

*International Journal of the Dutch-Flemish Society for Music Theory*

Volume 5, # II – OCTOBER 2018



MUSIC THEORY & ANALYSIS



LEUVEN UNIVERSITY PRESS

Reprint from MTA 5.2 - © Leuven University Press, 2018

---

Yoel GREENBERG

*Haydn's Early Altered Recapitulations  
as Evidence of Early Sonata-Form Logic*

---

**Abstract**

Haydn's "altered recapitulations" have long been considered trademarks of his style and evidence of his virtuosic freedom from convention. In this article I examine and contextualize Haydn's early altered recapitulations, arguing that they did not break with convention, but instead emerged from an earlier set of conventions rooted in baroque binary form, which was then beginning to subsume the double return. I show that Haydn's early recapitulations are not fettered to an underlying rotational logic, confirming the tonic through mostly functional changes and transpositions of expositional material to the tonic. Instead, Haydn's early double returns are only weakly prepared, and they are subsequently undermined by recomposed material, rendering them a temporary sojourn at the tonic, after which the final and more emphatically prepared tonic return arrives only with the commencement of the end-rhyme. Through comparisons between Haydn's practice and that of mid-century composers, these recapitulations emerge not as dialogues with sonata convention, but rather as an important link between Baroque binary form and sonata form of later years.

---

**Keywords**

Sonata form; recapitulation; double return; *Formenlehre*; eighteenth century

---

MUSIC THEORY & ANALYSIS

*International Journal of the Dutch-Flemish Society for Music Theory*

VOLUME 5, # II, OCTOBER 2018, 168–189

article © Yoel Greenberg and Leuven University Press

<https://doi.org/10.11116/MTA.5.2.3>

# *Haydn's Early Altered Recapitulations as Evidence of Early Sonata-Form Logic*

Yoel GREENBERG

The tonic recurrence of the opening theme in the second half of sonata form, or the “double return,” has long been considered one of the form’s most salient trademarks. Although absent from one of the five sonata “types” in James Hepokoski and Warren Darcy’s *Elements of Sonata Theory*, it is nonetheless the most easily recognizable feature of the form, or the event “on which the structure of sonata form depends.”<sup>1</sup> Taken as a signal for the onset of the last large section in sonata form, the recapitulation, the double return brings with it a number of formal expectations, particularly that the recapitulation will behave as a rotation, that is, that the ensuing material will roughly correspond thematically to the sequence of events we have already heard in the exposition. Post-double-return spaces in which the composer deviates radically from this sequence of events are generally referred to as “altered recapitulations,” a designation that reflects their status as exceptions that prove the rule, rather than challenging it. However, in a recent corpus study I demonstrated that the double return in the mid-eighteenth century did not necessarily imply that a thematic rotation would follow.<sup>2</sup> Here, using case studies rather than statistical methods, I argue that Haydn’s treatment of the post-double-return space in some of his early quartets reflects an early sonata-form aesthetic, related to binary forms used by Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach and other composers of the mid-eighteenth century, in which the double return did not necessarily imply the commencement of a closing rotation. I argue that Haydn’s model, like that of his predecessors, rather than emphasizing the double return as the central event in the second half of the movement

---

I would like to thank Uri Rom, Markus Neuwirth, and Shari Greenberg for their helpful comments on the manuscript; Naphtali Wagner for his always stimulating discussions of the music examples; Poundie Burstein, William Caplin, and James Hepokoski for their input on a conference version of the article; and Yossi Goldenberg for his assistance and advice in preparing Schenkerian graphs. Any errors are, of course, my own responsibility.

- 1 James Webster, “Schubert’s Sonata Form and Brahms’s First Maturity,” *19th-Century Music* 2/1 (1978), 18, <https://doi.org/10.1525/ncm.1978.2.1.02a00020>.
- 2 Yoel Greenberg, “Of Beginnings and Ends: A Corpus-Based Inquiry into the Rise of the Recapitulation,” *Journal of Music Theory* 61/2 (2017), 171–200, <https://doi.org/10.1215/00222909-4149546>.

and the start of a closing rotation, gives the double return a local effect only.<sup>3</sup> The double returns in these works are usually brief, with few large-scale thematic and harmonic implications, and are prepared less strongly than the tonic articulated by the end-rhyme.

Framed more broadly, my examination of Haydn's early formal practice and its connections to earlier traditions seeks to problematize the concept of thematic rotation in the early Classical repertoire. Although I do not deny the importance of the recapitulatory rotation in later works,<sup>4</sup> it did not spring, Minerva-like, from sonata form's head. Rather, at this early stage it was only a liminal phenomenon that was already undergoing, but had not yet completed, a gradual process of emergence. In fact, it is questionable whether the term "recapitulation," with its sonata-theory baggage, is at all suitable for the post-double-return space in sonata movements prior to 1770. Nevertheless, the greater appropriateness of terms such as "post-double-return space" and "proto-recapitulation" is outweighed by their unwieldiness. Furthermore, it would be pointless to attempt to demarcate exactly when proto-recapitulations became recapitulations, or what exactly differentiates one from the other. Hence, I refer to the space including and following the double return as a "recapitulation" in the most literal sense: this is where the music returns to the opening notes, whether or not the music adheres to a rotational logic afterward.

## HAYDN'S ALTERED RECAPITULATIONS

Haydn's altered recapitulations have long been considered hallmarks of his style, particularly after 1770. Whether through interpolation of new events, omission of old material, or reordering of expositional material, Haydn's recompositions challenge the clarity of the underlying rotational structure, at times to such an extent that their nature as recapitulations may be questioned. Traditionally taken as evidence of Haydn's creativity,<sup>5</sup> these altered recapitulations have, perhaps paradoxically, taken up the lion's

3 The approach towards the double return as a local signifier rather than a signifier of large-scale form resonates with ideas first presented by Peter A. Hoyt and more recently by Markus Neuwirth and myself. See Peter A. Hoyt, "The 'False Recapitulation' and the Conventions of Sonata Form," (Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1999); Markus Neuwirth, "Verschleierte Reprisen bei Joseph Haydn," in *Joseph Haydn (1732–1809) (= Memoria, Vol. 11)*, ed. Sebastian Urmonet (Berlin: Weidler, 2009), 33–66; Neuwirth, "Reprisen-Phänomene in den frühen Streichquartetten Joseph Haydns und Franz Asplmayers—Ansätze zur Revision eines anachronistischen Sonatenform-Paradigmas," in *Kammermusik im Übergang vom Barock zur Klassik*, ed. Christoph-Hellmut Mahling (Mainz: Villa Musica Rheinland-Pfalz, 2009), 95–124.

4 Paul Wingfield has criticized Hepokoski and Darcy for the axiomatic status given to the rotational principle in general. See Wingfield, "Beyond 'Norms and Deformations': Towards a Theory of Sonata Form as Reception History," *Music Analysis* 27/1 (2008), 149–53, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2249.2008.00283.x>.

