The

system of patronage, and the vast consumer demand from the nobility, for musicians, is well known. Geiringer quotes a notice which appeared in the *Wiener Zeitung* of 1789 which illustrates the point: "Wanted by a nobleman, a servant who plays the violin well and is able to accompany difficult keyboard sonatas" (Geiringer 1946: 28 N).

But in addition to the class division between aristocracy and lower classes which is implied in the use of music for the entertainment of the nobility, there came into existence two other socio-musical divisions which have particular relevance to this study. The first of these divisions has to do with the change in the structure of public audiences. The spirit of the Enlightenment which swept through Europe in the eighteenth century, was accompanied by a general improvement in the living standards of the middle-classes. In the Arts, the trend manifested itself through a popular interest in entertainment, and as the century progressed, public concerts such as the *Concert spirituel* in Paris, and the *Gewandhaus Konzerte* of Leipzig, gained in popularity, and the Symphony and Concerto genres in particular, bent comfortably to the new audience-demands. At the same time, and parallel with the trend towards larger audiences, the improved socio-cultural conditions also began to take effect in the private home, and the practice of private formal concerts reached not only the nobility, but also the wealthier middle classes (Mary Sue Morrow 1988: 2). Chamber music, and music for the solo instrument, maintained a *Gebrauchsmusik* function. The keyboard Trio in particular, remained true to the *Sonata da camera* heritage from which it arose; its "home-spun" quality persisted, and was used to good effect in the musical salons which became popular in private homes (Morrow 1988: 13-33). This is true even for Haydn's works in the Trio genre which

were written after 1780. By this time Haydn had made contact with various music publishers, and the later Trios, along with his other works of the same time, were written with the wider public in mind. Nevertheless the intimate style, and subdued, subtle textures, clearly reflect the composer's intention that these works be performed to a small audience. One may even imagine that on occasion these Trios would be played in the total absence of an audience, and simply for the pleasure of the players themselves.

The second significant division is that between connoisseur and amateur (*Kenner und Liebhaber*), a distinction which is of the utmost importance to the present study, since it is for the amateur that most of the early, and many of the later keyboard Trios were written. The early Trios were almost certainly written for members or friends of the noble household in which Haydn was at that time employed, that is the Morzin family. These works, like the solo keyboard Sonatas, often had a didactic purpose and were frequently intended for the instruction of the younger members of the household: this would help explain the simplicity of the string parts.

It was an important asset for a well-bred young lady of the mid eighteenth century to be musically accomplished and it was frequently to women that the composition of Sonatas and Trios was directed. C.P.E.Bach's *Six sonates pour le clavecin à l'usage des dames* composed in 1765-1766 are but one example of the composition of keyboard Sonatas for women. Rosen draws attention to the fact that the pianoforte was for Haydn, and even for Mozart and Beethoven, the instrument which was associated with women, and that most of Haydn's keyboard Trios were intended for performance by the ladies (1976: 46). This is borne out

by an investigation of the dedicatees of the Trios: there are a total of five dedicatees, all of whom are women. Katalin Komlos claims that two thirds of Viennese keyboard Trios (that is by composers other than Haydn) of the 1780s bear a dedication, and nearly all of the names are female (1987: 223). In Haydn's case, the women dedicatees of the later Trios, Mesdames Schroeter and Bartolozzi, were skilled pianists of considerable virtuosic ability. Despite this, the domestic function of the Trio was retained. Rosen aptly sums up the duality of virtuosic skill with private performance: "To the extent that they (the Trios) are display pieces, they are for private display" (1976: 352).

Since these Trios are intended for private performance, generally by amateurs, one would naturally expect that they possess unique characteristics; this does indeed turn out to be the case. Both Alfred Einstein (1946: 238) and Rosen (1976: 352) comment on the fact that works for piano, and this includes works for accompanied piano such as the Trios, were not as serious in intent as ensemble works for strings alone. A String Quartet with its standard four movements, would clearly fall into the "connoisseur" category, and therefore a fugue, with its connotations of intellectuality, would be considered perfectly appropriate as one of the movements. A fugue in a two-movement or three-movement piano Trio on the other hand, would be deemed quite out of place, and this is born out by the Trio literature.

Viewed as a whole, the Haydn Trio was intended for the "private use" of the trained amateur, and Haydn's compositional style was directed towards this end.

The Demands of the Work-place.

Haydn lived, for most of his working life, as a servant in the home of two aristocratic families: first, and for a short time in the Morzin family home, and then for about thirty years, as an employee of the Esterházy family. His place of residence, his movements, and especially his composing, were all dependent on the needs and the wishes of his employers. Geiringer remarks on the narrowness of the gulf which separated the lower classes from the nobility in Austria around the mid- eighteenth century-- narrow that is in comparison with the strict social distinctions which prevailed in some other European countries (1981: 5). We know from Haydn's letters that the composer had a comfortable, even friendly, relationship with Prince Nicolaus Esterházy. Nevertheless, the master-servant terms set out in his employment contract with the Esterházy family were maintained at all times.¹ One of the many examples of this is to be found in a letter from Haydn to Prince Nicolaus Esterházy, dated March 1773 (Landon 1959: 15-16). The purpose of the letter is to request funds for himself and his musicians, and it concludes thus:

May I therefore ask, in profound submissiveness, that Your Highness confirm, in your infinite kindness, your willingness to grant us this exceptionally gracious mark of esteem. For this, I shall offer you at all times my most faithful services, and I recommend myself to your serene favour and grace.

Your serene Highness'

most humble

Joseph Hayden

While making allowances for the writing style of the times, there is nevertheless no mistaking the ingratiating tone of servant to master in this letter. Nor did Haydn's dependence on his employers end with finance. His unsuccessful and childless marriage seemingly provided him

with little fulfilment and thus, his social activities too were bound with those of his employers.

Moreover it was not only to his princely employer that Haydn was subservient. When Haydn first took up his post with the Esterházy family, the old and ailing Gregorius Werner held the position of Kapellmeister to the Esterházy court. The following extract from Haydn's contract with Prince Paul Anton, leaves one in no doubt as to Haydn's subordinate status in relation to Werner; at the same time he was obliged to carry the burden of many and often onerous duties (as quoted in Landon 1976-1980: I, 350).

Gregorius Werner, in consideration of his long service, shall continue to retain the post of *Ober-Capel-Meister*, while the said Joseph Heyden, as *Vice-Capel-Meister* at Eysenstadt, shall in regard to the choir music depend upon and be subordinate to said Gregorio Werner, *quà Ober-Capel-Meister*; but in everything else, whenever there shall be a musical performance, and in all required for the same in general and in particular, said *Vice-Capel-Meister* shall be responsible.

In 1765 Haydn received a letter from Prince Nicolaus, in which the Prince severely reprimands Haydn for negligence of his duties (Landon 1959: 5-6).² Larsen, and other biographers conclude (1980: 334) that the reprimand was the result of a letter of complaint from Werner to the Prince regarding Haydn (reproduced in Landon 1976-1980: I, 418). The young composer seemingly presented a threat to the ageing and embittered Werner, although there is the possibility that the accusations had some foundation. Whatever the case, it is to our good fortune that Haydn confronted the humiliating accusation decisively and effectively. In response to the allegations, Haydn prepared a catalogue of his compositions up to that date. This *Entwurf-Katalog* as it is known, is an invaluable

source of information to scholars, though for reasons which are as yet unexplained, Trio No.22 is the only keyboard Trio which appears in the catalogue.³ Nevertheless, the *Entwurf-Katalog* is one of the most useful sources for establishing chronology and authenticity of Haydn's early works.

With the expansion of the court at Esterháza, Haydn's creative output stretched to the ever-increasing demands of his environment, and his activities became correspondingly more closely bound with those of his employers. Socially, artistically, and economically Haydn's life was governed and shaped by his work-place, and in this sense his creative output reflects the veracity of Adorno's assertion. But these environmental considerations convey an incomplete picture, for they fail to take into account the unusual personality of the man himself.

Haydn's Personality

The twentieth century psychologist, Abraham Maslow, has done a great deal of research into the personality of people who possess creative talent. Referring to his early findings he writes: "It was also obvious that some of the greatest talents of mankind were certainly not psychologically healthy people." (1968: 135). Haydn would seem to be a fine example of a highly talented creative artist who enjoyed excellent psychological health. Despite the security provided by the patronage system, the inability of many composers to cope with its exigencies is well known. Not so Haydn. He worked steadily, unperturbed by his isolation, and unhampered by the bureaucracy which surrounded him; moreover, by the time he died, he had amassed considerable wealth (Vernon Gotwals 1961: 331-353). It has been seen above that it was within Haydn's

nature to turn a potentially difficult situation to positive advantage; his direct and effective response to the "Werner affair" bears this out. The following often quoted report serves to illustrate the point further (Griesinger 1810, as quoted in Larsen 1980: 28):

My prince was content with all my works. I received approval, I could, as head of an orchestra, make experiments, observe what created an impression, and what weakened it, thus improving, adding to, cutting away, and running risks. I was set apart from the world, there was nobody in my vicinity to confuse and annoy me in my course, and so I had to become original.

It should not be imagined from the above, that Haydn was insensitive to the difficulties of his situation. One comes across occasional outbursts of discontent, especially in his later life, as for example in this extract from a letter to his dear friend and confidante Maria von Genzinger, written in 1790, apparently on his return to Esterháza, after a happy time in Vienna: "Well, here I sit in my wilderness--forsaken--like a poor waif--almost without any human society--melancholy--full of the memories of past glorious days" (1959: 96). For an artist to have had these feelings of frustration, would seem to be a normal reaction to an isolated work situation: to overcome the frustrations, and to continue equably with a highly productive existence as Haydn did, demonstrates unusual mental and emotional fortitude.

Haydn's living-experience, apart from the few years with the Morzin family in Lukavec, Bohemia, was until 1791, confined to a circumscribed area of Austria-Hungary. Yet, when as a man of nearly sixty, he was approached by the impresario, Salomon, to visit London, letters show that Haydn undertook the journey with enthusiasm and spontaneity. Once in London, he apparently coped

successfully with the new language, and with unfamiliar people and their social customs; all this in addition to a heavy compositional and performance work-load. His ability to adapt, to accept and yet to make use of opportunity when it presented itself reveal a remarkably balanced personality. These qualities are no doubt reflected artistically in his prolific output and his originality as a composer.

The Place of the Keyboard Trio
in Haydn's Creative Life

The Early Trios: Nos. 1-16

In about 1759 Haydn took up his first formal post: it was as Music Director to Karl Joseph Franz Morzin at Lukavec. Modern researchers agree that Haydn probably wrote all the early Trios, that is Nos.1-16, as well as the earliest Symphonies, Quartets and keyboard Sonatas during the Morzin period. However not a single autograph exists for the early Trios (Landon 1970: 14), and to add further to the uncertainty surrounding these works, they are characterised by a looseness of both form and nomenclature: multi-movement works of unstandardised form are entitled variously Partita, Concertino, Divertimento and so on.

Musicologists have made various attempts to date Haydn's works. Georg Feder, has attempted to use changes which occur in the notation of the appoggiatura as a guide, as well as the alteration of spelling from "minuet" to "menuet" (1962: 50-54 as quoted in C.Landon 1973: xx). A. Peter Brown has compiled an "Authenticity Table" in which the Haydn Trios appear (1986:110), but their chronology remains uncertain. Landon whose chronology is followed in this thesis, bases his dating partly on

historical deduction but admits that there is much that is doubtful (1976-1980: I, 260-267).

Landon suggests that Haydn's interest in keyboard music may have been stimulated by the beautiful Countess Morzin to whom Haydn gave harpsichord lessons while he was employed by the family. Landon makes a further point regarding the violin parts of these works, which are often more difficult than those of the later Trios, and suggests that the violin parts may perhaps have been for Haydn himself. This is however surmise. In the light of modern research one is as yet able to go no further than to suggest that the early Trios Nos. 1-16 were composed for harpsichord, in the Morzin period, that is between about 1755 and 1760.

After about 1760, for close on twenty-five years, Haydn wrote no works in the genre of keyboard Trio (No. 17 of 1772 is an arrangement of an earlier work for baryton Trio). Haydn's habit of setting aside a particular genre for some years, does not apply only to the keyboard Trio. The String Quartet as a genre, was neglected from about 1762 until 1772, after which time Haydn produced Opera 9, 17 and 20 in quick succession. The most likely reason for this spasmodic attention to a particular genre is the fluctuating demands of his employers and associates. The earlier Trios were probably distributed within the household, and to friends outside, through manuscript copies. All this changed in the year 1779, a year which marked a turning-point in Haydn's career: for it was in January 1779 that he was absolved from his obligation to compose exclusively for Prince Nicolaus Esterházy (Larsen 1980: 335). The outcome of this was that Haydn was free to make use of outside publishers, who could then disseminate his work to a wide public both in Austria and abroad. Later in 1779, Haydn made contact with the

publishers Artaria (Larsen 1980: 338), an association which was to exert a great influence on him for many years to come. It is highly probable that his return to the composition of Trios was triggered off by a request from the publisher Foster Bland of London, in 1780. The correspondence between Haydn and Artaria shows that by 1788 Artaria considered it preferable to commission Haydn for three Trios ("Sonatas with accompaniment of a violin and violincello") rather than three Quartets (Landon 1959: 77-78).

There are other possible reasons for the respite in the composition of keyboard Trios throughout the 60s, 70s and early 80s, and these have to do with the conditions at the court. Prince Nicolaus moved his court to the new Esterháza palace at Süttör in 1766. Plans for the project had already begun in the early 1760s, but it was not until 1768, when the elaborate new Opera House was completed, that the entourage moved from Eisenstadt where they had been based, to their new home where they were to spend the greater part of each year. From the time of the death of his predecessor Werner in 1766, Haydn was responsible for all the music at the palace; that is the composition of much of the music, its performance, the scores, instruments, as well as the well-being of the musicians. The function of music as a means of showing off social position and wealth, as discussed in Chapter I, was by no means lost. The new palace hosted a vast array of visitors including Empress Maria Theresia in 1773, and Archduke Ferdinand and Archduchess Beatrice in 1775. Naturally, Opera, the most public and extrovert of all the genres was high up on the list of entertainments. Haydn busied himself a great deal not only with the composition of his own Operas, but also with the production of Operas from abroad: Landon reports that works by the Italian composers

Paisiello and Cimarosa among others were performed at Esterháza. Haydn's responsibility for the composition and performance of Symphonies also figured high on the public entertainment list in the first decades at Esterháza, and so did the composition of Masses. The blossoming of the intensely private genre of keyboard Trio, on the other hand, was to wait until both the court at Esterháza, and Haydn himself attained greater maturity. The result of this long period of dormancy is that the early Esterházy period of experimentation, and the so called "*Sturm und Drang* years", are not directly reflected in the Trios. Rather, when Haydn once more took up the genre one sees him as a consummate artist, though of course this is not to say that elements of the earlier styles are totally absent from the more mature works.

The Middle-period Works

The group of Trios written in the 1780s and until Haydn's first London visit in 1791, that is Nos. 17-30, make up the middle group. All except No.17, an arrangement of an earlier baryton Trio, were written for various publishers, and unlike the early group, several autographs exist for these Trios. Landon reports that authentic manuscripts have been found for almost all, and authentic prints exist for the entire group (1970: 14).

Between 1784 and 1785, soon after the three keyboard Sonatas dedicated to Princess Esterházy (Nos. 54-56), and close to the Opus 42 Quartet, Haydn produced the Trios Nos.17-23. The re-arranged work Trio No.17, provides an ill-matched companion to the more mature Trios Nos 22 and 23, with which they were grouped. Nevertheless the three appeared together, in Forster's publication, as Opus 42.

No. 18 together with two Trios by Ignaz Pleyel go to make up another set,⁴ and Nos. 19-21 yet another. This last group of three Trios Nos. 19-21, was dedicated to the niece of Prince Nicolaus, Countess Marianne von Witzay, who lived close to the Esterháza palace, and was herself an enthusiastic amateur.

The years 1786-1790 immediately preceding the first London visit represent a period of intense creative activity for Haydn. Apart from Trios, he composed the twelve Quartets of Opera 54, 55, and 64; the C major Sonata No. 58, the E flat Sonata No. 59 for Marianne von Genzinger, as well as the D'Ogny Symphonies Nos. 90-92.

The seven Trios of the period are Nos. 24-30. Nos. 24, 25, and 26 were published by Artaria as Opus 57 in 1789, that is after a break of about three years. No. 27 stands on its own as Opus 61, and was performed a few years later in London during Haydn's visit, with Hummel at the keyboard.

The three "Flute Trios" Nos. 28, 29 and 30, so called because the flute is an optional alternative to the violin, were published in London as Opus 59, in 1790. In providing this option Haydn harks back to an old tradition which was common in accompanied keyboard music (see Chapter II above).

The Late Trios

The period from 1791-1796, which includes Haydn's two London visits, is once more remarkable for the quantity and quality of output. The twelve Salomon Symphonies, Nos. 93-

104; the six Apponyi Quartets Opus 71 and 74; the last three piano Sonatas Nos. 61-62 dedicated to Therese Jansen, and the F minor piano Variations H.XVII:6--all these as well as the Trios Nos. 31-45 were written within the space of five years.

The Trio No. 31 stands on its own, as a single work published by Preston and Bland, London in 1794, and entitled "Sonata for the Piano-Forte with Accompaniments for a Violin & Violoncello". This is the first time that the designation "Piano-forte" is used.

The three Trios Nos. 32-34 are dedicated to "la Princesse Douarière Esterházy", the Prince's mother, and were published by Preston Bland as Opus 70 in 1794.

Opus 71 comprises Nos. 35-37 and the set is dedicated to Princesse Marie Esterházy the wife of Prince Nicolaus.

Up to the early 1790s, the loyalty and devotion from Haydn to his employers is clearly reflected in the names of the dedicatees of the works discussed above since they are all in some way related to the Esterházy household. From 1795 the effects of the London visits become apparent, for the three Trios Nos. 38-40 (Opus 73) are dedicated to Madame Schroeter, and the last three, Nos. 43-45 to Mrs. Bartolozzi (Opus 75 of 1797). For Therese Bartolozzi née Jansen Haydn wrote the last three piano Sonatas as well as the three Trios Nos. 43-45. All the dedicatees are women; however the last two were "outsiders" living in London, and judging from the technical difficulties of these works, both were pianists of considerable proficiency. It is of interest that despite Rebecca Schroeter's capability as a solo pianist, Haydn chose the genre of Trio to express his regard for her (the relationship is discussed below).

Between the two sets Nos. 38-40, and Nos. 43-45, are the Trios Nos. 41 and 42. The finale of Trio No. 41 was originally a one-movement piano work known as "The Dream". A first movement, *Andante cantabile*, was added to its revision for three instruments in 1795, resulting in this two-movement Trio. No. 42. was probably written in 1796 after Haydn's return to Vienna.

Some Important Musical Influences

St. Stephen's Cathedral and the Viennese Tradition

According to Dies (1810 as quoted in László Somfai 1968: 3), there was a great deal of spontaneous music-making in the Haydn home in Rohrau, but the boy's first formal training, came from the St. Stephen's Cathedral Vienna, where he was taken on as a choir-boy in 1740, his eighth year. Georg Reutter the younger, who "discovered" Haydn, had recently succeeded his father Georg Reutter senior, as Kapellmeister of St. Stephens, but the extent to which Haydn received direct personal tuition from Reutter junior, or for that matter from anyone else at St. Stephens, is not known. Haydn himself was apparently not altogether happy about his early tuition; he told Griesinger: "I wrote diligently but not quite soundly until at last I had the privilege of learning the true fundamentals from the celebrated Herr Porpora" (1810 as quoted in Larsen 1980: 330).