5 See, e.g., Donald Francis Tovey, *The Forms of Music* (New York: Meridian, 1956), 217; James Webster, "Freedom of Form in Haydn's Early String Quartets," in Jens Peter Larsen, Howard Serwer, and James Webster (eds.), *Haydn Studies: Proceedings of the International Haydn Conference, Washington, D.C., 1975* (New York: Norton, 1981), 527–30; James Hepokoski

share of the theoretical literature on the recapitulation. Ethan Haimo and Steve Larson have attempted to explain individual compositional decisions through what Evan Bonds has termed a “generative form,” whereby the nature of the musical material justifies departures from standard, or “conformational,” formal models.<sup>6</sup> Haimo and William Caplin invoke characteristics of the exposition and development sections to explain recapitulatory departures from rotational logic.<sup>7</sup> Haimo, Larson, and Caplin all take for granted that the recapitulation is expected to “restate the material of the exposition in roughly the same order as it earlier appeared,”<sup>8</sup> and that a failure to do so demands explanation. Lubov Russakovsky, Markus Neuwirth, and most recently Matthew Riley, in his reformulation of “Haydn’s sonata principle,” have attempted to use Haydn’s ostensibly wayward practice in order to explore the limits of convention, trying to characterize what remains constant within Haydn’s tremendous diversity.<sup>9</sup> Hepokoski and Darcy make repeated references to Haydn’s altered recapitulations, which, in their view, “retain an underlying, readily traceable principle of rotation,” but they emphasize that such radical alterations were idiosyncratic to Haydn, conjecturing that his practice may have been motivated by a vitalistic understanding of form.<sup>10</sup>

Haydn’s later sonata forms have received the most attention, and for good reason: many (although not all) of the recapitulations within the later sonata forms include recompositions that are more radical than those in Haydn’s early works and are therefore both more fertile ground for “generative” form studies and more challenging for “conformational” theories (such as those advanced by Riley and Neuwirth).<sup>11</sup> The focus on

---

and Warren Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late-Eighteenth Century Sonata* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), 233.

- 6 Ethan Haimo, “Haydn’s ‘Altered Reprise,’” *Journal of Music Theory* 32/2 (1988), 335–51, <https://doi.org/10.2307/843439>; Steve Larson, “Recapitulation Recomposition in the Sonata-Form First Movements of Haydn’s String Quartets: Style Change and Compositional Technique,” *Music Analysis* 22/1–2 (2003), 139–77, <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0262-5245.2003.00178.x>. On “generative” and “conformational” form, see Mark E. Bonds, *Wordless Rhetoric: Musical Form and the Metaphor of the Oration* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1991), 13.
- 7 Haimo, “Haydn’s ‘Altered Reprise’”; William E. Caplin, *Classical Form: A Theory of Formal Functions for the Instrumental Music of Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 161.
- 8 Caplin, *Classical Form*, 161.
- 9 Lubov Russakovsky, “The Altered Recapitulation in the First Movements of Haydn’s String Quartets,” *Dutch Journal of Music Theory* 6 (2001), 27–37; Markus Neuwirth, “Does a ‘Monothematic’ Expository Design Have Tautological Implications for the Recapitulation? An Alternative Approach to ‘Altered Recapitulations’ in Haydn,” *Studia Musicologica* 51/3–4 (2010), 369–85, <https://doi.org/10.1556/smus.51.2010.3-4.9>; Matthew Riley, “The Sonata Principle Reformulated for Haydn Post-1770 and a Typology of His Recapitulatory Strategies,” *Journal of the Royal Musical Association* 140/1 (2015), 1–39, <https://doi.org/10.1080/02690403.2015.1008862>.
- 10 Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements*, 233.
- 11 Although all three are indeed conformational to the extent that they attempt to delineate the limits of a preconceived formal convention, they do so in very different ways: Riley attempts to redefine a familiar principle in light of re-examined material, Neuwirth offers the Baroque ritornello scheme as an alternative influence on Haydn’s sonata form,

the later works has buttressed the view of recomposed sections of the recapitulation as “altered,” in dialogue with a sonata-form convention that was well established by the time they were composed. Yet Haydn’s early recapitulations have often been characterized as less varied than they really are.<sup>12</sup>

In this article I will focus on Haydn’s early “altered” recapitulations, comparing his formal practice to that of C. P. E. Bach in the 1740s and 1750s. I will demonstrate that, rather than constituting a dialogue with the conventions of sonata theory as we know it, and rather than constituting an entirely idiosyncratic practice, Haydn’s ostensibly flexible approach to the recapitulation is the residue of an earlier formal aesthetic rooted in binary forms with double returns that did not signify the onset of a recapitulatory rotation. Additionally, most previous studies on modifications within the recapitulation have focused on the purging of redundancies in the first theme, on the reordering of modules vis-à-vis the exposition, and on the omission of S materials.<sup>13</sup> Here, I will focus on changes that occur shortly after the double return in what initially appear to be standard, if radical, modifications of the transition. Such changes are given short shrift in the literature on altered recapitulations and are considered to be necessary results of the different roles and tonal trajectories of the exposition and recapitulation. I will show why such explanations fail in the cases examined, arguing that they reflect a non-rotational model prevalent in earlier binary-form works with a double return, rather than a rotational one with functional modifications.

#### THEMATIC RESTATEMENT IN THE RECAPITULATION

Typically, as described in treatises as early as the late eighteenth century,<sup>14</sup> the recapitulation is expected to consist of three chunks of repetition. The first is normally a

---

and Russakovsky presents an alternative balance to that generally accepted in sonata form, delaying the structural drive to the tonic until after the double return.

12 E.g., Haimo, “Haydn’s ‘Altered Reprise,’” 341.

13 On changes designed to avoid redundancies in the recapitulation, see, e.g., Ethan Haimo, *Haydn’s Symphonic Forms: Essays in Compositional Logic* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), particularly 3–9; Caplin, *Classical Form*, 163. The literature on reordered recapitulations includes Haimo, “Haydn’s ‘Altered Reprise.’” On “mirror” recapitulations, see Charles Rosen, *Sonata Forms*, 2nd rev. ed. (New York: Norton, 1988), 144–45; Timothy L. Jackson, “The Finale of Bruckner’s Seventh Symphony and the Tragic Reversed Sonata Form,” in Timothy L. Jackson and Paul Hawkshaw (eds.), *Bruckner Studies* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 140–208. Hepokoski and Darcy (*Elements*, 368, 383–84) reject the notion of a mirror recapitulation, viewing it instead as a Type 2 sonata with a closing return; but see Wingfield, “Beyond ‘Norms and Deformations,’” 145–46. On local omissions of S materials, see Caplin, *Classical Form*, 169. On wholesale departures from S space, known as “truncated” recapitulations, see James Hepokoski, “Sonata Theory and Dialogic Form,” in William E. Caplin, James Hepokoski, and James Webster, *Musical Form, Forms & Formenlehre: Three Methodological Reflections*, ed. Pieter Bergé (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2010), 71–89; and Caplin’s response to Hepokoski’s essay in that volume.

14 Descriptions of sonata form can be found, for instance, in Heinrich Christoph Koch’s *Versuch einer Anleitung zur*

faithful repetition of all or part of the primary theme zone. The third, a tonic repeat of the secondary key zone that Ratner calls the “end-rhyme,”<sup>15</sup> is a faithfully transposed repetition. The second, referred to as the “transition” or “bridge” section, is normally modified to effect a smooth flow from the first section to the third. It is in the transition that we expect the recapitulation to deviate most from expositional events. Because modulation is no longer necessary in the recapitulation, the transition could theoretically have been omitted in the recapitulation altogether—a common option in mid-century works—but it is generally expected to make a feint to the subdominant, from which it can pick up material from the exposition leading this time from the subdominant to the tonic rather than from the tonic to the dominant.<sup>16</sup> Thus, we expect the transition to be modified in the recapitulation, but not too dramatically, and it will usually maintain a strong kinship with the transition of the exposition, constituting “a compression [...] of its most prominent phrases,” as Heinrich Christoph Koch put it.<sup>17</sup> Koch, like Galeazzi a few years later,<sup>18</sup> described the recapitulation in terms of a thematic rotation, repeating the thematic events of the exposition in order and departing from them only in response to tonal requirements. In more recent accounts, Charles Rosen’s brief characterization of the recapitulation at the start of *Sonata Forms* states that, after the double return, the movement “‘recapitulates’ the exposition as it was first played, [...] with the bridge passage suitably altered so that it no longer leads to the dominant but prepares what follows in the tonic.”<sup>19</sup> William Caplin justifies the destabilization of the home key in the recapitulatory transition as a way “to permit the subordinate theme to sound fresh when transposed into the home key.”<sup>20</sup> Consequently, as a first default, we interpret the introduction of new or modified material following the double return as an instance of the expected modified

---

*Composition* (1793) and in the second volume of Francesco Galeazzi’s *Elementi teorico-pratici di Musica* (1796). See Heinrich Christoph Koch, *Introductory Essay on Composition: The Mechanical Rules of Melody, Sections 3 and 4*, translated by Nancy Kovaleff Baker (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1983), 201; Bathia Churgin, “Francesco Galeazzi’s Description (1796) of Sonata Form,” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 21/2 (1968), 195–97, <https://doi.org/10.1525/jams.1968.21.2.03a00040>.

15 Leonard G. Ratner, *Classic Music: Expression, Form, and Style* (New York: Schirmer, 1980), 212.

16 The practice is referred to in eighteenth-century treatises such as those by Koch (*Introductory Essay on Composition*, 201 [§103 in the 1793 edition]) and Galeazzi (Churgin, “Galeazzi’s Description,” 195–97). As discussed below, Rosen (*Sonata Forms*, 289) cautioned against understanding the turn to the subdominant as an auxiliary device serving the necessary transposition of expositional material, but Hepokoski and Darcy nevertheless argue that the practice is rooted in tonal convenience. Caplin (*Classical Form*, 162) takes a middle path, explaining the emphasis on the subdominant as a means of exploring “flat” tonal regions, but also speaking of the tonicization of the subdominant in the transition as an “adjustment” designed to stay within the home key.

17 Koch, *Introductory Essay on Composition*, 201.

18 Churgin, “Galeazzi’s Description.”

19 Rosen, *Sonata Forms*, 2.

20 Caplin, *Classical Form*, 161. See also Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements*, 231–32; Seth Monahan, “Sonata Theory in the Undergraduate Classroom,” *Journal of Music Theory Pedagogy* 25 (2011), 17.

transition and do not allow modifications, however radical, to challenge our sense of an underlying rotational order.

Although such expectations were reasonable for the late eighteenth-century listener, it is doubtful whether they could have been entertained by listeners a few decades earlier. Double returns appeared in a good number of works in the 1730s and 1740s, but as often as not—the music of Giovanni Battista Sammartini is a good example—they were followed by entirely new material all the way through to the end of the movement.<sup>21</sup> End-rhymes became both longer and more common over the first half of the eighteenth century, but even where double returns were present, the overall aesthetic is usually better understood in terms of binary form with a double return, rather than as sonata form with a full-fledged rotation as a distinct third part.<sup>22</sup> The binary-versus-ternary question is and has always been a thorny issue with sonata form, and if, as James Webster asserts, sonata form is “a synthesis of binary and ternary principles,”<sup>23</sup> then the synthesis in mid-eighteenth-century forms tended to include a significantly larger dose of the binary, whereas later ones became increasingly ternary. Works from the 1740s and 1750s, with which Haydn might have become acquainted during his formative years, frequently introduced a double return in the middle of the second half and concluded with an end-rhyme. But in the interim there would be extensive new material, characterized by a fast tonal pace, sequential fragmentation, excursions to “flat-side” tonal centers, and other aspects of the “loose organization” that is more characteristic of development sections than of recapitulations. Furthermore, the harmonic preparation of the return to the tonic in the double return tended to be less thorough than that in the end-rhyme.

#### C. P. E. BACH: MODIFIED RECAPITULATIONS, OR NO RECAPITULATION AT ALL?

Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach's “Prussian” keyboard sonatas, Wq. 48 (1740–42), are good examples of such forms, especially convenient for the case in hand in that they were composed too early for a rotational norm to have been assumed as a high-level default for organizing the space following the double return. Double returns within this set are typically short (1–4 measures long), followed by sizable recomposed areas (5–15 measures), and concluding with an extensive end-rhyme (12–20 measures). The double returns are also

21 See Bathia Churgin, “The Recapitulation in Sonata-Form Movements of Sammartini and Early Haydn Symphonies,” in Eva Badura-Skoda (ed.), *Proceedings of the International Joseph Haydn Congress* (Munich: G. Henle, 1982), 135–40.

22 Detailed data can be found in Greenberg, “Of Beginnings and Ends.”

23 James Webster, “Sonata Form,” in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/26197> (accessed 25 August 2016).

## Example 1: C. P. E. Bach, Keyboard Sonata in E Major, Wq. 48/3, iii: exposition vs. recapitulation

The image displays a musical score for C. P. E. Bach's Keyboard Sonata in E Major, Wq. 48/3, iii. The score is divided into two systems. The first system shows the Exposition (Exp.) and Recapitulation (Recap.) starting at measure 51. The Recapitulation begins with a 'Double Return' at measure 51, followed by a sequence of measures marked with asterisks (\*). The second system shows the Exposition (Exp.) and Recapitulation (Recap.) starting at measure 61. The Recapitulation includes a 'P Paralle' section and ends with an 'End Rhyme'.

usually unobtrusive. They are frequently arrived at without strong dominant preparation following a non-emphatic half-cadence or, as in the first movement of No. 4, incorporated within a larger sequential process. In many cases, the double return is not preceded by a dominant at all; instead, it abruptly follows a hiatus from the mediant, submediant, or supertonic.<sup>24</sup> The third movement of No. 3, in E major (1741), is a typical example (see Example 1). The double return appears in m. 51 after a vi:PAC and lasts little more than a measure, followed by nine measures (mm. 52–60) that do not correspond to the events in the exposition, leading to a I:HC in m. 60. Mm. 61–63 then reconnect to the 4-3 sequence from mm. 4–6 in the exposition, but whereas m. 6 had carried the F# through a passing E down to a V<sub>5</sub> chord, the recapitulated version instead continues the sequence another measure to arrive back at the tonic and reconnect to the end-rhyme (m. 13, etc. = m. 65, etc.).