It is known that J.J. Fux still held office at the cathedral in 1740, the year in which Haydn entered the school. Fux was a keyboard composer and theoretician of the greatest importance, both contemporaneously and historically, and his principles of training the choir-boys were still being used, and his works still performed at the

time of Haydn's apprenticeship. Alfred Mann provides clear evidence, which he has deduced from Pohl's research, that Haydn studied Fux's *Gradus ad Parnassum* with the utmost thoroughness (1970: 323-332). Fux thus forms a perhaps indirect though none the less pivotal influence on Haydn's development. With his Jesuit background and his roots in the tradition of Palestrina, Fux represents the link between Baroque scholarship and the first Viennese school. It is worthy of note that Fux made no direct contribution to the accompanied Sonata, a fact which Brown uses in support of his impression that this genre had a late start in Vienna (1986: 195-196). But though Fux is not represented in the accompanied Sonata, the Minuet is almost always present in his keyboard Suites (Brown 1986: 180).

There is little knowledge of direct contact between Haydn and his contemporaries in his early years, but it is more than likely that he was familiar with the works of many pre-Classical Viennese composers. The following are among the more popular of those composers who were active at the start of Haydn's career, and who incorporated the Minuet into their instrumental works.

Georg Cristoph Wagenseil (1715-1777) was a much favoured pupil of Fux, and court composer from about 1736 until the year of his death: it is almost certain that the young Haydn was familiar with at least some of Wagenseil's compositions. In line with the loose categorisation of the times, Wagenseil uses the titles "divertimento", "sonata" and "trio" etc. interchangeably. Among the list of ninety works enumerated by Newman, there are two sets of six accompanied Sonatas, (Opp.1 and 2) published in London in about 1760 (1983: 352-354). The Minuet as a movement, abounds in all his instrumental genre.

The honour of being the first to include a Minuet movement in a symphony, is thought to belong to Mathias Georg Monn (1717-1750): the Symphony in D major composed in 1740 contains four movements, the third of which is a Minuet.⁵ Since Monn died in 1750 after a long illness, one may safely assume that Minuets were an accepted entity in instrumental works for at least ten years before Haydn's appearance on the musical scene.

Joseph Steffan (1726-1797) was a pupil of Wagenseil. He deserves mention for the fact that he, like Haydn in his later Sonatas, abandoned the regular use of the Minuet (Brown 1986: 190).

Florian Leopold Gassman (1729-1774) spent much of his youth in Italy, and came to Vienna in 1763 as a composer of ballets. It would appear that much of his chamber music, which includes string Trios, was written in Italy. From the evidence of musicologists it is almost certain that Gassman's work was known to Haydn (Brown 1986: 432 n.19) and (Larsen 1980: 338). The perception that Haydn was well acquainted with Gassman is strengthened by the fact that Haydn wrote his Oratorio *Il ritorno di Tobia* for a concert series which Gassman founded in 1774.⁶

Anton Zimmerman (1741-1781) wrote at least two sets of six accompanied Sonatas which contain Minuet movements. Newman mentions that Zimmerman's accompanied Sonatas Op.1 were published by Artaria in 1779 as one of their earliest issues (1983: 360). It will be remembered that Haydn made contact with the firm Artaria in that same year. The fact that both composers produced keyboard Trios at about the same time points to the crucial role which the publishing firms played in providing the incentive for works in a specific genre.

The Michaelerhaus Years

When Haydn's voice broke, he left St. Stephens and took up residence (modest in the extreme according to Dies) in the attic of a building in Vienna called Michaelerhaus. Here Haydn, ever susceptible to opportunity, made contacts which were to stand him in good stead for the rest of his life. On the first floor of the Michaelerhaus, lived Princess Esterházy, mother of Anton and Nicolaus who were to be Haydn's employers some years later. It is thought that this contact lead up to the later appointment (Larsen 1980: 330) The other contact which was to lead to highly significant encounters in Haydn's life was with the Italian poet and librettist, Metastasio, who lived on the third floor of the Michaelerhaus. It was through his friendship with Metastasio that Haydn met Porpora, the renowned Italian teacher of singing and composition, who was at that time living in Vienna. It may be seen from the Griesinger report above how much Haydn valued the tuition which he received from Porpora. It was not only as a teacher that Haydn benefited from Porpora, but through him Haydn made contact with other composers. Haydn, according to Griesinger (1810 as quoted in Somfai 1969: 20)

sometimes had to accompany on the keyboard for Porpora at a Prince von Hildburghausen's, in the presence of Gluck, Wagenseil and other celebrated masters, and the approval of such connoisseurs served as a special encouragement to him.

It was also at this time that Haydn met Karl von Fürnberg, a meeting which was destined to have far-reaching results: for it is now believed that it is through the von Fürnberg visits that Haydn first conceived of the String Quartet as a genre. It was also Fürnberg who probably introduced

Haydn to Count Morzin who then employed the young musician as music director to his household in about 1759.

The Italian Influence

The supremacy of Italy in music of the early eighteenth century has been discussed in Chapter I above. More specifically, the two Italian giants who have had a marked effect on the course of eighteenth century instrumental music are Arcangelo Corelli (1653-1713) in the early part of the century and later, Giovanni Battista Sammartini (1700-1775), the former having a great effect on the development of chamber music, and the latter on the development of symphonic writing. Both incidentally include occasional Minuet movements in their compositions. Since Corelli died in 1713, his effect on Austrian composers of the 1750s is an oblique one. In the case of Sammartini, we know that Haydn was familiar with his work from Dies' claim that Haydn dismissed Sammartini as "nothing but a *schmierer*". In recent years musicologists have endeavoured to show the positive influence which Sammartini's work had on Haydn. Bathia Churgin, has drawn attention to the striking similarities between the early Haydn Symphony No. 15, and the Sammartini Symphony J-C4 (1981: 334-336). Churgin goes on to state, giving convincing reasons, that the Sammartini Symphony, which was probably composed in 1750, was probably known in Vienna by 1760, as were other Italian works of about the same period.

Landon on the other hand, asserts that "the various modern attempts to resurrect the idea of Sammartini's influence on Haydn are neither convincing musically nor supportable historically" (1976-1980: I, 84).

While both these view points are impressive, emerging as they do from important lines of research, for the purposes of this study, it would be reasonable to accept that if Haydn was able to dismiss Sammartini as a "schmirer" he must at the least, have been well acquainted with the works of the Italian master. It is important to note too, that Sammartini composed amongst other ensemble works, a set of six accompanied sonatas for keyboard and viola, dedicated to the Marchesana di Rockingham published in London and Paris in 1766 (Newman 1983: 219).

Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach (1714-1788)

Frederick the Great of Prussia played an important role in the musical life of Europe, in the mid-1700s. He was both an able musician, and an influential and ambitious monarch of one of the most powerful courts of Europe. C.P.E. Bach was officially attached to the Prussian court of Frederick for almost twenty eight years, from 1740-1767; his reputation as composer, teacher, performer and writer on keyboard performance was acclaimed throughout Europe. Haydn's indebtedness to C.P.E. Bach has been accepted from the time of Haydn's earliest biographers, but recently A. Peter Brown has carried out extensive research which suggests that the influence was not as early on in Haydn's development as was originally assumed (Brown 1986: 203-229). Since the question is of importance to this study, the circumstances will be examined in greater detail.

The first volume of C.P.E. Bach's *Versuch über die wahre Art des Klavier zu spielen*, appeared in 1753, and the second in 1762. C.P.E. Bach's "Prussian" Sonatas were published in 1742, and the "Württemberg" Sonatas in 1744. Haydn left the St. Stephen's choir school in 1749 or 1750. The picture of Haydn sitting in his attic room in

Michaelerhaus, in the bitter cold winter of his sixteenth or seventeenth year (about 1749) and playing the Sonatas of C.P.E. on his old worm-eaten clavier, is one which was first portrayed in Griesinger's biography (Leipzig 1809), and which has endured to this day. The publication-dates of the two sets of Sonatas mentioned above would make it feasible for Haydn to have been acquainted with the Bach works at this time. The Dies biography dating from 1810, refers to an incident, not placed in time, in which the young Haydn came across, and bought a book of the writings of C.P.E. Bach. This has generally been accepted to be the *Versuch* though it is now obvious, if it is the Michaelerhaus years that are under discussion, that the book could not possibly have been the second volume published in 1762.

A. Peter Brown has presented a strong and carefully thought out case against these previously well-accepted theories (1981: 158-163 and 1986: 203-229). Brown does not argue the fact that Haydn played, studied and admired the Sonatas of C.P.E. Bach, nor that he studied the *Versuch*. However, he does put forward strong evidence that Haydn's acquaintance with the works of C.P.E. Bach was later than has been traditionally accepted: not before 1760 for the *Versuch*, and even later for the Sonatas, which might or might not have been the "Prussian". The investigation of this study into Minuet movements strongly supports Brown's hypothesis. On examination of the Bach works, it is discovered that there is not one Minuet movement present in the six "Prussian" Sonatas of 1742. Surely, if the young Haydn was well acquainted with these works at the time when he first began writing, one would expect him to have been influenced by the master whom he so admired? Instead of this, the opposite is true: Minuet movements occur almost routinely in both the early Haydn solo Sonatas, and the

early "accompanied Sonatas". Thus the earlier works would seem to be clearly based on the Viennese-Sonata model which, as has been noted above, seldom occurred without a Minuet movement. The most likely explanation for this is that Haydn did not know the Bach works when he wrote the early solo and accompanied keyboard Sonatas. Perhaps this also helps to explain our earlier question of why Haydn stopped writing Minuets in his later keyboard works: that is works that were written after he became acquainted with the works of C.P.E. Bach.

But there was another influence in Haydn's artistic life which cannot be overlooked, and which stands alone: it is the unique reciprocal influence of Haydn and Mozart, and this too may have a bearing on Haydn's abandonment of the Minuet in his Trios written from 1784 onwards.

Mozart (1756-1791) and Haydn probably did not meet before 1784, when Haydn was already fifty-two, and Mozart only twenty-eight, but the relationship was clearly of the deepest importance to both. Mozart composed only eight keyboard Trios, all between 1776 and 1788. Numbers 1, 2 and 4 contain Minuet movements, and numbers 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8 which were all written after 1785, do not. The Minuet thus behaves in a manner similar to those in the Haydn Trios: that is, it is present in the earlier works, and then abandoned in the later works in the same genre. A Minuet movement in the Mozart keyboard Sonatas is a rarity--only two Sonatas K282 and K.331 contain movements entitled Minuet. One is inevitably drawn to the possibility of the influence which the younger man might have had on Haydn in this regard. It is perhaps more than a coincidence that Haydn began to abandon the Minuet as a regular feature of his Trios and solo Sonatas after 1784, that is at about the time he met Mozart.

The Women in Haydn's Life

Four women deserve special mention, since they all served as an inspiration to Haydn's artistic growth. It is a sad fact that his wife, Maria Anna Keller, whom he married in 1760 figures but little in reports of Haydn's life. She is thus not included in this discussion.

In 1779 a nineteen-year old Italian singer by the name of Luigia Polzelli, took up service at Esterháza, with her husband, a violinist. It would seem that neither were artists of the highest calibre, but a warm relationship which was to continue for many years, developed between Haydn and Luigia. From the musical point of view Luigia influenced Haydn to the extent that he revised and extended not only his own arias so as to enable her to manage them, but also those of other composers.

A relationship of far greater parity existed between Haydn and Marianne von Genzinger. A correspondence beginning in 1789, reveals a friendship of deep trust and respect, and a musical understanding which resulted in the composition of many keyboard works for Marianne, who was a pianist of considerable skill. Her death in 1793 at the age of thirty-eight, cut short what was clearly a meaningful relationship.

During the London visit of 1791, Haydn met Rebecca Schroeter the widow of a well-known musical personality. Initially Haydn took her on as a pupil, but according to their correspondence the relationship developed into one of great intimacy. It was to Madame Schroeter who was a proficient pianist, that the keyboard Trios Nos. 38, 39 and 40 were dedicated.

The last three Trios, Nos. 43, 44, and 45 of 1797 were dedicated to Mrs. Bartolozzi. It is possible too that Trio No. 31 published by Preston and Bland London, was dedicated to her. Born Therese Jansen, she was one of the finest pianists of her day, and a pupil of Clementi. There is little evidence of a warm personal relationship between Haydn and Mrs. Bartolozzi, but the dedication of some of his most mature keyboard works to her bears, testimony to his regard for her musicianship.

NOTES TO CHAPTER III

1. Haydn's contract of 1 May 1761, with Prince Paul Anton Esterházy is reproduced in Landon 1976-1980: I, 350-352.
2. In this same letter of 1765 Prince Nicolaus instructs Haydn to compose pieces which the Prince would be able to perform on the baryton, the Prince's favourite instrument. Haydn's large output of baryton Trios is probably a direct result of this injunction.
3. A. Peter Brown, in personal correspondence with the present writer, suggests that the entry of Trio No. 22 into the *Entwurf-Katalog* was "a fluke". Most of the entries span from the 1760s to early 1770s. This would confirm the generally held notion that the early Trios were written before 1760.
4. Alan Tyson has done some remarkable "detective work" into the two Trios H.XV 3 and 4, which were thought to have been Haydn's but are now known to be Ignaz Pleyel's. The report appears in *Haydn and two stolen Trios*, *The Music Review*, Vol. XXII 1961: 21-27.
5. The autograph of this work is in the Vienna National Library: the work is printed in DTÖ XV-2.
6. A Thematic Catalog of the Instrumental works of Gassman is to be found in *Music Indexes and Bibliographies* No. 12, editor George Hill 1976.

PART TWO

**AN ANALYSIS OF THE MINUET MOVEMENTS
IN HAYDN'S KEYBOARD TRIOS**

INTRODUCTION

The present analysis attempts to identify the ways in which Haydn solves the problems of integrating a trio texture with the Minuet dance movement of the Sonata plan over a period of some forty years. The parameters of Form and Texture will be used as the main topics for carrying out this investigation. On the one hand, considerations of Form clearly expose the important changes which were taking place at a crucial stage in the development of the Sonata; on the other hand the Texture of the Trio distinguishes it from the other genres which are based on the Sonata principle. Texture is taken here to refer, as Wallace Berry suggests, not only to quantitative aspects, but also to qualitative interaction within the musical fabric (1976: 184-185). In the present instance quantitative aspects will refer to such features as number and density of parts while qualitative interaction will pertain to such features as the balance between instruments, increased intensity in certain areas, and motivic interplay between parts.

Although discussions of Form and Texture are separated for the sake of convenience, they continually overlap and are frequently inextricably bound with each other.

The line which the investigation will follow is firstly an identification of the salient features of the early Minuet-trio-Minuet movements; secondly an assessment of the changes which have taken place from the early movements through to the first of the *Tempo di Menuetto* movements (Nó. 19); followed by an investigation of each *Tempo di Menuetto* movement of the middle and late series of Trios. Since the chronology of the works from Trio. No. 19 onwards is reasonably certain, the investigation will, from that point onwards fall into a developmental line well-suited to this morphological study, but which is unfortunately not possible for the early, mostly undated works.

CHAPTER IV

THE EARLY TRIOS: NOS. 1-16

Musicologists estimate that Trios 1-16 were composed 82 between 1755 and 1760. Howard Chandler Robbins Landon however, in his Foreword to the Doblinger edition of the Trios used in this study, warns of the uncertainty of the dates of composition of these works, and even, in some instances, of the lack of positive proof of their authorship (1970: 15). Because of these uncertainties, and also because some of the Minuet and trio movements are arrangements of other works, it would seem inadvisable to analyse individual movements which might or might not be authentic, but rather to view them as a group which expresses the morphology of the Minuet movements as a whole, in an incipient stage of their development.

The Relation of the Minuet Movement to the Work as a Whole

Georg Feder's laboriously prepared work-list reveals that the Haydn Trios bear such varied titles as *Divertimento*, *Partita*, *Sonata*, *Concerto*, *Capriccio*, as well as *Trio* (1980: 388-389). The layout and position of movements, particularly in the early Trios is correspondingly unstandardised. Nevertheless, as Table I shows, there are

a number of constants which are regular enough to be accepted as almost routine.

TABLE 1
THE MINUET MOVEMENTS IN TRIOS 1-16

TRIO NO.	NO.OF MOVTS IN WORK	POSN. OF MINUET &TRIO	KEY OF WORK	KEY OF MINUET	KEY OF TRIO
1	3	3rd	F	F	f
2	3	2nd	C	C	c
3	3	3rd	G	G	g
4	5	4th	F	F	a
5	3	2nd	g	g	Bb
6	3	2nd	F	F	d
7	4	2nd	G	G	g
8	6	5th	D	*	*
9	*	*	D	*	*
10	3	2nd	A	A	a
11	3	2nd	E	E	e
12	3	N.A.	Eb	N.A.	N.A.
13	3	2nd	Bb	Bb	g
14	3	2nd	f	f	f
15	2	N.A.	D	N.A.	N.A.
16	4	3rd	C	C	a

* denotes that the relevant information is not available.
N.A. indicates that since a Minuet movement is not present in the particular work, the data is not applicable to this study.

Lower case letters refer to the minor tonality.

Thirteen out of the group of sixteen works are known to contain a Minuet and Trio movement; this includes No.8 which though partially lost, is known to have been a six-movement work of which the fifth movement was a Minuet. Of the remaining three works No. 9 is almost entirely lost; No. 12 contains a Polonaise as the middle movement, and No. 15 is a two-movement work, the finale of which is a Theme with Variations. Twelve complete works and one fragmented work are thus available for discussion.

In eight of the thirteen works, the Minuet is the middle of a three movement work, and in two works it is the Finale of a three-movement work. The other three Minuets of which we have knowledge are in works that contain more than three movements--relics no doubt of the earlier divertimento-type compositions. The Minuet movements of Nos. 4 and 8 are penultimate movements of five-movement or six-movement works, and no. 16 is the penultimate movement of a four movement work. Thus in eight works the Minuet and trio is the middle movement, in three it is an interior movement though closer to the end than the middle and in two works it is the final movement.

All the Minuet and trio movements are composed in the *da capo* form of Minuet-trio-Minuet, and in each case both the Minuet and trio are in binary form. The Minuets all have one distinguishing feature in common: at the end of the second section there is an allusion usually to the head of the first section, or if not the head at least to the second phrase of the first section. Examples of this latter arrangement are to be found in the Minuet of Trio No. 10 where at bar 25 there is a recall of bar 5 onwards, and the Minuet of Trio No. 14 where bars 19-22 recall bars 7-10. The Minuet of the Trio No. 5 is particularly interesting. Not only is it in a minor key, but in the

second section, the second phrase is repeated before the first (bars 21-26). When the first phrase does appear (bars 27-30), its function resembles that of an embryonic Coda--an unusual phenomenon in these early movements. For the rest all the Minuets allude to the first phrase of the first section in a manner which resembles a Reprise. The Minuets may thus be loosely classed as being in rounded binary form (A :||: B A¹ :||)¹.

On the other hand the trios while they are also often in rounded binary form, consistently reveal a parallel correspondence between the first and second sections. This is achieved through a recall of the head of the first section at the beginning of the second section. The effect is of a typical bi-partite structure instead of the tri-partite inclination of the rounded binary Minuets.

All but two of the works, are in a major tonality. The Minuets are, without exception, in the main key of the work, that is to say, in the same key as the opening movement. All the trios to the Minuets are in the minor mode except for Trio No.5 where the work itself is in G minor. In this work, the trio moves to the relative major. In the only other work which is in a minor key, No.14 in F minor, the trio retains the F minor tonality of the Minuet.

One may deduce from the above that Haydn at this early stage, rated the presence of a trio in the minor mode to be of importance, since it occurs in all but one of the Trios, and that Trio is itself in a minor key. It is possible too that the composer wished the minor key to occur around the middle of the work since the Polonaise, which substitutes for the Minuet movement in No.12 (that is the middle movement in a three movement work), is in the relative minor of the home-key E flat major. Trio No. 4 further

demonstrates Haydn's preference for the minor tonality in the trio. No.4 is a pastiche of various movements taken from other works. The trio of this work was originally the Minuet in A major from Sonata No. 8. In its trio version it is transposed to A minor. The fact that the trio of No. 14 is in F minor, retaining the minor mode of its Minuet, further suggests that the minor modality of the trio was, at that stage, even more important than the element of contrast of mode between Minuet and trio. It will be seen below, that it is the trio which usually carries the most intense emotional expression of the movement, and this is emphasised by the contrasting minor mode.

The Merging of the Old with the New

The exploitation of binary form by the Baroque masters is well known. The Minuet movements in these early Trios provide a penetrating manifestation of the ways in which Haydn adapted his compositional skills, so as to combine salient elements of the already existing form, with elements of the modern, more progressive style of composition which was coming to fruition at that particular time. The brevity of the Baroque dance form is a feature which, at the outset gives definition to the choice of compositional techniques.² Haydn's compromise between the old and the new is clearly exposed in these movements.

Remnants of the Old

An unusually vivid reminder of Haydn's closeness to Baroque practice exists in bars 42 and 43 of the trio of No. 1 where the indications for a figured bass are to be found. The figured bass indications are also found in the first movement of this work (bars 5-6; 20-21; 29-30; and 42) as well as an indication for a cadenza at bar 67.

Also reminiscent of Baroque practice are the many instances of "underflattening" in these works. The practice stems from polyphonic usage of the Dorian mode, where one fewer flat was used than in the key signature. Thus in the F minor trio of No. 1 there are three flats in the key signature while the sixth degree, in this case D, is flattened with an accidental. The fact that the trio of No. 14, which is also in F minor, has four flats in the key signature, is probably an indication that it was composed later. It will be seen below that this work exhibits other subtleties which are well in advance of some of the earlier movements.

There are many more indications that Haydn began his early compositions in a style period which had not completely freed itself from Baroque practice. Indeed the two-reprise small dance-form, as well as the *da capo* aria form in which these works are couched are in themselves reminiscent of the past and in a sense a negation of the newer and usually longer forms which were being explored by Haydn himself as well as others at that time.

In the trio sections especially, Haydn exploits his mastery of the "learned" style, using a variety of contrapuntal devices. Favourite among them is his use of a five-note quaver figure, the first half-beat of which is displaced by a rest



Haydn uses this extensively in the trio of No.1, where the F minor triad beginning in the bass of the opening phrase acts as a propelling agent throughout the section, forming a lower counterpoint against the upper keyboard and violin.

Juxtaposed against the irregularly phrased opening of the trio of this same work, is an example of Haydn's early

handling of imitative dialogue in a trio texture (bars 23-26). Here, in a regularly constructed phrase Haydn sets the upper keyboard part against the violin. This same contrasting motif is used in a recapitulatory fashion from bar 40.

In the D minor trio of No.6 a five-note quaver figure is again used, with the counterpoint now between upper keyboard and violin. In the F minor trio of No. 14 a similar technique is used with infinitely more sophistication. The counterpoint is extended over three parts: the familiar rest and quaver motif is in the upper keyboard, a counterpoint in a semiquaver motive is played by the violin, while the lower keyboard and cello have a crotchet motive which extends over two bars. A two-bar by two-bar phrase, followed by an elided three-bar phrase at bars 31-36, adds to the complexity of this beautiful early work.

Haydn's use of canonic style is exemplified in the Minuet of No.1 where the lower keyboard part with cello is imitated by the upper keyboard part at bars 1-5. At bars 9-14 the canon is transferred to the upper keyboard and the violin. In the trio of No.10 the short opening canon is between the upper keyboard and the violin alone (bars 33-35). It is of interest that the finale of this Trio opens with a canon, which leads one to speculate that Haydn may have been aware of a unifying style throughout the work.

The trio of No. 11 probably exhibits the most advanced use of counterpoint in this early series. Fourth-species syncopated counterpoint is used throughout the work with the violin usually doubling the upper keyboard at a third or sixth. The dominant pedal point picked up by the lower bass parts and violin at bars 42-45, is an unusual textural

combination and serves to provide contrast within the unified whole.

Aspects of the New

The X section

It has been noted above that the Minuets particularly conform to a rounded binary structure. Within this structure is an area which lies at the beginning of the second section where much morphological development is revealed. This area will be referred to as the X-section (A:||: X A¹:||). Structurally, the area resembles the corresponding section of a monothematic movement in for instance, many of Scarlatti's *Essercizi*. Yet, as will be seen below, it also bears a resemblance to the development section of a Sonata movement. The section will be referred to by Ratner's term "the X section" (1980: 213-214).

Conflicting tonality in the X section

One of the important prerequisites of the two-reprise form, and one which was to have far reaching effects on the shape of the Sonata-form, is the tonic-dominant (or perhaps tonic-relative major) polarity at the end of the first section. It was incumbent on composers to devise ways within the confines of a limited area, to maximize the tension and to create the desired contrast, without necessarily resorting to a key-change.

The X section of the Minuet of Trio No. 3 is typical of the procedure which Haydn follows in order to proclaim a dominant tonality without achieving a decisive modulation. Section I ends with a modulation to the dominant and a

perfect cadence in that key. But the X section from bars 11-18 picks up, not the dominant key, but rather the home key of G. However, by means of a strongly reiterated dominant pedal-point almost throughout the X section, Haydn creates the tension which is provided by the presence of the dominant note. The secondary dominant at bar 18 further serves to re-inforce the dominant, and the addition of an extra voice (the bass D) adds to the density of the phrase. Since no modulation has taken place Haydn obviates the necessity of having to return to the Tonic at the end of this short section. It is of interest to compare the sound of this with that of the corresponding passage in the keyboard Sonata No. 13, which is an arrangement of the same work. Since the long sustained notes of the cello and violin are naturally absent in the keyboard version, the impact of the tension is considerably weaker, though the structural means are in principal, identical.

The presence of a dominant pedal-point within a home-key phrase occurs also in the X sections of the trio of Trio No. 3, bars 46-50, and the Minuets of the following: Trio No. 4, bars 11 and 12; Trio 13, bars 13 and 14; Trio 14, bars 11-14 (the last two examples without the additional sustained bass part). A dominant pedal occurs in the trio of No. 11 at bars 42-47. The passage is unusual in that the low violin part which joins the lower bass instruments takes up the pedal point. A textural variant of the dominant pedal occurs in the Minuet of Trio 2 where a Musette-like drone bass continues for a full eight bars (13-20).

An early manifestation of what is to occur in a more sophisticated way in the mature works, is the division of the X section into two or more parts. The divisions are achieved mainly through motivic means, which are confirmed

through textural changes. The technique strongly foreshadows the Development section of the Sonata form. Examples of this are to be found in the trio of No. 1 where the phrase made up of a rest and five-quaver motive (bars 17-22), is followed by a contrasting phrase of imitative dialogue (bars 23-30). The X section of the Minuet of No.3 begins with a passage where the dominant pedal point dominates the harmony (bars 11-14). In the passage which follows (bars 15-18), imitation between the violin and upper keyboard is the outstanding feature. Even in this early work the contrast between the two sections is marked. The Minuet of No.7 has three sections (bars 9-12, bars 13-18, and bars 19-22), all of which show motivic and textural contrasts. Frequently in these works, one of the sections makes use of syncopated counterpoint as in the trio of No.3 bars 46-49; the Minuet of No. 4 bars 15-16; and the Minuet of No.7 bars 13-15.

The "Second Subject"

A full-blown second subject is rare in these generally monothematic movements, but a new motif which alludes to the dominant is often given added definition by a change of texture. In the Minuet of No. 5 for example the violin doubles the keyboard right hand, and the cello doubles the left hand from bars 1-8. At bar 9, there is an abrupt change of scoring to co-incide with a motivic change: the arpeggiated motif here changes suddenly to a dissonant diminished 7th chord out of which the violin picks up a falling minor 3rd. Presumably, in performance the dynamics too would expand at the point of the dissonant chords. Even in these early works Haydn demonstrates what is to become one of the hall-marks of his style--his refusal to cling to stereotypes: in the second reprise at bars 21-31,

Haydn allows the second phrase to supplant the first, while the first now functions as a coda (27-30).

Cadences

Cadences vary greatly between the Minuet and trio, the latter being immeasurably more forward looking. Minuet cadences are generally clichéd formulae such as

or the variant

Frequently the final cadence of a Minuet gives the impression of a formula which has little stylistic relation to the body of the work as for example the Minuet of No. 7 bars 31-32. In virtually all the trios however Haydn maintains the texture and style of the work right through to the cadences at the end of both sections. The reason for this may be that the cadence at the end of the trio is in the middle of the movement and culminates an area of contrast as regards style, texture and tonality. The cadence at the end of the Minuet on the other hand is not only in the tonic key, but at its final appearance it marks the end of the movement. It is thus required to be strong and decisive. Conservative handling is thus appropriate at this point, while more expressive, and artistically free

treatment, is acceptable in the trio cadences. The trios of Nos. 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 10 (though to a lesser extent), 11, 13, and 14 maintain the continuous flow of the style of the trio right through to the final cadences.

Use of thematic clichés

Haydn exploits the punctuation and definition of phrasing used by his pre-Classical compatriots. A typical device in these early works is his use of chains of triplets, often in scale passages, as in the following extract from the Minuet of No. 7:



Although the device represents a move away from the *Fortspinnung* technique of the Baroque masters, the style has clearly not yet arrived at the punctuated rhetoric of the later 1700s.

Haydn's use of triplets in the example above bears a marked similarity to Wagenseil's handling of the following passage from the *Tempo di Menuetto* from his Symphony in D (Wagenseil's Symphony in D is reproduced in DTÖ XXXI: 37-42).

Rests

Silence of one or more of the instruments is especially important in these works. Firstly rests are used as a means by which texture is varied. For instance in the Minuet of No.6 the rests at bars 5 and 6 and again at bar 9, cause a thinning of the texture, presumably so as to allow the keyboard to be heard.

Tentatively in these early works, and more extensively in those that follow, Haydn also uses rests to demarcate sections. In the trio of No. 1 for instance, the silence in all the parts at bar 40 heralds the final reprise in the tonic key. A similar situation occurs in the trio of No. 3 at bar 50. This exploitation of silence would seem to foreshadow the dramatic effects achieved by Beethoven and later composers.

The Trio Sections

Rosen suggests that the trios are examples of Haydn's compositions in the folk style, with an appeal to popular taste (1976: 340-341). Eric Blom refers to the way in which many Classical composers contrast the rustic, pastoral character of the trio with the more aristocratic tone of the Minuet thus following an earlier trend (1941: 162-180). Blom goes on to point out however that Haydn handles the Minuet and trio in his own individual way without adhering too closely to tradition. The findings of the present series reveal that Haydn's Minuets often reflect the style of the *galant*, and are coloured by the aristocratic tone of the dance from which the music emanates, but the trios of the Minuets are the very antithesis of "popular". All save the trio of No. 5 are in the minor mode and judging from the available evidence, this minor quality in the trio was of particular importance to Haydn (see table I above). Tonal, cadential and textural considerations all receive adventurous handling. This added to the intense, deeply expressive tone of most of these trios, is reminiscent of the style which Haydn employs later, in his so called *Sturm und Drang* works. It is far removed from the style of the pastoral dance. Haydn's break with tradition would appear to be a conscious one since a pastoral mood is frequently reflected in the trios of the solo sonatas.

The trios fall into two distinct textural categories. Firstly, there are the trios of Nos. 2, 5, 7, and 13 where melody is the dominating parameter and it is carried mainly by the violin. Themes consist of short motifs, frequent rests, intervals of a third and second which often fall, somewhat in the style of a sigh-motif. These are often

combined with longer melodies in the singing style as in the trio of No. 5. The textural support for the violin is usually a motoric keyboard accompaniment, the lower part of which is doubled by the cello in a triadic broken chord pattern as in no.5, or a "murky" bass as in No. 2. Both types of accompaniment provide a typically homophonic harmonic outline.

The second category of trios demonstrate Haydn's link with the past since all the trios make use of the a contrapuntal textural style. These are the trios of Nos. 1, 6, 10, 11, and 14. In these trios, Haydn uses either a single continuous contrapuntal technique as in the trio of No. 11; or a variety of techniques as in the trio of No. 1. In the latter trio the opening phrase (bars 17-22) outlines a counterpoint of three melodic motives. This leads to a subsequent phrase in imitative dialogue (bars 23-27). In No.10, a combination of counterpoint and homophony in the opening canonic phrase (bars 33-36) is followed by six bars of violin melody supported by an accompaniment (bars 37-42).

The trios of Nos. 3, 4, and 16 do not fall naturally into either of the above categories, nor do they follow a specific pattern. One may speculate as to the reasons. Trio No. 3 is an arrangement of solo Sonata No.13 and was originally not conceived for the trio texture at all. Trio No. 4 is a pastiche made up of various works. The trio section for example was originally the Minuet of solo Sonata No. 8. The position of No. 16 in this group is in the opinion of the present writer a dubious one. The work possesses few of the "fingerprints" discussed above, and its style is of a calibre which hardly merits its inclusion into this series, and certainly not as the final work in the early set.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

1. The uppercase letters A and B are used to symbolise the two sections of a binary form.

The prefix I, II, or III denotes the larger sections i.e. the opening, middle or end section in the *Tempo di Menuetto* movements. The number 1 written as a superscript after a letter denotes the return of a section. Thus IIIA¹ refers to the return of the first part, in the third section of a movement.

Motives are referred to by lower case letters a, b etc.

|| signifies a double bar-line, and :: signifies a repeat sign.

2. Charles Rosen gives a clear account of the harmonic and other implications which result from the brevity of the Minuet form (1980: 110-118).

CHAPTER V

THE MIDDLE TRIOS: NOS. 17-30
1784-1790

H. C. Robbins Landon places the Trios Nos. 17-30 together in one group, on the grounds that all these works were written before Haydn's first London visit. For the purposes of this study this provides a useful boundary line, except for the Trio No. 17 which seems to be out of place in the group.

The Minuet and Trio in F of No. 17

Trio No. 17 is an arrangement which Haydn probably made in 1784, based on his Baryton Trio H. XI:103, which was composed in about 1772 (Landon 1976-1980: II, 583). The first movement as well as the Minuet of the Baryton Trio appear in the keyboard version but the trio of the Minuet and the final movement do not.

Landon includes No. 17 as the first of the middle series of Trios on the evidence that the keyboard part makes use of f''', a key which existed on the instruments only from about 1767 onwards (1980: 262).¹ As far as the Minuet movement is concerned this would appear to be an erroneous assumption for the following reasons:

Firstly the Minuet, which is the section of the work which is an arrangement of the original, does not make use of f'''. The highest note is d''' at bars 10 and 11 and this d''' is already found in the Minuet of No. 13 (bars 15 and 35) in the early series of Trios, written probably before 1760. Landon himself testifies that Haydn's compositions from before 1765 made use of a keyboard whose upper range went as far as d''' (1976-1980: I, 262).

Furthermore, the tonic-dominant harmonies, the chains of triplets in the trio section, and the simplicity and brevity of the X section all point to a much earlier period in the composer's life. The title "Minuet and trio", is used in the Trios for the last time in No. 17: this in itself confirms the early date of this work. That the position of this work in the Trios is insecure is supported by the fact that it bears the title "*(Divertimento)*" in the Feder work list (1980: 388), and also by the fact that it does not appear at all in the *Joseph Haydn: Werke* edition of the Haydn keyboard Trios.

It would thus appear that the work has little value as a relevant source of information for a morphological study such as the present one. Its interest however does lie in the difference in scoring between the viola and bass of the baryton work, and the violin and cello of the keyboard version.

The transposition of the work from A major of the baryton Trio, to F major of the keyboard Trio may be accounted for by the fact that Haydn included the keyboard Trio No. 17 with his Trios Nos. 22 and 23 to make up Opus 42, which was sent to Foster of London in 1785. Trio No. 22 is in A major and it is probable that Haydn transposed the baryton

Trio into a different key to avoid duplication of the A major tonality.

Advantage is clearly taken of the capabilities of the keyboard: the four-note semi-quaver figure, which is so much a characteristic of the keyboard work, is present only twice in the baryton work--the first time functioning as a link between the two sections of the Minuet. Also true to the keyboard idiom is the replacing of the single-crotchet tones in the baryton work (as in the bass part of bars 1-4) with dyads in the keyboard work. The same process is apparent in the upper part of the cadential bars 9-10 etc.

After the re-arrangement of Trio No 17, great changes took place in the genre as far as the Minuet movements were concerned. Up to this point, Haydn had included a Minuet and trio movement in his keyboard Trios almost as a matter of course, with only very few exceptions. From 1784 onwards he no longer wrote Minuet and trio movements as such in his Trios, substituting instead the title *Tempo di Menuetto*, for the Minuet-type movements. Moreover, only four out of the thirteen Trios in this middle period, that is Trios Nos. 19, 21, 24, and 30, contain a movement which bears an allusion to a Minuet in the title. These four Trios have an unusual factor in common: they are all two-movement works, and the *Tempo di Menuetto* is the finale in each case. However since three other two-movement Trios in this middle series do not contain a *Tempo di Menuetto* movement, it is not possible to make the deduction that the two-movement works always have a *Tempo di Menuetto* as the final movement.

Since these later *Tempo di Menuetto* movements are substantially different from the earlier Minuet-trio-Minuet

variety, the change in nomenclature comes as no surprise. What is more difficult to understand is why two early works in different but related genre should contain *Tempo di Menuetto* movements: the solo keyboard Sonata No. 19 which is in the "before 1766" group in the Christa Landon edition, and the symphony No. 18 composed probably between 1762 and 1764. Both are movements which have little which relates them to the large-scale three-part structure of the later movements. One could perhaps speculate that the use of the term "*Tempo di Menuetto*" to signify a more complex structure, was something that only developed in the 1780s.

The *Tempo di Menuetto* in F of Trio No.19

The Trio No. 19 is the first work which Haydn wrote in the genre for twenty or more years. Since the changes which are manifest in the Minuet-type movement during this period are nothing short of spectacular and since the developing form of these works is central to this study as a whole, it would be as well to approach the *Tempo di Menuetto* of No. 19 from the view point of attempting to establish that which has been retained from the early Minuet-trio-Minuet movements.

Characteristics Retained from Earlier Works

The last Minuet and trio of the earlier series, No. 16, is not typical of the Minuet movements of the earlier works. For this reason the penultimate Minuet and trio of No. 14, will be used as a measure of comparison.

Overall Shape

The Minuet and trio of No. 14 is 70 bars long (excluding repeats) while the *Tempo di Menuetto* of No. 19 is more than twice that long. Despite the increase in length the basic principal of statement-digression-restatement remains the same in the surface structure of both works: that is each of the three sections although binary in structure, have a tripartite division since there is a reprise in each. Further, the movement as a whole has a ternary structure with a contrasting section in the middle.

Also the same in both works is the use of the minor mode in the middle section. However, No. 14 is somewhat of an exception in this regard, since the Minuet is, unusually, already in a minor key and so the mode of the trio does not contrast with the Minuet in this work.

The Opening Section: IA

Strangely, the phrasing of the opening section in the earlier work is, if anything, more complex than that of the later movement. IA of No. 19 is in a regular 4 by 2 phrase-construction, although there is a subtle shift in rhythmic emphasis at the cadential bars 6-7. No. 14 opens with a four-bar phrase: the second phrase is extended by means of an interpolation at bar 7 which is then repeated at bar 8, resulting in a six-bar phrase.

The X section: IB

In both works, this section is internally sectionalised, and in both, previously heard motives are used in a development-like way. In both, a pedal point is prominent, but in No. 19 a modulation to the dominant has been clearly

established, whereas in No.14 an allusion to the dominant has to suffice.

The Reprise: IA¹

Here again No. 19 paradoxically displays more conservative handling. In the reprise of No 19, apart from making minor concessions to the return to the Tonic, the eight bars of IA are repeated. Not so in No. 14, where only the end of the original 10-bar phrase is repeated in order to complete the rhyme.

The Middle Section: II

The middle sections of both No. 14 and No. 19 are in F minor. In No. 14 as well as in No. 19 there is a modulation to A flat major at the end of the first part and the second part begins in that key in both cases, before returning to the tonic F minor. The violin carries important thematic material in both movements though in No. 19 the violin is clearly the dominant partner. In other respects however the two sections are not easily comparable since No. 14 conforms to the "learned style" trio, while No. 19 is in the "singing" style with the motoric accompaniment as discussed above. Insomuch as the style of the middle section of No. 19, coupled with its minor tonality, bears distinct similarity to that of trios Nos. 2, 5, 7, and 13, one may safely assess that much has been retained from the old trio sections.