24 Motion to the tonic through a hiatus has been frequently noted in the scholarly literature on the Baroque concerto. See, e.g., Paul Everett, *Vivaldi: The Four Seasons and Other Concertos Op. 8* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 41–43; Simon McVeigh and Jehoash Hirshberg, *The Italian Solo Concerto, 1700–1760: Rhetorical Strategies and Style History* (Woodbridge, UK: Boydell, 2004), 18, 135; Michael Talbot, *The Chamber Cantatas of Antonio Vivaldi* (Woodbridge, UK: Boydell, 2006), 57; Bella Brover-Lubovskiy, *Tonal Space in the Music of Antonio Vivaldi* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008), ix. The hiatuses vi–I, ii–I, and iii–I preceding a double return are very common in binary-form movements from the 1740s through the 1770s, particularly in the works of Wilhelm Friedemann and Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach, the Graun brothers, and Johann Adolph Hasse.

Example 2a: C. P. E. Bach, Keyboard Sonata in E Major, Wq. 48/3, iii: Voice-leading analysis of mm. 50–55

Both thematically and harmonically, the double return in Emanuel Bach's sonata is ill-suited to the task of reaffirming the tonic. What is immediately apparent is that it is brief, and that it is not prepared by a dominant but arrived at after a hiatus from a *vi*:PAC. On a deeper level, as Example 2 shows, Bach's recomposition serves to weaken the status of the double return as a structural tonic. Rather than continue the descent of the main theme in m. 52 through an arpeggiated bass as in m. 2, Bach continues with a scalar descent, echoing the beginning of the second half (mm. 25–27 and 30–33). The offshoot of this is that the lowest point of this descent becomes G# in m. 53 (instead of E, as in m. 2), implying a first-inversion tonic, rather than the root-position one at the analogous point in the exposition. Furthermore, upon arrival at m. 54 we realize that the  $I^6$  underlying the double return is better understood within the context of a voice exchange from *vi* to  $V_5^6/ii$  (Example 2a). In the overall motion from *vi* to V in mm. 50–60 (which includes another apparent tonic in m. 57), the first-inversion tonic supporting the double return becomes a foreground event that does not play a part in the overall voice leading (Example 2b).<sup>25</sup>

Interestingly, the newly composed material in mm. 54–60 is not entirely removed from mm. 4–7, which we might have expected to hear recapitulated at that point. The new measures are a highly imaginative metrical augmentation of the series of descending sixths marked by asterisks in Example 1, albeit with entirely different harmony and voice leading. Yet from a rotational point of view, the recomposed measures cannot be seen as standing in for mm. 4–7, not least because mm. 4–7 are subsequently repeated in mm. 61–64.<sup>26</sup> Both the tonal and the thematic implications of Bach's double return are thus

25 Note how mm. 58–60 parallel the entire motion of mm. 50–60.

26 Emanuel Bach may have inserted the nine new measures, mm. 52–60, as compensation for the eight omitted measures, mm. 2–3 and 8–13. The notion of time symmetry has been invoked as a general concept by Robert Morgan and as a central tenet of Classical form by Rosen, Ratner, and (specifically in the context of recapitulations) David Smyth

Example 2b: C. P. E. Bach, Keyboard Sonata in E Major, Wq. 48/3, iii: Voice-leading analysis of mm. 50–60

very local. In the overall context it signifies the beginning of the retransition to the tonic rather than the commencement of a recapitulatory rotation.<sup>27</sup>

Indeed, the smooth spinning-out of the gigue-like theme, the sparsity of cadences in the exposition, and, of course, the date of composition all suggest Baroque binary form rather than sonata form as the likely formal structure of this movement (if such a distinction can be clearly made at all). Yet it is precisely the backward-looking binary framework that makes Bach's handling of the forward-looking double return illuminating for an appreciation of the emerging sonata form. The double return here, as in the other sonatas in the cycle, is not a central structural event, neither tonally nor thematically, and certainly not one that engenders any rotational expectations. It is a local marker of an intermediate tonic, followed only later by a better-prepared final return of the tonic, which will receive its most powerful and final articulation through the end-rhyme.<sup>28</sup> If we think

and Jonathan Guez. See Robert Morgan, "Symmetrical Form and Common-Practice Tonality," *Music Theory Spectrum* 20/1 (1998), 1–47, <https://doi.org/10.1525/mts.1998.20.1.02a00010>; Charles Rosen, *The Classical Style: Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven*, ed. (New York: Norton, 1997), 49–50, 74; Rosen, *Sonata Forms*; Ratner, *Classic Music*; David Smyth, "Large-Scale Rhythm and Classical Form," *Music Theory Spectrum* 12/2 (1990), 236–46, <https://doi.org/10.1525/mts.1990.12.2.02a00040>; Jonathan Guez, "Schubert's Recapitulation Scripts" (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 2015). Yet many post-double-return spaces by Emanuel Bach and his contemporaries show little concern for symmetry with the exposition in terms of proportions (Wilhelm Friedemann Bach's recapitulations are usually half the length of the exposition). Hence, substantiating such a conjecture would require an investigation that is beyond the scope of this article.

27 Beginning the retransition (on new thematic material) in the tonic directly after a hiatus is fairly common in works of the time. See, e.g., m. 88 of C. P. E. Bach's Sonata Wq. 65/28, or m. 63 in W. F. Bach's Sonata Fk 8. Thus, effecting a retransition by bringing the theme together with the tonic, as in our case, would not have been unexpected. Interestingly, in the Teldec recording of this sonata, Bob van Asperen performs the double return at approximately  $\text{♩} = 104$ , significantly slower than the opening theme, which he plays at  $\text{♩} = 116$ . The slower tempo choice suggests an interpretation of the post-double-return section as a retransition culminating in the I:HC of m. 60, rather than as a recapitulation. See Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach, *Prussian Sonatas, Württemberg Sonatas*, Bob van Asperen, harpsichord; Teldec Classics, 9031-77623-2 (1992).

28 For a similar formal layout in movements in a more galant style, see Wq. 48/2, i and Wq. 62/7, i and iii. For a discussion of Wq. 62/7, see Greenberg, "Beginnings and Ends." All these movements feature weak preparation of a double return that is immediately destabilized through new material. The recomposed section reconnects briefly to P material followed by a cursory return to P material in the tonic, finally moving to an extended end rhyme.

of the post-double-return space as a recapitulatory rotation, a curious result of the new material following the double return is that whereas the exposition had the continuous layout one might expect of the first part of a Baroque binary form, the recapitulation is punctuated by a I:HC MC (m. 60). Although this is not unheard-of, appearing in a number of Haydn's movements, in such an early movement it would make more sense to understand the half-cadence in m. 60 as punctuating not a recapitulation, but rather the entire second half, the structure of which could then be described thus:

Development	Double return + retransition	P-parallel + end-rhyme
mm. 27–50	mm. 51–60	mm. 61–78
V→vi:PAC	I→I:HC	I

It is also worth noting the role of the flattened seventh scale degree in m. 54, which in later works would become associated with the traditional feint toward the subdominant shortly after the double return. Charles Rosen has cautioned that it is a “mistake to identify the appearance of the subdominant” at this point “with the necessary alteration of harmony to transform an exposition that goes from tonic to dominant into a recapitulation that remains in the tonic.”<sup>29</sup> What Rosen is implying is that after the double return, the commitment to rotational practices was only one of several generic possibilities, with strategies such as the subdominant feint within the primary theme zone constituting alternative, and even contradictory, options. Hepokoski and Darcy, for whom the rotational principle is of foundational status in sonata form, disagree with Rosen, maintaining instead that cases of non-functional subdominant feints should be viewed “as if nodding toward the practice that was obligatory in the more common [...] situations.”<sup>30</sup> The sonata Wq. 48/3 and similar cases, such as the first movement of Wq. 48/2 (1742) and the first and third movements of Wq. 62/7 (1744), all composed before generic recapitulatory stereotypes could have formed, are possible evidence in favor of Rosen's hypothesis.

Emanuel Bach was not the only one to abandon expositional events after the double return. Bathia Churgin has observed the ubiquity of “varied recapitulations” in Sammartini's symphonies, as has Eugene Wolf in works of the Mannheim school.<sup>31</sup> Of course, the terminology is misleading: “varied recapitulation” implies an underlying expectation of a recapitulation that is unfulfilled, or “varied,” by the composer, whereas the high frequency of these cases in the early to mid-eighteenth century suggests that such expectations were

29 Rosen, *Sonata Forms*, 289.

30 Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements*, 236.

31 See Churgin, “The Recapitulation in Sonata-Form Movements,” 135–40; Eugene K. Wolf, *The Symphonies of Johann Stamitz: A Study in the Formation of the Classic Style* (Utrecht: Bohn, 1981).

unlikely. The double return had none of the familiar sonata-related associations that it would subsequently develop, such as long-term tonal closure or recapitulatory rotation, serving instead as a local thematic marker of the return to the tonic. Only later, and even then only gradually, did it assume the significance attached to it by theorists of sonata form.

Bach was to continue producing thoroughly recomposed sections after a brief double return in later works, too. Examples abound, including both outer movements of the sonatas Wq. 62/7 (1744), Wq. 62/9, and Wq. 62/10 (1749), and the first movements of the sonatas Wq. 62/13 (1752) and Wq. 62/19 (1757). In fact, Wq. 62/19, which is contemporary with Haydn's earliest keyboard works and string quartets, features a mere two-measure double return followed by twenty measures of new material before concluding with only eight measures of end-rhyme. Meanwhile, Bach increasingly composed works exhibiting a clear conception of the recapitulation as a complete rotation, with the kind of adaptations of transitional material recommended by late eighteenth-century theoreticians.

#### HAYDN'S QUARTET OP. 2 NO. 1

It is therefore not surprising to find a similar variety in Haydn's early quartets, too.<sup>32</sup> Many of these, and indeed some of his late ones as well, conform to Koch's and Galeazzi's descriptions.<sup>33</sup> Op. 1 Nos. 2 and 5, and Op. 9 No. 2, only slightly modify or shorten the material from the exposition, and Op. 1 No. 4 makes no modifications whatsoever, plunging directly into the subdominant in measure 117 (Example 3).

Yet, other cases are not so easy to understand in terms of Koch's rotational logic. For example, some aspects of the first movement of Haydn's String Quartet Op. 2 No. 1, in A major (ca. 1760), are better understood as having been inherited from the kind of binary forms with a double return typical of C. P. E. Bach and his contemporaries, rather than as being in dialogue with sonata form. The double return, although a firmer statement of the tonic than in Bach's sonata, is nonetheless noteworthy for its brevity (mm. 71–73). Instead of continuing with a dominant-to-tonic repetition of the first three measures, as in mm. 4–6 of the exposition, the recapitulation introduces seven new measures (mm. 74–80; see Example 4). Hepokoski and Darcy note the practice of quoting “enough of an incipit to recall the corresponding zone of the exposition (as if marking the arrival of a station), then significantly rework[ing] the material of that zone.” The incipit, they write, reflects “a synecdochic strategy, in which a telling part of a theme (its

32 The variety of Haydn's techniques and its parallels in contemporary quartets by Asplmayer has been observed and discussed with similar conclusions by Neuwirth (“Reprise-Phänomene”); see especially 103 onwards.

33 Haimo suggests that Galeazzi's description may have been based on early Haydn (Haimo, “Haydn's ‘Altered Reprise,’” 336).

Example 3: Haydn, String Quartet Op. 1 No. 4, i, mm. 13–19 vs. mm. 113–119

The image displays two systems of musical notation for Haydn's String Quartet Op. 1 No. 4, i. The first system covers measures 13 to 19, and the second system covers measures 113 to 119. Both systems are in G major and 3/8 time. The notation includes four staves: Violin I, Violin II, Viola, and Cello/Double Bass. Dynamics are marked as *p* (piano) and *f* (forte). Roman numerals are placed below the bass staff of each system to indicate harmonic structure: I, V, V, I, I for the first system and I, V, V, I, IV for the second system.

opening) is made to stand for a recapturing of the whole of it.”<sup>34</sup> According to such a reading, an eighteenth-century real-time listener would have assumed that the three-measure incipit stood in for the entire primary theme zone, whereas the subsequent measures (mm. 74–81) would be a recomposition of the bridge, designed to reconnect to the end-rhyme. Indeed, the recomposed measures depart from the periodic structure of the exposition, with its straightforward motion from tonic to dominant and back again, introducing instead a texture more typical of transitions or developmental spaces with a

34 Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements*, 233.