Also similar in principle to the trios of the early Minuet movements is a parallelism between the opening of the two parts of the middle section. In the middle section of the *Tempo di Menuetto* of No. 19 the pattern is set for what is to become important in the movements which follow, that is

the absence of the development like area (the X section of the earlier movements) which is found in the outer sections. Whereas IB (bars 9³-17) is development-like in character since it plays on the motif heard at bar 7³, section IIB simply reflects the opening of IIA in the new key. The result is that IIA-IIB-IIA¹ is an area of thematic continuity which is additionally unified by a continuous accompanimental pattern. IA-IB (quasi development)-link-IB presents a totally different motivic structure in which contrast is an important factor.

The Reprise: III

The third section retains and confirms the basic *da capo* roots of these *Tempo di Menuetto* movements, and in this essential characteristic it remains true to the traditional mould. A device which is frequently used in the X sections of the early Minuets, is used in the varied repeat of section IA (bars 86³-94); namely a pedal point phrase is followed by a phrase in syncopated counterpoint which strongly resembles the technique in the Minuet of No. 7 bars 9-16.

There is thus no doubt that the mould for the *Tempo di Menuetto* is to be found in the early Minuet-trio-Minuet movements: but the intervening years have made a vast difference to the depth of the composer's compositional skills, to subtleties of creative expression, and to his ability to manipulate large formal structures.

The Innovations

Overall considerations

Motivic integration is an important aspect of the movement in No. 19. Unlike the more sectionalised Minuet-trio - Minuet, the *Tempo di Menuetto* is one continuous movement. It thus requires treatment which is suited to a movement with a contrasting middle section, and yet at the same time exists as a single, unified whole. The ornamented anacrusis of the opening, acts as a unifying motif throughout the movement. In IA and IA¹ (and the corresponding sections in III), the opening motif leaps a perfect fourth before descending in a step-wise scale motion. Both the IIA and IIB sections open with this motif: in IIA bar 32³, the minor version of the opening anacrusis (bar 0³) leaps to a minor sixth. Motivic contrast is achieved through the lyrical theme which contains wide intervals. Though the anacrusis which opens IIB (bar 50³) leaps only a minor third, the theme continues to make use of wide intervals such as the minor seventh in the violin part at bar 52. The anacrusis occurs at the beginning of phrases within the section, and is especially conspicuous at the return to the tonic of the reprise IIA¹ beginning at bar 62³. This motif thus functions as a powerful unifying agent within contrasted sections--it opens all the sections including the codetta and coda and it helps to outline the parallelism of the parts IIA and IIB;

The connecting links in the later composite and formally complex movements, assume prominence in a way that was not called for in the more simple Minuet-trio-Minuet movements. Beginning with this movement of No. 19 these links assume a motivic character of their own. The connecting links at bars 18-20, bars 104-105, and bars 128-129 are examples of

this. They are all made up of the same descending motif while an ascending version occurs in section II (bar 44). Thus as well as joining parts, these links help to integrate the movement as a whole.

The manipulation of silence which had its place in the earlier movements, becomes even more important in the later works. Throughout the movement the rest acts as a means to punctuate and sectionalise, starting with the delineation of the smallest motif, as at bars 9 and 10 or the codetta keyboard motif at 28-30; moving on to the phrase definition as at the two-phrase violin part at bars 50-58; and finally the demarcation of sections as in the total silence which precedes the coda at 138²,

In the parameter of texture, the silences have a crucial function in providing contrast as for example at the protracted cadence of the middle section (58-62) where there is a momentary lull in the right hand keyboard part at alternate bars. Or rests are used in order to allow one instrument to be heard without distraction as at each appearance of the anacrusis motif--in this case the upper keyboard alone.

Sometimes whole sections are characterised by a thinning of the texture such as the IIA (bars 32-50) and IIA¹ (bars 63-74) sections where the left hand keyboard and cello have frequent rests, as opposed to the IIB section (51-62) where the rests are not so frequent.

The use of rests combined with double *piano* dynamics in the slurred right hand keyboard couplets at bars 18, 104, and 128 serve to highlight the lightness and openness of the connecting passages. The contrast in each case is emphasised by the *forte* marking of the section which

follows. The rests in the final coda have a somewhat different function: though the rests create the shortness of the broken dyads, the dynamics here build up to the climax which is appropriate to the final bars.

Scoring of the Outer Sections

In the Minuet of Trio No. 14 the violin slavishly follows the upper keyboard part with only a minor deviation at the cadential bars 9-10. No. 14 is not an exception among the early Minuets, but rather it is typical of a trend. On the whole the violin part runs parallel if not in unison with the upper keyboard voice, though there are occasional instances, as in the Minuet of No. 7 bars 9-11, where it doubles the inner keyboard part. In general however the violin achieves little independence in the early Minuets. The result is that there are frequently, as in the Minuet of No. 14, only two real textural components: the violin plus the upper keyboard, and the cello plus the lower keyboard. This despite the fact that there are four sounding component parts: upper keyboard, lower keyboard, violin and cello.² Since the violin so closely doubles the melody line of the keyboard, neither instrument stands out to any great extent and the overall effect is one of mutuality between the instruments.

The role of the violin in section I of No. 19, and indeed the entire textural lay-out in this section, have changed considerably. Firstly the number of parts have been increased by the addition of an inner keyboard voice, resulting in five sounding components. In real terms however there are now three components: upper keyboard, lower keyboard plus cello, inner keyboard plus violin. Secondly the violin, now doubles or at the least parallels the inner keyboard part throughout, except when the violin

is silent as at bars 8³-10³. At the cadential bars 7-8, 30-32 etc. the density is further increased by the addition of an occasional sixth voice such as at bar 7³ and 31³, and the tension in these bars is heightened by the dissonant chromatic movement in the inner keyboard part of these cadential bars. As a result of doubling the inner parts the violin no longer has much involvement in the main thematic outline of the outer sections.

Bearing in mind that the new scoring represented a move away from trio sonata texture, there is no doubt that the change was a progressive one at that time. Paradoxically, however the effect is to increase the subservient role of the violin, while the keyboard on the other hand emerges with its three and occasional four parts (lefthand, right hand and inner parts) as indubitably the dominant partner.

There is much evidence of the prominent role of the keyboard in the I and III sections. At the very outset, the ornamental anacrusis figure is given to the upper keyboard alone, and this remains so at each subsequent appearance. The connecting link (bars 18-19) is also played by the upper keyboard, and the upper keyboard dominates in the coda. The thematic material which is in the *galant* style is virtually carried by the upper keyboard, and when in section III it is decorated, this too takes place in the upper keyboard.

Dynamics are closely bound with the transmission of textures in performance. Curiously, dynamic signs occur in some profusion in the outer sections and not at all in the middle section. They often relate in the outer sections to the keyboard, and are frequently cited by researchers as an indication that from No. 19 onwards these Trios were written for the piano-forte. The *crescendo* mark at bar 143

is particularly supportive of this theory since it is obvious that a gradual and continuous rise in dynamics of this nature could not have been carried out by the harpsichord.

The Varied Reprise

A great change has taken place in section III, and the increased length of the work is in a large measure due to the expansion of this section. In the early *da capo* Minuet movements it is usual to perform the return of the Minuet without repeats (as for instance in the *Beaux Arts Trio* recording on Philips). When played in this way the *da capo* return of the Minuet of No. 14 would be twenty-two bars long, while the opening Minuet is double this length. In No. 19 the position is different: the section which corresponds to the *da capo* of the early Minuet movements, is seventy bars long while section I, with repeats is sixty-four bars long. The additional length of the final section is mainly due to the ten-bar coda, and if one were to discount the Coda the main body of Sections I and III would be found to be similar. This is because the repeats are written out in section III, and the reason for this is that the repeats present considerable variation on the original. However, since the variation is most often achieved by using four semiquavers to one crotchet beat, the quantity of bars remains the same in both sections. A similar scheme characterizes the majority of the *Tempo di Menuetto* movements which follow, and since it is somewhat unusual, and rarely mentioned in the literature, the plan will be set out here in some detail.

TABLE 2
THE VARIED REPRISE IN THE *TEMPO DI MENUETTO*
OF TRIO NO. 19

<u>BARS</u>	<u>SECTIONS</u>	<u>CORRESPONDING BARS IN I</u>
78 ³ -86 ¹	IIIA	0 ³ -8
86 ³ -94 ¹	IIIAv*	0 ³ -8
94 ³ -106 ²	IIIB	8 ³ -20 ²
106 ³ -114 ¹	IIIA ¹	20 ³ -28
114 ³ -118 ¹	Codetta	28 ³ -32
8 ³ -130 ²	IIIBv	8 ³ -20 ²
130 ³ -138 ¹	IIIA1v	20 ³ -28
138 ³ -148	Coda	28 ³ -32

The letter "v" denotes a variation on an original. Thus IIIAv is a variation on IIIA.

Table 2 shows that the repeat signs of section I, although they are absent in section III, are strictly followed. That is to say section IIIA is played in the original and then repeated; the same is true of the entire section IIIB with its codetta, all of which are played and then repeated with variation, and in the case of the codetta, with expansion.

The keyboard, and particularly the upper voice of the keyboard, bears most of the responsibility for the varied sections, and plays an especially prominent role in the coda.

Two possible deductions could be made from the layout of section III. The first is that considerable weight has been shifted to the end of the movement, and in this case to the end of the work. Secondly, it is clear that Haydn paid strict attention to repeat signs, and the fact that repeat passages are written out meticulously is perhaps a clue to performers that the composer intended repeat signs to be heeded. In this case their observance would be essential in section I so as to maintain a balance against section III.

The Middle Section: IIA and IIB

It was already apparent in the early Minuet movements that the trio section displayed a heightened sense of emotion, which contrasted with the more formal mood of the Minuets. To an even greater extent much of the change which takes place in these middle sections serves to increase the emotional intensity of the central area of the movement.

The balance of the instruments in the section which "used to be" the trio has changed surprisingly little in the intervening years. The violin, as in the early trios, carries virtually all the thematic material. In contrast to the outer sections, it here soars above the keyboard which, with the cello doubling its lower part, provides a homogeneous motoric accompaniment not unlike the accompaniment say of the trio of No. 7. The singing melody of the violin in a high register in the minor key, comes as a poignant reminder that this section is literally the heart of the movement.

Tonality and Harmony are more adventurous. To begin with the middle section, especially IIB, is longer than the trios of the earlier Minuet-trio-Minuet movements. There

is thus room for a comfortable modulation to A flat beginning in bar 41 in the IIA section. True, the chain of triplets so characteristic of the earlier works is still present in bars 42-43, but unlike their function in the earlier works which is mainly thematic, here they also serve to steer the harmony through the diminished seventh chord of A flat and onto the dominant seventh of that key (bar 42³). In IIB there are adventurous key changes which would not have been possible in the smaller trio sections: for instance the dominant 9th chord at bar 52 which ushers in a modulation to B flat minor. The outline of the B flat minor triad in the violin part at bars 53-54 is imitated by the left hand keyboard and cello at bars 54-55, the bass phrase overlap acting as a link between the two four-bar phrases of the violin. The subtle handling of the imitation serves to intensify the effect of the modulation to the super-tonic minor.

Phrasing often provides a sense of repose as in the two expansive four-bar phrases for the violin at bars 50³-58, or, conversely, to a sense of urgency such as the gradual telescoping of phrases beginning at 62³ and ending at 74. The latter, naturally is one of the ways in which tension is built into this section.

Cadences in this section are delayed through the use of the broken triad on C major. Again the technique is not new: it occurs in the Minuet of No. 6 bars 9-11 in a remarkably similar way. Here however the tension is markedly increased by the thrice repeated cadences at the end of both IIA and IIB before finally resolving. The broken chord figure moves temporarily to the left hand keyboard doubled by cello at the cadence points so that continuity is maintained throughout.

The Coda

The length and weight which the codettas and the final coda lend to the movement, constitute perhaps the most obvious of all the changes between these and the earlier movements. The four bars at the end of IA1 (bars 28³-32), their repetition at IIIA¹ (bars 114³-118) and the final virtuoso-type coda from 138³ to the end of the movement, all centre on the keyboard. Since this *Tempo di Menuetto* is the finale of the whole work, the coda assumes particular importance as an ending. It adds weight to the end of the work as well as highlighting the role of the pianist.

The *Tempo di Menuetto* in B Flat of Trio No. 21

From a formal point of view this movement varies little from the structure of the *Tempo di Menuetto* movement of No. 19. However many of the trends which were laid down in the earlier movement are so intensified that this *Tempo di Menuetto* is something of a milestone in its forward-looking qualities.

Formal Considerations

The Outer Sections (I and III)

The opening twelve bars display conservative treatment of tonality since, as in some of the early Minuets, no modulation occurs. Save for a momentary disturbance (bars 8³-9²) the phrase follows a regular two-bar pattern. The theme, carried almost exclusively by the upper keyboard, is of a stately, ceremonial character which is underlined by the processional regularity of the rhythm.

Section IB follows a trend which was already set in some early Minuets (for example No.7) and maintained in IB of No. 19: that is the internally sectionalised IB section. Here the section divides into three inter-related parts plus a linking passage.

1. A three by two sequential passage (12^3-18^2) which relinquishes the *galant* formality of IA in favour of a more dynamic pianoforte style. A remarkable aspect of this passage is the transition function which it fulfils. Since IA has ended on the the home key, it is left to this section to facilitate the move to the dominant. This is skillfully achieved by a passage that combines triadic movement with decorated scale passages; the passage culminates in the dominant, F major. The dominant allusion which traditionally belongs to this area, (the original X section), has here been supplanted by a transition before it broadens into the quasi-development which follows.

2. The second limb of IB, which is entirely in F major, is characterised by the use of contrapuntal techniques. In the earlier Minuet-trio-Minuet movements, the counterpoint apart from the Minuet of No. I is relegated to the trio sections. Here it forms part of an area which is distinctly developmental. The contrapuntal passage is subdivided into two sections. First a phrase consisting of canonic dialogue between the two upper voices, beginning on the upper keyboard (bar 18^3) and ending on the violin (bar 23^2). The pedal point in the lower bass bears a similarity to that in No. 19 bars 12-16, in that it occurs on the tonic of the new key, in the second phrase of the IB section. The use of a pedal point has clear antecedents in the X sections of the early Minuets. It occurs in No. 3 (bars 11-18), No. 4 (bars 11-12), No. 7 (bars 9-11) and No.

14 (bars 11-14) with the difference that in these X sections the pedal is on the dominant, since part of its function is to substitute for an actual modulation to the dominant. In the early works, probably because it stands in place of a dominant modulation, the pedal point appears as the first phrase of the above-mentioned X sections, that is immediately after the first double-bar. In No. 19 however, where a modulation has already occurred at the end of IB, and in No. 21, where the modulation has already been effected in the first "transition" phrase of IB, the pedal-point occurs in the second phrase of IB. In any case, the use of a pedal point in the developmental area of the outer sections of all these works is strongly characteristic of the Haydn style.

The second area of limb No. 2 (bars 21³-28) overlaps the first. It retains the dominant tonality as well as the contrapuntal character, but the contrapuntal technique and texture change radically. The cello, in a passage that demands great agility from this usually subservient instrument, now joins the lower keyboard in an invertible counterpoint of the "transition" motif which first appeared at bars 13³-14¹. The violin and upper keyboard provide the counterpoint to the lower keyboard and cello, while the violin doubles the long notes of the keyboard in a manner which is usually reserved for the cello. The reason for this reversal of roles of the instruments is of course due to the reversal of themes on the staff.

3. The third section (bars 28³-36¹) is dominated by the tonic pedal point in which the cello has now resumed its familiar role of supporting the bass keyboard.

In the connecting link which follows (bars 36-42²), the tonic pedal takes over the function of a dominant

preparation which leads back to IA^{1v}, which is now slightly varied in the upper keyboard part (bars 44, 46 and 48).

Both IIIBv (bars 94³-124²) and IIIA^{1v} of the final section are quite extensively varied but since this is mainly achieved by the addition of notes of shorter duration, the number of bars in each case remains the same as in the original. Significantly, the irregularity in the opening phrase at bars 8³-9² is in all instances left free of variation. The variation technique which was used for the first time in these Minuet movements in the reprise sections of No. 19, is here used more extensively and with greater assurance, especially in IIIBv and IIIA^{1v}.

The Middle Section (IIA and IIB)

The investigation into Minuet movements has, up to this point, led one to expect the opposite mode without a change of tonality in the inner section, since apart from a few exceptions in the early trios, this has invariably been the case. The middle section of No. 21 does not deviate from the plan even though the change in this case necessitates the five flats required in B flat minor. It is significant that the trio to the Minuet of the early Trio No. 13 in B flat is one of the rare exceptions to Haydn's usual practice of moving to the tonic minor in the trio section. In No. 13 the Minuet is in B flat while the trio is in G minor, rather than the expected B flat minor; this is probably due to the large number of flats which B flat minor would necessitate. It is known that B flat minor was an unusual key for compositions written even as late as the 1780s, and Haydn's venture into this key, and for that matter into F minor for the middle section of No. 19 represents a progressive step.

In the event, there is a change to D flat major after only a few bars (from about bar 61) and the second section IIB guides the work back, first sequentially and then through the connecting link at bars 78-81, to IIIA. Up until the *Tempo di Menuetto* of NO. 21 there has always been a break at the end of the trio in the early series, and at the end of the middle section at the end of No.19. In No. 21 for the first time, a break does not occur at the end of the middle section. Indeed via the link passage, the middle section overlaps right over to the B flat major area of the outer section. It is a significant development, and marks an important move away from the definite divisions of the earlier multi-sectional works.

As is usual in this section, the violin dominates, and though thematic material is derived from the opening, the ceremonial style of the outer sections is transformed into a lyrical, *dolce* section of great beauty. The section falls into a 4 plus 4 plus 6 phrase structure.

A change of mode, scoring, texture, and an apparent change of theme all help to give the IIB section a new character, but most of all it is a change of phrasing from bar 68 onwards creating an illusion of 6/8 time, that makes this section different. Formally, the trend noted in No. 19 of parallelism between the two parts of section II, is here even more deeply enforced since for the first time in all these works there is no return to A¹, but simply IIA (repeated)-IIB and a connecting passage leading on to IIIA. It is probable that the idea of a reprise as well as a long connecting link was not acceptable to Haydn's impeccable sense of balance and proportion.

The Connecting Passages

It has already been noted that the connecting passages of No. 19 serve an important structural function. In No. 21 too they fulfil the function of joining the various sections but here they also begin to assume importance in their own right.

The link which joins IB to IA¹ begins ostensibly at bar 32, but in fact grows out of the last section of IB, and acts as a modulatory pivot between F major of IB and B flat major of IA¹. The *piano* indication leading to *crescendo* and finally to *forte* (bar 42) heightens the effect of the E flat at bar 42, coming as it does after the relentlessly repeated E natural of the previous bars. Indeed the connecting passage is so long and so persistent that one almost suspects it to be a product of Haydn's well-known wit.

The connecting link between IIB and IIIA (78-82) has the task of facilitating movement from B flat minor to B flat major. Like the previous link, this passage grows imperceptibly out of the previous section. Haydn's care to maintain a unified style in the early trios as well as the in the middle section of No. 19 has been noted above. It shows itself once again here. The composer's sensitive awareness of the texture from which the link emanates, results in a link passage which is lightened with rests and staccato marks.

The passage linking IIIBv to IIIA¹ (bars 114-124) corresponds in all essentials to the original appearance of the link passage IA¹, although the added *fz* mark on the F sharp at bar 124 is cause for speculation. In all

probability its purpose is to dramatise the final appearance of the opening statement.

The Coda

Unlike the *Tempo di Menuetto* of No. 19, that of No. 21 lacks a codetta at the end of the opening section I, but this is more than compensated for by the twelve bars at the end of the movement which are here, for the first time, separated from the rest of the movement by a double-bar line as if to proclaim their separateness. Motives for this coda are drawn from the opening phrase and the keyboard is the decidedly prominent instrument.