fluid sequence, descending stepwise with quickened harmonic pace through a diatonic series of alternating 4/2 and 6/3 chords, and concluding with a half-cadence. This would have been an effective strategy for recapitulating a hypothetical expositional V:HC MC, yet the exposition included no such medial caesura at all, having instead followed a fairly common alternate layout to that offered by Koch.<sup>35</sup> Furthermore, and more significantly, in m. 81 (following the recomposed section) Haydn picks up from the tonic material from m. 7 as if no changes had occurred, and the real tonal correction of expositional material takes place with minimal fuss at the end of m. 87. Haydn's detour in mm. 74–80, though aesthetically gratifying, is thus completely superfluous from a formal point of view.<sup>36</sup> The hypothetical eighteenth-century listener familiar with the norms described by Hepokoski and Darcy would have had to abandon his or her synecdochic reading of the brief double return as representing the entire primary theme zone, instead interpreting it as an instance of “surprising interpolations into recapitulatory space” encountered “primarily in earlier composers around midcentury.”<sup>37</sup>

Yet, as also noted by Neuwirth, it is worth dwelling on the assumptions that underlie terms such as “interpolations,” “incipits,” and “synecdoche,” all of which imply that the double return signifies the onset of a recapitulatory rotation, and consequently that any non-rotational gestures should be understood as “interpolations” or “reworkings” that would have “surprised” the mid-eighteenth-century listener.<sup>38</sup> In the case of the quartet composed around 1760, not long after precedents such as the one by Emanuel Bach discussed above, it is doubtful whether listeners would have encountered enough examples of “normative” recapitulatory rotations earlier to make such a dialogic interpretation possible (although a dialogue with Emanuel Bach's practice would have been feasible). Furthermore, with the three-measure double return flanked on either side by cascading cycles of fifths, the first eleven measures long and the second seven measures long, to interpret the double return as the beginning of a closing rotation is to have the tail wag the dog. The “recomposed” measures, although diatonic in A major, do not consolidate the tonic in the stable manner usually associated with the recapitulation, but instead seem closer to the style of the (non-diatonic) sequence preceding the double return, in what

35 See L. Poundie Burstein, “Mid-Section Cadences in Haydn's Sonata-Form Movements,” *Studia Musicologica* 51/1–2 (2010), 91–107, <https://doi.org/10.1556/smus.51.2010.1-2.7>. We encountered a similar asymmetry in C. P. E. Bach's sonata discussed above. Differences in design between the exposition and the recapitulation in Haydn's works are discussed in Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements*, 239.

36 Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements*, 236. For the notion of formal superfluity see Caplin, *Classical Form*, 15, 81.

37 Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements*, 234.

38 Neuwirth, “Reprises-Phänomene” and “Surprise without a Cause? ‘False Recapitulations’ in the Classical Repertoire and the Modern Paradigm of Sonata Form,” *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Musiktheorie* 10/2 (2013), 259–91, <https://doi.org/10.31751/722>.

Example 4: Haydn, String Quartet Op. 2 No. 1, i: comparison of exposition (mm. 1–8) and recapitulation (mm. 71–82)

may be termed a “secondary retransition.” A comparison of mm. 71–80 with mm. 58–70 (Example 5) shows how Haydn’s development arrives at a convincing vi:PAC (like Emanuel Bach’s) in m. 58, followed by what appears to be a regaining of the tonic through a hiatus, which is hinted at by the  $\hat{4}-\hat{3}-\hat{2}-\hat{1}$  motion. Yet, rather than proceeding to the double return, Haydn backtracks to the submediant by introducing an F# in m. 59, continuing with a descending real sequence that runs through a segment of the circle of fifths before arriving at the dominant. The beginning of the recapitulation is essentially a repetition of this process, but with more of a commitment to the tonic: the weak hint at the tonic in mm. 58–59 is paralleled by the double return, and the real sequence is replaced by a tonal sequence, with a similar octave coupling in the treble. As a result, the brief double return, sandwiched between two emphatic dominant drives, feels more like an abortive attempt to regain the tonic (the hesitant echo in the viola and cello in mm. 73–74 can be heard to be staging this reading theatrically) before being overrun by further retransitional material in mm. 74–80. Such a reading undermines both the rotational and the long-term tonal significance the double return might have assumed, positing instead a definitive return to both expositional material and tonic key only in m. 81.

To be sure, for the listener well versed in late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century instrumental music, hearing mm. 58–80 in the way I propose requires some degree of mental acrobatics. We are so accustomed to hearing the double return as the start of a

Example 5: Haydn, String Quartet Op. 2 No. 1, i: parallel between retransition (mm. 58–70) and start of recapitulation (mm. 71–80)

The image displays two systems of musical notation for Haydn's String Quartet Op. 2 No. 1, i. The first system, measures 58-70, is annotated with 'Tonic hint' and 'Real Sequence (cycle of fifths) with octave coupling' leading to 'I:HC'. The second system, measures 71-80, is annotated with 'Tonic' and 'Tonal Sequence with octave coupling' leading to 'I:HC'. A dashed line connects the end of the first system to the beginning of the second system, indicating a parallel structure between the retransition and the start of the recapitulation.

new structural unit that hearing it as an aborted attempt or as a non-final recapitulatory gesture runs contrary to our schematic expectations—unless, of course, another double return appears later, in which case we reinterpret the first one as a “false recapitulation.”<sup>39</sup> Yet considering the prevalence of cases such as the one by Emanuel Bach discussed above in the 1750s and 1760s, it is unlikely that a listener at the time would have had the same schematic expectations we do. Consequently, the new material following the double return would not have been experienced as an interpolation or a “writing over,” but rather as a continuation of the developmental action.<sup>40</sup> A useful, if perhaps equally anachronistic, way for the modern-day listener to appreciate the work on eighteenth-century terms would be to think of the double return as a “false recapitulation” within a Type 2 sonata, that is, a false recapitulation not followed by another, “true” double return.

39 As pointed out by Peter Hoyt, Markus Neuwirth, and others, the term is an unfortunate one and does not reflect contemporary modes of listening. Hoyt’s line of reasoning is somewhat akin to the one I propose here. See Hoyt, “The ‘False Recapitulations’”; Neuwirth, “Surprise without a Cause?”

40 It is essential to distinguish between the developmental space, which is irrelevant here, and developmental action, which can occur anywhere in the movement. See Peter A. Hoyt, “The Concept of *Développement* in the Early Nineteenth Century,” in *Music Theory in the Age of Romanticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 141–62.

## HAYDN'S STRING QUARTET OP. 9 NO. 6

An even more radical altered recapitulation occurs in the first movement of Haydn's String Quartet Op. 9 No. 6, also in A major, composed in 1769. (A comparison of the melodic lines of the exposition and the recapitulation may be found in Example 6, but readers are encouraged to consult the full score.) The three-part exposition opens with an asymmetrical seven-measure phrase consisting of three vigorous *mezzo-forte* measures in the "hunt" topic, answered by four measures of a more lyrical, *piano* response, which culminate on a I:IAC. Haydn now repeats the three-measure hunting call an octave lower, suggesting a compound period;<sup>41</sup> but instead of completing the sentence with four more measures leading to a I:PAC or completing the consequent with a modulation, he suspends syntax in a strange, hovering, *pastorella*-like seven-measure prolongation of the dominant seventh with a pedal point in the second violin on E (hence the "hovering theme"). In m. 18 the music resumes with what may be understood as the completion of a modulatory consequent begun in mm. 8–10, resulting in an energetic transition and culminating in an emphatic V:HC MC in m. 25. The elaborate second theme group starts with virtuoso sixteenths for the first violin (S1.1), continues with a lengthy syncopated idea that seems to get stuck in a loop, and then cadences emphatically with a V:PAC in m. 41 (S1.2).

The development section starts with an exact quotation of the hovering idea in its original tonality, followed by a quotation in the subdominant of the opening theme. The rest of the development section is dedicated to spinning out the first violin's sixteenth-note passages, spelling out a grandly scaled harmonic progression of VI–V<sup>6</sup>–V/IV–IV–V to lead into the recapitulation.

Although the recapitulation begins with a significant and tonally unequivocal double return (mm. 86–100), it differs from the exposition in that the beginning of the recapitulated consequent (mm. 93–95) is cast in the parallel minor. In m. 101, however, after repeating four measures of the hovering theme, Haydn drives it into a powerful half-cadence (V<sup>6</sup>–I–ii<sup>6</sup>–vii<sup>o</sup>/V–V), which he then reiterates, this time prolonged over ten majestic measures of new material based on a combination of materials from the beginning of the expositional transition (mm. 18–20) with P material (compare mm. 4–6 with mm. 105–108) and ending up with a PAC (m. 113) that is roughly a transposition down a fifth of the cadence in mm. 40–41.<sup>42</sup> The obvious thing to do at this point would have been

41 Caplin, *Classical Form*, 65.

42 The loosely organized recombination of thematic material above a majestic dominant pedal is characteristic of what Robert Morgan has called the "coda as culmination," and Scott Burnham an "apotheosis." Of course, their examples were composed considerably later than Op. 9, and our case can hardly be considered a coda, yet it nevertheless brings with it a comparable dramatic force that perhaps overshadows the remainder of the movement. See Robert

Example 6: Haydn, String Quartet Op. 9 No. 6, i: comparison of melodic lines in the exposition and recapitulation

The image displays a musical score for Example 6, comparing the Exposition (Exp.) and Recapitulation (Recap.) of Haydn's String Quartet Op. 9 No. 6, i. The score is in G major, 3/4 time, and consists of six systems. Each system shows a melodic line from the Exposition and its corresponding line in the Recapitulation. Annotations highlight specific features: "Double Return" and "Minor version" in the first system; "Recap of 'hovering theme'" and "Swerve towards dominant" in the second system; "Extension of swerve toward dominant" and "'false' end rhyme (cf. m 42)" in the third system; "2nd theme not recapitulated" in the fourth system; and "Return to 'hovering theme'" and "End Rhyme" in the sixth system. Chord symbols like I<sub>6</sub>, ii<sub>6</sub>, vii°/V, and VI 1 are also present.

to continue to a tonic version of the closing group—from mm. 42 onward—forgoing recapitulation of the second theme group. With its thematic resemblance to the transition, the recomposed area would then have constituted a radical manifestation of the kind of recomposition of the bridge described by Koch. But instead, Haydn backtracks, bringing back the hovering theme for the fourth time (!) in the movement in the same key. Despite

P. Morgan, "Coda as Culmination: The First Movement of the 'Eroica' Symphony," in *Music Theory and the Exploration of the Past*, ed. Christopher Bernstein and David W. Hatch (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993) 357–76; Scott Burnham, *Beethoven Hero* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995). See also Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements*, 286–87.

Haydn's extensive recomposition, the identity of the material in mm. 96–97 and 114–115 makes the intervening material, its considerable rhetoric force notwithstanding, formally superfluous. Interestingly, Haydn nonetheless avoids recapitulating S1.1, perhaps because the dominant prolongation takes up enough space as it is, or because thematic material from the beginning of the secondary theme zone is so ubiquitous in the development section (including a significant tonic restatement in mm. 79–82).<sup>43</sup> Either way, Haydn abandons his restatement of the hovering idea after only two measures, proceeding directly to the end-rhyme (S1.2) in mm. 116–133, the tonic equivalent of mm. 34–51. In a musical narrative worthy of *Tristram Shandy*, to which the composer's style has been compared,<sup>44</sup> Haydn goes through all the necessary recapitulatory moves in an elaborate, even flamboyant fashion, only to then disregard them entirely, go back to where he started, and take an easy, even flippant way out.

The recomposition of the bridge in Op. 9 No. 6, thus resembles that in Op. 2 No. 1 in that, if we insist on understanding its role in terms of tonal modification of the exposition, it can only be understood as a failure, or an enactment of one. In other words, it does not succeed in effecting the tonal change required of the recomposed bridge in the recapitulation. It also resembles and even outstrips Op. 2 No. 1 in the forceful dominant drive in the recomposed section. Here the dominant preparation is magnificently extended over 11 measures, which—although thematically based on earlier material and harmonically extending the harmonic progression on a grand scale from mm. 99<sup>3</sup> to 102 (compare Examples 7c and 7d)—nevertheless constitutes a dramatic digression from the exposition. Russakovsky and Neuwirth have both suggested that increased emphasis on the dominant in the recapitulation can “compensate” for a relatively weak preparation of the tonic in the retransition, as is indeed the case here.<sup>45</sup> Yet it is worth noting that, as in Op. 2 No. 1, there is a strong kinship in harmony and voice leading between the retransition and the recomposed section (compare Examples 7d and 7b). And whereas the dominant preceding the double return lasted only one measure, that preceding the end-rhyme is more than five times as long, straddling mm. 104–109, and is articulated with an impressive dominant pedal in the cello. As in Op. 2 No. 1, the double return here is sandwiched between two powerful drives to the dominant, the second more emphatic than the first. Furthermore,

43 The idea of deletions within the recapitulation resulting from events in the development has been noted, among others, by Rosen (*Sonata Forms*, 288) and Caplin (*Classical Form*, 169).

44 Mark Evan Bonds, “Haydn, Laurence Sterne, and the Origins of Musical Irony,” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 44/1 (1991), 57–91, <https://doi.org/10.1525/jams.1991.44.1.03a00030>.

45 Russakovsky, “Altered Recapitulation,” 27, 32; Neuwirth, “Does a ‘Monothematic’ Expository Design Have Tautological Implications for the Recapitulation? An Alternative Approach to ‘Altered Recapitulations’ in Haydn,” *Studia Musicologica* 51, no. 3 (2010): 377.