Cadences

Haydn's use of the cadence to divide sections of this movement is worthy of mention. The cadential six four-dominant seventh-tonic cadence and the bar which precedes it, occur first at the end of IA (bars 10-12). The identical pattern culminates section IA¹ ((bars 52-54), section IIIA (bars 92-94) and a varied version at the end of section III (bars 134-136). It is however not present in the middle section although the cadence at bars 66-68 may be regarded as a variant of the cadential pattern. The formulaic cadences of the early Minuet movements and their freer counterparts in the trios have been noted above. This early practice is perhaps the precedent for the cadences in this movement.

Texture

The A Sections

As in No. 19 the thematic material in the A section is carried by the upper keyboard while the violin invariably doubles the inner voice of the keyboard in all the IA sections. The cello more consistently than in No. 19, doubles the bass note of the lower keyboard. There are thus three sounding parts.

The opening anacrusis, like that in No. 19, is always played by the upper keyboard alone and in its original form or as a derivative, it opens every new section. Like the prototype cadence bars discussed above, this opening motif helps demarcate sections while, in its sameness, it unifies the multi-sectionalised movement.

As if the composer wished to make sure that it would be heard in isolation, the repeated motif at the irregularly phrased bars (8³-9³) is also always played by the upper keyboard alone. The change from parallel thirds in the lower keyboard to parallel sixths, plus the *fz* markings on either side of these irregular bars creates a moment of change in an area of largely uniform texture.

The string instruments move through each sub-phrase in a step-wise motion each covering a remarkably narrow range; the rhythmic pattern too is confined to a regular meter with few beat-subdivisions in the strings. These considerations coupled with the uniformity of texture result in A sections which have a strong, static quality: a quality which the composer clearly felt appropriate for the outer parts of the work.

The B Sections

The B sections present a contrasting textural picture, which is obviously supported by more dynamic formal considerations. The different areas of the B sections require rapidly moving textural changes. After the "transition" phrase, the violin takes on a much more important role in contributing to the contrapuntal textures (bars 18-28). Even the cello receives an unusual amount of prominence in this section. It provides the deep bass note of the F major chord at bars 19 and 21 then joins the lower keyboard in a lively passage (bars 23³-28), and it is unusually linked to the violin in parallel compound thirds in the phrase which initiates the connecting passage (32³-36).

The Middle Section

As has been the case with all the works discussed, the violin comes into its own in the middle section and No. 21 is no exception. It is however noteworthy that the role of the piano is here far from subservient. In IIA the upper keyboard accompaniment has melodic interest of its own and comes through almost as a counter melody, to the singing melody of the violin. However the left hand keyboard and the cello maintain their customary role of harmony bearers.

In IIB the balance of the instruments changes distinctly in favour of the upper keyboard while the dyads of the left hand are doubled by the violin and cello respectively, in an answering accompaniment.

In general the section is one of decreased density, which matches the tonal instability and expressive melody of this area. The contrast to the strong outer sections is marked.

Motivic Structure

The material for the movement is derived mainly from the opening motif and its anacrusis. Indeed one may break the germ-cell down even further, and suggest that the movement is built on the interval of a perfect fourth, that is the F-B \flat outlined in the opening motif, and its inversion.

In the Outer Sections

Motif (a) is a stepwise motion of four notes which outlines the interval of a perfect fourth at its extremities.



Motif (a)

It occurs in the A sections in the lower keyboard doubled by the violin and the cello in the first and every alternate bar save for the irregular bars (8³-9²).³

In the IB section motif (a) figures prominently in the string parts and lower keyboard of the "transition" phrase (bars 13³-18). In the second limb the motif is inverted with some rhythmic augmentation in the upper keyboard and violin parts (bars 24-26). Meanwhile a version of the "transition" theme which appeared first in the upper keyboard at bars 12³-14 is now placed in the lower keyboard and cello parts at bars 23³-27 acting as a counterpoint to the augmented motif (a). Thus motif (a) in bars 23-27 moves with rhythmic augmentation in a descending instead of ascending motion as well as appearing in the upper instead of the lower stave. The descending motion is maintained by the violin and inner keyboard part in the third limb of IIB

(bars 29-32); in the link passage both the ascending and descending forms are used (bars 38-41).

Motif (b) is the turn motif.



Motif (b)

This motif is invariably used as an end-formula. It ends every two-bar phrase in the A section (bars 1, 3, and 5), and occurs in the violin part in the coda (bars 144-145). It is the final motif in the main cadences which occur at the end of sections. It occurs in the imitative passage of the B section in both the upper keyboard and the violin (bars 18³-28), and is inverted in the lower keyboard and cello part at 24¹ and 25¹. In the latter position it momentarily relinquishes its end-pattern function. In the connecting passage too it is used ornamentally in the cello and violin rather than as an ending. The persistent F-E♭ of the link passage clearly grows out of the last two notes of the turn motif, and furthermore, it is couched in the rhythm of the motif (a).

Motif (c) is characterised by a thrice repeated note, the third of which is often decorated.



Motif (c)

Motif (c) appears in every alternate bar (1, 3, 5 and 7-8). In bars 1, 3, and 5 it combines with the turn motif (b). It is cut short in the "irregular" bar 9, and in its undecorated form it occurs in bars 10-11.

In the B section in the contrapuntal phrase, motif (c) appears in the imitative dialogue between the upper keyboard and the violin (bars 20-23), and is prominent in the upper keyboard at bars 23-24. The motif is used extensively in the coda, and the idea of a repeated tone is an important part of the link passages.

Motif (d) in its ascending form outlines a perfect fourth from its first note to last. Its variant (d_1) is a descending form of (d) and outlines a perfect fifth from its first note to last. Motif (d^1) is embellished with passing notes but like motif (d) it occurs as a precursor to motif (c).



Motif (d)

Motif (d^1)

Motif (d) is the opening motif and as either motif (d) or (d^1) it fills this same role at the beginning of each new section, such as at the beginning of IB (bar 12³) and each subsequent limb of IB, as well as at the beginning of IA¹. It appears in both upper keyboard and violin parts and is used repeatedly within the contrapuntal texture of IB (the phrase 18³-28).

The Middle Section

The opening violin theme on which the section is built is clearly a loose inversion of motif (a). The descending version of the perfect fifth motif (d_1) figures in the violin part from bar 62, and the section IIB (bars 68-78) is clearly derived from this motif. The motif (d_1) thus not only integrates each section with the work as a whole, but unifies the two sections IIA and IIB with each other. It

is this motivic integration which contributes greatly to the continuous flow of the middle section.

The *Tempo di Menuetto* of No. 21 reveals subtleties of structure and texture that clearly stamp it as a work of a mature master. Whereas in the earlier Minuet movements, a comparison with what had gone before seemed appropriate, No. 21 points to the future in a number of ways, not the least of which is the close motivic integration mentioned above. The sectionalisation of the IB section, the individuality of the connecting links, the unusual key of the middle section, and the merging of the middle section with the final section, the separate coda--all these bring to mind features which were to emerge fully only much later.

The *Tempo di Menuetto* in E flat of Trio No. 24

On 26th October 1788 Haydn wrote to the publishers Artaria: "In order to compose your 3 pianoforte Sonatas particularly well, I had to buy a new fortepiano" (Landon 1959: 79). Haydn refers here to the Trios Nos. 24, 25 and 26. The letter leaves no room for doubt regarding the date of Trio No. 24, nor of the instrument for which it was composed.

Overall Structure⁴

The overall surface structure though fundamentally similar to the movements in Nos. 19 and 21, is here expanded to 162 bars as opposed to the 148 bars of both of the previous *Tempo di Menuetto* movements (all calculated without repeats). Like the previous *Tempo di Menuetto* movements in the group, this movement is built on three large sections, of which the last carries a great deal of the weight, not only of the movement itself but of the total two-movement work. Each of the three large sections is comprised of three smaller sections which may be expressed briefly thus:

I A :||: B A¹ Coda :||:

II A :||: B A¹ :||: Link

III A A[~] B[~] A^{1~} Coda B¹ A¹ Coda

Note: the sign ~ next to a letter signifies that the section is varied through contrapuntal treatment.

As the morphological survey of the two previous *Tempo di Menuetto* movements leads one to expect, section III of this movement presents as a varied Reprise of section I. Its uniqueness however lies in that instead of the expected variation through thematic decoration as in the movements of Nos. 19 and 21, the final section of this movement is an elaborate contrapuntal arrangement of the opening section. By writing out the repeats Haydn gives himself ample space to manipulate an intricate web of part writing. The following representational diagram shows the structure in some detail.

I A 1-8 :||: B 9-17 A¹ 17-26 C 26-31 :||:

II A 32-43 :||: B 44-54 A¹ 54-67 :||: 2nd_time 74

III A 74-81 A[~]82-89 B[~] 90-98 A^{1~} 98-106 C[~]106-110

B¹112-120 A¹ 120-129 C 129-139

Ca-~ 139-151

Cb-~ 152-162

Note: -~ denotes that the contrapuntal treatment does not commence at the beginning of the passage.

The Outer Sections

Section IA

The single phrase eight-bar opening is clearly designed so as to be capable of the contrapuntal manoeuvres to which it is to be subjected.

The three sound components which take part in the opening are the lower keyboard bass part doubled by the cello, the inner keyboard voice mainly doubled by the violin, and the upper keyboard which shares the melodic material with the inner keyboard voice in bar 2, but is not doubled by another instrument. That is there are five components, but only three sounding parts participating in IA. The violin occasionally adds decorative embellishment (bars 4 and 7). The range of the inner voice, and the violin which doubles it, is unusually wide in the opening bars; for example the inner part, doubled by the violin leaps from g (bar 2¹) to eb'' (bar 3¹) and up to f'' at bars 5 and 6. The wide pitch range of the inner keyboard voice is even more marked in the IA¹ section (bars 17-18) where the lower keyboard parts are placed one octave lower, and the violin remains silent.

Not only would the range be impossible for the violin, but it also serves the purpose of allowing the keyboard to be heard without distraction. In general the pitch range in this work is far wider than in the previous two movements; the inner voices in the opening sections of Nos. 19 and 21 are situated close to the bass voice and one may perhaps deduce that the present arrangement was for the sake of the unique contrapuntal demands of this movement.

The movement begins, unusually, on a down beat, and immediately states the first of the three motives to be set out in this section. Motif (a), is bow-shaped and is outlined in the upper and inner keyboard parts as well as by the violin (bar 1). Motif (b) is a scale pattern and occurs initially in the upper and inner keyboard in bars 2-3. Motif (c) is a chromatic motif which occurs in the inner keyboard part from bar 3-7.

Section IB

Although section IA ends with a strong perfect cadence in the dominant key, section IB reverts back to the home key of E flat. Motives (a) and (b) are repeatedly set against each other in an overlapping pattern. The overlap persists until the end of the section when the keyboard and cello parts end a full bar sooner than the violin part which now overlaps into section IA¹. There is a considerable lightening of the texture in section IB with only one motif being heard at any time, except for the overlapping bars (15-17). The parts are placed wide apart with plenty of silence interspersed, giving an effect of openness which contrasts well with the first eight bars. In an unusual arrangement of instruments, the violin takes on the role of doubling the lower keyboard in the first four bars while

the cello provides an unexpected independent bass line as if in response to motif (a) in the upper keyboard.

The exact point at which the Coda I begins is problematic since it emerges imperceptibly from IA and flows into what turns into a new section. Bar 26 has been chosen as the commencement simply for convenience, for the blurred definition of the sections is no doubt deliberate. The ornamented six-four cadence begun at bar 25 is however so typical of Haydn's early cadential formulae that it is probable that what follows the partial cadence was conceived as the addition, that is the coda. The function of the Coda is not merely an addition but also an interruption and a prolongation since the resolution to the cadence started at bar 25 only materialises at bar 31.

Section III

It is in section III (that is from bar 74) that the concentration of contrapuntal activity is most intense. The first eight bars are an exact repetition of IA (bars 1-8). However, in place of the double-bar repeat sign of the original, the next eight bars IIIA~ (82-89) are a repetition of the preceding eight with the voices now re-arranged in triple counterpoint: the original upper keyboard voice is now, with some small alterations, in the lower keyboard and cello; the lower keyboard voice has now moved to the upper keyboard; and the violin rather freely doubles the inner keyboard voice. The exchange of parts by the instruments naturally results in a complete change of texture. The opening bar (82) where all parts except the upper keyboard are involved in the decorated motif (a), is an example of the tremendous change in sound between this bar and the corresponding bar 74. This of course is

an important part of Haydn's mastery of the art of variation which is here textural rather than thematic.

The next section III B¹~ A¹~ C¹ (bars 90-110) begins with a version of IB A¹ C in double counterpoint: that is the parts of the original IB (bars 9-16/17) are exchanged. The bow motif (a) is now in the lower keyboard: its lower part is doubled by the cello while the upper part is doubled by the violin and the scale passages are left to the upper keyboard unaccompanied. This leads directly into the Reprise III A¹~ (bars 98-106), again in the triple counterpoint version of bars 82-89. The coda IIIC¹ follows, now in inversion: that is the ascending passages of the coda I now move in a descending direction, while the originally descending passages now ascend.

At bar 112, the point which corresponds to bar 31 where the repeat double bar sign occurred, the whole of the B-A¹-coda section as it appeared originally in section I (bars 9-31), is repeated with an expanded coda.⁵ The expansion of the coda is achieved first through an additional 6 bars of the inverted version of the scale pattern (bars 134-139). Then two new limbs are added. The first of these (bars 139-146) elides with the previous scale-passage section (bar 139). A new pattern built on chords of the circle of fifths is accompanied by motif (b) in the upper keyboard. This passage is marked *forte*. A bar of silence follows and the passage is repeated in inverted counterpoint, this time with a *piano* dynamic indication. The effect of statement and its antithesis in this context lend a sudden humorous touch. The passage is expanded by another five bars built on the scale motif (bars 146₂-151). The final limb begins with a repetition of the original coda of section I (bars 26-31) with textural variations such as the *staccato* strings; it is followed by an inverted version of the same

section. The sharp contrasts in bars 139-146 mentioned above and the delay of the expected cadence at the commencement of all the cadence sections provide moments of comedy in an otherwise serious and highly intellectual movement. The final coda ends with a distinctly jovial tone, which perhaps is intended to prevent listeners and players from taking the "learned" work too seriously.

The Middle Section IIA and IIB

Haydn makes a break with his own tradition in this section by casting it in the sub-dominant key of A flat major instead of the usual minor tonality at this point. The section IIB passes through a variety of keys including the distant key of D flat minor (bar 47).

A second departure from what had become an expected practice is that in this movement the violin does not carry the bulk of the thematic material of the middle section. It is true that the violin shows independence, especially in IIB where at bars 47-49 it traces an unusual dominant ninth in D flat minor and goes on to echo the upper keyboard in augmentation (bars 49-52). Nonetheless it carries nothing of the solo prominence which it holds in the previous minor-key middle sections, and as a natural corollary, neither does the keyboard execute the customary motoric bass accompaniment. On the contrary, the keyboard now carries the bulk of the thematic interest with material derived from the (a) and (b) motives from IA, which correspond in the middle section to the bow-shaped passages (for instance bar 9) and the scale passages (for instance bar 10). A passage in typically piano-idiom occurs at bar 62 and is repeated at bar 63, and here the violin plays a conservative role of faithfully duplicating the upper keyboard.

Thematic Material

The three main motives are each given a distinctive shape. Each is then able to function characteristically in the contrapuntal context in which it is set.

Motif (a)



Motif (a) always retains its bow shape though it is sometimes inverted as in the violin part at bars 84²-85² and 100³-101². It forms one of the basic motives of the work and especially in its decorated form, it is the distinctive kernel of the contrapuntal sections such as in IIA¹~ (bar 82). Here it occurs in four parts producing a dense, tightly woven pattern of sound. In its double-thirds form it is idiomatic to the keyboard and in this form it is an integral part of all the B sections as well as the middle section. Occasionally the violin and cello play the motive together at the interval of a compound third as, for example, in bars 90 and 93.

Motif (b)



Motif (b) is the semiquaver scale motif and along with motif (a) with which it is usually coupled, it forms the basis of melodic material in the movement. In its initial appearance in bar 2 it is shared by the inner and upper keyboard voices. It is an extremely pliable motif being able to change direction easily as well as to reverse its position on the staves. It lends itself to augmentation as in the violin part of bars 49-52 where in inversion it is the basis of the upper keyboard descending scale (F \flat E \flat D \flat C \flat B \flat). The versatility of motif (b) stretches to other rhythmic permutations as in the upper keyboard part of bars 26-29 where its irregular rhythmic groupings form a hemiola-like effect against the remaining parts. While an effect of two against three occurs at bar 26-27, at bars 106-108 the effect is of three against six over two bars. The hemiola effect in the Minuet as a dance was mentioned in Chapter I. One may speculate that its occurrence in a *Tempo di Menuetto* movement such as this is not entirely coincidental.

Motif (b) is the basic motif of the coda sections. Part of its function in these sections is to avert an expected cadence as at bars 25-26, 105-106, and 128-129. In each case the motif is drawn out so as to expand the cadential area.

Motif (c)



Motif (c) is less prominent than motives (a) and (b). It lies concealed in the inner keyboard part at its first appearance (bars 3-7), and it continues in an unobtrusive role throughout. Despite this, motif (c) plays a vital role in providing the harmonic colour which characterizes the movement. It occurs in a typical form in the violin part in bars 22-23, and 34-37 and in the cello and lower keyboard parts at bars 35-37.

The Connecting Links

Unlike the *Tempo di Menuetto* movements of Nos 19 and 21, this movement begins on a down beat. This clearly facilitates decisive beginnings and endings without a need for a linking passage. Defined endings occur in all sections apart from the return to the reprise in the A¹ sections, and the unusual second time repeat at bars 67-74. The latter eight-bar *tutti* passage functions as a bridge between the A flat major ending of the middle section, and the E flat major return of the important final section. The *forte* passage stands out in distinct textural contrast to all else in the movement. For the rest, Haydn takes great care to conceal and overlap phrases within sections. At bars 16-17 of No. 24 the lower keyboard and cello complete the phrase one full bar before the violin. When the perfect cadence signifying the "real" end does in fact occur (bar 17), this end turns out to be also a beginning. A similar device is used at bars 97-98. This lack of definition is in direct contrast to the movements of Nos. 19 and 21 where the connecting links are a feature of the movements.

Almost as if with Trio No. 21 Haydn had exhausted the possibilities of conventional techniques in the *Tempo di Menuetto* movements, he turns in No. 24 to incorporating

contrapuntal rather than thematic variation, a choice which allows him to use his ingenuity in handling the varied reprise. This is not to say that the manipulation of thematic cells is absent, far from it. There is however no doubt that contrapuntal originality is the dominating feature of this movement. Themes, harmony, tonality, texture are all moulded to suit specific contrapuntal demands. In so doing Haydn at the same time produced a movement of an innovative character, quite apart from the contrapuntal aspects with which he was so concerned. The vividly chromatic colouring gained mainly from the motif (c); the sub-dominant tonality of the middle section; the vastly expanded and scherzo-like codas; the concealed endings and beginnings, the rhythmic irregularities--all these are features of the movement which occur in addition to the counterpointal ingenuity. It would seem that in the *Tempo di Menuetto* movements of his Trios, and in this movement particularly, Haydn felt free to experiment and to give free rein to his powers of originality.

The *Tempo di Menuetto* in F of Trio No. 30

On June 20th 1790, that is about two years after writing Trio No. 24, Haydn wrote to Maria Anna von Genzinger "I have taken the liberty of sending your Grace a brand new pianoforte Sonata with accompaniment of a flute or violin, not as anything remarkable, but simply a trifle to amuse you in moments of utmost boredom" (Landon 1959: 104-105). Landon feels reasonably confident that Haydn refers here to Trio No. 30.

The Trio is one of a group of three, Nos. 28, 29, and 30, which Haydn wrote for the flute as an alternative to the

violin. The extract above makes it clear that even in 1790 the composer conceived of the Trio as a "pianoforte Sonata" with accompaniment. The fact that he sent the work to Marianne von Genzinger who was a pianist, lends added support to Haydn's bias towards the keyboard in this work.

This *Tempo di Menuetto* movement is in sonata form. As a sonata-form movement it is unremarkable. However what is unusual is that two such seemingly disparate movement-types as the sonata form and the *Tempo di Menuetto* should be merged together into a single movement. Both the combination and the way in which Haydn applies the trio texture to the hybrid movement, is of great relevance to this study. The texture is influenced not only by its use within the sonata form, but also by the composer's obligation to cater for the flute alternative.

The sonata-form structure appears to be the dominating feature to which most other parameters, especially texture, adapt; the textural changes which occur during the course of the movement do so according to the sectional changes of the sonata form. It is for this reason that the present analysis will focus on the sonata-form layout of the movement.

The Overall Form

The formal structure of the movement is similar to that used by Haydn in many of the opening movements of the keyboard Trios. The following is a representation of the bars contained in each area of the sonata form.

I Area 1 1-8;9-16 Area 2 16-26 / 26^{2½}-33 / 33-43: || :

II Development 44-56 / 56-64 / 64^{2½}-76

III Area 1 76-94 Area 2 94-104 / 104^{2½}-111 / 111-120: || :

Motives

Like the head-motives of the previous *Tempo di Menuetto* movements in the middle group of works, the main motives of this movement are made up of a triadic cell and a scale passage. Motif (a) is a triad which settles on a distinctive accented second beat:

Motif (a)



Motif (b) is the scale passage:

Motif (b)



Motif (c), like motif (a) from which it is probably derived, is built on a triad and comes to rest on the second beat of the bar. Because of its distinctive appearance as a semiquaver triadic figure in bar 15¹ it is treated here as a separate motif. However it is versatile and undergoes much change.

Motif (c)



I. The Exposition

The First Tonal Area

A solo keyboard introduction is standard practice in the sonata-allegro first movements of the Haydn Trios. It is however used here for the first time in a *Tempo di Menuetto* movement and presents as a double exposition: first as an eight-bar phrase for keyboard alone (bars 1-8) followed by an eight bar passage of *tutti* scoring (bars 9-16). In the opening phrase the main thematic material occupies an unusually high pitch range, no doubt as a concession to the capabilities of the flute. Scoring in the *tutti* section is conventional with the flute/violin part doubling the upper keyboard melody, and the cello doubling the pedal point of the lower bass. The low bass F on every first beat in the cello part (bars 9-11) produces a Ländler-like rhythm which is perhaps a reflection of Haydn's awareness of the Minuet component in the title.

The Second Tonal Area (bars 16-43)

The second area is centred on the key of the dominant C, and is comprised of three parts:

The first part (bars 16-26) maintains the rocking bass pattern of the previous sixteen bars. This in itself acts as a unifying influence between the first and second tonal areas; it is however the quickening of the bass part to a semiquaver figure from bar 16-30 which is largely responsible for the intensity in this area. A further textural change is achieved through the repeated two-bar passage (bars 16²- 22) in which the upper keyboard changes to octaves in a syncopated play on the dominant seventh chord (bars 17, 19, and 21) while in alternate bars the flute/violin engages in contrapuntal interplay with the upper keyboard which is based on the motives (b) and (c). Bar 22¹ marks the climax of the passage for it is on the long expressive E \flat that the contrapuntal voices come together on a single harmony, and at the same time the chord signifies a change to the minor mode of C. The effect is of a thicker, more intense and more continuous texture before the return to C major at about bar 25.

The second part of the second tonal area (bars 26^{2½}-33) has a considerably thinner texture. The semiquaver figure in the lower keyboard changes from the double notes of the previous section to a single line, and as this line proceeds, so the interval which it outlines grows larger and more consonant (bars 27-29). All the while the static dominant pedal G remains. The sparseness and lack of mobility of the texture is emphasised by the cello part which plays only one note to a bar (bars 27- 31) and the initial silence of the flute/violin which is then broken by only by a plaintive triadic melody at bar 28. This melody

(an augmentation of the flute/violin motif at bar 15) is embroidered until it reaches a passage in thirds at bar 30 between the upper keyboard and the flute/violin. The texture of this passage is so idiomatic to the flute-keyboard combination, that one may suspect that the work was conceived for the flute as the instrument of preference rather than the violin.

The third part of the second tonal area (bars 33-43) is essentially a closing section; virtually the entire passage is part of a long, protracted cadence in preparation for the development section. The flute/violin doubles the keyboard at the upper octave for much of this section. These two melody voices heard against the long sustained pedal point in the lower bass and cello, together with the static harmony of the passage, create a wide, sparse texture which eventually thins down to a single line in bar 42. This is played *piano* and *staccato* by the upper keyboard alone. The section ends with a surprising diminished-seventh of F chord, also played *piano*, on the keyboard.

The Development Section

This section too is comprised of three parts. Previously heard motives are presented in order of their original appearance: one motif to each section, with a textural change for each of the three sections.

The first of these, in contrast to the closing section of the Exposition, begins *forte* and in a new key, the sub-dominant with motif (a) in the upper keyboard. The cello runs in tandem with the flute/violin both in the first continuous phrase (bars 44-46), as well as in the short interjections in bars 49-52, which punctuate the upper

keyboard in its presentation of the triadic motif (c). There is a return at bar 48 to the rocking bass lower keyboard accompaniment which figures so prominently in the Exposition, and this unifying element persists almost until the end of the section. The cello is given an unusual degree of independence in bars 52-54 where its low range contrasts well with the high line of the flute/violin.

The change in the second section (bars 56-64) is largely brought about by a shift to D minor. The scale passage motif (b) is now arranged in overlapping phrase layers in a statement and response pattern between lower keyboard plus cello, and upper keyboard plus flute/violin. Once again the passage in double thirds between the upper voices at bar 57 is particularly idiomatic to the keyboard-flute combination. An insistent leaning towards the second beat in the scale passages in bars 56-58 is a subtle recall of the accent on the second beat, which is present in the opening motif (a).

The third section is ushered in by a sharp textural change: after a rest in all the voices, a series of chords interrupts the previous section (bars 62-64). The last of the chords, a second inversion tonic in D minor, turns out to serve as the dominant of G minor, the key to which the next passage briefly moves. The motif (c) is prominent in the upper keyboard, in a passage which bears some similarity to the closing section of the exposition (bars 64-75). The extended cadence, now in the dominant of F major, is part of a gradually thinning textural line which ends with bars 73-75 which are played *piano* and then double *piano* by the keyboard alone before leading into the triumphant *forte* of the final section.

The Reprise

This section omits the solo introduction of the exposition and begins at once with the *tutti* version, and the conventional doubling of instruments. However it breaks off into a second phrase (bars 83-94). which was first heard in the original introductory solo section (bars 5-8). This represents an expansion of ten bars over the original *tutti* section in the exposition. The passage is built on the scale motif (b) which undergoes various pitch and directional changes and consistently exploits the accent on the second beat. At bar 91 the voices coincide and all move together to the second tonal area with its three sections. The closing section manifests slight changes to compensate for the return to the tonic key. In the closing section the changes in the flute/violin part and the keyboard (bars 116 and 118-119) produce an effective and conclusive ending.

It is clear that, viewed as a whole, the textural changes in this movement coincide with the formal sections. The solo opening followed by the *tutti* section forms the first textural change. The key change of the second tonal area and the heightened semi-quaver activity in its first section with the dramatic change to the minor key at bar 22 constitutes another change. The second and third sections of the second tonal area also each have their own textural character. The development with its various key changes, motivic development and the addition of some new material such as the chords at bars 62-64 presents a textural area with increased tension and added movement. Although the Reprise reflects its own character through some textural change as well as its tonic tonal base, it corresponds generally to the Exposition. The cello and flute/violin doubling holds none of the subtlety of for example the

violin doubling of the inner voice which occurred in the *Tempo di Menuetto* movements of Nos. 21 and 24. Rather the doubling is conventional and serves to highlight a particular motif of a specific section. In other words, textural blocks, from the very first solo introduction, are conceived according to the sections set out in the Sonata form, and thrown into clear relief by changes of density and quality in the trio texture.

Certain features of this movement are suggestive of the Minuet as a dance. For example the accent on the second beat of the motif (a), and the Ländler-like cello bass in bars 9-11, and of course its triple meter. But all these features might equally well occur in a movement in sonata form. It would seem that there must be another essential aspect which justifies the title "*Tempo di Menuetto*", and this must surely be tempo, for it is this which distinguishes the movement from one in sonata-*allegro* form. The indefinable though essential mood of the Minuet in this movement is only revealed when it is performed at the appropriate tempo: in this case not quite as fast as the *allegro* of the first movement, and slow enough for the performer to execute for example, the turn over the dotted semiquaver in bar 2, in an unhurried manner which is in keeping with the spirit of the dance origins of the Minuet.

One other aspect of this movement is of importance to the study of the morphology of Minuet movements. Judging from the movement of No. 30 it would seem that the Minuet movements so closely reflect Sonata trends that the two are not only interchangeable but may be combined as one. This movement is perhaps a symbol of the merging of binary and ternary elements which have culminated in a full-blown sonata form.

NOTES TO CHAPTER V

1. The pitch names used here are those referred to in, D. Randel, ed. 1986: "Pitch names", Scheme 1. c' refers to middle C on the keyboard, and f''' is thus the third F above middle C.
2. Wallace Berry's terminology is used. See 1976: 185-186.
3. The mention of bar-numbers is usually confined to the first appearance of a passage. It is taken as understood that the situation applies also to corresponding bars in sections which are repeated. Thus when mention is made of bars 8³-9³ in section IA, it is also intended to refer to the corresponding passage 50³-51³ in Section IA¹ and so on.
4. Since texture is such an integral part of this movement it will not be discussed under a separate heading, but rather intertwined with the other parameters.
5. The present writer is grateful for much information gained from the article by Katalin Komlós, 1986: 351-400. With regard to Trio No. 24 however there is some disagreement. In discussing the contrapuntal inversion of the final section of this movement Komlós states: "The element of inversion is also present in the sequence of the original and the transformed versions: in the first half the variant follows the original pattern (a-a¹), in the second half the order is the opposite (b¹a¹c¹-bace¹)" (1986: 305). This is not so in the opinion of the present writer. The essence of this movement is that the varied Reprise follows the original in all aspects of surface structure, except that the repeats are varied and written out. Using Komlós' symbols the final section in fact comprises (a- and the repeat a¹) (b¹a¹c¹-and repeat bace¹), the order being the same as in the original.

CHAPTER VI

THE LATE PERIOD
1792-1796

Haydn's first London visit is regarded by Landon as the boundary line which separates the middle from the late Trios. Most of the Trios from this point forward, that is from Trio No. 31 to Trio No. 45, were written either in London or for English publishers.¹ Trio No. 40 is the only one from this period which includes a movement that refers to a Minuet in its title.

The *Tempo di Minuetto* in F sharp minor
from the Trio No. 40²

Brown assesses that Haydn probably wrote the Trios Nos. 38-40 between May and August 1795 (1986: 127). The Trio No. 40 was thus probably written shortly before Haydn's second departure from London on 15 August 1795. About five years separate the last *Tempo di Menuetto* movement of the middle group (that of Trio No.30), from the movement in Trio No. 40. Like No. 30 the title of Trio No. 40 suggests that the work was conceived for the keyboard with accompaniment of violin and cello since the full title of the 1795 publication is: "*aus 'Trois Sonates pour le Piano Forte*

avec Accompagnement de Violon & Violoncelle Composées & Dediées à Madame Schroeter'". As far as the emancipation of the violin and cello in Haydn's Trios are concerned, there is little difference between the *Tempo di Menuetto* movements of No. 19 the first, and No. 40 the last of the group; nor for that matter is there much progress from the early Minuet-trio-Minuet movements and the later *Tempo di Menuetto* movements in this regard. Indeed Landon has remarks that some of the early works contain more complex solo passages for the violin than many of the later works (1976-1980: II, 583). There is no doubt that the keyboard dominates the string instruments in this, the last of *Tempo di Menuetto* movements of the keyboard Trios. But it is not Haydn's forward-looking approach to the trio texture which makes this *Tempo di Menuetto* remarkable. Nor does it represent an advance in formal structure: indeed the form is possibly less complex than in some of the earlier movements such as in No. 21. The tri-partite sections here are arranged in a clear simple, design: IABA¹ IIAB IIIABA¹ + Coda. The Reprise is not varied in section III and there is no Reprise at all in the middle section. It is thus neither in its formal structure nor in the independent parts for each instrument that the main interest of the movement lies. Rather it is in the motivic design with its ingenious thematic pattern and distinctive rhythm. Scoring is carefully designed so as to highlight the motivic structure, and form reveals a keen awareness of motivic differences, but always it is the motif itself which most strongly shapes the other considerations.

Trio No. 40 contains the only *Tempo di Menuetto* movement in a minor key although two of the early Minuet-trio-Minuet movements are in minor keys. Unlike the preceding *Tempo di Menuetto* movement of this group, that of No. 40 is the finale of a three movement work and not the second movement

of a two-movement work. The mood of this movement, the final movement of the last of the three Trios written for Madame Schroeter, is perhaps indicative of Haydn's feelings for the attractive widow prior to his taking leave of her. It is composed in a reflective and subtle rather than showy style, and like the first movement of the Trio of which it is part, it is in the expressive key of F sharp minor. The central *adagio* which is in the unusual key of F sharp major in this Trio, is also used by Haydn as the slow movement of Symphony No. 102 where it is in F major. Landon suggests that the slow movement of the Symphony was a favourite of Madame Schroeter's, and that Haydn probably revised the movement in this Trio in her honour (1976-1980: III, 437).

The Motif in Relation to the Surface Structure

The phrase with which the work opens (bars 0^{2x}-4) sets out the basic building blocks of the movement: the opening anacrusis, the diminished seventh chord moving to the tonic at bar 2, and the dotted rhythm motif at bar 3. The anacrusis which opens the movement begins on the unusual fourth quarter of the second beat. It is essentially an extended turn. The turn not only opens the movement, but it occurs at the beginning of each subsequent section, that is at IB (bar 12); IA¹ (bar 32); IIA (bar 44); IIB (bar 56); the sections in III which correspond to I; and the Coda (bar 116). It is probably from the diminished triad in bar 2 that the triadic motif which is used extensively in Section II is derived. Bar 3 centres on the dotted rhythm in its scale-wise ascent. On closer examination the three constituent parts of the opening phrase are seen to stem from a single idea based on a consecutive arrangement of pitches. Stripped of ornamentation, and allowing for occasional repetition and octave displacement, the phrase

turns out to be nothing more than an ingeniously arranged scale pattern.

The Outer Sections

At the beginning of the movement, the scale pattern in the upper keyboard proceeds from the first note in bar 0 to the last note in bar 3 thus: B-C#-D-E#-F#-G#-A-B-C#-D#-E#-F#-G#-A. The new phrase beginning at bar 4²/₄ then begins again with B-C#-D etc. From bar 6 to bar 11 fragments of the scale are repeated imitatively by the various voices--the upper key and violin in bar 6, the inner keyboard in bar 7, the lower keyboard and cello in bar 8 overlapping with the upper keyboard and violin in bar 9, and so on.

In IB and IIIB the pattern is broken into shorter phrases which are repeated by the various voices as if in conversation. The repetitions occur at different pitches and with frequent changes of direction (bar 14-18 in IB). From bar 19³-22 the keyboard engages in a sequential play on the basic scale motif before returning to the dialogue pattern. From the lower keyboard part in bar 22 a new triadic motif appears though it retains the familiar dotted rhythm; from this point until the end of the section (bar 32¹) the scale motif is no longer strictly followed. The section ends with a rhythmically augmented version of the diminished seventh motif in the upper keyboard (bars 31-32), which was heard slightly differently in the violin part of the previous bar (30-32).

The Middle Section IIA and IIB

The triadic pattern in section IB (from bar 22) anticipates triadic movement in the middle section which, with the addition of unessential escape tones, is the most prominent

motivic pattern. This section is set in the major mode, and the triad motif, with its conspicuous major third, A#, sets a bright tone which contrasts well with the minor stepwise pattern of IA in which the interval of a minor second (E#-F#) is prominent. The scale motif is not entirely abandoned in the middle section; for example it is used sequentially at 45²-47, and again in bars 50-52 where it facilitates the sequential move to D sharp minor before the important modulation to the dominant at the end of IIB. From this point on it occurs intermittently until the end of the section, probably so as to help achieve a smooth transition between two sections which have neither a definite linking passage nor a clear ending or beginning.

A section which functions as a Retransition occurs towards the end of the IIB section (bars 65-72) and fulfils several purposes. It substitutes for a Reprise; it effects the modulation from C sharp major to F sharp minor and through anticipating the opening anacrusis it leads into IIIA (bar 72). The scale motif, the triad motif, and the anacrusis are used in this passage as well as the dramatically poised diminished seventh chord at bar 71 and 72 which was heard first in bar 1. The *fermata* indication on the first beats of bars 71 and 72 and the head motif which is repeated with an *adagio* tempo indication and played a third higher (bar 71-72) all help to intensify the dramatic effect, while the return to the home key and the original tempo (bar 72), serve to defuse the tension.

The Coda

This section of the movement is truly a summing-up of what has come before, and motives appear in the order in which they were heard originally. First the anacrusis motif is

declaimed three times, each time at a different pitch, before moving on at the fourth declamation to the diminished seventh motif (bar 120) which is then followed by the dotted rhythm scale motif. The anacrusis has in these bars (116-120), been instrumental in steering the sub-dominant harmony of D major onto a strong dominant ninth chord at bar 120. The effect is heightened by the plagal effect of the sub-mediante harmony which persists until the arrival of the F sharp cadence at bars 125-126. The triadic motif of the middle section finally appears at bar 131. Due to its transposition into the minor mode the motif loses some of its previous jaunty character. Nevertheless the movement ends as the previous *Tempo di Menuetto* movements have ended, on a note of bright optimism. Landon points out that apart from the *crescendo* mark leading to a forte at bars 131-132 there are no dynamic markings in this movement (1976-1980: III, 437).³

Scoring in Relation to the Motivic Structure

There is no doubt about the prominence of the keyboard throughout this movement. However the role of the violin is a particularly interesting one. In the *Tempo di Menuetto* movements already discussed, it is common practice for the cello to double the lower keyboard voice, while the violin doubles the inner keyboard voice. This occurs in the opening section of the *Tempo di Menuetto* movements of Nos. 19, 21, and 24. In the opening phrase of the movement in No.40 the technique is carried further. In bars 2-3 there are two parts to the inner voice instead of one as previously: both these are doubled by the violin, but the parts are inverted, that is the voices which are a third apart in the inner keyboard part, are a sixth apart

in the violin part. Meanwhile the cello doubles the lower keyboard at the lower octave.

The violin in the outer sections often doubles or parallels one of the keyboard voices, and, especially in IB, the voice which is doubled is not necessarily the upper keyboard voice. The result is that the violin only plays above the upper keyboard occasionally and when it does do so the effect is always unusual. For example in a rare instance of hand-crossing (bars 23³-27) the violin plays a repeated rising semitone which is well above the range of that of the other parts. In bar 23³ of this passage the cello provides the bass and the violin the augmented sixth note of an expressive German sixth chord. The cello doubles the low melody of the right-hand keyboard in the following bars which adds to the unusual effect of the passage. Bars 28-32 provide a further example of the special effect of the violin in an upper range. Here the upper string part parallels the melody line above the right-hand keyboard and at bar 30 the violin repeats the triadic motif of bar 29¹⁻² in rhythmic augmentation. Only then does it move into its lower range while the upper keyboard engages in an imitative repeat of the motif in augmentation. The passage coming as it does directly before the AI return, makes a considerable impact. The final appearance of the violin part in a high range is in the Coda. At bars 123-126 the turn motif followed by the diminished seventh motif are reiterated by the violin at various pitches, most of which are well above the keyboard part. From bar 131 the violin participates in the unison *tutti* build up to the final bars. The violin plays an octave higher than the upper keyboard and contributes to the triumphant tone of the final bars of the work.