Example 7: Common background and separate middleground graphs for Haydn's String Quartet Op. 9 No. 6, i: (a) background

(b) mm. 81–85

(c) mm. 99–102

the recasting of mm. 93–95 in the minor mode not only undermines the rotational faithfulness of the post-double-return space, but it does so by belying the tonic stability that we normally associate with the recapitulatory space.<sup>46</sup>

46 The status of a detour to the minor mode as a destabilizing device is debatable. In many mid-century expositions, resolving a cadence in the dominant minor rather than the major helps delay the stable resolution implied by the EEC. In *Sonata Forms* Rosen views appearances of the tonic minor in the recapitulation as a “subdominant substitute” (e.g., p. 155), which can help set the reappearance of the second theme in relief (p. 110). Yet some tonic minor substitutions, particularly in Mozart, may be seen as an attempt to avoid straightforward repetition. The topic, in any case, is too broad to breach in the confines of this article.

(d) mm. 103–108

The image shows a musical score for two staves, treble and bass clef, in the key of D major. The treble staff contains a melodic line with a double return structure. The first return is marked with a bracket and the Roman numeral  $I_6$ . The second return is marked with a bracket and the Roman numeral  $V$ . The bass staff contains a bass line with a similar double return structure. The first return is marked with a bracket and the Roman numeral  $V/IV$ . The second return is marked with a bracket and the Roman numeral  $IV$ . The final cadence is marked with a bracket and the Roman numeral  $V$ . The score is annotated with a large bracket above the treble staff and a large bracket below the bass staff, indicating the overall structure of the double return. The Roman numerals  $I_6$ ,  $V/IV$ ,  $IV$ , and  $V$  are placed below the respective notes in the treble staff. The Roman numeral  $V$  is placed below the final note in the bass staff. The score is annotated with a large bracket above the treble staff and a large bracket below the bass staff, indicating the overall structure of the double return.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

It would not be absolutely impossible to read both Op. 2 No. 1 and Op. 9 No. 6 in terms of “recompositions” of P material with an underlying recapitulatory rotational structure, yet it would require a good deal of what Wingfield has called “analytical gymnastics,”<sup>47</sup> repeated invocations of Hepokoski and Darcy’s notion of “writing over,”<sup>48</sup> and extensive “cherry-picking,” or selective culling of evidence from the score. Yet one cannot help wondering what is to be gained by such a reading, which essentially seeks to force works composed before 1770 into a set of norms formulated on the basis of works composed mostly in the 1780s and 1790s. This is all the more true when we consider just how similar many of Haydn’s would-be “plays with convention”—writings over, interpolations, incipits-as-synecdoches, and the like—are to common practice in binary works of the preceding decades, during which it would be a stretch to posit a recapitulatory rotation as an underlying structure.

Instead, if we are to understand these works within the context of contemporary formal practices, we must appreciate that the double return in mid-century works did not necessarily imply the beginning of a closing thematic rotation or the commencement of a final confirmation of the tonic. To be sure, the closing tonic rotation—the recapitulation—was emerging between 1740 and 1770: Double returns were gradually becoming longer, giving a more stable sense of the tonic, and an increasing number of works included a clear conception of a complete thematic rotation following the double return. Yet it would be a mistake to understand those works from that period that include extensive sections of newly composed material after the double return as a dialogue with a convention that

47 Wingfield, “Beyond ‘Norms and Deformations,’” 151.

48 Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements*, 214.

was not yet firmly established; rather, they represent residues of existing and accepted practices. The final confirmation of the tonic in these works commences not at the double return, but after the recomposed section, in the end-rhyme.

Haydn's early works do not slavishly follow the forms of Emanuel Bach and his contemporaries, and they contain much that heralds the emerging sonata-form aesthetic. But their indebtedness to earlier formal traditions must not be overlooked if we do not wish to be guilty of anachronism. Nor are these works "transitional" stages between binary form and sonata form, at least not any more than Haydn's late forms are between his early ones and Beethoven's. Sonata form was in a state of constant flux, so in one sense, perhaps, any formal practice should be viewed as transitional. Hence, any categorization of these works as closer to sonata form than to binary form, or vice versa, will depend more on our definitions of these forms than on any compositional truth. To situate Haydn's early compositions within contemporary practice allows us to appreciate their unique position within the evolutionary trajectory of musical form, and to enjoy their aesthetics while embracing both where they came from and where they were going.

---

### **Abstract**

Haydn's "altered recapitulations" have long been considered trademarks of his style and evidence of his virtuosic freedom from convention. In this article I examine and contextualize Haydn's early altered recapitulations, arguing that they did not break with convention, but instead emerged from an earlier set of conventions rooted in baroque binary form, which was then beginning to subsume the double return. I show that Haydn's early recapitulations are not fettered to an underlying rotational logic, confirming the tonic through mostly functional changes and transpositions of expositional material to the tonic. Instead, Haydn's early double returns are only weakly prepared, and they are subsequently undermined by recomposed material, rendering them a temporary sojourn at the tonic, after which the final and more emphatically prepared tonic return arrives only with the commencement of the end-rhyme. Through comparisons between Haydn's practice and that of mid-century composers, these recapitulations emerge not as dialogues with sonata convention, but rather as an important link between Baroque binary form and sonata form of later years.

---

### **About the Author**

Yoel Greenberg is a senior lecturer in the department of music at Bar-Ilan University and violist with the Carmel Quartet. An alumnus of Hebrew University and Princeton University, his research interests, published in leading journals in music theory, musicology,

and artificial intelligence, include the evolution of classical form from a systems-theory perspective; the reciprocal influences of music and the arts in the early twentieth century; and computerized recognition of style. His article “On Beginnings and Ends,” published in the *Journal of Music Theory*, received the 2018 Kraehenbuehl Award and was a finalist for the Society of Music Theory’s Emerging Scholar Award. He is currently working on a book on the emergence of sonata form, to be published with Oxford University Press.

# Table of Contents

MUSIC THEORY & ANALYSIS | VOLUME 5, # II, OCTOBER 2018

---

## ARTICLES

- 117 Zachary CAIRNS, *Interval-Class Succession Graphs in Edison Denisov's Sonata for Alto Saxophone and Piano*
- 147 Kyle FYR, *Ravel's Evolving Treatment of Leading Tones*
- 168 Yoel GREENBERG, *Haydn's Early Altered Recapitulations as Evidence of Early Sonata-Form Logic*

---

## ANALYTICAL VIGNETTES

- 190 Caitlin MARTINKUS, *Thematic Expansion and Elements of Variation in Schubert's C Major Symphony, D. 944/i*
- 203 Christopher SEGALL, *Rondo⇒Sonata Conversion: The Finale of Beethoven's String Quartet in C Minor, Op. 18 No. 4*

---

## PEDAGOGY

- 216 Peter SCHUBERT, *Zarlino's First-Species Illustrations: 100% Transparent!*

---

## BOOK REVIEWS

- 227 Stephanie PROBST, Review of Patrick Boenke and Birger Petersen (eds), *Musikalische Logik und musikalischer Zusammenhang*
- 236 Derek REMEŠ, Review of Johannes Menke, *Kontrapunkt II: Die Musik des Barock*

ISBN 978-94-6165-280-5



9 789461 652805