The style of the violin part in section IIA and B is vastly different from that in previous middle sections. This undoubtedly stems from the fact that this middle section is in itself different from the middle sections in the previous *Tempo di Menuetto* movements. At the root of the difference lies the major key tonality of both the A and B parts of the middle section, and consequently the major quality of the triadic motif upon which the section is built. In addition, there is neither a reprise of IIA in this section nor a double bar separating section II from section III. Rather in a manner that one would expect in a Haydn keyboard Sonata where the development leads into the recapitulation, here an area of retransition leads directly and without a break into section III. The intensely expressive and prominent violin parts of the middle sections of the *Tempo di Menuetto movements* of Nos. 19 and 21 are entirely absent in the process. Instead, the violin and the upper keyboard form a tight partnership in all but a few bars such as at bars 61-63 and bars 70 and 71 where the violin plays a decidedly accompanimental role. It is possible that Haydn in deference to his dedicatee who was a pianist, did not wish to detract from the keyboard prominence of the movement. Indeed an examination of the work as a whole reveals that the keyboard is prominent throughout.

The subtle scoring of this movement, the minor tonality of the outer sections, the F sharp major tonality of the middle section, the persistent dotted rhythm, and the expansive Coda, all are features which characterise the movement of Trio No. 40 as a forward looking work. But the most important feature of all is the arrangement and manipulation of scalar motion in this movement. The technique of motivic structuring is remarkable for its time, and one is tempted to suggest that the arrangement of

pitches in this movement bears a shadowy resemblance to the principle of serial music; a concept which was to become central to the thinking of a later generation of Viennese composers.

The Absence of a Minuet movement
in the Later Trios

After completing Trio No. 40 Haydn wrote five more Trios; the last one No. 45, was probably composed in 1796. None of these five late Trios contain a movement with a Minuet-type indication in the title. The decrease in the number of movements with such an indication was not sudden: whereas there were thirteen Minuet-trio-Minuet movements in the group of sixteen early Trios, there are three *Tempo di Menuetto* movements in the Trios of the middle period and only one in those of the late period. The phenomenon becomes more surprising when one considers that virtually all of Haydn's string Quartets and Symphonies contain a Minuet movement, and these are of the Minuet-trio-Minuet and not the *Tempo di Menuetto* variety. A. Peter Brown in personal correspondence with the present writer, has suggested that answers to this question are perhaps to be found in the fact that string music was written for men and keyboard music for women. However this does not explain why the Minuet movement should have persisted only in compositions which were intended for performance by men rather than women. One would perhaps have been entitled to imagine the opposite to be true; the elegant Minuet-dance movement might surely be considered appropriate for performance by women. The social background to the Trio has been commented upon in some detail in Chapter III of this study: the socio-musical divisions which existed at the time of Haydn's writing were not only between men and women, but also between amateurs and professionals, and the

Trio as a genre was intended primarily for performance by the amateur and probably for a not too demanding audience. One is led to consider that it was not the gender of the players which was a single, isolated issue, but that this, coupled with the composer's intention that these works were for private performance by amateur players, made the genre for Haydn altogether less serious than either the String Quartet or the Symphony which were written for professional men-players and an audience which had certain expectations. It is possible that the absence of sophisticated players and audience, together with the relaxed effect of the Minuet form, engendered a sense of freedom and adventure in the composer. Certainly the works show that the ever-innovative Haydn felt himself free to experiment in the Minuet movements of his keyboard Trios in a way which was not, for him, possible in the more formal genres. Furthermore, the Minuet-type movement had a long tradition of didactic usage and compositional experimentation (see Chapter I): this along with its origins in the dance and its flexibility as an art-form, made it an ideally informal vehicle for Haydn's originality: infinitely more so than either the Sonata-form first movement, or the *adagio* movement of the standard Sonata plan.

The following outline though speculative, is based on the findings of the present investigation. In the early Trios, Nos. 1-16, the young composer followed the existing tradition of including a Minuet movement in a Sonata plan work. However, as he grew more confident as an artist, Haydn possibly wished on occasion to have the freedom of substituting perhaps a rondo movement for the traditional Minuet-type movement as for example in the well known *Rondo all'Ongarese* of Trio No. 39., or an *Allemande* as in Trio No. 45. Haydn's was a personality which although original, was also trained in obedience. He thus continued

writing what was expected of him in the serious works which were for public performance, but in the keyboard works he felt free to omit the heretofore obligatory Minuet-type movement. When however he did include a movement of the Minuet type it was the *Tempo di Menuetto* rather than the Minuet and trio, the former being less rigid in its divisions and more compatible with the Sonata principle. As time went on the limitations imposed by the title "*Tempo di Menuetto*", became restrictive, and although elements of the structure in its original form were used for example in the final movements of the Trios Nos. 34 and 38, the title itself was abandoned after Trio No. 40.

The present study of the *Tempo di Menuetto* movements in the Haydn Trios reveals that each respective movement reflects a particular aspect of composition. The movement of Trio No. 19 is the first one in the composite three-part form of the *Tempo di Menuetto*. The multiple sections of this form require that they be linked in some way; in addition the written out Section III provides opportunity for the varied treatment of Section I. In No. 19 Haydn addresses both of these challenges: the linking passages are prominent and there is a varied reprise of considerable importance in Section III. The *Tempo di Menuetto* of No. 21 represents an expansion of the trends which started in the movement of No. 19: the linking passages in No. 21 have become even more a feature of the movement, and the reprise is varied. Moreover the composer has produced a movement in which a thematic motif announced at the outset acts as an integrating medium for the entire movement. In the movement of No. 24 Haydn exploits his mastery of contrapuntal techniques, and it is this aspect which dominates the movement. The movement of No. 30 is in Sonata-form and it is the formal structure of the Sonata layout which to a large extent defines the other parameters

in this movement. The movement of No.40 carries the technique of motivic structuring to limits which are remarkable for their time. Haydn thus confronted a specific compositional problem in each one of the *Tempo di Menuetto* movements of his keyboard Trios. When he felt that his experimental aims had been achieved, it was very possible that it was no longer important for him to use the Minuet-type movement. Its discontinuance viewed in this light represents a progressive approach to what had perhaps become a traditional stereotype.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VI

1. It is possible that the Trios Nos. 41 and 42 were not published by English publishers. The matter is referred to in Landon 1970: 17-18.
2. The indication above this movement in the Doblinger edition is "*Tempo di Minuetto*" instead of the "*Tempo di Menuetto*" of the previous movements of this type. The reason is probably to be found in the fact that the Trio No. 40 was dedicated to the English pianist Madame Schroeter and published in London after Haydn's first London visit. In this chapter the difference in spelling is acknowledged in the heading only. For the rest "*Tempo di Menuetto*" will be used throughout.
3. There is in fact an *fz* mark at bar 28 which draws attention to the return of the IA¹ section.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSION

The Minuet-trio-Minuet movements of the early Trios possess well-defined characteristics which prepare the groundwork for what is to follow. The ternary outline of the early *da capo* movements and the key-relationship of trio to Minuet and Minuet to the work as a whole are clearly the foundation stones of Haydn's later *Tempo di Menuetto style*. The return to IA¹ at the end of the first section of the *Tempo di Menuetto* stems from a similar structural pattern in the early Minuets, and the expansion of the IB sections is based on the "X sections" of the early works. The parallel correspondence of the two parts of the middle section of the *Tempo di Menuetto* movements is already set down in the structure of the trio sections of the early movements, as is the generally prominent violin part in these sections. Rests continue to perform an important textural and formal function and contrapuntal manipulation, though now highly developed, follows a practice which was set in the early movements. Thus, despite the gap of more than twenty years between the early Minuet-trio-Minuet movements and those marked "*Tempo di Menuetto*" there is a distinct sense of continuity between the early and the later works.

The flexibility of the Minuet both as a dance and as music, has been stressed in Chapter I above. This chameleon-like adaptability is nowhere more apparent than in the Minuet-type movements of the Haydn keyboard Trios. The works written after 1784, include a Sonata form movement (No. 30); and a highly sophisticated contrapuntal movement (No. 24). Conversely, the final movements of Trios Nos. 34, 38, 42 and 44 lack the "*Tempo di Menuetto*" indication, but their meter and structures are strongly suggestive of that style. When all of these factors are considered it is difficult to know to precisely what qualities the title refers.

If "tempo" is taken refer to speed alone, one is at the outset confronted with several seemingly incompatible facts. For example, as the finale of a two-movement work, the *Tempo di Menuetto* of No. 19 is preceded by a *vivace* movement. Since the listener would probably anticipate a contrast between the two movements, one would expect the speed of the *Tempo di Menuetto* to be slow or moderate. On the other hand, as the finale of a three movement work, as in No. 40, the *Tempo di Menuetto* is preceded by an *adagio* movement which would suggest a more lively pace for the *Tempo di Menuetto*. Musicologists have come up with various suggestions as to the tempo of the Minuet in various style periods (see Chapter I). These are impossible to confirm, and moreover the tempo markings which are given do not relate to the contextual aspects of a specific work such as a Trio, but merely to the Minuet as a generality. However, an examination of the Trios themselves provide a pointer to the tempi which were intended for the Minuet movements. It has been mentioned above that there are a number of final movements in the middle and late period keyboard Trios which though not entitled "*Tempo di Menuetto*" are clearly structured in the composite three-part form and triple

meter of those movements. These are the *allegro* of Trio No. 34, the *allegro, ma dolce* of Trio No. 38, the *presto* of Trio No. 42, and the *allegro* of Trio No. 44. Since all these movements meet the structural demands of the *Tempo di Menuetto* and yet do not bear that title, it would seem that the reason for their exclusion from the Minuet group lies in the tempo of these movements. In other words, if a movement bears the indication *allegro* or *presto*, it no longer falls into the Minuet-type category. It would thus appear that the indication "tempo di Menuetto" is intended to be taken as a genuine measure of tempo, that this tempo is intended to be moderate, slower than *allegro*, and that in order to assess the tempo, the performers should be sensitive to the tempi of other movements in the work, as well as to the style of the Minuet movement itself. Over and above these considerations there should always be an awareness of the mood of the Minuet as a dance.

"*Tempo di Menuetto*" as a generic term for a movement with a specific formal structure also presents inconsistencies. In Trio No. 30, for example the indication *Tempo di Menuetto* appears at the head of a sonata form movement. Turning to the solo Sonatas, in No. 35 the *Tempo di Menuetto* movement is a theme with variations. One is thus hardly entitled to deduce that "*Tempo di Menuetto*" can be used only to refer to a *da capo* type of ternary structure.

At the heart of this apparent variety however, there exists a sameness: it is the tripartite structure of the movements, (and this includes the movement in sonata form), and their triple meter which are the great unifying factors within the diversity. This "threeness" is usually carried further by the division of each section in turn, into another three sections. The result is, in most cases, a

three by three structure; in addition to this of course, all are in triple meter. One may even speculate that the *Tempo di Menuetto* movements within the three instrument genre fulfilled a special role for Haydn. It has already been noted in Chapter II above that the Minuet-type movements in the solo Sonatas and keyboard Trios receive treatment which is different to that given to Minuet movements in the other genres. But even in the solo Sonatas there is nothing for example which reaches the level of ingenuity of the *Tempo di Menuetto* of No. 24. It is a personal reflection of the present writer that it is not impossible that Haydn felt in the Trio Minuet-movements an integrated "three" concept which made them for him, unique. Certainly, it is the formal and metric "three" basis, which runs as a continuous thread throughout the series, from the first *da capo* Minuet, until the last of the movements marked "*Tempo di Menuetto*". It is this which evokes a spirit which clearly derives from the dance, and yet is not a dance, a spirit which is couched in the form of the old *da capo* aria, and yet is vastly different from that form.

The Form of the *Tempo di Menuetto* Movements: a Summary

When it comes to a more detailed view of formal structure, it is obvious that the *Tempo di Menuetto* and the Minuet-trio-Minuet movements require separation. The absence of the *da capo* return, and the more closely integrated tripartite structure of the *Tempo di Menuetto* have resulted in differences which preclude uniform discussion of both types.

The Outer Sections

In a manner which is markedly similar to the earlier Minuet movements, these sections begin with a single phrase, which usually moves to the dominant, and in all cases ends with a double bar and repeat sign. This is followed by a second section which then returns to the opening phrase, now slightly altered to compensate, for the tonic ending.

In three out of the five movements under discussion, the IA section is eight bars long, and in two movements it is twelve bars long.

No. 21 is unusual in that the IA section does not modulate: that is to say the section before the first double bar remains in the tonic throughout. However, as if to compensate, the B section which begins in the tonic, moves to a dominant statement of the original opening phrase. On the whole however, viewed chronologically, there is neither a quantitative expansion, nor a significant change in the handling of tonality in these sections. Indeed there is little structural difference between IA sections in the *Tempo di Menuetto* movements and the earlier Minuet movements. The situation is totally different however when it comes to the IIIA sections, for it is in the later series that varied repetition takes place, and it is this which has great bearing on the morphological view of the set as a whole. (The question of the varied Reprise merits a section of its own, and is mentioned here only insofar as it relates to the outer form).

The B sections of the later series show a marked degree of expansion. The longest B section in the early Minuets is that of No. 10, which consists of 20 bars. In the later series the *Tempo di Menuetto* of No. 21 has a IB section which is 30 bars long and comprises of three limbs.

Motives which have been heard in the opening section are worked through, and flow via a connective link to the reprise. The dominant tonal bias of these IB sections shows a strong resemblance to the "X sections" of the early Minuet movements, though in their sectional divisions and working of ideas heard in IA they look forward to the development section of a Sonata.

The shortest B section of the series is in No. 24 which is only 9 bars long in the IB section, and though it appears in varied guises in the final section, its length is always 9 bars. What it lacks in length however is amply compensated for by its terse contrapuntal intensity. The expansion of the B sections naturally has an effect on the changing symmetry of the series as a whole. Whereas B sections of the early Minuet movements have an average length of 10 bars, (5 of 8 bars; 2 of 6 bars; 1 of 12 bars ; 1 of 14 bars; and 1 of 20 bars) those of the later series average about 18 bars. Since the A sections have remained more or less the same length throughout, the later expansion represents a shift in balance from a generally symmetrical binary form (usually rounded binary) to a generally asymmetrical rounded binary form. The change seems to reflect the metamorphosis from Baroque structures to what came to be known as the Classical Sonata form.

The Middle Sections

Charles Rosen identifies two fundamentals in which ternary form differs from sonata form (1980: 17). The first is that the two outer sections of sonata form, unlike those in ternary form, are never harmonically similar since the first section (the Exposition) moves to an area of instability and tension, while the third section (the Reexposition in Rosen's terminology) is essentially in the

tonic key, and is thus an area of resolution. The second difference is, according to Rosen, that the middle section of a Sonata represents a prolongation of the tension of the opening section, while the middle section of ternary form although contrasting, is basically built according to a static design with a decrease in tension. The first of these differences would certainly apply to the early Minuet movements. Here the Minuet-trio-Minuet forms a typical ternary design as far as harmony and tonality are concerned: that is the Minuet ends in the Tonic key in both its first and second appearances. On the whole this is also the case in the *Tempo di Menuetto* movements. The second fundamental is untrue even for the early trios, for it has been apparent from the outset that the trio sections are not more static, and neither are they shorter nor less complex than the outer sections.

This is not to suggest that Rosen's view is incorrect in principle. It is however possible to state that according to the findings of the present study, the ternary concept as represented in these *Tempo di Menuetto* movements, (that is those ternary movements written after 1784), have taken on so many characteristics of Sonata form, that Rosen's premise no longer holds good. And what is more, as Rosen himself suggests, the outer as well as the middle section, taken individually, bear the indisputable hall-marks of sonata form in their own right. The outer sections particularly function as miniature, embryonic sonatas.

The middle sections, like the outer sections, generally reflect a tri-partite structure though the divisions are less decisive than in the outer sections. The middle sections of the *Tempo di Menuetto* movements of Nos. 21 and No. 40 stand out as exceptions since both these middle sections are set in a binary arrangement and there is no

IIA¹ section. For the rest, although the feeling of return is certainly present, it is musically and psychologically more ambiguous than in the outer sections. One of the main reasons for this lack of clear cut division is the fact that the middle sections are open-ended. Thus, instead of ending with a clear tonic cadence as is the case at the end of the A¹ sections, the middle sections, in two cases move to IIIA via a connecting link (Nos. 21 and 24). No. 19 ends with a protracted cadence in the new key which discourages a feeling of absolute finality; and No. 40 moves into a type of re-transition which once again serves to blur closure. Again the similarity to the move from a Development section of a sonata into its Recapitulation is obvious.

There is no doubt about the contrast which the middle section provides in relation to the movement as a whole. With No. 24 standing out as the exception (its middle section is in the subdominant key), the remaining middle sections are all written in the opposite mode to the outer sections. The tonal contrast is backed up by a contrast in scoring (usually the violin is more prominent than the keyboard) as well as by a change of motif. In addition, there is in the middle sections a subtle integration of motif and a tendency to a bi-partite structure which contrasts with the tripartite mould of the outer sections. The thematic integration of the trio sections right through to the cadence points was already apparent in the early Minuet-trio-Minuet movements, and this sense of continuous flow persists in the middle sections of the *Tempo di Menuetto* movements.

The Varied Reprise

The concept of statement-digression-restatement, is one which is central to all the Minuet movements, both in the early and the later series. Not only does this design invariably define the macro-outline of the movements, but it usually occurs in each of the smaller sections as well. The later series however, differs from the earlier, in one important aspect, the *da capo* instruction is dispensed with, and in its place is a written out version of the first section. Moreover, the double bar and repeat signs of the rounded-binary first section (A :||: B A¹ :||:) are omitted in the final section, and instead, the repeats are now usually written out in full. The reason for these changes is, of course to allow for embellishment. Paradoxically, the practice of avoidance of repeats in the return section of the early *da capo* movements has in effect been reversed in the later series. The result is a longer final section, and one which provides a more symmetrically balanced design--a design which is highly compatible with classical ideals, and which reflects the principles of sonata form. The presence of a varied Reprise in a basically ternary design has prompted contemporary musicologists such as Elaine R. Sisman to make use of the term "ternary variation" so as to distinguish these movements from those ternary movements without the varied Reprise. (1981: 509-510).

Haydn's *Tempo di Menuetto* movements in this form are by no means his innovation, for as early as 1760 C.P.E. Bach had written a set of six Sonatas entitled *Sonaten mit Veränderten Reprisen*. It is possible that Haydn was familiar with these works by the time that he wrote the later Trios (see Chapter III). Whether or not Haydn followed C.P.E. Bach's example, the varied reprise occurs

in four of the six *Tempo di Menuetto* movements under discussion: Nos. 19, 21, and 24 and 34. No. 30, the sonata form movement, does not have a varied reprise, though an added passage of about 11 bars occurs in bars 84 to 94 of the recapitulation, but this can in no way be likened to a variation. Nor does No. 40, the last of the series contain a varied reprise. The *Tempo di Menuetto* of this work ends with a rather elaborate Coda, thereby adding twenty bars on to the final section of the movement, which also happens to be the end of the work. It is perhaps because of the weighty coda that the reprise occurs without embellishment.

In each of the three varied reprise movements, the IIIA as well as the IIIA¹ passages in the final section, are repeated with variation. The IIIB passages too are varied, but in No. 19 the B A¹ section appears first in its original B A¹ form (bars 94-106), before being subjected to variation. In No. 24 the opposite happens: III B A¹ is varied first, and then repeated in the original. The IIIA of No. 21 is not varied. The following graphic representation indicates the formal outline of the reprise sections, and shows that Haydn followed no set rules with regard to the sections which are varied.

No. 19	III: A	Av	BA ¹ BvA ^{1v}	Coda.
No. 21	III: A		BvA ^{1v}	Coda.
No. 24	III: A	Av	BvAv B ^{1v} A ^{1v}	quasi-Coda v

Types of Variation

Ratner (1980 :255) draws attention to the difference between variation as a form, and variation as a process.

The variation techniques used in the movements under discussion undoubtedly fall under the latter group. Ratner goes on to quote the theorist Momigny, whose concept of variation is of significance since he was contemporaneous with Haydn: "The art of varying a theme and the talent of embroidering a canvas [adding ornamentation] are not one and the same thing. The first demands more of science, the other, more of taste". It is patently clear that in these movements Haydn "embroiders" his canvas with exquisite taste, exploiting various ingenious resources to do so, and all the while leaving the formal structure perfectly poised and balanced.

Haydn's variational techniques in these varied reprise movements may be summed up as follows:

Division into smaller note values is the most common of the techniques and one which had a long previous history of usage. The Bv section of the *Tempo di Menuetto* of No. 19, (bars 118-126) shows divisions into triplets as well as into semiquavers.

The Use of Larger Note Values are less common, but they are found in the *Tempo di Menuetto* of No. 21 bar 97.

Syncopation which occurred in the X sections of the early Minuet-trio-Minuet movements, is used in a more sophisticated way in the later Minuet-type movements as in that of No. 21 bar 125 and bar 127.

Counterpoint is the dominating variational technique throughout the reprise section of the *Tempo di Menuetto* of No. 24; it is a remarkably sustained example of variation which is achieved by contrapuntal means. Referring back to Momigny's theory of variation, it would seem that the

variation in No. 24 is an example of both science and taste, the two being inextricably bound in this movement.

The Connecting Links

There is no necessity in the early Minuet and trio *da capo* movements for a passage which joins one section to another. In these movements the two double bar lines in the Minuet section as well as the two in the trio section all mark a clear-cut closure punctuated by a decisive cadence. This is not so in the *Tempo di Menuetto* movements. The very essence of these movements is their multi-sectional character. Apart from No. 30 (that is the movement which is in sonata form), all the *Tempo di Menuetto* movements are comprised of a large ternary structure, in which each of the three sections is often made up of a further three sections. The sections IA, IBA¹ and IIB like their earlier Minuet and trio models, end with a double bar and repeat sign, and therefore pose no problems. However, the movements of Nos. 19, 21, 24, and 40 are all characterised by a return to IA after the IB section, that is IB flows into IA¹, and in the corresponding final section IIIB moves into IIIA¹. These naturally require some kind of linking passage. Furthermore the middle sections of the movements of Nos. 21 and 24 are also "open-ended" and move onto the final section without a finite closure, while the Development to the Recapitulation of No.30 does the same. This latter group move from the key area of the middle section (or the Development section of No. 30) to a final area in the home key, and this necessitates that the link fulfil some kind of modulatory as well as joining function.

The connecting link in No. 19 is extremely short and light in texture. It exhibits many of the characteristics of the later links, such as the change of texture into a single

upper-keyboard line. The open texture is partly achieved through punctuation by rests and detached staccato sounds. In a fashion which is to become typical in the later movements the link in the movement of No.19 combines within itself motivic elements from what has already been heard (the slurred couplet of the upper keyboard in bar 16), with what is to come (the return of the turn motif at bar 20). In this case the link serves two additional functions: harmonically, it "corrects" the imperfect cadence at bars 16 -17, turning it into a perfect cadence at bar 19-20. Psychologically, the thinly textured, double *piano* passage provides a dramatic contrast to the *forte* re-entry of section A.

In the *Tempo di Menuetto* movement of No. 21, the link is expanded to such an extent that it becomes a prominent structural feature of the movement, and constitutes an important last limb of the unusually long IB section. It occurs in a slightly altered form, between the middle and the final section (bars 78-82) where it facilitates a move from B flat minor to the home key B flat major (it will be remembered that the middle section of this movement has no Reprise but is a binary structure in which the second section is open-ended). The link passage temporarily alters the prevailing texture by its frequent rests and by being relegated mainly to the light tones of the upper keyboard. The linking passage has here assumed such importance that its 28 bars constitutes about one quarter of the whole movement.

In the *Tempo di Menuetto* of No. 24, almost all parameters are coloured by contrapuntal manipulation, and the links are no exception. The light texture of the linking passages of Nos. 19, 21 is replaced here by stretto-like overlapping of the head-motif at the intersections at bars

15-18 and bars 96-99. It was clearly important for Haydn that connecting passages merge with the style of the movement, and most of the links comply with this ideal. However, the link between IIB¹ (bar 67) and the final section IIIA (bar 74) presents breaks with this practice. Here, a seven-bar, unison, *tutti* passage effects the modulation from the unusual sub-dominant to the tonic of IIIA. The passage contrasts motivically, rhythmically and texturally with the rest of the movement and provides a most unusual interjection to the contrapuntal flow of the composition.

The sonata-form movement of No. 30, naturally does not demand the kind of link which would be deemed necessary in the ternary movements. The retransition at bar 69 however, which joins development to recapitulation, serves a connecting function and exhibits many of the characteristics of the previous links, such as the gradually dying dynamics leading to a *forte* Reprise (bar 76), and the diminished texture characterised by frequent rests and upper keyboard dominance.

Thematic integration is an essential element of the *Tempo di Menuetto* movement of No 40 and the process is carried through to the link passages which are virtually inseparable from the body of IB and IIIB. The dotted rhythm here pervades the entire movement, and is no longer, as it was previously, a distinguishing feature only of the link. The effect is of unity throughout the sections, and a corresponding ambiguity at section-endings and beginnings. The connecting passage between the middle and final sections contains repetitions of the opening motif accompanied by rests, tessitura, and tempi changes (bars 70-72) which is highly reminiscent of the retransitions of sonata form movements. While investing the link with

added importance, the passage is not perceived as a separate entity.

Viewed as a whole, a definite trend is discernible in the link passages. Beginning with the early Minuet-trio-Minuet movements where connecting passages are not required, the links gather prominence up to the movement of No. 21. From No. 30 there is a tendency for links to become more integrated, allowing sections to flow unobtrusively into each other. In almost all cases, these links act as a multi-dimensional pivot between what has been and what is to follow as regards rhythm, motif and tonality. In general, the tendency of the connecting passages is, paradoxically, to de-sectionalise these essentially sectional movements by a gradual leaning towards integration. This trend perhaps foreshadows a tendency which was to manifest itself in instrumental music only after Haydn's death.

All the movements have one negative feature in common: there is no link present after the end of the first section, that is at the conclusion of the Exposition in the movement of No.30, and at the end of IA¹ in all the other movements. The reason of course is that in all cases this is a point of definite closure. This perhaps obvious fact needs to be stressed in relation to the present study since it highlights a fundamental structural similarity between the *da capo* Minuet movements, the *Tempo di Menuetto* movements, and the movement in sonata form: that is that the ending at the end of the first section is decisive enough not to warrant a passage which leads into the next section. This next section is an area of "otherness" in all three forms, and in all three there is a final return to the original.

The Coda

There is clearly no place for a Coda in Haydn's early Minuet-trio-Minuet movements. However the written out third section of the *Tempo di Menuetto* movements, affords opportunity not only for the varied Reprise, but also for the addition of a substantial tail-piece. Haydn uses the opportunity well. All the movements contain a passage which sums up and closes the movement. In the movements of No. 24 and 30 the Coda is part of the main body of the work, and in Nos. 19, 21 and 40 the Coda is a separate section coming after a finite ending, that is after a perfect cadence in which the home tonic appears in the upper voice. The degree of separation of the Coda from the body of the work is easily traceable in the last three works mentioned: in No 19 the Coda occurs after a rest in all the voices (bar 138), but there is no double bar line; in No. 21 a double bar separates the Coda from the previous section, and in No. 40 it is not only a separate section which follows the double bar line but the word "Coda" accompanies its appearance. The Codas of the movements of Nos. 24 and 30 are different in that they prolong the area which leads up to the final cadence in addition to providing a final summing up of the movement.

The Coda is a section often associated with a sonata form movement.¹ Its presence in a *Tempo di Menuetto* is further confirmation of the closeness between the sonata form and the *Tempo di Menuetto*.

The Codas have several features in common. The virtuosic qualities of the piano are exploited and the pianist's part is given prominence through the execution of broken octaves, scale and arpeggio passages. Despite the prominence of the keyboard, the violin in each case

announces and often reiterates important motives or variants of motives. The texture of these passages is characterised by staccato chords separated by rests, varied dynamic markings with frequent *forte* indications, and a homophonic style which occurs even in the generally contrapuntal movement of No.24.

"Fingerprints" in the Minuet-type movements.

Several features occur with such regularity in these movements that one would seem justified in suggesting that these are indicative of Haydn's Minuet style. The outer sections of all the movements, both Minuet and trio and *Tempo di Menuetto*, are in the same key as the first movement of the Trio of which they are part. The middle section is always in a contrasting key, and usually in the opposite mode to the outer sections, and the violin usually plays a prominent role. In all the movements there is a return to the head-theme at the end of the first section, which results in a rounded binary structure, IA IB IA¹. The IB sections, that is the X section in the early movements and the quasi-development sections of the later movements, often make use of a pedal point in the lower parts. The keyboard, violin and cello participate in the opening statement of all the Minuet movements save the sonata form movement of No. 30 which begins with the piano alone and in this it resembles the structure and behaviour of a first movement. A. Peter Brown states that one of the characteristics of Haydn's early Trios is that they always begin with the keyboard taking the lead (1986: 82). However, this is not true for the Minuet movements, and Brown's statement serves to illustrate the fact that musicologists are apt to concentrate on first movements

while tending to neglect other movements of the work. It would seem that when faced with the problem of authenticating a work, and it is upon this aspect that Brown's statement centers, the researcher may not know whether or not the section under discussion is a first movement, and it would be as well to bear in mind the behaviour of a Minuet-type movement.

The *Tempo di Menuetto* movements reveal certain characteristics which are not present in the early Minuet and trio movements. All the *Tempo di Menuetto* movements contain a Coda of some kind though in some cases these resemble a closing section which is part of the movement rather than a separate entity. All the opening motifs of the *Tempo di Menuetto* movements consist of a turn motif, and a scale passage and all except No. 24 begin on an anacrusis.

When viewed from first to last, the Minuet movements in the Haydn Trios are seen to reveal an ever narrowing gap between the traditional Minuet and trio structure, and the sonata form, and a corresponding departure from the earlier Baroque based style of writing. Since this change took place at a crucial stage of the development of the sonata, many of the salient features of the sonata-form are clearly exposed in the Minuet movements. While Haydn has made no significant advances in the trio texture, his thematic, formal and stylistic originality in these movements are often models of musical ingenuity; as such, many of these movements stand well ahead of the times in which they were composed.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VII

1. Under the entry "Coda" in, W.Apel ed. *Harvard Dictionary of Music*, 2nd ed., 1970, Beethovens's Sonata Opus 2 No. 3 is recommended for study since "even the Scherzo ends with a Coda to be played after the repetition of the Scherzo". The fact that Haydn's *Tempo di Menuetto* movements contain Codas, and were composed some years earlier, is apparently overlooked.

LIST OF WORKS CITED

- Adorno, T. 1967 *Prisms*. Translated by S. and S. Weber.
London: Neville Spearman.
- Anthony, J.R. 1974 *French Baroque Music*. London: B.T.
Batsford.
- Apel, W., ed, 1970 *Harvard Dictionary of Music and
Musicians* 2nd ed., rev. London: Heinemann.
- Arbeau, T. 1589 *Orchesography*. Translated by M.
Stewart Evans. New York: Dover Publications, Inc.,
1967.
- Berry, W. 1976 *Structural Functions in Music*.
Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Blom, E. 1941 'The Minuet-Trio', in *Music and Letters*
XXII, 2, 162-180.
- Blume, F., ed. 1949-1951 *Die Musik in Geschichte und
Gegenwart*. Kassel: Bärenreiter Verlag.
- Blume, F. 1972 *Classic and Romantic Music*. Translated
by H. Herter Norton. London: Faber and Faber.
- Brook, B. 1962 *La symphonie française dans la seconde
moitié du XVIII^e siècle*. Paris: L'Institut de
Musicologie de l'Université de Paris. 2 vols.
- Brown, A.P. 1981 'Joseph Haydn and C.P.E. Bach: The
Question of Influences', in J.P. Larsen *et al*,
1981: pp. 158-164.
- Brown, A.P. 1986 *Joseph Haydn's Keyboard Music*.
Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

- Bukofzer, M.F. 1948 *Music in the Baroque Era*. London: Dent.
- Churgin, B. 1981 'The Italian Symphonic Background to Haydn's Early Symphonies and Opera Overtures', in J.P. Larsen et al, 1981: pp. 329-339.
- Davison, A.T., & Apel, W. 1950 *Historical Anthology of Music*. 2 vols. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Donington, R. 1981 *The Rise of Opera*. New York: Scribner.
- Einstein, A. 1946 *Mozart, his Character, his Work*. Translated by A. Mendel and N. Broder. London: Cassell.
- Feder, G. 1962 'Zur Datierung Haydnscher Werke', in *Anthony von Hoboken, Festschrift zum 75 Geburtstag*. Mainz. pp. 50-54.
- Feder, G. 1980 'Haydn: Work-list', in S.Sadie 1980: VIII, 360-407.
- Fuller, D. 1974 'Accompanied Keyboard Music', in *Musical Quarterly*, LX, 2, 222-245.
- Geiringer, K. 1946 *Haydn: A Creative Life in Music*. New York: Norton.
- Geiringer, K. 1973 *The Rise of Chamber Music*, in Wellesz & Sternfeld (eds.) *The New Oxford History of Music*, VII, 515-573. 11 vols. London: Oxford University Press.

- Geiringer, K. 1981 'Haydn and his Viennese Background',
in Larsen et al, 1981: pp. 3-13.
- Gotwals, V. 1961 'Joseph Haydn's Last Will and
Testament', in *Musical Quarterly*, XLXII, 331-353.
- Hilton, W. 1981 *Dance of Court and Theater: The French
Noble Style, 1690-1725*. Princeton, N.J.:
Princeton Book Co.
- Hogwood, C., & Mc Leigh, S. 1980 'Giardini', in S.
Sadie 1980: VII, 350-351.
- Isherwood, R.M. 1973 *Music in the Service of the King:
France in the Seventeenth Century*. Ithaca: Cornell
University Press.
- Kidson, F. 'Minuet', in *Groves Dictionary of Music and
Musicians*. 5th ed., V, 786-788.
- Kidd, R.R. 1972 'The Emergence of Chamber Music with
Obligato Keyboard in England', in *Acta Musicologica*,
XLIV, 122-144.
- Komlós, K. 1986 'Haydn's Keyboard Trios Hob. XV: 5-17:
Interaction between Texture and Form', in *Studia
Musicologica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae*
XXVIII, 351-400.
- Komlós, K. 1987 'The Viennese Keyboard Trio in the
1780s: Sociological Background and Contemporary
Reception', in *Music and Letters*, LXVIII, 222-234.
- Landon, C., ed. 1973 *Joseph Haydn: The complete Piano
Sonatas*. 3rd ed. Wiener Urtext, Musikverlag Ges.

- Landon, H.C.R. 1959 *The Collected Correspondence and London Notebooks of Joseph Haydn*. London: Barrie & Rockcliff.
- Landon, H.C.R. 1970 *The Piano Trios of Joseph Haydn: Foreword to the First Critical Complete Edition*. Vienna: Doblinger.
- Landon, H.C.R. 1976-1980 *Haydn: Chronicle and Works in 5 Volumes. Vols. I-III:*
The Early Years 1732-1765. Vol. I.
Haydn at Esterháza 1766-1790. Vol. II.
Haydn in England 1791-1795. Vol. III.
 London: Thames and Hudson.
- Larsen, J.P., & Feder, G. 1980 'Haydn', in S. Sadie 1980: VIII, 328-407.
- Larsen, J.P.; Serwer H.; & Webster J., eds. 1981 *Haydn Studies*. New York: Norton.
- Little, M.E. 1980 'Minuet', in S. Sadie, 1980: XII, 353-358.
- Mann, A. 1970 'Haydn as student of Fux', in *Studies in Eighteenth Century Music, A Tribute to Karl Geiringer on his Seventieth Birthday*. London: Allen and Unwin, pp. 323-332.
- Marcel-Dubois, C. 1961 'Menuett', in F. Blume (ed.) *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, IX, 106-110. Kassel: Bärenreiter.
- Martens, H. 1957 *Das Menuett*. Wolfenbüttel: Möselers Verlag.

- Maslow, A.H. 1968 *Toward a Psychology of Being*. 2nd ed. New York: Van Nostrand.
- Mellers, W. 1968 *Francois Couperin and the French Classical Tradition*. New York: Dover.
- Molière, J. 1760 *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme*. Translated as 'The Citizen Turn'd Gentleman' by A.R. Waller. Edinburgh: John Grant.
- Morrow, M.S. 1988 *Concert Life in Haydn's Vienna: Aspects of a Developing Musical and Social Institution*. New York: Pendragon Press.
- Nettl, P. 1947 *The Story of Dance Music*. New York: Greenwood; repr. 1977.
- Newman, W.S. 1947 'Concerning the Accompanied Clavier Sonata', in *Musical Quarterly*, XXXIII, 327-349.
- Newman, W.S. 1972 *The Sonata in the Baroque Era*, 3rd ed. New York: Norton.
- Newman, W.S. 1983 *The Sonata in the Classic Era*, 3rd ed. New York: Norton.
- Nutter, D. 1980 'Intermedio' in S. Sadie, 1980: IX, 258- 269.
- Oxenford, L. 1958 *Playing Period Plays*. Plymouth: Garnet Miller.
- Pestelli, G. 1984 *The Age of Mozart and Beethoven*. Translated by E. Cross. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Prunières, H. 1943 *A New History of Music*. New York: Macmillan.
- Randel, D., ed. 1986 *The New Harvard Dictionary of Music*. London: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Ratner, L.G. 1970 'Ars Combinatoria: Chance and Choice in Eighteenth Century Music', in *Studies in Eighteenth Century Music, A Tribute to Karl Geiringer on his Seventieth Birthday*. London: Allen and Unwin, pp. 343-363.
- Ratner, L.G. 1980 *Classic Music: Expression, Form, and Style*. New York: Schirmer Books.
- Riemann, H., ed. 1909 'Johann Schobert: Ausgewählte Werke', preface in *Denkmäler deutscher Tonkunst*, vol. XXXIX. Rev. ed. H.J. Moser. Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1958.
- Ripin, E.M. 1981 'Haydn and the Keyboard Instruments of his Time', in J.P. Larsen et al 1981: pp. 302-308.
- Rosen, C. 1976 *The Classical Style: Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven*. London: Faber.
- Rosen, C. 1980 *Sonata Forms*. New York: Norton.
- Russel, T.A. 1983 *Minuet Scherzando and Scherzo: The Dance Movement in Transition, 1781-1825*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina.
- Sachs, C. 1937 *World history of the Dance*. New York: Norton.

- Sadie, S., ed. 1980 *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*. 20 vols. London: Macmillan.
- Schwandt, E. 1980 'Trio', in S Sadie, 1980: XIX, 150-151.
- Sisman, E.R. 1981 'Haydn's Hybrid Variations', in J.P. Larsen *et al*, 1981: 509-515.
- Smallman, B. 1990 *The Piano Trio: its History, Technique and Repertoire*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Somfai, L. 1969 *Joseph Haydn: His Life in Pictures*. London: Faber & Faber.
- Steinbeck, W. 1973 *Das Menuett in der Instrumentalmusik Joseph Haydns*. Munich: Musikverlag Emil Katzwichler.
- Strunk, O., ed. 1950 *Source Readings in Music History*. New York: Norton.
- Taubert, K.H. 1968 *Höfische Tänze*. Mainz.
- Tunley, D. 1982 *Couperin*. London: British Broadcasting Corporation.
- Walter, H. 1981 'Haydn's Keyboard Instruments', in J.P. Larsen *et al*, 1981: pp. 213-216.
- Wollenberg, S. 1980 'Fischer, Johann Casper', in S. Sadie 1980: VI, 608-609.